

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 070048

Sale Date - 1/24/2007

Question Submitted: 1/14/2007

Question Number: 1

The sign supports (Ref 17) will require a new Ground Mounted Beam Support Foundation pay item. The general summary instructs us to see proposal note for Guardrail, Type 5, and Noise Barrier bid items. Is this referencing the proposal note for steel price adjustment? We can not find any other specific note in the proposal regarding the guardrail or noise barrier.

Question Submitted: 1/14/2007

Question Number: 2

The sign supports (Ref 17) will require a new Ground Mounted Beam Support Foundation pay item. The general summary instructs us to see proposal note for Guardrail, Type 5, and Noise Barrier bid items. Is this referencing the proposal note for steel price adjustment? We can not find any other specific note in the proposal regarding the guardrail or noise barrier.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2007

Question Number: 3

If the contractor elects to use an alternate post spacing rather than that shown in the plans, can we assume that the drilled shaft depths will remain unchanged as was the case on a similar project let in the same District? If the shaft depths will change, please inform the contractors what to use for various bay lengths and wall heights.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2007

Question Number: 4

1. Is the entire embankment to be built with aggregate as stated on sheet 6/171 or just the drainage layer shown in the typical sections? 2. There are no pay items for the Granular Material, Type E or Geotextile Fabric called out for use in the slope repair section. 3. The list of approved absorptive concrete noise barrier suppliers on sheet 10/171 is not current. Please revise this list to include all suppliers currently approved by ODOT. 4. Please review the list of approved absorptive metal noisewall suppliers on sheet 10/171. To our knowledge, at least one of these suppliers no longer manufactures this product. We request that the department allow the use of reflective fiberglass systems for the bridges as an alternative to the aluminum noisewall. This will help prevent the contractor from being placed in a sole-source supplier situation. 5. The noisewall method of measurement states that no wall constructed below grade or behind barriers will be measured for payment. This is not typical for recent ODOT projects. Since the plans show elevations and bottom of wall lines below proposed grades, please revise this note to include payment for the entire wall area from bottom of wall panel to top of wall coping. 6. Please clarify the following issues regarding the noisewall basis of payment on sheet 9/171: a. The note states that all excavation and backfill are included for payment with the wall. No quantities for this work are provided in the noisewall cross sections and it is unrealistic to expect all potential bidders to scale or digitize each individual section for this project. We request that this work be paid for with the established excavation and embankment bid items or that quantities be provided to the bidders. b. The note states that aggregate drains are to be included with the walls for payment. No aggregate drains are shown in the plans. Please delete this portion of the note. c. The note states that seeding, watering, fertilizing, and mulching are to be included with the walls for payment. Since there are already items for temporary and permanent erosion control work in the plans, we request that the work around the noisewalls also be paid for with these items. This will help eliminate possible conflicts between the contractor and the owner when this work is performed. 7. The Noise Barrier (Absorptive) note on sheet 9/171 states that the concrete shall be tinted light beige. Unless clarified by addendum, we assume this to mean that the precast elements shall be colored through the use of one of the ODOT approved coatings from a supplier on the Noise Barrier Concrete Panel Sealer/Coating Specification referred to on sheet 8/171.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/15/2007

Question Number: 5

1. Is the entire embankment to be built with aggregate as stated on sheet 6/171 or just the drainage layer shown in the typical sections? 2. There are no pay items for the Granular Material, Type E or Geotextile Fabric called out for use in the slope repair section. 3. The list of approved absorptive concrete noise barrier suppliers on sheet 10/171 is not current. Please revise this list to include all suppliers currently approved by ODOT. 4. Please review the list of approved absorptive metal noisewall suppliers on sheet 10/171. To our knowledge, at least one of these suppliers no longer manufactures this product. We request that the department allow the use of reflective fiberglass systems for the bridges as an alternative to the aluminum noisewall. This will help prevent the contractor from being placed in a sole-source supplier situation. 5. The noisewall method of measurement states that no wall constructed below grade or behind barriers will be measured for payment. This is not typical for recent ODOT projects. Since the plans show elevations and bottom of wall lines below proposed grades, please revise this note to include payment for the entire wall area from bottom of wall panel to top of wall coping. 6. Please clarify the following issues regarding the noisewall basis of payment on sheet 9/171: a. The note states that all excavation and backfill are included for payment with the wall. No quantities for this work are provided in the noisewall cross sections and it is unrealistic to expect all potential bidders to scale or digitize each individual section for this project. We request that this work be paid for with the established excavation and embankment bid items or that quantities be provided to the bidders. b. The note states that aggregate drains are to be included with the walls for payment. No aggregate drains are shown in the plans. Please delete this portion of the note. c. The note states that seeding, watering, fertilizing, and mulching are to be included with the walls for payment. Since there are already items for temporary and permanent erosion control work in the plans, we request that the work around the noisewalls also be paid for with these items. This will help eliminate possible conflicts between the contractor and the owner when this work is performed. 7. The Noise Barrier (Absorptive) note on sheet 9/171 states that the concrete shall be tinted light beige. Unless clarified by addendum, we assume this to mean that the precast elements shall be colored through the use of one of the ODOT approved coatings from a supplier on the Noise Barrier Concrete Panel Sealer/Coating Specification referred to on sheet 8/171.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2007

Question Number: 6

If the contractor elects to use an alternate post spacing rather than that shown in the plans, can we assume that the drilled shaft depths will remain unchanged as was the case on a similar project let in the same District? If the shaft depths will change, please inform the contractors what to use for various bay lengths and wall heights.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2007

Question Number: 7

The note on sheet 165 calls out for work to be paid with Item 606 - Special Noise Barrier Panel, APP. No such item exists.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2007

Question Number: 8

The note on sheet 165 calls out for work to be paid with Item 606 - Special Noise Barrier Panel, APP. No such item exists.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2007

Question Number: 9

The method of measurement note on plan sheet 9 states that the square feet of noise barrier constructed behind concrete parapet or below the ground line shall not be included for payment. This is inconsistent with recent projects (including the I-275 project 060414) which have included payment for noise wall from bottom of panel to top of panel. In order to have fair and equal bids between bidders, the entire wall area should be paid for as it is impossible to measure the portion of wall that would be incidental at any location.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2007

Question Number: 10

The method of measurement note on plan sheet 9 states that the square feet of noise barrier constructed behind concrete parapet or below the ground line shall not be included for payment. This is inconsistent with recent projects (including the I-275 project 060414) which have included payment for noise wall from bottom of panel to top of panel. In order to have fair and equal bids between bidders, the entire wall area should be paid for as it is impossible to measure the portion of wall that would be incidental at any location.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 11

The note on sheet 7 for Consultant for Concrete Quality refers to SS898. This supplemental specification does not appear to apply to drilled shaft concrete. Also, per 898.10, the first 3 truckloads each day will need to be tested for air. This will essentially require a technician to be on-site for the entire duration of the drilled shaft installation. Is this the department's intent and is this work necessary for this project?

This is the District's standard note for concrete testing. We do want at least one concrete testing technician the entire duration of the drilled shaft installation to perform the required concrete tests. Bid according to the note.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 12

1. There were several questions in Addendum #2 regarding the method of measurement that were answered based on the standard plan insert sheets. This question has been posed on all recent projects because much of the information on the plan insert sheets no longer applies; they are simply outdated. The answer that Project 060414 used this method of measurement is wrong. Please refer to Addendum #6 from Project 060414 which revised the method of measurement note. Additional examples include Project 050183, Addendum #4 and Project 050007, Addendum #1 which were both in District 8 and also recent Project 060468, Addendum #4 from District 12. All of these projects paid for the noisewall from bottom of panel to top of coping. The extra wall area below grade on this project will be tens of thousands of square feet which will result in hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is unfair to the bidders to make us assume the risk for this quantity of wall and it is not typical with recent ODOT practice. Please revise the quantities accordingly. 2. Addendum #2 states that the bridge mounted noisewall on this project is the same as that allowed for HAM-275-21.52. Please refer to Addendum #6 from said project which allowed the use of lightweight fiberglass materials. We request that the notes on this project also be modified accordingly.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 13

The note on sheet 7 for Consultant for Concrete Quality refers to SS898. This supplemental specification does not appear to apply to drilled shaft concrete. Also, per 898.10, the first 3 truckloads each day will need to be tested for air. This will essentially require a technician to be on-site for the entire duration of the drilled shaft installation. Is this the department's intent and is this work necessary for this project?

This is the District's standard note for concrete testing. We do want at least one concrete testing technician the entire duration of the drilled shaft installation to perform the required concrete tests. Bid according to the note.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 14

1. There were several questions in Addendum #2 regarding the method of measurement that were answered based on the standard plan insert sheets. This question has been posed on all recent projects because much of the information on the plan insert sheets no longer applies; they are simply outdated. The answer that Project 060414 used this method of measurement is wrong. Please refer to Addendum #6 from Project 060414 which revised the method of measurement note. Additional examples include Project 050183, Addendum #4 and Project 050007, Addendum #1 which were both in District 8 and also recent Project 060468, Addendum #4 from District 12. All of these projects paid for the noisewall from bottom of panel to top of coping. The extra wall area below grade on this project will be tens of thousands of square feet which will result in hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is unfair to the bidders to make us assume the risk for this quantity of wall and it is not typical with recent ODOT practice. Please revise the quantities accordingly. 2. Addendum #2 states that the bridge mounted noisewall on this project is the same as that allowed for HAM-275-21.52. Please refer to Addendum #6 from said project which allowed the use of lightweight fiberglass materials. We request that the notes on this project also be modified accordingly.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2007

Question Number: 15

Addendum #1 revised the maintenance of traffic notes, directing the bidders to follow a link provided in the addendum. The link does not work, so we assumed that we are to follow the ODOT Permitted Lane Closure table for this route and section. There is no data available for 2007 in this area, but using the 2006 data, no lane closures are allowed from 6am to 7pm. This is not feasible to construct a project of this type. Lane closures are necessary for the safety of both the contractor and the traveling public and will be required for much of the work on this project. Also, the Construction Noise note on sheet 6 prohibits night work. Considering both the noise note and the revised MOT notes, the contractor would be limited to constructing this project from 8am to 3pm on weekends only. Please revise the MOT restrictions, at a minimum back to the original notes allowing lane closures from 9am to 3pm on weekdays, otherwise this project is not constructible.

A1) The link in addendum #1 does work and you should consult you Information Technology personnel. Addendum #1 states that the contractor is to use, "THE LATEST REVISION, 14 DAYS PRIOR TO THE BID, SHALL BE IN EFFECT FOR THIS PROJECT". Since 2007 revisions have not been produced, the latest revision is 2006. A2) The District 8 Construction Engineer and the District Work Zone Traffic Manager feel that the project is constructible. Bid according to plan.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2007

Question Number: 16

Addendum #1 revised the maintenance of traffic notes, directing the bidders to follow a link provided in the addendum. The link does not work, so we assumed that we are to follow the ODOT Permitted Lane Closure table for this route and section. There is no data available for 2007 in this area, but using the 2006 data, no lane closures are allowed from 6am to 7pm. This is not feasible to construct a project of this type. Lane closures are necessary for the safety of both the contractor and the traveling public and will be required for much of the work on this project. Also, the Construction Noise note on sheet 6 prohibits night work. Considering both the noise note and the revised MOT notes, the contractor would be limited to constructing this project from 8am to 3pm on weekends only. Please revise the MOT restrictions, at a minimum back to the original notes allowing lane closures from 9am to 3pm on weekdays, otherwise this project is not constructible.

A1) The link in addendum #1 does work and you should consult you Information Technology personnel. Addendum #1 states that the contractor is to use, "THE LATEST REVISION, 14 DAYS PRIOR TO THE BID, SHALL BE IN EFFECT FOR THIS PROJECT". Since 2007 revisions have not been produced, the latest revision is 2006. A2) The District 8 Construction Engineer and the District Work Zone Traffic Manager feel that the project is constructible. Bid according to plan.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/23/2007

Question Number: 17

Addendum # 1 revised the lane closure times to 7pm to 6am (taken from the ODOT permitted lane closure website since the link in addendum no. 1 did not work). The construction noise note on sheet no. 6 permits work Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 7:30 PM. This leaves the contractor ½ hour to close 1 lane (7:00 PM – 7:30 PM). The noise barrier behind the guardrail, along the berm of 275, requires a lane closure to construct. A shoulder closure will not allow enough room for a piece of equipment to pick the panel, swing and set it. There is not enough allowable lane closure time to reasonably build the job. If this is your intent the conditions make the job unconstructable.

The Department respectfully disagrees with your conclusion. The District 8 Construction Engineer and the District Work Zone Traffic Manager feel that the project is constructible.

Question Submitted: 1/23/2007

Question Number: 18

Addendum # 1 revised the lane closure times to 7pm to 6am (taken from the ODOT permitted lane closure website since the link in addendum no. 1 did not work). The construction noise note on sheet no. 6 permits work Monday – Friday 7:30 AM – 7:30 PM. This leaves the contractor ½ hour to close 1 lane (7:00 PM – 7:30 PM). The noise barrier behind the guardrail, along the berm of 275, requires a lane closure to construct. A shoulder closure will not allow enough room for a piece of equipment to pick the panel, swing and set it. There is not enough allowable lane closure time to reasonably build the job. If this is your intent the conditions make the job unconstructable.

The Department respectfully disagrees with your conclusion. The District 8 Construction Engineer and the District Work Zone Traffic Manager feel that the project is constructible.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2007

Question Number: 19

After discussions with multiple noisewall suppliers, the completion date of 10/31/07 is unrealistic. There is not enough time between the anticipated award date and completion date to prepare shop drawings and fabricate panels, much less complete the erection. We request that the completion date be extended until 10/15/08.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2007

Question Number: 20

After discussions with multiple noisewall suppliers, the completion date of 10/31/07 is unrealistic. There is not enough time between the anticipated award date and completion date to prepare shop drawings and fabricate panels, much less complete the erection. We request that the completion date be extended until 10/15/08.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2007

Question Number: 21

The project completion date is listed as 10/31/2007. It is not possible to manufacture that amount of noise wall and deliver by the end of September, allowing the contractor 1 month to complete the final grading. Consider moving the completion date to spring (May/June) of 2008 to allow adequate time to complete the fabrication of the wall.

The completion date was revised in addendum #1.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2007

Question Number: 22

The project completion date is listed as 10/31/2007. It is not possible to manufacture that amount of noise wall and deliver by the end of September, allowing the contractor 1 month to complete the final grading. Consider moving the completion date to spring (May/June) of 2008 to allow adequate time to complete the fabrication of the wall.

The completion date was revised in addendum #1.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.