

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 101018

Sale Date - 2/4/2010

Question Submitted: 1/13/2010

Question Number: 1

The quantity of work zone raised pavement marker appears to be low. Please verify the quantity. Please provide a sub-summary of how the bid quantity was calculated.

**See addendum**

Question Submitted: 1/13/2010

Question Number: 2

Please verify that the quantities of temporary striping are correct. They seem low for the sequence of phasing. Plan sheets 12-15 will be set up in Phase 1C then removed and then set up again in Phase 3C. Between the phases the existing striping will be put back in place.

**See addendum**

Question Submitted: 1/13/2010

Question Number: 3

Is there any detour signing required for Phase 3 to demolish Bates Avenue?

**No detour signing is required. Bates Avenue traffic will be utilize the new permanent traffic pattern (Monmouth Street) to cross I-75 between Colerain Avenue and Central Parkway.**

Question Submitted: 1/13/2010

Question Number: 4

Would the Department please post the plans of the existing structures at Monmouth (Ham-75-0385), Bates (Ham-75-0369) and the pedestrian bridge (Ham-75-0415) on line for use in estimating the demolition of these structures.

**Existing plans have been put on the ftp at [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-PID82282/Existing\\_Plans/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-PID82282/Existing_Plans/)**

Question Submitted: 1/14/2010

Question Number: 5

The weights for approach slabs bars AS1002 thru AS1005 are incorrect. Please revise.

**An addendum is not required based on this question since the reinforcing steel is included with Item 526, Reinforced Concrete Approach Slab (T=15"), As Per Plan. The weights for the following bars in the approach slabs should be revised to the following: AS1002 - 1,387 lbs. AS1003 - 1,508 lbs. AS1004 - 1,405 lbs. AS1005 - 1,494 lbs.**

Question Submitted: 1/14/2010

Question Number: 6

Can the office calcs be made available for the Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per Plan?

**See addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/15/2010

Question Number: 7

Addendum 1 added another bid item for the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act Sign. Should one of them be deleted?

**See addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/20/2010

Question Number: 8

Supplemental Spec 800, dated 10/16/2010 that is noted on page 1 of the plans notes that a binder price adjustment will only be applicable if listed in the proposal. I cannot find a note indicating a binder index. This project has a completion date in 2011. Shouldn't a binder index be added to the multi-year contract?

**This is a multiple year project, but none of the asphalt line items have a quantity over 150 cu yds so a binder index is not required per PN-535 dated 1/15/2010 Asphalt Binder Price Adjustment for Multi-Year Projects**

Question Submitted: 1/21/2010

Question Number: 9

1.) On page 75 note 8, and on page 76 note 8 states (PIERS SHALL HAVE AN EXPOSED AGGREGATE FINISH. SEE DETAILS ON SHEET 7 OF 49.) I can not find the notes on page 7 of 49 for the details. Also page 8 of 49 reference page 6 of 49 for notes of piers in question, but again I can't find the notes that deal with this item. Could the notes be provided and shouldn't there be a bid item setup for formliner to produce this type of surface finish? Thank You

**The note that you are referring to for the exposed aggregate finish was removed back in October of last year. There are no bid items currently in the plans to pay for this aggregate finish. Note 8 on sheets 75 and 76 that referred to the aggregate finish should be ignored.**

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: 1/25/2010

Question Number: 10

No frequency of testing for the stockpiled petroleum-impacted and/or lead impacted soil is provided in the environmental notes. Please provide a sample per X cubic yard ratio or similar guidance.

**The Contractor's inspector will determine the frequency and type of testing based on subsurface conditions. The OAC Rule 3745-27-13 application includes a boring location map, an Analytical Table of Soil and Groundwater Results, and boring logs. These items can be downloaded at the following link: \\ctrfs100\d08\$\Addenda\HAM-82282 file name: 82282OAC\_ATT.PDF**

Question Submitted: 1/25/2010

Question Number: 11

Will it be necessary to mill & repave all the lanes of I-75 after the work zones are no longer needed on this project? See the requirement of note #11 on plan page 23 of 124.

**Milling and repaving will not be necessary. However, following completion of all I-75 maintenance of traffic lane shifts, the contractor shall place on the mainline interstate lanes and shoulders 0.75" Fine Graded Polymer Asphalt Concrete, Type B. The limits of this work are between Sta. 179+00 and Sta. 230+00. These limits include those where temporary work zone traffic markings are installed as shown on sheets 12-14 excluding ramps and gore areas.**

Question Submitted: 1/26/2010

Question Number: 12

On Project 1018-2010 there are 4 Reference Numbers set up for potential Environmental Work on Monmouth Avenue. Reference #35-Work Involving Solid Waste, #36- Work Involving Petroleum Contaminated Soil, #37-Work Involving Regulated Water, and #38-Work Involving Water. As per the plan note on 4A of 124 these are speculative numbers and are not verifiable. On a similar project that was sold last January – Project 14-2009 Hamilton County, the department by addendum established a bid price for this type of work to enable the bids to be comparative and enabled the bids be competitive. Would the department consider doing the same thing on this project as well, due to the fact that this work is normally paid for under Section 100 of the Specification Book and paid as a Time and Material Item? This would enable the department to put monies into the bid to complete the work if encountered and at the same time keeping everyone on the same plane.

**Information contained in the OAC Rule 3745-27-13 application provides verified information based the Department's engineering and testing efforts undertaken to date, and was used to estimate plan quantities.**

Question Submitted: 1/26/2010

Question Number: 13

1.) On page 64 of 124, Item 202-Portions of Structure Removed, As per Plan. This notes does not permit the use of hoe rams, does the department want this entire substructure removed with jackhammers? The only area of concern is saving 6 existing piles from the right column from the center pier of the existing structure. There is a note if the contractor damages these piles, the contractor must repair or replace at contractor own expense if damage. Would the department allow the use hoe rams to complete this work? ODOT will benefit from price. 2.) On the removable of Bates Ave. & Pedestrian Bridge there are conflicting notes & drawings how much of the existing structure is to be removed. On page 9, 10 & 11 of 124 it appears that the non-conflicting parts of the existing structure is to be demo only 1.00 Ft below grade that according to Item 202 Spec. But on page 109 & 110 there is general note stating "Existing Bridge Removed 1.00 FT. Below Footings." If the notes on page 109 & 110 is the project intent. There need to be additional item to complete this work since some of the existing piers and abutments footers lay under existing berms. Some the items that would be needed is 1.) cofferdams, cribs & sheeting, 2.) Pavement Removable & Replacement. Could the department please clarify what the plans intent is to be? 3.) Shouldn't there be an item for Temporary Roads for removable of the existing pavement and shoulders?

**See forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/27/2010

Question Number: 14

This question is regarding the MSE wall on Bates-Avenue Cul-de-sac. Right now, 20 days of on-site is the quantity shown for Line 0156, Item 840E2700. The MSE wall is only 1,905 sq.ft. in size. We request that the number of days of on-site assistance be reduced to 2 (two) days.

Question Submitted: 1/27/2010

Question Number: 15

1. Does the footing for the Retaining wall that gets removed under Bid Item 200 get removed also?

Question Submitted: 1/27/2010

Question Number: 16

Does the footing for the retaining wall that gets removed under Bid Item 2 get removed also?

---

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: 1/27/2010

Question Number: 17

Has an asbestos survey been done on each of the three bridge structures to be removed during this contract?

**An asbestos survey on all three structures was completed on December 5, 2008. No asbestos was found.**

Question Submitted: 1/27/2010

Question Number: 18

1) The old typical sections of I-75 show the shoulders as asphalt on aggregate base. Viewing the site, it appears that joint cracks run across the shoulder also, indicating that there is concrete pavement under the shoulder. Please provide as-built information on the existing shoulders that are to be removed. 2) Calculations provided with Addenda #2 indicate "(9' average width)" for the Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A. Is it ODOT's intent to have tapers at each end where this pavement is to be installed? If so, please provide length and width information for the tapers.

Question Submitted: 1/28/2010

Question Number: 19

1.0) On page 8 of 124 the note concerning Monmouth Street states that "Monmouth Street overpass shall be open to traffic by September 30, 2010." Can this date be moved November 15, 2010 due to the lead time required for structural steel & the three coat paint system that needs to be applied before shipping to the project and the time required to build the Sidewalks and the Bridge Railing - "Texas Style Railing", this coupled with the sequence that the piers are to be built and the amount of time that will be consumed between the dynamic test and the restrikes that are required and this must occur on both abutments and both piers. 2.0) On page 20 of 124 Sign "A" shows a road closure of 120 days, can this be changed to 180 days due to the construction sequence that is specified in the project plans. Also the detour route is only 1/2 mile around utilizing Bates Ave. There are only certain windows of time for the demo & setting the new structural steel and constructing the new superstructure. By the maintenance traffic sequence a contractor can only work on pier #1 first, then shift the traffic from the outside to the inside before getting to work on pier #2. Along with the Pile Driving constraints, Special Concrete Rail, 120 days is not enough time for this type of structure.

Question Submitted: 1/28/2010

Question Number: 20

Ref. 183, MISC. CONSULTANT FOR CONCRETE QUALITY CONTROL INCLUDING TESTING AND INSPECTION is listed with the bridge items, and the notes pertaining to this appear in the bridge plan notes. Since all of the bridge concrete is QC/QA, we are assuming all of the bridge concrete testing costs to be included with the individual concrete items. That being the case, what is the intent of Ref. 183? If it is for testing all of the non-bridge concrete, it should be part of the roadway quantities.

Question Submitted: 1/28/2010

Question Number: 21

On plan page 110 of 124 there is a note to remove an existing concrete wall. Does this wall have to be removed to the bottom of the footing similar to the connecting pedestrian bridge abutment immediately to the north or only to the limits of item 202 based on the existing grades on the I-75 side of the wall? There are no excavation or embankment quantities for the project in this area. How is the slope behind the existing wall when it is removed to be shaped and how will the excavation or embankment be paid? A 2 to 1 slope in this area will place the top of slope close to the right of way line. Ref 186 Bridge parapet concrete - the plan quantity of 95 cyds for this bid item only covers the volume of the Texas Rail panels. If the rail & light pole pilasters are included the quantity should be 118 cyds. Are the pilasters paid under reference 186 or under ref 184 concrete deck? Please refer to plan pages 39 & 109 which show the areas of the proposed cul-de-sac. There are no quantities carried to the general summary in this area for pavement removal or sidewalk removal which will clearly be required. Is this removal work incidental to the new MSE wall construction work?

Question Submitted: 1/29/2010

Question Number: 22

Please refer to plan sheets 32 & 45. There is considerable work being done to relocate a very deep section of existing 42" dia sanitary sewer to avoid work to be done for the new Monmouth bridge forward abutment piling. After the relocation work is complete and the flow of the 42" pipe redirected what is to be done with the section of 42" pipe no longer in service? It is not included in the item - removal of pipe > 24". There are no notes stating it is to be plugged, filled, abandoned or removed. As a general comment it seems it would be far easier, cheaper & faster to accurately locate & monitor the existing 42" pipe in the field during abutment construction, slightly relocate any piles found to conflict with the sewer & prebore the closest piles in permanent casing to below the sewer invert & slightly modify the abutment footing if necessary. Surface drainage could be piped to one of the existing manholes on the 42" sewer upstream or downstream of Monmouth with only a short pipe easement off of the right of way required or one new manhole built over the existing pipe within the right of way. Relining the existing line within the right of way if it is in bad condition could also be considered.

**See forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/29/2010

Question Number: 23

Plan page 57 shows concrete encasement for both 2" pvc conduit and 3" pvc conduit. There are no bid items in the proposal for either of these items. Are additional bid items needed for the encasement or do we disregard the detail? Also, if concrete encasement is needed it will reflect the quantity listed in the proposal for Conduit, 2", 725.05 and Conduit, 3", 725.05.

**See forthcoming addendum.**

---

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: 1/29/2010

Question Number: 24

1.) On page 5 of 124 Item 615 Pavement for Maintaing Traffic, APP, The Plans state that the contractor shall saw cut 1.00 Ft into the existing travel lane and remove & replace the Shoulder and the 1.00 ft of the travel lane with 615 pavement. The problem is the removable of the concrete pavement. This operation of construction is no longer a mill & fill operation that can occur over night. There is no concrete barrier setup to work behind. Would the contractor be allowed to mill down to the existing concrete pavement and mill the shoulder down to the required depth? This would allow a mill & fill operation to take place and leave no potential drop off.2.) Can a contractor substitute one additional inch of asphalt base for 4" of 304 under Item 615 pavement? This can be done at no additional cost to ODOT. This would allow the work to be completed in a normal paving train and be less hazardous to the traveling public.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2010

Question Number: 25

Based on field observation the pavement surface on I-75 is in poor condition especially along the longitudinal joint. When the existing pavement markings are removed per the specifications it is very possible that the surface of the pavement may not be an acceptable surface to maintain traffic. If this occurs I assume that ODOT will compensate the Contractor to make any repairs to the existing pavement. Is this a correct assumption?

Question Submitted: 1/31/2010

Question Number: 26

The plan note on sheet 64 titled Item 607 Vandal Protection Fence, 8' Straight, Coated Fabric, As per plan, indicates in the note that the fence shall have a black PVC coating. This description would normally mean that only the fence fabric would be black while other parts would be galvanized.If this item is intended to be entirely black then we suggest that the as per plan note be modified to include that "fence fabric, posts, rails, and all component parts be black vinyl coated."

Question Submitted: 2/3/2010

Question Number: 27

The Sun Valley poles and luminaires that are specified in the plans do not meet the requirements for ODOT TE-24 documentation. Furthermore, the pole and luminaires do not meet ARRA requirements per the manufacturer's quote. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 2/3/2010

Question Number: 28

With the completion date being September of 2011 shouldn't there be an asphalt index?

Question Submitted: 2/3/2010

Question Number: 29

An earlier prebid question asked why the asphalt index did not apply to this project. The departments answer was that the project had only small quantities of asphalt material and by rule the index did not apply. Since that time the amount of Temporary Pavement has tripled, by addendum, and a smooth seal asphalt of 3000 tons has been added. Thus my previous question of today, shouldn't the index apply?

Question Submitted: 2/3/2010

Question Number: 30

With the addition of item 424 fine graded polymer asphalt(quantity of 1522.22 cy) and the increase of pavement for maintaining traffic (quantity of 4267 cy, shouldn't the project have an asphalt index for a multi-year project with items of work greater than 150 cy?

Question Submitted: 2/3/2010

Question Number: 31

We are requesting an extension of the letting date to 2/25/10.

**An extension of the letting date to 2/25/10 will not be made.**

---

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.