

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 090201

Sale Date - 5/13/2009

Question Submitted: 12/10/2008

Question Number: 1

On sheet 52, the quantities for bid items 76 & 77, 8" conduit type E and 8" conduit type F are 32715 and 320 ft. respectively. The pipe is located w/in the temporary ROW and the depth is not referenced in the notes, plan & profile, or cross sections. What is the proposed depth of this pipe?

These pipe are the part of the conduits from the note on page 30 "Conduit Outside of LA R/W". As stated in the note these conduit are to be used to connection the field tile when they have been exposed. No depth is given because the field tile depth is unknown. Depth in the previous project have been anywhere from 2'-8' deep.

Question Submitted: 12/10/2008

Question Number: 2

Detours as directed by the engineer for SR 295, CR 3, CR 109 and CR 111 are referenced on sheet 38 of part 1 of the plans as well as a detour for TR 10 on sheet 30 of part 2 of the plans. How does the Department intend to pay for labor and materials associated with the installation and removal of these detours?

Question Submitted: 12/10/2008

Question Number: 3

Could the Department please include calculations for Part 2 Maintenance of Traffic quantities for bid items 508-523 found on sheets 30-32 so that these quantities can be verified?

Question Submitted: 12/10/2008

Question Number: 4

Sheet 57 of Part 2 has 9485 ft. of 6" Unclassified Underdrain Pipe to be installed on SR 424. The typical sections on sheets 19-20 show typical underdrain depths of 18", same as the base underdrains for the mainline on sheet 15. However, sheet 19 calls the underdrain '6" Shallow Pipe Underdrain' in the "Legend." What is the depth and type of underdrain to be installed on SR 424?

Question Submitted: 12/11/2008

Question Number: 5

Regarding bid item 0084 – 12" Conduit, Type D, there is an apparent error in the bid quantity. There are two pipe runs of 56 LF each that are not accounted for on sheet 50 in the Drainage Summary. Please verify that the bid quantity should be 179 LF instead of 67 LF.

Question Submitted: 12/11/2008

Question Number: 6

On sheet 15 of Part 2, the pavement edge detail for the US 24 full-width construction shows 16" from the edge of pavement to the limits of where aggregate base is placed. The office calcs, however, add 10" outside the edge of pavement for full-width (40') pavement on US 24. Is the pavement detail or office calcs correct?

Question Submitted: 12/11/2008

Question Number: 7

On sheet 38/820 under SR 295, CR 3, CR 109, and CR 111 it states that through traffic may be detoured as shown on sheet 1. Where is this detour plan shown?

Question Submitted: 12/12/2008

Question Number: 8

Will the State be providing revised cross-sections to accommodate changes made to Ref #0018-Excavation and Ref #0019-Embankment, per addendum #1?

Question Submitted: 12/3/2008

Question Number: 9

Are we to assume that Project HEN-24-10.74 will have surface pavement down on the westend? If so, will we be required to use removable work zone pavement markings on that section for MOT in Part 2?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 10

There are many 4" and 6" field tile lines being shown to be plugged in the plans. What bid item does this work go into?

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: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 11

The General Summary as shown on plan sheets 41, 42, and 44 references office calcs for numerous major quantities of work. Since the contractor is responsible to verify quantities per CMS 102.07, we are requesting that the office calcs be made available. Without this information there is insufficient data to verify quantities.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HEN-80446/80446.zip>

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 12

Bid Item #20 - Granular Embankment, APP -- Bid quantity of 63,167 cubic yards, consists of a 3 ft sand blanket at both CR 111 and SR 295. The cross sections at both of these locations do not reflect the 3 feet of Granular Embankment as defined by plan sheet 34/820. My question pertains to the embankment quantity at both CR 111 and SR 295, specifically has the Embankment quantity, Bid Item #19, at both of these locations been reduced to account for this 63,167 cubic yards of Granular Embankment, APP?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 13

The note for Part 1 Criteria For Maintaining Traffic states that all side roads shall remain open to traffic until the 4 overhead bridges are completed and open to traffic. Our question is will the side roads between 2 consecutively completed structures be allowed to be closed prior to the completion of all 4 bridges?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 14

Will vehicle traffic be allowed through the section of the project (Sta. 135 - Sta. 210) impacted by the presence of the bald eagle nests between Jan. 1 and June 30?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 15

SP 840 for MSE structures refers to a series of discriptions of cross sections for designing MSE. These discriptions for sloped surcharge and truncated surcharge loadings do not conform to AASHTO completely. Please clarify where appropriate whether the designer is to follow AASHTO or SP 840 when in conflict.

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 16

Ref # 521 Portable Concrete Barrier 32" and Ref #522 - Portable Concrete Barrier 50" A.P.P. Quantities. In reviewing the Part 2 plans specifically M.O.T. plan sheets 37 thru 44 of 201, I am having trouble matching the bid quantities for both of these reference numbers. Specifically I calculate more 32 in wall and less 50 in wall. I believe the problem is created on plan sheet #42, specifically at station 552+50 where the note directs you to change the 50" PCB to 32" PCB. Please confirm note and reconfirm quantities for both reference numbers.

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 17

Part 2 - Maintenance of Traffic - stage 2 and stage 3 requires traffic to be shifted onto the existing shoulder. Is this existing shoulder strong enough to support this temporary traffic load?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 18

We would like to dig onsite test holes for this project and have noticed limited ROW staking at side roads. Will ODOT please stake ROW throughout project so we can dig test holes? Is all ROW cleared so that test hole digging can be performed?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 19

Ref. 38- Monument Assembly- Bid quantity from summary on sheet 672 equates to 10 each. Five can be found on Bailey and Hertzfeld Roads. Where are the remaining five?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 20

Plan sheet 30, middle column- There is a 36" Type A, as per plan "C" note- however no bid item exists. Is this meant for another bid item or should this note be disregarded? Please clarify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 21

Ref. 113: 72" Type A, As Per Plan "B"- plan sheet 30 gives several options for the type of pipe to be used. Is it the intent of the state to compare a 72" concrete pipe with a 72" metal pipe? All other pipe items shown on this plan sheet compare concrete pipe of a certain size to a larger diameter metal pipe. For example, the preceding reference 112 compares 72" concrete pipe to 90" metal. Please verify in an 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: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 22

Ref. 113- plan sheet 491 shows longitudinal cross-section of proposed culvert. On plan sheet 491, existing ground appears to be around the elevation of 658.00, which would leave one to believe that this pipe is mainly in fill. However, plan sheet 203 which provides US 24 cross-sections in this vicinity shows existing centerline profile at around 665.00, which would lead one to believe that this same run of pipe is in a cut section. This is a discrepancy of 7.0' in existing topo elevations. Please review the profiles and corresponding cross-sections of this and other larger culverts and verify what the correct profile should be in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 23

What is the status of landlocked properties listed in the right of way plans? Will ODOT be purchasing these parcels? Will contractors be permitted to use these parcels for borrow and or temporary facilities?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 24

There are no items for demolition but there are quite a few homes and barns in the r/w that need to be addressed. Some homes have been moved, and others are being moved now. Where will we be paid for demolition of structures not moved by others?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 25

On Sheet 34 it calls for 18" of Granular Embankment, Type C, APP to be placed for Wick Drain Drainage Blanket. This is also shown on sheet 473. This blanket is to be placed on the existing ground. Under the notes on sheet 34 for high embankments for the CR 3 structure it states that after this is completed, we place the Select Granular MSE material. However, this procedure is in conflict with the MSE drawing 540 and the 840 specification for Foundation Preparation. Sheet 540 shows a 4' cut through the MSE Select Zone which would remove the Wick Drains. In addition the Type C granular is incidental to the MSE Foundation Prep but sheet 34 carries it to Ref No 21 as a pay item. Someone needs to Coordinate these two items and sort out the construction sequence and the pay quantities. The CR 111 MSE wall will have similar problems with the wick drains and Foundation Prep

Question Submitted: 12/4/2008

Question Number: 26

Will the latest version of Supplemental Specification 840 dated 1/16/2009 be applied to this project?

Question Submitted: 12/5/2008

Question Number: 27

The office calculations provided for pavement quantities appear to have a minor error (approximately 277 cy) on the sheet tabbed "CUL-DE-SACS and Drives". There are several asterisked quantities shown that do not carry down to the grand total due to excel not recognizing the celled number with the asterisk. Please verify and revise in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/5/2008

Question Number: 28

Ref. 131: Aggregate Base- office calculation summary sheet, after backing out mainline roadway aggregate base, doesn't match up with plan quantity for this bid item. The plan quantity for ref. 131 is understated by over 2000 c.y. based on this spreadsheet. Please verify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/5/2008

Question Number: 29

Ref. 108- 36" Conduit, Type A, APP "B": Plan sheet 30 gives the contractor option of using either 36" RCP or 48" CMP pipe. However, plan sheet 489 allows same pipe to be either 36" RCP or 42" CMP. Please clarify in an addendum what the correct alternate size for CMP should be.

Question Submitted: 12/5/2008

Question Number: 30

Ref. 131- #304 Aggregate Base: ODOT office calculation show a volume of 3132 cy for CR 3. From summing up columns, it appears that the quantity is incorrectly doubled. Please verify and correct in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/5/2008

Question Number: 31

Ref. 430- 6" Unclassified Underdrains: plan sheets 19 and 20 call this out as 6" Shallow Pipe Underdrains with a typical depth of 18" below subgrade. Cross-sections show a consistent 18" depth. Plan sheets and cross-sections don't show any different depths called out. Should this be still considered "unclassified"? Please clarify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/8/2008

Question Number: 32

Ref. 518- Pvmnt. for MOT, Type A: part B plan sheet 30 gives a quantity of 3606 sy as directed by the engineer carried to the general summary. However the office calculations show a total of 3006 sy. Is the correct quantity 3606 sy or 3006 sy? Since the temporary road item is lump sum, we need to know what area of pavement to figure preparation and removal for.

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: 12/8/2008

Question Number: 33

Regarding the cost of the 7 year warranty bond, the cost of the bond itself is calculated by first applying the cost of the performance and payment bond over the original contract time and then adding to that the additional cost for the 7 year warranty for the total cost of the 7 year warranty bond. The first question is that if the contract is lengthened for whatever reason, will ODOT compensate the contractor for the additional length of time needed for the performance and payment bond? Compounding this problem would be if the warranty work item is actually performed by a subcontractor, both the general contractor's and the subcontractor's performance and payment bond costs increase, would both be compensated for the additional costs?

Question Submitted: 12/8/2008

Question Number: 34

In the Part 1 plans on page 12 of 820, in the Legend for the Asphalt Warranty Typical Section, specific asphalt mix items and types are called out. Will the asphalt contractor be permitted to provide the asphalt mix items and types of their choice as well as the AC liquid types and various aggregates that they might choose in order to satisfy their own concerns regarding the warranty?

Question Submitted: 12/8/2008

Question Number: 35

May we have the mapping of the archaeologically (or historically) sensitive sites mentioned in the plan note on plan sheet 37/820? Apparently, there are seven known sites which must be avoided when addressing borrow, waste, or other project related activities. A detailed and accurate description of these areas is important in order to adhere to this note.

Question Submitted: 12/8/2008

Question Number: 36

Ref. 131- aggregate base: original office calculations appear to have omitted stone base and pavements for u-turn median areas from total quantities. Please verify and update in an addendum.

Quantity verified and is correct

Question Submitted: 12/8/2008

Question Number: 37

Ref. 131 and 143: aggregate base items. After addendum 1 was issued, it appears that per ODOT quantity that asphalt alternate stone base contains 704 cy additional quantity to make fair comparison between pavements. Plan sheet 12 pavement edge detail shows stone for asphalt pavement extending 10" beyond edge of pavement. Plan sheet 13 and 459a show edge details of stone base extending to outside edge of underdrain and 16" beyond edge of pavement. Plan sheets 14a, 14b, and 459 show the stone base extending 14" beyond edge of pavement for concrete alternate. Is the sheet 12 width of 10" incorrect? By having the asphalt alternate with more stone base, should the stone base width be greater than the 14" that is used for the concrete width? Please verify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/9/2008

Question Number: 38

Sheet 36/820 of the plans mentions 3 active bald eagle nests within one mile of the project. We have located one at the SW quadrant of the Box Road and SR295 intersection. Where are the other two?

Question Submitted: 12/9/2008

Question Number: 39

Parcels 251, 274, and 381 apparently still require that a cultural review be performed that may take 6 to 8 months. Has this process been initiated?

Question Submitted: 12/9/2008

Question Number: 40

In the absence of the cultural reviews for Parcels 251, 274, and 381 being completed, can a representative for ODOT direct where test digging may be performed to evaluate the soils for potential usage on this project?

Location of possible dig sites are called out in the Previous Archaeology Survey column of the table in Addendum #1 .

Question Submitted: 12/9/2008

Question Number: 41

We previously asked the following question: "In the absence of the cultural reviews for Parcels 251, 274, and 381 being completed, can a representative for ODOT direct where test digging may be performed to evaluate the soils for potential usage on this project?" The following answer was given by ODOT: "Location of possible dig sites are called out in the Previous Archaeology Survey column of the table in Addendum #1." After reviewing that table, we find no guidance there. Example: For Parcel 251, the column makes this statement: "Partial more than 50%". Is the contractor to assume that he can dig on more than 50% of the site and it doesn't matter where? The information for the other two parcels is equally confusing.

Question Submitted: 12/9/2008

Question Number: 42

1. Bid item numbers 208,245,282,319,& 534 are sealing concrete bridge decks with HMWM resin. The sealing of the joint between the deck and parapet are included with item 898 deck concrete, if this is for the phased joints on the deck isn't there too much quantity set up?

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: 12/9/2008

Question Number: 43

Addendum 1 included the Price Adjustment Exclusion Table to Sheet 36, but no mention was made to adding PN115. Is Proposal Note PN115 also to be added to the bid proposal?

Question Submitted: 4/23/2009

Question Number: 44

According to the note on sheet 32 for work zone raised pavement markers there are no rpm's placed in Stage 2 at the transitions and crossover. Is this correct?

Question Submitted: 4/27/2009

Question Number: 45

Can the State provide the "Office Calcs" for the items pertaining as shown on the general summary?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HEN-80446/> file is: 80446.zip

Question Submitted: 4/27/2009

Question Number: 46

Referring to the pre-bid questions Q2-18 and A2-18 responded to in Add #3, the answer addressed the lift thickness questioned but not the asphalt mix items and types, nor the AC liquid types nor the aggregate types. In order to satisfy their own concerns regarding the 7-year asphalt warranty requirements, will the contractor be allowed to alter the asphalt mix type, asphalt liquid type and aggregate types in order to satisfy their own concerns regarding 7-year warranty.

Question Submitted: 4/27/2009

Question Number: 47

On sheet 42/201 of the Part 2 plans it calls for the 50" PCB to end and 32" PCB to begin at station 552+50. This is per the old standard, and on sheet 1/820 it references MT-95.70 with the date 1/18/08 which requires 50" for the whole run of barrier. Please correct the quantities.

Question Submitted: 4/28/2009

Question Number: 48

The as per plan notes on page 30 give an assortment of pipe that can be used. These options have lighter wall thickness than supplemental specification 800. Can you please clarify which is to be used, the as per plan notes or ss 800.

Question Submitted: 4/28/2009

Question Number: 49

The third sentence of supplemental spec section 880.03, requires the asphalt shoulders to be constructed using the same asphalt concrete mixture and construction procedures as the mainline and ramps. 1. Hopefully there is a significantly lower number of EASL's on the outside shoulders. If that would be the case, a contractor required to warranty the pavement for 7-years may want to use an asphalt mixture on the outside shoulders suited for the lower number of EASL's. Would a different mix type be allowed on the shoulders as opposed to the mainline? 2. If two different mixture types are not allowed, in order to eliminate a cold joint between the mainline and the outside shoulder, can the same mix type be run at the same time from different plants with one plant sending to the mainline and one plant sending to the shoulder provided the mixtures are kept separate by lane or shoulder? 3. If two different mixture types are allowed, in order to eliminate a cold joint between the mainline and the outside shoulder, can the two different mix types be run at the same time from different plants with one plant sending to the mainline and one plant sending to the shoulder provided the mixtures are kept separate by lane or shoulder?

Question Submitted: 4/29/2009

Question Number: 50

1. The DBE goal established for the project is 8%. Due to the makeup of work and possibility of alternate pavement types selected, meeting the established 8% goal will be extremely difficult. We respectfully request for consideration lowering the goal from 8% to 4%.

In determining the DBE goal for HEN/LUC-24, PID 70446, Project 090201 the Goal Setting Committee determined that at least five DBE contractors are prequalified to perform a portion of the work involved in completion of the project. There are also two DBE material supply firms from which the contractor may purchase materials. Given the number of DBE subcontractors either in the area or willing to travel to Henry and Lucas Counties the Goal Setting Committee believes an 8% DBE goal is attainable.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2009

Question Number: 51

The soil profiles mention that subsurface information from remaining borings is presented on structure foundation investigations. For an example of this indication, please see the soil profile on page 48/54 from the soils section. Please indicate how to obtain the detailed foundation investigations and associated soils / geotechnical reports and borings.

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: 4/29/2009

Question Number: 52

Under Maintaining Traffic does access have to be provided at all times to residential & field Drives or just residential drives?

Question Submitted: 4/29/2009

Question Number: 53

Under Maintaining Traffic does access have to be provided at all times to residential & field Drives or just residential drives?

Question Submitted: 4/29/2009

Question Number: 54

There is no pay item for the 411 material shown on Sheet 34 Part 2.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2009

Question Number: 55

On Sheet 100 there is a quantity of 524' of 12" Type B that is missing from the drainage subsummary and the pay item needs to be corrected.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2009

Question Number: 56

Plan sheet 38 under criteria for "maintaining traffic" notes: Item 7 states that SR 295 cannot be closed to through traffic until CR 143 is constructed and open to traffic as a part of the LUC-24-6.19 (PID 80444) project and that the contractor shall coordinate the closing of SR 295 with teh contractor for LUC-24-6.19. Since that contract has been sold and awarded, what is the duration and time frame for the CR 143 closure as the timing could affect who this project is constructed?

Question Submitted: 4/30/2009

Question Number: 57

There was a previous pre-bid question that has not been answered on an addendum or on the ODOT prebid question website: "The note for Part 1 Criteria For Maintaining Traffic states that all side roads shall remain open to traffic until the 4 overhead bridges are completed and open to traffic. Our question is will the side roads between 2 consecutively completed structures be allowed to be closed prior to the completion of all 4 bridges?" Will ODOT please consider changing the criteria for side road and cul-de-sac construction such that roads adjoining and/or in between already-completed bridges may be closed and rebuilt as soon as the new overpass is completed and opened to traffic?

Question Submitted: 4/30/2009

Question Number: 58

1.) In Pt 2 for Twp Rd 10, the typical section on sheet 17 shows 3" 301 asph Conc base, but the office calcs show 302 and the bid item is for 302. It appears due to the thickness that the 301 is correct, but the 302 is calculated and set up for bid. Could you please verify? 2.) In Pt 2 for the SR 424 widening, the calculations show widening on two sides but the plans show widening on one side. Which is correct?

Question Submitted: 4/30/2009

Question Number: 59

On Sheet 107 the quantity of 27" conduit Type A is missing from the drainage subsummary and .98 CY Concrete Masonry for 2 HW-2.2.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2009

Question Number: 60

On Sheet 274 the invert of the 24" HW-2.2 Sta 41+27.5, 54.1 Rt is lower than the invert of the 24" Type B Pipe at the CB 2-3. Is this Correct?

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 61

Our review of plan closure durations for the overhead bridges are not adequate to complete all required construction. On pervious US-24 Projects this type of bridge construction was extended 360 day duration. The bridges on this project have additional work not required on the previous projects. Our review is in the range of 450 day duration to complete overhead bridges on this project. Thank for your time considering this matter.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 62

Will the haul road crossings be required to be setup per 6H-14, requiring the contractor to utilize flaggers and/or signals? Or, will the contractor be permitted to utilize stop signs without any flaggers, as is being done on the current projects?

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: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 63

Addendum No. 4, "For internet access to information referenced in this addendum, please see the ODOT web site at ->ftp://..." There are five pdf files appearing, I am unable to open (05.01.09 2:45 pm) the following three files: revised MOT Calc.pdf; revised Pavement Markings Conc80444.pdf; and, REVISED646.pdf. Please advise.

Use this link -> <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HEN-80446/AddendumD/>

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 64

Just received Addendum #4 And 5 and find that we will not have adequate time to properly prepare our bid proposal. Please consider extending the bid date to allow us the needed time to include this additional information in our bid.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 65

Addendum #4 has a list of 12 new drawings pertaining to bridge parapet details. When we printed out the 12 drawings there appears to be some missing. The following seems to have happened: a second copy of dwg 0553A is where 0569A should be Dwg 0613A prints 3 times & 0613B & 0613C are missing. Please provide the 3 drawings left off of the attachment.

Submitted Friday 5/1/09 @ 3:30PM

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 66

We just received Addendum #5 today (Friday) at 3:15 pm. This addendum added several buildings to be demolished, as well as asbestos abatement for the buildings. Along with this addendum were dozens of pages of asbestos reports. Given the short amount of time between now and the bid date, it will not be possible to solicit pricing and accurately bid these items. We strongly suggest that you delay the bid date so that the bidders can react to these changes and prepare a better bid.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 67

Please consider delaying the project as there is not enough time to prepare an accurate estimate due to addendum numbers 4, 5, and 6 being added so close to the letting date. The changes to the excavation and embankment are significant and will result in numerous changes to these items. The building demo items added via addendum number 5 will not allow enough time to obtain accurate estimates for demolition and the asbestos abatement. The everchanging pavement quantities will also require additional time to verify and estimate as well.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 68

The completion date has been extended to June 15, 2013, but the field office time has not been increased to 48 months. Please adjust.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 69

We respectfully request a bid date extension of at least two days due to the following:1. The three (3) addenda issued on the Friday afternoon prior to the letting date contain over 79 quantity changes, additions, and deletions as well as over more than 120 pages of information to review.2. Custom form liner material suppliers must be solicited and have time to review details in order to provide quotes.3. Addendum # 4 plan sheet insertions for pages 0569A, 0613B, and 0613C are not included in the 80446-AddendumD-13RevisedSheets[1].tif file on the ftp site. The last two sheets detail most likely detail the custom form liner referenced in item # 2 above.4. Abatement contractors must be solicited and have time to review the 58 page survey of the parcel demo items added in Addendum # 5 in order to provide quotations. Thank you for your consideration.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 70

With receiving addendum #5, and #6 on Friday afternoon, and the amount of changes that have been made to quantities, addition of items and deleting items. It is unfair for this project to bid next week with only 2 working days to complete all this work. There are also additional questions that have been asked and not answered yet. Also we received a notification of another addendum today but it is not available yet? Is there another addendum #7? Please advise.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 71

Addendum #4 added a bid item for each bridge to stain concrete. The added plan sheets with this addendum contain notes which state that the concrete is to be sealed with a non-yellowing epoxy urethane sealer which is compatible with the stain. After talking to representatives from 2 different manufacturers, we have learned that the epoxy coat cannot be completely clear, and will alter the color of the concrete. Furthermore, there is no specification provided for the stain, other than the color number.

We recommend that the bid date be delayed so that ODOT can provide a more thorough and feasible specification for this work.

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: 5/1/2009

Question Number: 72

Part 2, plan sheet 33 paragraph 6 under the criteria for maintaining traffic states the contractor shall maintain the east tie-in as detailed on sheets 45 and 46 until US 24 is open to traffic and as directed by the Engineer. Is it the contractor's responsibility to remove the impact attenuator and portable concrete barrier as well as maintain it? If so, under what pay item is this work included?

Question Submitted: 5/11/2009

Question Number: 73

In Addendum #8, answer A7-2 was given to a question. In it it states that "the pavement markings from 327+00 to 609+25 will be itme 646 Epoxy, because they will be going onto concrete". This is existing concrete we assume? The problem is when taking the quantities out of the original bid items to adjust for this area the state also included the quantities for the SR 64 ramps which are not on existing concrete. The ramps will be new asphalt or new concrete depending of the alternate.

State Route 64 Ramps were included in the alternate pavement in Project 098015. The pavement was selected to be Concrete.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 74

The pavement markings for this job are unclear to say the least. Addendum 4 made changes to the already confusing plans. This addendum however did not include any explanation for the changes, it just changed quantities around. It is impossible to make any educated striping quotes without substantial further explanation on what the state acutally wants.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 75

Part 2, plan sheet 33 under the stage 1 sequence of construction states to close the inside lanes of EB and WB 24 in accordance with MT-95.40 to construct the median crossover and pavement widening. MT-95.40 is the standard drawing to close a lane of a multi-lane highway with portable concrete barrier. No barrier wall or attenuator quantities are included in the MOT subsummary for this work. Also, should traffic be maintained in accordance with MT-95.40 phase 4 for the removal of the crossovers as well?

Question Submitted: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 76

Addendum 5 added several building demolition and asbestos abatement items. Some of the reports referred to parcels, some referred to addresses of buildings. Please provide addresses for all affected properties so that our subcontractors have no problem finding all locations on their site visits.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 77

Part 2- Maintenance of Traffic, plan sheet 33- part of stage 2 calls construction of WB US 24 through the intermediate course from station 550+00 to 567+00. Plan sheets 38 and 39 show typical routing of existing US 24 traffic in a bi-directional pattern with the use of a crossover.If this portion of stage 2 work is completed in the prior season to that of stage 3 work, will the contractor be required to move the westbound US 24 traffic back to the newly-built WB US 24 section prior to winter shutdown or will the contractor be permitted to keep the bidirectional traffic pattern over the winter?

Question Submitted: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 78

Maintenance of Traffic- Part 2 (plan sheet 38), Stage 3 calls for constructing of old US 24 and the improvements to SR 424 from TR 10 to the old US 24 connection.Will the contractor at their own option be allowed to construct the portion of SR 424 from just east (approx. station 741+00) of the existing TR 10 intersection to just west of old 24 (approx. station 778+00) at any time prior to or during stage 3 providing local access is maintained since this road is a dead-end road as is?

Question Submitted: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 79

Re: Item 18 – EmbankmentAddendum #4 reduced the pay quantity for Item 18 – EMBANKMENT by 207,288 CY. The provided cross-sections depict the adjustments for GRANULAR EMBANKMENT APP and MSE Wall Backfill quantities. According to my math, the total quantity reduction depicted on these new sections is only -37,042 Cy. Should the quantity adjustment only be limited to the changes depicted in the revised sections (-37,042 Cy)? If not, please provide sufficient information as soon as possible in the form of cross-sections and or calculations that define where the remaining adjustment of -170,246 Cy should be taken out of the project. We cannot proceed with cost calculations on this important item until this issue is resolved.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 80

Plan sheets 613B and 613C were not attached to Addendum 4. We can not accurately bid the revised work without these details. Please provide them with enough time prior to the bid to reflect the changes in our price.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 81

Why are there concrete and asphalt pavement marking alternate items in section 16 Traffic Control Part 2 (items 478 thru 491) without any option for concrete or asphalt pavement? The pavement in part 2 is only asphalt.

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: 5/4/2009

Question Number: 82

In addendum # 1, the final completion date was extended until June 30, 2013. An interim completion date of June 30, 2012 was also set for all lanes and ramps of US 24 to be open to traffic. What is the purpose of such a long extended time period with conceivably no work taking place?

Question Submitted: 5/5/2009

Question Number: 83

The new drawings issued with addendum #4 which show the graphics on the parapets of bridge 24-0142 (St. Rt. 295 over Rt 24) are confusing. Our form suppliers cannot figure out from the details provided what the relief is for each graphic. From section AA on drawing 613C it appears the graphics are indented 1" into the concrete. But then the raised line detail on the same drawing shows a 2" relief above some concrete surface. Can better details be provided that show what areas are indented by 1" or 2" & what areas are raised - if any? Shading the different reliefs would help immensely.

Question Submitted: 5/5/2009

Question Number: 84

Ref. 421 and 422: 24" and 27" bored pipes- Will ODOT consider allowing the contractor to install the steel casing pipe as finish pipe as opposed to installing a larger diameter casing and then grouting in a carrier pipe?

Casing pipe is not required Jack and Bored pipe is under existing Roadway.

Question Submitted: 5/5/2009

Question Number: 85

Part 2- Maintenance of Traffic in regard to sequence of construction (sheet 33): Addendum 3 stated that the SR 424/TR 10 intersection can not be closed until thru traffic is placed on the new US 24. The contractor shall then have 30 days from the closure of SR424/TR 10 intersection to complete the tie-in of the old US 24 and SR 424 to thru traffic. Addendum 8 (question Q7-3) states that SR 424 and TR 10 cannot be closed until US 24 is open to traffic, with the additional year (until 6/30/13) is for the construction of the TR 10 bridge (HEN-24-10.14), and the connection of SR 424 to existing US 24 and removal of no-longer-needed pavement. Will all resurfacing of mainline asphalt (532+00 to 550+00) and surface on new mainline (550+00 to 567+00) be required to be completed before bridge work begins or expected to be completed after the structure is completed? Either way, requiring the closure of TR 10 to wait until July 1, 2012 does not allow enough time for the project to be completed by July 1, 2013 based on what these two addendums have stated. Please consider allowing the contractor to begin construction of TR 10 overpass to an earlier date.

Question Submitted: 5/5/2009

Question Number: 86

Will the current version of SS832 dated 4/17/09 be applied to this project?

No

Question Submitted: 5/7/2009

Question Number: 87

In addendum #4 on page 6 under the Work Zone Pavement Markings header it calls for removable work zone pavement markings. I assume that means CL I, 740.06, Type I. If so, there is no bid item set up for this.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2009

Question Number: 88

In addendums 3 and 8, part 2 MOT, the intersection of SR 424/TR 10 is mentioned as not being permitted to be closed until new US 24 is open to traffic. For clarity, does ODOT mean the US 24/TR 10 intersection? Please clarify as the contractor could close down TR 10 and build the new bridge and embankments up to the SR 424/TR 10 intersection and still keep the intersection open.

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.