Project No. 070003 Sale Date - 1/24/2007

<u>Question Submitted:</u> 1/12/2007 <u>Question Number:</u> 1

MOT subsummary Sh 62 omits a quantity of 615 Temp Pvmt CLA APP for underdrain replacement on the westbound inside shoulders.

See Addenda #2

<u>Question Submitted:</u> 1/12/2007 <u>Question Number:</u> 2

MOT subsummary Sh 62 omits a quantity of 615 Temp Pvmt CLA APP for underdrain replacement on the westbound inside

shoulders.

See Addenda #2

Question Submitted: 1/14/2007 Question Number: 3

Work Zone Delineation note 1 on plan sheet 22 requires the use of permanent raised pavement markers. Note 2a on plan sheet 64 allows work zone RPM's during the period prior to Oct 15. Since these notes conflict please indicate whether Work Zone RPMs (Item 614) are permitted.

Question Submitted: 1/14/2007 Question Number: 4

Work Zone Delineation note 1 on plan sheet 22 requires the use of permanent raised pavement markers. Note 2a on plan sheet 64 allows work zone RPM's during the period prior to Oct 15. Since these notes conflict please indicate whether Work Zone RPMs (Item 614) are permitted.

<u>Question Submitted:</u> 1/15/2007 <u>Question Number:</u> 5

The rebar lists for the bridges lists parapet rebar as incidental to parapet bid item. This is not standard practice. Please advise if this is what ODOT wants or just an oversight.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2007 Question Number: 6

The rebar lists for the bridges lists parapet rebar as incidental to parapet bid item. This is not standard practice. Please advise if this is what ODOT wants or just an oversight.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2007 Question Number: 7

1) General note on page 11 indicates the construction limits are marked with a C/L designation. Plan sheet 254 and 255 show the west, east, and south limits but not the north limit. It appears plan sheet 326 and 327 has an XX line for the construction limits but again only on the west, east and south. Please provide clarification.2) The "DESIGN STRESSES (LOAD FACTOR DESIGN) note on page 261 and the "DESIGN DATA" note on page 333 indicate "spiral reinforcement may be plain bars, ASTM A82 or A615." The Item 524 - Drilled Shafts note on page 263 and 333 indicate the reinforcing steel is to be epoxy coated. Please provide clarification.3) Can the Phase 1 traffic pattern be initiated after the pre-phase 1 outside shoulder replacements and milling and filling of the rumble strips are completed but prior to the substantially completing pier 1 through 4 and the forward abutment?

Question Submitted: 1/15/2007 Question Number: 8

1) General note on page 11 indicates the construction limits are marked with a C/L designation. Plan sheet 254 and 255 show the west, east, and south limits but not the north limit. It appears plan sheet 326 and 327 has an XX line for the construction limits but again only on the west, east and south. Please provide clarification.2) The "DESIGN STRESSES (LOAD FACTOR DESIGN) note on page 261 and the "DESIGN DATA" note on page 333 indicate "spiral reinforcement may be plain bars, ASTM A82 or A615." The Item 524 - Drilled Shafts note on page 263 and 333 indicate the reinforcing steel is to be epoxy coated. Please provide clarification.3) Can the Phase 1 traffic pattern be initiated after the pre-phase 1 outside shoulder replacements and milling and filling of the rumble strips are completed but prior to the substantially completing pier 1 through 4 and the forward abutment?

<u>Question Submitted:</u> 1/16/2007 <u>Question Number:</u> 9

Drilled shafts are not normally considered mass concrete. Other projects that ODOT has bid with large diameter drilled shafts have not had the mass concrete spec on the shafts. Please consider making the drilled shaft concrete the standard per the 2005 CMS.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2007 Question Number: 10

Drilled shafts are not normally considered mass concrete. Other projects that ODOT has bid with large diameter drilled shafts have not had the mass concrete spec on the shafts. Please consider making the drilled shaft concrete the standard per the 2005 CMS

Question Submitted: 1/16/2007 Question Number: 11

The bar list given for the prestressed concrete beams on page 57 of 83 (382/408) is noted to be given for information only, however there is no mention of the #11 bars for members B, D, F, & H. In addition to the huge discrepancy this creates in total weight for the given members there is no special notes or details on page 53 of 83 (378/408) as to how these are to be incorporated in the beam given that 79 foot # 11 bars are not available nor practical to consider as a continuous "full length" bar for 12 locations in the beam bottom flange. There will have to be spliced coulpings to attain the length needed and the couplings will have to be staggered to prevent congestion within the flange. The diameter of these coulpings will likely be 3" (+-)and the placement within the area shown may be difficult, at best. Given the level of special conditions set out in the plans for complete detail of all embedded items some direction, or detail, should of been indicated on the plans for these bars. And a bar list for information only purposes should be expected to be a little closer than the error introduced by the missed # 11 bar of approximately 201,000 pounds. Please advise some detail or guidance for the placement and coupling of these bars as shown on Section A-A and Section B-B on page 53 of 83 (378/408). Thank you.

See Addenda #4

Question Submitted: 1/16/2007

Question Number: 12

The bar list given for the prestressed concrete beams on page 57 of 83 (382/408) is noted to be given for information only, however there is no mention of the #11 bars for members B, D, F, & H. In addition to the huge discrepancy this creates in total weight for the given members there is no special notes or details on page 53 of 83 (378/408) as to how these are to be incorporated in the beam given that 79 foot # 11 bars are not available nor practical to consider as a continuous "full length" bar for 12 locations in the beam bottom flange. There will have to be spliced coulpings to attain the length needed and the couplings will have to be staggered to prevent congestion within the flange. The diameter of these coulpings will likely be 3" (+-)and the placement within the area shown may be difficult, at best. Given the level of special conditions set out in the plans for complete detail of all embedded items some direction, or detail, should of been indicated on the plans for these bars. And a bar list for information only purposes should be expected to be a little closer than the error introduced by the missed # 11 bar of approximately 201,000 pounds. Please advise some detail or guidance for the placement and coupling of these bars as shown on Section A-A and Section B-B on page 53 of 83 (378/408). Thank you.

See Addenda #4

Question Submitted: 1/17/2007

Question Number: 13

What is the intent of the note on sheet 20 concerning the stopping of traffic on the freeway? The note states that we are to install two traffic signal heads per sign during the closure. This is not feasible for a short term (10 minute) closure. Please allow the substitution of Type B lights or flares for the signal heads.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2007

Question Number: 14

Sheet 237 shows a gabion anchoring detail with a #5 J shaped rebar anchored 12" minimum into shale. This detail also shows the gabion lying on shale. All of the profiles in the plans indicate that the gabions lie on the existing grade after some minor smoothing has been performed. The soil borings indicate that the area covered by gabions has 8.5'-20' of dirt covering the shale. Is it the District's intent that the contractor removes this overlying dirt prior to gabion placement? If not, how is the contractor to anchor the gabions into shale when there is 20' of overburden? The APP note on Sheet 237 indicates that the contractor is to level the existing slopes to a 2:1 to 1.5:1 slope. The existing west bank is on a 1:2 to 1:1 slope now. Is the contractor to grade this slope to a 2:1 to 1.5:1 slope? Please clarify the intent of this item

See Addenda #4

Question Submitted: 1/17/2007

Question Number: 15

Ref. 164, Transition Area Delineation & Ref 165, Tangent Area Delineation, include all striping and RPM's required for all phases in the linear foot price. On other recent ODOT projects, the temporary striping, temporary channelizing line, temporary RPM's, etc. have been included in the respective temporary pay items. Can ODOT split out the respective temporary striping items and include as pay items? Addendum #2 added a quantity of 615 Temporary Pavement. Are the calculations for that available?

Question Submitted: 1/17/2007 Question Number: 16

1.) Please refer to bid item 186 "Portable Concrete barrier 32" Bridge Mounted". The plans do not indicate the number of drilled anchors required per section of barrier that will be required. Almost the entire quantity of the barrier in this item will be placed on bridge decks where the existing parapets remain on both sides of the deck. The only exception to this is for approximately 100 LF placed on the existing west bound bridge near the west abutment for phase I & II. Cann all of the barrier in this item with the exception of the 100 LF detailed above be set without drilling anchors into the decks? How many anchors per section of barrier will be required for the 100 LF where the removal of existing parapet occurs? 2.) Please refer to bid items 197 & 233 Class HP Concrete, Bridge Deck (Parapet) APP. The as per plan notes on drawing 262 of 408 for this concrete do not list including reinforcing steel as part of the item. The reinforcing steel table on drawing 322 of 408 has a note designating some of the reinforcing steel as paid under these concrete items. Could this reinforcing steel be added to bid items 195 & 231 for payment by the pound in lieu of being included with the parapet concrete items?

Question Submitted: 1/17/2007 Question Number: 17

What is the intent of the note on sheet 20 concerning the stopping of traffic on the freeway? The note states that we are to install two traffic signal heads per sign during the closure. This is not feasible for a short term (10 minute) closure. Please allow the substitution of Type B lights or flares for the signal heads.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2007 Question Number: 18

Sheet 237 shows a gabion anchoring detail with a #5 J shaped rebar anchored 12" minimum into shale. This detail also shows the gabion lying on shale. All of the profiles in the plans indicate that the gabions lie on the existing grade after some minor smoothing has been performed. The soil borings indicate that the area covered by gabions has 8.5'-20' of dirt covering the shale. Is it the District's intent that the contractor removes this overlying dirt prior to gabion placement? If not, how is the contractor to anchor the gabions into shale when there is 20' of overburden? The APP note on Sheet 237 indicates that the contractor is to level the existing slopes to a 2:1 to 1.5:1 slope. The existing west bank is on a 1:2 to 1:1 slope now. Is the contractor to grade this slope to a 2:1 to 1.5:1 slope? Please clarify the intent of this item

See Addenda #4

Question Submitted: 1/17/2007

Question Number: 19

Ref. 164, Transition Area Delineation & Ref 165, Tangent Area Delineation, include all striping and RPM's required for all phases in the linear foot price. On other recent ODOT projects, the temporary striping, temporary channelizing line, temporary RPM's, etc. have been included in the respective temporary pay items. Can ODOT split out the respective temporary striping items and include as pay items? Addendum #2 added a quantity of 615 Temporary Pavement. Are the calculations for that available?

Question Submitted: 1/17/2007

Question Number: 20

1.) Please refer to bid item 186 "Portable Concrete barrier 32" Bridge Mounted". The plans do not indicate the number of drilled anchors required per section of barrier that will be required. Almost the entire quantity of the barrier in this item will be placed on bridge decks where the existing parapets remain on both sides of the deck. The only exception to this is for approximately 100 LF placed on the existing west bound bridge near the west abutment for phase I & II. Cann all of the barrier in this item with the exception of the 100 LF detailed above be set without drilling anchors into the decks? How many anchors per section of barrier will be required for the 100 LF where the removal of existing parapet occurs? 2.) Please refer to bid items 197 & 233 Class HP Concrete, Bridge Deck (Parapet) APP. The as per plan notes on drawing 262 of 408 for this concrete do not list including reinforcing steel as part of the item. The reinforcing steel table on drawing 322 of 408 has a note designating some of the reinforcing steel as paid under these concrete items. Could this reinforcing steel be added to bid items 195 & 231 for payment by the pound in lieu of being included with the parapet concrete items?

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 21

Would ODOT consider releasing the electronic .TIN's to contractors who are bidding on this project before the bid letting.

TIN files available at ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/Pub/Contracts/Plans/070003TIN/

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 22

Would ODOT consider releasing the electronic .TIN's to contractors who are bidding on this project before the bid letting.

TIN files available at ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/Pub/Contracts/Plans/070003TIN/

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007

Question Number: 23

The items for transition and tangent area delineation include the cost of RPMs within the item. Could the RPMs please be paid as a seperate items as is the case on most projects?

This question was answered in addendum No. 4.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2007 Question Number: 24

The items for transition and tangent area delineation include the cost of RPMs within the item. Could the RPMs please be paid as a seperate items as is the case on most projects?

This question was answered in addendum No. 4.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2007

Question Number: 25

THE PROJECT IS CALLING FOR PVC GABIONS PER SS838.THE SIZE THAT IS CALLED FOR IS 12'X 6'X 9". THIS IS A SIZE FOR A MATTRESS NOT A GABION. SUPPLEMENTAL SPEC. 838 ONLY ADDRESSES GABIONS NOT MATTRESSES. A PVC GABION IS MADE IN 12 GAGE BUT A PVC MATTRESS IS MADE IN A 13.5 GAGE. DO YOU WANT A 12'X 6'X 9" PVC MATTRESS IN A 13.5 GAGE. YOUR PLANS ALSO CALL FOR A MINIMUM 5" TO 8" AGGREGATE. THIS AGGREGATE IS TO LARGE FOR A 9" HIGH MATTRESS TO GET ANY COMPACTION.

The plan note on sheet 12 calls for a gabion (12' x 6' x 9") with additional coating which would be considered a mattress. The contractor shall supply a gabion (mattress) that meets the plan note and that is commercially available in the size required. The size of aggregate will be acceptable due to the shallowness of the proposed gabion, the aggregate will essentially be "placed" instead of "compacted."

Question Submitted: 1/19/2007

Question Number: 26

THE PROJECT IS CALLING FOR PVC GABIONS PER SS838.THE SIZE THAT IS CALLED FOR IS 12'X 6'X 9". THIS IS A SIZE FOR A MATTRESS NOT A GABION. SUPPLEMENTAL SPEC. 838 ONLY ADDRESSES GABIONS NOT MATTRESSES. A PVC GABION IS MADE IN 12 GAGE BUT A PVC MATTRESS IS MADE IN A 13.5 GAGE. DO YOU WANT A 12'X 6'X 9" PVC MATTRESS IN A 13.5 GAGE. YOUR PLANS ALSO CALL FOR A MINIMUM 5" TO 8" AGGREGATE. THIS AGGREGATE IS TO LARGE FOR A 9" HIGH MATTRESS TO GET ANY COMPACTION.

The plan note on sheet 12 calls for a gabion (12' x 6' x 9") with additional coating which would be considered a mattress. The contractor shall supply a gabion (mattress) that meets the plan note and that is commercially available in the size required. The size of aggregate will be acceptable due to the shallowness of the proposed gabion, the aggregate will essentially be "placed" instead of "compacted."

Question Submitted: 1/20/2007

Question Number: 27

The plans do not seem to address how the bridge mounted barrier is to be anchored to the bridge decks. Unless otherwise specified, we assume that the bridge mounted barrier is to be unanchored.

Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question Submitted: 1/20/2007

Question Number: 28

The plans do not seem to address how the bridge mounted barrier is to be anchored to the bridge decks. Unless otherwise specified, we assume that the bridge mounted barrier is to be unanchored.

Please refer to Addendum #3.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2007

Question Number: 29

- 1 Field inspection indicates both of the existing bridge decks have been overlaid (or the decks replaced) and the parapets have been retrofitted or rebuilt to the barrier shape. The existing drawings provided on the ODOT website for this project do not show these revisions. Can the modified plan sheets showing the changes to the original design be provided? 2 Field inspection indicates both of the existing bridges were repainted with the OZEU paint system in 1995. Was the original paint system, which was probably lead based, removed from all of the steel including the trusses during this repainting project?
 - 1: The upgrade project that overlayed the deck and rebuilt the barrier shape has been added and contains the plans that performed this work. Find it at ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/Pub/Contracts/Plans/070003Upgrade/ Answer 2: The District believes that all of the original paint was NOT removed from the steel during the 1995 painting project.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2007

Question Number: 30

- 1 Field inspection indicates both of the existing bridge decks have been overlaid (or the decks replaced) and the parapets have been retrofitted or rebuilt to the barrier shape. The existing drawings provided on the ODOT website for this project do not show these revisions. Can the modified plan sheets showing the changes to the original design be provided? 2 Field inspection indicates both of the existing bridges were repainted with the OZEU paint system in 1995. Was the original paint system, which was probably lead based, removed from all of the steel including the trusses during this repainting project?
 - 1: The upgrade project that overlayed the deck and rebuilt the barrier shape has been added and contains the plans that performed this work. Find it at ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/Pub/Contracts/Plans/070003Upgrade/ Answer 2: The District believes that all of the original paint was NOT removed from the steel during the 1995 painting project.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2007 Question Number: 31

We would like for ODOT to reconsider adding a bid item for the 'Access Road' to gain access to the valley floor from either end. It is understood that the contractor would be responsible for the design, maintenance and removal of said road. Having a reference item setup for this would be a safe and conveinent place to get paid for it since it will be the first item performed on the job.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2007 Question Number: 32

Will there be any charges to the contractor for use of the Vrooman Rd ODOT Outpost location for the ODOT project Field office and the contractor field offices?

The District will not allow the contractor to place the field office at the Vrooman Rd. post.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2007 Question Number: 33

Can the Field offices for the project be located at the existing ODOT outpost on Vrooman Road just South of I –90? At completion of the project the site should be cleaned up and put back to its original condition.

The District will not allow the contractor to place the field office at the Vrooman Rd. post.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2007 Question Number: 34

Can the Field offices for the project be located at the existing ODOT outpost on Vrooman Road just South of I –90? At completion of the project the site should be cleaned up and put back to its original condition.

The District will not allow the contractor to place the field office at the Vrooman Rd. post.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2007 Question Number: 35

Will there be any charges to the contractor for use of the Vrooman Rd ODOT Outpost location for the ODOT project Field office and the contractor field offices?

The District will not allow the contractor to place the field office at the Vrooman Rd. post.

Question Submitted: 11/30/2006 Question Number: 36

Can ODOT make the existing bridge plans available for this project on an ftp site?

Plans available at ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/Pub/Contracts/Plans/070003/

Question Submitted: 12/22/2006 Question Number: 37

THIS PROJECT IS CALLING FOR GABIONS WITH ADDITIONAL COATINGS AS PER PLAN. IN THE GENERAL NOTES IT SAYS THAT THEY ARE TO BE GALVANIZED AND PVC COATED DOUBLE TWIST WIRE MESH PER SUPPLEMENT SPECIFICATION 838.

THE QUESTION IS. CAN THE GABIONS BE GALVANIZED AND PVC COATED WELDED WIRE MESH PER SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIFICATION 838. THIS WOULD ALLOW FOR A MORE COMPETATIVE BIDDING PROCESS.

The District feels the double twisted wire mesh that was specified in the note is a better product and will be more durable where it will be placed in the plans.

Question Submitted: 12/22/2006 Question Number: 38

THIS PROJECT IS CALLING FOR GABIONS WITH ADDITIONAL COATINGS AS PER PLAN. IN THE GENERAL NOTES IT SAYS THAT THEY ARE TO BE GALVANIZED AND PVC COATED DOUBLE TWIST WIRE MESH PER SUPPLEMENT SPECIFICATION 838.

THE QUESTION IS. CAN THE GABIONS BE GALVANIZED AND PVC COATED WELDED WIRE MESH PER SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIFICATION 838. THIS WOULD ALLOW FOR A MORE COMPETATIVE BIDDING PROCESS.

The District feels the double twisted wire mesh that was specified in the note is a better product and will be more durable where it will be placed in the plans.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2006 Question Number: 3

Will ODOT consider accepting CI 50 Ductile Iron Lock Joint Pipe and fittings in lieu of the As Per Plan page 14 flange joint pipe required for the 18" and 20" Type F conduit As Per Plan?

No, the district feels that the pipe specified in the APP note on sheet 14 is best suited for this application.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2006 Question Number: 40

Will ODOT consider accepting CI 50 Ductile Iron Lock Joint Pipe and fittings in lieu of the As Per Plan page 14 flange joint pipe required for the 18" and 20" Type F conduit As Per Plan?

No, the district feels that the pipe specified in the APP note on sheet 14 is best suited for this application.

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.

Tuesday, October 12, 2010 5:42:18 PM Page 5

Question Submitted: 8/2/2007 Question Number: 41

On plan page 108 of 124 there are extensive notes that discuss the replacement of warped plates found on the twin structures during rehabilitation work. An estimated quantity of 500 pounds per bridge has been set up for this work. Depending on the location and size of the damaged plate(s) it may or may not be necessary to provide some additional temporary shoring or support to the girder being repaired. Another difficulty arises if the area of plate replacement occurs at a point of shown temporary support during the repairs. Should the contractor assume that the warped plate replacement will occur only in locations & be limited in length so additional support or shoring of the girder under repair will not be necessary? If the answer to the previous question is no can the Department describe specifically what steps will be required to allow the plate replacement to be made safely so every bidder can estimate the cost on an equal basis? Please verify that any rivets replaced as part of the warped plate replacement will be paid seperately under the rivet replacement bid item.