

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 060002

Sale Date - 2/8/2006

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 1

Reference no. 22 calls for a granular material, type D as per plan. The general summary indicates that the plan note is found on sheet 232, however, there is no plan note for type D. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 2

The plan note on sheet #34 concerning earthwork for maintaining traffic shows a quantity of excavation @ 3,670 CY and embankment @ 54,969 CY. Does ODOT have a breakdown of how they determined these quantities, as the cross-sections do not show earthwork for temporary roads and we have no way to determine in what areas this quantity will be used.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 3

On Cross Section Quantity Sheets 761/1100 thru 779/1100, your "Nominal Cut" volumes in column 3 match your "Excavation" volumes in column 6, but your "Nominal Fill" volumes (which seem correct WRT actual cross sections) are significantly (2 to 3 times) larger than your "Embankment" volumes in column 7; you then use the smaller col. 7 "Excavation" volumes for your Subtotals, carried to your Proposal quantities. Why are the "Nominal Fill" quantities NOT used for the "Embankment" volumes?

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 4

On Cross Section Quantity Sheets 761/1100 thru 779/1100, your "Nominal Cut" volumes in column 3 match your "Excavation" volumes in column 6, but your "Nominal Fill" volumes (which seem correct WRT actual cross sections) are significantly (2 to 3 times) larger than your "Embankment" volumes in column 7; you then use the smaller col. 7 "Excavation" volumes for your Subtotals, carried to your Proposal quantities. Why are the "Nominal Fill" quantities NOT used for the "Embankment" volumes?

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 5

The successful contractor on this major project will be required to mobilize a great deal of material and equipment in order to access the work areas (i.e. barges, mats, docks, boats, shoring at slab bridges, etc.). The standard CMS 624 mobilization item is inadequate to cover these major expenditures. Would the department consider adding a "special mobilization" item to the bid form, or substantially increasing the partial payment limits in item 624? Please advise.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 6

Plan sheet 29 states that the contractor shall not perform any work in and/or place any fill in jurisdictional streams or wetlands until the final 404/401 permits are authorized. It also states that the permits may be provided to the contractor by March 31, 2006. If these permits are not provided by March 31, 2006, will the contractor be reimbursed for delay costs or additional costs incurred to recoup lost time due to the permits not being in place?

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 7

The "Work Zone Traffic Control Devices Reminder" dated 12/13/04 states that "Contractors are allowed to use portable concrete barrier in their inventory for its useful life or until January 1, 2008, provided it was manufactured according to construction standard drawings MC-9.1 or MC-9.2 (or subsequently RM-4.1 or RM-4.2) and purchased before October 1, 2002." As the completion date of this project is 8/31/2009, will the contractor have to replace any PCB on the project that does not conform to dwg RM-4.2 after Jan 1, 2008?

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 8

Page 52 of the proposal calls for medium & light duty designs for the asphalt pavements for Lipkey Rd, the Service Road & the Metroparks bikepath, what design do we use for the 614 asphalt for resurfacing & the pavement for maintaining traffic.

For reference #209, Full depth rigid removal & flexible replacement, the note on plan sheet 32 calls for replacement with 13" of Class C concrete, what is the intent for this item - is the repair to be concrete or asphalt.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2006

Question Number: 9

Per Addendum 1, slag is prohibited for use throughout the project. Would this also include slag aggregates which could be utilized in asphalt and/or concrete pavement mix designs? Also, ODOT Supplemental spec 884.04 refers to the requirements of 499 Class C. This specification allows the use of slag cement in its mix designs. Would slag cement then also be prohibited from use on this project?

Question Submitted: 1/19/2006

Question Number: 10

The maintenance of traffic sheet #73 shows pavement for maintaining traffic, class A (PA38) on the left side of Ramp 46-C, however, the quantity summary on sheet #81 lists pavement planing and 2" overlay @ 1,346.9 SY. Please clarify.

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: 1/19/2006

Question Number: 11

Bid item 41 622 Conc. Barrier Single Slope, Type D

According to standards RM 4.5 Single Slope Type D is placed on the adjoining pavement. The majority of the Type D Barrier on this project is behind a ditch line, well away from any pavement. Standards only show a footer at the end of runs. Is this barrier to be placed directly on the dirt?

Question Submitted: 1/19/2006

Question Number: 12

Since the Permit for the work on the bridges over the reservoir has not been included in the bid package, can the application for the permit which the department had submitted to the Corps be made available to the prospective bidders?

Question Submitted: 1/20/2006

Question Number: 13

WITH REFERENCE TO LINE ITEM NUMBER 0209 (ITEM CODE 252E01000)
THE SCOPE OF WORK PER CMS & PROPOSAL CALLS FOR FULL DEPTH
RIGID PAVEMENT REMOVAL AND FLEXIBLE REPLACEMENT WITH
ASPHALT. WHERE AS PER PLAN SHEET 32 IT STATES THAT AFTER
FULL DEPTH REMOVAL REPAIR WITH 13" +/- CLASS C CONCRETE? PLEASE
CLARIFY.

Question Submitted: 1/23/2006

Question Number: 14

With regard to Maintaining Traffic and winter time limitations, Addendum #1 states that it is the intent to have all ramps & two lanes of mainline traffic open in each direction between Nov 15 and Apr 1. Are these two lanes of mainline traffic to be on the temporary and/or existing west-bound pavement utilizing portable concrete barrier? Or are the two lanes of eastbound traffic to be re-established on the existing eastbound lanes of the project? If so, who is responsible for maintaining the existing eastbound lanes in a safe condition for public use?

If the westbound lanes are restored to westbound traffic only for the winter, would any portable concrete barrier that has been set on the westbound areas remain in place or would it be removed for the winter and then re-set when work resumes the following year? If so, how is the contractor paid for removing and resetting this portable concrete barrier?

Question Submitted: 1/23/2006

Question Number: 15

On bridge MAH-80-0332, the bid qty for Class C concrete (line 0495) in footing's is 423 cy's. I believe that is the quantity for half of the culvert. In my take off I have roughly double that qty. Please confirm that the given qty is correct.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2006

Question Number: 16

on sheets 964 and 985 the quantity of P502 is incorrect.

There are 38 in the seismic pedestals, but there are also 6 shown on ea end of the pier cap. Please verify.

Also the dimensions for the 6 on each end are incorrect per the steel list. Was it intended to be a different mark number?

Question Submitted: 1/24/2006

Question Number: 17

IN REFERENCE TO GENERAL GROUTING AND MINE REMEDIATION NOTES.
PAGE 3A-13 UNDER HEADING GROUT MIXES.

NEAT CEMENT GROUT DOESN'T YIELD A YARD. AS OF PRESENT QUANTITIES IT IS YIELDING ONLY 1/2 A YARD. ALSO IT SAYS WE CAN USE ALTERNATE MIXES, BUT THERE IS NO INFORMATION ON THE PSI REQUIREMENT OF MIXES.

ANY QUESTIONS PLEASE GIVE ME A CALL, THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS MATTER.

THANK YOU,
ELMER FRAZIER
elmerfrazier@comcast.net

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: 1/26/2006

Question Number: 18

Addendum No. 1 "Use of Boats on the Meander Reservoir" states that all boats used by the contractor in the Meander Reservoir must have an electric motor. It is our understanding that this requirement is intended to apply to the ODOT inspection boats, all safety boats as required by OSHA, and any general personnel launches. Further, we understand that any two cycle, two stroke engine that mixes fuel with oil and then exhausts into the water would be prohibited. However, larger "barge-pusher" boats which move heavy crane barges and heavy supply barges (for piling, precast girders and plastic concrete in ready mix trucks) require significantly more horsepower. The greater power of diesel engines is required for both locomotion and stopping power to safely maneuver large heavy barges. These four cycle, four stroke engines do not mix oil with fuel and although they use reservoir water as a cooling medium, it is run through a closed system and is returned to the reservoir without any contact with any engine fluids. These pusher boats pose no greater threat to the water than the diesel engines and diesel fuel storage tanks on the cranes located on the barges being pushed. All bidders must recognize that diligent oversight of all operation and refueling of all pile driving cranes, general duty lift cranes and all heavy lift crane equipment is mandatory. Diesel engines are an essential aspect of the operations required to construct the bridges over the Meander Reservoir. Please review and advise on this critical issue.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2006

Question Number: 19

Addendum 1 & 2 state that Recycled Portland Cement Concrete is prohibited throughout this project. Will the use of concrete rubble from the pavement and/or bridge decks be allowed in the fill areas of the project?

Although Item 203 does allow the use of recycled Portland cement concrete in specific conditions, due to the sensitivity of the Meander Reservoir we believe that recycled Portland cement concrete should be prohibited on this project. Meander Reservoir serves as the main drinking water supply for the City of Youngstown, and recycled Portland cement concrete has a high ph runoff. As a result, the District has decided to prohibit the use of any recycled concrete or concrete rubble on this project.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2006

Question Number: 20

Addendum 2 states that any portable concrete barrier that does not conform to Std Dwg RM 4.2 is to be replaced after Jan 1, 2008. Approx 44,000 feet of wall will be needed in 2008. At an average current cost of \$26.00 per foot, to replace this amount of wall would cost approximately \$1,144,000.00, not including the labor cost for removing the old wall and setting the new wall. We respectfully request that ODOT re-consider and allow the use of old-style wall through out the duration of the project (or mandate the all new-style wall be utilized from the beginning of the project). This would prevent any "Value Engineering" at the District Level for a conceivable lower savings after the project has been awarded.

The Department has determined that addendum 2 correctly states that the Contractor will be required to remove any 32" Portable Concrete Barrier that does not conform to Standard Construction Drawing RM-4.2 and replace it with 32" Portable Concrete Barrier conforming to Standard Construction Drawing RM-4.2 after January 1, 2008. This requirement will not be changed at this time or at any future time in the life of this project.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2006

Question Number: 21

Reference No. 26 is for Excavation of Subgrade. There does not appear to be a corresponding item for replacement of the excavated area. What material (or bid item) is to be used to replace the excavated subgrade, and how will it be paid?

Question Submitted: 1/26/2006

Question Number: 22

The "anticipated" date that the 404/401 permits will be provided to the contractor is now May 31, 2006. Can the contractor rely on this date and plan to schedule work beginning June 1, 2006 within the affected areas?

Question Submitted: 1/27/2006

Question Number: 23

Spill Containment Basins, Easy & West

As detailed on Page 849 of 1100, the design requires the installation of 300 LF of "Special 24" Ductile Iron Pipe and Fittings (Dayton 901). None of my pipe suppliers are familiar with or have heard of (Dayton 901). Could you please clarify? Also, how do we determine what fittings are required? Are you calling the knife valves fittings?

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: 1/30/2006

Question Number: 24

On the MAH-80-0123 bridge plans; note 4 on sheets 25 and 26/49; states that "prior to placing concrete for the pier cap, adjust beam seat elevations as directed by the engineer to account for actual beam cambers in excess of the anticipated cambers at the time of erection tabulated in sheet 41/49." Please clarify the intent or intended method of achieving this objective. At what point will the "actual" beam cambers be determined; this cannot feasibly occur at the time of erection, but, the camber could be measured at the time of release or say, 28 days after the first group of beams are fabricated. The schedule will not allow the contractor to wait until all beams are fabricated to pour the pier caps. Also, from whatever date or age of the beams the camber is measured and "adjustments" are made, how will any further increase in camber due to creep be adjusted for? Please advise.

Addendum No.2, Note entitled: "Use of slag materials and RPCC", has prohibited the use of RPCC on the project. The context of the questions and answers about this issue leave us with some uncertainty regarding the department's intent.

ODOT 2005 CMS 203.06 D describes the requirements which allow RPCC slabs to be used in embankments. On this project, away from wetland areas, are bridge and pavement slabs allowed to be used in embankments if installed in accordance with the 203.06 D specification?

Question Submitted: 1/31/2006

Question Number: 25

Plan Sheet 983/1100 (46/49 Meander Bridge) Parapet Sliding Plate Elevation shows stainless hardware mounting this plate. Are we correct in assuming the plate itself, and anchor studs are to be carbon steel, metallized per the 2005 ODOT CMS 516 specification? Or stainless?

Question Submitted: 1/4/2006

Question Number: 26

All of the MOT plan sheets have blacked out sections to show proposed pavement in place. This makes it impossible to see the lanes and MOT devices needed in these sections. Could you please make these plan sheets available without the black hatching so that we can accurately bid this work?

Question Submitted: 1/4/2006

Question Number: 27

Can the plans of the existing dual bridges over the Meander Reservoir be included with the addendum or made available on line? They would be most helpful for estimating the demolition & all the bridge contractors will need them.

The plans for the existing dual bridges over the Meander Reservoir as well the the existing plans for the other bridges on this project are available on the District's website at: <ftp://www.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/MAH-80-0.97,PID%206080/>

Question Submitted: 1/4/2006

Question Number: 28

Can stay in place metal deck forms be used to form the interior deck bays of the dual bridges over the Meander Reservoir?

Question Submitted: 1/5/2006

Question Number: 29

1. Will ODOT allow the use of 42" weighted channelizers in the tangent area during night lane closures if drums are used for the taper?

2. The transition area delineation note on sheet 36 contradicts the illustrations on sheets 37A and 37B. Please specify which method is to be used.

Question Submitted: 1/5/2006

Question Number: 30

On November 30th and again on December 13th I faxed information into your office in regards to several items that needed address on this project.

1) There are approximately 4,953sf of extruded aluminum panel signs, yet there is no pay item.

2) There are three locations where new signs are being installed on new w6 X 9 gound mounted supports, the locations or these installations will require omni directional breakaway connections, yet these locations do not even show having standard breakaway connections. Plan sheet 905,907,911.

3) There are three locations where new extruded aluminum signs are being installed on existing OVHD sign supports, there should be new sign attachments required yet there are no pay items for sign attachment assemblies. Plan sheet 898, 907, 909.

Will there be an addendum issued regarding this inquiry.

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: 1/5/2006

Question Number: 31

In regard to maintaining traffic, a plan note on sheet 33, column 1 refers to winter time limitations. The note refers to "All existing lanes shall be open to traffic between November 15 and April 1..." Given that this project involves reconstruction of mainline pavement, is that the intent of the note or is it the intent to have two lanes of mainline traffic open in each direction and all ramps open during this time period?

Question Submitted: 1/9/2006

Question Number: 32

- 1). Pavement joint details for the concrete pavement (plan sheets 827 thru 848) indicate a typical transverse joint spacing of 15 foot. Is this spacing mandatory, or is this a maximum spacing?
- 2). Will value engineering proposals be allowed for areas outside of the "Incentive/Disincentive" areas on this project?
- 3). Proposal Note 108 "Dispute Review Board Process" states that the DRB members will be paid by the contractor monthly and the contractor will be reimbursed by the Department for the Department Member and one-half of the fee & expenses of the third member. Will a Bid Item be added for these costs? If not, where should these costs be included in the bid?
- 4). Proposal Note 108, Item VI.A.2: Please provide the "Rate" that is to be used for the Third Member of the DRB.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2006

Question Number: 33

Note #2 on page 926A states that the contractor is to provide temporary shoring for the existing portion of the pier cap left in place for phase 1B of the Lipkey Road bridge. What are the loading requirements for this shoring?

Question Submitted: 12/11/2006

Question Number: 34

1. Can the amount of work performed by the prime contractor be reduced to 40% ?
2. How is the excavation paid for at the pavement widenings (for 304 and asphalt) at the new D wall locations as shown on plan sheets 11 and 247A ?
3. Plan sheet 31 has established a quantity of 500 lf of pressure relief joint type a to be used as directed when patching pavement at an existing joint. All the patching work is being done with short term nightly closures. I don't think it is possible to remove the pavement, pour a sleeper slab, then pour the pavement patch, and lastly fill in the asphalt to reopen the lane to traffic with a nightly closure.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2005

Question Number: 35

Plan sheets 29 and 29a make reference to protection of existing wetlands and waterways. In the general notes, restrictions are given for 304 and 617 aggregates. However there are no notes specifying any restrictions for the types of approved and/or non-approved materials for the dump rock, rock channel protection, and 203 embankment as per plan items. Are there any restrictions involving slag or recycled concrete throughout the project?

Question Submitted: 12/22/2005

Question Number: 36

- 1 Included in the Table of Contents in the proposal is PN 108 dated 5/27/05. Should this note be updated to 9/15/05? There should be a contingency bid item established in the proposal for Dispute Review Board.

- 2 Should there be a Proposal Note for Value Engineering?

Question Submitted: 2/1/2006

Question Number: 37

sheet 937 of 1100, marks P1013, P1014, P1015, P1016 are missing weights from the reinforcing steel list. Please verify.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2006

Question Number: 38

Ref.209:Item 252:

On sheet 32, the pavement repair typical for the above referenced item shows an existing overlay of 5", two inches of which are to be milled prior to the repair. Sheet 32 would indicate the need to include 3" of asphalt to be removed and replaced.

This information is in conflict with Sheet 6 of the plans, the existing typicals indicate existing asphalt as deep as 13.5" thick.

At plan quantity, the 8.5" discrepancy generates 355 cy of material to be removed and replaced under the item without a means to pay for this work. The item is currently bid by the square yard, thereby requiring either an accurate depth of the existing conditions or a means to compensate for asphalt deeper than the 3" required by sheet 32.

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: 2/3/2006

Question Number: 39

The substitution of precast headwalls and wingwalls in lieu of cast-in-place walls as shown for bid item 0494 is allowed per ODOT CMS 2005. If the contractor elects to use precast walls, would the contractor still be compensated the full pay item quantity for the cast-in-place design and the full pay item for reinforcement steel as they would be under the 602 pay item, as was previously allowed on ODOT Project 060015 MAD-CR7?

We are not aware of any portion of the 2005 CMS which states that "The substitution of precast headwalls and wingwalls in lieu of cast-in-place walls ... is allowed per ODOT CMS 2005."

Question Submitted: 2/7/2006

Question Number: 40

second request to clarify the psi you need on alternate mixes, in reference to grouting and mine remediation. also the cement/grout as of present quantities is yielding only 1/2 a yd not 1 yd. thank you.

This prebid question was answered in Addendum #3. The neat grout cement mix proportion was revised in the addendum. As far as alternative mixes, a note was also added in addendum#3. Psi requirements are not provided since the pumpability and stability of the mix are the criteria for acceptance, not the compressive strength alone.

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.