

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 070523

Sale Date - 12/19/2007

Question Submitted: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 1

Will the award of this contract be made solely on the low bid, irregardless of which option is the low amount? Or will the Owner review the bid amounts for both options and possibly choose that option that does not have the low bid amount?

The award can only be based upon the lowest possible bid.

Question Submitted: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 2

Plan sheet 285/316 in the steel bridge plans indicates 2 ea 4" diameter multi-cell I.T.S. conduits in the median parapets. The corresponding sheet in the concrete bridge plans (285/314) just says 4" I.T.S. conduit. On the adjacent project MOT-75-13.11, all references to multi-cell were removed via addendum. Please verify what is required for this project.

Question Submitted: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 3

The link provided by the Department for access to the existing drawings for the dual structures to be replaced on this project in response to a previous question show only the original construction in 1956. Since that time the bridges have been modified. At least 1 steel girder line has been added to each bridge and the decks have been modified to close the median gap between them. Can the department also provide a link to the drawings that detail these revisions? These drawings will more accurately reflect the quantities of steel and concrete to be removed during this project & will show if shear studs are present on any of the existing steel girders.

Question Submitted: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 4

Would the Department post a link to the existing plans of the bridges on this project on the website?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Plans/070523/>

Question Submitted: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 5

ADDENDUM 3 CHANGED THE QUANTITY OF REF 225/546 TEMPORARY SIGNAL TO 2 EACH PER ADDENDUM 2. ADDENDUM 2 ADDS TWO PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS AND ONE VEHICLE SIGNAL TO THE PROPOSED TEMPORARY SIGNAL. THERE IS NO NEED TO CHANGE THIS QUANTITY. SINCE THIS WAS NOTICED SO CLOSE TO THE BID DATE, I WILL HAVE TO SHIFT SOME OF THE TEMPORARY SIGNAL COST ELSEWHERE FOR FEAR OF THE QUANTITY BEING CORRECTED TO 1 EACH.

Addendum 3 is correct in that the quantity of temporary signals has been revised to two each. The quantity of two pedestrian signal heads was specified in Addenda 2 for use with at the Stanley/N-9 and N-10 intersection only. There is no need to shift money in your bid.

Question Submitted: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 6

1. It appears that the quantity for HMWM Sealer does not include the gutter line at the Parapets. Per Specification 511, these joints are also to be sealed. Please adjust the quantity to reflect this work or direct the contractor not to seal these joints. 2. Will the contractor be allowed to combine multiple deck pours as shown in the plans into single large pours? This has been allowed on all recent projects in the area. 3. Will Stay-in-Place deck forms be allowed for use on this project? These have successfully been used on other projects throughout the state for fast-track construction. 4. The Static Load Test notes on sheet 238/314 state that a subsequent test shall be performed after completion of 10,000 lf of driving. Per the plan quantities for the structure, there will only be 155 lf of piling remaining at this point. Please revise this note to eliminate the second Static Load Test. 5. Does the Department intend to modify the Maintenance of Traffic scheme on this project and if so when will the new plan sheets be made available? 6. Where are the conduits in the bridge median barrier to be paid for? 7. This project has an extremely difficult schedule. Our understanding from previous projects is that ODOT is not subject to local noise ordinances. 8. When this project previously bid, the rebar bid item for the concrete beam bridge option was increased from 1,471,476 lbs to 1,515,125 lbs by addendum. The current bid is 1,447,570 lbs. Please confirm that the current bid quantity is correct. 9. Sheet 2, Section 21 of the 404 Permit Application states that the total volume of temporary fill is not expected to exceed 4,800 cy at any time. Sheets 248/316, 244/314 and 245/314 all depict phases which exceed this limit. Please clarify the restrictions to use for bidding this project. 10. The note added in Addendum #1 for high water states the following: Delays caused by fluctuating river elevations are excusable, non-compensable. If the water goes higher than elevation 741.18, the Department will compensate the Contractor for repair and cleanup of items within the sheeted cofferdams. The note fails to address how the Department will compensate the Contractor for repair and cleanup of the causeway, which is located outside the sheeted cofferdams, during any water elevation. The Department cannot reasonably expect the contractors to take the risk of repairing the causeway regardless of the severity of the high water event. Previous projects have compensated the contractor for any causeway repair or replacement costs regardless of the water elevation. Please revise the note to minimize the risk that the bidders must assume and provide for consistency among the bids.

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: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 7

The following questions pertain to the "milling and resurfacing" note located in the upper right hand corner on plan sheet 20/316. Where is the 1.5" milling paid? Where is the replacement asphalt paid? An estimated quantity of 17,947 sy of pavement removed is mentioned. Where is this located? Is it a contingency item? If so, please separate it from the actual item pavement removal item for it could greatly skew the way this item is bid since we have no idea what the limits of removal are.

Question Submitted: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 8

Contract plans sheet 262 of 314 refers to standard drawing details PSID-1-99 sheets 1 to 8 of 8. Sheet 6 of 8 calls out structural steel channel and angle. Will this project be using concrete or steel diaphragms?

Per note "Diaphragms" on Sheet 8 of 8 of PSID-1-99 the contractor has the option of using steel or concrete diaphragms.

Question Submitted: 11/26/2007

Question Number: 9

Supplemental specification 872 is referenced on sheet 1 of 314 (Prestressed Concrete Option) and 1 of 316 (Steel Girder Option). The date associated with this specification, 10/30/03, is old. Should this date be changed to 4/21/06? This would affect the type of LED's provided for the Traffic Control Signals. Thank you -

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

Project No. 068010

Sale Date - 6/13/2006

Question Submitted: 5/23/2006

Question Number: 1

- 1) Is the final completion date of 5/31/08 still applicable since the sale date has been moved by three months?
- 2) Are the addendum changes of 060115 made part of this contract? One specific item is the MOT changes from Addendum No. 3. Please clarify all changes.
- 3) Since clearing will not take place before April 15, have any potential Indiana Bat trees been cleared?
- 4) Is resurfacing required for both transition area and tangent area delineation? Are permanent striping and RPMs considered incidental in these areas or paid by reference item? It appears that it is ODOT's intent to pay by reference item since quantities are inclusive of the delineation areas. However, there are transition and tangent areas north of Sta 473+21 on the southbound side where there are no striping and RPM quantities. Please consider adding a planing reference item and paying for surface course, striping and RPMs by already established unit prices in the delineation areas.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2006

Question Number: 2

The following questions are in regards to the causeway plan shown on sheet 243A:

1. It appears that this design will be inadequate for some phases of work and too narrow for access to some portions of the work. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that we are to bid exactly what is shown in the plans and any modifications necessary for constructability will be paid for by change order including compensation for time and money.
2. It may be necessary to work from both sides of the river at the same time due to schedule constraints. Sheet 243A shows work from opposite sides as being separate 'stages' of causeway. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that work may occur on both sides of the river simultaneously and only the channel in span 3 needs to be left open.
3. Per sheet 243A, the culvert pipes are to be installed per SS 832. Section 832.10 states that culverts shall have a diameter at least two times the depth of normal stream flow. Normal flow as shown on the causeway typical section is 5.18', which means that the culverts would have a minimum diameter of 10.36'. This would leave the culverts sticking out of the top of the causeway rendering it unusable. Please provide a logical design for the culverts.
4. SS 832 states that Dump Rock, Type B, C, or D shall be used to construct the causeway. Allowing the use of reclaimed, clean, non-erodible material may significantly decrease the cost of this the project. Please consider allowing the use of other materials for causeway construction.
5. Sheet 243A, Note 6 states that project special provisions can be found in the 404/401 permits. This appears to be a nationwide permit and does not contain project specific data.
6. The completion date appears to be unreasonable given that this project has been delayed by several months.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2006

Question Number: 3

Re: PN 205 - Temporary Sediment & Erosion Control with Prices

The temporary sediment and erosion control prices listed in the proposal as part of supplemental spec. 832 do not correspond with the latest version of the 832 spec. Please revise the note to reflect the newest pricing schedule.

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: 5/30/2006

Question Number: 4

1) Please review the soil borings and piling requirements for the new bridge piers. The existing bridge drawings indicate that there is no piling under the existing pier footings. The existing bridge pier footings are embedded three inches into "sound rock" as follows:

Pier 1 elev 714.92

Pier 2 elev 718.00

Pier 3 elev 718.00

Pier 4 elev 719.00

Page 245 of new bridge drawings has a "piling data" table showing "required" pile tip elevations due to scour for the new bridge piers as follows:

Pier 1 elev 702.0

Pier 2 elev 697.0

Pier 3 elev 697.0

Pier 4 elev 702.0

This would require the contractor to drive piles at new pier footings No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4 to 13 ft, 21 ft, 21 ft and 17 ft, respectively, below sound rock.

Although the soil borings included with the new bridge plans show no rock, the blow counts indicate "refusal" would occur between elevations 712.00 and 715.00 (this would be 15 ft to 20 ft short of scour tip elevation and less than 80% of plan pile lengths).

Pay items should be set up for pile points and preboring if "scour tip elevations" must be achieved. If the contractor does this, the piles would no longer be "friction piles". Please advise how we should proceed and what basis to use for bidding purposes.

Question Submitted: 5/30/2006

Question Number: 5

Sheet 13 lists the fish spawning period as April 15 to June 15. Sheet 243A lists it as April 15 to June 30. What is the correct date?

Question Submitted: 6/1/2006

Question Number: 6

1. Will the use of SIP deck forms be allowed?

2. Can the deck pour sequence shown on sheet 269 be modified to pour the deck and diaphragms in a continuous pour including the midspan deck pours through the use of concrete additives?

A1) No. A2) Per ODOT Standard Drawing PSID-1-99 (Rev 7-18-03): THE DESIGNER SHALL INCLUDE A DECK POUR SEQUENCE IN THE PLANS FOR MULTI-SPAN, CONTINUOUS BRIDGES. TWO CONSTRUCTION JOINTS SPACED AT 8'-0", PARALLEL TO AND CENTERED ABOUT THE PIERS ARE REQUIRED. DO NOT PLACE CONCRETE BETWEEN THESE CONSTRUCTION JOINTS PRIOR TO THE PLACEMENT OF CONCRETE IN EACH ADJACENT SPAN. UPON COMPLETION OF THE CONCRETE PLACEMENT IN THE ADJACENT SPANS, PLACE THE DIAPHRAGM AND DECK CONCRETE BETWEEN THE CONSTRUCTION JOINTS. SEAL THE JOINTS WITH A 2'-0" WIDE STRIP OF HIGH MOLECULAR WEIGHT METHACRYLATE RESIN ACCORDING TO 511.22. CONTINUOUS DECK POUR PROCEDURES, WHICH PROCEED FROM END TO END OF THE BRIDGE AND PLACE THE PIER DIAPHRAGM CONCRETE CONCURRENTLY WITH THE DECK CONCRETE, MAYBE APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR IF THE PLACEMENT SUBMITTAL CAN ASSURE THAT THE DECK CONCRETE IN ADJACENT SPANS WILL BE PLACED BEFORE THE PIER DIAPHRAGM CONCRETE HAS REACHED ITS INITIAL SET.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2006

Question Number: 7

1. Addendum #3 of 115(06) deleted sheets 30 through 33. These sheets reappeared in 8010(06). Should they be deleted?

2. Addendum #3 postponed the Phase 1B work on N-9 to Phase 2. Sheets 37 and 39 still show work being done in Phase 1B and sheet 16 still lists work to be done in Phase 1B Parts 1 and 2. Is it still ODOT's intent to incorporate this work into Phase 2?

3. The transition area delineation scheme noted on sheet 20 seems to contradict the insert sheets on 81 and 82. Which scheme should be followed?

Question Submitted: 6/19/2006

Question Number: 8

referring to luminaire specifications:

fixture types, B, C, D, F, G, H, K, K-1, and K-2 describe a "one piece die-cast aluminum assembly" for the fixture body in the written specification. Is this a requirement or would extruded and/or formed fixture housings be acceptable?

also, will it be the requirement of the fixture manufacture to provide modeled calculations, or just data to perform calculations for fixtures that are not within 5% of the base manufactures beam distributions?

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: 6/2/2006

Question Number: 9

The answer in addendum #1 to the pile length question is confusing. The answer states "Estimated scour depth is 12 feet and minimum embedment length of pile is 15 feet requiring pile tips for the piers 27 feet below the ground surface at the pier. Proceed per plan." Why would a pile length of 27 feet for the piers require pile tips unless it was expected that the contractor would encounter rock? Also, if pile tips are required, a bid item should be established to pay for them. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that to 'proceed per plan' means that no pile tips will be required and that rock is not expected.

Question Submitted: 6/2/2006

Question Number: 10

RE: PN 520 – Fuel Price Adjustment

It is our understanding that ODOT's intent is to include Proposal Note 520 – Fuel Price Adjustment on all jobs that contain any category of work listed in the Table A-1 of PN 520 (see page 4 of PN 520). Since this project includes items of work that exceed the threshold quantities, should the Fuel Price Adjustment note be added to this project?

If not, will a Fuel Price Adjustment be added by change order to the successful bidder's contract?

Question Submitted: 6/2/2006

Question Number: 11

Transition Area delineation for the southbound side in phase 2 on 8010(06) is extended to 430+88.15. The milling and resurfacing stations on sheet 20 do not show any resurfacing in this section. Should the stations 430+88.15 to 446+87.30, LT be added to these quantities? Also it appears that area between stations 476+65.28 and 478+26.00, LT is not included.

Question Submitted: 6/2/2006

Question Number: 12

Addendum #1 added 296 ea object markers. The proposal already has an item of 285 ea for these. It seems the item was added instead of revising the existing quantity. Please revise these items.

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

Project No. 060115

Sale Date - 3/10/2006

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 1

Please post the existing plans for this project.

The plans can be viewed at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D07/mot/PID23828/>

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 2

In regard to bid items 225 & 226 In regards to bid items 225 & 226 for transition area delineation and tangent area delineation, will ODOT define the limits of the removal of the asphalt surface course and the resurfacing area?

Reference is made to the Work Zone Delineation note on Plan Sheet 20 and Note 9 on Plan Sheet 82 which provide for removal of the asphalt surface course and resurfacing area; limits to include all travel lanes and shoulder pavement.

Question Submitted: 1/31/2006

Question Number: 3

Please provide the existing structure plans on the ODOT website so that the contractors can download them.

The existing plans can be view at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D07/mot/PID23828/>

Question Submitted: 2/16/2006

Question Number: 4

There was discussion at the prebid meeting that the incentive/disincentive note would be revised to reflect a more realistic timeframe. Now that the bid has been delayed a week, the department cannot reasonably expect that the low bidder will have a signed contract in time to get their causeway completely installed and Phase 1B demolition completed prior to the April 15th cutoff for in-stream work. Additionally, since the construction of future phases of the I-75 corridor have been delayed, the requirements that the phasing for this project line up with the next project have changed. Please take this into account and provide the revised incentive/disincentive note as soon as possible to give the bidders enough time to prepare their bids accordingly.

Question Submitted: 2/16/2006

Question Number: 5

In the General Summary on Plan Sheet 84, RCP B and RCP C is referenced to Plan Sheet 236. Plan Sheet 236 calls for RCP B at piers and on abutment slopes. There is no reference to RCP C. Should RCP C be placed on abutment slopes or should this item be deleted? Please clarify.

There is no RCP C is the Gen Summary on sheet 84.

Question Submitted: 2/17/2006

Question Number: 6

1. Will the use of SIP forms be allowed?

2. Can the deck pour sequence shown on sheet 269 be modified to pour the deck and diaphragms at the same time through the use of concrete additives?

Question Submitted: 2/20/2006

Question Number: 7

Due to the fact that the borings given in the Structure Foundation Investigation do not extend down to the estimated pile tip elevations, unless clarified otherwise we will assume that the existing conditions for the missing lengths are consistent and the same as the soil found at the bottom of boring elevation.

Question Submitted: 2/20/2006

Question Number: 8

Item no. 50, class c concrete headwall is show in drawing 180d. From what is shown we cannot determine what is to be built. Can more detail be provided?

Question Submitted: 2/20/2006

Question Number: 9

There are several quantities that are different between the bridge estimated quantities on sheet 239 and the proposal. These include the quantities for rebar, pier concrete, and abutment concrete. Please verify which quantities are correct.

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: 2/20/2006

Question Number: 10

The note on sheet 16 under Sequence of Construction states that "during each phase of construction all new pavement shall be built to finished grade and permanent pavement markings installed..." This does not make sense because the temporary configuration for Phase 2 does not line up with the permanent markings that would be placed at the end of Phase 1B. It would make more sense to leave the surface asphalt off the entire project until all phases are complete and place it along with the permanent markings as the final phase of the project. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 2/20/2006

Question Number: 11

Unless clarified by addendum, we assume that the note on sheet 16 for lanes open during holidays or special events which states "all existing lanes shall be open to traffic" means that all lanes available to the traveling public during that particular phase of work shall be open and no additional closures can be made.

Question Submitted: 2/21/2006

Question Number: 12

We previously asked for the existing structure plans to be provided for this project and were informed via your website that they were posted on the intranet site. However, the plan set that is posted does not contain the river bridge. Please provide the existing bridge plans along with plans for any rehab work ASAP to give the contractors adequate time to prepare their bids.

Question Submitted: 2/21/2006

Question Number: 13

The relocation of the 36" water main must be completed prior to the start of construction of new Pier 4 because of a conflict with the existing waterline. It has come to our attention that it could take up to 12 weeks for shop drawing submittal, shop drawing review, and subsequent material procurement. Assuming the contractor receives a signed contract by April 1, this would put materials on the job at the end of June. Sheet 180A contains a note that prohibits the contractor from making the change of service within the months of June, July, or August. This means that the earliest that the waterline will be completed and Pier 4 construction can start will be the middle of September. Please take this into consideration and revise the interim completion date of 9/21/06 or tell the contractor how the department expects the work to be completed on time.

Question Submitted: 2/21/2006

Question Number: 14

1. What is the purpose of the pavement for maintaining traffic shown on sheets 30-33? It appears that the intent of these cross sections is to allow half-width construction of Ramp 7, however Ramp 7 is closed for the duration of Phase 1B so it appears that this pavement has no function. Also, it has not been carried to the general summary. Please clarify.

2. What is the purpose of the pavement for maintaining traffic that is placed on the outside of Ramp 9 in Phase 1B, Part 1? It appears that it is being used to allow traffic to use the ramp while work is completed in the gore area during Phase 1B, Part 2 as shown on sheet 39. However, this entire ramp and shoulder area are completely closed in Phase 2 so why not wait and construct it then and eliminate the temporary pavement?

Question Submitted: 2/24/2006

Question Number: 15

The following questions are in response to addendum #1:

1. The response to the incentive/disincentive question does not make sense. The answer as stated "all work on the project for IR-75 and Stanley Avenue being completed" basically means that the entire project has to be completed prior to 9/21/06. Please also reference our previous question regarding the waterline relocation for Pier 4 construction and consider that demolition of a portion of the existing structure must be completed prior to installing the cofferdams. Please revise the dates to a realistic time-frame and do so as soon as possible to allow the contractors enough time to prepare an accurate bid without delaying the bid date.

2. What are the specifics of the City of Dayton noise ordinance? If the department expects to hold the contractor to the incentive/disincentive date then night work will be required.

Question Submitted: 2/24/2006

Question Number: 16

Please also provide any rehab plans for the existing bridge. It appears that this bridge may have been widened and the railings replaced.

Question Submitted: 2/27/2006

Question Number: 17

We have previously asked for all rehab plans to be provided, however we can not find the modification of the bridge median area that added a beam line and widened the deck. If this has already been provided please direct us to the correct plan set and sheets. If it has not been provided please include it in the next 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: 2/28/2006

Question Number: 18

- 1) Is it still ODOT's intent to attempt to award the contract one day after the bid opening?
- 2) How long does ODOT anticipate for written approval of the temporary sheet piling submittal as outlined in Note 2 on sheet 237/309 per addendum no. 3?
- 3) Please clarify if the entire bridge is to be completed by 9/21/2007. Does this include the final pavement surface and permanent striping? Is the final completion still set for 5/31/2008?

Question Submitted: 3/2/2006

Question Number: 19

In regards to bid items 225 & 226 for transition area delineation and tangent area delineation, will ODOT define the limits of the removal of the asphalt surface course and the resurfacing area?

Reference is made to the Work Zone Delineation note on Plan Sheet 20 and Note 9 on Plan Sheet 82 which provide for removal of the asphalt surface course and resurfacing area; limits to include all travel lanes and shoulder pavement.

Question Submitted: 3/5/2006

Question Number: 20

IT IS OUR UNDERSTANDINT THIS PROJECT IS WITHIN THE CITY OF DAYTON AND THEREFORE ALL TYPE "B" DRAINAGE CONDUIT IS TO BE 706.02. IS THIS CORRECT??

Question Submitted: 3/6/2006

Question Number: 21

Is the completion date of 9/21/2007 also deleted as part of addendum no. 5? Please refer to the response of question 16 in addendum no. 4.

The final completion date is still 5/31/08. The interim date of 9/21/07 was dropped along with PN 121 - Incentive / Disincentive Contract in addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 3/6/2006

Question Number: 22

In reference to bid items 225 and 226, transition area delineation and tangent area delineation, will ODOT clearly identify the areas requiring removal of surface course and asphalt resurfacing to be performed?

Question Submitted: 3/6/2006

Question Number: 23

1. Is it ODOT's intent to follow the transition area delineation detail which would require a mill/fill over basically the entire project area even though future projects may be reconstructing this pavement area? Since the future projects may be under contract by the time this project completes, it seems that there may be some overlap and therefore cost increase to ODOT if the requirement is not changed for this project. Also, will polyester pavement markings be required on the new bridge deck per the transition area delineation detail? These are difficult to remove and typically require grinding which would scar the new deck surface.

A1) Yes A2) Yes

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.