

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 120494

Sale Date - 8/23/2012

MOT-77247 - IR-75-12.00

Question Submitted: 8/21/2012 12:04:22 PM

With Addendum 8 posting yesterday, it changed the plan notes for Bid Item 176 to be a Fluted Steel Pole with a Cast Iron Decorative Base, manufactured by either Union Metal, Spring City, or equal approved by Engineer. Will VISCO series VI-B17-F/12' be considered as an approved equal as this is the same pole which has been approved by the City of Dayton and supplied for their Great Miami Blvd Re-alignment project, in 2011?

Yes, this is an approved equal.

Question Submitted: 8/20/2012 2:24:00 PM

Are there any revised pavement calculations for the asphalt revisions in addendum #5 & #7?

The pavement calc summary on the ftp link has been updated. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D07/Wampler-Ley/77247-Pavement Calcs-Sum.xls>

Question Submitted: 8/20/2012 2:10:28 PM

Addendum 7 modified Phase 2 Construction notes on plan sheet 49/1565. What date should be used for completion of all work north of Washington Street on the adjoining project to the south (MOT-75-11.01) that is required before Phase 2 traffic patterns can be implemented on mainline I-75?

Question Submitted: 8/17/2012 5:11:25 PM

The typical sections show 2 runs of 4" multi-cell in the median barrier on I-75. Where is this multicell to be paid for?

Per Standard Drawings RM 4.3 and RM 4.4, the 4" conduit/raceways are included in the cost per lineal foot of single slope barriers.

Question Submitted: 8/17/2012 3:30:35 PM

As a follow up to pre-bid question and answer dated 8/13/2012 3:42:55 PM regarding the "No Excuse Incentive":

As written, in the event that the contractor qualifies to earn the \$3,000,000 incentive, he will not only have to absorb his acceleration expenses, but will also need to waive his rights to receive reimbursement for open project claims, such as changes to scope, differing site conditions, etc.

ODOT can delay resolution of such non-delay claims until the N.E.I. date occurs, and then wash their hands of financial responsibility if the contractor accepts the N.E.I. payment. Is this ODOT's intent?

ODOT and the Contractor are obligated to adhere to the Dispute Resolution Board Process set forth in the contract. This process sets forth timeframes that must be adhered to by ODOT and the Contractor. ODOT and the Contractor are obligated to execute the contract in good faith.

Question Submitted: 8/16/2012 1:32:51 PM

What date of Supplemental Spec 898 will be used for the project? Plan sheet 1/1565 shows 10/21/11. All bridge general notes do not agree. The latest date shows 7/20/12 on plan sheet 1255/1565. That date of 898 is not on ODOT'S website. Please clarify which date of Supplemental spec we are to use.

See Addendum 4. All references to SS 898 dated 7/20/12 were revised to SS 898 dated 10/21/11.

Question Submitted: 8/16/2012 10:49:22 AM

Reinforcing steel is not included in the steel price adjustment for this project. Due to the extensive quantity of reinforcing steel on the project we believe it would be in the best interest of ODOT to include it in the steel price adjustment. Can reinforcing steel be included in the steel price adjustment proposal note PN 525.

Proposal Note 525 will remain as written, reinforcing steel will not be included in the steel price adjustment.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/15/2012 8:29:04 AM

MSE plan sheet 838/1565 (note 6) states "low strength mortar shall be used to fill the resulting trench caused by the removal of the existing storm sewers for locations beyond the MSE wall foundation preparation limits/excavation limits. Payment for low strength mortar shall be incidental to the cost of the MSE wall construction." Please define what the pay limit is. Normally, required backfilling of trenches are included in the 202 Pipe Removal items. Please clarify.

: By addendum 8 the MSE notes for Low Strength Mortar will be revised to state that the low strength mortar will be incidental to Item 202 pipe removed items. Ref 0012 will be made As Per Plan and it shall require that all pipe removals outside of the MSE Wall Foundations will be backfilled with low strength mortar.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2012 11:14:01 AM

MSE plan sheet 815/1565 says "The foundation soil shall be evaluated by the contractor during construction to determine suitability for support of the applied bearing stresses." Typically ODOT does this geotech evaluation per SS840.06D. Where is this engineering cost to be paid? Does this include temporary walls as well?

Sheet 815/1565 will be revised to delete the line under the Allowable Bearings Capacities table. The foundation soil shall be evaluated by the Department, per SS 840.06D, during construction to determine the suitability for support of the applied bearing stresses.

Question Submitted: 8/13/2012 3:42:55 PM

The last sentence of paragraph 6 of addendum # 5; heading 3. General Notes sheet 45/1565: a. Note Special – Lump Sum Minus Incentive (Date 8/08/12): states that "The Contractor agrees that acceptance of the NEI payment shall constitute full and final settlement of all known or unknown claims for additional compensation or time extensions that the Contractor has submitted, could have submitted, or might otherwise hereafter submit for work performed up to and including the NEI Date." We believe that ODOT'S intent is to have the Contractor agree that acceptance of the NEI payments shall constitute full and final settlement of only known or unknown Delay claims for additional compensation or time extensions that the Contractor has submitted, could have submitted, or might otherwise hereafter submit for work performed up to and including the NEI Date. Please clarify.

As stated, the Contractor agrees that acceptance of the NEI payment shall constitute full and final settlement of all known or unknown claims for additional compensation or time extensions.

Question Submitted: 8/13/2012 2:33:01 PM

What are the PG binders required for Ref #0910 and #0911 added in addendum #5?

Also, is a Material Transfer Vehicle required for either the 12.5mm or 19mm?

In addendum 7, ref. 910 will be made an As Per Plan item with a binder of PG 76-22M, and it shall be required that the paver is equipped to be able to remix the asphalt concrete. This shall be a heavy mix design. Ref. 911 will not be revised, and should have binder PG 64-28 as per spec.'s. Due to the phasing of construction and the short areas between structures and several ramps, an MTV is not required, but as the previous statement indicates, the paver shall be equipped to be able to remix the asphalt concrete material.

Question Submitted: 8/10/2012 4:25:47 PM

Page 46, reference to City of Dayton Standards for Concrete Pavement Odot does not require joints to be sealed but Dayton standards show sealing if they are to be sealed is it for both 9" and 13" Pavements? 2. Page 27 curb detail does not show expansion at pavement, shows joint between curb and pavement to be sealed would this be 705.04? 3. Curbing also requires City D Concrete according to page 27 is the rest of concrete on project Class C?

For work in the City of Dayton right of way: concrete pavement joints shall be sealed; Yes, seal per CMS 705.04; Use City of Dayton Class D Concrete.

Question Submitted: 8/10/2012 1:58:38 PM

Addendum #1 changed Ref. No. 812 to Field Office, Type C, APP. Addendum #5 changed Ref. No. 812 to Field Office, Type C. Since bid item is no longer APP, are additional requirements in Addendum #1 waived?

The intention in Addendum 5 was to revise the number of months only for reference 0812. The "As Per Plan" note in Addendum 1 still applies to this item.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/10/2012 10:49:02 AM

per plan page 729 Item 625-light pole, decorative, as per plan. The note offers both straight mono tube steel or extruded aluminum fluted with a cast iron base. It is a normal industry std to have an aluminum cast base with aluminum. Also a clarification needs to be done between steel monotube or fluted aluminum. Or does the project want fluted steel? Or straight monotube aluminum?

By addendum, we will revise the note. The poles will be fluted steel with cast iron base.

Question Submitted: 8/10/2012 7:22:55 AM

Addendum 5, Item 428 Portable Concrete Barrier, 50", as per plan B has a revised quantity of 1,450 ft. The note on revised plan sheet 55 for Portable Concrete Barrier, 50", as per plan B states (from previous construction projects) the quantity includes (1,440 ft) of PCB installed in the median of IR-75 (at the North and South crossovers as shown on plan sheet 175) and, in addition, the note on plan sheet 55 includes a PCB quantity (1,190 ft plus 260 ft) installed for the temporary widening of Bridge 1261R and the partial demo of Bridge 1261E. We believe the correct bid quantity should now be 2,890 ft. Please review and adjust bid quantity as needed.

There is an error in reference 0428 which we will correct in addendum 6.

Question Submitted: 8/9/2012 4:59:31 PM

Please clarify the limits of excavation for item 479: Wall Excavation. As I view the cross section for Ramp C1, station 316+50 on sheet 363 it seems that the limit of wall excavation will extend from the footprint of the foundation preparation vertically to the subgrade of the existing roadway. Is this correct, or does payment for wall excavation extend only to subgrade of proposed roadway (in which case, the remaining area extending from proposed roadway subgrade to the existing grade would be inclusive to the roadway quantities)?

In order to build the wall at this station, the contractor will be required to layback the excavation beyond the back limits of the SGB quantities. What type of material will be required in this layback area? Also, where should the cost and payment for this additional work outside of wall limits be included?

Finally, please explain why there is a step down from the backside of the level pad (approximately 2') at this location. Is this a mistake on the cross sections? If not, what is it indicating?

Clarification: The limits of payment for wall excavation extend from the bottom of the MSE wall foundation preparation vertically to the subgrade of the existing roadway. The material used for backfill shall be as defined in the Supplemental Specification 840. The "step down" displayed in the cross-section represents the foundation preparation (i.e. the excavation/removal of existing soil and replacement with Item 203 granular material, Type C) beneath the MSE wall leveling pad and select granular backfill. Refer to section A-A on plan sheet 840/1565 for additional details pertaining to this foundation preparation.

Question Submitted: 8/9/2012 1:42:14 PM

The prebid question submitted 7/23/2012 at 10:00:40 AM concerning temporary pavement above pipe trenches has not been answered. Will this be paid under the same reference number as the Pavement Restoration for Monument Assembly Installations?

No. We will include a pay item(s) in addendum 6.

Question Submitted: 8/9/2012 8:29:30 AM

Please consider modifying the language in the Lump Sum Minus Incentive Contract Table for the December 1, 2014 completion date to only require completion of critical construction activities that are necessary for placement of traffic into the Phase 5 pattern as shown on sheets 114-129/1565.

We will not make the requested change. Refer to the latest Lump Sum Minus in addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 8/8/2012 4:58:19 PM

The plan detail on page 777 shows two 1 1/4" surface mounted conduits for the decorative underpass lighting going to the data enabler. One conduit is for power cable and the other is for the data cable. Plan page 766, Note 4 states that there are "...POWER AND DATA CONDUITS...", but does not give the size. Are all the power and data conduits to be 1 1/4"?

The conduit behind the wall should be 1-1/2". Two sheets will be revised in addendum 6.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/8/2012 1:50:09 PM

Given the extremely large quantity of pipe piling on this project, would ODOT consider making raw material payments for steel coils produced and stored off site early in the project? This would lock in the steel price, and the supplier could produce the piling from stored coil as needed and ship to the job. Steel coils take up considerably less room than the finished product would. This would also minimize the potential pay out that ODOT would have to make per the steel price adjustment (PN525) should steel prices increase after the bid date.

The Department will not consider making raw material payments for the steel coil stored off site early in the project.

Question Submitted: 8/8/2012 10:25:27 AM

Page 169 of the MOT plans shows curb and sidewalk being replaced along W. Riverview Avenue. Where will this be paid?

We will account for this under reference 0045 and associated references in addendum 7.

Question Submitted: 8/8/2012 10:23:40 AM

Pages 164-167 of the MOT plans show the phase line on Third Street offset 6 to 8 ft from the center line. The joint details show no longitudinal joint here. Will an additional longitudinal joint be permitted to account for this?

An additional longitudinal joint will be permitted to account for the MOT phase line (shots. 164-167) shown between Third Street Stationing 11+95 and 16+60.

Question Submitted: 8/8/2012 9:58:35 AM

A question submitted on 7/13/12 regarding multi-cell conduit has not been answered yet. I am re-submitting the question here. It is unclear how the 4" multi-cell in the median bridge parapets is paid for. For example, on Sh. 920/1565, Note 6 says to see traffic control plans for ITS conduit details and payment. There is no information in the traffic control plans. On Sh. 970/1565, the detail notes say that it is included in the linear foot price bid for conduits, see roadway General Summary. There is no such bid item for multi-cell.

We will add the pay item ITEM 625 CONDUIT, MISC.: MULTICELL, 725.20, 4" WITH FOUR 1 1-1/2" INNER DUCTS, quantity of 6,149 linear feet. This will include 2x4" multicell conduits in the median structure parapets and approach slabs.

Question Submitted: 8/8/2012 7:16:39 AM

Because of a difference in response to a previous prebid question and previous addendums, please clarify the requirements for static load tests. Please confirm that ODOT will change the description of "Static Load Test" to "Static Load Test as per plan". Please confirm that for Item 542 (Bridge 1227 L/R) ODOT requires two separate static load tests (one @ Pier 1 and one @ Pier 7), to be paid as Lump Sum. Please confirm that for Item 754 (Bridge 1282 L/R) ODOT requires three separate static load tests (one @ Pier 12L, one @ Pier 6, and one @ Pier 2R), to be paid as Lump Sum. Thank you.

The revised pay items and sheets are in addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 8/7/2012 2:27:51 PM

Per ODOT Standard Drawing BP-2.1 an additional longitudinal joint is to be added when the pavement width exceeds 16 ft. The typical sections on page 38 show Robert Drive with 2-17 ft lanes (including 1 ft buffer) and only 1 longitudinal joint at the centerline. Will any additional longitudinal joints be required?

No additional longitudinal joint will be required, bid per the typical sections.

Question Submitted: 8/6/2012 9:28:29 AM

Drawing on sheet 726 shows/calls out for our suppliers typical 4.5x30 lowering device type handhole for the CCTV Camera Pole. However, sheet 727 does not reference such and actually references both a 4.5x6 AND a 18x6 handhole. Considering the lowering device handhole our supplier requires... I am not sure that the pole can accommodate these other handholes at the base and still maintain the integrity of the structure. Please advise what if any other handhole (other than the lowering device handhole) is required at or near the base of these poles.

We will include the current Special Provisions and plan sheet details for The CCTV camera system and Pole in Addendum 5. This will correct the issue.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/6/2012 8:38:43 AM

The answer with regards to the SIP question on 7/10/2012 at 4:58:50 PM states that a VECP will be considered based off a cost savings or a cost savings and time savings. Tax payers along with ODOT will realize a cost savings of 100% if you allow SIP forms to be used in lieu of the 50% savings if approved through the VECP process. Please consider allowing bidders to use the best value decking solution on this project so that 100% of the possible savings can be obtained by ODOT and tax payers. Also, allowing SIP forms at bid time will allow more DBE firms the opportunity to work on this project.

Notes addressing the SIP forms on the river bridges will be included in addendum 5 which we are striving to post today.

Question Submitted: 8/4/2012 3:43:12 PM

Sheet 304 calls out a Truck Unloading Area (9" Concrete Commercial) along Vista View Boulevard. Will this be paid under the 9" pavement item or should there be a separate bid item?

Vista View Truck Loading Area is paid as Item 452- 9" Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement per the Office Calculations.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2012 3:50:33 PM

Reference 4 Pavement Removed - Asphalt includes removal of asphalt from Sta 345+62 to Sta 354+25. Are there any borings to show the thickness of the asphalt. Visually it appears that it may be up to 2 feet thick. Please clarify.

The pavement thickness for the adjoining project to the north (MOT-75-13.11) was designed as 14" asphalt concrete (7-yr warranty). No borings are available.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2012 3:38:23 PM

Section A-A on sheet 930 shows a section through the running bond pattern of the pier stem. Please verify the 3'-0" dimension as shown here and on Detail B. Should the running bond pattern be only 2'-8" out to out? Please clarify. Please also verify your pier concrete quantity for bridge 1227 if this is the case.

The 3'-0" dimension is the out to out dimension of the simulated stone bump out at the ends of the pier. The maximum out to out dimension in the area with the formliner is 2'-8". While Section A-A is cut through the formliner area, the simulated stone bump out is visible in the background. Detail B was included in the plans to clarify this. The plans and quantities are correct.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2012 3:18:57 PM

Addendum No. 4 says that Pier 5 on bridge 1282 was lengthened to accommodate a cantilevered sign. Several quantities were also revised on pier 5. However only sheet 1305 was reissued showing details of the sign pedestal. Please reissue sheets 1303 and 1304 if pier 5 is to be lengthened.

These revised sheets [1303 & 1304] will be included in Addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2012 3:11:17 PM

The aesthetic surface treatment quantity under ref 799 was not changed from the preliminary plans to match the new method of measurement. Please verify.

Reference 799 and the method of measurement is correct. No revisions are required.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2012 2:43:51 PM

The note on page 46 regarding the concrete joint details references the City of Dayton Standard Drawings, specifically pages 3-6. These conflict with BP-2.1 & 2.2 referenced on page 1 of the plans. Please clarify the following: 1. Will 1" or 1.25" dowel baskets be required? 2. Is joint seal required? 3. Is Class C or Class D concrete required? 4. Do the manholes in the pavement receive the reinforcing detail shown in page on page 13/46 of the City of Dayton Standard Drawings? 5. The plan note refers to "local city streets," but not the ramp paving. Will the concrete pavement on the ramps be constructed per ODOT spec or City of Dayton?

There is no conflict the COD Standard Drawings will apply only to the city streets. 1) 1" dowel bar is required on city streets. 2) Joint sealer is required on city streets. 3) Class D concrete will be required on city streets. 4) Manholes in pavement of city streets will receive the reinforcing detail shown on page 12/46 of the COD Standard Drawings. 5) The concrete pavement on the ramps will be per ODOT specifications.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/2/2012 3:46:49 PM

How will the barrier wall be paid through Inlet No. 3 Single Slope Barrier Type D, APP? If the wall is to be paid with the inlet item please revise Items 489 & 491 to reflect this.

The barrier wall for I-3-D APP Inlets (Drainage Structures) was NOT included in the Item 898E11000 and 898E98000 QC/QA Concrete quantities. The barrier is to be paid through Inlet No. 3 Single Slope Barrier Type D, APP. No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 8/2/2012 9:03:35 AM

On Bridge MOT- 1282 Pier # 1 L will have a 16" AT&T fiber optic line next to and within our pier footing. Bearing pile will be driven right next to it.

Since AT&T has said that they are not concerned about vibrations we assume that and protection of said line from the vibrations of pile driving is not the contractors responsibility.

Protection of the AT&T facility for damage directly due to the vibrations caused by the driving of bearing piles is not necessary

Question Submitted: 8/1/2012 5:19:39 PM

The foundation plan (sheet 1035) for bridges 1248 L/R is inconsistent with the forward abutment drawings and general notes with regard to qty of piling and footing length. There seems to be 8 more piling and the footing seems to be longer in the foundation plan. Please verify what piling quantity and footing length is to be bid.

The pile quantity and footing length is correct in the estimated quantity sheet, general notes and forward abutment sheets. The foundation plan sheet (sheet 1035) for bridge 1248 L/R is inconsistent and will be revised accordingly.

Question Submitted: 8/1/2012 9:38:48 AM

The typical sections and bid items 0143 and 0144 call for 448 TY-1 Surf/Int. PG64-22 for all areas, including I-75 and ramps. Should the quantities for I-75 be a different mix type (12.5mm and 19mm)? Please clarify the correct mix and quantities as well as corrected typical sections.

Question Submitted: 7/31/2012 3:49:59 PM

The title block lists the SS 802 date as 1/20/12. This revision requires all contractors to follow the 802 spec for all 603 and 604 reference numbers. This adds a very significant cost to the project for documentation, inspection, etc. Please confirm that we are required to follow the SS 802 spec for this project.

SS 802 dated 1/20/12 is required.

Question Submitted: 7/31/2012 11:21:59 AM

Are the signs that are called out as Install Overlay on Sheet 57 to be paid for under biditem 393 - Detour Signing or biditem 432 - Sign, Temporary Overlay? Please provide the sizes of these signs.

Payment for all signs shown on sheet 57 shall be included in the Lump Sum bid for Detour Signing. A revised sheets will be submitted in addendum 5.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/30/2012 3:25:16 PM

Please refer to Sheet 852 and 1364 of 1565 Beam Details: The beam in question is the Type 4 Modified 72".

The top flange of the beam has a depth of 4". The 60" & 66" Modified I-Beams for ODOT are standard 3' wide top with a 4" flange, then the 72" Modified I-Beam changes to a 4' wide top flange with a 4" flange.

The request is whether or not the 4" flange could be 1" deeper. Such Top flange section would hold equal or greater characteristics as the subject section.

(A pdf of the section and its properties can be sent for your review.

Please advise.

My very best,
Jonathan Ballestros
PSI

The alternate allowance in PSID 1-99 is intended for the post bid environment. The bidders should bid the beams as shown in the plans.

Question Submitted: 7/30/2012 11:31:46 AM

Please clarify the Portable Concrete Barrier items. Addendum #4 mentioned the current contractor on Project 090496, has supplied and placed 1190' of 32" PCB, unanchored and 260' of 32" bridge mounted barrier at the temporary widening of bridge 1261R and partial demo of bridge 1261E. Sheets 1092-1094 support this as the PCB already being installed. However, Sheet 213 provides a quantity of 870' of 32" PCB, BM and 310' of 32" PCB being paid for.

1. Will the contractor of 120494 be resetting the PCB of 090496 for Phase 1?
2. If the current contractor has 260' of bridge mounted barrier in use, where is the other wall required to get to 870'?
3. The sub-summary shows adding a bid item for portable concrete barrier, 32", bridge mounted, however there was no item added in the EBS file.

Addendum 4 did not contain the necessary quantities revisions. All of these issues will be addressed in addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 7/30/2012 11:14:13 AM

Original question submitted 7/12/2012 @ 2:56:43 PM.

The answer did not answer the question. The link provided shows the city fees for 4"x6" and 4"x8" taps. The example was for a new 12" line connecting to an existing 10" line. Does this, and the several other "connect to existing" shown, need to be tapped? If so please provide the fee schedule.

We will include the correct pay schedule and any needed pay items in addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 7/30/2012 10:57:59 AM

Ref # 0046 is stated in sf in the bid proposal and is measured as sy in the office calculations. It appears the quantity was not converted from sy to sf in the proposal. Please clarify.

By addendum the quantity for reference number 0046 will be revised to 27, 837 sq. ft.

Question Submitted: 7/30/2012 10:52:53 AM

Addendum No. 4 revised the quantity for Ref. No. 0083 Erosion Control to 34,318 each. The addendum also states "Reference 0083 Erosion Control is not changing in the Proposal." The original quantity was 304,318 each. Which is correct?

There was a typo in Addendum 4. The Erosion Control quantity is still 304,318 each and will be corrected in Addendum 5

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/26/2012 3:57:33 PM

We asked a question previously at both river bridges (1227 & 1282) regarding the number of static load tests and subsequent static load tests. ODOT appeared to respond by indicating that TWO piles will have a static load test at each river bridge paid under the lump sum. The ODOT 2010 Construction and Material Specification book for item 506 "Static Load Test", under 506.01 states the work consists of applying a static load test to A (ONE) driven pile. If ODOT will not make the second test a "Subsequent" static load test then the description for static load test should be "as per plan" since it deviates from the standard specifications. Please confirm ODOT wants TWO piles tested at each river bridge paid under the lump sum or make one of them a subsequent load test.

The static load test pay item will be revised to an "as per plan" pay item to address that two static load tests are required for both river bridges (1227 and 1282).

Question Submitted: 7/26/2012 11:20:24 AM

On Sheet 47/1565 under SUBGRADE COMPACTION AND POOF ROLLING the quantities listed for ITEM 204, GRANULAR MATERIAL, TYPE-B 10900 CY and ITEM 204, GEOTEXTILE FABRIC 32606 SY do not appear to have been carried back to the general summary. Please indicate how this work is to be paid.

Reference 33 will be revised and reference items for Granular Material, Type B and Geotextile Fabric will be added in addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2012 1:37:28 PM

We have been assessing the potential for DBE participation on this project. The project is extremely material intensive, with most of the major material shipping directly from the manufacturers. These material dollars represents a large percentage of the total bid, and will have no potential for DBE participation. For this reason, we respectfully request that the goal be lowered from 10% to 7%.

The goal committee has reviewed the prebid question and recommends that the goal remain 10% and the Department has considered all certified DBE firms identified at www.ohioucp.org.

If the awarded bidder intends to request a partial waiver of the assigned DBE goal, the process outlined in Proposal Note 13 shall be followed. The Good Faith Efforts expended by the low bidder will be evaluated when the Department reviews the request.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2012 1:36:24 PM

There is currently a stone monument under Bridge 1282L. Plan sheet 1251/1565 indicates the monument is to remain. Plan sheet 1550/1565 indicates the monument is to be removed by Owner. Which is correct?

The monument is to be removed by the owner. The callout on Sheet 1251 will be revised to read "Historical Stone Monument (To Be Removed by Owner)".

Question Submitted: 7/25/2012 1:25:35 PM

Has ODOT taken into account what affect pile driving vibrations may have on the on the AT&T Fiber Optic line adjacent to Pier 1 on bridge MOT-75-1282 LT?

AT&T advises that they are not concerned about vibrations. AT&T will provide a trench box to protect their conduit. See sheet 1255 for notes regarding AT&T locating and installing the trench box, also shown on Sheet 1266.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2012 1:09:58 PM

Bid item 83 Erosion Control 304,318 Ea is usually a given bid amount by ODOT in the EBS file. Currently it has no bid amount. The bid unit price is usually \$1.00 / ea. Please revise the EBS file if that is ODOT'S intention.

We will correct the EBS file while processing Addendum 4.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2012 11:15:24 AM

The notes for the Aesthetic Surface Treatment items (Reference Items 572 and 799) for bridges MOT-75-1227 L&R and MOT-75-1282 L&R found on plan sheets 905 and 1258 state that the method of measurement shall be based on the surface area of the piers from the top of footing up to the beam seat. The details for the aesthetic surface treatment at the piers for these bridges, found on plan sheets 930-931 and 1283-1284, indicate that the "tooled finish" will be required all the way down to the top of footing. Generally, a form lined or specific surface finish is only required down to an elevation that is equal to one foot below proposed grade or normal pool elevation. Is it the Department's intent to have this "tooled finish" all the way down to the top of footing? Please clarify.

The intent is for the "tooled finish" to be 1' below final grade for land features and 1' below bottom of river for water features.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/25/2012 10:37:56 AM

The details for Reference Item 24 – Removal, Misc.: Concrete Wall, Pavement, Etc. are shown on plan sheet 482. This item appears to include the scope of work listed for Reference Item 444 – Structure Removed, As Per Plan. The details for this item can be found on plan sheet 487. Please clarify the scope of work for each item.

Ref#24 and #444 are removing the same items. By addendum ref #24 will be deleted and the notes on sheet 482 and 487 will be revised.

Question Submitted: 7/24/2012 3:47:08 PM

Plan sheet 1198 of 1565 (Bridge 1267L/R) shows the abutment bearing pedestals shop welded to the bottom girder flange. These are normally shop welded to the bearing load plate. Since the pedestals are paid for with the bearings, please revise the detail to show shop welding to the load plate and field welding to the girder.

Section B-B on plan sheet 1198/1565 will be revised to indicate that the abutment bearing pedestal is shop welded to the bearing load plate and field welded to the girder flange.

Question Submitted: 7/23/2012 11:54:00 AM

The specification for 624 Mobilization includes Table 624.02-1 which lists limit of \$2,000,000 for projects in excess of \$80,000,000. Since this project is in excess of \$200,000,000 according to ODOT's Unsold Projects Report, will ODOT increase mobilization limit?

The Department will not increase the mobilization limit.

Question Submitted: 7/23/2012 11:53:30 AM

The specification for 624 Mobilization includes Table 624.02-1 which lists limit of \$2,000,000 for projects in excess of \$80,000,000. Since this project is in excess of \$200,000,000 according to ODOT's Unsold Projects Report, will ODOT increase mobilization limit?

The Department will increase the mobilization limit in Addendum 4.

Question Submitted: 7/23/2012 10:00:40 AM

The current MOT plan will require us to install water laterals and possibly storm laterals across existing pavements. Please add temporary pavement items to replace the pavement over top of the trenches.

In addendum 6, we will add 300 CY 6" Aggregate Base [ref 0139], 225 CY 2" Asphalt Concrete Surface Course [ref 0144] and 9" Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement [ref 0147] to pay for temporary pavement in these trench areas.

Question Submitted: 7/23/2012 9:50:23 AM

There are instances on the project where the MOT will not allow for proper drainage outlets. For instance, the drainage on I-75 from 316+00 to 322+00 is installed in phases 3 and 4, but the outlet for this drainage goes under the existing I-75 NB embankment. This embankment cannot be removed until phase 6. Please review the drainage as it relates to the phasing and provide the appropriate bid items to maintain outlets.

A temporary drainage plan will be provided by addendum to drain the west side of newly constructed Mainline (phase 3-4) into existing storm structures on the eastern half of the project.

Question Submitted: 7/23/2012 9:09:05 AM

Could all of the electronic files (CADD) be made available for the roadway items?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-77247>

Question Submitted: 7/20/2012 9:17:15 AM

Plan page 815 on the top left of the page refers to supplemental 840 and 898 dated 7/20/12. That is today. How quickly will ODOT put this supplemental dated 7/20/12 on the web so we can review it. This is for the MSE walls. There are a lot of MSE walls on the project, and the bid date is less than 2 weeks away. Could that supplemental be made available today?

The 7/20/12 release did not include these Supplemental Specifications. These will be revised by addendum to SS 840 dated 4/20/12 and SS 898 dated 10/21/11.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 1:17:03 PM

Plan page 318-1565 shows CL fences around the tennis court, is this fence only to be five feet high. Detail on page 485-1565 shows the fence post in sleeves is that detail for fence post and net posts. It also shows bottom tension wire or rail. Please clarify which posts to set in sleeves, bottom tension wire or rail and fence height.

In addendum 5, A detail is being added to plan sheet 489 showing the fence height, gate information and post spacing for the tennis court fence. An "as per plan" item will be added to both the roadway sub-summaries as well as the general summary.

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 1:09:32 PM

There is a stockpile of broken concrete that is located west of the Rear Abutment of proposed MOT-75-1227 Lt bridge. Since this location for the stockpile of material is solely or partially on ODOT property can the contractors bidding the project use this material for causeway material on this project? If yes does payment to ODOT of \$0.50/cy apply?

No, the material is not the property of the Department.

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 11:29:19 AM

Addendum #1 revised Proposal Note 107. Proposal Note 107 Paragraph H "Weather Days in Accordance with C&MS 108.06 C" uses table 108.06-01. Project Plan sheet 47/1565 shows another table depicting "Number of Weather Days Lost Due To Weather" which differs from table 108.06-1 in PN 107. Which table is to be used on this project?

The table depicting "Number of Weather Days Lost Due to Weather" as shown on plan sheet 47/1565 will be used on this project. By addendum PN 107 will be revised to agree with the plan.

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 11:19:27 AM

Per the parapet and median barrier details shown on plan sheets 1409 and 1410, the plan quantity for Reference Item 804 - QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC2, Superstructure (Parapet) appears to be understated. Additionally, some of the parapet and/or barrier lengths shown on these pages appear to be overstated. Please review.

The quantity to be used for QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC2, Superstructure (Parapet) will be reduced in Addendum 4. The plan quantity of 1065 cu. yd. included parapets/barriers on the approach slab.

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 11:08:22 AM

The quantity for Reference Item 758 - Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel appears to be overstated. Contrary to the plan notes, the approach slab parapet and median barrier rebar is included with this item. Please revise the quantity for this item to not included the approach slab parapet and median barrier rebar as this quantity is to be included with Reference Item 803 - QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC2, Superstructure (Approach Slab, T=17"), APP.

By addendum the quantity for reference item 758 will be revised. The reinforcing steel associated with the approach slab parapet and median barrier will be removed from reference item 758 as it is already included in reference item 803

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 11:00:10 AM

The quantity for Reference Item 803 - QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC2, Superstructure (Approach Slab, T=17"), APP appears to be overstated. Please review.

By addendum the quantity for reference item 803 will be revised.

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 10:16:44 AM

The plan quantity for Reference Item 582 - QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC1, Substructure (Footing) appears to be understated. Please Review.

The plan quantity for Reference Item 582 on Sheet 907 is slightly understated. Reference 0582 will be revised in Addendum 4.

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 9:26:05 AM

Typical Sections all show the intermediate asphalt course for I-75 to be 1.5", however all the calculations are at 1.75". Which is correct, and what should be the correct mix type for I-75?

In addendum 5, the pavement legend on Plan Sheet 9 will be updated to show a 1.75" Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 1, PG64-22.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 8:58:33 AM

The paving plan sheet 525 shows concrete pavement at the bottom of ramp C2. The typical section on plan sheet 19 and office calcs show asphalt for this area. Please clarify which is correct.

The paving plan sheet 525 showing concrete pavement at the bottom of Ramp C2 is correct. The typical section and office calcs will be revised in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 8:54:53 AM

The paving plan sheet 518 shows concrete pavement at the bottom of ramp C5. The typical section on plan sheet 21 and the office calcs show asphalt for this area. Please clarify which is correct?

The paving plan sheet 518 showing concrete pavement at the bottom of Ramp C5 is correct. The typical section and office calcs will be revised in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/19/2012 8:12:38 AM

ODOT answered pre bid question submitted 7/9/2012 @ 10:11:49 AM, regarding bridge mounted portable concrete barrier. The answer indicated bridge mounted P.C.B. is only required per plan sheets 1092 and 1093 (Bridge MOT-75-1261R, temp' widened Phase 1 bridge), and that an addendum will be issued to revise plan sheets. Please review and adjust quantity, if needed, for item 426 (32" P.C.B.). It appears a portion or all of the Phase 1 barrier was already installed as part of the substructure widening for bridge 1261R that is being completed prior to sale of this project.

Reference 0426 and affected sheets will be revised in Addendum 4.

Question Submitted: 7/18/2012 11:20:00 AM

Addendum 1 added PN-107 (02/06/12) - Critical Path Method Progress Schedule. Section E.2 Early Completion Monthly Update Schedule conflicts with PN-131 (07/16/10) of the Proposal for ODOT 120494. Please review and advise which governs on this project.

By addendum proposal note 131 will be deleted.

Question Submitted: 7/18/2012 11:10:21 AM

Plan sheet 48 of the "Maintenance of Traffic General Notes", under the heading "Non-Work Period for Multi-Year Contracts", indicates that the schedule must block out the month of November, each year, as a non-work period. Based on an August bid and an assumed notice to proceed in September, the contractor only has the month of October to perform the Phase 1 work. Would ODOT waive the November block out requirement for 2012 (only) to allow sufficient time for the Phase 1 construction?

By addendum add the following sentence to the note entitled "Non-Work Period for Multi-Year Contracts": The Non-Work period will not apply to November 2012 but does apply to all subsequent years.

Question Submitted: 7/18/2012 9:58:50 AM

Can the Pavement office calculations be made available?

The pavement office calculations have been made available.

Question Submitted: 7/18/2012 9:47:32 AM

The typical sections and bid items 0143 and 0144 call for 448 TY-1 Surf/Int. PG64-22 for all areas, including on I-75 and ramps. Should the quantities for I-75 be a different mix type (12.5mm and 19mm)? Please clarify the correct mix and quantities as well as corrected typical sections.

See revised pay items and sheets [9, 14-21] in addendum 5 which will be submitted within the next day.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 3:12:47 PM

Please clarify the limits and bid items for the D Barrier, APP. Plan sheet 42 shows different limits than the typical section plan sheet 19. Also there are bid items for end anchors app(ref #63) and transitions app (ref #58) that appear to go with the D barrier(ref #57) but are not labeled as such on sheet 42. I would suggest that ref #57 and #63 be deleted and include all the wall in ref #58 for whatever is the right limits.

The limits shown on sheet 42 are correct. The typical section on sheet 19 will be revised. The end anchors and transition sections will be labeled on sheet 42. References 0057 and 0058 will be increased and sheets 19, 42, 238 replaced in Addendum 4.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 2:59:59 PM

Ref #24 and #444 are the same item for removing the walls,etc under Br 1282.

Ref#24 and #444 are removing the same items. By addendum ref #24 will be deleted and the notes on sheet 482 and 487 will be revised.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 2:57:35 PM

Median inlet Ref #383 on plan sheet 175 is a duplicate of the inlet shown on plan sheet 260(Ref #121).

These are not duplicate. Sheet 175 shows inlets which are for temporary drainage during the maintenance of traffic phase. Sheet 260 shows permanent inlets. While looking at this question, we found an unrelated error which will be fixed in addendum 5 by increasing the quantity of reference 0384 to 2 each. We will also clarify the notes on sheets 175 and 188.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 2:44:47 PM

We have 63,273 CY of SGB for MSE Walls 1 through 6 to be tested. Is there additional SGB associated with the temporary MSE Walls that will require testing?

Yes, the SGB for the Temporary Wire Faced MSE Wall will require testing. This temporary SGB, and its testing, are included with the LUMP SUM pay item 610E60000 Special-Retaining Wall, Misc.: Temporary Wire Faced MSE Wall.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 11:26:04 AM

Correction it was project 110146 not 110147 that had a sign foundation on top of an MSE wall.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 11:18:06 AM

Please clarify who is responsible for the design of the foundation in the notes on page 591/1565 rigid overhead sign foundation, and what if any certification is required. A spread footer was shown on project 110147 for a sign foundation on top of an MSE wall. Is a spread footer acceptable for this project?

The plans state that the contractor is to design the foundation and that the design needs to be signed and sealed by a PE. No a spread footer is not acceptable.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 11:03:59 AM

Based on the scheduled completion dates and current traffic zones from two existing contracts (one north and one south of this project), has ODOT reviewed and adjusted quantities of traffic maintenance items and has the department evaluated possible traffic zone conflicts related to this projects, this years proposed work?

The current traffic zones have been evaluated. Quantities are under review.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 10:58:00 AM

Based on numerous quantity, price and schedule adjustments required as a result of answers from pre bid questions, on not having the 404 permit or soil boring information at this time, on not knowing the revised scope of the temporary widening at bridge MOT-75-1261R, and not having an addendum addressing a possible incentive/ dis incentive clause which will require a detailed schedule review for this project, we request a bid date extension till August 16, 2012. Please respond by 7/27/12 or earlier on our request for the bid extension. We appreciate your consideration of this item.

The project has been delayed to 8/16/12.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 10:36:03 AM

The following two comments apply to portable concrete barrier:

Comment 1 - Portable concrete barrier, 50", per plan B note and quantity shown on plan sheet 55 appear to represent the same south/north crossover 50" PCB quantities shown on plan sheet 175. Please review and adjust proposal item 428 quantities as needed.

Comment 2 - Portable concrete barrier, 32", plan sheet 213, reference PC104 shows a quantity of 1460 ft. Our take off for item PC104 from plan sheets 94 and 95 indicate 1040 ft. Please review and adjust quantity for proposal item 426, if applicable.

Comment 1- The quantity provided in the general note is a duplicate. The general note will be revised to eliminate the duplicate information. Comment 2- Agree. Sheets 94 and 95 show 1040ft for this PCB run. The sub-summary will be revised.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 10:21:44 AM

The following three questions pertain to bridge MOT-75-1282 L/R:

Question 1 - Plan sheet 1255, under "Friction Type Piles" heading, shows a static load test at Pier 12L and a static load test at Pier 6. We believe Pier 6 should be changed to a subsequent static load test and a proposal item needs to be added for bridge MOT-75-1282 L/R for a subsequent static load test (1 each). Please review and confirm that the subsequent static load test item should be added.

Question 2 - plan sheet 1255, second last paragraph under the heading "Static Load Test" indicates a subsequent static load test to be done every 10,000 ft of driven piles. For this bridge that would be 6 each subsequent static load tests, but the proposal has none. Please review and indicate if this note should be deleted from the plans or if a proposal item/ quantity should be added. If the subsequent static load tests are added, please indicate at which pier footings they will occur.

Question 3 - Plan sheet 1259 shows a quantity of 1159 each steel points or shoes, per plan. From the "Pile Data Table", "Steel Pile Point Required" column on plan sheet 1266 through plan sheet 1276, we calculate 1180 each pipe points. Please review and advise if proposal item 757 should add 21 each pipe points or shoes, per plan.

Q1. Subsequent Static Load Test does not need to be added to Pier 6.

Q2. Only 3 Static Load Tests are required. Revised sheets will be in addendum 4.

Q3. Steel points were underestimated. This quantity will be revised.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 9:59:43 AM

The following two questions pertain to bridge MOT-75-1267 L/R:

Question 1 - Plan sheet 1197, splice details, changed all "flange" splice and fill plate dimensions shown on the preliminary plans website versus the formal plans "flange" splice and fill plate sizes for all NB and SB bridge splices. The proposal item 687 (Structural steel, Level 4) quantities did not change between the preliminary plans and formal plans estimated quantities. Please review and advise if the estimated weight for proposal item 687 should be adjusted.

Question 2 - Plan sheet 1181 shows SB bridge superstructure being built in phase 3 and NB bridge superstructure being built in phase 6A. Plan sheet 1209 indicates the right (NB) rear approach slab being constructed in phase 3. Please review and confirm sheet 1209 is incorrect for the right rear approach slab construction phase.

1. The splice details on plan sheet 1197 are correct. By addendum the quantity for proposal item 687 will be revised.

2. By addendum plan sheet 1209 will be revised to show that the right (NB) rear approach slab being constructed in Phase 6A.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 9:36:59 AM

The following three questions pertain to bridge MOT-75-1262:

Question 1 - "Foundation Data" note on plan sheet 1137 indicates the minimum capacity for pipe piles of 70 tn/pile (140 tn Ultimate Bearing). "Pile Design Loads" note on plan sheet 1139 indicates an Ultimate Bearing value at the various footing ranging from 139 tn/pile to 118 tn/pile. Please indicate which note is correct and which note governs pipe driving requirements.

Question 2 - Plan sheet 1156, note 2, indicates that the bent point cross frames have an additional angle 3" x 3" x 5/16" near the top flange. Standard Dwg GSD-1-96 with a girder depth of 52" would require all intermediate and bent point cross frames to have an angle size of 4" x 4" x 3/8". Please review and confirm correct angle size to be used at this bridge and if applicable, adjust estimated quantity of proposal item 650 (Structural steel, Level 4).

Question 3 - Plan sheet 1150, note 5, indicates that additional reinforcing for post tension anchoring is incidental to post tensioning. Special Provision - Post Tensioning System, sheet 39 Of 40 (last paragraph of note 14.0), indicates 182,800 lbs for the SB bridge and 182,800 lbs for the NB bridge is included in the total quantity of reinforcing steel (for this bridge) and that the quantity will be adjusted. Please review and indicate if this note should be deleted from the Special Provision.

Response 1: The note on sheet 1139 is correct. The note on sheet 1137 will be revised in the next addendum.

Response 2: The angle should be a 4x4x3/8. The note on 1156 will be revised. The quantities were based on a 4x4x3/8 angle and are correct as is.

Response 3: Note 5 on sheet 1150 is correct. The paragraph on sheet 39 of the special provision will be removed.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 9:20:04 AM

Please provide a typical section for Ref # 53 Sinclair Pavers showing base depth and requirements.

The pavers shall be placed on 1" of leveling sand above 4" of Item 304 Aggregate Base. This will be included in Addendum 4.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 9:15:27 AM

The following two questions are for bridge MOT-75-1250:

Question 1 - Plan sheet 1070 shows the rear abutment piling being driven in phase 6A. Plan sheet 1071, note 2, indicates the entire rear abutment being constructed in phase 3. Please indicate which is the correct phase for construction of the rear abutment and which phase is not correct.

Question 2 - Structural steel Level 4 estimated weight appears to include the optional field splice shown on plan sheets 1076 and 1078. The estimated quantity for welded shear stud connectors is based on not using the optional field splice. Please review and advise if proposal item 623 welded shear stud connector quantity should be reduced by 60 each.

Question 1 – Maintenance of Traffic, Phase 6A is correct construction phase for the construction of the rear abutment and rear abutment piles.

Question 2 – The structural steel Level 4 estimated weight includes the optional field splice shown on plan sheets 1076 and 1078.

Bid reference 623 will be reduced by 60 each.

An addendum will be issued to address these questions.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 8:52:01 AM

The following question is for bridge MOT-75-1248 L/R: Structural steel Level 4 estimated weight appears to include the optional field splice shown on plan sheets 1046 and 1048. The estimated quantity for welded shear stud connectors appears to be based on not using the optional field splice. Please advise if proposal item 593 welded shear stud connector quantity should be reduced by 216 each.

Yes, the Structural Steel Level 4 estimated weight includes the optional field splice shown on plan sheets 1046 and 1048. Reference item 0593 quantity will be revised by addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 8:43:22 AM

The following comment is for bridge MOT-75-1227 L/R: plan sheet 907 and Proposal items 556 through 565, related to the laminated elastomeric bearings, indicate the load plate as 18.5" x 18.5". Per the bearing load plate table on plan sheet 1014 and based on the prestressed concrete I-Beam bottom flange width of 26", all elastomeric bearing load plates for this bridge should be 18.5" x 26" (Wt). Please review and correct plan sheet 907 and proposal descriptions for items 556 through 565, if applicable.

By addendum the proposal reference items 556 through 565 will be revised to indicate the load plate as 18.5" x 26".

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 8:35:40 AM

The following two questions are for bridge MOT-75-1227 L/R: Question 1 - plan sheet 904, under the heading "Friction Type Piles", indicates a static load test at Pier 1, a subsequent static load test at Pier 4, and a static load test at Pier 7. We believe the static load test at Pier 7 should be changed to a subsequent static load test and the quantity for Proposal item 543 should change from 1 each to 2 each. Please review and confirm.

Question 2 - plan sheet 904, second last paragraph under "Static Load Test" heading, indicates doing a subsequent static load test every 10,000 ft of driven piles. For this bridge, that would mean 4 each subsequent static load tests, but the Proposal indicates only 1 each. Please indicate if this note should be deleted from the plans, or the proposal quantity for subsequent static load tests be adjusted. If additional load tests are required, please indicate at which piers they will be done.

We will revise the Subsequent Static Load Test by addendum and provide revised notes. The estimated number of static load tests is based on the total order length for piles of the same size and ultimate bearing value. The total order length for piles with UBV=140 is 29,535 feet, which requires one static load test item and 1 subsequent test. The total order length for piles with UBV=139 is 21,850 feet, which requires one static load test item and 1 subsequent test. The plan quantity was calculated based on driven length and it will be corrected to show 2 subsequent tests. The additional test will be at pier 5. The two initial static load tests, one for the 140 ton piles and one for the 139 ton piles, will be paid for under the lump sum pay item for STATIC LOAD TEST. The general note will be revised to clarify that the criteria for subsequent tests applies to piles of the same size and ultimate bearing value.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 8:18:44 AM

After making a site visit to bridge MOT-75-1261R, we noticed work being done on the substructure widening. When will ODOT revise the plans and the proposal to reflect the revised scope of non-performing substructure widening and steel erection associated with the temporary widening of this bridge?

The plans for MOT-75-1261R are being revised to reflect the substructure widening that is being completed prior to the sale of this project. An addendum will be issued once the revisions are complete.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/17/2012 8:14:28 AM

Upon reviewing the proposal, the specifications, and the complete set of plans, we could not find any soil boring information or the 404 permit. When will ODOT make this information available?

Soils sheets are on the project ftp link. We will make the waterway permit available around August 10.

Question Submitted: 7/13/2012 2:49:59 PM

Overhead sign supports located at sta. 306+76 SB and 332+00 SB are shown as type T-7.65, design 8. Since these are being installed on the bridge superstructure, should they be type TC-15.115?

Also, the sign structure located at sta. 347+00 SB is shown in the summary sheets as type TC-7.65, design 8 and in the elevation view as type TC-15.115. Which is correct?

The overhead sign supports located at Sta. 306+76 SB and 332+00 SB are to be TC-7.65. The sign structure located at Sta. 347+00 SB is correctly shown on the elevation view. In an upcoming addendum the subsummary and general summary will be revised to show that the sign structure located as Sta. 347+00 SB is a TC-15.115..

Question Submitted: 7/13/2012 11:23:55 AM

It is unclear how the 4" multi-cell in the median bridge parapets is paid for. For example, on Sh. 920/1565, Note 6 says to see traffic control plans for ITS conduit details and payment. There is no information in the traffic control plans. On Sh. 970/1565, the detail notes say that it is included in the linear foot price bid for conduits, see roadway General Summary. There is no such bid item for multi-cell.

We will add the pay item ITEM 625 CONDUIT, MISC.: MULTICELL, 725.20, 4" WITH FOUR 1 1-1/2" INNER DUCTS, quantity of 6,149 linear feet. This will include 2x4" multicell conduits in the median structure parapets and approach slabs.

Question Submitted: 7/13/2012 11:20:32 AM

Bid item 432 Sign, Temporary Overlay quantity is extremely over stated. Bid quantity is 10,147 SF, actual quantity should be 634 SF. We believe a calculation error occurred by using square inches and dividing by 9 instead of 144 to come up with SF (Sh. 218).

By addendum the quantity for bid item 432, Sign, Temp Overlay will be revised.

Question Submitted: 7/12/2012 2:56:43 PM

The plans show several "connect to existing" on the main line, example is sheet 576 STA 110+00, is this a wet tap or a dry cut in? If this a wet tap (Sheet 574 "All taps to the existing water main will be made by the COD at the contractor's expense), please provide a schedule of live taps and the associated city cost.

The corrected pay schedule will be in Addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 7/12/2012 2:52:46 PM

Sheet 574 "Thrust blocks and restrained joints are required at all fittings. The length of restrained joint requirements are indicated on each plan and profile sheet". The restrained length is not shown on the plan and profile sheet and the restrained length requirement for 20" is not shown in the table on sheet 588. Please provide.

- 1)The note on sheet 574 should say "The length of restrained joint requirements are indicated on sheet 588" instead of "The length of restrained joint requirements are indicated on each plan and profile sheet".**
- 2)Also the restrained length of the 20" waterline from each bend exceeds the distance between joints so our intent was to restrain all 20" WL joints. Corrected sheets 574 and 585 will be issued in Addendum 4 stating "all 20" WL joints shall be restrained.**

Question Submitted: 7/12/2012 2:51:19 PM

Sheet 574 "No construction shall commence until COD permits have been issued as required". What permits are required and what is the cost?

The Contractor should contact the City of Dayton for a response to this question. The contractor may be required to pick up permits for road closures or partial closures. Contact Keith Steeber at (937)-333-3838. The Water Department requires permits also and the contact is Scott Holmes (937)-333-3737.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/12/2012 1:03:49 PM

Please clarify the intent of biditem 441, removal of pavement marking. If it's to include the removal of existing and temporary pavement markings by water blasting the quantity is understated.

Bid Item 0441 is for the removal of the existing pavement marking for the northbound direction. The plan note on sheet 55 will be revised in an upcoming addendum to read "The following quantity is estimated for removal of existing pavement marking."

Question Submitted: 7/12/2012 8:44:39 AM

The quantity of 120 sign-months for Portable Changeable Message Sign, APP seems understated. Per plan sheet 56, 4 message boards are to be in place for the detour routes shown(Phases 2-6B), which is a majority of the 70 month project. Please revise the quantity to reflect the 6/30/2018 completion date.

Bid Item 0403 Portable Changeable Message Sign, APP plan quantity will be revised to 7500 days in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/11/2012 4:26:23 PM

Can you post on the ftp site the City of Dayton Code of Ordinances Chapter 94 that you have addressed in the Construction Noise note on plan sheet 43 of 1565

The City of Dayton Code of Ordinances Chapter 94 is located at the following website:

http://library.municode.com/print.aspx?h=&clientID=13723&HTMRequest=http%3a%2f%2flibrary.municode.com%2fHTML%2f13723%2flevel3%2fCH_TITIXGERE_CH94NOPO.html&HTMTitle=CHAPTER+94.+--+NOISE+POLLUTION

Question Submitted: 7/11/2012 10:54:10 AM

Biditem 428, PCB, 50", APP, B has a quantity of 2,890 FT. Sheet 55 gives a quantity of 1,450 FT. Which one is correct?

Quantities are carried from Sheets 55 and 175 and add up to the Grand Total. No addendum necessary.

Question Submitted: 7/11/2012 9:28:09 AM

Biditem 403, Portable Changeable Message Signs, As per plan, has a bid quantity of 120 days. The note on Sheet 53 says 120 Sign-Months. Please change the bid quantity to Sign-Months.

Bid Item 0403 Portable Changeable Message Signs, APP unit of measure is correct. The quantity will be revised to 7500 days in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 5:45:28 PM

On Sheet 815/1565 under; Item 840 – Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall, As Per Plan: "Use standard panels with maximum dimensions of 5 feet high X 10 feet wide." On Sheet 823 & 824/1565, Panel section details show 4'-0" typical panel height dimensions.

Question: Can the supplier use standard 5'x10' nominal panel and modify the formliner block sizes to fit?

The proposed formliner block sizes shall not be modified.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 4:58:50 PM

Will the Department allow the use of Stay-in-Place Metal Forms for the two river bridges (MOT-75-1227 L/R and MOT-75-1282 L/R)? The magnitude of this project would allow the Department to reap the full benefits of time, cost, safety and reduced environmental impacts as noted in Report Number: FHWA/OH - 2006/13. If needed, the website of the report can be provided.

Stay-in-place metal forms will be considered as a Value Engineering Change Proposal (VECP) per 105.19 for bridges MOT-75-1227 L/R and MOT-75-1282 L/R provided the VECP includes: 1. cost savings or 2. a cost savings and a time savings. An addendum will be issued.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 4:20:07 PM

The backwall concrete above the construction joint for bridges 1227L&R, 1248L&R, 1250, 1262 and 1267W is to be QSC2 concrete per the plan notes. There is no note for 1282L&R. It appears that the quantity of this concrete was carried to the QC/QA QSC2 Deck bid item on some bridges and not others. Is this concrete to be paid in the QC/QA QSC2 Deck bid items? Also is this concrete to be QSC2 in bridges 1282L&R?

The backwall concrete above the construction joint for all bridges will be included in the bid item QSC2 Deck. An upcoming addendum will revise bridges 1227L&R, 1262, 1267W and 1282L&R.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 2:13:02 PM

Is the contractor to install longitudinal channelizers as shown on sheet 174 in lieu of drums for all ramp merges? Will the department specify where these are to be located for the different phases due to the high cost associated with them?

No, the contractor is not to install longitudinal channelizers in lieu of drums. Sheet 174 will be deleted in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 2:06:54 PM

1. Biditem 432, Sign, Temp Overlay, does not appear to include the overlays from Sheets 57, 60, 195, 196, and 200. Also the quantity of 10,147 sf was miscalculated.

2. In the MOT sheets there are a couple of overhead signs that appear to be placed on temporary supports. Here are 3 locations: Sheet 122, the overhead sign on the SB side shows it being placed on a cantilever. The traffic control plans, sheet 652, shows this sign on a truss. Sheet 124, the overhead sign on the SB side shows it being placed on a cantilever. The traffic control plans, sheet 654, shows this sign on a truss. Sheet 137, the overhead signs on the NB side at approx. station 305+00 shows them being placed on a truss. The traffic control plans don't show any signs at this location. Please clarify where these temporary supports are to be paid for?

1. By addendum the quantity for bid item 432, Sign, Temp Overlay will be revised.

2. The intent was to show the permanent mainline signing for MOT phases 5, 6 and 8. By addendum the plans will be revised to match the permanent signing locations shown on the traffic control sheets.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 11:21:46 AM

Ref. 0572 Aesthetic Surface Treatment for Bridge 1227L/R requires 2" deep rustication strips as shown on plan sheets 930 and 931/1565. At Bridge 1282L/R, 3" deep rustication strips are shown on plan sheets 1283 and 1284/1565 in similar applications. Does the Owner desire differing rustication depths on the project?

A 2" deep rustication strip should be used at bridge 1282L/R. The plan details will be revised to reflect this change in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 10:55:59 AM

Ref. No. 0575- Low Strength Mortar Backfill (for Bridge 1227) has a bid quantity of 3800 cy. Drawings 903 and 907/1565 indicate 77 cy to be used at the Forward Abutment. Where, if at all, is the remaining quantity to be used? Please clarify.

The quantity for ref 0575 – Low Strength Mortar Backfill (bridge 1227) will be revised to 77 CY in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 10:08:50 AM

The bid quantity of 50 months for Bid item 812 Field Office Type C appears to be understated or the project completion date of 6/30/18 is incorrect. Please clarify what ODOT'S intention is.

The quantity for bid item 812 Field Office Type C will be adjusted in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 8:36:37 AM

Could the Department please clarify what bid item 504 Class C Concrete is for?

Bid item 504, Item 511 7 cy of Class C concrete is for Northeast Wing Wall at the End Abutment.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 8:23:20 AM

7.The note on sheet 13/34 says that "A conical point with rounded nose or a cruciform end shall be used on all piles at pier 1, pier 2 and pier 3." There is a bid quantity of 5 ea. Should the bid quantity be revised to 84 ea?

The bid quantity for ref 0719 will be revised to 84 each in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 8:21:55 AM

6.The quantities for bid items 681 14" CIP Driven and 682 14" CIP Furnished appear to be overstated by 200 lf each. Please verify the bid quantity is correct or adjust as necessary.

The plan quantity is correct. The quantity calculations are per the BDM. The structure calculations can be found at the following location <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D07/Wampler-Ley/>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 8:19:52 AM

4.The bid quantity of reinforcing steel for bridge 1261R (Bid Item 499) includes 12,534 lbs of approach slab rebar. Typically the approach rebar is incidental to the approach slab item. Is the approach slab reinforcing steel to be included in the reinforcing steel bid item for this bridge or the approach slab item?

Approach Slab reinforcing steel is to be included with the approach slab item. The bid quantity for reinforcing steel for bridge 1261R will be adjusted to reflect this change in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 8:18:22 AM

3.Bid Item 612 QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC1, Substructure has a quantity of 1561 CY. The quantity seems to be significantly overstated. Please verify the bid quantity is correct or adjust as necessary.

The quantity for ref item 612 QC/QA Concrete will be revised to 1377 CY in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 8:17:00 AM

2.Note 1 on sheet 1201/1565 says the deck slab concrete qty is based on the constant deck haunch thickness of 2 inches. The haunch looks to be thicker than that based on the 13-3/4" dimension from the top of the deck to the top of the web given an 8.5" deck slab and the thickness of the girder top flange. Please adjust the constant haunch thickness note and bid quantity if necessary.

Note 1 on sheet 1201/1565 will be revised to indicate that the assumed haunch thickness is 5-1/4". No change is required to the quantities. This change will be made in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2012 8:15:16 AM

Bid Item 707 has a bid quantity of 376 CY. Our takeoff quantity is 188 CY. Please verify the bid quantity is correct or adjust as necessary.

The bid quantity for bid item 707 will be adjusted in an upcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 7/9/2012 4:56:34 PM

Will the micro station files be made available to the contractors prior to bid.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-77247>

Question Submitted: 7/9/2012 2:03:55 PM

Is the quantity of biditem 390, Worksite Traffic Supervisor, correct? Or does the department only intend to have the WTS for certain time periods of the project?

The quantity will be revised in an upcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 7/9/2012 1:56:55 PM

Biditems 394 and 395, Work Zone Speed Limit Sign and Work Zone Increased Penalties Sign's quantities are low. It appears that Phases 5, 8A and 8B were not included in the quantities. Please verify.

Bid items 0394 and 0395 quantities will be revised in an upcoming addendum to the following: 0394 - 54 Each Work Zone Speed Limit Sign and 0395 - 20 Each Work Zone Increased Penalties Sign.

Question Submitted: 7/9/2012 10:11:49 AM

Sheets 909, 910, 1092, 1093, 1262, and 1263 call for bridge mounted portable concrete barrier wall. There is no biditem setup for this. Please clarify if the intent is to use or not use bridge mounted barrier.

The intent of the plan is to only use bridge mounted portable concrete barrier placed at the deck edge (sheets 1092 & 1093). An addendum will be issues to revise the plans.

Question Submitted: 7/9/2012 9:57:44 AM

Please confirm if the following are correct:

1. In Phase 7A - Robert Dr. and S. Robert Dr. are closed.
2. In Phase 7B - Ramp C4, C5, and Vista View Dr. are closed.

Please provide the proper detour for these phases.

This is correct.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/9/2012 9:27:46 AM

Please provide a column in the MOT Subsummary to detail where the 831 ea work zone raised pavement markers, as per plan are to be used. Do the ramps require wzrpm's if shifting more than 4 ft? After doing a takeoff it appears 831 ea is low.

If a wzrpm is placed on a concrete surface and then goes through a winter, will the replacement wzrpm be paid for as another each or is it incidental to the first one put down before the winter?

The Work Zone Raised Pavement Markers, As Per Plan quantity is incorrect. By addendum the pay item for WZRPM, APP will be revised and a pay item for WZRPM will be added to the project.

Question Submitted: 7/9/2012 8:37:32 AM

Will ODOT make the Office Calculations available to download?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D07/Wampler-Ley/>

Question Submitted: 7/9/2012 8:08:58 AM

It appears that there are two runs of portable concrete barrier wall that were not carried to the MOT Subsummary sheets. Sheets 107 and 109 have runs of PCB along the right lane of NB traffic. Also, the PCB runs shown on Sheets 168-169 are not accounted for.

The plans and quantity for PCB will be adjusted in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2012 5:07:43 PM

Bridge MOT-75-1267 L/R ; design pages 1192, 1193, 1201

The bridge framing plan & note #4 on sh. 1192 indicates Type 4 crossframe. The bridge framing plan on sh. 1193 indicates Type 4 crossframe, however the "Intermediate Stiffener @ Crossframe Locations" detail specifies a 1/2"x5" stiffener (this stiffener size reflects a Type 3 crossframe). The section view of the crossframes on sh. 1201 indicates Type 3 crossframes, which matches the detail for the crossframe stiffener on sh. 1193, but conflicts with the Type 4 crossframe shown on sh. 1192 & 1193. Please update the plan sheets, where required, with the correct crossframe/stiffener information. Additionally, a revision to the payweight may need adjustment to account for the change.

The crossframe should be Type 3. Revisions to the plan will be in an upcoming addendum.