Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Project No. 040583 Sale Date - 12/15/2004

Question Submitted: 11/18/2004

Question Number: 1

Ref. No. 155 Item 617 SHOULDER RECONDITIONING 2,962 SY, the note on Sht. 20 states this item will be paid by the TON, also the General Summary on Sheet 49 has a quantity of 2,969 TON for this item. The Unit of Measure should be changed to TON.

Ref. No. 156 Item 617 SHOULDER RECONDITIONING, AS PER PLAN 3,667 SY, the General Summary on Sheet 49 has a quantity of 3,667 TON for this item. The Unit of Measure should be changed to TON.

Ref. No. 81 and 82 Item 605 4" and 6" SHALLOW PIPE UNDERDRAINS, both specify 707.33 or 707.41 pipe be used. Both of these specifications are for smooth wall pipe, which is normally only required for Rock Cut Underdrains. Was it intended that smooth wall pipe be used for all underdrains on this project?

Sht. 15 specifies station limits for Rock Cut Underdrains, and also provides different depth requirements. Are the Underdrains in these locations going to be paid under Ref. No. 81 and 82 or will separate bid items be established for Rock Cut Underdrains?

Ref. No. 15 Item 204 EXCAVATION OF SUBGRADE 117,485 CY, Sht. 10 identifies 28,300 CY of this item as ROCK CUT EXCAVATION and Sht. 16 identifies the remaining 89,185 CY of this item as EXCAVATION OF SUBGRADE for undercuts. We request that Ref. No. 15 be separated into 2 bid items, one for the rock excavation and the other for subgrade undercuts.

Question Submitted: 11/30/2004

Question Number: 2

Please clarify the following drainage questions:

Pg 80 Ref 16D Shows a 36" HW2.2 but none accounted for in summary on pg 50.

Pg 85 Ref 32D Shows a 15" HW2.2 but none accounted for in summary on pg 50.

Pg 50 Ref 35D Shows a No. 4 CB but no info is shown on pg 87.

Pg 88 Ref 39D What work is to be done at this location?

Pg 92 Ref 47D Plan view shows proposed to be 15" & profile shows proposed to be 18". What is the correct pipe size and the correct headwall size?

Pg 202 Ref 78D & 81D Show a 15" HW2.2 but none accounted for in summary on pg 51.

Pg 235 Ref 82D & 85D Show a 15" HW2.2 but none accounted for in summary on pg 51.

Question Submitted: 11/30/2004

Question Number: 3

Ref # 106: 1 Ea. Overpass Str. Mtd. Sgn. Supp. Ty. TC-18.26, Des. 1.

The max. sign width for a Des. 1 bridge mounted sign is 6'.

The sign being installed has a 20' width, therefore the design size should be a des. 4.

Please check with the district and make sure this is correct.

If there are any questions please give me a call.

Thanks

Steve Russell

<u>Question Submitted:</u> 11/5/2004 Bridge No. RIC-71-0439 L&R Bid Item No. 289-513 and 324-513 Question Number: 4

Transverse section on drawing no.384 and 385 of 395 state Type 2 crossframes but detail reflects Type 3.

Do we presume that Type 3 is the correct type.

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/1/2004 Question Number: 5

Ref# 106: 1 Ea. Overpass Str. Mtd. Sgn. Supp. Ty. TC-18.26, Des. 1.

The max. sign width for a Des. 1 brdg. mtd. sgn. is 6'.

The sign being installed has a 20 ft. width, therefore shouldn't the Des. be a Des. 4.

Please check and let me know.

If there are any questions please give me a call.

Thanks

Steve

Question Submitted: 12/2/2004

Question Number: 6

Can RPCC (Recycle Portland Cement Concrete) be blended with natural aggregate to meet the required gradation for use as Ref. No. 401 Item 204 GRANULAR MATERIAL, TYPE C?

use of RPCC will not be allowed in this project.

Question Submitted: 12/2/2004

Question Number: 7

Ref. No. 51 Item 832 EROSION CONTROL 630,000 EA, this quantity appears to be excessive for this project.

In Addenda No. 2, the last page gives a Link to ODOT's web site where minutes of the Pre-Bid meeting should be available, but there are no minutes for this project number listed there.

Q1) The Dept has reviewed this question and respectfully disagrees. We believe this quantity is appropriate. Q2) The web page is being update.

Question Submitted: 12/2/2004

Question Number: 8

Ref. 294 & 329-->Laminated elastomeric bearings:

Plans show an "H" section for the steel support pedestal at the abutment bearings, but the plans do not call out what steel section to use. I suggest the HP 10x42 steel support.

Question Submitted: 12/6/2004

Question Number: 9

On sheet 354 of 395 there is a pier diaphragm view A-A that shows marks S601,S602,S603 and ties S405 that are not shown on barlists for the left and right bridges for 0315L & 0315R. If these diaphragms are cast in place,please verify quantity and dimensions required for each bridge.

Question Submitted: 12/6/2004

Question Number: 10

In the second addendum, an additional five(5)overhead sign supports, TC-12.30, Des. 10 are being added.

It indicates that the detailed infromation is provided with the addendum.

After review of the addendum for this detailed information I'm unable to locate it.

Please advise where I should look for the information.

Thanks

Steve

Question Submitted: 12/8/2004

Question Number: 11

Addenda No. 2 replaced Ref. No. 13 Item 203E35110 GRANULAR MATERIAL, TYPE B with Ref. No. 401 Item 204E30020 GRANULAR MATERIAL, TYPE C. This material is to be used to backfill subgrade undercuts thru which 4 runs of underdrain are to be installed. Under specification 204.02 it states "Do not use Granular Material Type C, D, E, or F in the location where the underdrain is to be constructed." We also have concern whether this material will stand with-out caving while installing the 30" deep underdrain. This item should be changed to 703.16C Type-B granular, which would have a much better chance of standing up to underdrain installation.

District prefers to use Type C granular material.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/8/2004 Question Number: 12

Addendum No. 2, dated November 26, 2004, adds a bid item 409 for 240 Ft. Signing Misc.: 6" X 8" solid wood post.

The State already uses Laminated Veneer Wooden Sign Supports 7 7/8" X 7 7/8".

This product is used quite a bit in District 3. Will this be acceptable to use or is there a reaseon for solid wood post.

As always if there are any questions please give me a call.

Thanks

Steve

No, the intent, in this situation, is to use solid wood beams as opposed to the laminated hollow beams as these are temporary supports for the "...... Lane Ends Merge....." series of signs. They will be placed at the end of the first construction season between stage one and two, and will be removed and disposed when the project is completed.

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.