

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 070463

Sale Date - 11/7/2007

Question Submitted: 10/1/2007

Question Number: 1

Ref. 106, 148, 191, 235, 358, 384, 488, 515, 614, 658, 779, 808- Embankment, As Per Plan- the plans, while giving a description of the purpose of the material, do not give limits for payment. Will this quantity be paid off ticket quantities of material placed?

Question Submitted: 10/1/2007

Question Number: 2

Item 614- Maintaining Traffic at Structures- see plan sheet 8 in part 1 and 5; sheet 7 in parts 2-4...Both phases 1 and 2 call for completion of asphalt pavement on existing traffic lanes through intermediate course. The MOT notes do not mention when the surface course is to be placed. Please note that the surface of the temporary pavement is to be placed in the same operation as the adjacent shoulder in phase 1. Please clarify if the surface course on existing lanes is to be placed under a separate phase 3 or if the contractor will be allowed to place the surface in phases 1 and 2.

Question Submitted: 10/1/2007

Question Number: 3

The proposal does not contain a proposal note regarding design requirements for plant mix asphalt pavements. Please add PN 416 or PN 417 so that the correct materials can be designed and utilized for the temporary pavement and/or median shoulder.

Question Submitted: 10/1/2007

Question Number: 4

Plan sheets 9,11 of part 1; 8,10 of part 2; 8,10 of part 3; 8,10 of part 4; and 9,11 of part 5 call for a 4' wide resurfacing of the median shoulder that is to be placed in the same operation as the top two courses of the 615 pavement for maintaining traffic. The plan detail shows the top two courses of the median shoulder being 442 specification with the general note indicating that the top two courses of the 615 pavement for maintaining traffic being 448 specification. Specifying two different asphalt mixes defeats the purpose of placing in the same operation. If the 4' wide shoulder asphalt is changed to a 448 specification, then new bid items would need to be added. Please review and address in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/2/2007

Question Number: 5

Ref. 77, 351, 481, 607, 772- Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per Plan...The quantities for each item appear to be in error on the corresponding subsummary sheets as they appear to be calculated through the proposed structures. Furthermore, the corresponding volumes of excavation and embankment in the cross sections also appear to be in error due to the calculations again being carried through the structure instead of stopping at the bridge limits. Please review these quantities (area and volume) and address the revisions in an addendum since these bid items contain numerous incidental costs.

Question Submitted: 10/3/2007

Question Number: 6

On structure MRW-71-0705, there is no depth shown for Item 601- Rock Channel Protection, Type B. What is the required depth?

Question Submitted: 10/3/2007

Question Number: 7

In regard to all Approach Slab bid items (Item 898)...There are no aggregate base or subgrade compaction bid items that correspond to these bid items- can this please be addressed in an addendum?

Question Submitted: 10/4/2007

Question Number: 8

1. Regarding the 0596 L/R structure overlays, the construction sequence states that for stages 2, 3 and 4, the contractor is supposed to overlap the construction limit of the previous stage by a minimum of 2 inches. By doing so, it will add approximately 11.5 SY of pay quantity to the item. Will this additional overlap quantity be considered incidental to the measured deck area for payment? 2. Please verify the deck concrete quantities for structures 0705 L/R. It appears that the deck concrete quantities shown do not include the abutment diaphragm concrete (an additional 63 CY per structure). 3. Please verify the approach slab plan quantities for the 1763 L/R structures. Our take off quantities indicate 367 SY versus the plan quantities of 356 SY. 4. Please verify the deck concrete quantities for structures 0756 L/R. Our take off quantities indicate 349 CY versus the plan quantities of 371 CY.

Question Submitted: 10/4/2007

Question Number: 9

Can the existing bridge plans be made available on-line?

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: 10/4/2007

Question Number: 10

1) Part 5 has existing overhead power lines that run east/west directly above NB/SB pier row 3. Widening requires us to drive piles, set forms and pour concrete too close for OSHA limits. Please advise.2) All six steel beam bridges require field welding stiffener plates to the existing fascia beams in order to attach Type 3 crossframes for inside widening. The plans do not give any detail as to weld size or lengths for web/flanges. Please advise.3) The response to question 9 in addendum 2 states that the unit of EACH is correct for replacement signs. This would mean that a total of 800 signs would require replacement for the entire project. Please verify that ODOT wants 160 for the quantity in each part.4) In regards to the response to question 25 in addendum 2, the note reads ...no lanes shall be closed when no work is being performed on these parts. May the contractor institute a lane shift that is not changed or removed even though work is not being performed each and every day during this period?5) The response to question 25 in addendum 2 states that it is not the intent of the plans to waive the requirements of the drop-off policy. PCB would be required through the tapers until traffic is a lane width away from the temporary widening. Since there is a pay item for PCB please add the additional footage to the current quantities. Also include if temporary attenuators are required. This would allow for all contractors to price the same scope of work.

Question Submitted: 10/4/2007

Question Number: 11

Please verify the quantities of Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, APP for all parts. It appears the quantities are calculated through the bridge limits.

Question Submitted: 10/4/2007

Question Number: 12

Ref. 572- 15" Conduit, Type C...Plan sheet 30/78 (part 4) calls for slope pipes to be Type C. Should these be Type F instead of Type C?

Question Submitted: 10/5/2007

Question Number: 13

In part 4 drawings bridge number MRW-71-1763 has a bid item for fatigue retrofit which includes bolted cover plates as detailed on page 66/78. In part 1 bridge number MRW-71-0756 has a similar detail on page 129/142 but does not have a corresponding bid item. Please clarify which item this work should be bid under.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2007

Question Number: 14

Note of Clarification Requested:In the general plan notes the notes stipulate that there shall be no Hoe-Rams utilized in the demolition of the structures (superstructure and substructures). This note looks as thou it is to be applied to all structures and phases. We can understand the need too not utilizing Hoe-Rams on the existing structures where the Structural Steel Beams are to be utilized and where the plans do not call for complete demolition of the substructures. However, we would hope that the department would consider the use of Hoe-Rams on the Slab Top structures and when the project plans call for complete removal of substructure items. The inability to use Hoe-Rams on structures when complete removal is required will only add undue cost to the project and to the department. Will the department consider the use of Hoe-Ram equipment on those items where complete removal is required?Part 1 – 4 Steel Beam BridgesPart 2 – 2 Slab Top BridgesPart 3 – 2 Slab Top BridgesPart 4 – 2 Steel Beam BridgesPart 5 – 2 Slab Top BridgesWe would ask that the department allow Hoe Ram equipment in Parts 2, 3, and Part 5 and where there is complete removal of substructure items in Parts 1 and 4.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2007

Question Number: 15

Note of Clarification Requested:There appears to be some discrepancies in regards to the dimensioning of the approach slabs on this project. Please review and offer clarification on the following:On Part #5 – Sheet 69 of 72 – Shows a 30" Thick Approach Slab in the Details – but in the Plan Notes the notes state that the Approach Slab should be 15" Thick. Clarification is required.On Part #4 – Sheet 75 of 78, the plan notes and plan quantity dictate that the approach slabs should be 25' long but the detail plan sheets show that the approach slabs should be 30' Long. Clarification is required.On Part #3 – Sheet 65 of 67 - Shows a 30" Thick Approach Slab in the Details – but in the Plan Notes the notes state that the Approach Slab should be 15" Thick. Clarification is required.Will the department please review these sheets / parts and the other parts for the approach slab sizes and offer clarifications for any and all questions in regards to these concrete thicknesses.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2007

Question Number: 16

Has an addendum been issued.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2007

Question Number: 17

In regard to 604E01200,604E01400 Catch Basin #4 is a Cutoff Wall required with the Concrete Apron. Is ther a detail or specifications as to the 150 feet of Ditch Erosion Protection. Is the Concrete Apron, Cutoff Wall, 150 feet of Ditch Erosion Protection incidental to the cost of the Catch Basin #4.

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: 9/21/2007

Question Number: 18

Sheet 49/142 states, under note 11, that resurfacing of the transition area is to be performed following removal of the RPMs. This area extends beyond the resurfacing stations shown on sheet 7/142. Unless instructed otherwise, we assume that any additional resurfacing of the transition area will be paid under the appropriate pavement planing and asphalt items.

Question Submitted: 9/23/2007

Question Number: 19

Ref 112 & 154- the total weights for the diaphragm and deck are incorrect for the reinforcing. 6456 lbs diff. each. Please verify. Ref 378,404,509,536, approach slabs are detailed with transverse top 17 bars and transverse bot. 37 bars. The state standard for a 15" X 25'-0 is 18 top and 39 bot. Are the quantities on the state's lists correct? Please verify.

Question Submitted: 9/24/2007

Question Number: 20

Embankment items at each bridge site. Addendum #2 issued an answer to a previous question regarding how the volume of material was to be measured for the embankment item at each bridge site. After reading the answer in the addendum & the referenced CMS section we are still unsure how to calculate these quantities. For example - ref bid items #358 & #84 at bridges 71-1217 L/R & plan page 55/66 of part 2. If we measure the volume of material behind the abutments horizontally from the bottom of the footing to the top of the embankment & vertically from a plane 1' behind the abutment the volume is completely filled with porous backfill & the embankment quantity should = 0. If a vertical plane 1' behind the abutment is not the correct way to measure the volume what are the vertical limits of the embankment material? Similar situations exist at all 12 bridges to be redecked & widened on this project. The quantities for embankment in the proposal seem to vary widely between bridges even where the abutments are very similar in length & height. We suggest that at each bridge site the unclassified excavation item (paid by cyd) and the embankment item (paid by cyd) be combined into a single item - unclassified excavation (paid lump sum). The note at each bridge specifying granular backfill be used behind the abutment should be made a part of this new item. This would greatly simplify payment calculations on this project and minimize the amount (and cost) of the granular embankment which will now be under the contractors control. If the bid items for embankment remain as they are now the embankment quantities need to be recalculated using a clear method of measurement that will result in more accurate volumes.

Question Submitted: 9/24/2007

Question Number: 21

Are the new exposed portion of the pier piles at bridges 1217 LT/RT - Part 2, plan page 56/66 (ref 364 & 390) & 1550 LT/RT - Part 3, plan page 57/67 (ref 494 & 521) to be painted or furnished galvanized or epoxy coated? Are any types of sleeves required near the waterline for these same piles to protect them from corrosion required? Are the exposed portion of the existing steel pier piles on these same bridges to be cleaned & repainted? They were painted originally. The painting quantities for the existing & new structural steel on bridges 1763 LT/RT - Part 4 - appears to be insufficient to paint the entire structures. (Ref 630 - 633 & 674 - 677) Is it the intent of the contract to paint only the ends of the beams at the abutments on these structures? If the entire length of all beam lines is to be painted please correct the quantities as required.

Question Submitted: 9/25/2007

Question Number: 22

Would the department make available on line the existing plans for the 14 bridges to be reconstructed on this project? We are particularly interested in any renovations, retrofitting or redecking that has occurred since the original construction on the structures with steel beam supported decks. Those bridges are 71-0705 L/R (Part I), 71-0756 L/R (Part I), & 71-1763 L/R (Part IV).

Question Submitted: 9/25/2007

Question Number: 23

What reference number are the fatigue retrofit cover plates shown on sheet 129 of 142 to be paid under? Are they part of the Level 3 item? Please advise.

Question Submitted: 9/26/2007

Question Number: 24

Please make available copies of the existing drawings for the structures of this project, Parts 1 thru 5. Thanks.

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: 9/26/2007

Question Number: 25

We have questions regarding the electrical conduit which is incidental to the parapet concrete for the above referenced project. Parts 1 and 4 as indicated on sheet 73/78 (Part 4) states that the conduit shall be 3" & 4" galvanized conduit 725.04. This would be for the beam bridges. In parts 2, 3, & 5 (slab bridges) as indicated sht. 58/67 (part 3) Note 1 on this sheet does not refer you to any spec to meet for this conduit, but refers you to sheet HL-30.32 of the standards. Sheet HL-30.32 does not mention any spec we must meet. This standard sheet opens up a whole list of other questions at least for me. The standard sheet shows the conduit leaving the bridge deck and going under the approach slab, turning left under the guardrail and into a gizmo called a pull box. Since we are replacing the approach slabs on this project, how does ODOT intend to pay for the extra lineal feet required to get to the pull box. Also listed on the sheet are junction boxes, and expansion devices. I would have no clue as to how many of each of these items ODOT would require or expect. If memory serves me, the other projects on I-71 spec'd out multicell conduit. It would be handy if ODOT would add bid items for the electrical work, or at least clarify what you are expecting upon the completion of the project.

Question Submitted: 9/26/2007

Question Number: 26

In Addendum No. 2, the answer to question #8 stated "The conduit treatment between the abutment should be as per the "TYPICAL SURVEILLANCE CONDUIT TREATMENT AT END OF BRIDGE PARAPET" detail linked to this addendum." Where is the detail? The only detail linked to this addendum was HL-30.33 showing a transition junction box. Is it the intent of the plans to have both conduits go through the transition junction boxes and into the same pull boxes? Where is the junction box to be placed? HL-30.33 shows the transition junction box in the median not in the bridge parapet. The detail that is missing may clear up these questions. Since you have now set up bid items for the conduits, why is the conduit in the parapet still being paid as incidental to the parapet concrete? These conduits have always been paid separately in the past and it would eliminate any confusion if the length of each parapet was added to the conduit quantities you have already set up by addendum. This is the method used in 625.21 Basis of Payment in the Construction and Material Specifications. Furthermore there is no item for the Trench necessary from backwalls to pull boxes.

Question Submitted: 9/26/2007

Question Number: 27

All of the Replacement Sign references have a unit of EA. Should this unit be changed to SF? This project has rumble strips along the shoulders. Are these to be removed prior to the shifting of traffic to the outside shoulders? If so, how is the contractor paid for these removals?

Question Submitted: 9/26/2007

Question Number: 28

In reference to 614- Maintaining Traffic and 622- Portable Concrete barrier items: Typically on interstate projects ODOT includes a "Drop-Offs in Work Zones" plan sheet. This sheet is not included in the plans. The portable barrier quantities set up in these plans in phase 1 of parts 1-5 appear not to be in conformance with the Drop-Off standards, especially in taper sections (given the depth of the temporary pavement) during 615-Pavement for Maintaining Traffic construction. Is it ODOT's intention to allow such dropoffs outside the portable barrier limits?

Question Submitted: 9/27/2007

Question Number: 29

614- Maintenance of traffic: Plan sheet 7, under "sequence of construction" in the last paragraph, states that "Lane Closures will be limited to the permitted times and no lanes shall be closed when no work is being performed on these parts". Plan sheet 8 in the first column mentions that "All lanes shall be open to traffic between December 1 and March 31". A work zone setup (shift) may remain in place throughout this period to permit winter work on a structure, however the work zone may not be changed or removed during this period". There seems to be contradictory language between the two pages. If the contractor chooses to begin "make-ready" work on the first phase of parts 1 and 2 in 2008 and continues to work into the winter of 2008/2009, which of the two notes prevails if and when the contractor has to temporarily suspend work due to weather? Would the current zone stay in place or does it need to be removed?

Question Submitted: 9/28/2007

Question Number: 30

The existing shoulders of I-71 have rumble strips from a previously-constructed resurfacing project. Plans do not account for what to do with these as far as maintaining traffic throughout the project. Please address in an addendum since traffic in phase 1 would be affected by the existing rumble strips on the outside shoulder.

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.