

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 091042

Sale Date - 6/24/2009

Question Submitted: 6/10/2009

Question Number: 1

1) Can the existing roadway drawings be made available online? 2) Can the office calculations for the pavement removed, asphalt and base removed, as per plan be made available online? 3) Have the volumes for the pavement removal items been subtracted from the earthwork quantities? 4) Please clarify the number of lanes to be made available for the Circleville Pumpkin Show. 5) With the late project bid and the restrictive dates for the pumpkin show limiting the work to be performed the first season to preparatory please consider revising the completion date for the project. 6) Please consider revising the duration for the use of crossovers to start earlier since the first season is shortened and the second season is also shortened by the pumpkin show.

**A1) <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/PIC-25718/>**

Question Submitted: 6/11/2009

Question Number: 2

On sheet 17 under the note Portable Changeable Message Signs, As Per Plan, it says that the contractor shall furnish, install, maintain and remove, when no longer needed, 4 changeable message signs, on site, for the duration of the project. At the end it says the PCMS shall be located at the Franklin County line on the northern portion and the Ross County Line on the southern portion of the project. Should that note read 2 PCMS for the duration of the project, or should the quantity be changed for the number of sign-months?

Question Submitted: 6/12/2009

Question Number: 3

Will ODOT require the lane line to be removed in the phases that require face on face traffic? According to the cross-sections the lane line will be visible to traffic, however the quantity of bid item 107 Lane Line doesn't appear to cover the quantity that would be removed. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2009

Question Number: 4

There seems to be a discrepancy for the "Pile Order Lengths" for the piles in Bridge No. PIC-23-0876 L&R. The stated order lengths (found on plan sheet 214) do not correspond to the quantities found in the Estimated Quantities chart on plan sheet 216. The contractor believes the stated order lengths should be 25 lf/pile for the Abutment Piles, and 35 lf/pile for the Pier Piles. Please review and make the necessary revisions.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2009

Question Number: 5

There seems to be a discrepancy for the 16" Cast-In-Place Reinforced Concrete Piles in the Estimated Quantities chart on plan sheet 261 for Bridge No. PIC-23-0898 L&R. The "Left Total" and "Right Total" columns each show a Furnished Length of 240 ft and a Driven Length of 270 ft. Conversely, the "Left Bridge Pier" and "Right Bridge Pier" columns each show a Furnished Length of 255 ft and a Driven Length of 285 ft. The contractor believes the "Left Bridge Pier" and "Right Bridge Pier" columns display the correct pile lengths. Please review and revise the Furnished and Driven Lengths for both the "Left Total" and "Right Total" columns.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2009

Question Number: 6

Will the Department please consider lowering the 50% self performed work requirement to 40% on this project?

Question Submitted: 6/16/2009

Question Number: 7

The closest soil boring to the proposed retaining wall is B-5. This boring is only 7.3' deep. Are there any other borings that were drilled deep enough to properly examine the subsurface within the depths of the drilled shafts? Discrepancy: There are 13 drilled shafts shown on the plan view on sheet 1/8 of the retaining wall sheets. This quantity should be 12.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2009

Question Number: 8

Line item 0028 is "Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type A1". It appears that type A1 has been removed from the standard drawings. The barrier transition details are included on 112/288. Where can I find details for this barrier section?

Question Submitted: 6/16/2009

Question Number: 9

There is a note (found on plan sheets 160 and 260) which pertains to the removal of the existing structures for Bridge No.'s PIC-23-0326 and PIC-23-0898. This note states that, "The use of headache balls and/or hoe-rams will not be permitted." The plans call out for the complete removal of the decks and pier caps for each of these bridges. Because there is no existing superstructure or pier cap concrete to be left in place, will the Department allow the use of this and/or similar equipment for the removal of the existing structures?

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

## Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number: 10

Would ODOT allow Type B1 barrier to be used in stead of Type A1 barrier for items # 28 "Concrete Barrier Single Slope, Type A1" and # 29 "Conc Barrier End Section, Type A1"? Though the Type B1 barrier would be 4" thicker it would still be much less expensive to the state than A1 barrier would be. Please also note that in the most current set of ODOT standards drawings, the barrier wall standard RM 4.3 (dated 1-19-07) doesn't even have a standard for a Type A1 barrier. There is no current standard for Type A1 barrier.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2009

Question Number: 11

Bridge PIC 23-0898 is required to be constructed in 4 phases. By the time the job is awarded, all the temporary roads are in place, and all the work is done on SR 22, it appears that all the bridge work required cannot be done in the time restrictions required in the MOT Notes. A substantial longer working time frame will be required. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2009

Question Number: 12

1. During a sight visit I noticed a drainage system under Bridge PIC 23-0876. This system interferes with the construction of the piers and is not addressed in the plans. Does it get removed? How is paid for? Please Advise. 2. To do the pier construction on PIC 23-0876, it will require removal of sidewalk, curb and possibly pavement. There is no place in the project setup to remove, repair and/or replace these items. How does the Department plan to pay for them? 3. REF 253 – 503 Coffers/Cribs/Sheeting, APP note references the abutment sheeting. Is this the same item to pay for cofferdam at the piers? 4. The MOT Drawings do not provide adequate protection for the pier construction on CR 22. It appears that additional barrier will be required. Please advise.

**1. A note on sheet 224 addresses the removal and payment of the drainage system on the 0876 structure. 2. The items affected by the south eastern most pier are addressed on sheet 111. 3. Yes. 4. Assuming you mean SR22, sheets 38 & 39 adequately address protection for the pier construction by drums and striping closure of the adjacent lanes.**

Question Submitted: 6/19/2009

Question Number: 13

The difference between the proposed top of pier elevations shown on 197/288 and 198/288 and the corresponding elevations for the existing piers shown on the existing plans is only about 2" or 3". The proposed cap is to have #5 dowel bars and #6 continuous reinforcing steel. It appears the cover on the reinforcing will be between 1/2" and 1 1/2". Can the elevations be adjusted or the removal plans adjusted to allow more depth for the proposed concrete?

**This is not an error. There is a 0.56' datum difference from what was used to build existing structures and the datum we use today. There is actually 9-10" between proposed and existing elevations.**

Question Submitted: 6/5/2009

Question Number: 14

Could the existing bridge plans please be made available online via ODOT's website?

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/PIC-25718/>**

Question Submitted: 6/8/2009

Question Number: 15

1. Can the existing bridge drawings be made available online? 2. Plan sheet 69 has pavement quantities set up for maintenance of traffic. The last 2 areas don't appear to be within the project limits and the first 2 areas might be covered under the temporary pavement items. Please clarify. 3. Do the cross sections deduct the asphalt pavement and the base removed from the earthwork quantities?

Question Submitted: 6/8/2009

Question Number: 16

Are Work Zone Raised Pavement Markers the only item that is to be included under the bid item Transition Area Delineation?

---

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.