

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 130002

Sale Date - 2/1/2013

ALL-76691 - IR-75-5.53,PART1;ALL-117/309-18.65/15.17,PART2

Question Submitted: 1/31/2013 11:12:31 AM

Follow up question to prebid question dated 1/22/2013 8:10:38 AM. Please reconsider interim date of November 1, 2013 for SR 309 or remove the 'ALL PROPOSED SR 309 LANES' note. Assume a start date of March 4, 2013 at the south end of I75 and 45 day closure of the 4th Street Ramps. Note that the SR 309 Ramps 'C' and 'E' cannot be closed concurrently with the 4th Street Ramps. The earliest date to close SR 309 Ramps 'C' and 'E' is April 19, 2013. The SR 309 Ramp closure window is 127 days. Please note per plan sheet 76 no work (earthwork, bridge, aggregates, etc....) can be performed on I75 from Sta. 363+00 to 375+00 during this period because existing ramps 'G' and 'B' will need the acceleration/deceleration tapers in this area. Estimated completion date of SR 309 Phase 1 is April 19, 2013 + 127 day closure = August 23, 2013. The work on Phase SR 309 Phase IIA will start around August 26, 2013 and interim completion is November 1, 2013. That leaves 66 calendar days to construct: I75 Sta. 363+00 to 375+00 earthwork, aggregate, paving etc...; phase 1 bridge work NB/SB and demo existing structure; south half of SR 309, note that all lanes on SR 309 cannot be completed until the existing piers are removed.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2013 1:12:04 PM

1. Does ODOT Consider the National Lime & Stone Quarry in Lima to be "virtually adjacent" to the project?

Yes

Question Submitted: 1/25/2013 9:33:59 AM

Pay item 373,374, 375, & 376 are steps for painting various pole structures on Part 1 of this plan set / project. The quantity of each of these is 28 which breaks down per the subsummaries & notes on pages 841, 842, 843 & 767 as painting the following: 4 overhead sign supports, 12 signal supports, and 12 pedestals for a total of 28 sections. This is less than all the poles of each of these categories in part 1. The note on plan page 840 indicates all new signal poles in part 1 should be painted which is a total of 16 signal poles not the 12 in the subsummary. Are all the signal poles to be painted? It appears that the poles at the intersection of Leonard Ave. are not included in the subsummary paint items. Please clarify if the poles at this intersection are to be painted and where this paint cost is to be included.

The pedestal poles in part 1 have a similar discrepancy that needs clarified. The plan note on page 839 indicates that all pedestals in part 1 should be painted; however, the subsummary only accounts for painting 12 of the 17 pedestals that are pay items 402 & 403. Are these all to be painted? If so is the paint to be included with the pedestal pay item 401 & 402 in accordance with the note or is it to be included with pay items 373 through 376 in accordance with the sub summary, which does not account for Leonard Ave?

Please also confirm that only pay items 318 & 319 (TC12.30 design 3 & 4) overhead sign supports are to be painted. All others overhead sign supports on part 1 are to be only galvanized per the sub summary and notes. Is that correct?.

Question Submitted: 1/23/2013 2:02:41 PM

To maintain traffic as shown in the plans, transitions from proposed to existing pavement will be required at many of the ramps as they are constructed throughout Phase 1A and 1B. Also, in the event a contractor chooses only to construct Phase 1A in 2013, transitions will be required in each direction to move I-75 traffic from the newly constructed outside lanes to existing pavement north of the SR 309 interchange. Where will contractors be paid for the asphalt wedging associated with these transitions?

The transitions will considered Item 615 Pavement For Maintaining Traffic, Class A

Question Submitted: 1/23/2013 8:34:42 AM

Addendum No. 10 revised the quantity and unit for Ref 464 Temporary MSE wall to 1 lump sum. Should this item include the select granular backfill (SGB) in the lump sum? Or will Ref 497 select granular backfill be paid concurrently with Ref 464?

The select granular backfill has been kept as a separate quantity for estimating purposes and is not included in the lump.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 2:05:08 PM

It appears that Mark-up drawings for addendum #10 have not been uploaded. Will there be mark-up drawings issued for addendum #10 prior to the bid?

Mark-up drawings for addendum #10 have been uploaded and are available.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 11:58:59 AM

EBS ammendment for addendum #11 has not been posted. When will this file be made available?

It is now available.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 11:09:25 AM

Plans sheet 956 of 1224 show a support post for the abutment bearings on bridges ALL-75-0703 L&R. The type/size of the HP Section is not shown. What is the size of the support post?

The steel support posts should be HP10x42. A 5/16" fillet weld should be used along the entire perimeter to connect the HP section to the top and bottom load plates.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 10:51:51 AM

1. When the completion date of the project was moved to September 01, 2015 it appears that the WTS and Field Office monthly items were not extended accordingly. Please review.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 9:38:25 AM

Please confirm:

1. For the noise wall all sides of the posts, post caps, icon panels and panel caps are coated with #37875 (white) - Epoxy Urethane sealer.
2. The residential side of the panel is Ashlar Stone pattern with #0372 (Beige) concrete stain / latex.
3. The highway side of the panel is Rough Cut Stone #36373 (Grey), integrally colored concrete - No coating.

1. Correct

2. #30372 Beige Epoxy Urethane Sealer

3. Correct

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 8:49:41 AM

When item 878 was added via addendum #11, a pay item for this work was not added. Since a pay item was not added, we are assuming that SS 878 was only added because it is required to be due to SS 840 requirements. Please verify that this is the intent, and that compaction testing will not be required on additional materials outside of the MSE wall select granular backfill.

SS 840 for MSE walls requires that this Supplemental Specification be included in the plans. If all the inspection and compaction testing will be done on MSE wall select granular backfill, then a separate 878 pay item is not required.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 8:40:29 AM

Pre-bid Questions- Project 2-13 IR75/SR 309- Part 2 Only

1. Pg10/173 critical work table - what is the definition of "travel lanes in their final configuration East of Sta.908+25 " It reads like the project will need to be completed in its entirety East of 908+25 by August 1, 2013. Is this the intent? Or is the project only to be completed from 908+25 to Sta 935+00. Can the contractor be working with any lane closer after 8-01-13 within this area? What is the definition of "final configuration" ?

2. Pg 11/173 Table labeled Construction Duration Stipulations. What are the business Hours of Taco Bell?

3. Please add a topsoil item for Part 2?

4. Does SS 878 apply to Part 2?

1.) The sheet (Sheet 10/173) being referenced has been updated. Please refer to Addendum No. 3.

2.) Currently, Sunday - Thursday: 10 AM – 2AM & Friday - Saturday: 10 AM - 3AM, but hours should be confirmed during construction by contacting Taco Bell on SR 309 (Harding Hwy) at phone number: (419) 229-0746. Also, please reference sheet 11/173, subheading "5) MAINTAINING ACCESS AT EXISTING DRIVES:" for further requirements regarding coordination of contractor work with the respective property owners and business managers.

3.) No item for Topsoil to be provided.

4.) No.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 8:28:13 AM

Judging by several questions asked on January 18th, Addendum No. 11 was issued on or before that day. We have not yet received this addendum, and are unable to access any addenda on ODOT's "Bidding Documents Listing" on the website. Please advise.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 8:10:38 AM

The existing ML 75 bridges over SR 309 each carry 3 lanes of traffic due to existing Ramps B and G. In order to build the Phase 1 bridges on the outside, traffic will need to be restricted to 2 lanes on the inside of each existing bridge. Will contractors be permitted to reduce the ramp taper lengths for existing SR 309 Ramps B and G so that bridge construction can begin prior to closing existing SR 309 Ramps B and G? If not, proposed Ramps C and E will need to be open prior to starting SR 309 Phase 1 bridge work which will make the aggressive interim completion date for ML Phase 1A and SR 309 even more challenging to achieve.

The contractor shall follow standards and adhere to the decision sight distance as per ODOT's TEM.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2013 8:03:43 AM

The answer to the previous question regarding the reinforcement type in the existing concrete pavement (1/11/2013) was answered that the reinforcement is either wire mesh or bar mat. There is a significant cost difference to remove pavement with either mesh or bar mat. So that all bidders are bidding the same scope, what type of reinforcement are we to assume for our bids.

The existing reinforcing is 3/8" steel bar mats and is not continuously reinforced.

Question Submitted: 1/21/2013 3:16:59 PM

Bridge 0703: The new piers for phase 1 are being constructed under the existing slab decks (~1.5'). The underside of the existing decks are lower than the tops of the new piers and can not be constructed as shown. the re-steel, couplers, joint location, pier bearing widths, etc are all affected. Please advise.

Based on the plans this should not be the case – please see sheet 942 and the pier details on sheet 952 & 960 for limits and dimensions. The new bridge elements are clear of the existing; the edge of the new pier will be 3.5ft clear of the existing deck

Question Submitted: 1/21/2013 2:56:55 PM

The Item 898 QC/QA Plan Notes on Sheet 977 for the RR Bridge #0813 states the parapets and transition parapets on the approach slabs will have colored concrete. Plan sheet 1010 for the RR Bridge #0813 calls out colored concrete and form liner for the piers and abutments above footings. Please clarify

The note indicated that the integral concrete shall be only for the approach parapet and end towers. The approach slab itself does not get integral colored concrete.

The details on sht 1010 are correct the RR bridge will get aesthetic treatments

Question Submitted: 1/21/2013 11:37:42 AM

Ref No 688 (ALL-75-0813 R) is described as an ashlar stone formliner. The left bridge (ALL-75-0813 L) is a rough stone formliner. Please clarify or verify this is correct.

Form liner shall be rough cut stone, not ashlar

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/21/2013 10:34:06 AM

The following questions are in regard to the Waterway Permit Conditions provided as part of Addendum No. 8:

1. Item 13. Temporary Access Fills (Stream and River Crossings and Fills), states, "Temporary fills must comply with dimensions approved by the USACE in accordance with the permit and/or subsequent modifications." This information has not been provided within the Bidding Documents. Because all work associated with Temporary Access Fills/Causeways is considered incidental, please provide a detailed drawing of each temporary access fill, including all USACE approved dimensions, in order to ensure full permit compliance.
2. Table 1 – Proposed Stream Impact Summary, Stream 1 & 19 – Please provide a detailed drawing that represents the Temporary Fill/Causeway that was used to develop the Temporary Fill Volumes and Areas. Does this design meet all requirements of SS 832? If not, will the Department waive the SS 832 requirements or obtain a permit modification to meet SS 832 requirements?
3. In other ODOT Districts, this Bidder has been required by the Department to obtain a USACE Permit modification for Temporary Fill Volumes and Areas LESS than what was permitted. Will this contract be administered in the same way?

1. The temporary fills must comply with all Special Provisions, especially box 13, and Table 1 (fill volume, fill area, and stream impact length). Drawings showing the temporary fill were not required and were not created or submitted to the USACE.

2. Stream 1 (Little Ottawa River) is not within this project area. In an effort to allow the contractor the most flexibility during construction, drawings are not required and were not prepared that show the temporary impacts for Stream 19 (Ottawa River). Acreage and volume were calculated by using the stream bottom elevation of 845.22 and the OHWM elevation of 852.4 for a depth of 7.18 feet, the temporary stream impact length of 170 linear feet, and a width of 34.5 feet, which are all shown on plan sheets. This calculation did not subtract out the voids in the conduits necessary to keep water flowing and therefore has a higher fill volume than necessary. (Using the given $L \times W \times D = \text{Volume} = 1559.7$ cubic yards and permit allows 3141.9; Acreage = 0.13 and permit allows 0.27) It is the contractor's responsibility to ensure that the Temp Fill/Causeway is in compliance with SS 832.

3. Instructions on Deviations from Permitted Construction Activities are described in Special Provision box 2. All coordination with the USACE will be handled by ODOT. The contractor shall not contact the USACE for permits where ODOT is the permittee. If the temp fill volumes and/or areas are less than what is permitted, inform ODOT as described in box 2, but a permit modification is not required.

Question Submitted: 1/21/2013 9:57:11 AM

Please clarify the location of Ref# 442 Building demolished 1601 Findlay Road does not exist and there is no shed on either side of the road in the 1600 block area of Findlay Road.

Question Submitted: 1/20/2013 4:11:00 PM

1. Due to changes to the temporary surcharge, please indicate the limits of the surcharge area by station and by indicating how far to the left and right of each station the surcharge is to be installed.

The size and shape of the surcharge is basically bounded by the temporary MSE wall limits and the final sub-grade lines and should be constructed to the limits shown on sheet 62 and as shown in the cross sections for the side slopes. The below information bullets are offered to further clarify:

Temporary Wall limits/locations and related details are shown on Sheets: 62, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1045, 1079, 1080-1084.

Total length of Surcharge is 200 ft at the rear abut (applied in 2 phases –see sht 62) and 100 ft at the forward abut as stated in the notes on sheet 1045.

Total length of surcharge at the rear abut will not be applied all at once as stated in the notes on sheet 1042 and depicted on sheet 62.

Sheets 61, 62, 79-81 depict overview of provided SR 81 MOT sequence.

Portions of temporary walls will be constructed in Phase 1, and portions in Phase 2 to allow SR 81 traffic to remain on the existing E.B. SR 81 lanes until traffic can be shifted onto the new SR 81 pavement constructed in SR 81 Phase 1 (see sheet 62 and 79). Once traffic is shifted, the remainder of the temporary wall can be built, filled, and the remainder of the surcharge added. If suitable material is used, surcharge can remain as embankment.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2013 7:04:01 PM

Sht 939/1224, the notes for the Approach Slabs (898) would lead you to believe that 100% of the slabs get integrally colored concrete, not just the parapets as detailed on Sht 970+/1224. Is it ODOT's intent to colorize even the flat slab portion of the Approach Slabs?

The note indicated that the integral concrete shall be only for the approach parapet and end towers. The approach slab itself does not get integral colored concrete.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

1/19/2013 3:09:34 PM

Addendum #5 addresses issues with MSE walls 9, 10, and 11. Answer #A1 to Question Q1 dated 12/20/12 @ 10:33 am, indicates that for walls 9,10, and 11 the excavation quantities shown in the plans on note 6 (pgs 749 & 759) includes removal limits from 1' in front of the leveling pad to 2' behind the straps and from the top of existing ground to the top of rock. There are no quantities shown in note 6. Please verify that the actual bid quantities for wall excavation for the 3 retaining walls (items 509 & 523) include excavation to top of rock for wall #9 from point D to M, and for the other remaining walls (10 and 11).

Yes, estimated quantities have been provided per the limits shown in the plans for each wall. The notes further indicate that the top of rock may vary by location and leveling pad thickness and estimates of excavation may vary as a result.

Question Submitted:

1/19/2013 11:01:39 AM

Since the Temporary Surcharge or SR 81 is being bid as a LS, it is necessary for the Contractor to know the exact limits required for the surcharge in each phase. The answers provided in Addendum #10 appear to suggest that the requirements for the rear abutment are to be modified. Will the surcharge limits for Phase 2 be changed to match the revised limits for Phase 1, and what are the new limits supposed to be?

To clarify we offer the following:

Due to the fact that several spans of the existing SR 81 bridges are going to be replaced with embankment, settlement under the new embankments is a concern due to underlying soils. Settlement will have two primary impacts: 1) on the proposed pavement throughout the area of the new embankment and 2) on the piles under the proposed abutments. In order to alleviate settlement under the final pavement on the bridge approaches and minimize impacts to piles at the abutments, the plans require placement of 200' of embankment to the level of the footing behind each abutment. Placement of the embankment is a standard ODOT procedure for bridges with abutments behind MSE walls. In order to reach full anticipated settlement in a timely manner, a temporary surcharge will be applied to simulate the load of the full final embankment. This surcharge needs to be applied for 200' behind the rear abutment and 100' behind the forward abutment at some point in time and is impacted by the part width construction operations. Due to the proximity of SR81 and the construction schedule constraints, an allowance was made to allow approximately 50' of embankment with full-height temporary surcharge to be placed during phase 1 operations to facilitate settlement near the abutment and allow construction of the piles. This does not alleviate the settlement concerns for the remaining 150' of proposed embankment behind the rear abutment, the remaining 150' will have to be placed and settled once SR81 is relocated. For phase 2 operations, where no embankment/temporary surcharge has been previously placed, the full 200' of embankment and surcharge can be placed at one time at the rear abutment. Note that the surcharge or portions thereof could remain in place as permanent embankment provided it meets specifications and the contractor's needs/construction methods.

Regarding the locations and limits of temporary walls and surcharge area the plans provide information at several locations including sheets 62, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1045, 1079, 1080-1084.

Question Submitted:

1/19/2013 10:53:42 AM

Addendum #8 dated 1/16/2013 lists 10 revised plan sheets, however only 9 revised plan sheets are posted on the ODOT web site pertaining to this Addendum. Plan sheet 997 is still missing. In addition, Addendum #10 dated 1/18/2013 lists 13 revised plan sheets, but as of today those plan sheets are still not available. The original plan sheets are posted to the web site, but the revised version outlining the changes that are proposed are still not available. Considering that Monday is a recognizable holiday for ODOT, it is safe to assume that we will not see these 11 revised plan sheets until sometime on Tuesday, January 22nd. Will ODOT delay the letting of this project to give Contractors time to fully analyze and account for the changes included in these revised plans?

Sheet 997 was never revised it was 977 and it is available on the ftp site. The revision to sheet 977 was to the pile driving operation note in the payment, in which it was made part of piles driven, as per plan.

Question Submitted:

1/19/2013 8:58:50 AM

Addendum #11 adds supplemental specification 878 dated 12/31/12, requiring Inspection and Compaction Testing of Unbound Materials by the contractor. This specification calls for this work under certain items to be paid under Item #878 - Inspection and Compaction Testing of Unbound Materials (Lump Sum), pay item 878 has not been established. Please clarify.

SS 840 for MSE walls requires that this Supplemental Specification be included in the plans. If all the inspection and compaction testing will be done on MSE wall select granular backfill, then a separate 878 pay item is not required.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 5:00:27 PM

1. Part 2 of the plans includes a design note requiring the contractor to submit a Maintenance of Traffic Scheme/Plan to be sealed by a professional engineer. There is no mention in Part 1 of the plans requiring that a Maintenance of Traffic scheme for Part 1 be submitted to the engineer for approval. Are we correct in assuming that the requirement indicated in Part 2 of the plans is not a requirement for Part 1?

2. Please consider delaying the project to accommodate all of the recent changes which effect numerous parties involved with the bid.

It is correct in assuming that the requirement indicated in Part 2 of the plans is not a requirement for Part 1. The contractor with Part 1 still needs to make sure their MOT meets the requirements of the standards, manuals, OMUTCD & ODOT's TEM, and that the MOT provided is safe.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 4:27:51 PM

Addendum #11 added SS878 but there was no item added to the proposal. Shouldn't there be a pay item for testing of unbound materials? Also, shouldn't the MSE wall backfill testing items be deleted?

SS 840 for MSE walls requires that this Supplemental Specification be included in the plans. If all the inspection and compaction testing will be done on MSE wall select granular backfill, then a separate 878 pay item is not required.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 3:49:36 PM

The slab bridges ALL-75-0832 L & R have 6 scuppers per bridge shown on sheet 1012 of 1224 but there is no reference number or pay item for them. Please review and advise.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 3:42:27 PM

Please clarify your answers provided in Addendum 10 regarding the temporary surcharge at the rear abutment of SR 81. The Addendum mentions changes to Sheets 62 and 1042 (not yet available), but the surcharge note is on Sheet 1045. Will the Temporary Surcharge plan note on Sheet 1045 be modified to eliminate the 200 feet requirement or will the Contractor be required to wait through a second settlement period once the embankment and surcharge is in place through that area?

No, sheet 1045 will not be modified. This note refers to the overall length of surcharge. Yes the wait period will apply to the second area of surcharge being placed; to further clarify we offer the following narrative:

Due to the fact that several spans of the existing SR 81 bridges are going to be replaced with embankment, settlement under the new embankments is a concern due to underlying soils. Settlement will have two primary impacts: 1) on the proposed pavement throughout the area of the new embankment and 2) on the piles under the proposed abutments. In order to alleviate settlement under the final pavement on the bridge approaches and minimize impacts to piles at the abutments, the plans require placement of 200' of embankment to the level of the footing behind each abutment. Placement of the embankment is a standard ODOT procedure for bridges with abutments behind MSE walls. In order to reach full anticipated settlement in a timely manner, a temporary surcharge will be applied to simulate the load of the full final embankment. This surcharge needs to be applied for 200' behind the rear abutment and 100' behind the forward abutment at some point in time and is impacted by the part width construction operations. Due to the proximity of SR81 and the construction schedule constraints, an allowance was made to allow approximately 50' of embankment with full-height temporary surcharge to be placed during phase 1 operations to facilitate settlement near the abutment and allow construction of the piles. This does not alleviate the settlement concerns for the remaining 150' of proposed embankment behind the rear abutment, the remaining 150' will have to be placed and settled once SR81 is relocated. For phase 2 operations, where no embankment/temporary surcharge has been previously placed, the full 200' of embankment and surcharge can be placed at one time at the rear abutment. Note that the surcharge or portions thereof could remain in place as permanent embankment provided it meets specifications and the contractor's needs/construction methods.

Regarding the locations and limits of temporary walls and surcharge area the plans provide information at several locations including sheets 62, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1045, 1079, 1080-1084.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

1/18/2013 3:40:33 PM

1. Please consider listing the construction sequence from Station 460+00 to 461+28 and 462+74 to 463+42 and detailing each operation to take place to further clarify the order of construction operations for the permanent and temporary MSE Walls (the placement of embankment, temporary MSE walls, and permanent MSE walls) as there is not enough detail provided regarding the construction sequence and order of operations to estimate the work to take place in these areas at this time.
2. Please indicate if the permanent MSE wall and the temp MSE walls are to be constructed together prior to the settlement period (from Station 460+00 to 461+28 and 462+74 to 463+42).
2. Please indicate what is to happen once the settlement period is over from Station 460+00 to 461+28 and 462+74 to 463+42.
4. Is any portion of the permanent MSE Wall, the temporary MSE Wall, or the surcharge to be removed after the settlement period is complete or do they all remain in place and undisturbed?
4. Is the temporary surcharge to be built on top of the newly installed embankment with a temporary MSE wall or utilizing a separate method to retain the surcharge placed from the abutment footer up to proposed subgrade?
5. The cross sections indicate a quantity of embankment calculated all the way to station 461+46 on I-75 and resumes again at 462+75. Do these quantities need adjusted to account for the quantity of select granular material being used in the temp MSE walls in this same area (Ref# 497 total of 3,717 CY)?

- 1. It will be up to each contractor to take into account the factors at the site and develop their specific plans for completing the work described and detailed in the contract documents.**
- 2. Portions of the temporary walls from 460+00 to 462+74 (Rear Abut) will be built with the permanent wall in Phase 1 and portions in Phase 2. See limits on sheet 62. At the forward abut, the temp and permanent walls can be constructed together.**
- 2. The next construction items begin such as driving piles the remaining distance on the rear abutment, etc...The surcharge or portions thereof could remain in place as permanent embankment provided it meets specifications and the contractor's needs/construction methods.**
- 4. The walls may remain as needed, and the surcharge or portions thereof could remain in place as permanent embankment provided it meets specifications and the contractor's needs/construction methods.**
- 4. The full-height temporary wall will help retain that side of the surcharge material. The other sides are assumed to be placed at the slopes as shown on sheet 62.**
- 5. The estimated embankment quantity includes the temporary MSE wall volume and the contractor may account for this in their estimates.**

Question Submitted:

1/18/2013 3:23:11 PM

The answers provided in Addendum 10 with regards to Q1 submitted 1/15/2013 @ 2:12pm did not address the ability to complete the SR 81 bridges in Phase 2. The second part of the original question dealt with Phase 2, and the fact remains that the construction schedule cannot incur a settlement of 90 days, or even 60 days, after November 1, 2014 and still finish by the completion date of September 1, 2015.

In the forthcoming addenda the disincentive for the work on SR 81 to be done in one construction season has been removed therefore allowing work to begin in 2013 around SR 81, all other stipulations and tools are still applicable. This will allow work to progress on the fill and the building of the structure, while not being tied to getting SR 81 complete in one construction season.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 3:09:30 PM

With respect to the answer provided to Q1 Submitted 1/15/2013 @ 2:12PM and the answer provided in Addendum 10 we have the following questions.

1. From your answer it appears that the intent for the surcharge has been reduced from 200 feet behind the rear abutment to approximately 20-25 feet max. This is based on the eastbound lanes of SR 81 being located approximately 88 feet from the face of the rear abutment wall. When the rear wall is constructed to the bottom of the footer elevation (887.98), you will be left with a flat bench approximately 65' feet long sloping down at 2:1 and terminating before the edge of pavement (Elev. 877). The surcharge that sits on top of this embankment is roughly 11 feet in height at the face of the wall and the surcharge material will also have to be sloped down at 2:1 to the top of the bench. This means at most you will have 25 feet of surcharge material behind the MSE wall. Will this be acceptable?
2. Your answer also states that the settlement period may be reduced to 60 days. Will any required settlement beyond 60 days result in an excusable delay for the Contractor?

1. Sheet 62 specifies the surcharge to be 50 ft. long during I-75 Phase 1/SR 81 Phase 1; this is achieved utilizing 1:1 slopes for this short-term condition. The remainder of the 200 ft. surcharge area will be achieved during I-75 Phase 1/SR 81 Phase 2. The process will be repeated for the I-75 median workzone during I-75 Phase 2, however, the entire 200 ft. can be surcharged all at once.

2. The settlement period is estimated to range from 60 – 90 days in the geotechnical report. Settlement platform notes and guidance has also been provided in the plans. There is no intent to reduce the settlement period by any specific amount, therefore, the plan requirements shall be followed. The engineer may adjust the settlement period based on platform readings as stated in the plans.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 1:56:24 PM

The ebs amendments for addendum #8, 9 and 10 have not been posted. When will these files be made available?

They are out there. Both the website and Bid Express.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 12:28:58 PM

Please review the plan sheets associated with Addenda 1 thru 10. It appears that there are discrepancies with the plan sheets listed in the addenda versus that on the linked drawing revisions. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 12:22:46 PM

The proposal does not contain the train counts for the Chicago, Fort Wayne & Eastern Railway Company (SC-2). We need these to obtain the cost for RxR insurance.

Should be 4 trains per day at 25mph.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 10:54:20 AM

There were two different sheets posted for Sheet 978 and 979 regarding Add #8 in #8(H) and #8(I), please clarify which one set is for Add #8, (H) or (I)?

The sheets posted to Addenda 8 (I) would be the most current version of the sheets.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 9:41:54 AM

Regarding the posting of Add #8 Plan Sheet Revisions, Sheet #577 is not included on Add #8 (I) as answered previously in the Pre-Bid Questions. Please post the Revised Sheet 577 per Add #8. Thank you.

There was no revision to sheet 577, but there was a revision to 977 which is posted on the ftp site under addendum (I).

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 9:28:59 AM

Revised sheet 977 listed on Addendum 8 is not on the ftp site (addendum H or I). All revised sheets on listed Addendum 9 are not on ftp site (addendum J).

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/18/2013 8:57:25 AM

Please clarify the following MOT/Phasing issues:

1. Plan Sheet 72 details the SR 309 MOT Typical Sections per phase. Section B-B details the Phasing under the I75 Bridge. It appears from Phase 1 through Phase 2B, three 12' lanes of permanent pavement will be constructed. No further MOT Sections are given after Phase 2B. What are the MOT requirements for constructing the remaining SR 309 proposed pavement under the bridge in 2014?

2. Plan Sheet 76 details SR 309 Phase 1/ I75 Phase 1 Construction and based on the shaded areas no work on I75 will done from Sta. 362+50 to 375+00 in order to maintain the existing ramp "B" deceleration lane and existing ramp "G" acceleration lane. Is it the Departments intent to construct the I75 Phase 1 section from 362+50 to 375+00 and the proposed bridge over SR 309 in SR 309 Phase 2 as shown on Plan Sheet 77 of the Plans?

1. Note that the last Section B-B on sheet 72 (bottom rt. Corner of sht) depicts the MOT configuration that matches up with the plan view on sheet 122.

To complete the final pavement in areas where the final bridge demo has occurred, work should be phased as necessary to keep one lane of traffic open in each direction and the left turn lanes to the NB and SB entrance ramps shall be maintained on each side of the work area. The turn lanes may be shortened for the time necessary to cure the new concrete pavement. All misc labor, equipment, striping, etc necessary to complete the work shall be included with Item 614, Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan, Lump unless otherwise itemized.

2. Yes, that is the intent of the plans based on keeping existing Ramps B & G open during Phase 1 of SR309. There may be additional ways to phase it as long as the stipulations and plan requirements are met.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2013 4:59:51 PM

On the SR 309, Part 2 portion, Plan and Profile pages 27-41 show the 605 4" Base Pipe Underdrains crossing the intersections through pavement. What type of pipe is required under pavement? Can 707.31 be used under pavement or should this be 707.33 perforated or something else? Could these be relocated to follow the curb and gutter around the radius' and not cross the pavement?

Build as per plans and the CMS specification 605. For additional clarification see sheet 7/173 for pavement restoration for pipe installation note.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2013 4:55:11 PM

Do the existing light poles on the mainline that will be removed permantly need to be lighted during construction? Also the temp signals call for video cameras, however there are no existing cameras on these intersections. The cost will be prohibitive to install this many cameras, Can the permanant cameras be used then when finished be transfered to the permanent intersections?

Lighting does not have to be permanent but shall be lite to the levels of the proposed lighting plans, either using temporary or permanent poles and shall be in operation when the ramps & mainline are open. The contractor is to maintain the existing lighting for as long as possible with the approval of the engineer and payment for this will be under Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, as per plan.

The permanent cameras may be used at the temp signals, then when finished be transferred to the permanent intersections.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2013 3:05:12 PM

Plan page 50 at the bottom of the second column states payment for the Longitudinal Channelizer will be paid by the foot. Is there a pay item for this work?

Yes, it is provided in the Maintenance of Traffic General Summary on sheet 60 and the amount in the summary is correct as it differs from the quantity that is shown on sheet 50

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/17/2013 1:54:31 PM

The current specification allows for a 108" Liner Pipe, per 707.12 (Corrugated Steel Spiral Rib Conduits). Respectfully request an addendum be issued allowing SS 937 Type B (Polyethylene Liner Pipe) for the 96" liners. A 96" HDPE liner will increase flow 14% from the original culvert design. Additionally 96" HDPE can be utilized as a direct bury pipe thus keeping the same uniform pipe size, shape and material throughout the entire structure. The Mannings coefficient specified is higher than that of SS 937 materials, therefore reducing the amount of flow vs. SS 937. SS 937 materials also handle deformation, sags, and bends in the host pipe much better than SS 707.12 materials, as metal pipes are much more susceptible to damage during installation as liner pipe than HDPE. SS 937 materials also have a longer design life, and will respond very well to acidic soil conditions. We respectfully request the use of SS 937 Type B materials be added as acceptable materials for use on this project.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2013 1:43:17 PM

Due to the fact that the permanent MSE walls will be constructed at SR 81 prior to the surcharge load being applied, will the walls be accepted upon completion and the Contractor relieved of any liability for damage to the wall that may occur as a result of the anticipated settlement?

It is the opinion that the chance of damage to this wall through settlement during surcharge is highly unlikely. The contractor will be working with a manufacturer during construction, as the plans provide for on-site consultation, and this would further serve to minimize the chances of damage to the walls from this particular concern. The state will not release the contractor from his obligations to build the wall per the specifications.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2013 11:17:36 AM

In reviewing the allotted time frame for the construction of SR 81 and the I-75 Mainline structures at the same location we have the following questions/statements to consider involving the time frame allotted for construction of I-75 Phase 1:

1. The north side of SR 81 must be built so that traffic on the south side of existing SR 81 can eventually be moved to the newly constructed northern portion of SR 81 in Phase 2 of SR 81. Let's kid ourselves and say Phase 1 of SR 81 can be built in March and April of the year the contractor chooses to perform this construction.
2. Once construction advances to Phase 2 of SR 81 (May 01), construction can then begin on the rear abutment/embankment for the south half of the I-75 Structure over SR 81 (Both L&R sides). Let's assume 30 days for construction of the embankment required to finish off the fill needed for the rear abutment and the temporary surcharge construction. Once this is complete, then the 2nd 90 day settlement period can begin starting on June 01. A 90 day settlement period will take up June, July, and August. Then at the completion of the settlement period, the contractor must remove the temp. surcharge, construct the temp MSE walls, construct the permanent MSE walls, then drive piles, construct the abutments, beam seats, set beams, form the deck, pour the deck, approach slabs, and parapets in 60 days in order to be able to place traffic in the newly constructed outside lanes of I-75 prior to Nov. 01 in the construction season the contractor chooses to construct this area in.

It is not possible to build the amount of work mentioned to take place after the 90 day consolidation period in 60 days in order to open the outside lanes of I-75 on Oct 31. Please review and consider adjusting the interim completion dates and sequences to accommodate the issues presented.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2013 10:39:40 AM

Addendum 8 (H) lists revised sheets; 18, 51, 60, 940, 941, 977, 978, 979, 1046 and 1047. Viewable revised plan sheet attachments for Addendum H (8) are; 978, 979, 18, 51 and 60. Missing sheets 940, 941, 1046 and 1047.

Addendum 9 (I) lists revised sheets; 10, 140, 141, 142, 149, 150, 178, 200, 204, 207, 231, 232, 607, 679, 746, 747, 748, 749 and 1086. Viewable plan sheet attachments for Addendum I (9) are; 940, 941, 978, 979, 1046 and 1047. Missing all the sheets listed in the addendum.

There are plan sheet attachments for Addendum J (10) that the same listed in Addendum 9 (I).

Are the plan attachments for Addendum H and I for Addendum 8? If so, sheet 977 is missing.

Are the plan attachments for Addendum J for Addendum 9?

The plan sheets for Addenda 8 on the ftp site located in (H & I) and addenda 9 is (J). Plan sheet 977 is ftp site addenda 8(I).

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/16/2013 4:29:56 PM

Per plan specifications, Supplemental Specification dated 10-19-12 applies to this project. We would like to request that Supplemental Specification 800, Section 451.09 Joints be revised to reflect the latest revisions to the DBI Tolerance Specifications that were approved by ODOT at the December 5, 2012 Specification Committee Meeting.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2013 4:17:51 PM

In section 0006 pavement part one and the proposal addendum, there is no line item for a mixture design for Chemically Stabilized Soils. Will ODOT require a Mix Design for this section? Or is the intent to use 6% Portland based on a soil unit weight of 110 pcf?

The intent to use 6%.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2013 11:26:00 AM

Noise Barrier Details

Page 745 of the plans mentions the roadway side of the noise wall panels should be integrally colored concrete federal color No. 36373, and that the residential side should be painted beige.

Can the roadway side be painted instead of adding color to the mix being the residential side specifies a painted surface treatment?

The noise wall panels shall remain integrally colored as specified in the plans. No addenda is required.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2013 9:58:23 AM

Sheet 974 shows the structural steel as A588 in the proposed structure. Sheet 976 shows the steel as A709 Grade 50. Please clarify. also are the abutment ends and pier locations painted? Sheet 994 shows the load plates at the piers as ASTM A709 Grade 50 also and these are shop primed. Please clarify.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2013 9:05:19 AM

There are bid items for SGB Inspection & Compaction Testing for MSE Walls 9,10,11 and MSE walls at Bridges ALL-75-0875L&R. Is SGB Inspection & Compaction Testing required for REF 497 Select Granular Backfill? If so, where is it to be paid?

No, SGB Inspection & Compaction Testing is not required for REF 497 Select Granular Backfill. No Addenda is required

Question Submitted: 1/16/2013 9:03:21 AM

The temporary wire walls as show on sheets 61 & 62 appear to be paid for in REF 464 Retaining Wall Misc.:Temporary MSE Wall (SF) and REF 497 Select Granular Backfill (CY). These walls are typically paid for as a lump sum including the wire wall, granular backfill, excavation, pipe (if needed), etc. If it is paid by the unit price please clarify where the incidentals are to be paid and how actual design of the walls will affect quantity adjustments.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2013 4:07:25 PM

As discussed at the pre-bid meeting, the typical sections as defined on plan sheet 81 of 1224 for SR 81 do not reflect the existing pavement. Please provide the correct pavement typical sections for SR 81.

This issue of the existing typical section of SR 81 was addressed with Addendum 8 in which sheet 18 was revised and made available

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

1/15/2013 2:11:52 PM

The contractual requirements for the construction of SR 81 and the new ALL-75-0875 L/R structures will not allow for the required work to be completed by the October 31, 2014 interim completion date listed on Sheet 55 based on the following.

- The Tools and Stipulations for the SR 81 work require that all of the work on SR 81 and Nuebrecht Rd. be completed during one construction season.
- The surcharge loading that is to be completed as part of the new structures has a minimum duration of 120 calendar days inclusive of the settlement period and cannot begin until the embankment is constructed to the bottom of the proposed abutment footing.
- The construction of the rear abutment MSE and temporary walls cannot be completed until SR 81 – Phase 1 is completed.
- Based on a realistic starting date in the spring of 2014, SR 81 – Phase 1 will not be completed until sometime in July, at which point traffic will enter the SR 81 – Phase 2 configuration. The following list includes the remaining major items of work with estimated durations that will then need to be completed so that mainline IR 75 traffic could be placed onto new pavement and bridge decks prior to November 1, 2014.

1. Completion of rear approach embankment and temporary MSE wall to abutment footer elevation. 2 weeks.
2. Installation of surcharge material, settlement period, and subsequent removal. 120 days.
3. Driving abutment piling to UBV. 1 week.
4. Forming, pouring, and curing of substructure concrete. 2 weeks.
5. Forming, pouring, and curing of integral abutment. 1 week.
6. Forming, pouring, and curing bridge deck. 3 weeks.
7. Forming, pouring, and curing approach slabs. 2 weeks.
8. Forming, pouring, and curing parapet wall. 2 weeks.
9. Completion of approach pavement. 1 week.
10. Mainline MOT switch.

• The loss of 120 calendar days during the 2015 construction season in IR 75 - Phase 2 will also make it impossible to complete the project prior to the contract completion date of September 1, 2015. Even if the Contractor and Department can devise a way to revise contract requirements and meet the November 1, 2014 mainline traffic switch, there simply aren't enough workable days between November 1, 2014 and September 1, 2015 to complete the remaining work on the bridges and mainline at SR 81. The timeline for the major items of work along with durations for IR 75 – Phase 2 is as follows.

1. Demolition Phase 2 structures. 3 weeks.
2. Excavate MSE wall, pre-drive piling, and pour leveling pad. 1.5 weeks.
3. Winter shutdown. Not able to complete embankments. 120 days.
4. Construct Phase 2 MSE wall and approach embankment. 2 weeks.
5. Installation of surcharge material, settlement period, and subsequent removal. 120 days.
6. Driving abutment piling to UBV. 1 week.
7. Forming, pouring, and curing of substructure concrete. 2 weeks.
8. Forming, pouring, and curing of integral abutment. 1 week.
9. Forming, pouring, and curing bridge deck. 3 weeks.
10. Forming, pouring, and curing approach slabs. 2 weeks.
11. Forming, pouring, and curing parapet wall. 2 weeks.
12. Completion of approach pavement. 1 week.
13. Remove MOT.

Please review the above statements and consider modifications to the contract stipulations and interim and final completion dates.

Question Submitted:

1/15/2013 2:10:00 PM

In the part 2 section, we are installing a lot of pipe under existing pavement that does not get replaced (mill and fill only). Please add pavement quantities to replace this pavement over the pipe trenches.

Refer to General Notes, Sheet 7 of 173 of the Part 2 Plans for Pavement Restoration notes and quantities for pipe and drainage structure installations.

Question Submitted:

1/15/2013 10:52:53 AM

Plan sheet 200 of 1224 calls our "Riprap Using 6" Reinforced Concrete Slab" on sheet #199, reference E11. Reviewing sheet 199, reference E11, this item is called out as Tied Block Mat, Type 3. Which is correct? If needed please correct bid quantities.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/15/2013 8:15:48 AM

On sheet 46, waterline details page 3 and page 4 seem to contradict each other on backfill. Detail page number 3 says that backfill under pavement areas is to be 1' of granular and CDF to subgrade. Detail page number 4 only shows CDF under tar and chip surfaces and 304 under flexible and concrete pavement. Since there is no tar and chip on the project, is 304 to be used as backfill for the waterline?

That is correct the backfill shall be 304.

Question Submitted: 1/14/2013 10:39:46 AM

For the temp. traffic signals, can the existing equipment be used for the temp. Signals?

This is acceptable as long as the intersections designated remain signalized and the signal equipment meets the requirements of 614.10.

Question Submitted: 1/14/2013 10:31:23 AM

Bid Item 106 - ROCK CHANNEL PROTECTION, TYPE C WITH FABRIC FILTER is defined by the measured unit, cubic yards. In review of the plans, the general summary, sheet 140, lists the unit as cubic yards, however the sub-summary sheets, specifically sheets 204, 207, etc... list the unit as square yards. Which is the correct unit of measure? Are the quantities listed cubic yards or square yards?

Question Submitted: 1/11/2013 5:02:28 PM

The link provided previously for the "PART 2 OFFICE CALCS" is not very helpful, specifically the Pavement Calcs. When you download the file it opens up the exact same spreadsheet as shown on Plan Page 19/173 of the Pavement sub-summary, no additional or more detailed information was provided. Part 2 contains 40+ driveways (various size/shape) and the Station to Station limits as provided in the plans/office calcs do not provide enough information to calculate the surface area of all these drives for bidding purposes.

Can a detailed breakdown complete with calculated CADD areas of the Part 2 Driveways, separate from the actual roadway quantities be provided?

The Part 2 CADD files and office calcs provided for information is what was used to develop the plans for the driveways which are detailed out on sheets 92-99/173 and the plans indicate the quantities to be bid.

Question Submitted: 1/11/2013 12:56:56 PM

The existing typical section for I-75 shows 9" Reinforced Portland Cement Pavement. What type of reinforcement is included in the pavement? In other words, does the pavement contain wire mesh, or is it continuously reinforced?

The standards when IR 75 was built allowed for either a wire mesh or bar mat, as for what was utilized is not known.

Question Submitted: 1/11/2013 10:21:44 AM

Regarding the Ground Water Monitoring Wells - there is not enough information provided to price these items.

Can the Department provide the original well logs for the wells? For the wells abandoned we need to know the depths, size, how many feet of screen. For the wells reconstructed to grade we need to know if the protectors are above ground or flush mount.

Also we need to know what method of abandonment will be required. Abandoned in place or overdrilling. If there is pcs or regulated water involved with the abandoning of wells will the cost of handling the pcs and/or water be included in the abandoning or handled with the other bid items already set up for pcs and water?

The wells shall be abandoned in accordance with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources' (ODNR) Technical Guidelines For Sealing Unused Wells (Appendix 4, Sealing Monitoring Wells and Boreholes). Payment for this work shall be as per Item Special - Ground Water Monitoring Well Abandonment.

Yes, if there are pcs or regulated water involved with the abandoning of wells the cost of handling the pcs and/or water will be included in the abandoning or handled with the other bid items already set up for pcs and water.

The ESA Phase 2 reports have been added to the zip file for Part 1 posted to <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-76691>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/11/2013 9:56:50 AM

Project ALL IR-75-5.53 (#130002)

The proposal Line 0232, Item # 880E15000 Asphalt Concrete Pavement for Design Option A is a 7 year warranty item. Can you clarify that this item will not be eligible for an asphalt binder price adjustment after the project completion date and during the 7 year warranty period? ODOT Proposal Note 535 is included in this project proposal and does allow for asphalt binder price adjustment for multi-year projects, even though this is an optional bid pavement material project.

Specification section 880.06 states: Supply all materials, equipment, and labor to perform Remedial Actions at no additional cost to the Department.

Also, reference is made to the FHWA Guidance document dated December 20, 2012. The FHWA Advisory Circular, item 7b) Commodity price adjustments, states that, "The use of commodity price adjustments for material prices is not desirable for alternate bidding contracts."

As state in SS880 in Section 880.09 Basis of Payment. The Department will not pay for materials, equipment, or labor required to perform Remedial Actions or routine maintenance.

Question Submitted: 1/11/2013 8:25:31 AM

Plan Sheet 974 shows 2 retaining wall which appear to be in conflict with Pier #1 SB and Pier #1 NB. Our site visit confirmed the presents of these retaining walls. Storm sewers use these walls on the outside as headwalls. If these wall would have to be removed it will require regrading, other work on slopes and retention of the headwall portion or redesign. Please advise

Reference sheets 761-766 for details, notes and quantities for these walls. No addenda is required.

Question Submitted: 1/10/2013 5:49:46 PM

Plan note on Sheet 977 for "Pile Driving Operations" 2nd paragraph states "Movement or damage to tracks, ballast, and or subgrade shall be repaired by the contractor." Please review this note the contractor should not be responsible unless damage occurs form his negligence.

The referenced note requires the contractor to provide monitoring of vibration to ensure stability of the track and bed and prevent damage. If there is damage associated with the operations while the contractor is monitoring it would be considered negligent and the contractor would be held responsible.

Question Submitted: 1/10/2013 5:10:47 PM

Plan note on Sheet 977 for "Pile Driving Operations" states "vibration during all driving shall be monitored to ensure stability of track and track bed is not compromised." Can ODOT define the scope of monitoring required and add a bid item for vibration monitoring?

Question Submitted: 1/10/2013 4:09:50 PM

There have been conflicting answers regarding the work zone raised pavement markers (Items 475 & 476). A prebid question was asked on 12/20/12 asking "Are both bid items going to be used or is it based upon which pavement alternate the contractor chooses?" Addendum #5 answered this stating "No, only one should apply dependent upon which pavement type is chosen." Another question was asked on 1/4/13 as to why if we're only to bid one aren't they a part of the alternate packages. The answer was "These are temporary MOT items and not dependent on the pavement option chosen. Items should be bid accordingly." The notes for these items on Sheet 54 specifically say work zone raised pavement marker, APP on asphalt surfaces and work zone raised pavement markers on concrete surfaces. Please clarify.

Prebid question addressed with addenda #8

Question Submitted: 1/10/2013 3:56:13 PM

Is a Type S joint without tie bars or Type Y doweled butt joint required between the new ramps and 4th St. pavement as shown on the joint detail plan sheets?

The joint is to be a Type S Joint.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/10/2013 3:29:42 PM

It was stated at the pre-bid meeting that PN 802 requires the use of SS802 dated 1-20-12 for both Parts 1 and Part 2. With the high cost associated with this requirement, would ODOT consider adding a lump sum bid item that would include all engineering costs for designing the laying schedule, submittals, daily inspection, video, laser and compaction testing as well as post construction location and elevation documentation this requires for storm sewer (603 & 604) items?

No lump sum bid item will be included to cover all engineering costs for designing the laying schedule, submittals, daily inspection, video, laser and compaction testing as well as post construction location and elevation documentation, the contractor shall bid accordingly for the requirements of PN802 and SS 802. The requirement of PN 802 & SS802 will not be applicable for Part 2 of the project and is addressed in the addenda #8

Question Submitted: 1/10/2013 9:30:52 AM

Addendum #1 added a bid item for Asbestos Abatement, and included a list of all materials to be removed. I have 2 questions.

1. If the materials are non-friable, do they still have to be removed prior to demolition operations?
2. The list shows a quantity of 3860 Square Feet of drywall joint compound for Parcel 119. How was this quantity calculated? It appears to be rather high for a 1-story house.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-76691>

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 3:00:05 PM

1. Please consider adding detailed drawings for the MOT sequences involving I-75 and the ramp tie-ins at 4th Street, SR 309, and SR 81. This would eliminate any confusion and aid tremendously in the estimating process. This is not a request for all of I-75, simply the areas mentioned as the current plans do not include enough detail in these areas.

2. Are the pull-off areas mentioned in the MOT notes and plans provided to be built with the same pavement section as Pavement for Maintaining Traffic Class A or something different?

The contractor shall utilize the standards, the OMUTCD & ODOT's TEM to for the tie-ins and transitions with the ramps.

Assuming reference is being made to the pull-offs along Service Rd #3, it is anticipated that the existing and proposed pavements can be used alternately; as the work moves the pull-off can be shifted. The contractor may also opt to use Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, however traffic compacted surface would be sufficient for this short-term situation unless otherwise directed by the engineer.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 2:49:28 PM

1. The winter pavement markings & removal note on sheet 52 needs clarification. The note states that re-striping may be required at the start of season two as directed by the engineer. If re-striping is required will it be paid for in the appropriate bid items?
2. If the contractor elects to only complete in the first year Phase 1 to just north of SR 309 ramps, will the transitions and work zone raised pavement markers be paid for in the appropriate bid items? This would add an additional transition in each direction.
3. Is the contractor for the future project ALL-75-0.21 responsible for the temporary striping, stripe removal, PCB movements and etc. inside this contracts project limits for the different movements shown on sheet 82 after 2013?

1. Re-striping is required at the beginning of the second season due to remove from snow removal it will be paid for in the appropriate bid items

2. Yes, transitions and work zone raised pavement markers be paid for in the appropriate bid items.

3. Prior to the ALL-75-0.21 project starting the contractor for ALL-75-5.53 is responsible for any MOT items. Once the ALL-75-0.21 project begins the split in responsibility for MOT items is at sta. 292+00, until ALL-75-5.53 is complete then the remainder of the ALL-75-0.21 construction schedule will be responsible for any MOT items.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 2:23:01 PM

The quantities for biditems 578, 615, 652, 688, 787, and 832 - Forming of Rough Cut Stone Surfaces are all substantially understated. The general notes on these bridges state the formliners will not be measured individually for payment, however the aesthetic details and the fact that there is a biditem by the 'Square Foot' indicate differently. Please revise the notes for all three bridge to state how the pay items are measured and update the quantities accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 1:24:19 PM

Can the businesses on 309 north side West of Ramp "C" up to S. Leonard Ave. use their existing access off Lenore during 309 Phase 1 construction? This would make a much safer traffic pattern by eliminating sight distance issues with temporary barrier wall on 309.

The businesses on the NW quadrant of the SR 309 interchange have access to SR 309 from Leonard Ave. It will be acceptable to restrict the access off SR 309 during Phase 1 construction.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 11:18:06 AM

For Ref #'s 142, 149, 154, 157, 164, 167, 168, & 170, the proposal calls for Type A Conduit (706.02), but the plan/profile sheets give the option for using alternate Corrugated Metal Pipes. Do these Ref #'s require 706.02 pipe or can the CMP options be used?

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 11:13:21 AM

Plan sheet 50 lists a quantity of 4,400 ft for longitudinal channelizer. The quantity on sheet 60 has 2,256 ft. Which is correct? If there are any resets of the channelizers will they be paid for at the unit price?

The quantity on sheet 60 of 2,256 ft is correct.

The contractor will be responsible to maintain the channelizers, but if the channelizers are moved and reset they will be paid for at the bid unit price.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 10:54:01 AM

The plan notes on sheet 749 require the Contractor to excavate down to the top of rock along RW09 between points A & M. The plans show a 36" conduit inside a 60" casing at approximately 423+00, and the plans state that the elevation is unknown. What restrictions will apply to working over and around this conduit and casing pipe? What is to be done if the conduit is encountered above the top of rock?

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 10:18:24 AM

At the pre-bid meeting, a question was raised concerning the Pavement Options (Option A Asphalt Pavement Ref 96, 97, 226-232)(Option B Concrete Pavement Ref 98, 99, 233-241)(Option C Asphalt Mow Strip Ref 242-244)(Option D Concrete Mow Strip Ref 245-246)and why they were not setup as Alternates in the proposal and EBS. The answer was that they were options not alternates and that you only needed to bid 1 option. Will this work in EBS? If we leave options blank in EBS will our bid be responsive? If we fill in unit prices for both options in EBS it will add both option into the total. Please clarify how the bid form is to be filled in and update EBS accordingly.

There are 3 groups of options on this bid.

The bidder should only bid one of the options for each group. The other option is left unbid.

If both options in the group are bid, Expedite warns that too many options are bid.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 10:07:27 AM

Is the Department willing to reconsider their answer with regards to the use of stay-in-place metal deck forms for this project? The use of SIPMF for this project will increase safety for Contractor and ODOT personnel as well as the travelling public. The impact to traffic will be significantly reduced on both SR 81 and SR 309, and SIPMF are being used on projects by ODOT throughout thte state.

The District is still prohibiting the use of the stay-in place forms.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2013 8:20:08 AM

At the pre-bid meeting on January 8th, it was stated that the MOT plan depicted on plan sheet 76 would satisfy the note requirements on plan sheet 55 which states "All ramps shall not be closed during the Allen County fair...". Is this correct?

The intent of the stipulation is to provide SR 309 NB & SB entrance and exit ramp movements, the MOT plan depicted on sheet 76 does meet this stipulation of providing for those NB & SB ramp movements.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2013 4:13:04 PM

Where is the removal of the existing asphalt overlays on the bridges and approach slabs paid for? Biditems should be added for Wearing Course Removed.

The bridge decks do not have an asphalt surface and the asphalt on the approach slab will be removed with the approach slab

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/8/2013 9:17:29 AM

The plan notes on Sheet 751 require the Contractor to salvage both horizontal and vertical resteel from existing RW's 9B & 9C. At the Contractor's expense, can the existing resteel be cut and replaced with the appropriate size and number of rebar drilled and grouted in place?

It would be acceptable for the contractor, at no additional cost to the project, to cut the existing reinforcing steel in walls 9B and 9C and replace it with appropriately designed reinforcing steel drilled and grouted in place.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 4:57:12 PM

Some of the ramps have 14 day closures then LD's. They are all 14" concrete pavement over 14" cement stabilization. 14 days does not allow for cure time for both. What does ODOT want to do?

There are no disincentives associated with individual ramp closure times the intent is to keep the closure time to a minimum and have the ramps accessible as soon as possible and the questioned 14 days is as long as the District would like to see some of the ramps closed for. The only disincentive associated with the ramps is for all work being complete as stated on sheet 55.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 3:20:57 PM

We would like to request that the SS 840 revision date be changed to the most current revision date to allow for additional MSE wall providers.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 3:12:16 PM

Various MSE wall details in the plans show geotextile fabric at the bottom of the Foundation Prep limits, however the Supplemental Specification 840 dated 10/19/12 was added in Addendum #3. The requirement for geotextile fabric was eliminated as part of the changes to SS 840 dated 10/19/12. Is geotextile fabric required as part of the Foundation Prep?

Geotextile fabric in the foundation prep was eliminated as part of the changes to SS 840 dated 10/19/12, therefore geotextile fabric will not be required as part of the foundation prep.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 1:27:45 PM

The Pier Above Footing quantities for Ref Nos. 676 and 711 (each 400 cy) appear to be overstated. Please review these quantities and revise accordingly.

Prebid question addressed in addenda #8

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 11:00:21 AM

Note 6 on sheet 1067 states that the 2" conduit is incidental to the parapets. However there are separate pay items for the electrical items on the bridges. Please remove this note.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 10:55:21 AM

On sheet 679 it shows us removing 468 lf of 60" CMP. However, nothing has been carried to the general summary for this work. Also, with the depths involved with installing the new 72" pipe in Phase 1 it is impossible to maintain 2 lanes of traffic on existing I-75. Will we be required to install temporary pavement and all of the associated MOT items or will we be able to temporarily maintain only 1 lane of traffic on I-75 until this work is completed? The same issue of installation occurs at the 54" pipe at station 498+50

The quantity for removal has been carried to the General Summary. See removal bubble "RM-3" on sheet 179 (472') which is carried to the roadway sub-summary on sheet 148 and then to the Gen Sum for Pipe Removed over 24".

Strict details are not provided so that the contractor can best determine his/her desired approach to the culvert construction. With the extra ramp deceleration lane and acceleration lane pavement in the vicinity of the culvert, there should be enough room to keep two lanes open and phase the pipe construction. Sheeting and shoring will likely be necessary and some details will be determined by the pipe material selected etc. We would also note that the contractor may refer to the Permitted Lane Closure Note on sheet 52. It may be possible for the freeway to be reduced to one lane for weekend work. Coordinate with District 1 and the Project Engineer per the note and the PLCM website. In any case, the contractor should plan an approach and provide for any quantities not otherwise specified in the plans.

Please see applicable portion of the reply above to the other pipe. Also, it was answered in a earlier prebid question that it is possible to move this proposed pipe slightly to the south so that it can be bored and jacked rather than open cut. However, the pipe left in place that was to be removed will need to be plugged & filled at no additional cost to the project. If the pipe is moved to the south, cover over the pipe will not be an issue. An underdrain outlet may also have to be moved slightly to accommodate the new pipe location.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 9:43:44 AM

Approximate amount of tons in Demolition phase of Project.

There is no estimate on the amount of demolition debris. The contractor will need to visit the project site and determine the amount of effort it will take to demolish and remove the debris.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 9:28:04 AM

Given the large amount of Pavement for Maintaining Traffic (Ref. #492), are there estimated quantities of excavation and embankment available for Roads for Maintain Traffic (Ref. #491)?

In the "Earthwork for Maintaining Traffic" notes on sheet 51, earthwork estimates are provided for informational purposes.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2013 8:26:28 AM

Prebid Question 12/26/2012 9:40:13AM regarding a Pre-Bid Meeting request was answered with a proposed date, time and location of a Prebid Meeting. Will an Addendum be issued with the date, time and location. Also will it be a mandatory meeting?

The information for the Pre-Bid meeting was placed in addendum #6. The Pre-Bid meeting attendance is not mandatory, but encouraged.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2013 10:35:24 AM

On page 672 of the plans (Driveway Summary) there is 2,199 sq yd of driveways listed under column header "452 - Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement (8 inch)". However, this quantity was carried to the general summary on page 143 to the row for "9" Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement". Please clarify if the concrete driveways will be paid at 8" or 9" Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement". If they are paid as 8" pavement, please adjust the quantities accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/4/2013 10:01:03 AM

In review of the Maintenance of Traffic Plans at all interchanges, it appears ingress and egress to I-75 has not been addressed for phase 1. Please note, existing and proposed pavement grades are approximately the same in some areas. However, there are situations where a significant grade modification is proposed, examples are Ramp C and E at the SR 309 and Ramps C and D at SR 81. Both situations require Maintenance of Traffic details along with provisions for payment for the additional work required.

During any period where a proposed ramp will be used to connect to the mainline I-75 traffic being maintained on existing lanes and pavement there will likely need to be a transition wedge or filler to close the gap between proposed and existing pavements. Based on profiles and cross sections, in the vicinity of SR 309 Ramps C and E, the profile matches closely from approx Sta. 382+50 to 417+00 and in the vicinity of SR 81 from approx Sta. 440+00 to 452+50. This typically would be ample room for merging the ramps although it is understood that field conditions can vary in these scenarios. Ingress and Egress shall be as per the Std. Dwgs.MT-98.10, 98.11, 98.20, & 98.21 etc. The guidance in the notes, OMUTCD and ODOT's TEM shall also apply.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2013 9:23:59 AM

It appears the parapet quantity reference # 603 & #640 include the median parapet on the approach slabs. The approach slab notes state that all concrete barrier is included in the approach. When referencing the barrier is that only the outside parapet with the connected towers? Please clarify whether the median parapet on the approach slabs is paid in the parapet item or the approach item and correct the parapet quantity if necessary.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2013 8:52:16 AM

Addendum #5 answered the question submitted on 12/20/2012 @ 2:47 PM related to Temporary RPMs, stating that only one type would apply (ITEM 475 or ITEM 476) depending on which pavement type is chosen. Since one item is going to be non-performed, shouldn't these items be part of the Alternate packages?

These are temporary MOT items and not dependent on the pavement option chosen. Items should be bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2013 4:28:11 PM

Addendum #5 stated that work zone raised pavement markers are required per the standard drawings for tangent area delineation. The quantities that were updated do not seem to reflect this, are the tangent area wzrmps to be included in the MOT lump sum or should the quantity be raised?

The WZRPM's quantified in the plans cover the transition areas (lane shifts at the begin and end project). The contractor should accommodate the quantity for the tangent area WZRPM's along the lane lines in the price bid for Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, Lump As per plan. Applicable plan notes on sheet 54 regarding pavement type and snow-plowing season shall apply in either case. Therefore, pavement type selected will impact quantities and application specifications.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2013 11:45:09 AM

The evergreen tree called for as per plan Pinus Rigida 'Pitch Pine' 8' height is unavailable in Ohio from any of our growers. We have checked with similar zones as Ohio and have found no supplier of this variety of pine. Is there another variety of pine we can substitute with?

Question Submitted: 1/3/2013 8:49:51 AM

Sheet 939 has a note heading for Item 898-QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC2, Superstructure(Parapet), As Per Plan. This heading does not have any notes under it. Should there be a note or should the As Per Plan designation be removed?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/2/2013 11:18:16 AM

Will ODOT establish a bid price for Ref 1119 Special - Dispute Review Board?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/2/2013 9:22:17 AM

Can the office calc's for Part 2 be made available? It appears they are not included in the link already provided.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-76691>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/2/2013 8:22:57 AM

On sheet 57/1224 the schedule shows SR 309 Interim completion date on 309 as November 15, 2013. Plan note sheet 55/1224 disincentive states November 1, 2013. Which is correct?

November 1, 2013 as stated on sheet 55 is correct the information on sheets 57, 58, & 63 are for informational purposes only.

Question Submitted: 1/2/2013 8:17:34 AM

Typical sections on sheet 72/1224 and MOT notes on 55/1224 show temporary pavement being required and remaining under the I-75 bridge adjacent to the piers until I-75 phase 2 completion. I-75 phase 2 completion is in 2015 and SR 309 completion is 2013. When does the SR 309 permanent pavement under the bridge on 309 have to be completed by?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/2/2013 8:15:11 AM

Does the permanent ramp lighting need to be operational prior to opening the new ramps?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/2/2013 8:07:36 AM

The concrete paving joint details shown on numerous plan sheets require expansion joints as per BP-2.2. Where 14" ramp concrete pavement meets either a 9" SR 309 or 10" SR 81 concrete pavement should these expansion joints be doweled? If so, please provide a joint x-section detailing the dowel size and vertical location within the adjoining slabs.

These joints should not be doweled.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2012 4:00:24 PM

Are stay-in-place metal deck forms allowed for any of the bridges on this project?

Stay-in-place metal deck forms are not allowed for any of the bridges on this project.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2012 9:08:36 AM

Addendum #3 revised plan sheet 37A with note "janitorial services at a minimum of bi-weekly". We assume this means every other week rather than twice a week? Please confirm.

As per Addendum #3, the revised plan note on sheet 37A, "janitorial services at a minimum of bi-weekly" means janitorial services at a minimum of every 2 weeks.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2012 7:49:59 AM

On sheet 696 it shows a 54" conduit crossing I-75. On the southbound Side it is approx 12' deep. It seems that moving the pipe slightly and boring the pipe across I-75 would be a much safer option for the traveling public than the open cut proposed. Is this a possible option?

If the contractor chooses too, the pipe may be moved slightly and bored. However, the pipe left in place that was to be removed will need to be plugged & filled at no additional cost to the project.

Question Submitted: 12/27/2012 3:50:36 PM

Plan sheet 55 of 1224, Interim Completion Dates, requires completion of proposed SR 309 Ramps by July 31, 2013 and the overall completion date for SR 309 of November 1, 2013. Taking into consideration the bid date of January 24th, normal contract award time frame, partnering meeting, CPM schedule preparation and approval, execution of subcontracts and purchase orders, procurement of both standard and nonstandard materials (i.e. Box Culvert, Large Diameter Pipes, etc....), preconstruction conference, preliminary site survey, 3D modeling of project, timely submittal and approval of required contract documents significantly increased by Proposal Note 802, it is not possible to begin construction at SR 309 on March 3rd. By allowing SR 309 work to move to 2014, all preliminary contract processes will not impact the aggressive completion schedule of SR 309. The phasing of I-75 work, as defined by contract documents for 2013 will be maintained. Rescheduling of the SR 309 work to 2014, will result in the completion of some preliminary work, will provide for a safer traffic flow and assurance of the interim completion date of July 31st. Will ODOT allow the SR 309 work to be moved to the 2014 season?

See forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/27/2012 3:14:09 PM

on sheet 697 it shows a new 48" bore & jack pipe to be installed. We are also to remove a portion of the existing 36" rcp to complete this work. I look from the plan that there is interference with the two pipes all the way to the center of the existing I-75 traffic lanes. Is it possible to move the bore & jack to the north so that it does not interfere with the existing 36" RCP?

If the contractor chooses too, the pipe can be moved slightly to avoid the interference between the existing pipe and the new proposed pipe. However, the remaining pipe left in place that was to be removed will need to be filled as the portion not being removed at no additional cost to the project.

Question Submitted: 12/26/2012 3:55:41 PM

In the MOT drainage Engineer Quantities there are lump sums for the Ref 451, Cofferdams, Cribbs & Sheeting and Ref 452, Unclassified Excavation. How are we to price these items as we have no idea on the quantities or scope of each?

On Sheet 60, Maintenance of Traffic General Summary, the pay items for these two, Item 503, Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing and Item 503, Unclassified Excavation, are listed and the Lump quantities are shown being carried from Sheet 53. If you refer to Sheet 53, there are two notes, "Sheeting and Excavation Bracing" and "Maintaining Drainage", providing limits, details and scope for these items. Please refer to Sheet 53.

Both Lump items provided in the "Maintaining Drainage" notes on sheet 53 are dependent upon the methods the contractor may employ at certain pipes/culverts to maintain drainage as stated in the notes (bored or jacked vs. open cut and braced). Furthermore, these quantities are intended for potential unknowns that may arise in maintaining drainage so they will have bid items to address this work. Each contractor should estimate based on his/her preference and expected site conditions and constraints.

Question Submitted: 12/26/2012 11:40:34 AM

Plan sheet 55 of 1224, Interim Completion Dates, requires completion of proposed SR 309 Ramps by July 31, 2013. Reviewing the work required, applying realistic activity durations to a CPM schedule, beginning March 3, 2013, working 7 days per week, with no allowance for weather, the calculated interim completion date is beyond July 31, 2013. When the PN-130 weather days are applied, this date pushes even further past this date. Additionally, the required critical path drainage work within existing streams will be impacted by weather substantially beyond rain events and potentially beyond the PN-130 allowance. The overall completion date for SR 309 of November 1, 2013 is realistic and obtainable. Will ODOT please review and modify the Interim Completion Date of July 31, 2013 for the Proposed Ramps at SR 309?

Question Submitted: 12/26/2012 9:40:13 AM

Due to the complexity and timing of the project, is ODOT planning a Pre-Bid Meeting? If not, we respectfully request a Pre-Bid Meeting be held.

This Prebid question was originally answered stating that a Prebid meeting would not be held, this has since been reconsidered and a Prebid meeting will be held on 1/8/13 at the District 1 headquarters in Rm 39 at 1:00pm.

Question Submitted: 12/21/2012 1:54:58 PM

Where is the "as per plan" note or change for Reference Number 101, Riprap using 6" reinforced Concrete Slab, As Per Plan? The General Summary refers to page 668, but there is not any explanation on page 668.

As per the cross reference Sheet 688 noted in the General Summary, the "as per plan" refers to the details in the plan and profile views on Sheet 688. The details show the riprap with shorter lengths than the length noted in the pertinent standard drawing, and it also shows the rip-rap slab as odd shaped without a cut-off wall on the angled side of the slab. There are no other notes or details that apply to the as per plan label.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2012 2:09:32 PM

Please clarify the work zone raised pavement marker and work zone raised pavement marker, as per plan items.

1. Are both bid items going to be used or is it based upon which pavement alternate the contractor chooses?
2. The quantities seem low based upon going 300' each side of where the tapers start and end per MT-99.30.
2. Is tangent area delineation required?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/20/2012 12:54:28 PM

The MSE wall panels at walls 9A,9D,10 & 11 are to have integrally colored concrete per plan note on sheet 748 & 758/1224. Is the CIP coping to have integrally colored concrete as well? Also, the quantity of non-epoxy sealer appears to be overstated by a factor of 9. Please review.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2012 10:32:40 AM

Note 6 on sheet 749 says to "Remove soil within limits of wall excavation to top of rock and replace with Item 203 – Granular Embankment, Type C, from location "A" to Location "M" on Wall 9. The intent is to place the leveling pad along the top of rock." Based on the soil borings, rock is at approximately elevation 845.0 to 846.5. The bottom of leveling pad is at 849.75 to 856.75. Based on this, the 203 granular could range from 4.75' to 10.25' thick. It does not appear the intent is to place the leveling pad along the top of rock based on the top of leveling pad elevations provided. Is the intent to place a thicker granular type C pad to be paid under Foundation Preparation, APP? This same scenario applies to Walls 10 & 11. See sheets 91-95 of the soil profiles for more detail. This may also affect wall excavation quantities.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2012 8:42:17 AM

The MSE wall, APP bid item notes provide a description of the panel aesthetics including formliner and integral color. The Basis of Payment note says this item shall include fabrication and erection of formliners. There is also an Aesthetic Surface Treatment bid item. Please clarify what is to be paid under each bid item.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2012 8:27:52 AM

In the first phase of I-75, when traffic is pushed up against the existing median wall, are barrier reflectors required to be placed on the median wall?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/19/2012 9:55:02 AM

The anchored portable concrete barrier note on Sheet 52 details the quantity of anchored barrier that is required for the structures. In the structure plans for structures 75-08.13 and 75-08.32 it says no anchors are required for Phase I (Sheets 980 and 1016). Which is correct?

The MOT sheets 980 and 1016 are correct, no anchors are anticipated for placement of the PCB on the existing decks in Phase 1. For these two structures it is anticipated that the proposed work in Phase 1 can be completed without removal of any portions of the existing bridge decks. This allows the PCB from the roadway to be continued across the bridges while leaving the existing railing in place and with enough clearance from the edge of deck such that no anchoring will be required. Sheet 52 lists quantities for anchored PCB that would be required should the existing railing and any portion of the existing deck require removal in Phase 1. The quantities for Phase 1 anchored PCB given for bridges ALL-75-0813 and ALL-75-0832 on sheet 52 should be disregarded based on the proposed MOT.

Question Submitted: 12/19/2012 9:51:50 AM

Is there a concrete base on the existing concrete barrier? If so, is that part of the concrete barrier removal or part of the pavement removal? How thick and wide is base? Is there any reinforcing steel in the base?

There is concrete base under the existing concrete median barrier. The base removal is considered as part of the pavement removal. The base is approx. 12" thick and varies in width from 3ft. to 10ft. The base is listed as "Item 305 – 12" Portland Cement Concrete Base" in the original 1973 plans and there is no reference to the base being reinforced.

Question Submitted: 12/17/2012 4:40:27 PM

On sheet 907 under the note for 10' x 5" Conduit, APP it states we are to remove and relay the sections of the existing culver up to joint 5 under the southbound I-75. If we do this we will be out to the centerline of the existing pavement on I-75. We will not be able to maintain 2 lanes of traffic. Please advise. It also states the we are to remove and relay the pipe on the northbound end up to the dip but it does not tell us how many sections of pipe that are to be relayed for this to occur. How many joints back from the end is this dip?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/17/2012 9:21:32 AM

1. Proposal Note 416 on page 56 of the proposal states to use asphalt pavement designs for HEAVY traffic volumes while many of the liquid types called out in the list of bid items are not typical liquid types for heavy designs. Are the heavy designs to be used on the pavements NOT on the IR 75 mainline pavement with the liquid types as shown in the bid item summary or will medium designs be used at these other pavement locations?

2. Bid ref #203 448 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 1, As Per Plan uses the As Per Plan designation. Where is the As Per Plan note describing the variation from the typical specification?

3. Bid ref #449 under the maintenance of traffic items uses the item code 446. The item code on plan sheet 52 calls out 448 but when it is carried forward to the maintenance of traffic summaries on plan sheet 60, the code is switched to 446 and then forwarded to the proposal ref #'s as 446. Should 448 be shown on plan sheet 60 and in the item code for ref #449?

Question Submitted: 12/17/2012 7:34:26 AM

When determining whether or not to anchor the portable concrete barrier for the non-bridge deck areas listed on Sheet 53, can the contractor use standard barrier in areas that PCB-DD dictates anchoring is not needed?

Yes, this is acceptable.

Question Submitted: 12/13/2012 4:53:37 PM

Will the department consider adding bid items for Portable Concrete Barrier - 32" Standard and Portable Concrete Barrier - 32" Bridge Mounted considering the dollar value associated with this job in these two items?

The Portable Concrete Barrier - 32" Standard and Portable Concrete Barrier - 32" Bridge Mounted are to be paid for under Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan. No addenda is required.

Question Submitted: 12/12/2012 10:54:56 AM

Since there are no bid items for Portable Concrete Barrier and Bridge Mounted Barrier, the "Anchored PCB on Pavement" note on Sheet 52 needs clarification. The plan note says that bridge mounted barrier will be required as directed by the engineer. So that all Contractors are using the same criteria for adding the expense for bridge mounted barrier, please define the limits for which the PCB will need to be anchored as shown for the bridges on Sheet 52. The cost for bridge mounted barrier is significantly higher than standard barrier and the contractor is taking all the risk with there being no bid items.

To clarify, the plan note does not require the bridge mounted barrier to be as directed by the engineer when applied to bridge decks (PCB-91 & PCBDD shall apply). However, the note does say that when anchored in pavement beyond the bridge decks, the contractor shall evaluate the need for anchors (per PCB-91 and PCBDD) based on field conditions. This work shall be coordinated with or as directed by the engineer. The "Anchored PCB" note on sheet 52 should be considered with the "Sheeting and Excavation Bracing" note on sheet 53.

**The approximate limits for anchored barrier on Bridge decks is listed in the note on sheet 52 and can be used for estimating purposes. The limits for the areas where the contractor should evaluate the need for additional anchored barrier is listed on sheet 53 in the "Sheeting and Excavation Bracing" note. These approximate limits are supplied for estimating purposes for additional anchored PCB. Field conditions may dictate otherwise. Note that in the areas along the top of temporary MSE Walls or other temporary bracing close to the PCB and the travel lane, the PCB could be either anchored to concrete pavement, located with a sufficient clear zone from the edge determined from the Design Data Sheet PCB-DD, or the PCB could be anchored to asphalt pavement per the guidance in the notes on sheet 52 or as referenced from the below ODOT webpage:
<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Engineering/Roadway/DesignStandards/roadway/Pages/FAQandDesignerInformation.aspx>**

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/11/2012 2:44:52 PM

1. After the existing piers are removed at SR 81 and SR 309 before I-75 Phase II starts, how is the remaining permanent roadway constructed? Will traffic be reduced to 1 lane each direction to remove the temporary pavement and build the proposed?
2. There are a lot of sub-phases such as after the completion of Phase I at SR 81 which will require part-width construction at three locations per sheet 131. Will all the temporary striping for these be paid for in these cases?

1. Yes. Work should be phased as necessary to keep one lane of traffic open in each direction and the left turn lanes to the NB and SB entrance ramps shall be maintained on each side of the work area. The turn lanes may be shortened for the time necessary to cure the new concrete pavement. All misc. labor, equipment, striping, etc. necessary to complete the work shall be included with Item 614, Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan, unless otherwise itemized.

2. The striping for the sub-phases are not separately itemized in the plans and should be included in Item 614, Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 12/10/2012 3:53:46 PM

Could you please provide the office calcs for this project?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-76691>

Question Submitted: 12/6/2012 7:59:08 AM

Can all of the CAD files be made available?

Question Submitted: 12/5/2012 3:05:26 PM

We would like to request that SS 840 be updated to the most current published spec in order to include additional MSE wall suppliers.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/3/2012 3:17:39 PM

It appears that the volume of pavement removal for Bid Item 3 Pavement Removed is also included in Bid Item 54 Excavation. Will the department adjust the excavation quantity and also provide corrected end areas and volume calculations.

The quantities carried to the general summary (from the cross section sheets via the roadway subsummary) have already been adjusted to include a deduction for pavement removal. On the last cross section sheet for each roadway or ramp is a table summarizing the quantities and deductions that were then carried to the roadway subsummary and ultimately the general summary.

Question Submitted: 12/3/2012 2:26:56 PM

Reference Number 954 4" Conduit Type B 706.02, Reference Number 957 6" Conduit Type B 706.02, and Reference Number 960 8" Conduit Type B 706.02, is not available. What kind of pipe can be used for these bid items?

Addressed in Addendum #1.

Question Submitted: 11/29/2012 8:08:14 AM

Bid Item: 657-513 has a W36 beam size discrepancy between sheet 996 and 995 which show W36@135 and W36@256 for abutment beams. Neither way does the weight meet 331,968 pounds

Addressed in Addendum #1

Question Submitted: 11/26/2012 11:40:49 AM

For bridges 75-0813 L&R, the structural steel quantities and plans do not match. Plan sheet 995 shows end spans of 36x135 beams sheet on sheet 996 it shows the end spans as W36x256. Using the 36x135 the plan quantity seems to high, using the 36x256 the plan quantity is too low. Could the structural steel design be checked and confirm which beam sections are to be used, 36x135, 36x194, or 36x256 and revise the pay weight depending which beam section is correct.

Question Submitted: 11/26/2012 9:19:08 AM

1. Is it possible to provide the geotechnical report as an electronic source for viewing, in lieu of viewing it at the district?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-76691>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/21/2012 11:45:22 AM

Can existing bridge plans be made available online?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-76691>

Question Submitted: 11/21/2012 10:24:18 AM

Reference is made to plan sheet 956 for the abutment bearings for the Railroad bridge. The weld symbols are missing for the attachment of the top and bottom load plates to the H-section. Also what H-section support post is required. Non is shown.

The steel support posts should be HP10x42. A 5/16" fillet weld should be used along the entire perimeter to connect the HP section to the top and bottom load plates. No addenda is required