

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Project No. 040465

Sale Date - 8/11/2004

Question Submitted: 7/27/2004

Question Number: 1

They have 448 type 1h w/70-22m liquid specified for a parking lot along with a density specification. This is a fairly intricate lot that will require a lot of hand work and I am concerned about the constructability and the appearance of the finished product. Our experience with trying to place a 1H mix with polymer in parking lots has not been good. The hand work areas have a very rough appearance due to the polymer sticking to the lutes and shovels and not raking out smoothly. This along with a density spec on a lot that is in a pretty rough shape.

A1)- The material specified in the plans is Item 448E46905 ASPHALT CONCRETE SURFACE COURSE, TYPE 1, PG70-22M, AS PER PLAN, with a proposal note requiring a heavy mix design. This is not a ASPHALT CONCRETE SURFACE COURSE, TYPE 1H material. A2) There is not a density specification, the asphalt concrete material is specification 448, not 446. The plans require 3 rollers unless the contractor, utilizing thin lift density gauges, proves that proper compaction can be achieved with less.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2005

Question Number: 2

It appears that the approach slab rebar for bridge MOT-70-1734L/R has been included with the Epoxy Ctd Rebar pay item for these structures. This is contrary to the 2005 specifications; please advise how this should be bid.

Question Submitted: 9/20/2005

Question Number: 3

The approach slab rebar for the bridges over Mud Creek appears to be included in the bid item for Epoxy Ctd Rebar. Is this correct or should it be included in the Approach Slab bid item per the 2005 specs?

Question Submitted: 9/23/2005

Question Number: 4

What formliner should be used for the soil nail wall facing on structure MOT-70-2097L/R? Sheet 712/797 only states Ashlar Texture, please be more specific.

Question Submitted: 9/26/2005

Question Number: 5

The details for the SR201 structure show 21' long metal anchors attached to the back of the abutments. The unclassified excavation quantities do not seem to reflect the mass amount required to excavate to the bottom of the footing for an area 21' behind it. Please adjust the pay items. Also, does the entire 21' below the approach slabs need to be backfilled with granular material per the 2005 CM&S?

Question Submitted: 9/26/2005

Question Number: 6

Will the contractor be allowed to make full-night closures on SR 201 for bridge demo? The existing structure is a slab bridge and the entire span between the piers will need to be removed at one time without traffic on the lanes below it.

Question Submitted: 9/29/2005

Question Number: 7

Addendum #3 changed the quantity of unclassified excavation for the left bridge over SR 201. It appears as though the quantity also changed for the right bridge on the explanation sheet for the right bridge, but not on the non-bubbled sheet and also not in the addendum verbage. Please make the correction to the right bridge bid item in the next addendum.

We submitted a question a couple of weeks ago concerning the bridge over Mud Creek. The approach slab rebar has been included in the rebar bid item. It should be included in the approach slab for payment for the 2005 CMS. This correction was made to the Miami River bridge but not to the Mud Creek bridge. Please address this issue in the next addendum.

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