

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 130568

Sale Date - 12/12/2013

ALL-89029 - IR-75-0.21

Question Submitted: 12/6/2013 12:29:02 PM

Concerning Drawing 795 and 801. The S606 Bars listed on page 801 are miss labeled as S604 Bars on sheet 795 in the Drawing of the Typical Parapet. ie: 8 Sets of 1-S508, 1-S604 and 1-S605 should be 8 Sets of 1-S508, 1-S605 and 1-S606. This error is in two places.

The S606 bar is mislabeled as S604, the reinforcing steel table and quantities are correct. No addenda will be issued.

Question Submitted: 12/5/2013 2:29:04 PM

ODOT answered a prebid question submitted 11/25/2013 at 11:58:16 AM regarding concrete paving and payment for additional temporary pavement in high fill areas near the SR 65 and IORR bridges such that any extra pavement needed would be paid for under the temporary pavement bid item. In order to accommodate track widths for concrete pavement construction, additional temporary pavement will be needed throughout the project. The prebid question submitted 11/8/2013 at 3:34:36 PM regarding payment of line items with the contractor-designed MOT plan was answered such that line items would be paid based on contra-flow design in accordance to stipulations and restrictions referred to on the plans. Will ODOT pay for additional 615 temporary pavement (above plan quantity) that will be needed to be constructed in order to accommodate the concrete pavement alternate? We request a quick response as to not delay the bid again.

ODOT will pay for any extra temp. pavement needed by the contractor within close conformity to what is shown in the plans so as not to preclude the concrete option. The Contractor should show in their MOT plans the width of needed temp. pavement and the amount of room needed to accommodate the equipment, as the contractors MOT plans will still need approved and if the department feels the widths are excessive the contractor will be directed to adjust the limits of the temp. pavement.

Question Submitted: 12/2/2013 10:45:45 AM

We still are having problems with the concrete quantity for ref no 456. I think that the quantity for the parapet rail is still in this total and not in the 517 item as indicated in addendum 9

The quantities have been reviewed again and have been found to be appropriate.

Question Submitted: 12/1/2013 9:39:55 PM

Bid item 265- Full Depth Pavement Sawing: Plan sheet 40 shows 5000' set up as directed for maintaining traffic. Is this how all phase-line longitudinal and transverse sawing for the project will be paid for or will the sawing be incidental to bid item 4- Pavement Removed? If ODOT intends to make the sawing incidental to bid item 4, then please provide more information as to what would be covered under bid item 265.

Question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 11/25/2013 11:58:16 AM

Addendum Number 16 included an answer to a pre-bid question stating that the pavement joints are to be located as shown in a provided detail. That Phase II A (similar to IA) detail was provided via revised plan sheet 53/907 for the "High Fill" scenario around STA 226+00 and requires that bidders construct the proposed outside shoulder and travel lane to the joint location on the inside edge of travel lane. The same detail provides a typical offset from the centerline of proposed Right of Way and Construction of I-75 of 20.5'. If bidders assume the construction of the project according to this detail, only 2' of width will remain from the location of the Cofferdam to the inside edge of lane longitudinal joint. This does not allow enough room for a mainline concrete paver track line. Additionally, when Phases IIB and IB are constructed, there will be a width of subgrade that cannot be cement stabilized due to the location of the pavement constructed in Phases IIA and IA and the operational limitations of soil stabilization equipment. Does the Department intend to eliminate concrete pavement as a mainline paving option? How does the Department intend to deal with the unstabilized portion of the subgrade? In order to overcome this situation, bidders must assume that additional temporary pavement will be constructed toward the median to provide the width necessary. Will the Department pay for this additional temporary widening at the bid unit price? ☐

Concrete will not be removed as an option this is the contractors option as to the pavement selected. There will possibly need to be about 150 ft of the lane that will not be able to be done with the concrete paver and will need to be done with with forms and handwork. The detail shown shows what will be needed going into and out of the structures over SR65 and I&O RR to allow for the one lane over the existing structures. The contractor may chose to widen to the median to allow for more room to construct the pavement beyond the 150 ft as mentioned above. Any extra pavement to widen into the median to allow for more room in these high fill locations will be paid for under temp. pavement bid item.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/22/2013 3:03:22 PM

A prebid question was asked on 11/8/2013 at 3:34:36 PM in regard to bid item 701. Addendums 16 and 17 as well as the ODOT pre-bid question website have not addressed the question that was submitted two weeks ago. Please provide a prompt and concise response to this question so that contractors can adequately prepare their bids in a timely manner.

Yes; that being said, the contractor shall develop the MOT based on the concept of contra-flow shown in the plans, also all stipulations and time restrictions specified in the plans shall be adhered to.

Question Submitted: 11/22/2013 2:06:07 PM

Plan sheet 42, under the "Earthwork for Maintaining Traffic" note: there is a note suggesting the contractor evaluate the need for undercuts by doing a geotechnical evaluation but that additional soil borings are not normally required. If unstable soil is encountered, will ODOT pay for remedies under (but not limited to) bid items 32 through 43? Also, without knowing whether their designed MOT plan is approved, how is the contractor expected to account for geotechnical evaluation costs?

The department will handle soft subgrade according to CMS 615.

Question Submitted: 11/19/2013 11:57:21 AM

I have been unable to access the drawing sheets revised in addenda 12 or 15 through the links provided in respective addenda. Could you check to see if these are posted?

Addendum 12 is addenda L & addendum 15 is addenda O. Yes, the information is posted.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2013 1:29:25 PM

In the initial bid item list, Ref No. 0115 from Item No. 603E19400 refers to 591 FT of 42 "conduit, type B (open cut). By Addendum No. 5 from 10/21/2013, Ref No 0115 is revised to 285 FT, the difference of 306 FT being allocated as a bored or jacked conduit of 42", Type B (ref no 0802). By Addendum No.11 from 06.11.2013, the same Ref No 0115 (591 FT of 42 ") is revised to 521 FT , the difference of 70 FT being allocated as bored or jacked conduit of 42", Type B (ref no 0808). In the final bid item list, downloaded on the 11/14/2013, Ref No 0115 has a value of 521 FT. Since in the two mentioned Addendums was decided that 376 FT out of 591 LF (initial Ref No. 0115) will be executed without excavation, shouldn't the value of Ref No 0115 be 215 FT? Thank you and please advise.

The quantity will be revised in a forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2013 10:35:00 AM

Ref. 44- Vibration Control and Monitoring, APP: plan sheet 39 notes give a description for the requirements for the vibration specialist "to monitor safe vibration limits". Will the contractor be required to provide onsite personnel for the monitoring or be allowed to provide remote monitoring with onsite equipment? Please clarify.

Clarification of the question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2013 7:30:49 AM

The response to the PBQ submitted 11/8/2013 1:30 PM failed to address the Class S Concrete reference. Please clarify.

A forthcoming addenda will remove the reference to Class S Concrete.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2013 2:43:20 PM

For structure ALL-75-0448 L&R, it appears that some of the quantities are only half of what would be required. The Mark #'s in question are:

Drilled Shafts SP402, DS1101 & DS1102

Piers SP401, SP403 & P1105

Please advise.

This question was originally presented with PreBid Question submitted 11/08/2013 2:53:11 PM. A forthcoming addendum will address the quantities.

Question Submitted: 11/12/2013 4:31:05 PM

Plan sheet 42 calls milling and resurfacing shoulders to remove rumble strips in areas where active travel lanes will be shifted onto the shoulders. On other ODOT projects (including the adjacent Allen-75 project), the contractor has been allowed to fill and compact the rumble strips with asphalt in lieu of milling and filling. Since this is considered incidental to the lump sum 614 Maintenance of Traffic, please verify which method is or isn't permitted.

The rumble strips shall be milled and filled as per the note.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/12/2013 3:34:18 PM

Addendum No.13 adds a base and alternate item: Sign Lighting Misc.: RR-Queue Warning System. Please provide dimensions as well as capabilities of the Changeable Message Sign with regard to number of lines of text, font size, etc. Is the proposed Changeable Message Sign to be installed on an existing support structure or will the project add a bid item for a new structure? If existing, has the structure been analyzed for adequate strength? The alternate bid item specifies equipment manufactured by a particular vendor. This vendor does not manufacture the Changeable Message Sign. Please provide necessary additional details.

The changable message boards are to be portable changable message boards and a forthcoming addenda will address this question.

Question Submitted: 11/12/2013 2:41:32 PM

Plan sheet 40 of 907, second column, "The contractor shall devise a maintenance of traffic scheme or develop further the scheme provided which shall be stamped by a professional engineer, and present it to the engineer for approval." Addendum #13, specifically eliminated the contractors' ability to devise its own Maintenance of Traffic Plan by the statement "the contractors approved MOT plan which needs to utilize the contra-flow concept shown in the plans". The contra-flow plan presents constructability issues for mainline paving because it does not provide standard locations for planned construction joints. Although the M.O.T. plans call out non-standard joints in defined locations, there are other areas where this condition applies. Because of this, considerable time and resources have been spent developing an alternate maintenance of traffic plan as was permitted by the original bid documents. To further develop ODOT's contra-flow plan, we hereby respectfully request a delay to the bid date.

The project has been delayed and the joint issue in the details will be addressed in a forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 11/12/2013 2:19:29 PM

Bid item 146- Mow Strip: plan sheet 36 gives the option of using 4" concrete in lieu of the mow strip shown in the typical sections. The mow strip is shown on the typical sections but no detail is shown for the depth of stone and asphalt. What are these depths?

The mow strip note will be modified in a forthcoming addenda to indicate a concrete mow strip so there will be no asphalt option.

Question Submitted: 11/12/2013 11:52:17 AM

Will permanent metal deck (stay-in-place) forms be permitted on the new structures on this project?

Permanent metal deck (stay-in-place) forms are not permitted.

Question Submitted: 11/12/2013 10:10:35 AM

A question was Submitted on 11/8/2013 @ 9:37:55 AM regarding the final carrier for Bored or Jacked pipe. Please clarify your answer.....will steel casing pipe be acceptable as the final carrier?

Yes, it is acceptable.

Question Submitted: 11/11/2013 2:39:57 PM

Reference #'s 298 and 299 are for Work Zone Raised Pavement Markers and Work Zone Raised Pavement Markers, APP respectively. It appears that only 1 reference number will apply based on the pavement option selected. Reference 298 for Concrete Pavement and Reference 299 for Asphalt Pavement. Is this correct?

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

Question Submitted: 11/8/2013 3:34:36 PM

In response to ODOT's answer to the prebid question submitted on 11/7/2013 at 2:59:00 PM regarding bid item 701 and line item quantities: will the contractor be paid based on these MOT line item quantities performed in the event the approved MOT plan differs from what is shown in plans?

Yes; that being said, the contractor shall develop the MOT based on the concept of contra-flow shown in the plans, also all stipulations and time restrictions specified in the plans shall be adhered to.

Question Submitted: 11/8/2013 2:53:11 PM

The rebar tables for bridges 0423L/R on plan sheets 716 and 717 (minus approach slabs) seem to have all of the bars needed for both bridges, and they total up to 340,055 lbs. However, the pay items have this quantity for each of the bridges so that the quantity is doubled. In addition to this, the pier and drilled shaft rebar tables for bridges 0448L/R on plan sheet 765 seem to only have enough rebar for one of the 2 piers. This will affect the pay quantity for Refs. 574 and 609, and the incidental quantity for the drilled shafts. Please review these issues and revise the rebar quantities in an addendum.

A forthcoming addendum will address the quantities.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/8/2013 2:41:49 PM

There have been three prebid questions asked regarding bored pipes, the plan note on sheet 34, and possibilities of using the casing pipe as the final conveyance/carrier pipe. It has been ODOT policy on numerous projects to allow the contractor to install the casing pipe of the chosen diameter to then become the conveyance/carrier pipe (sheet 34 note). On this project there are several bores which have the designation "D-LOAD", but without indicating that the pipe is reinforced concrete pipe. Can the contractor use steel casing pipe in the size shown in the biditem description for the final conduit? Please answer yes or no.

yes

Question Submitted: 11/8/2013 1:30:13 PM

Plan sheet 789 indicates that the intermediate diaphragms should be Class S Concrete. Should it be Class QC/QA Concrete QSC2? Is it allowable to use steel diaphragms for the intermediate diaphragms. Please advise.

refer to standard drawing. The inter. diaphragms can be either steel or concrete

Question Submitted: 11/8/2013 1:25:44 PM

Reference #642, 14" CIP Pile, Furnished should be 9500 LF and it appears there are 149 total piles. Please confirm.

A forthcoming addendum will address the quantities.

Question Submitted: 11/8/2013 1:22:45 PM

Bridge structures ALL-75-0448 L/R deck quantities seem to be understated and does not include the concrete for the abutment diaphragms. Please confirm the quantities for Reference #596 & 631.

The quantities will be addressed in a forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 11/8/2013 10:55:24 AM

Bid item 44- Vibration Control and Monitoring, APP: plan sheet 39 calls for this to be done for certain construction activities within 300' of the specified pipelines. The plans give five different sensitive areas, one of which is on sheets 180 and 181. Since an existing railroad track (outside the ROW) runs within 300' of the affected area, how can the contractor be expected to monitor this as it is already affected by an outside influence?

The note is for monitoring construction activities that will induce vibration within the 300'. The influence of the RR should not be taken into consideration into the monitoring.

Question Submitted: 11/8/2013 9:37:55 AM

The biditems for the jack/bore pipe have D-loads in their descriptions. This would imply that the pipe is to be reinforced concrete pipe. Based on the plan note on sheet 34 and previous prebid answers, it appears that ODOT's intent is to use the steel casing pipe as the final drainage structure with no concrete pipe. Please confirm that the biditems for bore/jack pipe are the size of the steel casing pipe and there is no carrier pipe. For example, ref. #691- CONDUIT, BORED OR JACKED:72" TYPE A, D-LOAD 2500 is to be bid using a 72" steel casing pipe with no carrier pipe.

That is not the intent to use the steel pipe as the drainage structure, but if the contractor chooses to leave the casing pipe it must be at least the size of the proposed concrete. Otherwise, the casing pipe will need to be large enough to accommodate the concrete pipe.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2013 4:20:15 PM

This question regards bid items 580 and 615, fabricated structural steel for bridge ALL-75-0448-L&R. What type of crossframes are required? Sheet 755 indicates type-2 or 4 crossframes (bolted). Is that the intent? (Material is A709-50W.)Please clarify.

The intent of the plans was to allow the contractor to choose the most cost-effective crossframe configuration within the parameters of Standard Drawing GSD-1-96. For this bridge the standard drawing would allow the use of Type 2, 3 or 4 crossframes at the contractor's option and within the other parameters of the standards.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2013 4:17:02 PM

This question regards bid items 580 and 615, fabricated structural steel for bridge ALL-75-0448-L&R. What type of crossframes are required? Sheet 755 indicates type-2 crossframes (bolted). Is that the intent? (Material is A709-50W.)Please clarify.

The intent of the plans was to allow the contractor to choose the most cost-effective crossframe configuration within the parameters of Standard Drawing GSD-1-96. For this bridge the standard drawing would allow the use of Type 2, 3 or 4 crossframes at the contractor's option and within the other parameters of the standards.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/7/2013 2:59:00 PM

Plan sheet 40, bid item 701 "Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan" notes call for a contractor-designed and ODOT-approved maintenance of traffic scheme. This is a lump-sum bid item with incidental items specified in the plan sheets which would normally be paid as standard unit price items. There are also a significant amount of other MOT related pay items (non-lump sum) that could have quantities either increase or decrease as a result of the contractor's approved MOT design. Does ODOT intend to pay these affected pay items by their performed quantities and unit prices?

The plans provide pay items for the major items of work and any work done or not done under these items will either be paid for or deducted under their respective items based on the contractors approved MOT plan which needs to utilize the contra-flow concept shown in the plans. Any other items that were not itemized and as stated in the MOT plans will be included in Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan and will be paid under the lump sum.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2013 9:29:19 AM

Bid item 145- Misc.- Geoweb: plan sheet 35 plan notes specify that one manufacturer of the product "shall" be used. GEO Products (www.geoproducts.org) manufactures a similar product, the Envirogrid EGA 20. Please review their information and allow that the bid item be open to more than just one manufacturer.

A forthcoming addendum will allow for an approved equal.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2013 9:13:18 AM

Addendum 11 dated 11/6/2013 refers to project 130586 in Allen County, and didn't have a corresponding amendment. Given the content of the addendum, did ODOT mean to make it for 130568?

The Amendment No. 11 EBS file is available. Yes, there was a typo on the coverletter of Addendum No.11. 130586 should read "130568" as it does on page 2. This will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2013 9:12:00 AM

On Plan Sheet 746/907 Section D-D is taken and shown on Sheet 747/907. Section D-D has 2 circles of #11 Bars 40LF, the outside circle is attached to a spiral the inside circle is not. In order to place the inside circle we believe there should be a 2nd spiral. Please advise.

This will be clarified with a forth coming addendum

Question Submitted: 11/7/2013 9:06:58 AM

A prebid question was asked on 10/30/2013 at 2:22 PM regarding closure of SR 65-Ramp D and the answer given on revised plan sheet 47 from addendum #6. We are now through addendum 11 and this prebid question has not been answered to date. Given the significance of this question, can ODOT please answer this in a timely manner?

This question will be addressed in the next addendum

Question Submitted: 11/6/2013 6:23:29 PM

Our preliminary takeoff of the areas to be seeded along the IR-75 mainline show that the ODOT quantity is understated, which in turn has an effect on all erosion control items including topsoil. Please review the cross-section quantities and address the understated quantity in an addendum.

The seeding was calculated to cover only the disturbed areas within the work limits. No need to revise the quantity.

Question Submitted: 11/6/2013 9:17:26 AM

Plan sheet 125 shows a 42" bored and jacked pipe crossing SR 65. This same pipe is shown on plan sheets 146 and 357 as a 42"B. Based on the plan MOT schematics, should this pipe run be considered open-cut or bored and jacked?

Question will be addressd in a forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 11/5/2013 1:53:17 PM

The S.R. 65 section of the project does not get chemical stabilized. There is no subgrade compaction item included prior to the Geoweb (ref. 145). Should there be quantities of subgrade compaction set up for S.R. 65?

No quantity of subgrade compaction needed under the geoweb.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/4/2013 4:16:12 PM

For the 8'x6' Box Culvert at station 178+44 it shows the culvert being backfilled with LSM through the pavement areas. The detail for this is shown on sheet 486/907. What it does not show is the 60" cmp that is to be removed that is along side of the new box. This removal will increase the amount of LSM required by about 100 cy. Will ODOT pay for this material or will it need to be added into the pipe removal item? Using the LSM also creates another problem. With the limited time for single lane closures, the LSM will not set up in time for us to install the temporary pavement and move traffic back into the two lane configuration required. Please advise.

Question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 11/4/2013 2:55:45 PM

The plan note for the Mow Strip indicates that the steel post for the cable barrier guardrail is to be integral to the mow strip. Please consider allowing socketed foundations to be placed in the concrete mow strip using expansion joint material meeting the requirements of 705.03 between the foundation and the Mow Strip. This method has been permitted on most other cable guardrail projects with concrete mow strips including 26(12)Miami and 118(12)Medina. The plan note for the 26(12)Miami project is on plan sheet 77 in the second paragraph under the mow strip note. This method will allow all approved systems to compete equally without providing an advantage to a particular manufacturer. This should also lower the cost of maintaining the system by allowing removal of the damaged posts without the need to saw each post from the Mow Strip when the posts are damaged

The mow strip note states "integral to the socketed foundation" and the cable rail note makes note that the "Installation will be a four cable high tension system installed in socketed posts foundation with a four foot wide "no mow strip""

Question Submitted: 11/4/2013 9:29:25 AM

The note on sheet 34 referring to construction and demolition debris states that demolition debris encountered in this location are to be handled according to 105.17 and costs associated with this work are considered incidental to item 203 excavation. 105.17 requires that debris containing wood, road metal, or plaster is to be legally disposed of at a licensed construction and demolition debris site. The contractor has no way of knowing the magnitude of this work. Please provide a contingency quantity and/or an Excavation, APP item to pay for this work.

Question to be addressed in a forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 11/1/2013 1:14:16 PM

Culverts C-2, C-13, C-17, and C-18 call out 706.02 on their respective plan and profile pages. The bid items in the proposal for these culverts do not specifically call out 706.02. Can alternate types of pipe be utilized for these culverts, or does the plan sheet note supersede the proposal?

No other alternates are to be used as the pipe types designated on the culvert sheets are to be utilized.

Question Submitted: 10/31/2013 2:16:03 PM

Ref #4 - Pavement Removal, in reviewing the office calculations, it appears the quantity included at Breese Road, includes both the concrete and asphalt areas, overstating the bid quantity 2,517 sy. Please correct bid quantity.

Quantity revised in forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 10/31/2013 1:18:34 PM

Will the Contractor be required to use ODOT's PIS dated 04/16/10 for construction access points inside the work zone? If not, what is acceptable?

The PIS is to be used, unless the contractor chooses to do something different a proposal will need to be submitted to the project engineer for approval under the provisions of the contractor designed MOT.

Question Submitted: 10/31/2013 7:57:32 AM

The proposed culvert C13 (sheet 490) is to be constructed in 4 phases. The existing 60" Concrete pipe flow line appears to be 1.73' higher than the proposed 84" culvert pipe. This will not allow for positive drainage during phase IIa. There is currently no contingency for 84" bore or jack in the MAINTAINING DRAINAGE note page on 45/907. Will this culvert be changed to a bore or jack, or will Item 603 CONDUIT BORED OR JACKED, 84" TYPE A be added to the note via addendum?

The proposed pipe will serve as a sump until the water elevation reaches the existing pipe flowline and the water passes through the existing pipe. The pipe will need to be built in phases.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/31/2013 7:55:02 AM

The proposed culvert C2 (sheet 475) is to be constructed in 4 phases. The existing 36" Concrete pipe flow line appears to be 1.46' higher than the proposed 48" culvert pipe. This will not allow for positive drainage during phase 1a. There is currently no contingency for 48" bore or jack in the MAINTAINING DRAINAGE note page on 45/907. Will this culvert be changed to a bore or jack, or will Item 603 CONDUIT BORED OR JACKED, 48" TYPE A be added to the note via addendum?

The proposed pipe will serve as a sump until the water elevation reaches the existing pipe flowline and the water passes through the existing pipe. The pipe will need to be built in phases.

Question Submitted: 10/30/2013 4:54:16 PM

Do supplemental specs 888 and 896 only apply if the concrete alternate is accepted?

This question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 10/30/2013 2:22:00 PM

A question was asked on 10/15/2013 4:53:48 PM concerning if traffic has to be returned to their original pattern over the winter months or remain in contraflow. The answer was traffic can remain in contraflow over the winter. Addendum #6, on plan sheet 47, states that Ramp D at SR 65 has to be open during the winter months between Phase 1B and 2A. These two answers contradict one another as Ramp D cannot be opened if traffic remains in contraflow over the winter. In order to not have traffic in contraflow over the winter months, Phase 1A and 1B will have to be completed in the same season, before the winter of 2014-15. Given the amount of activities in the pre-phase work (as detailed on plan sheet 47), it appears that completing phases 1a and 1b construction in the same season would be impossible, which would result in a contraflow traffic pattern over the winter. Furthermore, the temporary widening of the railroad bridge will not provide enough width to allow proper decision sight distance and merge length for Ramp D traffic to be merged in by the time it reaches the railroad bridge. Given all of these conditions, please allow closure of Ramp D (at SR 65) over all of the winter months.☐

This question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 5:11:25 PM

Reviewing cross sections for SR 65, pages 363 thru 372 of 907. "Pavement Removal (Concrete) is called out from station 97+00 to 110+55. In reviewing the typical sections, pages 15 and 16 of 907, I can find no typical section on SR65 that shows this existing pavement. Please provide.☐

The typical for the concrete pavement is 9in. of reinforced concrete pavement on 6 in. of subbase.

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 11:41:44 AM

October 24 at 2:56 pm a request was made for the office calculations. The answer directed contactors to the FTP site. In review of the FTP side, I cannot find the office calculations for the "Pavement Removed Item or the Pavement Removed, Asphalt Item." Please provided.

The pavement removal calcs can be accessed for reference at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-89029/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 10:06:11 AM

What are items 236-239 for? The new signal supports will come from the factory galvanized, primed and coated. Is the project wanting a separate price from the manufacturer to do this work?

Yes, as specified on sheet 577

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 9:56:05 AM

The environmental notes on sheet 37 require the contractor to handle contaminated groundwater. Please add bid items for Work Involving Water and Work Involving Regulated Water.

Will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 9:50:31 AM

The environmental work notes on sheet 37 state in paragraph 2 that "The contractor will be responsible for any testing necessary to determine if the material is in fact petroleum contaminated" but further states in paragraph 3 that "all material excavated by the contractor at this location shall be subject to testing by an inspector provided by the engineer." Who is responsible for the testing?

The contractor is responsible for the testing. The project engineer may take separate samples to have verified if necessary.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 9:42:28 AM

The culverts on I-75 will be built in multiple phases. This will require the existing culverts that are not in the same location as the proposed culverts to remain operational until the proposed culverts are completed (C-1 for example). Eventually these existing culverts will need to be filled in place. Please add quantities to the fill and plug pipe item for these culverts.

The existing pipes are designated for removal, if the contractor should choose to plug and fill vs. removal the cost of the plug and fill will be paid for under the pipe removal, with enough of the pipe ends removed to bury the pipe a minimum of 1ft below the finished grade.

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 9:41:42 AM

The proposed 42" Culvert at Sta. 290+18.72 CL I-75 is to be constructed in 4 phases. The existing 24" CMP flow line appears to be 1.45 FT higher than the proposed 42". This will not allow for positive drainage during the final two phases. There is currently no contingency for 42" bore or jack on page 45/907 of the drainage notes. Will this culvert be changed to a bore or jack via addendum?

The proposed pipe will serve as a sump until the water elevation reaches the existing pipe flowline and the water passes through the existing pipe. The pipe will need to be built in phases.

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 9:37:16 AM

The bore and jack pipes for culverts C11 (48"A) and C16 (72"A) are shown in the same locations as the existing pipes. The proposed pipes will need to be relocated away from the existing pipe in order to perform the bore. Please revise the locations for these proposed culverts and add quantities to the fill and plug pipe item for the existing culverts.

This will be addressed in a future addenda.

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 9:30:19 AM

Please confirm that the sizes shown for the bore and jack pipe bid items are for the steel casing size and there is no carrier pipe.

The bore and jack bid items are for the the size pipe to carry the water not the steel casing size.

Question Submitted: 10/29/2013 9:20:36 AM

Plan sheets 474 through 509 (culvert details) specify what type of pipe materials are to be used for each location. Many of the bid items in the proposal do not specify what type of pipe materials are to be used. Will the contractor be restricted to using pipe types/sizes per the plan notes or will the pipe types/sizes be per the proposal (when not specified)?

Yes, the contractor will be restricted to the pipe types specified in the plans for each specific location.

Question Submitted: 10/28/2013 2:37:00 PM

Ref. 24- Removal Misc: Monitoring Wells- plan sheet 355 gives the locations which are adjacent to the existing gas station on SR 65. Corresponding cross-sections on sheets 365 and 366 give approximate depths but nothing exact. Can the contractor remove these to a given depth and cap off? If required to go full depth for removal, please provide additional information on existing wells.

This question was addressed in addenda #7

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/28/2013 10:54:54 AM

The following list of questions concerns the Waterway Permit Conditions that were attached as part of Addendum #5. Item 13. Temporary Access Fills, states, "Temporary impacts are currently authorized for Streams 1 and 19,.....", however, Stream 19 does not appear on the Stream Impact Table included with this Special Provision. Please provide temporary impacts to Stream 19. Stream 1, Temporary Impact - Please provide the design, layout, and hydraulic analysis of the Temporary Access Fill that was used to calculate the Temporary Fill Volume of 708.6 CY and Temporary Fill Area of 0.12 AC. Does the Department's Temporary Access Fill design meet all of the TAF criteria listed in Section 13 of the Waterway Permits Conditions? Stream 19, Temporary Impact - Please provide the design, layout, and hydraulic analysis of the Temporary Access Fill that was used to calculate the Temporary Fill Volume of xxxx CY (See Question 1 above) and Temporary Fill Area of xxxx AC (See Question 1 above). Does the Department's Temporary Access Fill design meet all of the TAF criteria listed in Section 13 of the Waterway Permits Conditions? If the Contractor were to propose a TAF that resulted in lesser impact than what is permitted, would a modification to the Permit be required?

1.) Item/Block 13 of the special provisions, Temporary Access Fills, includes this paragraph: "Temporary impacts are currently authorized for Streams 1 and 19, but temporary impacts are not currently authorized for the remaining streams within the construction limits. Temporary impacts will be authorized by the USACE for the remaining on-site streams following receipt of a permit modification. The permit modification will be authorized within sixty days from the special provisions date on the title sheet. Temporary impacts for all streams within the construction limits shall comply with Condition #13 of these special provisions." However, this paragraph should not have been included with this project. Please disregard that paragraph as it does not apply to this project.

2.) In an effort to allow the contractor the most flexibility during construction, a Regional General Permit (RGP) was acquired. The RGP application does not require drawings of TAFs, therefore none were prepared that show the temporary impacts for Stream 1 (Little Ottawa River). Acreage and volume were calculated by using the stream bottom elevation of 857.62 and the OHWM elevation of 860.3 for a depth of 2.68 feet, the temporary stream impact length of 170 linear feet, and a width of 31 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. (Volume = 708.6 cubic yards; Acreage= 0.12 which permit allows.) The contractor is responsible for designing a TAF that meets the criteria of Block 13 of the special provisions.

3.) Stream 19 is not in this project area. As discussed in question 1, the paragraph that includes stream 19 is not relevant to this project.

4.) So long as the TAF complies with special provisions block 13, a lesser impact than what is permitted would not require a modification to the permit.

Question Submitted: 10/25/2013 3:19:35 PM

For Ref. No 445, Railing (Concrete Parapet with Twin Tube Railing the as per plan alludes to the concrete to included with this item. However, note 3 on 647/907 states that the concrete is to be included with the QA/QC Concrete, superstructure(deck) for payment. Please advise

Question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 10/25/2013 3:09:17 PM

Bid item 145, Geoweb: plan sheets 25 and 35 give a description and show a 6" thickness of this item. Per the specification we are to follow the manufacturer's specifications for installing the product, including the infill materials. The manufacturer's detailed drawings call for either "granular infill" or "aggregate infill" without any specific gradation, top size, etc. for the infill material. Please specify what granular/aggregate material and/or gradation is to be used for the 6" thickness in the Geoweb.

The infill material information is in the note for the Geoweb on sheet 35.

Question Submitted: 10/25/2013 1:19:18 PM

The concrete quantities for the Breese Rd bridge seem to be in error. Ref 458, pier above Footing is overstated by over 50 cy and the deck concrete is understated by over 120 cy. Please advise.

Question will be addressed in forthcoming addendum

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/24/2013 5:05:00 PM

Bid item 152- #304 Aggregate Base (Concrete Option): on plan sheet 162, the takeoff for the 4 main runs of IR 75 are based on a total width of 82' in both directions. Based on the standard 4-12-12 and 14" edge steps (sheet 32), the total width comes out to 84.67' which means this quantity is understated. Please review and revise the quantity in an addendum.

The quantity is correct, the edge step should be 6" thus making the dimension 82'. The detail in sheet 32 was revised with the next addenda to reflect the dimension change.

Question Submitted: 10/24/2013 2:56:14 PM

Can the department make the "office calculations" available online?

All available office calcs are available at :

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-89029/>

Question Submitted: 10/24/2013 10:20:23 AM

The plan notes for the form liners call for pattern 1 and pattern 2. Can we use either form liner or are there specific locations where each is to be used?

There are 2 different patterns used in the aesthetics on the structures and there are specific locations where each are used. See the respective aesthetic plans for the bridges which use these formlines for the location they are used at.

Question Submitted: 10/24/2013 10:07:59 AM

We also are having trouble meeting the quantity for ref 492, parapets for McClain rd.. Is the tower at the abutments included with the abutment concrete or the parapets? Can the office calculations for the structures concrete be made available to assist in reconciling these quantities?

The structure calcs are available for reference on the following FTP site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-89029/Reference Files>

Question Submitted: 10/24/2013 8:23:54 AM

The quantities set up for Worksite Traffic Supervisor (ref. 289) and Portable Changeable Message Sign APP (ref. 302) appear to be based on a two year project duration. With the completion date being 9/30/16, should these quantities be revised to reflect this duration?

This will be addressed in a forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 10/23/2013 10:57:22 AM

This question concerns bid items 0383 and 0412; modified scuppers for concrete slab bridges, No details of the scuppers are provided in the drawing set for these bridges, and none of the reference drawings cited include details. Could you provide a detail showing what is intended?

Refer to sheet 602 for scupper details.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2013 8:26:30 AM

Sheet 1 of 907 of the plans shows the effective dates of the Standard Construction Drawings for this contract. Currently a number of Standard Construction Drawings have been revised in the BP Series. Examples: BP 2.1 (7/18/08) on plan sheet 1, revised (7/19/2013) BP 2.3 (7/16/04) on plan sheet 1, revised (7/19/2013) BP 6.1 (1/21/11) on plan sheet 1, revised (7/19/2013) Should the contractor base the bid on the Standard Construction Drawings listed on plan sheet 1 of 907 or on the most current Standard Construction Drawings at the time of the bid?

The project will be constructed with the standard drawings and supplemental specifications as shown on the title sheet unless changed in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2013 8:14:19 AM

Please confirm the 2010 Construction and Material Specification Book is part of the bidding documents on this project as noted on the Proposal document and sheet 1 of 907 of the plans and not the 2013 Construction and Material Specification Book.

This project will be constructed under the 2010 specifications

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/22/2013 9:28:56 AM

On sheet 125/907 it calls for twin 42" temporary pipes for the 8' x 6' box culvert construction. Where are the costs for these pipes to be included in?

Will be addressed in forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 10/21/2013 3:41:29 PM

Pile driving Constraint note on plan sheet 686/907 states to build embankment up to subgrade for 200 ft behind each abutment. The Cross section on plan sheet 687/907 shows Limits of excavation at proposed abutments. These limits are in conflict with the previous note above. Which is correct?

With the next addenda, the detail on sheet 687 was removed to eliminate confusion. Pile driving constraint note shall be adhered to.

Question Submitted: 10/21/2013 2:55:45 PM

We would like to request that the schedule for payment of item 802 be modified as follows for this project: Insert the following after the second paragraph of 802.17: "All conduits and drainage structures installed without required submittals per 802.04 are considered unacceptable materials per 106.07." Also in 802.17, replace the third paragraph with "The Department will pay for accepted quantities at the contract prices as follows:" Again in 802.17, delete the following pay structure from the third paragraph. "After installation of conduit or drainage structure 60%. After performance inspection is completed 10%. After acceptance of the conduit or drainage structure 30%." This change will have been accepted for Item 611 in the current C&MS and will be beneficial to both ODOT and the Contractor from both a contract administration standpoint.

Please see forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/21/2013 1:24:13 PM

A prebid question submitted 10/15/2013 at 4:45:41 PM regarding SR 65 Ramps was answered "The entire project may not be complete by Oct. 1, 2015, however the SR 65 ramps shall be completed by this time". Plan sheet 47 (third column) under SR 65 sequence of construction says that Ramp D to be closed for the duration of the project with only exceptions being the winter months between I-75 phases 1b and 2a, and that the ramp will be constructed during I-75 phases 2a and 2b. Furthermore, sheet 132 shows Ramp D being closed to provide access from Yoder to SR 65 while phase 1 of both is being performed- which per plan sheet 47 calls for Yoder and SR 65 phase 1 not to begin until both of the existing I-75 bridges over SR 65 have been demolished (phases 1a,1b,2a,2b). Can ODOT please clarify the time and/or phase limits for Ramp D closure?

See forthcoming addendum for clarification.

Question Submitted: 10/21/2013 11:36:37 AM

On plan sheet 126, a portion of the temporary pavement runs outside of the right-of-way. Can the contractor assume that ODOT have this particular area secured (and all affected utility remedies accounted for) prior to the bid date so that proper scheduling of work can be verified?

This will be addressed in a forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 10/21/2013 10:43:47 AM

This project is not yet available on Bid Express. The project is due to bid 11/15/13. Will the bid date be extended since the project is not yet available for download.

The Project is now available on Bid Express. We apologize for the inconvenience.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/20/2013 9:19:30 PM

REF # 492 for the parapet on McClain Road seems to be overstated. The quantity seems to include the amount of concrete for the parapet on the approach slab and the approach slab is bid as per plan and includes the cost of the parapet on the approach slab with the cost per SY of the approach slab. Please correct the CY quantity for REF # 492 or remove the note including the parapet with the approach slab.

The quantity estimate for the parapets on Bridge ALL-75-0328 does not include any allowance for barrier placed on the approach slab which is already accounted for with the approach slab. The quantity given in the plans is correct.

The quantity estimate does include an additional thickness for the aesthetics on the outside of the 1'-6" parapets for the full length of the bridge that may not have been accounted for by the contractor. This will occur on each of the bridges that have the aesthetic treatment on the outside of the parapet. A 2" by 4" additional area of concrete was added to the barrier quantity at the top and the bottom of the aesthetic surface for the full length of the bridge as well as an allowance for the concrete in the "form liner" area of the parapet that was included with the enhancements for payment.

Question Submitted: 10/19/2013 11:14:32 AM

We want to second the question submitted on 10/18/13 7:42AM. We have built several bridges of this type, all the item stated in the 10/18/13 question are correct in addition the cure time for the concrete pours also adds time to the construction. 180 day is still aggressive to complete this type of bridge over an interstate highway. Please review the closure duration on Breese Rd.

The duration will be adjusted to 150 days with the next addendum

Question Submitted: 10/18/2013 10:00:05 AM

We do not believe the existing plans posted to the website are the most current for the Breese Road and McClain Road Bridges. We are 99% sure Both of these bridges have been re-decked since the original plans with shear studs installed on them. Can ODOT see if they have any files from the re-deck and try to confirm the presence of shear studs on these 2 decks. We do not believe Hanthorn Rd. has any shear studs.

The requested information will be available on the ftp site link below.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-89029/>

Question Submitted: 10/18/2013 7:42:42 AM

Currently the Breese Road closure is stated to be 120 days. This bridge is very ornate in design. It has large walls with formliner, sidewalk w/ ornamental railing and large ornamental facades at the abutments. All of this work takes time and this is a complete demolition with pile driving (196 piles) etc. A similar structure at Reservoir Road was given 180 days. Can the Breese Road detour be lengthened to 180 days? This may extend the project completion date as this work cannot begin until the final phase of work.

The 120 day duration will remain as stated in the plans.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2013 9:26:29 AM

Item#151-#156 Is there any possibility of eliminating or reducing the 7 year warranty?

Warranty duration will remain at 7 yrs.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2013 4:53:48 PM

Is the contractor required to return mainline traffic to its normal pattern over the winter months or can the traffic remain in the contra-flow configuration over the winter?

Traffic can remain in the contraflow over the winter.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2013 4:50:01 PM

The note on sheet 42 describing existing rumble strips and shoulder rehab - Are we required to mill and fill the entire surface area of the existing shoulders or just wide enough to remove the rumble strips.☐

Mill the entire shoulder, as a surface course will be placed on the shoulder and any widening.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/15/2013 4:45:41 PM

The last note on sheet 46 states that all SR-65 ramps shall be open to traffic by October 1, 2015. The drawings on sheet 58 show Ramp D being closed through Phase 2B. If the October 1, 2015 date is correct, the entire project must be completed through Phase 2B by this date. Is this correct?

The entire project may not be complete by Oct.1, 2015, however the SR 65 ramps shall be completed by this time.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2013 1:52:35 PM

ON PAGE 34 UNDER THE GENERAL NOTE FOR CONDUIT, BORED AND JACKED IT STATES THAT " THE INSTALLED CASING PIPE IS THE SORM WATER CONVEYANCE CARRIER UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED IN THE PLANS." DOES THIS MEAN THAT IF THE BID ITEM IS FOR 36" CONDUIT D-LOAD 2000 THAT WE DO NOT HAVE TO INSTALL THE CONCRETE PIPE INSIDE THE CASING AND USE THE CASING PIPE FOR THE STORM WATER FLOW?

The casing pipe can be considered the water conveyance carrier if the concrete pipe is not installed inside the casing pipe.

Question Submitted: 10/14/2013 4:50:30 PM

Bid item #115: 42" Conduit, Type B- Plan sheet 357, ref. D-12 has a 306' run going under the proposed reconstructed ALL-75-0423 L/R structures. The opposing but similar run west of SR 65 (36") is to be bored and jacked. Given the depth of excavation, phasing of work, and proximity to the c-i-p piles (per plan sheet 684), should this run of 42" B pipe be bored and jacked instead of being open cut?

Quantity for 42" to be jacked or bored will be added and the quantity for the 42" Type B has been revised accordingly with the next addenda.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2013 3:22:24 PM

This question regards bid items 0580 & 0615, structural steel, level 2 for bridges ALL-75-0448 L & R. Sheet 748 section AA shows a bearing stiffener, however bearing stiffeners are not shown on sheets 749 or 750. Are bearing stiffeners intended on these two structures?

The answer to the question is that there are no bearing stiffeners intended for the structures in question

Question Submitted: 10/11/2013 10:16:24 AM

Plan page 45/907 has a note that provides various contingency quantities of drainage items to facilitate the maintenance of drainage during construction of the project. By review of the MOT plans and notes it appears that there will also be a need for temporary underdrain conduits to maintain drainage as construction progresses (especially in earlier phases when the entire drainage system is not yet completely installed). Will the department consider adding contingency quantities for temporary underdrains?

There will be no addition of temporary underdrains.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2013 4:54:49 PM

Could the state please verify the station and offset distances for MSE wall 3 as the plotted points do not seem to match the given dimensions on the elevations?

This will be addressed in a forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 10/4/2013 4:45:58 PM

The quantities for Aesthetic Surface Treatment (Bid Items 349 & 364) for MSE Walls 3 & 4 seem to be understated by a factor of 9. Please review and adjust as necessary.

Quantities will be addressed in a forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 10/4/2013 2:52:49 PM

Sanders Pre Cast Concrete Systems of Whitestown, IN is approved as a designer and supplier of the Sanders tabbed strip MSE retaining wall system. Please issue an addendum for this project adding the new 840 MSE specification so Sanders may bid. Mr. Gene Lamberson, P.E. may be contacted at 765-404-5396 concerning technical matters about this inquiry and the specifics of this supplier.

Sanders Pre Cast will be added in a forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 10/3/2013 9:03:19 AM

Bid Item #313- 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per Plan: may the contractor use the rigid pavement option set forth in CMS 615? The plan note "Existing Rumble Strips and Shoulder Rehab" on sheet 42 describes the method of construction to require the 615 flexible pavement option.

The contractor may use either asphalt or concrete per CMS 615 for Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per Plan.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/30/2013 3:35:05 PM

Ref. #313: Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per Plan – the only plan note for this item is on sheet 42/907 which states “Any area widened with Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic shall be included in the bid price for that item.” Our understanding of this note is that all temporary pavement widening and crossovers used on the project will be paid at the unit price for Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per Plan; and all 1 ¼” mill and fill of existing shoulders used to maintain traffic is to be included in the Lump Sum 614 Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan bid item (ref. 701). Is this correct?

The contractor’s understanding of the note is correct. All temporary pavement widening and crossovers used on the project will be paid at the unit price for Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per Plan; and all 1 ¼” mill and fill of existing shoulders used to maintain traffic is to be included in the Lump Sum 614 Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan bid item per the note on sheet 42 for shoulder/rumble strip rehab.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2013 12:50:47 PM

Will incorporation of broken concrete into embankment areas be permitted on this project as previously accepted on the adjoining project 2(13)?

This will be acceptable within the guidelines of the C&MS.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2013 12:44:52 PM

Plan sheet 43 note for coordination with adjacent projects notes that ALL-75-5.53 will be in the second season of work. For purposes of coordinating, please provide more information, including what phase and traffic pattern will be in effect at the start of this project.

The project will have traffic on the new pavement from south of Fourth St to Reservoir Rd. there will be work in the median that will need to be completed.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2013 9:27:18 AM

It appears the GEOPAK roadway alignment files (landXML format) were not included in the reference files. Can these be added to the ftp site?

**The xml files can be found on the following FTP site link:
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-89029/>**

Question Submitted: 9/27/2013 3:42:12 PM

There is no bid item setup to pay for the Intermediate Diaphragms on Bridge ALL-75-0508, please advise.

Bid item added with addenda 3

Question Submitted: 9/25/2013 10:36:16 AM

The quantities for concrete sealing for Walls 1, 3, and 4 (Ref. 320, 339, and 354) seem to be extremely overstated. We wonder if the sealing quantities are actually square feet instead of square yards. Please review and revise accordingly.

Quantities revised in forthcoming Addenda No. 2.

Question Submitted: 9/24/2013 1:37:21 PM

Can the existing bridge plans be made available on the ftp site?

Existing Bridge Plans are available for reference at the following FTP site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ALL-89029/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 9/24/2013 9:09:22 AM

On sheet 146A there is a quantity of 41 feet of 42" Type C drainage pipe, however there is no biditem. Please add the appropriate item.

Please see forthcoming addenda no. 1