

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Project No. 090460

Sale Date - 11/4/2009

Question Submitted: 10/1/2009

Question Number: 1

The existing drawings were not posted on ODOT's website as of 10/1. Can ODOT please post the drawings.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/ATB-90-14.25/>

Question Submitted: 10/12/2009

Question Number: 2

Plan sheets 97 and 98 show numerous 4' runs of 15" through 30" pipe that replace old runs. There is no quantity set up for all the removals. Please verify and revise if necessary pipe removed quantity to reflect these omissions or set up an "As Directed" plan note if the particular removal is considered incidental to applicable pipe item.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 3

In Biditem 65, Concrete Masonry, the Culvert Subsummary (sheet 99) references 24.8 cy on sheet 271 as headwalls for a 60" RCP culvert. Based on SCD HW-1.1 (1/2), sheet 271 shows a type "A" headwall at the outlet and a type "B" headwall at the inlet (the skew is approx. 15 degrees). Based on the table on HW-1.1 (2/2), the concrete quantity for a 60" RCP, type "B" headwall at a 15 degree angle is 12.4 cy, while a type "A" is 11.8 cy. The plan quantity of 24.8 cy indicates the intent for 2 type "B" headwalls, which contradicts sheet 271. Please clarify the headwall types on sheet 271 and the quantity for Biditem 65.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 4

A question was asked in regards to the availability fo the CAD & GeoPak files for this project and was answered last week that they would not be available. Under 102.05 the contractor is required to examine the Bid Documents and the Site of Work. Without these files it takes much longer for the contractor's takeoff of the earthwork portion of the project. To fulfill our obligation under 102.05 this contractor would like to request the state delay this project until the next letting date.

CAD & GeoPak files are not available.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 5

At Sta 329+00 78' right, does the state want stabilization 26" thick in this area?

NO, the Stabilization shall be per the typical sections.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 6

Ref. 340- Granular Embankment, as per plan. Plan cross-section A-A on sheet 276 shows 3 sloped areas at 1.5' thick by approximately 50' long of this material. Plan quantity based appears to be greatly overstated. Please either provide calculations or revise a corrected quantity in an addendum. Plan sheet 276 also calls for backfill behind gabions as two different materials (703.11 type 1 backfill shown in gabion wall detail and 703.11 type 3 backfill shown in sections A-A and B-B. Please clarify which is to be used.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 7

Ref. 347- Item 690- Geotextile Fabric, 712.09 Type A...EBS File has this labeled as "Type 4"- please clarify. Ref. 347- Plan quantity of 391 sy appears to be understated. Please provide calculations and/or provide a corrected quantity in an

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 8

Ref. 140- Building Demolished, APP, 1 Story Brick Plan sheet 266 makes reference to results of hazardous assessment report finding different materials. Should there be separate bid items with unit prices for abatement of said hazardous materials?

Please bid as shown

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 9

Plan sheets 12 of 437 (part 1) and 7 of 64 (part 2) show identical "Paving Under Guardrail" notes. Part 1 does not have a linear grading bid item where Part 2 does (ref. 355). Since there is no linear grading in part one, is herbicide required for paving under guardrail items or should there be a linear grading bid item added? Please verify in an addendum

The herbicidal spraying for part 1 is included in the paving under guardrail note.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 10

On the District 4 FTP site for the ATB-90-14.25 job there is a file called Plan View0000.pdf that shows the design for the bench repairs from Sta 71+00 to Sta 80+50. These details show geoweb, filter fabric, underdrain and aggregate coarses. Are these items required to be performed in the special bench areas? If this work is required how will it be paid?

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

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/13/2009

Question Number: 11

On plan sheet 12 of 437, there are notes referring to Item 209, Linear Grading, As Per Plan. However, there is no bid item for this work. Please add a bid item for Linear Grading.

Question Submitted: 10/14/2009

Question Number: 12

May 6"x8" wood posts be used in place of the breakaway beams shown on sheet 19 for temporary supports?

Yes, refer to standard drawing MT 105.10

Question Submitted: 10/14/2009

Question Number: 13

In phase 3, the new inside WB pavement is constructed with a single lane of traffic running on the existing WB outside lane. On sheet 23/437, the portable barrier is located on the phase line, with new pavement being constructed right up to the edge of the barrier. In areas of overhead bridges, there is a significant grade lowering of approximately 5 to 6 feet. Per the detail this cut would have to be vertical in order to construct the pavement as shown. Has this condition been reviewed by the designers? Some additional design detail should be provided, or if field changes are necessary for design and safety concerns will potential extra costs be compensated by change order?

Question Submitted: 10/14/2009

Question Number: 14

On sheet 97 there is listed three type of 24" conduit to be installed in structures D12, D13, and two type for D15. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 10/14/2009

Question Number: 15

1) For structures 1450 and 1583 the contractor must excavate in the end spans that are in contact with the piers per the plan notes. Is this excavation to be included in the pay quantity or is it considered incidental? 2) Since there is a slope stability problem at the west slope of the 1583 bridges please consider extending the reconstructed slope section on sheet 276 to the outer limits of the bridges. 3) Shifting of the PCB at the bridges and the box culvert between Phases 4 and 5 were not included in the pay quantity. This is shown on sheets 55 and 70, 58 and 73, 64 and 79. Please add 1,550 ft to the pay item. 4) Ref item 231 needs to be changed to 9 sy for Type 2 waterproofing.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2009

Question Number: 16

Sheet 12A/437 Scenic River Commitments states that all existing concrete rubble shall be removed from the project site as part of this project and disposed of. Does this statement apply to the rest areas/ weigh stations made available to the contractor? Can broken concrete be wasted in these areas? Please clarify.

The contractor may use the abandoned rest areas for waste activities, as per the C&MS. However, no waste activities shall occur at the ATB 90 bridges over the Ashtabula River nor within 1000 feet of the river.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2009

Question Number: 17

Station 147+95 94LT D24, please clarify type and quantity of conduit for structure. Also for station 152+48.9 D25 clarify type and quantity of conduit for structure.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2009

Question Number: 18

Due to the nature of the work on this project. Would the Department lower the requirement of work performed by the prime contractor to 40%.

Please bid according to contract requirements

Question Submitted: 10/16/2009

Question Number: 19

In order to construct the temporary pavement for Phase 1 & 2. The existing guardrail will need to be removed and replaced in order to achieve the temporary pavement limits in the plans. Where is the removal and replacement of the guardrail paid?

There is 2' from the edge of shoulder to the face of guardrail. We are adding 2' of pavement leaving a 1' buffer between the temporary edge line and the existing face of guardrail which is acceptable. No existing guardrail is needed to be relocated.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/16/2009

Question Number: 20

Plan sheet 6 makes reference to existing pavement makeup including 10" +/- Reinforced Portland Cement Concrete Pavement. The type of reinforcing has a significant effect on the price of the removal cost. What type of reinforcing does this pavement contain?

No as built plans were produced from the original construction and no sample of the existing steel was taken. To the best of our knowledge According to the specifications of 1953 it is either a mesh of No 4 gage steel spaced 12" center and No. 00 gage steel spaced" center or it is a mesh of 3/8" steel bars spaced on 24" center and 3/8" steel bars spaced 7 inch center. Please bid according to the bid documents.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2009

Question Number: 21

There are four amendments shown on EBS site. However there is only one addendum posted on the website and we have only been notified of one addendum. When will the remaining addendums be posted to match up with the amendments given that it is Friday morning the week before the bid? If the remaining three addendums are not posted by 10:00 am this morning, we ask that the project be delayed to allow us proper time to make adjustments to our bid based on the yet-to-be-posted

The 3 outstanding addenda will be posted by Noon today(10-16-09)

Question Submitted: 10/19/2009

Question Number: 22

1. On plan sheet 366/437 there is a plan note "Pier Construction Constraint" We understand that this constraint is applicable to bridge ATB-90-1583 L/R since the piers are not founded on Piling and there is a chance for movement of the piers. Bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R is founded on piling but the same note is on plan sheet 297/437. Can this note be deleted from bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R?

See Addendum No. 7

Question Submitted: 10/19/2009

Question Number: 23

1. On plan sheet 366/437 there is a plan note "Pier Construction Constraint" We understand that this constraint is applicable to bridge ATB-90-1583 L/R since the piers are not founded on Piling and there is a chance for movement of the piers. Bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R is founded on piling but the same note is on plan sheet 297/437. Can this note be deleted from bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2009

Question Number: 24

1. On plan sheet 366/437 there is a plan note "Pier Construction Constraint" We understand that this constraint is applicable to bridge ATB-90-1583 L/R since the piers are not founded on Piling and there is a chance for movement of the piers. Bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R is founded on piling but the same note is on plan sheet 297/437. Can this note be deleted from bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2009

Question Number: 25

1. On plan sheet 366/437 there is a plan note "Pier Construction Constraint" We understand that this constraint is applicable to bridge ATB-90-1583 L/R since the piers are not founded on Piling and there is a chance for movement of the piers. Bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R is founded on piling but the same note is on plan sheet 297/437. Can this note be deleted from bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2009

Question Number: 26

During the installation of temporary pavement in Phase 1 & 2 can the asphalt contractor leave the 3" drop left after the base course is installed or will the intermediate and surface need to be installed at the end of every day prior to removing the construction zone?

Per MT-101.90, the contractor must wedge the shoulder or add the intermediate and surface courses at the end of each day.

Question Submitted: 10/2/2009

Question Number: 27

During the winter shutdown of 2010-2011, will ODOT allow the contractor to store portable barrier in the I-90 median?

The contractor will be allowed and shall follow the 107.11 specification within the project limits along with meeting all safety criteria.

Question Submitted: 10/2/2009

Question Number: 28

MOT plan sheets 37-82 make reference to 4 different types of "special" signs: 1) "Express Lane No Access..." 2) "Emergency Pull-Off..." 3) "Exit 228 Ashtabula..." and 4) "90 West All Lanes". Can ODOT please provide the dimensions of above referenced signs?

Some of the signs mentioned, are existing signs to be relocated. Sheet 19 gives dimensions for the others.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/20/2009

Question Number: 29

1. Will the quantities for bid items 279 and 311 be increased to account for the embankment excavation mentioned On plan sheet 366/437 in the plan note "Pier Construction Constraint"?

The embankment excavation referred to in the note has been included in the unclassified excavation quantity. Therefore, the quantities as shown in the plans are correct.

Question Submitted: 10/20/2009

Question Number: 30

1. On plan sheet 366/437 there is a plan note "Pier Construction Constraint" We understand that this constraint is applicable to bridge ATB-90-1583 L/R since the piers are not founded on Piling and there is a chance for movement of the piers. Bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R is founded on piling but the same note is on plan sheet 297/437. Can this note be deleted from bridge ATB-90-1450 L/R?

Question Submitted: 10/22/2009

Question Number: 31

Plan sheet 11 has a note that specifies the 42" bored/jacked conduit to be the steel casing pipe. This seems to conflict with the answer given in the prebid questions. Is the plan note correct?

No, the Department will require conduit, bored or jacked: 42" type A

Question Submitted: 10/26/2009

Question Number: 32

Addendum 6 provided added bid items for the slope repair on eastbound IR 90 west of the railroad bridge. a. Ref. 505- Granular embankment type E, as per plan- what plan sheet does this reference from or are we to use the BBCM supplemental plans listed on the ftp site as reference? b. ref. 506- Geotextile Fabric, type A- quantity of 166557 sy appears to be off by a factor of 10- please review and revise. c. ref. 507 and 511- neither of these is shown on the BBCM plan sheets- please provide detail for application of these items with respect to remainder of slope-related items. d. ref. 510- Slope protection system- is this bid item limited to Geoweb brand or will it be open to all other manufacturers?

See Addendum No.7

Question Submitted: 10/26/2009

Question Number: 33

1. The quantity for ref # 506 in addendum 6 should be 16,656 sy. 2. It is still unclear to me if the unclassified excavation for the pier construction constraint is to be paid by the CY for all the excavation required (no quantity seems to be set up) or is it incidental?

The embankment excavation referred to in the note has been included in the unclassified excavation quantity. Therefore, the quantities as shown in the plans are correct.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2009

Question Number: 34

With the large quantity of concrete pavement to be removed, would ODOT consider allowing the contractor to crush this material and recycle it for item 304 aggregate base?

No, follow the requirements of item 304.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2009

Question Number: 35

Plan sheets 25 and 26 call for catch basins for crossovers. What type of catch basins does ODOT want?

The drainage items are incidental per the Item 615 – pavement for maintaining traffic APP note on sheet 14. The catch basins should be per the standard Interstate median inlets – CB-4 or CB-5.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2009

Question Number: 36

On Sheet 6 of the Drawings under the Notes it lists the conventional build up for the asphalt warranty pavement. It shows Item 442 SuperPave Asphalt for the intermediate and surface asphalt. Under the 880 Supplemental Specifications it does not require Item 442 Superpave in the intermediate or surface courses. It also states on Page 6 that the note is for information only. Does this project require to use Item 442 SuperPave for the intermediate and surface courses for the Item 880 Warranty Asphalt? Please verify the CY quantity of Asphalt Warranty Pavement as it differs from your office calculations.

The conventional pavement buildup was supplied by C.O., the "for information only" note was copied verbatim from that correspondence; and was shown to develop the typical sections and quantities, it shouldn't govern the work, The contractor needs to follow SS 880 The Item 880 quantity in the plans is correct.

Question Submitted: 10/29/2009

Question Number: 37

Is the increase in quantity of Ref. No. 97 in Addendum NO. 6 to reflect the additional footage required in the special benching areas?

Yes

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

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/29/2009

Question Number: 38

Is the granular material required for the 6" Geoweb in Ref 510 included in the Granular Embankment Item Ref 505 or is it incidental to Ref. No. 510?

It is included in the reference 505

Question Submitted: 10/29/2009

Question Number: 39

Do the added quantities in Addendum No. 6 deal with the special benching area Sta 70+50 to Sta 75+50 as attached to the bid documents on the District 4 website or all 4 areas of special benching show on the plans Sta 73+50 to Sta 83+50, Sta 88+00 to Sta 98+00, Sta 100+00 to Sta 103+00, and Sta 162+87.89 to 165+00?

The added quantities apply to stations 70+50 to 81+00

Question Submitted: 10/7/2009

Question Number: 40

Ref #72 Unclassified Excavation the quantity of 741 CY appears to be overstated. It looks like the calculation was divided by 3 instead of 27. A quantity of 1 lump sum would be even easier.

Question Submitted: 10/7/2009

Question Number: 41

At bridges ATB-90-1583 L&R, the approximate top of water elevation is 772. Is this the high water elevation or normal water elevation? Could these elevations be stated for use in cofferdam design?

The high water shown on the bridge site plan sheet 362 is a 100 yr flood elevation. The Ordinary High Water is not shown in the plan set. It is shown on the Causeway detail that was provided for environmental permitting. The OHWM is 763.00+/-

Question Submitted: 10/7/2009

Question Number: 42

If the contractor chooses to use the abandoned rest areas and weigh station areas for borrow or waste, is the contractor responsible for restoration of those areas? If so, what is the extent and guidelines of the restoration of these areas?

See the notes on sheet 11 and refer to construction and materials specifications 105.16.

Question Submitted: 10/8/2009

Question Number: 43

Ref. 83- 24" Conduit, Type C, 706.02: plan sheet 113, ref. D19 calls for 600' between stations 126+00 to 132+00. Given that this pipe runs down the middle of the median and connects to adjoining runs of 18" C and 24" C, why is concrete pipe specified? Can this be regular 24" C?

At station 126+00 to 127+00 the pipe gets shallow and there was a concern about limited cover.

Question Submitted: 10/8/2009

Question Number: 44

Ref. 81- 24" Conduit, Type B: There is a 695' run on plan sheet 122 (ref. D-44) that with the exception of running under a future median crossover is not under pavement. Should the majority of this run be Type C instead of Type B?

Only portion is under the crossover, however it was decided to make the run type B rather than break out sections as type B or C, please bid according to plan.

Question Submitted: 10/8/2009

Question Number: 45

Ref. 89- Conduit, Bored or Jacked: 42" Type A: Instead of requiring contractor to install casing and carrier pipe, would ODOT consider allowing the contractor to install a 48" I.D. galvanized pipe per 748.06 with welded joints as the final carrier pipe?

No, the Department will require conduit, bored or jacked: 42" type A

Question Submitted: 10/9/2009

Question Number: 46

Ref. 73- 15" Conduit, Type C, 706.02- plan sheet 129 shows 110' crossing under the pavement at station 329+00 (ref. D57). Cross-section sheet 232 shows this as 15" B pipe. This appears to be an error. Please correct this in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 11/2/2009

Question Number: 47

The pre bid questions refer to addendum 7 for further revisions and answers. We cannot locate addendum 7 on ODOTS website. When will it be available?

Addendum No. 7 is now posted.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/2/2009

Question Number: 48

It looks like the amendment that goes with addendum #7 added an item 646E104000 that is not listed on the addendum. Is this correct or should it not have been added?

No, it is not an additional item , the stop line has been changed from paint to epoxy.

Question Submitted: 8/31/2009

Question Number: 49

Plan sheet 96 gives a subsummary of excavation and embankment quantities by the plan sheet. From preliminary review, there are several numerical mistakes and/or omissions on plan sheets 145,151,173,232,240. Please review these conflicts and revise in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/31/2009

Question Number: 50

Plan sheet 96 gives a subsummary of excavation and embankment quantities by the plan sheet. From preliminary review, there are several numerical mistakes and/or omissions on plan sheets 145,151,173,232,240. Please review these conflicts and revise in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/10/2009

Question Number: 51

Will the Department please provide the Office Calculations for Pavement items as referenced on plan pages 92 and 93?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/ATB-90-14.25/>

Question Submitted: 9/10/2009

Question Number: 52

1. Can the office calcs and existing bridge drawings be made available online?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/ATB-90-14.25/>

Question Submitted: 9/17/2009

Question Number: 53

Plans give boring locations and logs for both ATB-90-1450 and ATB-90-1583. However, although there are 26 sheets of soil profiles, no information on the any of the cores is given on the plans. Please provide soil boring information for mainline reconstruction work.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/ATB-90-14.25/>

Question Submitted: 9/18/2009

Question Number: 54

Plan sheets 3 and 4 mention that ODOT has designated the abandoned rest areas and weigh stations as potential suitable borrow/waste areas for use by the contractor. Will the contractor be charged the royalty fee of \$0.50/cy per specification 107.11 or will the fee be waived?

Yes the fee will be charged as per 107.11

Question Submitted: 9/21/2009

Question Number: 55

Plan sheet 23 shows 5' and 12' wide sections of temporary pavement to be performed on the EB lanes in phases 1 and 2. Are constructed temporary pavements to match existing shoulder slope or are they to match pavement slope in case the two existing slopes are different?

The cross slope should match the existing shoulder slope so that the temporary pavement matches at the mainline structures.

Question Submitted: 9/22/2009

Question Number: 56

Throughout the cross-section sheets exists WB inside temporary pavements which are to be constructed during phase 3. The temporary slope to the median is shown as well. There is a significant amount of grading work including embankments, topsoil, and seeding required to build the temporary pavement to grade. Plan sheet 16 gives "for information only" volumes for the excavation and embankment quantities. Will the contractor be paid for regular seeding (659 item) for this or will this be paid under the erosion allowance? Is the contractor expected to provide 4" topsoil prior to seeding and if so is this paid under the 659 pay item? Does the estimated volume of embankment on plan sheet 16 include 4" topsoil allowance? Please answer in an addendum.

The earthwork quantities shown on sheet 16 under item Earthwork for Maintaining Traffic do not include topsoil. ITEM 615 includes all work necessary to provide maintain and remove roads and pavements for maintaining traffic. Two items have been included in the general summary to handle the temporary pavement. ITEM 615 EXT 10000 - LUMP ROADS FOR MAINTAINING TRAFFIC ITEM 615 EXT 35001 - 103340 SQ YD PAVEMENT FOR MAINTAINING TRAFFIC, AS PER PLAN The lump sum item is to handle all the incidental items and the square yard item is for the placement of the pavement. Temporary Sediment and Erosion Control, SS 832 is part of this contract.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/23/2009

Question Number: 57

Are the office calcs going to be made available?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/ATB-90-14.25/>

Question Submitted: 9/24/2009

Question Number: 58

Bid Ref.229 and 261 - "Sealing of concrete surfaces (Epoxy/Urethane), AS PER PLAN" has no "AS PER PLAN" note for(Epoxy/Urethane), But there is a plan note on page 296 for "Item 512 Sealing of concrete surfaces, AS PER PLAN, (PERMANENT GRAFITTI PROTECTION)" per SS 1083. There is no bid item for PERMANENT GRAFITTI PROTECTION per SS 1083. Here is the confusion: 1. Do you want the Epoxy/Urethane applied to the concrete first, then apply the 3 coat PERMANENT GRAFITTI PROTECTION(POLYCARB MK 77.3), per SS 1083, to every square yard in ref. 229 + 261 second ??OR 2. Do you only want the 3 coat PERMANENT GRAFITTI PROTECTION (POLYCARB MK 77.3), per SS 1083, applied to every square yard in ref. 229 + 261 ??Please note the PERMANENT GRAFITTI PROTECTION (POLYCARB MK 77.3) has 1 coat of epoxy sealer, 1 intermediate coat, and 1 topcoat. POLYCARB MK 77.3 is on the approved list for PERMANENT GRAFITTI PROTECTION per SS 1083.Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 9/24/2009

Question Number: 59

In the link provided today for the soil borings, there is a file for office calculations, however those calculation sheets do not include the office calcs for Reference 164, Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, As per plan. Page 92 of the General Summary shows the quantity for this item under office calcs. Will these calculations be made available?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/ATB-90-14.25/>

Question Submitted: 9/25/2009

Question Number: 60

Plan sheet 16 under "Earthwork for Maintaining Traffic" gives excavation and embankment quantities (for information only). Our takeoff for these items comes out nowhere near what is shown in this note. Please provide calculations and/or assumptions since this is all incidental to a lump sum item.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/ATB-90-14.25/>

Question Submitted: 9/28/2009

Question Number: 61

The As Per Plan note on sheet 17 of 437 regarding Item 622, Portable Concrete Barrier (Bridge Mounted), 50" As Per Plan, allows for the use of 32 inch high wall with minimum height of 18" glare screen at the option of the contractor. Does this As Per Plan note also pertain to the Item 622, Portable Concrete Barrier, 50" As Per Plan? If yes, during Phase 3 and Phase 4 construction (Contra-flow), may the contractor use 32" PCB wall without glare screen on the current West bound side?

32" could be used for phase 3 and 4, however, 50" was used because the barrier only requires a 3' move between phases 3 and 4 and the phase 4 position is to remain in place for phase 5. Phase 5 requires the 50" barrier. If the contractor elects to use 32" for phase 3 and 4, he would have to come back and place the glare screen in for phase 5.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2009

Question Number: 62

MOT note on sheet 13 of 437 implies that Temporary pavement (phases 1 and 2) will be built at night and references the permitted lane closure (I-90) Note. This note refers the contractor to the Permitted Lane Closure Chart (<http://pclm.dot.state.oh.us>). This chart does not have any restrictions to 2:1 lane closures for this section of IR-90. It is our interpretation from this chart that the contractor may pursue this Item 615 construction at any time day or night. What hours will be classified as "nighttime period"? Please clarify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2009

Question Number: 63

Can the CAD & GeoPak files be made available online for this project?

Not available

Question Submitted: 9/29/2009

Question Number: 64

A prebid question was asked on 9/17/2009 requesting soil boring information for mainline reconstruction work. ODOT answered with a link on the ftp website. The only geotechnical information given on the ftp website is limited to a slope repair between stations 74+00 and 80+00 in the eastbound direction. There was no boring information provided for all remaining mainline soil profiles beginning at station 79+00 through 362+00. Please provide this information.

The soil report for the mainline pavement has been posted as well as the soils legend on the districts ftp site.

Question Submitted: 9/29/2009

Question Number: 65

The quantity for Bid Item 322 Class HP Concrete, Bridge Deck, APP seems overstated by approximately 22 CY. Please verify the bid quantity is correct or revise in an 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.

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/29/2009

Question Number: 66

The Steel H-Pile at Bridges 1450L&R and 1583L&R are to be driven to refusal on bedrock. This will require steel pile points. Could the Department please add bid items for these?

No steel pile points will be added , according to the bridge design manual they are not required, unless encountering strong rock. According to our soils report the rock does not qualify.

Question Submitted: 9/8/2009

Question Number: 67

Recently, all New Construction and Major Reconstruction projects have given the contractor the option of bidding on asphalt or concrete pavement. The proposal for this project only list asphalt pavement, and no concrete alternate. Was the omission of an alternate for concrete an oversight? Will an alternate for concrete pavement be issued via an addendum?

This project will not have alternate bids for pavement type.

Question Submitted: 9/8/2009

Question Number: 68

Based on the quantity of mainline paving for this project and the significant cost-saving results demonstrated by requiring alternate pavement bids on several other major projects this year, will a similar addendum be issued on this project? If so, we would ask that it be issued as soon as possible so everyone can plan accordingly.

This project will not have alternate bids for pavement type.

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.