

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 103016

Sale Date - 10/7/2010

ATB-25501 - SR-11-13.30

Question Submitted: 10/4/2010 5:01:41 PM

Please identify which ramps at the SR46 interchange are to be included in the work of this project.

A: As stated at the Pre-Bid meeting the ramps to be included are the northbound off ramp and the southbound on ramp.

Question Submitted: 10/4/2010 3:50:18 PM

The parapet transitions on the overhead bridges (ATB-11-1637/2007/2095) are not sufficient to accept current standard bridge terminal assemblies. ODOT previously answered a question with the response that the overhead structure parapets are NOT to be removed and replaced. Is it ODOT's intention to allow a non-standard bridge terminal assembly or will the ends of the parapets on the wingwalls of those structures need to be removed and replaced with an acceptable transition?

A: The DBT is not required to remove the ends of the parapets and replace with a current standard parapet. The DBT is to investigate if a current Bridge Terminal Assembly will work with the existing parapet, if not, then the DBT may use the retired Bridge Terminal Assembly that will work with the existing parapet. The retired Bridge Terminal Assembly Standard Drawings can be found at <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ProdMgt/Roadway/roadwaystandards/Pages/RoadwayStandardsRoadwayPlanInserts.aspx>

Question Submitted: 10/4/2010 10:31:39 AM

The completion date is not realistic given the SOS. Please consider revising completion date until 10/31/11 from 9-30-11.

A: The scope of work has been reviewed by the Department and the completion date will not be changed.

Question Submitted: 10/1/2010 5:26:28 PM

According to the Scope of Work Section 11 the Right-of-way is to be flagged and staked. Is this needed for the entire length of the project?

A: Refer to CMS 623 for the requirements for staking.

Question Submitted: 10/1/2010 2:33:55 PM

A question was submitted on 9/28 regarding bridges 1555 L/R. The bridge number was miss-referenced. The question was to apply to the 1545 structure. The question is still valid and needs a response. Thank you!

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2010 3:54:53 PM

- 1) There is a substantial amount of bridge work and length of paving work to be accomplished for this project in addition to the engineering work that must be completed ahead of this. Other projects of similar or smaller size have traditionally been given 2 years to complete. Will the ODOT consider adding one year to the project schedule and revise the completion date to 9/30/2012?
- 2) Per section 13.4B, ODOT is specifying full depth asphalt pavement for the shoulders. The existing shoulders and the proposed full depth shoulders per section 14.3.2 are concrete with asphalt. Will ODOT consider allowing concrete pavement for the shoulder reconstructions required for MOT?
- 3) For bridge ATB-11-1545, does the proposed Micro Silica overlay extend onto the approach slab or is it only on the limits of the bridge deck?
- 4) On previous projects, ODOT has had an agreement setup with the railroads to cover the cost of the required flaggers. There are no bid items or mention of flagging costs in the RFP. Is ODOT directly paying the railroad flagging costs for this project?

A1: The completion date will not be changed.

A2: No, the requirements in Section 13.4 of the Scope of Services will not be changed.

A3: In Section 15.2.A of the Scope of Services states the new concrete overlay is placed "(on Bridge Deck)", therefore, it DOES NOT extend onto the approach slabs. Be advised that section 15.5.A of the Scope of Services states the new concrete overlay is placed "(on Bridge Deck and Approach Slabs)", therefore it DOES extend onto the approach slabs.

A4: If needed the cost of Railroad Flagging will be billed directly to the Department and paid for by the Department under a Force Account directly to the Railroad.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/29/2010 10:15:54 AM

Addenda #4 eliminates the possibility of twin cell culverts. Our design calculations indicate that three of the culverts may need to be a pre-cast box culverts with limited cover in the median. Does the District understand that the existing culverts are drastically undersized using L&D criteria and therefore will be significantly upsized? Does the District have a history of flooding at the existing culverts? Regardless of the theoretical hydraulic calculations, the best determinate of proposed pipe size is actual historic flood data. If there isn't a history of flooding, the District should consider duplicating the existing culvert sizes or simply up-sizing the pipe one (1) size. Can the District provide sizes for the bid to eliminate the uncertainty in the proposed sizes and hydraulics?

The Department does not plan to provide any additional information. The DBT will be required to properly size the replacement culverts as per the Location and Design Manual.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2010 1:52:05 PM

1) The scope-of-services for bridge 1555-L/R requires the removal and replacement of the existing overlay under supplemental spec 848. The 1994 plans for the initial overlay shows the removal of the existing 1" concrete wearing surface (leaving only the design minimum deck thickness) and the placement of a 2¾" MSC wearing surface (overlay). The current 848 spec requires the removal of a minimum of 1" of the original deck (below the 1994 overlay) before any new overlay is placed. This would produce a new 3¾" overlay. After the existing overlay is removed, the additional 1" of hydro-removal will encroach on the design minimum deck thickness that is required by the Bridge Design Manual. Are we to reduce the thickness of the structural portion of the deck and remove another 1" in order to satisfy the 848 spec?

2) The scope for bridges 1952-L/R and 1984-L/R calls for the removal of the existing "monolithic concrete" wearing surface and the placement of a 1¼" MSC overlay (848). All of these decks were overlaid in 1994 with 2¾" of MSC. What is the intent... to remove only a thin portion of the existing overlay? If the entire existing overlay is to be removed (producing a 3 ¾" overlay), note that there will be the same design thickness issue noted in the first question.

3) Are any of the approach slabs on any of the 848 overlay bridges to be repaired/overlaid?

4) None of the overlay bridges have a quantity for full-depth repair. Will ODOT be paying for this as an extra-work item if needed?

5) Addendum 4 clarified the culvert end treatments, et.al. Are we to inspect/grade/etc the ends of all of the culverts within the project limits, or confine our work to the 5 culverts listed?

A1) These bridges (ATB-11-1555L & ATB-11-1555R) are not to have a new concrete overlay, please refer to the Scope of Services Section 15.3 for the work to be performed.

A2) Clarification will be provided in a future Addendum.

A3) Please refer the individual bridges in Section 15 of the Scope of Services description of work for the information requested.

A4) No extra work item will be paid, this is included with the Lump Sum Pay Item ITEM 848E99100 - BRIDGE DECK OVERLAYS, this Pay Item is provided in the Proposal.

A5) Work on culverts other than those listed in Section 14.5 of the Scope of Services (Cross Culvert Replacement) is not required unless impacted by other work within the project (refer to Section 14.5 of the Scope of Services).

Question Submitted: 9/27/2010 2:34:05 PM

Will ODOT provide LIDAR mapping for plan development?

Section 12.2 requires the DBT to perform a SUE at level A&B. Is this level of SUE necessary for this work?

No, ODOT will not provide LIDAR mapping for plan development. Yes, SUE is required for this project, this is required as per Section 12.3 of the Scope of Services, not 12.2 as you reference in the question.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2010 2:29:58 PM

Section 14.4 Roadway requires the removal & replacement of the approach barrier protection (guardrail, concrete barrier, etc) for the overhead roadway on 3 overhead structures. Please clarify what is required here. Does all guardrail/barrier approaching the structure need replaced? The roadway actually on the structures has no guardrail, only barrier. Are we required to remove and replace all of the barrier on the actual structures or just any that leads up to the structures? Please clarify your intention.

Yes, all APPROACH guardrail (or concrete barrier protection if present) for the Structures on the overhead roadway is to be removed and replaced, Only the approach barrier is to be removed and replaced. The parapets on the Structures are NOT to be removed and replaced, Refer to Sections 15.4, 15.6, 15.7 of the Scope of Services for work that is required on the overhead structures in question.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/24/2010 1:05:52 PM

- 1) What grading requirements per section 307.2.1 of the L&D Manual, Vol. 1 will be required for the culverts that are to be replaced? It appears that at least one of the culverts to be reconstructed culvert satisfies only common grading, but not clear zone or safety grading. Is the DBT to replace the culverts to match existing pipe length & grading, or is the DBT required to improve grading/barrier protection at the five culverts to be replaced? If "improve", is the DBT required to improve the grading/barrier protection at the numerous existing culverts not being reconstructed?
- 2) Are culvert replacements performed under Nationwide Permit #3 – Yes or No? [Per L+D Section 1105.2.1, bankfull discharge design is not required for culvert replacements permitted under Nationwide Permit #3]
- 3) For the design of the replacement culverts, should bankfull discharge design be followed in accordance with L+D Section 1105.2.1?
- 4) If bankfull design procedure is to be followed, should the end treatment follow L+D Section 1105.2.2 [Item 601 riprap, 6" reinforced concrete slab with cutoff wall] or should the end treatment follow Addendum #2 [tied concrete block mats]?
- 5) Are the tied concrete block mats specified in Addendum No. 2 in place of BOTH rock channel protection AND rip rap? CMS Section 601.12 states "Tied Concrete Block Mats may be used instead of Rock Channel Protection, Dumped Rock, OR RipRap with the approval of the Office of Structural Engineering".

Clarification to be provided in a future addendum for all of these questions. Note: The grading at these locations is not to be improved. Concerning Barrier Protection, per Section 14.4 of the Scope of Services all existing Barrier Protection is to be removed and replaced and also requires the DBT to install new Barrier Protection to meet current Design Standards, if there is a location that does not currently have Barrier Protection but it is required as per current standards it will be installed by the DBT.

Question Submitted: 9/16/2010 8:11:38 AM

According to the Scope, Page 28, the only signs which are to be replaced within the project limits are the Bridge ID signs. Is that correct?

Yes

Question Submitted: 9/8/2010 2:27:53 PM

- 1) Would ODOT consider adding a variable lift scratch course to the scope of work. Based on a field survey of the existing pavement conditions, it is doubtful whether the specified 1.25" mill/fill will provide the department with the quality pavement that we all would like to achieve. We feel a scratch course would help correct any deviation in the pavement surface and/or cross slopes prior to placement of the fine graded polymer mix.
- 2) Please confirm that the proposed culverts indicated in section 14.5 for replacement are as follows from the original ATB-11-14.57 (1967) construction plans:
a.SLM 14.85 = Culvert #3 at STA 788+00 b.SLM 16.78 = Culvert #8 at STA 890+58 c.SLM 17.09 = Culvert #9 at STA 907+00
d.SLM 18.15 = Culvert #12 at STA 963+00
e.SLM 18.59 = Culvert #13 at STA 986+00
f.SLM 21.90 = Culvert #23 at STA 1140+00
- 3) Please clarify culvert size at SLM 18.15. Scope section 14.5 indicates 12" diameter whereas original plans indicate 48".
- 4) Scope section 14.2 indicates that "the existing horizontal and vertical alignment of SR-11 will be maintained.....". Scope section 14.3 indicates a simple mill & fill operation for the mainline/ramp resurfacing. Please confirm that the proposed profile grade and cross slope are to match existing conditions and that no variable depth grinding and/or overlay is required.
- 5) Scope section 10.4 indicates "no excavation, grading or filling operations shall be performed in any wetlands, streams or other waters of the US..." and section 10.1 indicates that "no waterway permits are required for the project based on no impacts to any streams, wetlands or other waters of the US". However there is standing water and potential wetland plants (cat-tails, et.al.) at/near each end of almost every culvert that must be disturbed and/or removed to reconstruct the pipes. Has the State performed wetland delineations on the project? What is the scope of our responsibility in this matter given this potential conflict?

Answer 1: The pavement build-up in the Scope of Services will be used. Answer 2: A revised table of the culverts to be replaced will be supplied in a future Addendum. Answer 3: A revised table of the culverts to be replaced will be supplied in a future Addendum. Answer 4: Yes, in the resurfacing section of the Project the existing profile grades and cross slopes are to be maintained and match the existing. Answer 5: Changes will be made in a future Addendum for this Project to address the areas disturbed at the locations of the culvert replacements.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

7/30/2010 2:26:56 PM

1)Are there existing drawing for the bridges? 2)Scope Section 14.4 states that there is to be 25' of full depth replacement off both ends of the bridges. Is this to include the overlay bridges on the mainline, and the SRS/repair bridges on the mainline and overheads? 3)ODOT has an editorial note in section 15.7 regarding work on the approach slab. It is unclear what to do with the note. 4)Are there any other electronic files available?

A1) All of the existing bridge plans are on a CD/DVD which is available from the Office of Contracts. Refer to Section 1.2 of the Scope of Services for a list of the existing plans. A2) As stated in the Scope of Services Section 14.4 this applies to Structures ATB-11-1555L, ATB-11-1556R, ATB-11-2132L, ATB-11-2132R. A3) This will be revised in a future Addendum. A4) All electronic files which are available are on the CD/DVD which is available from the Office of Contracts. A complete list of the files available is available in Section 1.2 of the Scope of Services.