

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 140537

Sale Date - 11/13/2014

ATB-83599 - US 20-21.43

*Question Submitted:* 11/12/2014 3:43:12 PM

After thorough review of the construction schedule we believe the 270 day closure to be too aggressive. No matter when you commence closure, critical elements of construction will be significantly impacted by winter weather. We concur with an earlier submittal that a 330 day closure period would be more realistic.

*Question Submitted:* 11/12/2014 3:42:23 PM

Plan pages 8 & 9, paragraph titles "Unrecorded treated non-storm water drainage" & "Unrecorded storm water drainage", will the Department furnish all R/W use permits & will the Department secure the NPDES permit from the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency?

*Question Submitted:* 11/11/2014 11:45:17 AM

We are in agreement with others that the 270 day closure period is inadequate, even with multiple crews, shifts, etc. Please reconsider and extend the closure period to a minimum of 330 days.

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2014 11:23:47 AM

Please provide a copy of the schedule analysis that was performed to determine a 270 day road closure was achievable. If the analysis could be provide in Primavera P6 it would be helpful.

*Question Submitted:* 11/7/2014 3:25:27 PM

The 270 day closure is not adequate. Increase the closure period to run from March 1, 2015 through the completion date of 6/17/16.

**The closure period will not be extended.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/7/2014 3:13:32 PM

Further clarification is needed to the answer provided to the question submitted 11/6/2014 2:42:26 PM. The aerial electric lines that currently run parallel with the RR, cross S.R. 20 at the location of the proposed forward abutment. Are these lines going to be moved to cross S.R. 20 up station of the proposed forward abutment? Clearance is needed for pile driving operations. Please add the proposed utility relocation drwgs to he ftp site.

**Utility Relocations are stated in the Utility Note that was included in Addendum 1.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/6/2014 2:42:26 PM

Please provide drawings indicating the proposed relocation of the 36kV aerial lines that are to remain energized for the duration of the project. Please include the proposed elevations for the lines over the construction site.

**The 36kV lines will be relocated to the south side of Industry Road where the existing distribution poles are now. New poles will be set and both distribution and transmission will be on the new poles. The proposed elevations for the lines are not available.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/5/2014 5:00:16 PM

The 270 day closure period is not achievable, due to the large amount of work demolishing the existing bridge and constructing the proposed bridge. The existing bridge has 16 spans within N.S. R/W that will required track time to demolish. The demolition of these spans could take 90 to 120 days or more depending on N.S. willingness to provide track time. Additionally, per the note on page 89/189 there is an anticipated wait period of 60 days for embankment settlement. Also, CMS 511.14 indicates a 30 day wait period to open the bridge to traffic if the deck is poured after October 15. With the parameters involved the roadway should be closed on or about January 1, 2015 but none of the utility relocations are started. As of yesterday they are just clearing for the utility relocations. Please provide clarification of what 270 day period it was anticipated the road closure would occur and with all the constraints how it was anticipated this bridge could possibly be replaced in a 270 day period.

**The contractor has the ability to choose the start of the 270 day closure period to meet the completion date of June 17, 2016.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/4/2014 4:08:01 PM

In reference to the previous question regarding slip joints, an MSE system utilizes a ship-lap slip joint at each vertical panel joint. Please advise if this type of joint is sufficient or would an actual precast slip joint "panel" be required..?

**The details of the slip joint design are left to the manufacturer of the MSE wall system.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2014 4:21:58 PM

To follow up on a previous question referencing the width of the panels, how can these walls be built as an MSE wall (NOT listed as "per plan") with 9' to 25' wide panels according to the 840 spec where the maximum size panel allowed is 5' high x 10' wide? Also, re-design of the MSE structural system as well as form systems of each supplier would be required and be extremely costly to the Department to build such a wall (unconstructable as detailed) Gene Lamberson 765-404-5396

**The response to the previous question regarding the string of dimensions above the MSE wall panels lacked clarity. Those dimensions are showing the width between slip joints in the wall which the design consultant internally referred to as the panel width. It is not our intent to show the actual dimensions of the precast wall panels.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2014 10:04:09 AM

Please verify what is being dimensioned by the string of dimensions with panel numbers shown above the MSE wall elevations?

**The string of dimensions in question is showing the widths of the panels along the MSE wall.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/31/2014 3:53:39 PM

Ref number 120 is the reinforcing steel for the MSE wall items. It has a quantity of 11,968.05 lbs. This is a highly unusual quantity. Is this quantity correct?

**The value in question should have been reported as 11, 968 lbs. This quantity includes steel reinforcement in the approach parapet moment slabs and the approach parapets connected to those moment slabs.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/31/2014 9:21:48 AM

What is the disposition of the 10" gas line shown on plan sheet 2/189 and on cross-section sheets 53,64 and 65/189? Will it be relocated prior to our work, or will temporary shoring/support be required? Please advise.

**Refer to the soon to be posted addendum no. 1.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/30/2014 6:24:31 PM

Regarding the MSE walls: 1) The plans call out the 1/17-2014 version of 840, yet there is a more current 10/17-2014 version. Which does ODOT desire used? 2) The proposal has a quantity for both the Subgrade Prep and the Type C fill material. By 840.06 the Type C material is incidental to the Subgrade Prep item. Are we to remove the Type C requirement from the Surface Prep item and cover the cost under the separate Type C item?

**The 1/17/2014 version of 840 shall be used as specified. The Type C fill material should be bid as a separate item as shown in the plans.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/30/2014 3:38:03 PM

Please confirm compliance with PN 555 is required on this project. Due to the irregular loading of the prestress concrete I-beams it will be impossible to predict the camber deflection due to deck placement. Compliance with PN 555 will certainly require an excessive amount of corrective diamond grinding. What is the minimum final deck thickness that will be acceptable? Has the reinforcing steel clearance been adequately increased to allow for the potential corrective diamond grinding?

**Yes, compliance with PN 555 is required. An additional 1/2" of concrete cover has been provided over the top mat of deck reinforcement to allow for corrective grinding.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/30/2014 3:06:09 PM

Please confirm compliance with 511.16 will not be enforced on this project. The maximum paving width is 116' for the currently available finishing machine. The paving on the skew would require a 198' paving width.

**The designer anticipates the deck finishing machine to be aligned perpendicular to the centerline of US Route 20. Alternate finishing machine alignments may also be acceptable. Conformance with 511.16 is not critical for the stability of the structure.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/30/2014 2:35:15 PM

4A notes page 2 of 2 indicates "Disposition of Utilities to be added at a later date" Please provide a complete list of the disposition of utilities.

**Refer to upcoming addendum No. 1.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 10/29/2014 10:44:50 AM

In both the Proposal and EBS, Ref. No. 0120, Epoxy Rebar, has a quantity of 11,968.05 lb. Please round this to the nearest lb. Similarly, Ref. No. 0131 Natural Soil, has a quantity of 957.09 cy. Please round this, as well.

*Question Submitted:* 10/22/2014 9:55:51 AM

This project does not have a 615 Roads for Maintaining Traffic item. Is the excavation and other work incidental to construct the temporary pavement to be included in the SY price for the 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A or will the Department add a Roads for Maintaining Traffic item.

**ITEM 615 - Roads for Maintaining Traffic will be added in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/21/2014 8:40:34 AM

Are stay-in-place metal deck forms allowed on this project?

**No. Stay-in-place metal deck forms will not be allowed on this project.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/8/2014 12:52:21 PM

Could the Department please provide a link to the Office Calcs for the Roadway & Pavement items?

**Calcs are posted in the Reference Files: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ATB-83599/Reference%20Files/>**