

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Project No. 093005

Sale Date - 12/9/2009

Question Submitted: 11/10/2009

Question Number: 1

Are all underdrains to be replaced in both resurface and full depth areas? Where are the underdrains to be placed? In areas where the existing concrete pavement is to remain, the underdrains will have to be placed beyond the pavement limits.

See Addendum 1, Scope of Services, Section 14.5.

Question Submitted: 11/10/2009

Question Number: 2

1.) Will ODOT consider setting up a unit price pay item for concrete pavement repair for joints that might need to be replaced outside of the full depth replacement areas? There is no way for the DBT's to quantify this prior to bid. 2.) Will ODOT consider setting up a patching planed surfaces item prior to placing the 1" intermediate asphalt bond breaker material? 3.) ODOT needs to provide the survey information prior to bid referenced in the SOS section 14.1A so that the DBT's can determine the limits of the full pavement areas. 4.) What is the intent of SOS section 15.1? Where do you see this section being applicable on this project? 5) Is the depth of the new underdrains measured from the original subgrade?

1. No. See addendum 1, Section 14.3.2. No.3. See Addendum 1, Section 14.1(A)4. See Addendum 1, Section 15.15. See Addendum 1, Section 14.5

Question Submitted: 11/10/2009

Question Number: 3

Please post all existing plans to the ODOT ftp site. Currently, the following plan sets are missing: BEL-70 7.61 (1985); BEL-70-11.62 (1990); BEL-70-11.77 (2002); BEL-70-11.88 (1981). This information is needed ASAP in order to start pre-bid design.

**See Addendum 1. All plans and the pre-bid meeting transcript have been posted to:
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D11/76825/>.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2009

Question Number: 4

1. Concerning 14.9 - Confirm ODOT's intent is to install fence in current position and a full boundary survey is not required.

2. Concerning 13.3/14.3/14.4 - Is it ODOT's intent to stabilize all of the existing areas under the shoulders. In the event that stabilization is required, please clarify if undercut may be performed. 3. Concerning 14.4 - Is it ODOT's intent to perform safety grading within median section? 4. Concerning 14.4 - Location and Design Manual Volume One Figure 301-3E shows that required right side treated shoulder width is 12 feet with a 2 feet guardrail offset from edge of treated shoulder. The existing right side treated shoulder width is 10 feet with an existing guardrail offset of 2 feet. Will the right side treated shoulder width need to be 12 feet or can it remain 10 feet wide? If it needs to be 12 feet wide, can the face of the new guardrail be placed at the edge of the 12 feet wide treated shoulder or will the new face of guardrail need to meet the 2 feet offset? This question is important because the existing graded shoulder width does not meet current standards and the design exception allows for the graded shoulder width to remain substandard. The raising of the roadway surface by 10 inches greater than the original plans makes the slope at the edge of existing treated shoulder non-standard and steep. While this may be mitigated with the use of paving under the guardrail, the movement of the guardrail out two feet will place the guardrail on the 2:1 slope or likely steeper to grade for the higher pavement. 5. Concerning 14.4 - At the limits of the project, there will be an estimate 5" vertical pavement transition from the proposed pavement section to match the existing condition. Will ODOT accept an asphalt wedge course in this section? 6. Concerning 14.4 - Will ODOT require that entrance ramp acceleration lanes be upgraded to meet current L&D requirements? The current ramp lengths do not meet current design standards. 7. Concerning 14.5 - Is it ODOT's intent to replace storm sewer that crosses I-70 traveled lanes and/or median sections? Has ODOT reviewed the pipes that laterally cross I-70? Please clarify exactly the drainage scope. 8. Concerning 14.1 - Survey : Per page 19 Section 14.1A, information provided on FTP site does not match notation per RFP. Vertical clearance and other information are undeterminable without point codes. Please provide description of point codes on FTP site. Has ODOT generated a centerline? Copy of right-of-way plans are needed. Where are these plans posted? 9. Concerning 14.4 - Can replacement emergency turnarounds be deep strength asphalt design? 10. Missing Bid items in proposal: - MOT - Temp. Roads (LS) , Message boards (SNMT), WZ Speed limit signs (each) & Increased Fine Signs (each) - Traffic Control - 646 Epoxy Striping & 621 RPMs - Erosion Control - Seeding & Mulching & SWPPP

1. As per the L&D Manual, verification of the placement of the fence within the right of way is required. 2. Yes, see Addendum 1. Design as per GB-1.3. Meet current design standard as per the scope of services. 4. Refer to Section 14.3 and Section 14.6 of the scope. Also, the DBT is required to mill a minimum of 5 inches off the existing asphalt surface, therefore, the final surface will not be 10 inches higher than the existing. 5. An asphalt wedge, with a butt joint, as per Standard Construction Drawing BP-3.1, is acceptable. 6. Design to current standards. 7. It is not the intent of the scope to replace any transverse drainage structures that are under the mainline pavement of IR 70. 8. See Addendum 1. The right of way plans and the pre-bid meeting transcript have been posted to: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D11/76825/>. 9. See addendum 1 and revised Scope of Services, Section 14.4. 10. See Addendum 1. SWPPP shall be included in Item 832E99100 - Construction Erosion control.

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: 11/11/2009

Question Number: 5

The sketch for the contra-flow with 11 foot lanes with 2 foot barrier offset located on page 13 of the Lewis & Zimmerman Associates "Value Engineering Study Report" dated September 2009 indicates a pavement width of 41 feet is acceptable. The only way 41 feet works is if ODOT is allowing only 1 foot from edge line to the edge of pavement. Is this correct? A 2 foot distance from edge lines would make this pavement width 43 feet not 41 feet. Please clarify since this additional 2 feet for a distance of 5 miles adds an over 6,000 square yards of temporary pavement in each phase. Will Item 410 required on the edge of the temporary pavement?

As per Scope of Services, Section 13.2, a 2 foot barrier offset is required.No. Item 410 is included as a contingency quantity for maintenance of traffic purposes..

Question Submitted: 11/11/2009

Question Number: 6

•The following record plans were not incorporated into the FTP site per the scope of services:•BEL-70-11.62 (1990)•BEL-70-11.77 (2002)•BEL-70-11.88 (1981)Please indicate where the following plans are located per the scope of services Section 1.2: BEL-70-11.62 (1990), BEL-70-11.77 (2002) ,BEL-70-11.88 (1981)

**See Addendum 1. All plans and the pre-bid meeting transcript have been posted to:
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D11/76825/>**

Question Submitted: 11/12/2009

Question Number: 7

1. Will HP or QCQA concrete be used for bridges? Please confirm the requirement for the concrete mix.2.Please confirm that ODOT will submit the Notice of Intent (NOI) Application and provides the associated application fees to the EPA. The awarded contractor will submit an NOI co-permittee application to the EPA.3. Please advise if there are record plans available for the ramp widening at the existing rest areas. The record plans provided do not show the widening. Please clarify ODOT's intent for replacement of these shoulders and appropriate treated shoulder widths. 4.Please clarify the scope and limits of pavement replacement or resurfacing at rest area entrance and exit ramps per a station reference from the record plans. Also, if pavement repair or resurfacing is requested through the rest areas, please clarify the typical section. 5.Please clarify ODOT's intent for lighting requirements at the rest areas and entrance/exit ramps. Lights were identified in 1963 record plans; however, have been removed. No records to modifications.

1. See Adendum 1. 2. This is not a question. Please refer to Scope of Services, Section 10.23. Please refer to Scope of Services, Section 1.2, paragraph 3. 4. DBT shall design and construct Eastbound and westbound rest area ramps from IR 70 mainline to meet existing concrete ramp pavement. Please refer to Scope of Services, Section 14.4 for additional rest area work requirements.5. The only lighting required shall be as per Section 16.3 of the Scope of Services.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2009

Question Number: 8

1.) Please clarify the construction limits along SR 149.2.) Will guardrail replacement be required on TWP Road 260 under I-70 as part of the work on the mainline structure above?3.) Will the state allow the use of in-situ pavement as the bond breaker in lieu of adding a new 1" thick layer if the existing asphalt left in place is 1" thick or greater?4.) Does the state require the use of Item 617 Compacted Aggregate to make up the elevation difference between the new pavement grade and the existing graded shoulder grades?5) Upon our review of the Design Exception report provided as attachment E of the scope of services, the existing structure widths are listed as being measured 42'-0" toe to toe of the safety curb. Upon review of the existing plans, the clearance toe to toe is less than 42'. Are the existing plan dimensions correct or is the dimension listed in the design exception report correct?

1. DBT shall establish construction and work limits based on their selected maintenance of traffic scheme.2. See addendum 1, Section 15.3.3 No.4. No.5. The existing plan dimensions are correct.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2009

Question Number: 9

Beam No. 1 on Bridge No. BEL-70-0963 left was damaged and subsequently repaired as project Bel-70-7.61 in 1979. Is this beam capable of carrying full highway traffic loads as will be required in both contra-flow and Bi-directional schemes for maintenance of traffic?

There is no information that indicates a problem exists with the capacity of Beam 1 of Bridge No. BEL-70-0963L. Design accordingly.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2009

Question Number: 10

1.) In section 1.1 of the SOS the percentage of trucks to shown to be 50%, is this correct? 2.) The pavement is being raised approximately 5". What is the allowable slope from back of guardrail? Is it the intent of this project to reconstruct the slopes from edge of pavement to the new toe of slope with a sliver fill?

1. The Scope of Services, Section 1.1 is correct.2. ODOT does not want a sliver fill to the toe of slope. An acceptable solution is a 1.5 to 1, or flatter, slope from the graded shoulder break into the existing foreslope

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: 11/16/2009

Question Number: 11

1.) Section 14.4 'Roadway' states to see Attachment D for soil information. Under note #2 in attachment D, there is reference to undercutting bedrock from Sta 210+00 to 218+00. Is the DBT to assume this undercut of bedrock is required to be undercut regardless of profile through this area, therefore, resulting in full depth concrete replacement over this 800' section of the project?2.) Under section 15.3 of the scope of services, the new superstructure is to be designed to carry HS20 loading. In the past, ODOT (BDM 3.2.4.1, 4.2.4) required a 25% increase in the live load beta factor for the max load case (B=1.25*1.67). For the overload case the B is 1.67. Are we going to use this requirement for this project? The current BDM is only for HS25 loading.

3.) Does the 1' sidewalk as described under the transverse sections in section 15.3 of the scope need to be applied to one side, both sides, or not at all? Is the 1' sidewalk a description of the existing conditions as of the 2'-2" wide safety curb?4.) Does the State have as-built record plans of the SR 149/IR 70 interchange where lighting is to be replaced in accordance with section 16.3 of the Scope of Services?5.) Can TWP Rd 260 be detoured for any period of time during construction?

1. No.2. Design per Section 400 of the 2004 Bridge Design Manual.3. The proposed sidewalks will not have sidewalks. See addendum 1. Provide railing as per Section 300 of the 2004 Bridge Design Manual.4. No.5. See addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 11/16/2009

Question Number: 12

1. Please clarify the station limits of the ramp paving required on this project.2. Please clarify the limits of the rest area work required on this project (are we to reconstruct just the vehicle parking area, are ramps included, etc..).

1. IR70/SR 149 interchange ramps shall be designed and constructed from IR 70 mainline to the edge of pavement of S.R. 149. 2. DBT shall design and construct Eastbound and westbound rest area ramps from IR 70 mainline to meet existing concrete pavement on ramp. Please refer to Scope of Services, Section 14.4 for additional rest area work requirements.

Question Submitted: 11/17/2009

Question Number: 13

Is it ODOT's intent to replace fence around rest area? If so, what is intended fence material?

Yes. Refer to L&D Manual 1, Section 606.3.3

Question Submitted: 11/18/2009

Question Number: 14

Section 13.3 states that the DBT shall reconstruct any existing shoulder or shoulder adjacent to any existing lane that will be used to carry traffic. 1. Does the existing condition count as shoulders adjacent to traffic carrying lanes? If so, this would require that all shoulders be reconstructed. 2. What is the required pavement buildup for reconstructed shoulders that traffic will run on? 3. What is the required pavement buildup for reconstructed shoulders (if any) that will never carry maintenance of traffic? Will these just be planed 5", receive the 1" bond breaker, and 9" of PCCP? Are the existing shoulders sufficient to do this or will a different full depth asphalt/concrete section be required for this situation?

1. Yes. Design as per Scope of Services, Section 13.3.2. See Scope of Services, Section 13.3.3. Design as per Scope of Services, Section 14.3.

Question Submitted: 11/18/2009

Question Number: 15

1. Proposal scope of services section 18.1 states "Simplified Plans (section 1301.2) are NOT allowed". Typically for design-build projects, preliminary plans are provided to the DBT. Without preliminary plans, what Sections of the ODOT Location and Design Manual Volume 3 Section 1403.7 Stage 1 Detailed Design will ODOT require for the Stage 1 submission?2.Per the scope, DBT shall design and replace all median drainage, down slope pipes and underdrains. Please confirm that drains that cross mainline pavement are not to be replaced and will remain in place.3.Per the pre-bid meeting, we are to replace down slope pipes. Per the ODOT Location and Design Manual Volume 2 Figure 1104-1 (broken back detail), down slope pipes are meant to be the pipes on steep down slopes; however, the project contains pipes with outlet pipes that are not "broken back" and simply outlet into roadside ditches. Please clarify ODOT's intent on limits of pipes to be replaced.

1. The DBT will submit their Buildable Units in a format that conforms to the requirements for the stage review they are submitting. 2. Refer to the scope.3. Refer to the scope.

Question Submitted: 11/19/2009

Question Number: 16

Page 21/37 of the proposal requires the contractor to replace all median drainage and down slope pipes. What are the limits of this work? Is this work limited to only the No. 8 catch basins and connector pipes between them, or are we also required to replace all of the outlet pipes? Will the replacement of the down slope pipe be limited to replacing the pipe between the collar and the headwall, or will the entire outlet be replaced?

It is not the intent of the scope to replace any transverse drainage structures that are under the mainline pavement of IR 70. Pipe that is beyond the pavement, and in the median, is to be replaced. The down slope pipes and the outlets will have to be replaced.

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: 11/19/2009

Question Number: 17

The existing ramps are not wide enough to maintain traffic and perform half width construction. In order to eliminate additional expensive temporary pavement, will the Department allow the use of 10' lanes and 1' shoulders on the entrance and exit ramps? This is allowed per the Traffic Engineering Manual.

Yes, as long as the design meets the design standards as established in the relevant design manuals.

Question Submitted: 11/19/2009

Question Number: 18

Section 14.4 of the Scope states that the DBT shall design the median as required to facilitate MOT and meet current standards. The existing mound does not meet safety or clear zone grading standards. Is it the Department's intent that this mound is completely removed or will an exception be allowed?

The design of the median should meet current design standards.

Question Submitted: 11/19/2009

Question Number: 19

The scope is not completely clear on the required width of the outside shoulders. What is this width to be?

Refer to Scope of Services, Section 14.6 and Attachment E.

Question Submitted: 11/20/2009

Question Number: 20

As of 11/20, there are a lot of questions at the pre-bid web site which have not been answered, nor has there been an addenda issued to address contractors questions at the pre-bid meeting of 11/02. Would ODOT consider extending the bid date to allow the designers and contractors ample time to assess ODOT's response to the pre-bid questions?

We will take this question under consideration but at this time we are keeping the 12/4/09 sale date.

Question Submitted: 11/20/2009

Question Number: 21

Addendum #1 does not answer most of the prebid questions, and the ODOT Q&A website has not been updated for the last four days. Due to the Thanksgiving holiday, we need answers to all outstanding questions on Monday, November 23rd in order to have time to prepare our bids. No outstanding questions should be allowed to lap into the week of November 30th as this will not allow the DBTs time to adequately prepare their bids (considering both design and bidding time).

We will take this question under consideration but at this time we are keeping the 12/4/09 sale date.

Question Submitted: 11/20/2009

Question Number: 22

Is the bridge information provided in Addendum #1 a complete replacement of section 15.3?

No, details and quantities will be adjusted in addendum no. 3

Question Submitted: 11/20/2009

Question Number: 23

Would ODOT please consider extending the bid date until the December 16th letting, since you as owner are obviously not responding in a timely manner to detailed questions on this DESIGN-BUILD project? ODOT needs to be responsive to the information/data needs of the design consultants, plus give the contractors time to submit a properly scoped bid. We are two weeks away from the bid date with a major holiday inbetween, while no questions have been addressed as of 9:00 am on 11/20/2009.

We will take this question under consideration but at this time we are keeping the 12/4/09 sale date.

Question Submitted: 11/23/2009

Question Number: 24

Near the westbound rest area, there is some chain link fence that separates the "Jamboree In The Hills" property from the ODOT right of way. Our question is, is this ODOT right of way fence that needs to be removed and replaced in this project, or does this fence belong to "Jamboree In The Hills"?

The chain link fence that borders the Jamboree In The Hills property is ODOT Right of Way fence. It will need to be replaced with chain link fence.

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: 11/23/2009

Question Number: 25

Answers to several pre bid questions are stating that the DBT's will stabilize the existing shoulders in accordance with SOS 13.3. SOS section 13 is for MOT only. Is it ODOT's intent to stabilize the existing shoulders for MOT only? Reason being is that prior to placing the white topping, 5" of the existing asphalt needs to be milled off of the existing roadway surface, this includes the shoulders that were stabilized and replaced with asphalt for MOT purposes from previous phases. After this 5" of asphalt is milled from the temporary pavement it is no longer designed per SOS 13.3. Bi directional and contra flow traffic schemes would allow for some of the existing shoulders to be white topped prior to utilizing the shoulder for temporary traffic. In these areas where traffic will not be placed until after it has received the white topping operation can the reconstruction of the shoulders to carry loadings based upon the current traffic data be waived?

As per Section 13.3 of the Scope of Services, the pavement build up for shoulders that carry traffic during any MOT scheme must be designed to carry the current traffic loadings.

Question Submitted: 11/24/2009

Question Number: 26

Question 1: It appears based on preliminary calculations that it will be difficult to connect into the existing transverse storm pipes at the inside of existing shoulders when the existing median is converted to a single swale to meet current design requirements. The proposed catch basins in the median ditch will be deeper than the existing catch basins. Therefore, the proposed transverse storm pipes in the median would be lower than the existing storm pipes that are under mainline pavement. Preliminary calculations took into consideration the previous and proposed increases in mainline profile, various median foreslopes (between 8:1 and 24:1), and maintaining 1' clearance between the design year storm depth and the proposed edge of pavement. Should consideration be given towards replacing the transverse storm pipes under pavement? Question 2: SOS Section 14.5 states that the DBE shall design and replace all median drainage, down slope pipes and underdrains. Is ODOT going to issue an addendum that changes the requirement of SOS Section 14.5 to leave the existing transverse storm pipes in place under the mainline pavement?

1. Section 14.5 specifies what drainage items have to be replaced. The DBT will have to determine if their design requires additional drainage items to be replaced. 2. No.

Question Submitted: 11/24/2009

Question Number: 27

Section 13.3 states that the shoulders will require stabilization. In order to perform any type of chemical (lime or cement) stabilization, traffic would need to be moved onto a different shoulder, which will not work because said shoulder will not have been reconstructed to carry the MOT. The project is not constructible if lime or cement stabilization is required. Please clarify that this will be eliminated from the scope or services or provide details as to how the contractor shall accomplish this work.

Section 13.3 requires the DBT to design and reconstruct the shoulders, and to stabilize, as necessary, as per the requirements of GB-1. Refer to this section. Section 13.3 requires the DBT to design and reconstruct the shoulders, and to stabilize, as necessary, as per the requirements of GB-1. Refer to this section.

Question Submitted: 11/24/2009

Question Number: 28

As of 5:00 p.m. on 11/24/09, no official addendum has been released which answers the numerous outstanding prebid questions on this project. The answers on the ODOT Q&A website are not official; and until they are, we cannot complete our design and bid the project. At this point, there is not enough time with the holiday for this to occur even if the addendum is released tomorrow, therefore we request that the project be delayed by two weeks.

ODOT will only issue an addendum when the Department determines that the bid documents require clarification. If ODOT determines that the bid documents are clear, an addendum will not be issued. For all other questions, a response will be provided in due course.

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: 11/24/2009

Question Number: 29

1.) Is guardrail replacement necessary for the existing guardrail protecting the truck parking stalls at the rest areas?2.) Should a 2' wide by an average 2" thick layer of compacted aggregate be provided to back up the pavement drop off edges where the proposed pavement will be elevated 5" above the existing grade or can embankment be utilized?3.) ODOT's response to the prebid question number 6 posted on 11/10/09 at 9:31 AM indicates the requirement to correct the entrance ramp acceleration lanes to meet current design criteria. Figures 503-2a and 503-2c of the L&D Volume One state the acceleration lane taper shall be 1250' @ 50:1 taper. Based on the original construction plans, the existing acceleration lanes were constructed 1200' @ 48:1 taper rate. This would require widening throughout the length of the acceleration lane(1' maximum width located 1200' from the start of the taper). Additionally, ODOT's response to the pre-bid question posted on 11/13/09 at 2:11 PM indicates the State's preference to NOT utilize sliver fills and its acceptance of 1.5:1 or flatter slopes from the graded shoulder into the existing foreslope. Also, please note the presence of multiple existing culverts located over the length of these acceleration lane tapers and the wetland (W5) at the end of the Ramp B acceleration lane taper based on the Ecological Survey Report supplied as Attachment B. Given these responses and existing conditions, how should the DBT grade the shoulder without the use of sliver fills especially when the scope requires the 5" increase in profile grade by means of the concrete pavement overlay and widening due to the ramp acceleration?4.) Given ODOT's acceptance of 1.5:1 or flatter slopes from the graded shoulder into the existing foreslope, will benching then be required along the hillside and has soil analysis been performed to substantiate the acceptance of the 1.5:1 slopes?5.) Please confirm that asphalt wedges can be utilized to transition the profile grade at all project limits?6.) To correct the deficient super elevation for 70 mph design speed through the 2,370 linear foot mainline IR 70 curve No. 3 where the existing pavement is normally crowned, can the DBT suspend the 5" planing of the existing asphalt on the high side to reduce the amount of leveling required? If permitted, the amount of required leveling would be greatly reduced. Regardless of the State's preference, what material shall the DBT use to correct the super elevation from the existing normal crown to 0.036: would item 442 - Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course 9.5mm Type A (448) be used in such a thick wedge of leveling? Would the State agree that the effort and cost associated with grinding off the existing asphalt concrete to only then replace with new asphalt concrete would be an expense not necessary?7.) Pleadse confirm that shoulders where MOT traffic and/or construction traffic will travel on will be treated as per the Scope of Services Section 13.3.8.) Pleadse confirm that shoulders where MOT traffic and/or construction traffic will NOT travel on will be treated as per the Scope of Services Section 14.3.9.) ODOT's response to the pre-bid question posted on 11/19/09 at 8:15 AM requires the DBT to design the median to meet current standards. Volume 1 of the L&D, specifically section 304.3.1, indicates that medians in rural areas are NORMALLY depressed to a swale in the center, therefore is the DBT required to construct the median to match the 60' median typical section provided on figure 304-1E thus requiring the removal of the entire median "hump" over the five mile length of the project?

1. Design as per current standards.2. Design as per current standards.3. The DBT is restricted from using sliver fills on this project. Design accordingly. 4. Design as per the requirements of GB-1. No. Soils analysis would be the responsibility of the DBT.5. This is not a question. Refer to the Scope and prebid questions.6. Design as per Section 14.3 and 14.4 of the Scope of Services.7. This is not a question. 8. This is not a question.9. Design as per the standards.

Question Submitted: 11/24/2009

Question Number: 30

This project will have an EDA > 5 acres, therefore Post Construction BMP's are required per L&D Volume 2, Section 1115.2. The most logical BMP would be vegetated biofilters. A vegetated biofilter could be constructed in the median and treat the sheet flow from the inside lanes and shoulders in a normal section. Will the outside lanes and shoulders in a normal section need treated to satisfy post construction BMP requirements? If so, would the outside existing roadway ditches have to be re-designed to meet current vegetated biofilter design standards?

ANSWER: The DBT's project design will determine the extent and type of BMP's required, therefore, the DBT will need to design the BMP's to meet current standards.

Question Submitted: 11/24/2009

Question Number: 31

A question was asked on 11/19/09 regarding the limits of replacement of median drains and slope drains. The answer is that it is not the intent to replace transverse drainage structures under the I-70 pavement, only the pipe that is beyond the pavement, the median drains and the slope drains. The majority of the drains under the I-70 pavement that drain the median to the slopes are undersized per current standards and a number of them are plugged/filled with debris. Transverse drainage structures are generally thought to be the large diameter culverts that run completely under the interstate to drain creeks, etc., not the small diameter median drainage to slope drains. Please clarify the intent here. Are the small, undersize median pipes under I-70 that connect median cb's to the slope drains to remain in place and new slope drains connected to them, or are they to be replaced in addition to the median drainage and slope drains?

Section 14.5 specifies what drainage items have to be replaced. Refer to this section.

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: 11/25/2009

Question Number: 32

Question 1: Are changes to the Item 451 specifications for slip form concrete pavers with dowel bars inserters per the IOC Dated September 2, 2009 from The Division of Construction Management a requirement of this project? Question 2: This is a request for copies of any bridge overlay plans and signing replacement plans from previous projects on this section of I-70. The plan sets that are currently posted on ODOT's website do not include either of these upgrades. In the case of signing the existing signing plans for the project length have not been posted. Can ODOT please post these plans?

1. Refer to CMS or Supplemental Specification 800, dated 10-16-09, for the requirements for this item. 2. All existing plans are now on the FTP site.

Question Submitted: 11/25/2009

Question Number: 33

The required outside shoulder width is unclear in the scope. Does the Department want a 12' treated shoulder with a 2' offset? Please do not simply refer us back to the scope. If the scope was clear, we would not need to ask the question.

Section 14.6 of the Scope of Services states that a design exception was approved for the graded shoulder width and this approved design exception report was provided as Attachment E.

Question Submitted: 11/25/2009

Question Number: 34

Does temporary pavement placed in the median need to be completely removed at the end of the project? Can it be left in place for future use by ODOT? Does it need to be covered with dirt and seeded?

The temporary pavement placed in the median will need to be completely removed at the end of the project. The area will need to be restored to its original condition.

Question Submitted: 11/25/2009

Question Number: 35

On page 17 of the scope it states "All detour routes shall be provided by the Department and signed by the Contractor. The designated local detour shall also be provided by the Department." Please give us the detour route so we can bid the detour signing appropriately.

The detour and designated local detour routing for the westbound entrance ramp closure at IR70 and SR 149 will be SR 149 north to US 40, west on US 40 back to IR70. The detour and designated local detour routing for the eastbound exit ramp closure at IR70 and SR 149 will be IR 70 to Exit No. 204, then US 40 eastbound to SR 149.

Question Submitted: 11/25/2009

Question Number: 36

Resubmission of questions that you haven't properly addressed. From 11/12/2009: Please advise if there are record plans for the ramp widenings at the existing rest areas. The record plans do not show the widening. Please clarify your intent since there are no design drawings concerning the added shoulder parking areas. What are we as a bidding DBT responsible for? Your scope as written and your reference to SOS Section 1.2 paragraph 3 is severely inadequate. From 11/10/2009: Will ODOT require that entrance ramp acceleration lanes be upgraded to meet current L&D requirements? The current ramps do not meet current design standards. - Your response of "design to current standards" doesn't address the issues. We are assuming that since the project is purely an overlay job that a design exception will need to be prepared so that additional right of way and environmental issues can be ignored within the confines of the scope of this project. Will a design exception in accordance with SOS 14.6 be granted for this work or is this something we have to take a guess on ??? Please clarify and amend your response. 3. We want to side with the other DBT's that this job needs to be delayed 2 weeks due to the lack of timely responses by ODOT. Considering the major holiday (for all parties including the owner agency) please act quickly on this request.

A1: See addendum. A3: We will take this question under consideration but at this time we are keeping the 12/9/09 sale date.

Question Submitted: 11/25/2009

Question Number: 37

1. Are the tolerances in regards to dowel bar placement for dowel bar inserters to be as stated in BP-2.2 of the Standard Roadway Construction Drawings? 2. If not, what is the allowable tolerance for vertical and horizontal misalignment, side shift, depth and X-Position? 3. If dowel bar inserters are used who will verify the tolerances required? 4. Will verification of tolerances be required in the QC/QA by the contractor?

Questions 1, 2, 3, & 4: Design as per Standard Construction Drawing BP-2.2

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: 11/30/2009

Question Number: 38

On Wednesday 11/25 this project was delayed by 5 days (from 12/04 to 12/09). Today is 11/30 and we still have not received an addendum which answers all outstanding questions. The 5 day delay to the bid date has been eaten up and we still have no official response from the Department. The pre-bid Q&A .pdf file cannot be used to start designing and bidding the project because ODOT has been changing answers on this site after they are initially posted (see question submitted on 11/20/2009 at 4:47:08 PM). We need real answers to all questions released in an official addendum. Answers that simply refer us back to the scope generate additional questions because the scope is unclear enough to warrant a question in the first place. At this point, we don't even have a scope for the bridge work (see same prebid question referenced above). We request that this project be delayed in order for the Department to release a meaningful addendum, allow the Consultants time to design the project, and allow the Contractors time to bid the project. There simply is not enough time left for this to occur since the first bid date delay has been wasted.

We will take this question under consideration but at this time we are keeping the 12/9/09 sale date.

Question Submitted: 11/5/2009

Question Number: 39

There is no bid item for Temporary Roads on this project. This is a big dollar amount on this project, under what bid item should these costs be placed? In section 13.2 of the Scope of Services a barrier offset of 2 feet is required, is a bridge parapet considered a barrier? Please further clarify what you define as a "barrier". There are no noisewalls required on this project, why is section 15.4 in the Scope of Services? In the Scope of Services section 16.40, the Section (A) box is not check yes or no. Which one should be checked?

1. Temporary roads shall be included in Item 614E99000 SPECIAL- MAINTAINING TRAFFIC, LUMP SUM2. Bridge parapet, portable concrete barrier, guardrail - all are considered "barrier"3. No noise wall barriers are required.4. See addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 40

Section 13.3 of the SOS states that any existing shoulder or any shoulder adjacent to any existing lane that will be used to carry traffic shall be reconstructed and that these areas will require stabilization. Section 14.3 states that the DBT shall investigate the need for stabilization for areas subjected to construction traffic. 1. At some point, all shoulders will either carry traffic or be adjacent to a lane carrying traffic, regardless of the MOT scheme. Is it ODOT's intent to reconstruct all mainline shoulders? 2. Is stabilization a requirement or shall the DBT investigate the need for it?

1. Yes, See addendum 1.2. See addendum 1; Section 14.3, Paragraph 2 has been removed. Refer to Section 13.3, paragraph 1.

Question Submitted: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 41

Is soil boring information available for the EB rest area pavement reconstruction area? If not, shall the DBT's interpolate this information from the closest applicable roadway borings? There is not time for all DBT's to perform their own investigations prior to the bid.

No soil data is available.

Question Submitted: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 42

Can Township Road 260 be closed to traffic and detoured for periods of bridge construction? If not, what are the MOT restrictions?

No. See addendum 1

Question Submitted: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 43

What are the MOT restrictions on SR 149? At least one lane of traffic will need to be closed to reconstruct the pier caps.

See addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 44

What is the intent of the temporary traffic signals in section 13.3 of the SOS? These ramps are not currently signalized.

See section 13.3 of Scope of Services.

Question Submitted: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 45

We request that contingency bid items be established for potential undercutting and subgrade treatment in order to provide for a fair bidding environment. There is no way for the DBT's to establish these quantities prior to the bid.

Stabilization requirements have been defined in the scope of services. Quantities will vary based on the DBT's plan of operation and final design.

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: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 46

We request that contingency quantities be established for potential joint repairs to the existing concrete base pavement in order to provide a fair and level bid between contractors.

No joint repairs are required. See addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 47

What are the vertical clearance requirements for the I-70 bridges over SR 149 and Township Road 260?

See addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 11/9/2009

Question Number: 48

What are the dates for Jamboree in the Hills for both the 2010 and 2011 construction seasons? This information needs to be known in order to prepare detailed prebid schedules.

The dates for Jamboree in the Hills for 2010 are July 15-18 and the approximate dates for 2011 are July 14-17. These dates need to be confirmed with the Jamboree in the Hills organization by the DBT. See addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 12/1/2009

Question Number: 49

Per specification 614.11 the department will compensate for replacement of worn work zone pavement markings after 120 calendar days under traffic. Will ODOT pay for this by force account?

All work zone pavement markings and any re-applications that may be necessary are included for payment under Item 614E99000 - Maintaining Traffic. Refer to Section 8.1 of the Scope of Services.

Question Submitted: 12/1/2009

Question Number: 50

1.) Should shoulders where MOT traffic and/or construction traffic will travel on be treated as per scope of services section 13.3?2.) Should shoulders where MOT traffic and/or construction traffic will NOT travel on be treated as per scope of services section 14.3?

1. Yes 2. Read to Section 13.3.

Question Submitted: 12/2/2009

Question Number: 51

There are no bid items for the substructure work on the mainline bridges. Please clarify where these costs are to be included.

See Addendum for new bid items and description of substructure work. See Addendum for new bid items and description of substructure work.

Question Submitted: 12/2/2009

Question Number: 52

Due to the massive amount of earthwork required for this project, we request that the Department add a bid item since no current bid items appear to include excavation or embankment.

See Addendum for new bid item for earthwork

Question Submitted: 12/4/2009

Question Number: 53

RE: FUEL PRICE ADJUSTMENTS. The project proposal contains PN520 Fuel Price Adjustment, intended to minimize risk to the contractor due to fuel price fluctuations that may occur. The fuel price adjustment calculation is based upon the sum of quantities of completed and accepted work for specified items. Since the contract for this project is of the design-build method, the majority of items of work are paid as lump sum rather than a specific unit of measure. Please verify that the fuel adjustments for this project will be based upon the quantities provided by the contractor's design consultant in the general summary of the approved construction plans.

Yes, the fuel adjustments for this project will be based upon the quantities provided by the contractor's design consultant in the general summary of the approved construction plans.

Question Submitted: 12/4/2009

Question Number: 54

RE: FUEL PRICE ADJUSTMENT ITEMS. The project proposal contains PN520 Fuel Price Adjustment, intended to minimize risk to the contractor due to fuel price fluctuations that may occur. However PN520 does not include item 888 Portland Cement Concrete Pavement which will represent the most significant item of work on this project. Please include item 888 Portland Cement Concrete Pavement in the list of items that are eligible for fuel price adjustments for this project.

See 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: 12/4/2009

Question Number: 55

We just received Addendum #4, which states under Section 14.9 that we are to replace the existing chain link fence around the east bound rest area. We are unaware of any existing chain link at the east bound rest area, but know that there is some at the west bound. Did the Addendum mean to say west bound?

The chainlink fence that needs to be replaced is along the WESTBOUND rest area. See Addendum for the correction to Section 14.9.

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.