

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 160102

Sale Date - 3/1/2016

BEL-80599 - IR 70-14.24

Question Submitted: 2/25/2016 3:27:00 PM

There are several bid items that have QC concrete but do not specify "With QC/QA". This includes substructure concrete, approach slabs and railing (concrete parapet). Please clarify if ODOT wants contractor tested "With QC/QA" concrete for the following references. REF 389,390,394,407,408,425,437, 438, 455

All items for concrete are correct as called out in plan.

Question Submitted: 2/25/2016 3:17:32 PM

Line item 0287 "CONTROLLER UNIT, TYPE 2070E, WITH CABINET, TYPE 332L, AS PER PLAN" is stated in the plan notes to be a Siemens Model 2070E. However, the intent of the 2070E controller is to utilize open standards allowing any manufacturer to quote an equal controller. There are multiple manufacturers that have 2070E controllers listed on ODOT's QPL that have been tested to work with Siemens software. In addition, the project specs state that this controller is to be supplied without traffic software. For these reasons, will ODOT allow a 2070E controller other than Siemens if it has been tested by ODOT and approved to work with Siemens software and is on ODOT's OTE approved list?

ODOT will NOT accept a controller other than a Seimens Model compliant to the OTE approved list. ODOT District 11 has proprietary approval for Seimens 2070 traffic signal controllers on all ODOT-maintained projects as of August 14, 2015.

Question Submitted: 2/25/2016 3:00:04 PM

Item 59: Paved Gutter, Type I-2, located on US-40 from Sta. 131+58 to Sta. 134+41, appears to be understated. Please verify the quantity is correct.

The quantity will be revised by addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/25/2016 9:11:43 AM

Plan sheet 500 detail for steel pipe encasement detail note E calls for leaving annular space open between casing pipe and carrier pipe and refers to carrier pipe being of metallic material with cathodic protection or unless otherwise noted. The carrier pipe on this project is PVC. Does this annular space needed to be grouted?

Question Submitted: 2/24/2016 4:56:52 PM

Plan sheet 498 shows thrust block details for waterline fittings. Plan sheet 501 note regarding item 638 refers to sanitary force mains being built to 638 specifications. Will thrust blocks be required at sanitary force main bends?

Yes, the sanitary force mains will require thrust blocking.

Question Submitted: 2/24/2016 2:13:51 PM

For reference number 129 - Manhole Reconstruction to Grade, will the contractor be required to replace the riser sections down to spring line or to the elevation at which the new pipe ties into it?

The intent of the plan is to reconstruct the manhole to be at the proposed grade. The risers will not need to be replaced down to the elevation of the new pipe.

Question Submitted: 2/24/2016 1:32:25 PM

Note on Plan sheet 454/743 regarding 840 Foundation Preparation, APP says that granular material, type C shall be 3'-0" deep as shown in the plans and placed as outlined in SS840. Bid item 333 is for Granular Material, Type C. Please clarify payment for this work.

The payment for the Granular Material Type C should be included in Item 840 Foundation Preparation, As Per Plan. The pay item for Item 203 Granular Material Type C will be removed by addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/24/2016 1:30:45 PM

MSE Wall Concrete Coping, APP says that PEJF between coping and barrier shall be included in the unit bid price per foot for this item. There is a bid item for 1" Preformed Expansion Joint Filler. Please clarify payment for this work.

The payment for the 1" PEJF is to be separate from the Concrete Coping APP. The note on sheet 454 will be updated by addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/24/2016 12:47:03 PM

MSE Walls 3&4 do not have a pay item for SGB Inspection and Compaction Testing. Will this work be required? If so, please add a bid item.

A quantity will be added by addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/24/2016 10:56:00 AM

Plan sheet 500 shows a detail for steel pipe encasement. There are several bid items on the waterline and sanitary items that require casing pipes with carrier pipes threaded through. Casing insulators for the carrier pipe are to be located "per the manufacturers recommendation" for which the manufacturer/distributor isn't going to likely want to be responsible for. Given all the different diameters of carrier pipes and casing pipes for both the water and sanitary items, please provide standards for these so the contractor has something less arbitrary to base their costs on.

No additional details will be provided. As stated in the note please refer to the manufacturers recommendations.

Question Submitted: 2/23/2016 3:29:40 PM

Plan sheet 501 has a note directing the contractor to construct and maintain temporary bypass sanitary sewers to provide continuous flow. Can ODOT please provide existing sanitary sewer and forcemain information from the utility owner, including existing as-built plans, flows, etc. of existing lines?

Very limited information is available from the utility owner. No information is available at this time. Any information that becomes available will be provided at the pre-construction meeting.

Question Submitted: 2/23/2016 9:15:43 AM

Plan Sheet 451/743 shows an Estimated Quantity of 1400 cy of Embankment APP (Bioretention Cell). This Bid item does not exist. Please add a bid item for it.

The quantities will be added by addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/23/2016 9:14:30 AM

Plan Sheet 451/743 shows an Estimated Quantity of 1400 cy of Excavation APP. (Bioretention Cell). This quantity was not carried to a bid item. Please either add a bid item for it or add it to Bid item 25.

The quantities will be added by addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 4:45:50 PM

Based on a field observation, it appears there is asphalt on the approach slabs but not the bridge deck of existing Bridge BEL-331-1529). The bid quantity in Ref 370 appears to be over stated. Does the bid qty need to be adjusted?

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 3:18:55 PM

As a follow up to a previous answer: Please clarify the note on sheet 29 regarding the wingwalls or headwalls for 611 items. Are precast wingwalls and headwalls only allowed if concrete pipe is used? ODOT's answer: This note only pertains to wingwalls or headwalls that are paid for using Item 511 Concrete. This item is only used on concrete pipe in this plan. Nothing in the plans specify that the pipe has to be concrete. The pipe shown on sheet 435 is not called out as 706.02. The pipe shown on sheet 446 is spec'd as 707.01. Will precast wingwalls and full-height headwalls be allowed in lieu of cast-in place wingwalls and headwalls throughout the job regardless of pipe type?

Precast wingwalls and headwalls will be allowed in lieu of item 511 Concrete Wingwalls and Headwalls regardless of pipe type.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 2:03:43 PM

Following up with the answer to pre-bid question submitted 2/22/2016 8:05:14 AM regarding bridge backfill. Since properly compacted embankment is sufficient for the fill, will 203 embankment be used for backfilling the Unclassified Excavation and Rock Excavation, APP in lieu of 203 granular type B as required in CMS 503.08? The majority of the abutment will have select granular backfill to build the temporary wire faced mse walls so the abutments will have a combination of fill materials.

The limits of the unclassified excavation backfill should follow CMS 503.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 1:41:02 PM

Bid item 148 Pressure Relief Joint Type A - 112 LF covers what is needed for SR 331 at the ends of the bridge approach slabs. The pavement makeup on mainline I-70 at Bridges BEL-70-1428 L/R is concrete pavement base and asphalt on top. The plan view drawing (sheet 636/743) for the bridges appear to show sleeper slabs. Should the quantity for Bid item 148 be increased to include Pressure Relief Joint Type A for these two bridges also?

The quantity will be revised added by addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 1:30:52 PM

The Note under Item 517 Railing on plan sheet 599/743 states that the sidewalk is also included in the 517 railing bid item. This has not been ODOT standard practice. Should this be revised to make the sidewalk concrete quantity included in the bridge deck concrete bid item or is it truly ODOT'S intent to make it incidental to the Railing Bid item?

Bid as per the plan.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 1:30:02 PM

Please clarify the note on sheet 29 regarding the wingwalls or headwalls for 611 items. Are precast wingwalls and headwalls only allowed if concrete pipe is used?

This note only pertains to wingwalls or headwalls that are paid for using Item 511 Concrete. This item is only used on concrete pipe in this plan.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 12:17:26 PM

On page 639 in addendum #1, The quantities and description for the 516, elastomeric bearings were changed from the original plans, however there is not a detail page supporting this change. Can you please clarify?

Sheet 639 will be revised in a forthcoming addendum to reflect no change to the 516 items.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 11:26:57 AM

Are all impact attenuators on the project intended to be bidirectional? There seems to be approximately 25 out of the 73 that can be unidirectional due to a large clear distance from the opposing traffic. Please advise.

The intent of the plan is that all Impact Attenuators are to be bidirectional.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 9:21:52 AM

With the project bidding on 3/1 the Contract and Notice to proceed on the project will probably not happen until 4/1/16 or after that date. The Indiana bat Note states that Clearing may not happen from 4/1 - 9/30 which delays the schedule on the project right away in Phase 1 areas that require clearing and grubbing. Can ODOT cut down the potential bat roosting trees so the project is not delayed in these areas until 9/30?

Tree clearing will be the responsibility of the Contractor.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 8:37:34 AM

The cross sections indicate specific dimensions for proposed benching of the embankment foundations. There is about 1,500 cy of benching that is shown on the cross sections, but not quantified. We understand that the CMS 203.05 calls for benching of all sloped embankment areas and that will not specifically be paid for. However, where the cross sections show more extensive benching excavation, this is typically quantified and paid for by the department on most, if not all other projects. Will the department adjust the quantity of excavation and embankment for this work?

On all cross section sheets where special benching is shown there is a note in the top left corner that states the estimated volume and notes that it is NOT included in the earthwork quantities, This is an interpretation of the benching required based on ODOT guidelines (GB2). The intent is that the CMS 203.05 is met and the benching shown is only to help estimate this quantity.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 8:36:38 AM

The plan note titled ITEM 204 – EXCAVATE AND REPLACE on sheet 31/743 contradicts itself. The first paragraph states that the undercuts are to be excavated and backfilled prior to proof roll. The fourth paragraph states that the limits and depths of the undercuts are to be determined in the field by the project engineer after proof roll. Which is it? If we are to follow the first paragraph, we know that the entire quantity will be used and we can plan for productivity. If we are to follow the fourth paragraph we need to account for the possibility of small quantities of work in scattered locations that is a much different situation than the other. How will the undercut limits and depth be determined?

The locations given in the ITEM 204 EXCAVATE AND REPLACE note on sheet 30 are to be excavated and replaced based on the limits and depths provided before proof rolling.

After proof rolling and inspection by the engineer, it will be determined if the limits estimated in these areas were enough or if and additional excavation and replacement is needed.

Please refer to the note on sheet 30 which describes the work required.

Question Submitted: 2/22/2016 8:05:14 AM

Due to the location of the new abutments of bridge BEL-331-1529, there is embankment required behind the abutments. Typically, we see granular behind the abutments under the approach slabs in order to provide good compaction for the approaches. Will granular be required and if so, where will it be paid?

The full limits of the approach embankment will not require granular material. Properly compacted embankment material will provide sufficient support for the approach slab as minimal settlements are anticipated due to the shallow bedrock. The standard aggregate base will be required under the approach slab and is paid for with the roadway quantities.

Question Submitted: 2/19/2016 8:21:31 AM

Can the department please provide the Office Calcs for Structure BEL-70-1428L/R, only the calculations for Structure BEL-331-1529 were included on the ftp site.

The calculations are now on the FTP Site.

Question Submitted: 2/19/2016 8:20:36 AM

The intermediate crossframe detail shown on Sht 652/743 for Br. 1428 shows the 5/8" Filler Plate welded to the diagonal crossframe angles in the field. Can this be shop welded by the fabricator to one of the crossframe angles? The detail also shows the welds between the crossframe angles and the stiffener plates to be overhead welds along the bottom side of each angle and no weld along the top side of the angle. Can this fillet weld be moved to the top size of the angle? This would eliminate an area that could trap water and make the weld detail more consistent with this style of crossframes.

The filler plate can be shop welded by the fabricator to one of the crossframe angles.

In the Intermediate Crossframe Detail on Sheet 652/743, it is permissible for the fillet weld to be moved to the top side of the angle(s) to avoid welding in the overhead position.

Question Submitted: 2/18/2016 8:57:27 AM

The pavement calculations provided for Ramp I from Sta. 773+56.40 to Sta. 780+79.59 use a width of 33' to calculate the area. According to the plans, the width is 25'. Please revised the quantity for 12" Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement with the correct area for Ramp I.

The quantities will be revised by addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/17/2016 10:28:00 AM

The sanitary sewer casing pipes shown on sheets 489 and 497 are called out to be bored. (reference 190). Being that both of these bores are in the same location as the existing sewer line makes boring impossible. Please change these to open cut casings or relocate the sewer line to allow boring.

The sanitary line on sheet 489 is to be placed using an open cut as indicated on sheet 489. The pay item will be changed by addendum.

The intent of the plan is to place the sanitary line on sheet 497 as close to the existing line as possible by boring and jacking. The exact alignment/location will be determined once the existing line is marked and located in the field. No plans changes are will be made at this time.

Question Submitted: 2/15/2016 10:19:20 AM

Plan sheets 209, 210, and 243 indicate the installation of Curb, Type 6, around the perimeter of the 6" Concrete Traffic Islands. The quantity of Curb, Type 6, does not include curb around the islands in its entirety. If it is the intent to install curb around the perimeter of the islands, how will the curb be paid?

The curb along the roadway side of the Traffic Islands is included in the roadway curbing quantity. The curb around the remainder of the perimeter of the Traffic Island is included in the cost of the 6" Traffic Island.

Question Submitted: 2/15/2016 10:07:19 AM

Will all 7 Girder Lines be able to be erected in a single phase? Page 6 of 38 shows two separate phases? Please Advise

The girder lines are being built in two separate phases due to the fact that the abutment is being built in two phases because of the close proximity of the existing structure.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2016 3:28:00 PM

1. The subtotals on the bottom of the page for the underdrains quantities (pg 184 & 185) do not summarize correctly.2. Sheet 419 depicts underdrains on Commercial Drive, however there is no quantity setup for this. Are underdrains required on Commercial Drive?

The totals shown in the plan on sheets 184 & 185 are incorrect. Corrected sheets will be issued by addendum. The intent of the plan is that no underdrains are to be placed along the commercial drive. The plan and typical sections will be updated by addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/3/2016 3:06:47 PM

Ref 227 Light pole, conventional, AT-16. Please clarify light pole design requirement as it pertains to HL 10.11.

This item is for the school flasher assembly. It consist of a 16' pole with an Aluminum Transformer Base. No arm or post top are needed. The item description is correct.

Question Submitted: 1/25/2016 9:58:21 AM

There is no bid item set up for clearing and grubbing, which is required by the plans.

The bid item will be added by addendum