

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 090171

Sale Date - 4/22/2009

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 1

After reviewing the typical sections on page 7, it is unclear what is expected in the rubblized areas. The existing section shown for I-75 on page 11 illustrates 6" of asphalt across the entire width of the pavement. In the traveled lane areas 10" of concrete pavement is shown under the 6" asphalt. This concrete is 36' wide. The pavement calcs show the pavement planning to be 36' wide in the rubblized areas. On page 7 in the legend, bubble 22 states the pavement planning is 1.5" deep. What is the 1.5" planning in these areas for? How is the removal of the 6" asphalt on top of the concrete paid for. In the shoulder areas 3" bituminous base is shown under the 6" asphalt. The combined shoulder width for the inside and outside shoulder is 15' wide as shown on page 11. The pavement calcs show a width of 16' wide pavement removal in the rubblized areas. Since the rubblized concrete is 36' wide, this would leave both the inside and outside shoulders to be removed. The typical on page 7 shows only removing the inside shoulder and leaving the outside shoulder. Will both the inside and outside shoulders be completely removed as shown in the pavement calcs, or should the quantity be adjusted and only the inside shoulder be removed as shown on page 7? Also, if the 6" of asphalt is removed off the traveled lanes, shouldn't the same amount be removed from the shoulders to match the elevation and have a consistent pavement section? Will the 2" temporary asphalt placed on the northbound outside shoulder need to be removed or can the new asphalt be placed directly on top of it as shown on the typical on page 7?

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 2

On page 381 of the removal quantities, under item "Special fill and plug existing conduit", there are 3 separate quantities shown. The first is 259.5 ft. The quantity does not have a ref or sheet number associated with it on the left hand side of the sheet. What reference no. and sheet no. is this quantity attached to? The next 2 quantities, 100.2 lf and 321 lf are on the same line as Ref number R8 and R9 respectively. Looking at page 1201 R8 and R9 are pointing at existing curb. Should these 2 quantities be associated to a different ref # on page 1201?

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 3

Addendum #3 fails to answer our question concerning the removal of the existing asphalt on the concrete pavement area of the Rubblized Section. How is it paid for?

Addendum #4 added Ref 1303 and a note.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 4

The Rubblized Sections shown on page 7 & 8 of 2346 are incorrectly drawn for the outside shoulder. "Bubble A" is shown as being below the top surface of the existing concrete pavement, when in fact the depiction shown in the top right corner of page 11 of 2346 is the correct typical. We believe that the intent is to remove all the existing overlay asphalt (Bubble A) down to the level of the existing concrete – including in the outside shoulder area. If so, how is the existing asphalt removal paid for. The only pavement planning item shown in the typical is "Bubble-22" which shows 1 1/2" of removal. Is it your intention to reduce the thickness of the 302 placed in the shoulder area by the existing thickness minus 1 1/2" or approximately 4 1/2"?

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 5

Is the proposed "Temp Pavement for Maintaining Traffic , Class A, as per plan" shown on page 41 of 2346 to be removed beyond the edge of the proposed 12' shoulder. And is the portion within the proposed 12' shoulder to be left in place as permanent pavement base?

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 6

The existing gas line shown along proposed Ramp E, appears to be in conflict with the 2 arch culverts at approx Sta. 208+75. If the existing cannot be taken from service until June 1st, construction cannot start until that date. This may not allow enough time to complete the installation and backfill at the structures by July 31st, when the rough graded ramp is be ready for the gas company.

This has been looked at by District Construction personnel and we feel that there is enough work in this area that the contractor will not be held up due to this gas line. There is a retaining wall that needs to go in along with alot of dirt work. The Gas line can be taken out of service around the beginning of May. This gives the contractor 2 month at this area. The contractor can work on this ramp in other area that are not effected by the gas line as soon as a signed contract is obtained.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 7

Will the concrete inspection and testing for the 12" portland cement concrete pavement be performed per supplemental specification 888?

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: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 8

ODOT Project 171(09) WAR IR 75Page 364/2346 - Pavement Sub-Summary - Contains "Note: All Items Have Been Generated From Office Calculations". Can we get a copy of the design engineer's office calculation?

The pavement calculations are at the following site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/BUT-10754/>

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 9

ODOT 171(09) WAR I-75 – Please clarify the difference between the office calculations, 98,603.39 SY, for 254 Pavement Planing Asphalt Concrete and the plan quantity, 118,976 SY, shown on page 364/2346.

Additional pavement planing was added for the shoulders in the Rubberized and Rolled sections. The existing pavement in these area's on the shoulders will be salvaged instead of full depth replacement. This was added after the plans were submitted. So the office calcs will not match. The 118,976 SY is correct.Cement Stabilization was also reduced and will not match the consultants calcs.We will also be reducing Proof Rolling by 10 hours, and cement by 1705 Tons

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 10

Addendum 6 addressed the warranty pavement issue by correctly showing it on the typical sections, but we still have three questions about this item that remain:1. Per the attached drawings from addendum 6 the typical sections reference "Item 880 12.5" Asphalt Concrete (7-Year Warranty), As Per Plan" but there was no APP note added. Please provide a description of the APP requirements.2. Item 880 as shown is still in the bid form as two separate items, both 880 and item 302. It would seem any and all portions of item 302 that are now shown in the typical as item 880 should be deleted from the bid form and the quantity added to item 880. Bid this way you will get two prices for the same item, you are somewhat dictating lift thicknesses in the upper courses, and there could be confusion on where to include the warranty bond cost required by 880.02 for the quantity being bid as item 302. Please correct.3. There was a statement made in the pre-bid question answer given on Addendum 4 that indicated that the 880 pavements would be tested, inspected and accepted according to 301 and 302 and all the requirements of 401. The 880 specification specifically references needed subsections of 401 where needed, but this addendum note adds additional requirements that are unprecedented from our perspective on a 7 year warranty pavement (and we have seen other pre-bid questions that seem to be asking this same question about the confusion this statement causes). Please remove or clarify.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 11

Sheet 1529 – Retaining Wall 1 – Measurement for payment for drilled shafts above bedrock will be the distance between the existing ground surface and the top of bedrock. The plan quantities for both drilled shaft items on Wall 1 appear to be from the bottom of wall elevation to the bottom of pile elevation as shown on sheet 1531. Since the shafts will need to be drilled from existing ground, and will be paid as such, the quantities for biditems 479 and 480 are understated. This is an issue on the other walls as well, please correct.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 12

The note on sheet 1529 for the galvanized steel soldier piles states not to field weld on the piles. The shear studs must be field welded, which requires blasting and cleaning of the galvanizing on the weld area. Please remove the requirement that the piles be galvanized. This is an issue on the other walls as well, please correct.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 13

An answer provided in Adden #4 regarding Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, APP, Pavement Wedging (Sheet 41 of the plans), stated this is to be paid under Reference 434 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, APP. Upon review of that bid item, there are notes that the surface and intermediate are to be installed under the Warranty Specification and this pavement is to remain in place. It would not seem either note is applicable to the wedging. Furthermore, it does not appear the quantity for this wedging is included in the estimated quantity for Ref 434. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 14

Could the electronic files be made available including Geopak files and the existing and proposed cross section data (.xsr)?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/WAR/>

Question Submitted: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 15

Plan page 34 under heading titled environmental notes references removal of Indiana Bat trees prior to April 15 or after September 15th. With this job scheduled to sell April 1st, it is not likely the contract will be executed until after the April 15th date. If bat trees are present the contractor will lose a big portion of the 1st years construction season by having to wait until after September 15th to remove the trees. Please advise.

All bat tree on this project, Part 1 and Part 2 have been removed.

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: 1/12/2009

Question Number: 16

Ref # 438 Portable Concrete Barrier 50", APP includes a quantity of approximately 65,000 lf for phase 4-1. Most of this wall is already in the exact right place from the previous phase. Is this quantity correct? Will 50" barrier be required in locations where traffic is not opposing each other?

Ref 438 was revised in Addendum #4.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 17

The Item Special Misc.: Consultant for Concrete Quality Control Including Testing and Inspection note on drawing 33/2346 is not clear. Supplemental Specifications 888 and 898 are referenced in paragraph 2, but not Items 451 or 452. There is no bid item for Supplemental Specification 888 in the bid pamphlet. Is the concrete pavement testing performed under Supplemental Specification 888 as indicated in paragraph 2 or Item 451? Does the balance of the Item Special note after paragraph 2 apply to structures, pavement, or all other concrete? Should paragraph 2 be deleted from the Item Special note?

Answer: The note reads that concrete testing for SS 888 and 898 will fall under that spec and not the Consultant for Concrete Testing note. Answer: Correct, This is a standard note used in many projects. Answer: Since there is no 888 in the plans the testing for pavement is for Item 451, but it is paid under Reference 85 - Special - Misc.: Consultant for concrete quality control including Testing and Inspection. Answer: Paragraph 2 should not be deleted. The balance of the note applies to all Concrete that does not fall under SS 888, SS 898. SS 884 is warranty pavement so that falls under that Supplemental Spec.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 18

Along Ramp E there is a portion of the proposed 21" sanitary sewer that will require drilling and blasting to remove the rock. Since there are several buildings including a school in this area, will the department require a preblast survey and or monitoring of any water wells if present and if so, will there be bid items added to the bid proposal for this work?

The contractor shall evaluate the subsurface conditions and proposed work. If the contractor's means and methods dictate blasting of bedrock, the contractor is responsible performing preblast survey and well monitoring. The cost to perform the additional surveys due to the proposed construction methods is incidental to the cost of the sewer installation.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 19

Can the existing bridge plans be put on an ftp site?

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 20

It appears that the barrier on top of Retaining Wall 3 is counted as both structural concrete deflector parapet and also Type D Barrier in the roadway quantities. Please clarify where this is paid for and confirm that the plan quantities are correct.

The Type D Barrier runs from Station 47+19.27 to 50+16.27. That is paid for in the roadway general summary. When this barrier gets to the approach slab for the bridge over Dicks Creek on SR. 122 it is called out as Parapet and additional steel is needed as shown in the plans. The parapet is paid for on sheet 2236. Quantities are correct.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 21

Addendum 4 states that the noisewall and barrier in front of the wall is to be constructed as detailed in the plans. Since no specific details are provided (only a simple section on sheet 2283), we are bidding to place the back of the roadway barrier as close to the front of the posts as possible with typical construction tolerances. Due to the nature of the post/panel connection, there will be a gap between the face of panel and back of barrier. This is not shown otherwise in the plans anywhere and is also not feasible because the noisewall panels are not designed to handle the loading of the wet concrete placed against them. If the Department wishes to have a specific detail included in the bid documents, please provide it by addendum.

Sufficient details have been supplied. What is proposed in this question is acceptable.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 22

We asked a prebid question on 3/20/09 regarding seeding and mulching for the noisewall. To our knowledge, this question has been ignored by ODOT. It appears that the plan quantities for the separate seeding bid items should cover the noisewalls that have planned earthwork around them. Since no seeding widths are provided on the cross sections, it is not possible to verify this. Please clarify what is to be included incidental to the noisewall, if any.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 23

Note 4 on drawing 2035 states that bolts will be ASTM 325 TYPE 3. This type of bolt generally is used with weathering steel. The steel for the moment plates is specified as ASTM A709(M) Grade 36. Is it your intent that we bid the type 3 bolts with the grade 36 steel?

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: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 24

On drainage quantity sheet 397 item 603 15" conduit, Type B 706.02, bored and jacked. On the plan sheet 456 and profile sheet 557 notations D1 show just 15" Type B. Is this run to be a casing as final structure or does it require a carrier? There is also question on what type of carrier is to be installed in the jack and bored crossings at sta 378+00 the descriptions on the summary sheet 398 do not match the plan sheet 474 descriptions. or can this be a final structure?

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 25

Regarding the Signal Support Foundation, APP (bid reference #360 and #1242) we have been unable to determine the foundation size based on the proposed signal supports. The cost of the design itself may vary pending ODOTs review. How is the contractor to determine the cost of the signal support foundations if the signal supports are not yet approved? Given the required arm lengths, the cost of the foundation installations as well as their design is a potentially significant cost that we cannot determine prior to the award of the bid. This seems an unfair burden to place on the contractor. Please advise

There are signal supports in the project that are bigger than the largest ODOT standard signal supports. We added notes in the project to have the contractor design, fabricate, and furnish the custom signal supports at the lengths and support the signal heads and signs as specified in the plans. We also made the foundations for the signal supports designed by the contractor or his signal support fabricator since we don't know the size of the support base or its loading. That is why it is an as per plan item. There has been plenty of time in the review process to work with the support fabricators to come up with an accurate bid price.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 26

Proposal Line 0085 ITEM 690E98400: Special - Concrete QC Consultant. The plan note for Consultant concrete testing indicates that the Consultant shall be pre-qualified with ODOT. What consultant pre-qualification category is required to perform the concrete QC testing work?

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 27

1. On page 129 it states PCB from stage 2 in area of crossover. On page 96 it states drums at 40' c-c along centerline. Which is correct? 2. On page 136 it shows a WZ impact attenuator on PCB2 and PCB 3 but it was not carried to subsummary on sheet 336. Are they required? 3. On page 137 it states PCB from stage 2 in area of crossover. On page 104 it states drums at 40' c-c along centerline. Which is correct? 4. On page 176 it shows PCB and WZ impact attenuators on the ramps (PCB2 and PCB3). These items are not listed on the subsummary on sheet 340. Which is correct?

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 28

1. On page 129 it states PCB from stage 2 in area of crossover. On page 96 it states drums at 40' c-c along centerline. Which is correct? 2. On page 136 it shows a WZ impact attenuator on PCB2 and PCB 3 but it was not carried to subsummary on sheet 336. Are they required? 3. On page 137 it states PCB from stage 2 in area of crossover. On page 104 it states drums at 40' c-c along centerline. Which is correct? 4. On page 176 it shows PCB and WZ impact attenuators on the ramps (PCB2 and PCB3). These items are not listed on the subsummary on sheet 340. Which is correct?

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 29

Why is item 880 7-year warranty only set-up for the top 3" of asphalt over item 302 base? This creates issues with lift thickness decisions and future warranty considerations. It would seem the project should be a warranty asphalt top to bottom, or not at all. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 30

1.) On the WAR-75-0864 Left Bridge, the existing bridge deck was replaced back in the late 1980's was there shear studs put in at that time? This will make difference how contractor will demo this structure. 2.) On WAR-75-1146 The resteel for the drill shafts are shown being paid under item 509 and not 524. Should item 524 be marked "as per plan" since the resteel is being covered by another bid item? As it stated, the contractor will have to account for the resteel in both items by spec. 3.) On WAR-75-1146 the intent is to construct the drill shafts prior to the construction of the MSE walls? You don't want drills drilling through the straps do you. The part of shaft that's above existing ground can be formed with a temporary casing or conventional forming methods above the existing grade? 4.) Ref 938 Cofferdams, Cribbs & Sheeting APP for War-75-1002L, this item was setup for MSE wire walls & soldier piles and wood lagging placement w/tie backs as by plan notes, but I can't find any of this work on this bridge, it is needed on the right structure, should this item be deleted?

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 31

(Bridge WAR 75-1146) The demo note on page 2213 of 2346 states no hoe rams can be used on this structure. This is an existing bridge that is being completely removed with the exception of the old center pier footers and only using them as base below the new pier footers. This note doesn't really apply to this type of demo procedure. Could the department review this note and allow the use of Hoe-Rams and ect. Thank You

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: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 32

1.) In addendum No 3, in item 5, the note states "that all existing vertical clearances must be maintained". Can ODOT allow the Contractor to maintain a certain minimum clearance throughout the project? For example, can the Contractor maintain the lowest vertical clearance of the existing structures that are to be worked on? The notes should really only apply to the lowest bridge clearance that the contractor will be dealing with on the project. 2.) The completion date of September 30, 2011 is not enough time to complete this project. Stage 4 can not start at best until late 2010 or early 2011. The SR 73 bridge will take all of 2010 to construct, due in part for the need for three phases just for the right structure itself and this is compounded due to the fact that no bridge work can be started until traffic control and temporary pavement are in place and that will be late summer or early fall of 2009 before any bridge construction can occur. On top of that the schedule doesn't allow any time for bridge painting in 2011 of the southbound bridges. Completion date really should be September of 2012. 3.) The interim completion date of October 31, 2009 of SR 122 Part 1 & 2 as stated on sheet 42 is not enough time construct this section of road. There is barely 5 months of construction time after a contract is awarded and preconstruction meetings and basic traffic control are set up. There is a bridge to be constructed in two phases and 3 retaining walls that need to be constructed during these phases on top of the fact that this work will need to be completed during multiple phasing sequences. ODOT really needs to take a better look at this and consider extending the interim completion date to June of 2010. There are too many steps to be completed in this phase of construction for the amount of time that has been allotted for construction.

Answer: ODOT wants the elevation to remain the same at each location. There are several exits through out this project that have a large number of truck traffic. Due to this we want to make sure that they remain the same.

Answer: Completion date to remain September 30, 2011 Answer: The time frame is tight but can be completed if Contractor concentrate workforce where needed.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 33

On pages 1920 & 2155 of 2346 note # 9 states "No portion of the connection shall be attached to the pile prior to placement". What are the reasons for this or what are the designer concerns here? This is adding addition cost to the project by making these entire connection field welded. These connections could be fabricated in a steel fabricating shop at less cost. These piles are being set to an elevation that determines the location of tie connection. Also the plans allow the contractor to use a different design as stated in note # 1. Please advise, thank you.

Note #9 in sheets 1920 and 2155 of 2346 was a procedure specified to control the exact location of the tie back, the integrity of the steel H piles, and quality of the tie back connection. We understand that there may be additional cost associated with this procedure. Note #1 was meant to allow the contractor to have a different design of the temporary shoring wall (such as the size of the steel pile spacing, pile size, pile length, embedment length, horizontal force of tie back, etc.) that meets ODOT design requirements and can serve the same function as the proposed temporary shoring wall. Any deviations from the proposed temporary shoring wall shall be designed by a professional engineer registered in the state of Ohio and be reviewed and approved by ODOT.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 34

The phasing between Part 1 (WAR-75-3.4) and Part 2 (BUT-122-10.94/WAR-122-0.00) doesn't match up. On sheet 29/187 in Part 2 it shows from station 46+00 to the right to see the WAR-75-3.40 plans Stage 1, Phase 1B. Part 1 (Sheet 234/2346) shows the southeast corner of the Towne Rd. intersection complete while Part 2 shows it still under construction with portable concrete barrier. Then in the notes on page 14/187 under Stage 1 - Phase 1 it says that the Part 2 - Stage 1 - Phase 1 - Step B is concurrent with Part 1 - Stage 1 - Phase 2A, which doesn't line up either. Also, the note below that which reads "Contractor shall see Part 1 plans for MOT layout from 42+00 to 46+00 for overlap of Part 1 Stage 1, Phase 1B and Part 2 Stage 1, Phase 1." is conflicting with sheet 25/187 that says to see Part 1 Stage 1, Phase 1A for the overlap. There needs to be impact attenuators at stations 65+50 on page 229/2346 and approximately 42+90 on sheet 221/2346.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 35

Paragraph 13 in Addendum No. 3 does not include temporary raised pavement markers, as per plan, for transitioning traffic for the design/build maintenance of traffic portion. Please provide a quantity.

Temporary raised pavement markers, as per plan to be paid for under Item 614 - Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 36

Biditem #4090 seems understated. Please confirm.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 37

Since the Department is not paying for any width greater than 3' on the Geocomposite Drain at Retaining Wall 1, the quantity for Item 483 appears overstated. This is an issue on the other walls as well, please clarify.

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: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 38

The Noisewall Basis of Payment on sheet 2278 states that seeding and mulching is included in the payment for the noisewall. Typically on projects that already have established pay items for this type of work, this note is removed in order to avoid conflict on the project. Please remove this note.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 39

1. Please confirm that all square feet of noisewall as shown in the plans will be paid for and that no deduct will be made for the wall below the top of barrier at Noisewall 1.2. Will the contractor be permitted to move Noisewall 1 away from the road slightly and leave a gap between the wall and the barrier. There are constructability issues with slipforming barrier around the posts and panels. Also, with an Ashlar Stone formliner pattern, the small voids will trap water which upon freezing may damage the wall in the future.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2009

Question Number: 40

The version of SS898 referenced on the title sheet is outdated. Please review and advise by addendum which version should be used.

Question Submitted: 1/14/2009

Question Number: 41

Bid item #409, work zone raised pavement markers, seems understated. Please confirm.

Ref 409 is correct.

Question Submitted: 1/14/2009

Question Number: 42

Plan insert sheet on page 314/2346 under note #11 calls for resurfacing of the transition areas. How is this to be paid?

This is to be paid for similar to how the cross overs are paid for on Sheet 34A. Use reference no's 200, 206 and 224.

Question Submitted: 1/14/2009

Question Number: 43

Per Addendum No. 1 Item 225 12" Portland Cement Concrete Pavement had been adjusted to 49,631 SY due to removal of Ramp B. In Addendum No. 4 Item 225 12" Portland Cement Concrete Pavement has been adjusted to 66,669 SY due to a recalculation on SR 122 Ramp of 7,494 SY increase. Where does the 9,544 SY come from? Has Ramp B been added back into the bid?

Question Submitted: 1/14/2009

Question Number: 44

Since the letting date has been delayed twice will the October 31st completion date for the SR 122 work be extended?

The October 31st completion date for the SR. 122 work will be moved to November 15, 2009

Question Submitted: 1/6/2009

Question Number: 45

Please consider updating the supplemental specifications 840 for this project to the SS840 Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls dated 1/16/2009.

Question Submitted: 1/6/2009

Question Number: 46

The concrete pavement joint details shown on pages 1380 to 1397 typically show the transverse joint spacing at 21ft. Since the 12" concrete pavement is specified as 884, which allows either reinforced or non-reinforced pavement, are the joints to be shortened to 15ft if non-reinforced pavement is selected by the bidder?

Yes, Refer to Standard Drawing BP-2.2 (7/18/08)

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 47

An answer in addendum #4 (received Friday 4/3/09) noted that the MOT phasing on SR 73 Ramps C and D was changed to make the phase lines match the pavement joints. Part of the answer stated "The linked drawings show the MOT joint line imposed on the joint plans". We can not find this link. The link on the first page of the plans do not include this drawing. We are not sure if the phase lines have been moved to one of joints already shown on the joint details (3ft off the edge of shoulder and 8ft off the opposite shoulder) or if ODOT intends to add a joint down the center of the 16ft lane. Please clarify our question about the joints and also provide the drawing. Thanks.

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: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 48

Can 4-inch 707.31 perforated tubing be used for 6" Shallow Pipe Underdrains or 6" Base Pipe Underdrains on this project?

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 49

We believe the quantities for biditems 1093 (Headwall) and 1094 (Junction Chamber) are incorrect please review and confirm your quantities.

Quantities are correct

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 50

#1. Sheet 1421 has a detail for utility trenches within the City of Middletown. Will this detail apply to this project? #2. What is meant by "ACMP" storm sewer? #3. The detail references notes 3 and 4, however there are no notes 3 and 4 on this sheet. Please provide these notes. #4. Sheet 1422, under the Plastic Pipe Storm Sewers note, states that, "Except for sump drain lines and subgrade drains, pipe shall not be installed within the street right-of-ways nor in areas subject to live loads." Does this mean that plastic pipe is not permitted on SR 122?

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 51

There are multiple retaining walls with soldier piles & wood lagging. The piles used are to be galvanized. We are to attach welded shear studs to the face of the pile flanges prior to placing a 1-sided concrete facing wall. Are the studs to be applied prior to galvanizing the piles, or are we to grind the galvaizing off and apply the studs in the field?

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 52

We asked a pre bid question on February 16th regarding the fact that the concrete pavement joints on SR 73 ramps C and D, and SR 122 ramps A and B do not match the MOT phase lines. We can not complete our bid on the 12" Portland Cement Concrete Pavement until we receive an answer to this question. Please provide an answer at your earliest convenience. Thanks.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 53

A question was answered in addendum #4 (that we just received today, Friday 4/3/09) in regards to moving the Type D Barrier in front of the Noise Wall #1 slightly away from the wall to allow a gap so the wall can be slipformed. ODOT answered no, and stated they want the wall "constructed as detailed in the plans". The detail in the plans show the wall up against a flat surface. In fact this wall consists of panels 12 to 24ft long with posts that stick out an additional 4". So what needs clarified is, will the back of the Type D Barrier to be placed against the Posts, or is it to be placed against the noise wall panel themselves? If it is to be placed against the noise wall panels, does the top width of the Type D Barrier (which per standards is 12") narrow to 8" at the Posts, or is the top width 12" at the posts and goes to 16" wide when it is against the noise wall panels? Also, if it is placed directly against noise wall panels is expansion joint material required between the Type D Barrier and the noise wall panels and/or posts?

Type D Barrier can be placed along the posts. If the contractor wishes to place it along the wall then expansion joint material will be needed and paid as part of the wall.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 54

We asked a pre-bid question on 3/30 in regards to barrier wall called out on page 452 from station 172+17 - 172+57 and from 172+82 to 173+22. They are barrier transitions. We said we can't find the quantity for these walls. ODOT responded that this is "Reference B1 on sheet 383". We looked at Reference B1 on sheet 383, it is for the Type B barrier from 161+00 to 172+10. This 1110ft of wall does not include these to transitions. Please clarify were this wall is to be paid for.

See Standard Drawing RM-4.4, Transitions to be paid for under Item 622 Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 55

We asked a question on 3/30 in regards to the Type B barrier called out from station 161+00 to 172+10 (off the limits of this project). We asked for a detail of this wall since there was no typical section. ODOT answered on the web site "See Standard Drawing RM-4.3...". This is not what we were asking. We are assuming this wall is on asphalt placed by another contractor on ODOT 070480? We can not tell from our plans if this wall sits on, i.e. is there going to be any associated prep work, or do we just place the wall on top whatever is out there?

This is the area that will be used for cross over for MOT for this project. When the crossover is not needed any longer the the contractor for Proj 09(171) will be required to remove the crossover prep this area and construct the Type B Barrier to finish off this project.

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: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 56

We asked a question on 3/30 regarding what is being shown on page 452 from station 173+22 to 180+00. ODOT replied on the web site that "There is no wall here, only barrier rail." Is the barrier rail there permanent or is it replaced ultimately with Type B Barrier. If it is replaced by Type B Barrier is it part of this contract? An explanation of what is going on in this area would be very helpful.

It is to be replaced with Type B Barrier as part of this contract. This is the area that will be used for the cross over for MOT. So this barrier could not be constructed in the southern project that is currently under construction.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 57

In addendum #4 (received Friday 4/3/09) the quantity of 12" Portland Cement Concrete Pavement was increased to 66,669 sy. This quantity appears to be over stated, please review.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 58

In a follow up to our previous question asked earlier this morning: The addendum # 4 (received on Friday 4/3/09) increased the quantity of 12" Portland Cement Concrete Pavement to 66,669 sy. It appears that in this addendum the quantity of 7,494 sy was added to the original plan quantity of 59,175 sy to get 66,669 sy. In addendum #1 we were told Ramp B at SR 73 would not be performed and the quantity of 12" pavement was decreased to 49,631 sy. Based on the new quantity in addendum #4 please clarify if Ramp B at SR 73 is now being built as part of this contract, or if the addendum #4 quantity is now overstated. Thanks.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 59

ODOT website shows that there are 3 addenda. #3 is not accessible. Please post ASAP.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 60

Bridge 75-0864 (LEFT) appears to have been rehabbed at some point. Are there plans available from this Rehab project? In particular, I am looking for the possibility for the presence of shear studs, similar to the 0396-W ramp bridge. The style of the newer barrier indicates that this MAY be a possibility... unless the rehab was a simple overlay.

As per addendum #4 Shear Studs were installed.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 61

Bridge 0396W staged deck removal details on sheet 1868 leaves an overhang that is excessively wide. In addition, there is a portable concrete barrier on the overhang. Typically in this extreme case, ODOT requires that the overhang be supported. Has the width of this overhang been checked for structural integrity?

The proposed cutline, overhang length, and location of portable concrete barrier were designed and checked to support the proposed MOT scheme for WAR-75-0396W without requiring any additional support to the overhang.

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: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 62

Re: Pavement Removal On plan sheet 364/2346, the pavement removal quantity for SR 122 Ramps is shown as 133,199 sy. This quantity appears to be significantly too high. This quantity can't be verified because the SR 122 Ramp and SR 122 sections of the office calculation spreadsheet do not include pavement removal calculations. Please verify that these quantities are correct and provide calculations for these two areas. Note - the provided calculations do include one tab that shows calculation for the SR 122 Ramps but the quantities and stations on this sheet are completely different than what is shown on the plans. This tab is labelled "Ramp-122-MNL-not used". Please clarify.

QUESTION 1: On plan sheet 364/2346, the pavement removal quantity for SR 122 Ramps is shown as 133,199 sy. This quantity appears to be significantly too high. This quantity can't be verified because the SR 122 Ramp and SR 122 sections of the office calculation spreadsheet do not include pavement removal calculations. Please verify that these quantities are correct and provide calculations for these two areas. ANSWER 1: The pavement removal quantities in the SR 122 area were recalculated. SR 122 Ramps should be 30,480 SY, not 133,199 SY. SR 122 should be 27,098 SY not 10,893 SY. Net Change: subtract 86,514 SY. Also, it appears that Commerce Drive and Union Road should have Pavement Removal, Asphalt quantities, although none were shown. Commerce Drive should be 3039 SY. Union Road Should be 6258 SY. Total added: 9297 SY. Total Net Change for Pavement Removal = Minus 77,217 SY. Also, sheet 421 includes a correction to the earthwork based on the pavement removed quantity. Due to the above revisions, the excavation quantity should be increased 25,739 CY. QUESTION 2: Note - the provided calculations do include one tab that shows calculation for the SR 122 Ramps but the quantities and stations on this sheet are completely different than what is shown on the plans. This tab is labelled "Ramp-122-MNL-not used". Please clarify. ANSWER 2: These removal quantities were determined using CADD areas. Below is a summary these areas:

PAVEMENT REMOVAL AREAS	SR122 AREA	CADD Area	SF	CADD Area
SY Ramp A	199+50.00	209+34.00	33981	3776
Bridge	210+67.00	217+25.00	27028	3003
Ramp B	218+05.00	240+91.00	76140	8460
Ramp C	216+09.00	244+42.00	77189	8577
Includes removal of old ramp C				
(loop) Ramp D	200+67.00	216+52.00	51218	5691
Ramp E	195+80.00	200+32.00	8764	974
SR122 Ramp				
Subtotal	30480	SR122	26+00.00	51+38.00
		181105	20123	Bridge
			52+09.00	65+50.00
			62774	6975
				SR122
Subtotal	27098	Commerce Drive	0+00.00	0+00.00
			27349	3039
		Union Road	14+25.00	23+60.00
			56323	6258

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 63

Please provide all office calculations so that we can verify quantities. So far the only calculations posted are for pavement and a portion of the pavement removal. For example see plan sheet 1251/2346 for reference to MOT EARTHWORK OFFICE CALCS.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 64

Item 3 - PAVEMENT REMOVED - Is the existing 10" PCC Reinforced Concrete reinforced with mesh, or is it continuously reinforced?

The original plans are provided on the FTP site: [FTP://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/districts/D08/WAR](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/districts/D08/WAR). Please refer to these plans.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 65

As of 3/18/2009, thirty (30) pre-bid questions remain unanswered with less than two weeks remaining before bid time. Several of these questions were submitted at least two weeks ago. We are at a standstill in calculating our bids on most of the items related to these questions. I'm sure you are aware that an estimate for a project of this magnitude and scope will require significant time to complete given the large number of quantities we have to verify. Would ODOT consider publishing an addendum immediately to answer any questions that can be clarified now? If you wait until the deadline to answer questions, this project will definitely get delayed because of follow-up questions. If these questions can't be answered within a week or two, how can we be expected to bid the job in even less time.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 66

Some of the ramps on this project (for example SR 123 Ramps K and M) have a joint down the center of the 16ft lane, while other ramps with 16ft lanes do not. Is it the owners intent to have a joint down the center of all 16ft lanes, so as to avoid future center line cracking?

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 67

The typical section on plan sheet 7/2346 shows no 304 or Cement Stabilization on the outside of the rubblize & roll pavement area. According to this typical, we are to leave the existing outside shoulder in place to be overlaid. The pavement calculations include Cement Stabilization and 10" of 304 in this area. Please clarify.

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: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 68

This question is in regards to the 12" Portland Cement Concrete Pavement, which is spec'd as 884. The current SS 884 dated April 18, 2008 does not address joint sealing. The version dated April 15, 2008 gave the contractor the option to either seal or not seal the joints (see section 884.04). The 2008 version of spec 451 and 452 (as called for on the cover page of this job's plans and referred to in SS 884) does not require joint sealing, but these plans also call out Standard Drawing BP 2.1 and 2.2 dated 7/16/04 which does show the joints being sealed (please note the most current Standards BP 2.1 and 2.2 dated 7/18/08 do not require joint sealing). Please clarify if the joints in the concrete pavement on this project are to be sealed.

Joints in the pavement DO NOT need to be sealed.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 69

There are 4 concrete ramps on this project (SR 73 ramps C and D, and SR 122 ramps A and B) where the M.O.T. phase line and the pavement joint line (shown on the pavement joint details pages 1380 to 1397) do not match. Will the M.O.T. phase lines (and presumably temp. pavement width) be adjusted to match the pavement joint lines, or will pavement joints be moved/added to match the M.O.T.?

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 70

We can not find any information in the plans for the Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B that is to be installed from Station 161+00 to 172+10. We do not see where it is shown in the typical or cross-sections. Please provide a typical section of this wall and clarify what phase it is to be constructed in. Thanks.

See Standard Drawing RM-4.3 Dated 1/19/09 The contractor can build it in any phase that they feel it will work and not interfere with any other work.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 71

A note in the top left of page 452 of the plans says to install barrier transitions from 172+17 to 172+57 and from 172+82 to 173+22. We don't see where the quantity for this wall is listed in the barrier quantity subsummary. Please clarify.

Reference B1 on sheet 383

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 72

Is 4" Raceway to be included in the Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B? If so, does a No. 10 copper clad or aluminum clad wire also need to be installed?

Yes; No.

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 73

Plan page 452 appears to show barrier wall from 173+22 to 180+00, we do not see where this is shown on the typical. Is this existing wall?

There is no wall here, only barrier rail

Question Submitted: 1/7/2009

Question Number: 74

Based off of standard RM 4.3's notes (pg 2/2) noting were expansion joints and reinforced end anchorages are to be installed, we can not come up with the plan quantity of 13 each for Reinforced End Anchorages. Please provide the quantity calculations for Concrete Barrier, End Anchors, Reinforced. Thanks.

I just looked at the plans using sheets 455, 457, 482, 484, 486 and 487 and was able to verify all 13. Most are at bridge seams were there is an expansion joint.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 75

Can you please explain why there are two reference items for patching rumble strips. Reference #199 - 251 Partial Depth Pavement Repair - 650 SY (pg.34 of the plans), and Reference #395 Pavement Repair, Misc. Patching Rumble Strips - 1725 CY (pg. 40/41 of the plans). Also please review the quantity for Reference #395 again. 1725 CY would amount to 23.52 Miles of patching at 3' wide and 1.5" deep as the note states. The breakdown of the areas for this work on page 40&41 also does not support the need for 1725 CY. This quantity seems significantly overstated and seems that it should be in SY if anything.

Reference 395 is for mainline rumble strip removal and Ref 199 is for rumble strips at the beginning and ending of the project where the tapers and lane shifts take place. Ref 199 was added for those areas that may be out of the project limits. I recalculated 2 more times and the quantity of 1725 is correct. Remember this is calculated for 8.4 miles X 4 = 33.6 miles

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: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 76

If 6" of existing asphalt is to be removed from the mainline in the rubbilized areas above the concrete, you would also have to remove 6" from the outside shoulder to maintain the 12.5" permanent pavement section across the travel lanes and shoulders. The 1.5" milling in these areas does not account for the 6" of asphalt that is across the entire section as shown on page 11. Or, is the permanent pavement section on the shoulders in the rubbilized areas different from the traveled lanes to account for this and will quantities be adjusted accordingly? Currently there is pavement removal, 304, and full depth pavement figured for all of the outside shoulder area.

See Addendum #4 Ref 1303.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 77

Should Reference #0395 - Pavement Repair, Misc: Patching Rumble Strips be in SY instead of CY? Page 41 of the plans shows an estimated quantity of 1725 SY, however, a quantity of 1725 CY has been carried to the proposal.

CY is Correct, Quantity is Correct, Typo on sheet 41

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 78

In the rubbilized areas on the outside shoulder there is an existing 9" of asphalt. After removing the 6" asphalt overlay (which seems to be included in the pavement removed item) and the 1.5" of additional pavement planing, there would only be 1.5" of existing asphalt left on the outside shoulder in the rubbilized areas. Is ODOT's intention to leave only 1.5" of existing asphalt in these areas prior to placing the permanent pavement?

No, The contractor is to remove 1.5" of the 6" asphalt overlay and then pave.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 79

Pg. 41 of the plans states 2425 SY of Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, APP, Pavement Wedging has been carried to the general summary, however there is not a bid item for this. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 80

Does the 880 Warranty item cover the Ramps? If not, shouldn't the quantity be reduced to reflect this. The quantity was increased in addendum #7 for the mainline 302 quantity, but the 19mm and 12.5mm quantity for the ramps was not taken out. Currently the 880 quantity includes. 12.5mm & 19mm for ramps and mainline, and 302 for mainline only. Is this correct? Also, what were ref# 1305 and 1306 added for, especially since no other quantity was reduced by the same amount? The quantity does not match the ramp calculations or the mill and fill sections. Please clarify.

A1) No, see addendum #7 prebid question. A2) Revised in addendum #8. A3) For mainline I75 from Sta 186+00 to end of project. See revised typ on sheet 10.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 81

The reinforcing steel bid quantity for Bridge WAR-75-0864R over Clear Creek is 181,052 lb while the summary plan sheet quantities equal 186,067. Also, WAR-75-0864L over Clear Creek rebar bid quantity is 154,517 lb while the summary plan sheet quantities equal 158,003. Please verify the correct bid quantities.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 82

The reinforcing steel list on plan sheet 2202/2346 for bridge WAR-75-1002 Northbound Deck (Stage 3) is incomplete and the list for Northbound Parapets (Stage 2) is not shown. Please provide this information in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 83

Bid Item 861 QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC1, Substructure on Bridge WAR-75-0864L has a quantity of 70 CY while the estimated quantity plan sheet 2062/2346 shows 91 CY. Please verify the correct bid quantity.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 84

The quantities for bid items 559, 589, 850 & 880 Semi-Integral Abutment Expansion Jt Seal, APP seem to be substantially understated. Also the quantity for 703 seems overstated. Please verify these quantities are correct.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 85

This is in reference to bid items 590 & 704 Structural Jt. or Jt. Sealer, Misc.: Concrete Deck Jt. Preparation. It appears that bid item 590 on Bridge WAR-75-0396R includes the approach slab lengths in the quantity while bid item 704 on Bridge WAR-75-0410R does not. Please add the approach slab lengths in bid item 704 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: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 86

A 6" Reinforced Concrete Slab between the MSE wall coping and the abutment footing is detailed in the abutment sections of Bridge WAR-75-0410L&R and WAR-75-1002L&R. What is it reinforced with and what bid item is it paid under?

The 6" concrete slab in between the abutment footing and MSE wall coping shall be reinforced per ODOT CMS 601.04.D. The steel reinforcement shall be included with Item 601 11000 for payment.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 87

Per the typical MSE wall section, the pile sleeves are filled with bentonite slurry. Under the new Supplemental Specification 840 MSE Wall dated 1/16/2009 the bentonite slurry was replaced with 703.11 granular material. Please replace SS840 dated 1/19/2007 with SS840 dated 1/16/2009.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 88

This question pertains to the MSE Wall note which states "Ashlar stone architectural finish shall be used for all exposed MSE wall panels." Based on typical panel sizes and the finish grade elevations given in the plans for Bridge WAR-75-0410L&R, a portion of the bottom row of panels will most likely be exposed. Given that this is the case, should the Aesthetic Surface Treatment pay quantity equal the MSE Wall pay quantity?

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 89

The 6" non-perforated pipe at bridges WAR-75-1002L&R over SR73 tie into the MSE wall drain pipe as detailed on sheet 2209/2346 per the plan note. It also notes the same pipe at a 1% minimum slope that daylight beyond the MSE wall limits. Please clarify which is to be done. If the pipe is to tie into the MSE wall drainage, the bid quantities for items 958 and 1002 seem overstated.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 90

Per Supplemental Spec 840.03F "MSE Wall Backfill Drainage Material", the contractor may furnish drainage pipe with filter fabric surrounding and attached to the pipe in lieu of porous backfill if installed within the SGB. If the contractor chooses to do this, will the porous backfill bid quantity for MSE walls still be paid?

As noted in SS 840.08, payment for the porous backfill and filter fabric around the drainage pipes is included in the 6" Drainage Pipe Perforated and Non-Perforated pay items. Thus, payment specifically for MSE wall porous backfill will not be made.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 91

There are no bid items for SGB Inspection and Compaction Testing for the MSE walls. Is this testing to be considered incidental to the Select Granular Backfill bid items?

Per SS 878.01, payment for the inspection and compaction testing of MSE walls is included in the SS 878 work. Thus, the contractor shall provide adequately trained and qualified inspection personnel to perform inspection and compaction testing of the MSE walls as well as other items outlined in SS 878. Please use SS 887 Dated 4/18/08

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 92

Do the structural steel bid quantities include the weight of the optional field splices? (Bid Items 611, 653, 697, 772, 810, 947, 991)

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 93

Bridges 0410R and 1002R detail Temporary MSE Wall to be constructed between stages/phases. The temp MSE wall requires a select granular material backfill. Sheets 1963 and 2209 detail 203 - Embankment, APP from the top of abutment footing to below the approach slab. This backfill will not work with the temporary MSE walls. Should the 203 Embankment, APP be a select granular material?

The Item 203 As Per Plan requirements for the 0410R and 1002R bridges is detailed on sheets 1903 and 2140. The As Per Plan requirement specifies that the embankment is to be compacted in 6" lifts. The As Per Plan requirement does not specify the embankment material to be utilized. Suitable embankment materials are specified in Item 203. The select granular backfill for the temporary MSE wall meets the Item 203 specification.

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: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 94

There are no quantities listed on sheet 383 for single slope barrier between station 172+10 to 180+00 on sheet 452. Sub summary sheet 383 has B-3 barrier on sheet 457 showing a station of 234+10 when it should read 240+10 giving 600 feet more of single slope barrier than there should be. Sub summary sheet 384 has B-5 barrier on sheet 464 that shows a station of 319+10, it should read 320+10, reducing the quantity by 100 feet. How will the raceway shown in the single slope barrier type D on Ramp B be paid for? on sheet 34, single slope barrier type D, APP, the note says steel as per RM4.5. The only steel shown on the standard drawing RM4.5 is for End Anchors. Is that the intent? How many raceways will be required to be placed in the single slope barriers Type B and C?

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 95

There are 3 Vandal Fence bid items on this project. Ref. 756 appears to be standard 6' Vandal Protection Fence with standard gray vinyl coated fabric. Ref. 929 is 12' Vandal Protection Fence. Note 3 on plan sheet 2123 indicates that the fence will be black. This note typically indicates that the vinyl coating on the fence fabric should be black instead of gray, but the framework (posts, rails, and fittings) which are galvanized are not black vinyl coated. Ref. 1043 is 6' Vandal Protection Fence. On plan sheet 2213 in Column 1 under colors, the plans indicate the fabric, posts, rails and hardware should all be black on this structure. As specified all three fences will be different. Please review and indicate whether you intend change the plan notes so that the coatings will be consistent on all three bid items.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 96

There appears to be a quantity error for 304 Aggregate Base, Subgrade Compaction, and 12" Concrete Pavement for the Ramps at SR 122. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 97

A question was previously asked regarding the existing concrete pavement reinforcement and whether it is mesh or continuous reinforcement. In response, existing plans have been provided showing the pavement to be T-71 Reinforced PCC Pavement, but no information is provided to define what T-71 means. So the question remains - What type of reinforcement was used in the existing pavement (ODOT T-71 PCC Pavement)?

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 98

Addendum 3 stated new requirements regarding the Vectren Gas line relocation along SR122 Ramp E. Please provide a profile for Vectren's existing gas line so the relationship between the existing gas line and major utility work can be evaluated. Our analysis of this area indicates that it will be very difficult to meet the stated schedule requirements. In order to meet the July 31, 2009 date for Vectren, major drainage and sanitary work in the Ramp E area will need to start prior to shutting down their existing line on June 1, 2009. Without this information we cannot determine if it is feasible to have the ramp ready for installation of their new line by July 31, 2009. Also, would it be possible to continue construction in the area that does not conflict with Vectren's relocation crews? If so, please provide a plan and profile of the proposed relocated gas line so we can analyze any work that might be able to occur concurrently with the relocation.

Profile is provided on sheet 1015 and 1016 (4" Gas Line) Proposed Gas line is still in development, but I can tell you it will cross the creek on the West side of the ramp, Then cross under the Ramp around Station 211+00, and run down along the East side along the R/W line down to SR 122. It will then run along the South side of SR 122 to Union Rd.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 99

Addendum #3 made numerous quantity changes to the proposal that are not explained in the addendum. Therefore we have no method to verify quantities or understand the scope of these changes and how our bid prices should be adjusted. Please provide plan sheets depicting items that have changed so that we may calculate meaningful prices that account for the changes in scope.

Quantity changes were made due to calculation errors and missed quantities or quantities that were not carried to the General summary. No work that requires plan sheets were changed. The scope of work has not changed.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 100

The quantity for ITEM 42 - SUBGRADE COMPACTION, as revised by addendum #4, appears to be overstated. It appears include the quantity that was previously deleted by addendum #1. The same holds true for ITEM 225 - 12" PCC PAVEMENT. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2009

Question Number: 101

Line item numbers 210, 213, 214, and 1187 show 448/446 Type 1 surface PG 64-22, traffic volume states Heavy, please clarify.

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: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 102

As of 4/02/09, ODOT has issued 3 addendums that have revised quantities, etc. These addendums have not included any revised plan sheets to detail changes. When will these revised plan sheets be released? There are 78 pre-bid questions on ODOT's website of which 24 have been answered. When will the remaining questions be answered and when will an addendum be issued that will address these pre-bid questions? Answers to these pre-bid questions and revised plan sheets are needed NOW to permit bidders adequate time to complete the bid, if the 4/08/09 bid date holds. Please advise.

Revised plan sheets were not needed for the change. The changes were quantity changes.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 103

The following are questions that were asked at the pre-bid that have not yet been answered: 1. Page 24 - Lines 17 thru 25 and lines 1 thru 9. Payment for dirt piled on the east end of SR-122. Will ODOT charge and will the contractor be paid to move this dirt? 2. Page 25 - Lines 1 thru 16. Concerning the typical section warranty pavement thickness for 19mm intermediate course. Typical shows a 1 1/2" thickness for 19mm. The standard for 19mm has been 1 3/4" thickness because of the top size aggregate. 3. Page 25 & 26 - lines 17 thru 25. Is there to be a pay item for potential undercuts when building temporary pavements.

A1) Ref 1302 added in Addendum #4. A2) Addendum #6 revised the pavement and added Ref 1306

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 104

Addendum #4 states "On the typical sections on sheet 7, item no 2 and item no 4 should be marked as Item 880 Warranty Asphalt ... ODOT also tests, inspects and accepts the material according to 301 and 302 including all requirements of 401 but is measured and paid for as 880" reference 202 on Part 1 - 302E46000 includes 11,172 cyds on SR-122 which is not a warranty pavement section. Does this mean the base asphalt placed on SR-122 is now a warranty pavement section and subject to SS 880? This addendum note is not very well thought out.

Only the pavement of I-75 is Warranty and fall under the 880 spec. See Addendum #7 for additional information.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 105

Part 2, drawing 14/187. The description of work to perform in phases 1 and 2 of stages 1 and 2 all call for an enclosed storm sewer system. What does that mean? Please note the storm sewers installed in stage 1 are not functional till later stages are completed. Many storm crossings have portions which are outside of the work areas. This situation will require closing travel to one lane. Pavement patching and police flagman will be required. Will patching and police be pay items?

Answer: Normal Storm Sewer
Answer: The storm sewer can be installed in phase during normal closures.
Answer: The storm sewer can be installed in phase during normal closures so there is no need for these items.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 106

In order to price bid item 0024 we need the tank sizes. The plug and fill call outs R8 and R9 on drawing 1201 do not point to conduits. What size pipes are to be filled?

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 107

Storm sewers crossing I75 are in bores in many locations. We find at least 9 locations where bores are located in the same location as existing pipe. These bore locations need to shift. On drawing 1165 an existing waterline is shown to be concrete encased. How will this be paid for?

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 108

Drawing no. 1440 shows a culvert replacement. This work cannot be accomplished in phase as the differing alignments of the old and new culverts do not coincide, thus, flow cannot be maintained. Can the alignment of the new culvert be changed to the existing location? If not, then the road will need closed to allow out of phase construction.

This work can be done in phase by diverting the water from the old to the new during construction and/or the use of pumps

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 109

Bid item 94 RCP, Type C w/Filter calls out RCP C to be placed on plan sheet 1016 under Ref E4 [1093 cy] and E5 [573.4 cy] and further detailed on plan sheet 1790. These quantities appear to be significantly overstated. Please adjust or provide quantity calculations.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 110

Typical section on page 7/2346 attached to addendum #6 shows "bubble" 4 as 12.5" Item 880. On the typical on page 8/2346 lower left hand corner "bubble" 4 has "bubbles" 1 & 3 over top of it. The same is true for the typicals on page 11/2346 left hand middle and right hand bottom. Is this the designers intent?

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: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 111

After reviewing the bridge painting quantities, it appears that Ref. Nos. 1030 and 1031 are substantially understated. Please verify. In addition, there are no pay items for Final Inspection Repair for bridges 0410L and 0410R. Please advise via addendum if bid items need to be added.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 112

In the General Notes for Part 2 of this project, sheet 10 of 187, the note under Clearing and Grubbing says to remove all trees and stumps within the right of way limits. Normally clearing is only done to the construction limits, and we assume that would be all that is necessary here. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 113

All 3 of the noise walls are shown in the plans to be within the project construction limits. By specification, we would have to clear all trees within these limits. The noise wall clearing note on Sheet 2277, clarified by Addendum #3, states that 25' total clearing will be permitted for noise walls (12.5' on each side). A 25' wide path would be substantially less than what specifications require. Please clarify. Further, noise walls 2 and 3 are out at the right-of-way line, making it impossible to clear 12.5' beyond the centerline of the noise wall.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 114

Plan sheet 34 of Part 1 shows Fence, Type CL on top of Type D Barrier. Please indicate how the fence is to be mounted.

The Contractor has the option of putting sleeves into the top of the wall to except the fence poles or mounting a bracket per Standard Drawing VPF-1-90 (Dated 9/26/90). This will be incidental to the cost of the fence.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 115

Please post revised staking reports

[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WAR-10754/File name is 10754_xs_clexi075_rev_2009_03-27.txt](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WAR-10754/File%20name%20is%2010754_xs_clexi075_rev_2009_03-27.txt)

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 116

Please review the October 31, 2009 date for completion of the SR122 detailed on page 42 of the plans. After a detailed schedule review of the work to be completed, considering the use of multiple crews, double shift work etc, we have determined that this date is unrealistic for the work detailed. A more realistic, yet still extremely aggressive date, for the completion of this work is the end of November 2009. Please consider revising this date accordingly.

After review by our Construction Department: Date to stay at October 31, 2009.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 117

In reference to Addendum 3, under Misc. Changes, it is noted that Project Maintenance shall include mowing. It is our interpretation this will be paid under Bid Ref Nos. 107 Mowing, for Part 1 and Bid Ref No 1150 Mowing, for Part 2 of the project. If the Department's intent is otherwise, please advise.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 118

Sheet 1/18, Section II, Note B of the General Notes for the Noise Barrier has a sentence which states, "Post concrete shall be colored to match the noise panel material unless otherwise specified in the plans." Please clarify that this is not an integral concrete coloring, but rather a colored sealer.

The note states that the posts shall match the panels in color by the use of a sealer. The posts shall be coated at the plant before arrival to the project.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 119

The noisewall method of measurement, on sheet 2/18, Section IV, Method of Measurement, states, "Square feet of noise barrier constructed below the ground line shall also not be included for payment." This is contrary to the current ODOT methodology which pays for all wall area from bottom of panel to top of coping. Current jobs are eliminating this note either before the plans are released or by addendum. Please modify this note to include payment for all square feet of wall erected and modify the plan quantities to reflect this change.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 120

We believe the plan quantities for Item 51700 – Structure, Misc. Timber Lagging Left in Place and Item 51900 – Misc. 3-ft Wide Prefabricated Geocomposite Drain, As Per Plan to be overstated. We also believe the quantity for Item 51800 – Formliner is understated. Please verify the quantities for each of these items.

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: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 121

Will the contractor be permitted to use galvanized steel diaphragms in lieu of cast-in-place concrete intermediate diaphragms for Bridge No. WAR-122-0094 Over Dick's Creek?

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 122

The quantity for Reference Number 516 - Drilled Shafts, 30" Diameter, Above Bedrock, As Per Plan given in Addendum 4 seems to be incorrect. Please verify.

The quantity for Reference Number 516 - Drilled Shafts, 30" Diameter, Above Bedrock, As per plan should be 1612 Ft which was stated in Addendum #3. The change was a mistake in Addendum #4. The contractor should bid on the current amount of 276 ft with the knowledge that the remaining 1336 ft will be paid for as part of a change order after the project is awarded.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 123

Question about SS 880 7 year warranty pavement -- SS 880 combines all the different types of asphalt courses used in the pavement composition under one pay item. I don't see how a reference number can be labeled as item 302 and be paid for as SS 880. If you want SS 880 then combine all ingredients and bid it as 880. If not, the warranty should only apply to the reference numbers bid as 880 - not to the 302. I believe that this method of bidding is unprecedented

See addendum #7.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 124

Still a question about the 880 Warranty Asphalt. The new typical section sheets attached to addendum #6 show "bubble" 4 as "Item 880 12.5" Asphalt Concrete (7 year warranty), as per plan. The "bubble" indicates the thickness of the surface courses and the 302 - inclusive. The quantity in reference 224 - 880 - Asphalt Concrete W/Warranty, APP has not changed. Reference 224 should have increased and reference 202 - 302 - Asphalt Concrete Base, PG64-22 should have decreased by the same amount to reflect including the 302 in "bubble" 4. Reference 202 also currently contains 302 which is not in the Warranty Pavement Areas. Until this change is made, how are we to determine the quantity of 302 to include under 880 warranty in order to provide a Warranty Bond? Please advise

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 125

SP 840 refers to a series of design cases for MSE design based on precedence to AASHTO MSE criteria. The cross section descriptions for the truncated slope and infinite slope both refer to the same section in AASHTO. This reference contradicts AASHTO. Please provide direction as to whether the contractor should design the MSE walls per AASHTO or to the reference in 840 which is not the same as AASHTO.

Section 840.04 outlines the design requirements for MSE wall systems. Sections 5.8 of the 2002 AASHTO Specifications and Section 11.10 of the LRFD AASHTO Specifications are referenced. The project was designed under the 2002 AASHTO Specifications and as such, these specifications will apply to the MSE wall design. For a sloping backslope case, AASHTO Figure 5.8.2B is referenced in SS 840. The wall height, H, for which the minimum reinforcement length is calculated (0.7H) shall be determined by measurement of the wall height from the top of the leveling pad to the top of the coping, for both the sloping backfill case and the broken backslope case, away from bridge abutments. The design wall height, h, shall remain as outlined in AASHTO for evaluation of the internal stability for these cases. The minimum reinforcement length at bridge abutment locations shall be based on the MSE wall height and the roadway profile grade as outlined in SS 840.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2009

Question Number: 126

Part 2 plan sheet 12/187, 3rd paragraph. Is ODOT paying for the testing of the potentially contaminated soil? If the contractor is paying for the testing, how do they get paid if the soil, after testing, turns out not to be contaminated?

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.