

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 070480

Sale Date - 12/7/2007

Question Submitted: 10/15/2007

Question Number: 1

Based on the final paragraph of Standard Drawing RM-4.3 page 1 of 2 (Dated 1-19-07) Concrete Barrier End Anchors are to have their own pay item "Item 622 - Concrete Barrier End Anchor, Reinforced" paid per each. We can't find such a pay item for this job. From the paragraph on page 2 of 2 on RM-4.3 listing where Reinforced End Anchorages are required there should be several on this job for the Type B, Type D and Type D APP Barrier Wall. Please advise if End Anchorage items should be added to this project. If so, will 15 ft of barrier wall be deducted for each?

Question Submitted: 10/15/2007

Question Number: 2

The quantity in Plan Part 1 for Ref # 37 - "Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B" of 40,258 ft appears to be overstated. Based on the limiting stations given in the quantity sub-summaries, and taking into account station equations, 20' deducts at inlets, and skipping Plan Part 2, we come up with approximately 26,600 ft. Please review.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 3

The proposal does not include a pay item for 448 Intermediate as a variable depth 0"-5" maximum leveling course for Part 1. Should there be an item added for this for Part 1? Since Part 2 includes this item we assume that an item will be added as a change order after the job is awarded unless added by addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 4

Reference Bid Item #639 - 448 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Type 2, PG 64-22 is setup as a variable depth 0"-5" maximum leveling course. This item is to be used as a pre-level course over the rubblize and roll section in Part 2. Does the placement of Item # 639 fully cover the initial asphalt course requirement to be placed within 48 hours of rubblizing per CMS 320.04?

Question Submitted: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 5

In our review of the plan quantities, we have found 2 discrepancies that we request to be reviewed. Ref. # 934 has a plan quantity of 1884 cy but we believe the true quantity to be 1837 cy. Ref # 906 has a plan quantity of 1352 sf. On page 651, the minimum tip elevation is shown to be 657.5 making an embeded length of 25 feet, and on page 654 the minimum tip elevation is shown as 675.5 making an embeded length of 8 feet. We believe the elevation on page 651 to be a typo. The plan quantity for this item does not corrolate to either of these embeded lengths. Please Review these biditems quantities. Thanks

Question Submitted: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 6

This message is to clarify our earlier question regarding epoxy on bridge#750851. The epoxoy is needed above the beams to be straightened.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 7

This question pertains to Bridge 75-0851. We have visited the site and believe epoxy injection will be needed. We can find no pay items to cover this work. We suggest force account on this item would not be fair to the contractor, or in the spirit of partnering.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 8

in part 2 there is existing waterproof aggregate base to be removed under some of the asphalt. what exactly is waterproof aggregate base course? is there an ac content?

Question Submitted: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 9

Sheet 33/1020, under the pavement for maintaining traffic note, states that the contractor is to temporarily relocate, among other things, signs for placement of temporary pavement. It goes on to state that this cost is to be incidental to the Pavement for Maintaining Traffic item. Is it ODOT's intent to relocate the existing guide signs for the MOT phases? The MOT plans do not show any sign relocations for part 1. If required, when would these signs need to be relocated? For example, sign 4S and its associated guardrail will be in conflict with the temporary pavement in stage 1. We will have to remove this sign and support in stage 2. Are we required to temporarily install this guide sign for stage 2? Will we need to relocate it for stage 3? Would sign 96S need to be relocated for stage 7? Please clarify the intent of this note and add the appropriate biditems to pay for the temporary sign supports and guardrail.

As per the notes on sheet 33/1020, Payment for all labor, equipment, materials and other incidentals required to construct the temporary roadway widening shall be included under Item 615 APP contract bid price (this includes maintaining or relocating any sign supports and guardrail).

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: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 10

1. The table on sheet 29A states that the liquidated damages for Tylersville Rd are \$100 per 15 minute interval. Sheet 30 states that liquidated damages are \$200 per hour. Which is correct? 2. The LEO note on sheet 30 of part 1 does not include payment for total road closures which differs from sheet 45 of part 2. Will ODOT pay for the required officers for full closures in part 1? Will the same detail and restrictions apply for part 1 for full closures as apply for part 2, shown on sheet 45? 3. Part 1 does not have an item for asphalt concrete for maintaining traffic. How will pothole patching be paid? 4. Sheet 41/954 of part 2 states that attenuators for hazards wider than 24" shall be sand or water filled barrels or similar devices specifically designed for wide obstructions. Typically there is a separate bid item for attenuators for wide hazards since there is a significant price difference between these types of attenuators. Please add a bid item for impact attenuators for hazards greater than 24". 5. It appears that in part 1 all critical slopes on the outside shoulder are protected and paid for with 32" portable concrete barrier. Part 2 states that guardrail is to be provided to protect the slopes. For uniformity, could part 2 be changed to PCB and paid under the appropriate bid item for 32" Portable Concrete Barrier?

A1) Proposal provisions take precedence over plan notes (Lane Value Contract Table on sheet 29A is as per Proposal Note 127, and thus will take precedence). A2) No. A3) See Sheet 25/1020, Pavement Repair note. A4) No. A5) No.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2007

Question Number: 11

Are we correct in our assumption that note #7 in Addendum #1 is meant to replace the first three paragraphs of the plan note shown on plan sheet 29 titled "SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION - INTERSTATE WORK"?

Since Addenda take precedence over plan notes, Addendum #1, note #7, overwrites the conflicting sequencing notes in the plans.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2007

Question Number: 12

In the noise barrier section of the plans, I have not been able to find the detail for the primary (vertical) reinforcing steel requirements. On page 792, a detail shows the #4 ties only. Please provide the vertical rebar requirements.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2007

Question Number: 13

We request that the amount of work that must be done be reduced from 50% to 40%. This reduction will allow more contractors to bid and therefore increase the competition. It will be difficult for some contractors to reach the 50% mark to bid the project.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2007

Question Number: 14

As a followup to Question No. 41. Some type of closure will have to be allowed for the operations that were mentioned. At a minimum short term closures or perhaps longer nighttime closures, but the structure removal and steel erection over Mason road cannot be performed safely with shoulder closures only.

Regarding short term closures, as per Sheet 40/954, the "GENERAL REQUIREMENTS" note states 'Length and duration of lane closure and restrictions shall be at the approval of the engineer. It is the intent to minimize the impact to the traveling public.' The plans do not specify restrictions (such as 'night time' closures only) for Mason road due to low volume traffic. Thus, the 'General Requirements' note applies in which the contractor will be allowed total closure within a reasonable time frame to allow for any operation that requires complete blockage of traffic. Also, See 45/954 note 'Item 614 - Law Enforcement Officer', 2nd bullet. This note allows closure sequence where complete blockage of traffic is required (this includes structure removal and steel erection over Mason road). As per the referenced LEO note, Law Enforcement Officers (with patrol car) required for short term closures on Mason road shall be paid for under Item 614, Law Enforcement Officer (with patrol car).

Question Submitted: 10/17/2007

Question Number: 15

addendum #1 refers to a link to see pavement core data. we have been to the link but do not see the data. has it been posted yet?

The data has been reposted. It should be ok now.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2007

Question Number: 16

we can not find ref #132 - 302 asphalt concrete base. the general summary says it is on page 25. we do not see it. can you please let us know where these 134 cy are suppose to go? thanks.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2007

Question Number: 17

Is there an approved source for Vegetated Filter Strips for Ref 54? Where can the specification for this material be found?

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: 10/17/2007

Question Number: 18

Structure No. BUT-75-1091 is the mainline IR 75 structure over Mason Road. I do not see any notes regarding the traffic control for Mason Road during the structure removal, steel erection, etc. Are we allowed to close the road?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 19

1. Supplemental Spec 884 04-15-05 Concrete Pavement w/ Warranty, included in the plans on sheet 1/1020, specifies that surface tolerance will meet requirements of 451.12 unless modified elsewhere. The Proposal on page 50 has PN 420-4/21/06- Surface Smoothness Requirements for Pavements which has PI and IRI smoothness specifications for mainline and collector-distributor roads and standard specs for other areas including side roads. Route 63 is designated a minor urban arterial. Is Route 63 considered a side road in which 451.12 will apply or a mainline or C-D requiring PN 420?2. Both Part 1 & 2 include a Spec General Note - Consultant for Concrete QC including Testing and Inspection. That General Note states that testing for Concrete Pavement shall conform to Spec 888 Portland Cement Concrete Pavement using QC/QA. The testing requirements for Spec 884 Warranty Pavement and Spec 888 QC/QA Pavement are not consistent; i.e. QC/QA is tested for strength using cores and 1.65 std dev plus 4000 psi for payment. Warranty pavement can be Standard 499 concrete. The pay factors on depth are also not the same. Which spec, 884 or 888, will control the mix design and acceptance testing for strength on the warranty pavement?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 20

Plan sheet 726A of 954 in the Part 2 plans shows 3'-6" diameter foundations above the bridge deck surface for the monotube signal structure. There is no indication as to how this work is to be paid. Please add bid items for the rebar and QSC2 concrete.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 21

1. Can fiberglass noise barrier panels be used for the bridge mounted noise barrier on bridges 0279L and 0405R?2. There are bid items for parapet work for noise barrier on bridge 0279L, but there are none for 0405R. Please add bid items to cover this work.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 22

Most of the bridges in Part 1 have an item for Clearing and Grubbing, while none of the bridges in Part 2 have one. Since the construction limits include the areas shown to be cleared at each bridge, the Ref. No. 1 Clearing and Grubbing should be all that is necessary for Part 1. We recommend eliminating the individual clearing bid items within the Part 1 bridges.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 23

The bid proposal does not state a DBE goal. Is there one for this project?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 24

On page 135 of the plans for Part 2, there is a table for Item 202 Pavement Removed Asphalt. The pavement thickness shown for each area includes the aggregate base material under the asphalt. Does this mean the contractor is required to remove all of the asphalt and the aggregate base under this pay item?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 25

As a follow-up to your answer to Question #2 in Addendum #1, there is a significant difference in the cost for removal of concrete pavement with mesh versus bar mat. Can ODOT further determine which reinforcement was used? If not, can the contractor core the pavement to determine reinforcement?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 26

Part 2Ref 503 Pavement Removed Asphalt 92,522 syOn Plan Sheet 135 of 954 there is a table of quantities covered under this item. Listed in table is average pavement thickness. We assume the thickness includes aggregate as well as asphalt. To accurately determine asphalt milling cost and RAP generated, we need a breakdown of thicknesses of asphalt and

Question Submitted: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 27

Part 1 and 2Ref 4 and 502 Pavement Removed is shown in typical sections. The concrete pavement is described in the legends as 10" Reinforced Concrete. Can we assume that the reinforcement is mesh rather than reinforcing steel, since there is a tremendous difference in the cost of removal? In Part 1 there is a wide range for wearing course removed [4"-10"] and asphalt concrete over concrete pavement [4"-10"]. Are we to assume an average of 8" which effect milling cost and quantity of RAP generated? Will the contractor be permitted to core the asphalt to verify thickness?

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: 10/18/2007

Question Number: 28

This project has a Generic and Eagle Alternate Bid for the Remote Monitoring Station and the Local Controller Software; however, the Master is specified as proprietary Eagle. In order to bid the Generic Remote Monitoring Station and Local Controller Software, the Master Controller specification needs to be changed to a Generic item with an Eagle alternate. Will an addendum be issued to add a Generic Master Controller Bid Item?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2007

Question Number: 29

The Reinforced Noisewall Post detail on sheet 791 shows inserts on the post facing and a note that states wall sections shall be fastened to the face of the post. Please clarify this note, we assume that this is not typical for the entire wall area. Is this detail optional or to be used in a particular area?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2007

Question Number: 30

The noisewall Basis of Payment on sheet 786 states that permanent erosion control of the disturbed areas is to be included in the noisewall for payment. The note on sheet 783 however, states that erosion control will be paid for separately. Please revise the Basis of Payment to match the updated note on sheet 783.

Question Submitted: 10/19/2007

Question Number: 31

IN THE PAVEMENT PART 1 THERE IS A BID ITEM FOR CEMENT STABILIZED SUBGRADE 12, BUT NO BID ITEM FOR TONS OF CEMENT. IN PAVEMENT PART 2 THERE IS A BID ITEM FOR BOTH SY AND TONS. WILL A BID ITEM BE ADDED?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2007

Question Number: 32

Addendum no. 1 revised the cement stabilized items to as per plan. This change specified the type of curing coat to be used. Shouldn't this revise reference number 540 Curing Coat since this is where the curing coat is paid for. Also, reference number 540 curing coat, is shown on page 39 of part 2 as 70,442 "gal" and shown in the proposal as 70,442 "sy". Please clarify if the curing coat will be paid for by the gallon or the square yard.

Question Submitted: 10/19/2007

Question Number: 33

Can the electronic files be made available for this job, in the same format that Licking County 161 was made available (<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/DGN/LIC-77221/>). This file included the Geopak files and cross section reports.

Question Submitted: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 34

There is no soil boring information for Bridge BUT-405 Lt. It appears that there was a soil boring taken --CRR-2 shown on plan sheet 652/1020. Please provide this information to the contractors in an addendum.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/plans/070480/>

Question Submitted: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 35

Can Stay-in-place metal deck forms be used for forming the interior bays of the bridge decks.

Question Submitted: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 36

The quantity for bid item 878 appears to be incorrect. We believe the quantity should be 376,889 lb. Please clarify

Question Submitted: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 37

1. Should The HP 14x73 piling on Bridge BUT-75-1091 75 over Mason Rd require pile points? There is not a bid item for it?

Question Submitted: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 38

Can the Existing bridge drawings be made available on an FTP site?

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: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 39

The 3 pair of mainline bridges require temporary shoring. Bridges 1091 and 0093 have extensive details in the plans (sheets 646 to 656 of 954). Regarding these details: a) since this is temporary shoring, can the contractor redesign the details if stamped by a PE? b) both bridges, and the 3rd mainline pair (0170) have notes stating much of the sheeting is to stay-in-place. there are large quantities of this material and is very expensive to waste on-site. since it seems to serve no value to leave in place, and given that it is a temporary shoring application, can it be pulled and returned to our inventory?

Question Submitted: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 40

1. Can you clarify what ref #897 & 933 superstructure concrete are? It appears that they might be the abutment diaphragm concrete which is typically included with the deck concrete. 2. Will the additional 1/2" of concrete required for the stage 1 deck overpour for the mainline bridges in part 2 be paid by the cy of deck concrete?

Question Submitted: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 41

How is ODOT going to pay for the portable concrete barrier wall as shown on sheet 190 and 190A?

Question Submitted: 10/22/2007

Question Number: 42

Can wet reflective pavement tape squares be used in lieu of work zone raised pavement markers? This has been allowed on other interstate projects in District 8.

The contractor should prepare their respective bid using work zone raised pavement markers-as currently specified in the plan. During construction - the contractor may submit to the District Construction Office for evaluation - the permissible use of wet reflective pavement tape squares in lieu of work zone raised pavement markers - with a cost savings.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2007

Question Number: 43

I would like some further clarification as to the sequence of construction. On Part one, plan sheet #29, the sequence of construction states that part one shall be constructed in two seasons. In the pre-bid meeting, it was stated that part two shall be constructed concurrently with the stages identified in part one, this would mean that all mainline work will be completed in two seasons. Is that ODOT's intent.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2007

Question Number: 44

On plan sheet #67 and 68 of the part one maintenance of traffic plans, there appears to be 1,250 LF of PCB wall between Sta. 2092+00 to 2104+58, CL, however, it is not accounted for in the summary on sheet #77.

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.