

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 150529

Sale Date - 10/8/2015

COL-91557 - SR 170-04.91

Question Submitted: 10/7/2015 5:10:51 PM

Sorry for the timing of this question but we noticed a discrepancy during our final bid review. Per ODOT CMS 105.04, the order of precedence lists the proposal before the plans. Therefore, the extensive stipulations regarding the clearing and grubbing plans notes (damaged trees, replacement trees) would be null and void since the proposal item for clearing and grubbing is not listed "as per plan". Please advise.

Question Submitted: 10/6/2015 9:16:41 AM

Please clarify Ref # 34-35. Are GM1 and GM2 on plan sheet 16 mounted on 54 Lf posts per sign? Also the speed limit sign GM3 will probably require a Ground Mounted Support Post No. 3 in lieu of No. 1. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2015 3:23:42 PM

Addendum C added a modified table 108.06-1 that lists lost weather days. For the months shown in the modified table are we to anticipate that in the months NOT shown we will get a one to one weather day for the 7 months not shown or are we to build in anticipated lost days for those 7 months?

For months not shown in TABLE 108.06-1 (MODIFIED), weather will be granted day for day. The bidder shall not anticipate weather days for months not shown in the table.

Question Submitted: 10/2/2015 9:43:05 AM

The construction limits are inadequate for the construction of this project. Please adjust the construction limits to allow access to construct a causeway for pier removal and structural steel erection.

The construction limits as provided in the plan will not be changed. All work must be completed within the construction limits provided.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2015 7:25:59 AM

Recently, Central Office has taken a larger role in reviewing and approving TAF's and Cofferdams in projects that involve waterways as this project does. Will Central Office review the Contractors TAF plan or will it be handled in D11? We are trying to determine the complexity of the engineered TAF plan and time frame in the prebid stage. Please advise.

The requirements for TAF are clearly spelled out in the special provisions.

Question Submitted: 9/23/2015 1:10:03 PM

Please confirm that the DBE goal @ 10% only applies to Part A (Contract Value), and not A + B (Bid Value). Thanks.

Correct, the DBE goal percentage is based on the total contract amount. Part B from an A+B bid is subtracted from the total bid for the contract value.

Question Submitted: 9/21/2015 3:40:36 PM

Regarding the replacement of any damaged or removed trees will the Department clarify what size the replacement trees need to be?

The replacement trees shall be One Gallon Containerized Nursery Stock.

Question Submitted: 9/21/2015 9:06:07 AM

With the interim date being extended shouldn't the A+B portion be modified in the EBS file or just totally removed from the proposal?

No changes to the A+B are needed. The A+B deals with the detour limit which has not been changed. An Addendum is forthcoming.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

9/18/2015 1:32:26 PM

Plan sheet 4 of 42 (General Notes) has a note titled "Clearing and Grubbing, as per plan", which states "The contractor shall replace any tree removed or damaged during construction at no cost to the department". There are no trees marked on the drawings or at the project site for removal. In order to build the causeway, abutment wing walls, and crushed aggregate slope protection and rock channel protection type B with filter fabric, all trees within the construction limits will need to be removed. Does ODOT intend the contractor to replace every tree removed within the construction limits? If yes, are the limits from top of bank to ordinary high water level? From top of bank to normal water level? Please better define how many trees of each type listed on sheet 4A of 42 ODOT intends the contractor include in the clearing & grubbing price.

All trees that are within the construction limits that are removed or damaged due to the work required or the by the Contractor's operations shall be replaced in kind with one of the species listed in the plan. The actual number of trees that are to be replaced will be dependent on the Contractor's operations. No set number has been determined.

Question Submitted:

9/18/2015 1:04:42 PM

Please provide the prime bidders with the latest bridge inspection report for Bridge COL-170-0489. Thanks

The inspection report will be made available at the following FTP Site:

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D11/91557/>

Question Submitted:

9/15/2015 3:02:15 PM

On page 23/42, drilled shafts #2,6 and 7 are shown to be drilled through the existing abutment footings. We don't believe that this will be achievable. Will the Department consider enlarging the span to avoid any drilled shaft conflicts with existing substructure units?

No changes in the span will be made.

Question Submitted:

9/15/2015 2:56:57 PM

Will the department please make available online the causeway/TAF drawings and details that were submitted for the permit approval?

All information regarding the causeway/TAF are contained in the Special Provisions.

Question Submitted:

9/15/2015 8:00:26 AM

This question is in regard to ODOT's answer to the question submitted 9/10/15 @ 11:58:35, about the 6 weeks duration to complete the project after causeway installation. Even if the existing bridge superstructure is removed from sitting above on the existing deck instead of on the causeway and even if both new abutments are built before the causeway is installed, the east side wing walls for both abutments can't be built until after the causeway is removed in order to provide access for the causeway without encroaching on the wet lands. That leaves only 6 weeks to install the causeway, remove the existing piers, erect and detail the steel, form/pour/cure the deck, strip the deck forms, form/pour/cure the parapets and then remove the causeway. Since river access is allowed from August 1 to October 31, we request ODOT move the completion date to October 31, 2016. Please provide details on how ODOT determined that 6 weeks is "ample time".

An Addendum will be issued to change the completion date as follows:

- An interim completion date of 10/31/16. The roadway will be required to be open to traffic by this date.

- The completion date for all work will be set at May 31, 2017.

Question Submitted:

9/15/2015 7:43:51 AM

In order to build the rear & forward abutment wing walls and the fills in front of the wing walls, would ODOT allow the contractor access outside the construction limits but within the existing R/W ?

Due to environmentally sensitive items (wetlands, trees, etc..) no work may be performed outside of the proposed work limits.

Question Submitted:

9/15/2015 7:38:49 AM

In the interest of reducing the time that the road is closed to traffic, would ODOT allow the use of S.I.P. metal decking to eliminate the time required to strip conventional deck forms?

The use of S.I.P. metal decking will not be permitted.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/10/2015 1:29:41 PM

On page 17/42 2 sheds nears Station 291+50 are designated to be removed. However, there is no correlating bid item for their removal. If the sheds are to be removed could appropriate bid items be added? Additionally, on this sheet it looks as if the sheds are outside of the construction limits. Please advise.

The biuldings are outside of the work limits but inside the R/W. They will be removed by others prior to the start of construction.

Question Submitted: 9/10/2015 1:06:35 PM

Has the Department performed any hydraulic analysis on the permitted temporary access causeway that has been included with the waterway permit? If so, can the analysis be made available to bidders?

No analysis has been performed.

Question Submitted: 9/10/2015 12:58:15 PM

A plan note on page 5/42 in the first paragraph states to minimize the access fill causeway. That being stated, will a waterway permit modification be required if the access fill is smaller than the permitted footprint or should bidders plan on using the entire 1690 CY of fill stated on page 7 of the waterway permit provisions? Please advise.☐

No modifications will be required for areas of volumes less than the allowable indicated in the plan.

Question Submitted: 9/10/2015 12:50:51 PM

What is the permitted footprint (area) for the temporary causeway? Is this measured at the OHWM or at stream bottom?

The area is the total area of fill alowed in the stream which in this case would be the stream bottom.

Question Submitted: 9/10/2015 11:58:35 AM

The project waterway permit states that no work below the OHWM can occur between November 1 and July 31, 2016. The forward abutment is 6 feet below this mark. Without a causeway being able to be installed after July 31st that leaves only 6 weeks to reach the completion date of September 15, 2016. Would the District please review the note and completion date and revise the completion to allow sufficient time to complete the project in the 2016 season?

The work needed for the abutment is considered outside the boudry of the OHWM as shown on sheet 17/42. All work associated with the forward abutment is considered to be outside of the stream and not restricted by the permit. The restrictions would effect only work in the stream such as removing the existing piers. The completion date allows for ample time for this work.