

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 080211

Sale Date - 3/21/2008

Question Submitted: 12/17/2007

Question Number: 1

Plan sheet 316 and 407 show a 30" storm sewer at station 244+00 that is to replace an existing storm sewer in the same location. Part of the new storm sewer is to be bored/jacked under the southbound IR-77 mainline as well as ramp D-2. How is the contractor expected to remove the old pipe and bore a new one when the new bore goes in the exact same line? Please clarify in an addendum.

Questions 5: There is not enough time to complete the project given the current schedule of the Def-24-7.96 project. Parts of the project can't even start until after the completion date has passed. Also weather conditions at that time of year may not be conducive to superpave mixes. Will an extension of the completion date be granted ?

Question Submitted: 12/18/2007

Question Number: 2

With regards to maintenance of traffic:1.Can we utilize the Phase 1 traffic shifts at the bridge locations in 2008, provided that the Pre-Phase 1 temporary shoulder strengthening is constructed?2.At the conclusion of Stage 1 work, will all four lanes be opened to traffic? If not, will the northern section be striped for three lanes (current configuration) or striped for four lanes and the inside lane closed with drums until stage 2 is complete? 3.Will ODOT pay for the 642 paint markings prior to installation of the 643 Polyester markings, as stated on sheet 46, under the bid items for work zone markings items? 4.Please clarify the winter restriction dates. Sheet 46, note 1, states that traffic is to be returned by October 1. Notes 2, 3, and 4 have a cut-off date of October 15. The note under winter pavement markings states that polyester markings must be down by November 1. What is the winter limitation date and when must the 621 RPMs and 643 Polyester markings be installed?5.Are Law Enforcement Officers required for lane closures? If so, will they be paid under the bid item for LEOs or paid under the maintaining traffic, lump sum bid item as the LEOs for complete stoppages of traffic and ramp closures are?6.What is item 299 Maintaining Traffic (Work Site Lighting) for? It appears that this is for floodlighting, however the note on sheet 48 states that floodlighting is to be paid under the lump sum contract price for maintaining traffic. 7.Due to the high traffic volume and significant exposure to work zone traffic control devices, could a bid item be added for replacement drums?

Answer 4: Agree - the correct station for the start of Phase 1 EB lane reconstruction is 584+04.54.

Question Submitted: 12/18/2007

Question Number: 3

Regarding Reference 2- Pavement Removal 256,768 sy, the legend for pavement removal on Plan Sheet 14 calls for asphalt over 10" reinforced concrete base and the legend on Plan Sheet 18 calls for 9" reinforced portland cement concrete pavement. Please confirm type of reinforcing –mesh or bar mat/continuous rebar. There is a tremendous difference in the cost of removal based on type of reinforcing.Also what is thickness of asphalt to be removed? The thickness of asphalt effects the milling cost and the quantity of RAP generated.

Question Submitted: 12/7/2007

Question Number: 4

Can stay-in-place forms be used on this project?

Question Submitted: 2/21/2008

Question Number: 5

Can the Microstation / CAD files be made available for this project?

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/dgn.htm>

Question Submitted: 2/21/2008

Question Number: 6

Plan page 47 under signage references Standard drawings MT-98.16, MT-98.17 & MT-98.18. We have not been able to locate these standard drawings. Please advise.

Answer 3: The necessity to remove and reset any of the PCB installed by the contractor for Def-24-7.96 to switch from MOT Phase 1 to MOT Phase 2 on this project shall be detailed in the Contractor's Maintenance of Traffic Scheme submitted to ODOT, as stated in the Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan note on sheet 8. Any such operation shall be the responsibility of the contractor on this project and coordinated with the contractor on Def-24-7.96. All costs associated with any such operations shall be included in the Lump Sum price bid for Item 614 Maintaining Traffic As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 2/21/2008

Question Number: 7

1.Can the existing structure drawings be put online?

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: 2/25/2008

Question Number: 8

In regard to maintenance of traffic notes: The Contractor Access from Work Zones note on sheet 46 states "For operations that require more than 10 trucks per hour to enter or exit the work zone, close the lane adjacent to work zone...". Per the Schedule of Through Lanes to be Maintained on sheet 45, lane closures can only occur at night (or a small window during the day in the 3 lane section). This condition will be in effect during excavation/pavement removal, 304 aggregate, and asphalt operations and will essentially turn this job into a night job. This will have significant impacts on schedule and cost to the project. This note severely restricts the contractor's ability to meet the October 1 interim completion date each year. Could this note be removed for this project?

Question Submitted: 2/25/2008

Question Number: 9

In regards to Item # 43 - "CONCRETE BARRIER SINGLE SLOPE, TYPE C1, AS PER PLAN", to expedite the construction of this wall can it be constructed per STD DRAWING RM 4.3 PG 2/2. The top of the wall can still be maintained at 16.5", but in lieu of using a verticle section of wall for the height variaton, the slope of the wall would be maintained at 5.25 to 1 for the total height of the wall (as shown in the standards for type C1 barrier). Based off of the superelevation tables, this would result in the bottom width of the wall varying from 38-1/4" to 42-1/4".

Question Submitted: 2/25/2008

Question Number: 10

We can find no pay item for CONCRETE BARRIER END ANCHOR, REINFORCED, TYPE C1. Based off of STD DRAWING RM 4.3 page 1 it appears end anchorages are to have their own pay item, and based off of RM 4.3 page 2's description of REINFORCED END ANCHORAGES it would appear there should be some end anchors in the TY C1 barrier. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 2/29/2008

Question Number: 11

Sheet 52 adds 13,500 lf of standard PCB and 400 lf of bridge mounted PCB and states this is to be used for protecting the pre-phase 1 median work as shown on sheet 57. On sheet 57, under the drawing for protection of median bore pits, there is a note that states "Costs of PCB for protecting bored and jacked conduits is included in the 603 price". Will this barrier be paid as shown on sheet 52 or is it incidental as shown on sheet 57?

Question Submitted: 3/10/2008

Question Number: 12

It appears from the quantity of 643 Polyester that between October 15, 2009 and March 15, 2010, Stage 1 will be open to 4 lanes of traffic and between October 15, 2010 and March 15, 2011, Stage 2 will be open to 3 lanes. However, as stated in previous addenda, we are allowed to maintain the phase 2 traffic shifts at the bridges through the winters of 2009 to 2010 and from 2010 to 2011. In phase 2, the bridges can only maintain 3 lanes of traffic in Stage 1 and 2 lanes of traffic in Stage 2. This would mean we would need to install a lane closure at each bridge. Is this ODOT's intent for maintaining traffic over these two winters? If ODOT does intend to open Stage 1 to 4 lanes of traffic for the winter, is the contractor to install a standard lane closure with arrowboard at the southbound closure point over winter or utilize signs W9-H4L and W9-H5L as on previous projects?

Question Submitted: 3/11/2008

Question Number: 13

On plan sheet #104, please check the quantity given for PCB, 32" and bridge mounted for Ramp F-3. The planned quantity is a total of 540 LF between Sta. 38+75 to 46+25 and the detail on sheet #160 & 161, shows wall from Sta. 33+30 to 53+40 for a total of 2,010 LF. Thank you.

Question 3: If not who will remove and reset if required the PCB installed by the contractor for Def-24-7.96 to allow Phase 2 construction on this project to proceed?

Question Submitted: 3/12/2008

Question Number: 14

Addendum 5 addressed the situation with the pipe boring at Station 244+00 on plan sheets 316 and 407. Given that the existing pipe runs under existing IR-77 and Ramp D-2, and construction takes place in multiple phases, wouldn't it make more sense to abandon or plug/fill the existing 30" pipe instead of removing it?

Question Submitted: 3/13/2008

Question Number: 15

Regarding plan sheets 1155, 1156, 1157 and 1158 for structure number CUY-77-0570 L&R (Brookside Road): 1. Please provide the abutment footing dimensions for the front face and the fillet on the back side of phase 1 construction. 2. Please provide the outside wingwall dimension for the horizontal top portion of the wingwall. 3. The plan views on sheets 1155, 1156 and 1158 detail the footing beneath the wingwall to be 8'-6" in length. However, on sheet 1159, the elevation view for the wingwalls shows the footing to be 9'-0" in length. Which dimension is correct?

Question 4: Addendum #1 incorrectly gives a station of 684+04.54 several times. This should be corrected to say 584+04.54

Question Submitted: 3/14/2008

Question Number: 16

1. Due to the size of this project would the department consider lowering the amount of work performed by the general contractor from 50% to 40%? 2. There are several notes on the underdrain drawings stating that existing underdrains are to be removed. Some will come out with the excavation but others will have to be removed seperately. How is this removal to be paid?

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: 3/17/2008

Question Number: 17

Plan sheet 18 shows existing typical ramp sections. All of the sections on plan sheet 18 show concrete pavement with bituminous aggregate base shoulders. Existing site conditions show asphalt on all of the ramp pavements and shoulders. Specification 202.05 calls for removal to bottom of pavement courses "as shown on the plans". Furthermore, asphalt on the shoulders that gets removed is paid under excavation. Are the ramp cross-sections accurate as is to reflect the thickness of the removed pavement (including asphalt overlay) as well as shoulder thickness of asphalt?

The Department believes the cross-sections are sufficiently accurate. The presence of an existing asphalt overlay at the ramps was considered in the estimate of end areas and earthwork volumes presented in the plans.

Question Submitted: 3/17/2008

Question Number: 18

This question addresses the Unclassified Excavation for the bridge structures. We are calculating quantities in excess of the plan amounts. It appears the plan quantity for unclassified excavation only includes the excavation for the widening of the new structures and does not account for the excavating and backfilling of the existing abutments, which is necessary for the replacement of the 6" plastic pipe. How are the plan quantities calculated and where is the excavation of the existing abutments paid?

Unclassified excavation was calculated and itemized for the widened portions of bridges only. The required additional excavation to replace existing abutment drainage is incidental to the conduit item, consistent with the provisions of CMS 518.10.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2008

Question Number: 19

In regards to the detail shown on pages 72, 74-76 for Conversion of Ramp Butt Joint to Lapped Joint. At what locations shall this detail be used? Why is it incidental to Item 880? Ramps are not reconstructed under Item 880.

This detail cannot be incidental to Item 880 because ramp pavement is not built under Item 880. The detail cannot be required at these locations. The Department must tolerate a full-depth butt joint where this detail was required.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2008

Question Number: 20

The noisewall plans do not provide any elevation views of the bridge mounted barrier, they only state to see the respective bridge plans for that location. The bridge plans provide an anchor detail and post size, but no noisewall elevations and state to see the noisewall plans for further details. Please provide the elevation views of the bridge mounted noisewalls with elevations so that this item can be accurately bid.

The Department will not provide elevation views for bridge-mounted noise barrier. This item can be bid from the information shown in the plans. The required panel height can be computed by dividing the area of bridge-mounted noise barrier (8192 Sq Ft) by the bridge length at the 6 locations where it is required (184'+184'+152'+152'+184'+168'=1024'). Accordingly, the required panel height is 8'-0". At the deck slab details sheet for each bridge, the bottom of the panel is detailed as being 6" below the top of the parapet, making the top of the panel 7'-6" above the top of the parapet.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2008

Question Number: 21

On many projects ODOT has bid Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic Class A APP, allowing 9" of item 302/301 to replace 7" of item 301 and 4" of item 304. Will ODOT allow this on this project?

Please prepare your bid based upon the bidding documents. The Department will consider this proposal if made in conjunction with a Value Engineering Change Proposal.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2008

Question Number: 22

Addendum 2 summarized plan revisions from the original 070479 plans to the current plans. Plan sheets 349-489 were revised to reflect existing grades, end areas, and volumes. Current 080211 plan sheet 489 shows 122,443 cy excavation and 117,973 cy embankment, both which are carried to general subsummary and general summary sheets (plan sheets 285 and 218). However, if the total of volumes from plan sheets 349 through 489 are added, the total volumes are significantly different than what is shown on plan sheet 489. The differences in quantities significantly change the character of the work. Please verify this potential error in summary in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2008

Question Number: 23

Please clarify whether or not multi cell conduit is required for the ITS conduits shown in the median barrier, retaining walls, and bridges. The typical sections for median barrier on sheet 27 show the bottom conduit as 725.20 (multi cell). The retaining wall details and most of the bridge and approach slab details do not specifically mention multi cell or 725.20.

Multi-cell is specified at Note 3 of Sheet 1177, Note 5 on Sheet 1247, Note 6 of Sheet 1294, Note 7 of Sheet 1340. Additionally, it is detailed as "conduit for future ITS" on Sheet 1031, the sheets mentioned previously, and throughout the lighting plans. As stated in the question, Sheet 27 shows that one of the conduit raceways is 725.20, the only material description in the Construction and Material Specifications that contains the requirements for multi-cell conduit. The Department believes the plans are sufficiently clear for bidders to understand that 725.20 multi-cell conduit is required for all ITS raceways at median barrier wall, retaining wall, and bridge parapet wall.

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: 3/19/2008

Question Number: 24

I wanted to know if this particular project in Cuyahoga required any post tension work?

Answer 2: These materials are property of the contractor on Def-24-7.96 and paid under that contract. The use of any MOT materials from the Def-24-7.96 project on this project shall be the result of a separate agreement between the contractor on this project and the contractor on Def-24-7.96. Any materials used from the Def-24-7.96 project on this project shall meet all requirements of the Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways, current addition and the specifications and proposal for this project. As stated on sheet 8, the contractor on this project shall coordinate MOT efforts with the contractor on Def-24-7.96 to establish and maintain a safe, efficient flow of traffic from one project to the next. All costs associated with any such operations shall be included in the Lump Sum price bid for Item 614 Maintaining Traffic As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 3/19/2008

Question Number: 25

Due to the volume of work required, there is not enough time to complete the noisewalls at the north end of the project during Stage 1, Phases 2 and 2A. Under the Sequence of Construction on sheet 44, the listing for Stage 1 does not include the noisewall work; therefore our understanding of this is that the contractor will be allowed to construct noisewalls within the Stage 1 limits during Stage 2. Please confirm that this is correct, otherwise direct us when, besides Stage 1 Phase 2, this work area will be available for noisewall construction.

Correct

Question Submitted: 3/3/2008

Question Number: 26

1. Sheet 950 has a note which states "post spacings shown in the noise barrier material manufacturer's approved drawings may be used in lieu of the post spacing shown in the plans." There is also a note in the same paragraph which states "post spacing shall not exceed 16." These two notes contradict each other since most manufacturers have systems which will span 24'. Please clarify what is allowed. 2. Under the noisewall basis of payment on sheet 951, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching around the noisewalls is listed as incidental to the wall. Typically this note is only used on stand-alone noisewall projects. Please remove the incidental erosion control work from the wall note since there are already separate pay items set up for erosion control on the project. 3. There are several noisewall locations (example Wall 1, sheet 962) where no drilled shaft depth is provided. The note on these sheets states "All drilled shaft foundation depths shall be 6'-0" into bedrock." Is the contractor to assume that bedrock is at the top of shaft elevation and the total foundation depth will be 6'-0"? Please note that sheet 956 should be removed from the plans. It is current ODOT practice that all shaft depths are to be provided to the contractor so that no disagreements occur from interpretation of the borings and the depth charts.

Answer 5: The project completion date was revised in addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 3/4/2008

Question Number: 27

1. On bridges CUY-77-0523 (Sprague Rd) and CUY-77-0570 (Brookside Rd) the elevations of the existing pier cap beamseats do not match. Please clarify which is correct. This will make a difference on the pier concrete bid items. See information below for locations. Elevations compared are where the bottom of the new pier cap meets the bottom of the existing cap over the column. Existing Proposed Difference Existing Proposed Bridge Location Elev. Elev. (ft) Sheet No. Sheet No. CUY-77-0523 (Sprague Rd) 1L 1042.98 1042.36 -0.62 327/382 1114/1386 2L 1041.89 1041.30 -0.59 327/382 1114/1386 1R 1032.56 1032.98 0.42 327/382 1115/1386 2R 1033.09 1032.54 -0.55 327/382 1115/1386 CUY-77-0570 (Brookside Rd) 1L 994.10 993.42 -0.68 337/382 1161/1386 2L 993.19 992.48 -0.71 337/382 1161/1386 1R 988.82 988.18 -0.64 337/382 1162/1386 2R 987.87 987.23 -0.64 337/382 1162/1386 Elevations at top of pier caps Existing Proposed Difference Existing Proposed Bridge Beamseats** Elev. Elev. (ft) Sheet No. Sheet No.

CUY-77-0570 (Brookside Rd) 1L B8 997.77 997.13 -0.64 337/382 1161/1386 2L B8 996.82 996.14 -0.68 337/382 1161/1386 1R B18 992.69 992.48 -0.21 337/382 1162/1386 2R B18 991.74 991.56 -0.18 337/382 1162/1386 1R B19 992.45 992.36 -0.09 337/382 1162/1386 2R B19 991.50 991.42 -0.08 337/382 1162/1386 These elevation discrepancies will make a difference in the bid quantities. Please clarify what elevations are to be used.

The Department has reviewed this concern and determined that the plan details and quantities appear to be correct. A comparison of elevations between original construction and the proposed design is not useful to the extent that both projects were surveyed on different datums. The average difference in elevations (original vs. current) is roughly -0.65', assuming the contractor hit the plan elevations on original construction. It appears the bidder's takeoff of elevations from original construction is incorrect at the bottom of pier at 0523 at 1R. The original elevation is 1033.56, not 1032.56 as stated in the question. The correct elevation yields a difference of 0.58' from the proposed design, within an inch of the average difference stated above. At the beam seats for 0570, the bidder's takeoff of the seat elevations from original construction is incorrect at B18 and B19. The difference of the correct values is between -0.66' to 0.69', again well within an inch of the expected difference due to the inherent difference in survey datums.

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: 3/5/2008

Question Number: 28

1. It appears that the rebar weight for the DS401 bars in the table on plan sheet 1362/1386 are incorrect. Please revise in an addendum 2. It appears that the drilled shaft quantities for Bid items 815,816,856,857 are all incorrect. Please revise in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/5/2008

Question Number: 29

At the phase lines on the bridges the existing bridge decks are required to be saw cut leaving an overhang that the plans show traffic and or portable barrier mounted on it. Has ODOT checked to see that these overhangs will carry the load?

The strength of the overhangs was evaluated during the design of this project. The Department believes they are adequate.

Question Submitted: 3/6/2008

Question Number: 30

Bid item 122- Manhole, #5: Plan sheet 297, Ref. D-5 calls for a new manhole to tie-into an existing 48" storm line at station 112+61 (also shown on cross-sections on plan sheet 356). There is no pay item for the 48" pipe tie-in. Should there be a pay item for the 48" pipe or is it expected that the cost for the tie-ins to the 48" pipe be considered incidental to the cost of the new manhole?

Question Submitted: 3/6/2008

Question Number: 31

1. Retaining wall bar LW801 is called out on sheet 1034 as straight. It is clear from the section on sheet 1031 that this bar is bent. Please verify that the rebar chart on sheet 1034 is correct. 2. There are several sections of retaining wall on sheet 1031 that appear to be mislabeled. It appears that the difference between the top middle section and the top right section is that the lower deflection shape extends into the top 4'-9" of the wall in the right section where in the middle section it is below the top 4'-9". In order for the high and low deflector shapes to not overlap (top middle section), the low side of the wall needs to be a minimum of $4.75' + 4.75' + 1.5' = 11.0'$ tall. Station 314+00 for example is $981.88 - 969.51 - 2'(\text{footing}) = 10.37'$ tall. Hence this station should be included in the top right section. Please clarify. 3. Please verify the plan quantities for Items 347 and 348. Our takeoff is significantly different.

Question Submitted: 3/7/2008

Question Number: 32

What location on the abutment diaphragms will be used to determine where the diaphragm concrete ends and the deck concrete starts? If you use the optional construction joint as that location then the diaphragm concrete bid quantities are all too high for all the bridges.

Question Submitted: 3/7/2008

Question Number: 33

Plan sheet 321 shows an existing 36" conduit crossing under the road just south of the Sprague Road bridge. Ref. R-6 on that plan sheet refers to removing 34' of existing 15" pipe connecting an existing catch basin (to be removed) to the 36" conduit, which is 17' below existing grade. The profile on plan sheet 322 calls for plugging the pipe just outside the catch basin which would indicate that the 15" connection is being abandoned instead of removed. Is this run of 15" pipe to be removed or abandoned?

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

Project No. 070479

Sale Date - 11/9/2007

Question Submitted: 10/12/2007

Question Number: 1

Are the electronic files available for this project? And if so where can we get them?

Question Submitted: 10/12/2007

Question Number: 2

The Noise Barriers Plans refer to the Structural Plans to see the details of the Bridge Mounted Noise Barriers. We couldn't find the Bridge Mounted Noise Barriers details in the Structural Plans. The question is, Where we can find the Bridge Mounted Noise Barriers Details?

Question Submitted: 10/13/2007

Question Number: 3

A September 7, 2007 Notice from the Office of Contracts scheduled a pre-bid meeting for above project Tuesday, October 9, 2007. The project has recently been deferred from the November 9, 2007 letting. Has the pre-bid meeting been cancelled? We have not seen any cancellation notice.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2007

Question Number: 4

1.Can the existing bridge plans be made available online?

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.