

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 050566

Sale Date - 12/2/2005

Question Submitted: 10/20/2005

Question Number: 1

Ref. 118 Item 513 Structural Steel Members, Level 2 919,281# Since there is so much concern over painting steel bridges and since this bridge is over a railroad, can the grade of steel for this item be changed to Astm A588 weathering steel? This would eliminate the paint notes and refs. 119 & 120 intermediate and finish coats of paint. Another alternative would be to just paint 10 feet at the abutments ends.

Question Submitted: 10/24/2005

Question Number: 2

The soil boring logs were not included with the drawings; will the logs be issued by addendum?

Question Submitted: 10/31/2005

Question Number: 3

Sheets 9 and 10 of the plans give different times that the contractor will be allowed to work during night time hours. Please clarify the extent that we will be allowed to work at night. There will be some items of work that need to occur at night such as deck pours and some demo items.

Question Submitted: 10/31/2005

Question Number: 4

1. Due to the phasing and the location of the Pier 3 drilled shafts with relation to the N&S spur tracks, drilling will have to occur during track shut down periods. It appears that these tracks are rarely used and they are currently shut down with boots attached on either side of the bridge. Unless clarified by addendum, we assume that complete shut downs of the N&S spur tracks will be allowed.

2. It appears from a site visit that the existing arches on either end of the bridge are "true arches" which require the weight of the fill on top for support of the system. Please clarify if any temporary shoring is required under the arches when the fill material is removed and where this shoring shall be paid for. Also, the arch on the rear end of the structure is being used for access by a local business; does this access need to be maintained when working on the arch? This may present a problem if temporary shoring is required.

Question Submitted: 11/1/2005

Question Number: 5

BID ITEM 40, METER AND VAULT REMOVED AND RESET. WHAT IS THE SIZE OF THIS VAULT?

Question Submitted: 11/1/2005

Question Number: 6

1. The existing pavement section shows concrete base with an asphalt overlay. There is no pay item for pavement removed. Should this be added or is the removal of the asphalt and concrete included in the quantities for excavation?

2. Does the quantity for bid item 117, structural steel include the optional field splices or not? We are having a hard time confirming the quantity for this pay item. Can a detailed breakdown be included in the addendum?

Question Submitted: 11/1/2005

Question Number: 7

We sent in a question yesterday with an incorrect bid date on the form. It was for project 050566 and was labeled with a bid date of 10/19/05. Please change this to the correct bid date of 11/16/05 and respond to the questions. Sorry for the inconvenience.

Additional questions for the same project are as follows:

1. Will the use of stay-in-place deck forms be allowed?
2. Where is the removal of the existing railing and parapet on the retaining walls outside of the bridge limits to be paid?
3. Will drilled & grouted anchor bolts for the twin steel tube railing be allowed?

Question Submitted: 11/10/2005

Question Number: 8

On page 65/143 you say to use 3M markings or acceptable alternative approved by engineer. 3M is still the only one on approved list. Please clarify what is to be bid on lines 76 - 79.

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: 11/11/2005

Question Number: 9

- A) There are mechanical connectors shown in the deck phased joints, yet there is adequate splice length available in the closure pour. Can we eliminate the connectors?
- B) There are also mechanical connectors shown in the approach slabs. Given the phasing, there may be the possibility of eliminating these. Would we be allowed to do this?
- C) The existing sidewalk and concrete/aluminum railing must be removed from the sandstone wall coping for most of the length of the project. In order to not damage the sandstone, we need to know how it is attached (i.e. drilled & grouted, just sitting on top of it, etc). Can you please supply this detail?
- D) Both the plan/profile sheet (41/143) and the bridge site plan (107/143) show that one of the drilled shafts for Pier 3 conflicts with a storm drainage culvert pipe within the R/R right-of-way. This conflict is not reflected in the bridge's Pier 3 plan sheet, and its removal and/or relocation appears to have been neglected in the sitework items. What are we to do to resolve the conflict?
- E) North Arch In-Fill:
- a) Notes 4 and 8 on plan sheet 135/143 refer to the removal of stones from the top West/East portions of the arch. What are the limits of this removal and why is it being performed?
 - b) The notes for the South arch (sheet 134/143) states that there is a concrete top protecting the top of the arch stones. Is this also true of the North arch? If so, is it also to be removed? This will affect question "a)" above.
 - c) Note 5 discusses installing only enough block to retain a 4' lift of LSM fill at a time. Is this a contract requirement, or is it a suggestion from which deviation will be allowed?
 - d) Is it the intent of the plans to cut the new stone facing to conform to the shape of the arch? View B-B depicts otherwise.
 - e) There are no footing grades given. The elevation of the existing dirt fill varies from one end of the viaduct to the other. This would indicate that the area/volume of facing block/stone could vary substantially between the east and west walls.
 - f) Are we to place the LSM fill directly on the dirt/stone/roadway inside the arch?
 - g) Will ODOT allow us the option to spread/compact granular fill inside the arch as high as possible prior to filling the balance with LSM?
 - h) Does the pay quantity of the masonry (paid by volume and not area) include both the concrete block and the stone facing?
- F) Throughout the plans there are notes stating that we are expected to stay within the confines of the existing right-of-way for USR 23 during the construction of the bridge and roadway (note 12 on sheet 135, et.al.). The right-of-way is literally within 7' of the viaduct walls and the edge of the bridge at all locations, rendering the site inaccessible for construction operations. Has ODOT discussed ingress & egress routes with either CSX or Norfolk railroads to get relief from this requirement?
- G) The plan/profile sheet and the bridge site plan both show temporary construction limits around Pier 3. 90% of the area is already within the existing R/W. why is this "temporary" area cordoned off?

Question Submitted: 11/11/2005

Question Number: 10

Pavement marking tape items 645 show two alternates (reference numbers 76-79) and one is described in the plan notes (plan sheets 66-69). Type A3 approved material is 3M Preformed only. Why are two alternates bid?

Question Submitted: 11/14/2005

Question Number: 11

Ref 90, Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A Plan Quantity is 3155 Sy. We Can only locate 255-284 sy of this temporary pavement on plan sheets 20 & 21 of 143. Is this plan quantity correct is so where it to place and what traffic phase does it occur in.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2005

Question Number: 12

- 1) There seems to be a major error in the quantity for the temporary pavement (ref 98). It appears that the quantity in the proposal is the SF area and not the intended SY, overstating the quantity by 900%.
- 2) Ref 40 is for Removing/Restetting a water meter vault. The existing location is shown on the drawings, but the new location is not. Please clarify the location, depth, etc so that we can accurately determine the fittings, castings, risers, excavation/backfill/granular etc that may be required.

Question Submitted: 11/15/2005

Question Number: 13

Addendum No. 2 has not been downloaded into Bid Express yet. The quantity change from add. # 2 has not been made.

Question Submitted: 11/2/2005

Question Number: 14

Bid Item 105 is for Unclassified Excavation, As Per Plan. The bridge summary sheet references a note on bridge sheet 2/32; however this sheet does not contain any notes on excavation. Please clarify the As Per Plan portion of this bid item. Does the entire volume of the unclassified excavation need to be backfilled with granular material or just the portion under the approach slabs? Are there any special compaction requirements on top of the existing arches or can standard equipment be operated on top of them?

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: 11/21/2005

Question Number: 15

Are existing plans available for this project and how can they be obtained?

The existing plans can be located at the following ftp site.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D06/download/FRA-23-0832/ExistingPlans/>

Question Submitted: 11/21/2005

Question Number: 16

These questions are presented in regards to the answers given in Addendum #4 for this project:

1. With respect to the question asked concerning the potential conflict of the existing storm culvert with the drilled shafts in Pier 3, we assume that since the field survey conducted by the design engineer did not locate this line that it no longer exists. The response given to the pre-bid question in Addendum #4 references notes that pertain to circumstances in which the contractor damages utilities which may otherwise have been avoided. However, since this project has been knowingly designed with a drilled shaft overlapping the existing location of this utility, the only logical assumption is that this utility no longer exists otherwise the drilled shaft would not have been located on top of it. The contractor has no option but to install the drilled shaft in the location called for in the plans.

2. In reference to the question asked regarding how the existing sidewalk is attached to the sandstone retaining wall, the existing structure plans for the 1967 replacement of the railings show 2 each dowel holes into the top of the retaining wall every 18" for the length of the railing.

Question Submitted: 11/30/2005

Question Number: 17

Bid Line #0027 Manhole, Misc.:Electric and Traffic Manhole, 6 each-Should not be item 604 but item 625, work type is not 35 but 43. There are 2 each 8x8x14 Electric Manhole and 4 each 32" Traffic Pullbox.

Bid Line #0050 Conduit, Misc.:Conduit, 5" (with circuit cable)-plan page 81 of 143 under power subsummary indicates 2180 circuit cable in conduit, there is no specifications for this cable (we suspect it should be 15 KV caqble).

Bid Line 0051 Luminaire, Conventional, 14 each-plan page 80 of 143 has 3 different items for this work. There should be 3 separate bid items.

Plan page 80 of 143 under interconnect notes indicates the coaxial cable system is to be maintained. There is no bid item for this work.

A1) The mahholes are adequately described in the plans. WT may be adjusted after the letting if necessary. A2) There is a note in the plan, see note 14 plan sheet 79. A3) This is an "as per plan" item and is adequately described in the bidding documents. A4) The intent of the note is that if the poles or coaxial cable is damaged due to unforeseen accident, it shall be replaced in kind. No bid item is necessary.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2005

Question Number: 18

Bid Item 203E98000 is for Roadway Misc: Stockpiling of Non-Contaminated Material.

The general notes on p.6 indicate that material that is suspected of contamination is to be stockpiled and tested. Payment for material that is determined to be non-contaminated will be made thru this bid item.

1. Should there also be a bid item for material that is determined to be contaminated?

Question Submitted: 11/8/2005

Question Number: 19

The drilled shaft for Pier 3, shown on sheet 120 of 143, is 6'-6" in diameter. The spiral Mark P403 has a 4'-0" diameter. (sheet 137 of 143) Is this correct?

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.