

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 083001

Sale Date - 6/4/2008

Question Submitted: 5/14/2008

Question Number: 1

Fence removal was discussed at the prebid meeting but the scope of services does not specifically require it. Please clarify this issue by addendum. Where will this work be paid for?

Question Submitted: 5/14/2008

Question Number: 2

Will the contractor be allowed to access the work from side roads outside of the project limits in order to limit clearing and exposure to traffic? It appears that the soil boring contractor was allowed to do this.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2008

Question Number: 3

Would it be permissible to move Wall 1 down to the edge of pavement? This will eliminate a substantial amount of clearing and access problems. If the wall can be moved, what top of wall elevation would be required based on the noise abatement study?

Question Submitted: 5/14/2008

Question Number: 4

Some signing work was discussed at the prebid meeting but the scope of services does not specifically require it. Please clarify this issue by addendum. Where will this work be paid for?

Question Submitted: 5/14/2008

Question Number: 5

The Scope states the lateral load analysis shall be performed in accordance with current AASHTO Standard Specification and the ODOT Bridge Design Manual which both follow the LRFD Specification. Should the noisewall drilled shafts be designed using LRFD? If LRFD is required, the design wind pressure in the current ODOT Bridge Design Manual is 25 psf (same as old Bridge Design Manual from 2004). Has this load already been factored?

Question Submitted: 5/14/2008

Question Number: 6

The current AASHTO Standard Specification and ODOT Bridge Design Manual are in LRFD. Has the Noise Barrier Foundation Table in the Scope of Services been updated to LRFD Specifications or is it the same one used over the years? If the table doesn't follow LRFD Specifications but the lateral load analysis is required to follow the current AASHTO Standard Specification and the ODOT Bridge Design Manual (both in LRFD) then we are not comparing similar values. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2008

Question Number: 7

The Structure Foundation Investigation gives us the boring logs, but actual soil parameters are required to perform a lateral load analysis (using LPile). The Geotechnical Engineer determines these parameters and they should be categorized by soil type and consistency/density. The parameters that are needed for the lateral load analysis are the following: a. Soil unit weight (pcf) b. Soil internal friction angle c. Cohesion (psf) d. Modulus of subgrade reaction, k (pci) e. Strain @ 50% of maximum stress (E50).

Question Submitted: 5/14/2008

Question Number: 8

The Noise Barrier Report indicates that predicted noise levels were determined using Version 2.5 of the FHWA Traffic Noise Model (FHWA TNM). Are the TNM electronic files available for this project. This will save the designer time, increase accuracy and maintain conformance with the FHWA Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise, 23 CFR 772.

Question Submitted: 5/16/2008

Question Number: 9

The existing drawings available for reference in the design of this project do not include FRA-71-23.72 and FRA-71-23.61. Could these drawing sets be made available to aid in the design of the project south of the area covered by the plans currently available?

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: 5/19/2008

Question Number: 10

1. The Scope says to use the "Noise Barrier Foundation Table" (table on page 10 of the Scope) to determine minimum drilled shaft depths. This table closely resembles the Cohesive Soil Noise Barrier Table found in the "Noise Barrier Details" plan insert sheets. However the plan insert sheets have a Granular Soil Noise Barrier Table as well. Scanning through the boring logs; some drilled shafts will be constructed in granular material. Should the table in the Scope be used for both soil types does the table for granular material need to be added to the contract documents? 2. The ROW fence on Wall 6 at approximate station 152+50 turns perpendicular to the roadway for a stretch before turning again to run parallel the road. Does the Department want the noisewall to make two 90° turns to follow the alignment of the fence or should the wall taper from approximately boring B6-12 to B6-13, avoiding these sharp turns? 3. Walls 1 and 6 have existing concrete curb along the edge of shoulder. Some of this curb is in bad condition. Will the Department consider adding a pay item by the linear foot to replace curb damaged during construction of the noisewall? This will help eliminate conflicts in the field that could arise over whose responsibility it is to repair sections at the end of the project.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 11

For the transparent barrier can you please confirm the following information: Transparent panels will be in a Ready Fit Panel Format with an aluminum frame with standard mill finish. Please advise whether the transparent sheet will be Type GSCC, (with embedded filaments), or standard clear transparent sheet, (without filaments.)

Question Submitted: 5/22/2008

Question Number: 12

1. Addendum 1 states that the drainage details design and construction requirements are linked to the addendum. We can not find the link, please clarify. 2. Addendum 1 states that the DBT is responsible for determining the length of need for guardrail during the bidding process. We request that ODOT revise this back to the same method used on other projects (ODOT providing a length for use in the bid). The bidders have no way of determining where specific walls will be located due to utility conflicts. This can only be established after clearing and a detailed site survey are completed. Forcing the bidders to make an assumption on guardrail length may result in conflicts between jobsite and ODOT personnel, which can be eliminated by establishing a baseline length in the bid. 3. Please clarify the culvert crossing note in Addendum 1. It states that the opening between the conduits across the ditch shall be maintained. Does this refer to the open gap between the end of the conduit exiting the slope from the ROW and start of the conduit that runs under the interstate? If so, extending the conduit at the ROW may result in removal of a portion of the length under the interstate. What length of gap needs to be maintained and will the department allow the shortening of the conduit that runs under the interstate? 4. Please clarify the 5% adjustment requirement for the wall area. Is this 5% based on the area of wall provided in the scope of services (as modified by addendum) with or without the transition areas included? Note that the area totals provided for each wall include totals both with and without the transitions. 5. Addendum 1 changed the total wall area for Wall 6 from 37,691 sf to 38,325 sf but did not revise the table provided in the scope of services. The totals on this table still sum to 37,691 sf. Please provide the basis for changing the wall area. 6. The ROW fence removal note in Addendum 1 states "If the ROW fence is removed..." Does this mean that fence removal is not required and is at the contractor's option? 7. The answer to Question 4 in Addendum 1 states that the noisewall standards are linked to the addendum. We can not find the link, please clarify. 8. The scope and addendum require the contractor to allow for 5% of additional wall area in their bid; however there is no method to account for additional drilled shaft length that may occur due to the increase in wall area. If the walls move down a slope and become taller, the shafts in that area may increase in depth. If the walls become longer, additional shafts over the original bid amount will be required. The bidders have no way to calculate this additional shaft length at bid time. We request that ODOT add an item for the drilled shaft foundations paid by the linear foot. This has been done successfully on other recent design-build projects.

Question Submitted: 5/23/2008

Question Number: 13

The answer to question 17 in Addendum 2 states that the ground mounted transparent wall should all be protected by barrier to prevent impacts. If this wall is out of the clear zone, will impact protection be required? If protection is required, can the contractor use guardrail?

Question Submitted: 5/26/2008

Question Number: 14

Addendum 2 clarified the acrylic panels do not require embedded filaments in the sheet, however there was no answer to the question of framing for the acrylic sheet. Please confirm that an aluminum frame system, mill finish is acceptable for use on this project. Alternatively, please provide more details for sheet connection to the posts as required by ODOT for this project if an aluminum frame is not required.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2008

Question Number: 15

Addendum 1 changed the consultant prequalification from Level 1 Bridge to Geotechnical Engineering Services. Please clarify the services that the Department expects the Geotechnical Engineer to provide. The scope of services does not require the DBT to perform additional soil borings and Addendum 1 directs the DBT to use FHWA recommendations for the missing soil parameters. Therefore we do not see the need for the consultant to be prequalified in Geotechnical Engineering Services. We request that the scope be changed back to Level 1 Bridge.

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.