

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 050343

Sale Date - 8/10/2005

Question Submitted: 6/13/2005

Question Number: 1

Bid Item #3 Approach Slab Removed includes approach slab removal for structures #1450 L&R, #1499 L&R, and #1569 L&R. Within bid items for each structure [#1450 L&R, #1499 L&R, and #1569 L&R], there is a bid item for Approach Slab Removed [Bid Item 202, 236, 270, 303, 336, 368, 400, and 432].

It appears that each approach slab removal is included in two bid items. If this is the case, Bid Item #3 should be deleted.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2005

Question Number: 2

Bid Item #4 Approach Slab Removal includes approach slab removal for Structures #1450 L&R, #1499 L&R, and #1569 L&R. Within bid items for each structure [#1450 L&R, #1499 L&R, and #1569 L&R], there is a bid item for approach slab removal [Bid Item 202, 236, 270, 303, 336, 368, 400, and 432].

It appears that each approach slab removal is included in two bid items. If this is the case, Bid Item #4 should be deleted.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2005

Question Number: 3

In the pre-bid meeting notes, the question was asked about using crushed concrete for granular embankments. ODOT's response was this material was forbidden, however, the plan note on sheet #12 states that the material used must meet the gradation of 703.16C, type B. Under this specification, paragraph C allows the use of recycled portland cement concrete when blended with 30 percent natural sand or natural granular material. Please clarify ODOT's intent as it pertains to the granular embankment, Type B.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2005

Question Number: 4

Will ODOT consider alternate methods for maintaining traffic?

Question Submitted: 6/15/2005

Question Number: 5

This project has a 10% DBE goal. We have studied many avenues for DBE participation on this project, and feel that the potential for participation falls significantly below the stated goal. Part of the basis for setting the 10% goal apparently lies in some DBE firms carrying Work Type 09 for stone base. This project has a quantity of 119,706 CY of aggregate base, which will prove to be a challenge even for the large general contractor. We do not feel that it is reasonable to expect that this work would be subcontracted, especially when this will be an extremely schedule critical item. To further complicate, there is warranty pavement going on top of the stone base, which adds to the risk of subcontracting the base work. We respectfully suggest that this type of work not be considered as DBE potential on this and future projects of this magnitude. Other recent projects in the area have had smaller DBE goals with much greater potential for meeting the goal. Based on this information, we suggest that the goal on this project be reduced significantly to a more realistic level.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2005

Question Number: 6

Please provide the existing bridge plans for all structures on this project. The preferable method would be Zip files which can be downloaded from the ODOT website and printed by the contractors.

Question Submitted: 6/17/2005

Question Number: 7

On ODOT Project No. 050048, Wayne/Medina County, the areas of the interior of the IR71/IR76 loop ramps was made available as a waste site for the disposal of excavated materials, pavement removed and concrete removed from structures. Will this same area be available as a waste site on this project?

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: 6/20/2005

Question Number: 8

Plan sheet 5: Regarding the normal typical section- the plans show an existing 10" reinforced concrete pavement overlaid with asphalt. The boring reports given show varying thicknesses of asphalt on the shoulder, but do not show any information for the pavement. The thickness of existing asphalt over the existing 10" concrete pavement is not given on sheet 5 or anywhere in the plans. What is the thickness of asphalt? Given the value of this item of work, we ask that ODOT provide the pavement thickness information for estimating and bidding purposes.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2005

Question Number: 9

The noisewall method of measurement note on sheet 567 states that noisewall constructed below the ground line shall not be included for payment. The typical section on sheet 547 and the profile sheets all show the bottom of the wall embedded approximately 6" in the ground. It appears as though this embedded area is included in the pay quantities for noisewall. Please clarify that the wall will be measured for payment from bottom of wall panels to top of panel coping.

Please clarify if the noisewall drilled shaft rebar is required to be epoxy coated.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2005

Question Number: 10

What is the elevation of the existing 12" water main on SR 162 which crosses I-71 at station 766+20 between pier 2 and the forward abutment? If the elevation is not provided we will assume that the waterline will not be in interference with the excavation or construction of Pier 2 for the new structure.

Question Submitted: 6/24/2005

Question Number: 11

In reviewing the plans & calculations for Project 343 (05) we believe that there are significant errors on Page 24 of the plan:

1. STA 521+00 to STA 528+00: under Item 301 Asphalt Concrete Base: Quantity listed is 142.6 Cu.Yds. Is this quantity correct?

STA 528+00 to STA 547+00: under Item 301 Asphalt Concrete Base: Quantity listed is 104.3 Cu.Yds. Is this quantity correct?

STA 547+00 to STA 582+00: under Item 301 Asphalt Concrete Base: Quantity listed is 713.0 Cu.Yds. Is this quantity correct?

STA 591+00 to STA 661+00: Length shown is 1000 feet. Is this dimension correct or is the length 7,000 feet?

If the correct length is 7,000 feet, revisions will be required for the quantities listed under the following headings:

Item 254 Pavement Planing
Item 301 Asphalt Concrete Base
Item 448 Asphalt Surface Course
Item 617 Compacted Aggregate

Under Item 448 Asphalt Concrete Surface: Is the total quantity 9345 Cu. Yds.?

Thanks

Question Submitted: 6/30/2005

Question Number: 12

Plan sheet 16: 614 Maintaining Traffic note identifies October 15 of each year as an interim completion date for returning traffic to two lanes. What is the earliest start date of each year for altering traffic patterns?

Question Submitted: 6/7/2005

Question Number: 13

1. Sheet 17/624 states that detour signs and quantities are shown on sheet 545. We have been unable to locate this page. Please assist.

2. Will OC-49-48 "Right Lane Must Use Shoulder" signs be required throughout the length of the job and what spacing?

Question Submitted: 6/9/2005

Question Number: 14

Sheet 33/624 seems to conflict with the the last line on sheet 16/624. Is it ODOT's intent to keep the 3rd lane closed from 486+28.80 to 676+00 until stage 2 phase 3 is complete? If so what drum spacing is acceptable to close this lane long term?

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: 6/9/2005

Question Number: 15

On Bridge 1499 over CR 49 and the Rocky River, it appears as though the golf course has an existing cart path leading up to the bridge on the forward abutment end. Does the course use this for access and will it have to be maintained during bridge construction? There are no provisions in the plans for connecting the existing pieces of the path under the bridge. Is the intent to maintain a clear zone for golf cart access under the bridges?

Question Submitted: 7/12/2005

Question Number: 16

Please provide a detailed breakdown of what is to be included in bid item 179 for payment. We can not verify the plan quantity.

Question Submitted: 7/12/2005

Question Number: 17

Please verify the quantity for bid item 183. It appears that this item is only for replacing the 25 sections of parapet which amount to ~3 cy. Where is the remaining 19 cy to be used?

Question Submitted: 7/15/2005

Question Number: 18

PLAN NOTE ON SHEET 13, SS837, REQUIRES THE CONTRACTOR TO FIELD MEASURE PROPOSED LINER PIPES. MANY OF THESE LINES WILL REQUIRE CLEANING PRIOR TO SURVEYING. BID ITEMS SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR CLEANING AND ALSO FOR SURVEYING THESE LINER PIPES.

Question Submitted: 7/23/2005

Question Number: 19

On page 7 of addendum #5, we are told to add two paragraphs to sheet #16. The last line in the first paragraph tells us to stripe the pavement for 3 lanes for the winter. This conflicts with the last paragraph which states that we are to maintain 2 lanes of traffic for the winter. Is it still ODOT's intent to keep the left lane closed on the stage 1 sections until stage 2 is completed?

As stated in addendum no 1, 3rd lanes should not be open to traffic unless the adjacent section is already in a 3 lanes operation. In this case, at the end of stage 1 construction the northern section (Sta. 735/751+00 to 833+00) shall be stripped to 3 lanes operation and the southern section (Sta. 486+28.80 to Sta. 660/676+00) to 2 lanes operation.

Question Submitted: 7/5/2005

Question Number: 20

On reference 471 of the proposal it calls for 102" 707.12 liner pipe. The O.D.O.T. spec book only covers pipe from 18" thru 90". My question is what gauge do you want for this pipe.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2005

Question Number: 21

Please verify the quantity for reference #179. According to the dimensions and count given on plan sheet 259/624, the quantity seems overstated. Thank you.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2005

Question Number: 22

Plan Sheet 272/624, for the Poe Road bridge over I-71, shows bar mark R501 embedded into the top of the existing bridge parapet. Should these bars be installed with a 510 dowel hole bid item? Also same sheet upper left shows the same bar mark R501 for two different bar details. Please advise. Thank you.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2005

Question Number: 23

Please verify the quantity at reference # 183. According to the dimensions and count listed on plan sheet 259/624, the quantity seems overstated. Thank you.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2005

Question Number: 24

Please disregard two earlier submissions regarding a 510 dowel item for the Poe Road Bridge. The plan note entitled ITEM 517 - RAILING FACED, APP on plan sheet 261/624 answers the question. Thank You

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: 7/6/2005

Question Number: 25

We were checking out the EBS bid form today. When we entered unit prices into the bid form for reference number 502 and 503, alternates AA1 for the Tensioned Cable guardrail, and ran the check estimate command in EBS, we received a section error message stating that the section 0001 was only partially bid. To get the error message to not be displayed we needed to enter prices for reference numbers 504 thru 507 the other alternate bid items AA2, and AA3. When these unit prices were entered, the totals were not added to the running total for the section.

The same thing happened when we entered unit prices for bridges MED-71-1499 left and right in section 0014 and 0016 (the prestress beam option) and not for the alternate sections 0015 and 0017 (the steel beam option). We would get an error message stating the section was not bid. If the units were entered for section 0015 and 0017, these units were subtotaled for the section and but the bid total for the project did not reflect the subtotals for sections 0015 and 0017.

Normally on an ODOT bid we are required to bid only on one alternate and (see page 3 of the proposal under PN 019 the 5th paragraph) leave blanks for the second alternate. If that method is used on this project, we will have several section and item errors reported by the EBS bid form. Please advise us on how to handle this situation.

The situation the bidder is describing is true for optional bids, not alternate bids. In an optional bid, ODOT allows the contractor to bid the design he wishes to build. In an alternate bid situation, ODOT requires the contractor to bid all alternates and then the determination of which design to award to is made by ODOT or the local participating agency. This has always been standard procedure. In this instance, the scenarios are alternate bids. The bidder is thereby required to bid all items. The total in his ebs file will reflect the lowest possible combination of alternates, and the others will not be included in the total. It is this low total scenario on which the award is based, but the final contract items are determined by ODOT preference.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2005

Question Number: 26

Plan sheet 272/624, for the Poe Road Bridge over I-71, shows rebar mark R502 embedded into the existing concrete deck. Does the State intend to include a 510 bid item for 598 each dowels to install these bars? Please advise. Thank You.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2005

Question Number: 27

Reference Number 142-Transition Area Delineation-Which Standard Drawing is to be followed for use on this project?-MT-99.30 or 209930?

MT-99.30 is listed on the title sheet and it will be used.

Question Submitted: 8/4/2005

Question Number: 28

On plan sheet 16/624, the note under Pre-stage 1, states that pre-stage 1 construction shall be completed and traffic returned to the normal two lanes in each direction by October 15th. With the sale date being delayed by 4 weeks and with the additional work required as per addenda #5 & #6, will ODOT consider extending the interim completion date to allow additional time?

The District has considered your request and respectfully declines to extend the interim completion date.

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.