

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 060349

Sale Date - 8/23/2006

Question Submitted: 7/11/2006

Question Number: 1

Please provide the soil boring information for the following structures:

MED-71-0810 Left & Right
MED-71-0794 Left & Right
MED-71-0860 Left & Right
MED-76-0158 Left
MED-76-0061 Left
MED-71-0750

Are as built drawings available for the structures on this project?

Question Submitted: 7/12/2006

Question Number: 2

Regarding Ref. 493 Structural Steel, plan sheets 684 and 687 (Bridge 0729L) specify weathering steel. This looks to be in error, since the bridge gets painted and the adjacent bridges (0729R and 0729EN) are not specified to be weathering steel. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 7/12/2006

Question Number: 3

Re: Item No. 260 Landscape Watering

The quantity for this pay item is 2,310 MGal.
This seems excessive. Is this quantity correct?

Question Submitted: 7/13/2006

Question Number: 4

The bridge notes on plan sheets 986/1120 and 1012/1120 titled "EMBANKMENT AS PER PLAN" call for Granular Material Type B to be used in the bridge approach fills according to the defined station limits.

What pay item covers the cost for the Granular Type B?

Question Submitted: 7/21/2006

Question Number: 5

Can the plans for all of the existing bridges be put on ODOT's website?

See the Department's website: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/dgn.htm>

Question Submitted: 7/26/2006

Question Number: 6

Structure No. MED-76-0061L (Ramp NS-W over US 224)

The note on plan sheet 986/1120 for ITEM 203 EMBANKMENT AS PER PLAN calls for a 180 day waiting period following embankment construction prior to excavating for abutments and driving piling.

Construction of this bridge is to take place during Stage 2. According to the Maintenance of Traffic Notes, Stage 2 shall start no earlier than 3/15/2009, and must be complete by 10/15/2009 subject to liquidated damages.

With 180 days of waiting time, only 30 days are available to construct the entire bridge, including demolition of the old bridge and building the approach fills prior to starting actual bridge work.

Does there need to be a waiting period at this structure considering the proposed approach fill is minor and overlaps the existing approach fill?

If the 180 wait period remains, please extend the completion date for Stage 2 as well as the overall completion date to allow for sufficient time.

Question Submitted: 7/27/2006

Question Number: 7

Will contractors be permitted to cross I-76/SR 224 and/or I-71 with construction traffic using flaggers?

No crossing of I-76/SR224 or I-71 using flaggers will be permitted. No change in the plans or addendum is required.

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: 7/5/2006

Question Number: 8

Re: Reference Items 54-59

Reference items 54-59 are for Guardrail Alternates. The proposal currently has these two sets of items in different orders. Typically they are in the same order according to vendor. To avoid confusion, should these items be revised?

Question Submitted: 8/1/2006

Question Number: 9

Addendum #1 responded to a question regarding the SEQUENCE OF OPERATIONS plan note on plan sheet 51. The response addressed proof rolling but Subgrade Compaction was not addressed.

Unless further clarified, we assume that subgrade compaction will be paid a second time in the undercut areas as reflected in the pay quantity for this item.

Yes, the second subgrade compaction is listed in the plans as Sequence 6 and will be paid for the second time. No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 8/10/2006

Question Number: 10

CAN WE PLEASE GET A COPY OF ADDENDUM #2 & #3

Question Submitted: 8/10/2006

Question Number: 11

RE: Maintenance of Traffic Notes

The note on plan sheet 87A under Stage 1 – Phase 3 & 3A discusses optional I-71 median bridge work for the 2008 season but requires that the traffic shifts be returned to normal by 10/15/2008. This note applies to the structures at I-71 over Greenwich, I-71 over I-76, and I-71 over Chippewa Ditch. Due to the magnitude of work required at these structures, it will not be possible to construct both phases within the 7 months allotted during 2009. Therefore, it will not be an option but rather a necessity to construct the median (phase 1) segments completely in 2008 and it will not be possible to remove the traffic shifts at these structures for the 2008/2009 off-season. Please consider revising the MOT note requiring the traffic switches to be removed at these structures.

The notes on plan sheet 88 for Stage 2 phases 1 and 2 describes the sequence of construction for the Ramp SW and Ramp WN bridges over I-71. The Ramp SW detour is to begin on 3/15/2009. After this bridge is complete and open, the Ramp WN bridge is to be constructed and opened by 10/15/2009. Due to the magnitude of work required at these structures, it will not be possible to construct both bridges within the 7 months allotted during 2009. Please consider closing Ramp SW starting approximately 1/5/2009, by utilizing the Ramp SE detour.

Bid according to the plan. No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2006

Question Number: 12

Project Reference #173, is described in the proposal as "LOW MAST LIGHT POLE, DESIGN ATON51.7". The luminaires for these poles are, as specified by plan note (page 616), to be high mast luminaires detailed in CMS 725.21. A DESIGN ATON51.7 pole accepts a post top mounted fixture per SCD HL-10.11(01-16-04). Further, on the same SCD are the details for various light pole styles. The high mast fixtures mount to the horizontal plane rather than post top. The available pole for horizontal mount is an ATLM51.7 (LM designation being "LOW MAST"). It is our feeling that the project desires ATLM51.7 rather than ATON51.7. This would allow use of luminaires specified.

Question Submitted: 8/16/2006

Question Number: 13

Addendum #1 added items 801 and 802 "Granular Material, Type B, APP" for the bridge approach fills for structures 0061L and 0112R. Shouldn't the approach fills for structures 0729L, 0729R, and 0750 have these items added as well?

"Granular Material, Type B, As Per Plan" is not required for the bridge approach fills for structures 0729L, 0729R, and 0750.

Question Submitted: 8/17/2006

Question Number: 14

Are soil borings available for structure MED-71-0860 L&R? The locations of the borings are shown on the plans but the boring logs were not included in the documents.

The boring logs for structures MED-71-0860 L&R are available through the link in Addendum 1.

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: 8/17/2006

Question Number: 15

In reference to Bridge No. MED-76-0112R over Chippewa Ditch. Should the pier piling be tar coated or galvanized due to the possible contact with water?

ODOT's standard drawings indicate when the piles are reinforced concrete, the pile sleeves do not need galvanized.

Question Submitted: 8/17/2006

Question Number: 16

Some of the existing bridge structures have an asphalt overlay. Where is this being paid? Should there be a bid item for wearing course removed?

The removal of the asphalt overlay on the existing bridge structure is incidental to the structure removed and is included in the lump sum for item 202 Structure Removed.

Question Submitted: 8/19/2006

Question Number: 17

Proposal Note (b) 7 on page 50 states that "The Railroad company will assign, at the sole cost of and expense of the Department, railroad flaggers." The Cooperation with the Railroad note on drawing 1031 of 1120 states "The contractor shall...pay the railroad the cost of flagman."

Who pays the flagman?

Question Submitted: 8/2/2006

Question Number: 18

Re: Maintenance of Traffic at Greenwich Road

The note on plan sheet 60/1120 states that the closure for Greenwich road for demo of the existing structure is limited to 14 days. Unless clarified further by addendum, we assume that this means 14 days per phase since these bridges are taken down half width.

Question Submitted: 8/4/2006

Question Number: 19

Piezometer Notes and Details (sheet 46/1120)

1. The typical piezometer installation detail indicates the VW piezometer should be installed within a 6-inch minimum diameter borehole in a layer of sand, which is bound both above and below by Bentonite. Instead of this procedure, can the VW piezometers be grouted into place within a 3-1/2 inch diameter (standard tricone bit) borehole as was done in District 12 for the I-90 project and as is preferred and recommended by SlopeIndicator? SlopeIndicator reports, which summarize the benefits of the grout-in procedure, can be found on their website.

2. Note 2 indicates that the installation depths should be approved by the engineer prior to placing the piezometers. Who will be the engineer of record making this decision, and how long should we expect for a reply from the engineer? For the I-90 project in District 12, the borings were performed without installing the piezometers immediately and were grouted upon completion. The field logs were given to the engineer when completed. This allowed the engineer a little time to review the logs and allowed the drilling and sampling of other borings to continue without waiting for the engineer's response. Once the engineer confirmed the desired locations for the piezometers, the drilling crew was able to return to the grouted boring location and quickly auger down (without sampling) in a slightly offset hole to the correct depth and install the piezometers. Would this be an acceptable alternative to having the drill rig and crew waiting in the field after completion of each boring for the engineer to respond prior to completing each boring?

Question Submitted: 8/8/2006

Question Number: 20

Ref #120-123 Conduits, Bored and Jacked. The plan calls for boring the entire pipe run. All of these bores will be performed during the middle phase construction. This will allow a portion of each drainage run to be installed by open cut method. Please reduce the quantity of the Conduits, Bored and Jacked and increase the quantities of the other drainage items to reflect this.

The plan quantities should be bid as listed. Alternate recommendations for installing the portion of pipe not specifically under pavement or shoulders can be submitted to ODOT for review and approval during construction.

Question Submitted: 8/8/2006

Question Number: 21

Please provide the missing CSX Railroad information from plan sheet 922/1120.

The information is in the Proposal pages 49 -52.

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.