

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 090103

Sale Date - 2/18/2009

Question Submitted: 2/4/2009

Question Number: 1

Please see page 333 in the center median from station 176+35 to 177+01 and from 180+63 to 181+24, please clarify what the double lines are within the Item 451 - Reinforced Concrete Pavement Misc 4" Enhanced Concrete Pavement? Is there a detail of what this is at these locations? How is this item (whatever it is) paid for? This also occurs on page 327 from station 148+27 to 148+92 and page 329 from 158+24 to 158+92.

Question Submitted: 2/4/2009

Question Number: 2

The proposal quantity for Item # 45 - 4" Concrete Walk is 75,608 sf. The quantity in the General Summary (page 58) is 52,271 sf. This is also the quantity shown on the "office calculations" provided on the web site. The plans provided no quantity breakdowns and the office calculations are not clear or detailed enough for us to figure out which quantity is correct. Please clarify.

**Refer to addendum #1. The quantity in the proposal was changed to match the plans. In addition, there was a section of sidewalk removed from the project.**

Question Submitted: 2/4/2009

Question Number: 3

The detail at the bottom right of Typical Sections page 17 shows the Concrete Median APP. Please clarify if the adjacent curb shown on this detail is supposed to be incidental to the cost of this median. If so what are the dimensions of this curb, what is the thickness of the median, and will the pay limits of this median extend from face of curb to face of curb?

Question Submitted: 2/4/2009

Question Number: 4

Sheet 385 states that the excavation for the 16' x 6' box culvert shall extend to a depth of 905.3. This results in an undercut from 4' to 5' below the culvert. The note states that any overexcavation may be replaced with compacted soil per the soils report by Bowser Morner. We are unable to locate this report. Will we be able to reuse the soil excavated from the undercut for the replacement compacted soil fill per the report?

Question Submitted: 2/4/2009

Question Number: 5

This request is regarding the MSE wall notes provided on Sheet 684 of the contract drawings. As per the fourth paragraph, the bearing capacity is limited to 4,000 psf. The actual computed bearing pressures approach 4,500 psf. We request that the allowable bearing capacity be increased to 4,500 psf.

Question Submitted: 2/4/2009

Question Number: 6

We just received Addenda 4 (02/14/2009) and are questioning the answer to Q27 b) concerning the Modular Block Retaining Walls. It does not seem possible that the walls detailed on the addended drawing 399/773 could be gravity walls based on the heights shown on 394-398/773. Typical gravity walls for the specified modular block units are a few feet tall, not the 4' to 8' range detailed for most of the lengths of these walls. In accordance with C&MS 102.07, please revisit question Q 27 b) prior to bid so that all bidders can bid on the same criteria and avoid potential claim.

**Per addendum 4, the wall can be built as a gravity wall.**

Question Submitted: 2/4/2009

Question Number: 7

1. Reference Line 0135 - Sheet 25 of the plans specifies a color for the colored concrete but does not mention how to achieve the color. Will the engineer allow both integral and shake on methods? 2. Reference Line 0135 - Sheet 25 of the plans specifies a color for the colored concrete but does not mention the color or type of the release agent required for the stamp to concrete face. Please advise. 3. Reference Line 0135 - This item references 451 Reinforced Concrete Pavement. Is the intent of these areas to be flush with the pavement so they can be driven on therefore needing the reinforcing specified in reinforced pavement standard drawings? Or are they to be 4" on top of the new pavement similar to a median? If so, what type of reinforcing is necessary for this application? 4. Reference Line 0135 - If the new pavement is flush with the Type 6 curb, will any tie bars be necessary? 5. Reference Line 0140 - Is any of this item adjacent to enhanced pavement required to be colored?

**Answer 1: The contractor may use any method that results in a satisfactory product. Answer 2: The contractor may use any method that results in a satisfactory product. Answer 3: See detail sheet 17 for concrete median and use of enhanced pavement. Reinforcement should be in accordance with Item 451 and the applicable standard construction drawings. Answer 4: Tie bars to the Type 6 curb are not required. Answer 5: Only those areas specified in the plans at Item 451 Reinforced Concrete Pavement Misc.: 4" Enhanced Concrete Pavement requires color treatment.**

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: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 8

Answers to numerous submitted questions were not included in Addenda #1 & #2. Is an additional Addenda forthcoming in the near future? Some of the outstanding questions are: 01/29/09 10:39:04AM How is traffic maintained while constructing the full-depth portion of SR-741? 02/03/09 3:44:46PM Can soil embankment be used for undercut replacement in the 16'x6' box culvert undercuts? 02/04/09 7:40:32AM Please verify pile lengths and soil conditions below the bottom of the borings for the culvert at 133+63? 02/04/09 4:02:15PM and 02/05/09 6:54:30AM Regarding the 30" casing across SR-741 how is traffic to be maintained while installing or should this be a bore?

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 9

1) Could the existing plans for Miamisburg-Springboro Pike over I-75 on microfilm "MOT14" at the central Office Library be printed out and made available on the website.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 10

Plan sheet 606 calls for "round tapered signal support". These signal supports are very similar to the cantilever sign supports being used on this project. There is no indication in the signing plans for "round tapered". Will this be required for the cantilever sign supports? And...will it be required for the box truss span type supports?

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 11

I have four related questions about painting overhead sign structures. #1. Plan sheet 528 contains the notes for painting of sign structures. The first paragraph states "...to be supplied with a primer finish. A minimum of two additional coats of paint will be required...." Are the structures to be furnished with a primer finish and not galvanized? #2. The notes seem to be talking about field painting the last two coats. Is this the requirement? #3. ODOT usually has bid items for painting sign structures. Is the painting to be incidental to the sign structures on this project? #4. The specification covers sign structure type TC-12.30, TC-16.20, & TC-81.21. What about type TC-7.65 & TC-15.115. Are they to be painted also? And, if so, is the aluminum part of the 7.65 to be painted?

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 12

Sheet 36/733 allows for the Detour/Closure of Miamisburg-Springboro Pike for 260 Days. Will ODOT allow this to be done in more than one period if the 260 Day total is not exceeded? Will ODOT consider an incentive if the Detour/Closure can be less than 260 Days? Do Winter Days count as Detour/Closure days from December 1 to April 30?

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 13

Ref. 236 & 237 Removal of Pavement Marking implies a 642 Paint Item. The plan list this Item as 644 Thermoplastic. Could clarification be made.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 14

Sheet 420 / 773, Section VI, has a sentence which states, "Square feet of noise barrier constructed below the ground line shall also not be included for payment." This statement is contrary to the current ODOT methodology which pays for all wall area from bottom of panel to top of coping. Current jobs are eliminating this note either before the plans are released or by addendum. Currently, MOT-75-0.75 only pays for the wall above the ground line and it also appears that the plan quantities for this project do not in fact include the entire wall area including buried portions. Please modify this note to include payment for all square feet of wall erected and update the plan quantities.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 15

Could the existing bridge plans for the Miamisburg-Springboro Pike Over I-75 bridge please be made available on the website? Thank you.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-77246/>

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 16

The Pile Driving Constraint on sheet 656 requires a 60-day waiting period at the Abutments and allows the Engineer to adjust the length of the waiting period based on Settlement Platform readings. Please add a bid item for Settlement Platforms and also specify what the settlement criteria is that will allow the Engineer to reduce the length of the waiting period.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 17

SS840 dated 4-18-08 is specified for this project. Please update this to the 1-16-09 version.

---

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: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 18

Note 7 on sheets 658 and 659 references filling the pile sleeves with Bentonite Slurry. The Supplemental Specifications no longer require Bentonite; please remove these notes.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 19

The notes in the MSE Wall sections on sheet 688 state that the sides of the excavations shall be cut to prevent caving. Please clarify by addendum that any additional select granular material required to backfill an OSHA approved cut slope will be paid for at the unit bid price for Select Granular Backfill.

**There will be no additional payment for wall excavation or backfill beyond the limits in the contract documents. Include all costs for sloping or shoring the excavation in the lump sum item for cofferdams, cribs, or sheeting for the bridge.**

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 20

The Noisewall Basis of Payment on sheet 420 states that aggregate drains are included with the wall for payment. The only aggregate drains shown for the walls are paid for with Item 601 Rock Channel Protection. Please modify the Noisewall payment note to remove the aggregate drains.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 21

Ref No 433 is for Vandal Protection Fence, however no description or fence height is provided. In the plans the bridge summary uses an as per plan designation, however there are no plan details or description to provide guidance related to the as per plan designation, the fence height, the coatings, or other information needed.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2009

Question Number: 22

Ref. Nos. 22 and 24 are fence and gate removal items that require removal of fence and a gate in a manner that would allow them to be reused. There are no corresponding items for the reinstallation of the fence and gate. Will items be added in the future for fence rebuilt, and gate rebuilt? Or are these items to be rebuilt by others? Should we plan to store these items on the jobsite?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 23

Please provide a cross-section of the Soldier Pile Wall along Wood Road which details the distance from the wall to the existing structure.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 24

Per 511.20, Bridge Decks are to be grooved after curing. Will the Department please verify if 511.20 applies to the 14-ft Bikeway on Bridge No. MOT-75-0075, Miamisburg-Springboro Pike over I-75.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 25

Should there be a bid item for cut and plug 12" water line? Drawing 402 has a note regarding inspections and reports for water lines. Does that note apply to this project? Are inspections to be done at the place of manufacture or at the job site? Please provide a list of approved laboratories.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 26

Plan sheet 116 shows the profile for the relocated sanitary sewer line. None of the borings in the area of this work go deep enough to show soil conditions. What ground conditions should we expect to be digging thru?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 27

How should we handle the maintenance of traffic for the 30" casing crossing SR 741 at 14 feet depth?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 28

I would like to print a copy of the bid pamphlet for the above project to calculate aggregate quantities, but the 2/11/09 letting is not listed as bidding. Where do I find this information? Thanks

**There are only two projects in that letting, 090047 and 090103. We don't create pamphlets for special lettings. 090047 was delayed from the Jan 28th letting, Gary will need to look in that pamphlet. 090103 isn't in any pamphlet - so look in the proposal for that 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: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 29

PAGE 24 - ASBESTOS INSPECTION THE NOTE STATES STRUCTURES WILL NOT BE DEMOLISHED UNTIL ASBESTOS INSPECTIONS ARE COMPLETE. THE PLANS ARE SILENT AS TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSPECTION COST OR IF ASBESTOS AS FOUND HOW PAYMENT WILL BE MADE FOR ITS REMOVAL. OTHER PROJECTS RECENTLY BID INCLUDED A BID ITEM FOR THE INSPECTIONS AND STATED PAYMENT FOR REMOVAL, IF NECESSARY, WOULD BE PAID UNDER 109.05. PLEASE ADVISE

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 30

The bid item description for Ref. No. 333 states that 3 parcels are included: parcels 119, 160, and 161. The description further indicates 6 structures, all of which seem to be on parcel 119. Parcel 160 is adjacent to 119, but 161 appears to be on the other side of the interstate. Please confirm that no demolition is required on parcels 160 and 161.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 31

For Ref. 365 Soldier Pile Wall, the notes on sheet 393 do not indicate what type of timber is required. They reference 711.26, which references 712.06, which refers to preservative treatment. We assume that this means pressure treated Southern Yellow Pine, but please confirm this. Also, please indicate if the 6" thickness shown on the plans is nominal or actual.

**Southern Yellow Pine is acceptable. The 6" listed in the plans is the nominal thickness of the timber lagging.**

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 32

Is it the intent of the plans that the 30" Steel Casings as called out in Line 0168 be bored & jacked or installed by open cut methods? It appears that the casing crossing Miamisburg-Springboro Pike (sht 207) could be open cut, while the one crossing SR 741 (sht 208) should be bored & jacked. Please clarify which method is to be used.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 33

Re: 451 & 452 Pavement Sheet 1 of the plans indicate 2008 specs which call for unsealed joints. Sheet 1 also refers to BP-2.1 & BP-2.2 which call for sealed joints. Do you want sealed or unsealed joints?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 34

Could the electronic files be made available including Geopak files and cross section data(.xsr)?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 35

Could the electronic files be made available including Geopak files and cross section data (.xsr)?

**This project has legacy CAD standards (pre-CADD 2004). Cross section data files (.xsr) for each alignment are provided. Note that these files do not include undercut as shown on the cross section sheets and the files were "spot checked" only. The information on the cross section sheets should be held in the occurrence of conflicting information. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-77246/>**

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 36

Regarding the electronic files that were made available, there was not any cross section data for the ramps where they tie into 75. Also, there was no existing cross section data available for any of the areas. Could these 2 items be made available?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 37

The soil borings for the culvert at 133+63 terminate at 25' deep, however the piles for this structure are 75' friction piles. The borings for the bridge over I-75 show shallow limestone. Please verify by addendum that the plan pile lengths for the culvert are correct and that the bidders can assume that soil conditions below the bottom of the boring at the culvert are consistent with the soil conditions represented within the length of the boring.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 38

Is it really the intent to put pile points on the 12" CIP Piles at the Station 133+63 Culvert or should this item be removed?

**Yes, it is our intent to use pile points. Points are recommended in the Bowser-Morner geotechnical report #132049-0907-253, dated September 28, 2007.**

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 39

For the culvert at station 133+63, will a construction joint be permitted between the footing and short stem wall shown in Section G-G on sheet 380?

**Yes, a construction joint is permitted between the footing and the stem wall shown in Section G-G.**

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: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 40

The Noise wall Basis of Payment on sheet 420 states that seeding, fertilizing, and mulching is included with the wall for payment. Since there are already items for this work established on the project, please remove this requirement from the note.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2009

Question Number: 41

The Noise wall basis of Payment on sheet 420 states that any excavation or backfill required for wall construction is included with the wall for payment. Please verify that the quantity for this work is not already carried to the mass excavation and embankment bid items. If it is to be included with the wall for payment, please provide the end areas or volumes by station on the Noise Barrier Cross-Section sheets.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2009

Question Number: 42

Regarding the Modular Block Walls: 1. Please provide more details in terms of block manufacturer, block color and finish that are to be used on this project. 2. Is the wall intended to be tied back or just a gravity wall system? 3. Are the blocks to be pinned together? 4. Are the cap units to have a positive attachment to the wall units? 5. Provide gradations or specifications for the Unit Core Fill, Low Permeable Soil, and Crushed Stone Leveling Pad. 6. Where is the excavation for the leveling pad to be included?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 43

1. On sheet 31 under WORK ZONE RAISED PAVEMENT MARKER, AS PER PLAN, shows 1570 WZRPM's and 8430 SY of Pavement Planing Asphalt Concrete. Looking at the Pavement Quantities Calculation Sheets it does not show where this quantity of pavement planing is. The note on sheet 31 says that payment for resurfacing within the transition area shall be paid for under the appropriate bid items for the work required, as provided for in the plans, however it appears that these items are not included in the calculation sheets as well. Please provide a subsummary detailing the transition areas and WZRPM's. 2. What municipality or municipalities are providing the LEO's? 3. Stage 1 construction (Sheet 46) shows building the south side of Austin Pike, southeast corner and the west side of SR 741. In Stage 2 (Sheet 52) it shows the Austin Pike traffic running on the new pavement to turn on to SR 741 while constructing the Northeast corner of SR 741. The new pavement of Austin Pike at the intersection is about one foot lower than the existing SR 741. When are we supposed to build the new pavement on SR 741 and maintain traffic while doing so?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 44

Item #433, Special Vandal Protection Fence Ornamental Steel, special provisions sec. 2.02 material sec. E calls for the square mesh to be fastened to the pickets. The pickets are smaller than the horizontal rails. Do the full height of the pickets get covered with the mesh? This would require (3) special height panels per section of fence, or, can the mesh be one piece full height and be fastened to the horizontal rails? Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 45

Ref 400 Steel Pile Points or Shoes, APP., these points are for 12" CIP Reinforced Concrete Piles. What type of pile point is the designer looking for the standard 3/4" Flat plate or Conical Point or Drive-Tite Booth for these piles? Please clarify, thank you.

**We have verified that all of the manufacturers / suppliers that are listed in the plan note supply pile points for pipe piles. Also, through discussions with these manufacturers, the sentence in the note about the material is relevant to pipe piles also. Therefore, note in the plans is correct for pipe piles.**

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 46

Can the Office Calculations be made available?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-77246/>

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 47

Bid reference numbers 233 and 234 reference Standard construction drawing TC-81.21 which was issued 1/16/09 to replace SCD TC-81.20. However, all other signal supports on this project reference SCD TC-81.20 not TC-81.21. The weld styles used for these two SCDs is specified differently. Are both types of poles to be provided for this project depending on the bid reference or are should these all be TC-81.21 type poles? Additionally, bid reference # 212 specifies SCD TC-16.20 design 3 which has been superseded by SCD TC-16.21 per the standard construction drawing update on 1/16/09. Should this be changed to a TC 16.21 overhead sign support? If so TC-16.21 does not have a design 3 on the new chart which starts at design 5. What should be provided for this pole and the other pole specified as TC-16.20 (bid reference 219) ?

---

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: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 48

Bid reference # 312 "Controller Item, Misc.: Controller Unit, type 2070 With ITS Cabinet, Type 340 As Per Plan" Specifies that the controller supplied be furnished with a proprietary brand Eagle controller with the latest software to operate with the existing ACTRA system. However, ODOT already maintains a license for Siemens 2070 software which is capable of operating on other manufacturer's 2070 controllers, such as Econolite Control Products. Therefore the need for this item to be proprietary is not justified. Will the specification be opened to allow for Econolite's 2070 controller to be provided with software to be provided by ODOT under their current license?

**ODOT evaluated and approved the request for the proprietary controller. Bid as is.**

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 49

On sheets 48 and 49 it shows truck mounted attenuators. This will add a substantial amount of money to the bid. Are these necessary?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 50

This is a follow up question with regard to the Special Vandal Protection Fence Ornamental Steel, Item #433. The pickets will extend 7 3/8" above the top rail which will need another special height panel of fabric if full height coverage is required. If a one piece panel is approved, what height will be required?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 51

Ref. No. 433 Vandal Fence per Addendum No. 2 added provisions for the vpf. How is the square weave mesh attached to the ornamental fence panels? What size, type and spacing are the fasteners? Is the mesh coated black? Are the fasteners coated black? What side of the panel is the mesh installed on? The posts are shown as 2 1/2" square - the base plate has a 3 1/2" square sleeve - we don't think this will work. Will the post be changed to 3" or will the base plate sleeve be changed to 3" to accommodate a good fit?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 52

Addendum 1 revised plan sheet 658/773 and 659/773 to delete the last two sentences in note 7. Did this eliminate the requirement for pile sleeves?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 53

We are requesting that the work type percentage performed by the prime contractor be reduced from 50 percent to 40 percent.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 54

Are reference numbers 186 and 435 duplicate items? Same with reference numbers 190 and 436.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2009

Question Number: 55

The existing drawings supplied do not match current infield bridge. Do you have a newer set of plans for the existing structure?

**There are no other plans 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.