

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Project No. 050389

Sale Date - 7/13/2005

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 1

Pursuant to your conversation with Wayne Brassell and myself yesterday, we would ask that you consider a change in the PG graded liquid asphalt on the above referenced project. The current specification calls for PG 70-22M. We are of the opinion that an upgrade to PG 76-22M would benefit the Department for the following reasons: 1.This project is a fix to keep this section of road in a serviceable condition until the 3rd lane project is bid. We understand that could be as long as 10 to 12 years. An upgrade to PG 76-22M would give the Department a better pavement and increase your chances to accomplish that goal. 2.Studies have shown that PG 76-22 SBS modified liquids have lower rut numbers and higher fatigue numbers than a PG 70-22M. These factors combined with the Superpave specifications that will be used on the project will increase your pavements durability and rut resistance. 3.Your District has previously specified PG 76-22M on our Madison/ Clark I 70 project. 4.The increased cost of approximately \$150,000 would be money well spent when you consider the long term benefits of PG 76-22M (less rutting potential and greater fatigue resistance) In conclusion, we are of the opinion that this project warrants a change in PG liquid to 76-22M when you consider the what you are trying to accomplish with this "mill and fill" construction. You need this project to hold up for many years before 3rd lane construction takes place. Using PG 76-22M will significantly improve your chances that your goals will be met. If you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance, feel free to contact me at any time. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration in this matter.

We checked with Production, as well as well as the pavements section at CO, and we do not think we need to consider the PG76-22 binder. This interim project is not expected to last for 10 to 12 years. We have another interim project scheduled in the next 5-6 years should we need it. Per Aric Morse, we do not need to use PG76-22 on this project because it is not a high-stress location (such as an intersection). Also, the situation on the MAD/CLA-70 project that Kokosing referenced below was a different situation. That project was a reconstruction (under warranty) and not an interim project like this one is.

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.