

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 103019

Sale Date - 10/21/2010

POR-87966 - IR-76-(17.59)(19.61)

Question Submitted: 10/12/2010 10:03:38 AM

Will seismic pedestals be required on the modified semi-integral abutment seats to satisfy BDM Section 301.4.3(A)? In the past, seismic pedestals have been provided on structures where semi-integral abutments have turn-back style wingwalls when the skew angle is less than 30 degrees.

Please consider revising 60 day closure to a minimum of 75 days given the proposed SOS.

A1: The Bridge Design Manual Section 301.4.3.A does not specifically require the use of seismic pedestals; rather it requires objects providing the restraint of free movement during seismic events to be designed for seismic loads. For semi-integral bridges, these objects are typically the wingwalls. Typically the Department recommends not to add seismic pedestals on existing beam seats given the congestion of primary steel near the surface.

A2: As addressed previously, the Department has reviewed the detour duration and the length of the detour will not be changed.

Question Submitted: 10/6/2010 9:53:34 AM

For areas off of the structure that do not require catch basins per the L&D Manual and BDM Manual, doe the District require 300 ft of asphalt curb (where 2:1 slopes are present) with no sodded flumes or 26 ft minimum curb, Type 4A/4C with sodded flumes per ODOT SCD DM-4.1. Please clarify.

A: The requirements as per DM-4.1 will apply in this situation. The District 4 Drainage Preferences does not apply to this Project.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2010 11:51:24 AM

The 60 day detour duration indicated in section 13.2 for both POR-76-1759 and POR-76-1961 is extremely aggressive. This is particularly a problem with the POR-76-1961 structure due to the existing composite deck which will undoubtedly take additional time to remove. Please extend the detour duration to a minimum of 90 days for both structures.

The Department has reviewed the detour duration and the length of the detour will not be changed.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2010 10:22:03 AM

The DBE goal of 12% on this project is excessive. Please consider reducing this goal

The goal will remain at 12%. If the awarded contractor is unable to meet the assigned goal, the process to request a partial waiver of the goal is described in Proposal Note 22.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2010 11:08:58 AM

Section 15.2.L and 15.3.L of the Scope of Services state that VPF is to be installed on the proposed structures. The existing VPF is in good shape at both sites. Can all (or any part of) the existing VPF be stored and reused on the proposed structures?

None of the existing Vandal Protection Fence is to be retained and reused.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2010 11:07:25 AM

Section 15.3 - Existing Structure Data of the Scope of Services states that the existing bridge width is 33'-4"± out/out. Please verify if this is correct. The existing plans state that this width is 31'-0"± out/out.

See forth coming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2010 11:06:19 AM

Section 15.2 - Existing Structure Data of the Scope of Services states that the 4th span is 48'-11 1/2". Please verify if this is correct. The existing plans state that this span is 42'-6".

See forth coming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/30/2010 11:04:07 AM

Section 14.6 of the Scope of Services states that no Design Exceptions have been previously approved, and that the Consultants will prepare any and submit them to ODOT for approval. For Design-Build projects, bids are based on preliminary designs (beam sizes, number of beams, length of approaches, etc.). For bidding this project, with the way this scope section is written we must assume that future Design Exception requests will be approved as submitted. Please verify this assumption.

Your assumption is not correct. It is in the best interest of the DBT to design the project such that a Design Exception does not need to be processed.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2010 11:02:57 AM

Section 10.4 of the Scope of Services discusses that wetlands were identified at both sites. However, no field delineation exists. Will ODOT provide the field delineation of wetlands to be protected?

Delineation will not be provided. The wetlands identified are outside and along the existing right of way line.

Question Submitted: 9/30/2010 11:00:00 AM

Section 5 of the Scope of Services states that Consultants who have provided services to ODOT for this project previously are not eligible for participation on a DBT. Please provide a listing of ineligible Consultants for this project.

A: The only Consultant to provide services to ODOT for this Project is ms consultants, inc, they provided the Asbestos Inspection and Report for this Project.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2010 1:49:49 PM

Section 14.2 of the scope states that the existing vertical alignment of McClinticksburg Road will be adjusted to obtain the required minimum vertical clearance over I-76. Section 15.3 of the scope also requires a relocated profile but footnote "B" under Section 15.3 states that the existing vertical clearance is 16'-7" +/- and will not be reduced. Please clarify the extent of the profile work required on McClintockburg Road (POR-76-19610) and the required vertical clearance for the structure.

As per Section 15.3.B of the Scope of Services the existing vertical clearance will not be reduced, therefore the minimum vertical clearance is the current existing vertical clearance. The extent of the profile work required will be determined by the DBT based upon the structure superstructure proposed, the depth of the new superstructure will have a direct relation to the amount of profile adjust required.