

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Project No. 060467

Sale Date - 11/22/2006

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 1

On plan sheet 238/1421 bottom left corner, it says "PAVEMENT CALCULATIONS PROVIDED SEPERATELY." Where do we find these?

They can be found at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/plans/060647>

Question Submitted: 10/13/2006

Question Number: 2

1.) On summary sheet #201, the quantity for phase 3 PCB, 50" A.P.P. is 6,000 LF short for the quantity required for the left edge of SR 8 Northbound in step 2. The plan sheets #189 and #190 explains that this is the same traffic pattern to be used in phase 4, however, on sheet #172, the last item in the sequence of construction states that for the winter after phase 3, all traffic shall be in existing and/or completed lanes with full shoulders. It would appear then that the intent is to remove the phase 3 wall then reset it in phase 4. Please clarify.

2.) On sheet #44, the incentive/disincentive note states that embankment at Twinsburg Road on SR 8 northbound shall be completed before 9/30/2007, however, the phasing of the project shows this work being performed in phase 3. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 3

In order to receive incentive as shown in the table on sheet 44 of 1421, do the embankments behind MSE walls 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B and 7C also have to be completed before 9/30/2007?

No, the embankment work associated with the incentive/disincentive for Ramps A , B & C (completion 9/30/07) is the area south of Highland Road.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 4

During the pre-bid meeting on October 12, 2006, we were informed that this project is to be awarded on November 30, 2006. With an 8% DBE Goal for this project, will ODOT be able to make an award on November 30, 2006? Is this statement realistic? Please confirm.

The award date is OK, 8 days after the sale is the norm.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 5

Please clarify completion date for Part 2. Page 11 of 115 lane value disincentive note states that all thru and turn lanes on Highland Road and S.R. 8 have a completion date of July 31, 2007. This is essentially the entire Part 2 project. Page 14 of 115 states "... Contractor shall complete all work prior to October 15, 2007..." During the pre-bid on October 12, 2006, the October 15, 2007 date was also mentioned. Please confirm and clarify Part 2 completion dates.

The lane value disincentive noted on Sheet 11/115 is for the thru and turn lanes noted. The 7/31/07 completion date for the items pertains to having the lanes completed and open to traffic. This is a traffic capacity issue. While the lanes noted do comprise the majority of the Part 2 improvement, other non-capacity work elements can be completed after 7/31/07. The 10/15/07 completion date noted on Sheet 14/115 pertains to all other work in Part 2. The intent for the completion (7/31/06) of thru and turn lanes is to help relieve current congestion problems that may reduce backup along SR8.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 6

Construction Noise And Construction Activities Involving Power Operated Equipment: General Notes shown on Part I pg 41/1421 and also on Part 2 pg 11/115 state "...If a variance to a local noise ordinance is necessary during construction, the contractor shall be responsible to apply for and obtain the variance(s) from the local governmental unit(s) and provide the variance documentation to the engineer prior to conducting the construction activity..."

After researching noise ordinances for Boston Heights, Macedonia, and Northfield Center, most if not all have provisions in their "criminal" codes with respect to noise and disturbing the peace, specifically at night. With the substantial night work mandated on this project and the equipment required to fast track construction, ODOT should seek the required variances not the contractors. Most of the communities use the traffic code and, therefore, it is questionable whether a variance may even be obtained. Even if a variance may be obtained, it could take up to 4 to 6 months. Please review these notes and advise.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2006

Question Number: 7

On sheet 14 of 115 of part 2 in the maintenance of traffic notes, the not Trench for Widening states that for this project the base widening will be completed to a depth 3" below the existing pavement at the end of each work day. Is the intent of this note to have asphalt bases completed to within 3" of existing pavement or can we temporarily utilize 304 base material to accomplish this and removing it in subsequent operations when placing the asphalt base.

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: 10/23/2006

Question Number: 8

Throughout the cross-sections, there are several fill areas over old pavements on SR 8 and IR 271. Specification 203.04 requires the contractor to "remove all existing pavement before the embankment construction". After doing sample end-area takeoffs, it appears that the volume of pavement removed and/or excavation of these areas along with the embankment replaced has not been included in the respective volumes of work. Is it ODOT's intention that excavation of and replacement of old pavements in fill sections are incidental or should there be quantities assigned to these? Can ODOT please verify and make quantity adjustments?

Ref. 4- Pavement Removed- The typical existing cross-section for SR 8 on plan sheet 9 shows asphalt pavement over macadam base over aggregate base. The subsummary plan sheets 261 and 262 quantify pavement removal on SR 8 of 44872 s.y. where by specification it should be classified as excavation. Please verify this quantity as well as how payment will be made for replacement of removed asphalt pavements in fill sections.

A1) The pavement is being removed and paid under 202. 202.01 includes the backfilling of resultant void. Section 202.05 specifically includes the following statement;" Backfill the cavity created by the removal item according to 202.02 except when the cavity lies within the limits of subsequent excavation or other work." This area is not in an excavation area and therefore backfilling the void is included with the removal item. A2) In the change to the 1997 CMS and again in 2002 and 2005 updates, Section 200 Earthwork Section 4, it was determined that the quantifying and separate payment of full depth asphalt pavement "improves the ability of contractors to bid the project and saves the State money." The asphalt pavement has some salvage value and can not be determined how much of this material is available if it is all lumped with 203 materials. Again the backfilling of this voids is included under 202.01 and 202.05 for payment. This pavement removal is quantified and paid separately.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2006

Question Number: 9

Ref 752 - Sheet 1305 of 1421 Bar Marks S601 & S602 deck transverse quantities should be doubled. Please Verify.

Question Submitted: 10/24/2006

Question Number: 10

1. Plan sheet 47/1421-Item Special-Filter Fabric Fence-Why is there a separate pay item for this? Should this not be taken out of the SWPPP item set up on this project?
2. Why are there two field offices set up on this project? Is there really going to be a separate field office set up for the Part 2 work?
3. There are several bids items that repeat themselves under parts 1 and 2, for example SWPPP items, worksite traffic supervisors, field office. Can you combine these similar items prior to bid or will the ODOT Project Engineer be paying for these separately on estimates?

Question Submitted: 10/25/2006

Question Number: 11

Bid item 0404 Pavement Removed under Maintenance of Traffic Part 1 calls out a quantity of 33,542 sy. The plans are unclear as to where this pavement removed occurs, please clarify the locations of all pavement removal areas for this item.

Question Submitted: 10/25/2006

Question Number: 12

On sheet 71 where temporary earthwork for temporary roads are shown, it appears that the earthwork for the temporary road on the median station 534+00 to 552+25 Northbound S.R. 8 is not included. Is there quantities available for this area.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2006

Question Number: 13

On sheet 50/1421 the total quantity for excavation of subgrade is listed as 174,956 CY. Backfill of this item is comprised of 100 CY of Embankment, 113,234 CY of Gran Material Type D, and 52,689 CY of Gran Material Type E. The total quantity needed to backfill the excavation of subgrade item is short by 8,933 CY. Please adjust the quantities to make up for this difference.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2006

Question Number: 14

Item 615 Pavement for maintaining traffic, as per plans 1 and 2- on plan sheet 69, the note reads that the contractor is to sawcut the existing pavement and/or shoulder prior to the replacement of the 1' wide and 3" deep transition section between temporary and existing pavements. If the contractor chooses to mill out the transition section, will the contractor be allowed to omit the sawcut provided that the milled edge is stable?

Question Submitted: 10/3/2006

Question Number: 15

Can ODOT make the CAD file sheets available for the cross section sheets for this project?

The District respectfully declines.

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: 10/30/2006

Question Number: 16

Plan sheets 91 and 92 show a 10' wide temporary pavement section on the northbound SR 8 inside shoulder from approximately station 539+70 to 552+25. The cross-sections on plan sheets 416-424 do not show any corresponding temporary grading plans the way other temporary pavement sections do (summarized on plan sheet 71). Are we to assume no outside slope grading will be required or did the engineer miss these details in the cross sections?

Question Submitted: 10/30/2006

Question Number: 17

Plan sheet 71 contains a summary of quantities for earthwork for maintaining traffic. There are several plan sheets for Southbound and Northbound I-271 which temporary pavements are to be installed that do not have any "for information only" grading quantities on this plan sheet- in particular, plan sheets 438-444 and 497-527. In addition to these omissions, there are no cross-sections provided for installation of temporary pavements on the southern (station 577+50 through 586+00 southbound and 593+00 northbound) and northern (station 88+50 through 98+10 southbound) ends of I-271. This inconsistent information is creating what a very confusing and misleading Roads for Maintaining Traffic item. Can the "for information only" earthwork quantities please be updated and/or clarified what is and what isn't covered in the summary?

Question Submitted: 10/30/2006

Question Number: 18

Plan sheets 91 and 92 show a 10' wide temporary pavement section on the northbound SR 8 inside shoulder from approximately station 539+70 to 552+25. The cross-sections on plan sheets 416-424 do not show any corresponding temporary grading plans the way other temporary pavement sections do (summarized on plan sheet 71). Are we to assume no outside slope grading will be required or did the engineer miss these details in the cross sections?

Question Submitted: 10/31/2006

Question Number: 19

Per the note on plan sheet 64 of 1421, Winter Traffic Limitations, we are at the sole discretion of the Construction Engineer for closing lanes prior to April 1, 2007. With the amount of work required to meet the first interim completion date should this not be based upon weather conditions?

Question Submitted: 10/31/2006

Question Number: 20

Bid Ref. # 0424 Work Zone Lighting System refers to Standard drawings MT-102.10 & MT 102.20, which shows no lighting. Why can't ODOT show us how many and give locations of poles and lights, so everyone can submit a like bid for this item Thanks.

Question Submitted: 11/10/2006

Question Number: 21

In response to ODOT's answer to the prebid question regarding completion of embankments for Ramps A,B and C by 9/30/2007, please clarify:

1. Does this include the approach embankment to Ramp A, which by maintenance of traffic drawings calls for this embankment and MSE wall to be performed in phase 3?
2. Please clarify the southern-most stations of Ramp A and B embankments that fall under the 9/30/2007 completion date.

Question Submitted: 11/11/2006

Question Number: 22

1. Sheet 1337 states that the square feet of noisewall constructed below the ground line shall not be included for payment and that wall constructed behind barrier will not be measured for payment. This is inconsistent with recent ODOT practices and unfair to the contractor to rely on us to calculate the amount of incidental noisewall based on plans provided by your consultant. Please revise this note to conform with all recent ODOT projects to pay for the wall from bottom of wall panel to top of wall panel or coping.

2. The noisewall basis of payment on sheet 1337 includes seeding and mulching activities as incidental to the noisewall. This is inconsistent with recent ODOT practice. All permanent and temporary erosion control for the noisewall should be included for payment with the separate pay items set up for the project. Please revise this note accordingly.

Q2) As stated above, these are the standard notes supplied by OES for the noise walls. That are being used on existing construction projects.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2006

Question Number: 23

Ref. 4- Pavement Removed

No thickness for asphalt on existing ramps is shown on the existing typical sections as well as in the soil boring reports. Can ODOT please provide asphalt thickness?

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: 11/13/2006

Question Number: 24

Please clarify the method of measurement for the MSE wall panels and select granular backfill. Will the pay quantity be based on the limits shown in the ODOT plans or will the final pay quantities be determined from the approved supplier shop drawings? The 'MSE Wall Payment Limits' note on sheet 694 states that no adjustments will be made to the unit BID PRICE for the quantities, however it does not state if adjustments will be made to the QUANTITIES.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2006

Question Number: 25

Can you please confirm that us of an integral panel coping and post cap can be utilized on this project, with the exception of the Finials, which are clearly non integral?

Question Submitted: 11/13/2006

Question Number: 26

With respect to the MSE panels that require an absorptive finish, can these panels be made by an approved noise wall supplier, under guidance from an approved MSE supplier?

Due to the relatively small volume, it may be prohibitively expensive to set up an MSE precaster to make the absorptive panels at their plant.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2006

Question Number: 27

Please clarify the finish of the absorptive MSE panels.

Is the absorptive finish to have integral pigment and be coated with a sealer coating from ODOT approved list?

Are the panels to have an ODOT approved noise barrier sealer coating applied? At the manufacturing plant or in the field?

Are any other specific coatings required on the absorptive finish?

Thanks

Question Submitted: 11/13/2006

Question Number: 28

All H-piling on the project is driven to rock. There are no bid items for pile points. (1) Are pile points required? (2) Typically there are bid items for pile points. Please add pile point bid items for all bridges that have h-piling.

Pile tips are not provided if the depth to rock exceeds 50 feet or if we are driving to shale. We meet this criteria so pile tips are not required.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2006

Question Number: 29

The Department's answer to the prebid question on 10/16/2006 concerning the incentive/disincentive for the embankments of Ramps A,B, & C stated that the incentive/disincentive was for the area south of Highland Road. Does this include the embankment for MSE walls 2A, 2B, and 2C? Please identify the beginning and ending stations for the incentive/disincentive embankments.

Question Submitted: 11/13/2006

Question Number: 30

Bridge plan notes state that rebar spirals can be plain bars. Whether these bars are plain or deformed do they need to be epoxy coated?

all reinforcing shall be epoxy coated as noted on Sheets 961, 1021, 1071, 1082, 1142, 1186, 1217, 1265, 1278, 1304, and 1330.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 31

The new SS 840 for MSE walls directs that the bottom 3' of the select granular embankment zone must use 304 material rather than the option of 703.11 material. Since this is a new requirement, most aggregate suppliers have not had time to get their 304 material tested and certified for this use and will not be able to do so prior to the bid. We request that ODOT modify the requirement on this project to allow the use of 703.11 material in the entire select granular zone. If the state then wishes to change back to a 304 material after the suppliers have had time to get their sources tested, it could be negotiated with the low bidder at that time.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 32

In regard to all 204 granular embankment materials on the project- will slag be allowed?

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: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 33

The sheeting requirements detailed on sheet 695 for the temporary MSE walls state that the top of the sheeting shall be at existing grade elevation 976.3 and that the toe of the sheets shall be at 949.3 resulting in 27' long sheets. Since the existing ground varies between 979.93 at the start of temporary wall 1 and 972.85 and the end of temporary wall 2, we will assume that the top elevation of the sheets may also vary, but the 27' long sheeting length will remain the unchanged. Please clarify by addendum if this is incorrect.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 34

The sheet piling specified on sheet 737 for scour protection of MSE wall 5A is called out to be 15' long. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that any additional length required for temporary excavation protection during wall construction will be paid at the unit bid price of bid item 465.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 35

Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that additional MSE wall (paid by square feet) and Select Granular Embankment (paid by cubic yard) necessary due to settlement will be paid for at the contract unit prices for these items. It is unfair to the bidders to make us assume the responsibility of including an unknown amount of extra work in our bid to account for the extra quantities that may occur due to settlement.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 36

There are several locations where planned undercuts per sheet 50 are in the areas of the MSE walls. In these areas, is the undercut depth meant to be additional depth below the bottom of leveling pad elevation? If so, unless clarified by addendum we will assume that any additional excavation and backfill required to open cut these undercuts will be paid at the bid unit prices for excavation of subgrade and the associated granular material items. This would be necessary because the 3' or 5' undercuts would not be able to be cut with vertical side walls and would require extra quantity to create a safely sloped cut.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 37

Please clarify the pay limits for the biditem 475 - Wall Excavation. According to SS 840 it appears that this item it intended to pay for the unclassified excavation of the MSE walls, however the quantities are extremely underestimated.

As shown in the plans the Type E granular material will extend 10' (min.) beyond the toe of slope on both sides of the embankment. The 4" perforated drain (Detail 2) and temporary ditch need be provided only on one side of the embankment.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 38

Please review and provide additional information for Line Numbers 215 and 216 the replacement of 650' of 21" Sanitary sewer Type C and 288' of 24" Sanitary Sewer Bored and Jacked. These items are given as a contingency if the sewers are damaged as a result of construction activities. In order to price the 21" sewer line we need a profile view and location for the work. For the 24" bore we need to know the alignment and location of the bore. Will manholes have to be added? Are we to assume that the existing flow of sewage can be maintained in the existing sewer or are we to figure pumping around the work. If we have to pump the sewage how do we get it across RT-8 at Twinsburg Road? We need additional borings for these sewers. The Bore at twinsburg road is +/- 25' deep and the contractor that installed this sewer had extreme difficulties due to the amount of water and poor soils. These two items could be very costly and difficult to bid without more information. We recommend that these items be removed from the proposal and pricing be negotiated with the low bidder if this work is needed.

Question Submitted: 11/14/2006

Question Number: 39

1. The MSE wall sections show a 1' undercut under the select granular backfill and extending to 1' in front of the leveling pad. Is the 1' undercut intended to be the area of the foundation preparation called out for in SS840 and paid for in biditem 476? The cross sections do not call this area out as foundation preparation. If this are is to be paid as foundation preparation, what all is to be included in the biditem (for example is the excavation of this area included in foundation prep. or is it included in wall excavation)?

Question Submitted: 11/15/2006

Question Number: 40

Per SS840, Section 840.06.D, the foundation preparation item is to include leveling and compacting the foundation soil. This item also discusses geotextile fabric and 12" of Type C granular material, however it does not state that the walls are over-excavated by 12" to account for placement of the granular material. Are the walls to be overexcavated in the areas of the foundation preparation and where is this overexcavation to be paid for? Also, where is the geotextile and Type C granular to be paid for?

Question Submitted: 11/15/2006

Question Number: 41

The rebar lists for the approach slabs on plan sheet # 1073 & 1265 of 1421 do not include the complete list for the whole Rear Approach slab. Please revise these plan sheets.

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: 11/16/2006

Question Number: 42

Addendum #3, dated 11/15/2006 modified Item 390AB1/395AB2 Item 633 - Controller Master Traffic Responsive as per plan to read "The necessary system software will be provided and installed on the existing computer equipment at the remote monitoring station." This creates a problem if the proposed system is not compatible with the existing system. Additional hardware will be required including a new modem, serial card and phone drop. Two separate systems cannot share the same phone drop and properly monitor the system. Otherwise, any failures as they happen will not be properly reported to the system.

To maintain the integrity and proper operation of the existing remote monitoring station please add the following requirement to this item. "The contractor shall modify the existing remote monitoring station with any additional equipment needed to properly monitor and operate the system. This work may include additional modems, serial cards and phone line sharing devices as needed, or may require a new remote monitoring station. The proposed system shall not interfere in any way with the operation of the existing system."

The existing system is a on-street master-responsive system, not a central computer system. The master connects to the remote monitoring station via a phone line and they are not in constant communication with each other. It is possible for 2 different systems to be on a single computer.

Question Submitted: 11/16/2006

Question Number: 43

Sheet 42 specifies a very involved paint specification for the fence framework and fittings. Can these be vinyl coated to match the chain link fabric? Vinyl coating the pipe and components is a standard in the industry.

Dist 4 Maintenance request that the paint be used for the fence framework and fittings. Please prepare your bid based upon the bidding documents.

Question Submitted: 11/16/2006

Question Number: 44

Addendum 3 answered a prebid question regarding the incentive/discenctive note: "COMPLETION OF EMBANKMENTS FOR RAMPS A, B, AND C AND AT TWINSBURG ROAD (NB S.R. 8), INCLUDING ANY WICK DRAINS INSTALLATIONS BETWEEN STA. 541+70.90 TO STA. 560+99.00 AND ANY PREPARATION FOR THE SETTELEMENT PERIOD".

We understand the requirements for completion of the A,B,C embankments and the wick drains between the stations. However, the maintenance of traffic drawings indicate that the embankment at Twinsburg Road and NB SR 8 is to be completed in phase 3 and feel that given the amounts of required work in the previous phases, it is impossible to construct the Twinsburg Road/NB SR 8 embankment by the date of 9/30/2007.

Can ODOT please review this requirement and comment?

Question Submitted: 11/16/2006

Question Number: 45

In Part 2- plan sheet 33 and 34 of 115- General Summary: subgrade compaction, linear grading, and pavement subsummary sheets are "provided separately". A previous prebid question regarding pavement subsummary sheets for part 1 was answered with the spreadsheets being put on the ODOT plans online web page. However, there is no online spreadsheet for the part 2 quantities. Please provide this information since this is a highly phased portion of the project involving large disincentives.

The spreadsheet has been added to the website at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/plans/060467/>

Question Submitted: 11/16/2006

Question Number: 46

Addendum #3 Q&A stated that no slag will be allowed for the 204 granular embankment materials. CMS Spec Section 703.16 C allows the use of air cooled blast furnace slag. With the quantity of granular material required for this project, please review the answer to the Addendum #3 prebid question and let us know if air cooled blast furnace slag is acceptable for granular material, Type D.

Answer: As per the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's (Ohio EPA's) Division of Surface Water (Policy Number 400.007). The policy was issued in response to the large number of requests regarding reuse of certain industrial by-products (including foundry sands and slag materials) ODOT prohibits the placement as defined by the above policy within: 1. 100 feet of any intermittent or perennial streams, unless the waste is otherwise protected by a properly engineered diversion or structure. 2. 300 feet of any drinking water well, including a well used for livestock watering; 3. a regulatory floodplain unless a properly engineered dike, levee or other structure that can protect the structural fill from a 100 year flood is permitted. 4. 5 feet above the aquifer system used as the primary source of water to wells within 2500 feet of the beneficial use site; 5. 100 feet of any wetland. As stated in the previous prebid, no slag.

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: 11/16/2006

Question Number: 47

The following questions relate to the noisewall on this project:

1. There are no bottom of wall elevations provided in the plans. These are necessary to perform an accurate takeoff to verify the plan quantities and for the suppliers to figure their productions. Please provide these elevations as soon as possible.
2. The notes on sheet 1341 state that the noisewalls shall be 3"-6" above the finished gradeline, however the noisewall profiles show the bottom of panel below the proposed ground line. Please clarify how the bottom of wall is to be constructed along with providing the elevations required per question #1 above.

Answer: The noise wall bottom elevations are to be 3"-6" above the finished groundline as detailed on plan sheet 1341. The proposed groundline elevations at the face of the wall are provided in the plans as are the proposed top of wall elevations. The noise wall profiles depict the bottom panels squared off for simplicity purposes, as they were for all of the I-77 Corridor projects which have already been bid and built. No additional information will be needed. Contractors shall bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 11/16/2006

Question Number: 48

Addendum #1 deleted the General note regarding "Construction Noise" on plan sheet 41/1421. Addendum # 3 revised this same plan sheet for other reasons but the Construction Noise note still remains on the plan sheet. We assume that this "Construction Noise" note is deleted and should not be on the Addendum #3 plan sheet.

Question Submitted: 11/16/2006

Question Number: 49

Regarding our previous questions concerning the bottom elevation of the noisewalls, it appears from the profile views that some of the bottom elevations are not on even 6" increments. In order to be able to efficiently produce the panels, the total panel height in any given bay must be an even increment of 6". The bid quantities also represent that this is not the case as currently shown. Please review addendums from recent projects around the state and you will find that noisewall bids are being changed to accommodate this and that ODOT payment will be from bottom of panel to top of coping for the full height to incorporate the even 6" increments. Please revise any applicable notes and bottom of wall elevations accordingly.

Answer: The noise wall bottom elevations are to be 3"-6" above the finished groundline, as detailed on plan sheet 1341. It is understood that the Contractor will have to adjust the bottom of wall elevations to satisfy the aforementioned requirement. The proposed groundline elevations at the face of the wall are provided in the plans as are the proposed top of wall elevations. As stated in section "VII Method of Measurement" on plan sheet 1337, "Noise barrier plan quantities are measured in square feet of acceptable barrier using a height from bottom of wall to top of wall including the cap and a length from post to post". Contractors shall bid accordingly. As previously stated, the noise wall profiles depict the bottom panels squared off for simplicity, as they were for all of the I-77 Corridor projects which have been bid and built.

Question Submitted: 11/17/2006

Question Number: 50

We request clarification regarding the sealing of the sound absorptive concrete surfaces of the MSE wall panels, Item 512 on drawing sheet 3/87 (695/1421) indicates that an epoxy urethane sealer is required for application to the sound absorptive surface. We would recommend that the sealer of the sound absorptive surface be an acrylic stain, such as Tamms Aquastain so that the NRC of the surface is not degraded. If that is not possible, we would recommend that the materials approved by ODOT as sealer coatings for sound walls be used in lieu of the epoxy-urethane as shown on the drawing.

Please prepare your bid based upon the material required by the bidding documents.

Question Submitted: 11/17/2006

Question Number: 51

Biditem 465 is set up to pay for sheet piling left in place at MSE wall 5B, however there is also sheet piling left in place at Walls 1A & 1B as dictated by sheet 695. Should biditem 465 also include the sheeting left in place at 1A & 1B?

No, include the sheeting with "Item 503- Cofferdams, Cribbs and Sheeting, As Per Plan" as shown in the plans.

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: 11/17/2006

Question Number: 52

The following questions are in response to addendum #4:

1. We previously asked the following question which we can not find an answer to: "Please clarify the pay limits for the biditem 475 - Wall Excavation. According to SS 840 it appears that this item is intended to pay for the unclassified excavation of the MSE walls, however the quantities are extremely understated." Based on the answers provided in Addendum #4 concerning the Wall Excavation and Foundation Preparation biditems, we would like our original question answered and the following clarified: Is the Wall Excavation biditem intended to be used only for payment of the 1' thick Foundation Preparation area or is it intended to pay for the entire amount of MSE wall excavation on the project?
2. Addendum #4 states that "Undercuts within the wall limits would be paid for under the 840 Wall Excavation pay item and the associated granular material item." We assume that this only refers to the 1' undercut that is backfill with Granular Material Type C per SS840 and not the undercuts listed on sheet 50 of the plans. Please confirm.
3. The statement in Addendum #4 which answered our question regarding the noisewall pay limits is off-base. Please review the profile sheets provided for the noisewalls - they clearly show the bottom of panel below the proposed ground line. There is a conflict with the drawings vs. the detail on sheet 1341. Also, please review recent ODOT project 063000, 060468, & 060414. These recent projects (2 in Northeastern Ohio) have revised the basis of payment to include any barrier constructed below grade.
4. Our question regarding seeding and mulching to be included with the noisewalls is listed in Addendum #4 but no answer is given.

Answer: Please look at Sheets 49 & 50 of 1421. Sheet 49 pays for excavation of undercuts listed on Sheet 50 of 1421 to install wick drains below portions of MSE walls (Item 204 - Excavation of Subgrade 203,640 CY). After the wick drains are installed, some additional volumes will have to be excavated to construct the MSE Walls (i.e. - excavation for the remaining portions of walls that do not have wick drains). These areas will be excavated to 1' below the MSE wall. These may appear small because of the 203,640 CY of material that was already excavated. The Wall Excavation Item is intended to pay for excavation from existing grade to 1' below MSE Wall in ALL areas of MSE Wall that DO NOT HAVE WICK DRAINS. Answer: Correct, the 3' to 5' undercuts are paid for under Item 204-Excavation of Subgrade on Sheet 49 of 1421. The remaining areas have 1' undercut and are paid for under Item 840 - Wall Excavation on Sheet 698 of 1421. Answer: The noise wall profile sheets depict the bottom panels as being squared off/below the finished groundline for simplicity purposes. This is consistent with all of the I-77 Corridor projects which have already been bid and built. The noise wall bottom elevations are to be 3"-6" above the finished groundline, as detailed on plan sheet 1341, and should not be constructed below the finished groundline. The proposed groundline elevations at the face of the wall are provided in the plans as are the proposed top of wall elevations. As stated in section "VII Method of Measurement" on plan sheet 1337, "Noise barrier plan quantities are measured in square feet of acceptable barrier using a height from bottom of wall to top of wall including the cap and a length from post to post". Contractors shall bid accordingly. Answer: These are the standard notes supplied by OES for the noise walls. Pay items and work is consistent with the work currently being done on I-77 in Canton.

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: 11/2/2006

Question Number: 53

ODOT has specified an absorbive Noise abatement product to be furnished as a facing on an MSE wall panel for one wall. Contractors need to recognize that ODOT maintains lists of:

1. Approved/ certified precast plants to make only certain products.
2. Approved/ certified MSE system suppliers which must furnish products from ODOT approved plants (above)
3. Approved / certified Noise Abatement wall systems.

The marriage of these panels is mandated to be produced as a 2 part wet cast production in the MSE plant with the Noise abatement System representative controlling and approving the operation.

This procedure is highly complex and forces the MSE supplier in a mode of operation not necessarily compatible with the requirements and a one time major capital investment.

Considering that no bids may come to the contractors for this mandated scheme, I suggest that ODOT also permit production of the product using plant produced Absorbive planks shipped to the MSE supplier and placed in moist forms. Wet cast concrete would then be cast over the dry plank placed face down.

The noted concept is workable and will likely draw bids of a reasonable value from the MSE suppliers.

In this evaluation one must recognize that the expertise of two different industries must be put together by two different producers because no MSE precasters (three) are in the business to produce Noise abatement walls.

No Noise abatement products normally produce Pigmented concrete Noise panels and any color would be field applied via stain.

MSE panels are now, via a new spec 840 prohibited from being bigger than 25 sq ft like in the last decade. Available MSE forms can be modified to accept the Absorbive panel surface for thousands less than making a MSE plant modification.

Color if needed on balance of MSE walls should be only field applied (if any) so as to match the special wall noted here in.

As a point of order MSE panels should always be field stained rather than ODOT demand pigmented concrete. Copings are always specified as field stained for MSE walls.

Question Submitted: 11/20/2006

Question Number: 54

This project has an area of wall where the height is over 30 feet. This area is located on walls 2a and 2b, sheet 722 of 1421. I assume that you have reviewed this project and that our system is still considered an approved system for the project, unless I hear otherwise before the bid.

Question Submitted: 11/20/2006

Question Number: 55

The response to our pre-bid question dated 11/16/2006 concerning Addendum #3, the Master, Traffic Responsive is incorrect. The existing computer system constantly monitors to field devices for failures and requires its own modem and serial port for this operation. It cannot be shared with any other system. Therefore, if a second system is to be installed, the supplier must provide its own monitoring equipment, separate in and independent of the existing system. The proposed system shall not interfere in any way with the operation of the existing system.

Question Submitted: 11/3/2006

Question Number: 56

1. According to the settlement platform schedule on sheet 55/1421 the piling and abutment work on SUM-271-1186L can not begin until the 6 month settlement period and preload criteria A have been completed. Is this correct?

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: 11/3/2006

Question Number: 57

Item 392AB1/397AB2: Controller Item, Misc.: Preemption Priority Control: The plan note on page 803 requires "If a light activated system is supplied, the contractor shall inventory the city's existing emitters to determine compatibility with the proposed system." The city currently does not use any type of preemption system. Therefore if a light based system is to be provided, then emitters, transmitters, switches, wiring and all required vehicle equipment should be provided with a light based preempt system, in the quantities as specified.

Second question, same item(s). The quantities for this item in the proposal is for a quantity of three (3) each. However the plan notes apply to the overall system operation and training and do not apply to each individual controller. Therefore a quantity of one (1) each would be appropriate for these items.

Item 390AB1: Controller, Master Traffic Responsive, As Per Plan: The plan note for this item on page 806 of the plans requires "...with the necessary system software at the locations shown in the plans." The "system software" would typically be provided with a "Remote Monitoring Station" and not the master controller. For proper operation and monitoring of this system, a "Remote Monitor Station" as defined in the ODOT CMS section 733.07 needs to be added to this project. This item includes the required system software. An Alternate Bid Item for the "Remote Monitoring Station" would also be required and needs to be added to the project. The plan note for this item should be:

"Item 633 - Alternate Bid - Remote Monitoring Station, As Per Plan. The alternate bid items shall meet the same specifications as Item 633 - Remote Monitoring Station except that the existing computer equipment shall be re-used and that the computer equipment as defined in 733.07E shall not be required. The current system software as owned and operated by the city shall be upgraded to the most recent release of Aries as manufactured Econolite Control Products, Inc. of Anaheim, California.

Item 395AB2: Alternate Bid - Controller, Master Traffic Responsive, As Per Plan. The plan note on page 806 of the plans requires "...and the system software shall be included in the bid item." The City of Macedonia currently owns a licensed copy of the system software for the Econolite closed loop system. Additional software is not required; therefore this requirement should be removed from the plans.

Question Submitted: 11/6/2006

Question Number: 58

The structure drawings that have pile extended thru the MSE walls show 18" sleeves to be used, see sheet 1219/1421 for an example of this. However, section 840.03 paragraph K of SS 840 requires a pipe sleeve with a diameter of 6 inches greater than the largest pile's diagonal dimension. According to this note, a 24 inch pipe would be required. This additional pipe dimension will require twice as much bentonite slurry material as required in 840.06 paragraph J to fill the pipe void. Which dimension should be used?

Also, will regards to the bentonite fill, is it the designers intent to fill the entire void with this grout mixture? If so, what is the purpose of the 3" thick expanded polystyrene fill as described on sheet 1233/1421?

Question Submitted: 11/6/2006

Question Number: 59

Between addendum # 1 and addendum # 2 plan sheet 72 is lost a line at the bottom of the page. The item was 630 - 1 ea Removal of Overhead Mounted Sign and Reerection. Addendum 1 or 2 did not delete this item. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2006

Question Number: 60

Line items 399 through 403 Building Demolition; this work appears to have already been performed. Please confirm and remove these line items from the proposal.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2006

Question Number: 61

Line item 22 Removal, Misc AT&T Coaxial Cable is not located in the general summary or in the general notes. Please provide information pertaining to the scope of this work.

Question Submitted: 11/7/2006

Question Number: 62

When will the Prebid Meeting Transcripts be available on line?

Question Submitted: 11/7/2006

Question Number: 63

Due to the size of this project and the amount of work to be subcontracted; will the Department please consider lowering the requirements of section 108.01 from 50% to 40%.

The 50% percentage will be reduced to 40% in the next addendum.

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: 11/7/2006

Question Number: 64

Would the department consider lowering the amount of work performed on this project by the general contractor to 40 or 45 percent in lieu of 50 percent due to the amount of db e etc.

The 50% percentage will be reduced to 40% in the next addendum.

Question Submitted: 11/8/2006

Question Number: 65

REF.36...GEOTEXTILE FABRIC..P.57 STATES 8 OZ. NONWOVEN GEOTEXTILE 712.09 TYPE "D".Does the state want type "D" nonwoven or an 8 oz. nonwoven?

Question Submitted: 11/8/2006

Question Number: 66

Can the Department post the drawings for the existing bridges on the website?

The can be found at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/Pub/Contracts/Plans/060467/24508exbridges/>

Question Submitted: 11/8/2006

Question Number: 67

Plan sheet 52 shows a detail #2, which depicts the drainage of the granular backfill where 204 type E granular materials are to be installed.

Are these areas in new construction to be drained to both sides of the embankment or only one side of the embankment at the 150' on center locations?

Question Submitted: 11/8/2006

Question Number: 68

Being that the anticipated settlement within the embankment areas ranges from 2.5" to 16" as stated on Sheet 55 of 1421, how will ODOT control the possible differential settlement that will occur within the MSE walls over the course of the settlement period?

Question Submitted: 8/30/2006

Question Number: 69

Can't find suppliers for Railing Misc.: Decorative Concrete Railing, Decorative steel Railing, Decorative concrete Column. Who are known suppliers?

Odot District 10 discussed each of these items with suppliers prior to putting them in the plans. One manufacturer of concrete is Sidley Precast (740-373-3640), a couple Steel railing suppliers are Legna Iron Works, Inc. (630-894-8056), Decorative Iron (888-380-9278)

Question Submitted: 9/20/2006

Question Number: 70

There are sections set up in the EBS file for supplier specific MSE wall biditems, however no biditems exist under these sections. Please clarify.

These sections will be remove in the next EBS amendment.

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.