

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 101044

Sale Date - 4/1/2010

Question Submitted: 2/22/2010

Question Number: 1

It appears the quantity of Portable Concrete Barrier, 32" is incorrect. The summation on sheet 40 is incorrect.

Question Submitted: 3/1/2010

Question Number: 2

The MOT plans show Work Zone Double Fine Signs. Please add a biditem for these.

Question Submitted: 3/15/2010

Question Number: 3

Please review Reference # 105 & 106. Bid Information is 1-3/4" Type 2 & 1-1/4" Type 1 - However the bid quantity and calculation sheet calculates these items both at 1-1/2" for the same total of 480 CY as the bid pages reflect. The quantities at 1-3/4" is 560 cy and at 1-1/4" is 400 CY

A: References 0105 and 0106 have been revised due to a calculation error on plan sheet 36. See revised plan sheets 31 and 36.

Question Submitted: 3/17/2010

Question Number: 4

RE: Embankment for Settlement. Page 147 of the plans discusses settlement at the bridge approaches and provides a table of expected settlement. How will additional embankment required to bring the fill back up to the subgrade elevation be paid for?

A: Item 203 Embankment and Item 203 Embankment, As Per Plan have been increased to account for the anticipated settlement. See sheets 15 and 30.

Question Submitted: 3/17/2010

Question Number: 5

The proposal includes PN 419-Design Requirements for Plant Mix Pavements stating Light traffic design for Woodcutter Drive and Frontage Road A & C, and Medium traffic design for CR 124. The pavement specified for CR 124 in the plans is used for Heavy traffic. Please clarify.

A: Proposal Note 419 has been revised by specifying a HEAVY mix design for CR-124.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2010

Question Number: 6

The estimated quantities on Sh 145 of the waterline plans indicate a 14"x14" Tapping Sleeve/Valve/Box and a 16"x16" Tapping Sleeve/Valve/Box. There are also 2 each 16" Gate Valves/Box shown. Are the 16" gate valves really required here in addition to the tapping valves? Please review and delete the gate valve references if not required. Sh 72 of the Frontage Rd "A" plans indicate a 12"x6" Tapping Sleeve/Valve/Box. There is also a 6" Gate Valves/Box shown. Is the 6" gate valves really required here in addition to the tapping valve? Please review and delete the gate valve references if not required.

see addendum

Question Submitted: 3/18/2010

Question Number: 7

It appears that the temporary pavement required for Commercial Drive 4 has been omitted from the summary. Please review the quantity.

A: Additional temporary pavement has been added to the quantities to account for maintaining drive access for Commercial Drive 4. See sheets 31A, 40 and 41.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2010

Question Number: 8

The estimated quantities on Sh 146 of the waterline plans indicate 2 each 12"x12" Tapping Sleeve/Valve/Box. According to the plans, it appears that these should be 12" Cutting-In Sleeves/Valve. Please review and clarify what type of connection is required. On the same page there are also 2 each 12" Gate Valves/Box shown. Are the 12" gate valves really required here in addition to the tapping valves? Please review and delete the gate valve references if not required.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2010

Question Number: 9

Have all of the utility relocations been completed? If not, when do you anticipate the work will be done?

Utility relocation is expected to be completed by May 15, 2010.

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: 3/19/2010

Question Number: 10

Please review the 304 quantities on sheet 36. The quantities given do not add up to the plan quantity in the general summary.

There are quantities for Item 304 carried from sheets 36 and 36A, for a total quantity of 6421 CY. The quantity for Item 304 is correct and no addendum is needed.

Question Submitted: 3/22/2010

Question Number: 11

We have also reviewed ODOT's 304 quantity and added the totals from page 36 & 36A and we come up with 5561 cubic yards. On page 36 - 4" 304 Aggregate - 247 cy On page 36 - 6" 304 Aggregate - 4938 cy On page 36a - 6" 304 Aggregate - 212 cy On page 36a - 10" 304 Aggregate - 164 cy Total 304 aggregate - 5561 cy

The quantity of Item 304 has been corrected.

Question Submitted: 3/22/2010

Question Number: 12

Is the 143 lf of 48" Type B Conduit between structures 6 and 7 shown on sheet 120 supposed to be RCP with gasketed joints per 706.02? If so, description of Ref. No. 79 to be 48" Conduit, Type B, As Per Plan, 706.02.

A: Replace 603 20900 48" Conduit, Type B with 603 20901 48" Conduit, Type B, 706.02 Pipe w/Joints per 706.11 in 66" Casing, As Per Plan. Quantity to remain at 143 FT.

Question Submitted: 3/23/2010

Question Number: 13

Please review References 143-145, Buildings Demolished. All three buildings identified on the plans appear to have been already removed. Please verify if any demolition is required for these items.

The buildings shown in the plan for demolition have been removed by others, as a result the items of work have been deleted from the Proposal.

Question Submitted: 3/24/2010

Question Number: 14

Addendum #4 replaced 143' of 48" Conduit Type B with 143' of 48" Conduit Type B in 66" Casing, APP. Does the 66" casing pipe have to be galvanized per 748.06 or can it be ungalvanized pipe with the largest wall thickness?

The casing pipe material should be as per CMS 748.06 and should be galvanized since the installation will be via an open cut.

Question Submitted: 3/3/2010

Question Number: 15

Could ODOT please make the electronic files for this project available for use?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/DEL-75917/ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/DEL-75917/>

Question Submitted: 3/30/2010

Question Number: 16

Ref 202 approach slab bar Mark AS1001 (AS1002) needs a 180 degree hook which is not included on the reinforcing list shown on sheet 176. Please verify.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2010

Question Number: 17

Section D-D shown on sheet 152 of 199 appears to show a 3' min. embed at the face of the MSE wall. This is different from the other three sections (A-A, B-B & C-C) where 3' min. embed is 4' out from the face of the wall. On sheets 148-150, the elevation views show for Wall 1-A, the embed is 6' in the areas of Section D-D and for Wall 2-A, the embed is 4.2' in the areas of Section D-D. There is a contradiction regarding the amount of embed of the MSE Walls between Section D-D & the MSE Walls 1-A & 2-A elevation views. Which is correct?

Answer1: Section D-D also shows a 4' dimension to the 3' minimum depth to the top of leveling pad. It may not be clear since the ground line is relatively flat from the wall to the 4' location. Answer2: It is intended that the top of the leveling pad be located a minimum of 3' below the ground line for a distance of 4' minimum from the face of the wall. The proposed top of leveling pad elevations shown in the wall elevations are based on the lowest proposed ground elevation and were shown as a constant elevation given the fairly level proposed ground elevations. The top of leveling pad elevations may be adjusted as long as all other plan requirement and SS840 requirements are met.

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

Project No. 090453

Sale Date - 10/21/2009

Question Submitted: 10/15/2009

Question Number: 1

Sheet 73 shows a 24" Type C conduit that runs parallel with the MSE wall between CB 7 and CB9. These sections of storm sewer need to be installed prior to the installation of the MSE wall in order to accept the drainage from the 6" drain tiles in select granular backfill. These section of 24" storm sewer are located underneath existing Home Road. How will the Contractor be compensated for the pavement replacement in existing Home Road? Can a short term closure of Home Road be utilized to install the 24" storm sewer or will traffic be maintained by using flaggers?

Compensation for the pavement replacement shall be included in the lump sum Item 614-11000 Maintaining Traffic. Traffic will be maintained by use of flaggers during installation of the storm line.

Question Submitted: 10/19/2009

Question Number: 2

RE: Embankment for Settlement Page 147 of the plans discusses settlement at the bridge approaches and provides a table of expected settlement. How will additional embankment required to bring the fill back up to grade be paid for?

Question Submitted: 10/5/2009

Question Number: 3

1.) On sheet 121, there is a note to provide gaskets for concrete pipe; however, the bid item for the conduit does not specify concrete pipe. Is it ODOT's intent to utilize concrete pipe in the MSE backfill areas? 2.) On sheet 123, there is a note that the 15" type B conduit is to be concrete encased. Where will the concrete encasement be paid?

Question Submitted: 10/6/2009

Question Number: 4

Addendum #5 delayed the bid date for the project three weeks from its original bid date. With a new bid date of 10/21, any work that could have been performed this year is now likely to occur during unfavorable weather. As stated in previous questions, the current completion date for the project seems aggressive; will ODOT consider extending the completion date three weeks to account for the delayed start?

Question Submitted: 10/6/2009

Question Number: 5

MSE Wall: Please clarify whether the bid area should be based on minimum embedment criteria (3' min from ditch invert level) as provided on cross sections as drawing 151/199, or on top of leveling pad levels stated on the elevations.

Question Submitted: 10/7/2009

Question Number: 6

The Proposal Note 535 Asphalt Binder Price Adjustment for Multi Year Projects was added to this project by addendum. It states that the Bidding Index is the asphalt index for the month the project is bid effective on the last Wednesday of the month. This project bids on October 21st and the index will not be determined until October 28th. The previous specification 401.20 Asphalt Binder Price Adjustment in the 2008 Spec Book defined the bidding index as the asphalt index in the month immediately before the month the project is bid. This specification allows the contractor to know the ACTUAL index which reduces the risk involved in the binder pricing at the time of the bid. Please consider changing the definition of the Bidding Index to the asphalt index for the month before the project is bid.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2009

Question Number: 7

Our takeoff indicates that there is only one 12" gate valve for Ref. No. 118 and there are no 16" gate valves for Ref. No. 119.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2009

Question Number: 8

Ref. No. 24 Granular Embankment, As Per Plan (Sand Blanket Drain) The as per plan note on sheet 14/199 states that the sand blanket is to be placed on top of existing ground. Note 1 on sheet 41K states that the contractor is to clear, grub and excavate as necessary prior to placing the sand blanket. Neither of these notes mentions topsoil stripping prior to placing the sand blanket. Is the contractor required to strip the topsoil prior to placing the sand blanket?

Question Submitted: 8/24/2009

Question Number: 9

There is no bid item for porous backfill at Bridge DEL-CR124-0438. Please add a bid item for this work in an 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: 8/24/2009

Question Number: 10

There is no bid item for porous backfill at Bridge DEL-CR124-0438. Please add a bid item for this work in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/24/2009

Question Number: 11

The proposal lists train traffic as 25 trains/day at 50 mph max while plan sheet 159/199 has 43 trains/day at 30 mph max. Please identify the correct train traffic data.

Question Submitted: 8/24/2009

Question Number: 12

The proposal lists train traffic as 25 trains/day at 50 mph max while plan sheet 159/199 has 43 trains/day at 30 mph max. Please identify the correct train traffic data.

Question Submitted: 8/28/2009

Question Number: 13

1) Page 12 of the plans indicate borrow area on the project. Where are these located on the project? 2) There is an existing stockpile of dirt within the project R.O.W at approximate station 233+00. Is this soil available for use on the project? 3) Plan note on page 147 indicate a 90 cal day waiting period to start abutment work after completion of embankment and M.S.E wall construction. On the same page another note refers to a 9 month waiting period prior to driving pile. Which note takes precedence?

Question Submitted: 8/28/2009

Question Number: 14

1) Page 12 of the plans indicate borrow area on the project. Where are these located on the project? 2) There is an existing stockpile of dirt within the project R.O.W at approximate station 233+00. Is this soil available for use on the project? 3) Plan note on page 147 indicate a 90 cal day waiting period to start abutment work after completion of embankment and M.S.E wall construction. On the same page another note refers to a 9 month waiting period prior to driving pile. Which note takes precedence?

Question Submitted: 8/31/2009

Question Number: 15

The following questions concern the Wick Drain installation in the area of the MSE walls. 1. Plan Sheet 41K states that the area is to be cleared, a 2'6" sand blanket placed and wick drains installed to elevation 910.0. Then we place the piezometers and after the readings have stabilized begin embankment and MSE wall construction. However, to begin MSE wall construction we have to excavate approx. 3' through the wick drains and sand blanket to one foot below starter footing grade for the MSE wall foundation preparation. Please advise as to the proper sequence of construction in this area. 2. The wick drains and sand blanket are not shown on the cross sections. Has the 18,426 cy of Granular Embankment APP for the sand blanket been removed from the Embankment quantity?

Question Submitted: 8/31/2009

Question Number: 16

The following questions concern the Wick Drain installation in the area of the MSE walls. 1. Plan Sheet 41K states that the area is to be cleared, a 2'6" sand blanket placed and wick drains installed to elevation 910.0. Then we place the piezometers and after the readings have stabilized begin embankment and MSE wall construction. However, to begin MSE wall construction we have to excavate approx. 3' through the wick drains and sand blanket to one foot below starter footing grade for the MSE wall foundation preparation. Please advise as to the proper sequence of construction in this area. 2. The wick drains and sand blanket are not shown on the cross sections. Has the 18,426 cy of Granular Embankment APP for the sand blanket been removed from the Embankment quantity?

Question Submitted: 9/1/2009

Question Number: 17

The following items are in the plans and proposal: Ref 29 Monument Assembly 25 ea Ref 30 Reference Monument 25 ea General Summary on plan sheet 30 lists plan sheet 178 for these items. Plan sheet 178 lists 25 ea Adjustable Centerline Monuments and no Reference Monuments. Are there Reference Monuments and if so where are they located or should this item be deleted?

Question Submitted: 9/1/2009

Question Number: 18

The following items are in the plans and proposal: Ref 29 Monument Assembly 25 ea Ref 30 Reference Monument 25 ea General Summary on plan sheet 30 lists plan sheet 178 for these items. Plan sheet 178 lists 25 ea Adjustable Centerline Monuments and no Reference Monuments. Are there Reference Monuments and if so where are they located or should this item be deleted?

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: 9/1/2009

Question Number: 19

The following items are in the plans and proposal: Ref 29 Monument Assembly 25 ea Ref 30 Reference Monument 25 ea General Summary on plan sheet 30 lists plan sheet 178 for these items. Plan sheet 178 lists 25 ea Adjustable Centerline Monuments and no Reference Monuments. Are there Reference Monuments and if so where are they located or should this item be deleted?

Question Submitted: 9/1/2009

Question Number: 20

The following items are in the plans and proposal: Ref 29 Monument Assembly 25 ea Ref 30 Reference Monument 25 ea General Summary on plan sheet 30 lists plan sheet 178 for these items. Plan sheet 178 lists 25 ea Adjustable Centerline Monuments and no Reference Monuments. Are there Reference Monuments and if so where are they located or should this item be deleted?

Question Submitted: 9/10/2009

Question Number: 21

Page 144 of the plans shows proposed 14" Water Main work at station 5+77. There is no pay item under the Water Work section of the proposal. Will ODOT add a reference item for the 14" Waterline?

Question Submitted: 9/14/2009

Question Number: 22

It will be very difficult to locate material for select granular backfill, item 304 that meets MSE wall spec in this area. Would the Department consider eliminating the 304 layer and using typical select granular backfill?

Question Submitted: 9/14/2009

Question Number: 23

We have been unable to locate any relocation plans or 4A notes in the plans or proposal for the existing third party utility lines throughout the project. These existing utilities conflict with the proposed underground utility work and MSE excavation (see sheet 59). When will these lines be relocated, and will the relocated utility lines influence the installation of any of the underground utilities or MSE wall construction?

Question Submitted: 9/15/2009

Question Number: 24

Is it acceptable to reduce the Work Type Percentage Performed by the Prime Contractor from 50% to 40%?

Question Submitted: 9/16/2009

Question Number: 25

could you please make the electronic files available for use?

Question Submitted: 9/17/2009

Question Number: 26

Please provide bid items for the tapping sleeve and valve waterline connections. There are 3 ea 12" x 12" TS&V, 1 ea 14" x 14" TS&V, 1 ea 16" x 16" TS&V and 1 ea 12" x 6" TS&V.

Question Submitted: 9/17/2009

Question Number: 27

Please provide the sizes of the water service lines and meters that are to be relocated under Ref. No. 122. This information is not shown on the plans.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2009

Question Number: 28

Plan Sheet 14 details locations of Pneumatic Piezometers to be installed, however, no mention is made as to the elevation of piezometer placement. Plan Sheet 14 and Sheet 41K describes locations of piezometer placement. 4 locations (all left of centerline) appear to fall outside the limits of the MSE Wall and Embankment fill. Please verify the placement locations.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2009

Question Number: 29

RE: Existing Liberty Road. MOT plan sheets 21 and 28 and plan and profile sheet 51 depict existing Liberty Road coming to a dead end prior to reaching Home road. An onsite visit revealed that existing Liberty Road currently intersects with Home Road. The plans currently do not address how to maintain traffic from Liberty Road onto Home Road and Frontage Road C during the construction of this project. How should the traffic on Liberty Road be maintained? Is there another project that is to be completed on Liberty Road prior to the work on this project? If so, when would that work be completed?

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: 9/18/2009

Question Number: 30

RE: Phase 2 - Part 2 Temporary Pavement. The work zone typical section for phase 2 – part 2 of the maintenance of traffic shown on sheet 27 indicates the use of work zone pavement (variable width) on the west-bound shoulder of the newly constructed CR-124. However, no temporary pavement for maintaining traffic is shown for phase 2 part 2 work in the maintenance of traffic plan sheets and no quantity has been included in the MOT summary for this phase. Does ODOT intend to use temporary pavement for maintaining traffic in phase 2 part 2? If so, where should the temporary pavement be placed and what quantity is to be placed?

Question Submitted: 9/2/2009

Question Number: 31

Concerning plan note on plan sheet 18 - Work Zone Delineation, plan sheet 19A - WZ Delineation standard, and the 2 corresponding bid items: Ref# 145 - Transition Area Delineation, and Ref# 146 - Tangent Area Delineation. This subject matter is for freeways and expressways, and doesn't apply to this type of project. Shouldn't these bid items and notes be deleted by addendum?

Question Submitted: 9/2/2009

Question Number: 32

1. Can you please identify the Transition Area Delineation and Tangent Area Delineation areas on the plans. 2. On sheet 18 it says that the striping, work zone raised pavement markers, removal of raised pavement markers, removal of existing surface course are to be included in the items above. It appears that all of the temporary striping is broken out into the individual bid items of edge line and channelizing line. Please verify.

Question Submitted: 9/2/2009

Question Number: 33

MOT plan sheet 22, Traffic Control plan sheet 143, and the Cross-sections sheets 70-71 all show a three lane road coming in to the project on the east end. They also show an existing turn lane into the park on the EB side. After an onsite visit there is only two lanes on the east end of the project and no turn lane. These changes will affect the temporary pavement, excavation/embankment quantities, and etc.. Is there another job that is to be completed before construction starts on project 090453? Please verify which is correct.

Question Submitted: 9/21/2009

Question Number: 34

RE: Construction Phasing. The MOT phasing plan of the project seems to have not taken into consideration the constructability of the MSE wall and difference in elevation between the proposed roadway and the existing roadway. In phase 2 part 2 of the maintenance of traffic plans, traffic is to travel through the project on the newly constructed portions of Home Road built during phase 1 part 2 in which the plans show building approximately to the centerline of the proposed Home Road. Construction to the centerline of pavement necessary to carry traffic shown in the MOT plans between Sta. 224+00 and 227+50 and between Sta. 237+00 and 238+00 seems infeasible given that in order to construct the embankment necessary to build the pavement to centerline, the embankment slope (assuming 1.5 :1) would encroach into the existing Home Road where traffic would be travelling during phase 1 part 2. (Please refer to x-section sheets 59-61 & 67) In addition, if the embankment was placed; the required MSE wall undercut necessary for MSE Wall construction performed in phase 2 part 2 would undermine the embankment in these areas where traffic is running on the proposed portion of Home Road. How does ODOT expect the contractor to maintain traffic while constructing these portions of the project?

Question Submitted: 9/22/2009

Question Number: 35

RE: Ref No. 24 Granular Embankment, APP. The general note on page 14 of the plans states that the granular embankment sand should conform to 703.02.A. Will ODOT require the material to meet the sieve analysis included in 703.02.A.2?

Question Submitted: 9/23/2009

Question Number: 36

The 4A utility relocation notes do not address the conflicts with the buried telephone lines along Home Road. Will these lines be relocated?

Question Submitted: 9/23/2009

Question Number: 37

How will the Contractor be compensated for the temporary 12" Type C conduits shown on 41D, 41E, 41G and 41H? Will this be paid under Ref. No. 56 or Ref. No. 63? Are these lines to be abandoned in place or removed once the sediment basins are no longer needed?

The cost of the conduit is included in Item 832, see 832,13. The conduit should be removed as part of the cost.

Question Submitted: 9/23/2009

Question Number: 38

How will the Contractor be compensated for the temporary manholes and flap gates shown at the basins shown on sheets 41D thru 41G?

The cost of the manholes and flap gates are included in Item 832, see 832,13.

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: 9/23/2009

Question Number: 39

The proposed 48" Type C Conduit is in direct conflict with an existing Transformer at storm sewer Sta 141+57 along Woodcutter Drive. This transformer needs to be relocated in order to install this line, however it is not included in the 4A notes in the proposal, and no bid items are provided for this work. Will this transformer be relocated by others, or is it the Contractor's responsibility. If it is the Contractor's responsibility, please provide the appropriate bid items in the proposal.

Question Submitted: 9/24/2009

Question Number: 40

RE: Project Schedule Completion Date. Upon developing a detailed pre-bid CPM schedule, meeting the contract completion date for the project seems unrealistic given; the restrictions on night work, the 9 month embankment waiting period, and the amount of time necessary to construct the MSE wall, embankment fills, and the bridge. Please consider revising the current contract completion date. A more reasonable date would be June 30, 2012. If the department still feels that the current completion date is achievable, we request that you furnish a project CPM schedule demonstrating that contractor can meet the current completion date.

Question Submitted: 9/24/2009

Question Number: 41

This question is in regards to the detail shown on page 7 of the plans for the Combination Curb and Gutter, Type 2, As Per Plan. The detail of the stone under the curb appears to be very similar to the City of Columbus standard for underdrain under curb. Typically this is all # 57's or 8's under the curb. However the material in this detail is shown to be 6.5" of 304. This would make the 4" Base Pipe Underdrain trench 6" x 6". Please clarify if the base pipe underdrain trench on Woodcutter is 6" x 6" and also clarify where the quantity 6.5" x 30" of 304 was to be included. Thanks.

Question Submitted: 9/24/2009

Question Number: 42

Will you please put up the link for the revised drawings per add # 2?

Question Submitted: 9/24/2009

Question Number: 43

There is no porous backfill itm in the proposal for the bridge.

This was addressed in Question # 1 in Addendum 1 and quantities were added. No further addendum needed.

Question Submitted: 9/25/2009

Question Number: 44

The 30" casing pipe shown on sheet 145 must be installed and operational prior to excavating the MSE wall in phase 1. There is no temporary pavement in this area for traffic to be shifted on. Since this conduit is 13 feet deep, it will be impossible to safely flag during installation. How does ODOT intend on installing the pipe? Will a weekend road closure be permitted?

Question Submitted: 9/25/2009

Question Number: 45

When will the revised plans referenced in Addendum #2 be available to download, we have checked the ftp site referenced in Addendum #1 and can not find them. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 9/26/2009

Question Number: 46

Addendum #4 added 60 ft of 30" Bored or Jacked pipe, but did not reduce the 30" Open Cut pipe by 60 ft. Please correct.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2009

Question Number: 47

Per the plans supplemental specification 800-2008 dated 7-17-2009 was added. This replaced proposal note 401.20 asphalt binder price adjustment. Should proposal note 535 asphalt price adjustment for multiyear projects be added?

Question Submitted: 9/28/2009

Question Number: 48

Prior addendums changed the lower 3' of the SGB and the Subgrade Prep material to 703.02a to be used as a sand blanket. Will the requirements for resistivity, friction angle, ph, etc in the 840 spec still apply to this material?

Question Submitted: 9/29/2009

Question Number: 49

Sheet 155/199 shows a gap between the sleeper slab and the MSE wall coping. Is this what the Department intends or should there be PEJF in the gap? If PEJF is to be used, please add a bid item for this work.

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: 9/4/2009

Question Number: 50

On sheet 13, under item 661-Tree Seeding, APP-I states a total of 20 2" Cal seedings, per ODNR list. Is there a certain quantity allowed for one species or can they all be the same species? Could I get a clarification on what exactly they want for this item?

Question Submitted: 9/4/2009

Question Number: 51

Has the Embankment APP Reference 23 quantity been deducted from the Embankment Reference 22 quantity?

Question Submitted: 9/8/2009

Question Number: 52

Bid item 151 Portable Changeable Message Sign, APP's quantity seems to be understated for the length of the job. Please verify.

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.