Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Project No. 076004 **Sale Date - 6/29/2007**

Question Submitted: 6/13/2007 *Question Number:* 1

Pertaining to Reference 128:1. Are the Intermediate Crossframes for the new facia bays to be Type 1 ?2. By Note 1 on page 60/96 (16/23), replace the end crossframes between beam lines D-E and F-G; the "End of Superstructure" section view on page 62/96 (18/23) appears to show otherwise as though replacing end frames E-F, F-G, and G-H. Please Advise.3. Page 47/96 (3/23) shows (in the "estimated quantites" table) that the crossframes are to be ASTM A709 Gr. 36M, while just to the right of that table lies a Note saying "Structural steel - ASTM A709 Gr. 50. Please Advise. 4. Are the 16 Crossframes labeled ø, located along the centerline of the piers included in this item?

Question Submitted: 6/19/2007 *Question Number:* 2

1.The project completion date is schedule for 8/31/08. Due to the sale date of the project (no permanent work to be done up top this year), this completion date seems very unrealistic for a multi-phase bridge construction including bridge painting. Should the completion date be extended?2.Plan sheet 47/96 Note: Drilled Shaft Construction Method: indicates the contractor is to use a permanent casing. Is it ODOT's intent to extend this permanent casing to the bottom of the rock socket?3.Plan sheet 48/96 Note: Dowel Holes... requires dowel holes to be "Core Drilled". This is more time consuming and more costly. This structure has a significant number of dowel holes. Please clarify ODOT's intent.4. Plan sheet 48/96 and 63/96 have contradictory notes regarding bridge deck elevations. Plan sheet 48/96 Note: Bridge Deck Elevations... requires the contractor to provide to ODOT's engineer with beam top elevation AFTER the bridge deck has been removed. Plan sheet 63/96 Note: Screed Elevations... requires the contractor to provide these elevations BEFORE and AFTER the deck has been removed.Please clarify ODOT's intent.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2007 *Question Number:* 3

Ref. 59 "Trench Drain with Standard Grate"Only information we can find on this is that the minimum depth is to be 275mm (sheet 7)and that the thickness of the concrete shall match the thickness of adjacent pavement (sheet 3). Given that the specification 839 was issued only a couple of months ago, can ODOT please provide a detailed drawing that shows dimensions of the drain and grate?

Supplemental Specifications 839 and 939 contain enough details required to construct the trench drain.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2007 *Question Number:* 4

1) Have the bat trees been removed for this project? And in particular around the railroad bridge, and we will have some clearing at the river bridge for access to the river.2) Sheet 9/96 under earthwork for maintaining traffic, there is a quantity setup as 660 CY or M3??? Which is it?3) I have not seen on the plans any details for the toe of slope for the concrete riprap. I would like to know what the elevation is and what it looks like. 4) Completion Date??? There appears to be a conflict between the Notification of emergency project stating 10/31/2008 as completion date. Sheet 8/96 states that 10/1/2008 is the completion date. The proposal indicates that 8/31/2008 is the completion date. Due to the late bid date this year, there will not be much work performed this fall. We would hope that the end of next season 10/31/2008, as a realistic completion date.6) It is not usual or customary to include adding new steel work under a demolition item as stated on sheet 62/96 Note #5.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2007 *Question Number:* 5

Project plans (Page 75/96) show a full-height wingwall on two adjacent corners of the three-sided structure and two very short wingwalls on the other two corners. This creates an unbalanced fill situation on the structure and also exposes the concrete arch, possibly the joint wrap and the back side of the headwall. To address these concerns, should these two shorter wingwalls be full height - starting from the top of headwall similar to the other two?

The District does not believe there is a loading problem. The wingwalls should be bid as per the plans.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2007 *Question Number:* 6

Ref. 62- #304 Aggregate Base- no quantity setup for stone base under approach slabs- can ODOT please check, verify, and revise quantity?

Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/20/2007 *Question Number:* 7

Pre-bid questions as follows:1)I assume that line item 129 A-709/Grade 50 Level I Structural Steel (LS) includes 'only' the new fascia beam line and associated splices both northbound and southbound for Bridge ERIE-250-20036... Please confirm.2)Since Line item 128 A-709 Grade 50 Level UF Structural Steel is Lump Sum, it's important to define the scope of work required. I believe it includes only Type I intermediate crossframes between beam line A-B, F-G, & L-M. In addition, I believe it includes new end frames @ both abutments, only between beam lines A-B, E-F, G-H, & L-M. Please confirm.3)Addendum No. 1 - Note 2 states... "these crossframes shall be included" ; this is confusing... I believe note 2 on page 60/96 simply tells the contractor that crossframes marked with the symbol * (intermediate crossframes @ the piers nos. 1 & 2) have 4 chords (A top horizontal angle, a bottom horizontal angle, and 2 diagonal angles), instead of a typical type 1 crossframe with 3 chords (a bottom horizontal angle and 2 diagonal angles). A site visit confirms that they already exist now. We don't believe the engineer intended to reuse the existing type 1 intermediate frames, but instead to remove/replace pier x-frames. Please confirm.4)Regarding item 3 above, the new intermediate crossframes between beams A-B, F-G, & L-M do not show the symbol * at piers 1 & 2. I assume only type 1 crossframes (3 chords) are required instead of 4 chords. Please confirm.5)I think ODOT should make Line item 129-Level UF steel paid by the KG instead of Lump Sum, to establish a unit price for extra work. Since the original design, there has been additional deteioration . In some locations where you show the beam end rapair (pgs. 60 & 61) and expect to reuse the existing end frames, they are too badly rusted and don't even connect to the existing beam web anymore!6) Page 62 shows a 'typical' end crossframe replacement detail that may have been for the railroad bridge instead of the river bridge. The section shows a 'typical detail' for beam spacing of 8' - 12'. (A bottom chord plus 4 others, like an inverted 'W'). Since the beams spacing is 7', the end frames should have a bottom chord and 2 others,(like an inverted "V"). I believe all replacement end frames should look like the median end frame section shown on the middle of page 62. Please confirm. (The weight is not significant, but the welding is)Also confirm that the end frame chord size is 102 x 102 x 7.9 (4" x 4" x 5/16") instead of that shown in the standard drawings. Thank you7) For reference 058, Exfiltration Trench Type C, can the cement treated free draining base per CMS 306 be mixed by hand since it is a very small quantity.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2007 *Question Number:* 8

Ref. 105: Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A:Plan sheet 9 gives the area as well as the estimated earthwork volumes. However, there are no other details as to station limits of work. Please provide some type of quantity breakdown.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2007 *Question Number:* 9

Are ther any restrictions to working in the Huron river due to fish or other aquadic spawning?

Question Submitted: 6/25/2007 *Question Number:* 10

The details for interim phase partial deck replacement on page 13F/96 do not provide a reinforcing steel layout for the proposed portion of the deck to be replaced. This is necessary not only to determine reinforcing requirements but also to determine the amount of doweling neccessary to connnect the new reinforcing to the portion of deck to remain. Please provide clarification.

Item 502 Structures for Maintaining Traffic in the Construction and Materials Specifications, Paragraph 502.01; Description, says "This work consists of preparing plans, providing, maintaining, and subsequently removing temporary structures." Therefore, the contractor is responsible for providing the District with a plan for review and approval to remove and replace this section of deck.

Question Submitted: 6/25/2007 *Question Number:* 11

1. Reference No. 13 Removal Misc.: Deck Joint and Concrete is a lump sum item and note 3 of sheet 13F only refers to “the bridge”. Does this item apply to both ends of both structure 20036 AND structure 20326? Could ODOT provide a detail of how/if the steel plate should be anchored and the dimensions required to transition down to the temporary pavement?2. Regarding Reference Nos. 91, 92, 93 & 94, plan sheet 13F and notes do not indicate if the existing deck rebar is required to be salvaged or if full depth sawcutting and dowels are required. Please clarify. Also the existing decks have existing concrete overlays and the overlay thicknesses are not given or shown on the demolition drawings in the plans. Please provide these dimensions and clarify the new temporary deck thickness and rebar requirements.

Question Submitted: 6/26/2007 *Question Number:* 12

Plan sheet 13F of 96 indicates limits of removal and replacement of the existing bridge deck for the maintenance of traffic. In accordance with spec item 502, which allows for contractor design and construction, are we allowed to design our own method of reinforcing the deck edge for traffic maintenance?Please verify the quantity of 32" temporary concrete barrier wall on this project.

A1) Yes. Item 502 Structures for Maintaining Traffic in the Construction and Materials Specifications, Paragraph 502.01; Description, says "This work consists of preparing plans, providing, maintaining, and subsequently removing temporary structures." Therefore, the contractor is responsible for providing the District with a plan for review and approval to remove and replace this section of deck. A2) The quantity has been verified on the plans. Quantities match on the plan sheets and the proposal.

Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Project No. 063002 **Sale Date - 12/1/2006**

Question Submitted: 11/16/2006 *Question Number:* 1

Has any of the information provided on the Attachments cd been modified from the 063001 cd?

There were no modifications made to the Attachments CD

Question Submitted: 11/21/2006 *Question Number:* 2

1. Ref # 50 Special - Professional Liability Insurance
For design build contracts less $10,000,000, a project specific professional liability insurance policy is not required by the DBT as described on proposal page 40 and 41. The DBT must instead submit a certificate of insurance evidencing that the designer has the required professional practice liability insurance coverage. This coverage is standard and typically incidental to the design fees. Since the project specific policy is not required for this size, we will not have an additional invoice required for payment of this bid item. Will the department accept this bid item with a cost of $1.00 since no bid is considered non-responsive per CMS 102.14?

2. There a several bid items (Ref # 36-41) provided for the repair or replacement of the ERI-250-1157 structure. Depending on what type of structure is provided, one or more of these bid items may have no cost associated with them. Will the department accept one or more items with a cost of $1.00 since no bid is considered non-responsive per CMS 102.14?

Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Project No. 063001 **Sale Date - 10/18/2006**

Question Submitted: 10/11/2006 *Question Number:* 1

No allowance for pavement repairs on the milled surface has been included in the S.O.S. or the proposal. If any pavement repairs are encountered, will they be paid by force account?

Question Submitted: 10/11/2006 *Question Number:* 2

Scope of Services page 23 describes the Steel Repair to be performed on both rear and forward abutment beam ends on the structure carrying US 250 over the Huron River. CMS specification 513.25 Nondestructive testing describes the methods for testing the welding procedure for steel members. This work is to be performed "As the Engineer Directs". The method and extent could result in significant expense. Would the Department indicate the type and extent of the testing that will be required to complete the repairs as indicated?

Per Section 513.25, the construction engineer will determine what method shall be used at the time of testing. The extent of testing shall conform to AASHTO/AWS Bridge Welding Code, per Section 513.25.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2006 *Question Number:* 3

Q) HOW LONG WILL THE FIELD OFFICE BE REQUIRED? WILL IT BE REQUIRED THROUGH THE INTERIM COMPLETION DATE ONLY, OR WILL THE DEPARTMENT REQUIRE IT FOR THE PAINTING OPERATION IN 2008?

A field office is normally provided for for the entire project length. The field office on this project will be required for the entire project length.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2006 *Question Number:* 4

Q) WHAT ARE THE LANE RESTRICTIONS OR WORK WINDOW RESTRICTIONS FOR THE PAINTING OPERATION IN 2008.

Lane restrictions shall be as described in Section 13.2 of the Scope. The work window available to the contractor is described in the CMS, Section 514, Painting of Structural Steel and the 6/30/08 completion date.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2006 *Question Number:* 5

It seems that all of our access roads for fill, concrete, and demo are township roads or city streets. Can ODOT add an item for MOT of existing roads?

The Design/Build Team will comply with CMS Section 105.13, Haul Roads for transportation of fill, concrete and demolition material.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2006 *Question Number:* 6

Note 1. on Plan sheet 63/96 (19/23 of 250 over Huron River Structure Drawings) seems to indicate the haunch concrete volume will not be included for payment. This is one of the few Bid Items with a measured quantity. Please clarify the Department's intent with regard to payment of the haunch concrete.

Question Submitted: 10/6/2006 *Question Number:* 7

In response to addendum #2 answers to questions relating to Scope of Service item 10.4: If the DBT intends to reconstruct the Huron River bridge in an identical manner to that of the Proudfoot plans, and then after submitting the flood plain analysis it is determined by the governing authority that due to the submitted flood plain analysis that the bridge must be reconstructed completely (or differently to the intended method), we assume that this situation would constitute a change of condition. Can ODOT please verify this and/or please revise the wording of scope of services?

Question Submitted: 10/9/2006 *Question Number:* 8

Plan Sheet 47/96 Note: Drilled Shaft Construction Method:
indicates the contractor is to use a permanent casing. Is it the Department's intent to extend this permanent casing to the bottom of the rock socket?

Question Submitted: 10/9/2006 *Question Number:* 9

Plan sheet 48/96 (4/23 of Huron River Structure); Plan Note: Item 514 Painting of Structural Steel: indicates the new steel, which will come shop primed, must be "cleaned and painted with a prime, intermediate and finish coat...". The Estimated Quantities sheet (47/96) does not seem to indicate that the new steel would be primed. Please clarify whether the Department intends that the new steel would be primed in the shop and again in the field. The proposal Note 891, referenced in the plan note does not seem to be part of the contract documents.

Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/9/2006 *Question Number:* 10

Scope of services section 14.3 gives the pavement requirements. Only full depth and full depth asphalt paving and base is addressed. Is the DBT also responsible for performing mill-fill and shoulder replacement sections byond those stations as well? The only locations specified for full-depth replacement are called out in parts c, d, and f.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2006 *Question Number:* 11

Plan sheets 48/96 and 63/96 have contradictory notes regarding bridge deck elevations. Plan sheet 48/96 Note: Bridge Deck Elevations...Requires the contractor to provide the Department with beam top elevations after the bridge deck has been removed. Plan sheet 63/96 Note: Screed Elevations...requires the contractor to provide these elevations before the deck was removed and again after the deck has been removed. Please clarify the Department's intent.

Plan sheet 48/96 Note : Dowel Holes... requires dowel holes to be "Core Drilled". This is more time consuming and more costly. This structure has a significant number of dowel holes. Does the department intend for the contractor to comply with this note?

Question Submitted: 9/1/2006 *Question Number:* 12

1. Ref # 35 QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC 2, Superstructure (Deck) w/Warranty - Is it ODOT's intent to include the bridge parapet quantity in this item or under Ref # 33 Superstructure? In either case, the concrete quantity is incorrect will need to be adjusted.

2. Section 15.3 - Pier repairs have been added to the scope of services for the ERI-250-1138 structure. Is it ODOT's intent to repair the pier surface to the top of footing or normal water elevation?

3. Section 16.5 - Loop detector payment is to be included in Item 632 Traffic Signals. There is no Item 632 Traffic Signals in the proposal.

4. The project completion date is scheduled for 10/31/07. Due to the sale date of the project, this completion date seems very unrealistic to allow for adequate design time as well as multi-phase bridge construction including bridge painting. Should the completion date be extended?

Answer 1: Parapets are not considered as part of the deck and should be paid for under Ref # 33. Answer 2: Repair areas are as shown on the sxisting ERI-250-19.742 plans, Sheet 58/96. Answer 3: See addendum. Answer 4: The project completion date will remain at 10/31/07.

Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/1/2006 *Question Number:* 13

1. Section 1.3 1A - Can the prima facie speed limit through the work zone be reduced during construction?

2. Section 8.4 - Do the stage review submission drawings have to meet the current CAAD standards?

3. Section 10.4 - A detailed flood plain analysis is requested from the DBT. Is this necessary for the proposed construction methods or for the permanent construction? What flood plain encroachment was used for the environmental permit? If the DBT complies with the approved environmental permit stipulations, will a hydraulic analysis still be required?

4. Section 11 - What type of right-of-way exists over the old NS tracks (City of Norwalk parcel)? Has the right-of-way as defined on sheets 94-96 of 96 in the construction plans been acquired? The structure type study sketches for several of the options show work extending outside of the right-of-way. If any of the options are utilized, what type of right-of-way will be acquired? The existing right-of-way restricts construction to 110 feet at the city property.

5. Section 13.2 - Is the 11 foot minimum lane width for the maintenance of traffic measured from toe to toe of curb or barrier, or lane line to lane line?

6. Section 13.3d - Will glare screen be required on the 32" PCB for the bidirectional maintenance of traffic?

7. Section 14.1 - Is field survey required beyond what is necessary to construct the project utilizing the ERI-250-19.742 plan prepared by Proudfoot Associates?

8. Section 14.4 - Is the guardrail and shoulder grading work to be suspended between the bridges as shown on sheets 21 and 22 of 96? Will additional embankment be necessary on the existing slope to maintain the constant offset throughout the project limits?

9. Section 15.3 - The scope of services calls for the ERI-250-1138 structure to be build according to the plans developed for the unbuilt ERI-250-19.742 project except as noted. The plans call for the 2005 specifications to be used. The design load on bridge ERI-250-1138 is HS20-44 for a rehabilitated structure. Is a future wearing surface allowance to be included? If so, how much is required, 60 psf or 30 psf?

10. Section 15.4 - The scope of services for ERI-250-1157 has an HS-25 design loading listed per the new structure specifications. Is a future wearing surface allowance to be included? If so, how much is required, 60 psf of 30 psf? Will the redecking/rehabilitation of the existing structure be considered as an option to total replacement?

11. Section 16.2 - "Construct all flat sheet signs as shown on sheet 44." Should all existing flat sheet signs be replaced with new flat sheet signs?

12. Section 18 - Will right-of-way plans be required if no new right-of-way is needed? Do right-of-way plans need to be submitted for three stage reviews?

Answer 1: The Prima Facie speed limit through the work zone cannot be reduced. Per the ODOT Temporary Traffic Control Manual, Section 640-18.2, the classification must be an expressway. The project roadway is not an expressway. No addendum is required. Answer 2: Stage review submissions must meet current CADD standards per ODOT L & D Manual, Volume 3, Section 1206.1. No addendum required. Answer 3: Any construction within the 100-year floodplain must apply for a floodplain permit. No "flood plain encroachment" was used for the environmental permit. The DBT is responsible for obtaining a floodplain permit. Depending on the final design by the DBT, a hydraulic analysis may still be required. Answer 4: The Right of Way type existing over the City of Norwalk parcel is a standard highway easement. Sheet 96A (3A/3) provides the Right of Way currently owned by the State. No additional Right of Way will be required. The replacement/rehabilitated structure and appurtenances will be constructed within the permanent Right of Way. The contractor may make arrangements with adjacent property owners for access to the project. Answer 5: The 11-foot lane width is measured from lane line to lane line. Answer 6: There is no requirement for glare screen. Answer 7: The DBT will need to complete field survey work required to submit a complete set of constructable construction plans as required by the ODOT L & D Manual. Answer 8: All guardrail within the project limits will be replaced--see Scope of Services, Setion 14.4 c. The DBT will determine if additional embankment is necessary, based on the final design. The design has to meet all current design standards. Answer 9: A future wearing surface allowance of 60 psf shall be included in the design of the rehabilitated bridge as per Section 401.2 of the Bridge Design Manual. Answer 10: The Design/Build Team will determine the structure to build that adheres to the parameters described in the Scope. If a culvert is determined to be the structure, it will be designed to an HS-25 loading with no allowance for a future wearing surface. If a new bridge is determined to be the best structure, it will be designed to an HS-25 loading with an allowance for a future wearing surface of 60 psf. If the existing structure is rehabilitated, it will be designed to an HS-20-44 loading with an allowance for a future wearing surface of 60 psf. All three scenarios are addressed in the Bridge Design Manual. Answer 11: There are no new flat sheet signs on this project. Answer 12: No new Right of Way is required. Therefore, no Right of Way plans are needed.

Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/12/2006 *Question Number:* 14

1. Scope of Services (SOS) 10.4 - Second paragraph, last line says “Should the DBT make any changes to the bridge design. . .” SOS 15.3 states that the structure ERI-250-1138 over the Huron River should be constructed according to the set of plans received with the Scope except that the plans will be revised as listed on page 23 of SOS 15.3. These revisions do not change the basic design of the structure. Please clarify.

2. Structure ERI-250-1138 over the Huron River. SOS 15.3 (page 23) “Note: Collection of additional soils information shall be the responsibility of the DBT and considered incidental to the design effort.” But, we are not changing the basic design of the structure and, therefore, we do not need any additional subsurface investigation. Please clarify.

3. SOS 15.3 (page 24). Structure No. ERI-250-1157 over abandoned railroad. “Note: Collection of additional soils information shall be the responsibility of the DBT and considered incidental to the design effort.” The existing 5 - span steel beam bridge is to be removed and replaced with a new structure, and therefore additional subsurface investigation is needed. Further, the Proposal Section 0007 (on page 4) has a line item 0048 Special - Subsurface Investigation, LS.” It is our understanding that the additional subsurface investigation will be paid for under this item. Please clarify. Also see Proposal 104.011 Design of the Project, paragraph G on page 38.

4. Questions regarding ROW
Right of Way (verification)

A. Have the proposed right of way takes already been acquired?

B. We are only to establish and stake the existing right of way for constuction.

C. Right of Way Plans will not be revised to English units only. Existing Right of Way Plans will not be changed.

Question Submitted: 9/15/2006 *Question Number:* 15

Will slip forming of the 42" high single slope deflector parapet be permissible?

Slip forming will be permitted as per CMS Section 622.03. Slipforming must conform to Section 609.04C.

Question Submitted: 9/20/2006 *Question Number:* 16

Scope of Services, Page 20, Section 14.4, Roadway: directs the DBT to "replace all guardrail within the project limits".
Scope of Services, Page 4, Section 6. Scope of Work: defines the project limits, with a "Suspend Project" area. Please clarify the Department's intent with regard to the Guardrail within the "Suspend Project" area. Should this guardrail be replaced or re-used?

Question Submitted: 9/27/2006 *Question Number:* 17

1. Section 14.3, Item E indicates to provide reinforced mesh for the longitudinal pavement joints. Section 14.10 states that the placement of the mesh is to take place after the placement of item 301 and prior to the placement of the intermediate course. Is this correct or should section 14.10 read prior to the placement of the surface course?

2. Is there a minimum median width required?

3. In review of the metric construction plans on sheet 68/96 it was noted that an existing catch basin was located on the south side of the ERI-250-1157 structure east of USR 250. The catch basin is drained through an existing 15" pipe along the south side of the abandoned railroad to headwall on the west side of USR 250. The cross sections in the original construction plans indicate the conduit is about 10' existing grade. The metric construction plans stated that this drainage run were to remain in use with the bridge rehabilitation. The design-build scope of services request a conduit type structure replace the existing bridge and the USR 250 roadway be constructed on embankment. No mention of this drainage structure and conduit is made. Placement of the embankment to accomplish this results in the existing 15" conduit having approximately 40' of earth covering it and burying the catch basin. It appears that this drainage course along the City of Norwalk Right-of-Way will need to be incorporated into the project. Is this correct?

The minimum work will include relocating the catch basin and extending the 15" conduit in kind or that the existing 15" conduit be removed and replaced with a 36" conduit [per the L&D manual guidelines for conduits through high earth fills] due to the new high fill condition. Please indicate which option ODOT will require, extending the 15" conduit or replacing it with a new larger conduit.

Answer: Section 14.3, Item E is correct. If the mesh is placed at this location it will not be disturbed when the pavement is planed and paved in future projects. Answer: No. Answer: This Design/Build project only requires a minimum opening size, and does not specify a certain structure type. If the DBT designs a replacement bridge structure then the existing conduit MAY remain in place if additional water is not directed to it, or it may need to be replaced with a larger pipe if the hydraulic capacity is exceeded. If the DBT designs a culvert-type structure which requires a high embankment over the existing pipe, the pipe will need to be replaced per the L & D manual.

Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/27/2006 *Question Number:* 18

Scope Of Services , Page 14, Section 13.9: Law Enforcement Officers (With Patrol Car): states "Law enforcement officers (with patrol car) ...shall be paid for on a unit price (hourly) basis....The following estimated quantities have been carried to the General Summary. Item 614, Law Enforcement Officer With Patrol Car ___40___ Hours.
There is not a Bid Item supporting the Department's intent to pay for the LEO's with a unit price. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2006 *Question Number:* 19

Addendum No. 2 dated September 25, 2006 listed a ftp website to review the "existing Plans". This website does not seem to contain any of the project's existing (structure) drawings. Please advise.

Ohio Department of Transportation
Prebid Questions

Project No. 040587 **Sale Date - 11/17/2004**

Question Submitted: 10/26/2004 *Question Number:* 1

Ref. 90 and Ref. 127 Item 513 Structural Steel Members, Level 1 sheets 47/96 and 70/96 show the design loading as Case I. Sheets 62/63 of 96 and 87/88 of 96 show a Type 1 crossframe detail per GSD-1-96. Should these be Type 2, 3 or 4 to go with the Case I loading. And if so which reference number are the connection plates and bolts paid?

Question Submitted: 11/5/2004 *Question Number:* 2

The completion date stated in the proposal is October 31, 2006. In the maintenance of traffic general notes, the sequence of construction for phase 1 completion is 60 calendar days from the first day of work. Phase 2 completion is 60 consecutive calendar days from the completion of phase 1. The question is with the total of 120 calendar days to complete the work, why is there a completion of 2006? Is it due to the fact there is a restricted start date for this project?

Question Submitted: 11/5/2004 *Question Number:* 3

1. Note 2 on page 79/96 and 82/96 reference cleaning piling per CMS 514.06. It appears the designer is referencing the 1997 spec. Please clarify.

2. Piles No. 7 and 8 on page 79 of 96 are designated HP 310 x 79 yet bid items only exist for HP 250 x 62. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 11/8/2004 *Question Number:* 4

Under the "sequence of construction" note on plan sheet 8, a time constraint of 60 consecutive days is indicated for phase one and another 60 days for phase two. Is this correct? If so, why is the final completion date 10/31/2006?