

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 060011

Sale Date - 1/11/2006

Question Submitted: 12/27/2005

Question Number: 1

This question is regarding Bridge No. HAM-126-22.07. Techspan is technically equivalent to Bebo. Techspan is also an Ohio DOT approved alternate. The bid quantities for Techspan (unclassified excavation, epoxy coated reinforcing steel, class C concrete, sealing of concrete surfaces, type 2 water proofing, 6-inch conduit, length of arch, etc. for Techspan will be very similar to Bebo. The Reinforced Earth Co. is willing to supply a quantity summary sheet for the Techspan option so that the contractors can easily bid the Techspan Option.

The Reinforced Earth Co. requests Ohio DOT to include Techspan Option for Bridge No. HAM-126-22.07

**Thank you for your question regarding this project. Please prepare your bid based upon what is shown in the plans and specifications.**

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. 050540

Sale Date - 11/4/2005

Question Submitted: 10/22/2005

Question Number: 1

This question is regarding Bridge No. HAM-126-22.07. Both the alternates Conspan as well Bebo are under the same corporate ownership of Contech, Inc. Contech, Inc. has purchased both the companies. This means that Bridge No. HAM-126-22.07 is a sole source bid. We request Ohio DOT to allow Techspan as an alternate bid. Techspan was approved by Ohio DOT on 10/02/2000. Techspan is almost same as Bebo for all structural purposes.

**Please see addendum number 2.**

Question Submitted: 10/22/2005

Question Number: 2

This question is regarding Bridge No. HAM-126-22.07. The drawings indicate that Conspond by Contech Inc. and Bebo Structure by Contech, Inc. are the two approved alternates. There are other Ohio DOT approved arch structures. Techspan Arch System was approved by Ohio DOT on October 2, 2000 by Brad Fagrell, P.E., Administrator, Office of Structural Engineering. The Techspan Submittal was reviewed and approved by Mr. David Riley, P.E. as well. The Reinforced Earth Co. requests Ohio DOT to allow Techspan as an alternate bid for Bridge No. HAM-126-22.07

**Please see addendum number 2.**

Question Submitted: 10/26/2005

Question Number: 3

"#2 Alternate" under the detail "Hydrant perpendicular to the main" on 41/69 says, "Plain end pipe and 'negalou' retainer glands." Should "negalou" be "megalug".

**Yes, the word should be "megalug" and not "negalou".**

Question Submitted: 10/26/2005

Question Number: 4

"Testing" plan note on 40/69 says, "For acceptance, there shall be no discernible drop in pressure from the section under test." Please clarify "discernible drop" or change the test requirements to those outlined by 638.09.

**"Discernible" means to perceive by sight or to distinguish mentally. Therefore, when conducting the pressure test the needle on the gauge should not move enough for the eye to notice. This note was developed and has been used by the Cincinnati Water Works department. The requirements will not be changed to those outlined by 638.09.**

Question Submitted: 10/27/2005

Question Number: 5

The proposal indicates that the completion date for the project is 8/31/2006. With a 30-day interim completion, all work items will have to be complete by 8/1/2005.

Not allowing for lost days due to weather, this project will take about 12 months to complete. Can the completion date be extended or does the engineer's estimate allow for 3-4 months of liquidated damages?

Question Submitted: 10/28/2005

Question Number: 6

In reference to part 1 of the project:

1) Plan sheet 12 of 69 shows installation of sheet pile to support the new roadway (south lane) constructed in phase 3 of the project. The notes on the plan sheet state that the sheeting is paid for under item 503, Cofferdams, Cribbs and Sheeting. Plan sheet 13 states that this sheeting is to be left in place and plan sheet 16 shows the sheeting removed to 1' below subgrade.

There should be a separate pay item for this sheeting and paid as item 504 Sheet Piling Left in Place or the original item should be an "As Per Plan" item with clarifications.

2) Since the access to the large culvert site is very limited, the most obvious method in setting the arch culvert pieces is to utilize the arch culvert base slab for access and as a platform for the equipment used to set the pieces.

Has the arch culvert base slab been designed to withstand setting the arch culvert sections utilizing a piece of heavy equipment on top of the base slab?

If this is a contractor means and methods issue, there should be an addendum issued to clarify the loads that the base slab shown in the drawings is capable of withstanding.

**A1) Yes, the sheet piling is to be left in place as is specified on plan sheets 13 and 16. There is a plan note on sheet 12 that states that the sheeting is to be paid under Item 503, Cofferdams, Cribbs, and Sheeting. Bid accordingly. 2) This is a contractor means and methods issue and the contractor needs to determine the best way for him to construct the culvert. There is no further data is available on the allowable base slab loading. Bid accordingly.**

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: 10/31/2005

Question Number: 7

1) Due to the fact that part 2 of this project must be complete prior to installing the single lane configuration shown for part 1, the maintenance of traffic pavement for the part 1 portion of this project won't be installed until April '06. The completion date for this project needs to be extended a minimum of three months.

2) If Techspan is an option on this project, under which set of items is it bid? Should there be a separate option and set of items for Techspan?

**A1) This project is in a very time sensitive location, therefore we respectfully decline to extend the completion date. 2) Please see addendum number 2.**

Question Submitted: 10/31/2005

Question Number: 8

Addendum #1 added an option C to the bid for the arch culvert, but did not add the corresponding reference numbers. There should be a total section added for this new arch culvert design, just like there is an Option A and Option B section.

---

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.