

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 060414

Sale Date - 11/3/2006

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 1

Question 1: Does the project require the contractor to pay for the use of temporary power for the project duration? Use of metered service early in the project can result in considerable saving for ODOT. Question 2: The manufacturers will warrant equipment only for one year. ODOT can save considerable amount of expenses if the department were to either accept the equipment on an ongoing basis or were to seek maintenance cost as a line item. Please advise if the department will accept equipment on an on-going basis. Question 3: Galvanized poles will fade during the long project duration. Will ODOT require poles to be painted at the end of the project? A decision at this time can avoid expensive field painting. Question 4: Permanent fixtures installed early in the project may need replacement before the project ends. Replacements could require expensive lane closures. Will ODOT consider setting up a line item for replacing fused items? Such a line item can result in substantial savings for ODOT. Question 5: ARTIMIS installations will have to be shut down for two to three days when the controllers for variable message signs are relocated. Downtime for ARTIMIS could result in liquidated damages. Should the contractor add the cost of such damage? Question 6: Piezo cables and loops will be damaged during the widening of highway. Will the contractor be required to install temporary cables and loops for the ARTIMIS system?

Answer 1: Refer to addendum number 9. Answer 2: Refer to addendum number 9 and sections 109.11 and 109.12 in the Construction and Material Specifications book. Answer 2: No. Answer 4: Refer to sections 109.11 and 109.12 in the Construction and Material Specifications book. Answer 5: Refer to addenda numbers 1 and 5. Answer 6: Refer to addenda numbers 1 and 5.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2006

Question Number: 2

1. The bridge plans state that the back side of the parapets will receive an architectural treatment, however there are no provisions in the plans to pay for such treatment. Please clarify how the additional costs will be paid for.

2. Addendum #2 answered the question regarding biditem 536 that it is for the footing concrete. This appears to be incorrect. The only footing concrete on this structure is built in the median and must be built during Phase 1. All footing concrete appears to have been included in the biditem for the right bridge (Biditem 505).

Question Submitted: 10/10/2006

Question Number: 3

Ref# 1232 in the proposal shows a quantity of 10 each laminated elastomeric bearings. The quantity should be 20 each.

Ref# 1264 in the proposal shows a quantity of 10 each laminated elastomeric bearings. The quantity should be 20 each.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2006

Question Number: 4

Please clarify the Lump Sum Minus Incentive note and table. The note in the proposal states the contractor will be paid a lump sum for completing the work before the completion date. With the duration given of 515 days for Phase 1 and 2, we assume if the contractor completes the work on day 515, he will be paid the full \$1 mill, and for any day it takes to complete beyond that date, \$20k will be deducted off of the \$1 mill. If this is incorrect, please notify by addendum.

In reference to this same note and your answer in Addendum 1 regarding, when does the 457 days begin for phase 3&4? We assume it does not begin until after traffic is fully in the Phase 3 traffic configuration. If no, please notify by addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2006

Question Number: 5

The approach slab notes state that the parapet transitions and the epoxy-urethane sealing for the transitions is to be included with the approach slabs for payment. Please verify that this is correct and these quantities have not already been included in separate pay items - it appears that at least some of the sealing has been noted to be paid for separately.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2006

Question Number: 6

Thank you for responding to my earlier questions.

An additional question has arisen out of one of the answers, since there are to be new structures TC-15.115 designed for reference No's 336 and 337, can you provide us with the end column lengths. We have the new span requirements but not the height requirements.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2006

Question Number: 7

THE PLAN NOTES ON SHEET 45 TALK ABOUT SOIL BORINGS FOR THIS PROJECT. WHERE IS THIS SOIL BORING INFORMATION LOCATED?

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: 10/12/2006

Question Number: 8

The second paragraph in the note for Item 898 - Parapet concrete on sheet 2411 does not make sense. It appears that this paragraph which talks about basis of payment should be included in a general note for Approach Slabs, APP (which is missing for this bridge) instead of the Parapets.

Question Submitted: 10/12/2006

Question Number: 9

Please review your answer o addendum #1 in reference to barrier deductions. Standard sheet RM 4.3 1/2 clearly states there will be a deduction for inlets, lights, pullboxes, and sign foundations. Thewe are seperate bid items which include the concrete barrier.

We are aware that transitions are included with the barrier for payment. The cost to construct these transitions is incorporated in with the unit barrier price. A reduction in barrier quantities after the project has been awarded would result in the contractor not being fully compensated for the extra costs in constructing transitions.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2006

Question Number: 10

The Right of Way under bridge HAM-275-2733 I-275 over Abandoned NSRR, is being used by a company that fabricates concrete erosion control mats. There is alot of equipment and materials under the bridge that will be in the way of the work. Will the contractor have to maintain access for the erosion control mat company to continue their work or will the whole area around and under the bridge be available for contractor operations?

Question Submitted: 10/13/2006

Question Number: 11

The rebar tables for bridge 2238L/R over Kenn Rd are missing some of the callouts (asteriks) to show which bars require a mechanical connector. For example, connectors are required in the deck slab, but no bars in the slab steel list on sheet 1853 are marked as such.

We have not yet checked the other structures, but similar occurences may exist. Please review and advise the bidders how to handle situations where a mechanical connector is required but is not designated in the bar lists.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2006

Question Number: 12

1. Please clarify the basis of payment and method of measurement for the retaining walls shown on sheets 1303-1327. There are no notes for these items.

2. Please clarify the minimum pile embedment lengths given in the tables for the retaining walls (see sheet 1305 for example). Are these lengths from existing ground, from bottom of lagging, or other? Also, for the minimum total height shown on these totals, what does the 6" freeboard represent?

3. Sheet 41 shows a precast facing for the steel piles that support both the retaining wall and noisewall. Are these to be included with the noisewall for payment? It appears that these are only required on the posts that hold both retaining wall and noisewall panels, please confirm.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2006

Question Number: 13

Has soil boring information been provided for this project? If not, please provide it in a timely manner to allow for bid preparation. There is a significant amout of drilling and pile driving that is dependent on this information.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2006

Question Number: 14

1. Please clarify the determination of the shaft lengths to be used for the retaining walls. For example, the table on sheet 1305 uses a 3' lagging embedment and 6" freeboard. Assuming an 8' tall total height, the 3' embedment and 6" freeboard would leave 4.5' exposed which would require a 17' long shaft. Is this correct? Also, there are portions of Wall #1 that are 10' tall which would leave 6.5' exposed height and is therefore out of the range of the table provided.

2. The tables given for the retaining walls on sheets 1303-1327 provide 'minimum pile embedment' lengths. Unless clarified otherwise by addendum, we will assume that these are the lengths to use for bidding and shop drawing preparation purposes and any changes required by ODOT will be grounds for additional compensation. It is not rational to expect the bidders to take responsibility for lengths greater than the 'minimum' shown in the plans.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 15

Please verify that the drawings and quantities for retaining wall #7 on sheets 1313-1314 are correct. The plans call out 79 spaces @ 8', but the drawing only shows 78 spaces.

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: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 16

1. Sheet 50/2613 says that 10,604 ea of item 614 Work Zone Raised Pavement Marker, As Per Plan have been carried to the general summary; however, no WZRPMs, APP were carried to the general summary. Please advise.
2. What is the intent of the bid item for "flaring impact attenuators"? Is this to be a modification to the impact attenuator or is the contractor to relocate the existing attenuator to 4' off of the edge line?

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 17

1. Are the transition areas to be lit as shown on MT-102.10? If so, please provide a bid item for temporary crossover lighting.
2. Sheet 54A states under item #11 that resurfacing of the transition area shall be performed. Looking at the pavement calculations, it does not appear that these areas have been accounted for. Please provide quantities for this asphalt work.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 18

Bid item 40 608 5" Conc. Walk 3622 SF, on plan sheets 620 and 621 it shows the summary for this work. The two sheets are referring to the same location. The quantity should be 1811 SF.

Bid item 1359 452 14" Rein. Pav't 2264 SY, This quantity is not correct. Going by the typical sections and the plan sheets I come up with a quantity of 3500 SY.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 19

1. The method of measurement note on sheet 2511 states that noisewall constructed behind barriers and below the ground line shall not be included for payment. This is inconsistent with recent projects, which have included payment for wall from bottom of panel to top of panel. In order to make a fair and equal bid between the contractors, ODOT should pay for the entire wall area as shown in the plans since it is impossible to tell exactly how much wall would be considered incidental at any location.
2. The noisewall plans require a lightweight material on Wall #1 on top of the bridge parapet. The only non-concrete wall systems listed are metal absorptive. Our understanding is that these systems are no longer in production. Please add a fiberglass option for this structure, otherwise the wall as detailed may not be constructable.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 20

On page 50 of part 1 of the plans it states that payment for the work zone impact attenuators includes work "necessary to construct, maintain, repair, replace or relocate a complete and functional impact attenuator system". Under 614.16 of the specifications there is a provision to compensate the Contractor if the traveling public damages flashing arrow boards, changeable message boards etc. under section 107.06 of the specifications. Since work zone impact attenuators are high dollar items, are work zone impact attenuators covered under this provision of the specification?

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 21

1. There are numerous locations where the noisewall is in excess of 20' tall which it does not typically fall into the design or construction criteria set by ODOT (see table for drilled shaft depths on sheet 2518). Should the bidders assume that these locations fall within the same range as 20' tall walls?
2. The noisewalls are not shown to standard heights in the plans. It is not practical to build wall panels to heights other than even 6" increments. Unless clarified by addendum, we assume that any extra wall area necessary to build the wall to common, accepted 6" even increments will be paid for by change order.
3. Note 1 on sheet 2518 states that transverse ground slope will be as designated in the plans. There are no designations called out on the noisewall cross sections or any other sheets as far as we can tell. Please provide either the cross slopes or the exact drilled shaft depths to use to make sure that all contractors are bidding the same quantities.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 22

Please review the wall stationing for Noisewall #2. It appears that the breakpoint station labeled 512+40 on sheet 2554 should be 513+40, which in turn makes the remaining stations on the wall incorrect. Also, the run shown on sheet 2557 from 527+52.00 to 528+47.87 is not an even 24' increment even though no non-standard 24' panel is called out in the profile view. Also, sheet 2563 shows 16 each 8' panels in the profile view but there are 32 each called out.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2006

Question Number: 23

Retaining Wall #10 shown on sheet 1317 is listed as 42 spaces @ 4' and the stationing provided gives a length of 168'. The profile view shows 46 spaces and scales to a length of 184'. Which is 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: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 24

1. The bridge notes allow for SIP decking, however the bridge cross sections show haunches typical of removable wood decking, which is consistent with the pay quantities. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that no quantity deduct will be made in the superstructure concrete bid item for the elimination of the haunches if the contractor elects to use SIP decking.

2. Sheet 2413 shows temporary deck overhang shoring required to be installed during Phase 1 construction of structure HAM-275-2733. The shoring is conceptually shown as bearing on the existing bridge structure that will be removed in Phase 2. If this is the case, what is the purpose of the temporary shoring as it will be removed during the second phase and provide no support to the Phase 1 overhang during that time period. Also, no shoring is shown for the similar situation in Phase 3. Is any required?

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 25

On page 146 of 2613 the plans state that there is 42,150 lf of portable concrete barrier, 32" required in Phase 1. According to our take off only 31,860 lf is required. Could ODOT check the quantity of portable concrete barrier needed per phase since it is essential to the Contractor to know the approximate amount barrier needed per phase to determine a realistic unit price?

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 26

A company is leasing the Norfolk Southern property under Bridge No. Ham-275-2733 L/R. According to the company that is leasing this property the existing access to this property may not be able to be used since it is partially owned by him and the company next door. Has ODOT made any arrangements for use of the existing access? If so what are the terms?

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 27

Where is the formliner for the piers on bridge HAM-275-2572L/R to be paid?

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 28

What is the Normal Water Elev for Mill Creek at Bridge No. HAM-275-2620 L/R?

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 29

1. In phase 2 of Part 1 of the MOT plans there are numerous references to temporary trusses. Where is the pay item for these trusses and where is the specifications (foundation type, span length, etc.,) for these trusses?

2. In addendum # 3 it states the the emergency access gate systems must be at least 72 feet long. If the traveling public damages these systems and the Contractor cannot locate the party responsible for causing the damage will ODOT pay for the repairs under the provisions of 107.16 of the specifications? These gate systems will mostly likely be in use on the project for 3 winter seasons.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 30

During median pier construction there will be interference on many of the mainline bridge median pier battered piling with the existing Westbound bridges. The contractors will not be able to batter the piling without getting interfered with by the existing Westbound bridge decks and parapets. Even if you drove short pieces of piling there will still be interference. Can the contractors drive a vertical pile in place of a battered pile that gets interfered with?

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 31

Please clarify where the work areas are for construction of piers 1 and 3 for the I275 bridge over I75. It appears from the recent information issued via addendum that no permanent lane closures are allowed on I75. This is not feasible due to the magnitude of the work on this bridge and time frames it must be built in. Under what I75 traffic configuration do we remove existing beams and erect new beams?

Please clarify what will signify the start of the 457 day duration for Phase 3&4. The notes in the proposal and on the plan sheet are not clear.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 32

This question refers to noisewall sheets 2583-2584 for Wall #4. There is a breakpoint shown at wall station 424+88.00 and then again at 427+28.00 which is 240' apart. The profile view shows 9 panels between these two breakpoints which calculates to 216'. Which is correct? There are also bottom of wall elevations missing and incorrect on Wall 3.

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: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 33

1. Soil borings have not been provided for the noisewalls on this project. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that all drilled shafts for noisewalls will be constructed in soils that are able to stand up without the use of casing and that no rock will be encountered.

2. No soils information has been provided for the majority of the structures on this project. Is there any available?

Question Submitted: 10/17/2006

Question Number: 34

We can not find any details of the Maintenance of Traffic setup required for filling in the Median Barrier Cross-overs at approx. stations 1062+00 to 1067+00 and 1165+00 to 1174+00. From the MOT plans the permanent wall in these areas still appear to be out in Phase 4A, but in Phase 4B this wall is in. We can find no workzones that allow this barrier wall to be filled in between Phase 4A & 4B. Please Clarify.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2006

Question Number: 35

There is no parapet concrete bid item for structure HAM-275-2454L/R. The parapets appear to be included with the deck quantities, which is different from all other structures on this project. Please confirm that this is correct.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2006

Question Number: 36

On typical section sheet 44 and on plan sheet 1195, 1196, show type 6 curb to be placed along one side of Chesterdale drive for approximately 500 ft. There is no bid item for type 6 curb for part 1 of this job.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2006

Question Number: 37

1. In Addendum #3 the Lane Closure Times for Side Streets requirements for Reading Rd. allow a reduction to one lane two-way traffic from 6AM to 9AM and 3PM to 6PM. Is it ODOT's intention to allow one lane two-way traffic during rush hour traffic only? Should this have been 9AM to 3PM and 6PM to 6AM for one lane two-way traffic?

2. With the exception of Bridge 2733 I-275 over Norfolk Southern R.R., none of the bridges show temporary shoring of the deck during demolition (plan sheet 2413 and 2414 of 2613). Have all of the other structures been checked for stability during each stage of demolition and each stage of new construction to support the traffic sequences as shown?

Can we assume that the new structures have been designed to handle these loads and no temporary shoring will be required?

3. The metal deck note for the bridges under the Design heading mentions that the corrugations will be filled with concrete. Will this additional concrete be paid for at the respective unit prices or is it incidental to the QC/QA Concrete item?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2006

Question Number: 38

1. On the retaining wall drawings, (use plan sheet 1305) what is the significance of the minimum total height column? For example, with an 8' tall lagging wall and 6' maximum exposed wall height, a seventeen foot deep drilled shaft would be used, plus the 8' of wall would equal 25'. The minimum total height column is 26.5'. What would change to meet this requirement?

2. Addendum #3 addressed the lane closures times for side streets and appears to have modified the plans for construction of the substructure at the SR 747 bridge and the I-75 bridge. On plan sheet 54 of 2613, third column, last paragraph titled Bridge Pier Construction Along SR-747 and I-75, the plans allowed for long term lane closures to construct the piers. Are long term lane closures still allowable per MT-95.30?

3. During construction of the substructure for the I-275 bridges over the side streets and I-75, significant amounts of maintenance of traffic items will be required. How is this maintenance of traffic to be paid? Will ODOT paid for the maintenance of traffic items that have existing unit prices (portable temporary concrete barrier, temporary striping, LEO's)?

4. During construction of the substructure for the I-275 bridges over the side streets and I-75, significant damage to the surrounding area will occur. How will removal and replacement of the existing features be paid? (removal and replacement of pavement, guardrail, traffic barriers, sidewalks, pavement markings)

5. At the prebid meeting reference was made to a revised 4A note along with the actual utility relocation plans. As of addendum #5 they have not been made available. Based on the prebid meeting minutes and the 4A note, all overhead electric line at each bridge will be relocated to clear the bridge work. This is different than what is shown on the bridge plans. Can these utility relocation plans be made available?

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: 10/18/2006

Question Number: 39

Question goes to Ref 327. 3 each 18" pull boxes, 725.08. On page 1756A of the plans, two of these pull boxes are shown in the asphalt shoulder and require a Neenah casting, R-6686.

Does the precast concrete portion of the pull box have to be heavy duty design ?????

Question Submitted: 10/18/2006

Question Number: 40

Line Item: 0374 Work Zone Impact Attenuator, Misc.: Quadguard CEN Unidirectional, is the Trinity Industry FASTRACC an approved equal for this line item?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2006

Question Number: 41

We assume there will be a phase 5 to complete the final surface course, and permanent pavement markings. Is this correct?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2006

Question Number: 42

Page 41 of the plans has details and specifications for the retaining walls. The soldier pile coating options (as we understand them) are:

1. A588 steel with coal tar epoxy applied to the ground contact surfaces, and paint exposed surfaces to match the noise panels, OR
2. Grade 50 steel galvanized post and paint exposed surfaces to match the noise panels.

My questions are, 1. Since only Wall #1 has noise barrier mounted to the top, is that the only wall that requires paint? 2. The notes are specific regarding the coal tar epoxy (black, 16 mils, etc.), but do not indicate what type of paint to use on exposed surfaces. Unless directed otherwise by addendum, we will assume that walls 2 through 17 do not require paint, and that the paint required for wall #1 is one coat of urethane for galvanized posts OR zinc prime and one coat of urethane for A588 posts.

Question Submitted: 10/19/2006

Question Number: 43

Regarding the artimis relocation, sheet 1697 refers to item special: Artimis Controller Removed and Relocated. Where is this pay item located?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2006

Question Number: 44

There are a number of existing sign trusses that will have to remain in place after the proposed Type B median barrier wall is installed in phase 1. We have been unable to find any details on how the proposed wall will be tied into the existing sign foundations. Please clarify how we are to tie into these foundations and where this will be paid. Also, these sections will need to be removed and replaced following phase 2. Where should the cost to remove and replace these sections of median barrier be included in the bid?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2006

Question Number: 45

Bid Item 0135: 452E15050 - 14" NON-REINFORCED CONCRETE PAVEMENT (WT: 12)(WT:12) Question: Will Contraction Doweled Joints be required in the concrete shoulders if they are used for Maintenance of Traffic?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2006

Question Number: 46

What type of concrete is required for use in the retaining wall drilled shafts?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2006

Question Number: 47

The cross sections for I-75 ramp D (p.1078 thru 1088) seem to be incorrect; the calculated volumes indicate embankment in this area, however the cross-sections show only excavation.

Are the calculated volumes correct and the cross-sections shown are wrong, or are the cross-sections correct and the calculated embankment volumes wrong? Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 10/19/2006

Question Number: 48

There is a quantity of 10,851 ea barrier reflectors, type A for the job. These reflectors appear to be for the portable concrete barrier which should be type B. Please change this item to type B reflectors.

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: 10/20/2006

Question Number: 49

Several questions asked at the pre-bid remain unanswered as of this date:

1. Page 20 Lines 12-20 concern the 4A notes. The minutes state an addendum would be issued to clarify the 4A note changes.
2. Page 44 lines 5-16 concern pavement restoration detail for storm sewer. No detail has been specified for this restoration.
3. Page 44 lines 17-25 & Page 45 lines 1-9 concern the pavement pay calculations for the warranty pavement. The typical section is drawn showing the outside edge vertical. Asphalt pavement will require a wedge of material wider than the finish edge. The question asked was whether this additional quantity was to be included in the pay quantity.

Question Submitted: 10/20/2006

Question Number: 50

Addendum #5 specifies the interim date for completion of the work on USR-42. Please clarify if this interim date includes the bridge painting.

Page 52A specifies a duration for the Chesterdale Road bridge. Please clarify if this duration includes the bridge painting.

Addendum #5 and Addendum #6 add items of work for WZRPMs, APP, pavement planing and surface course Type 1. These added items along with original bid items for Channelizing Lines are all components of Transition Area Delineation(reference 369) With these bid references, why is there a bid item for Transition Area Delineation? Please advise

Question Submitted: 10/22/2006

Question Number: 51

Addendum #6 does not properly answer our question regarding noisewall standard panel heights. Using the elevations for the top and bottom of wall, very few of the noisewall bays have a standard, even height (that comes out to an even 6" increment). For example, the last 5 bays of Wall #1 have heights of 9.37', 8.58', 7.58', 7.11', and 6.11'. This will be extremely difficult and very expensive to construct for the suppliers. It is not practice to construct the wall in this manner. We will assume that any extra wall area required to construct this project with even 6" increment heights will be paid for at the contract unit price for the noisewall biditem.

Question Submitted: 10/22/2006

Question Number: 52

There are some borings for the retaining walls that were terminated before they reached the drilled shaft tip elevation. Since the soils information is not complete in these areas, we will assume that these shafts will not encounter rock and that the soils will stand up on their own unless clarified otherwise by addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/22/2006

Question Number: 53

There are some borings for the retaining walls that were terminated before they reached the drilled shaft tip elevation. Since the soils information is not complete in these areas, we will assume that these shafts will not encounter rock and that the soils will stand up on their own unless clarified otherwise by addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/22/2006

Question Number: 54

Addendum #6 answers the question regarding payment for replacement or repair of items that may be damaged during construction on the side roads and I-75 with the statement 'The intent of the plans was not to damage these items.' It is impossible to construct this project without damaging the items listed in the original question. For example, there are existing sidewalks on Kenn Road that are in the way of the excavation for the new pier footings and will have to be removed and replaced. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that ODOT will compensate the contractor by change order for rehabilitation of the areas required to be affected by the construction of this project.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2006

Question Number: 55

Sheet 2510 states that the post and panel caps can be integral, however the note on sheet 2519 appears to describe a non-integral cap system. The use of a non-integral system will be more expensive and add time to the schedule. Since there is a contradiction, we will assume that the supplier's approved integral caps and dimensions will be acceptable on this project unless clarified by addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2006

Question Number: 56

In reference to biditem 122 Rubbelize and Roll and corresponding specification section 320.04, is it the Department's intent that a sawcut is made at the phase line separating the phased construction areas to Rubbelized and Rolled?

Question Submitted: 10/23/2006

Question Number: 57

We can not find any details for the noisewall fire hose connection biditem in Part 1. Please provide the details for this.

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: 58

In reference to Biditem No. 3, Pavement Removed, it is our assumption that there is no continuously reinforced pavement on this project to be removed. If this is incorrect, please notify by addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2006

Question Number: 59

I would like to express a concern expressed about the Emergency Access Gates on ODOT Project 060414 scheduled to bid this Wednesday October 25th. The bid allows the use of either the SafeGuard Gate-Link or the Vulcan Barrier Gate from Energy Absorption Systems.

The first FHWA acceptance for the Vulcan barrier (B134 dated Feb 14, 2005) does not allow the Vulcan to be used in the proposed "Gate" application. The second letter (B134a dated Nov 17, 2005) addresses the Vulcan attached to "anchored" QuadGuard backups. This configuration addresses an attachment to an anchored (permanent) type concrete barrier or a rigid bridge rail, not an unanchored temporary barrier which this project is using.

This B134a letter also noted that additional anchors are needed on the Vulcan to eliminate FHWA's concern about pocketing. The letter states, "I agree that the results of the submitted test and the addition of anchors to the Vulcan units adjacent to the barrier support the acceptance of your transition between Vulcan and Concrete Median Barrier (CMB) when Vulcan-to-CMB transition piece is used". Again, temporary unanchored barrier is not addressed.

It does not appear the Vulcan can be used for the specific application intended on your Project 060414. It appears that the Vulcan approval is for permanently fixed sections utilizing additional anchors in the Vulcan Barrier. It does not approve attachment to Portable Concrete Barrier in construction zones nor does it make able to be opened as a gate without removing the anchors within the Vulcan Barrier segments.

Action needs to be taken in order to follow the guidelines given in the FHWA acceptance letters.

Question Submitted: 10/23/2006

Question Number: 60

Under the basis of payment for noisewalls on sheet 2511, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching is listed as incidental to the wall pay item. Since these walls are part of a larger project with separate pay items for permanent erosion control, it would make more sense to pay for these items at the contract unit prices. Please advise how we should proceed.

Question Submitted: 10/24/2006

Question Number: 61

Bridge HAM-2572 L/R are both being lengthened. The excavation behind the existing abutments does not appear to be included in the roadway x-sections or the Unclassified Excavation bid items 765 & 797 for this bridge. Please clarify where the excavation is to be paid for and adjust the appropriate bid item quantities.

Question Submitted: 10/24/2006

Question Number: 62

The roadway engineering standards for roadside safety on the ODOT website lists the following Approved Work Zone Impact Attenuators; Quadguard CZ, TAU-II, TRACC 2005, & SCI-100GM. The Quadguard CEN as specified in Line Item: 0374 is a European crash tested impact attenuator that is not an "Approved Work Zone Product" as listed by the ODOT website. Can the Approved Work Zone Impact Attenuators be used as an equal?

Question Submitted: 10/24/2006

Question Number: 63

In addendum no. 4, a question was asked regarding the start of the 457 day period for maximum bonus on phase 3 & 4. In fact it has been asked several times. One more try. Since the Phase 1 & 2 portion of the incentive minus table states that critical work includes "all phase 3 maintenance of traffic implemented", does this mean that the 2nd incentive minus portion begins immediately after the completion of the phase 1 & 2 portion, with no possibility of a break or timeout period between the two portions, regardless of the time of year when the 1st portion is completed? If a break would be allowed, Eastbound traffic could be in its Phase 3 configuration and Westbound traffic could be in its Phase 2 configuration with no major impediment to traffic. Traffic will have to be in this configuration anyway for period of time when switching between phase 2 and 3. This would be the logical breakpoint between the two incentive minus portions.

Question Submitted: 10/25/2006

Question Number: 64

It appears as if there are several locations where drainage pipes installed in Phase 1 will not have functioning outlets until Phase 2 work is installed. The same problem appears to occur for phases 3 and 4 drainage as well. On past projects, these drainage issues were resolved on the project via change order. Should any drainage outlet issues exist on this project, we assume that ODOT will resolve these issues with a change order. If this is not acceptable please issue an addendum detailing temporary drainage plans at locations where proposed pipe outlets are below existing grade.

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: 10/25/2006

Question Number: 65

Sheet 2411 states that the outside parapets for bridge HAM-275-2733L/R will have formliner. The detail on sheet 2449 does not depict formliner. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that there is no formliner on this structure since it is over the abandoned railroad.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2006

Question Number: 66

Addendum #6 added bid item 1620, 16 ea Final Inspection Repair to the Chesterdale Road bridge. This seems to be a duplication of the 18 ea under Ref. 756. Unless clarified via addendum, we will assume that Ref. 1620 is not needed.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2006

Question Number: 67

General note on page 45 of 2613 has item 607 Fence rebuilt type CL.
We can only find bid ref. numbers 36 thru 38 for 607 Fence, none of which states type CL rebuilt.
Ref. 36 is fence type CL.
Is this to be used for that item?
There are locations given for ref. 36 which do not match the plan note.
It appears additional ref. numbers and estimated quantities are needed.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2006

Question Number: 68

US42 Interim Completion Date and Window Contract.
Since the US42 structural steel is to be painted, and must be painted in the phasing of the I275 construction below the bridge, we assume the bridge painting portion of this structure does not fall into either the interim completion date or the Window contract. If this assumption is incorrect, please notify by addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/26/2006

Question Number: 69

Reference number 0374 calls for a "Workzone Impact Attenuator, Misc. : QUADGUARD CEN UNIDIRECTIONAL "
The "CEN" model is designed to meet European standards. The products are generally referred to as QUADGUARD (US domestic standards) and QUADGUARD CEN (European Standards.) We assume that the proposal item should read "QUADGUARD UNIDIRECTIONAL" Please confirm.

Question Submitted: 10/27/2006

Question Number: 70

Addendum #6 provided two related answers to deck concrete questions which are ambiguous. The first question stated that we assume that no deduct would be made in the superstructure concrete biditem for the elimination of the deck haunches if SIP decking is used. The answer states that our assumption is correct. The second questions asks if the volume of concrete required to fill the corrugations in the SIP forms will be paid for at the unit price of the deck concrete biditem. The answer refers the contractors to 898.17 which does not state how the item will be calculated, only that the unit price will be adjusted per the QC/QA pay factors. We would like additional clarification on these questions. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that if the contractor uses SIP deck forms the final pay quantity will include payment at the contract unit price for the haunch concrete volume as shown in the plans (haunches will be paid for regardless of elimination by the use of SIP forms) plus additional payment will be made at the contract unit price for the concrete required to fill the corrugations of the SIP forms.

Question Submitted: 10/27/2006

Question Number: 71

Addendum #9 adds a note that states Phase 1 shall be implemented no later than January 15, 2007. We do not feel it should be mandated the contractor start on this date. The first items of work necessary to get the Phase 1 MOT implemented are temporary embankment followed immediately by temporary pavement on the EB lanes. This work cannot realistically occur until the spring of 2007. Therefore, from approx. Jan 15, 2007 to March 1, 2007 traffic would be needlessly impacted (during winter months) attempting to get this work in place and the feasibility of substantial work occurring will be minimal. Had the temporary pavement been previously placed on the EB lanes, it would be possible to start on this date. However, it is not. Please remove this mandatory start date and allow the contractor to select his own start date.

Question Submitted: 10/27/2006

Question Number: 72

Please review the duration of the Window Contract specified for Chesterdale Rd. The duration is far too short for the work involved and the MOT plan specified. Per plan, 1 lane, 2 way traffic is to be maintained. The work involves raising the bridge ~ 1.5', removing and replacing all superstructure concrete, new vandal protection fence, etc. The MOT plans call out 4 separate phases to accomplish this work. The schedule on page 52A calls for a 90 Calendar day duration to complete this work. Bearing in mind, the bridge will remain open to traffic during construction, we suggest an aggressive duration for this work to be 240 Calendar days (Assuming bridge painting is not included in the Window Contract duration).

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: 10/27/2006

Question Number: 73

In addendum no 9, It is noted that phase 1 MOT shall be implemented by January 15, 2007 and the lump sum minus table will begin when the contractor first interferes with traffic. Is the January 15, 2007 date when phase 1 implementation must be complete or started? Also, there is some pre-phase temporary pavement widening the must be complete before phase 1 is implemented. The contractor will have to install this in some unfavorable weather conditions. Will temperature restrictions apply to the temp pavement work in order to meet your phase 1 implementation date?

It is safe to assume that award of contract will be very fast to allow the contractor enough time to meet the January 15, 2007 deadline?

Question Submitted: 10/27/2006

Question Number: 74

Request information for two each soil borings on Part 2 Str. HAM-S0272-0103 Mosteller Rd over Tributary to Mill Creek. Refer to Part 2 drawing No. 97 of 161 upper right corner indicates two soil boring No. S-8 & S-9. These two borings were not included in addenda No. 4 soil info. Please supply.

Question Submitted: 10/27/2006

Question Number: 75

1) In addendum no 9, the 1.5" asphalt overlay for the transition area delineation was non performed from ref no 129 and placed back in ref no 369. However, ref no 1614, the pavement planing for the transition area is still a separate pay item. We request that the pavement planing and asphalt overlay for the transition area be made a separate bid item from the transition area delineation reference item as was done prior to addendum no. 9.

2) In addendum no 9, it was noted that any additional asphalt in the warranty pavement due to the wedge of material wider than finish edge will not be paid for. It is noted that the payment will be according to the construction plans. The plans also specify STD Drawing BP-3.1 which shows the steps required to construct a full depth asphalt pavement. It is noted that additional material required due to contractors construction methods are incidental. Therefore, Can the contractor ignore STD Drawing BP-3.1 if he feels he can construct the edge differently? What about the non-warranty pavement sections, the typical section do not show any steps either. Will the steps in the asphalt be required per STD Drawing BP-3.1? How will that material be paid?

Question Submitted: 10/27/2006

Question Number: 76

1) In addendum no 9, the 1.5" asphalt overlay for the transition area delineation was non performed from ref no 129 and placed back in ref no 369. However, ref no 1614, the pavement planing for the transition area is still a separate pay item. We request that the pavement planing and asphalt overlay for the transition area be made a separate bid item from the transition area delineation reference item as was done prior to addendum no. 9.

2) In addendum no 9, it was noted that any additional asphalt in the warranty pavement due to the wedge of material wider than finish edge will not be paid for. It is noted that the payment will be according to the construction plans. The plans also specify STD Drawing BP-3.1 which shows the steps required to construct a full depth asphalt pavement. It is noted that additional material required due to contractors construction methods are incidental. Therefore, Can the contractor ignore STD Drawing BP-3.1 if he feels he can construct the edge differently? What about the non-warranty pavement sections, the typical section do not show any steps either. Will the steps in the asphalt be required per STD Drawing BP-3.1? How will that material be paid?

Question Submitted: 10/3/2006

Question Number: 77

The Barrier wall items have no deductions for inlets, lights, pullboxes, sign-tower, or message board foundations. Why?

Question Submitted: 10/30/2006

Question Number: 78

The answer in Addendum #9 regarding the parapets on Bridge HAM-275-2733L/R does not make sense. Your answer states that the bid items (1175 and 1207) are for QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC2, Superstructure (Parapet), As Per Plan therefore these parapets are to receive formliner. However, Addendum #6 modified these items to remove the As Per Plan note and specifically states that no formliner is required. Please clarify this issue since the answers provided contradict each other.

Question Submitted: 10/30/2006

Question Number: 79

For the drainage bores, will the owner accept the .500" wall thickness steel casing meeting the 748.06 specification in lieu of the Type B and Type F? The bored casing would serve as the final Storm Drain Structure.

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: 80

Need sample proposal and plan overnighted today if at all possible.

Thank you.

T. Wallin

Question Submitted: 10/30/2006

Question Number: 81

In addendum # 9 it states that the Contractor is to implement Phase 1 no later than January 15, 2007. On page 50 of the plans it states that during the snow plowing season the work zone raised pavement markers must conform to 621 of the specifications which has a temperature restriction for installation of the RPMs of 40 degrees. According to the plan the traffic must be switched into Phase 1 at night since lane closures are required. It is most probable that the pavement and the air temperature will be considerably lower than 40 degrees at night in late December and January. It looks like it is impossible to comply with the specifications and the required start date if normal weather conditions are encountered. Contractors are very reluctant to violate the temperature requirement due to the liability issue if a RFM is dislodged by a snow plow. Is ODOT going to grant a time extension if the specifications for the installation of the RPMs cannot be met?

Please see addendum #10 for the answer.

Question Submitted: 10/31/2006

Question Number: 82

Addendum #9 increased the quantity of bid item no. 20 Excavation and bid item no. 21 Embankment by 10,446 CY and 3,066 CY respectively. What prompted these revisions?

Please see the question & answers in that addendum for explanation.

Question Submitted: 10/31/2006

Question Number: 83

Addendum 10 states the Closure Duration for Chesterdale Rd is to remain at the 90 Calendar days as shown on page 52A of the plans. We have reviewed this work multiple times and see no feasible work sequence that completes the work in 90 days. It is our understanding that ODOT must have reasonable backup to illustrate how these durations were determined. Please provide the contractors this backup showing how this work can be accomplished in the specified timeframe. If no such backup exists, please reconsider this duration.

Question Submitted: 10/4/2006

Question Number: 84

Sheet 1307/2613 shows 3-RET beginning at station 8+95.07 and ending at station 12+31.07 for a total length of 336'. The same sheet shows a total approximate length of wall of 408' and calls for 51 spaces at 8' which totals 408'.

What are the correct beginning and ending stations and the correct length of this wall?

Question Submitted: 10/5/2006

Question Number: 85

In the construction of barrier inlets, if the horizontal rebar extends thru the joint at inlet ends, can the end anchors be eliminated. Ref. RM4.3 (1/2) under end anchorage paragraph three.

Question Submitted: 10/6/2006

Question Number: 86

Since this project is well over \$100,000,000, can the maximum mobilization be increased to 2.5% of the bid amount?

Question Submitted: 10/6/2006

Question Number: 87

Project # 060375 will apparently be overlaying some of Westbound 275. Will the existing bridges be overlayed with asphalt also? If so, what bridges and what thickness will be on the bridges?

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: 10/9/2006

Question Number: 88

1)Page 53 of plans, the contractor is told that nighttime lane closures may be utilized between 12:00 am & 5:00 am. This is a small window of time for work to be accomplished. There is a resurfacing project presently going on that can start at 9:00 pm. Please review the time requirements and allow night lane closures to begin at 9:00 pm.

2)In the MOT drawings, there is an item for work shown as work zone guardrail. I have not been able to find a note and/or quantity to describe this work. Could details and a pay item be provided?

3)The 7 year warranty asphalt item is specified at 13.75". If the contractor feels the proposed thickness is too thin, How is that handled. Does the contractor only get paid for plan quantity? If the contractor feels that the thickness is too large, how is that handled. Does the contractor get paid for plan quantity?

Question Submitted: 10/9/2006

Question Number: 89

1. Page 48/2613 has a note referring to Item 616 "Water for Dust Control" - 2000MGAL. We do not see a biditem for this item in the Proposal. Please add.

2. There is no item for "Roads for Maintaining Traffic" in either Part 1 or Part 2. Due to the magnitude of this work, please add.

3. Addendum 1 added Ref No. 1601, 615e35001 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan - 18,234sy. This is somewhat confusing as there already is a biditem with that same description and Item Code - 0404. Please differentiate.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2006

Question Number: 90

Reference #760 for the pier cap concrete at Chesterdale appears to calculate back to approximately 18" of new concrete on top of the all five existing pier caps. From the elevations on the existing plans, the actual average dimension of the new concrete is only 8-9".

There are several other instances of beam seat height extension dimensions that do not match what they calculate to be from the new beam seat elevations and those on the existing plans. Please verify if the structure concrete and rebar quantities are correct.

Question Submitted: 11/1/2006

Question Number: 91

It appears that several items are duplicated as follows:

bid reference 349 appears to be repeated as #1292
bid reference 351 appears to be repeated as #1293
bid reference 352 appears to be repeated as #1294
bid reference 354 appears to be repeated as #1295

Regarding the removal of the temporary fiber optic cable and wood poles (bid reference #357 and #358), do these pay items include the removal of this equipment? The plans do not address the removal.

There is no pay item for trench for installation of bid reference #334, 4" pvc with 4 - 1 1/4" innerduct. If this conduit is to be concrete encased, is the concrete encasement to be included with the conduit, or the trench?

I respectfully request that these items are addressed prior to the project selling.

Thank you for bringing some inconsistencies in the bidding documents to our attention. Because of the relatively small dollar value of these inconsistencies when compare to the value of the entire project, we will not delay the sale of the project in order to make corrections. When possible, please submit prebid questions 8 days prior to the letting to allow an addendum to be processed.

Question Submitted: 9/1/2006

Question Number: 92

In order for more contractors to bid this project and allow for more competition, we request that the percentage of work that the prime contractor must perform be reduced from 50% to 40%.

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: 9/14/2006

Question Number: 93

Ref: Bridges HAM-275-2620 L/R (sheet 2276) and HAM-275-2733 (sheet 2441).
Artimis Conduit

- a. Is the horizontal bottom leg included in item 513 (Structural Steel)?
- b. Under what bid item is the stainless steel U-bolt to be paid?
- c. Under what bid item is the 4" ARTIMIS Conduit to be paid?

End of questions.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2006

Question Number: 94

Reference No.256, 1 Ea. OVHD Sgn. Str. Ty. TC-7.65, Des. 6:

Sign subsummary for this structure indicates it is sign location M047 & M048 on plan sheet 1393 and elevation sheet 1469.

Reviewing plan sheet shows that the signs m047 and m048 are being mounted on cantilevers, after review of the elevation veiw sheet 1469 it also referes to cantilevers. The question is will there be a TC-7.65, des6 required or not.

Reference NO.259, 11Ea. OVHD Sgn. Structure Ty, TC-15.115.

After review of the sign summary sheets 1373 signs M080,M081, & M082 are all to be mounted on the same TC-15.115, sturcture. This would reduce the number of structures from 11 to 9.

Reference No. 336 & 337, 1 Ea. OVHD Sign Structure, TC-15.115, 107' & 80' Artims Standard. After reviewing the detail sheets, It would appear that these two structures are existing and are having extensions added to them. Is this the desire or shall new structures be designed.

Question Submitted: 9/20/2006

Question Number: 95

On page 46/2613, there is a note "Protection of Drinking Water Supply". This note essential prohibits refueling and maintenance activites on equipment from the 75/275 interchange to the eastern turminus of the project within the project corridor. This note, if allowed to stay in the plans, has tremendous cost and time implications. On a project of this scope, it is not at all practical to move the equipment necessary to build the project in and out of the corridor soley for refueling and maintenance purposes. Please reconsider this note.

Question Submitted: 9/20/2006

Question Number: 96

On page 46/2613, there is a note "Protection of Drinking Water Supply". This note essential prohibits refueling and maintenance activites on equipment from the 75/275 interchange to the eastern turminus of the project within the project corridor. This note, if allowed to stay in the plans, has tremendous cost and time implications. On a project of this scope, it is not at all practical to move the equipment necessary to build the project in and out of the corridor soley for refueling and maintenance purposes. Please reconsider this note.

Question Submitted: 9/21/2006

Question Number: 97

In reference to the Lump Sum Minus Incentive proposal note and subsequent information on page 52A of the project plans we offer the following:

- 1.We assume the "Duration"s shown on page 52A of the plans would not start until there is permanent MOT impact to I275 traffic. Day closures, during non-peak hours, for pre-phase work and bridge work would not be included. This would be for work at the onset of Phases 1&2 as well for work at the onset of Phases 3&4.
- 2.Please clarify if the "Duration"s shown are for Work Days or Calendar Days.
3. Due to the similarity of the assumed critical bridge work required for Phases 1&2 vs Phases 3&4, please consider making the "Duration"s for Phases 3&4 the same 515 days as indicated for Phases 1&2

Question Submitted: 9/22/2006

Question Number: 98

Have a question concerning the Ditch Erosion Protection. Which type are you wanting to use? There are several to pick from.

For line items 55 and 1321 - Seeding and Mulching. Which seed mix are you wanting to use?

Question Submitted: 9/5/2006

Question Number: 99

There are 3 bridges which have 885 Warranty Structural Steel Painting: Ref 495-499, 526-530, & 751-756. Can these items be changed to non-warranty specification?

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: 9/6/2006

Question Number: 100

It appears that the furnish & drive piling for the following bid items need to be changed.

475 should be 2400 lf
476 should be 2160 lf

477 should be 1200 lf
478 should be 1050 lf

894 should be 2640 lf

Question Submitted: 9/6/2006

Question Number: 101

It appears that bid item 536 -- QC/QA Conc QSC1 Substructure is not needed? It looks like a duplication of a portion of the footing concrete. Please confirm.

Question Submitted: 9/7/2006

Question Number: 102

Bridge Unclassified Excavation Bid item #'s 1084,1117,1149,1183,1215,1249 seem to be duplicated. There are already Unclassified Excavation bid items for those bridges. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 9/7/2006

Question Number: 103

The question below refers to paint of the structural steel for the bridges.

1. Ref: Sheet 2052/2613.

Under "Design Data" there is a statement as follows: "STEEL SHALL BE SHOP PAINTED. SEE SPECIAL PROVISIONS." This note refers to bridges HAM-275-2572 L/R, which are Level 6.

In the Special Provisions, in the "STRUCTURAL STEEL MEMEBERS LEVEL 3, AS PER PLAN" there are instructions regarding shop paint.

Question:

Since the above referenced structures are Level 6, does the Special Provision referenced above apply? If not is there another Special Provision which should be referred. Since the above referenced structure is made of weathering steel is there any shop and/or field paint to be applied?

Question Submitted: 9/7/2006

Question Number: 104

Please make the existing bridge plans available to the bidders as soon as possible either on a CD or the ODOT website.

The existing plans are available at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Plans/060414/>

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.