

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 060037

Sale Date - 2/15/2006

Question Submitted: 1/10/2006

Question Number: 1

On Sheet 135/173 it calls out for permanent sheet piling for sludge removal. It is further detailed on sheet 142/173. There is no pay item for this work nor is there any section modulus called out.

Question Submitted: 1/11/2006

Question Number: 2

There is no pipe specification for the 30" and 36" Prestressed Concrete Cylinder Pipe.

**The pipe spec for the concrete pressure pipe is shown in the general summary. The spec is AWWA C301.**

Question Submitted: 1/11/2006

Question Number: 3

The following questions pertain to the MSE walls

1. Limits for the undercut are shown on sheet 139/173. No quantities have been carried to the general summary for this work. How is it to be paid for? If it lump sum and included in the MSE wall, there is no where this is stated. Also, what if the limits change. This should be a pay item for both the excavation and backfill.

**The estimated quantities on plan sheet 102/173 contain Item Special 610 16000 Lump Undercut and Backfill for this work. It is also Ref 0125 in the Proposal. In the Special Provisions 8.0 Basis for Payment - "The Dept will pay for undercut and backfill quantities beyond the limits shown in the Plans as Extra Work, as described in 109.04." Please also note in the Special Provisions 4.2 Undercut and Backfill refers to sections 2.4 to describe the select granular embankment material. This should be section 2.5.**

Question Submitted: 1/11/2006

Question Number: 4

On sheets 133/173 and 135/173 there are quantities given for embankment. However, in the special provisions it does not say that the embankment is to be included in the MSE wall for payment. The roadway quantities do not include the 4,771 cy of embankment listed in the MSE wall quantities. Where is this embankment paid for?

Question Submitted: 1/18/2006

Question Number: 5

1. Addenda #2 address's the permanent sheet piling. It states that it is incidental to the 500 tons of "Work Involving Solid Waste. There are two problems with this. First, on sheet 142/173, Section F-F it states that the "depth of sheet piling to be determined". Also, no section modulus has been specified. Therefore, we can not quantify a quantity to bid. Second, the quantity for the solid waste is not determined. If the quantity significantly under runs, we would not get paid enough to cover the cost of the sheeting.

2. There are no pay items for undercut excavation and backfill for the MSE walls. The plans and special provisions state that it is a lump sum item. Due to the uncertainties of this work, pay items with field measured quantities should be added to the proposal.

3. On sheet 136/173 they give elevations of the MSE wall leveling pad. As you can see they are sloped. This is not consistent with standard MSE wall construction practices. The leveling pad should be at a constant elevation with elevation changes in even feet.

4. Special provisions Section 1.0 states that the epoxy urethane concrete sealer is included in the MSE wall but it looks like there is a pay quantity for it under the bridge quantities.

5. As a general question, if the sub-grade in the area in the area of the MSE select granular fill is unacceptable, why is it acceptable under the 203 embankment area between the select granular when both are under the roadway?

6. Where are the pipe sleeves for the piling to be paid for?

Question Submitted: 1/20/2006

Question Number: 6

1. Detail A on sheet 137/173 calls for porous backfill and filter fabric around the 6" perf poly pipe. The proposal only calls for 6" Per. Corr. Plastic Pipe. Should this be "as per plan"

**This is handled in Section 2.7 of the special provisions of the wall options for "Backfill Drainage" and payment is with the wall.**

Question Submitted: 1/23/2006

Question Number: 7

Bid item 61 609 Curb, Type 6 416 FT

On plan sheets 5 and 28, it shows a section of curb to run along the superelevated section of Watson Ave. This quantity is not included in the bid item. I measure 480 feet. The bid quantity should be 896 feet.

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: 1/23/2006

Question Number: 8

Question on bid item 128 Work Involving Solid Waste. Information is given on plan sheets 3, 37 & 44 of 58. All cost with this item are to be included in the unit price bid for 500 ton. This unit price item contains a lump sum permanent sheet pile wall, limit defined on sheet 37. We cannot bid the lump item in a unit price bid item due to the chance the quantity would decrease leaving the cost of lump not covered. Should have another bid item for the sheet pile. Also backfilling of the area of sludge removal is not addressed, see sheet 44.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2006

Question Number: 9

Referring to typical section sheet 4/173, I am inquiring about the step detail for the 6" aggregate base for the normal roadway section of Tiffin Road. I reviewed the general notes and the typical sections and I am unable to find the step detail dimension.

Question Submitted: 1/25/2006

Question Number: 10

In your response to the question of 1/20/06 concerning the 6" perf pipe and porous backfill you state that they are paid incidental to the MSE wall. However, both have been carried to the estimated quantities on sheet 102/173 (184 cy of porous backfill and 2,206 lf of 6" perf corr. plastic pipe) and to the proposal. Which is correct? If it is in the MSE wall for payment, the quantities for Ref Nos 119 and 120 should be adjusted.

Question Submitted: 1/27/2006

Question Number: 11

After reviewing the plans for the proposed project, I am unable to find profile and cross section plan sheets for both Cleveland and Independence Streets. Also the drainage subsummary sheet calls for a proposed installation of two type 3A catch basins however, I am unable to find a storm sewer profile sheet detailing the grate and invert elevations and the information that pertains to the proposed pipe exiting the two structures, i.e. pipe size, type and slope.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2006

Question Number: 12

Item #47 in the Drainage Section lists 12 ea No 3 Manholes. Is this correct, or should a portion of this quantity be bid under a sanitary manhole item? Also, if there are sanitary manholes to be bid, where can a detail of the manholes be found?

Question Submitted: 1/30/2006

Question Number: 13

Plan sheets 69,70,71 show work to be done on Independence, Cleveland and Elwood (Alleys and Driveway). However, there are no cross sections to show what is to be done with the existing Tiffin Street pavement between Elwood Ave and Independence Ave. Is it to be removed and if it is what type of restoration is to be included. If it is removed, there has been no quantities carried to the general summary for this work.

Also, what is to be done with the existing pavement on Lakewood Ave? Is it to be removed or left in place? If it left in place, do we patch it in the area of utility replacements?

In the areas for building demolition, how are the drives that are to be removed to be paid for? Again, there are no cross sections in these areas so no quantity has been carried to the General Summary.

Question Submitted: 1/31/2006

Question Number: 14

On sheets 90 & 91 the profile shows the flowline for the new storm pipe at elevations ranging from +/- 779.0 to 774.0 (sta 25+90 to 30+76.77). At sta 25+90 the CB detail states the 15" pipe flowline is 771.96 and at sta 30+76.77 the Exist MH has the 18" flowline at 770.08. It seems the profile drawing shows the storm pipe to be 4 to 7 feet higher than the proposed flowline elevations given. Which is correct, the profile drawing or proposed flowline elevations?

Question Submitted: 1/5/2006

Question Number: 15

1. According to the proposal on page 42, the maximum total days for the road to be closed to unrestricted traffic is 150 days. On plan sheet 130/173, the notes state that there is a 90 day settlement period from the date of MSE walls are completed before pile driving can commence. This leaves only 60 days to build the MSE walls which will take a minimum of 30 days and construct the bridge which will take 120 days.

2. The proposal note for SWPP 832, 833 it is not clear as to who performs weekly and rainfall inspections for the project. Is ODOT going to perform these inspections or will it be the contractors responsibility? If it is the contractors responsibility how is to be paid and are there any special requirements/certifications for the inspector.

---

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: 12/29/2005

Question Number: 16

1. WILL STAY-IN-PLACE FORMS BE ALLOWED IN FORMING THE DECK BOTTOM?

**No**

Question Submitted: 2/1/2006

Question Number: 17

After reviewing the drainage subsummary sheet 19/173, the utility plan sheet 84/173, and the storm sewer profile sheet 92/173 a discrepancy was discovered. The proposed storm sewer at Tiffin Steet Station 20+97.03 is shown to be a 12" Type B pipe on the storm sewer profile sheet 92/173, however on the drainage subsummary sheet 19/173 and the utility plan sheet 84/173 it is shown as an 8" Type B pipe. I would like to request clarification of the pipe size.

Question Submitted: 2/10/2006

Question Number: 18

Is the 6" inserting valve meant to be an actual inserting valve in a live water line? Or can this line be shut down for a short time and a new valve with cutting-in sleeve installed.

Actual inserting valves are no longer available and would require line stops and bypasses installed. If this is the case we need to know what the flow rate is through this line.

**Based on information I received from our utilities coordinator and his contacts with some local entities, I was informed that the inserting valve in question are still available and are to be used to install the valve in an existing water main where it is mandatory not to interrupt the water supply.**

Question Submitted: 2/13/2006

Question Number: 19

We are attempting to prepare an estimate for fabrication of twin steel tube railing for this project (for proposal line numbers 117 & 118). The total weight of material required, being less than a full coil of steel, is making our steel suppliers reluctant to quote us material that will meet CMS 707.10 requirements. Can these requirements be waived for this particular project?

**The Department respectfully declines to waive the requirement.**

Question Submitted: 2/2/2006

Question Number: 20

After reviewing the Tiffin Street Utility Profile Sheets 90/173 and 91/173, it seems to me that the called off proposed flowline elevations for the storm sewer pipe from Tiffin Street Station 25+90 to 30+76.77 disagree with the profile view proposed flowline elevations. I think that at the called off flowline elevations, if installed, would place the proposed pipe to low and in potential conflict with the 18" combined sewer and the proposed 8" waterline.