

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 050187

Sale Date - 4/6/2005

Question Submitted: 2/17/2005

Question Number: 1

This project require railroad insurance bond. I cannot find any information such as the number of trains, type of trains, maximum speed of trains, or insurance requirements for this project. Please provide this information.
Thank you.

Question Submitted: 3/10/2005

Question Number: 2

Would the State allow the use of permanent steel bridge deck forms in this project.

Question Submitted: 3/14/2005

Question Number: 3

1. ON PLAN PAGES 7,9,&10/24 OF THE STRUCTURE IT DOES NOT INDICATE OR SHOW THE FORM LINER ON THE CHECKWALL AREA. IS THERE A CUT AREA TO SHOW THE COLUMN OFF THE END OF THE BRIDGE, THE WIDTH OF THIS COLUMN IS NOT SHOWN ANYWHERE?

The form liner area and the column widths are shown on the Aesthetic Details sheet 97A/137 under "Detail A and Partial Transverse Section".

Question Submitted: 3/15/2005

Question Number: 4

1. Are there any waiting period requirements for the fills?
2. Are there any limitations on the length of closure on the side streets?
3. There are no interim completion dates- given that this is a two-year project, has ODOT considered what must be done and/or open to traffic by the end of 2005?
4. There seems to be some duplication of quantities on the embankment and granular embankment items- can ODOT please check and verify?

Question Submitted: 3/15/2005

Question Number: 5

Prebid questions:

1)Sheet 12 of the plans mentions the protection of Indiana bat roosting habitat. Considering the time when this project will receive a signed contract, there will be no remaining time to perform tree removals prior to April 15. Will ODOT perform an evaluation of the existing trees and clear it from this restriction? If trees are involved, will they be cut down prior to April 15 by another party?

2)Utilities were supposed to be removed and/or relocated by March 7, 2005. Have all of these concerned obstructions been completed as intended? A review of the site might indicate that this has not occurred in all cases.

Question Submitted: 3/16/2005

Question Number: 6

The introduction to the soil borings indicates that Toltest did a soil boring to investigate a potential borrow site. Does any additional information exist concerning this soil boring and location.

Thanks

At the time the soil borings were taken, the City of Bellevue was considering purchasing land to provide as a borrow but did not pursue it further, otherwise there is no additional information available.

Question Submitted: 3/16/2005

Question Number: 7

Plans for this project include an Indiana Bat Note calling for tree removal before April 15, 2005. Many trees on the project already have red X's as if they are marked for removal. Has district made arrangements for these trees to be felled prior to contract award or will other special arrangements need to be make.

Thanks for your consideration of this question.

Question Submitted: 3/16/2005

Question Number: 8

Ref. 52- Manhole #3, as per plan: the city is to provide and install the riser pipe for this type of manhole. Plan sheet 91 shows a detail. There is a fabricated trap and cast iron grate over the riser pipe to be included in the price.

Does the city also provide the trap and grate over the riser pipe or is it the responsibility of the contractor? There is no detail on either.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/16/2005

Question Number: 9

1) Under ref 63 in the proposal shows that asphalt intermediate course being a TY 1 mix. In the typical sections legend (sht 4/137) in the plans show the intermediate course to be a TY 2 mix. Which Type of mix should apply TY 2 or TY 1?

Question Submitted: 3/16/2005

Question Number: 10

Railroad protective insurance is required but there is no information provided in the Proposal Book. In reviewing pre-bid questions, this was noted on February 17 and again on March 7. It takes 7 working days to obtain a railroad protective insurance quote. Time is of the essence in obtaining this information from ODOT. We need to know the exact name of the railroad and their mailing address, limits of insurance required, the 75 trains noted on the supplemental site plan - are these passenger or freight, will there be slow orders issued. Please respond as soon as possible to enable us to obtain the needed quote for railroad protective insurance. Thank you.

Question Submitted: 3/17/2005

Question Number: 11

I SENT A PREBID QUESTION IN ON 3/7/05 ABOUT THE TRAIN INFORMATION TO GET A RAILROAD PROTECTIVE POLICY AND HAVEN'T RECEIVED ANY INFO BACK AS OF YET. TODAY'S DATE IS 3/17/05 AND THE PROJECT BIDS ON 3/23/05. IT TAKES A COUPLE OF DAYS ONCE THE INFO IS RECEIVED TO OBTAIN A RR PROTECTIVE QUOTE. PLEASE RESPOND WITH THE NECESSARY INFORMATION ASAP. THANK YOU

Question Submitted: 3/17/2005

Question Number: 12

The structural steel for reference # 149 is designated as Level 6 Fabrication. The description of Level 6 in the 2002 CMS describes Level 6 as "Truss bridges, fracture critical bridges, fracture critical members, or fracture critical components new or retrofitted", none of which apply to this structure. Can this structure be fabricated as a Level 5 Fabrication instead of Level 6?

Per The Office of Structural Engineering, the level 6 is required for the specified structural steel.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2005

Question Number: 13

Waterline detail on plan sheet 92 calls for minimal 6' cover to grade. Plan profile shows 5' cover over 12" waterline. Corresponding cross-sections show 5' cover over proposed and existing waterlines.

Which prevails?

Question Submitted: 3/21/2005

Question Number: 14

1) In regards to ref 63, addendum #2 changed the mix type from TY 1 to a TY 2. The quantity also changed from 437 cy to 375 cy (same qty as surface course). Is the qty of 375 cy correct for ref 63?

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/22/2005

Question Number: 15

There is a critical conflict of information between the plans and the proposal and direction is not clear. Sheet 95 of the plans states that the existing aerial lines for the Ohio Edison will be relocated. These are 65KV transmission lines. Then, the 4A notes in the proposal state that the lines will remain in place, but they may be de-energized except during the months of June, July, and August. The cost to de-energize is to be assumed by the contractor. Finally, the proposal has the "As per plan Designation" note that instructs the contractor to adhere to the controlling plan notes.

With the voltage of 69kv, it is our understanding that the safe clearance would be approximately 19 feet. It would be impossible to construct this structure without infringing upon this clearance. So, there shouldn't have been any question of whether the lines were to be de-energized. Even more in question is the final clearance under traffic conditions. If the structure will be 20 +/- feet below the lines and tractor trailer rigs are around 13 feet high, the remaining vertical clearance would be 7 +/- feet. Can this structure be opened to traffic upon completion?

Response: The plans are not in conflict with the utility note in the proposal. On sheet 95, the "to be relocated by others" leader points to the railroad owned communication and signal lines not to Ohio Edison's 69KV transmission lines. The other "to be relocated by others" electric line is along Cherry Blvd. and are not transmission lines.

Response: The Utility Note addresses the vertical clearance, see below. OHIO EDISON TRANSMISSION – 69kV Aerial Transmission Conductor The company has an existing 69kV aerial transmission conductor crossing at station 336+10 which will remain in place and in service. The vertical clearance over the proposed structure will be approximately 20 feet +/- . This existing transmission line can be de-energized, if necessary, for construction of the proposed structure, except during the months of June, July and August. The highway contractor must provide Ohio Edison Transmission with 4 weeks advance notice for any outage requests. Any fees charged by Ohio Edison Transmission for the outage will be the responsibility of the highway contractor. The vertical clearance over the proposed structure will be approximately 20 feet. This should allow the contractor to build the structure and maintain the safe clearance required. Ohio Edison has stated in the utility note that this line can be de-energized as an additional safety measure if the contractor desires with exception of June, July and August.

Question Submitted: 3/22/2005

Question Number: 16

1. No unit price for painting pole where should we put it?
2. No unit price for 2" RGS conduit in bridge. Ref. 102 2" is PVC (725.05) is that a typo?

Question Submitted: 3/22/2005

Question Number: 17

1. No unit price for painting pole where should we put it?
2. No unit price for 2" RGS conduit in bridge. Ref. 102 2" is PVC (725.05) is that a typo?

Question Submitted: 3/23/2005

Question Number: 18

Will there be an EBS amendment made available for this project and 050106 for the 3-25-05 SPECIAL LETTING ?

All amendments are out on the BidXpress web site for 050106. 050187 has been removed since it was delayed to the 4/6 letting.

Question Submitted: 3/28/2005

Question Number: 19

We have received addendum #5 which delays the bid date until April 6, 2005. The updated EBS file for the project does not have the revisions that are called out in addendum #5. Can ODOT please update the EBS file for ref. 146,147, and 202?

Question Submitted: 3/29/2005

Question Number: 20

1. can the material specification for the embankment app also allow 203 granular per 703.16B ?

No. The note in the plans on sheet 9 states 703.16.C is to be used.

Question Submitted: 3/7/2005

Question Number: 21

1. I CANNOT FIND ANY TRAIN INFORMATION IN THE PROPOSAL FOR THIS PROJECT. THIS INFORMATION IS NEEDED SO A RAILROAD PROTECTIVE POLICY CAN BE OBTAINED. NEED TO KNOW NUMBER OF FREIGHT TRAINS DAILY, NUMBER OF PASSENGER TRAINS DAILY, SPEED OF ALL TRAINS, AND IF THERE IS A SLOW DOWN ORDER?

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.