

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 080597

Sale Date - 1/28/2009

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 1

Please check the details on sheet 975 for the noise barrier drainage details. According to the dimensions on this sheet each drain measures 32' wide x 64' long x 8' deep with each drain spaced at 48' intervals.

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 2

A prebid question was asked on 12/3/08 regarding the 36" sanitary sewer crossing SR-2 shown on sheet 1030A. This question asked if this sewer was to be open-cut or bored. ODOT's response was to bid the item as per plan (open cut in phase) and the District would consider alternate methods by VECP. If this sewer is to be open cut then there should be an additional item to fill and plug the existing sewer since removing it would not be possible (in-phase). I suggest that the department re-evaluate it's response and include an item to bore this sewer across the roadway. Given the depth and the skew this is the most logical way to install this sewer and provide the department with a competitive/responsible proposal.

**Since answering this question, the contractor must prepare the maintenance of traffic plans. This sanitary sewer may be open cut or bored depending on the MOT plans and within the guidelines provided in addendum #10.**

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 3

On sheet 43 the note titled "Item 603 Conduit, Type F, As Per Plan" limits the type of pipe to 707.21 and 707.04 corrugated aluminum alloy conduit and precast galvanized steel culverts. This as per plan note applies to Ref 85 - 6" Conduit, Type F, APP and Ref 91 - 15" Conduit, Type F, APP. Ref 85 is all of the underdrain outlet pipe. Per this note, all the pipe is to be of this type including the hundreds of underdrain fittings, and all the fittings require a thrust block. Is this note intended to only apply to Ref 91?

**ITEM 603 6" CONDUIT, TYPE F, AS PER PLAN was changed to ITEM 603 6" CONDUIT, TYPE F in an addendum. The as per plan note on sheet 43 applies only to the median drain Type F pipe that is along steep slopes (i.e. ITEM 603 15" CONDUIT, TYPE F, AS PER PLAN).**

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 4

Plan sheet 967 under method of measurement for the noise walls states "Square feet of noise barrier constructed below ground line shall also not be included for payment". Noise Wall 'C' is a buried wall. The quantities in the plans appear to be the entire SF of wall installed. Please provide the quantity of noise wall above the ground line which will be included for payment.

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 5

A prebid question was asked on 12/3/08 regarding the 36" sanitary sewer crossing SR-2 shown on sheet 1030A. This question asked if this sewer was to be open-cut or bored. ODOT's response was to bid the item as per plan (open cut in phase) and the District would consider alternate methods by VECP. If this sewer is to be open cut then there should be an additional item to fill and plug the existing sewer since removing it would not be possible (in-phase). I suggest that the department re-evaluate it's response and include an item to bore this sewer across the roadway. Given the depth and the skew this is the most logical way to install this sewer and provide the department with a competitive/responsible proposal.

**Since answering this question, the contractor must prepare the maintenance of traffic plans. This sanitary sewer may be open cut or bored depending on the MOT plans and within the guidelines provided in addendum #10.**

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 6

Please compare the number of signal supports to be installed per Plan Sheets 1167, 1170, 1173, 1177, 1180, 1183, 1186, 1189, 1194 and 1197 and compare it to the information contained on the signal support charts per Plan Sheets 1169, 1172, 1175, 1179, 1182, 1185, 1188, 1191, 1196 and 1199 there are numerous discrepancies where neither match the plan summary or the bid line items. Please clarify. Reference Number 346 has a total quantity of 32 each signal support foundations, however if you add the quantities contained in Reference Numbers 354 thru 372 there are a total of only 30 different types of signal supports. Please clarify.

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 7

On sheet 43 the note titled "Item 603 Conduit, Type F, As Per Plan" limits the type of pipe to 707.21 and 707.04 corrugated aluminum alloy conduit and precast galvanized steel culverts. This as per plan note applies to Ref 85 - 6" Conduit, Type F, APP and Ref 91 - 15" Conduit, Type F, APP. Ref 85 is all of the underdrain outlet pipe. Per this note, all the pipe is to be of this type including the hundreds of underdrain fittings, and all the fittings require a thrust block. Is this note intended to only apply to Ref 91?

**ITEM 603 6" CONDUIT, TYPE F, AS PER PLAN was changed to ITEM 603 6" CONDUIT, TYPE F in an addendum. The as per plan note on sheet 43 applies only to the median drain Type F pipe that is along steep slopes (i.e. ITEM 603 15" CONDUIT, TYPE F, AS PER PLAN).**

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:

Question Number: 8

Please check the details on sheet 975 for the noise barrier drainage details. According to the dimensions on this sheet each drain measures 32' wide x 64' long x 8' deep with each drain spaced at 48' intervals.

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 9

Plan sheet 967 under method of measurement for the noise walls states "Square feet of noise barrier constructed below ground line shall also not be included for payment". Noise Wall 'C' is a buried wall. The quantities in the plans appear to be the entire SF of wall installed. Please provide the quantity of noise wall above the ground line which will be included for payment.

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 10

Please compare the number of signal supports to be installed per Plan Sheets 1167, 1170, 1173, 1177, 1180, 1183, 1186, 1189, 1194 and 1197 and compare it to the information contained on the signal support charts per Plan Sheets 1169, 1172, 1175, 1179, 1182, 1185, 1188, 1191, 1196 and 1199 there are numerous discrepancies where neither match the plan summary or the bid line items. Please clarify. Reference Number 346 has a total quantity of 32 each signal support foundations, however if you add the quantities contained in Reference Numbers 354 thru 372 there are a total of only 30 different types of signal supports. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 10/15/2008

Question Number: 11

Bid reference 324 2 Ea Pull Box, 725.08, 36". After review of the plan sheets and the general notes I have been unable to locate a detail for this pull box. Will the engineer provide a detail so the pull box can be fabricated.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 12

These project plans list Standard Drawing BP 2.1 and 2.2 dated 7/16/04 for the concrete pavement. These Standards show all joints in concrete pavement getting sealed. However, this job is under the 2008 specs which under 451 has eliminated all joint sealing except expansion joints. The current Standard Drawing BP 2.1 and 2.2 which is dated 7/18/08 shows all joints except expansion joints unsealed. Please clarify if concrete pavement joints are to be sealed or unsealed.

**The standard drawing dates are updated in the alternate bid addendum (#10).**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 13

Where the concrete pavement widening on Vine St are shown on page 36 of the plans there is a note (Note A) that says "INSTALL A BUTT JOINT PER BP 2.5 & SPEC 255". On standard BP 2.5 we cannot find a reference to a "butt joint". Please clarify if the longitudinal joint between the old pavement and the proposed pavement on Vine is to be a Doweled joint as shown on BP 2.5 or a Type D tied joint as shown on BP 2.1?

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 14

Regarding an answer in Addendum # 11 about the raceway in the barrier wall the owner answered, "The raceways are included in the cost of the barrier where required as per details RM-4.3, 4.4, and 4.5, so no quantity changes are required." Please clarify what item # 223 - "CONDUIT 4", 725.05 (MEDIAN BARRIER)" is for? We assumed this was to pay for the raceway in the barrier wall.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 15

In the revised roadway subsummary submitted in Addendum # 11 it appears that at each "CONCRETE BARRIER END ANCHOR REINFORCED" 15 ft of barrier is being subtracted from the quantity of the "CONCRETE BARRIER, SINGLE SLOPE, TYPE B1". However, in the standard drawings RM - 4.3 no mention is made of deducting any footage from the barrier wall at end anchors (see list of what is to be deducted at bottom of page RM 4.3 page 1/2). Also, on RM 4.5 page 1/2 it shows the pay length of "Item 622 - CONCRETE BARRIER, SINGLE SLOPE, TYPE D" overlapping the 15ft of end anchor. Please clarify if the Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B1 and Type D will be paid through the end anchorages, or if 15ft of wall will be deducted at each end anchor, thus requiring the cost of this deducted barrier to be added to the end anchor pay item.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 16

Based on the note "REINFORCED END ANCHORAGES" in RM 4.3 page 2 of 2, it would appear that some end anchorages would be required in the Concrete Barrier, Single Slope items (171, 172, and 173). However, we do not find any end anchorage pay items. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 17

The typical sections on page 15 and 16 appear to show a raceway in the Type D Barrier. Does all Type D Barrier get raceway, or only the walls with light poles in them? Also, how is this raceway paid for? Please note Detail "A" on page 15 appears to show 3 conduits in the Type D Barrier!

---

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: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 18

What is the difference between item # 174 - "Concrete barrier end section, Type D" and item # 1012 - "Concrete barrier end section, Type D" (which was added in Addendum #9)? Please clarify where # 174 is to be used and where # 1012 is to be used. Thanks.

**They are duplicate items. The quantity has been adjusted in the alternate bid addendum (#10).**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 19

Does item # 404 - "11in Reinforced Concrete Pavement" - 6563 sy (set up in MOT plans page 53 of 1679) get removed or does it stay in place upon completion of the project? If it gets removed how is the pavement removal paid for?

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 20

On the "office calculations" provided on ODOT's web site there is a run of Type 6 Curb shown on the quantity spreadsheet on Lost Nations Road Ramp D, the stations given are 358+77-379+29. The quantity shown is 2052 ft. Where do the plans (typical sections, plan view, etc.) show this curb? The typical of the acceleration area for Lost Nation Road Ramp D (shown on page 15) does not specifically show this curb. It does say "SEE DETAIL A, THIS SHEET". Detail A shows shoulder details with no curb, with barrier, and with curb, but does not specifically show where the curb detail is to be used. It appears that there is Type D barrier in the same area this 2052ft of curb is being called out. Please clarify.

**You are looking at the old pavement calculation Excel spreadsheet. The curb quantity is no longer in the current one. This was corrected in October – the curb had been double counted on the south side from Sta. 358+77 to 379+29. You are correct that the north side has Type D barrier from Erie Road to Ramp D.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 21

Revised plan sheets (pages 17B & 17C) were submitted with Addendum # 23. The section of the wall around the piers appear to be made out of Low Strength Mortar now. There is no notes as to why this is being done, or how it is to be paid for. Is this permanent barrier or temporary? If it is temporary are we to connect Portable Concrete Barrier to it (in Stage 1 Phase A presumably), and if so then how? As the detail depicts, do the permanent concrete transitions get placed during the same time as the temporary LSM wall which is only shown at the piers? If pages 17B and 17C now show temporary barrier (before this addendum we thought this was the detail for the permanent barrier wall at these 2 bridges) then where now is the detail for the permanent barrier at these locations? We need more info about what is going on at these locations and how it is being paid for.

**A quantity and pay item are included in addendum #23. As shown in the detail, the LSM is placed as fill in-between the permanent barriers. There is no mention of temporary barriers on sheets 17B or 17C.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 22

Can the CAD & GeoPak files be made available online for this project?

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 23

Will reinforcing steel be required in the B1 barrier as shown on SCD RM 4.3

**Yes. Please see Addendum #9 for revised / added quantities.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 24

Could you please provide a detail for the concrete masonry headwall for the 43" x 68" Conduit Type A on sheet 858? Could you please provide a pay quantity for the pipe joints to be sealed per item 516 as detailed on sheet 858?

**A1) The headwall quantities should not be appreciably different between elliptical and round pipe. SCD HW-1.1 can be adjusted for elliptical pipe as stated in the notes. A2) All work is included under Item 603 - 43" x 68" Conduit, Type A, 706.04, As Per Plan. See note 3 on sheet 858.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 25

Will ODOT be giving a weighting to one of the alternate pavement types that would change the award of this project? Will the contractor with the lowest responsible bid, regardless of alternate pavement type, be considered the lowest bidder? Or, will the contractor with the lowest responsible bid, including a pavement alternate be considered the lowest bidder?

**This wording was included in addendum #10: "Notice to all Bidders: Bidders are required to provide a responsive Bid, which shall include responsive unit bid prices for each alternate contract item provided for within the Bid Documents. In accordance with section 102.14 of the Department's Construction and Material Specifications Manual non-responsive and ineligible Bid's will be disqualified. The Department will follow section 103.02 of the Department's Construction and Material Specifications Manual and award the contract to the lowest competent and responsible Bidder."**

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: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 26

Drawing 926 summarizes the Underdrain work and includes 6,045 FT of 6" Conduit, Type F for Underdrain Outlets. On drawing 245 that quantity is added to 200 FT of as directed by the Engineer 6" Conduit, Type F from Unrecorded Storm Water Drainage on drawing 43 and 320 FT of 6" Conduit, Type F from the Vine St. Drainage Subsummary on drawing 853. The 6565 FT total is then designated as 6" Conduit, Type F, As Per Plan which is specified on drawing 43 as either 707.21 Corrugated Alloy Conduits and Underdrains or 707.04 Precoated Galvanized Steel Culverts. The 6" Conduit, Type F, As Per Plan further specifies that all pipe joints (not just butt joint connections to existing pipes) shall have a concrete collar per DM 1.1. This seems unusual for Underdrain Outlet Pipe. Shouldn't the 6,045 FT of Conduit, Type F for Underdrain Outlets have its own bid item and follow normal 603 specifications?

**ITEM 603 6" CONDUIT, TYPE F, AS PER PLAN has been changed to ITEM 603 6" CONDUIT, TYPE F in addendum #6. The as per plan note on sheet 43 applies only to the median drain Type F pipe that is along steep slopes (i.e. ITEM 603 15" CONDUIT, TYPE F, AS PER PLAN). Therefore, the underdrain outlets should be installed as per the normal item 603 specifications. The quantity has been revised in addendum #6.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 27

The details of the Exfiltration Trench on drawing 947 show Item 605 6" Shallow Pipe Underdrain, 707.31, with Fabric Wrap beneath the Exfiltration box structure. The Underdrain Details list 6" Base Pipe Underdrain with Fabric Wrap going through many of the same locations without any deductions for the Exfiltration Trench length. Is the pipe at the Exfiltration Trench incidental to Item 835 Exfiltration Trench or is it paid as either Item 605 6" Base or Shallow Pipe Underdrain with Fabric Wrap? Are all of the Items 605 Underdrain Pipe to be designated as 707.31?

**The intent of the underdrain design is to pay separately for the exfiltration trench and the underdrain pipe. The pipe is not incidental to the Item 835 Exfiltration Trench as it is paid for under either Item 605 6" Base or Shallow Pipe Underdrain with Fabric Wrap. The intent is not to exclude any of the varying pipe materials (i.e. plastic, steel, concrete, etc.) for underdrains for the length of the project as per the current construction and material specifications, but standard drawing WQ-1.2 detail calls for the underdrain directly under the exfiltration trench to be 707.31.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 28

For the underdrain items References 0141 and 0143 the item descriptions include "with Fabric Wrap". Should Reference 0142 also include "with Fabric Wrap"?

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 29

Sheet 960 of 1679 has missing information at the top of the page. Can you reissue this sheet?

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 30

1.) Will CSX railroad protective liability insurance be required for this project? There is underground utility work that is located within the CSX right-of-way when projecting these r/o/w limits from the railroad above to the work area below. (approx. rt. 2 sta. 340+87.2.) The temporary pavement required for the phasing of the 8"4" box and 42" culvert crossings on rt. 2 are indicated on the drawings and these quantities are included in the bid form. Will ODOT also pay for the temporary pavement required for the phasing of the 27" sanitary and 36" storm crossings on rt. 2 in the same fashion even though this temporary pavement is not indicated on the drawings? 3.) Please clarify the quantity for reference No. 41 Curb Ramp. Summary sheet 261 shows 75 for SR 306 page 727. This appears to be a significant error.

**1.) No railroad construction agreement is necessary. 2.) Quantities for temporary pavement are included in the plans. If you feel more temporary pavement is needed than provided for, that should be included in your lump sum MOT quantity. (As explained in Addendum #10) 3.) The quantity has been revised in addendum #23.**

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 31

Ref. 892 approach slab for 0530EN reinforcing listed on sheet 1546 shows mark AS1001 as being a straight bar. The standard drawing indicates a 180 degree hook @ the abutment end of the bar. Can you please verify that you want this bar straight with no hook?

---

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: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 32

Addendum No. 10 for this project calls for a Contractor Prepared Maintenance of Traffic Plan for both the Asphalt Concrete Alternate and the Portland Cement Concrete Alternate. In addition to the lump sum, there is a list of individual items that may or may not be used. The contractor is to provide a unit price for these contingency items, and the department will pay for what is used, up to the contract amount. Any quantities in the contractor's plans over the contract quantity must be included in the asphalt or concrete MOT lump sum for payment. There are several problems with bidding the project this way. First, if a contractor is designing the traffic control, and knows that they will use less of an item than the contract quantity, it is only prudent to move as much risk, indirect costs, profit and overhead out of these items as possible. The department will have to make a judgement as to how low an acceptable bid is for each of these items and decide whether or not the items are mathematically unbalanced to the extent that they may change the low bidder if non-performed. Second, these prices are commonly used to compare in determining change order prices for similar items on similar projects. With these prices artificially low, comparing the bids for items on this project will be meaningless. Our suggestion is to delete the individually bid MOT items and have contractors include these in their bids in the two MOT lump sums - one for the concrete alternative, and one for the asphalt alternative. This would still allow the department to compare pavement type alternatives and would make the bid process more meaningful for everyone. Each lump sum would reflect the costs according to the contractor's design for each alternative, including all anticipated costs. No additional costs for anticipated non-performances would be included. In addition, many of our members have suggested that another pre-bid meeting would be beneficial. Since the initial pre-bid meeting on 10/30/08, there have been 6 addenda issued (out of 10 total), as well as over 20 pages of pre-bid questions and answers. With this amount of clarification requested and issued, it would seem that another meeting may help contractors in providing ODOT with bids based on a clear understanding of the requirements. We understand the need to bid this project soon and would not want to have the bid date conflict with project 3(09), another major project, if there would be a need to postpone the sale of this project. Thank you for your consideration.

**With regard to the MOT items in the proposal, they will all remain in place as agreed to with FHWA. With regard to comments about moving money out of certain bid items, please refer to section 102.08 of ODOT's "Construction and Material Specifications" book. As always, the Department will appropriately analyze all bids submitted. The Department also respectfully denies the request for a second pre-bid meeting.**

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 33

Recent audits performed on contractors by the Ohio Department of Taxation have revealed that there is a significant change in the interpretation of sales and use tax law with regard to temporary items performed by subcontractors. Previously, tax was paid by the prime or subcontractor only when purchasing temporary materials. Now, prime contractors are expected to pay sales tax on the entire subcontracted amount for temporary items. This will require prime contractors to increase their bids on all temporary items they subcontract in order to cover this cost. On this project, the amount will be quite substantial. How should prime contractors address the matter of sales tax on temporary items provided by subcontractors in light of recent field audit reports issued by the Department of Taxation?

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 34

Plan note on drawing 1465/1679 "Inspection of Existing Structural Steel" In reference to the non destructive testing of the existing butt welds the testing method is not specified. Note requires engineer to report "Location of Cracks, Length and Depth" if depth is a requirement of the test is the Ultrasonic procedure the method to be used? This note appears on others structures as well.

**The plan note does not limit the method to ultrasonic. Item 513 of CMS leaves it up to the engineer to select the method and gives guidance to which method to use at which location or type of weld. Follow CMS Item 513.**

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 35

In regards to reference items 0047, 0048 and 0049 (asbestos abatement) on the LAK-2-3.32 project, we have the following question: On page 46/1679, a takeoff of the summary of the two asbestos surveys (conducted by HZW Environmental) shows a total of 110 SF of asbestos removal and 146 LF of asbestos removal for the bridges within the scope of this project (LAK-2-4.00, LAK-2-4.86 and LAK-2-5.30). However, sheet 46B/1679 shows a total of 6300 SF (REF 0047) and 200 LF (REF 0048). How do the quantities on sheet 46/1679 correlate with the summaries on sheet 46B/1679 in regards to references 0047 and 0048. Additionally, what does reference 0049 (asbestos abatement – 1.0 LS) encompass?

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 36

In regards to Bridge No. LAK-2-0760 L&R, we have the following question. On page 1603/1679, Section A-A shows the existing porous backfill to be removed. However, pages 1604/1679 and 1605/1679 show the limits of the porous backfill with filter fabric ending at approximately 12' LT/RT of CL. Also, Section B-B on page 1606/1679 notes the existing 2'-0" +/- of porous backfill to remain. Will the Department please clarify if the existing porous backfill beyond 12' LT/RT of CL is to be removed or retained.

---

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: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 37

There appears to be a duplication of quantity for the under cut at retaining wall #3. Ref # 22 "excavation of subgrade" includes approximately 7200 cyds of under cut at wall #3 as shown on cross section sheets 358 to 361. Ref # 480 "unclassified excavation, app" at wall #3 has a quantity of 5140 cyds for undercut excavation in the same location. See detail on plan page 965. Please review this duplication and decide which bid item will be utilized for the undercut at wall #3 and make the appropriate quantity revisions to the proposal.

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 38

Bid item 171 622 Single Slope Barrier, APP.B-2 on sheets 292-293 and B-1 on sheet 580 is the same piece and is listed twice in the summary tables. Also does there need to be a bid item for Single Slope Barrier APP End Section where abutting the attenuators - what about End Anchors at the ends of some of the runs?

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 39

We have been attempting to retrieve addendums 20 and 21 for the last 3 days without success. Have addendums 20 and 21 been posted? Do you still expect to bid this project this week?

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 40

Regarding ODOT SS 888888.15 - When are the cores to be taken? Where will the QA cores be tested by ODOT? How and when are the QA cores to be delivered to ODOT for testing? App.2, T2.2 - Who performs strength testing for opening to traffic? App.3.2.1 - What does "compared to the latest 10 sample results" mean? Please give an example. App.3.3.2 - This appears to penalize good quality control and reward poor quality control. The air spec and tolerance is 6% +/- 2%. If the QC average is 6 and the standard deviation is 2 or greater, work will not be stopped. If the average is 6 and the standard deviation is 0.3, work will be stopped if QA results are less than 5.5 or greater than 6.5. Is that correct? App.3.3.2 - This section is not clear to me. If the difference between QC and QA cores is greater than 750psi, check accuracy of QC and QA equipment. If still a discrepancy between cores --- when were more cores tested? --- recore the lot and test both cores in Central Lab. Results will be compared and difference will not exceed 650 psi --- what difference? in new cores tested in Central Lab? Please provide an example.

**A1) Cores may be taken anytime after completion of any corrective work required by 888.12. QA cores are tested by the Department at the Laboratory (Central Office Test Lab). QA cores need to be delivered to the Engineer. This may be done at the time of coring or at the time and place of the Engineer's choosing. A2) Contractor A3) As written, it means the Department air content results will be compared to the 10 most recent, prior air content tests taken by the Contractor. A4) This is correct but misses the point. The Contractor is responsible for quality control. Concrete with air contents above 8 or below 4 would be non-conforming material and the Contractor's QCP requires non-conforming materials not be incorporated in the work. A Contractor who deliberately varies air content to increase the standard deviation runs a much higher risk of producing non-conforming material. A Contractor with consistent air contents has no fear of a QA test. EACH TEST WILL BE WITH 6% +/- 2. THE AVERAGE IS WHAT THE AVERAGE IS. THE STANDARD DEVIATION IS NOT 2. THE STANDARD DEVIATION IS WHAT IS CALCULATED FROM THE 10 TESTS. IF THE RESULTS ARE AS THE EXAMPLE SAYS THEN IN ABOVE EXAMPLE IF ODOT GETS A RESULT OUTSIDE OF 5.5 TO 6.5 IT WILL BE STOPPED TILL IT IS DETERMINED WHAT HAS CAUSED THE VARIANCE IN RESULTS. A5) WHEN THE DEPARTMENT PERFORMS THEIR QA TESTING OF CORES THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEIR CORE RESULT AND THE CONTRACTOR'S CORE RESULT FOR THE ADJACENT CORE WILL NOT SHOW A DIFFERENCE IN STRENGTH OF MORE THAN 750 PSI. THIS WILL DRIVE AND EVALUATION OF CHECKING TEST PROCEDURES AND CALIBRATION OF EQUIPMENT. IF THAT EVALUATION DOESN'T FIND THE REASON FOR THE DIFFERENCES. THE LOT WILL BE RECORDED IN THE DEPARTMENT WILL TEST THE TWO CORES AND RESULTS WILL HAVE TO BE WITHIN 650 PSI. IF THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO CORES TAKEN ON THE SAME DAY AND TESTED ON THE SAME DAY WITHIN THE 650 THEN THE MATERIAL WAS NOT CONSISTENTLY CONTROLLED AND THE DEPARTMENT'S RESULTS WILL BE USED (NOT THE CONTRACTORS) FOR ESTABLISHING THE STRENGTH ACCEPTANCE.**

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 41

The answer to question 6 concerning the Exfiltration Trench and the 6-inch underdrains says that 6-inch pipe 707.31 must be used directly under the Exfiltration Trench, but that varying pipe materials can be used for the length of the project. Since the kind of pipe is not specifically listed per 605.02, can 4-inch 707.31 perforated corrugated polyethylene drainage tubing be used in lieu of 6-inch pipe for underdrains for the length of the project excluding the Exfiltration Trench areas?

**No. The material type may vary, but the size is specified in the plans as 6".**

Question Submitted: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 42

Reference 0072 671 Erosion Control Mat, Type D is no longer available for purchase. An Item Master Search on the ODOT website reveals that Erosion Control Mat, Type D has not been bid on other projects for several years as "No matching records found" is the response. Please consider deleting this item.

---

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: 3/31/2009

Question Number: 43

Contract Drawing 967, Noise Barrier Notes, Restoration of Work Area specifies "using a Crown Vetch type seed mixture as defined in Section 659.09" for "areas located on the freeway side of the noise barriers". That work is incidental to the Noise Barrier items. Reference 0059 Seeding and Mulching as well as the General Notes do not specify particular seed mixtures for use elsewhere on the project. For Reference 0059, is the contractor to choose the seed mixtures to be used based on Table 659.09-1?

**The contractor is to choose the seed mixture based on table 659.09-1 for all areas where crown vetch (class 3C) is not specified.**

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 44

Could you please issue an addendum to allow the use of the latest supplement specification dated 1-16-09 for this project?

**Follow the supplemental specification date that is listed on the title sheet.**

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 45

The box culvert replacement at station 336 +/- shows an existing 16" waterline going directly over the culvert. Can this line be taken out of service? Will removal and replacement be paid as extra work? The maintenance of traffic notes for this box replacement allows for weekend lane closures. The web site says Friday from 7pm to 11am Saturday, then 7pm Saturday to 6am Monday. This needs to be changed to allow work continuously from 7pm Friday to 6am Monday. The MOT shows only barrels for protecting the work area which will be at least 13 feet deep with traffic only feet away. Barrier protection needs to be included for reasonable safety. The new and existing boxes are on differing alignments. This greatly complicates the excavation and water handling schemes. Is there a compelling reason not to place the new structure on the existing alignment? The box cuts through Stevens Blvd. What is the pavement cross section for Stevens? Will pavement replacement be paid under the various bid items? Sanitary sewer ss-4 is shown on sheets 1030a/b. This installation will require a very wide excavation with an area for temporary storage of excavated materials. Is the adjacent property available for use to accomplish this work?

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 46

Maintaining Traffic plan sheet 85 from original MOT Design (for information only) Stage 1 Phase B Sta 482+12 to 514+50 indicated a barrel along the Eastbound left shoulder. Will ODOT permit this Barrel in the Contractor's prepared MOT Plan? Or will Portable Concrete Barrier be required?

**Under: The contractor prepared Maintenance of Traffic plans shall provide for the following in Addendum #10:50"  
Portable Concrete Barrier required for SR-2 mainline and ramps. 32" Portable Concrete Barrier will be acceptable on side streets.**

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 47

Addendum No. 21 added reference number 1063 RPM 1763 each for the Concrete Alternate AA2 portion of the bid. Prior to this addendum there was only one item for RPM - reference 246, with the same quantity of 1763 each. This is now not a comparable bid between the asphalt AA1 and concrete AA2 pavements. This needs to be revised by also adding this item to the Asphalt Alternate AA1, to make comparable bids.

**The quantity has been revised in addendum #22. There are now separate quantities for AA1 and AA2 RPMs.**

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 48

Reference plan sheet 284 West bound Rt-2 approximate stations 349+75lt. to 357+00 lt. Please provide stations along with widths for the shoulder pavement and tapers. The shoulder widens in this area and typical sections or details do not provide this information. Also, sheet 804 Ramp D Pavement details have conflicting shoulder widths.

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 49

There are conflicts in shoulder with dimensions shown between Rt.2 plans sheets and Ramp Gore detail sheets. Please see sheets 292 and 811 for Ramp I conflicts. Also see sheets 295 and 814 for Ramp O conflicts. Please confirm shoulder widths 8ft or 10ft.

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 50

For Bridge No. LAK-2-0400 (SR 2 Over Vine St.) the abutment cross-section shown on plan page 1348 clearly defines the area for Item 840 - Select Granular Backfill and the area for Granular Material, Type C. Please verify that the 3,398 cy of Select Granular Backfill only includes the quantity specified as Item 840 and does not include the quantity for Granular Material, Type C. Our takeoff quantity for Item 840 - Select Granular Backfill yielded a quantity approximately 400 cy less than the plan quantity of 3,398 cy. Also, our quantity for the Granular Material, Type C was approximately 400 cy. It was our presumption that the Granular Material, Type C quantity was included in the quantity for Item 840 - Select Granular Backfill. Please verify.

---

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: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 51

Please provide the ODOT calculation sheets for the new Concrete Alternate Items AA2. Thank you

**The calculations were done on scratch paper, but they were derived as explained in addendum #11.**

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 52

Addendum #1 deleted plan sheet 184. Will ODOT be issuing a revised sheet for this work area? Information is needed for the Class B Pavement for Maintaing Traffic and E 367th Street for the proposed Pipe Lining Work.

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 53

Addendum No.9 made significant modifications and additions to the concrete barrier wall items. Please provide the revised Roadway Subsummary sheets for these added items and also the revised items. Thank you

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 54

Regarding SS 888:App.2, T2.2 - Plastic concrete is to be tested once each 1/2 day of production. Is this testing to be performed at the plant or at the project? Can the technician be present part time, say one hour each morning and afternoon or four hours from 10:00 to 2:00; or should he be present full tme while concrete is being placed? 888.15 - Is the same core to be tested for both thickness and strength or are separate cores required so the thickness core can be retained? Is the Engineer testing his core for both thickness and strength?

**A:THE TESTS ARE MINIMUM FREQUENCY. A CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO DETERMINE WHAT HE WANTS TO TEST AND HOW OFTEN AND WHERE. THAT IS WHAT IT SAYS IN THE QC PLAN 2.2 THE CONTRACTOR WILL DETERMINE WHAT HE NEEDS IN QC AND HOW LONG. THE DEPARTMENT SHOULD NOT ANSWER NOR CAN IT ANSWER WHAT THE CONTRACTOR'S MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS ARE. THIS IS A QUESTION BY A TESTING COMPANY NOT A CONTRACTOR BIDDING THE PROJECT.A:IT SAYS OBTAIN CORES FOR THICKNESS BY THE RANDOM METHODS OF S1064. IT SAYS OBTAIN CORES FOR STRENGTH BY RANDOM METHODS. CORES CAN'T COME FROM THE SAME LOCATION AND BE OBTAINED BY RANDOM METHODS.**

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 55

Is there a way to view the answers to pre-bid questions for past projects?

Question Submitted: 4/1/2009

Question Number: 56

1. As per the cross-section for Retaining Wall #1 (plan page 953), the wall pay limits for Unclassified Excavation are clearly specified. The legend at the bottom of the page contradicts these limits. Please specify where the Unclassified Excavation specified in the cross-section as Roadway Quantity and referenced in the legend as Wall Quantity is to be paid.2. The legend at the bottom of plan page 953 states that fill material is to be included in wall quantities for payment. Please specify which wall quantity is to include this fill.3. Takeoff quantities for the Unclassified Excavation for Retaining Wall #1 are significantly higher than plan quantities. It appears that the "notched" excavation to the front of the wall has not been included in the plan quantity. Please verify.

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 57

Addendum number one revised the quantity of reference number 160 to 24,658 sy. The office calcs given in addendum one show a quantity of only 20,566 sy. Where is the additional quantity located or is the new quantity incorrect?

**Scroll the spreadsheet to the right, and see a total quantity of 24,658 for Ref #160**

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 58

Can ODOT please clarify the dates that in-stream work is allowed to take place at the Chagrin River. The only reference appears to be in the prebid meeting minutes stating July 1 to September 15. Are there any other dates 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: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 59

The inlet, sign and light foundation wall sections have not been deleted from the total length of the type B, B1 and D barrier wall items. Sheet 261 shows Type D barrier wall for sheet 580 references B-2(56 LF) and B-3(57 LF). However, sheet 253 indicates that there is 72 LF of Type D wall on sheet 293 for reference B-3 (72 LF). There is a double up of wall, please delete 72 LF from the total quantity. Sheet 286 shows barrier wall B-4 as a type D wall. It should be type B wall. Sheet 252 shows a quantity of 207 LF for reference B-2 on Sheet 288. According to sheet 288 this barrier wall run ends at station 392+75 where the guardrail begins. Please verify? Sheet 255 shows a summary for Type D wall of sheet 254 of 1190 LF. However, looking at sheet 254 for the Type D wall shows a quantity of only 432 LF. Please correct. Sheet 858 has a note to reseal the pipe joints in accordance with item 516. Item 516 in the spec book is for expansion and contraction joints joint sealers and bearing devices. What is the intent of this note?

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 60

The quantity given on the pavement calculation sheet in addendum one shows a quantity of 566.3 sy of 9" concrete pavement on Lakeland Blvd. Calculating the sy of pavement from the two typical sections on sheet 36 of 1679 for Lakeland Blvd. indicates a greater quantity. Please verify.

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 61

It appears that the surface area quantities for the first two rows listed on the pavement calculation sheets for the SR-306 ramps I, K and N are incorrect. These surface areas listed for these three ramps are all identical. These surface area errors make the quantities calculated to the right of this column incorrect too. Please verify and correct.

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 62

This question is in reference to your answer to question number four. You answered the question with the concrete pavement ends at station 201+25 and then the asphalt pavement begins. This is correct, however, the normal typical section shown on sheet 23 of 1679 shows the asphalt beginning at station 200+00. It appears that the section for the concrete pavement from station 200+00 to station 201+25 is not detailed. Please clarify this discrepancy.

**Please see sheet 37, which shows the typical section for Lost Nation Road, (9" concrete over 6" base), and the intersection/joint details on sheet 824.**

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 63

The field office is set up for 42 months. This should be less than 36 months since the completion date for the project is October 15, 2011. In the office calc given in addendum number one, there are quantities of various items that are listed on a row with name of GPD. Please give a breakdown of where these quantities are calculated. On plan sheet 184 section A-A, the 6 inches of 411 aggregate is to be included with the temporary pavement class B. Is this material incidental to the temp pavement item or will the sy of the 411 material be calculated and paid under the temp pavement item?

**Q-1. The field office is set up for 42 months. This should be less than 36 months since the completion date for the project is October 15, 2011. A-1. The quantity has been revised to 36 months in addendum #2. Q-2. In the office calc given in addendum number one, there are quantities of various items that are listed on a row with name of GPD. Please give a breakdown of where these quantities are calculated. A-2. A-2. The calculations and addendum #2 have been placed at \\Ctrfs100\id12\$\Addenda\LAK-2-3.32; PID 13486; Project 080597\addendum #2**

**Q-3. On plan sheet 184 section A-A, the 6 inches of 411 aggregate is to be included with the temporary pavement class B. Is this material incidental to the temp pavement item or will the sy of the 411 material be calculated and paid under the temp pavement item? A-3. Addendum #1 deleted sheet 184.**

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 64

The normal typical section for ramp B/F shown on sheet 23 of 1679 starts at station 200+00. Plan sheet 824 of 1679 shows concrete pavement ending at station 201+25. There appears to be a discrepancy here, please clarify. Also, station 200+00 is in the middle of the intersection.

**The concrete pavement ends at Sta. 201+25 then the asphalt pavement begins.**

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 65

There is extensive roadway work required under the CSX structure that is located in Stage 3, however, there has been no Railroad Protective insurance bid item set up on this project. Is CSX going to require this policy? If so, a bid item needs to be added along with the information needed for contractors to receive a premium quote for this policy.

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 66

Addenda #9 extends the Let Date to 12/17/2008. On the ODOT Construction Bidding Information page in the Construction Addenda section the let date says 01/21.2009. There is no addenda stating this. Please confirm let date.

**Please see Addendum #10**

---

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: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 67

Addenda #9 extends the Let Date to 12/17/2008. On the ODOT Construction Bidding Information page in the Construction Addenda section the let date says 01/21.2009. There is no addenda stating this. Please confirm let date.

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 68

During the Pre-Bid meeting it was stated the 132" culvert rehabilitation had to be completed by June 1 2009. Now that the Let Date has be delayed almost 7 weeks, is that June 1 date still firm or has that been extended also.

**After speaking with industry experts, ODOT is confident that the June 1, 2009 deadline can be met.**

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 69

On the pavement marking subsummary page 1057, there are numbers in seven different columns in addition to the actual reference number call-out for edge line for Ramps H and D. These numbers have then been carried forward to the general summary totals and have skewed the actual totals for each item. There is no pay item established for item 645, Lane Arrow Type A1 (inlaid tape) although called for in the plans. These appear to be included with item 646, Lane Arrow, as per plan (epoxy paint).

**The seven numbers on sheet 1057 have been deleted in addendum #19. The lane arrow quantity has also been revised and a Lane Arrow, Type A1 quantity has been added.**

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 70

Ref 147 Please provide details. width? bolted? etc.

**SS 839 and SS 939 provide sufficient information to bid on this item. All trench drain manufacturers have been included on the qualified products list.**

Question Submitted: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 71

The structure drawings showing the phased construction show temporary bridge mounted concrete barrier wall with anchors. There is no bid item for this wall. The project cover sheet shows the old date for standard drawings BP 2.1 and BP 2.2, please update these to the current standards shown online.

---

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: 4/10/2009

Question Number: 72

1) Bridge LAK-2-0363 Lt & Rt•Plan sheets 1282 and 1283, rear abutment left and right, show 5 ea steel (bearing) retainers per abutment. Plan sheets 1294 and 1295, rear abutment left and right, show 3 ea steel retainers per abutment. Which is correct, 5 ea or 3 ea per local?•Plan sheets 1283 and 1285, forward abutment right and left, show 5 ea steel (bearing) retainers per abutment. Plan sheets 1296 and 1297, forward abutment left and right, show 3 ea steel retainers per abutment. Which is correct 5 ea or 3 ea per local?2) Bridge LAK-2-0400 Lt & Rt•Plan sheet 1348, upper right hand corner, under "Legend" heading, has two notes. The double asterisk note calls for 6 ea seismic steel retainers per abutment. The triple asterisk note calls for 4 ea bearing retainers per abutment. That totals 10 ea steel retainers per each abutment! These retainers do not show on the abutment drawings, bearing drawings, or abutment diaphragm drawings. Please confirm that 10 ea steel retainers are required at both abutments for both bridges. •Plan sheet 1362, bottom half shows existing girder elevation. It appears ODOT wants 4 ea new bearing stiffeners  $\frac{3}{4}" \times 7 \frac{3}{4}"$  to be field welded at each pier on all existing (left/right) plate girders. There are no notes to address this. Please confirm if these stiffeners are required. Where is this steel paid? Where is the existing paint removal and touch-up paid for these locations?3) Bridge LAK-2-0486 Lt & Rt•Plan sheet 1421 (eastbound piers 1 and 2), and plan sheets 1423 and 1424 (westbound pier 1 and pier 2) have a note in plan view stating "prebored grouted anchor rod assembly (typ). See sheet 30/70 for details." Plan sheet 30/70 has no such detail and pier bearing detail on plan sheet 1449 shows no anchoring requirements. Please confirm that the referenced note does not apply to these bridges. •Structural steel, level 2 (left and right bridges) plan quantity appears low. The takeoff weight appears to include WF beams, splices and connection plates, only. Adding type 3 crossframes to both bridges, will make plan weight overrun. Please check left and right bridge steel weights.4) Bridge LAK-2-0530 Lt & Rt•Plan sheet 1514 (rear abutment-drilled shaft spiral) SP 402 appear to weigh 107.5 lb/ea. On plan sheet 1515 (forward abutment drilled shaft spiral) SP 402 appear to weigh 34.25 lb/ea. Both rear and forward abutment drilled shaft spirals, SP 402 are identical in size/shape and should be the same weight. Please correct the appropriate plan sheet "table" weight. •Plan sheet 1514 (rear abutment-drilled shaft spiral) SP 403 appears to weigh 203.2 lb/ea. On plan sheet 1515 (forward abutment drilled shaft spiral) SP 403 appears to weigh 64.7 lb/ea. Both rear and forward abutment drilled shaft spirals, SP 403 are identical in size/shape and should be the same weight. Please correct the appropriate plan sheet "table" weight.5) Bridge LAK-2-0542•Plan sheet 1551 lists two structural steel estimated quantity pay items: the first is level 1 and the second is level 4. There are no general notes or steel notes defining what is to be included under each pay item. Level 4 appears to include girders, stiffeners and splice plates. Level 1 appears to cover intermediate crossframes. Please confirm that it is the designer's intent to split these items as outlined above. •Plan sheet 1576, web splice detail shows the bottom flange "outside" plate as  $5/8" \times 12"$  and  $3' - 7'$  long and the bottom flange "inside" plates as  $1/2" \times 5"$  and  $3' - 7'$  long. Since the bottom flange is 24" wide on both sides of the splice, we believe the bottom flange outside plate should be  $5/8" \times 24"$  and  $3' - 7'$  long and the bottom flange "inside" plates should be  $1/2" \times 11"$  and  $3' - 7'$  long. Please review and advise what is required at the bottom flange. •Please confirm that the ATT utility work (ls) includes 20 ea steel bottom chord supports not paid as part of level 1 steel. •Please confirm that the Dominion utility work (ls) includes 6 ea steel bottom chord supports not paid as part of level 1 steel.6) Bridge LAK-2-0760 Lt & Rt•Plan sheet 1607 and 1609 show 1 ea intermediate diaphragm for each structure (WB and EB). Can these diaphragms be galvanized steel MC 18 x 42.7, or must they be cast in place concrete intermediate diaphragms?7) Addendum No. 1 – Added Bid Items•ODOT added 97 ea pile splices in addendum no. 1 between the following bridges: Bridge Piles Splices Percent0363 L/R72 ea24 ea33.30400 L/R44 ea38 ea26.40486 L/R95 ea10 ea10.50542 112 ea25 ea22.3Since none of the bridges require splices due to order lengths, what is ODOT's intent here? We don't see why any of these would be performed. Based on soil borings piles will probably underdrive!

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 73

After reviewing the pavement calculations for the Vine Street Ramps, it appears that the quantities calculated for Vine Street Ramp "D" are severely overstated and the quantities calculated for Ramp "D/H" are severely understated. Please review these calculation and clarify the quantities.

**See the most current spreadsheets. You may be looking at an older version. The quantities have been reviewed and are correct.**

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 74

After drawing the MSE walls (elevation view) for Bridge LAK-2-0542, I can't seem to get a surface area quantity anywhere close to the 5,326 sf that is listed on sheet 1565 of 1679. My quantity is much lower. Could you please advise as to how you are coming up with this number (5,326 sf)?

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 75

Could you please provide the "office calcs" for the bituminous asphalt pavement items listed in the general summary.

---

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: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 76

TL-41. Further to data on sheet 976 please confirm that all steel components of the TL-4 transparent barrier system are coated "buff" after galvanizing. 2. We would suggest that coating be applied to all areas "exposed to view". Since there is colored acrylic sheeting covering all steel from the top of the precast barrier to the deck, could this portion of the steel framing just be left in a galvanized state? 3. It is clear on sheet 976, that the non transparent acrylic panels are to be "buff color". Is the GSCC transparent sheet to be clear transparent with black filaments or a tinted color, (smoky brown), with black filaments? Noise Barrier: 1. On past projects the icon(sign) panels have always been a separate bid item to avoid an escalated cost for the regular noise wall items. Will ODOT consider the sign panels as a separate unit price item? 2. Please clarify that the icon, (sign) panels is a projected relief from the face of the panel. What is the minimum relief of this projection? 3. Please clarify the brick formliner finish on the absorptive surface. Is the brick size 4" x 12" or 6" x 12"? 4. There is no specific elevation view of the residential side of the panels. Typically the rolled brick pattern has been a large CMU type pattern (8" x 16"). Please clarify the pattern on the concrete face of the noise wall panels. Also please clarify the coating for this side. Are the mortar joints to be left natural color? or is the whole panel to be coated one color, (buff)? 5. On sheet 973 Post and panel caps are detailed and there is a note that integral caps are acceptable as decided by the project engineer. Integral caps can not have the same dimensions as detailed on sheet 973, (20" wide for panel cap, and 26" wide for post caps) as typically the maximum overhang on a panel is 2" and on the post there is no overhang, the cap detail is a false joint cast into the top of the post. If the post and panel caps can in fact be integral, please clarify the dimensions that the post and panel caps must be for this alternate. 6. Can manufacturers approved spacing, ie: 24 feet be used on this project or must we adhere to the plans as detailed?

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 77

For the Bridge mounted TL-4 system, please specify the type and method of coating after all steel components are galvanized. Powder coating has been used in the past but is more expensive than an epoxy-urethane type finish. Please confirm which method is acceptable to ODOT?

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 78

The total count for bid item 606E10810 "Noise Barrier Concrete Posts" shown on sheet 970 (qty=653) conflicts with the values shown on sheet no. 247A (qty=673) and in the bid pay schedule (qty=673). Please confirm the correct amount.

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 79

Post # 67 on sheet 982 should be allocated to column "Concrete Noise Barrier Post w/Baseplate" (i) and not to column "Concrete Noise Barrier Post and Drilled Shaft Foundation" (ii). Moreover, the "Totals Carried to General Summary" for column (ii) should read 13 for the items as shown (and not 12). If correct, the resulting correction to sheet 982 would be to column (i) only, where Totals should read 15 (and not 14). As a result, qty for bid item 606E10810 "Concrete Noise Barrier Post w/Baseplate" on sheets 247A, 970 and Schedule of Pay Items should be 27 (and not 26 as shown). Please review and confirm.

**Posts #66 and #67 are associated with panel #66, so Post #67 is correctly designated as "concrete noise barrier post and drilled shaft foundation".**

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 80

"Top of Barrier Elevation" and "Barrier Height" are understated by 1 ft for Noise Barrier Bays B168-B171 (ref sheets nos. 985 & 986). As a result, item 606E10310 is understated by 4x 8sq.ft = 32 sq.ft on sheets 247A, 970 and Schedule of Pay items. Please review and confirm.

---

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: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 81

1. The quantity for reference # 931, ...Noise Barrier, Absorptive, may be overstated. Please review the quantity table on plan sheet 970 for Noise Barriers A and B. Sub-summary schedule and quantity sheets 978 and 986 do not match the General Summary on sheet 970.2.2. Reference # 933, ...Post and Drilled Shaft Foundation, has a quantity of 673 each, which would seem to indicate the state's intent to pay for the noise barrier drilled shafts and columns here, and not incidental to the square foot of wall. Please clarify the method of payment for the drilled shaft foundations and posts.3. The quantity for reference # 936, ...Structure mounted wall, may be overstated. The quantity for the Erie Road structure, as listed on plan sheet 970, seems excessive for a 200' long structure.4. Please review the dimension callouts on plan sheet 975, Noise Barrier Drainage Details. The width and depth of Section A-A does not seem consistent with ODOT typical installations.5. Are the icons and finials depicted on plan sheet 974 to be considered incidental to the wall items? There is not a separate reference number or quantity provided.6. Plan sheet 966, Section IV. Construction Methods, third paragraph: "Concrete pedestals shall be used to support the bottom wall panels and maintain a level wall." Please confirm that these concrete pedestals are only required where the wall bottom is "stepping" up or down.7. Please clarify the state's intent with regard to the final coating required for the vertical (steel) posts at the structure mounted wall locations as depicted on plan sheets 976, 976A and 976B. Are they to be galvanized, or painted (buff); or galvanized and painted?

**Q-1. The quantity for reference # 931, ...Noise Barrier, Absorptive, may be overstated. Please review the quantity table on plan sheet 970 for Noise Barriers A and B. Sub-summary schedule and quantity sheets 978 and 986 do not match the General Summary on sheet 970. A-1. Quantity has been revised in addendum #2. Q-2. Reference # 933, ...Post and Drilled Shaft Foundation, has a quantity of 673 each, which would seem to indicate the state's intent to pay for the noise barrier drilled shafts and columns here, and not incidental to the square foot of wall. Please clarify the method of payment for the drilled shaft foundations and posts. A-2. Reference #933, will be paid as a separate quantity as shown in the proposal. Q-3. The quantity for reference # 936, ...Structure mounted wall, may be overstated. The quantity for the Erie Road structure, as listed on plan sheet 970, seems excessive for a 200' long structure. A-3. The quantity has been revised in addendum #2. Q-4. Please review the dimension callouts on plan sheet 975, Noise Barrier Drainage Details. The width and depth of Section A-A does not seem consistent with ODOT typical installations. Section A-A should be 8' wide, not 64'. A-4. Because the cost associated with this detail is incidental to the noise barrier, no quantities will change as a result of correcting that dimension. Q-5. Are the icons and finials depicted on plan sheet 974 to be considered incidental to the wall items? Q-6. A-5. Yes There is not a separate reference number or quantity provided. Q-6. Plan sheet 966, Section IV. Construction Methods, third paragraph: "Concrete pedestals shall be used to support the bottom wall panels and maintain a level wall." Please confirm that these concrete pedestals are only required where the wall bottom is "stepping" up or down. A-6. The concrete pedestals are specified instead of clip angles and are required for all noise walls. Q-7. Please clarify the state's intent with regard to the final coating required for the vertical (steel) posts at the structure mounted wall locations as depicted on plan sheets 976, 976A and 976B. Are they to be galvanized, or painted (buff); or galvanized and painted? A-7. Painted Buff.**

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 82

Will slip forming be allowed to construct the bridge parapets? Reference #'s 5130, 5530, 8340 and 8540; Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel, appear to have included quantities for Approach Slab reinforcing steel. Does the state intend to pay for Approach Slab reinforcing by the pound through this reference, or incidental to the Approach slab 526 item number?

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 83

With the amount of changes to the pavement calculations, along with the number of files containing and addenda that contain changes to different calculations throughout the project, could ODOT please make available a complete file containing all the current pavement calculations for the project.

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/LAK-13486-AllPavementCalcs-REV20080120.zip>**

Question Submitted: 4/13/2009

Question Number: 84

Going through the pavement calculations for the ramps on Lost Nations Road, the Ramp "E" average pavement width that was used to calculate all the quantities for this ramp was 60 ft. Based on both the plan and profile sheets and the typical sections, it appears the correct width should be 25 ft. Please verify correct pavement width and pavement calculations for this ramp.

**The width is 25 ft and the affected quantities have been revised in addendum #22.**

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 85

1. The general Notes on plan sheets 41 and 42 of 1679 mention that the 404 and 401 permits are attached to the plans. The 401 permit is but the 404 permit is not. Is there a Nationwide permit that is in effect for this project? If so which one?

---

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: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 86

Addendum No. 21 changed the quantity of item No. 936: Special-Noise Barrier Misc.: Structure Mounted TL-4 Noise Barrier from 4,391 sft to 11,040 sft. The three bridge mounted walls should sum about 490 lin feet x 12 feet high and should total approximately 5900 sft. Please define the parameters by which this new quantity was derived. The steel posts to support this wall are galvanized and painted and are incidental to this item number. Please verify that this item will be measured and paid from the bottom of the single slope deflector parapet to the top of the paragas wall; as depicted in plan sheets 976, 976A and 976B.

**A1) The quantity has been revised in addendum #22.A2)The item will be measured and paid for from the bottom of the parapet to the top of the wall.**

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 87

On sheet 1030A of 1679, the plans call for 227 lf of 36" Sanitary Sewer to cross under both S R 2 and the CSX Railroad. Please indicate if this line is to be open cut or bored and jacked.

**The contractors should bid as per plan (open cut in phase), and the District will consider alternative methods of construction by VEP.**

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 88

Can specification 840 be updated to the new specification 840 dated 1/16/09 for this project? Please advise the contractors in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 89

1. The quantities for Bid items 790 & 825 appear to be overstated. It appears that Bid item 790 should be 263 lf and 825 should be 194 LF. Please revise in the next addendum

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 90

1. The approach slab removal bid item quantities for bid items 505,545,760,796,831,851,895 appear to be substantially overstated. Please revise these uantities in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 91

There are bid items for removal of approach slabs on all bridges except 0486 L/R Erie Rd bridges. Please provide bid items for the removal of the approach slabs in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 92

Bid item 489 is 203 Granular Material Type C (703.16C) 470 cy. Plan sheet 1565 / 1679 shows that 203 Granular Material Type C at the bottom of the MSE embankment. Bid item 494 is item 840 Foundation Preparation 1150 sy. Placement of Granular material 703.16C is incidental to item 840 Foundation Preparation. There appears to be duplication of the Granular Material Type C material. Should bid item 489 be deleted?

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 93

1. The bid items Structural Steel Misc: Crack Repair are on bridges 0363 L&R and 0530 L&R. The plan note "Inspection of Existing Structural Steel" on sheets 1274 and 1465 mentions crack repairs but gives no details as to what is to be done for these repairs. Please provide details as to what is to be done so the contractors know how to bid these items.

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 94

There is no quantity for subgrade compaction or 12" cement stabilization for Vine St., Lakeland Blvd. or Riverside Commons Drive in the latest version of the office calculations (posted 12/2/08). Is this accurate?

Question Submitted: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 95

In the latest version of the roadway office calculations (posted 12/2/08) the Vine Street & associated ramps quantities from the "copy13468GC200" spreadsheet differ from the summary in the "ARCADIS Revised PAVEMENT-CALCS\_11-21-08" spreadsheet. Please clarify.

**An updated spreadsheet has been posted: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/> and the filename is LAK-13486-20081217-PavementCalcs.xls.**

---

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: 4/14/2009

Question Number: 96

Can the existing structure drawings be made available?

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>**

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 97

The bid quantity for Subgrade Compaction per Addendum No. 6 is 35,411 SY. However, the sum of the Subgrade Compaction quantities from the latest version of the pavement office calculations (posted 12/2/08) is 27,456 SY. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 98

Due to significant changes in earthwork quantities revised in Addendum 10, an answer to a previous prebid question stated, "While calculating the quantities for the addendum, some errors were found. The revised quantities reflect this." Please identify these errors and quantity differences.

**The earthwork quantities were re-calculated by ODOT using the geopak files supplied to us by the designer. We believe the ODOT calculations to be correct. The designer originally included the asphalt shoulders in Item 202 - pavement removed instead of Item 203 - Excavation. The excavation quantity was revised, but the pavement removed quantity appears correct.**

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 99

There are no existing typical sections for the Lost Nation Road ramps provided in the plans. Could the District please provide these typical sections?

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 100

There is no quantity for pavement removed for Lakeland Blvd in the plans or office calculations. Could the District please include this quantity or identify where it is?

**The quantity has been added to addendum #15 and an updated spreadsheet supplied. Use <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/> with a filename of LAK-13486-20081222-PavementCalcs.xls.**

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 101

Due to significant differences between the Addendum #10 Excavation and Embankment quantities and takeoff quantities, could the District please provide a revised summary sheet 264/1679 to show the revised quantities?

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>**

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 102

1. Addendum 22 changed the barrier wall quantities for ref #172 & 173 in the asphalt alternate but did not change the corresponding ref #1038 & 1039 for the concrete alternate.

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 103

1. The underdrain subsummary on plan sheet 926 conflicts with the typical sections for some of the ramps and sideroads. For examples, 1.sr91 ramps and lost nation ramps typ sections call out 18" deep base ud but the subsummary calls out shallow ud which seems wrong. 2.sr91 typ sections call out shallow ud with a depth of 18" but the subsummary lists it as base which seems right. 3. lost nation typ sections call out shallow ud with a depth of 18" and the subsummary lists it as shallow which seems like it should be 18" base ud

---

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: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 104

The following questions apply to the excavation and embankment quantities: 1. The new attachment for the earthwork summary when compared to the original summary on plan sheet 264 does not include the quantities for sr91, sr640, lakeland, lost nation st clair, riverside commons or sr3062. the excavation quantity for sr2 increased by 45,000 cy. Where is this additional excavation/are the cross sections going to be revised? 3. many of the quantities for the ramp earthwork for the concrete alternate can't be right. my understanding is that the profile grade remains the same therefore the edge of pavement is the same so nothing changes on the cross section except that the pavement subgrade goes up 1.5" which means in a fill there will be more fill and in a cut there will be less cut underneath the pavement only. for example lost nation ramp d is primarily in a fill and the embankment quantity increased 9000 cy. there is approx 2400 sy of subgrade for this ramp so  $2400 \text{ sy} \times 1.5"/36 = 100 \text{ cy}$  of additional embankment not anywhere close to 9000 cy. please review and advise. 4. Addendum #11 added ref # 1051 and 1052 for the box culvert headwall, but the drainage summary on plan sheet 854 already has this quantity in the concrete masonry??? 5. We feel the pipe culverts to be done with the 3 weekend closures will require the lane closures in place for the entire weekend ie friday night to monday morning in order to install the culverts and restore the pavement. addendum 15 states that the permitted lane closure times are to be followed for these weekend closures which would not allow any real work to start until saturday night. can this be allowed? 6. for our traffic maintenance plan will we allowed the same variance for 10' lane widths under stevens blvd and csx bridges as shown in the original plans?

**A1) Quantities have been included in addendum #20. A2) The cross sections have not been revised, but the quantities are based on the geopak files supplied to us by the consultant. A3) You are correct concerning ramp D. Embankment qty has been decreased by 8900 CY in addendum 21. A4) Additional information was provided for the box culvert because the standard drawing doesn't cover this situation. The quantity for concrete masonry is a duplicate. Ref #77 has been revised in addendum #21. A5) The permitted lane closure times must be complied with. A6) Yes.**

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 105

1. It appears that the d barrier quantity overlaps the moment slab barrier at wall 2.2. the d barrier appears to be overstated also on plan sheet 251 where B-4 on sheet 286 is in the d barrier column (533 lf) and it should be under the b app barrier column. 3. Are the median light pole foundations going to be deducted from the plan quantity of b1 barrier? 4.6 of the overhead sign foundations are median barrier foundations which include the 10' of b1 barrier wall. Is there suppose to be a separate bid item for these?

**1. The quantity has been subtracted in addendum #22. 2. The barrier should be Type D, 572', which was revised in a previous question/addendum. 3. Per standard drawing HL-20.13, the light pole foundations were not deducted from the plan quantity. 4. The quantity for 10' of barrier wall is included in ref #281, Rigid Overhead Sign Support Foundation.**

Question Submitted: 4/15/2009

Question Number: 106

Item 633 Controller Unit Type TS2A2, with cabinet, Type TS1 Quantity 5 summarized for: SOM Center and Ramps B/C, SOM Center and Ramps A/D, SOM Center and Curtis Blvd., Vine and WB Ramps, Vine and EB Ramps. Interconnect and coordination timing is indicated on the intersection plans. Is there an existing master or system? Is a new Master needed for the referenced intersections? Where will it be located?

**The master controller is located outside of the project limits, the intent of the interconnect plan is to tie the upgraded signals back into the existing system without changing the overall coordination timing from existing.**

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 107

Revised Office Calcs listed as GPD calculations provide 661 CY of Item 448 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 1 Under Guardrail, PG 64-22. Please provide calculations showing locations for the installation of this material. Additionally, Revised Office Calcs provide for 394.7 CY & plan sheet 255 of 1679 provides 340 CY in essentially the same locations. Which quantity is correct?

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 108

GPD calculations recently provided appear to be grossly overstated. Please verify quantities on Item 302 Asphalt Concrete Base, Item 407 Tack Coat, Item 408 Prime Coat, and Item 442 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course 12.5mm.

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 109

Plan Sheet 41 makes reference to Construction Noise. It states not to operate power-operated construction type devices between the hours of 9 PM and 7 AM. This is in direct conflict with the note on sheet 49 referring the contractor to the ODOT Permitted Lane Closure times, which does not allow daytime weekday work. Please clarify.

---

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: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 110

Regarding the previous pre-bid question number 10 dated 10/24/2008 and the answer given, the Contractor respectfully disagrees that GPD calculations have been provided. Four worksheets of data were provided in the Pavement Calculations Excel file given in the link provided in addendum #1 <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>. Quantities for GPD were shown as a numerical value on the SR 2 worksheet in the Pavement Calculation Excel file. No calculations were given for quantities listed as GPD. If no further calculations will be provided, please explain what the anagram G P D stands for. Currently the contractor is left to guess where all GPD quantities are to be used. Addendum #2 did not address any pavement quantities as it referred only to items 509 Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel, 511 Class HP Concrete, 606 Noise Barrier, and 619 Field Office. The presumed link provided in pre-bid question 2, \\Ctrfs100\d12\$\Addenda\LAK-2-3.32; PID 13486; Project 080597\addendum #2 is not a link at all. Please clarify.

**The calcs mentioned in the response for addenda #2 were never placed out there - they are out there now. The link we have in the response to prebid question #2 won't work for the contractors. It needs to be replaced with <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/> GPD is the company name of the consultant.**

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 111

Is it the department's intent to limit competition on this project? By not reducing the 50 percent controlling factor requirement you are doing exactly that. Will the Department entertain a reduction of the requirement to 40 percent?

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 112

Is it the department's intent to run traffic on Item 302 Asphalt Concrete Base in Stage 2 Phase C and Phase D prior to the installation of Median Barrier from station 351+25 to station 361+00 as shown on Sheet 86 of 1679?

**Based on the MOT drawings and sequence of construction general notes, the pavement will be built up through the intermediate course, Item 442, 1.75" AC Intermediate Course, 19.0 MM Type A (446) during Stage 2, Phase C and D for Sta. 351+25 to 361+00.**

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 113

Please provide pavement quantity calculations for the ramps at SR 640 Vine Street. No Calculations have been provided.

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>**

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 114

Item 632 Pedestrian signal Head with LED Lamp units, Type A2 as per plan note on page 1039. The intersection plan sheets depict a side by side legend which would indicate a single housing type D2. They are labeled as A2. Please verify which type is desired. Item 633 Controller, Misc.; Preemption plan note on page 1040 provides a list of cities with an estimated number of emergency vehicles. It is assumed the contractor will not be responsible for more than the estimated quantities provided. Is there a breakdown of how many vehicles are equipped with functioning Opticom Emitters? Item 633 Controller Unit Type TS2A2, with cabinet, Type TS1, as per plan note on page 104 specifies the controller and software to be compatible with the system on Lost Nation Boulevard. What type of controllers and software are controlling Lost Nation Boulevard? Item 816 Video detection, as per plan note on plan page 1041 specifies the equipment shall be manufactured by a list of possible manufacturers in accord with supplemental 816. The notes beginning with paragraph 9, "There shall be a field network ....." are specific to one manufacturer. Are any of the products conforming to Supplemental Specification 816 and listed on ODOT's current QPL acceptable?

**Answer: A2 Answer: The number of vehicles provided in the plans is the number of existing vehicles with functioning Opticom Emitters provided by the Cities. The contractor should bid based on this number. Answer: The plan notes states: 633, CONTROLLER MASTER, TRAFFIC RESPONSIVE, AS PER PLAN THE MASTER CONTROLLER SHALL BE PEEK M3000E OR EAGLE CONTROLLERS. THE CONTROLLER AND SOFTWARE SHALL BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE EXISTING INTERCONNECT SYSTEM ON LOST NATION ROAD. THE CONTROLLER SHALL INCORPORATE OR BE FURNISHED WITH ALL THE DESIGN FEATURES, AUXILIARY EQUIPMENT, ACCESSORIES, AND PREWIRED CABINET FEATURES AS REQUIRED IN THE STANDARD BID ITEM. PAYMENT WILL BE AT THE CONTRACT UNIT PRICE FOR EACH, IN PLACE, ALL CONNECTIONS MADE AND WIRING COMPLETED, TESTED AND ACCEPTED. So the controller shall be peek M3000E or an Eagle. Answer: The plan note states: THE VIDEO DETECTION EQUIPMENT SHALL BE MANUFACTURED BY ECONOLITE CONTROL PRODUCTS, ITERIS, QUIXOTE TRAFFIC CORPORATION OR APPROVED EQUAL. So the answer is yes.**

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 115

Note 11 on plan sheet 188 of 1679 states that following removal of 621 RPMs resurfacing of the transition area shall be performed. General summary for this project do not provide quantities for resurfacing existing pavement beyond project limits. Please provide appropriate proposal items for this work.

---

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: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 116

Revised Office Calcs under the worksheet named LNAT Ramps have incorrect summations. Please revise quantities to include the last two rows listed as LN Ramp BF station 203+30 to station 203+80 and station 203+80 to station 207+14.

Question Submitted: 4/16/2009

Question Number: 117

Revised Office Calcs show full depth pavement replacement from station 510+00 to station 514+50. There is no quantity for Item 202 Pavement Removed in this area, nor are there excavation/embankment quantities provided in the cross sections. Is this area to be replaced full depth?

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 118

Please provide all pavement quantity calculations including those for ramps. The only ramp quantity calculations currently provided are at the Lost Nation Road interchange. Similarly, "GPD" quantity calculations have not been provided.

**All the pavement and ramp calculations have been provided under addenda #1 and #2 including the "GPD" calculations.**

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 119

Plan sheet 53A refers to the procedures for the removal or placement of any existing or proposed asphalt course shall be such that no greater than 12/2" discontinuity in the elevation of traveled surface shall be exposed to traffic. What depth does the department intend for the allowable discontinuity in this note?

**The allowable discontinuity is 1 1/2". See addendum #6**

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 120

Thank you for adding quantity to Item 615 Temporary Pavement Class A from sub-summary sheet 67 (1622 SY) in addendum number 8. Please deduct quantities for calculation errors that occur on sheet 58 (TP-1 on sheet 97), sheet 59 (incorrect qty carried to total sub-summary sheet 75), and sheet 75 sub-summary shows 509 SY (sheet 70 plan view shows 0 SY).

**In the alternate bid addendum (#10), sheets 58, 59, 70 and 75 are to be disregarded. The addendum requires contractor prepared MOT plans, so they will need to determine temporary pavement usage.**

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 121

The proposal has not provided a pay quantity for Item 254 Pavement Planing 3 inch max. listed in the proposed Typical section sheet 40 of 1679 on SR 306. Please clarify.

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>**

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 122

General Summary quantities do not provide for Item 202 Pavement Removed on Lost Nation Road Ramps, Lost Nation Road, St. Clair Street, Riverside Commons Drive, SR 91 Ramp A and B, and all acceleration and deceleration lanes throughout the project. Furthermore, the quantities provided for Som Center Road (24,990 SY) on sheet 260 of 1679 would be sufficient to remove all existing pavement within the entire Som Center Road work limits. Similarly the quantities for Item 202 Traffic Island Removed listed on sheet 260 of 1679 for sheet 632 and the blank row beneath it are wrong.

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 123

Thank you for pointing out that sheet 184 of 1679 was deleted in addendum number 1. Can you please revise quantities shown on this sheet for Item 615 Temporary Pavement Class B?

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 124

GPD calculations recently provided for side roads on SR 91 and SR 306 show quantities for Item 446 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course PG 64-22 and Item 446 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course PG 64-22. Typical sections for these areas show them receiving Item 446 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course PG 64-22 and Item 448 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course PG 64-22. These quantities seem to be included in Item 442 19mm and Item 442 12.5mm for payment. What is the Departments intent for these side road areas?

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 125

GPD calculations recently provided for ramps at SR 306 and SR 91 show quantities for 1.75 inches of Item 446 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course PG 64-22 and 1.25 inches of Item 446 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course PG 64-22. Typical sections for these areas show them receiving 1.75 inches Item 442 19mm and 1.5 inches Item 442 12.5mm. What is the Departments intent for these ramps?

---

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: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 126

Please provide the list of DBE contractors considered for establishing the DBE Goal on this project.

**DBE contractors considered for establishing the DBE Goal on LAK 080597 PID 13486:** Able Contracting Group, Armstrong Steel B & G Trucking & Construction, Ballast Construction dba Ballast Fence, Barbicas Construction, Cook Paving, Cosmos Denise's Flagging Referral Service, East-West Construction, Granger Trucking, Mohawk Re-Bar Services, Rockport Construction & materials, Ridge Electric, Sandusky Bay Tab Construction, Wolf Creek

Question Submitted: 4/17/2009

Question Number: 127

Due to the large amount of subcontract work on this project (i.e. noise barrier, concrete median barrier, electrical and structure work), we would respectfully request the department to lower the 50 percent controlling factor requirement to 35 percent. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

**ODOT respectfully decline the request.**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 128

Current plan documents inform bidders that no work is to be performed on SOM Center Rd. Bridge LAK-2-03231. However, plan sheets 632 and 634 show traffic island removals being performed over this structure and also the SOM Center Rd. Bridge over Lakeland Blvd. Please provide additional information and details of these existing Traffic Islands and confirm proposed scope. It appears that the details on plan page 35 do not represent correct conditions.

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 129

Miscellaneous detail sheet 17 shows Type D Barrier Transition details for barrier mounted light poles with 4ft transitions on each side of the light pole foundation. Please advise if ODOT wants these same transition lengths of 4ft for all median light pole foundations including the single slope, type B1 as per plan? Or the standard 40ft transitions?

**The reason for the special detail is because the light pole foundation would not fit within the 20" type D barrier section. The 4' barrier transitions are correct. For the case of the single slope, type B barrier in the median, there should be no need for a transition section according to the standard construction drawings- the 40' transition section is for piers/ wider objects in the center of the median.**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 130

Addendum No.17 answered a pre-bid question dated 12/23/08 regarding added reference numbers 1048 and 1049. Please review your answer. It appears that these are duplicate reference items with reference numbers 1007 and 1008. Also advise if the intermediate asphalt (ref. 1007 and 1048) should be item 446 or item 448. Reference 1007 indicates item 446, reference 1048 indicates 448 which also matches the current updated calc. sheets.

**Ref Nos. 1007 and 1049 were deleted in addendum #19.**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 131

Addendum No.10 added Concrete Alternate items to bid including separate alternate bid items for the various Concrete Barrier Wall items. Will ODOT provide square yard compensation for item 888 11.5" Non Reinforced Concrete Pavement for pavement areas under the proposed barriers? Asphalt typical sections indicate and provide compensation for the 302 10" Asphalt Concrete Base. Please confirm and advise.

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 132

We would like ODOT to re-evaluate the answer given to the pre-bid question submitted on 12/1/2008 @ 1:35:53PM regarding excavation of Retaining wall #3. Plan sheet 960 states "Variable depth unsuitable material to be excavated to a depth determined by The Engineer". How can the contractor properly bid this item when the soil borings indicate the area to be under water and indicate soft soils ranging from 1 to 7 feet deep? Instead of including the Angular #1 & #2 stone along with the #304 Stone in the 503 Unclassified Excavation, As per plan item, the stone should be made a separate line item / contingency as found on most ODOT projects. This should be a separate bid item determined by the Consultant and directed by the Engineer.

**The quantities were recalculated by the designer and the quantity for Ref #480 was revised to 4511 CY in Addendum #18. For estimation purposes only, the designer estimated the following quantities to assist you in bidding:**

**#1s/#2s=1621 CY 304=227 CY Backfill as per item 503=2663 CY**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 133

Addendum No. 10 revised plan sheet 40 and added "Proposed Legend". This legend does not match up to the Proposed Typical Section shown on page 40.

**Revised sheet 40 was attached to addendum #19.**

---

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: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 134

Addendum No. 18 provided existing structure information for SR91 Bridge over Lakeland Blvd. and SR91 Bridge over SR-2. Please provide details and scope as to how ODOT wants the pavement and islands removed and the new proposed pavement section constructed. There will be significant structure work to these two bridges in order to remove the islands and pavement including bridge deck and reinforcing removals. Details on pg 35 AE, AG and H cannot be utilized. The proposed pavement thickness exceeds the existing deck thickness. This work should be considered structure work and not normal roadway and pavement work. Please review these existing structures and new proposed work and advise via Addenda with details.

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 135

Please provide Noise Barrier Moment Slab detail for the Concrete Pavement Alternate indicating how ODOT proposes to adjoin the new 11 1/2 " concrete pavement to this concrete moment slab. Current details shown on page 956 and 977 are based on asphalt paving only.

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 136

There appears to be conflicts with Reference No. 173, Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type D. Summary sheets 250, 251, Ref B-2 and B-3 plan pages 284 and 285 approximate Stations 352+00 to 356+00 show this barrier in the same location as the Noise Barrier Moment Slab. Moment slab details, page 977 indicate this barrier wall to be inclusive to the moment slab item with reinforcement. Please advise if this barrier should be included with the Noise Barrier Moment Slab line item or Single Slope Type D Barrier line item. Also, page 286 and 287, Code B-4, Station 373+80 to 380+23 LT shows Single Slope Type D. Cross sections appear to show this as a Type B Barrier. Please review and advise as to which barrier type should be constructed.

**Answer: We have reviewed the quantities and although there may be some minor discrepancies, it will not affect the unit bid price. Please bid accordingly. Answer: Sheet 286 - the barrier should be 572' of type D single slope concrete barrier, already revised in a previous question/ addendum. Sheet 287/252 – Item B-4 bubble doesn't show up on the plan sheet. It shows up as Type B Barrier APP in the subsummary like it should, but the number should be 946. (Already picked up with previous addendum) Sheet 288/252 – Item B-2 is quantified as Type B APP as it should be, but the end station is wrong. It should end at station 392+75, for a total of 25' on that sheet. (Already picked up with previous addendum)**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 137

1) Sheet 29A, Detail C, as revised in addendum 10 depicts the Concrete Barrier, Single Sloped, Type B1 as integral with the footer. With the Concrete alternate, will the Department permit the footer to be paved with one of the shoulder pours and eliminate 1 of the vertical construction joints beneath one edge of the Concrete Barrier? 2) Concrete Barrier, Single Sloped, Type B1, will the Department allow the 4" PVC Raceway to be installed within the footer portion of the Barrier?

**1) No, bid as per plan. 2) No, bid as per plan.**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 138

Regarding Ref. 166 Curb, Type 2A. There appears to be curb that is counted twice. Sheet 247 refers to 5717 LF of curb quantified in the "office calcs." This quantity appears to be the same area as depicted on sheet 259. Please verify the actual quantity for Curb, Type 2A.

**Please see addendum #22. Revised pavement calcs at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/LAK-13486-AllPavementCalcs-REV20090122.zip>**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 139

The question on the Type 6 Curb quantities asked on January 14 and answered on January 15th. It appears that the proposal quantity still reflects the 2052 LF from 358+77 to 379+29 RT on Lost Nation Ramp D. Please revise the quantity in the proposal.

**We have reviewed the quantities and although there may be some discrepancies, it will not affect the unit bid price. Please bid accordingly.**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 140

MOT sheet 94 (for information only) says to place straight face barrier on S.R.2 at Stevens Rd. and CSX Railroad. No detail was issued for this work. Please provide an ODOT approved detail for the straight face barrier.

**Please see sheets 17B and 17C for details.**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 141

Addendum #8 questions & answers regarding the asbestos abatement mentions an inspection report for parcel 9, dated 3/24/08 for the Building Demolition at 36628 Vine St. We cannot locate this report, please provide.

---

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: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 142

Addendum No.10 added new plan sheets 29A-Q, 56A-56H, 188A. The following sheets were no included in Addendum No.10; 29H, 29I, 29O. Please advise.

**There will be no revised plan sheets 29H, 29I or 29O.**

Question Submitted: 4/2/2009

Question Number: 143

Addendum No. 11 added reference No.1050, Portable Concrete Barrier 50" Bridge Mounted. Per SCD RM-4.1 (10/20/06) wall is not to be used on bridge deck edges or similar drop-offs. The only suitable barrier is 32" PCB per Structural Engineering's Standard Drawing PCB-91 (7/19/02). Please advise, there is no 50" approved Bridge Mounted Portable Concrete Barrier for ODOT.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 144

Will the Department allow RPCC for use as structural backfill for Item 603 bedding and backfill or Item 304 Aggregate Base on this project?

**The structural backfill shall meet item 703.11, which allows RPCC according to the conditions in the spec. Also, Type 1 structural shall meet the gradations of 304. Under item 603, the contractor shall furnish Types 1, 2 or 3 structural backfill as per item 703.11.**

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 145

Will the Department allow RPCC for use as Item 304 Aggregate Base on this project for either of the bid items in Alternate AA1 or AA2?

**No. CMS 703.17 - Aggregate Materials for 304 does not permit the use of RPCC.**

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 146

There are no quantities provided in the General Summary for the large size Conduits Removed as shown on pages 855-862. Please verify and address in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 147

Quantities for Item 202 Pipe Removed Over 24 inches, was revised in addendum 11 and addendum 12. The quantity added in addendum 11 was not taken into consideration when the department deleted quantity in addendum 12. Please revise and include a corrected quantity spreadsheet, which references pipe locations that are to be removed using this bid item, and add it in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 148

Quantities derived on "scratch paper" for Alternate AA2 appear to be inconsistent with quantities provided for the same work in Alternate AA1. Please provide some documentation proving that these two alternate bids are indeed comparative for bidding purposes. Original Asphalt calculation sheets have had numerous errors (some still yet to be corrected). For example AA2 Item 304 Aggregate Base is shown at T = 6" in the revised typical sections (for concrete alternate). The quantity of this item (50,332 CY) is 24,431 CY less than the Asphalt Alternate AA1 for the same thickness and comparative areas. Please advise in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 149

The quantity provided in Revised calculation sheets Addendum K for Vine Street Ramps Item 302 Asphalt Concrete Base appear to still be grossly overstated (approximately 4900 CY overstated). Please check all quantity calculations on the Vine Street quantity spreadsheet (copy13486GC200) and revise in an addendum.

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>**

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 150

Addendum 11 revised quantities for reference 89 Item 603 15" Conduit, Type B and reference 112 Item 603 15" Conduit Bored and Jacked, Type B. The quantities changed have a discrepancy from the description of changes made. Please verify the quantities on these items and respond in an addendum.

**The proposed 15" pipe carries over to sheet 875 –in other words there is 91 feet on sheet 874 and 20 feet on sheet 875 for a total of 111 feet. This is the entire item D-4, since the 20 feet is not accounted for any other place. Therefore, 111 ft is correct.**

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 151

Addendum 11 added reference 1048 Item 448 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, PG 64-22 and reference 1049 Item 448 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, PG 64-22. Items already exist in the EBS file for this work. What is the Department's intent for these items?

---

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: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 152

Plan sheet 176 of 1679 shows Vine Street Ramps A, E, H, & D closed for one 60-day period, with traffic detoured to SR 306 for access to Eastbound SR 2. Addendum #1 Lane Value Contract Table limits all four of these ramps to a closure not to exceed 30 days each. Will the Department allow the Contractor to close all four of these ramps for 60 days concurrently per the details of sheet 176? Please answer in an addendum.

**Plan sheet 176 has been revised in the alternate bid addendum (#10) to limit the closures to 45 days. Closing of all four ramps at any interchange is not permitted. There is clear language concerning this in the alternate bid addendum.**

Question Submitted: 4/20/2009

Question Number: 153

Lost Nation Ramps A & E and Ramps B & F have closures in both Stage 1 Phase B Step 3 and Stage 2 Phases C & D. While the Contractor is in Stage 1 Phase B Step 3 he is required to work on a portion of these ramps. Once Lost Nation Road is open, will the Contractor then have a 30-day closure per ramp to complete the remaining work required per Addendum #1 in Stage 2? Please answer in an addendum.

**The closure time has been revised to 45 days in the alternate bid addendum (#10). The contractor may use 45 days to complete each stage of the work required for the Lost Nation Rd. ramps, as stated in the alternate bid addendum.**

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 154

The revised plan quantity calculation sheet for the Vine Street Ramps labeled as <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/LAK-13486-AddendumQ-PavementQuantitiesRevised.xls> still include quantities that are grossly overstated. Please check the cell formulas for cells Q52, Q53, Q54, Q55, and all Totals listed in row 72 (duplications due to subtotals being included in the column summation) then revise the appropriate quantities in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 155

Is it the Department's intent to use WZ Pavement Markings per Class 1 642 paint if alternate AA2 is accepted? Will these conflicting markings be ground off of newly installed Concrete Pavement? The list of maintaining traffic items shown in Addendum #10 does not include quantities for WZ Pavement Markings per 740.06 Type 1 on new concrete mainline and ramp pavements (required for phased traffic shifts)? Please advise and include in an addendum.

**The contractor is responsible for determining the type of pavement markings (within the guidelines of addendum #10), in the contractor prepared MOT plans. Addendum #10 has provided for quantities of 740.06 Type 1 pavement markings. If more quantity is needed, that quantity should be included in the lump sum maintenance of traffic quantity as described in addendum #10.**

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 156

Why is there a difference in surface area quantities being bid for the AA1 442 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course and the AA2 888 Non-reinforced Concrete Pavement? Item 442 -  $16,370 \text{ CY} \times 36" / 1.5" = 392,880 \text{ SY}$  which does not = Item 888 - 386,215 SY. Please revise one quantity or the other in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 157

Revised earthwork quantities, shown on the files provided with addendum Q on the Department's FTP site <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>, have once again omitted all excavation and embankment work for all side streets (AA1 & AA2). The quantities for side streets listed on Plan page 264/1679 are not shown in the revised earthwork summary (Addendum Q). The Department has added 44,720 CY of excavation for shoulders as answered in a pre-bid question (dated 12/16/2008). Our Detailed shoulder excavation takeoff cannot justify this magnitude of change in quantity. Please provide revised cross section and detailed summary sheets of how these quantities have been derived and include in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 158

Regarding the 888 Portland Cement Concrete Pavement Calculations Revised 1/13/2009 (addendum 20), it appears that the quantities for Item 304 Aggregate Base (1032 AA2) and Item 206 Cement Stabilized Subgrade (1029 AA2) were incorrectly reported on the summary sheet 3/3. By my calculations Item 304 should be mainline 58,652 CY + ramps 9249 CY = 67,901 CY. Adding in all other areas already included in the Item 304 AA1 we have; Stevens Blvd 26 CY (addendum 15) + Side Road SR 306 150 CY + Side Road SR 91 1000 CY + Lost Nation area 3425 CY + Lakeland BLVD 398 CY + Vine ST 670 CY + Driveways 50 CY = 73,620 CY. This quantity is much higher than the current plan qty (reference 1032 AA2 is 69,051 CY through addendum 21). By my calculations Item 206 should be mainline 357,025 SY + ramps 61,430 SY = 418,455 SY. This quantity is also much higher than the current plan qty (411,788 SY through addendum 21). Please revise and include in an

**The quantities have been revised in addendum #22.**

---

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: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 159

Considering the magnitude and complexity of this project and the number of addenda already posted (21) wouldn't it benefit both the State and the Contractor if PN 108 – 1/16/2009 DISPUTE REVIEW BOARD PROCESS were added along with its bid Item 100E50000 Special - Dispute Review Board in lieu of PN 109 – DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE CLAIM PROCESS? This project fits all the design parameters for usage of PN 108 and is the type of project that would benefit from its use.

**When the final project was filed, the use of PN 109 was discussed with Construction, and it was agreed that PN 109 was the most appropriate for this project.**

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 160

Quantity for Item 302 changed in addendum #22 to 119,093 CY has again taken the incorrect quantity from the Arcadis pavement calculation excel spreadsheet for Vine Street Ramp D causing an overstated quantity ( $5642.58 - 636.72 = 5005.86$  CY). This gives the concrete alternate AA2 a comparative bidding advantage. Please reduce the quantity of reference line 150 Item 302 Asphalt Concrete Base to 114,087 CY and include it in an addendum.

**This has been checked by the consultant several times. They say it is correct**

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 161

Will the department please provide an addendum listing all questions and answers posted on the Departments pre-bid question website, or eliminate the disclaimers on the bottom of each page of this website. Many questions have been answered on the pre-bid website and not included in an addendum, which may affect the terms of the contract and should be made a part of the bidding documents. A legal dilemma exists in that the pre-bid questions are not part of the bidding documents unless included in an addendum. However, per PN 110 - 4/18/2008 - ESCROW BID DOCUMENTS all documents used in the preparation of the bid are to be submitted to the Department for Escrow.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 162

Will the Department allow slag for use as Item 304 Aggregate Base on this project for either of the bid items in Alternate AA1 or AA2?

**The use of slag is permitted provided the material meets all the requirements specified in 703.17.**

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 163

How is the pavement widening on side roads SR 306 and SR 91 to be handled if the concrete alternate is accepted?

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 164

Prior to the changes made in addendum #15, it appears that the proposal has duplicated Item 1007 and 1008 with Items 1048 and 1049. Does the Department intend to bid both sets of items for the Asphalt Concrete Intermediate and Surface Courses on Side Roads SR 91 and SR 306? Also relating to these items, reference 1007 and 1008 were changed in addendum #15 to add quantities for the replacement of pavement at Stevens Blvd. where the box culvert will be replaced. However, the quantities listed in the answer to the pre-bid question included in the addendum were transposed when added to their respective reference numbers (1007 Item 446 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 2, PG 64-22 should be  $661 \text{ CY} + 7.6 \text{ CY} = 669 \text{ CY}$  and 1008 Item 448 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, Type 1, PG 64-22 should be  $472 \text{ CY} + 5.4 \text{ CY} = 477 \text{ CY}$ ). Please clarify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2009

Question Number: 165

Again we will ask how is the pavement widening on side roads SR 306 and SR 91 to be handled if the concrete alternate is accepted? The oversight exists in that the Department has not provided any quantity for Item 302 in widening slots if concrete alternate AA2 is accepted.

---

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: 4/22/2009

Question Number: 166

With regard to the previous pre-bid question asked 1/23/09 and answered 1/26/09: Quantity for Item 302 changed in addendum #22 to 119,093 CY has again taken the incorrect quantity from the Arcadis pavement calculation excel spreadsheet for Vine Street Ramp D causing an overstated quantity ( $5642.58 - 636.72 = 5005.86$  CY). This gives the concrete alternate AA2 a comparative bidding advantage. Please reduce the quantity of reference line 150 Item 302 Asphalt Concrete Base to 114,087 CY and include it in an addendum. A: This has been checked by the consultant several times. They say it is correct. There is no question that the consultant's spreadsheet (LAK-13486-Addendum Q-PavementQuantitiesRevised2) is correct. The question is in reference to the Arcadis Summary spreadsheet (ARCADIS Revised PAVEMENT-CALCS\_01-21-09) that has not been updated to the corrected quantity of 636.72 CY for the Vine Street Ramp D #302 (cell location V195). It still lists the overstated quantity of 5642.58 CY (the quantity that the consultant changed to 636.72 CY). This overstated quantity is currently included in the total proposal quantity. Again I will ask the department to fix the proposal quantity and include this question in an addendum.

**We have reviewed the quantities and although there may be some minor discrepancies, it will not affect the unit bid price. Please bid accordingly.**

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 167

Two drainage runs cross SR 2 pavement (8'x5' box at station 336+00 and 42" pipe at station 345+00). While the original intent before addendum 10 was to install in phases with temporary pavement, nothing was addressed on the subject of removal and replacement of existing twin median barrier walls. How will removal and replacement of these be handled? Will contractor be allowed to use portable barrier sections to replace existing?

**The removal and replacement of the twin median barrier walls will be determined by the contractor prepared MOT plan. Yes PCB is permitted during construction."**

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 168

Ref. 7- Traffic Island Removed: included in total plan quantity of 15,656 sq. yd. is a quantity of 7099 s.y. indicated on roadway subsummary sheet 260. Is this a mistaken quantity? Please review this bid item takeoff and address in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 169

Addendum 10 addressed in the maintenance of traffic in requirement #12 that all normal lanes of traffic shall be open to unrestricted traffic from November 1 through March 1. Does this mean the the winter time limitation note #1 on plan sheets 53 and 56G should be changed from October 1 to November 1? Also, winter time limitation note #2 states that traffic shifts for bridge work may remain in place between November 1 and March 1. Does this still apply?

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 170

#304 Aggregate base quantities for both alternates appear to be incorrect. The up-to-date aggregate base quantity for the asphalt alternate is 74789 cy. The aggregate base quantity for the concrete alternate is 50332 cy. Based on the foot print areas covered by both, the asphalt alternate's #304 base appears to be overstated and the concrete alternate's #304 base appears to be understated. One suggestion to these differences could be the volume of stone base under areas not covered in the alternates being included in one but not the other. Should there be a separate #304 aggregate base item for those areas not covered in the alternates? Please review, revise, and provide updated calculations for both alternates including all 304, asphalt, concrete, and affected quantities in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 171

1. The phased bridges show anchored barrier (i.e. sheet 1277), however there is no bid item for this. Please provide a bid item for 32" PCB, Bridge Mounted. 2. All Portable Concrete Barrier on SR 2 is shown as 50", As Per Plan, however most of this barrier is to protect the work zone; not face-on-face traffic. Is it ODOT's intention to use 50", APP PCB for all PCB on SR 2? 3. On sheet 52 under Side Road Maintenance of Traffic for Bridge Construction, the plans call for the using Standard Drawing MT-96.10 on East 361st St Bridge and Erie St Bridge. This standard utilizes temporary signals, however, these signals are not paid under the work zone signals item. Is it ODOT's intent to include this cost in the lump sum item 614, Maintenance of Traffic? 4. The note on sheet 53 under Work Zone Pavement Markings for Winter Months states that states that polyester markings are to be placed between November 1st and April 1st. Please provide bid items for this work. 5. Also, under Winter Time Limitations, note 3 states that we are to return traffic to their unshifted position by October 1st and have pavement markings placed by October 15th. This conflicts with the note under WZ Pavement Markings for Winter Months note. Please clarify. 6. Sheet 55 states that the remaining portion of Lost Nation Ramp A is to be constructed in Stage 2, Phase C. However, there is no Maintenance of Traffic shown for this work. Can the ramp be closed and detoured in Stage 2 Phase C as it was in Stage 1 Phase B Step 3?

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 172

Plan sheet 901- existing catch basin is located at station 65+52 RT.- Plan sheet 850 calls for this to be adjusted while plan sheet 709 calls for this to be removed. Is this catch basin to be removed or adjusted? If removed, does existing 18" pipe connecting it to catch basin at 64+98 RT. also get removed or abandoned? Please clarify in an addendum.

---

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: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 173

Ref. 190- 36" B Sanitary: this bid item was not mentioned in maintenance of traffic notes. However, there is drainage to be installed in stage 1, phase a, steps 1-3 that includes various culverts, crossovers, and mainline runs of pipe (see plan sheet 54 for notes; see sheet 102,104,105,107,and 108 for plan view). Plan sheet 1030A shows the plan view and profile of the new 36" pipe which goes below the 15" and 18" conduits that are constructed in stage 1, phase a, steps 1-3.Please clarify which stage and phase the 36" sanitary crossover is to be constructed, and how it is to be constructed.

**The contractors should bid as per plan (open cut in phase), and the District will consider alternative methods of construction by VEP.**

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 174

Ref. 190- 36" Conduit, Type B (Sanitary)- would it make more sense to have this item bored or jacked under the highway instead of being constructed in multiple phases given the skew of it in relation to SR 2? Will the contractor be given this option?

**The contractors should bid as per plan (open cut in phase), and the District will consider alternative methods of construction by VEP.**

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 175

Ref. 598 "Manhole #3- 1 Each"- this manhole is covered under subsummary for LAK-2-0395. Plan sheet 1319 shows it in the estimated summary. However, cannot find this manhole anywhere on plan sheets 1316-1326. Please provide information as to where this manhole is located.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 176

Maintenance of Traffic:Plan sheet 41 has a note referring to "Construction Noise" that states not operating construction-type devices between the hours of 9 PM through 7 AM. On plan sheet 54, there is a note under stage 1, phase A work requiring traffic to be maintained per lane closure map on plan sheet 48. Plan sheet 48 does not contain a lane closure map.In addition to the above-mentioned notes, the ODOT District 12 website lane closure schedule for SR 2 gives different times for lane closures. Is this what is meant for reference for the "lane closure map"?Furthermore, alot of the shoulder reconstruction for maintenance of traffic done in stage 1, phase A will fall under existing sections of highway with 2 directional lanes. Closing a lane of traffic under the District 12 closure in many cases will have to be done during the restrictive hours of 9 PM - 7 AM.Will ODOT please review the construction noise note and exclude it for the shoulder reconstruction phase of the project?

**We are awaiting signed noise variances from 2 of the 3 Cities (one has been signed). Although we expect the variances to be signed, the plans can't be revised until then. Lane closures are allowed as per the District 12 permitted lane closure map, which is located on District 12's web site, that is in effect 14 days prior to bidding (see sheet 49).**

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 177

Plan sheets 121, 122, 167 and 168 show temporary pavement ramp connectors with the the item designated as "Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A".These two sections of temporary pavement appear to run across existing pavements and shoulders. Is the contractor supposed to reconstruct temporary pavement over existing here?Since these two area are paid as temporary pavements, when are they supposed to be constructed? Construction of these will require multiple lane, shoulder, and ramp shifts if they are required to be done prior to Stage 1, Phase C.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 178

Plan sheet 184: can ODOT please provide "for information only" excavation and embankment quantities for temporary runaround pavements at Lakeland/E. 367th intersection?

**Plan sheet 184 has been deleted from the plans per addendum #1.**

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 179

Ref. 446- Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A:Quantities on subsummary sheet 67 (1622 sy) were not carried to plan sheet 75 subsummary which in turn was not carried to general summary. Final quantity appears to be understated by this quantity. Please verify and address in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 180

Ref. 446 and 447 (Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Types A and B)- will ODOT please allow contractor at their own option to substitute additional 2" of 302 asphalt in lieu of 4" 304 stone as opposed to Value Engineering after the bid?

---

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: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 181

Roadway Subsummary pages 258-259 for Lost Nation Rd./St. Clair St./River Side Commons Drive do not include any quantity for Item 202 – Pavement Removed. The existing typical sections, however, show 9" to 10" of concrete on Lost Nation Rd. The cross sections for Lost Nation Rd. and St. Clair St. show Item 202 – Pavement Removed detailed in these sections. The stations on Lost Nation Rd are from Sta. 46+10 – 70+22 and the on St. Clair St. from Sta. 114+00 – 116+00. Please review pavement removal quantities in these areas and revise in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 182

As a follow up to the addendum 10 alternate pavement bid items, we feel that based on our takeoffs, either the volume of asphalt pavement is too high or that the area of concrete pavement is too low. Our takeoffs included stepouts for the asphalt pavement and pavements below barrier walls. This is a significant price difference and we ask that this be reverified in an addendum and revised office calculations be provided.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/>

Question Submitted: 4/3/2009

Question Number: 183

Addendum 10 changed original roadway quantities to AA1 and AA2 to reflect both asphalt and concrete pavement alternates. Original asphalt pavement quantities were to be reidentified as AA1 quantities. However, excavation increased from 361,191 cy to 387,194 cy while the embankment remained the same and slight changes were encountered in stabilization items. What are these changes attributed to?

**While calculating the quantities for the addendum, some errors were found. The revised quantities reflect this.**

Question Submitted: 4/4/2009

Question Number: 184

Ref. #3 "Pavement Removed"- Plan Sheet 260 in the roadway subsummary states that there are 24,990 SY on SR 91 (SOM Center Rd.). The breakdown provided on pp 260 is as follows: 3,711 SY on pp 630, 3,206 SY on pp 632, 11,685 SY on pp 634 and 6,388 SY on pp 636, all of which reference the SR 91 plan and profile plan sheets (pp 630 – 637). A pavement removal takeoff based on cross-hatched sections of the SR 91 cross sections yields quantities that are much less than the given 24,990 SY. The roadway subsummary also does not reference any pavement removal quantities for any of the SR 91 ramps A and B, despite existing typical sections (page 24) that show existing concrete pavement and proposed typical sections (page 19) that show proposed asphalt pavement, as well as office calculations that give subgrade compaction quantities. These office calculations, however, show no pavement removed quantities for either SR 91 or ramps A or B. Can the Department please check and clarify pavement removed quantities on SR 91 and its adjoining ramps and address in an addendum?

Question Submitted: 4/4/2009

Question Number: 185

Plan sheet 874, references D-3, D-4 show a pair of longitudinal pipe runs as 15" B pipe. Drainage subsummary on plan sheet 842 shows both of these as "Conduit Bored or Jacked, 15" Type B". Given that these are longitudinal runs that do not cross pavement, should these be bored or open cut as 15" B? Please review and address in an addendum. Plan sheet 887, reference D-5 shows a crossover on the westbound side of mainline SR 2. Drainage subsummary shows this as 15" Conduit, Type C. Should this run of pipe be paid for as a bored or jacked pipe? Please review and address in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/4/2009

Question Number: 186

These prebid questions were asked on November 6, 2008 and to date are still not shown on ODOT's prebid question website nor have they been addressed in an addendum: Ref. 190- 36" Conduit, Type B (Sanitary)- would it make more sense to have this item bored or jacked under the highway instead of being constructed in multiple phases given the skew of it in relation to SR 2? Will the contractor be given this option? Ref. 190- 36" B Sanitary: this bid item was not mentioned in maintenance of traffic notes. However, there is drainage to be installed in stage 1, phase a, steps 1-3 that includes various culverts, crossovers, and mainline runs of pipe (see plan sheet 54 for notes; see sheet 102, 104, 105, 107, and 108 for plan view). Plan sheet 1030A shows the plan view and profile of the new 36" pipe which goes below the 15" and 18" conduits that are constructed in stage 1, phase a, steps 1-3. Please clarify which stage and phase the 36" sanitary crossover is to be constructed, and how it is to be constructed. Please address these questions in an addendum.

**The alternate bid addendum, which ( #10) requires contractor prepared MOT plans. The conduits are to be constructed within the parameters provided in the addendum. As stated in an earlier prebid question, the conduits may be bored or jacked at no additional cost to the State.**

Question Submitted: 4/4/2009

Question Number: 187

The office calculations for S.R. 306 (Reynolds Road) include subgrade compaction and proof rolling quantities for asphalt overlay, which appear to be erroneous when this work will not be performed. The stations included are the entire length of S.R. 306 within the project limits, Sta. 14+50 – 30+05. Please verify and update quantities in an addendum.

---

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: 4/4/2009

Question Number: 188

Plan sheet 35: proposed pavement section sheet for SR 91 shows existing pavement composition as asphalt over asphalt based upon legend on plan sheet 11. Plan sheet 32 shows existing SR 91 as asphalt base over concrete pavement. There are no boring reports attached to the plan to verify either pavement composition. Since reference 3, item 202 "Pavement Removal" includes a quantity for SR 91, please verify in an addendum what the existing typical SR 91 pavement section is.

Question Submitted: 4/5/2009

Question Number: 189

Ref. 123- Catch Basin, 2-2B Plan sheet 848- drainage subsummary shows 2 each but no source of quantity shown. Where are these 2 basins? Also, plan sheet 902 calls for a 2-2B catch basin with a solid top. Does this get paid for under this bid item or should it be paid separately under a new bid item?

Question Submitted: 4/5/2009

Question Number: 190

Ref. 399- Aggregate Base and Ref. 404- 11" Reinforced Concrete Pavement... Plan sheet 53 calls for quantities of each for as directed for unsuitable soils at crossover locations. Are these to be substituted for pavement for maintaining traffic items (ref. 446 and 447)? Please provide more information as to probable locations and/or probable dimensions/calculations given the value of the items.

**In the alternate bid addendum, contractor prepared MOT plans are required. If the contractor elects to utilize a crossover, he may use these quantities.**

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 191

Ref. 90- 15" Conduit, Type C Plan sheet 886, ref. D-9 calls for 62' of 15"C. Cross-sections on plan sheet 911 show this as 15"B, as a good portion of this run of pipe goes under pavement. Please clarify what this should be in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 192

Plan sheet 723, ref. D-405 shows a 15" pipe leading from a catch basin to a headwall on Reynolds Road. Cross-section on plan sheet concurs that this is 15" pipe. Subsummary sheet 851 shows this run as a 21" pipe and not a 15" pipe (which in turn gets carried to general summary). Please clarify in an addendum whether this is 15" C or 21" C.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 193

Ref. 93- 18" Conduit, Type B: Plan sheet 893, ref. D-2 is called out in the subsummary as 18" B but is shown on plan sheet 893 and cross section sheets 423-425 as 15" B. Please clarify what size this run of pipe is to be in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 194

Ref. 89- 15" Conduit, Type B- Plan sheet 880, references D-5 and D-6 call for 15" B in drainage subsummary which is then carried to general summary. Plan sheets 330-332 and 881 show these as both 18" B. Please clarify this plan conflict in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 195

Ref. 89- 15" Conduit, Type B: plan sheet 881, ref. D-11 calls for type B conduit in subsummary but is shown on cross sections as type C conduit. Pipe run is outside the paved area. Please clarify whether this is to be type B or type C in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 196

Ref. 89, 12" Conduit, Type B: plan sheet 881, ref. D-15 and plan sheet 884, ref. D-13. Subsummary says these are type B conduits, however cross-sections specify these as type C and both runs are outside of pavement. Please clarify whether type B or type C in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 197

On the mainline cross-sections (pp. 298 – 452), are the existing asphalt shoulder areas (designated by a dashed outline) included in the excavation quantities?

**The earthwork quantities have been revised to account for the exclusion of the concrete pavement only from the excavation quantities, in the alternate bid addendum (#10).**

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 198

Ref. 96- 24" Conduit, Type A: Plan sheets 870, 871, and 873 specify this to be 706.02- proposal is not specific to limiting to this- please verify in an addendum.

**The contractor is limited to 706.02. Bid as per the plan.**

---

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: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 199

Ref. 98- 24" Conduit, Type C: Plan sheet 532, Ref. D-2 shown in subsummary as 24" C. Details on plan sheet 917 calls this out as 27" C. Please clarify whether 24" or 27" in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 200

Ref. 102 and 104 (36" B, 42" B pipes): proposal does not specify what type of pipe to be used; however drainage subsummary sheet 854 specifies all of these to be reinforced concrete pipe. Please clarify what types of pipes are allowed and answer in an addendum.

**These pipes have special circumstances that necessitates concrete pipe. The items have been revised in addendum #11.**

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 201

Ref. 54- "Rock Channel Protection, Type D with Filter": Subsummary on plan sheet 245 calls for 30.7 cy worth on plan sheet 848-850 drainage subsummary. This 30.7 cy worth is nowhere to be found on plan sheet 849. Please clarify this quantity in an addendum.

**The 30.7 CY of Type D is not needed. The quantity was subtracted in addendum #11.**

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 202

Ref. 52- Rock Channel Protection, Type B, with Filter: Quantities on plan sheets 855 through 858 appear to be understated when actually taking off areas that are designated. Please review, revise, and address these volumes in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 203

Plan sheets 858 and 862 call for full-size headwalls to be built for elliptical pipe and box culvert. ODOT Standard Drawings HW-1.1 sheets 1 and 2 give details for round pipe. Please provide additional information for elliptical and box culvert so formwork and reinforcing steel can be taken off.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 204

Plan sheet 901, ref. D-1 shows a 12" B Conduit crossing the pavement on Lost Nation Rd. at station 63+59.5. This sheet shows it on the plan and profile as a 12" pipe. Plan sheet 850 in the subsummary shows this as a 15" B Conduit. Please verify in an addendum what size this pipe is to be.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 205

Ref. 103- 36" Conduit, Type B: Plan sheet 898 calls this out as Type C conduit and not Type B. Please verify which this should be since this is outside of the paved area. Also, drainage subsummary on plan sheet 850 calls for 1' of 36" B on Lost Nation Rd. sta. 69+42L. Is this a mistake? Ref. 102- 36" Conduit, Type A: Plan sheet 860 specifies this pipe for two of the sections to be 706.02, D-2750. Is pipe limited to this or is open to all applicable type A pipes? Also, plan sheet 856 shows 211' of this item which crosses the SR 2 mainline at station 450+95. Plan sheet 115 in the MOT plans shows this as being "bored or jacked under pavement". Given that this section of pavement must be built in three phases (1B, 1C, 1D), it will be impossible to properly maintain flow given that an adjacent 36" pipe must also be removed in these three phases. Also note that there is no quantity setup for removal of existing 36" pipe at this location. Please review this and revise in an addendum as there is no bid item for 36" pipe bored or jacked as well as for the adjacent removal.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 206

On plan sheet 48 in the Maintenance of Traffic Notes under the heading "WORK ZONE MARKINGS PRIOR TO FINAL SURFACE COURSE", it calls for three lanes to be opened up upon completion of Stage 2. By opening up three lanes in the completed Stages 1 & 2, this will result in traffic going from 2 lanes to 3 lanes then back to 2 lanes. Is this what ODOT wants?

**The note the contractor is referring to has been revised in the alternate bid addendum (#10) and there is no requirement to open 3 lanes at the completion of stage 2.**

---

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: 4/6/2009

Question Number: 207

Addendum 1 addressed allowable ramp closures and their corresponding completion dates (day 30) and disincentives. Existing MOT plans call for phased mainline, ramp, and side street reconstructions that conflict with each other and could cause needs for two closures of given ramps (one while the side road is being reconstructed and one for when the ramp is to be reconstructed). For example, plan sheet 91 calls for Reynolds Road to be rebuilt in stage 1, phase B, steps 5 and 6 while mainline stage 1, phase B calls for median reconstruction of SR 2. Ramp reconstruction of Reynolds Road ramps per this same sheet occur in both phases C and D. This scenario would cause two closures needed for each ramp. Another example is on plan sheet 90, where reconstruction of Lost Nation Road is to occur in stage 1, phase B, steps 3 and 4 while ramps A,B,E and F are to be reconstructed in stage 2, phases C and D. Again, two sets of ramp closures would be required. Will the contractor be allowed 30 days per closure period given the mismatched phasing of construction or does ODOT expect one closure with a total of 30 days or does ODOT allow multiple closures with maximum 30 days total shutdown? Keep in mind that either way, the soil stabilization will require several days cure time which will limit the 30 day closure even more (if ODOT would allow 30 days total, two closures would mean even greater percentage down time). Please review phasing plans, time restrictions, and disincentives for these areas and please define closure periods in mismatched stages/phases/steps.

**In the alternate bid addendum (#10), the contractor will be required to prepare MOT plans within provided guidelines. Also in this addendum, the ramp closure completion dates with disincentives have been increased to 45 days.**

Question Submitted: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 208

There are several bores that will be taking place in stage three (stations 276+00 through 351+25). Plan sheet 42 notes under "Item 603- Conduit Bored or Jacked" that no trench excavation shall be closer than 30' to the edge of pavement along SR 2 and 20' at other locations. Please note that since the existing median width with barrier is too narrow for a boring machine to work, that borings cannot be installed from the median. The trench note of 30' would require the boring machine trench setup to be basically located in temporary fills outside the existing or proposed slopes, which would not be practical. Given that the contractor must now be responsible for maintenance of traffic with constraints, this note of trench limitations has an effect on performance of these bores. Addendum 10 did not address this. Will ODOT consider waiving the requirement of 30' and allow the contractor to bore from the outside phase, and then allow the contractor to install remainder of bored pipe by open-trench method?

**The 30' requirement may be waved, but the contractor must comply with all safety requirements (in the TEM, OMUTCD, all current ODOT standard drawings and applicable design guidelines for maintaining traffic) pertaining to this item of work. The contractor may determine the method to perform this item of work, again complying to all requirements/specifications.**

Question Submitted: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 209

Ref. 939- Monument Assembly- Plan sheet 1618A gives detail for monument assembly in barrier wall. Note that some of the new assemblies on plan sheets 1620 - 1628 are located on side street pavements which are not in barrier wall. Should there be two different reference items for this since different situations? Please clarify in an addendum.

**In addendum #18, a quantity of 10 monument assemblies was subtracted from Ref # 939, so Ref #939 will only represent the monument assemblies in barrier wall. Ref # 30 was increased by 9 to represent monuments in pavement. One Vine Street monument was already included in Ref #30.**

Question Submitted: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 210

Addendum 17 revised quantity for ref. 10 (Pipe Removed, Over 24") to include larger pipes removed on plan sheets 855 through 862. Plan sheets 857 and 858 call for pipe cleanouts of entire lengths of existing conduits as well as resealing of pipe joints and lifting holes per 516. There is no pay item set up for resealing of the pipe joints and lifting holes. Also, the length of the two proposed conduits to be cleaned on these pages totals approximately 450' after end sections are removed. Reference 17 (Pipe Cleanout) calls for 400' as directed by the engineer. Should this quantity revised based on the two conduits? Please address resealing of pipe joints and pipe cleanouts in an addendum. Also, plan sheet 856 calls for installation of new 36" conduit and removal of existing 36" conduit. Given that both must be completed under different phases due to maintenance of traffic restrictions, will ODOT allow contractor to plug and fill old 36" line instead of removing and backfilling?

Question Submitted: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 211

A prebid question was asked back on November 24, 2008 regarding construction noise and lane closure availabilities. The response was that ODOT was awaiting signed noise variances from 2 of 3 cities, and that only one had been signed. Is there an update on the status of this? Will there be any restrictions on night work?

**We have received signed noise variances from Mentor and Willoughby and are still awaiting Eastlake. We expect the signed noise variance from Eastlake soon.**

---

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: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 212

Addendum 17 addressed and changed the aggregate base for the concrete alternate to 66790 cy. This is the aggregate base that will go under concrete pavement alternate for mainline and ramps only (not including side roads, driveways, pavement repairs). However, ODOT did not address correctly the change that should occur to the aggregate base for the asphalt alternate. The current quantity of aggregate base (Revised to 74789 cy per addendum 15) is still incorrect in terms of comparing one pavement alternate to another. Takeoffs for #304 base for asphalt alternate from updated calculation sheets are as follows: Mainline Pavement = 60119 cy; Vine Ramps = 2100 cy; Lost Nation Ramps = 3266 cy; SR 91 Ramps = 646 cy; SR 306 Ramps = 2962 cy. These locations total 69,063 cy, which should be the comparison volume to that of the concrete pavement. Additional volumes for Lakeland Blvd (397.5 cy), Vine St. (670.4 cy), Lost Nation/Side Rds. (3425 cy), SR 91 (1000 cy), SR 306 (150 cy), Stevens (26 cy) and Driveways (50 cy) are currently included in the asphalt alternate and not included in the concrete alternate. We feel that ODOT needs to revise the asphalt alternate stone base to the 69,063 cy shown above to compare with the 66,790 cy shown for the concrete base (this is assuming that all of the engineer's mainline and ramp calculations as is are correct). We also feel that ODOT needs to set up a third quantity for non-mainline and ramp stone base (5,782 cy based on totals of side roads and driveways). Finally, there appears to be no stone base and subgrade treatment for areas under approach slabs. Please review and address.

**A quantity of 5719 CY was added to Ref #1032 to account for the side roads under the concrete alternative. From spot checks, it appears that 304 and subgrade treatment were included under approach slabs.**

Question Submitted: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 213

Ref. 10- Pipe Removed, over 24": Plan sheets 881 and 882 call for 870' of 24" pipe to be removed as part of this item, which in the subsummary sheet 840 is listed as "Pipe Removed, 24" and over". This appears to be under the wrong bid item. Please review and revise quantities for ref. 9 and ref. 10 in addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 214

Addendum 10 addresses maintaining traffic for both asphalt and concrete pavement alternates. Item 6 under the provisions calls for 50" portable concrete barrier required for SR 2 mainline and ramps. The original bid item for the PCB (ref. 450) was for 50" PCB as per plan which allowed the contractor to use 32" PCB with an 18" glare screen. Does ODOT plan on limiting the revised MOT plan to using only 50" PCB or will the contractor be allowed to use 32" PCB with the 18" glare screen as originally specified?

Question Submitted: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 215

Ref. 3- Pavement Removed- the updated spreadsheets appear to total as follows: Mainline SR 2 = 146024 SY; VINE/SR 91/SR 306 Ramps = 45998 SY; Lost Nation Ramps = 10409 SY; Lost Nation Rd. = 14282 SY. In addition to these, plan sheet 834 shows 881 SY. These total 217,594 SY. Latest addendum received shows an updated plan quantity of 179,637 SY. Please clarify, review and make necessary revisions in an addendum.

**The pavement removed quantity has been revised for a total of 208,706 CY. Reference #3 has been revised in this addendum, and a revised spreadsheet has been posted. Use <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/> with a filename of LAK-13486-20081222-PavementCalcs.xls.**

Question Submitted: 4/7/2009

Question Number: 216

Plan sheet 889, Ref. D-1- shown on this sheet as well as sheet 912 as 18" Bored Pipe. Plan sheet 846 subsummary shows this as a 15" Bored Pipe, which is then continued to general summary. Please verify bore size in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 217

Ref. 7- removal of existing medians on SR 91 bridge over Lakeland and SR 2 will leave exposed bridge deck. There will be old vertical bars that tie the median to the deck. There will be an existing deck with dozens of old vertical bar holes and a surface that will be uncertain due to how well the raised median bonded to the deck surface. There are no bid items set up for repair of the holes as well as treatment of the existing deck surface prior to any restoration work being done. Also, given that this removal is over a bridge deck, are there any restrictions on what equipment and/or methods can or cannot be used? Please address this in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 218

Due to the structural steel delivery schedules of the suppliers for the Lost Nation Bridge LAK-2-0542 only one half of the bridge will be able to be completed by November 1, 2009. Can Lost Nation Road be left over the winter of 2009 – 2010 with one half of the existing bridge and one half of the new bridge in place?

**Yes, but traffic cannot be placed on the new SR-2 pavement until all existing beams are removed.**

---

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: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 219

Addendum 18 provided plan sheets of the existing SR 91 bridges over Lakeland Blvd. and SR 2. Reference 7, Traffic Island Removed, has quantity to be removed on top of both structures. For the Lakeland Bridge, the replacement called for per plan sheet 35, detail AE is a curbed widening with full depth stone and asphalt pavement totalling 19" deep. The existing deck thickness is 8.25". On structure over SR 2, plan sections call for pavement removal and replacement to a similar depth (19") without new curb, and an existing deck thickness of 8.5". In both cases, the depth of reconstruction goes below the existing bridge decks. Please revisit what should be done with removal and replacement when these islands are on existing bridge decks in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 220

According to addendum #10, ODOT will only pay up to the plan quantities for the established MOT bid items. Under the LEO bid item, we are supposed to include "Routine patrolling through the work zone (with flashing lights off) as specified in the plans". This is an "as directed" item that cannot be quantified prior to the bid. This project could be under construction for 1000 days. Just to patrol 10 hours a day would add 10,000 LEO hr to our bid, which, using average unit prices, would increase the Maintaining Traffic, LS cost by almost \$500,000. This project is located in three different municipalities, who with their police departments, county sheriff forces, and state highway patrols routinely patrol these roads as is. Please remove this note from the LEO bid item so that all contractors can provide equivalent bids.

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 221

The following prebid questions were asked December 1, 2008 and to date have not yet been answered. Please answer these prior to bid date. Regarding Asbestos Abatement: 1. Please clarify how the quantities were determined for Ref. 47 and 48. What is this material, and where is it located? 2. The lump sum Asbestos Abatement item (Ref. 49) has notes on plan sheet 46/1679 that are confusing. Several of the structures listed there are not even within the scope of this project. For the structures that are in this project, why are the Square Foot and Linear Foot quantities shown not part of Ref. 47 and 48? 3. In the Special Provision "Ohio EPA Notification of Demolition Renovation", the reports seem to correspond to the items listed for the lump sum Ref. 49. However, the reports that quantify asbestos containing materials show the materials as being "Non Friable Asbestos Material NOT to be Removed, Category I". Do these materials need to be removed as part of this project? 4. Also in the asbestos Special Provision, several structure are reported as having asbestos, but no material or quantity is mentioned. 5. For the Building Demolition, the plan notes on Sheet 46A state that asbestos abatement will be performed by the contractor. Where is this work to be paid for? Are there asbestos reports indicating what needs to be removed? Regarding addendum 9: Addendum 9, which came out on November 20, 2008, called for removal or non-removal of asbestos on structures that are not being worked on within the job (LAK-2-4.56, LAK-2-9.55, LAK-2-11.41, LAK-2-11.69, LAK-2-12.62, LAK-44-6.20, LAK-2-13.54, LAK-2-14.28, LAK-2-14.76, LAK-2-15.17). Please verify that no work is to be done on these structures since they are not within limits of the project.

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 222

In Addendum #10, ODOT revised the MOT to Contractor Prepared Maintenance of Traffic. For the purposes of fairly evaluating the bids, the method of comparison is also established in Addendum #10. Bidders are required to bid quantities that were derived from ODOT's original design, and bidders are told to include any costs that exceed the quantities in ODOT's design in Item 614 – Maintaining Traffic which is bid Lump Sum. This method does not allow the bidder to fairly establish the true cost of their design. For MOT quantities that over-run or for items that are not in ODOT's list, the bidder will include its cost in the Lump Sum item. However, for items the bidder does not need or will under-run, the bidder is still required to include this cost in the original bid. ODOT would later receive a cost non performance by change order due to final quantity adjustments. ODOT should know the value of the non-performance cost to fairly evaluate the bids. A better comparison would be to simply require the bidders to include all of its anticipated quantities of work in a single Lump Sum MOT bid item. The bidder can truly bid the cost of their design. We request that ODOT remove the unit price MOT items established in addendum #10, and require the contractor to bid only the Lump Sum Item 614 – Maintaining Traffic. A second concern with the list of MOT items established in Addendum #10 relates to quantities that are established by ODOT for use "as directed" or "as determined" by the engineer. These quantities of work are for the Department's use, and are outside the control of the contractor. For example, there are a number of bid items with quantities established for maintenance and restoration of local detour routes. Addendum #10 requires the bidder to include costs for quantity over-runs on these items in the LS MOT bid item. We request that if ODOT would like unit prices for items that are "as directed" or "as determined" by the engineer, that these items should be bid separately outside the requirements in Addendum #10, and not be included in Lump Sum Item 614 – Maintaining Traffic.

**This issue has been extensively discussed with Construction and FHWA. The approach used was determined to be the most practical for construction management and the most equitable for all parties. Quantities and notes have been revised in addendum #23 to address the "as directed by the engineer" issue.**

---

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: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 223

Ref. 150- Bituminous Aggregate Base: Addendum 22 increased the quantity from 115,117 cy to 119,093 cy. The engineer's calculations have a significant error under Vine Street Ramp D for which the quantity currently shows 5642.58 cubic yards. Judging by the corresponding quantities of stabilization, prime coat, stone base, asphalt surface, and asphalt intermediate courses, it appears that this quantity is off by a factor of 9, with the correct quantity being around 627 cubic yards. Please revise this quantity in an addendum. There was a prebid question asked on 1/17/2009 that questioned this quantity being severely overstated.

**We have reviewed the quantities and although there may be some minor discrepancies, it will not affect the unit bid price. Please bid accordingly.**

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 224

1. Under the LEO note on sheet 47, the required tasks for the LEO include "Routing patrolling through the work zone (with flashing lights off) as specified in the plans." This is a quantity that cannot be estimated prior to the job. Since the contractor is now responsible for any quantities over bid quantity per addendum #10, this is a huge risk for the contractor. In order to encourage a more competitive bid, please remove Law Enforcement Officer With Patrol Car from the list in addendum #10 and pay for all hours used on the job. 2. Several areas of the plans call for the use of blackout tape markings (614.11, F.1B) to cover existing markings (i.e. Sheet 118). Is this ODOT's intent? If so, please provide quantities for blackout tape. 3. Are Work Zone RPMs required in the tangent areas as well as transition areas? 4. The original MOT plan calls for a large number of overhead guide signs to be removed and reerected as temporary signs. Please provide bid items for this work. Also, please provide clarification on these signs. For instance, sheet 148 shows 3 existing signs on a truss to be removed and temporarily reerected in a different location. Is it ODOT's intent to install a temporary truss in this location? Please clarify what is required to maintain the guide signs.

**Answer: All hours will be paid for as included in the lump sum maintaining traffic item. Bid as per plan. Answer: You are referring to disregarded sheets, so a quantity for this item will not be provided. The contractor may use WZ pavement markings according to the guidelines provided in addendum #10. Answer: Only in transition areas. Answer: Disregarded sheets are referenced. The contractor prepared MOT plans must comply with all current ODOT standard drawings, OMUTCD, TEM and all applicable design guidelines for maintaining traffic.**

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 225

Specification 102.07 "Duty to Notify of Errors in Bid Documents"- to date, we have discovered that there are quantity overruns (errors) on the following items of work: a) ref. 41- Curb Ramp; b) ref. 168- 6" Concrete Traffic Island; c) ref. 171- Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B, APP; d) ref. 1013- Concrete Barrier, End Anchor, Reinforced; e) ref. 492- Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall, APP; and f) ref. 769- Class HP Concrete, Superstructure, APP. Please verify these quantities.

**We have reviewed the quantities and although there may be some minor discrepancies, it will not affect the unit bid price. Please bid accordingly.**

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 226

As a follow up to the prebid question submitted on 1/23/2009 regarding specification 102.07 "Duty to Notify of Errors in Bid Documents"- we would like to add that there is a quantity overrun (error) on reference 150- Bituminous Aggregate Base. It has been recently brought up in two previous prebid questions that this quantity is overstated by approximately 5,000 cubic yards due to an error on the most recent summary sheet on Vine Street, Ramp D. The magnitude of this overstatement in quantities could have an effect on the final outcome of comparison between asphalt and concrete packages. If ODOT believes that the consultant is correct and more than one contractor concurs that there is an error, will ODOT consider for comparison purposes a deduct to the asphalt package by the amount bid per cubic yard multiplied by the disputed erroneous volume of ref. 150?

**We have reviewed the quantities and although there may be some minor discrepancies, it will not affect the unit bid price. Please bid accordingly.**

Question Submitted: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 227

Ref. 92- 18" Conduit, Type A: plan sheets 622 and 872 specify this to be 706.02 pipe. Is contractor limited to 706.02 or is pipe open to all conduits meeting Type A specifications? Please clarify in an addendum.

**The contractor is limited to 706.02. Bid as per plan.**

---

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: 4/8/2009

Question Number: 228

Maintaining traffic- plan sheet 133 of original maintenance of traffic design (for informational purposes only) stated that "Entrance Ramp (Ramp E, the westbound on-ramp at Lost Nation) To Be Closed During Phase B Per MT 101.60". Note that the ramp is not being reconstructed during this closure in this phase. Addendum 10 gives the contractor 45 days closure for this ramp with disincentives of \$5,000 per day beyond 45 days. It appears that the reasoning for this ramp closure could have been due to a combination of lack of: acceleration length, curvature, and/or safe distances from the Lost Nation overhead bridge and Chagrin River bridge. The ramp itself is set for reconstruction during the outside WB phase (original stage 2, phase C). If the ramp is to be closed for both phases, then the number of days closed will easily go beyond 45 days. Does this ramp need to be shut down while westbound traffic is on the existing outside shoulder? If so, will ODOT revise the length of closure to extend beyond 45 days? Also, to confirm addendum 10, under stage 1 work to be completed notes, ramps A,E,B,F can be closed for 45 days. Stage 2 work to be completed notes also state that ramps A,E,B,F can be closed 45 days. The disincentive table shows 45 days closure with disincentives after 45 days. Please confirm whether or not the contractor will be allowed two closures of up to 45 days at these respective ramps.

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 229

1. One of the questions in Addendum 12 answered that there are no non-transparent acrylic panels specified for this project. Please note View B-B on sheets 976-976B specifically does call out the back side covers on the bridge mounted wall as Acrylic Panel (Non-Transparent). Please clarify. 2. How are the Non-Transparent Acrylic Panels on the back side of the parapet as shown on sheets 976-976A to be paid for? Are they measured separately for payment as additional square feet of noise barrier?

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 230

The plan quantities for the 18" drilled shafts Ref. #0790 (314.0 LF) & #0825(227.0 LF) appear to be incorrect. Please verify these quantities.

**These quantities have been revised in addendum #11.**

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 231

My company is a distributor for HDPE pipe. We have been working closely with a contractor in the Cleveland area which is very interested in bidding on subject job. The specs. for the 132" and 90" pipe have been written around pipe manufactured by KWH. We cannot quote/ furnish this product. However, I feel we have a better product. The pipe specified must be extrusion welded at each joint, which is time consuming and costly. Our pipe can be furnished with bell and spigot ends sealed with o-ring joints. The closest match we have for the 132" size is 120" and for the 90" size is 96". Without knowing the hydraulics involved, I am asking if you would consider using the smaller 120" pipe. Also, I am somewhat confused as to why given the direction of flow, that the 132" reduces down to 90" Is it possible that total job could be done with our 96" pipe? Please let me know if you have any interest in discussing this matter. We would be willing to meet with you at any time. John C. Oswald, P.E. Lee Supply Engineering Office 814-255-1481

**This product must be on the qualified products list. If it is, this product will need to meet the size and specs in the plans. All the provisions of the plans must be met.**

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 232

1. The noisewall method of measurement on sheet 967 states that noise barrier constructed below the ground line shall not be included for payment. This is an old note and is contrary to the current ODOT measurement for noisewall. Please amend this note to pay for all wall from the bottom of the bottom panel to the top of the top panel including coping. This has been an issue on several recent projects, please review the most recent noisewall guidelines from central office and revise this project accordingly. 2. The noisewall notes on sheet 967 state that there is incidental seeding and mulching paid with the noisewalls. This has been changed on many projects since there are already established unit prices for this work in other items. In order to simplify measurement and payment of erosion control items, we request that any seeding and mulching around the noisewalls be paid for at the established project unit prices.

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 233

1. Sheet 956 calls out the noisewall on top of the moment slab as fiberglass, however the noisewall plans do not include any fiberglass noisewall. It appears that this portion of Wall B is included for payment with the rest of the ground mounted wall. Please clarify as to material type and where it is to be paid. 2. Reference No. 175 for the moment slab should be itemized by the linear foot or cubic yard and provide a breakdown of the rebar since this is a structural element similar to MSE wall sleeper slabs.

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 234

1. The noisewall Method of Measurement on sheet 967 states that the top of parapet shall be defined as the bottom of barrier when the wall is constructed behind a barrier. It appears that ODOT Reference No. 930 is for 3,928 sf of wall attached to the moment slab in Wall B. The plan quantity accounts for the entire wall panel as shown on sheet 1010-1011 per the note on sheet 968. Please verify that no deduct will be made for any wall below the top of barrier.

---

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: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 235

Please provide a summary of how the Plan Qty for the bridge mounted noisewall (Reference No. 936) was calculated. Does this qty include payment for the wall area below the top of parapet or not? Either way, we can not duplicate the ODOT Qty based on the dimensions on plan sheets 976-976B.

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 236

1. We can not find the exact start and end stations for the moment slab (Reference No. 175). Please provide or tell us what plan sheet to look on. 2. Typical details for sleeper slabs and parapets provide a construction joint between the two elements at the bottom of the parapet. Please clarify if such a joint will be allowed on the moment slab shown on sheet 977 of the plans. This would be extremely difficult to construct without said joint.

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 237

Addendum #21 revised the pay limits for Reference No 936, Bridge Mounted Noisewall, to include payment for the entire height including the portion below the top of parapet. It appears that the revised quantity for this item includes both the left and right structures, when in fact only the left bridges receive noisewall. As this quantity is overstated, we will submit our bid using the noisewall material unit cost as the unit price for this item unless a corrective addendum is issued.

**The quantity has been revised in addendum #22.**

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 238

There is 304 Aggregate Base and Crushed Angular #1 and #2 stones called out on sheet 965/1679 for retaining wall 3 unclassified excavation, as per plan. These items are not quantified and depths of placement are as directed by the Engineer. Due to the fact the placement depths will vary due to the direction of the engineer, how will the contractor be compensated for these materials? Will the department set up contingency pay items for these materials?

**Please look at the Structure Foundation Investigation for Retaining Wall #3, sheets 1-12, for further information to help you determine the amount of unsuitable material for bidding purposes.**

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 239

Regarding Asbestos Abatement: 1. Please clarify how the quantities were determined for Ref. 47 and 48. What is this material, and where is it located? 2. The lump sum Asbestos Abatement item (Ref. 49) has notes on plan sheet 46/1679 that are confusing. Several of the structures listed there are not even within the scope of this project. For the structures that are in this project, why are the Square Foot and Linear Foot quantities shown not part of Ref. 47 and 48? 3. In the Special Provision "Ohio EPA Notification of Demolition Renovation", the reports seem to correspond to the items listed for the lump sum Ref. 49. However, the reports that quantify asbestos containing materials show the materials as being "Non Friable Asbestos Material NOT to be Removed, Category I". Do these materials need to be removed as part of this project? 4. Also in the asbestos Special Provision, several structure are reported as having asbestos, but no material or quantity is mentioned. 5. For the Building Demolition, the plan notes on Sheet 46A state that asbestos abatement will be performed by the contractor. Where is this work to be paid for? Are there asbestos reports indicating what needs to be removed?

Question Submitted: 4/9/2009

Question Number: 240

There is currently one bid item for Raised Pavement Markers (Ref. 246). There is normally a significant price difference between installing these in asphalt vs. concrete. Please add the appropriate bid items to cover each pavement option.

---

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.