

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 070138

Sale Date - 4/18/2007

Question Submitted: 1/1/2007

Question Number: 1

where can I find the Environmental Commitments Exhibit for project 070138?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/plans/070138/>

Question Submitted: 2/21/2007

Question Number: 2

Are the electronic files available for this project, and whom do we contact to obtain them?

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/dgn.htm>

Question Submitted: 2/26/2007

Question Number: 3

I would like to know if Gibraltar is approved to bid on this project? Can we be added by addendum? Please let me know. Jay

Question Submitted: 2/28/2007

Question Number: 4

This e-mail is regarding the architectural finish for MSE wall panels as specified on Sheets 1102 and 1193 of the contract drawings. The note under the heading 'Architectural Finish (Bridge)' states that The surface finish shall be the pattern described below in the Architectural Wall Elevation from Foster Geotechnical....'The pattern from Foster Geotechnical works only for 5-ft. x 10-ft. panels. We request Ohio DOT 5-ft. x 10-ft. MSE panels for this job so that the architectural requirements for this project can be met.

Question Submitted: 3/1/2007

Question Number: 5

Should Single/Slope type B wall replace the S/S type A wall so that the width of the wall remains the same when the S/S type C starts @ Sta.569+14.22 and 578+29.61.(There is a 4" diff. between the A and C) That would also change the Concrete Barrier end sections to type B. Shouldn't there only be 2 end sections? One @ 546+50, the other @ 596+90.

Question Submitted: 3/13/2007

Question Number: 6

1. Is night work permitted?2. Is blasting permitted?3. It appears that the underdrains in from mainline station 499+00 to 513+00 are in shale and sandstone. Spec section 605 calls for a separate pay item to be established for rock cut underdrain. How are we to be compensated for this?4. York road is to be closed for 120 days as stated in addendum #1. This is totally unrealistic. In this time frame we have to install 450 of 60" culvert, import 75,000cy of embankment, import 49,000cy of granular embankment type B, wait 60 days to monitor settlement per sheet 46, undercut and backfill abutments, install MSE wall abutments, construct the bridge and about 2500' of York Road. A more realistic time frame for this work would be 270 days. Please re-visit this time frame.5. Will we be permitted to cross SR 161 with off road equipment? If so, could you please provide details as to what you expect from a traffic maintenance standpoint and any other stipulations or restrictions you may have such as work hours, etc..

Question Submitted: 3/19/2007

Question Number: 7

Sheet 84 & 85 of plans. Quantity for Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A 6,720 S.Y. seems high when you calculate the limiting stations (360+00.00 to 370+80.00)and use a width of 30' from the typical section on sheet 84. Is there more to this item at this location?Supplemental Specification 800 dated 1-19-07 is included in this project. In this specification a density requirement is attached to all 448 items. Will this density requirement be enforced on this project?

Quantity will be revised with the forthcoming addendum. Yes, the density requirement will apply according to 448.03 Density.

Question Submitted: 3/19/2007

Question Number: 8

RE: Granular Material Type D, APP Filter FabricThe general note on p. 45 states that granular material type D and filter fabric may be placed if surface water is present. There is no quantity listed for the filter fabric under this note. How is the filter fabric to be paid for? Is the filter fabric be included for payment with the Granular Material Type D item or should it be included in the Geotextile Fabric item?

A quantity of 10,000 sq.yd. of geotextile fabric has been carried to the general summary, but was not indicated in the note on sheet 45. This quantity is to be used in conjunction with Item 203 - Granular Material, Type D, 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: 3/20/2007

Question Number: 9

In the MOT plans sheet 54F Phase 2, Stage 1 it states that SR37/York Road, Outville Road, and Morse Road cannot all be closed at the same time, until the re-opening of through traffic on S.R 310. At the pre-bid meeting it was stated that S.R. is scheduled to be re-opened in September. Could you please provide a date when SR 310 will be re-opened?

Please see Addendum 070138c for clarification of the MOT on Sheet 54f.

Question Submitted: 3/20/2007

Question Number: 10

RE: Undercuts of unsuitable soils A general note on plan sheet 51 identifies areas for undercut of unsuitable soils. Under the subgrade construction sequence, step 2 states that the quantities for the unsuitable soils are to be paid under item 204 Excavation of Subgrade, however currently there is no bid item setup. Please add a bid item for this work.

These undercuts are shown on cross section sheets. The quantities are shown to be carried to general summary sheets as CMS 203 Items. Additional clarification will be forthcoming with addendum. (Delete this general note.)

Question Submitted: 3/20/2007

Question Number: 11

1. Will the use of stay in place deck forms be allowed on this project? 2. The intermediate diaphragms on the concrete beam bridges are shown being constructed with concrete. Will the use of galvanized steel intermediate diaphragms be allowed on this project?

A1. The use of stay in place deck forms will not be allowed on this project. A2. The Galvanized Steel intermediate diaphragms will be allowed and this will be reflected in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/20/2007

Question Number: 12

See below for our questions from the prebid meeting that still have not been addressed: 1. Aesthetic Treatment on Bridges 1175 and 1255: The notes call out the treatment to be paid with the MSE walls, however the plans show the treatment also applied to parapets with no provision for payment. 2. Will the department consider changing from integrally colored concrete to epoxy-urethane sealer? 3. Will there be a deduct made in the measured concrete quantity for the volume of structural members embedded in the diaphragms? 4. Please make the existing structure plans available for 1405R over Chimney Creek on the internet.

1. Question 1 is answered in Addendum 070138C. 2. The Department will not consider changing from integrally colored concrete to epoxy-urethane sealer. 3. Question 3 is answered in Addendum 070138C. 4. Question 4 is answered in Addendum 070138C.

Question Submitted: 3/21/2007

Question Number: 13

Addendum 3 extends the York Road closure duration from 120 days to 180 days and stipulates that it is to occur concurrently with the Outville Road closure as stated in the revised traffic sequence of operations sheet 54F. Addendum 3 adds time to complete the York Road closure but also adds good deal of work that must occur simultaneously between York Road and Outville Road. We are requesting that you also extend the Outville Road Closure duration to 180 days to coincide with the York Road closure duration.

The closure for Outville Road will remain 120 days as stated in the plans.

Question Submitted: 3/21/2007

Question Number: 14

The APP designation on the 16" piling for the slab bridges references drawings that show rebar extending into the piling. There are no notes however that state where this rebar is to be paid for. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/21/2007

Question Number: 15

Addendum #3 permits the operation of a Temporary Crossing on Existing S.R. 161/37 between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. for a maximum of 60 days of operation. Is this 60 calendar days or 60 night shifts of work? Does this 60 days have to be concurrent or can it be divided? This project is about 6 miles long and we may need to install multiple crossings on SR 161/37. Can we install multiple crossings on S.R. 161/37? Assuming that multiple crossings are permitted, Is this 60 days per crossing or 60 total days? If ODOT only will permit 60 days total, can we use 10 days for crossing #1, 20 days for crossing #2 and 30 days for crossing #3? Can we operate two crossings simultaneously in order that we would only be charged 1 day while operating two crossings?

1). 60 days of operation as stated in the addendum is equal to 60 calendar days that do not have to be consecutive and can be divided. 2). Multiple crossings will not be permitted. 3). Multiple crossings will not be permitted. 4). Multiple crossings will not be permitted.

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: 3/21/2007

Question Number: 16

A question regarding CIP pile wall thickness for project 070096 was answered on the website stating "the equation for minimum pile wall thickness in CMS 507.06 was developed for 12-inch diameter piles" and that thinner sections may be allowed for 14" and 16" piling. Some of the piling on 070138 is up to 0.400" wall following 507.06. Will a similar reduction in wall thickness be allowed on this project and if so what are the minimums that the Department will allow?

The answer is no. The pile wall thicknesses must meet the requirements in CMS 507.06

Question Submitted: 3/22/2007

Question Number: 17

Please note that on page 1069 of 1349 of the project, plan note ITEM 625, Luminaire, High Mast, that the section waived by the plan note 725.21 in CMS is for luminaire supports. The section that pertains to Luminaire arrays and associated illumination test areas is 725.11. Which section does the project wish to waive? If the section 725.11 is waived or portions of it, is the QPL requirement for that section still in place? Do the manufacturer's listed in the plan note or equals as approved by the engineer need to be on the QPL system?

Beginning with the 2005 specification, no section of the Specifications is to be waived by the luminaire note. With regard to the QPL, the luminaire is to be on the QPL before it can be brought to the job and installed. However, the luminaire does not have to be on the QPL at the time of Letting or Award.

Question Submitted: 3/22/2007

Question Number: 18

Ref 394 epoxy 214713 lbs has included the approach slab weight was this your intention?

The issue is being addressed in the upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/23/2007

Question Number: 19

RE: Foundation Improvement Addendum #3 added a note and bid items for foundation improvement. Are there specific locations on the project that have been identified for this work to be performed or is this to be a contingency item? The sizing and material types for 203 Rock, as defined in the CMS is very open, does the department have any project specific requirements for this rock? What lift thicknesses should we assume for the placement of this rock?

We have no specific locations on the project that have been identified. The listed items of work for Foundation Improvement note will be performed "as directed by the engineer." This note will be revised in the forthcoming addendum. For the sizing and material types for 203 Rock, refer to CMS 203.06 C. Rock. For lift thickness for the placement of this rock refer to CMS 203.06 C. Rock.

Question Submitted: 3/23/2007

Question Number: 20

Drawing 104 describes the phased construction for the 120" culvert at station 375+13. Since the old and new culverts are on different alignments, flow will be severely restricted between phases. Is this condition acceptable to ODOT? Can the alignment of the new culvert be changed to align with the existing culvert?

The 120" culvert at Sta. 375+13 conveys Simpson Run. Because of the approved environmental commitments for this stream, the alignment of this culvert cannot be changed.

Question Submitted: 3/23/2007

Question Number: 21

Drawings 109 and 989, please be advised that the 36" storm sewer at station 589+28 will not function till phase 2, stage 3 portion is installed.

This advisement has been noted.

Question Submitted: 3/24/2007

Question Number: 22

One of the answers in Addendum #3 revised the Disincentive table on sheet 53. The revised table shown in the addendum no longer has limited timeframes for Morse Rd and Outville Rd. Please verify that this is correct.

Question Submitted: 3/24/2007

Question Number: 23

Addendum #3 replaced plan sheet 54F, but still makes reference to various portions of Project No. 060150 being open prior to work occurring on this project. When will the sections of 060150 reference on sheet 54F open?

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: 3/27/2007

Question Number: 24

1. This question refers to the sequence of operations on sheet 54F. Phase 2, Stage 1, No. 9 states that S.R. 37 from 395+50 to 395+80 is constructed in Phase 1, Stage 2 as part of the relocated Worthington Road North construction. It appears that the intent is to complete the Worthington Road relocation and switch traffic onto it prior to closing 37/York Road. However, the entire intersection of 37/York and Worthington Road is scheduled for cement stabilization per sheet 45. There are no provisions in the plans to build this intersection part width and the dropoffs to perform the full depth asphalt and cement stabilization will require portable concrete barrier which is not shown in the plans. Please provide further details for this work.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2007

Question Number: 25

Morse road is allowed to be closed for 60 days per sheet 53. During this timeframe, Morse will be tied into the new Outville-Morse frontage road. There are no requirements for the frontage road to be completed or details for a new connection across the new mainline to tie back into existing Worthington Road. What will be the required traffic pattern for reconstructed Morse road at the end of the 60 day closure?

Question Submitted: 3/27/2007

Question Number: 26

The sequence of operations on sheet 54F states that portions of EB161 and the Watkins-York Frontage Road shall not begin until the opening of WB161 on Project 060151. This happens sometime during Phase 2, Stage 1. At this point, according to sheet 83, existing Worthington Road is closed and traffic uses both the new EB and WB lanes of Project 060151 along with Pavement for Maintaining Traffic shown on sheets 84 and 85 which is not to be placed until Phase 2, Stage 2 per the sequence notes. Please clarify what portions of 060151 need to be open and when this will occur as well as when the temporary pavement should be placed.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2007

Question Number: 27

As a follow up to our previous question regarding the temporary pavement shown on sheets 84 and 85, the notes state to install the temporary roads using flaggers and end-of-day dropoffs of 3" or less. Per the cross sections, we are making a substantial cut for this work (see sheets 194 to 209). This does not appear feasible, please address.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2007

Question Number: 28

We can not find any quantity in the bid for water for dust control. Please add this item.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2007

Question Number: 29

Drawing 109 shows a 36" culvert to be installed in phases. The existing culvert will have the discharge end covered by phase 2, stage 1 earthwork. The new culvert will not function until the pipe work is complete in phase 2, stage 3. A bore of the existing roadway will be needed to avoid this situation.

Question Submitted: 3/28/2007

Question Number: 30

Ref 291 epoxy 298498 lbs.also includes approach slab weight.Please verify.

Question Submitted: 3/28/2007

Question Number: 31

The note on sheet 1128 for Undercut and Backfill states that the undercuts at the MSE walls are filled with Select Granular Embankment, however, the cross section on sheet 1131 shows Granular Material, Type C. Please clarify. Also, what are the limits of the Embankment and Select Granular Embankment. These do not appear to be shown clearly on sheet 1131.

Question Submitted: 3/28/2007

Question Number: 32

We respectfully request control for this project be reduced to 40%. This reduction will allow more contractors to submit competitive bids on the project.

Question Submitted: 3/29/2007

Question Number: 33

Is it possible to get a copy of the plans for the existing 161 bridge over Moots Run or review them at the district?

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: 3/30/2007

Question Number: 34

The following issues are based on a review of the utility plans at the District office and the utilities shown in the contract documents as well as site visits: 1. Plan sheet 163 shows an existing overhead AEP line running along the right side of existing S.R. 37. There is also an existing Sprint line buried along the centerline of the roadway which will conflict with driving piling for the new bridge. This area is critical to the schedule and must be constructed immediately upon project commencement. 2. All utilities in the area of relocated Worthington Road and the reconstruction of S.R. 37 must be relocated before May 15th to maintain the project schedule. 3. Existing overhead utilities from approximate mainline stations 550+00 to 575+00 Right and in the vicinity of the Chimney Creek bridges must be moved so that work can start in those areas immediately following the notice to proceed. 4. The existing buried Sprint line along the right side of Morse Road needs to be moved as a priority. The utility note provided with Addendum #3 states that AEP lines will be cleared by December 31, 2007 and Embark (Sprint) will be cleared by September 1, 2007. There is no way to schedule or complete this project without more accurate times for relocation of the utilities. The specific areas in items 1-4 above need to be a priority. Please advise the contractors when these areas will be cleared.

The utility note provided with Addendum #3 is the best information that can be provided at this time.

Question Submitted: 4/11/2007

Question Number: 35

With the large amount of work required at the two overpass structures (York & Outville) the time allowed to have these roads closed is far too little. We would ask that you change your restrictions as follows: York Road 270 days Outville Road 180 days

The closures for York Road and Outville Road will remain as stated in Addendum 6. The completion date for project 070138 has been extended to September 30, 2009 and will be revised in the forthcoming addendum #7..

Question Submitted: 4/12/2007

Question Number: 36

Is ODOT going to make the prebid meeting minutes available to the contractors before the letting?

Question Submitted: 4/12/2007

Question Number: 37

Per plan sheet 54F, proposed work on EB S.R. 161 from 351+00 to 360+00 and on Watkins-York Frontage Road from 103+50 to 112+00 "shall not begin until the opening of the Westbound lanes of S.R. 161 on Project No. 060150." What date are the bidders of 070138 to use for this opening in preparing our estimates? Since the Department is placing a restriction on when work can occur, a date must be provided in order to allow for fair, competitive bids. Previous answers in Addendum #6 and on the website are insufficient.

Once again, we reiterate our answer in Addendum #6 to the question regarding when project 060150 will open. Do not bid in reliance on the current completion date of 11/14/08 for project 060150. The awarded contractor on project 070138 will not be a third party beneficiary of project 060150. The completion date for project 070138 has been extended to September 30, 2009 and will be revised in the forthcoming addendum 7.

Question Submitted: 4/12/2007

Question Number: 38

It appears that there should be Cofferdams, Cribbs and Sheeting set up for the structures over Chinney Creek (LIC-37-1405 L/R; CR539A Extension; Outville-Morse Frontage Road) for sheeting between the structures because of the sequencing of the construction. Please review. Thank you.

Question Submitted: 4/13/2007

Question Number: 39

1. Per sheet 54F, there is work on this project that can not start until the opening of the westbound lanes on Project No. 060150. Our bid and CPM schedule will be based on an opening date of 11/14/08 as provided by ODOT. 2. Our question regarding utility relocation was never addressed; therefore our bid will be based on the following: a. All utilities affecting the construction of Relocated Worthington Road and SR37/York Road including the bridge over SR161 will be cleared for immediate construction following the notice to proceed. b. Existing utilities from Mainline 550+00 to 575+00 Right and in the vicinity of the Chinney Creek bridges will be cleared prior to 6/1/07. c. Existing utilities along Morse Road will be cleared prior to 7/1/07.

Prebid Answer 1: Once again, we reiterate our answer in Addendum #6 to the question regarding when project 060150 will open. Do not bid in reliance on the current completion date of 11/14/08 for project 060150. The awarded contractor on project 070138 will not be a third party beneficiary of project 060150. The completion date for project 070138 has been extended to September 30, 2009 and will be revised in the forthcoming addendum. Prebid Answer 2: This question has been answered and posted previously. This is addressed by Addenda # 03. The bidding documents are clear. The dates submitted in this question are not in the bidding documents. Bid in accordance with the bidding documents provided in the contract, not the dates prescribed in this question. The dates are not negotiable.

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: 4/16/2007

Question Number: 40

The project calls for Cement Stabilized Subgrade, 14" Deep. Per the Item 206 Chemically Stabilized Subgrade specification, compaction is to be performed in accordance with 204.03. Per Item 204.03: "When the Contract Documents specify subgrade compaction and drying to a depth greater than 12 inches, manipulate the soil by plowing, dozing and turning the soil to dry and compact to the specified depth." Per the 206 specification for cement stabilized subgrade: "Once the water is added to the mixture, complete the mixing, compacting and shaping within 2 hours from start to finish." It seems unlikely that it would be possible to add the additional step of manipulating the soils to obtain full depth compaction within the 2 hours allotted by the 206 specification. Will the stabilization contractor be required to adhere to Item 204.03? If so, can the stabilized subgrade be constructed in two lifts? This may require additional contract time and present and issue with bonding of the cement stabilized subgrade between lifts. If lifts are required, will the curing coat and curing time be required before the construction of the second lift?

The Section of 204.03 references states "When the Contract Documents specify subgrade compaction and drying to a depth greater than 12 inches (300 mm), manipulate the soil by plowing, dozing, or turning the soil to dry and compact to the specified depth." The contract documents specify "cement stabilized subgrade 14 inches deep" BUT does not show subgrade compaction and drying to a depth greater than 12 inches, therefore that paragraph of 204.03 does not apply. All other aspects of 204.03 per 206 apply. The contractor shall follow 206.5 for mixing, compacting and shaping of the soil.

Question Submitted: 4/2/2007

Question Number: 41

Our takeoff indicates that the plan quantities may be missing the parapet concrete for Bridges 1225L/R over Moots Run. Please verify the quantities.

The parapet quantities on the structure are included with the Item 511- - Reinforced Concrete Approach Slabs (T=15"), As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 4/2/2007

Question Number: 42

The excavation and embankment quantities on sheet 125 for Watkins-York sheet 597 appear to be wrong. Could these be reviewed and corrected if you agree?

Question Submitted: 4/2/2007

Question Number: 43

RE: Existing Pavement Composition. We submitted a permit requesting to take pavement cores of the existing pavement in order to determine its composition. Our request was denied and we were informed that the District has recently taken pavement cores. Please provide the findings of said pavement coring. This information is important to be able to provide an accurate bid for the pavement removal item.

Question Submitted: 4/2/2007

Question Number: 44

On Bridge 1255, the prebored hole bid item is for 90 lf at the abutments but there is a quantity of 750 lf of 12x53 piling installed in prebored holes at the abutments. Similarly, there is a quantity of 270 lf of prebored hole at the pier with no quantity set up for installing piles in prebored holes at the piers. Should the quantities for drilling and installing piling match at each location?

No. The Items for drilling and installing piling are different at the pier and abutment. The prebored holes at the rear abutment have a defined diameter and will be filled with grout to hold the piles in place. The piles will be set in the holes and braced until the grout has set. This is different than CMS requirements. The piles at the pier are to be prebored following the CMS requirements. The pier piles are driven in the prebored holes and thus are paid for with Item 507E00350 Steel Piles HP 14x73, Driven.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2007

Question Number: 45

Are "Stay in Place" Decking forms permissible on this Project. And if they are permissible are there any specifications required. Galvanized - 22 Gauge acceptable?

Stay in place forms will not be permitted.

Question Submitted: 4/4/2007

Question Number: 46

There will be a substantial amount of excavation required behind the MSE walls at Bridge 1255 to create the area for the Select Granular Embankment and safe layback. This does not appear to be accounted for in the roadway cross sections or the bid item for Wall Excavation. The new standards of SS840 typically give pay items for this excavation including a proper layback and quantities to backfill the excavation. Please clarify the material requirements and add items to cover this work. Also, we request that the closure duration for Outville Road be extended to 180 days due to the extra work required to excavate and backfill this large quantity of material that is not currently accounted for in the Department's quantities.

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: 4/4/2007

Question Number: 47

Will the bid items for the MSE Walls (panel area, excavation, and associated backfills) be modified in the field to reflect actual quantities based on the approved supplier shop drawings or will payment be based on the contract drawings regardless of the actual quantity installed?

The square foot area for the MSE wall will be measured from the design plans in accordance with Section 840.08. "... The Department will determine the area of the Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall from plan dimensions using a length measured along the outside of the uppermost facing panels and a height from the top of the concrete leveling pad to the top of the concrete coping. The Department will not adjust pay quantities for variations in the concrete leveling pad elevations required to accommodate actual panel placement." Pay items for MSE wall related excavation and associated backfill will be measured by the actual quantities installed or performed.

Question Submitted: 4/4/2007

Question Number: 48

Bridges 1225L/R only have a small amount of unclassified excavation set up for one of the four abutments. Per the note on sheet 1134, the abutment slopes must be constructed prior to the waiting period and then excavated back out for pile driving. There should be quantity added to perform this work. A logical solution would be to utilize similar construction as required by Addendum #3 which modified the note on sheet 1101 for Bridge 1175. This would eliminate the need for excavating embankment placed prior to the waiting period. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 4/9/2007

Question Number: 49

In reference to the question in Addendum #6 regarding when project 060150 will open, the answer given that the current completion date for 060150 is 11/14/08 and is subject to change is completely unfair to the bidders of the new project (070138). First, there is no way to schedule the new project without having a set date for opening of the current project. We can not base our bid on the uncertainties of when the adjoining project 'might' finish. Also, there is a tremendous amount of work to be completed once traffic is switched to the new Eastbound lanes in Phase 3, Stage 1. This switch can not be made until the West end of the Eastbound lanes is completed; which can not be built until after project 060150 opens. There is not enough time between 11/14/08 and the completion date to complete the project. Please provide a realistic answer to these issues which is fair to the bidders of 070138.

We reiterate our answer in Addendum #6 to the question regarding when project 060150 will open. Do not bid in reliance on the current completion date of 11/14/08 for project 060150. The awarded contractor on project 070138 will not be a third party beneficiary of project 060150.

Question Submitted: 4/9/2007

Question Number: 50

Please clarify the locations for the Embankment, Select Granular Embankment, and Select Granular Backfill bid items found in Bridges 1175 and 1255. The embankment item is shown on sheet 1131 behind the select granular zone, however it is not specified to be granular material. Since the bridge approach embankment is granular material, should this also be granular? The quantity for Select Granular Embankment is very small compared to Select Granular Backfill, however the MSE wall cross sections call out the reinforcing strap zone as Select Granular Embankment, not Select Granular Backfill. Assuming this area is to be paid for under Select Granular Backfill, where is the Select Granular Embankment to be placed? Also, the MSE wall cross sections show large areas of Item 203, Granular Material Type B to be paid for with the bridges and MSE walls, however there is no item to pay for it.

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.