

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 100281

Sale Date - 6/3/2010

Question Submitted: 4/20/2010

Question Number: 1

Is the noise barrier absorptive on both sides or one side? Is the absorptive finish below the cap and above the 3' base of panel?

The noise barriers specified as "absorptive" are required to be absorptive on the interstate face only. Yes, the absorptive finish is below the cap and above the 3' base of the panel.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2010

Question Number: 2

Is the design of the noise barrier based on the manufacturer standard or the ODOT standard?

There are two different types of noise barriers on this project: (1) ground mounted and (2) structure mounted. The ground mounted noise barrier follows the ODOT requirements for precast concrete noise barriers. The structure mounted noise barrier follows section 800 of the ODOT Bridge Design manual which lists approved suppliers.

Question Submitted: 4/23/2010

Question Number: 3

On sheet 980 of 1331 of the plans, the detail "Typical Wall Panel Elevation" shows the panel widths as either 5'-0" or 10'-0" and the height as 5'-0" for MSE panels. Often at the bottom and top of walls it is required to have shorter or taller panels to match the required height of wall. Also the width of the panels may be required to be narrower than 10' to match the overall wall lengths shown on the plans. Please consider changing the note to allow for varying panel widths and panel heights.

Per ODOT Supplemental Specification 840.04.A.10, the 5' and 10' dimensions are standard panel dimensions and special panel sizes may be utilized along the top and bottom of the wall, within the limits specified.

Question Submitted: 4/23/2010

Question Number: 4

Reference #233 & 234 Show up in the summary sheets and the proposal as two post sign supports. The elevation sheets show them to be single post. Please clarify.

The sign supports OH-8 and OH-9 should be single post as shown on the elevations.

Question Submitted: 4/23/2010

Question Number: 5

1. There are several places (sheet 76, 137, 141) that show access openings, but not according to the Plan Insert Sheet. Can the contractor use the access openings as shown on these sheets? 2. The bridge plans call for anchored barrier. Please add a bid item for the bridge mounted barrier if it is required. 3. There are multiple runs of portable concrete barrier that do not continue to the next sheet. (Sheet 85 - I-75 NB run, Sheet 90 - Ramp N-W on LT side, Sheet 81 - Should the run on sheet 80 and 88 connect, Sheet 140-141 - Ramp D5) 4. Phase 1 Subsummary: PCB quantity needs checked along with the Impact Attenuator quantity 5. For Phase 4, where do the runs of Portable Concrete Barrier start and stop on I-475? 6. What are the large quantities of temporary striping for in Phase 4 shown on Sheet 173 (13.16 miles of white edge line, 25.74 miles of lane line...)

see forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 6

Please provide the CADD files for this project

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/>

Question Submitted: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 7

Please add a Reference for Worksite Traffic Supervisor-29 months as per plan sheet 57.

This question was addressed in Addenda b, question 6.

Question Submitted: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 8

Plan sheet 200, Earthwork Summary, indicates that the quantity for Reference 26, Excavation, is 222,828 cy, but the proposal quantity is 193,988 cy. Please clarify which quantity is correct. Plan sheet 200, Earthwork Summary, indicates that the quantity for Reference 27, Embankment, is 138,177 cy, but the proposal quantity is 107,986 cy. Please clarify which quantity is correct.

We did not receive this question through prebid, however, Addenda 5 addresses this question.

Question Submitted: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 9

General Summary sheets 174 & 177 indicate that quantities for the earthwork, granular material, geogrid/geotextile, 304 and asphalt were derived from office calculations. Please make the office calculations for these items available.

We will post the calculations once received from the consultant.

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: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 10

Could the existing structure files be made available online?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/>

Question Submitted: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 11

Dear Sir / Maam On sheet 849 the structure mounted noise barrier is shown attached to the back face of a vertical parapet (flat backed) and the Notes state the design is based on the PARAGLAS SOUNDSTOP GS CC System. However, on sheet 865 Section A-A the parapet is shown with an aesthetic treatment as per Note 1. Will this aesthetic treatment be required where the posts attach to the parapet as it may affect the crashworthiness of the design? Thank you in advance for your help.

see forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 12

Could the department make the cadd/microstation files available for this project as well as any office calcs?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/>

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 13

A. Bridge LUC-475-1478C (Item 514 Paint) The painting procedure is inconsistent with the other girder bridges (excluding LUC-475-1550C) which specify that all three coats of paint to the entire fascia girders is to be applied in the shop. Please clarify. B. Bridge LUC-475-1550C (Item 514 Paint) (Special 51480020) The girders supplied are to widen an existing bridge.

1. Are the new girders specified Grade 50W or Grade 50? 2. Of the new girders are only the entire surface of fascia girders to be shop painted? 3. How many coats of shop paint are to be applied to the entire surface of the fascia girders?

We will answer Part A in an addenda. Here are the answers to Part B: 1. The plan note on Sheet 958 specifies all structural steel as Grade 50W. 2. Yes. 3. Only the prime coat is applied in the shop.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 14

The overhead sign support elevation views (pages 730 through 739) do not show walkway. However, the detail sheets (pages 749 through 759) do show walkway. Is the walkway required? Page 704 has a note about the finish on the overhead sign structures (powder coated). Is the material to be galvanized prior to the finish coat?

This question will require a future addenda.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 15

What is the required windload for the structure mounted noise barrier, 30psf?

Per BDM 805.2 Structure mounted = 30 psf.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 16

The locations and quantities for Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A called out on sheets 170 and 171 do not correspond with the Maintenance of Traffic sheets shown? Can we get the office calculations for this work?

We will post the calculations once received from the consultant.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 17

The note on sheet 871 states that the contractor shall determine the size of the wood lagging for the permanent Soldier Pile Walls. Since these are not temporary and are a part of the permanent construction, the Department should provide the wood lagging thickness based on the engineering calculations that they have already completed for the CIP facing. What lagging thickness should be used?

We will address this question with addenda 3.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 18

Please provide the plans from previous project LUC-475-14.53 that are referenced in the Soldier Pile Wall drawings.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/> Response sent 5-11-10.

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: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 19

Per RM 4.3 page 2/2 there is a note titled "Reinforced End Anchorage" this note lists everywhere an end anchorage is required. Based on this note end anchorages are required at expansion joints, and expansion joints are required at maximum of 800ft spacing in the barrier. Also expansion joints are required at Inlet No 3 for Single Slope Barriers (per I-2.1). Based on expansion joints being required in barrier per these ODOT Standards should their not be pay items for Reinforced End Anchorages for Type B1, Type C1, and Type D barrier? Please Clarify.

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 20

Will slipforming of the aesthetic parapets be allowed?

This will be addressed in addendum #2

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 21

Cross Sections on I-475 Eastbound and Westbound identify Item #204 - Excavation. The Proposal and the General Summary do not address Item 204 Excavation. Please clarify,

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 22

On sheet 57, for the relocation of overhead signage note there are several issues on how to maintain them. The trusses at 330+50 EB and 330+75 WB have noisewall along the outside shoulders, thus eliminating MT-105.10 for placement. For the trusses at stations 280+00 WB and 290+00 EB there is concern whether there is enough room to place all three signs on the ground and whether all of the signs need to be moved since they will no longer be overhead and therefore relevant.

The signage at STA 330+50 EB and 330+75 WB may be left side mounted in the median/work zone. Contrary to the question, the signage at STA 280+00 WB and 290+00 EB are still relevant. Reference the note on Sheet 57 of 1331 which references the MOT detail sheets – indicating “FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS, SEE SHEETS:” These details indicate which signs must be modified including covering arrows and additional signage components.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 23

1.) Regarding the sidewalk on the approach slab for Br. No. LUC-475-1527C, sheet 1040 of 1331 details 12 each - AS401 bars in the top reinforcing steel mat in the sidewalk. However, these bars are not included in the bar list provided for information only. Please add/revise by addendum. 2.) Please verify the concrete quantity for RN 546, QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC2, Superstructure (Deck), As Per Plan. The plan quantity is 500 CY, but our take off indicates 560 CY. 3.) Please verify the concrete quantity for RN 548, QC/QA Concrete, Class QSC2, Superstructure (Parapet). The plan quantity is 155 CY, but our take off indicates 48 CY. 4.) Please provide the elevation that the rear abutment piles are to be prebored to for RN 514, Prebored Holes.

1. The bars are not included in the bar list since standard drawing AS-1-81 is referenced on sheet 1039, but should be #4 straight bars, 29'-6" long. 2. The quantity has been verified – did the Contractor include sidewalk concrete? Reference the note at the bottom of the table on Sheet 1023 3. The quantity has been verified – see response to #2 above. 4. Reference the note on Sheet 1024 which stipulates the elevation (574.0).

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 24

The General Summary Sheet on page 177 of 1331 lists 4,060 LF of Curb, Type 6. The Roadway Quantity Subsummary on page 198 of 1331 only has a total of 3,578 LF, as broken down in the Subsummary. What is the correct bid amount?

The correct quantity is 4,060 LF of Curb, Type 6. The subsummary sheet (198) will be revised in addenda 5.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 25

The quantities of the Work Zone Increased Penalties Sign and Speed Limit sign appear to be overstated. Please verify that the quantities are correct.

The Work Zone Speed Limit sign quantity and Work Zone Increased Penalties sign quantity are correct as stated Reference the conditions stated for the Work Zone Speed Limit signs on Sheet 55, and the Work Zone Increased Penalties signs on Sheets 55 & 56, in addition to the MOT plan sheets.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 26

At the start of SPL Wall 003 (station 10+00.00), the CIP facing height is 7.18'. Per the typical section on sheet 902, this wall is buried 3.0' and then the Type D wall is 3.5' tall. This leaves 0.68' at the top of the wall, which is not enough room for the 2' cap detail. This same situation occurs on other retaining walls. What is the detail for this situation? Is the cap to vary in height to 'sit' on top of the barrier?

The barrier is intended to sit in front of the wall/coping and in the case where the wall height is less than 8.5 feet, the entire coping height will not be visible.

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: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 27

It appears that there are several locations on the job where guardrail hooks up to the end of Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type D. However, there is no Concrete Barrier End Section Type D pay item set up on this job. Should one be added?

The details and quantities for the concrete barrier end sections are included with Addenda 5.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 28

Typical Sections page 37 shows a barrier from station 259+61 to 264+35 on Central Ave. A note on page 37 designated by ** says the wall is 42" tall. However, in the quantity subsummary this quantity is added into the Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B1. Per the Standards B1 barrier is 57" tall. Is this wall shown on page 37 to be 42" tall, if so please add a pay item for Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B. ALSO, this run of wall transitions on each end to an impact attenuator as shown on pages 289 and 290, yet there is no Type B (or Type B1) end section bid item set up for this job. Please clarify.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 29

The quantity listed on page 193 for Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B1 for BR-7 from station 279+12 to 328+96 of 4983 If appears to be incorrect. This is straight line quantity from station to station, with no deductions made for Mainline Bridges, nor inlets, light pole foundations, and sign foundations (per RM 4.3 20ft is to be deducted at each inlet, 4ft at each light pole foundation, and 10ft at each sign foundation). The same thing seems to have been done with the Type C1 barrier and Type D barrier quantity. Please clarify.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 30

The detail on page 18 of the "Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type D, As Per Plan" shows a reinforced wall with a 9" thick footer. However when it is shown on the typical sections (call out # 31) it is depicted sitting on the leveling course of asphalt. Please clarify if this wall does have a footer, and if so, what the 9" footer sits on. Please note that the total build up of asphalt is 13.5" so a 9" footer would not extend to the bottom of the adjacent asphalt pavement.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 31

Based on hand takeoffs of the cross sections, it appears that the area cross-hatched for Item 206, Cement Stabilized Subgrade was included in the excavation quantity. Is it ODOT's intent for this section to be excavated per item 203? If so, dirt will need to be imported to perform the Item 206 work. Where should the cost for importing this dirt be included?

Cement Stabilized Subgrade has not been included in the Excavation quantity, but has been accounted for separately. The intent is to re-use the existing Subgrade, not to import borrow.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 32

Based on hand-takeoffs of the cross sections, it appears that the existing aggregate base and subbase removal (Sections B and E on existing typical sections) was not included in the excavation quantities. Thus, by default, it must be included with the pavement removal quantities (Bid Items 9 and 10). Per ODOT Spec 202.05, base is only to be removed under 202 if called for in the plans, which it is currently not. Is it ODOT's intent to remove the base and subbase as 202 Pavement Removed? If not, please add the base quantity to the 203 excavation quantity.

The removal of the existing aggregate base and existing subbase has been included in the Excavation Quantity.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 33

Please provide more details for the noisewall removal item: 1. Please post the plans for these walls on-line. 2. What are the removal limits? Do the posts and/or foundations need to be removed to a specific depth or limit? 3. Can any elements of these walls be re-used on this project?

1. The plans are available on the website. 2. The removal limits are listed on sheet 850 of the plan. Addenda 6 will address the depth. 3. Not for this project. They are online here: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/>

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 34

Per plan sheet 1255/1331, temporary sheeting for Structure No. LUC-475-1618R shall be paid under Item 503 - Cofferdams, Cribbs, and Sheeting, As Per Plan. The sheeting description on the MSE wall plan view on plan sheet 1282/1331 states that sheeting between the existing and new abutments shall be left in place. Please verify if the sheeting is temporary or permanent. If permanent, please add the appropriate bid item. Reference number 755 for this structure is not specified with an as per plan designation.

See forthcoming 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: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 35

The bar schedule on sheet 1252 of 1331 appears to be way short and might only include the fanned areas of the approach slab. Could this be cleared up as the rebar is incidental to the approach and this bar schedule could be very misleading?

The design sheet is correct according to ODOT Standard Drawing AS-1-81. Please see sheet 1245, note 4 for a reference to AS-1-81 regarding detailing of the remaining reinforcing steel.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 36

The quantity of Curb Removed set up in the General Summary is 21,535 FT. However, the subsummary on Sheet 192 gives a quantity of 21,751 FT. Please clarify which quantity is correct.

The general summary quantity of 21,535 FT is correct. The subsummary sheet (192) will be revised in addenda 5.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 37

1. Plan sheet 456 - 460 WB IR 475 cross sections show noise barrier # 3 further left of centerline than the noise barrier schematic plan baseline geometry provided on plan sheet 847 and 857. Please verify which location is correct. 2. If the noise barrier geometry on plan sheet 847 is correct, then there may be drainage concerns at the RCP slope outfall at STA 330+54. All surface drainage from STA 325+00 +/- to the outfall will drain to the face of the noise wall.

We will address by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 38

ON structure number 1602-R where is the retaining wall and moment slab to be paid? If it is to be paid as abutment the stated quantity is not enough. Please either create a new bid item or revise the abutment concrete quantity under reference # 749.

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 39

1. Phase 2 drainage from Ramp D1 to I-475 285+00 +/- drains into the proposed 36" conduit that runs across 475. This pipe can not be completed until phase 3. Should this pipe be Bored and Jacked? 2. The 48" conduit at Station 358+70 N-W is listed under both the type A and type B conduit bid items, which one is correct? Also there are two different quantities for this headwall, which one is correct? Please adjust the bid quantities accordingly. 3. Bid Item # 126 MH reconstructed to Grade, APP appears to be understated. Please verify that the quantity is correct.

1. Yes - quantity revised in addenda 72. Extension of existing culvert - correct item is Type a, correct masonry quantity is 8.2. Addenda 5 has these changes. 3. See the addenda revisions for sheets 176, 209, 210, and 214.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 40

During the pre-bid meeting it was mentioned that the temporary pavement in the I475 median would be non-performed, and that instead the rumble strip would be removed and paved. Reviewing the office calc's posted this morning, we did not see any reference to the temporary pavement. Our scaled take offs from the plan sheets don't match the temporary pavement bid quantities. Are there changes and or more information coming for the temporary pavement?

See forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 41

The project completion date is currently specified at November 12, 2012. Based on our CPM bid schedule, we do not believe the current completion date is realistic. The work is highly phased with several constraints that must be complied with including time allotted for settlement in various locations, waterline relocation restrictions along Upton Avenue, and limitations on night work. A completion date of fall, 2013 is more accurate. Please review.

Answered in Addenda d, question 7.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 42

Please provide a shoring design and basis of payment for the temporary walls that will be required to make the initial abutment excavations at Bridge 1538C prior to building the permanent and temporary MSE walls. This information was provided for the other structures, but left out on this bridge.

There is not an intent for the Contractor to provide any shoring other than the temporary MSE walls as called out in the plans. The basis for payment is indicated in Note 8 on Sheet 1076 of 1331. The design information for the MSE wall is indicated on the same Sheet.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 43

Plan sheet 690 indicates that the City of Toledo will install the 8" gate valve at Westland Sta 15+36, 3.00'LT. The plan quantity for 8" gate valves is 3 ea. If the City installs this valve, the plan quantity should be reduced. Please clarify the number of 8" gate valves the contractor is to install.

Answered in Addenda d, question 5.

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: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 44

How is the pavement removal and pavement replacement for the waterline and sanitary sewer installation paid for?

The quantities for the pipe work are included in the pavement quantities.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 45

Please check the units for Ref. 150 8" Concrete Traffic Island. It appears from the takeoff that the unit of CY should really be SY. Please verify.

see forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 46

Please verify the quantity of Ref. 146 Combination Curb & Gutter, Type 2. The General Summary has 4161' but the Roadway Quantity Subsummary has 4643'.

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 47

Cross Sections, sheet #543 thru 546, call out Item 204 - Geotextile Fabric, As Per Plan. In reviewing the General Summary, I can not find Item #204 - Geotextile Fabric, As Per Plan, please clarify. If this is meant to be Item #57 - Geotextile Fabric (client #690E12010) as referenced on the General Summary, page 174/1331, noted Special, page 47/1331, is the Granular Material identified by the special note incidental to the Fabric or will it be paid for separately under Items 30 - Granular Material, Type C and/or 31 - Granular Material, Type D?

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 48

Based on preliminary calculations at the rear abutment of bridge 1618R, we are calculating a max applied bearing pressures (static) of 6700 psf. Per the drawings for that wall, the max allowable bearing pressure undrained is 4156psf and 11,400 psf drained. Is the 6700 psf allowable in the undrained condition? The geotechnical engineer should be aware that the adequacy of the undrained foundation soil will have to be confirmed.

Answered in Addenda d, question 8.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 49

There is a noise barrier on top of Wall 005. What are the loads imparted on Wall 005 by the noise barrier?

75 #/ft was used for the weight of the noise barrier (including posts). This is the load to the parapet, which sits on the moment slab. The weight of the parapet and moment slab will need to be added to the weight of the noise barrier to get the total load to the wall SYSTEM. We assume that the question does not pertain to the load to the wall panel, which theoretically does not receive the loading from the parapet/moment slab.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 50

There are layers of reinforcement shown in the abutment backwalls and abutment footings at the MSE retaining walls. Please provide the horizontal loads for each structure so these reinforcement layers can be calculated and determined.

Please see the note and table on Sheet 959 of 1331.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 51

Please look at replacing work zone temporary tape with temporary paint for the ref numbers 347-355. This project being that it is a multiple year project would be better served to have paint than tape through the winter months. If any of the work zone markings that are placed on a surface that will not be replaced, removal of the painted lines can be done by waterblasting.

Please bid per plan details and quantities.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 52

Are pile points required at any bridge locations? If so, please add bid items for this work.

Pile points are not required. The BDM requires piles when H-piles are driven onto strong bedrock not to bedrock. In this case, the borings show weathered bedrock, then strong bedrock below the depth of the piles.. The note labeled "Piles to Bedrock" also confirms that piles will only be driven "to" strong bedrock.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 53

Cross Sections, sheet 328/1331 thru 331/1331 calls out a Granular Material Type E. I cannot find a bid item covering this item of work, please clarify.

See forthcoming 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: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 54

For the MSE walls at Promedica Parkway where is the porous backfill in the 1' x 1' squares to be paid?

In accordance with SS 840 which is referenced in the plans on General Notes Sheet 942, Section 840.08, "The Department will not measure the backfill or filter fabric for the drainage pipe for payment. Include this cost in the drainage pipe."

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 55

The plans and specifications for Item 633 Controller Unit, Type TS2/A2 with Cabinet Type TS2, As Per Plan (Item 305) does not include provisions for a fiber optic termination panel, fiber optic data modem, fiber optic patch cords or other accessories as needed to complete the fiber optic communication system. Are these items to be included with the controller or bid as separate pay items?

The plans are correct.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 56

Project #100281 - PID #77255 Section 0007 (0163) 625E10481 is listed as 15 "Light pole, decorative, as per plan, Design 8B16.5(WT: 43)". The drawing shows the curved pole but lists two different radius, R17 and R75. The last project that we did in Toledo had some of each and if that is the case we need to know how many of each there will be? Or are all 15 are one radius, which one is needed? Thank you. Steve Howells

Please see the transverse section detail on each bridge. For example for LUC-475-1478C (Sherbrooke over IR475) sheet 1008 of 1331 shows a R=17' for this bridge.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2010

Question Number: 57

I would like to get some clarifications on Bid Ref 225-239.1) Plan Pages 750 & 751 have charts determining the post type. In the charts on the left, they referencing the span length & heights, the post types are numbered 1-5. The smaller charts on the right, according to note 8 and note 13, respectfully, should match up to those numbers. All are marked with asterisks, and there are multiple pipe sizes for types 1 & 2 and no pipe sizes for 4, 5 or 6. Please clarify the intent of how to determine the upright "post" size.2) Note 3 on page 750 & note 4 on page 751 state that "all mast arms" are standard pipe. I assume this means the same diameter pipe as the post (once that is determined) & std schedule (3/8" wall for 20", 24" & 30" pipe). Please verify.3) The details for the structures on pages 749-752 all shown walkways. None of the elevation views show walkways. Please verify no walkways are required for these structures. If they are, please verify details.4) Note 6 on page 750 and note 8 on page 751 refers to Standard Plan ES-15C. Where can this Standard Plan ES-15C be found?5) On plan page 755 and 756, note 1 refers to Standard Plan S-35. Where can this Standard Plan S-35 be found? Also on the same pages, The Post Type No refer to an asterisks instead of a roman numeral. Please confirm which post types go with which foundation. Thank you.

1. We will address this question by addenda.2. Regarding note 3 on page 750 & note 4 on page 751, the same diameter pipe and standard schedule are correct.3. No walkways are to be provided.4. We will address this question by addenda.5. We will address this question by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2010

Question Number: 58

Please provide the typical sections for the existing pavement to be removed for Ramps U-1, U-2, 5-A, 5-B, NC-2 and NC-4.

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2010

Question Number: 59

Overhead Tubular Signs reference the pipe material to have a 52,000 psi min. yield. Is a particular pipe spec needed or as long as it meets the 52,000 psi rating?

The sign supports also require the CMS 630 specification except as amended by the plans.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2010

Question Number: 60

The specification for Dynamic Load Tests states that a minimum of two piles should be tested. On Bridge 1538L, a quantity of 1 each has been established. Is the contractor only testing 1 pile at this bridge or should the quantity be revised? Please also clarify for any other structures with similar quantities.

The quantity revisions are in Addenda 7

Question Submitted: 5/14/2010

Question Number: 61

Reviewing the pavement calculations, there seems to be some missing quantities. Please review Upton Ave., Promedica Parkway, and Sherbrook Rd.

1. The Upton Typical Section from 6+28 to 10+70 indicates 9" Reinforced Concrete Pavement.2. The intersection of Promedica and Upton was measured in CADD and has been included in the overall quantity. 3. The Sherbrooke Typical Section is 9" Reinforced Concrete Pavement.

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: 5/14/2010

Question Number: 62

The pile bearing values for bridge 1550C on sheets 959 and 1124-1125 are in conflict. What is the correct bearing value for these piles?

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2010

Question Number: 63

The pile bearing values for bridge 1602R on sheets 959 and 1202 are in conflict. What is the correct value for this structure?

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/14/2010

Question Number: 64

Please provide the typical sections for the existing pavements to be removed that are indicated on plan sheets 306 & 307.

Answered in Addenda d, question 3.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2010

Question Number: 65

Where are the pier beam seat elevations given for Bridge 1602L?

The pier beam seat elevations for LUC-475-1602L are detailed on sheet 1177 of 1331.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2010

Question Number: 66

On page 37 the normal section of Upton Ave from 6+28 to 10+70 (442ft) shows full width 9" Reinforced Concrete Pavement (call out bubble # 22). Based on looking at the "Office Calculations" provided on ODOT's web site the total roadway area of Upton Road from 6+28 to 10+70 is 30,622 sf (3,402 sy). In this area of Upton Ave the office calcs has 567 sy of 6" Aggregate Base (which appears correct), but it also has 969 cy of 10.25" Asphalt Base, 165 cy of 1.75" Asphalt intermediate course, NO surface course, and 851 sy of 9" Reinforced Concrete Pavment. We can not tell from the typical on page 37, the plan view of Upton Road on page 298, and from the "office calc's" what is actually happening with the pavement on Upton Ave from 6+28 to 10+70. Please provide clarification and/or additional information so we can bid these items.

The Upton pavement in that area should be concrete as shown in the Typical Section on Sheet 37. The quantities for 6" Aggregate Base (567 CY) and 9" Reinforced Concrete Pavement (3402 SY) have been revised in the Subsummary and General Summary sheets in Addenda 5.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2010

Question Number: 67

Page 224 (plan view of IR 475) shows the Median Barrier Replacement starting at 267+00. However, the quantities on page 193 include Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type C1 starting at 258+30. In other words there is 870 ft of C1 wall that is included in the barrier quantities that is showing on the plan view on page 223 and 224 as "Ex. Barrier (To Remain)". Please clarify.

Please see addenda 5 for clarification.

Question Submitted: 5/15/2010

Question Number: 68

Bid Item # 23, Fill & Plug Existing Conduit, has a total of 5,897 LF. There is a breakdown for the pipe runs on Plan Sheets 681 and 695 but the 2,748 LF shown on Plan Sheet 47 does not have a pipe size, number of runs or pipe depths. Can you supply this information on the size of pipe, number of locations and depth of pipe.

The quantity on Sheet 47 is for existing storm sewers that are to be abandoned. Please reference the plan and profile sheets and cross sections for pipe lengths, diameters, types and depths.

Question Submitted: 5/16/2010

Question Number: 69

The structure mounted noise barrier details for Walls 2&4 shown on plan sheets 848 and 849 do NOT give standard post spacing. The contractor has searched through all associated plan sheets and cannot find anything detailing what the post spacing shall be for the structure mounted barrier. Is it the department's intent for the wall designer to provide the post spacing? Please advise.

It is our intent that the spacing be provided by the fabricator/supplier since provisions for alternate barrier systems to be bid have been included in the plans and the spacing may vary by system.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2010

Question Number: 70

Subject: Central Ave bridge underdeck lighting, are the mounting brackets to be furnished under the lighting? If so would the department provide a design for these brackets. Also the power service for the underdeck lighting needs to be designed. please submit materials needed for this item.

We will address this question by addenda.

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: 5/17/2010

Question Number: 71

If SIP deck forms are used, will the department still calculate the theoretical haunch angles for payment or will the new deck cross section be used as the method of measurement?

The theoretical haunch angles shown in the plan will be used for payment.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2010

Question Number: 72

On reference Item #122 is it the intent of the department to install a new section of 102" pipe for the Manhole #4 as shown in the standard drawing MH-2.1, or is it the intent to tie into the existing pipe with the 48" riser sections, if so should this item be MH #4, APP?

The intent is that the manhole be installed as specified in Standard Drawing MH 2.1.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2010

Question Number: 73

During the prebid meeting, it was discussed that cores were taken on the existing pavement. Is the core information available? The cores should provide an idea of the pavement sections that will be removed.

Core data obtained by the Department on the inside shoulders and the abandoned local streets in the Promedica interchange area have been uploaded to the server. Other pavement data can be obtained from the geotechnical sheets included in the plan and from the old plan data, also available on the server.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2010

Question Number: 74

The footing length dimensions on sheets 1210-1212 do not make sense. The overall length is listed as 277'-4.25". The Phase 3 dimension is shown as 224'-1.125" and the Phase 2 dimension is 87'-6.375". This would give a total length of 311'-7.5". What are the correct dimensions for this abutment?

The changes will be included with addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 75

Addendum #2, Answers 2A and 3A state that they include sheet changes, however none are provided.

**The contractors can go to the following address to access the Addenda 1 plan sheet changes:
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/> Plan sheets 1002, 1003, 1015, 1027, 1103, 1105, 1110, and 1111 were revised with addenda 1.**

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 76

Why do we need Railroad Protective Public Liability Insurance, Line Item # 0799, for this project since Structure # 1475C is replaced as a Shared Use Path for Pedestrians? It seems that this item should be removed by Addendum to save unneeded costs to the Project.

We will address this question with an addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 77

No painting references or direction is given on Structure Number 1602-R. What is the desired painting to be done to this bridge and can a bid item and or items be created for this?

The quantities are correct on the plan. No painting is preferred on 1602-R.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 78

I have several questions. 1. What is the design wind speed for this project? 2. What is the wind exposure category for this project? 3. We are bidding metal sound panels as an alternative to the concrete panels, on sheet 870, Note 2 indicates that the neighborhood side of the panel is to have a random ashlar pattern, what would be the requirements for finish of a metal sound wall? Kind regards, Sean Iliff Customer Service and Sales Empire Acoustical Systems 1106 S. Mays Suite 240 Round Rock, Texas 78664 Ph: 512-828-3138 Fax: 512-233-1757

1. and 2. Please see Standard drawing NBS-1-09 dated 7-17-09. 3. The requirement for all wall types on the neighborhood side is Random Ashlar Pattern. The aesthetics for this project were selected by a lengthy community process. For more information go to www.improvingyourride.com.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 79

Addendum 2 specifies Item 690 Special Misc. Trackless Tack. Does the Department have a list of certified manufacturers for the material?

Try, Blacklidge Emulsions or Meredith Bros. or equal.

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: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 80

The MOT note on sheet 59/1331 states that the surface course of asphalt will be installed during Phase 4, with night time lane closures. This note contradicts the MOT typical sections on sheets 50-53 of 1331, which show the asphalt surface course being installed during each phase. The night time lane closure note on sheet 59/1331 also contradicts the construction noise note on sheet 45/1331. Please clarify the Phases and the allowable hours of work, for the installation of the asphalt surface course.

Please see addenda 5 which addresses these issues.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 81

In Addendum #2 the department changed the aesthetic parapet to a non-aesthetic parapet for all of the locations where noise wall is attached to the parapet. Will the department desire the standard straight faced parapet or the job-like curved parapet without the rustication grooves? If the straight faced parapet is desired which seems to make more sense for the noise wall connection the quantity should change. Will the contractor be required to hand set this parapet?

We will clarify the intent by note in Addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 82

For structure 1538C, sheet 1046 refers to Phase 1 and 2 Construction while the rest of the sheets for this bridge refer to Phase 2 and 3 Construction. What Stages are this bridge constructed in?

This question was addressed by the sheet revisions in Addenda 3 (labeled with the #5 triangle).

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 83

There are no bid items for SGB Inspection and Compaction Testing set up for Retaining Walls #5 & #7. Are these costs to be included in another item, or is ODOT handling the testing of the SGB for these 2 walls?

Per SS 840, Section 840.09 – Basis of Payment, “The Department will pay for all of the work described in 840.03.G and 840.06.D under Foundation preparation. The Department will pay lump sum Select Granular Backfill (SGB) Inspection and Compaction Testing as follows: Upon approval of the project personnel 10%, Uniform Progress Payments 80%, Wall Completion 10%”. The last paragraph of 840.03.D describes the requirements for the testing of the SGB. Both Walls 005 and 007 include pay items for Item 840, Foundation Preparation.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 84

Original Question: Addendum #2, Answers 2A and 3A state that they include sheet changes, however none are provided. Question Submitted: 5/18/2010 ODOT's Answer: The contractors can go to the following address to access the Addenda 1 plan sheet changes: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/> Plan sheets 1002, 1003, 1015, 1027, 1103, 1105, 1110, and 1111 were revised with addenda 1. The revised plan sheets on the site above does not include changes from Answer 2A in addendum #2 which was Phase 1 quantity changes, sheet 170. The revised plan sheets do not include changes from Answer 3A in addendum #2 which states Phase 4, Portable Concrete Barrier has been better detailed with sheet changes.

We will better address these issues in Addenda 4.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 85

Plan sheet 943 gives consolidation periods for embankments at various locations on the project. The chart gives both minimum and maximum consolidation periods. Note 7 gives some “what-if” situations which affect the consolidation periods in relation to the schedule. Which (maximum or minimum) consolidation period are we to base our bid upon?

The contractor per note 7 will be required to wait the “max” time listed in the table. As stated “The 90% consolidation number is based on the maximum number listed in the table for estimated total settlement”. If 90% consolidation occurs before this time and ODOT reviews and confirms the consolidation measurements, the waiting time can be waived.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 86

1. Phase 1 sub-summary calls for 50" barrier. Shouldn't Phase 1 be all 32"? 2. Should Phase 2 have some 32" PCB with Glare Screen in the median? If so, please add the bid item. 3. Are Work Zone Raised Pavement Markers required? If so, please add a bid item with a takeoff sub-summary.

1. Will be addressed by addenda. 2. A glare screen is not required. 3. Will be addressed by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 87

Earthwork Quantities - In reviewing the cross sections for I-475 westbound, the cross sections indicate work starting at station 261+00. In reviewing the office calculation for this location, earthwork volume is summarized from station 267+00. Which beginning station is correct?

The office calculations are correct. For more information on the difference see the addenda 5 changes to MOT.

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: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 88

The current prebid questions state that an answer would be given to whether the aesthetic barrier wall would be allowed to be slipformed in addendum #2; however, an answer was not given to this question in addendum #2. Could the department provide the answer in the next upcoming addendum?

This question was addressed in Addenda #3, Question 9.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 89

The Maintenance of Traffic Drawings, Phase 1 and 3 define "Contractor Access Locations in the Portable Concrete Barrier. The Phase 2 Maintenance of Traffic Plans do not define "Contractor Access Locations in the Portable Concrete Barrier. Will the contractor be allowed "Contractor Access Locations" in the Portable Concrete Barrier in the Phase 2 work?

Yes, the contractor may select construction access points with the approval of the engineers according to plan sheet 63.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 90

The quantities of the 6" Shallow Pipe Underdrain appears to be overstated while the quantities for the 6" Deep and 6" Base Underdrains appears to be understated. Please verify that the these quantities are correct.

Adjustments to the underdrain quantities are included in addenda 5.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 91

Will drilling & grouting of anchor bolts into the parapets for noisewall and fence installation be allowed or must these be cast in place?

For the noisewall, as noted on plan sheet 849 of 1331, the manufacturer is to supply these details. For the fence, the installation procedure is included on sheet 971 of 1331.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 92

Please review the quantity for Ref 102 48" Conduit, Type A. This appears to be included with Ref. 103 48" Conduit, Type B. Ref. 102 should be deleted.

Answered in Addenda e, question 14.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 93

1) The quantity of Granular Material, Type B on Sherbrooke appears to be overstated. The office calculations show the material being calculated through the length of the bridge. 2) There does not appear to be any quantities for Pavement Removal, Subgrade Compaction, or Aggregate Base included for driveways on side streets. The only place that addresses driveway quantities is sheet 658, and none of the above items are on that sheet. Is this correct?

1. The Type B quantity is being revised by addenda. 2. Per the L&D, Aggregate Base is not required for driveways. The quantities for Subgrade Compaction and Pavement Removal will be revised by addenda. Answered in Addenda f, question 6. Email response sent 5-24-10

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 94

Sheets 1120-1121 only show the right bridge at 1550C being constructed in two phases. However the abutment, deck, diaphragm, and approach slab details have 2 construction joints in this structure. What phasing is required for this bridge?

Sheets 1120-112: Phases 2 & 3 but Phase 2 is on the outside, Phase 3 inside. There are 2 phases and 2 joints.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 95

At the prebid meeting, the Department stated that MOT changes were going to be implemented for phase 1. The changes included using the existing shoulders and milling and replacing the rumble strip. It does not appear that anything has been addressed in addendum 1 or 2. Several quantities would be affected by this change including portable concrete barrier, asphalt items, pavement for maintaining traffic, temporary striping, etc. This change would be significant to the scope and schedule. Please address as soon as possible.

The District office is currently revising the details of these plan sheets.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 96

The concrete facing quantity for Retaining Wall 008, reference number 448 is listed as 207 CY. Our takeoffs indicate that the quantity is overstated by approximately 15%. Please verify that this quantity is correct.

The concrete facing quantity has been verified and is correct as stated in the plans.

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: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 97

Where is the cost for the 4" of compacted clay on Retaining Wall 004 (detail on sheet 920) to be included? At the Upton Bridge, it is included with the bridge. However, there are no notes with Retaining Wall 004 that make it incidental.

Please refer to the cross sections. For example sheet 331 shows end area cut and fill quantities for the proposed final grade.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 98

1.) There are proposed pipe runs that are called out to have the existing pavement repaired. How is this pavement repair to be paid? Please provide details of the pavement repair. 2.) Is the 2748 l.f. of Fill and Plug Existing Conduit noted on sheet #47 to be used for existing storm sewers that are called out to be "TBA" on the plans? 3.) What is the material type of the existing 30" waterline?

1. The pavement repairs for proposed pipe runs are included in pavement quantities. Use the Promedica typical section (Sheet 39) for an example of pavement details. 2. Yes, the quantity, however, was revised to 2913 FT. 3. Concrete

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 99

The structure removal note on Sheet 958 makes a blanket statement that the use of hoe-rams will not be permitted. This does not make sense for portions of structures that are to be completely removed. Will the contractor be allowed to use hoerams on portions that are not connected to concrete that is being re-used?

We will address this question by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 100

The existing beam seat elevations for Piers 1-3 on Structure 1550C given on Sht 1135/1331 are 1' lower than the elevations given in the existing drawings. Please advise.

There is a 1' change in datum. See the note on sheet 1117.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 101

The Utility Note does mentions the First Energy Transmission line that crosses I-475 on an angle from 282+80 to 285+31 (there appears to be a typo in the 4A note). The note does not mention the overhead transmission line that runs parallel to the Shared Use Path from the same tower at 282+80, 154' left. Both of these lines will need to be de-energized during removal of the existing bridge and construction of the new. What are the outage periods allowed on both of these lines?

We will address the additional overhead transmission line by addenda. As discussed in the prebid meeting, however, these power lines will remain energized throughout the project since they feed Toledo Hospital.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 102

On Bid Item 155 the quantity of 756 LF covers the 8" ductile water line, is the polyethylene encasement for the 30" ductile water line incidental to the water line or will the bid quantity for the polyethylene encasement be increase to cover the 30" line?

Answered in Addenda f, question 9.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 103

The concrete barrier wall B1, C1, and D do not subtract for lightpole foundations and barrier inlet sections. Please review and correct the quantity. The C1 wall is stated as starting at station 258+30 whereas on plan sheet 224 it shows the wall starting at station 267+00 and the wall before this to remain. Consequently new lightpoles are show all the way to station 258+30. One of these is incorrect. Near station 342+00 the C1 wall must stop as the wall splits and D wall should start; however, the takeoff on sheet 193 shows the C1 wall continueing to station 344+66.71 please review and correct if necessary?

We will be addressing this question by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 104

We request that ODOT publish both the question and answer in addenda for this and all projects. It is very difficult to match up the questions with the answers in the format given in Addendum #2. Even the ODOT staff are making mistakes with it, for example Addendum #2 Question 8Q states that it was submitted on 05/11/2010 @ 12:58:34 PM. However the answer (8A) deals with aesthetic treatment on the back of parapets while the referenced question is for cofferdams. Answering the questions in this manner is causing mistakes and will open the state up for potential claims and litigation after the project is awarded.

No response required

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 105

The answer provided on the website to the question submitted on 05/11/2010 @ 8:03:27 AM is confusing. Does plan sheet 1252 depict all of the rebar required for this approach slab or is this chart for rebar that is additional to AS-1-81?

Plan sheet 1252 supplements standard drawing AS-1-81.

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: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 106

The answer provided on the website to the question submitted on 05/12/2010 @ 4:41:29 PM states that no shoring is intended at Bridge 1538C other than the temporary MSE walls. If no other shoring is provided, then how does the contractor make the excavation shown in Section A-A on sheet 1076 that appears to undermine the existing abutment? This excavation would also leave the maintained roadway next to the work area un-supported. As currently stated, ODOT has told the contractors not to include any thing except the temporary MSE walls. Please revisit this answer and provide further clarification if deemed necessary.

Addressed by addendum

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 107

The answer to the question submitted 5/19/2010 at 1:50:46 PM does not appear to be correct. SS 840, Section 840.09 sentence one describes basis of payment for foundation preparation. Sentence two describes the basis of payment for the lump sum SGB inspection and compaction testing. The answer then references 840.03.D which describes the material requirements for the facing panel joint cover fabric. Structure No. LUC-475-1527C (Ref 0545), LUC-475-1538C (Ref 0588), and LUC-475-1618R (Ref 0784) all specify the appropriate SGB Inspection and Compaction Testing bid item for SS 840 MSE Wall work. Retaining Wall 005 and 007 do not include the SGB Inspection and Compaction Testing bid item as indicated in the original question. Please provide the appropriate bid items or clarify payment requirement with as as per plan designation. Without these items, testing is not required by the contractor and a claim will most likely result.

The addition of the sheeting wall will be included in Addenda 7 revisions to Sheet 1046, 1076, and addition of Sheet 1046A.. The Wall 5 and 7 issues were covered by the revisions to sheets 946 and 953 in Addenda 6.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 108

The plans currently specify an outdated version of SS840. Will the Department update the required version of SS840 to the Active version dated 07/17/09?

No, use SS840 dated 1-16-09.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 109

The MSE wall plans show a backslope excavation of 1:1. If the soils do not permit the slope to be cut this steeply, how will the Department compensate the contractor for the additional Wall Excavation and Select Granular Backfill to perform the work safely and effectively?

The MSE walls including the following locations: Wall 5, Wall 7, 1527C, 1538C, 1538L, 1541C, 1618R, - will be constructed generally as a fill. This question does not appear to be valid. The material that will be place will be the responsibility of the contractor. Please refer to the geotechnical sheets in the plan to determine soil conditions.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 110

Retaining wall 005 typical section shows a drainage structure inside the limits of the moment slab and parapet. The plan and profile sheet for area shows three Inlet, No. 3 w/Single Slope Barrier, Type D are specified in this area. There does not appear to be any special wall details to accommodate the void in the moment slab caused by the drainage structures. The parapet in these locations will have a noise wall attached to it. Please review.

This question was addressed with sheet changes to 946 and 953 in the addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2010

Question Number: 111

Addendum #2 added 32" Bridge Mounted PCB in the MOT sub-summary however no bid item was added.

This item is in Addenda 5.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2010

Question Number: 112

Could ODOT please post the temporary pavement office calculations on the FTP website? The quantities are difficult to derive based on the given MOT Subsummary and MOT plan sheets.

ODOT does not have calculations for these areas. The quantities were based on CAD measurements.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2010

Question Number: 113

The Subgrade Compaction quantity for Ramp S-W appears to be in error. Based on the Office Calculations, the Cement Stabilized SG area for this ramp is significantly greater than the Aggregate Base area for the ramp. Since the Subgrade Compaction was calculated by subtracting the Cement Stabilized SG area from the Aggregate Base area, this results in a negative SG Compaction area. Please revise this quantity.

Subgrade compaction was calculated using the overall project quantities for aggregate base area and cement stabilization area. Overall, the aggregate base area for the project is greater than the cement stabilization area.

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: 5/21/2010

Question Number: 114

Based on the Office Calculations, there is a quantity of 14073 sy of Subgrade Compaction for I-475 both EB and WB. Also, based on the earthwork office calculations, it appears that the median (7"-10" wide) for both EB and WB does not receive cement stabilization, nor is it undercut. Is this correct? Is the above SGC quantity intended to be used in the I-475 median?

We will address this question by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/22/2010

Question Number: 115

Much of the Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type D is poured directly against retaining walls. Is expansion joint material to be installed between the Type D barrier wall and the retaining wall in these areas? If so, please clarify what thickness of expansion material and which item its cost is to be included in.

No, expansion joint material is not required.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 116

For the Cofferdams, Cribbs, & Sheeting, APP items established at bridges 1602L and 1602R, there are plan notes regarding the abutment phase line sheeting. However, there is no mention in the plans of shoring requirements to construct the piers in the river. Since the Department has provided design details for the abutments but has failed to mention the pier and per 503.10, the contractor is not obligated to include CC&S incidental to the excavation since a pay item has been established; there is no obligation for the contractor to include shoring at the piers which could lead to a large change order on the project. Please address this issue by addendum. Where is shoring required to construct the piers to be included?

General plan sheets revised by addenda (sheets 1167 and 1197) address this question.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 117

This question is regarding the elevation of the top of coping of MSE walls with respect to the bottom of the pile cap. As per Sheet 1020, 1045, 1079, 1098 and 1253 of the contract drawings as well as the corresponding bridge and MSE details, the top of the coping is set at 3-ft. above the bottom of the pile cap. This will result in significant conflict between the top row of reinforcing elements and the pile cap. As per Figure 303.5.1-4 of the Bridge Design Manual, the top of coping is set at 1-ft. above the bottom of the pile cap. We request that at bridge abutments, the top of the coping shall be set at 1-ft. above the bottom of the pile cap.

The design is correct. The District requires this configuration in order to perform required inspections on the bridges and the MSE walls.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 118

1. One of the pre-bid questions submitted on 4/29/10 regarding bridge painting asked how many shop coats of paint were required for Bridge LUC-475-1550C. The posted answer is confusing, as it states that only the prime coat is applied in the shop, which contradicts bid item #663. Is it ODOT's intent that since the existing steel is being painted anyway, that the new steel can also be field painted? If so, a revision to Ref. 663 should be made. 2. Would any of the other bridges be allowed to be field painted, particularly ones that are not over traffic? 3. Addendum #4 revised bridge 1478C from field paint to shop paint. A revision was made to Ref. 484 to indicate this change, however, if field painting is not an option, then Ref. 485 and 486 should be eliminated in the process.

1. The new steel will be prime shop painted. 2. The current plans detail ODOT's requirements. 3. Reference Items 485 and 486 have been removed from the project in Addenda 6.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 119

What are the elevations of the First Energy Transmission lines around Bridge 1475C? What are the voltages for the First Energy Transmission lines?

Please call First Energy. We do not have exact data on their lines. The contact information can be found in the plans.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 120

1.) On Pg. 784 Quantities call for 3" conduit. On Pg. 792, 807 & 808. plans call for 2" conduit. Please verify. 2.) On Pg 810 the underpass lighting calls for a control system but no further information is given?

The summary description is correct. A 3" conduit will need to be installed.

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: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 121

On page 193 there are 2 runs of Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type D listed that conflict with the typical sections on page 34. The 2 runs are Ref# BR-15 on Ramp D-4 Sta 314+02 - 315+44 Lt (141 ft) and Ref # BR-17 on Ramp D-4 Sta 317+34 - 319+15 Lt (181 ft). If you look at typical sections on page 34 both of these walls are shown as Moment Slabs with Noise Wall attached, not Type D barrier. This moment slab from 317+34 - 319+15 Lt on Ramp D-4 is included in the quantity of retaining wall 005, so it appears there should be no D-wall there at all. The moment slab shown from 314+02 - 315+44 does not appear to be quantified anywhere, but clearly is not Type D barrier. Please adjust the quantities of the items in question to match what is shown in the plans.

The question was addressed in Addenda f.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 122

Under 401.15, SS800, 1/15/10, states that a MTV will be used for night paving. In order to use the MTV for the on/off ramp paving, the ramps will need to be closed to allow full width paving. Will the MTV be required on the on/off ramps? Will the ramps be closed to allow full width paving if the MTV is required?

SS 800 1/15/10 Section 401.15 is specific for night paving of more than 1 continuous lane mile. The on/off ramps are less than 1 mile in length.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 123

Sheets 1253 and 1255 show shoring at the rear left abutment to protect the 75NB to 475WB ramp during MSE Wall excavation. Is a similar run of shoring required at Pier 1 to protect the ramp during pier footing excavation?

No, it is not required.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 124

If the contractor performs the 302 base and 19mm intermediate paving during nighttime hours, will the MTV be required under 401.15, SS800, 1/15/10? The more current SS800, 4/16/10, 401.15, only requires the MTV for surface course applications.

The project is being bid under the SS 800 dated 1/15/10. Supplemental Spec. 800 requirements will be needed for this project.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 125

The project has PN420, surface smoothness requirements, included in the proposal. Which locations will PN420 be applied to on the project? PN420 excludes turn lanes, deceleration lanes, acceleration lanes, ramps, ect. Will PN420 be applied to the City's surface streets; Central, Upton, Promedica, ect?

The Wall 5 and 7 issues were covered by the revisions to sheets 946 and 953 in Addenda f.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 126

There appears to be a conflict with the run of Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type D listed on page 193 and shown on plan pages 234 and 235. The run is Ref # BR-19 and is called out on page 193 as being on 475 WB from Stations 317+76 to 324+29 LT, the quantity is shown to be 652 lf. BR-19 starts out along the Mainline shoulder from station 317+76 and goes to approx station 319+13, this portion does appear to be Type D barrier, however, the rest of BR-19 (from 319+13 to 324+29 LT) overlaps retaining wall 005. Per the typical this area gets a Moment slab which is part of retaining wall 005. This portion should not be Type D barrier. Please adjust the Type D barrier quantity. We have another conflict with the Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type D listed on page 193 and shown on plan pages 236 - 237. The run is Ref # BR-21 and is called out on page 193 as being on 475 WB from Stations 328+04 to 330+24 LT, The quantity shown is 190 lf. If you look at the typical sections on page 20 the wall in this area is actually a Moment Slab with noise barrier attached. It is not clear if this Moment Slab is quantified anywhere, but it is definitely not a Type D barrier. Please adjust the Type D barrier quantity and if necessary add an item for this Moment Slab.

The related subsummary sheets and general summary have been revised by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 127

Sheet 871 states that splicing of the SPL Wall piles is not acceptable. How are the contractors to construct the walls under the overhead transmission lines between Bridges 1475C and 1478C? For example, the line crosses approximately Pile 50 on Wall 003: The existing ground elevation is ~604 and the pile length is 49'. This gives a top elevation of 653 plus necessary rigging. Assuming that the low wire elevation is also 666.0 at this location, we will be within the safe clear zone of the energized wire. Please clarify how the Department will handle this situation.

We will remove the note in Addenda 6.

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: 5/24/2010

Question Number: 128

We have found 3 more locations where the Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type D (see barrier sub-summary on page 193) overlaps retaining wall moment slabs: BR-25 on Ramp W-N from Station 346+25 to 349+38 Rt 282 ft of Type D barrier. 346+25 to 348+46 should be Type D barrier, 348+46 to 349+38 looks like it should be Moment Slab, not Type D barrier. BR-26 on Ramp W-N from Station 356+56 to 357+85 Lt 114 ft of Type D barrier. This whole run appears to be a moment slab for a retaining wall, not Type D barrier. BR-30 on Ramp W-N from Station 363+14 to 370+11 Lt 683 ft of Type D barrier. 368+68 to 370+11 should be Type D barrier, 363+14 to 368+68 looks like it should be moment slab and the quantity of Type D barrier should not have been included. Please adjust barrier quantities.

The related subsummary sheets and general summary have been revised by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 129

Where is the reinforcing steel paid for Bid Items 0794, 0795 and 0796, Noise Barrier, and what is the reinforcing steel weight and detail for these Bid Items?

Please see the as per plan note on sheet 871 for clarification.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 130

Regarding the answer provided on the website to the question submitted on 5/20/10 at 9:01:10AM: Your response states that the question is not valid and that the walls are generally constructed in fill. Please refer to the cross sections on sheets 447-452. The backslope excavation for Wall 005 is clearly almost entirely in cut. Therefore we will restate our original question. If the soils do not permit the slope to be cut as shown in the plans, how will the Department compensate the contractor for the additional Wall Excavation and Select Granular Embankment to perform the work safely and effectively? Unless answered by addendum, we will bid the quantities provided based on the plan slopes.

The plans correctly address ODOT's requirements and design safety issues. There is a process the contractor must consider for excavation safety. Review the "Guide to OSHA Excavation Standards". It is the responsibility of the contractor to operate and construct their project safely. Based on the information has, ODOT and the consultant have not identified soils below the "Type B" soils. If the contractor is seeing something different based on the geotechnical sheets 1-187, please specifically ask a clear question.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 131

A response to a prebid question dated 5/21/10 at 10:54 AM concerning temporary pavement quantities states: "ODOT does not have calculations for these areas. The quantities were based on CAD measurements." Could ODOT please provide the consultant's CAD measurements? The MOT subsummary provides temporary pavement quantities by phase and sheet only. Without stations or reference numbers, it is impossible to derive quantities. Also, many of the sheets referenced in the MOT subsummary are in error. For example, sheets 102-109 are said to have 6303 sy of temporary pavement. However, these sheets have no temporary pavement being constructed in Phase 2. Please provide additional guidance as to how the temporary pavement quantities were derived.

We will answer this question in addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 132

Maintenance of traffic on Upton Avenue: The drainage from Promedica Parkway ultimately empties into the existing 48" storm sewer (see plan sheet 297). Plan sheets 93 and 96 show the respective areas of work for which the storm sewer takes place in, which is phase 1. However the outlet pipe into the 48" is shown on plan sheet 168 shows the outline of the pavement cut and pipe as being done in phase 4. If built as currently shown, then there is nowhere for the water to outlet to after the 21" line enters the catch basin at 5+35 on Upton. Please clarify in an addendum.

The proposed storm sewer can be built in Phase 1 of MOT to tie into the existing 48" storm. Pavement repairs can be taken care of in Phase 4, as shown on Sheet 168. The CB No. 3A will have a 21" line entering from the north and will have a 21" line exiting to the southeast, where it will tie into the existing manhole on the 48" storm. The 21" conduit from CB No. 3A at 5+35 to existing manhole can be built during Phase 1 MOT.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 133

The Phase 1 construction detail on the top right of Page 50 of the MOT plans depicts 50" PCB being installed, but also shows call out bubble #9 which is ITEM 622 - CONCRETE BARRIER, SINGLE SLOPE, TYPE B1, which is the permanent median barrier. This seems to be in conflict. Also in the bottom left corner of page 50 is the "Temporary Pavement Section" It shows call out bubble 26 and 24. 26 is ITEM 442 - 1-1/2" ASPHALT CONCRETE SURFACE COURSE, 24 is ITEM 204 - GRANULAR MATERIAL TYPE C. Is this the temp pavement buildup to be used in this area? It was also our understanding that the work in Phase 1 may be changed, but to date we have seen no revisions.

This question was addressed in addenda #5.

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: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 134

Addendum 2 changed the tack coat to trackless tack coat, the quantity revision to reference 137 in addendum 5 says tack coat (no trackless). Please clarify which tack coat will be required. We currently do not have a source of supply for the trackless tack coat, does the Department have the contact information for a supplier?

The quantity was clarified in Addenda f.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 135

Sheet 50 in the revised plan sheets for addendum 5 references Items 254 pavement planing and 442 9.5mm asphalt concrete. Neither Item is included in the contract quantities. Please add them.

These items were added to Addenda 6.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 136

Our scaled take off's of the temporary pavement still do not match the quantities shown in the revised plans for addendum 5. Will the office calcs's for the temporary pavement be made available?

This question is answered in addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 137

Addendum 5 lowered the quantities on reference 134, 302 asphalt base and reference 140, 19mm intermediate. What work was non-performed to cause the quantities to go down?

The quantities had been incorrectly included for Item 302 and Item 442 for Upton Ave, which is concrete.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 138

I ask the question: Where is the reinforcing steel paid for Bid Items 0794, 0795 and 0796, Noise Barrier, and what is the reinforcing steel weight and detail for these Bid Items? Your response was: Please see the as per plan note on sheet 871 for clarification. The as per plan note on sheet 871 is for the soldier pile retaining wall that has HP 12 x 84 and HP 14 x 89 pile in the 30' shafts under Item 524. The reinforcing steel in question is for the shafts that support the posts for the Noise Barrier Wall. Are you saying that you do not want reinforcing steel in the Noise Barrier shafts that are under Item 606?

The Standard Drawing NBS-1-09 dated 7-17-09 was added to Addenda 6.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 139

Please revisit your answer to the First Energy elevation and voltage question submitted on 5/24/2010 @ 11:26:42 AM. If you have multiple contractors calling a third party, they may each receive different information which in turn could affect the outcome of the bid. This information should be provided by the Department to ensure that all contractors have the same answer. What are the elevations and voltages on the overhead transmission lines?

The information that ODOT has in the plans and the 4A (Utility) notes.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 140

Addendum 4 states that slipforming of the parapets will not be allowed. Does this only apply to parapets with aesthetic treatments? Will the contractor be allowed to slipform the median bridge barriers which do not receive an aesthetic treatment?

We will clarify the intent for median barriers in Addenda 6.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 141

In addendum #4 the painting item for reference 484 was changed to the shop painting and touch up item. However, reference #485 and #486 remained in the EBS file. Shouldn't these two items be removed as no specific coats of paint or repair inspections are needed with the touch up as per plan specification?

Removal of these items will be included in Addenda 6.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2010

Question Number: 142

What are the horizontal and vertical pressures applied at the base of the cantilever walls shown on Addendum 4 sheets 14A, 14B, and 14C? As these newly detailed cantilever retaining walls sit on top of the MSE reinforced backfill zone, these pressures need to be considered in the design of the MSE walls at those areas. Additionally, please verify that the requirements of SS840 Figure 840.04-1 "Zone of Influence" applies at these locations.

The maximum design bearing pressure at the base of the footing is 2.41 kips per square foot. The design horizontal load is 8.1 kips per foot. Also the requirements of Figure 840.04-1 do indeed apply in this situation.

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: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 143

Plan sheet 1072 calls for the mainline EB IR 475 bridge and Ramp D-6 bridge to be constructed in two separate phases (Phase 2A and Phase 2B). In addition, plan sheet 58 calls for phased work for ramp D-6 construction. Through phase 2 work, the contractor is to keep the existing slip ramp from Central/Kelly as a means of access to the EB mainline IR 475 (plan sheet 106). On sheet 58 under phase 2A notes, the contractor is allowed to close and remove existing ramp D6 in order to construct the new ramp D-6 (also shown on plan sheet 128). There is no maximum duration shown for this closure. Is the contractor allowed to close ramp D6 as long as they feel is necessary?

The intent is clarified in Addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 144

Regarding the question submitted on 05/11/2010 @ 11:07:30 AM: The answer provided on the website does not address Parts 2 and 3 of the question. What are the answers to these items?

1. The plans are available on the website. 2. The removal limits are listed on sheet 850 of the plan. Addenda 6 will address the depth. 3. Not for this project.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 145

Review your answer to 5/25/2010 @ 10:57:59 AM. The sheet referenced in the answer is for the SPL walls while the question was for the noisewalls.

Please ask a specific question on the project.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 146

A bid item was added for work zone raised pavement markers, however there was no note associated with it that says whether or not there are any winter time limitations for the 614 RPMs. Going through the subsummary there is no correlation with it and Table 614.115-1 in the Construction and Material Specifications book that details the spacing of the RPMs. If the quantity was derived from different spacing and/or different locations than the standard PIS 209930 states (greater than 4 feet lane shifts) please clarify.

A copy of the RPM office calcs have been placed here: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/>

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: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 147

Can the completion date of this project be extended and phasing changed? We are aware that this question has been asked and answered previously. Our continued evaluation keeps leading us to the same conclusions which we have decided to share. Critical path of the project revolves around sequencing work in the Upton Avenue area. Specific project constraints leading to the completion date conclusion are as follow: 1. Plan Sheet 58 Pre-Phase 2 note restricts 30" waterline reconstruction on Upton Avenue from taking place between July 1st and September 15th. IR 475 structure over Upton Avenue cannot begin until relocation is complete. IR 475 structure over Upton Avenue includes the abutment MSE walls for 1538C, 1541C, and 1538L. (Project Start to September 15, 2010) 2. Waterline Construction (September 15 to October 1, 2010)

3. Plan sheet 1074 – Note 4 states stage 2A - Structure No. LUC-475-1541C (Ramp D6) must be constructed prior to the start of construction of stage 2B - LUC-475-1538C (Mainline over Upton) and LUC-475-1541L (Ramp D4). a. Worst Case - Due to late start restriction of LUC-475-1541C, MSE wall construction would not be completed in 2010. Therefore 14 week settlement period for wall fill would delay remaining 1541C bridge construction until mid-summer, 2011. Bridge 1541C construction completed by September 30, 2011. Due to late start and demolition of existing structures, MSE wall construction would not be completed in 2011. Following logic above 1538C and 1550C bridge construction would be completed fall around September 30, 2012. Stage 3 EB/WB would not begin until mid-October, 2012. Stage 3 work would take place until late fall, 2013. Stage 4 final paving, temp pavement removals, noisewall completion, overhead signing, guardrails, lighting, striping, and bridge painting would finish in spring, 2014.b. Better Case – LUC-475-1541C MSE wall construction would be completed in November, 2010 allowing abutment work to begin during the winter, 2011. 1541C superstructure would be completed by June 15, 2011. Stage 2A 1538C MSE walls construction and 14 week settlement would be completed by November 15, 2011. Substructure and steel erection to take place in the winter. 1538C and 1550C bridge construction would be completed by June 15, 2012. After switching traffic configurations, stage 3 EB/WB roadway and structures would begin around July 1st. Driving work is once again 1538C MSE wall and 14 week settlement period. Stage 3 work would take place until mid-summer, 2013. Stage 4 final paving, temp pavement removals, noisewall completion, overhead signing, guardrails, lighting, striping, and bridge painting would finish in mid to late fall, 2013.c. Best Case – 1541C restriction listed above is not required and existing ramp D6 could be closed at the start of stage 2. 1538C and 1541C could be started immediately after waterline relocation and forward abutment MSE walls could be constructed in 2010. Settlement periods would be over the winter. Stage 2 construction could be completed by September/October, 2011. Stage 3 1538C MSE walls would most likely not be completed until spring 2012 due to late traffic switch. Stage 3 work would be completed in late fall, 2012. Stage 4 final paving, temp pavement removals, noisewall completion, overhead signing, guardrails, lighting, striping, and bridge painting would finish in early summer, 2013. 4. Plan sheet 106 phase 2 MOT shows traffic being maintained four lanes wide across LUC-475-1538C (Upton) and LUC-475-1550C (Central Ave.) to accommodate the existing ramp D6 acceleration lane distances. Confirms sequencing note on plan sheet 1074.5. Current completion schedule does not take into account long lead time items. MSE wall shop drawings submittal, Department approval, and fabrication will take a minimum of 3 months from award. All MSE walls will not be available to build at the same time.

We will address this question in Addenda 7

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 148

On Structure General Notes on sheet 962 of 1331 there are notes under the following heading, "ITEM 516, ELASTOMERIC BEARING WITH INTERNAL LAMINATES AND LOAD PLATE (NEOPRENE) (9.5" X 12" X 3.64" WITH 13.5" X 14.5" X 1.5" LOAD PLATE), AS PER PLAN". There is no bearing meeting this description in the Unit Price Contract items list and no bearing matching this description or requiring PTFE and stainless steel is detailed in the contract plans. Is this note in reference to a bearing that has since been removed? If this note is still valid, what line item number, item code, and bridge number is it in reference to?

The note will be removed from sheet 982 in Addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 149

We are assuming that the formliner on the soldier pile retaining walls is supposed to run parallel with the coping at the top of the wall. If the Department is expecting anything else please clarify as it will have a tremendous impact on the forming and placing of the formliner. Is our assumption correct?

We will address this question by plan sheet revision in Addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 150

Sheet 58 states that the right side of Bridge 1602L is built in Phase 2 and the left side is built in Phase 3. Sheet 116 shows the left side built in Phase 2 and Sheet 151 shows the right side built in Phase 3. What is the correct phasing for this structure?

The notes and phase details are correct as shown in the plans. The notes are written in the direction of travel not in the direction of stationing.

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: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 151

Addendum 5 included revised cross section sheets 541-593. The legend in the upper right hand corner identifies the black line as Item 204-Granular Material Type D. Below that is a notation for Item 204-Granular Material Type C but there is nothing indicated on the sheets for this material. Please clarify if there is Type C material in these embankments.

No response required. - See retraction below.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 152

Please disregard my previous question regarding the Granular Material Type C.

No response required.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 153

On the underdeck lighting on the Central Ave bridge the plans say that a j-box is required for each light. On sheet 811/1331 it shows a j-box every 5 luminaires which is right? Thanks

There will be a J-box required for each light for wiring each individual luminaire. The box every 5 lights is for distribution of circuit power. In short, the boxes for mounting on each luminaire are not shown in the conduit distribution detail. The boxes in the circuit distribution detail (detail 2) are for splicing from the No. 4 conductors down to No. 10 conductors that feed the individual luminaires. These boxes will be required every 5 lights.

Question Submitted: 5/26/2010

Question Number: 154

Ref. 88: 18" Conduit, Type B. Plan sheet 293 shows a crossover referenced as D-95. The subsummary on sheet 211 and bid item show this as being an 18" conduit. Plan sheet 293 shows this as a 21" conduit. Please clarify what size in an addendum.

The conduit size is 21". Sheets 211 and 175 were revised by addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 155

Even after receipt of addendum 5, there are still several outstanding issues regarding correctness of plan quantities, maintenance of traffic, phasing, and completion date. Given that the 72 business hour cutoff is Friday (5/28/2010 given that Monday is a holiday) at 10:00 am for issuing another addendum, we request that the project be delayed, and the delay be announced prior to this weekend.

No response required.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 156

All of the following questions are regarding Item 615, Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A 1) MOT typical sections on Revised Sheet 52 show permanent pavement buildup in Phase 1 in the gore area for Ramps WN and WS. However the cross-sections on sheets 501-512 (WN) and 520-523 (WS) show a cross-hatched area for Pavement for Maintaining Traffic. Is this pavement intended to be permanent pavement buildup or temporary? Please address in an addendum and adjust quantities of pavement for maintaining traffic or roadway quantities accordingly. 2) The cross-sections for Ramp WN for stations 362+66.06 to 368+00 (Sheets 505-510) show temporary pavement on the right shoulder. Sheet 84 of the MOT plans does not show a cross-hatched area of pavement for maintaining traffic in that area, nor is it included in the MOT subsummary on sheet 170. Please state your intent regarding temporary pavement in this area and revise quantities if necessary. 3) The MOT subsummary on sheet 170 states that there is 199 sy of temporary pavement on Sheet 85. Is this 199 sy the area on Ramp WN, I-75 NB, or both? 4) Sheet 170 states that there is 420 sy of pavement on sheet 95. Sheet 95 shows the median on Central Ave cross-hatched, but not for temporary pavement. Nowhere else in the MOT notes or sections is this temporary pavement mentioned. Please verify if it is ODOT's intent to place temporary pavement in this location. 5) Please state the station limits for the 5'-7" of temporary pavement shown on Sheet 50 to be constructed on I-475 EB and WB during Phase 2. Sheet 171 references quantities on sheets 102-109, but those sheets have no temporary pavement areas shown on them.

1. The MOT details were revised by addenda 5. This addenda also notes that the cross section details were not changed. The quantities were calculated by CAD. A summary of the CAD measurements is available on-line. 2. The summary of CAD measurements, which is available on-line, covers this question. 3-5. The summary of CAD measurements and sheet revisions, which are available on-line, covers these questions.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 157

Ref. 125, 126: there are a total of 15 between the two items on the plans. However in taking off both, only 14 total up. Please review updated plans and revise one of the two items.

The subsummary sheet totals are correct, which show 4 MH Reconstruct to Grade and 10 MH Reconstruct to Grade, APP. The General Summary sheet #176 is being revised in Addenda 7 to reflect the correct number of MH Reconstruct to Grade.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 158

Ref. 125, 126: there are a total of 15 between the two items on the plans. However in taking off both, only 14 total up. Please review updated plans and revise one of the two items.

The subsummary sheet totals are correct, which show 4 MH Reconstruct to Grade and 10 MH Reconstruct to Grade, APP. The General Summary sheet #176 is being revised in Addenda g to reflect the correct number of MH Reconstruct to Grade.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 159

Plan sheets 234 and 239 show bores of different sizes pipes going across the pavements. Based on the phasing and maintenance of traffic restrictions, it is assumed that the bores will have to take place from the outside phases. We foresee a problem boring different-sized pipes as a problem since there will be no means to connect the two to maintain flow from the high side (median inlets proposed to receive both will not be installed until phase 3). If same-size pipes are called out for both directions (as shown on plan sheets 228), then the boring could be installed across in phase 1 or 2, and then in phase 3, the pipe could be cut out for the new inlet to be installed. Please address the situations at the 2 different-bore sizes in an addendum. Also, if outside of the 15' trench excavation limit, does the contractor have the option of open-cutting the new casing pipe instead of boring?

On Sheet 234, if the Contractor prefers, a 21" conduit can be bored rather than an 18" and a 21". On Sheet 239, a 24" conduit can be bored rather than an 18" and 24". This change is also covered in CMS 603.04.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 160

Regarding the Structural support posts for the noise barriers. Is there an option for Galvanized finish? This would represent a cost savings for ODOT and Have a longer service life than primed and painted.

The plan details show the requirements of ODOT.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 161

A prebid question regarding a significant change in the Embankment quantity in Addendum #5 was answered: "Originally there was excavation set up for noise wall in error. These quantities were corrected. The office calcs for embankment are correct." The embankment quantity increased by 31761 in Addendum #5. The noise wall quantity corrections only accounted for 2 cy of this change. What is the source of the remaining 31759 cy of the change?

This issue was addressed in addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 162

A bid item for 821 of Granular Material, Type E was added per Addendum #5. The general summary references the quantity in the Office Calcs, but the quantity was not in the Office Calcs Earthwork Summary. Where is this granular material, type E to be placed?

The Granular Material, Type E is to be placed as shown in cross sections for 475 EB STA 282+50 to 286+00 (sheets 328 – 331). In addition, an office worksheet has been placed in the project folder on-line.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 163

1) Addendum #5 changed the excavation quantity from 193,988 cy to 223,474 cy. The reason for this difference is mostly because the I-475 EB & WB cross-sections show the median being undercut and replaced with Granular Material, Type B, while the office calculations eliminated this undercut. The original excavation quantity was taken from the office calculations, while the current one was derived from the cross-sections. What is the Intent of the Department regarding the I-475 median undercut? If ODOT elects to use the excavation quantity that includes the I-475 undercut, please revise the Granular Material, Type B quantity to reflect this change. If it is not ODOT's intent to undercut I-475, please revise the excavation quantity accordingly. 2) If ODOT elects not to undercut the I-475 median, is it ODOT's intent to cement stabilize the area? Although the original office calculations eliminated the I-475 median undercut, they did not include the 15'-8" wide median (both sides) as part of the cement stabilization quantity. If ODOT elects not to undercut the median and to cement stabilize it, please increase the Cement Stabilized Subgrade item to reflect this change.

Please see Addenda 7 for additional revisions.

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 164

Per Addendum #5, the Embankment quantity is 139,747 cy while the original was 107,986 cy. The Addendum #5 quantity was derived from the cross-sections while the original was derived from the office calculations. It appears that the cross sections for the new Promedica Pkwy interchange and associated ramps include the areas cross-hatched for Granular Material, Types C and D as part of the embankment quantity while the office calcs do not. Therefore, the office calcs appear to be correct, while the cross-sections are in error. Please address the reason for the significant change in the embankment quantity.

Originally there was excavation set up for noise wall in error. These quantities were corrected. The office calcs for embankment are correct.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/27/2010

Question Number: 165

Plan sheet 299 shows utility construction work (storm and waterline) to be performed on Westland Avenue. The maintenance of traffic notes do not specify which phase this work is to be performed in. Please clarify in an addendum.

Per the phasing, the utilities need to be installed in Phase 1, before Promedica is constructed. Traffic on Westland will need to be maintained during installation, because existing Ramp U-2 will still be in use.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 166

Are single full height panels required for the ground mounted noise wall (as shown on sheet 870 of 1331) or stacking panels as detailed in the ODOT Standards NBS 1-09?

Sheet 870 is intended to provide an explanation of aesthetic details, and is not intended to be an all-inclusive design guide. The intent is to work this sheet with the others in the set so the provisions of General Note 8, as well as the other requirements of the plans and Standard Drawing NBS-1-09 still apply.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 167

The plans detail a 12' post spacing for the noise wall on this project. Is a 24' post spacing acceptable?

No, the plans show the correct spacing.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 168

ON SHEET 48, UNDER THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMENT NOTES, THERE ARE TWO PROPERTIES THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED WITH CONTAMINANTS. THERE ARE NO BID ITEMS SET-UP FOR THESE SOILS THAT ARE TO BE EXCAVATED, TESTED AND DISPOSED (ONE PROPERTY CONTAINS PAHS AND VOCs AND THE OTHER PROPERTY CONTAINS HIGH LEVELS OF LEAD). THERE HAS BEEN A BID ITEM SET-UP FOR THE EXCAVATION, TESTING AND DISPOSAL OF THE PETROLEUM CONTAMINATED SOILS THAT ARE LOCATED AT ANOTHER PROPERTY. WILL YOU BE ADDING SEPARATE BID ITEMS FOR THE SOILS TO BE EXCAVATED, TESTED AND DISPOSED OF AT THE 3266 UPTON AVENUE PROPERTY AND THE 1146 WEST CENTRAL AVENUE PROPERTY? IF NOT, HOW WILL THE COSTS INCURRED FOR THE STORAGE, TESTING AND DISPOSAL OF THESE SOILS BE HANDLED ONCE THE PROJECT IS AWARDED AND THIS WORK IS PERFORMED?

The two notes in question on sheet 48 were removed by Addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 169

Addendum 6 states that a waiver for night work has been granted for the 2010 construction year. Obviously there will be night work required in the 2011 and 2012 construction seasons for bridge demolition over roadways, paving, striping, deck pours, etc. Will waivers be granted for work as required in 2011 and 2012? If not, how will the Department direct the contractor to handle these work activities?

The Department has never had an issue in the past in gaining a waiver for necessary work activities on State projects. ODOT will review the schedule with the contract if a waiver cannot be gained in 2011, 2012.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 170

There was a major structures repair project on this section of IR475 in the early 1990's. Do you have those drawings available for our review?

The 1993 plans have been uploaded to the FTP server. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/>

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 171

Addendum 6 was received via e-mail at 2:41 pm today. There were a combined total of 26 bid items that were added, deleted, or revised as well as 49 new plan sheets and additional documentation posted for FTP website. A part of this addendum includes asbestos abatement and building demolition items, for which are specialty items that will require lead time getting subcontractor quotes. Furthermore, the current prebid question website makes reference to past tense language that "This issue was addressed in addenda 7". Given that addendum 6 being released on a Friday afternoon prior to a holiday weekend will make it difficult to obtain timely subcontractor quotes prior to the bid date, and that there is still another addendum still to be released, please delay this bid.

The District prefers to keep the sale date of this important project.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 172

Note 2 on drawing sheet 849 describes the criteria for the structure mounted noise barrier, which includes conformance to NCHRP 350 Test Level 4, and identifies a sole source supplier. The notes also say that alternative noise barrier designs may be used. The question is: If a noise barrier is proposed for use that meets the criteria but was not NCHRP 350 TL4 approved at time of bid, can the contractor use it?

The noisewall in question needs to meet NCHRP 350 TL4 at the time of 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: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 173

Sections of the referenced noise barrier are mounted on ground mounted parapet where the risk of impact with vehicles appears to be low and the risk to pedestrians and vehicles from falling debris in the event of an impact also appears to be low. On these sections, would the use of a barrier that meets EN 1794 criteria but not NCHRP TL4 criteria be considered.

Please bid per plan. The noise walls have been designed correctly.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 174

1. Please verify that all quantities for the MSE walls are correct. Takeoffs on all walls are showing some big differences in quantities.

The MSE wall quantities have been independently checked and appear correct as shown in the plans.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 175

How does ODOT plan to handle the drainage issue at the D-1 Ramp to 285+00? All of this drainage is crossing I-475 through the 36" conduit that as of right now will have to be installed half in Phase 2 and the other half in Phase 3.

This was revised to a bored or jacked conduit in Addenda 7.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 176

Addendum #5 changed the underdrain quantities slightly on all four bid items. According to our takeoff they are still wrong. Looking at the typical sections the only place that calls out 6" Shallow pipe underdrain is one run in the EB median which is approximately 6,700 LF. The Underdrain tables are calling out Shallow UD in the Ramp areas but the typical sections does not show any Shallow UD but are showing 6" Deep and 6" Base UD, please advise which one is correct.

Underdrain quantities on the subsummary and summary sheets are correct. Addenda 7 has plan sheet revisions to help clarify.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 177

Addendum 5, answer 16A, states that ODOT has submitted a waiver for night work. In regards to "... work, that is required to be completed only at night" - What work is to be included and who determines the night work requirements?

Permitted lane time closures govern the work and plan requirements indicated in the plan for night work. All other cases will need to be presented to the project engineer to show "need".

Question Submitted: 5/28/2010

Question Number: 178

Will there be a Roads For Maintaining Traffic bid item add to cover the embankment needed for the construction of the pavement for maintaining traffic?

The earthwork quantities needed for this work have been included in the office calculations.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2010

Question Number: 179

Addendum # 7 (received Friday 5/28 in the afternoon) added plan pages # 947A and 947B. These pages depict a "I-3D, AS PER PLAN, TYPE 1". It appears to be a barrier inlet in the Moment Slab/Parapets. No item was added for this. The current item # 119 "INLET, NO. 3 SINGLE SLOPE BARRIER, T-D" is not "AS PER PLAN" and also is not the same dimensions as these inlets shown (example: the top width of the barrier shown on these inlets is 10", but per std I-2.3 the top width of a standard Dwall inlet is 12"). It appears that an item needs to be added for the inlet shown on Pages 947A and 947B and quantity for item # 119 needs adjusted accordingly.

The question was submitted after the cutoff period. No response required.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2010

Question Number: 180

Addendum # 6 (Received on Friday 5/28) added Bid Item # 920 which is 472 ft of "Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B". Revised sheet 193 with addendum # 6 shows this run of barrier on Central Ave from 259+61.95 to 264+35.18. HOWEVER, Addendum # 5 (Received Tuesday 5/25) added Bid Item # 0906 which is 444 ft of "Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B". Revised sheet 193 with addendum # 5 showed this run on Central Ave from 259+61.95 to 264+35.18. What is ODOT's intent here? Please Clarify!

The question was submitted after the cutoff period. No response required.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2010

Question Number: 181

Per ODOT Spec 608.09, "Payment for curb ramps in new concrete walk includes the cost of any additional materials, grading, forming and finishing not included in the new walk, which is measured through the curb ramp area." Please adjust the current walk quantities as they do not appear to include the area of the curb ramps.

The question was submitted after the cutoff period. No response required.

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: 5/3/2010

Question Number: 182

Will ODOT make available CAD files and GEOPack files for this project?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/>

Question Submitted: 5/30/2010

Question Number: 183

Ref. 129, 130, and 132: The latest plan sheets available on the ODOT FTP website indicate quantities that are updated as of addendum 5. Addendum 7 significantly changed all quantities of all three items, but no updated plan sheets are available to show these changes. Please provide updated plan sheets showing sources of quantities.

The quantities for Ref. items 129, 130, and 132 were reviewed, based on prebid questions on these items. Sheets 176 and 204 were revised with addenda 7 detailing the locations of the revisions.

Question Submitted: 5/31/2010

Question Number: 184

Since the completion date was extended on Addendum #7, will the Department be revising the number of months for the Field Office?

No, the majority of the work on the project will be completed Nov. 2012.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2010

Question Number: 185

It appears the approach slab details are wrong/misleading on plan sheets 1157, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1163 for structure 1550C. The plans show the approach to be 30' long but the details depict an approach slab less than 15 ft in length. Furthermore the detail shows only 11 sets and 22 sets of transverse rebar which is standard for 15 foot approaches not 30 foot. Could the drawings be revised and since rebar tables were giving as non-standard rebar is to be used could the tables be updated to show the real quantity. Can the contractor use mechanical connectors instead of the threaded rebar shown in various structure rebar tables. It is unrealistic to try to thread bars over 20 foot in length to other bars over 20 foot in length. Sheet 959 shows ultimate bearing values for pile on 475- 1550C at a different value than those stated on sheet 1124. Which values are correct? Where is the Epoxy-Urethane Sealer to be paid on the MSE wall on structure 1527C Promedica Parkway. It appears a bid item for this has been left out. Could the rest of the phase 4 MOT plans be given as only sheet 161 is given and the rest of the job before that has no plan sheets. Is barrier wall required on plan sheet 81 of the MOT? Who is to maintain the detours if the city of Toledo is to erect? This is a liability issue for the contractor and ODOT if these detours are not placed in a timely manner and maintained adequately. Should the detour be designed and given to the contractor to place as to eliminate a third party?

See forthcoming Addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2010

Question Number: 186

Please review the plans for Structure LUC-475-1538L. Structure Plan Sht 13 is included twice, as Sht 1089/1329 and 1091/1329 and the Structure Plan Sht 11, which contains the bearing and bearing retainer details is missing.

The detail was addressed in Addenda b, question 18.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2010

Question Number: 187

The laminated elastomeric bearing details are missing from the plans for REF# 607 at Bridge LUC-475-1538 L.

The detail was addressed in Addenda b, question 18.

Question Submitted: 5/7/2010

Question Number: 188

Please post all existing bridge plans online.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-77255/>

Question Submitted: 5/8/2010

Question Number: 189

The typical sections for Retaining Wall 004 show 31' drilled shafts below the bottom of wall however the table on sheet 921 indicates that that this dimension would be 30'. What is the correct length of shaft below the bottom of panel?

The correct dimension is 30'-0".

Question Submitted: 5/8/2010

Question Number: 190

The quantities for the drilled shafts on sheet 875 appear to be incorrect based on the typical sections and data table. Please review and clarify.

The quantity on Sheet 875 was recalculated and appears correct. The contractor may not be considering the entire height of the shaft/pile.

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: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 191

We still have a few questions after Addendum 6 coming out on Friday:1) To determine the structure sizing, the sign depth must be used. On the span & cantilever tables, a maximum depth of 120" is listed. There are 2 structures, OH-3 (Ref 0232) & OH-15 (Ref 0236), with sign panels that exceed this height, 132" & 180" respectively. Also, are the exit sign heights to be considered in the sign panel sizes? Direction is needed on what to do for these structures in order to determine the proper pipe sizing.2) It appears the maximum bent tube span post height is 29'-0" per the design charts. The right upright for OH-6 (Ref 0239) is 38.8' tall, which is way too tall for the charts. Direction is needed to determine the proper pipe size.3) The pipe specifications are not listed. What are acceptable pipe specifications to be used for the bent tube structures?4) The bent tube structures are specified to be powder coated over galvanizing. Due to the size & weight of these structures & power coat facility capacities, is a wet paint specification acceptable?

1. Although the sign depths exceed the 120" size listed in the tables, the 120" designs as listed in the table are appropriate with no change required. For OH-3, using D = 120", H = 21', 109' max span results in a Type 4 Design. For OH-15, using D = 120", H = 27', 79' max span results in a Type 3 design.2. The support for OH-6 is a special design as referenced by the note to see sheets 757 – 759. It utilizes a 20" diameter pipe with ½" thickness. The other details are referenced on these 3 sheets.3. This question was submitted after the cutoff. This was covered in a previous addenda. No answer required.4. This question was submitted after the cutoff. No answer required.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 192

Plan sheet 95 details the MOT requirements for phase 1 construction on Central Avenue. Traffic is being maintained along the outside in single lane conditions through the use of drums. Median pier construction will require excavations in excess of 6' deep adjacent to traffic less than 12' away. According to the drop off in work zones plan sheet 64, portable concrete barrier is required for protection since . This condition is also likely to occur in stage 2 for pier 1 and 3 construction. Please address.

The question was submitted after the cutoff period. No response required.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 193

Sheets 113 and 115 show temporary pavement on NB I75. The temporary pavement calculations don't appear to include the quantities for this work. Please clarify what temporary pavement is to be performed on NB I75.

The question was submitted after the cutoff period. No response required.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 194

Per SS800, Section 503.03, Cofferdams are to be designed to 3' above the Ordinary High Water Mark. 1. What is the elevation of the OHWM for Bridge 1602L?2. The elevations given for the top of sheeting at Pier 2 and Pier 3 on sheet 1167 are only 1.1' above normal water. Is the contractor exempt from following SS800 at these locations? If so, how will excusable and compensable days be calculated here?3. The elevations given for the top of sheeting at Pier 2 and Pier 3 on sheet 1197 are only 1.8' and 0.8' above OWHM respectively. Is the contractor exempt from following SS800 at these locations? If so, how will excusable and compensable days be calculated here?

The question was submitted after the cutoff period. No response required.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 195

Sheets 116 and 118 show temporary pavement on Ramp S-W. The temporary pavement calculations don't appear to include the quantities for this work. Please clarify what temporary pavement is to be performed on Ramp S-W.

Please see revised sheet 51 for MOT work on S-W in phase 1.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 196

CMS 446.06 calls for a hot longitudinal joint between the shoulder and lane. SS 800 calls for an MTV for nighttime paving. There isn't enough room for a second MTV on the shoulder while making the hot longitudinal joint. Will the MTV be waived on the shoulder so that the hot longitudinal joint can be made?

If the shoulder is paved with a hot longitudinal joint, the MTV requirement for the shoulder can be waived.

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: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 197

Question Submitted: 5/17/2010 12:56:40 PM Subject: Central Ave bridge underdeck lighting, are the mounting brackets to be furnished under the lighting? If so would the department provide a design for these brackets. Also the power service for the underdeck lighting needs to be designed. please submit materials needed for this item. "We will address this question by addenda." The prebid above was partially answered in Addendum 6 stating that the cost of the mounting bracket is to be included with the luminaire. This answer leaves out the most important part of the question; the design of the brackets. What type of mounting bracket would be acceptable? The movement of the deck makes the plan note (page 810) of "suspending the underpass light with junction box on a bracket from the bridge deck" a maintenance concern for the 446 underpass luminaires since they will experience so much movement that they will never stay lighted for an extended period of time. How are they to be anchored? Would an alternate method of attaching the brackets be acceptable? Please provide a design for these brackets because it was not addressed by Addendum 6.

This question was submitted after the cutoff period. Since different lighting manufacturers have different fixture configurations, no set design was included. It is anticipated that the lights can generally be attached to an angle or channel which is then mounted to a substructure on the bridge.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 198

1.) On Pg 810 the underpass lighting calls for a control system but no further information is given? Answer was addressed in Addendum 5 stating to review sheet 811 A, but sheet 811 A is not found in directory. Discussion with ODOT office 5.28.10 stated issue would be addressed. Issue has not been addressed as of 6.1.10

The sheet in question can be found in the FTP under this name: 77255-AddendumE-27RevisedSheets-0726-1124.tif

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 199

Please disregard prebid question of 5/30/10 as we were able to locate revised plan sheets for underdrain revisions.

No response required.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 200

Addendum 6 added reference 919, Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, 9.5mm, Type A (448). Plan sheet 50/1331 calls for Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, 9.5mm, Type A (448). Will intermediate or surface be required?

The pay item is correct in the last addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2010

Question Number: 201

Currently we've found 1 supplier for the tackless track added per addendum #2. They are located in Columbus. Will the manufacturer be required to approve every application or just the initial one?

The question was submitted after the cutoff period. No response required.

Question Submitted: 6/2/2010

Question Number: 202

Questions have been asked regarding Central Ave underpass lighting and how the fixtures are to be mounted. A partial answer was given in addendum 6 stating that mounting brackets are considered to be incidental to the luminaires. This answer does not adequately address the question. Luminaire manufacturers are fleeing from the mounting bracket item, vehemently excluding them from their quotes since they have not been designed. They simply have nothing to offer. As contractors we too need to know what is wanted. We need to know what method of attachment to the structure is acceptable and where to attach. There is little doubt that you are overburdened with the number of questions that come with a 50 job letting, yet the questions, and subsequent answers are crucial to the contractors who are also overburdened trying to bid so many projects that lack critical information. Please issue an appropriately detailed addendum defining the intent for the placement of these 446 lighting fixtures.

Since different lighting manufacturers have different fixture configurations, no set design was included. It is anticipated that the lights can generally be attached to an angle or channel which is then mounted to a substructure on the bridge.

Question Submitted: 6/2/2010

Question Number: 203

It appears that ref numbers 906 and 920 are for the same run of wall on Central Avenue. Simple fix, just delete one of them.

The question was submitted after the cutoff period. No response required.

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.