

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 070148

Sale Date - 3/16/2007

Question Submitted: 1/1/2007

Question Number: 1

1. Please look at the quantity listed for the 19mm Asphalt Intermediate Course. It appears to me that the 2081 sy @ 1.75" thick listed in the Pavement Calculations on Plan Sheet 11 is overstated. 2.

**The consultant reviewed his quantities and the intermediate asphalt course quantity in the general summary is correct. As for question 2, the answer is yes.**

Question Submitted: 3/7/2007

Question Number: 2

As a follow up to my original question regarding the possible overstatement of quantity for Ref # 43, 19mm intermediate course: the 1.75" 19 mm intermediate course is shown being placed only on the widened areas of US 24 (except for the 1.5" scratch course), and the widened area is approximately 1130 sy (see the pavt calculation areas shown for 301 base or 304 agg base). However the area shown in the pavt calcs for 1.75" 19mm is 2081 sy. Where is the additional approx 950 sy of 19mm? The typical sections do not reflect it being anywhere else.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2007

Question Number: 3

1.) Please clarify wall joint detail (bottom left of page) on page 30. There is a deminsion of 1', labeled walk. Is "walk" suppose to be "wall"? Also, in the same detail, the left hand portion (expansion joint?), shows the expansion offset. In this detail it looks like the rustification groove is in the middle of the wall. Is there suppose to be a line represent the edge of the wall or is this a detail of the footer. Please Clarify. 2.) Does the city of Waterville allow use of their fire Hydrants? 3.) Does the contractor pouring the wall have to stop the pour at each construction joint or will the rustification joint be sufficient?

Question Submitted: 3/9/2007

Question Number: 4

This project is a relatively small intersection improvement with multiple work types including paving, pavement planing, traffic signals, pavement marking, misc. concrete, retaining wall, anchor assembly, seeding. It will be a hardship for some smaller contractors to control 50% of the work by dollar amount - but not in manhours. Due to the fact that ODOT looks at \$ amount - I respectfully request ODOT to reduce the requirement of controlling 50% of the work to 35% of the work by dollar amount. (We are capable of performing and managing a large poertion of this project in manhours but not necessarily by \$ amount.) If the % is not reduced - you will eliminate a large portion of smaller contractors who have fewer work types approved.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2007

Question Number: 5

Page 34/45 Item 632 Vehicular Signals Paragraph 5 under mounting hardware: Reflective signal backplates shall be provided per CMS 732.22 etc. CMs 2005 does not have 732.22

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