

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 098015

Sale Date - 4/22/2009

Question Submitted: 10/10/2008

Question Number: 1

A question was asked for this project when it originally bid under project #090003. The question was as Stated below: Question Submitted: The Ramps and US 24 section north of Section 609+25 as stated in the pre bid minutes are not part of the alternate bid items for asphalt verses a concrete pavement section. Since the typical pavement sections are the same for this area and the rest of the project, why can't all of this pavement be considered in the alternate? Wouldn't this benefit ODOT to the best possible savings for the project? ODOT Response: The alternate pavement stops at 609+25 on the mainline because of Maintenance of traffic Issues. As a contractor that installs both asphalt and concrete pavement, we disagree with this answer and feel that it should be revisited. There are no pavement installation issues between the two pavement types due to MOT. By breaking up the pavement section and not allowing the concrete alternate for the entire job you may be adding cost to the project and ruling out possible savings. Under section 108.05 it is the contractor's responsibility for the means and methods, let the bidders decide which alternate is less expensive and give ODOT the best possible savings at bid time. ODOT has nothing to lose by adjusting these quantities and only an opportunity to save. In addition, with the asphalt index in place on the non alternate work, there is a potential for even more additional costs that would not be incurred if all the pavement on the project was bid as alternate 1 or 2 plus part of the project carries a 7 year warranty and the area east of 609+25 does not.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2008

Question Number: 2

In the attachments for Addendum #1, there is a file borrowlocations80444.pdf. What does the green line depict on the right of way drawings?

Question Submitted: 10/10/2008

Question Number: 3

A question was submitted in regards to the pavement section of asphalt that is not part of the alternate bids for the 098015 Project. Another question was submitted for the original bid 09003 about this as well. The first time this question was answered because of MOT issues (which is not the case) and the second time the question was not answered other than a blank statement "the pavement area will remain the same". From the bid results, (low concrete pavement vs. low asphalt pavement) the difference is a savings of over \$600,000 to ODOT for making all the pavement on the project set up as an alternate bid. This savings does not even take in account the asphalt index cost that will be incurred to the state. Based on the past history of the index this cost could be in excess of \$1,000,000.00 dollars. These cost don't even take into consideration life expectancy savings. In such a time of financial economic crisis and hardship, we cannot believe the department would not even consider this option. If there is a reason for the area remaining asphalt we think the contractors should know why you are willing to spend the excess money.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2008

Question Number: 4

Are the borrow areas still available from the first bid 090003? Will the areas be available that are west of the project in 090201? Will there be additional borrow areas available for this project?

Question Submitted: 10/13/2008

Question Number: 5

Even though there is a revised set of plans for this project, those revisions do not address all of the non-plan related issues asked during the bidding process for Project 090003. All of the previous addenda that addressed these issues should be re-addressed for this project. Examples include: The borrow pit regulation issues and the associated questions, the railroad shoring and sheeting, the MSE walls, the acceptance of the base bid as it relates to the alternates, abandoned water wells, waterline, Supplemental Specification dates, tunnel lighting, wall mural, wall form liners, MOT, price index adjustments, etc. Somewhere in this new set of bidding documents, these issues have to be restated and answered once again for the record. It shouldn't be necessary for every contributing contractor to ask these questions again. ODOT has them and they need to be re-issued with the appropriate answers.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2008

Question Number: 6

A pre-bid question was asked on 4/6/2009 at 3:00:29 PM that read: "It appears that the bid items for Ref No. 749 Special - Providing Electronic Instrumentation and Ref No. 750 Special - Technical Assistance are duplicated under Ref No. 347 and 348 respectively. Please review." This has not been addressed in addendum 1, 2 or 3. However, EBS Amendment No. 3 deleted Ref No. 347 & 348 entirely. This then renumbered every item thereafter (i.e.: Ref 349 became Ref 347, Ref 350 became Ref 348, etc.). This re-numbering in EBS without issuing this as an addendum is a MAJOR problem. I am not an expert in HCSS to EBS downloads but I believe unless this is addressed every unit price after Ref 346 will be downloaded to the wrong line (every unit price will be off by 2 items). I believe this could be avoided by issuing an addendum deleting Ref 749 & 750 and leaving Ref 347 & 348 alone. Since 749 & 750 are the last 2 bid items in the original proposal, this should not impact the download ALTHOUGH ODOT SHOULD VERIFY THIS WITH EBS.

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: 10/13/2008

Question Number: 7

Are the revised office calcs available for the pavement quantities?

Question Submitted: 10/13/2008

Question Number: 8

Item Number 27 Granular Material Type D is show in the proposal as 83,235 CY, in the plans this item is addressed as a 12" Bridge Lift and has the stations listed where this material is to be placed. Under section 203.09 this item is to be paid using a volume calculation. The method of calculation is using an average end area technique. Under section 203.06A it specifies the minimum compaction effort required for this item. In the plans under the general notes it states that end dumping of this material and a waiving of the scalping requirement is allowed if standing water is present. With such differing conditions, large thicknesses of topsoil, varying terrain elevations and possible standing water it seems improbable to be able to cross section this work according to the specifications. Also if cross sectioning can be done, it does not take into consideration any loss of material that is placed on a unsuitable foundation. There is no way for the contractor to quantify the loss of material. This cannot be calculated. Should this item be calculated and paid on weight rather than area? Is there another method of measurement ODOT will allow to take into consideration any loss of material encountered by the contractor. As a contractor it is difficult to bid an item without knowing the loss of material you will encounter and as contractor's having differing views of the loss it does not put the bid on an even playing field.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2008

Question Number: 9

It is obvious that changes have been made to the plans for this project. In the interest of expediting the bidding process, submitting an informed bid, and not creating a scavenger hunt through 1000 plus pages of the plan, could we have a list of the changes incorporated into these plans that were not a part of the plans for Project 090003?

Question Submitted: 10/7/2008

Question Number: 10

It appears that the bid items for Ref No. 749 Special - Providing Electronic Instrumentation and Ref No. 750 Special - Technical Assistance are duplicated under Ref No. 347 and 348 respectively. Please review. Plan sheet 1001A states the MSE wall with the mural will be alternate B which when carried to the quantity summary on plan sheet 1001 is item 840E20001. The ebs file shows item 840E20001 as Ref No. 371, alternate AB2. Addendum # 1 referred to the proposed mural on the retaining wall as AB1. Please clarify which item is correct. In the original 090003 bid, ODOT permitted the use of a Techspan arch system for use as a base bid item in lieu of the Conspan arch shown in the drawings. Will a Bebo arch system be permitted as a base bid item as well? Both a Bebo or Techspan arch use a different geometry than the three sided arch shapes shown in the plans. The different geometries will require modifications to the quantities for headwall concrete and reinforcing steel, waterproofing, sealing, etc. Will ODOT pay for variations in the associated bid items or are these quantities adjustments considered incidental to the arch system used?

Question Submitted: 10/8/2008

Question Number: 11

In reference to the Alternate Bid on Retaining Wall AB2. The issue of this wall has been addressed in addendum no.1 and addendum no.2, but a few questions remain. The dollar amount associated with "limited funding" is not included in the addendum. We believe that this amount is known locally and should be available to all bidders. What is the dollar amount? Waterville is still soliciting donations for this wall and the possibility of an unknown amount of "limited funds" makes for an unlevel playing field in the bidding process on the base bid. What is to prevent a bidder from submitting an unbalanced bid for this alternate?

Question Submitted: 10/8/2008

Question Number: 12

Plan sheet 979 outlines general notes for the form liner requirements on the LUC-24-1272 cut-off walls and headwalls. No aesthetic details for this structure are provided in the plans. Are aesthetic details required on the cut-off walls and headwalls for the LUC-24-1272 structure since the proprietary retaining walls adjacent to them will have an ashler stone pattern? If so, please provide. In the original 090003 bid, this question was answered that aesthetics are NOT required.

Question Submitted: 10/8/2008

Question Number: 13

Addendum # 2 significantly adjusted the earthwork quantities from the changes already made in addendum # 1. The net differences are Ref # 21 -129,874 CY, Ref # 22 -796,501 CY, Ref # 190 +4254 CY. The revision files referenced in the addendum are not available on the ftp site. Please supply cross-sections, tabulations, or other documentation so these changes can be verified.

---

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: 10/8/2008

Question Number: 14

The retaining wall enhancement plan detailed on sheet 1001A shows the MSE wall mural limits starting at station 677+50 and ending at station 680+86. The average height from top of leveling pad to top of coping in this area is approximately 37.80'. Based on the station limits and height dimension, the total area of the mural section is 12,701 SF. Ref # 372 base bid and Ref # 373 alternate bid item quantities for this wall section are 9300 SF. Please verify which quantity is correct. If a quantity adjustment is necessary, please adjust the MSE wall quantity for Ref # 363 outside of the enhancement limits accordingly. The total retaining wall area is 33,566 SF which has been verified.

Question Submitted: 10/8/2008

Question Number: 15

The plan quantities for ref nos 398,435, and 474 Select Granular for the MSE walls all seem to be grossly in error. The quantities supplied by the MSE wall suppliers are all approximately 1/3 of the plan quantities for these items. We have also checked these quantities and agree with the suppliers. There are also minor discrepancies in the square foot of wall quantities that should also be checked for all of the MSE walls.

Question Submitted: 10/8/2008

Question Number: 16

We were able to download addendum #2 for this project this morning (4/10/09). Per the addendum both the roadway excavation & embankment quantities were reduced by very significant volumes & both by over -30%. These changes affect all of the aspects to the earthwork operation on the entire project & will take considerable time to identify & analyze. Given that this weekend is a holiday for many people & there are less than 3 days next week until the bids are due there is insufficient time remaining to properly analyze the changes made in this addendum prior to the scheduled bid date. We therefore respectfully request that the bid date on this project be delayed for at least 7 calendar days.

Question Submitted: 10/8/2008

Question Number: 17

How was the Aerial Survey variation (Addendum #1) identified? What is the degree of accuracy?

Question Submitted: 10/9/2008

Question Number: 18

Are all the pre bid questions and responses from 090003 incorporated into the new plans and specifications or is it the contractor's responsibility to be aware of these questions from the first bid?

Question Submitted: 10/9/2008

Question Number: 19

Addendum #2 adjusted both the Excavation and Embankment bid quantities significantly, (Excavation quantity reduced by 129,874 cy & Embankment quantity reduced by 796,501 cy). The explanation given does not track with these adjustments. Please review, confirm and provide a detailed explanation of this reduction.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2008

Question Number: 20

On sheet 3/11 of the office calcs the total qty of 302 is 7021cy for US 24 Ramp C. Could this quantity be verified? We are coming up with a total quantity of 1804 cy for US 24 ramp C.  $7021 \text{ sy} \times 9.25" \text{ (thickness of 302)} / 36 = 1804 \text{ cy}$  Thank You.

---

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

Project No. 090003

Sale Date - 2/25/2009

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 1

Page 46 of the proposal has a note title "PN 115-Price Adjustment Exclusions". The last sentence states, "The quantities listed in the Price Adjustment Exclusions Table are subject to revision according to C&MS 109.04 and C&MS 109.05." We are not totally clear on the reference to these two spec items as they relate to the price adjustment exclusion table. Could this be clarified?

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 2

The answer to Question #13 in Addendum #11 is still attempting to tell us that all borrow pits will have to be a minimum of 17' deep. So, knowing the possibility that bedrock is close to the surface in some areas, if a borrow pit is begun and strikes rock after just 7' of excavation, the contractor is expected to blast away an additional 10' of rock to meet this requirement. Correct? If so, ODOT is going to have some very expensive dirt on this project.

**This is a requirement from the township, min. 17'.**

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 3

Last week your website listed Addendum #9 but it was not available on the website. We called Contract Sales on Friday 02/13 and we were told that even though it was listed it had not yet been posted and that it would be posted by the end of the work day on Friday. As of this morning, the addendum is still not posted. Monday February 16 is a holiday. When will addendum #9 be available? Will the bid date be delayed?

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 4

The cover sheet for the plans lists SS880 with an effective date of 7-18-08. A check of the ODOT website produces an effective date of 4-18-08. If the plan listed 7-18-08 date is correct, then how do we obtain a copy?

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 5

Last week your website listed Addendum #9 but it was not available on the website. We called Contract Sales on Friday 02/13 and we were told that even though it was listed it had not yet been posted and that it would be posted by the end of the work day on Friday. As of this morning, the addendum is still not posted. Monday February 16 is a holiday. When will addendum #9 be available? Will the bid date be delayed?

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 6

Please provide a detail indicating where Bid Item #23 (Granular Material Type B) is to be placed. The pavement summary indicates the quantities are derived from cross section sheets 566-570, but there are no details to indicate where the material is to be placed and what the limits are. The retaining wall plans for Ramp D do not indicate where this material is to be placed either.

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 7

The proposal is missing the laminated elastomeric bearings for Bridge LUC-24-1263 R. ODOT needs to show their descriptions and reference numbers.

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 8

General notes, page 56, describes how the water wells should be abandoned. It does not give a location for the four (4) wells. Please locate. Thank you.

**This pay item is, as directed by the engineer, no locations needed.**

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 9

On sheet 67 of the plans, the general notes for CR143 and CR136 mention a 180 day limit for the closure of Neowash Road and Neapolis-Waterville Road. Considering the high embankment fill construction restrictions and the MSE wall construction restrictions, this time period is too short. On sheet 60, each structure has an estimated 60 day waiting period for settlement of the embankments. Also, CR136 has an additional 15 day waiting period once the high embankments have reached 15.5 feet. Consequently, we would propose that the 180 day closure limits be extended for CR143 to 240 days and for CR136 to 255 days.

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 10

Could we have the complete list of the environmental consultants that are pre-qualified by the Department for ecological work? According to Item 105.16 of the spec book, ODOT should have a listing of these consultants.

**<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ProdMgt/Consultant/Consultant/prequal-environ.pdf>**

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 11

The plans illustrate an unrefined reference to existing wetlands spotted throughout the project. In the interest of not infringing upon these areas when performing the required work or when securing dirt from borrow sites, could the Department supply detailed drawings of the known wetland areas?

Question Submitted: 3/10/2009

Question Number: 12

Plan sheet 62 has a general note that addresses the issue of archaeologically sensitive areas that have been mapped and the information is available for review in District 2. I made a request for the information to be forwarded to us. I received a response stating that the request had to be made in the form of a prebid question and submitted as such. So, even though the need for this escapes me, I will do as directed. Could the information that mapped the archaeologically sensitive areas mentioned to be available for review in the District be released by the District as it states it would be in the plans?

**Please see addendum #3.**

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 13

1.) What is the length of the 12'x8' Conduit located at approximately Station 565+25? It scales to be 216 LF and is noted on the detail as 216 LF, however the pay item 603E96000 it is 240 LF. (Sheets 822 and 823 of 1193)2.) Should the 12'x8' Conduit located at approximately Station 565+25, have Type 3 Waterproofing on the top of the conduit? (Sheet 823 of 1193)3.) Pay Item 513E33000 the quantity is 504 SY, which would only cover the sides of the Conduit at a length of 216 LF. The detail on sheet 823 shows the Type 2 Waterproofing also on the top of the conduit. Should the Type 2 Waterproofing also be placed on the top of the conduit? (Sheet 823 of 1193)

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 14

On page 807/1193 the primary conduit for the power co. feeder is shown as 5" PVC conduit. Addendum #7 shows 6" Steel conduit for the same item. Which is correct? Also when will addendum #9 be posted?

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 15

1. On previous projects Norfolk & Southern RR has had the requirement: "any sheet piling within 15' of the centerline of tracks shall not be removed." On plan page 984/1193 the temporary sheeting is shown 10' min. from centerline of track to temporary sheeting. Can you verify that the sheeting as shown can be removed after backfill is completed? If it cannot be removed should the ODOT pay item be changed to read "permanent sheeting" or "sheeting to remain in place"2. Can a copy of Norfolk & Southern's shoring requirements for excavation adjacent to tracks be furnished?

**A1. What is shown in the plans was approved by NS in a letter dated 1-3-2008 to district.A2. The plans clearly depict NS's shoring requirements for this project.**

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 16

1. Ref. 564 unclassified excavation for the RR structure is not bid APP. On plan page 978/1193 under track bed notes it directs the contractor to use certain materials for the shoulder and ditch areas. Does the entire area of excavation from sheet piling to the new concrete wall get premium backfill material, and shouldn't it be an APP item?

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 17

1. On plan pages 951/1193 & 976/1193 on the bottom of the sheets in the longitudinal section along centerline of culvert or RR the top of rock elevations do not correspond with the bore hole number associated with it. Which elevation is right the bore hole elevation for rock or the elevation listed on the plan pages?

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 18

Plan sheet 802/1193 shows cableduct going thru right side of S. Bound lane bridge #LUC-24-12-63. Bridge plans show sheet 1029/1193 shows 2" conduit thru bridge. There is no pay item for 2" conduit. Please also specify type of conduit. Thank You

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 19

Sheet 796/1193 shows 2-225 KVA Transformers furnished by power co. Plans show just 1-transformer please clarify. Also who installs the transformer. Also the plans shows no location of power co. feed. Since the contractor must install the conduit we will need footages for bidding. There are also discrepancies to what size conduits should be installed Pg. 807/1193 Shows 4" and also 5" please clarify. No sizes of concrete pads are given for trans. pad and meter cabinet. THANK YOU

---

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 20

Q1 The Concrete Association requests that we eliminate the warrantyQ2 The Concrete Association requests that the footprint for the concrete typical section be reduced

**A1 The warranty requirements for both the asphalt and concrete will remain as specified A2 The footprint will remain as designed**

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 21

Please review & advise on the following questions:1.Pile points are specified for the LUC-24-0678 and LUC-64-0230 structures. Both structures have battered pile at select locations and driven to bedrock. This condition is also true for the LUC-24-1062 L/R and LUC-24-1111 L/R as well. All structures are specified to have pile driven to bedrock refusal. Should pile points be specified at the other structures for tip protection?2.Plan sheet 868 of 1193 at the LUC-64-0230 structure shows the estimated drive length for abutments at 75 FT and pier at 60 FT. Plan sheet 869 of 1193 shows the order length for the abutments at 75 FT and pier at 60 FT. The furnish quantity specified under Ref # 442 is 6430 FT. Based on the order lengths specified in the plans, the furnish quantity would be 6000 FT. In order to equal specified furnish quantity, the estimated drive lengths should be 80 FT for the abutments and 65 FT for the piers which would include 5 FT additional per piece. Please review and advise.3.The furnish and drive quantities for the LUC-24-1111 L/R piling referenced appear to have been doubled up and include totals for both the left and right structure instead of the individual structure. See below for summary and advise accordingly.

	Plan Qty	Required Qty	Ref #	522	4380 FT	2190 FT	Ref #	523	3900
FT	1950 FT	Ref # 543	4380 FT	2190 FT	Ref # 544	3900 FT	1950 FT		

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 22

On the MSE wall typical section sheets 975/1193 and 1000C/1193 in detail "A" they are showing a 6" Perforated plastic pipe w/ porous backfill and filter fabric behind the Concrete Coping of the MSE Walls. There is no reference item for this work. Should their be a reference item set up for this work or is the work incidental to some other item of work?

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 23

EBS Amendment 4 line no. 0823 203E10000 Excavation (Asphalt Alternate) 131 CY is added to AA2. AA2 is the Concrete Alternate. This item should be added to AA1 the Asphalt Alternate. Please correct the EBS so the bids tabulate correctly.

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 24

Addendum #3 deleted Bid Item #0424, Foundation Preparation, APP for the MSE walls at CR 136. Are we to assume there is no preparation required for these walls?

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 25

A question was asked at the pre-bid meeting regarding the alternate bid items for the MSE Walls, we have not seen the answer. The bid items in question are 357 and 802, we believe one item includes the mural and the other ashler stone panels. please clarify which bid item is to include the mural and which is for ashler stone. This answer is critical to submitting bids. These alternates also will affect the determination of the low bidder. Will ODOT use the low MSE Wall alternate to select low bid, and pick the preferred alternate after low bidder has been determined, the same method as the pavement alternate?

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 26

I spoke to Ms. Molly Maguire (Principal Planner of the Toledo-Lucas County Planning Commission) and she informed me that her department has been given notice of an indefinite layoff, starting February 16, 2009. It is important to point out that her department is the one responsible for all "site plan reviews" for the Waterville Township borrow pit applications and the earliest her department could review the borrow pit applications would be February 16, 2009, the first day of the layoff notice. Can you please confirm this layoff notice with-in the County and as to how the County will handle the site plan reviews in lieu of the layoff notice. Thank you, Michael R. Pfeiffer E.S. wagner Company

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 27

Is ODOT going to require the contractor to get a "Cultural Review" done on the borrow pits that will be used to construct this job? MRP

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 28

Is it an unconditional requirement by Lucas County and Waterville Township to reach a minimum depth of 17' feet in a borrow area regardless of the type of materials encountered?

---

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

## Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 29

On sheet 1012 and 1012A it states there is to be blast cleaned and primed 10889 sf of steel but only intermediate and finish of 9557 sf. On page 1011 note 14 under construction sequence the painting is to be done after all other work is completed. Where did the 1332 sf of steel go? The one beam which is being removed is done so during the reconstruction of the structure and would not be figured in. If we are losing this amount in the beam ends then the steel will need to be blasted and primed in sequence with rehabilitation and more mobilizations would be incurred.

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 30

1. ON PLAN PAGE 869/1193 UNDER THE PILE SECTION THE ORDER LENGTHS SHOWN DO NOT ADD UP TO REF 442 STEEL PILES HP 12X53 FURNISHED QTY OF 6430 FT ?

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 31

1. ON PLAN PAGE 852/1193 BOTTOM LEFT HAND CORNER IT CALLS FOR ITEM 503 UNCLASSIFIED EXCAVATION, AS PER PLAN. IN THE THE PROPOSAL, REF. 404 UNCLASSIFIED EXCAVATION DOES NOT CALL FOR THE EXCAVATION TO BE AS PER PLAN. PLEASE CLARIFY!

Question Submitted: 3/11/2009

Question Number: 32

1. IN PLOTTING THE FOOTER FOR THE PIERS IN REFERENCE TO THE EDGE OF ROAD ON THE DUTCH ROAD STRUCTURES LUC-24-1062(L&R)AND WATERVILLE-MONCLOVA STRUCTURES (LUC-24-1111 L&R)IT LOOKS LIKE TO MAINTAIN TRAFFIC WITH 11' LANES BOTH WAYS SHEETING COULD BE REQUIRED? ALL OTHER STRUCTURES TO THE WEST OF THESE ON THE PROJECT HAVE A COFFERDAM, CRIB, AND SHEETING BID ITEM, WHY NOT THESE STRUCTURES? 2. SINCE WE ARE DIGGING CLOSE TO THE EDGE OF ROAD ON THE TWO STRUCTURES NAMED ABOVE WHY IS THERE NO TEMP. CONCRETE BARRIER SET UP TO PROTECT THE PIER EXCAVATIONS?

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 33

Does the Department plan on letting a Tree Clearing contract prior to the start of this project? There are locations that contain trees that will need cleared prior to April 15th, due to the Indiana Bat plan note.

**Clearing and grubbing is part of this contract reference 0001**

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 34

The temporary striping items (Ref # 321 – 328) are specified as class I, 740.06, type I and II which is removable and non-removable temporary tape. The temporary striping will be placed on old pavement, temporary pavement, or intermediate course and will be in use during the winter months. Considering these scenarios, should the temporary striping be specified as 740.02 traffic paint instead of tape?

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 35

Is the footing concrete for the box culvert LUC-24-1071 now QC/QA concrete? Page 4 of Addendum #6 lists QC/QA Concrete on sheet 823 where it was originally Class C.

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 36

1.SHEET 952/1193 AND 978/1193 (CULVERT STRUCTURE TYPICAL SECTIONS) SHOWS A 1 TO 1 SLOPE FOR THE BACKFILL OUTSIDE OF THE TWO STRUCTURES UP TO SUBGRADE. SHEET 302/1193 AND 303/1193 SHOWS A VERTICAL FACE WHERE THE GRANULAR MATERIAL TYPE B STOPS. PLEASE CLARIFY YOUR INTENTION FOR BACKFILL OUTSIDE OF THE TWO CULVERTS. 2.ON SHEET 952/1193 AND 978/1193 (CULVERT STRUCTURE TYPICAL SECTIONS) THERE IS NO DISTANCE SPECIFIED IN BETWEEN THE TWO CULVERTS FOR THE LIMITS OF THE GRANULAR MATERIAL TYPE B. WHERE DO WE SPLIT THE QTY FOR EACH STRUCTURE FOR THE GRANULAR MATERIAL TYPE B IN BETWEEN THE TWO CULVERTS? PLEASE CLARIFY

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 37

1.The plan sheet 953 general notes outline the form liner requirements for the LUC-24-1293 cut-off walls and headwalls. The aesthetic details for this structure are provided on plan sheet 954A showing the locations of the form liner and keystone pattern. Plan sheet 979 outlines general notes for the form liner requirements on the LUC-24-1272 cut-off walls and headwalls. No aesthetic details are provided for this structure. Are aesthetic details required for the LUC-24-1272? If so, please provide aesthetic details.2.Please verify that the cast-in-place concrete detailed on plan sheet 962 and 988 are included for payment under Ref # 588 and 618 respectively. If so, the quantities for both items appear to be in error.

---

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



## Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 38

There was a question submitted on 1/15/09 in reference to the sheeting along the Norfolk Southern RR. The Department did not seem to clearly answer the question. Can we remove this sheeting/shoring?

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 39

Addendum #8 added Ref. No. 823 as an Asphalt Alternate item. It is listed as an AA2 & adds to the Concrete Alternate items in the EBS program file. Is this correct? Please advise.

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 40

Addendum 9 added steel encasement pipe. What is the wall thickness supposed to be for this pipe? 638.11, Steel Pipe Encasement states: "Furnish and install a steel casing of the diameter and wall thickness shown in the plans." This is not shown in the plans.

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 41

LUC-24-1263 L/R sheets 1026+1027/1193 calls out moment retrofit plates "structural steel members, level 3, item 513" there is no line/reference number in the proposal book nor a line in the estimated quantities for these two items. What should the line/reference numbers be? What type and grade of material should be used? What will the coating require?

**See addendum #8. revised sheet 1024**

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 42

Line item #0189 - Portland Cement Concrete Pavement, 11.5" Thick (7 Year Warranty)(Concrete Alternate) -1. Is this concrete reinforced or non-reinforced? a. Supplemental Specification 896 refers to SS 888 for paving specifications, however, in SS 888, it states that work shall conform to 451 for reinforced concrete pavement or 452 for non reinforced concrete pavement. It does not specify which type of pavement should be used on this project, please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 43

1. The MSE walls @ structures 1293 & 1272 show the 12" layer of 203 Granular Embankment Type C per the 840 specification while the MSE walls @ structures 0678, 0847 & 0230 show the layer same layer @ 24" thick. Should all the locations be 12" thick & if not how is this additional quantity paid for? 2. The structure work at Dutch Rd. (1062) & Waterville-Monclova Rd. (1111) have no maintenance of traffic set up in the bid. The substructure work will be conducted extremely close to traffic. Should there be a pay quantity for Portable Conc. Barrier Wall set up for these locations? Also, there is only 2 days allowed for road closures for erecting beams. Will the Department allow other short term closures for the pier work?

Question Submitted: 3/12/2009

Question Number: 44

There is no reference item set up for 'Bridge Mounted Portable Concrete Barrier Wall'. Structures 1263 L & R will have bi-directional traffic placed upon them. Should there be an item for this?

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 45

Sheet 26/521, Catch Basin Abandoned in Place, calls for a 3/4" steel plate to be installed on top of the abandoned structure. Is a precast reinforced concrete top an acceptable substitute for the 3/4" plate?

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 46

There's no item for RPM's placed in concrete pavement. Please add an item for this work.

**Ref 230 RPM applies to both alternative.**

---

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



# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 47

1. In addendum #4, answer 4A, states that "the contractor that has the lowest responsible bid regardless of the pavement alternate be considered the lowest bidder". When you state "regardless of the pavement alternate" is it the intent of ODOT to make a low bidder award on a "base" bid without consideration of the Alternate Pavement Item pricing? Will ODOT then determine which alternate pavement it chooses only in the awarded bidder's alternate pricing? 2. What criteria or formula will ODOT use to determine which pavement alternate will be selected as low bid? Will this criteria or formula be public and included in a future addendum so the bidders know how ODOT will determine the low pavement design prior to bid date? 3. Will ODOT make a decision on the Pavement Alternate by the time the contract is awarded or will contract be awarded with both Pavement Alternates and then at a later date make a decision?

**A1) The department looks at each bidders lowest bid no matter what the lowest alternate may be. The single lowest responsible bid among all of the bidders will then be evaluated for award of the contract. Upon award of the contract, the department may then choose which alternate they want but we must use the awarded bidders unit pricing. A2) The lowest dollar amount. A3) This is already public knowledge and will not be in an addendum. A4) see #1 above.**

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 48

Sheet 954A of 1193 indicates Ashlar Stone pattern formliner is to be used for MSE Walls 2 and 5, and Retaining Wall 01. Are MSE Walls 1, 3 and 4 also supposed to have Ashlar Stone pattern formliner?

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 49

1. Sheet 57/1193, ITEM 443, STONE MATRIX ASPHALT CONCRETE, 12.5mm, PG76-22M, (446), AS PER PLAN, plan note states that the 443 SMA will follow the specification for 442 except for the binder in the intermediate course. This pay item is surface course, please clarify. If the 443 SMA is to follow the 442 specification except for the 442.04 section, are we to provide 443 or 442 12.5mm? The note also calls out for a material transfer vehicle for the 443 SMA intermediate and surface courses. Is the material transfer vehicle required for the mainline and ramp driving lane, passing lane, and shoulders or just the driving and passing lanes? The 443 SMA is a surface course; please clarify what courses and lanes or shoulders require the material transfer vehicle. 2. The typical sections on sheet 40/1193 (Fischer Dr) and sheet 43/1193 (Kay Drive) call out the asphalt base as 301. The Office Calculations and General Summary call out asphalt base as 302 for Fischer Drive and Kay Drive. Please clarify what asphalt base is required. 3. Sheets 73/1193 and 76/1193 show the temporary runaround for SR 64 tying into existing SR 64, will butt joints be required for the 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B, As Per Plan? 4. Sheet 67/1193, Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B, As Per Plan, calls out an intermediate course of T2 at 0"-1", variable thickness, should a T1 material be used? 5. Sheet 61/1193 states that Construction Noise - Lucas County, no power equipment will be operated between 9 pm and 7 am. With volume of asphalt, maximizing efficiencies will require night paving. Please clarify if the noise restrictions can be lifted and if they can be lifted how. 6. Which sections of roadway does PN420, Surface Smoothness Requirements for Pavement, apply to?

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 50

Addendum 6 states that a material transfer device is required for Mainline US 24 on the 443 SMA 12.5mm surface course. Our interpretation is that the transfer device is for driving and passing lanes only, and that the transfer machine will not be used on the shoulders.

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 51

Please clarify the note on plan page 796/1193 Utility Primary Electric Service Plan. It states "...that the contractor shall supply and perform the following items which supports the primary power system and all work shown on sheet 762...". Plan page 762 is a signing page; nowhere in the plans can we find a sheet labeled "UTILITY PRIMARY POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM". Since the contractor is to install the duct bank for the primary power feed please provide details on where the duct bank begins and ends. If it is not known where the power supply is to be picked up, then bid items should be established on a lineal foot basis.

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 52

On plan page 794/1193 under note PAD MOUNT TRANSFORMER (BY UTILITY COMPANY) section I. states "... The transformer will be provided, set, and primary wiring connections made by the Utility Company. On plan page 796/1193 under the Utility Primary Electric Service Plan note section B. #3 states that contractor shall set the transformers, the line below that states that the contractor shall install all primary, secondary, and meter conduits and wiring. Please clarify who is to set the transformers, and who is to provide and install the wiring for the primary power.

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 53

Can you make available on ODOT website the existing bridge plans for Bridge No. LUC-24-1263, US 24 over Stitt Rd?

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-80444/>**

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 54

1. What are the MOT requirements for Stitt Rd during the reconstruction of Bridge No. Luc-24-1263L&R?2. There is existing guardrail shown of pg 1009/1193 along Stitt Rd at pier 2 of Bridge No. Luc-24-1263L&R that will need to be removed and replace in order to construct the footing for the crashwall at pier 2. How is the removal and replacement of this guardrail to be paid for? While this guardrail is removed for the pier construction shouldn't temporary barrier wall be placed in lieu of the guardrail for protection of traffic on Stitt Rd? If so how is this temporary barrier to be paid for?3. There is existing crushed aggregate slope protection at pier 1 of Bridge No. Luc-24-1263L&R that will need to be removed and replace in order to construct the footing for the crashwall at pier 1. How is the removal and replacement of this crushed aggregate to be paid for?

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 55

On plan sheet 1026 and 1027 on the existing beam elevation there is a note: "MOMENT PLATE RETROFIT SEE DETAIL, SHEET16/28(TYP) and it only points to the top flange. The detail it refers you to shows the top flange moment plate retrofits. Are the bottom flange moment plates to be retrofit also? If so where is the detail calling out the plate sizes for the bottom flange retrofits. The existing top and bottom moment plates are different widths and thicknesses so the retrofit detail would not be the same for the bottom and top.

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 56

With receiving 3 addendums in the past 6 days are you going to extend the bid letting date to give us more time to analyze the changes?

Question Submitted: 3/13/2009

Question Number: 57

How do we set the price for RPM's when it is more costly and a different operation for concrete compared to Asphalt? Rumble strips have different line items, pavement has different line items, and many others. I don't think it is fair that we have only one item for two different operations. Odot has gotten away with this for too long and it needs to be corrected.

Question Submitted: 3/14/2009

Question Number: 58

There needs to be a bid item for end-anchors per Items 622-Single/Slope Types B-1, C-1, and D.Item 622 Single/Slope C-1 @ Station 665+00 sheet 551, there should be an End-Section C-1 paid as each.Should the barrier from Station 639+00 to 648+39.5 be type C-1 not B-1 as listed. (Sheet 144 sub-summary, sheet 198 G-2)If 3.5" or 4" polystyrene is placed between the Type-D and the tunnel walls as per sheet 50, the top of the barrier will only be 2" or 2.5" thick. Widening the barrier will reduce the 38' Ramp D width shown on sheet 952. What is the intent?

Question Submitted: 3/15/2009

Question Number: 59

Please advise if the Ref 217, Luminaire Underpass, As Per Plan, 250 Watt HPS fixtures as listed on plan page 796/1193 does it need to be listed on the 725.11 ODOT Material Management Qualified Products Listing (QPL) prior to order placement or installation? In the plan note the ballast note has a of a regulator type with power factor isolated transformer windings rated for 480volt and 250 watt requirement, does the luminaire manufacture need to meet this requirement and if it is not possible will ODOT allow another type of ballast? Does the luminaire manufacture also need to supply at time of installation a copy of the CSA certification and UL listing as "suitable for wet location 40 degree C ambient "?

Question Submitted: 3/2/2009

Question Number: 60

Will ODOT allow supplemental specification 840 "Mechanical Stabilized Earth Walls" dated 10/17/2008 to be utilized for this project

Question Submitted: 3/2/2009

Question Number: 61

We can not find any pay items for Item 622 - Concrete Barrier End Anchor, Reinforced. Please clarify if there are going to be pay items for Barrier End Anchors for the Type B1, Type C1 and Type D barrier, or if there are going to be no Barrier End Anchors on this project. Thanks.

Question Submitted: 3/2/2009

Question Number: 62

Please provide the "Office Calcs" for the 269,284 sy of PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT, 11.5" THICK (7 YEAR WARRANTY) (CONCRETE ALTERNATE) and for the 94,688 cy of ASPHALT CONCRETE (7 YEAR WARRANTY) (ASPHALT ALTERNATE). Thanks.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-80444/>

Question Submitted: 3/3/2009

Question Number: 63

Bid Item #124 42" CONDUIT, TYPE B , 706.02 3250 D-LOAD will have to be installed in two phases. On Sheet number 1002 it shows this pipe run in a 60" steel encasement pipe. Is this pipe run intended to be bored and jacked? If not, is the encasement pipe needed and if so what are the limits of the encasement pipe?

---

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

## Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/3/2009

Question Number: 64

The 6" Underdrain references, Item 159 and 160, does not specify a pipe type. Will it be permissible to use 4" underdrain for these references?

Question Submitted: 3/3/2009

Question Number: 65

The drive details, sheets 667 and 668, do not show any typical sections for the drives. Also there is no quantity on the driveway subsummary for the drives. Please advise what kind of pavement sections to use for these drives.

Question Submitted: 3/3/2009

Question Number: 66

We have the following 2 questions regarding the roadway barrier on this project: 1) There is no lighting raceway shown in the Type B1 and C1 Barrier Wall. Please clarify if this is correct that the wall gets no raceway, or if raceway is to be installed for future use. 2) Pay item # 61 - "CONCRETE BARRIER SINGLE SLOPE TYPE D" appears to overlap item # 608 "BARRIER MISC: CONCRETE BARRIER TYPE D WITH SLEEPER SLAB REINFORCED" on US 24 Lt from Station 631+99 to 634+36. It looks as though quantity has been included in the roadway subsummary for this location under item # 61 and was also included on page 999 for item # 608. We are further confused by the note on page 1000D. Which states "Type D Barrier (include with roadway quantities for payment)". Please let us know which pay item the cost of this 238 ft of reinforced barrier with sleeper slab is to be included in.

Question Submitted: 3/3/2009

Question Number: 67

On the cross-sections for SR 64 it shows an overbuild on the slope for MOT. The cross-sections for the temporary run-around do not show this overbuild. What is the purpose for the overbuild, and is it necessary?

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 68

This question is regarding the MSW wall notes provided on Sheet 972 for LUC-24-1293 (US 24 over Ramp D) and Sheet 999 for LUC-24-1272 (US 24 over NS RR). As per the fourth item under Proprietary Retaining Wall Data, "Global Stability of the Retaining Walls within the project site have indicated that the reinforcing lengths for the walls may be required to exceed 0.7 times the height of the wall to prevent sliding." As per SS840, the global stability is the responsibility of Ohio DOT and vendor is responsible for the internal stability only. Therefore, Ohio DOT needs to provide the minimum strip length required to meet global stability as it was done in past projects. Therefore, please supply the minimum strip length required for global stability for the MSE walls on LUC-24-1293 and LUC-24-1272 and remove the ambiguous note on Sheet 972 and 999.

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 69

This question is regarding MSE wall notes for LUC-24-0678 on Sheet 815 and Sheet 833 (bridge notes) AND also regarding MSE wall notes for LUC-24-0847 on Sheet 818 and Sheet 850 (bridge notes). Please resolve the conflict between sheet 815 vs. 833 and 818 vs. 850. As per second paragraph on Sheet 815, the design for the internal stability shall include an unfactored horizontal load of 7.00 kips/ft applied perpendicular to the face of the wall at the base of the concrete footing. Later as per the fourth item on the second column of sheet 833, the design for internal stability shall include a horizontal strip load from the superstructure of 4 kips/ft. Please confirm the load (7 kips/ft. or 4 kips/ft.) As per second paragraph on Sheet 818, the design for the internal stability shall include an unfactored horizontal load of 7.52 kips/ft applied perpendicular to the face of the wall at the base of the concrete footing. Later as per the fourth item on the second column of sheet 850, the design for internal stability shall include a horizontal strip load from the superstructure of 4 kips/ft. Please confirm the load (7.52 kips/ft. or 4 kips/ft.)

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 70

In review of the MOT plans there are areas that call for installation of Work Zone Guardrail. There is no reference item for this work. Will there be reference items added for this guardrail and the associated end treatments, or is this work to be included in the lump sum item Maintaining Traffic?

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 71

Can there be an alternate for 614 temporary striping (Ref# 321-328), for the use of 642 Paint instead of temporary tape (740.06, Type 1) that is on the proposal. The temporary striping is on old pavement or on intermediate course. This should save some money, for the tape will cost substantially more than the paint. Also can there be a removal bid item put in the proposal, for there will be at least some removal at the crossovers.

---

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 72

1) After review of the quantities contained in the office calcs for item 202 Pavement Removed, Asphalt it appears that item 203 Excavation includes the pavement removal areas. Please confirm. 2) The SY of item 202 Pavement Removed needs additional review. Per office calcs, on Ramp D between station 665+00 and 677+44.23 the width to be removed is 42', these stations are within the resurfacing areas of Ramp D, the width to be removed appears to be 18' for both shoulders to face of proposed median wall.

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 73

1) How is the 203 embankment re-fill of the paved shoulder removal shown in detail A sheet 45/1193 paid for? All cross sections in this area show excavation only.

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 74

It is typically the contractor's responsibility to provide a protection of traffic plan while building structures in accordance with ODOT CMS 501 or an associated plan note. In the prebid meeting minutes, use of the tunnel structures for traffic is discouraged until all work is complete around it and over it. If an adequate protection plan is proposed, will the Department reconsider use of the tunnel for traffic prior to final completion of the project.

**No**

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 75

On Friday afternoon February 13, 2009, your website listed 9 addenda for Project 090003. Addendum 9 was not accessible at that time and remains unavailable at 10:10am on February 16, 2009. Please make it available ASAP.

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 76

The following questions pertain to the backfill for the two tunnels.1. On MSE Wall 5 does the Select Granular for the MSE wall extend all the way from the back of the MSE panels to the porous surrounding the railroad tunnel wall or is there Granular, Type B required outside of the MSE reinforcing straps? The same question is for MSE Wall 2 and Ramp D Tunnel.2. Is the area between the tunnel walls backfill filled with Type B Granular and is it paid for under that item?3. What are the limits of the Granular Type B on the outside of the tunnels?4. Is the material on top of the Tunnels up to subgrade paid for under the Granular, Type B pay item?

Question Submitted: 3/4/2009

Question Number: 77

On sheet #822 it shows the proposed box culvert being 216' long and in the estimated quantities on sheet #823 they call out for 240' for the box culvert. Ref# 706 calls for 52' and Ref# calls for 188' for a total of 240 feet. Please advise what is the correct quantity 216 feet or 240 feet, and how it should be split between the two Ref #'s.

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 78

The deck concrete quantity Ref 654 for the Eastbound Stitt Rd structure looks to be in error.

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 79

on the Stitt Road structures, how is the restoration of the existing crushed aggregate slope protection due to pier construction be paid for?

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 80

On sheet 1027 it calls for the existing beams to be removed and resst on the rehabilitated substructure. Are the beams to be disassembled at the splices and lowered to the ground or just cut loose from the cross frames and temporarily supported until the substructure is modified? How is this work to be paid for?

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 81

The following questions pertain the surface sealing and painting for the Mural shown on sheet 1001A.1. How is the Painting, Surface Seal and Graffiti guard for the mural section paid for?1. Is the mural one color or are multiple colors used? 2. Is the background epoxy-urathane surface seal?3. What are the limits of the Graffiti Guard?On sheet 827 it shows Low Strength Mortar Back-fill to be used. However, the limits shown are unreasonable due to the undercut and safety requirements. Since this structure is in a fill section would it not be reasonable to back-fill the structure with 703.11

---

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 82

We have recieved a letter from Reinforced Earth stating that the Techspan Arch system is "approved as an alternate with approval" to the Conspan arch shown in the drawings. Our question is, is this type of structure approved as the base bid or will we have to submit it as a VE after award?

**The Techspan Arch system is approved to be installed on ODOT projects and can be used in the base bid for this contract. The precast segments must be produced by an ODOT certified precast concrete producer that is in accordance with supplement 1073.**

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 83

There is no detail shown for the Fire Department Connection for the dry standpipe at the tunnel. It calls out for a check valve amd ball drip valve but does not show how everthing is connected. Also, there is no part number or description for the acutal fire hose connection. For the 2 1/2" connection in the tunnel there is no detail or size requirements for the air release or vacuum release valves and how they are connected. Also no part number for the 2/1/2" hose connection.

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 84

The bending diagram for the barrier wall resteel on sheet 1008 looks to be incorrect. The R504 bar in the list is straight but you show a bending detail for it below. The R503 bar is shown bent but no detail is shown. The R505 is called as bent but it is straight on the details

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 85

Supplemental Spec 840, Sction 840.06 D Foundation Preparation states that 12" of Type C Granular is to be placed on the subgrade. Plan sheet 820 shows this to be 24". How is the extra 12" of type C Granular to be paid for?

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 86

The plans call for the effective date for the 840 Supplemental Specification to be April 18,2008. However, there is a revised Supplemental Dated October 17,2008 which removes the 30' limitation in 840.02 F for the Ares wall system. Copuld this new Supplemental be used for this project?

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 87

On sheet 1001A it calls for the mural to be paid for under Bid Item 840, Aesthic Surface Treatment, Mural. However, ther is no pay item with this description. There is a pay item for Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall, As Per Plan. Since the quantities are the same are we to assume that the As Per Plan Quantity is for the MWE wall with the Mural? A note on 1001, states that the panels associated with the MSE wall shall have Ashler Stone form liner used. On sheet 1001A, it shows limits for the Ashler Stone. What are the limits of the Ashler Stone?

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 88

on sheet 823/1193 under Foundation Base Preparation, it states that we are to "under cut below wingwall footings and the box culvert bottom slab to elevation 631.0 ..." is this refering to the 240' long base of the box culvert or just the footings under the ends?

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 89

There are no pile points specified for structure LUC-24-0847. Since we are driving to Rock should there be points on these pile?

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 90

Due to the proximity and amount of traffic on Dutch Rd and Waterville Monclova Rd Temporary Barrier Wall would seem to be in order. Also, there is no Cofferdam, Cribbs and Sheeting for these structures

Question Submitted: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 91

The following questions pertain to the the two strutures at Ramp D and N/S Railroad1. There are no construction joints shown for the footings or walls. Are we to assume that we may place them at any location convenient to our needs? 2. There are no details for any construcion joints.3. Is waterstop required for construction Joints?4. Does the back of the joint have to be covered with a waterproofing membrane?5. Are there any expansion joints required?6. Is there any pour sequence if joints are 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: 3/5/2009

Question Number: 92

On sheet 1022/1193 the elevation on the left side of the west bound pier footing is shown as 701.91. This is in error as the top of the crash wall above is 623.51. Please advise as to the proper elevation.

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 93

Hello, My question is regarding the specification 706.02 - Reinforced Concrete Pipe. When trying to prepare bids for ODOT projects, what is the most effective way to determine the class of RCP to be used in each case? Our interpretation is that if a D-Load is not specified then the charts detailed under 706.02 will prevail in determine the class of pipe: Size Minimum D-Load 12 in (300 mm) 2000 lb (100 kg) 15 in (375 mm) 2000 lb (100 kg) 18 in (450 mm) 1250 lb (62.5 kg) 21 in (525 mm) 1250 lb (62.5 kg) 24 in (600 mm) 1250 lb (62.5 kg) 27 in (675 mm) or larger 1000 lb (50 kg) ASTM C76 D-Load (0.01 in Crack) 2(Class II) 1000 3(Class III) 1250 4(Class IV) 2000 5(Class V) 3000 If a D-Load is specified on the bid tab are we to compare the D-Load given to the chart above and determine an appropriate class? What is the major relevance of "Conduit Type A-D" being listed? Or does this have a role in determining the Class to be used in each situation? Thank you for your time. David Middleton middleton@cocogroup.com Co-Pipe Products Inc. Taylor, MI

**A1. The above statement is correct. A2. This is also correct. A3. Conduit types are based on where the conduit is being placed. Please refer to the 2008 CMS section 603.02.**

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 94

The Ramps and US 24 section north of Section 609+25 as stated in the pre bid minutes are not part of the alternate bid items for asphalt versus a concrete pavement section. Since the typical pavement sections are the same for this area and the rest of the project, why can't all of this pavement be considered in the alternate? Wouldn't this benefit ODOT to the best possible savings for the project?

**The alternate pavement stops at 609+25 on the mainline because of Maintenance of traffic issues.**

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 95

QUESTION NUMBER 1: Addendum Number 8 changed the earthwork quantities. Are the revised quantities correct? Will the awarded contractor have the right to review how these quantities were obtained? The plans have cross-sections that we can compare the actual elevations to, but the revision just have some quantities. For instance, Moosman Drive from station 28+85.56 to 30+00 has an "ACTUAL FILL" of -171 cubic yards. How can this happen? The Addendum raised the Bench Mark 0.5 ft. and the calculations were based on "Lowered 0.45" changed. Why wasn't the new calculations based on a 0.5 foot change? How much will that effect the earthwork quantities? What effect does the changing the bench mark have on the existing drainage outlets and meeting the existing roads? QUESTION NUMBER 2: Addendum Number 7 made a change on County Road 143 (Neowash) time of completion. The original time was CR 143 could be closed for 180 days and the Addendum changed this on page 67 to "shall be completed and open to traffic by October 31, 2009." How did this change help? This made the actual time for construction less. This was discussed at the Pre-Bid meeting and cannot be done in this time frame with the waiting period that is in the plans.

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 96

Addendum Number 11 has "The following files have been added and are linked: 80444 addasphalt.xlsx, 80444 modadd concrete.xlsl, 80444 final mod.xlsl and 80444 parcel 500.pdf" but we are unable to find these attachments.

**Go to the link on the cover page of addendum 11. When you open the link you will see a folder named: Addendum-20090220. The files are contained in that folder.**

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 97

Addendum Number 11 under Q-9 asked about the "revised" sheet in Addendum Number 9 were not attached to Addendum Number 9. What we need is for ODOT to attach these revised sheets to some addendum.

**"revised" sheets in this instance refer to change on these sheets which are described in the body of the addendum. A revised electronic file for a revised plan sheet was not intended to be linked to the 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: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 98

Question Number 1: Addendum Number 9 in the "TREE CUTTING REQUIREMENTS" on the first page, left column states "ALL TREES SHALL BE CUT BY APRIL 1, 2008." We cannot get this done in 2008. When will the "Liquidated Damages" start? This project has a letting date of February 25 and the normal award time is 30 days, which means the work could not start until March 25 and leaves four work days to get the CLEARING AND GRUBBING AS PER PLAN completed. Question Number 2: Addendum Number 9 in the answers to question section there is a reference to "Revised" Sheets 326, 814, 817, 702, 688 and 67. There is also a "Modified" Sheet 1002. These were not included in the attachments. How can we get these? Question Number 3: Addendum Number 9 Revised Bid Item 0003 "PAVEMENT REMOVED ASPHALT" has a new Bid Quantity of 84,699 SY and the quantity before Addendum Number 9 was 90,431 SY. This is a deduction of 5,732 SY. The answer to 9Q-25 part 2 says 202E23010 is corrected by -756 SY. Which is correct? Question Number 4: Addendum Number 9 Revised Bid Item 0164 "PAVEMENT PLANING, ASPHALT CONCRETE" has a new Bid Quantity of 35,333 SY and the quantity before Addendum Number 9 was 34,577 SY. This is a Addition of 756 SY. The answer to 9Q-25 part 2 says 202E0100 is corrected by -5,732 SY. Which is correct? Question Number 5: Reference Number 0021 EXCAVATION 203E10000 was decreased by 17,191 CY. We will need cross-sections or explanations as to the location of this deduction. Question Number 6: Addendum Number 4 contains the "AMENDMENT TO THE WATERVILLE TOWNSHIP ZONING RESOLUTION" which states in 9.27.2 Area and Design Requirements Section c) The sides slopes of a borrow pit shall not exceed a 3:1 ratio horizontal to vertical. This ratio shall be maintained to a minimum depth of 17 feet. This does not mean the borrow pit has to be 17 feet deep but the slope has to be a 3:1 for the first 17 feet. Is this a correct assumption? Question Number 7: Addendum Number 9 under "Add the following Notes: Sheet 67 add note: Stitt Road Maintaining Traffic" why isn't the Work Zone Impact Attenuator paid for under Reference Number 305? Why isn't the Portable Concrete Barrier paid for under Reference Number 337? The ODOT Specification book in the second paragraph states "The Department will pay for the following items under their associated item numbers:..... 622 Portable Concrete Barrier. Question Number 8: Addendum Number 9 under "Added Bid Items" Ref. No. 0825 is 68 feet of 60" STEEL PIPE ENCASEMENT, OPEN CUT and under Sheet 1002 the Item is "Provide 68' Item 638E0733 60" steel encasement, bored and jack. Which is correct? One is Open cut and the other is bored and jack. Reference Number 0826 is turned around the other way.

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 99

Addendum Number 11 Q-12 The question was where is the 17,191 cy that was deducted from the Excavation? Using the stations that were given in Addendum Number 9 as limits and the width as given (42 ft), the thickness of the pavement removal would be 8.88 feet. Is that pavement that thick?

**See back up document at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-80444/80444-Excavation.pdf>**

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 100

In the 2008 construction and material specifications section 707 a specific wall thickness is given for all corrugated metal pipes. Then supplemental specification 800 made many of these wall thickness heavier. On this project in the as per plan notes the wall thickness in some instances do not match either of the previous specifications. Could you clarify what wall thickness you want for this project.

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 101

On Plan Sheet 1024 of 1193 or sheet 16 of 28 on LUC-24-1263, on the bottom right corner it refers to the moment plates as a Level 3 Steel. I have found no proposal item or any notes to back this. Should this be Level UF as well or are you going to add a Level 3 pay item.

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 102

There is no detail shown for the Fire Department Connection for the dry standpipe at the tunnel. It calls out for a check valve and ball drip valve but does not show how everything is connected. Also, there is no part number or description for the actual fire hose connection. For the 2 1/2" connection in the tunnel there is no detail or size requirements for the air release or vacuum release valves and how they are connected. Also no part number for the 2 1/2" hose connection. Does the 6" dry line need the joints restrained and if so what are the restraint requirements

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 103

What does the APP pertain to for Ref 194, 6" Fire Hydrant, APP? Are there any restrictions as to how long and when waterlines can be taken out of service? On the 12" waterline on CR 124, can the road be closed during this work since the new line is in the road and we are taking a lane for installation? How is the pavement restoration being paid for on CR 124 due to waterline installation

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 104

Please clarify the following regarding substitution of concrete diaphragms with steel diaphragms: 1. Per PSID-1-99, 7/8" bolts are to be used for steel diaphragm connections to beams, not threaded inserts as shown in the plans. 2. ASTM A709 Grade 36 material can be used for these members. There could be a significant difference in price based on these requirements.

---

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



# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/6/2009

Question Number: 105

Please confirm that it is acceptable to use, at the contractor's option and without any cost to the Owner, the latest version of SS840 - Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall, dated January 16th 2009.

Question Submitted: 3/8/2009

Question Number: 106

For Bid Reference Number 217, Luminaire, Underpass, As Per Plan, 250 Watt HPS, neither product specified on plan page 796 of 1193 is on ODO's QPL. With the product being specified as a 725.11 Tunnel Luminaire which is not a sub category of ODOT's QPL, will ODOT allow either one of these products to be supplied without being added to ODOT's QPL? It is my understanding that both products have been used in the past by ODOT as 725.11 Tunnel Luminaires without being on ODOT's QPL. Assuming the Reference Items passed previous ODOT requirements as Decorative Luminaires with multiple product offering, for competitive bidding.

Question Submitted: 3/8/2009

Question Number: 107

In order to begin construction of MSE Wall #1, an access road will be necessary to deliver materials (steel, concrete, stone, wall panels) from Waterville Monclova Road (US 24 Station 587+00 +/-) to the area west of MSE Wall #1 and the existing railroad, as this area cannot be accessed from the east. Please consider adding an aggregate quantity to construct this access road.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 108

Proposal - Page 46, PN 115 -01/16/2009 Price Adjustment Exclusions: states "The Contractor shall Not receive Asphalt Binder Price Adjustments (C&MS 401.20), Steel Price Adjustments (PN 525) or Fuel Price Adjustments (PN 520) for any work on items listed in the Price Adjustment Exclusions Table. The Price Adjustment Exclusions Table on page 62/1193 of the plans includes Asphalt Concrete, Portland Cement Concrete Pavement, Underdrains, Pressure Relief Joint Type A, Embankment, Aggregate Base and Rumble Strips. The Embankment, Aggregate Base and Rumble Strips construction is required regardless of which pavement alternate is taken. Therefore, these items, Embankment, Aggregate Base and Rumble Strips, which represent a significant portion of work, should be eligible for the Fuel Price Adjustment per PN 520.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 109

At the Pre-Bid Meeting a lengthy discussion regarding the process and timing of local regulations for potential Borrow Pit Plan & Approval took place. It is our understanding ODOT anticipates Waterville Township to approve an amendment regarding these regulations on January 14th. In addition ODOT stated that if the contractor submit all documentation required on January 15th, the contractor should have a response from Waterville Township regarding Borrow Pit Approval within 2 weeks of this date, approximately January 29th, prior to bid submission on February 4th. In conversations with Molly Maguire, Lucas County Planning Commission we have been informed of the following: "That on January 14, 2009 when the Waterville Township Trustees vote on the "Amendment to the Waterville Township Zoning Resolution regarding borrow pits" there will be a 30 day wait period before any borrow pits can be approved, to allow any constituent to challenge the legislation that was voted on by the Trustees". The earliest any contractor can plan to have a borrow pit approved would be February 15, 2009. It appears, from this statement, the contractor will not know prior to bid submission on February 4th if any local borrow pit is approved. Due to significant cost impacts and safety implications involved with utilizing non-local borrow sources, please confirm Lucas County Planning Commission's statement regarding the 30 day constituent challenge period.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 110

Bid Item #23 - Granular Material, Type B, bid quantity of 6,538 cy is summerized on plan sheet 162/1193, Earthwork Subsummary. This work shown to be on plan sheets 566 thru 570. After review of plan sheets 566 thru 570 I cannot find were this work is identified and/or quantified. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 111

Reference #827 - Clearing & Grubbing APP - per the notes has a completion date of 04/01/2008, this date has past, what is the new completion date? Reference #3 - Pavement Removed, by addendum #9, quantity revised to 84,699 sy, a reduction of 5,732 sy, please provide location and calculation of this reduction. Reference #23 - Excavation - per addendum #9, quantity of 17,919 cy, I am not clear on where this reduction occurred. Please provide a detailed accounting of the excavation quantity reduction.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 112

Can a copy be provided to the contractor of the pavement calculations were ODOT has indicated Office Calcs were used?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-80444/>

---

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 113

Does Ref. 357 MSE Wall, APP (mural) receive any color treatment or staining of the relief mural pattern other than the epoxy urethane and graffiti guard?

**The mural does not receive any color or staining.**

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 114

On Sheet 67 of the Maintenance of Traffic Note under Criteria for Maintaining Traffic Note 4 States "CR 143 shall be completed and open to traffic prior to the start of any other work." Note 10 States " Embankment work that does not require the closing of any roadway or affect the permitted roadway closure periods may be constructed at any time." Under Sequence of Construction Stage 1 – General it states " Stage 1 work may be performed concurrently with Stage 2 work provided that all the provisions in these maintenance of traffic plans are met." It also lists work that may be performed at any time during the sequence of construction. Will the contractor be allowed to do other work on the project prior to the completion of CR 143 or must it be completed prior to the start of any other work as stated above in Note 4 under Criteria for Maintaining Traffic?

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 115

The Ramps and US 24 section north of Section 609+25 as stated in the pre bid minutes are not part of the alternate bid items for asphalt verses a concrete pavement section. Since the typical pavement sections are the same for this area and the rest of the project, why can't all of this pavement be considered in the alternate? Wouldn't this benefit ODOT to the best possible savings for the project?

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 116

Please provide the sheet numbers for the pavement removal quantities shown in the excel takeoff spreadsheets (pavement sub-summary added via addendum number 2) for all work associated with US 24 (US 24 westbound, US 24 Eastbound, US 24 Ramp C, US 24 Ramp D, US 24 Ramp A, and Ex. US 24) as it is difficult to identify the pavement removal limits.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 117

1. Type D Granular Material is to be used to fill in part of an existing pond @ Station 625+00 along proposed US 24. Is it the intention of the department to have the water in the pond pumped out prior to placing the Type D granular material? 2. After a review of the R/W plans it is apparent that numerous properties throughout the project have been purchased by the department. Will any of the properties be made available for use as borrow pits? Also, could any of these areas be used as a staging area for ODOT's and/or the contractor's field office and staging area?

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 118

Recently on other projects ODOT has been deleting 7 year warranty requirement on concrete and asphalt pavement. Does ODOT intend to delete the 7 year warranty requirement on pavement for this project?

**No**

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 119

The typical sections on plan sheet 23A and 23B show a 14" step-out for the 304 aggregate base under the concrete pavement. Typically on ODOT projects [including Proj 070110 USR 24 Paulding County], there is only a 6" step-out for the 304 aggregate base under concrete pavement. Since concrete pavement does not require stair stepped construction, this additional 8" of 304 aggregate base is not necessary. For a fair comparison between concrete and asphalt pavement, Ref 185 Aggregate Base should be reduced to reflect an 8" step-out in lieu of 14". The fact that the concrete pavement alternate requires a smaller step-out than the asphalt pavement alternate, for a fair comparison between the two designs, the quantities for cement and cement stabilized subgrade should be established for each pavement design.

**The total aggregate base width and underdrain placement were based on the widest pavement alternate. The Pavement Design Manual states in Section 303.6 Edge Course Design The Aggregate Base for a rigid pavement should extend 18 inches (450 mm) beyond the pavement edge or to the outside edge of the porous backfill over the pipe underdrain, or to 6 inches (150 mm) beyond the outside edge of the paved shoulder, whichever is greater. The slight width change would have caused a doubling of a multitude of sheets within the plan. The decision was made to leave the plan as currently shown, since the Pavement Design Manual does not require it. Thus the cement and cement stabilized subgrade will not be revised.**

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 120

A question was asked earlier regarding the larger footprint for asphalt pavement alternate versus concrete pavement alternate due to step-out for each layer for asphalt pavement. If the underdrain was moved to the edge of the shoulder for the concrete pavement alternate as designed on prior sections of USR 24 [Project 78(07) and 110(07)], the footprint for the concrete pavement alternate would be reduced by approximately 8900 sy. The reduction in 304 aggregate base, cement stabilized subgrade, and cement would be approximately \$120,000. For a fair comparison of the two pavement designs, this difference should be taken into account, if the quantities are not adjusted.

---

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

## Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/9/2009

Question Number: 121

Bid Item #320 - Portable Changable Message System, APP, Bid Quantity of 84 SNMT. After reviewing the notes on plan sheet 65/1193, I submit the following questions. 1 - What is the maximum number of Portable Changable Message Boards required for the project? Is the total number of Portable Changable Message Boards required for the entire duration of the project or will it vary in each phase of work? If the quantity varies by phase, how many are required by each phase of work? 2 - Where will the Portable Changable Message Boards be located?

---

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.