

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 080340

Sale Date - 6/6/2008

Question Submitted: 4/29/2008

Question Number: 1

On pages 121, 145 and 189 of the plans under Item 202, portions of structure removed, as per plan it states that "Hoe-rams will not be permitted" to remove the concrete in the bridges. Since all three of the bridges are being removed completely, it would seem this does not pertain to the complete removal process. Is this just a general spec if reinf bars were left in conc to remain and the bars and concrete were used to build a new bridge on? This is the first job in Ohio we have pulled plans on and want to be able to bid it correctly.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2008

Question Number: 2

Please post the existing drawings.

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/attach/LUC-81567/>

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 3

With respect to Bid Items 0262 and 0263 and On Drawing 148/227 (Item 514), please confirm the quantity of 5,226 SY for the field painting structural steel from a measurement method of two times the beam depth of the fascia girder plus three times the flange width, as specified in the ODOT manual.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 4

Page 180 shows the limits of the MSE Wall excavation to be at stationing 11+18.84 and the limits of the abutment excavation to be at stationing 11+30.83. Page 181 does not show any abutment excavation limits and the MSE Wall limits seem to be defined as a one to one slope from one foot behind the back of the undefined length tie backs at elev. 582 to elev. 600, then a vertical line. Which is correct?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 5

Is the Granular Material, Type C to be considered incidental to the foundation prep, the MSE wall, or the SGB?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 6

The piling plan references Spec 202.03 for the demo of pier 3, which states that it is to be taken out to the bottom of the proposed stream bed. Addendum 1 states that all pier foundations are to be removed. Which is correct?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 7

The plans show pier 5 being taken out to elevation 585.2 but Addendum #1 states that all pier foundations are to be removed. Which is correct?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 8

How will the diaphragm concrete for Douglas and Auburn be paid for? Is it included in Bid Items 0209 and 0264 - Superstructure Deck Concrete for Douglas and Auburn respectively?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 9

Will the steel load plate, steel masonry plate, and guide angles for Auburn and Douglas bridges be painted similarly as specified in page 215 of the plans for Central Bridge

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 10

On Drawing 136/227 and Drawing 217/227 on both the original and revised drawings, HMWM sealer is called out on slab but there is no bid item for HMWM sealer in Bridge 1453 or 1578. Will bid items be created for this work or is it considered to be incidental to another Bid Item.

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 11

Addendum #1 changes the quantity on the proposal form for Bid Item 189 from 1,073 to 1,000 SY, but on the revised drawing sheet 123/227, (also Addendum #1) the quantity is stated is 1,204 SY. Please clarify which is the correct quantity.

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: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 12

Addendum #1 changes bid item 188 from 405 to 201 SY, but on revised drawing sheet 123/227 (also part of Addendum #1), the quantity stated is 405 SY. Please confirm that the revised quantity is 201 SY

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 13

Is HMWM sealer required on the Forward Approach Slab of Bridge 1595 (Auburn Avenue)?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 14

In the estimated quantities for each bridge, under the item "Sealing of Concrete Surfaces (Epoxy-Urethane), as per plan" There are quantities listed for the abutments, piers, and superstructure as detailed in the plans. There are also quantities associated with the heading of "General". Please identify where in the plans the quantities listed under the heading of "General" coming from?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 15

Specification Section 203.10 states that "If during excavation, the Contractor encounters hazardous material or waste, the Department will pay according to 109.05". Section 109.05 specifically details payment for Extra Work however neither specification identifies the State as being the "Generator" of the waste. Does another ODOT specification identify the State as the "Generator"?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 16

By Addendum #1, Bid Item 412 - Special - Asbestos Abatement was added to the scope of work and referenced on Drawing Sheet 12/227 - General Notes. We have not found any additional ODOT specifications that outline the requirements for the disposal of Asbestos materials, does one exist and in particular, is the State considered the Generator of the waste?

Question Submitted: 5/20/2008

Question Number: 17

With respect to 100% Performance and Payment Bonds that are required by the successful bidder, Specification Section 101.03 indicates that these Bonds are to be provided in accordance with ORC 5525.16 and 5525.13. We understand this to mean that the Contractor must warrant the work for a period of 1 year from acceptance of the project. Our understanding of the description for various bid items is that if extended warranties were required, the item would include in the description a phrase similar to "with Supplement 1059 Warranty" as noted in ODOT's Bulletin titled 2006 Status of Warranty Program. Are we correct in this understanding?

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 18

Bid item 28 Reference 622 The bid item is for Concrete Barrier, Type D. SCD listed on the front cover is for Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type D. Sheet 48 of the plans shows Single Slope. If the bid item is changed to Single Slope, Type D, then bid items need to be added for End Sections as per RM 4.6 3/3, and End Anchors as per RM 4.5 2/2. This would also result in a quantity reduction for bid item 28.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 19

In the Pre-Bid Meeting Minutes, on Page 8 (Lines 1 to 6) the relocation of the AT&T telephone line has been targeted for the end of April, 2009. On Drawing Sheet 13/227 it notes that Douglas Rd construction shall be performed in the spring with five (5) month duration. Is this not a conflict or can the demolition of the bridge be performed before AT&T relocates its plant? We also reference the Nationwide Permit that was issued as part of Addendum #1 and the potential of bats roosting along the underside of the bridge deck so that demolition could not commence prior to September 15th.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 20

The proposal documents note a Contract Completion date of October 31, 2009. Construction period restrictions noted on Drawing Sheet 13/227 along with Indiana Bat Roosting Habitat along the underside of bridges (noted in the Nationwide Permit) and the restrictions of working in the waterways from March to June may seriously effect this completion date. Will the contract completion date be extended or would ODOT consider allowing work to progress on both Auburn and Central Ave. bridges at the same time?

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 21

On Drawing Sheet 10/227, it states that the Contractor cannot operate power operated construction devices between 9:00 PM and 7:00 AM and per Addendum #1, two lane closures on IR 475 will be permitted between 11:00 PM and 5:30 AM. Due to the partial scope of the work (demolition of superstructure, erection of new steel bridge girders and field painting of steel over travel lanes), without daytime two lane closures, the work cannot be performed other than at night. We request that the noise restriction requirement be waived during the bidding process as has been suggested on Page 23, Lines 8 to 16 of the Pre-Bid Meeting Minutes.

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: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 22

Special Condition Item #7 of the Nationwide Permit suggests that the bridges must be examined for the presence of bats between April 15 and September 15. This was also addressed on page 24 lines 1 to 18 of the Pre-Bid Meeting Minutes. In the event that the work is required to be suspended for this reason, will the Contractor be compensated for schedule and impacts as described in the General Conditions, Article 109.05 – Extra Work?

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 23

On Drawing Sheet 29/227 the notes indicate that the existing Type 'D' Barrier/Retaining Wall is to be removed and replaced upon completion of the pier work. Please provide details for reconstructing this wall and how will the Contractor be paid for the work?

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 24

On Drawing Sheets 33/227 and 34/227 the left column is labeled as "Calcs". Please provide details of how these quantities were determined so that we may estimate the extent of the work accordingly.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 25

In general, does ODOT have a mandatory cut-off date for the Contractor's to ask questions (i.e. 10 days prior to the date of the bid)?

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 26

On page 33 lines 6 and 7 of the Pre-Bid Meeting Minutes, it states in part "If we get a question on the day of Pre-Bid Lock Down" What does the term Pre-Bid Lock Down mean?

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 27

On Drawing Sheet 178/227, Section A-A indicates the thickness of the approach slab as being 17". Note #5 on the same sheet states that payment will be made for (T=15"). Please confirm that the slab thickness is 17" and that it will be paid under Bid Item #0266 for a 17" Slab and not as part of Bid Item #0265, 15" Thick Slab.

Question Submitted: 5/21/2008

Question Number: 28

On the Nationwide Permit that was provided as part of Addendum #1, references are made to a 404 permit and 401 WQC or waiver being obtained. Has ODOT obtained both of these documents so that the project could proceed assuming that the contract was awarded 10 days after the opening of the bid?

Question Submitted: 5/27/2008

Question Number: 29

Addendum #3 issued many new plan note that pertain to the maintenance of traffic for the project. The notes for plan sheet 24 have revised several quantities for pavement work required on the interstates during the work. These quantities have not yet been revised (through addendum #3) on the bid form. When will this be done? Also if the shoulder removal and replacement work is being paid under various bid items what is Ref 175 "Pavement for Maintenance of Traffic, APP" to be used for? Is some of the shoulder replacement to be paid under ref 175 & some under other units? Existing cast in place barrier will need to be removed & replaced Under Douglas & Central along the interstate center line or shoulders. Where is the removal & replacement of these barriers paid for? Same question for existing guardrail runs under the bridges that may need to be removed & replaced during pier removal or replacement. The quantity summary for portable concrete barrier on plan sheet 32 does not include any quantities for the barrier required for the numerous shoulder closures now listed in the plan notes. The quantity of portable barrier listed for plan sheet 30 is too low. Our takeoff for this item including shoulder closures totals over 5300 lf. Will this bid quantity be revised or is the barrier required for the shoulder closures to be part of the lump sum for maintaining traffic? Can a break down be given by location for the quantities listed under the Calcs column on summary plan pages 33 & 34? Is it ODOT's intention to reconstruct the Douglas Road bridge during the 2009 construction season or can it yet be closed & rebuilt in 2008?

Question Submitted: 5/27/2008

Question Number: 30

#1. The General Summary shows a column labeled as "CALCS", with quantities for various items listed below. Please provide more detailed information regarding these items, as the work is contained in 3 separate locations. #2 A quantity of 18,900 sy of Pavement Planing is listed in the General Summary, and is referenced to be described in more detail on Plan Sheet 16. However, Plan Sheet 16 says that this item "...should be included in the plans". More info is needed. Also, mention is made of resurfacing the transition areas. What are the transition areas? What resurfacing? No asphalt mix has been listed for resurfacing.

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: 5/28/2008

Question Number: 31

Question Number 1. - Addendum Number 3 revised Sheet 24, Phase 1A, Note 2 added Pavement Removed, 302, 304, 407, 442 Intermediate and 442 Surface for the shoulder strengthening. Where is the Pavement for Maintaining Traffic Type A (ref. No. 175) now used? Question Number 2. - The Proposal, General Summary and Estimated Quantities sheets in the plans show Ref. No. 58, 6" Shallow Pipe Underdrains as a bid item. The Typical Section - Pavement Legend shows the Underdrains as Item 605 -6" Shallow (30") Pipe Underdrain with Fabric Wrap. Which is correct? The following are questions that were asked at the Pre-Bid Meeting and have not been answered through Addendum Number 4. Question Number 3. - How are the ends of the Portable Concrete Barrier (Ref. No. 29) going to be placed so that the ends will not be a traffic hazard? See Pre-Bid meeting notes on page 15, line 6 through page 16, line 17. Question Number 4. - We need the calculations quantities and locations of items shown on pages 33 and 34, left column. These are for Pavement Removed, Subgrade Compaction, Pavement Repair, Aggregate Base, Asphalt Base, Asphalt Intermediate Course and Asphalt Surface Course. See Pre-Bid meeting notes on page 29 line 20 through page 30 line 2. Question Number 5. - When will the utilities finish their work and be clear of the project? This was asked at the Pre-Bid meeting notes on page 7 line 20 through page 9 line 25.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2008

Question Number: 32

1. How is removal of concrete slope protection to be paid on all bridges? 2. How is removal of mainline concrete median barrier at Douglas Rd to be paid? 3. Where should cost for work described in plan note on sheet 29/227 be included? 4. Plan Sheet 181/227 shows an area beyond the select granular backfill to be excavated incidental to item 202, backfilling of this area is not indicated. What type of material is to be used and how is it paid? 5. Are all conduits cast into bridge decks, sidewalks and approach slabs accounted for in pay items? 6. We are receiving indications from steel fabricators and suppliers they will be quoting this project based on bid date mill prices, with all mill price increases at ship date being passed on to contractor. We are told this is do to the way ODOT's Steel Price Adjustment is applied and the recent large price increases by the mills. We are facing issues with recently bid project between ourselves and the suppliers. There are substantial costs involved which are not being addressed. We want to go on record this is a major issue which affects general contractors bidding, with no control of final cost. 7. Due to the complexity of the project and the unanswered questions to date we are asking ODOT to review the possibility of delaying the bid until 6/18/08. This would allow time issue all addendums need for the bid package and time for the contractors to evaluate the addendums for his bid.

Question Submitted: 5/28/2008

Question Number: 33

After we imported the EBS file with Addendum No. 4 into Expedite, Reference 314 (Field Office) the quantity changed from 28 mnth to 56 mnth; Is this correct?

28 months is correct.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 34

When loading the EBS file for Addendum #3, Bid Item 314 - Field Office, Type C came in as 56 months instead of 28 months. Please advise on how we should handle this bid item.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 35

In the typical sections item 12 curb & gutter, type 2 and item 17 curb, type 6. Both are shown going to the bottom of the 302 10 1/2" asphalt base. 1- Is the curb & gutter a 13 1/2" T or 9" T? 2- Is the curb, type 6" 19 1/2 high or 18".

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 36

Question Number 1. - How will the traffic be handled during the shoulder replacement in the eastbound and westbound lanes under Douglas Road. Addendum Number 3 added removal of the existing shoulder, and placing 302, 304, and two courses of 442, which add up to 15 inches. This will require the shoulder and driving lane to be closed for at least three days. The plan on page 13, ITEM 614, Maintaining Traffic, the 5th paragraph only allows a lane to be closed from 11 PM to 5 AM. Plan Sheet 23, DROP OFFS IN WORK ZONES, requires Portable Concrete Barrier if the Drop-Off exceeds five inches.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 37

Plan sheet 26/227 (44/227 also) shows PCB to protect shoulder replacement, D wall replacement, bridge pier #3 demo and construction of new pier #3. Location Eastbound I-475 shoulder at Auburn Ave. Plan sheet 45/277 shows replacement of Westbound I-475 shoulder at Auburn Ave, pier #5 demo is also at this location. Plan sheet 26/227 does not call for any PCB to protect shoulder or demo work. Also the D wall is not replaced at this location and Sequence Notes on sheet 26/277 may need clarification.

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: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 38

On plan sheet 189/227: Question regarding Reference No. 276 Static Load Test, As per Plan 1 LS. This plan sheet shows two locations for static load test: 1 Static Load Test item at Pier 4 and 1 Static Load Test item at the forward abutment under the middle column of notes on the piling. If we are to do static load test at both these locations then another bid item of 1 each subsequent static load test should be set up. Per the Item 206 specifications 1 LS is for one static load test. A similar bid item setup at a different bridge, Reference No. 182 is correct as there is 1 location listed for one test pile. Please clarify & correct. Thanks

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 39

Addendum # 3 details stationing and quantities for shoulder replacement on IR 475. Plan sheet # 24 under the notes for Phase 1A states that payment for these shoulders will be paid under Ref #175 (Pavement for maintaining traffic.). Since addendum # 3 changes this, will Ref # 175 be deleted from the project?

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 40

At the pre-bid meeting a request was made to remove proposal note PN 525 - Steel Price Adjustment from this project, and the feeling was that it would be removed. Since we have not seen an official change through Addendum #4, we are wondering if this is going to happen. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 41

Addendum 3 shows the limits for shoulder replacement under Douglas. In addition to describing the station limits, quantity increases are shown for items 202 23000, 302 46000, 304 20000, 407 14000, 442 10000, and 442 10100. It appears that the quantity changes have not carried thru to the EBS file. Is this correct? Should the EBS file be changed? Also, plan sheet 16 indicates 2600 sy of Temporary Type A Pavement As Per Plan. Where is this to be used? Given the quantity changes described above, it will not be used for reconditioned shoulders? Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 42

Addendum plan page 119A pertains to the Vandal and Fall protection fence. Paragraphs 1 thru 7 call out the exact post and rails and members to be used. It also states to use standard VPF-1-90 for other material. Paragraph 8 calls out for clamps, boulevards, bands ties, and other connectors to be submitted with calculations stamped by a P.E. Isn't this covered already by the ODOT standard? It says right in this paragraph to use VPF-1-90 for these items. What exactly members are to be submitted, since all material is already specified?

Question Submitted: 5/29/2008

Question Number: 43

Addendum page 119A, paragraph 9 specifies the type of PVC coated, welded wire mesh to be used. Plan page 119H shows the fabric being continuous from light to light. The manufacturer of the mesh tell us that this is not possible with the specified material. It can only be made in 7' sections, therefore, cannot be used in this application. Would it be acceptable to use a black PVC coated fabric per standard VPF-1-90? This is a 1" mesh and would allow the fabric to be erected as shown, and still maintain the look that is desired. If this is not acceptable, will there be a revised method to attach this fence? We also have a concern that there is only a top and bottom rail. This fence is 10' tall, and we believe there will be sagging in the fence. Should extra rails be added also? Also, the specified fabric to be used cannot follow the slopes on the bridge, therefore, panels would have to be field cut to follow the slope, in order to maintain a horizontal line of the mesh. Will this be permitted?

Question Submitted: 5/30/2008

Question Number: 44

Question on Unclassified Excavation Item 503. The 503 spec call for granular backfill behind abutment and below approach slabs. This project has several locations where pier excavation is below shoulder pavement, will a granular embankment material be required at these locations ?

The pier removal backfill details and payment are covered under CMS 202.03 and 202.02. Contractors are encourage to submit their questions as early as possible. We will accept questions until the bids are opened. However, significant issues raised after the cut-off for issuance of addenda will result in projects being delayed or deferred.

Question Submitted: 5/30/2008

Question Number: 45

Looking over details for stiffeners for the type 3 cross frames on plan page 170/227 there is a detail "A" showing the Contractor to weld in the field these stiffeners. This is not a normal procedure since these stiffeners are normally shop welds. Please let me know if this what we are suppose to do.

Question Submitted: 5/30/2008

Question Number: 46

The vandal fence detail appears to only have a top and bottom rail. Will this be enough rails to hold the wire mesh in proper alignment. The details also appear to show tie wires on the top and bottom rails. Is this the intent to use standard vandal fence ties to hold the mesh fabric in place? Please clarify attachment of the mesh to the framework. Thanks.

A clarification can be found in Addendum #7 question and answers 11 and 12.

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: 5/30/2008

Question Number: 47

Question on structure removed for Auburn Ave and Central Ave. We assume Add. #7 supersedes Add.#1, which take us to the plan sheets and Item 202 Removal of Structure to use for bidding purposes. If there are any special requirements beyond our assumption please advise.

Yes Addendum 7 supersedes #1. Addendum 7 addresses sheets 145 and 189. Addendum 1 addresses 121, 145, and 189. The end result is the removal notes in addendum 1 only apply to sheet 121. The removal notes in addendum 7 apply to sheets 145 and 189.

Question Submitted: 5/6/2008

Question Number: 48

On the Auburn Ave Bridge Ref No 267 QA/QC Concrete, Parapets it looks as if they did not include the sidewalk quantity in the pay quantity of 83 cy. It should be 247 cy. The deck quantity ref no 264 also seem a little light. We calculate 715 cy On Douglas Rd, REf no 209, deck concrete also seems low. we calculate 575 cy. Ref no 214 footing concrete seem high. Our calculation yields 92 cy not 102 cy.

Question Submitted: 6/2/2008

Question Number: 49

Ref. Addendum # 7 Question #24 states that bridge conduits will be paid for under ITEM 898 Superstructure (Parapet) or (approach Slab) However it does not if it is plastic or steel. please identify.

We have no preference.

Question Submitted: 6/2/2008

Question Number: 50

Addendum No.7 Revised the quantity of ref. 276 Item 506 from 1LS to 2LS. EBS file did not change the Item's quantity.

Question Submitted: 6/2/2008

Question Number: 51

A question about conduit in the bridges was asked & answered in Addendum #7. After reading the answer we are still unsure which conduits are to be paid with the concrete items. It appears all the conduit listed as lighting are paid under the electrical items. However the following conduit also appear. Specifically - Douglas Road - Plan page 136 - Where is the 4" diameter conduit paid? Auburn Ave - Plan page 170 - Where are the 3" diameter conduit for the City of Toledo & the 2 - 4" diameter conduit for Toledo Edison paid? Central Ave - Plan page 217 - Where is the 3" Diameter conduit for the City of Toledo paid?

What material is to be used for all of these conduit - steel or PVC?

Question Submitted: 6/2/2008

Question Number: 52

In Addendum 7 the quantity for Ref No 276 was change to 2 lump sum. However, the EBS file shows only 1 lump sum. Which quantity is correct.

Question Submitted: 6/3/2008

Question Number: 53

In Addendum #7, the answers to Q7 and Q9 indicating the "handler or contractor will be considered the Generator of the waste" is not consistent with past practices. In the past, ODOT has been listed as the Generator on the manifest, not the contractor. The contractor does not produce nor does he possess or inherit the waste prior to or during the commencement of the project. It belongs to ODOT. As per OAC 3745-50-10, "Generator means any person, by site, whose act or process produces hazardous waste identified or listed in Chapter 3745-51 of the Administrative Code or whose act first causes a hazardous waste to become subject to the hazardous waste." Please review this item.

See addendum #8

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: 6/3/2008

Question Number: 54

In response to the answers provided for Questions 7 and 9 in Addenda #7, that the bidding authority considers the contractor to be the "Generator" of waste as it relates to the disposal of Hazardous Materials, we request that the State review this answer in greater detail and provide the possible bidding contractor's with relief from the global statement that they are considered the "Generator". Having read further into the OHIO EPA standards, the answer provided that a Hazardous Waste Generator is any person by site whose act or process produces hazardous waste identified or listed in Ohio Administrative Code chapter 3745-51 or whose act first causes a hazardous waste to become subject to the hazardous waste rules would therefore infer that the State of Ohio is the "Generator" as they "own" the site and the bridge structures that are producing the waste. The Contractor is being required to remove and transport the materials that are on the property and is therefore not responsible for generating the waste materials. This project identifies the removal of a small amount of duct bank that contains asbestos materials and potentially, the removal of lead paint that may be present on the steel bridge girders that are to be removed, the unknown risk of the presence contaminated dirt is not addressed in the construction specifications. The potential presence of contaminated soil materials on this site may be minor, however the risks to the Contractor when they are globally considered the "Generator" of the waste drastically outweigh the reward of being the successful bidder in the event that hazardous waste materials are encountered based on our interpretation of the articles contained in the ODOT Construction and Material Specifications Manual. Without the Owner assuming the responsibility of "Generator" (as is the case with other public authorities), we will reluctantly be unable submit a bid proposal for this project. Your reconsideration of the original response is appreciated.

See addendum #8

Question Submitted: 6/3/2008

Question Number: 55

There are no items for SWPP plan or Erosion Control in this project. With the slope grading, channel disruption ect we will need silt fence, temp seeding and other items to properly comply with the EPA permit.

Question Submitted: 6/3/2008

Question Number: 56

Ref. # 156 Calls for video det. systems APP 3 EA addendum # 7 adds Ref # 419 Video detection Systems 2 EA Are both line items going to be used?

Yes

Question Submitted: 6/3/2008

Question Number: 57

would it be possible to use the latest version of supplemental spec 840 "Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall" dated 5/18/2008 in lieu of the 1/19/2007 version. This would allow the filling of the annular space between the pile sleeves and the abutment pile with sand in lieu of bentonite clay where the piles pass through the MSE wall granular fill?

Question Submitted: 6/6/2008

Question Number: 58

I have a question in regards to Project 080340. It was originally bidding on 6/4/08, but by Addm 8 the date changed to 6/6/08. After downloading the EBS files for the Addm 8, there are NO Addm's attached to the new EBS file. Shouldn't there be an acknowledgement of 8 Addm's attached to the new EBS file? If you could please let me know, I would appreciate it.

When a project is delayed and a new EBS file is generated, all of the previous addenda are incorporated into that file. So it is normal to have no addenda showing with a delay when the EBS file is recreated under the new letting date. All of the items added, changed, or deleted by the 8 previous addenda are in there.

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.