

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 088014

Sale Date - 4/9/2008

Question Submitted: 3/28/2008

Question Number: 1

Will the Department consider revising the bid date for this project? The plans arrived on March 28th for a project that bids in less than 2 weeks. This project has been deferred from a prior letting. Unless any and all changes are highlighted or ballooned (which they are not) then we have to review the entire new set of documents to prepare our bid. Furthermore, as of today the plans have not been available online either.

The plans incorporated all the addendums into the plan with some minor changes requested by construction. District would not recommend revising the bid date. Any further delays would have our Construction Department concerned with getting MAH 224 work phases buttoned up before the snow flies next fall. Plans will be online today.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2008

Question Number: 2

Can the office calcs be made available for this project.

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/attach/MAH-76443/>

Question Submitted: 4/4/2008

Question Number: 3

On page 15/171 please provide more detail for the Phase 1 and 2 sheeting with waler system. This is the only place where this system is shown. There is not enough detail or parameters to accurately determine what is required. On page 11/171, the US 224 completion is 10-30-08. This contradicts the phasing and completion date. In addition, with all of the work required on 224 it is extremely unlikely that all work can be completed on 22 before 10-30-08.

A waler system was specified to aid in the sheeting of the trench. No specifics are given because it is up to the contractor to determine what kind or brand of Waler that they want to use. If a contractor does not want to use a waler system, he has the right to propose an alternate method. This is a means and method that we do not attempt to direct the contractor. The plans are buildable and biddable. The completion date for the US 224 work was discussed extensively and scheduled through our construction department who felt that this was an attainable date.

Question Submitted: 4/5/2008

Question Number: 4

The battery specification found on page 148 of 171 pertaining to bid reference 191, Uninterrupted Power Supply (UPS), 1000 watt, appears to be an older ODOT specification no longer in use. It is our understanding that "approved equal" specified in note # 1 of the battery system after the 105 Ahr specification is no longer acceptable to ODOT and that the current specification requires 105 Ahr batteries (no substitutes or approved equals) as was specified in the ODOT annual contract ITB 004-08. Will an addendum be issued removing the approved equal from this battery system note.

The contractors question is based on 2008 specifications. This project is to be bid based on 2005 specifications. Bid as per 2005 spec.

Question Submitted: 4/5/2008

Question Number: 5

Bid reference 185 & 186, local controller and master controller items, require interconnected communication to an existing control cabinet at the intersection of US 224 & Pheasant Dr that currently has an Econolite brand controller. However, the specification does not specify that Econolite brand equipment is necessary at the new intersection to form this interconnected system. Additionally, a bid item is not specified to replace equipment in the existing cabinet. Since Econolite brand equipment is the only controller capable of forming a system with the existing cabinet, will an addendum be issued to specify that Econolite brand equipment is required for both of these items?

The signal at Pheasant Drive is currently interconnected with the one at Tippecanoe. The new signal at Tippecanoe is generic bid. As other projects on the US 224 corridor may include the signal at Pheasant Drive, the timing provided in the plan can be implemented as time base coordination if the controller bid at Tippecanoe is not compatible with Pheasant Drive. Bid as shown.

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. 080024

Sale Date - 1/25/2008

Question Submitted: 1/4/2008

Question Number: 1

Would the Department consider adding appropriate work items to the general summary for excavation of unsuitable soils, geogrid, and Type B granular fill to repair the soft subgrade usually normally occurs on a widening project of this type?

The District scoped the consultant during the preliminary engineering design to take boring throughout the project and the results of the testing indicated the soil is suitable for the widening. Bid as shown.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2008

Question Number: 2

Reference number 102 is "Combination Curb and Gutter, Type 2". Is the thickness nine inches or sixteen inches?

Both 16" and 10" are correct. The reason for different gutter thicknesses between sheet 3 (16") and 5 (10") is US 224 and Tippicanoe Rd. have different pavement build ups. As stated in the standard construction drawing BP-5.1, "Thickness of gutter plate "T" shall be 9" unless otherwise shown on the plans." The plans does this in the typical section. Therefore, contractor should bid as plans shown.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2008

Question Number: 3

Reference 102 Curb & Gutter, Type 2, Typical sheet 3 show thickness at possibly 16" sheet 5 possibly shows 10" thickness, standard drawings shows 9", what is correct?

Both 16" and 10" are correct. The reason for different gutter thicknesses between sheet 3 (16") and 5 (10") is US 224 and Tippicanoe Rd. have different pavement build ups. As stated in the standard construction drawing BP-5.1, "Thickness of gutter plate "T" shall be 9" unless otherwise shown on the plans." The plans does this in the typical section. Therefore, contractor should bid as plans shown.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2008

Question Number: 4

On plan sheet #36 of the maintenance of traffic plans, there appears to be approx. 440 lb of 32" PCB wall which has not been included in the sub-summary on sheet #58. Please clarify.

Addendum

Question Submitted: 1/4/2008

Question Number: 5

Will the Department consider adding a plan note that allows the contractor to submit alternate MOT plans?

Question Submitted: 1/4/2008

Question Number: 6

Please clarify that after Phases 1 and 2 are completed that there are no other lane restrictions on USR-224. It appears from the MOT notes that there are no other restrictions for taking lanes except for Holidays. We feel that lanes will have to be taken to complete the work. With that being said, it appears that the PCB set up along 224 will severely impede construction progress. There is not enough room for conventional equipment to remove and haul excess spoils, deliver aggregates, slipform curbing and place asphalt. In some places along 224 there is no access behind the work zone other than at the beginning or end of the PCB run. Therefore, without adding additional temporary pavement would the Department consider removing the PCB and Attenuator items and increase the 410 item for MOT wedging purposes. This proposed method is based on taking lanes on USR-224 without restrictions per the current MOT notes. This change would most likely result in an overall cost savings to the project for the reduction of PCB, attenuators and overall productivity.

Addendum 2 clarifies the lane closure question. The District believes there is adequate room to perform the work.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2008

Question Number: 7

Will ODOT allow the contractor to set the temporary barrier wall according to the MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC note 1 on sheet 14/171 during construction of the work? The note states a minimum of one 11 ft lane will be maintained in each direction. This will allow the contractor additional space in the work zone to build the work items. The location shown on the typical does not allow enough room for the delivery and placement of asphalt or concrete.

Addenda #2

Question Submitted: 1/4/2008

Question Number: 8

Will ODOT make available the office calculations as referred to on plan page 69?

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/CONTRACT/ftp/attach/MAH-76443/>

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

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/20/2008

Question Number: 9

Ref 296 Cofferdam, Cribbs & Sheeting APP. The plans show excavation approx. 10 feet behind existing abutments causing soldier piles and wood lagging to go back 20 feet behind the existing abutments as shown on plan sheet 476 of 601. To excavate the abutment 10 feet back and the start the lay back at 1 to 1 slope is not need to construct these abutments and also the excavation only needs to go to elevation approx. 908.5 because the existing footers are not being remove at the location of temporary shoring. Normally the contractor has the option to determine what shoring would be require but the "as per plan" description prevent the contractor from changing what is shown in the plans. Would the department allow the contractor to change the shoring design if we determine we don't need to excavate the amount that is shown on the project plans. Would the department consider removing the "as per plan" description and allow the contractor to determine the necessary shoring that is 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.