

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 060151

Sale Date - 4/12/2006

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 1

Reinforcing for ref. 349 & 385 shown on sheet 901/1099: Shouldn't mark AS1001 have a 180 degree hook making the overall length 25'-11"?

Yes, the length should be 25'-11". Reinforcing steel is included with the approach slab for payment. There is no change in pay quantity.

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 2

1) The interim completion dates listed in the 3rd paragraph of the "Sequence of Construction" notes on page 43/1099 are unrealistic. If stages 2 and 3 can not begin until April 1st, as noted on page 46/1099, this allows the contractor only 5 months to complete both phases in stage 2 and only 4-1/2 months to complete both phases in stage 3. This provides the contractor with approximately 2 months to complete each phase. Someone in construction should review this limited duration and reconsider the interim dates listed on page 43/1099. 2) The final completion date of September 30, 2008 also needs to be reviewed. Painting of the northern structures can't be started until the structure work is completed. If the above interim dates are not changed, this would allow less than 6 weeks to paint these structures, which is not likely to happen. 3) These unrealistic dates will only add non value added dollars to this bid. These additional costs along with escalating material prices only adds to the reasons why contractor bids are over the Engineer's Estimates. 4) The construction sequencing of the Ridgewood structure needs to be reviewed. The current schedule will require the new median asphalt pavement to be removed to construct the phase 2 substructure. A possible solution would be to build phase 1 in 2006 and build the substructure for phase 2 during the 2006/2007 winter months/prior to the start of stage 2. 5) With the limited amount of DBE's material suppliers, truckers and contractors in this area, we are requesting the 8% DBE goal be reduced. 6) Please review the need for warranty painting on this project.

1) The note on sheet 46 does not prohibit stage 2 or stage 3 work from beginning prior to april 1. Only Stage 2, phase 2 and Stage 3, phase 2 are prohibited November 1 to April 1. There is no 'winter shutdown' for this project; we anticipate that the contractor will perform suitable work activities through the winter months in order to achieve the incentive offered in the bid proposal note 121 - incentive / disincentive, sheet 35. The dates in the contract were closely coordinated with the Construction Dept and are reaffirmed as reasonable dates. 2) Given the above explanation, schedule your work and bid accordingly to meet the dates in the contract. 3) Noted. 4) We are aware of this situation & are working to resolve. A remedy will appear in a future addendum. 5) We respectfully decline. 6) It will be removed in a future addendum.

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 3

1) Would ODOT review page 67 Item 614 Work Zone Lighting System and consider requiring lighting of the interchanges only rather than maintaining mainline lighting between the Pedestrian Bridge and the White Pond interchange ? 2) Please clarify if the intent of the plan is that no temporary pavement placement and substructure work will occur during the winter shutdown dates.

On Question #1: Sound reasoning to keep the temporary lighting in this segment is that conventional lighting exists in this area now, and it will be removed as part of the third lane construction. We want the temporary lighting during construction to meet driver expectations and for work zone safety; bid as shown. Question #2 is answered in addendum no. 1, Q/A #6d.

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 4

Is it correct to assume that the 3,500 sy +/- of partial depth pavement repair is incidental to the temporary pavement for maintaining traffic class A as per plan detail on sheet 51/1099? The quantity for this temporary pavement does not include this partial depth repair quantity.

This is covered in the plan note: Payment for partial depth repair shall be included in the unit price bid for item 615 pavement for maintaining traffic, class a, as per plan

Question Submitted: 2/28/2006

Question Number: 5

Page 2, Section 0001, Ref. No. 0029 refers to 349,160.000 SY of cement stabilized subgrade. How deep is the stabilized subgrade going to be?

The depth is depicted on plan sheets 15 - 25.

Question Submitted: 3/10/2006

Question Number: 6

1) Bridge Sum-77-1996 (Ridgewood)page 914 shows phase 1 32" bridge mtd PCB with 2 anchors per segment. The (*) suggests 2 "partial depth"anchors in the new deck (phase 2). Traffic maintenance drawing on page 68 shows 2 anchors per segment in phase 1, but indicates phase 2 is unanchored. Please clarify if phase 2 bridge mtd PCB is anchored or not.

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: 3/10/2006

Question Number: 7

Due to the major work types on this project being divided among Paving, Structures, and Earthwork, We would request that the Department under Section 108.01 reduce the 50% requirement to a 40% requirement of work being performed by the contractor on this project.

Question Submitted: 3/13/2006

Question Number: 8

Please verify the quantities for Noise Barrier F on sheet 860/1099.

Also, there is overlap for the stations for Noise Barrier F in the Foundation Depth Table on sheet 865/1099. Which are we to use?

Question Submitted: 3/13/2006

Question Number: 9

The District should cut down trees that fall into the Indiana Bat note description for work that is slated for 2006.

The note on sheet 51/1099 for temporary sheet piling for phased construction states that sheet piling must be used. A similar note was included in the I-77 Canton project this past December which was changed to allow contractors to use other options other than installing steel sheeting. Can this note be modified to allow contractors to use other methods to support the adjacent pavement?

Question Submitted: 3/14/2006

Question Number: 10

Ref# 688: 10 Ea. Surface preparation, existing support section, as per plan.
Ref# 689,690, and 691 deal with the painting of these support sections.

My question is if the existing support sections are being painted shouldn't the new support sections be painted in both parts one and two.

Question Submitted: 3/16/2006

Question Number: 11

Bridge No. SUM-77-1897 R has no pay item for cofferdams, cribs and sheeting. How will the phase line sheeting for this structure be paid.

Question Submitted: 3/20/2006

Question Number: 12

In part 3 of the plans the term "retrofit" is used in conjunction with the noise barrier but is not carried to the bid items in the proposal. Does this term imply any special requirements? Does it imply any reuse of existing materials? Please clarify.

Retrofit in the context of Part 3 means noise abatement was previously justified because the interstate is already six lanes; and we are now going back to this six lane section of interstate to 'retrofit' with noise walls without adding capacity to the interstate. Conversely, Part 1 has existing noise walls which are being replaced with new walls plus several new noise wall locations where none are presently exist. No existing noise wall materials will be reused.

Question Submitted: 3/21/2006

Question Number: 13

On Sheet 42 of 1099 the substructure for the Ridgewood Road bridge is constructed in Stage 1 and the superstructure is constructed in stage 3. In order to complete the substructure, the existing superstructure and pier caps must be removed (see sheets 922 thru 924 where new piling is being added to the existing pile cluster at certain footings). If the substructure is delayed until stage 3, then the median is complete and the traffic is running where the new footings are to be located.

How is this work to be sequenced?

Question Submitted: 3/21/2006

Question Number: 14

Part 3 Plan sheet 39/41 (48/52) has a note regarding organic soils encountered in the noise barrier borings. The first paragraph of the note entitled: ORGANIC SOIL: indicates the tabulated foundation depth shall be "below the depth of organic soil material." This must mean the depth from the chart must "begin" at the bottom of the organic soils, then extend downward to the appropriate depth from the chart. Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the same note add length to the shafts in the same area as the borings which encountered organic material. Are the "additional lengths" at barriers 2 and 3, (8 ft and 10.5 ft respectively), designed to eliminate the need to start at the bottom of the organic soils? Or, are they to be added to these shafts, which are to start at the bottom of the organic materials? Please advise.

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: 3/21/2006

Question Number: 15

Reference # 320 / Item 622 - 32" Portable Concrete Barrier, Bridge Mounted plan quantity should increase by an additional 500 lf. Page 68 shows Bridge Mounted PCB in both phase 1 and phase 2 on Ridgewood Rd bridge. The quantity table on page 72 shows 260 lf in stage 3 / phase 1, but missed 260 lf of 32" Bridge Mounted PCB in stage 3 / phase 2. Page 65 shows Bridge Mounted PCB on SB I-77 deck over NB SR-21 during deck removal / widening in stage 3, phases 2 & 3. This would require 240 lf of Bridge Mounted PCB which is not listed on page 72 quantity table at all. Please confirm.

Question Submitted: 3/22/2006

Question Number: 16

The following questions pertain to the Single Slope Barrier walls on this project. Please clarify the areas that require "Reinforced End Anchorage" sections.

SCD RM-4.3 page 1/2 - End Anchorage note – states these are required at the ends of and at interruptions in the concrete barrier. When barrier does not abut another barrier run, construct the last 15' using the END ANCHORAGE Detail as shown on sheet 2/2.

There are 57 median inlets on this project. Are END ANCHORAGES required coming in and out of at each of these inlets?

At expansion joints, construct an End Anchorage on both sides of the joint, with a maximum gap of 2"

Are END ANCHORAGE sections required at every median light pole since there is an expansion joint on either side of the light foundation as shown on SCD HL-20.13? There are a total of 133 median light poles/median junction boxes on this project, which could require 266 END ANCHORAGE sections. Are we interpreting this SCD correctly?

SCD RM 4.4 page 1/1 – End Anchorage note – states to be used at expansion joints where barrier is not reinforced, construct the last 15' using the END ANCHORAGE Detail shown for common barrier types on SCD RM-4.3.

Where would this apply?

Question Submitted: 3/23/2006

Question Number: 17

Reference Number 288, Transition Area Delineation

There appears to be a conflict in the M.O.T. general notes on sheet 47/1099 the description for this item is either (873 Wet Reflective tape) or (740.06 Tape and 614 RPM's)

and sheet no 157/1099, that describes Transition Area Delineation on Asphalt Surfaces as (642, Type 2 Alkyd Paint with 621 Raised Pavement Markers) or (643 Polyester paint and 621 Raised Pavement Markers).

Which Item will we use on this project?

Question Submitted: 3/24/2006

Question Number: 18

Please verify the quantity for reference number 230, it appears that the quantity of 16,268 cy has been doubled up; see pages 40 and 210.

Question Submitted: 3/24/2006

Question Number: 19

1) Would ODOT review page 67 Item 614 Work Zone Lighting System and consider requiring lighting of the interchanges only rather than maintaining mainline lighting between the Pedestrian Bridge and the White Pond interchange ?

2) Please clarify if the intent of the plan is that no temporary pavement placement and substructure work will occur during the winter shutdown dates.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2006

Question Number: 20

The incidental items are broken into the many parts that are a part of this contract. It appears that there is no bid item for the bond for Part 4.

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: 3/27/2006

Question Number: 21

The interim completion dates listed in the 3rd paragraph of the "Sequence of Construction" notes on page 43/1099 are unrealistic. If stages 2 and 3 can not begin until April 1st, as noted on page 46/1099, this allows the contractor only 5 months to complete both phases in stage 2 and only 4-1/2 months to complete both phases in stage 3. This provides the contractor with approximately 2 months to complete each phase. Someone in construction should review this limited duration and reconsider the interim dates listed on page 43/1099.

The final completion date of September 30, 2008 also needs to be reviewed. Painting of the northern structures can't be started until the structure work is completed. If the above interim dates are not changed, this would allow less than 6 weeks to paint these structures, which is not likely to happen.

These unrealistic dates will only add non value added dollars to this bid. These additional costs along with escalating material prices only adds to the reasons why contractor bids are over the Engineer's Estimates.

The construction sequencing of the Ridgewood structure needs to be reviewed. The current schedule will require the new median asphalt pavement to be removed to construct the phase 2 substructure. A possible solution would be to build phase 1 in 2006 and build the substructure for phase 2 during the 2006/2007 winter months/prior to the start of stage 2.

With the limited amount of DBE's material suppliers, truckers and contractors in this area, we are requesting the 8% DBE goal be reduced.

Please review the need for warranty painting on this project.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2006

Question Number: 22

Will "Field Painting of Existing Structural Steel, with Warranty" (Supplemental Spec.885) be changed to the 514 Spec. as in previous lettings?

Question Submitted: 3/27/2006

Question Number: 23

Reinforcing for Ref 349 & 385 shown on sheet 901/1099:
Shouldn't mark AS1001 have a 180 degree hook making the overall length 25-11?

Question Submitted: 3/28/2006

Question Number: 24

Is it correct to assume that the 3,500 sy +/- of partial depth pavement repair is incidental to the temporary pavement for maintaining traffic class A as per plan detail on sheet 51/1099? The quantity for this temporary pavement does not include this partial depth repair quantity.

Question Submitted: 3/31/2006

Question Number: 25

ODOT has specified a quantity of 9,000 SY of Item 251 Partial Depth Pavement Repairs. Following a field survey, the intended use of the item is unclear. The quantity could be used in both the longitudinal and transverse direction. Please explain the intention of the Department with respect to this item. What portion of the quantity is intended to be used longitudinally? What portion is to be used transversely? Due to the fact that the repairs differ substantially in cost, relative to direction, please clarify the departments intended use of the item.

Per CMS Section 251.02 "REMOVAL OF EXISTING PAVEMENT. The Engineer will designate the location and limits of the areas to be repaired"

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: 3/31/2006

Question Number: 26

1) According to the note on sheet 34, Item 202 - Pavement Removed, the cross sectional area for the pavement removal on the earthwork cross sections has not been omitted. The pavement removal has been subtracted from the excavation quantity based on the typical section described in the note. Please verify if the pavement removal was not omitted and if the quantity subtraction is necessary per the note.

2) According to the note on sheet 34, Benching of Foundation Slopes, the cross sections indicate locations for benching. No payment will be made for benching per 203.05. Please verify if the cross sections include the areas for benching and if the quantities were carried to the General Summary.

1. The note states " An area of pavement removed is shown on the cross sections and adjustments for the earthwork using an average pavement end area are reflected in the corresponding earthwork numbers." Therefore, the second sentence of the question is accurate; the pavement removal has been subtracted from the excavation quantity based on the typical section described in the note. No quantity subtraction is necessary. 2. Where the plans indicate special benching, quantities of both excavation and embankment have been included in the volumes shown on the cross sections. Therefore the Contractor will get paid for excavation and embankment for constructing the benches in the areas shown on the plans. Other locations in the cross sections will require benching per the CMS, item 203.05, and have not been specifically shown in the plans "If the existing slope is steeper than 8:1, bench into the existing slope....." The necessary excavation and embankment to bench these locations, not shown in the plans but required to be benched by the specifications, will be accomplished with no additional payment.

Question Submitted: 3/6/2006

Question Number: 27

Part 1 noisewalls; determining drilled shaft depths; Wall B-1; Plan sheet 50/52 (865/1099) has a note which reads: "Foundation depth in existing ground not including new embankment for mound." Please confirm our interpretation that additional length of the embankment for the mound must be added to the foundation depths shown on the table (same sheet) entitled: Noise Barrier Table (Post and Panel Construction).

If yes, does this condition apply to areas where benching is required to make additional fills, as depicted graphically on Plan Sheet 337/1099?

When determining Transverse Grade Slope, what is the minimum width at the wall location for the location to be considered "Level"? Plan sheet 49/52 (864/1099), Section A-A, would seem to indicate that 2' is required (per side), from wall centerline to top of slope, for this location to be considered "Level". As an example, what should be the Transverse Grade Slope at station 1010+00 as drawn on Plan sheet 339/1099?

What would the Transverse Grade Slope be at Station 1025+00 on Plan sheet 349/1099?

Please clarify the criteria for TGS determination.

A1). Yes, the additional length of the embankment for the mound must be added to the foundation depths shown in the table on sheet 865/1099 per the note. A2). Yes, the additional length of the benched embankment must be added to the foundation depths shown in the table on sheet 865/1099 in areas depicted similar to cross section plan sheet 337/1099. A3). The transverse grade slope is considered level when there is a minimum two feet level bench on either side as depicted in Section A-A on plan sheet 864/1099. For example: At Station 1010+00 on sheet 339/1099 the left noise wall is in a 2:1 slope and the right noise wall is in a level area. At Station 1025+00 on plan sheet 349/1099 the left and right noise walls are in level areas.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2006

Question Number: 28

Ref# 688 is for the surface preparation, existing support section, as per plan.

Ref# 689,690, and 691 deal with the painting of these support sections.

If you are requiring the contractor to paint the existing support sections shouldn't the new support sections be painted as well, and if you paint the new support sections in part 2 shouldn't the new support sections in part 1 be painted also.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 4/10/2006
ODOT 151-06 IR-77 Summit

Question Number: 29

1.) Upon completion of a field investigation of I-77, the intended use of Reference 667, Item 251 Partial Depth Pavement Repair is vague and not clear.

According to the 2005 Ohio Department of Transportation Construction and Material Specifications book, Item 251.02 Removal of Existing Pavement states, "The Engineer will designate the location and limits of the areas to be repaired."

Plan quantity could also be exhausted either entirely on longitudinal joint repair or transverse joint repair. Each contractor who bids this item of work will interpret the intent of the repair differently. Since the cost of performing the transverse joint repair is significantly higher than the longitudinal repair, unit prices for this reference will vary. Maintenance of traffic costs assigned to this work will also vary due to the difference in time required to perform the different operation.

The Engineer who designed this project knew the scope of the work when he established the plan quantity. We request that he share this information with the proposed bidders. What percentage is for transverse joint repair and what percentage is for longitudinal joint repair.

In the current format, the Item 251 Partial Depth Pavement Repair is left to individual interpretation and could be performed anywhere within the limits of the resurfacing. By furnishing the requested information to the contractors, the Ohio Department of Transportation will clarify the intent of the proposed work and level the playing field for all bidders.

2.) Reference 288 Transition Delineation Area – Plan page 47/1099 states that area shall include the cost of removal of the surface course within the transition area and the resurfacing of the area. What are the parameters of this area (Length-Width-Thickness)?

3.) Reference 166 Asphalt Concrete Warranty – On page 43/1099 sequence of construction (Stages 2 and 3): The fourth paragraph states "stage 3 phase 5 placement of final asphalt surface course and final pavement markings shall be completed by September 30." Since the type 2 asphalt intermediate course will be subject to considerable traffic in the current ADT as shown on page 2/1099 is listed as 85,830, How can the warranty spec be applicable when traffic will be permitted to use the stage 2 (approximately 2.8 miles) pavement for nearly one year prior to placement of surface course? It is appropriate that approximately 2.8 miles of roadway will be completed with the exception of the surface course as per plan and open to traffic?

4.) Reference 318 – 617 compacted aggregate Sheet 52/1009 includes placement of prime coat to be paid under this item. All of the other references to 617 compacted aggregate have a separate pay item for the item 408 Prime coat in addition we already have Reference # 151 Item 408 Prime coat – Why is this material not paid for separate from the 617 compacted aggregate?

1. Per CMS Section 251.02 "REMOVAL OF EXISTING PAVEMENT. The Engineer will designate the location and limits of the areas to be repairs." 2. The lengths are shown on sheet 157; the widths are that of the work zone lanes shown on the MOT typicals; thickness is that of a standard surface course. 3. Supplemental Specification 880 covers the completed pavement, both with, and without the surface course. 4. There is nothing wrong having made this an 'as per plan' item; bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2006

Question Number: 30

In Part 1, typical sections show item 880 7 year asphalt warranty to be 12.5". Calculations and quantity for this item are based on 12.75" pavement. Which is correct?

In Part 2, typical sections do not give a depth for pavement planing. Will the depth of planing be 3", the same as the total resurfacing courses?

1) The quantity will be lowered in the next addendum. 2) Yes.

Question Submitted: 4/3/2006

Question Number: 31

Addendum number one modified Item 614 - Law Enforcement Officer to be used 24-7 on Part 1. We have contacted the State Highway Patrol, The City of Akron, The City of Fairlawn, Copley Township and the Summit County Sheriff's Offices and they have all stated that they can not staff this project with an officer 24-7.

Also, due to the fact that this project falls within 3 different municipalities, each entity has stated that they can not patrol outside of their jurisdiction. If we are to have an LEO on site 24-7, we will have to have one from each municipality since the Highway Patrol and Sheriff can not staff this project. The quantity for LEO would triple if this is what the District requires. It seems more reasonable to have the contractor patrol the project with the Traffic Control Inspector, which was deleted in Addendum 1, and when a LEO is required the proper entity can be notified. This would be more economical for the District and eliminate the confusion if LEO's are used.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 4/4/2006

Question Number: 32

Plan Sheet 861/1099 (46/52), Section: Noise Barrier Typical Section At LA-R/W: Does the Aggregate drain as shown run the entire length of the wall at the LA-R/W; or, is this a typical section at some undefined spacing? Also, please dimension the stone section.

Question Submitted: 4/4/2006

Question Number: 33

Proposal note 420 - Surface Smoothness for Pavement, Does this note apply to all parts or just the 880 asphalt for part 1?

It applies to Parts 1 & 2.

Question Submitted: 4/5/2006

Question Number: 34

Addendum 1 changed the bid quantity for Ref. No. 0018 to 143,245 FT. Drawing sheet 194 was added to show a total of 14,345 FT. for Ref. No. 0018. It appears that 14,345 is the correct quantity.

Question Submitted: 4/5/2006

Question Number: 35

It has been brought to our attention that on Lighting summary drawings 741 and 753 there is a total of 3 36" x 40' Lighting tower foundations. On the bid form there is only 1 line item #200. Can you tell us which is correct.

Thank You

Question Submitted: 4/5/2006

Question Number: 36

It is still not clear, as to whether the new overhead sign structures are to be painted at the factory, or if they are to be painted in the field, or if they are to be painted at all.

New sign structures will not be painted.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2006

Question Number: 37

On project 060151 in the April 12th, 2006 letting, ODOT has specified a quantity of 98,533 SF of Item 251 Partial Depth Pavement Repair to be paid for under Ref. 300 Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, Misc.: Partial Depth Repair. A field inspection was conducted of the areas specifically stated in the plan note on page 49, and the schematic on page 154. These areas show very little if any sign of distressed joints or potholes as indicated in the plans. Could you please clarify the intended use of this item and confirm the quantity and unit measure.

There was some maintenance resurfacing work in these areas last year, however, knowing the poor condition prior to the resurfacing, these areas have some serious underlying joint problems. These problems will likely become apparent once traffic is shifted onto the outside shoulders and may even begin to show signs of joint failures prior to the MOT traffic shift in Stage 2. The quantity and unit of measure will remain in the plans to be used as directed by the engineer.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2006

Question Number: 38

Page 34/1099 reduces the quantity of the excavation shown on sheet 453/1099 by the volume of the concrete pavement and asphalt on that pavement. Sheet 53/1099 has a confusing note about the excavation for the temporary pavement being included with the lump sum temporary pavement bid item. Should the quantity of 17,213 cy shown on sheet 53/1099 be deducted from the excavation quantity?

Question Submitted: 4/7/2006

Question Number: 39

Addendum #3 added the following items to the project:

Item 948: Controller Unit, Type TS2/A2 with cabinet Type TS1 as per plan

Item 949: Controller, master, Traffic Responsive, as per plan

The plan note on page 709 requires the master to be a type 2070 and that ODOT is to supply software. The 2070 master as specified is not compatible with the proposed NEMA controllers (item 948) or with other equipment currently maintained by District 4.

The special as per plan note on page 709 for the master controller should be removed from the plans. A standard Master Controller, traffic responsive as specified in the 2005 ODOT CMS, section 733.06 be supplied.

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.