

# Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Project No. 080121

Sale Date - 2/13/2008

Question Submitted: 2/5/2008

Question Number: 1

The EBS file for this project is flawed. We cannot match several of your sub-totals, even adding them by hand off the EBS form with a calculator. Please review and reissue a new EBS file for this project.

**There doesn't appear to be anything wrong with the file. The alternates are a little different than usual for this project, which I suspect is where the confusion is coming from. There are three different alternate sets: The AB Set: AB1, ref. 47, 48, and 49 AB2, ref. 50 This is for subgrade stabilization. The bidder bids both sets, whichever is lowest will be included in his/her EBS total. This one is the one that appears different than normal as there is not a one-to-one match for alternate items. The reason is that the 206 item (ref. 50) is all inclusive, whereas the geotextile item has to have separate pay items for the excavation and embankment. The AA Set: AA1 ref. 253-262 AA2 ref. 263-272 This set is for pavement markings. The bidder bids both sets, whichever is lowest will be included in his/her EBS total. The AC Set: AC1 ref. 273 AC2 ref. 274 This set is for video detection. The bidder bids both sets, whichever is lowest will be included in his/her EBS total. So the total in Expedite should include only the lowest total for each set (AA, AB, AC). The award can be based on different combinations of the sets, for example: All the ones (AB1 with AA1 with AC1) All the twos (AB2 with AA2 with AC2) Combinations (AB1 with AA2 with AC1 or AB1 with AA2 with AC1, etc.)**

Question Submitted: 2/5/2008

Question Number: 2

Please place the original construction plans on the ODOT server.

**The original construction plans are at: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/attach/SUM-78119/>**

Question Submitted: 2/5/2008

Question Number: 3

Please disregard our comment about the EBS file being flawed. It appears the flaw is on our end.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2008

Question Number: 4

Addendum No. 4 states "All bridge and ramp work requiring work zones on SR8 shall be completed by 8-1-08" This would require structural steel delivery by June 1, 2008 in order to complete the deck, the railing and fence, and the sealing. This would require the 95' long beams to be rolled at a mill and at present we are being told that this delivery is not possible. Can the 8-1-08 date be extended to accommodate the steel delivery? It may be possible to find shorter steel in warehousing if additional splicing would be permitted.

**The work zones on SR 8 that need to be completed by 8/1/08 are shown on sheets 34, 35, 39, and 40. Steel will be set using the Stoppage of Mainline Traffic note on sheet 23 and therefore would not need to be completed by 8/1/08. This allows for more time for the steel to be ordered. Additional work (fence, railing, sealing) not requiring the permanent zones shown on sheets 34, 35, 39, and 40 will be allowed after 8/1/08. That being stated we are not extending the 8/1/08 date for steel delivery nor allowing additional splicing.**

Question Submitted: 2/5/2008

Question Number: 5

1) Please clarify the general note All Conduits, All Types on plan sheet 21. Is 304 limestone bedding and backfill required outside of pavement limits to subgrade, or is just the 6" of limestone bedding required and dirt backfill needed outside of pavement limits to subgrade?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 6

Ref. 9- Pipe Removed, 24" and Under: There are some locations for which pipe runs to be removed cross existing pavements under live traffic and also occur in locations where the pavement will not be replaced. Would ODOT consider changing the following locations to pipe abandonments by filling the pipes with grout instead of removing? Sheet Ref. ===== 79  
R-30114 R-51115 R-58116 R-61

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 7

Addendum 2 addressed requirements for temporary shoring, whereas any excavation that exceeds 5' deep is to have contractor-designed shoring. Given that the length of work could be up to 450' long, this could be a potential costly item that is being bid at a lump-sum price without knowing for sure the required length and/or exact depth of excavation. We ask that this bid item be revised to unit prices instead of lump sum, and please be addressed in an 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: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 8

Ref. 28- Embankment, as per plan: Plan note on sheet 20 "Embankment Construction" indicates possible need to overexcavate area from stations 74+00 to 78+50 on the right side of Steels Corners Road. From checking the plan cross-sections, the average distance from existing edge of pavement to right-of-way, if undercut completely, would result in an 8' to 9' deep undercut of the entire area including the slope in order to calculate back to the quantity of 7612 cubic yards. Given this volume, are we to assume that this will include benching of the slopes as well as undercutting of the bottom? Will the depths of the undercut slopes have an effect on the stability of what is left under the existing road? Will there be a need for portable concrete barrier in this area? Please provide calculations and more details on how the quantity was derived in an addendum.

**Clarification has been provided in the revised Embankment Construction Note. Refer to addendum no.2.**

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 9

Addendum 1 reduced the volume of embankment (Ref. 28) by 916 cubic yards. Addendum 1 also answered a prebid question regarding embankment volumes between roadway volumes and new wingwalls saying that "additional volumes have been added". Was the volume mistakenly reduced instead of being increased by the amount?

**The earthwork volume in Addendum No. 1 also included a reduction for the use of topsoil. Volume listed is correct.**

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 10

Ref. 27,28,303- There is a significant amount of embankment required between the new wingwalls and where the roadway excavation/embankment items stop. Cross sections on plan sheet 97 show roadway excavation and embankment volumes ending at the outside of the approach slabs. There is no embankment quantity called out between these stations and the proposed wingwalls. Should there be a quantity added for these embankments or is this embankment considered incidental to the unclassified excavation item? Please clarify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 11

Ref. 74, 77, 81- All of these three conduit items are Type F, for which 706.02 reinforced concrete pipe (which is called for) is not consistent with the 603 specification. Given that these are slope pipes, would it make sense that these bid items be changed to the specified pipes under 603.02?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 12

Plan sheet 25- "Pavement Widening" note appears to be contradictory as far as payment. Is necessary asphalt wedging or milling work paid for as either 614- Asphalt Concrete for Maintaining Traffic and/or 254- Milling (plan shows 245 which also appears to be incorrect) or is necessary work considered incidental to 614- Maintaining Traffic? Also, does this note correspond to the plan note "Temporary Ramping of Vertical Surfaces at Driveways" shown on sheet 23 or is this for all longitudinal widened joints throughout the project (mainline, drives, ramps)? Please clarify these notes in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 13

Plan sheet 21- Item 603- All Conduits, All Types note states that "All pipe over 12" in diameter is premium joint concrete, all 6" pipe is SDR 35". Please note that ref. 80,83, and 85 all call for pipe other than premium joint concrete. Please verify if general note is correct or not in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 14

Ref. 54: Seeding and Mulching, as per plan- plan sheet 21 describes bid item, noting that "contractor will place 2" topsoil (pay item) over a minimum of 4" of compacted clay material (not a pay item, but not required). There is no bid item for topsoil, and bid items for excavation and embankment. Furthermore, it appears that cross sections do not deduct for volumes of these two items. Should there be a bid item for the topsoil, or is it considered incidental to this bid item? Is 4" compacted clay considered incidental to excavation and embankment instead of this item? Please clarify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 15

It appears that the quantity of Work Zone Dotted Line, was omitted in the subsummary from plan pages 34 and 35.

**The dotted line quantity was omitted from the plan. This line is a supplemental line which is not required. The "AND DOTTED LINE" references (two on each sheet) should be removed from sheets 34 and 35. Refer to addendum no. 2.**

Question Submitted: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 16

Plan Page 23 - Item 614 - Maintaining Traffic Paragraph 11 - All construction in a given phase including driveway construction, shall be completed prior to beginning the next phase. However, the landscape items need not be completed prior to moving to the next phase. Plan page 26 - Progression of work Paragraph 1 - The widening & resurfacing of Steels Corners Road, Hudson Drive, Allen Road and the Interchange Ramps shall be completed in 3 phases during one construction season. The intent of these Maintenance of Traffic plans is to have each phase completed and open to traffic, except for final surface course and pavement markings, prior to implementing the next phase. Which is Correct?

---

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: 2/6/2008

Question Number: 17

Plan note on page 251/309 "Pile Driving Constraints" requires the embankment from the top of footing to top of subgrade on a 1:1 slope be constructed for 250 ft prior to driving piling. Is this necessary as the new footing is being constructed in existing soil not the new embankment?

---

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.