

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 080598

Sale Date - 12/10/2008

Question Submitted: 3/25/2009

Question Number: 1

Tensar International received a letter from Mr. Tim Keller of Ohio Department of Transportation dated August 25, 2008 stating "The 30 feet height limitation for the TENSAR ARES will be removed from the ODOT Bridge Design Manuals and the ODOT Supplemental Specification SS840". Will the TENSAR ARES Mechanically Stabilized Earth wall system be allowed to be utilized for wall heights with design height greater than 30 feet?

Question Submitted: 3/25/2009

Question Number: 2

Do the contraction, construction, and longitudinal joints in the 9" and 10" Reinforced Concrete Pavement (Items 104 and 105) get sealed? We are asking the question due to the fact that the section on sealing contraction, construction, and longitudinal joints have been removed from the 2008 spec book (which this job is under). However, the standards listed in these plans for BP 2.1 and BP 2.2 are dated 7/16/04. These standards show the joints being sealed. The more current BP 2.1 and 2.2 dated 7/18/08 do not show the joints being sealed. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/25/2009

Question Number: 3

1. Structure D102 is called out as a Catch Basin, No. 3A; however, this structure is not large enough to accept the proposed 36" conduit. Should this be a Manhole, No. 3 with a curb and gutter top? 2. Reference #R22 is for 419 If of pipe removal under the existing railroad tracks. Is this ODOT's intent or will this pipe be plugged and filled in place?

Question Submitted: 3/25/2009

Question Number: 4

Sheet 16 states that, "Payment for the WTS shall be included under the lump sum Item 614 – Maintaining Traffic." This work is usually bid on a per month basis. Please add a bid item for this work.

Question Submitted: 3/25/2009

Question Number: 5

The utility note in the proposal states that the Cleveland Electric, AT&T Telephone, Columbia Gas, and Time Warner Cable lines will be relocated on the project. Could Cleveland Electric and Time Warner's relocation plans be posted to the ftp site? Also, the utility note states that Columbia Gas and AT&T's relocated lines are depicted in the Highway construction plans. We have been unable to locate relocated utilities anywhere in the plans. The existing utilities conflict with proposed utility work and MSE excavation. Will these relocated utilities influence the installation of the any underground utilities or MSE wall construction?

Question Submitted: 3/25/2009

Question Number: 6

The reference ftp site Attach/CUY-21272/ was not available

**Thank you. It has been fixed.**

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 7

Regarding the retaining wall on this project, there are areas that look like they need to be shored in order to do the excavation to begin building the walls. There is no bid item set up for shoring in the retaining wall section. Would ODOT consider adding a bid item for shoring the retaining walls.

**The shoring is covered by the SS 840 and included for payment in with the MSE walls.**

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 8

There is no pay item for bridge conduit, is ref# 159 2" conduit 725.05 to be used for this item? For every foot of pipe there is a foot of trench listed. Normally steel conduit is used in bridges. Also the foundation detail shows a 1 1/2" riser up to the light, to do this a junction box will be needed. Please clarify. Thank you

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 9

Item 0090: Lime Stabilized Subgrade, 12 inch depth Section 206 includes an item for Lime as well as the processing item per 206.07. There is not Lime item included in this job. Please advise on how to bid this item or provide a line item for Lime material.

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 10

We do not see a pay item for the luminaires in the proposal. The pole plan note does not include them. There is also no description of the luminaires. This is probably a six figure item. Please add a pay item and description for this work.

**See sheet 245 first paragraph explains that the luminaries and lamps will be supplied and installed by First Energy.**

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: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 11

I would like to concur with question #22 with regards to interim completion dates listed on sheet 16. In particular Phase 1B Front Street Sta. 32+00 - 38+20 We are building retaining walls and bridges which will take a lot more than the 119 days allowed. Phase 2A Front Street Sta. 38+20 - 49+50 we are allowed 28 days in phase 2A and 56 days in phase 2B. Within these boundaries we are to build a bridge and MSE retaining walls which will take an entire construction season to build. I think we could live with the notes (3rd paragraph from table on sheet 16) if you extended that date until October 31, 2010. Maybe.

**The work on the MSE walls and CSXT bridge can start in Phase 1A and would carry through 1B as long as access is maintained to properties between the tracks from the north. This would allow 154 days for the walls and CSXT bridge. For Phase 2A and 2B are to get the MSE wall and roadway section completed and open while working on the NS bridge piers. Phase 2C completes the NS bridge superstructure. The wall and roadway total 84 days.**

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 12

With regards to addendum No. 4 and your teepee design to protect the AT&T communications line, we calculate an angle of 63 degrees for the side slope of this teepee or levee. We do not believe this will hold up especially at the station you choose to detail it. This section makes the teepee about 10' tall. We will have equipment running along side to excavate the undercut and also to place the wall backfill. And can you imagine the straps for the wall bending over the top of this 10' teepee. In the event we are able to keep this teepee uprighted, will ODOT require benching into this slope with our embankment material? The North side of the job will require about 3 ea. teepees to protect the other 2 or 3 AT&T communications lines.

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 13

Regarding addendum No. 4 we have the following comments. 1)The detail you show to protect the AT&T communication line will not comply with OSHA regulations. It is too steep and we will not put our people or equipment in a dangerous situation. Also the Time Warner cable was going to relocate with the AT&T communication line the way I read your utility notes. I believe it is aerial now, where will it go now that it appears AT&T is not going to relocate.2) We believe there will be a conflict with the AT&T communication line and the piling and the concrete footings for the piers and abutments. There is such a skew to the pier lines which will not allow the AT&T communication line to pass through without interference at the footing locations.3) Due to all the congestion involved with construction activities and the limited access in work areas to support multiple crews, it is not possible to meet the schedule requirements of interim completion dates which are unrealistic and not achievable.

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 14

Bid Items 213 and 214 Signal Support don't match what's shown on plan pages 214 and 215, the design, arm quantity and unit quantity are all different, what does the owner want?The lighting work shown on plan page 251 as well as some of the lighting on N. Rocky River Rd (plan page 254) extends outside of the project limits as shown on pages 2 and 3. Shouldn't the limits be extended?Plan page 251, how is the contractor to handle the conduits that cross under streets and drives, there isn't an item for conduit jacked or drilled or an item for trench in paved area

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 15

EarthTec MSE wall system has been recently approved by ODOT office of structural engineering and will be included in the January revision of the supplemental specification 840. The contract plans sheet 338 of 398 General Notes MSE Walls refers to the April 18 2008 supplemental specification 840 which does not currently include the approved EarthTec system. Given that approval has already been granted and the addition of EarthTec to the January 2009 supplemental specification 840 is simply an administrative formality, will the department allow contractors bidding this project to adopt the January revision to 840 once it's published. The contractors bidding this project have indicated that the actual design, supply and construction of the MSE wall will take place well after the January 2009 revised specification date.

**The version of the supplemental specification that is listed on the title sheet (or listed in an addendum) is the version that is part of the contract documents. The adoption of a later version after the contract is awarded must be done by change order with an appropriate cost adjustment. Bid the project according to the contract documents. Do not bid in anticipation of a change order being approved.**

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 16

Bid item 11, fill and plug existing conduit has a plan note on sheet 14 indicating the locations are shown on the plans. We cannot find these locations. We need pipe sizes, depths and lengths to determine a cost. Bid item 12, pipe cleanout has a plan note on sheet 15 indicating the locations for this work are shown on the plans. We cannot find these locations. We need pipe sizes, depths and lengths to determine a cost.

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 17

Proposal Ref. 168 and 169 have the same description (LIGHT POLE, MISC.:11'). Which one is the base bid and which one is the alternate that is described on plan page 245A? Why is there is an alternate bid for the 11' Light Pole but none for the 16.5' Light Pole (Ref. 152)? When the job was out for bid earlier in the year both had alternates.

---

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: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 18

This question is regarding the Foundation Data for MSE walls provided on Sheet 338 of 398 (or 3 of 29). The allowable bearing capacities were compared to the applied bearing pressures. The specified allowable bearing capacities are not sufficient. Increasing reinforcement lengths alone will not provide sufficient factor of safety. In the case of Walls 1L, 2R, 2L, 3R, 4R, 3L and 5R, the maximum applied bearing pressures are in the range of 5.5 to 6.5 ksf. In the case of walls 4L, 6R and 5L, the maximum applied bearing pressures are in the range of 3.4 to 4.5 ksf. Please advise how to proceed.

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 19

The structure plans require that the pre-bored holes for the piling are to be drilled after the 30day MSE waiting period is complete. This introduces some very costly obstacles to overcome... specifically: a)It has been our experience that the pile sleeves we are to drill within can not be held perfectly vertical during the sand fill operation. As you insert and retract the drilling auger in the sleeves during excavation, it will likely destroy portions of the sleeves, resulting in voids in the MSE wall envelope due to the loss of sand into the sleeves; b)The isolated MSE wall cell between the 0513 and 0517 bridges presents a "perched" drilling operation with no direct access for equipment and manpower. As shown, it would require expensive cranes and slower productions to perform the drilling from on top of this "perch." In effect, the access is costing more than the operation itself for these holes. As a reasonable solution, we would like to utilize the following procedure in all MSE wall locations: 1)perform the required MSE undercuts and fills; 2)predrill the 25' deep holes; 3)stand the piles in the holes and fill the annular space with sand; 4)install the MSE wall fills; 5)apply the 30 day waiting period; 6)drive the piles to bearing. Will this method be acceptable?

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 20

1) Can the sewer and water work be performed as a "pre-phase" work during the winter months and the the subsequent trenches be restored with Temporary Pavement?, If so, how would the contractor be paid for this Temporary Pavement?2) Are the days indicated in the Interim Completion Requirements shown on sheet 16 to be consecutive days?3) Must one area (as shown within the Interim Completion Requirements) be complete and opened to traffic before the next area can be closed?4) Is the contractor allowed to combine the phases, or the areas shown on the Interim Completion Requirements

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 21

Regarding Phases 2A and 2B, it appears that a phase is missing to construct the center lane portion of the Front Street pavement from sta 49+50 to 56+00. Please clarify the phasing of this portion of the project.

**Between Sta 49+50 and Sta 56+00, the center lane is only resurface. See sheets 5 and 18. Sheet 18 notes under Phase 2C it lists resurfacing of Front St from Bagley to 2nd St. and at the north end of the project.**

Question Submitted: 3/26/2009

Question Number: 22

This project contains Proposal Note PN 110 which requires the low bidder and second low bidder to submit their escrow documents by 4:00 PM the next business day after the bid opening. As the letting date for this project is the day before Thanksgiving, are the escrow documents to be submitted on Friday Nov 28 or Monday, Dec 1?

**Monday, December 21, 2008.**

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 23

1. Several of the cross sections show existing utilities in the MSE wall undercut areas. Please verify that all of these utilities are being relocated either by removal pay items on this project or by others prior to the start of construction and that no temporary support is required.2. The utility note needs to be clarified as to actual dates that work areas will be available. For example, the ATT Telephone note states that they will require 31 weeks of pulling and splicing but that work can not start until the right of way is cleared. The contractors need real dates for either the start or the finish of this work along with the other utilities.3. Please clarify the interim completion date table on sheet 16 of the plans. It lists 28 days for Phase 2A from 38+20 to 49+50 and also 56 days for almost the same limits in Phase 2B. We understand this to mean that work in that area is only partially completed in Phase 2A and may proceed through the duration of Phase 2B.4. Please clarify the Lanes Open During Holidays or Special Events note on sheet 16 of the plans. Obviously the roadway will not be completely open during then holidays because some will fall in the middle of a work phase. Does this note mean that no additional closures (i.e. single lane closures) may occur on these dates?5. The plan cross sections show some substantial depths on the undercuts with vertical walls, which is not feasible or safe. Will the contractor be paid at the unit price for wall excavation for excavating this on a safe slope?

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 24

1. Will a construction joint be permitted between the top of the 2' tall sleeper slab/coping and the 42" tall parapet on section L-L on sheet 352?2. If the contractor requires a temporary railroad crossing, where will this cost be paid and what involvement and cost will the associated railroad require?

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 25

Question 31 on the website requested information regarding how to backfill the MSE Pile sleeves and the answer states to refer to CMS 105.04 for order of precedence. This does not answer the question. All recent contracts have followed SS840 when it conflicts with plan notes, CMS 105.04 would reverse this and require bentonite slurry per the plans. Please review recent bids by the Department and if necessary consult with the Office of Structural Engineering to get a more researched answer.

---

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: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 26

The Interim Completion Requirement note on sheet 16 has no provision that these durations must directly follow each other. Therefore, it is not required that Phase 2C start immediately at the end of Phase 2B. Due to the winter shutdown at the end of the 2009 construction season, the Phase 2C duration will not start until the beginning of the 2010 construction season. Please advise by addendum if this is not correct.

**Yes, that is correct.**

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 27

The Utility Notes state that the utilities cannot begin their relocation work until all railroad agreements have been acquired. Have all needed railroad agreements been acquired?

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 28

Plan sheet 201 shows 141.5' of 48" steel casing pipe, but Bid Ref. 87 Steel Pipe Encasement is for 172'. Please verify the quantity. On plan sheet 227, reference W4 includes 20' of 6" waterline and 20' of 2" copper waterline and indicates a combination 2" water service and fire service connection. Does this require the single feed/combination vault shown on Sheet 239? Please clarify what is required here and provide details. On plan sheet 228, reference W7 includes 45' of 6" waterline and 45' of 3/4" copper waterline and indicates a combination 3/4" water service and fire service connection. Does this require the single feed/combination vault shown on Sheet 239? Please clarify what is required here and provide details. Plan sheet 50G, drainage reference D102 indicates 192' of 36" conduit and 1 ea CB No. 3A. There is no plan sheet 135. Please verify these quantities and provide details. Plan sheet 50E, drainage reference D8A indicates 22' of 12" conduit and 1 ea CB No. 2-2B. These are not shown in the storm sewer profile sheets. Please verify these quantities and provide details. Plan sheet 50E, drainage reference D7B indicates 8' of 30" conduit and 1 ea CB No. 2-3. These are not shown in the storm sewer profile sheets. Please verify these quantities and provide details. Plan sheet 50F, drainage reference D60B indicates 10' of 8" conduit and 1 ea Side Ditch Inlet. These are not shown in the storm sewer profile sheets. Please verify these quantities and provide details. Plan sheet 50F, drainage reference D60C indicates 43' of 8" conduit and 1 ea Side Ditch Inlet. These are not shown in the storm sewer profile sheets. Please verify these quantities and provide details. Plan sheet 50E, drainage reference D5A indicates 47' of 8" conduit and 1 ea Manhole No. 3. These are not shown in the storm sewer profile sheets. Please verify these quantities and provide details.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 29

This project is under the 2008 spec book, and lists BP2.1 & BP2.2 dated 7/16/04 as the SCD for this project. Standard drawings BP2.1 & BP2.2 were revised to 7/18/08. This eliminates the resaw and neoprene seal and hot seal except for exp joints. Please clarify which SCD applies to this project.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 30

Upon review of Addendum #4, pages 4-5, the material left in place around the AT&T duct is paid for in the plans under Reference 243, Wall Excavation. The quantity of Reference 22, Excavation has been changed incorrectly. Reference 243, Wall Excavation should be reduced to 20,949 cy to reflect the intended changes for the AT&T duct run. Reference 22 should remain 5,021 cy.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 31

The quantities for Ref. 91, Pavement Planing, Asphalt appear to be overstated. Calculations on Sh. 49 include the area from 49+50 - 56+00. Calculations on Sh. 50B include quantities for the same areas. Please verify the quantity.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 32

Union Metal would like to submit alternate for: Item Item Ext Description 625 10500 light pole, misc: 16.5' 625 10500 light pole, misc: 11' lighting alternate bid Item Item Ext Description 625 10500 light pole, misc: 11' What do you need to approve an alternate to the above mentioned items?

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 33

For Ref. 239 Decorative Steel Railing, there is a discrepancy on Sheet 332 regarding the size of the pickets. The Detail Elevation view indicates that they are TS 2X2X1/4, but Section A-A shows TS 2X4X1/4. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 34

Regarding Ref. 239 Decorative Steel Railing, plan sheet 332/398 indicates that the railing is to have a black finish. The notes further indicate that the railing shall be coated as specified in the plans. However, there is no further indication as to what the coating requirement is. Please provide a specification for this coating.

---

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: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 35

There is a pay item for structural survey and vibration monitoring for each bridge (Ref. Nos. 278, 305, and 336). There does not seem to be a specification for this work. Please provide one via addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 36

The bridge plans all have notes which state that the pile sleeves should be installed during the MSE construction and that the prebored holes and piling shall be installed thru the pile sleeves after the MSE settlement period. This potentially causes major issues if the pile sleeves are not exactly vertical since the drilling could penetrate the sleeve and allow the MSE select granular backfill to run into the sleeve. There are also significant equipment access issues on top of walls 3L & 5R. Please revise the notes to allow the installation of the piles prior to the MSE wall construction.

**Bid as per plan. In terms of equipment access issues the department does not determine the contractor's means and methods.**

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 37

1. A note on sheet 22 states to keep Temporary Road 2 Closed With Drums Until Phase 2A. Sheet 29 shows Temporary Road 2 open in Phase 1A and removed by new permanent construction in Phase 1B (sheet 33). Please clarify. 2. Sheet 22 shows temporary striping, drums, and signs on Front Street to construct Temporary Road 2. Why are similar items not shown for the construction of Temporary Road 1? 3. Is it really the Department's intent to temporary stripe Item 410, Traffic Compacted Surface on Temporary Road 2? It does not seem to make sense to stripe an aggregate drive. 4. The 35 Calendar Day duration listed on sheet 16 for Phase 1A is unrealistic. Cure time on the Lime Stabilization and Concrete Pavement alone take up almost a third of the duration. Please review and revise this duration to 90 Calendar days. 5. The Interim completion dates on sheet 16 do not appear to take into account winter shutdown periods. MSE Wall backfill cannot be placed during freezing weather, therefore Phases 1B, 2A, & 2B are potentially affected by the winter months and the time limit for these phases should be adjusted accordingly. 6. The Interim completion dates on sheet 16 do not appear to take into account the waiting periods per the Pile Driving Constraints. The bridge abutments and superstructure cannot be started until 30 days after the completion of the MSE wall embankment. In Phase 1B for example, this waiting period takes up over 25% of the allotted construction time. Please review and modify the interim dates accordingly. 7. Why is the final completion date July 31, 2011 when the note on sheet 16 requires essentially all work to be completed by August 31, 2010? Due to issues already stated in Question 4, 5, & 6 above, we request that all interim dates be removed and allow the contractor to schedule the work to complete on July 31, 2011. If this request is denied, please provide the contractors with the Department's detailed schedule showing how they expect this work to be completed in the timeframe given.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 38

Pg 332/398 Please specify metal treatment and paint system of the decorative steel railing. Also pickets are called out to be 2" x 4" and 2" x 2" please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 39

Please clarify the Interim Completion Dates shown on sheet 16 of 398. Specifically, in Phases 2A & 2B between stations 38+20 to 49+50 on Front Street in Phase 2A which shows a 28 day completion and between stations 38+40 to 49+50 on Front Street which shows a 56 day completion.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 40

Please clarify what is required for the Water Work, Misc.: Single Feed Combination Domestic/Fire Line Connection, the plan changes in Addendum # 4 call out a 3/4" and a 2" service feed but the only detail shown in the plans call for a vault and ductile iron pipe and fittings which are not available in the 3/4" and 2" as called for.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 41

In response to your answer to Question 27 in Addendum #4, it is still not clear which Proposal Reference Number (Ref. 168 and Ref. 169) should be the ALTERNATE and which should be the BASE since both have the same description (LIGHT POLE, MISC.:11)? The revision of plan page 245A in Addendum #2 is what is causing the confusion; it does not clarify what Reference should be the ALTERNATE and which should be the BASE. Normally the generic pole would be the Base designation which is the first reference number (Ref. 168) and is designated by the "AA1" in the proposal. The ALTERNATE is usually the second reference number (Ref. 169) and is designated by the "AA2" in the proposal. HOWEVER, this logic is "reversed" in the above project. ODOT's revision of plan page 245A in Addendum #2 states that the generic pole is the "ALTERNATE BID" and plan page 257A states that the potentially more expensive "Main Street" pole is the "BASE BID". The confusion is further complicated by BOTH Reference Numbers having the same description ("LIGHT POLE, MISC.:11"). We request you clarify what Reference Number should describe the pole on revised plan page 245A in Addendum #2 and what Reference Number should describe the designated pole on plan page 257A? Please do not keep the same proposal description for both reference numbers.

---

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: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 42

Plan sheet 50 does not have the quantities for 304 Aggregate Base. Please provide these. Plan sheets 50C and 50 D account for 4" of topsoil over all of the seeded areas. Plan sheet 15 includes an additional 1728 cy of topsoil to promote growth of permanent seeded areas. Isn't this material already included for the seeded areas? Please confirm the intent and quantity.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2009

Question Number: 43

The MSE wall cross section sheets indicate a thickness of approximately 3-5' of undercut below the bottom of the leveling pad. SS 840 Section I states that Select Granular Material conforming to 703.17 (Aggregate Material for 304) shall be used to a height of at least 3' above the bottom of the leveling pad. What material is required for the space between the bottom of the leveling pad and the top of the foundation preparation? Is 304 required or may 703.11, Structural Backfill Type 2 be used?

Question Submitted: 3/28/2009

Question Number: 44

Ref 239: Decorative Steel Railing: This item is bid as 517 and according to the specs the tube must pass the toughness test as outlined in section 707.10. Since this railing is a decorative rail and sitting on top of a 32" concrete wall and not being used as a crash type rail, does the tube steel have to meet the toughness test.

**Yes**

Question Submitted: 3/29/2009

Question Number: 45

Bid reference # 218 Signalization, Misc.: Preemption on plan page 204B states "The equipment shall match the existing preemption system in the city of Berea and be manufactured by EPS and Sonix." However, the city of Berea currently uses the Sonem 2000 preemption system as manufactured by Traffic Systems, LLC. Will an addendum be issued to correct this? Additionally this item states that detector home run cables shall be supplied and bid separately. However, a bid reference for such a pay item is not in the proposal. Will this pay item be added? Additionally, Plan page 204B lists an item as "controller item miscellaneous confirmation light." A pay item for this is not listed in the proposal. Will this be added?

Question Submitted: 3/29/2009

Question Number: 46

Bid reference # 424 (AB2) is listed as an alternate bid for Econolite controller equipment. However, the City of Berea meets the criteria established by the ODOT TEM for this item to be a base bid not an alternate because the majority of controller equipment controlled and maintained by the city of Berea is Econolite. Will this alternate item be eliminated and the base bid for controller equipment be changed to specify Econolite.

**The bid items were set up in accordance with the ODOT Traffic Engineering Manual.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 47

There is a general note on Sheet 14/398 that requires conduits for storm sewers (Type B or C) to be constructed using 706.02 RCP sizes 12" and up or 707.45 PVC sizes 4" to 15". However, on Sheets 45 and 46 of the General Summary, many of the Type B and C Conduits do not reference Sheet 14. Where does this note apply? There is an APP note below for the same storm sewers. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 48

addendum no. 2 details the paint spec. for the railing. You are calling for an organic zinc prime coat over hot dipped galvanized steel. We are being told by the paint suppliers that this will not work. Will this step be eliminated? How do we bid this item?

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 49

There is a quantity of 4 each signal support foundations shown for Reference 209. However, there are 5 poles called out on the Sign Support schedule per Sheet 215/398. Ref 214 has a quantity of 2 but should be 1 per same schedule. There should be a Reference for "TC 81.20, Design 4" according to the same schedule. There should also be References for "power service" for the signals & "2 conduit riser". A Reference is needed titled "cabinet riser" for the traffic signal controller cabinet.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 50

Sections H, J, and K on Sheet 352/398 show what appears to be a 2' inset on both sides of the parapet. Please clarify that this is where the form liner shall be applied.

**Yes, it is for the form liner. Refer to sheet 331a.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 51

We cannot find any technical difference between References 420 and 424, other than one is an Alternate Bid 1 (AB1) and the other is (AB2). Please clarify.

---

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: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 52

Bid reference # 427 (AB2) is listed as an alternate bid for Sonem 2000 preemption equipment. However, the City of Berea meets the criteria established by the ODOT TEM for this item to be a base bid not an alternate because the majority of preemption equipment in use by the City of Berea is Sonem 2000. Will this alternate item be eliminated and the base bid for controller equipment be changed to specify Sonem 2000?

**The bid items were set up in accordance with the ODOT Traffic Engineering Manual.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 53

What work is Reference 400- 615 Roads for Maintaining Traffic for? Page 4/398 includes it in the "PROPOSED LEGEND" but I can't find where it is indicated to be utilized in any of the typical sections. On page 17/398 there is a plan note "ITEM 614 ASPHALT CONCRETE FOR MAINTAINING TRAFFIC, CLASS A. what does the CLASS A designate.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 54

The general summary shows an item for Roads for Maintaining Traffic and Portable Concrete Barrier, 32" A.P.P., however, these items are not in the proposal, please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 55

We are looking for ODOT Proposal Note 530 referenced in the Prime Engineering and Architecture, Inc. report, page 20, titled "ITEM SPECIAL - STRUCTURAL SURVEY AND MONITORING OF VIBRATIONS".

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 56

Reference 206 shows a plan quantity of 7 each Detector Loops. However, there are 8 loop detectors called out on the chart shown on Sheet 214/398. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/30/2009

Question Number: 57

The plan note titled "Pile Driving Constraints" on Sheet 259/398, etc. indicates that the void between the pile and the pile sleeve shall be backfilled with bentonite slurry. However Supplemental Specification 840.03.K.2 calls for granular fill backfill material. Please clarify.

**Refer to CMS 105.04 for contract document order of precedence.**

---

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. 080151

Sale Date - 3/14/2008

Question Submitted:

Question Number: 1

In regards to bid item 0007, manhole removed, can these manholes be fill with low strength mortar in lieu of removal provided that this does not interfere with any other works?

Question Submitted: 12/17/2007

Question Number: 2

1. Sheet 236 of the plans shows 2 different trench details for waterline under pavement. One shows 6" of sand below the pipe with 12" of cover sand, while the other shows no sand below the pipe with 12" of cover. Which one is required for this project? 2. The utility notes state that the utilities cannot begin their relocation work until all railroad agreements have been acquired. Have all railroad agreements been acquired?

**Answer: Only 6" of sand is to be placed on the bottom of the waterline trench in all locations. Answer: Both NS and CSX railroad agreements has been signed. The Standard Construction Agreements that Odor has executed w/both CSX and NS do not cover any new or relocated above-grade or underground utility relocations, as that is handled separately through each RR's Property Services group via License Agreements.**

Question Submitted: 12/7/2007

Question Number: 3

In regards to bid item 0005, pipe removed 24" & under, will grout filling of these runs be allowed if there is no conflict with other items?

Question Submitted: 2/12/2008

Question Number: 4

The structural steel members level 4 reference # 279 and structural steel members level 5 reference # 336 are to have the full 3 coat paint system done in the shop according to the general notes. Framing plan drawings indicate that a Type 3 Crossframe be provided. This requires field welding at each crossframe and would result in extensive 3 coat touchup and repair. Should a Type 4 crossframe be used instead? This would be a bolted only connection and would eliminate field repairs.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2008

Question Number: 5

The typical sections on page 4 and 8 call out a "D" joint and point at two longitudinal joints. The legend on page 4 lists the "D" joint as "DOWEL BAR PER BP 2.1 (TRANSVERSE JOINTS)". However, the Intersection Details on page 186 to 191 show the same longitudinal joints that are shown on the typical as "D" joints, but call them out as "A" joints. The "A" joints shown in the Intersection Details are called "LONGITUDINAL JOINT AS PER STANDARD DRAWING BP 2.1". Please clarify which joint is required. Also, if the owner does want a dowel (in lieu of the standard tiebar or hook bolt) in the longitudinal joint (as shown on pages 4 and 8) can it be inserted mechanically or is it to be drilled and grouted? And, what size of dowel goes in a longitudinal joint?

Question Submitted: 2/12/2008

Question Number: 6

Can the Microstation CAD files be made available online. Also can the proposed and existing surfaces be made available in LandXML format

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/dgn.htm>

Question Submitted: 2/12/2008

Question Number: 7

I have a question in regards to the format of the bid tab that is produced by the Expedite software. After downloading the bid tab for job 080151 and looking over the tab, it appears that any items that are lump sum on the bid tab do not line up correctly after inserting numbers. For example, the total cost of a lump sum item will appear to be cut off. While the total bid amount is unaffected by this glitch, I was wondering if there is some way for you guys to adjust these lump sum items so that the entire amounts entered will appear when printing? Thanks

**This is corrected in the next upgrade. Thank you.**

Question Submitted: 2/13/2008

Question Number: 8

1. Roadway Quantity Sh 50D lists 494 cy of embankment of Drive 1 that should be indicated on Sh 130. Sh 130 doesn't show any embankment & this quantity is not indicated on the cross sections. Please clarify the location of this embankment. 2. Roadway Quantity Sh 50D lists 1423 cy of excavation on Access Road 1, but the cross sections sheets for this road only show 141 cy. Please clarify this quantity. 3. How is the embankment behind the curbs in the cut areas paid for? 4. Please clarify the locations of the 6" waterline sections W4 & W7. 5. Sh 223 states that all waterline fittings shall be AWWA C110, but Sh 235 states that all waterline fittings shall be compact style. Please clarify which style is required. 6. Sh 223 states that all line valves shall be Mueller double disk or equal. Sh 235 states that all gate valves shall be resilient wedge. Please clarify which type is required. 7. Sh 193 appears to show an incorrect invert of the existing 30" conduit on D6-MH No.3 APP. Please clarify.

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: 2/27/2008

Question Number: 9

Ref.#s 292,319, and 349, Item 607, vandal protection fence 8' straight,coated fabric (black) as per plan. The notes on pages 265,288,and 307 are identical notes for the vinyl coating of the fence and components.These notes have several specs that cannot be followed,as they do not apply to vinyl coating, but to painting. For example- It calls for no water quenching on the high strength pipe. This cannot be done, as it affects the tensile strength of the pipe, and it would not pass spec. The pipe cannot be blasted, as it only has 1 oz. of galv. per specs. Also, wire and framework for vinyl coating is not alkaline washed,It should be wire brushed for profile. Framework and fittings cannot be coated per ASTM F668, as this is a spec. for wire only.It should be ASTM F1043.The 22 mils Class 2a is an extrusion process not used on pipe.7 mils thick class 2b is a wire spec and is to thin for pipe.The bolts and nuts would have to be coated after instalation, as you cannot coat before. Should these fences be coated per a manufacturers specs. and TE-24 tested for use in lieu of the incorrect specs listed?

Question Submitted: 3/3/2008

Question Number: 10

Union Metal Corporation is requesting approval of an alternate construction of the 11ft and 16ft (line items 0167, 0168, 0169 & 0170) decorative light poles and alternate size anchor bolts (line item 0151).Based on calculations from our Ohio Registered Structural Engineer that the type of construction specified (aluminum welded) for the 11ft and 16ft (line items 0167, 0168, 0169 & 0170) decorative light poles will not hold the loads as required by ASSHTO standards that are outlined by ODOT.Union Metal Corporation also would like to bid an alternate size anchor bolts (line item 0151) based on calculations from our Ohio Registered Structural Engineer that the anchor bolts specified (5/8 x 18") for the 11ft and 16ft (line items 0167, 0168, 0169 & 0170) decorative light poles will not hold the loads as required by ASSHTO standards that are outlined by ODOT.Union Metal Corporation requests approval as per plan on an alternative base plate construction pole that would meet the load requirements in the plans, thus meeting ASSHTO standards as required by ODOT. Union Metal Corporation requests approval as per plan on an alternative size anchor bolt that would meet the load requirements in the plans, thus meeting ASSHTO standards as required by ODOT.

Question Submitted: 3/4/2008

Question Number: 11

The curb removed quantity for line # 0004 is over stated by 400 lf. Please check quantities and confirm.

Question Submitted: 3/4/2008

Question Number: 12

This question is regarding the Foundation Data for MSE walls provided on Sheet 338 of 398 (or 3 of 29). RECo compared the allowable bearing capacity to the applied pressure based on a strip length that corresponds to 70% of the wall height.The specified allowable bearing capacities are not sufficient. We request that the allowable bearing capacities should be increased.For walls 1L and 2R, the maximum exerted bearing pressure of 5,600 psf exceeds the allowable capacity of 4,500 psf.For walls 2L, 3R and 4R, the maximum exerted bearing pressure of 6,500 psf exceeds the allowable capacity of 4,500 psf.For walls 3L and 5R, the maximum exerted bearing pressure of 6,500 psf exceeds the allowable capacity of 4,500 psf.For walls 4L and 6R, the maximum exerted bearing pressure of 4,700 psf exceeds the allowable capacity of 3,125 psf.For wall 5L, the maximum exerted bearing pressure of 3,800 psf exceeds the allowable capacity of 3,125 psf.

Question Submitted: 3/5/2008

Question Number: 13

The Buildings to be demolished for references 224 thru 226 are either removed or being removed at this time. Please advise us if all work will be done by others or will there be portions of work to complete.

---

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.