

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 060150

Sale Date - 4/28/2006

Question Submitted: 3/10/2006

Question Number: 1

1. Culvert @ Sta 87+10.02 SR 161: The wingwall footing dimensions on sheet 1509 do not correspond with the wingwall footing dimensions detailed on sheet 1513. Please advise which dimensions are correct.

2. Culvert @ Sta 131+75.46 SR 161: The wingwall footing dimensions on sheet 1519 do not correspond with the wingwall footing dimensions detailed on sheet 1523. Please advise which dimensions are correct.

Question Submitted: 3/10/2006

Question Number: 2

1. The Brick Masonry notes on sheets 1752 and 1792 of 2117 for structures LIC-161-0062L/R imply that the brick is to be sealed. However, no sealer is specified, nor are the sealing limits indicated on the plans. Please clarify by addendum.

2. The Class HP Concrete Deck pay quantities for structures LIC-161-0062 L/R are 379 CY per structure. Our take off quantities are approximately 340 CY per structure. Please confirm that the 379 CY quantities are correct.

3. Regarding structures LIC-161-0227 L/R, the plans do not indicate any 6" diameter abutment drainage pipe in the porous backfill. Please confirm that drainage pipe is not required behind the abutments.

4. Regarding structure LIC-310-1005, the plans do not indicate any 6" diameter abutment drainage pipe in the porous backfill. Please confirm that drainage pipe is not required behind the abutments.

5. The 2" PEJF for Br. No. LIC-310-1005 adjacent to the approach slabs is incidental to Approach Slabs for payment. Where is the pay quantity of 325 SF designated in the plans?

6. The ultimate bearing value (158 Tons) for the pier piling shown on sheet 1885 of 2117 does not correspond with the plan note ultimate bearing value (120 Tons) shown on sheet 1887. Which ultimate bearing value is correct?

7. Dynamic Load Tests for Br. No. LIC-310-1005: Under the Pile Design Loads note on sheet 1887, A dynamic pile load test is designated at each substructure unit for a total of 3 tests. The pay quantity, however, only shows 2 tests. Please verify if 2 or 3 dynamic pile load tests are required.

8. For structures LIC-161-0062 L/R, there are no Architectural Finish notes and details for the parapet, as well as sealing of concrete surfaces (non-epoxy), similar to the other structures on the project. Please verify if the architectural finish is required on the parapets for these bridges.

Question Submitted: 3/15/2006

Question Number: 3

The summary on Plan Sheet 130 calls for 200 cy of Rock Channel Protection, Type C with filter on Plan Sheet 56A. There does not appear to be any reference to RCP C on Plan Sheet 56A. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 3/16/2006

Question Number: 4

At the pre-bid meeting held March 14, 2006, it appears that ODOT intends to eliminate cement stabilization of subgrade in areas where fills exceed 5'. Since this is warranty pavement, will pavement sections be redesigned in areas where cement stabilization is eliminated?

Question Submitted: 3/20/2006

Question Number: 5

Reference is made to REF #496 16 each laminated bearings. There are size conflicts on page 1904 for ref # 496. Ref to Section B-3 and the detail above it: Both of these call for a 12" x 17" laminated pad with a 13" x 18" load plate. Section B-4 calls for a 13" x 17" laminated pad with a 14" x 18" load plate. Which size 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: 3/31/2006

Question Number: 6

1. Sheet 61/2117 states that all detour signing is to be furnished, erected, maintained, and removed by the contractor; however, sheet 76 states that all signs for state detour shall be done by state forces. Which is correct?

2. The detour sheets state that all signs shall be type "H" sheeting. Will ODOT consider allowing type "G" sheeting for non-orange signs since this is what most contractors have in their inventory?

Question Submitted: 3/7/2006

Question Number: 7

We would like to request the following electronic design file information for Project 150(06).

1. Existing DTM
2. Proposed DTM
3. Centerline/Baseline Geometrics
4. ASCII File of Cross-section breakpoints (Northing, Easting, Station, Offset, Finish Grade Elevation, Point Code/Description)
5. 2D Base Map of project showing existing and proposed features (utilities, structures, roads, fences, property and r/w lines, etc.) in AutoCAD .DWG format.

**The file can be obtained at <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/dgn.htm>**

Question Submitted: 4/10/2006

Question Number: 8

Will the SWPPP for this project include Part II since the clearing of Part II is part of this contract?

If so, shouldn't the Construction Mulching for Part II be covered under Item 61 - Erosion Control instead of being incidental to Clearing and Grubbing?

Will there be any other BMPs required other than Construction Mulching for Part II?

Question Submitted: 4/10/2006

Question Number: 9

Bid Item 603E04400, 12" Conduit Tye B, is defined on Page 130 of 2117 as being part of the general notes on Page 56A of 2117. However, there is no mention of this pipe nor it's location within the project. Please Clarify.

Question Submitted: 4/10/2006

Question Number: 10

Plan sheets 143 and 144 show the location of clearing and grubbing for the future Phase 2, but the details have been reduced so much that they are difficult to read, even when enlarged on a copier. Please provide a larger version of these details so that a proper takeoff can be done.

In addition, please indicate if the right of way for phase 2 has been staked.

Question Submitted: 4/12/2006

Question Number: 11

Re: PN 205 – TEMPORARY SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL PRICES

On past projects including Proposal Note 205, maintenance of Temporary Erosion Control Devices was paid for by ODOT via Force Account in accordance with a proposal note titled "MAINTENANCE OF EROSION CONTROL ITEMS IN THE CONTRACT." The proposal for this project does not currently include this note. Unless clarified by addendum, we assume that maintenance will be paid for via force account on this project and that the unit prices listed in PN 205 are meant to cover installation only?

Question Submitted: 4/12/2006

Question Number: 12

Item 633 Controller Unit, Type TS2/A2, w/ Cab Type TS2:

The specifications under the general notes, plan page 1694/2117, calls out for the load bay to have 8 flash relay positions. The standard NEMA TS2 16-Position Load Bay only has 6 flash relay positions. Why is the specification require additional relays, and if they are required what are their purpose? Please clarify the quantity of flash relay positions required on the load bay and if it is more that standard give their functionality.

Question Submitted: 4/12/2006

Question Number: 13

Re: PN 520 – FUEL PRICE ADJUSTMENT

It is our understanding that ODOT's intent is to include Proposal Note 520 – FUEL PRICE ADJUSTMENT on all jobs that contain any category of work listed in Table A-1 of PN 520 (see page 4 of PN 520). Since this project includes large quantities of all five categories, should the Fuel Price Adjustment note be added to this project?

If not, will a Fuel Price Adjustment be added by change order to the successful bidder's contract?

---

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: 4/12/2006

Question Number: 14

Item 632 Vehicular Signal Head (LED):

On plan page 1691/2117 the general notes for this line item require that the LED's meet the 872 specification and then states the LED's are to be manufactured by Dialight. There are multiple manufacturers of LED's that meet the 872 specification. Why is this project being limited to only one approved manufacturer, and will there be an addenda released opening up this specification?

Question Submitted: 4/12/2006

Question Number: 15

There are conflicting specifications regarding the fiber optic modems that are to be used on this project. On plan page 1692/2117 under FIBER OPTIC INTERFACE it states that the fiber optic modem is to be installed on this interface and communicate with the controller via an RS232 connection, as well as, be powered up via the controllers telemetry module. Then on plan page 1694/2117 under CONTROLLER UNIT...it states that the controllers are to have an internal modem. Normally the interface panel would simply be a termination box and splice tray, you would then use your patch cords to go between the interface and the controller's F.O. modem. Please clarify this discrepancy at your earliest convenience.

Question Submitted: 4/13/2006

Question Number: 16

bid item 244 644 Lane Arrow 40 EACH

As per sheets 1670 and 1671 the bid quantity should only be 14 EACH

Question Submitted: 4/13/2006

Question Number: 17

bid item 244 644 Lane Arrow 40 EACH

As per sheets 1670 and 1671 the bid quantity should only be 14 EACH

Question Submitted: 4/14/2006

Question Number: 18

ITEMS 103,107,108,109,126,127,THE PIPE MATERIAL NEEDS TO BE CLERIFIED. THE PROPOSAL IS DIFFERENT FROM THE GENERAL SUMMARY SHEETS.

Question Submitted: 4/14/2006

Question Number: 19

Plansheet 967 (plan & profile for proposed Harrison Rd) does not exist. The sheet 967 that is in the plans is just a copy of a previous cross-section sheet. This missing sheet is not on the ODOT website.

Question Submitted: 4/17/2006

Question Number: 20

In the Sequence of Operations pages of the Maintenance of Traffic plans there appears to be a conflict. In Phase 1, "General Information for Phase 1" it states Proposed Burnside, Service Road 4, Jersey Mill Road (North and South) are to be completed and open before the Jersey Mill and SR310 intersection can be closed. In Phase 4 notes for Mink Road, it states Mink shall be completed and open to Traffic before Harrison and Burnside can be detoured. This would indicate, Phase 4 work on Mink must occur before Phase 1 work on Burnside. In addition, the revised Utility Relocation notes indicate that the AEP poles on Mink may not be relocated until December 31, 2006, which does not allow enough time to perform the work on Mink, and then Burnside, to be able to close the SR310 intersection and have it back open by the specified May 15, 2007. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 4/17/2006

Question Number: 21

Addendum #5 refers to a website for a Monthly Base Price to be used for Fuel Price Adjustments. The Contract Base Price is to be the Monthly Base Price for the month the contract was bid. There is no Monthly Base Price for April on the website. Please advise.

**The prices will be posted the first week in May for April bid contracts.**

Question Submitted: 4/17/2006

Question Number: 22

1. The 9" concrete pavement on the ramps does not call out for a centerline longitudinal joint in the 16 ft lane width section. It was my understanding that ODOT does not want any pavement lane widths to exceed 12 ft. Neither the typical sections or the joint details for the ramps identify this additional longitudinal joint. Does ODOT want 16 ft lane widths on the ramps, or should a longitudinal joint be added at the centerline creating two 8ft lanes.

2. The MSE Walls at Mink Rd. and SR 310 have been design with acute corners. It was my understanding that ODOT was going to eliminate acute angles in MSE Walls due to compaction concerns in these corners.

**1) No joint, please prepare your bid as shown in the bidding documents. 2) The design will not be altered, please prepare your bid as shown in the bidding documents.**

---

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: 4/17/2006

Question Number: 23

CMS page 436, 1st paragraph states "If the size of the underdrain is a 6-inch shallow pipe underdrain and the kind of pipe material is not specifically itemized, then 4-inch 707.31 perforated corrugated polyethylene drainage tubing may be used". Ref # 156 6" shallow pipe underdrain, does not specify a kind of pipe in the proposal, but does specify a kind of pipe in the underdrain quantities header page 1473. Does this mean 6" underdrain is required?

Question Submitted: 4/18/2006

Question Number: 24

Addendum #4 included several revisions to Utility Relocation notes for this project. In regards to American Electric Power, please provide more information as to their relocation schedule. It is noted when SR310 will be complete by June 30, 2006, but stating the balance of the project will not be completed until December 31, 2006 does not provide the bidders enough information to fairly evaluate the construction schedule for the project. There are many restrictions in the MOT plans that dictate in what sequence roads can be closed for reconstruction. Please provide dates for completion for the various locations of their work.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2006

Question Number: 25

Addendum No. 7, dated April 21, 2006, attempted to clarify aspects of Bid Item No. 156, Item 605 6" Shallow Pipe Underdrains. However the quantity unit was changed to EACH and the Item Spec 707.31 was not added to the EBS Bid Item Ref # 156 as intended. How should Bid Item No.156 be submitted by the Contractor ? Thank you.

Question Submitted: 4/24/2006

Question Number: 26

The Traffic signal poles on this project are single line item specified. It is my understanding that New Albany wants to purchase these poles and this is why it happened. In the past, this situation was bid as a base, alternate situation. New Albany would then have the ability to pay the difference for the low bid and the bid they may want to purchase. The agency representing Valmont is lot pricing his traffic signal pole, with the High Mast poles and the GE lowering device and the GE fixtures. Under the base alternate situation, he could not do that and other parties could bid. Please delay this project and change the bid documents to reflect a base alternate situation.

Question Submitted: 4/24/2006

Question Number: 27

Ref #s 300 thru 304 are a proprietary spec for traffic poles. Why isn't there a base bid and an alternate bid? Without it our competitor is using this to hold a package together preventing UM from competing on Refs# 180 thru 191- \$150,000 worth of high mast poles! Thanks

Question Submitted: 4/3/2006

Question Number: 28

All 603, type A,B and C conduits are as per plan which require them to fall under supplemental specification 802. Ref 142 is as per plan A which does not require SS 802. Is this ODOT's intent?

Question Submitted: 4/4/2006

Question Number: 29

As per Proposal Note: PN 090  
We are requesting that the Director reduce the requirement that the bidder must perform work equal to at least 50% of the total submitted bid price. We are requesting by contract provision that the Director reduce this amount to 40%.

Question Submitted: 4/4/2006

Question Number: 30

1. Plan Sheet 1/2117, Supplemental Specifications Index:  
Supplemental Specification 800 dated 4-21-06. What procedure does the Contractor follow to obtain a copy of the 800 Spec dated 4-21-06 ?

Thank you.

Question Submitted: 4/4/2006

Question Number: 31

Bid Item 603E04900 is defined on pages 130 and 1431 of 2117 as 12" Conduit, Type D. However, on page 1033 of 2117 it is defined as 12" Conduit, Type D, 706.02 A.P.P.. Which sheet governs?

---

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

Re: Interim Completion Date for SR 310 Reconstruction.

Addendum 2 revised the interim completion date on SR 310 from 11/1/2006 to 5/15/2007. Are we to assume that the 150 calendar day closure limit is no longer required, especially in light of the fact that there is a 60 day wait requirement for the abutment fills?

Question Submitted: 4/5/2006

Question Number: 33

Sheets 77 through 86 show the temp crossovers/runarounds constructed for maintaining traffic. There are no pipe quantities on these sheets for drainage in these areas. Could items be added for these quantities of pipe?

Question Submitted: 4/6/2006

Question Number: 34

Addendum #2 combined the 511 concrete (wingwalls, footers) with the 602 concrete masonry. How will the rebar be paid for?

Question Submitted: 4/7/2006

Question Number: 35

The following questions pertain to the implementation of Supplemental Specification 802 on the project.

Question 1

How soon after installation can flexible conduits be deflection tested?

Question 2

How close to the end of the warranty period will flexible conduits be deflection tested?

Question 3

Will deflection testing of flexible conduits be done in accordance with ASTM D 2321 and the latest revisions of AASHTO Section 30?

Question 4

Are the 5% and 10% deflection limits outlined in SS 802 measured from the nominal pipe diameter?

Question 5

Will laser deflection testing be permitted to measure deflection or will deflection be measured by pulling mandrels?

Question 6

How will the Contractor perform accurate deflection measurements on the larger diameter conduits, sizes where commercial mandrels are not available?

Question 7

What is the acceptable procedure for "re-rounding" flexible conduits with deflection between 5% and 10%?

---

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.