

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Project No. 101069

Sale Date - 4/22/2010

Question Submitted: 3/19/2010

Question Number: 1

Will the office calc's be available for review?

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FUL-23114/>**

Question Submitted: 3/24/2010

Question Number: 2

Note 8 on sheet 315/430 states that the MSE wall facing panels shall have a maximum width of 5'0". Can 10'-0" wide panels be substituted for the 5' panels?

**SEE REVISED SHEET 315**

Question Submitted: 3/24/2010

Question Number: 3

Note 8 on sheet 315/430 states that the MSE wall facing panels shall include an aesthetic surface treatment cast into the front face of the panels. There does not appear to be any specification or drawing describing the aesthetic treatment. Please provide this information.

**SEE REVISED SHEET 315**

Question Submitted: 3/29/2010

Question Number: 4

Plan sheet 32- cross sections for temporary access drive refer to 12" Type B pipe as 706.42. There is no 706.42 specification per 2008 CMS. Does ODOT mean 707.42 or can the pipe by any type meeting Type B criteria be used? Please clarify in an addendum.

**An addendum will be issued to address this question.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2010

Question Number: 5

On Sheet 17A/430 we can assume that the lower limit for being considered "HAZARDOUS WASTE" is based on what is accepted as "SOLID WASTE". Disposal costs for "HAZARDOUS WASTE" will vary based on the contaminant and concentration. Please provide the contaminant and upper concentration limit to be used in pricing the "WORK INVOLVING HAZARDOUS WASTE ITEM".

**An addendum will be issued to address this question.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2010

Question Number: 6

On Sheet 17/430 at the end of the fifth paragraph the note states "THE CONTRACTOR SHALL EXECUTE A BOND IN FAVOR OF BOTH THE STATE AND THE COMPANY AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 5525.16 OF THE REVISED CODE OF OHIO." Does ODOT intend for the contractor to provide a Payment/Performance Bond in favor of the Railroad in addition to ODOT on this project?

**An addendum will be issued to address this question.**

Question Submitted: 3/30/2010

Question Number: 7

Will the department include any notes as how to coordinate with the railroad, as well as their allowable laybacks and sheeting requirements which is typically given on projects? It is stated that the power transmission line will be in place during construction over top of pier 2 and therefore the contractor may need to splice pile to work safely under and around the power lines. This is possible, however, with that power line constraint will make setting the new structural steel over the railroad tracks with that additional constraint almost impossible with a span over the r.r. of 125' of relatively heavy girders. What if anything can be done with this transmission line? Furthermore, how is the contractor to assume the r.r. will work with them to set the steel over the tracks with an estimated 100 trains per day passing? Will the Contractor be given a window for track closure, or can a week long, or couple day track closure be given to allow for the structural steel set minimizing the cost to ODOT as well as allowing for rapid setting of the steel to minimize the affect on the r.r.?

**An addendum will be issued to address this question.**

Question Submitted: 3/31/2010

Question Number: 8

Reference number 185 and 199 refer to Granular Embankment as per plan. The as per plan note is referenced to sheet 301 there are no notes that specifically call out Granular Embankment As Per Plan, only Embankment As Per Plan notes can be found. Please advise as to which note to use, or provide the note.

Question Submitted: 3/31/2010

Question Number: 9

Reference number 185 and 199 refer to Granular Embankment as per plan. The as per plan note is referenced to sheet 301 there are no notes that specifically call out Granular Embankment As Per Plan, only Embankment As Per Plan notes can be found. Please advise as to which note to use, or provide the note.

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: 3/31/2010

Question Number: 10

Reference number 185 and 199 refer to Granular Embankment as per plan. The as per plan note is referenced to sheet 301 there are no notes that specifically call out Granular Embankment As Per Plan, only Embankment As Per Plan notes can be found. Please advise as to which note to use, or provide the note.

Question Submitted: 3/31/2010

Question Number: 11

For reference items 185 and 199 Granular Embankment APP, the sheet referenced for the plan note pertaining to these items does not have a plan note for "granular" embankment app. Is there a different note for these items of work, furthermore, the mse wall cross section does not show where this material is to be placed, could the plan note and placement of this material be clarified?

**See Revised Sheet 315 New note**

Question Submitted: 4/12/2010

Question Number: 12

If the leveling pad and MSE wall is built per the plan elevations, and the settlement occurs as expected, will the pay quantity of wall be adjusted for the additional wall needed to meet the plan top of coping elevation? How will the additional select granular be paid for?

Question Submitted: 4/12/2010

Question Number: 13

Plan note on sheet 19 allows for 540 calendar day detour for phase 3. Plan note on sheet 301 calls for a 6 month waiting period in season number 2 after completion of fills and surcharges over the wick drain areas. The proposal utility notes show relocations not complete until June 30, 2010. The project completion date is Sept. 30, 2012. Given the above restrictions along with waterline-sanitary-storm sewer work to be done prior to placing sand blanket and wick drains, and CMS construction season and weather restrictions the 540 calendar days and Sept. 30, 2012 project completion date is not achievable. Please review the impact of these parameters on these dates and adjust them accordingly.

**See Revised completion date**

Question Submitted: 4/12/2010

Question Number: 14

Ref. 90- Manhole #3- ODOT quantity is 22. This appears to be greatly understated. Please review and revise in an addendum. Ref. 81- 42" Bored Pipe- Does the contractor have to wait until the end of the settlement period to bore this under the embankment or is the intent to have the contractor bore this prior to any embankment construction. If this has to wait until the end of the settlement period to bore, then it could hold up a significant amount of upstream drainage (basically everything north of station 29+00). Please provide more information about sequencing and phasing of this work in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/13/2010

Question Number: 15

Addendum 8 was issued Tuesday afternoon, which addressed changes in the reinforcing steel quantity. Amendments 2 and 3, which both appeared on EBS in conjunction with this addendum, not only addressed the change in reinforcing steel quantity, but also changed the quantity and unit of the temporary sheet piling bid item (previously ref. 282) from 35000 square feet to 2639 feet. There were four prebid questions asked between March 4 and March 18 in regard to this item. This item was changed Tuesday afternoon without any plan change or explanation in an addendum, as the contractor currently is led to believe that this item will be paid for by the square foot of piling installed (per the prebid question asked and answered on 3/16/2010). ODOT further stated in the pre-bid answer that undercutting depths would be based on field conditions at the time of construction, and that the depth of sheeting required would be based upon digging test pits once the first side of the road was closed. Since the item was paid by the square foot, a pre-bid design and an assumption of risk by the contractor for a sheeting depth was not necessary. By changing the bid item to a linear foot pay item, the contractor is now required to design the wall pre-bid with only 1 day notice prior to the bid. This is a significant change and should be explained in an addendum and the plan notes on Sheet 10/229 should be revised.

**Should be project 101040.**

Question Submitted: 4/13/2010

Question Number: 16

Addendum 8 was issued Tuesday afternoon, which addressed changes in the reinforcing steel quantity. Amendments 2 and 3, which both appeared on EBS in conjunction with this addendum, not only addressed the change in reinforcing steel quantity, but also changed the quantity and unit of the temporary sheet piling bid item (previously ref. 282) from 35000 square feet to 2639 feet. There were four prebid questions asked between March 4 and March 18 in regard to this item. This item was changed Tuesday afternoon without any plan change or explanation in an addendum, as the contractor currently is led to believe that this item will be paid for by the square foot of piling installed (per the prebid question asked and answered on 3/16/2010). ODOT further stated in the pre-bid answer that undercutting depths would be based on field conditions at the time of construction, and that the depth of sheeting required would be based upon digging test pits once the first side of the road was closed. Since the item was paid by the square foot, a pre-bid design and an assumption of risk by the contractor for a sheeting depth was not necessary. By changing the bid item to a linear foot pay item, the contractor is now required to design the wall pre-bid with only 1 day notice prior to the bid. This is a significant change and should be explained in an addendum and the plan notes on Sheet 10/229 should be revised.

**Should be project 101040.**

---

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: 4/16/2010

Question Number: 17

Ref. 82- 42" B Bored or Jacked with Steel Rings: further correspondences with manufacturers indicate that the use of steel end rings on reinforced concrete pipe is extremely rare, if ever used, for storm sewer applications. Steel end rings are normally used for concrete pressure pipe. In order to manufacture pipe with steel end rings, specialized equipment must be purchased far in advance and at a considerable cost, without any guarantee of being used on a regular basis. Other railroad bored pipes using reinforced concrete pipe have typically used rubber gaskets at joints. Please consider omitting the requirement for steel end rings and allow the contractor (and their manufacturer) to provide a reinforced concrete pipe with rubber gasket joints.

Question Submitted: 4/5/2010

Question Number: 18

Page 15 of the plans under the "GENERAL NOTES", CONSTRUCTION NOISE the non-work hours are from 6 PM to 9 AM. Contractors work hours start at 7 AM or 7:30 AM. Can the AM time be changed to 7 AM? The bridge deck will be done in the evening. Will there be a waiver for this work?

**See revised sheet 15 new hours**

Question Submitted: 4/5/2010

Question Number: 19

Page 17 of the plans under "GENERAL NOTES" ENDANGER SPECIES HABITAT (INDIANA BAT) the trees cannot be removed from April 15 to September 15. The sale date is April 15 so the tree removal could not begin until September 15. Are any of the trees to be removed potential "bat trees"?

**An addendum will be issued to address this question.**

Question Submitted: 4/5/2010

Question Number: 20

Can the office calcs in the GENERAL SUMMARY be made available to the contractors?

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FUL-23114/>**

Question Submitted: 4/5/2010

Question Number: 21

Can the electronic files be made available to the contractors?

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FUL-23114/>**

Question Submitted: 4/5/2010

Question Number: 22

On page 301 of the plans under "PROCEDURE FOR EMBANKMENT CONSTRUCTION" after ITEM 6 there is a line that states "SEASON No. 2: (MOT PHASE 3)." Does that mean that ITEM 7 cannot be started until 2011?

**The text refers to the MOT set up in the plan. Alternate MOT note allows the contractor to propose a different method as long as the earlier steps are completed. The text refers to the MOT set up in the plan. Alternate MOT note allows the contractor to propose a different method as long as the earlier steps are completed.**

Question Submitted: 4/5/2010

Question Number: 23

The plans call for 34 trees to be removed for this project. On sheet 17 in the General Notes the Endangered Species Habitat ( Indiana Bat ) note applies for this project. Note states "Therefore, any unavoidable cutting of such trees will be performed only after September 15th and before April 15th when the bats would not be utilizing such habitat". Do all the trees that need removed for this project fall under the unavoidable. If not, then shouldn't they be removed before April 15th?

Question Submitted: 4/8/2010

Question Number: 24

Are the station limits for the Embankment As Per Plan B the same as the wick drains? We need to know how much embankment is on each side of the railroad tracks.

**See Calculations: [OverburdenEmbankment.pdf](#)**

Question Submitted: 4/9/2010

Question Number: 25

Ref. 69: 15" Conduit, Type C, 706.02 Plan sheet 77, Refs. P-95 and P-96 are included in the subsummary and summary as 15" C, but shown on plans as 21" C. Please verify in an addendum if this is to be 15" or 21".

**See Revised Sheets 36, 44 and 57**

Question Submitted: 4/9/2010

Question Number: 26

In order to derive an accurate and competitive cost to manage, sample, transport and dispose of soil characteristic of hazardous waste, additional information is requested that identifies the potential contaminants of concern with respect to bid item: Line #0180, #0181, #0182 and #0183. Also these items could be handled by allowances, to be worked out per unit cost with ODOT, if this issue would even come up during excavation. This way everyone would bid these items on an even playing field. Thank You, Harry Porter

---

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: 4/9/2010

Question Number: 27

Please confirm that the existing RR Grade Crossing on Hallett Ave. may be used by the Contractor during all Phases of the project. If the RR requires a Flag Man for this, it will be at ODOT expense.

Question Submitted: 4/9/2010

Question Number: 28

Ref. 82: Conduit, Bored or Jacked: 42" Conduit, Type B, 706.02 (Steel Ring)- There is a plan note on sheet 270 calling for a "Steel Ring Joint", but no detail or notes defining of what is required of the steel ring joint. Having had a conversation with a pipe supplier, they also need details in order to properly price their product. Please verify.

**See Example drawing Joint Ring, This drawing is only a sample of the Joint Ring**

Question Submitted: 4/9/2010

Question Number: 29

Ref. 181: Conduit, Bored or Jacked: 42" Conduit, Type B, 706.02- This is for a pipe which goes under existing Hallett pavement and proposed Hallett Road embankment. Why is this even a boring item? If the contractor chooses to open-cut this item, will ODOT pay the contractor under this item or under 42" B and/or 42" C pipe items?

Question Submitted: 4/9/2010

Question Number: 30

Regarding the 42" Bore question, ref. 181 was referred to. It was meant to be ref. 81 (42"B Bore item).

Question Submitted: 4/9/2010

Question Number: 31

Ref. 102 and 103 are way off on quantity. Plan sheet 298 shows 21 locations for the type A totalling 144' and 2 locations for the type B totalling 8'. Please review the quantities and revise in an addendum

**See revised sheet 36, 44, and 298**

Question Submitted: 4/9/2010

Question Number: 32

Ref. 102 and 103 are way off on quantity. Plan sheet 298 shows 21 locations for the type A totalling 144' and 2 locations for the type B totalling 8'. Please review the quantities and revise in an addendum

**See revised sheet 36, 44, and 298**

---

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.