

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 100215

Sale Date - 5/20/2010

Question Submitted: 3/30/2010

Question Number: 1

Will the Department please provide the Office Calculations for Roadway and Pavement items as referenced on plan pages 162 and 165?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-79545/>

Question Submitted: 3/30/2010

Question Number: 2

Would the Department please provide the design files for LAK-79545 on their ftp site?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-79545/>

Question Submitted: 3/31/2010

Question Number: 3

1. There is a General Note on plan sheet 983/1258 under "Pile Design Loads" stating that "all piles shall be re-tapped prior to completing the pile driving operation". We assume that ODOT means restriking will be required. ODOT usually has a bid item for restriking. Please clarify what is required and how it is to be paid for. 2. On plan sheet 700/1258 under "Item Special Retaining Wall, Misc.: Soil Nail Wall" it states that the construction shall conform to the specification of ODOT Special provision for Item Special - Retaining Wall, Misc.: Soil Nails, Verification Tests & Proof Tests. Please provide this special provision.

A1) The note in question is derived from a general statement in the subsurface investigation report. The re-tapping mentioned in the note is a standard activity per CMS 507.04 and does not require any additional pay items. Pile driving may cause uplift to occur at previously driven piles—these piles must be driven back down and is covered by Item 507.A2) Please provide this special provision. Has been supplied with Addendum #2.

Question Submitted: 4/13/2010

Question Number: 4

Refer to plan page 700 of 1258 - lower left corner - Note "Item Special" this note refers to a special provision - Retaining Wall, misc.: Soil Nails, verification tests & proof Test. This special provision was not attached to the plans. Where can it be found?

Question Submitted: 4/14/2010

Question Number: 5

Will the department please post the latest version of the as built plans for the following structures: Lak - 2 - 0955 L/R SR 2 over SR 615 (renovated 1997) Lak - 2 - 1169 L/R SR 2 over Heisley Creek (built 1961)

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-79545/>

Question Submitted: 4/15/2010

Question Number: 6

Two questions: The Typical Sections on sheet 18 show a Type C Barrier Wall. There is no Type C Barrier Wall bid item in the proposal form. (This is not to be confused with Type C1 Barrier Wall). Regarding the barrier wall quantity, the typical sections do not coincide with the sub-summary sheets.

Question Submitted: 4/15/2010

Question Number: 7

Two questions: The Typical Sections on sheet 18 show a Type C Barrier Wall. There is no Type C Barrier Wall bid item in the proposal form. (This is not to be confused with Type C1 Barrier Wall). Regarding the barrier wall quantity, the typical sections do not coincide with the sub-summary sheets.

Question Submitted: 4/16/2010

Question Number: 8

Ref. 124- 12" B, Bored or Jacked Conduit: subsummary shows this is being on plan sheet 570, ref. D-2. Plan sheets 570, 571 and 581 show this as being an open-cut 15" B conduit across Heisley Road. Please verify what size and type of pipe this is in an addendum

See forthcoming addendum for consistent cross sections and quantities.

Question Submitted: 4/19/2010

Question Number: 9

Based on the MOT Phasing notes on Sheets 47-48, all of the work on side streets is to be done during Phase B. Sheet 153 has Market St. being constructed in Phase C. Is this correct?

See sheet 47. SR-615 and Heisley Rd. improvements shall take place during phase B or C, but must be completed in one construction season.

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: 4/19/2010

Question Number: 10

Plan sheet 30 has a "Construction Noise" note whereas the contractor is not allowed to operate power-operated construction-type devices between the hours of 9 PM and 7 AM. Plan sheet 40 has "Floodlighting Note" for nighttime work periods. Plan sheet 41 has a "Permitted Lane Closure Note" which basically leads to lane closures only being allowed at night for Phase A outside shoulder work. Plan sheet 46 "Maintaining Traffic- General Provisions" note 3 refers to nighttime work, flood lighting, and a lighting plan. The plan sheet 30 note conflicts with the remainder of the above-referenced plan notes. Please clarify what governs in an addendum.

See addendum

Question Submitted: 4/19/2010

Question Number: 11

Plan sheet 47 calls for construction of the seven culverts in phase A (to be done in steps 1-7). One in particular is located at station 701+00, a 14' x 4' box culvert. Plan sheet 103 calls for this to be done in Phase A, Step 5. Plan sheets 967-973 give more details on this item, but on sheets 969 and 970 call for portions of this to be built in both Phase B and Phase C, which contradicts what is shown on sheets 47 and 103. Please clarify in an addendum which phase(s) the culvert is to be built in.

See addendum

Question Submitted: 4/19/2010

Question Number: 12

General Summary sheets 162-168 refer to two different Columns of Office Calcs. Two files have been posted (in response to a previous pre-bid question) in reference to the quantities in one of these columns. Please provide information pertaining to the quantities listed in the left column of Office Calcs.

These quantities refer to the beginning of the project which required revision based on project 080597. The quantities represent a very small portion of the project and were mainly computer generated, so there are no calculations.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2010

Question Number: 13

Per the cross-sections on sheets 282-284: There is a significant systematic drop in the excavation quantities from station 580+00 onward without any apparent significant change in the cross sections themselves. From this point forward, the calculation method for deriving excavation quantities seems to systematically change. Please review these cross sections and revise takeoff quantities in an addendum. Also, please clarify which parts of the existing pavement section are intended to be included as part of the excavation quantity.

See forthcoming addendum for consistent cross sections and quantities.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2010

Question Number: 14

Based on hand take-offs of the SR-2 cross sections, some of the cross sections include the cross-hatched area representing existing concrete pavement as part of the excavation quantity. The removal of the existing concrete pavement is already included in the Pavement Removed item. Please note that this error does not occur in most cross-sections. Please revise the excavation quantity in an addendum such that it does not include any pavement removal quantities as excavation.

See forthcoming addendum for consistent cross sections and quantities.

Question Submitted: 4/20/2010

Question Number: 15

Would the Department please provide a link to the report mentioned on sheet 38 regarding the Reinforced Slope Design on their ftp site?

Question Submitted: 4/20/2010

Question Number: 16

Please clarify in an addendum the General Note Item 603-Conduit Bored or Jacked. Can the casing pipe be the storm conveyance pipe, or is a carrier pipe required inside the casing pipe?

See Item 603 - Conduit Bored or Jacked note on sheet 32/1258. A casing pipe and a carrier pipe are required as stated in the note.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 17

Plan sheet 677- there are twin 48" culverts that are to be removed when constructing the new 58x91 pipe. No quantity has been set up for the removals. Are pipe removals considered incidental to ref. 123 or are they paid for separately?

See 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: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 18

Should the seven lights on ramp D, that are in front of noise wall G, be barrier mounted? If so please provide details of transitions and raceway placement. Typical section sht 23 shows Single slope barrier Type B around the Center street piers. Sub-summary sht 541 lists the same as Single slope barrier Type B-1 and is carried to the general summary as such, please clarify.

A1. Use lighting standard drawing HL-20.13 type B barrier foundation for each light pole. There will be enough room in between the noise barrier and the back of the foundation. The type D barrier will abut up against the light foundation. The front of the barrier and foundation will line up but the back of the foundation will stick out. According to standard DWG RM-4.5, raceways are to be mounted on the back of Type D barrier. The foundation for the lights were not deducted from the total length of the Type D barrier, so this was also corrected in forthcoming addendum. A2. Typical section sheet 23 was changed to reflect a type B1 barrier, see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 19

For bid item 360, Work Zone Speed Limit Sign: The note on sheet 41 states that R2-1, 50 MPH speed limit signs are included in this bid item. Are the 60 MPH and 25 MPH speed limit signs shown on the MOT plans to be included in this bid item or paid under the Lump Sum Maintaining Traffic item?

They would be paid for under the Lump Sum Maintaining Traffic Item.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 20

Is it the responsibility of ODOT or the contractor to install and remove the detours shown on sheets 140-143? If it is the contractor's responsibility, could ODOT please add a bid item for detour signing in an addendum?

Quantity was added in forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 21

Addendum # 2 states that the Soil Nail Wall Special Provisions were made available. Where are they?

The Special Provisions can be found at the internet address listed on the cover page of this proposal.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 22

Proposal note 416 states that all asphalt mixes should be designed for heavy traffic volumes. Both ref. 162 and 163 are specified with PG64-22, which are more in line with medium traffic volumes instead of heavy traffic volumes. Please verify in an addendum if this is the correct material for the required design.

Ref #162 and 163 are to be used on the side roads. Ref #s 160 and 161 are for mainline pavement. See the typical sections.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 23

Will NBS-1-09 (Noise Barrier Specifications for Ground Mounted Applications) apply to this job? If so, please advise all bidders via addendum.

No. This project was developed prior to this standard. The plans already contain the notes, details and quantities needed for the construction of the noise barriers.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 24

The noise barrier wall area for 'Wall E' seems to be slightly overstated. More specifically, it seems as if several panels have been classified incorrectly and/or double-counted. Please review and revise via addendum.

Quantities corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 25

The noise barrier wall area for 'Wall K' seems to be overstated. It appears that the unit area for each 14'-20' height panel in the schedule and quantities chart on plan sheets 747-749 is incorrect. Please review and revise via addendum.

Quantities corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 26

The noise barrier wall area for 'Wall M' seems to be overstated. It appears that the unit area for each 14'-20' height panel in the schedule and quantities chart on plan sheets 753-756 is incorrect. Please review and revise via addendum.

Quantities corrected in forthcoming 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: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 27

The noise barrier wall area for 'Wall G' does not take into account the 24' panel section (G217) between posts 217 and 218. The total wall area seems to reflect this section as a standard 16' section. Please revise via addendum.

Quantities corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 28

The noise barrier wall area for 'Wall H' does not take into account the 24' panel section (H99) between posts 99 and 100. The total wall area seems to reflect this section as a standard 16' section. Please revise via addendum.

Quantities corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 29

The estimated quantities sheet (Pg. 200/1258) has a total quantity of 2266 LF of Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B1 and no quantity for Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type C1 on that page. However, the quantities that were carried to the subsummary sheet (Pg. 172/1258) show 1542 LF of Type B1 wall and 724 LF of Type C1 wall for Page 200 and these quantities were used in totals. Please advise the correct quantity of each wall type for this discrepancy.

See addendum

Question Submitted: 4/21/2010

Question Number: 30

Addendum #2 added the special provision for soil nail walls & shotcrete to the list of special provisions on the plan title sheet. However these special provisions are not attached to the plans, were not attached to the addendum & are not listed on the FTP site for this project. Please provide these special provisions or directions to where they can be viewed.

Question Submitted: 4/22/2010

Question Number: 31

What is the required ID of the casing pipe to the OD of the carrier pipe for Line Items Numbers 0124, 0125, 0126, 0127, and 0128, Conduit, Bored or Jacked Type B.

The ID of the casing pipe can be any size as long as there is sufficient space for the carrier pipe and grout material. The carrier pipe shall not be crushed.

Question Submitted: 4/22/2010

Question Number: 32

Ref. 110- 27" Conduit, Type A: proposal does not specify what type of pipe is allowed but plan sheet 684 says 706.02. Is this limited to 706.02 or is it open to all pipes meeting the type A specification?

It is open to all types meeting the type A specification.

Question Submitted: 4/22/2010

Question Number: 33

Ref. 105- 21" Conduit, Type B: there is a run that crosses Center Street on plan sheet 536, ref. D7. The maintenance of traffic plans do not clearly give the phasing of how this crossover is to be built. Is this to be built under live traffic or per longitudinal phase of Center Street? Please answer in an addendum

It is to be constructed under live traffic.

Question Submitted: 4/22/2010

Question Number: 34

Sheet 536, D11, station 22+38 to 24+09 calls out 170 lf of 12" Type C, is that correct?

Type B is correct. Quantities corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/22/2010

Question Number: 35

Ref. 116-123 call for elliptical conduits. The dimensions specified are those that correspond to concrete pipe. Would ODOT allow dimensional changes for corrugated metal pipe arches if the equivalent pipe diameter criteria is met?

Corrugated metal pipe arches require a foundation investigation as per L&D 2 section 1002.2.3. Therefore, bid as per plan.

Question Submitted: 4/22/2010

Question Number: 36

Ref. 116-123 call for elliptical conduits. The dimensions specified are those that correspond to concrete pipe. Would ODOT allow dimensional changes for corrugated metal pipe arches if the equivalent pipe diameter criteria is met?

Corrugated metal pipe arches require a foundation investigation as per L&D 2 section 1002.2.3. Therefore, bid as per plan.

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: 4/22/2010

Question Number: 37

There is an elliptical storm sewer that runs along the north side of Center Street (SR 615) on plan sheets 539 and 542. This crosses ramp A, which per MOT plan sheet 125 is to be built in two different phases (B and C). Does the storm sewer have to be built per these phases or can it be installed all at once? If done at once prior to phasing, will ODOT allow ramp A to be closed for storm crossover work, and will restoration of existing pavements be paid under temporary pavement items or must it be considered incidental to the pipe items?

No ODOT will not allow Ramp A to be closed for storm crossover work. We are allowing only one weekend closure, and there won't be sufficient time to tie in the pavement and perform the storm sewer crossover work. Pavement restoration is incidental to the pipe items.

Question Submitted: 4/23/2010

Question Number: 38

Plan sheet 42 contains quantities for pavement planing and asphalt concrete intermediate course intended for resurfacing in the transition areas on either end of the project. However, the EB transition area (west end) will be concrete pavement based on project 080597 and therefore cannot be planed and resurfaced. Were these items intended to repair the WB (east end) transition only? If not, please revise the pavement planing and intermediate course quantities in an addendum. In either case, please consider adding quantities for waterblasting the EB (west end) transition area paint or allowing for 740.06 (Tape) pavement markings in that area.

These items were intended for the east end only. 740.06 pavement markings have been added in addendum 6.

Question Submitted: 4/23/2010

Question Number: 39

Ref. 102- 18" Conduit, Type A: plan sheet 685 shows this as being 706.02, but the proposal does not designate pipe specific pipe requirements. Is this to be RCP or is the specification open? Please clarify in an addendum.

It is open to all types meeting the type A specification.

Question Submitted: 4/23/2010

Question Number: 40

1) There are 2 mainline bridges on this project, yet there is no quantity of Bridge Mounted PCB. Is the PCB on the mainline bridges to be bridge-mounted? If so, please add an item for bridge-mounted barrier. 2) All of the PCB on this project is 50", APP. Typically this application is utilized for face-on-face traffic scenarios, none of which occur on this project. Will ODOT allow the barrier that is intended to be 50" to instead be 32" PCB? 3) Sheet 42 states that all WZRPM's in use during the snow-plow season shall be 621 RPM's. Since the EB (West End) of the project will be concrete pavement, will ODOT allow the use of 614 WZRPM's during the snow-plow season in that location so as not to damage the existing concrete pavement?

Question Submitted: 4/24/2010

Question Number: 41

There is 23 each "Concrete Barrier, End Achor, Reinforced" set up for this project. Per Standard RM 4.3 page 2 of 2 end anchorages are required "...at interruptions in barrier caused by expansion joints". Per Standards I-2.1 and I-2.2 each Barrier Inlet gets a 3/4" expansion joint on each end of the 20ft barrier section. There are a total of 70 each Inlet No. 3's for Type B1 and Type C1 barrier which would mean there is 140 expansion joints at these inlets in the median barrier. Should an additional 140 Concrete Barrier, End Achor, Reinforced be added to this project? If so, please also clarify if the quantity of barrier for each of these 15 ft end anchorages are to be deducted from the quantity of Type B1 and Type C1 barrier wall.

The quantities have been adjusted to reflect the direction in the standard drawing. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/24/2010

Question Number: 42

Two Barrier Related Questions: 1) Detail "B" on page 27 shows 2 conduits in the Median Barrier Wall. Please clarify what type of conduits these are. 2) Are both of these conduits incidental to the barrier items in which they are shown? 3) Typical Sections page 18 and 19 show raceway in the Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type B on SR 615 Ramp C and in the Concrete Barrier Single Slope Type C (which there is no pay item for Type C wall) on SR 615 Ramp A. Is this correct that the Type B and Type C barrier get conduit, and if so, what type of conduit is required?

Specs for the conduit are shown on STD DWG RM-4.3. Conduits are incidental to the barrier. The Type C and B barrier conduit is to be installed per STD DWG RM-4.3 and the barrier type long Ramp A has been corrected previously.

Question Submitted: 4/26/2010

Question Number: 43

I believe the quantities of Type B and Type C 29" X 45" Conduit are incorrect. Please revise.

See forthcoming addendum for corrected quantity.

Question Submitted: 4/26/2010

Question Number: 44

On sheet 540 seventy feet of 24" x 38" Conduit Type C is not accounted for in the bid proposal.

See forthcoming addendum for corrected quantity.

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: 4/26/2010

Question Number: 45

On Sheet 46 under "Winter Time Limitations" it requires all pavement work up to the proposed intermediate course to be completed by November 1st of each year, and to return traffic to unshifted position with full lane widths. It further states under "Maintaining Traffic (Winter Time Limitations)" that all existing lanes shall be open to traffic between November 1st and April 15th. Once traffic is shifted in Phase B there are no details provided on how traffic can be returned to an unshifted position with full lane widths by November 1st. Throughout the project, there are significant grade changes between proposed and existing, and if traffic is returned such that two lanes are open over the winter, there could be significant dropoffs. The phasing indicates that the Phase C traffic shift will immediately follow the completion of Phase B. Please explain in more detail on what is meant by an unshifted position by November 1st of each year.

The traffic should be shifted back to the median area to provide 12' lanes and wider shoulders on the median side (almost 7') as for the comment on the grade changes there are contingency quantities to handle the grade changes on sheet 46 (longitudinal butt joints and butt joints).

Question Submitted: 4/26/2010

Question Number: 46

Plan sheet 30 notes that existing plans are may be inspected at the district 12 office. Will ODOT please put these on the FTP website? Also, it was mentioned at the prebid meeting of joint repairs being performed on the last rehab project that are different than the typical sections shown on these plans. Will ODOT please provide the log with locations, areas, etc. on the FTP website? Also, what type of reinforcing in the existing reinforced concrete pavement exists?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-79545/>

Question Submitted: 4/26/2010

Question Number: 47

Will ODOT allow precast headwalls for elliptical and larger diameter conduit on this project?

per Item 602 of the 2008 CMS:Half-height headwalls up to 72" having pre-approved precast drawings on file with the Office of Material Management are permissible. Any non-pre-approved drawings are required to be submitted to the Office of Structural Engineering for approval.

Question Submitted: 4/26/2010

Question Number: 48

Sheets 976 and 969 of the structure plans show PCB to protect dropoffs while constructing culverts in Phase A. The MOT summary for 50" PCB on sheet 68 does not include this barrier. Where is the cost for installing and removing this PCB to be included?

The PCB in Phase A around the box culverts is not needed. The culvert typicals have been adjusted and attached (see forthcoming addendum).

Question Submitted: 4/27/2010

Question Number: 49

There are no waterline detail drawings. Please provide these in an addendum.

Refer to the Lake County Regional Sewer District No. 1 – Standard Waterline Construction and Material Specifications (Feb 15, 1983 or most current Specification revision).

Question Submitted: 4/27/2010

Question Number: 50

Sheet 984 of the structure plans states that the PCB on the SR-2 bridge over SR-615 shall be included under item 614. Since the PCB item on this project is included in item 622, should the PCB on this bridge be paid for under the lump sum MOT item 614, or should it be included with the item 622 barrier?

As the note on sheet 984 states, the PCB is included under Ref 568.

Question Submitted: 4/27/2010

Question Number: 51

Ref. 414- After review of plan sheets 962-966, there is no 601D rock channel protection shown. Please provide more information as to where this is located. Also on plan sheet 962, the 601B rock is called out on the Westbound side of the pavement. On the Eastbound side, there are two small areas of what appears to be Rock channel protection. Is this 601B or 601D? Please clarify in an addendum.

See forthcoming Addendum

Question Submitted: 4/27/2010

Question Number: 52

Ref. 560- After review of plan sheets 974-5, there is no 601D rock channel protection shown. Please provide more information as to where this is located. Please clarify where the 601D is to be located in an addendum.

See forthcoming 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: 4/27/2010

Question Number: 53

This is a reinforcing bar question. Sheet 1039 - Bar Mk A801 indicates that this bar is mechanically coupled. We believe it is not. Please confirm. Thanks

See forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 54

Sheet 218 RM3 is 79 feet of existing 15" Conduit, it is itemized under Pipe Removed over 24". Please revise summary.

See forthcoming Addendum

Question Submitted: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 55

1) Addendum #3 changed the phase drawings for Structure LAK-2-1138 (Sheets 967,969,970). Does ODOT intend to re-phase structure LAK-2-1315 (Sheets 975,976,977) in a similar manner? 2) The phase sections for 1315 (sheets 976-977) appear to have EB and WB reversed. In addition, the temporary pavement widths shown for 1315 on sheets 976-977 do not correspond with the widths shown on MOT Sheet 91. Which temporary pavement widths are correct? 3) Structure phase drawings on sheets 969,970,976, and 977 show PCB in Phase A. There is no PCB quantity included in the MOT plans for Phase A. Please revise the Item 622 PCB quantity to include this Phase A barrier. 4) Structure phase drawings on sheets 969,970,976, and 977 show PCB to be anchored. This implies that the PCB should be bridge-mounted. However, there is no bridge-mounted PCB quantity set up. In which item is the bridge-mounted PCB and associated costs to be included?

A1) No re-phasing is necessary for the 1315 structure. A2) We do not believe the phase sections are reversed. The temporary pavement widths have been corrected on the 1138 and 1315 plans. The required widths are slightly wider than the MOT plans indicate; therefore, the MOT typical section has been revised to reference the 1315 plans for construction phasing at the culvert. See revised sheets 69, 969, and 976. A3) PCB will not be required for the 1138 culvert during Phase A; however, it is necessary for 1315. The sheets have been revised to clarify barrier use. A4) All PCB used for culvert construction shall be anchored. A quantity of bridge mounted PCB has been added to addendum 7.

Question Submitted: 4/28/2010

Question Number: 56

Ref. 124-128, Bored or Jacked Conduits: Out of the 75 bored segments of pipe, over 1/2 will outlet at elevations below that of proposed outside ditchlines. This is a different issue as opposed to what the bored pipes (ref. 347-350) in the Maintenance of Traffic items will be able to accomplish. How does ODOT intend to address this issue as there will be nowhere for the drainage to flow?

The final elevation of the pipe outlets will be at the proposed ditch line. See the note on sheet 45 which provides for quantities to maintain the drainage during construction.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 57

1.) Bid item 396, port str rem, as detailed on plan sheet 960 of 1258 requires no work. This bid item should be deleted. If there is work that is to be performed under this reference number, please specify what is to be included. 2.) Plan sheet 961 of 1258 shows the work areas for the 519 patching item. I'm assuming that this patching is on the interior of the pipe since there is no unclassified excavation item for this work. Is this correct? 3.) If 519 patching is below the waterline, where are the costs for dewatering or control of water to be included?

A1) We agree this item should be removed. See revised Sheet 960 in addendum 7. A2) Yes, the repairs are to be made to the interior of the culvert. A3) This work is to be included with Item 519. The general note has been revised to include dewatering with this item. See revised Sheet 960 addendum 7.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 58

Ref. 378- Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A: Plan sheet 40 has 1,000 s.y. setup as directed for maintaining traffic. Plan sheet 44 shows a detail that calls for this item to match the depth of existing pavement and base for culvert replacements in phase A, steps 1-7. The depth of the existing mainline pavement is approximately 14.4" and existing base 11.7" average. This appears to be a conflict with 615A pavement specifications, which call for 9" rigid pavement or a flexible pavement consisting of 10" asphalt and 4" stone base. Please clarify this conflicting detail in an addendum.

Has been clarified in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 59

Would the Department please provide a detailed explanation of what is required for "Air Enforcement" as it pertains to the LEO (With Patrol Car) For Enforcement in Work Zones plan note on sheet 39/1258? How will Air Enforcement be paid for and which agency might supply said Air Enforcement? Please advise how the contractor is to handle this item in an addendum.

The note on sheet 39 states that LEOs can be used in the form of: stationary patrol, circulating patrol car, and/or air enforcement in combination with ground patrol car. Air enforcement may be used. It is not required.

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: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 60

Would the Department please provide a bid item for RPM Removal?

See forthcoming addendum for revised quantities.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 61

1.) It appears that reference number 384 is overstated, please adjust or simply change it to a lump sum item. 2.) There is a pile mob bid item, ref 494, for LAK-2-1169 R, but there is no pile mob ref number for 1169 L. Where will the costs for the pile mob for the left structure be paid? 3.) There are bid items set up for HP Concrete Testing, ODOT has non performed these over for several years now, should these be deleted?

A1)We believe our estimate is reasonable. A2)We have added a bid item for 1169 L. See attached Sheet 1018 addendum 7. A3)Our plans show Test Slabs but no Testing, which is consistent with the BDM 302.1.2.1.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 62

This question pertains to ref 481 detailed in plan notes on drawings 984 & 1005 and ref 532 detailed in plan notes on drawings 1016 & 1032. Both references are "structural joint or joint sealer, misc.: 2" precompressed expansion joint filler" paid by the square foot. In talking to the sales representative for the named manufacturer "emseal" they are telling us this product is not meant to fill the entire height (approximately 6") of the 2" gap between the left & right bridges but is made to only seal the top 2"+/- of the joint at the top of the parapets. If this product is to be used should these seals be paid by the lineal foot? Should they only be installed at the top of the 2" space/parapets between the bridges for the length of the bridges - not filling the entire void full depth? 2" compressible emseal is not designed to be installed the full depth of the space between the decks as shown and quantified on the plans.

The quantity has been corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 63

May I have any office calculations for barrier wall and concrete paving item?Thank you.

Question Submitted: 4/29/2010

Question Number: 64

May I have any office calculations for barrier wall and concrete paving item?Thank you.

The quantity calculations have been posted.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 65

On Sheet 38 of the plans there is a contingency quantity of 200 CY of Excavation and 200 CY of Embankment that is to be used "as directed by the engineer to remove weak, wet, or soft soil that may be encountered". After realizing that these quantities are carried to the general summary under Ref # 22 Excavation for 397,894 CY and Ref. # 24 Embankment 44,608 CY would ODOT consider a separate bid item for these contingencies based on the fact that this work has a different scope and cost? Also a job of this size should have a higher contingency quantity established based on the amount of earthwork area on the project.

Items have been revised and added to addendum 7.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 66

Due to the May bid date on this project, with a likely start in late June, there is no way to complete Phases A & B in 2010. All the culvert work and temporary pavement will require lane closures and limited working hours. There is simply not enough time to complete 2 phases in a 4-month construction season. Therefore Phase B should be constructed in 2011 and Phases C & D in 2012. Can the completion date be pushed back to October 31, 2012 to allow a realistic schedule?

The completion date will remain at October 15, 2012.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 67

Ref. 154- Aggregate Base: in checking the office calculations, the quantity for the Center Street ramps appear to be overstated. Please recalculate and revise in an addendum.

The quantity has been revised in addendum 7.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 68

Please provide calculations for the earthwork for the temporary pavement item?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-79545/MOTEarthwork.xls>

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: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 69

There is no bid item established for the temporary fence noted on sheet 703. Please clarify.

Temporary fence has been added to addendum 7.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 70

If the contractor elects to use the integral noisewall post caps as allowed on sheet 701, can they be notched to allow the panels to slide into the posts? If this is not allowed, then the note regarding optional post caps should be eliminated.

Yes, but a test section with panel, posts and caps will still be required to be approved prior to the production of any additional noise barrier panels or posts. See sheet 702.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 71

An answer to a prebid question stated that the intent is to shift traffic from Phase B configuration directly into Phase C configuration. This implies that traffic will be in Phase C configuration over the winter of 2011/2012. Given the revised phasing of the project, 621 RPM's must be used for Phase C since the intent is for the traffic to be in that configuration over the winter (snow-plow season). Could ODOT please add the WZRPM's intended for use in Phase C to the item 621 quantity? Could ODOT also please add a bid item to remove the Phase C 621 RPM's?

The as per plan WZRPM item includes RPMs that conform to 614 or 621, installed and removed. See sheet 42.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 72

The general summary pages on plan sheets 162-165 show two sets of "office calcs" quantities. The FTP website gives the quantities for the one set (in the middle of the page). The office calculations on the left side of the pages are nowhere to be found on the FTP site. Please provide these missing office calculations as they affect several bid items.

This question was already answered on 4/21/10. These quantities refer to the beginning of the project which required revision based on project 080597. The quantities represent a very small portion of the project and were mainly computer generated, so there are no calculations.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 73

I asked several questions on 4/29 and your response to those questions was "we don't want to delay this project". Was this response in reference to another question? Will you be answering my original questions?

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 74

The quantities for Type B Conduits Bored or Jacked reflect casing pipe extending to the headwalls, is this your intent. Pipe outside the proposed pavement to the proposed headwalls is usually called out as Type C.

Yes it is intended to carry the type B pipe to the headwall. Most of the runs of pipe outside the pavement are too short and do not require a change in pipe type.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 75

Sheets 969 and 976 show temporary pavement in the median both eastbound and westbound for construction of the culverts at station 701+/- and the culvert (bridge) at 794+75. This temporary pavement is not shown on the MOT drawings nor is it included in the quantity sub-summary. Please provide details for the limits, width and geometry of this temporary pavement and also increase the bid quantity to reflect this additional work.

The temporary pavement in the median is no longer used, and has been removed from the plans. These revisions were previously submitted.

Question Submitted: 4/30/2010

Question Number: 76

The concrete pavement ramps do not show a longitudinal joint down the center of the 16' ramp lanes as is recommended. Please advise if this joint is to be added by addendum.

In locations where the ramp lane is constructed half width due to MOT restrictions, place the longitudinal joint as depicted on the MOT details. In locations where the ramp lane is placed at a 16' width, place a longitudinal joint in the center of the 16' wide ramp lane.

Question Submitted: 5/1/2010

Question Number: 77

Ref. 3- Pavement Removed: plan sheet 669 which summarizes driveways has a few on Heisley Road (sheet 570). These quantities to be greatly overstated. Please review and revise in an addendum.

The quantity has been revised in addendum 7.

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: 5/10/2010

Question Number: 78

A prebid question was asked on 4/30/2010 in regards to the contingency quantity of excavation and embankment set up for the project. The answer was that the items had been revised and added to addendum #7. Addendum #7 was to delay the job and addendum #8 had earthwork changes but did not address the contingency quantity for weak, wet or soft soil that may be encountered. Will this be addressed?

Addendum 8 added excavation of subgrade 800 cy and granular material, type B 800 cy for any weak, wet or soft soil that may be encountered. See revised sheet 38, also part of addendum 8.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 79

It appears that the conduit that the plan (pages 882, 885, 888, 891, 894 and 897) calls out to be used between the Signal Support Foundations and the closest Pull Box is under sized to handle the number and size of the signal cables to be used. (suggestion, create a 3" conduit item) Also at several of these locations the signal wires (number and type) called out to be installed are different from the Intersection overview pages 882, 885, 888, 891, 894 and 897 than the wiring diagram listed on pages 883, 886, 889, 892, 895 and 898. Please review.

the wiring and conduit has been corrected in addendum 10.

Question Submitted: 5/11/2010

Question Number: 80

The quantity for Ref #192 (Light Tower Foundation, 36" x30' deep) appears to be wrong. The subsummary on sheet #915 includes a tower at MJB-6 and another tower on sheet #916 at PB-30). Towers are not shown on the lighting plans at either of these locations. Please confirm the correct plan quantity is 21 foundations, not 23.

The light tower foundation quantity has been corrected in addendum 10.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 81

On sheet 68/1258 there is a call out for work zone crossover lighting, but there is no quantity. My second question is for the median pole foundations there is no pay item for the barrier junction box, which is required at each one. With a qty of 171 this is a large cost. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 82

Bid reference # 237 is described as Overhead Signal Support, Type TC-16.21, design 3 which is not a design on the current ODOT TC-16.21 SCD drawing dated 1-16-09. Will an addendum be issued clarifying what this pole should be?

The overhead sign support was revised to design 8 in addendum 10.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 83

Answers to previous Pre-Bid questions indicated that the following items would be added or revised in a future addendum: (1) 516 Structural Joint or Joint Sealer was to be added; (2) Ref 3 quantity was to be revised; (3) Ref 154 quantity was to be revised; (4) Temporary Fence was to be added. As of addendum #8 these items were not addressed. Please include these items in the next addendum

All the quantity revisions that refer to addendum 7 are in addendum 10.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 84

1) Sheets 969 and 976 modified in Addendum 5 still show temporary pavement in the median for Bridge 1138 and Culvert 1315. A previous answer to a pre-bid question stated: "The temporary pavement in the median has been removed from the plans". Please clarify. 2) Please add quantity for Ref 380 PCB for Phase A at culvert 1315. 3) Please provide quantity for Bridge Mounted PCB.

These quantities and/or revisions have been included in previous addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/12/2010

Question Number: 85

A prebid question was asked on 5/10/2010 in regards to the excavation of subgrade and granular material, Type B. The answer was that quantities of 800 cy were added to the bid items and shown in the general summary. These quantities were not added to the ebs file for bidding, please add these items.

The quantities have been included in addendum 10.

Question Submitted: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 86

We can not locate any plan details that pertain to bid reference number 266, Signing, Misc.: Changeable Lane Use Sign other than it is to be mounted on structure S-118. Are we overlooking a plan note that explains what is required for the legends, etc. for this item or will an addendum be issued detailing this item's requirements?

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 addendum 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: 5/13/2010

Question Number: 87

The Phase C mainline MOT sheets (109-123) show 50" PCB at the ramp areas in paths A & B simultaneously. The PCB quantity in the MOT summary reflects this configuration. However, When the project is being built, traffic cannot run in both paths simultaneously. Therefore the openings in the barrier runs for each path will have to be closed while the other path is open. Because of this, the 50" PCB (Ref. 380) quantity appears to be in error. Please review and revise the quantity.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2010

Question Number: 88

Where in the bid documents can I find any information about liquidated damages and if they exist on this job?

Look at sheet 46/1258 in the plans, and refer to CMS 108.07.

Question Submitted: 5/17/2010

Question Number: 89

The prebid question website refers to "addendum 10". It is now 6:10 PM on Monday May 17, 2010. There is no addendum 10 on ODOT's website. When will the addendum and corresponding EBS amendment be available?

Question Submitted: 5/17/2010

Question Number: 90

Bid references # 234, 235, and 236 (painting) each have a total quantity 50 in the proposal. However, the list of sections shown on plan page 790 totals 71 sections not 50. Additionally, most (not all) of the TC-12.30 design structures list 3 section member for each pole on plan page 790. However each of these structures typically only has two members each, which would make the total for these items 55 sections for each bid reference not the 71 on page 790 or the 50 in the proposal. Will an addendum be issued to clarify what the correct quantity for this item is as the unit cost is based on an average of many different type of supports which is dependent on an accurate total.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 91

The previous question submitted on 5/12/2010 regarding bid reference # 237 was answered that addendum 10 was changing this pole design to a TC-16.21 design 8. However, this was not changed in addendum 10. Is another addendum being issued to address this?

In addendum 10, reference 237 (Item 630E10302 Overhead Sign Support, Type TC-16.21, Design 3) was deleted and Item 630E10802 Overhead Sign Support, Type TC-16.21, Design 8 was added and given a new reference number.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 92

We received addendum 10 for the above referenced project at 1:15 PM today (Tuesday 5-18-10. This addendum includes 76 plan page changes with only 37 of those posted on the FTP site as this question is written and 33 bid item changes. Is this project going to be delayed since addendum was not issued within the 72 hour limit.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 93

Upon receipt of addendum 10, the first page has a link to the FTP site for revised plan sheets (total of 77 per page 3 of the addendum). The revised plan sheets are not on the FTP site. Please get these revised plan sheets on the FTP site.

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 94

The amendment corresponding to addendum 10 came out this morning, changing over 20 bid items. Still, there is no addendum 10 posted as of noon on Tuesday May 18, 2010. When will addendum 10 be posted as to explain all changes corresponding to the recent amendment?

Addendum 10 is now posted on the internet

Question Submitted: 5/18/2010

Question Number: 95

Are the revised quantities correct for Reference Nos. 0058, 0059 and 0060. These are the concrete barrier end anchors. The revised General Summary does not indicate so.

In addendum 10, these quantities were revised as well as the general summary. The quantities are correct.

Question Submitted: 5/19/2010

Question Number: 96

addendum # 10 has added 3 cross over lighting systems where are these to be located so they can be bid according to available power sources

The crossover lighting systems go where the plans detail MOT crossovers at Heisley, S.R. 615 (Center Street) and the end of the project.

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: 5/3/2010

Question Number: 97

Plan sheet 188 has a table that shows 55 each Vegetated Biofilters. Plan sheets 189-194 give all the locations on the project site plan. There is no bid item for these biofilters. Please verify if these are for information only or if there should be a bid item for these.

The vegetated bio-filter table (sheet 188) is for information only. It is only to show the width of the ditch needed at outlet points to achieve post construction requirements. These widths are reflected in the cross sections and ditch protection is shown on the plan and profiles.

Question Submitted: 5/3/2010

Question Number: 98

It is within the 72 hour period to issue an addendum. Nothing has been received since addendum 3 from 4/27/2010 and there are still several unanswered prebid questions. Please delay the project so that we can adequately make adjustments to our bid once the addendum is received.

Question Submitted: 5/3/2010

Question Number: 99

Are the liners for the icons 1-5 and County icons available (as shown on sheet 709) or are they to be included in the noise barrier sqft cost?

Icons are to be included in the SF cost of the noise barrier. The icons for Eastlake and Willoughby were inadvertently included and will not be used for this project. Sheet 709 will be revised in addendum 7.

Question Submitted: 5/3/2010

Question Number: 100

Will the department permit the Contractor to maintain traffic in Phase B configuration over the 2010/2011 winter season to allow completion of median drainage, excavation & embankment, bridge work, electrical work, etc.?

No, bid as per plan.

Question Submitted: 5/3/2010

Question Number: 101

There are no bid items for the 516 Structural Joint or Joint sealer. Misc: 2: Precompressed Expansion Joint filler for either set of bridges. Please provide bid items in an addendum.

Quantity has been revised in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2010

Question Number: 102

Prebid questions refer to changes that were to be in addendum 7. However, addendum 7 included no item changes. Please provide an additional addendum with these changes.

Will be in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2010

Question Number: 103

Addendum 5 revised plan sheet 168 added an item for detour signing, but no associated bid item was placed in the addendum file. Please add an item for this work in an addendum.

Lump Sum Detour Signing is in Addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2010

Question Number: 104

Excavation and Embankment quantities revised in addendum 5 appear to have end areas that do not match the revised plan sheet cross sections. Additionally, the attached revised plan sheets do not add up the total plan quantity revision amount. Please review and clarify in an addendum.

Quantities and plan sheets have been revised in addendum 8.

Question Submitted: 5/4/2010

Question Number: 105

For further clarification to all previously asked questions regarding Maintenance of Traffic and phased construction; Page 46 Winter Time Limitations note 1 says that traffic shall be returned to an unshifted position with full lane widths by November 1. Once traffic is placed into Phase B configuration it cannot be returned to and an UNSHIFTED POSITION with full lane widths due to elevation differences along the longitudinal phase construction joint. Previous prebid questions have been answered in conflicting ways. The contractor should not be expected to bid a project of this magnitude based on the Departments interpretation of conflicting plan notes and prebid answers. Please provide detailed construction MOT phasing timelines with specific interim completion dates and winter traffic configurations in an addendum.

The note on sheet 46 has been revised to direct the contractor to place traffic in phase C after phase B has been completed. Quantities for longitudinal butt joint have been increased. Elevation differences occur at the end of the project and at the ramps. A transition is to be constructed during phase B at the end of the project, and quantities for the ramp differences are already included in the plans.

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: 5/4/2010

Question Number: 106

Will ODOT allow the temporary X-Over on the East end of the project (Sheet 107) to remain in place after the project has been completed?

No

Question Submitted: 5/5/2010

Question Number: 107

The revised plan sheet 168 from Addendum 5 added an item for "Detour Signing" in the MOT section of the General Summary. However, a Detour Signing item was not added in Addendum #5 or the EBS file. Could ODOT please add an item for Detour Signing in an Addendum and update EBS to reflect this change?

Question Submitted: 5/7/2010

Question Number: 108

Is it the Department's intent to limit the Contractor to work in Phase A in 2010, Phase B in 2011, and Phase C in 2012? The Contractor does not wish to bid based on intent, however, inconsistent answers to prebid questions, addenda, and plan notes leave us without any clear interpretation. Please provide clear and concise phasing limitations in an addendum.

There are no time limits in the plans pertaining to when a phase may occur. There are winter time limitations, and a phase must be completed before proceeding with the subsequent phase (phase A must be complete before implementing phase B, and phase B must be complete before implementing phase C). The contractor also has the option of submitting an alternate method of maintaining traffic as per the note on sheet 43, but must be approved by the Director before it can be implemented.

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.