

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

**Project No. 080493**

**Sale Date - 8/27/2008**

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 1

On past projects that have large earthwork quantities the electronic design files have been made available to contractors during the bid process. Can these drawings be posted for our use on this project?

Question Submitted: 7/1/2008

Question Number: 2

The combined plan of Part 1 and Part 2 attempts to instruct the bidder to integrate the sequence of construction of one part to the other. This is proving to be difficult at best. The phasing becomes so mutilated that the intent of the designer is possibly being re-interpreted. Could the designer please reissue a sequence of construction that has already integrated the two parts and has clarified the designer's intent? It's better to clear it up now rather than argue about it after the contract is awarded.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2008

Question Number: 3

Question: Can we have the calculations that determined the quantities of each of the two stockpiles? Were these quantities calculated to meet the final profile elevations along I-75, SR51, and the entrance ramp from SR51 mentioned in the plan notes? If they were, how much deeper can the excavation go if needed? How much material would this extra depth produce? Question: Can we have the results of the soil testing program conducted on the stockpiles that was conducted in 2003? If this report does not include soil moisture content, we will need that to assist in determining the amount of drying required. Question: What is the soil classification of each stockpile?

Question Submitted: 7/10/2008

Question Number: 4

Ref No 80, Manhole Reconstruted to grade. Most if not all of these manholes were new precast concrete manholes installed under the MRC Contract. 604.03A2 States that the existing walls need to be removed down to the spring line or below as necessary. Will we be required to do this or will we be able to remove the top sections and add to the existing sections to make the required height?

Question Submitted: 7/10/2008

Question Number: 5

Will the department please post a link(s) to the existing drawings for all the existing bridge structures to be removed in both Part I & Part II of this project. This would include the two ramps to be removed on the north end of the Craig Bridge, The Summit St interchange structures, The Front St. interchange structures, Front St. east & west bound over the old railroad right of way, and the 4 streets passing over the original I-280 alignment (Ash St, Erie St, Ontario St, Michigan St.). It would also be helpful to have the as built plans for the Temporary Bridge at Ash St. that is to be disassembled & delivered to the ODOT District 8 location.

<http://www2.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/attach/LUC-21895/>

Question Submitted: 7/14/2008

Question Number: 6

1. THERE ARE QUITE A FEW BRIDGES TO BE REMOVED ON THIS PROJECT, CAN WE GET THE EXISTING PLANS FOR THESE BRIDGES SO WE HAVE AN IDEA OF WHAT IT WILL TAKE TO DO THIS WORK? WE NEED THESE DRAWINGS ASAP SO WE CAN START ESTIMATING THE DEMOLITION!

[www2.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/attach/LUC-21895](http://www2.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/attach/LUC-21895)

Question Submitted: 7/15/2008

Question Number: 7

Are percolation tests required? Will there be an area for staging equipment? On page 441, what does 6 ft minimum at tall grasses mean? Which seed mix is used for Basin Seed Mix? Which seed mix is used for repair seeding? Where is the closest water source? What type of Ditch Erosion Protection is required?

Question Submitted: 7/15/2008

Question Number: 8

On okan sheet 21 it states that in 2003 a soil testing program was conducted for the above project. How can we get this information?

[www2.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/attach/LUC-21895](http://www2.dot.state.oh.us/contract/ftp/attach/LUC-21895)

Question Submitted: 7/16/2008

Question Number: 9

QUESTION: Is the existing grade under the new I-280 constructed according to the plans for that project? In other words, do the dirt quantities for Project 080493 accurately represent the excavation and embankment work described for this project? The reason for asking involves the perceived irregularly graded terrain with apparent random contours not typical for final grading on most projects.

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: 7/16/2008

Question Number: 10

QUESTION: Since it appears the contractor is required to take cores and perform testing to verify the condition of the shoulders on Ramp U and Ramp W, please specify how many cores are required and what tests are to be performed on the cores. QUESTION: If the shoulders on Ramp U and Ramp W prove to be sufficient and are not removed as a result of the plans direction to core and test them, how will the contractor receive payment for the coring and testing? QUESTION: If only a portion of the shoulders on Ramp U and Ramp W are removed and replaced, how does the contractor receive payment for the full cost of coring and testing when this work is incidental to the Item 452, 12" non-reinforced concrete pavement placement, as per plan? QUESTION: The application of general notes from Part 1 to Part 2 and vice versa may be creating a major issue. What notes prevail if there is a conflict between the two Parts' General Notes? Which Part prevails if there are specific plan sheet notes that conflict between the two Parts or exist on one Part but are not repeated on the other Part? EXAMPLE: General note in plan part 2 sheet 18 "Communications Equipment" reads in part "Cost for providing the cellular phones and services shall be incidental to mobilization". Does this note only apply to part 2? If no, please clarify by addendum. Since this is beyond the scope of Item 624 in the C&MS, should the wording "As Per Plan" be added to the description?

Question Submitted: 7/17/2008

Question Number: 11

In talking with the Bridge Tender for the Craig Bridge, he stated that there were additional wights available for the balancing of the bridge during construction. Our question is, if there are not enough weights to balance the bridge, where do we get the additional weights and who pays for them? There should be a pay item for additional weights.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2008

Question Number: 12

1.the following ref # have incorrect units of measure on the proposal 117 FT vs EA119 FT vs EA464 SY vs SF465 SY vs SF395 EA vs SF2.there is no proposal note that i saw for ref # 46 & 47.3.on plan sheets 198-201 for craig bridge street the items for D wall,PCB,remove barrier,median wall transitions, appear to be in conflict with the part 1 bridge plans.4.on plan sheet 261,i cannot find any pipe for ref #65 and ref # 64 shows 277 ft vs 70 ft. please clarify.5.do the ud outlets in part 2 for ref #415,416 really have to be 707.45 pvc pipe?

Question Submitted: 7/18/2008

Question Number: 13

1.are the seeding items for part 2 already covered in the part 1 landscaping plans?2. the seeding quantity on part 2 is 228,793 sy per the proposal and general summary on plan sheet 360, but this does not match the subsummary quantity of 176,275 sy on plan sheet 374. please clarify.

**Q3. The PCB question was answered in a response to a similar question in addenda three.**

Question Submitted: 7/18/2008

Question Number: 14

Do you have a list of approved/qualified suppliers for the water plants for this project? For the liners and the bare root plants? We have no idea where to start looking for these plants that would be on an approved list.

Question Submitted: 7/18/2008

Question Number: 15

With the price of asphalt, is there a chance that ODOT would consider putting in an Concrete Pavement Alternate for this project?

**The district declines to make any change to concrete.**

Question Submitted: 7/18/2008

Question Number: 16

Under Structures Removed in Part 1 it calls for the structures to be removed to 5' below finish grade. Under Part 2 there is no note as to the removal limits. Since the pay item description for Ref No. 357 is Structure Removed and not Portions of Structure Removed, are we to remove these structures in their entirety? If not what are the removal limits?

Question Submitted: 7/19/2008

Question Number: 17

In the construction phasing, the work to remove the Erie St bridge and construct the temporary road is set in Phase 1. In phase 1A you complete the balance of the preliminary work for Erie St so that traffic can be shifted off Michigan and Ontario. The notes state that all work in Phase 1 and 1A must be completed before you start any work listed in Phase II which includes the work on Michigan and Ontario. Why do we have to wait for the completion of all of the Craig, Front and Summit work before we start the work on Michigan and Ontario if the Erie St work in Phase 1A has been completed? Regarding the 240 day cloure for the Craig Bridge in Phase I, if this work is started in the Fall of 2008, will the time be suspended for the winter months?

Question Submitted: 7/21/2008

Question Number: 18

In reviewing the embankment for Part 1, reference #29, specifically Erie Street cross sections, pages 221 thru 222, it appears the Item #203 Embankment used for the phase 1 Maint. of Traffic can be left in place as permanent embankment. Is this correct? If so, should the embankment used for the phase 1 temporary road be paid for under reference #29 - Embankment? Also please reconfirm the quality calculation of these cross sections, there appears to be a problem.

---

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: 7/21/2008

Question Number: 19

Plan sheet 21 - General notes, Item 203 Embankment, As Per Plan note discusses requirements for stockpile locations at both I-280/SR 51 and I75/I280. In addition, page 94A shows a grading plan for the I-280/SR 51 location only. I can find no drawing showing the grading for the I75/I280 location. The drawing that has been provided generates a quantity in excess of the 51,153 cubic yards indicated on page 94A. Understanding that ODOT wants the contractor to regrade both of these stockpiles base upon the as per plan notes, we have not been provided enough information to accurately measure and price this work. Please provide detailed drawings reflecting both the original and final requirements of these stockpile locations.

**Addendum No. 1 provides revised sheets that include a grading plan for the area at I-75/I-280 and a revised grading plan for the Northwood stock pile neither of which generate surplus material.**

Question Submitted: 7/21/2008

Question Number: 20

In looking at the details from the existing bridge drawings for Ramp X, there seems to be some sort of clip angles welded to the top of the beams. I know that this structure was rehabilitated with new decks. Were shear studs placed on the beams when this was done or were the clip angles replaced? If the were what is the spacing and how many are on the beams?

**The Craig Bridge redeck was not made composite with shear studs. The existing angles that extend up into the deck from the top beam flange were left in place.**

Question Submitted: 7/22/2008

Question Number: 21

Is ODOT certain they want to place the small rock mulch (3/4") and the large rock mulch (1 1/2") on this project as specified? This looks a lot like slingshot and arm throwing ammo that won't stay put as hoped. We seriously doubt that this is the best material to be placing in this area. It might look good for the immediate time after completion, but it probably won't stay that way for very long. In addition to the ammo, Kids will be climbing these slopes and the mulch will be sliding down like marbles.

**Yes we are certain. Provide stone mulch material as specified.**

Question Submitted: 7/22/2008

Question Number: 22

For Bid item 64, 18" Conduit, Type C, 706.02 qty of 70 ft and Bid Item 65, 18" Conduit, Type C, 706.33 Qty of 173 ft.the General Summary on Sheet 31/555 calls for this material coming from sheet 261/555. However, sheet 261/555 calls out for 277 ft of 18" Conduit, Type C, 706.02 and none of the 18" Conduit, Type C, 707.33. Please clarify these items.

**Bid References 064 and 065 clarified in Addendum No 1.**

Question Submitted: 7/22/2008

Question Number: 23

It is not clear if the plans are addressing payment for any repair seeding that may be required after the maintenance period is over. Under the Alternate 1 and Alternate 2 description on plan sheets 351 and 352 of 555, it mentions damage due to traffic or erosion being paid for but it also mentions payment for the "above work". Well, prior to mentioning the damage due to traffic and erosion, mention was made about correcting deficiencies. Is that part of the "above work"? Additionally, if the correction of deficiencies is not paid for under repair seeding and if this is an item of work that is not a guaranteed product and the contractor completes the work according to the spec, then he should not be liable for the repair costs. ODOT cannot specify the method of placement and maintenance and then not assume the liability if the grass does not grow.

**Repair seeding will be paid for any area required to be reseeded for any reason other than obvious contractor impact causing the need for repair. An example of such a case would be if the contractor operates over a previously seeded area to access and complete work that is left undone.**

Question Submitted: 7/22/2008

Question Number: 24

On plan sheet 355 of 555, Item 601 Slope Protection, Misc. mentions obtaining the washed river stone from a local source. Considering the very specific colors listed in the description of these small rock mulch and large rock mulch items, please offer three(3) sources where this special stone may be obtained. We know of none, unless ODOT wishes to clarify its description of a "local source".

Question Submitted: 7/22/2008

Question Number: 25

Plan sheet 355 of 555 mentions placement of Item 601 Slope Protection, Misc as per Item 307.09, 307.10, 307.11, 307.12, 307.13, and 307.14 of the CMS book. Since this project is governed by the 2008 Spec book and since it does not contain an Item 307, how is this to be accomplished? Please do not refer back to the 2005 Spec book for guidance because the plan specified material is being placed on a benched slope and cannot be placed as directed in the 2005 Spec using a spreader box or asphalt paver.

---

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: 7/24/2008

Question Number: 26

1. On sheet 61/555, Part 1, the 301 quantity for Ash Street from station 10+61 to 16+00 should be 538 cy, not 179.64 cy. 2. On sheet 62/555, Part 1, the 301 quantity for Michigan Street should be 371 cy not 13,357 cy. 3. On sheet 36/351, Part 2, the typical section shows traffic being maintained on 25' wide pavement. When the individual dimensions are added up (1+10+10+2+2+3), they equal 28'. Will there be enough room to maintain traffic? 4. On sheet 38/351, Part 2, the typical section shows traffic being maintained on 32' wide pavement. When the individual dimensions are added up (1.5+12+12+2+2+3), they equal 32.5'. Will there be enough room to maintain traffic?

Question Submitted: 7/24/2008

Question Number: 27

We have reviewed the existing drawings for the bridges to be removed. Several of the existing bridge drawings indicate asbestos conduits are encased in the superstructures. We cannot find any reference in the plans to the conduits. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 7/24/2008

Question Number: 28

In part 2 of the contract drawings, specifically pages 87 thru 211, a note on the cross sections state, "EXISTING PAVEMENT REMOVED AND BACKFILLED WITH SUITABLE EMBANKMENT". Is the suitable embankment backfill measured and paid for as "Embankment" or is it incidental to the item "Pavement Removed"?

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 29

Thank you for providing the requested electronic design files with addendum number one. In addition to these drawings, please provide the electronic design files for plan sheets 69 and 70. These appear to be files GM101.dgn and GM102.dgn. We request this project be delayed one letting to provide bidders with additional time to provide the State with a more complete and competitive bid. This will also allow bidding contractors the opportunity to study the plans in greater detail and ask any needed pre-bid questions.

**added these two files to -> <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Attach/LUC-21895/>**

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 30

Can the department provide the following plan drawings in DGN format? Part 1 - plan sheets 82 thru 91, 94A & 94C of 555.

These are basically the site grading drawings for the project. Having these drawings will allow us to more accurately study & estimate the earth moving requirements for the project.

**I've added these two files to -> <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Attach/LUC-21895/>**

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 31

1) The calculations and bid quantity for Ref 88 on sheet 62/555 of the part 1 plans, specifically at Michigan Street, appear to be grossly wrong. Please verify this quantity. 2) There is no plan note to explain what is to be provided for Ref 46 and 47. 3) On sheet 23/555 the MOT Craig Bridge time limitation note states that Craig Bridge Street shall be completed and opened to vehicular traffic within 240 days of the Craig bridge closure. Sheet 23B/555 Comprehensive MOT sequence shows that the Craig Bridge is to be closed at the very beginning of Phase 1 and Craig Bridge Street is not due to be opened to traffic until Phase 2A. Is it ODOT's intention that all work in Phase 1 and 1A of the comprehensive sequence be completed in 240 days? 4) Many of the profile sheets that identify the locations for Ref 82 City of Toledo Catch Basin No 3 show a No 3A structure instead. Which is correct.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 32

Addendum #1 replaced plan sheet 164/555. After reviewing, I can find no changes. Please identify addendum #1, plan modification.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 33

Addendum #1 replaced plan sheet 168/555. After reviewing, I can find no changes. Please identify addendum #1, plan modification.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 34

Addendum #1 replaced plan sheet 178/555. After reviewing, I can find no changes. Please identify addendum #1, plan modification.

---

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: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 35

It appears that in changing the quantities for Ref. No. 64 that you added the 18" 707.33 pipe that is shown on sheet 263 to this quantity. This pipe is pipe that runs down the slope with 45 degree bends and should remain 707.33 and not 706.02. You should not have eliminated Ref No 65 but changed the quantities only.

**The conduit noted as being shown on Sheet 263 is 15" not 18." It is shown in Reference 0062. Reference 0064 was revised because incorrect total of 18" Conduit, Type C, 707.33 was carried to General Summary. You will notice that there is no 18" Conduit, Type C, 707.33 in Sheet 261 sub-summary.**

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 36

Addendum #1 replaced plan sheet 306/351. After reviewing the lower right hand corner of the page, I noticed the end areas for the previous station have been revised, however plan sheet 205/351 was not re-issued. Please forward a copy of plan sheet 205/351 for our review.

**Sheet 205, Part 1 was provided with Addendum 1. It is available for download.**

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 37

1. What are the existing typical sections for Buffalo Street and Ramp G-G ?2. Are we only to obtain borrow material from the north pit?3. What is the cut off date for prebid questions.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 38

1. Can we get the est qty sheet for Craig Bridge?2. The Craig Bridge was rehabbed on 1997. Can we get x-sections of the redeck and ramps X and EE?

Question Submitted: 7/25/2008

Question Number: 39

The Dept previously provided a link to existing original plans for most of the structures to be removed on the project. However Ramp EE and X at the north end of the Craig Bridge have been modified and redecked since they were originally built. Can the Dept provide a link to the most up to date information on the walks, decks and parapets and hopefully answer the question if shear studs are present on the structure. Also the link to the original plans did not include the west bound Front St Bridge over the RR ROW. Can these be provided?

Question Submitted: 7/26/2008

Question Number: 40

On Part 2, plan sheet 273, the notes under the cantilever, and pole foundation notes indicate the foundation details are on plan sheet 316. The foundation details on 316 are not for the cantilevers. The correct details are on plan sheet 292. There also does not appear to be a foundation indicated for Structure S17 at Station 23+93 Front St on the table on plan sheet 295.

Question Submitted: 7/28/2008

Question Number: 41

On Plan Sheet 62/351 Drainage Sub Summary, it calls for 310 ft of 24" Conduit, Type C. On Sheet 74/351, the plan sheet shows 56'-24" B Conduit and 254' of 24" B Conduit equalling the 310' on the Sub Summary. Since the 56' and 254' are in the pavement, I believe the plan sheet is correct. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 7/28/2008

Question Number: 42

There are several items for steel hand railing using 1/4" & 3/16". The drawings refer you to the 517 spec section and that in turn refers you to the DWTT. Is this required for this type of tubing?Thanks

**All provisions of the 2008 Construction & Material Specifications for Item 517 shall be adhered to as clarified in the Part 1 plan General Notes related to the railings.**

Question Submitted: 7/28/2008

Question Number: 43

On sheet 65/351, Drainage Sub summary it calls out for 53',36' & 39' of 15" Conduit, Type B. On the plan sheet 166/351 this pipe is called out as 15" type C. Please advise as to which is correct.

---

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

# Ohio Department of Transportation

## Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/29/2008

Question Number: 44

My question concerns Reference 224 61770 sy Geotextile fabric. The plan note on page 355 says to "pin" this fabric to the subgrade. No pin size or spacing is stated. Which length and pin spacing is needed? Example: For rock channel protection with fabric filter, we use an 18" long pin. 6" long and 12" long pins are also available. Can we use the 6" x 1" x 6" staple used for Ditch erosion control blankets???

**The referenced note on Sheet 355/555, Part 1 reads, "Overlap and pin fabric to the subgrade in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations and specifications. In no case shall overlap be less than 12". This means that whatever is recommended and specified as pin size/spacing by the manufacturer of the fabric is acceptable to the Department, but the overlap has to be 12" even if the manufacturer says less is acceptable.**

Question Submitted: 7/29/2008

Question Number: 45

QUESTION: Addendum #1 makes a statement about the deletion of the "Worksite Traffic Zone Supervisor". The second sentence is a partial, incomplete sentence. What was left out? QUESTION: When will the utilities in the 4A notes be clear of the project? QUESTION: Does the extra dirt left throughout the project by the previous contractor meet compaction requirements? QUESTION: Considering the high moisture content of the dirt in the stockpile at SR51, what will the compaction requirements be when this dirt is moved to the adjacent infield? Remember that this dirt was removed from a previous project because it was part of an undercut. QUESTION: What access must be supplied to the MRC contractor until he completes that project? QUESTION: Are all tables and calculations that were used to determine plan quantities for this project included in the plans? If not, please supply. QUESTION: For Wetland Plan A, there is a detention basin being built next to the East Loop Trail. At approximately station 232+50, 280 feet right, there is an electric pole with an underground line running from it to the west. This would be under the new detention basin. Does this get relocated? What is its depth?

Question Submitted: 7/29/2008

Question Number: 46

Are the FRP panels shown in plan view on drawing 509/555 of part one perforated with many small holes? The plan note on plan page 465/555 does not call for panel perforations but the plan view could be interpreted as showing perforations to allow water drainage through the panels and open grid deck below.

**The FRP panels are solid, but the pattern shown is drilled to accommodate the fastening bolts as shown on Sheet 510/555.**

Question Submitted: 7/29/2008

Question Number: 47

For preparation of my bid, please define the mechanism in your contract that allows an ODOT approved pipe manufacturer to submit a request of payment for price escalation. The referenced project (080493) does not call for pipe until the late stages of the project, circa late 2009 or early 2010. Since this project bids in August of 2008, pipe materials would not be manufactured until 13 to 15 months following the bid date. The general terms in our contract allow for a small price escalation every calendar quarter until shipments are complete. We are requesting clarification of our ability to receive payment from the state for this escalation.

**The Department will not pay escalation for pipe costs. The Contractor may, at their option, choose to order the pipe early in the project and manufacture it and place the completed pipe in stock until it is needed in the Work. Pipe completed and stocked may be paid under the Construction & Material Specifications Section 109.10, Payment for Delivered Materials. Precast concrete cylinder pipe and fittings would be considered "bulky materials that are durable in nature" as mentioned in the referenced section.**

Question Submitted: 7/29/2008

Question Number: 48

On sheet 45/555, they call out for 136' of 12" Consult, type B located on sheet 193 and labeled D-3. When I go to 193 and look at D-3 it shows 18" pipe in both directions from this structure. Also, on page 193 there are three 18" lines shown that are not carried to any summary

Question Submitted: 7/29/2008

Question Number: 49

In the general notes of Part 2 on page 19/351, it states that the City of Toledo specifications will supercede the ODOT specifications. The City requires premium pipe backfill to extend to the subgrade while ODOT only requires it to extend 4' above the pipe. Are we to assume that the Cities requirement will prevail in this instance? This Note does not appear in Part 1 of the plans. Are we to assume that ODOT Specifications will prevail here or will the City of Toledo Specifications apply here also? Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 7/30/2008

Question Number: 50

The plans designate the placement of the small and large rock mulch by a method similar to special benching. Type A is to be placed 2 inches thick, Type B is to be placed 2-5 inches thick, and Type C is to be placed 2-8 inches thick. How is this to be calculated for payment? The bid item is by the cubic yard. None of the treated areas have straight dimensions conducive to measuring for calculation and the thicknesses are variable. Will the quantities be based upon delivery tickets with a weight conversion?

---

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: 7/30/2008

Question Number: 51

on sheet 48/555 for 207 D-4, it calls for 52' of 12" Conduit, Type B. However, on plan sheet 207, the pipe between D-4 and D-8 is called out as 15".on sheet 49/555 for 210 D-3, it calls for 310' of 12" Conduit, Type C. However, on plan sheet 210, the pipe between D-3 and D-6 is called out as 18".ON SHEET 192 AND 210 there is 38' of 15" pipe from D-2 on 210 to D-6 on 193 shown but is not carried to the pipe sub summaries on sheet 51/555 for 219 D-3, it calls for 78' of 12" Conduit, Type B. However, on plan sheet 219, the pipe between D-3 and D-3/193 is called out as 18".on sheet 51/555 for 219 D-4, it calls for 104' of 12" Conduit, Type B. However, on plan sheet 219, the pipe between D-4 and D-3 is called out as 15".

Question Submitted: 7/31/2008

Question Number: 52

For Ref. No 16, Pipe Removed over 24" they have carried the same pipe from sheet 72/555 and 262/555 to the general summary. Ppe removals R-30, R-31 & R-33 on sheet 72 are the same pipes as R-1, R-2 & R-5 on sheet 262

Question Submitted: 7/31/2008

Question Number: 53

Plan page 358 of 555 describes Item 690 Special Bicycle Rack. It mentions three(3) manufacturers of this product that can be contacted for a price for this item with a stainless steel finish. Contacts with these companies prove that there is no stainless steel bicycle rack available and if anyone made such an item, it would be inhibitive expensive. These same manufacturers mention that the rack can be had with either a powder coat finish or a galvanized finish. Which does ODOT wish to designate?

**C**

Question Submitted: 7/31/2008

Question Number: 54

Clearing & Grubbing - In Part 1, plan sheet 20/555 the note for Clearing & Grubbing requires the contractor to remove all trees and stumps within the construction limits unless specifically designated as "Do Not Disturb". In Part 2, plan sheet 17/351 the note for Clearing & Grubbing requires the contractor to remove only trees and stumps specifically marked removal. Because Part 1 and Part 2 plans overlap, it appears these clearing notes are in conflict. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 8/1/2008

Question Number: 55

On plan sheet 296/555 there is note on the profile of the existing 48" PCCP waterline stating that the line is to be abandoned (Fill with CDF) How is this to be paid for?

Question Submitted: 8/1/2008

Question Number: 56

On the General Summary, Sheet 30/555 Ref Nos 46, Providing Electronic Instrumentation and 47, Technical Assistance, under See Sheet No., it has a PN for proposal note. I have looked though the Proposal and can find nothing describing what these two items of work are.

**Proposal Note 623 was added in Addendum No. 1. The requirements for those pay items are described in the note.**

Question Submitted: 8/11/2008

Question Number: 57

1. On Plan Sheet 62 of 555, see the calculation for 301 Asphalt Base on Michigan St. It is incorrect, and was subsequently carried thru to the General Summary and the proposal. 2. On Plan Sheet 62 of 555, see the calculation for 301 Asphalt Base for Access Drive(east). The calc for Sta 15+50.15 to 16+60.13 is incorrect, and carry Summary and the proposal. 3. On Plan Sheet 64 of 555, see the calc for 448 Ty 2 Intermediate Course for Ash Street. The quantity of 314.36 cy in the first entry is incorrect. 4. On Plan Sheet 65 of 555, see the calc for 448 ty 1 Surface Course for Parking Lot Access Drive(west). The first entry, 43.77 cy has been added to the subtotal, and should not have been. It is listed as NOT IN CONTRACT. 5. On Plan Sheet 65 of 555, see the calc for 448 ty 1 Surface Course for Tribute Park Parking. The area shown, 1013 sf, does not match the area shown for 448 Ty 2 Intermediate, 4013 sf, shown on the previous page

Question Submitted: 8/12/2008

Question Number: 58

Regarding question #60 and answer. Topsoil is only applied to the areas designated as Lawn Mix and Shade Lawn Mix areas, per your answer the only areas not receiving Seeding and Mulching Class 1 are the stockpile areas. If this is true, isn't the quantity for Alternate #1, Ref #229 Seeding & Mulching, APP A (268,512 sy) and the quantity for Alternate #2, Ref #232 Seeding & Mulching APP B (268,512 sy) overstated? What I am saying is the topsoil required by alternate #2 does not cover the entire seeded area, whereas alternate #1, which includes compost, does cover the entire area.

Question Submitted: 8/12/2008

Question Number: 59

Part II of the project seems to have some of the drainage items duplicated. The general summary lists 53 Catch basin, No 3 and 26 Catch basin, no. 3a along with 52 COT Catch basin No 3 and 25 COT Catch basin NO. 3a and but all of the structures in the Drainage Sub Summary are classified as COT catch basins no. 3 and 3a. Are these items to be bid as Drainage Structure Misc: COT Catch basins No. 3 and 3a or should they be the ODOT standard basins?

---

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: 8/12/2008

Question Number: 60

In regard to excavation and embankment, accounting for the numerous piers and drainage structures throughout the excavation and embankment zone, what are the ODOT's requirements for the excavation and embankment/compaction adjacent to these structures?

**All excavation and embankment shall meet the requirements of Item 203.**

Question Submitted: 8/12/2008

Question Number: 61

Sheet 13, typical section ramps U & W, calls out 302 asphalt base under the concrete pavement. Sheets 53 and 71, general summary & pavement calc's, call out 301 asphalt base under the concrete pavement. Which type of asphalt will be used under the concrete pavement on Ramps U & W?

Question Submitted: 8/12/2008

Question Number: 62

Part 1, cross sections, plan sheet 177/555 & 178/555, there is zone from station 258+00 to 259+50, 150 feet where we have no intermediate cross section. The balance of the project for the most part is based upon cross sections every 50 feet. Does ODOT have cross sections between station 258+00 and 259+50?

**Please refer to sheet 93A as to how the x-sections were cut in this area.**

Question Submitted: 8/13/2008

Question Number: 63

Plan sheet 474/555 calls out in transverse section - bascule piers, a concrete island with grooved surface. Please define grooved surface as in diamond grooving of bridge decks etc. Also is the grooving to transverse or longitudinal ?

**Please refer to the transverse groove detail on sheet 485/555.**

Question Submitted: 8/13/2008

Question Number: 64

RE: The new primary bridge feeder. Who will switch this out of service, and how long will it be allowed to be out of service? There are no splicing details given in the plans. It looks like we are required to splice into existing lead cable on each end. The manhole end will end up with a very short piece of lead cable with a pothead on the pole. Why don't you eliminate all the lead cable possible, because the lead splices are very costly. What size and type primary cable will we be using, why don't you specify the new cable footage?

Question Submitted: 8/13/2008

Question Number: 65

In addenda #3 you changed the description for Ref No 60 to 15" Conduit, Type C. I think that you wanted to just change the quantity for Ref No 61, 15" Conduit, Type C from 8 ft to 46 ft and not eliminate the 12" Conduit, type C. In Part 2 you have duplicated the quantities for Ref No 431 Catch Basin, Type 3 with Ref No 443, COT Catch Basin, Type 3. The quantity for Ref No 431 should be 1 Each. The same can be said for Ref No 432 Catch Basin, Type 3A with Ref No 444 COT Catch Basin, Type 3A. The quantity for Ref No 432 should also be 1 Each. The quantities for Ref Nos 443 and 444 are correct.

Question Submitted: 8/13/2008

Question Number: 66

On page 339/351 the line item for pre-cast man hole shows 60" Id X60"Dp X48" Dia cover. On pg.339/351 man hole is shown as 4' X4' X 4'. Which is correct?

Question Submitted: 8/13/2008

Question Number: 67

ODOT 2008 CMS, 401.17 calls for longitudinal cold joints to be coated with PG binder or Rubberized Asphalt Emulsion. Does this include base courses (302,301, T2), along with the surface course?

**PG binder is required for all cold joints on all courses under the 2008 specification.**

Question Submitted: 8/14/2008

Question Number: 68

On sheet 260/555 the quantities for Slope Protection Misc, Small Rock Mulch, Type C show zero quantities coming from sheet 375 but they still have 128 cy under the Grand Total. Is this correct or did they just fail to eliminate this item in the addendum as they did for the other items.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2008

Question Number: 69

On sheet 355/555 you give the specification for the Large Rock Mulch Type D which states that the material must be crushed and either sandstone or crushed gravel. Limestone is excluded. We have no sandstone in this area and the natural aggregates suppliers up in Michigan do not crush this large size material. Could you please give an approved local source for this material.

---

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: 8/14/2008

Question Number: 70

QUESTION NUMBER 1 If there is excess excavated material from the site work can the excess material be wasted at the SR 51 - I-280 interchange area or the I-75 - I-280 interchange?. QUESTION NUMBER 2 What will become of the Portable Concrete Barrier (PCB) that is in place to maintain traffic when the Project 010493 contractor leaves the project? Will the Project 010493 contractor take the PCB off the project? If the Project 010493 contractor removes the PCB will the 080493 contractor be responsible to replace the PCB to maintain traffic? Will the Project 080493 contractor be required to remove the PCB when it is no longer needed? Does the existing PCB meet the "350" PCB requirement?

Question Submitted: 8/14/2008

Question Number: 71

1.Addendum 3 changed ref # 60 to 46 ft, it should have changed ref #61 to 46'.2.If the part 1 seeding quantites supersede part 2why even have part 2 quantites since there will be unit prices already established in part 1?

Question Submitted: 8/15/2008

Question Number: 72

Addendum Nuber 4 did not answer the question about the 4A notes. The question was when will the utilities be clear of the project work? The answer was six weeks for Toledo Edison and then Buckeye Cable and AT&T will do their work. We need to know what date the utility work will be complete.

**The Department cannot provide a hard and fast "date" as to when Toledo Edison aerial facility lines will be relocated. Due to the need to complete the grading for the new Front Street alignment prior to beginning the relocation, the exact scheduling of the relocation depends on when the Contractor has the alignment in a condition which will allow the relocation to move forward. This will be a matter of coordination and cooperation with the utility after determining the work schedule.**

Question Submitted: 8/15/2008

Question Number: 73

This question applies to ref # 334 - 8" Pipe downspout & ref - 336 - 8" pipe horizontal conductor. We are having difficulty determining what pipe material to use on these items (PVC or galvanized steel). Drawing 501/555 shows 8" galvanized steel pipe for a downspout (far right detail). Drawing 502/555 on the elevation plan shows 8" dia plastic pipe for the horizontal conductor. Drawing 502A/555 shows 8" plastic pipe for part of the downspout in section JJ. What are the limits of each type material. Is galvanized steel to be used only for the work shown on drawing 501? Can all of the pipe & fittings below the scupper tails on drawings 502 & 502A be plastic?

Question Submitted: 8/15/2008

Question Number: 74

Addendum 3 has eliminated all small & large Type B and Large Type C Rock Mulch. What is to be placed in these areas?Addendum 3 adds 1728 CY of Large Rock Mulch Type D. Where does this go?On page 351-under 659.17 there is mention of four waterings to be included in the bid. Are we to include a mobilization cost for each of these waterings in addition to the cost of the waterings?On page 354, mentions mobilization, does the same apply for this water? Do we include a mobilization cost for the 20 waterings for this also?

**A: See Sheet 446 included with Addendum No. 3. A: See Sheets 449 and 450 included with Addendum No. 3. A: The initial and secondary waterings (four) mentioned on Sheet 351 under 659.17 are different from subsequent waterings to be paid. There will be no additional payment to mobilize for those four times. A: After the initial four waterings, mobilization for the subsequent waterings will be paid at the unit price bid for Item 624, Mobilization, As Per Plan which is not currently included in the proposal. The Department will add this item in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 8/15/2008

Question Number: 75

Reference #60 in the proposal was 12" Conduit, Type C - 3291 LF.Addendum 3 has changed Reference #60 to 15" Conduit, Type C - 46 LF.Was it the intent of Addendum 3, to replace 3291 LF of 12" Conduit with 46 LF of 15" Conduit or revise Reference #61?Thank you.

**Please see addendum number 6**

Question Submitted: 8/15/2008

Question Number: 76

On part 2 page 12/351 there is a detail for stamped concrete median. Do both reference numbers 464 and 465 get this finish entirely? Also you mention to follow manufacturers specifications, does this mean you want integral color with colored release agent? There are several variations in every manufacturers specifications.

Question Submitted: 8/18/2008

Question Number: 77

Reference # 328 - Steel handrailing at bascule piers has a pay quantity of 177 lineal feet. I am coming up with about 255 feet based on my interpretation of sheet 514 of 555. Could ODOT please verify the 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: 8/18/2008

Question Number: 78

1. Plan sheet 59/555 lists barrier removed limits for ref #12. Hasn't the centerline barrier listed there been removed previously?

Question Submitted: 8/18/2008

Question Number: 79

For Ref No 209, Roadside Cleanup, APP. plan sheet 350/555 as per plan notes that we are limited to "Clearing & grubbing of all existing Phragmites, Purple Loosestrife and Cattails in areas indicated". What limits are they to be removed? Do we excavate out the muck that they grow in or do we just cut them down? If we cut them down do we go below water level? If we remove the muck, how deep is the removal and how do we save the willows and other plant materials around them? Also, if we have to remove the muck, how are we to access the area along the slope of I-280 and the island on the pond on sheet 454?

Question Submitted: 8/19/2008

Question Number: 80

Addendum #6 - Reference #714 - Barrier, Misc.: Portable Concrete Barrier Removed for Disposal, after reviewing the PCB at the project it appears some of the PCB has Glare Screen attached. How does ODOT want to handle the removal of the Glare Screen? How will this removal be paid? Will ODOT retain ownership of the Glare Screen or will ownership transfer to the contractor?

Question Submitted: 8/20/2008

Question Number: 81

The 11-15-2008 earliest start for demolition of the Bridge in Ramp EE over the railroad, is a predecessor to completing the "Pre-Phase" BMP pond at the north end of the ramp. This date puts major excavation occurring in the middle of winter. Will the Department consider adding the appropriate soil stabilization items to make the material suitable for use as embankment.

Question Submitted: 8/21/2008

Question Number: 82

Under the Proposal Section 0003 Drainage Part 1 is Ref 80 Manhole Reconstructed to Grade, 90 each. In the drainage summary it calls out a MH on sht 76, D-4. This is a sanitary MH. Under Section 0006 Sanitary Sewer Part 1 there is no pay item for MH Reconstructed to Grade. How will the Sanitary MH Reconstructed to Grade be paid for? The sanitary MH to be reconstructed is shown in cross section on plan sht 257 and reads "Reconstruct Sanitary MH with drop". How is the proposed drop connection (approx. 20 ft deep) paid for? (Note: the description given in 604.03 A for Reconstruction to Grade does not include drop connections.)

**Thank you for pointing out this inconsistency in the bidding documents. However the dollar value of this is very small relative to the entire project and we will not delay the sale of the project in order to correct it by addendum. Please prepare your bid based upon the information in the bidding documents.**

Question Submitted: 8/21/2008

Question Number: 83

New power feed to the Craig Bridge, reference plan pages part 2, sheets 338 thru 342. Question 1, page 338 calls for a 24" w x 24" d x 48" l steel junction box, please clarify, NEMA 1 or 3R? Galvanized or painted? What method of attachment will be allowed, welding?, bolting?, strut attachment? Question 2, page 338 details a hanger for supporting the 5" conduit between Bent 8 and Pier 6, it does not detail any type of support for the transverse run, only "see note", what note and how are these attached to the structural steel? Question 3, page 340 shows the transverse conduit run and shows 6-90 degree bend and 2-45 degree bends, this is more bends than allowed by NEC. can additional junction boxes be added to the plan? Question 4, pages 340 and 341 indicate the transverse conduit on the south side of Pier 6, this will require a man lift on a barge, would the Department consider locating the conduit on the north side of Pier 6 to reduce installation cost?

**A1. Junction boxes must at least meet the requirements for 725.10. Page 341/351 states that the junction box will need to be field located. The final location should not vary greatly from what is shown in the plans. The exact attachment method will need to be determined in the field based on the final location. Please bid the items as shown. A2. The exact placement for the conduit again may vary slightly from the plan based on the final location of the junction box. The plans are an estimate of the quantities and work to be performed. There are procedure's within the current CMS specifications for contractors to request payment for work during actual construction which they feel is beyond the scope of what was specified within the plans. Please bid the items as shown. A3. This is really a means and methods question which ODOT does not dictate. The exact process for this installation may vary based on the contractor. The contractor needs to bid what they feel is best method for them for the installation. Thus the plans will not be revised. But as always during construction, the department is always open to ideas that contractor may have to save time and money.**

Question Submitted: 8/22/2008

Question Number: 84

Pre-bid question number 20 ask for local sources for the various ROCK MULCHES and ADDENDUM NUMBER 7 answered the question by removing the word "local" and adding "from ODOT pre-approved supplier." How can we find a list of "ODOT pre-approved suppliers" to bid the ROCK MULCH items?

---

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: 8/22/2008

Question Number: 85

Reference Addendum 6 and Bid Items Added, 715 & 716 Correct me if I am wrong, these items were added in response to question Q5-9. But the cables added are (B/R715) a 5kv cable and (B/R716) (by Department description) a 600 volt cable. The plans indicate (338 / 351) the feed to the bridge is a 15kv cable and the existing conditions are an Edison pole with riser feeding transformers in the bridge control room. Please check to see if the cable to be bid should 15kv.

**Thank you for pointing out this inconsistency in the bidding documents. However the dollar value of this is very small relative to the entire project and we will not delay the sale of the project in order to correct it by addendum. Please prepare your bid based upon the information in the bidding documents.**

Question Submitted: 8/22/2008

Question Number: 86

Per Addendum #7 Sheet 355 updated specs for the Large Rock Mulch D to an ODOT approved supplier. Could a list be given for such a supplier?

Question Submitted: 8/22/2008

Question Number: 87

In addendum 7, you state that the Rock Mulch must be supplied by a ODOT pre-approved supplier. Where can we find these pre-approved suppliers?

**While there may be other suppliers that could supply the gravel materials, the following are names and addresses of suppliers who are currently ODOT Pre-Approved Aggregate Suppliers in District 2 that may be able to supply some or all of the specified gravel products. Currently, nobody is pre-approved for these materials, but the following suppliers should be able to add them to their product list. Round Lake Sand & Gravel 8707 Round Lake Hwy Addison, MI 49220 517-507-8193 Irving Sand & Gravel 600 W. 225 S Angola, IN 46703 260-437-6017**

**CTE Sand & Gravel 10555 Tecumseh - Clinton Hwy Tecumseh, MI 49286 517-456-8667 Hillsdale Sand & Gravel 11671 South Tripp Rd Waldron, MI 49288 517-567-4406 Stansly Mineral Resources 13500 Allen Rd Clinton, MI 49236 517-456-6310**

Question Submitted: 8/24/2008

Question Number: 88

Addenda #9 Shows bid ref. #602 Revised 280' conduit, misc. 5" dia. RGS, including Fitts. This duplicates bid ref. #601 which already exists. and bid ref #602 is trench. please explain. thank you

**Addendum #6 mistakenly revised Ref 0601 to Item 625 Trench APP. This effectively deleted Item 625 Conduit, Misc.: 5" Diameter RGS, including fittings. To correct the error Addendum #9 revised Ref 0602 to reinsert Item 625 Conduit, Misc.: 5" Diameter FGS, including fittings.**

Question Submitted: 8/25/2008

Question Number: 89

What are the specifications for the herbicidal spraying? Are they on any of the drawings?

**There are different specifications for each type of seeding. The herbicides to be used for Type 1 seeding are shown on Sheet 351, Part 1 under 659.10 (glyphosate prior to seeding) and 659.22 (one or more of five different materials). For the remaining seeding types, the herbicides are shown on Sheet 352 under 659.10 (again glyphosate prior to seeding) and on Sheet 354 (during maintenance. Note that the Department provides any necessary material for impace-based herbicides for application by the contractor.**

Question Submitted: 8/25/2008

Question Number: 90

Item numbers 53 and 414 for erosion control are \$90,000 and \$80,000 each, Should these numbers be higher due to the size of the project, time duration and proximity to the Maumee River?

**The district has looked at the amount and believe it is adequate for this project.**

Question Submitted: 8/26/2008

Question Number: 91

The rock mulch items refer to constructing to a minimum thickness. Will the final pay quantity be based upon the actual thickness? When the one rock item varies in size from 1 1/2" to 2" and the placement thickness is directed to be a minimum of 2", it is difficult to determine the actual final quantity prior to bidding. Placing this material on slopes will also affect the final position and thickness.

**The rock mulch quantities will be based on a calculation of the volumes of each type of material at the minimum depth as shown on the plans.**

Question Submitted: 8/4/2008

Question Number: 92

Ref. #93 calls for a Power Service with a quantity of nine. In the Lighting Notes (Pg. 327, note 13 states: "Power Service Will Be Furnished And Installed By Toledo Edison". Who is responsible for these Power Services?

---

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: 8/4/2008

Question Number: 93

On sheet 200/351 it calls out for 4-RW and 5-RW to be PCB. However, on the sheet 60/351, Roadway & E.C. Sub-Summary thier quantities have been carried to Single Sloped Barrier, Type D column. Which is Correct? Also for Ref No 400 and 401, are these Temporary Barries to be left in place at the conclusion of the Contract or removed? There is also a note on sheets 200/351 and 201/351 stating that if Part 1 is bid, these quantities will be non performed. Since this is the case, Ref No 400 and 401 should be deleted and Ref No 399 adjusted for the 800 If that was carried Single Slope Barries, Type D in error to the Sub-Summary sheet.

Question Submitted: 8/4/2008

Question Number: 94

On Sheet 342/351 there are quanties for Ref. Nos 593-598. Are these additional quantities or duplicates for the Craig Bridge? If they are, what are the limits and locations for this work?

**Quantities shown on Sheet 342/351 are for removal of existing concrete median barrier on Craig Bridge. They are not duplicates. Limits are shown on Sheet 342 in the "Typical Median Barrier Removal Detail" and there is a note at the bottom of the quantity table referring to Sheet 200 for barrier removal limits. Removal is also shown on Sheets 200-201.**

Question Submitted: 8/5/2008

Question Number: 95

Reference #232 - Seeding & Mulching, Class 1, As Per Plan B, Bid Quantity is 268,512 sy. Reference #230 - Topsoil Furnished and Plased, As Per Plan, Bid Quantity is 22,855 cy. According to the note on plan sheet 352/555 the thickness of the topsoil is 4 inches. Based upon reference #232 seeding area, I calculate a larger topsoil quantity. Please confirm.

**On Sheet 352, it specifies "This specification applies to all areas designated as Lawn Mix and Shade Lawn Mix on the Plans. " It does not apply to the seeding in the two stockpile areas that are to be regraded. After deducting those areas, the total seeded and mulched area to receive topsoil is 205,693 SY, which correlates closely with the calculation for the amount of topsoil shown in the proposal.**

Question Submitted: 8/6/2008

Question Number: 96

There are two pay items for Worksite Traffic Supervisor Ref. No 296 for 20 months and Ref No 571 for 20 months. Only one Worksite Traffic Supervisor is needed, one of these Ref Nos should be deleted

Question Submitted: 8/6/2008

Question Number: 97

LUC-Front Street, Part 2, plan sheet 17A/351, Roadway Subgrade paragraph discusses pre-loading the subgrade and requires a 3 month settlement period. Specifically Front Street - station 23+75 to 29+75 and 31+25 to 34+25. The first location, 23+75 to 29+75, cross sections 98/351 to 104/351 starts in a cut section and transitions into a shallow fill section, approximately 5 ft. thick. The next location, station 31+25 to 34+25, cross sections 105/351 to 109/351 is basically in a cut section with limited embankment. Please clarify preloading of these locations. What is ODOT looking for?

Question Submitted: 8/7/2008

Question Number: 98

Ref 136 Item 625E14501 Light Pole Found. APPWhat is size of foundation? What is size of anchor bolts?

**Light pole foundation detail is shown on Sheet 339B, Part 1**

---

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.