

PREBID QUESTION

#	DATE	PREBID QUESTION/ANSWER
1		ODOT REQUEST - STATEMENT ABOUT PRE-ATC MEETING REQUESTS
	3/31/2010	<p>CUY-90-14.90 Design Build PID 85531 Project Number 103000</p> <p>Use this form to submit all prebid questions for this project. DBT prebid questions will be posted to the following website. http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Pages/Cuy90-Prebids.aspx Department answers that do not require an addendum will be posted to this same website. Contract addenda will be posted to the regular Department addenda site.</p> <p>This form is also to be used for requesting pre-ATC meetings. As noted in the Selection Criteria, requests for pre-ATC meetings must be submitted at least two working days in advance of the proposed meeting date. (See Bid Proposal Selection Process Calendar for set dates for pre-ATC meetings.)</p>
2		Location of 4-7-2010 Utility Meeting
	3/30/2010	<p>Question: The Proposal lists a meeting conducted by the Department with the involved utilities and the short listed DBTs next Wednesday 4/7/2010. We cannot find a listing for the time and place of this meeting. Please confirm this meeting so that we may make travel arrangements for the appropriate people.</p>
	3/31/2010	<p>Answer: Cleveland Innerbelt Utility Meeting CUY-90-14.90 WB Project 10-3000 Date: April 7, 2010 Time: 9:30 am to 12:30 pm Location: Middleburg Heights Community Center, 16000 East Bagley Road, Middleburg Heights, Ohio 44130</p>
3		ODOT REQUEST - General Information Concerning Project Earthwork
	3/31/2010	<p>General Information Concerning Project Earthwork</p> <p>The Department wishes to advise the design-build teams that The Greater Cleveland Community Improvement Corp is currently working on a development site which is roughly bounded by Heidtman Parkway, Independence Road, Pershing Avenue, and Interstate 77. This site is looking for fill dirt in order to prepare the site. The site is charging disposal fees based on how the material is characterized. The contact person for this site is:</p> <p>Mr. Doug Prodoehl Joe Dirt 513-200-0523</p> <p>The Department is providing this information to all bidders so that all of the design build teams are aware of this location.</p>
4		Location of 4-7-2010 Utility Meeting
	3/30/2010	<p>Question: Can ODOT please advise all short listed DBTs as to where and at what time the utility meeting will be held that is scheduled for April 7, 2010? Thanks</p>
	3/31/2010	<p>Answer: Cleveland Innerbelt Utility Meeting CUY-90-14.90 WB Project 10-3000 Date: April 7, 2010 Time: 9:30 am to 12:30 pm Location: Middleburg Heights Community Center, 16000 East Bagley Road, Middleburg Heights, Ohio 44130</p>
5		ODOT REQUEST - Pre ATC Meetings

4/1/2010	<p>Pre-ATC Meetings</p> <p>As stated in Section 6.6 of the Selection Criteria, the Department may have subject matter experts participate in pre-ATC meetings via teleconference or video conference. In order to facilitate active participation by the ODOT Central Office participants, the Department can utilize web conferencing using Microsoft Live Meeting software between the ODOT computer in the District 12 room and the ODOT computer in the Central Office Innerbelt project room. Microsoft Live Meeting allows meeting participants in both locations to view the same computer graphics. DBTs are encouraged to bring appropriate materials on a CD or DVD in order to adequately explain the ATC concept. Electronic files should be in a widely readable format such as PDF, JPG, TIF, DOC, DOCX, XLS, XLSX, PPT, PPTX, etc. The CD or DVD will be returned to the DBT at the conclusion of the meeting. The Department will handle the necessary set-up of the Microsoft Live Meeting in both the D12 room and the ODOT Central Office Innerbelt project room using Department owned computers.</p>
6	<p>ODOT REQUEST - Geotechnical Database Management System</p> <p>Request to post link to Geotech Document Management System</p> <p>4/5/2010 Answer: Please be aware that the ODOT Office of Geotechnical Engineering has created a electronic database of all historic geotechnical related documents in its possession. The database or Geotechnical Document Management System (GDMS), may be accessed by all internal and external customers. To request access, follow the following link for an unique id and password.</p> <p>http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ProdMgt/Geotechnical/Pages/GDocMS.aspx#GRSR</p>
7	<p>DBT Contact Information</p> <p>4/6/2010 17:36 Question: Could a list of the contacts with phone numbers for each bidding team be made available so that interested subcontractors can contact them.</p> <p>Answer: At the 4/7/2010 Utility meeting, ODOT asked DBTs if they would like to provide a contact person so interested subcontractors can contact them. DBTs were advised, if interested, to send in contact information via the CUY90 prebid website. DBT contact information will be posted on this web page if received by ODOT.</p>
8	<p>Utility Meeting Location-Time</p> <p>4/5/2010 4/5/2010 Question: In regards to the upcoming Utility Meeting on April 7, 2010, has a time and location been announced?</p> <p>Answer: Cleveland Innerbelt Utility Meeting CUY-90-14.90 WB Project 10-3000 Date: April 7, 2010 Time: 9:30 am to 12:30 pm Location: Middleburg Heights Community Center, 16000 East Bagley Road, Middleburg Heights, Ohio 44130</p>
9	<p>30% Structure Drawings</p> <p>4/6/2010 05:36 PM Question: Sections 14.3.10 and 14.3.3 of the Project Scope require 30% design drawings for the structures per Section 202.2 of ODOT's BDM to be submitted with the Technical Proposal. Section 4.15 of the Selection Criteria limits the Technical Proposal to 75 pages plus an unlimited number of additional exhibits, plan, schedules and figures. The drafting of 30% submittal quality drawings is not normally required to estimate or write a Technical Proposal of a design build project of this scope. Is there a conflict in the requirements of the Project Scope and Selection Criteria? If required, are the 30% structure design drawings counted as part of the 75 pages of the Technical Proposal or are they part of the unlimited appendices?</p> <p>Answer: ODOT is requiring 30% design drawings so that adequate information is available for evaluation of the Technical Proposal. The 30% structure design drawings can be considered part of the unlimited appendix items.</p>
10	<p>Extend ATC Submission Time-frame</p> <p>4/6/2010 05:38 PM Question: We request that the submission of ATC's be extended from the present deadline of May 14, 2010 until June 25, 2010. This will enable the DBTs more time to develop ATCs that are not apparent until our design is further developed.</p> <p>Answer: ODOT will revise the ATC process in Addendum #1. The following information is provided in advance of the addendum: Fifth pre-ATC Meeting 5/17/10; Last Day for DBTs to submit ATC proposal 6/4/10; Last day for Department to inform DBTs of ATC approval status 6/25/10;</p>
11	<p>Extend ATC Submission Time-frame</p> <p>4/8/2010 09:44 AM Question: Given the wealth of information provided by ODOT, an extension of the ATC deadlines is requested as follows;Last day for DBTs to submit ATC proposals - revise to 5/28/10 (2 week extension)Last day for Department to inform DBTs of ATC approval status - revise to 6/18/10 (2 week extension) Please note that we do NOT request an extension to the submission of the Technical and Price Proposals.</p> <p>Answer: ODOT will revise the ATC process in Addendum #1. The following information is provided in advance of the addendum: Fifth pre-ATC Meeting 5/17/10; Last Day for DBTs to submit ATC proposal 6/4/10; Last day for Department to inform DBTs of ATC approval status 6/25/10;</p>
12	<p>Pre-ATC Meetings - Move Day of Week</p>

4/6/2010 05:38 PM Question: We request that the pre-ATC meetings be changed to Wednesdays or Thursdays to allow more flexibility in arranging travel for those DBT out of town personnel.

Answer:

We are unable to change the pre-ATC meeting days. These dates have been published for quite some time. DBTs and ODOT staff have likely made advance schedule arrangements to attend the published dates.

13 Ramp A5 Aesthetic Requirements

4/8/2010 05:24 AM Question: Project Scope Section 14 "STRUCTURES" addresses the structural requirements for the I-90 Viaduct Structure Approach and Main Spans. Aesthetic requirements are given in scope section 16 "AESTHETICS and ENHANCEMENTS" for the structures. It is unclear in these sections the requirements structurally or aesthetically for the Ontario Street on Ramp to I-90 WB (Ramp A5). Is the ramp required to conform to the Viaduct structure main span or approach span requirements? Would you please clarify the structural and aesthetic requirements for this ramp structure?

Answer: Any portion of Ramp A5 (Ontario Street on-ramp to I-90 WB) that is within the defined limits of the Main Viaduct bridge, shall meet the aesthetic requirements of Project Scope Section 16.3.4-Main Viaduct Bridge Design Requirements. Please also see Project Scope Section 16.3.4 C.

14 Primavera P3 vs P6

4/8/2010 09:23 AM Question: Section 1.19.1.h of the Project Scope specifically references the purchase of two licensed copies of Primavera (P3) for the Project. This software is no longer available for purchase to new users. Furthermore reference document PN 107 (1/16/2009) – Critical Path Method Progress Schedule in section C, item 1 references the use of P3 Project Planner by Primavera Systems. Primavera Systems, has been purchased by Oracle. As noted previously the specified software is no longer available to purchase, in addition, technical support will no longer be available for P3 Project Planner after December 2010. Will the Ohio Department of Transportation be migrating to the new version of Primavera software supported by Oracle, Primavera P6 Project Management version 7? If so, should the DBT prepare their proposed project schedule for the Innerbelt Bridge Project in Primavera P6v7 or P3 Project Planner format

Answer: The Department will be utilizing Primavera P3 software for the duration of this project, Per Scope Section 1.19.1.h. The DBT will be required to supply 2 licensed copies.

15 Missing Bridge Plans

4/8/2010 05:38 PM MISSING BRIDGE PLANS We have reviewed all the documents made available to the us and we are unable to locate existing bridge plans for the following bridges:- CUY-90-1490L- CUY-90-1490R- CUY-90-1506. Please advise if these plans are available.

Answer: Additional historic plans have been added to Appendix EX-80, which will be included in Addendum #1.

16 ODOT REQUEST - Supplemental Boring Program Locations

4/6/2010 Project Scope Section 9.2.2 Supplemental Subsurface Explorations

The list below summarizes the final locations of the requested borings to be shared with the potential DBT's.

Boring ID Station Offset

B-39-1-10 138+00 CL

B-44-1-10 155+00 CL

B-47-2-10 160+75 55' LT

B-74-1-10 24+00 (E. 9th St.) CL

B-69-1-10 524+47 115' RT

B-69-2-10 524+97 115' RT

Per Section 9.2.2 of the project scope, the department will be updating the anticipated drilling schedule for each boring location daily by posting the schedule to the following ftp site.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID77332/SupplementalBoringSchedule/>

17 Bridge Painting

4/12/2010 09:15 AM Question: Structural Steel Painting Clarification Referencing section 14.4 of the Project Scope for Non-Viaduct Structures, we request clarification of the painting of the structural steel. The Scope of Work for Bridges 7, 8 and 9, Pages PS-167 thru 169, indicates that "Painting is not required for (these structures)". However, we are required to perform steel retrofits per Paragraph 14.4.2 (B), bearing replacements per Paragraph 14.4.2 (D) and end cross-frame replacements. Please confirm that no paint will be required at these repairs / retrofits.

Answer: Any new steel shall receive a coating using system IZEU per C&MS 514. Areas of damaged paint on the existing steel shall be repaired per C&MS 514.22.

18 Bridge Painting

4/12/2010 09:16 AM Question: Structural Steel Painting Clarification Referencing section 14.4 of the Project Scope for Non-Viaduct Structures, we request clarification of the painting of the structural steel. The Scope of Work for Bridges 10 & 11, Pages PS-169 thru PS-171 indicates that "Painting is not required for (these structures)". However, we are required to perform bearing replacements at these bridges. Please confirm that no paint will be required for the bearing replacements.

Answer: The Project Scope indicates that it is NOT required to replace the existing bearings for Bridges 10 and 11. Refer to the Project Scope on Page PS-170, under Bridge 10, Comment B, and Page PS-171, under Bridge 11, Comment D.

19 Bridge Painting

4/12/2010 09:18 AM Question: Structural Steel Painting ClarificationReferencing section 14.4 of the Project Scope for Non-Viaduct Structures, we request clarification of the painting of the structural steel. Bridge 12 Scope of Work Pages PS-171 thru PS-174 indicates that "Painting is not required for this bridge". If due to MOT restrictions we are required to provide additional widening, for temporary traffic conditions, using additional steel framing, will we be required to paint this additional framing and paint the cross-frame connections at the existing framing?

Answer: Refer to the Project Scope on Page PS-172, under Bridge 12, Comment G, which states that any new steel shall receive a coating using system IZEU per C&MS 514. Areas of damaged paint on the existing steel shall be repaired per C&MS 514.22.

20 Streetscaping CADD files

4/12/2010 09:27 AM Question: Requesting CADD files for Streetscape PlansThe Streetscape and Landscape Plans in Appendix AE-02 are very detailed in their design. The plans are not included in the list of files provided to the teams. Given that the plans are so extensive in their details but do not appear to be scalable, will the CADD versions of the plans be made available?

Answer: CADD files of the Streetscape plans, created by Crosby, Schlessinger, Smallridge (CSS), will be provided in Addendum #1.

21 Painted Illustrations

4/12/2010 09:29 AM Question: Painted Illustrations on the Starkweather and Kenilworth piersTable 16-1 of the Project Scope (pg PS-183) indicates that the existing illustrations on the piers for both the Starkweather and Kenilworth Piers shall be replaced. Are these illustrations to be recreated or are we to provide similar, but not the same, illustrations? Are the new illustrations to be created by an artist?

Answer: The painted illustrations on the Starkweather and Kenilworth piers are to be recreated.

22 Landscape Architect

4/12/2010 09:30 AM Question: Requesting clarification for the requirements for a landscape architect for historic artworkSection 16.3.3 of the Project Scope indicates that the team shall include a landscape architect with "demonstrated previous experience in the incorporation of historic elements in public displays or public art". Given that the pool that meets this requirement is very small, is it acceptable to include a local artist on the team to meet this requirement?

Answer: No. Please bid as written.

23 Electronic Geotech Files

4/12/2010 09:51 AM Question: Request for Electronic Geotech FilesThe following gINT files cannot be found on the Departments ftp site nor the GDMS system. We request the Department provide these files in their electronic format to facilitate our analysis and proposal preparation. These files are as follows:• Electronic gINT files, where available, for all test borings drilled between project Station 123+00 and Station 169+00 (Viaduct Structure). Specifically, we will need all Project Files (GPJ) and all associated Library files (GLB) if they do not match the current library files available on the OGE website. • Electronic CADD Files (DGN) for the following soil plan and profile drawings included in Appendix GE-03: CUY-90-14.52 Soil Profile Drawings, sheet Nos. 51/114 through 64/114. • Electronic CADD (DGN), where available, for all remaining test borings drilled for the CUY-90 project. Specifically, we will need all Project Files (GPJ) and all associated Library files (GLB) if they do not match the current library files available on the OGE website. • Electronic Microstation Files (DGN) for the following soil plan and profile drawings included in Appendix GE-03: CUY-90-14.52 Soil Profile Drawings, sheet nos. 47/114 to 50/114o CUY-90-14.52 Soil Profile Drawings, sheet nos. 65/114 to 114/114

Answer: The requested files have been posted to: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID77332/Geotech/>

24 Column/Pier Cap

4/12/2010 09:57 AM Question: Intent of Column/Pier Cap Transition Project Scope 16.3.4.1.C states "For single column piers supporting a multi-girder superstructure, a curved transition between the top portion of the column and the base of the pier cap shall be used." Is the intent to make mandatory a curved transition that is transverse to the bridge, longitudinal to the bridge, or both?

Answer: For single column piers supporting a multi-girder superstructure, a curved transition, that is transverse to the bridge, between the top portion of the column and the base of the pier cap shall be used.

25 Building Drawings - Access

4/12/2010 10:08 AM Question: As-Built Plans of Buildings Scheduled for DemolitionIn order to prepare a reasonable estimate for the building demolition, can any as-built drawings be made available for the buildings as listed in Appendix RW-04? In particular we request the drawings of Parcel 602, The Cleveland Cold Storage Building and associated Power Plant, and Parcel 610, The Broadway Mills Building. Can a site visit be arranged to view any of the buildings slated for demolition?

Answer: The historic plans ODOT has of Parcel 602 will be added in Appendix EX-81 in Addendum #1. ODOT does not have building plans for any of the other structures. It is ODOT intent to provide building access to the DBTs as they become available. Additional information on building access will be forthcoming.

26 Missing Bridge Plans

4/14/2010 05:55 AM Question: Can ODOT please advise where we can locate the existing plans for the following bridge structures as we cannot find them or provide them to the DBT's? CUY-90- 1490L SFN: 1809342 I-90 WB over Starkweather Ave CUY-90- 1490R SFN: 1807625 I-71/ I-90 over Starkweather Ave CUY-90- 1506 SFN: 1807684 I-90 over Kenilworth Thank You

Answer: Additional historic plans have been added to Appendix EX-80, which will be included in Addendum #1.

27 Broadway Mills Salvage

4/15/2010 03:12 PM	<p>Question: Broadway Mills Salvage Section 5.2.3 Of the Project Scope indicates that the medallions and the 10 architectural sandstone center pieces above each half-circle window in the building are to be salvaged for reuse in the commemorative display. Appendix AE-02 also includes the decorative frieze work in addition to the aforementioned elements. In addition, Appendix AE-02 indicates where these elements are to be reused in the commemorative display area. Since Appendix AE-02 spells out what is to be salvaged and how it is to be used, how does Table 16-2's requirement for 3 options apply? Are additional elements to be salvaged to meet the 16-2 requirement?</p> <p>Answer: Section 5.2.3 details specific requirements related to Section 106 historic properties and includes requirements for design and construction of a commemorative display for the Broadway Mills building. Section 5.2.3 doesn't spell out the full set of requirements for the historic documentation and interpretation of the Broadway Mills, but references Section 16 – Aesthetics and Enhancements for additional requirements. Section 16.3.3 - Historic Mitigation Requirements more directly spells out the DBTs requirements for salvage of key architectural elements and incorporation of those elements into the Broadway Mills wall and commemorative display.</p> <p>Appendix AE-02 pages L2.3 and L2.4 provide specific information on the Broadway Mills wall, but it is not a fully developed plan. The requirements for the commemorative display are less prescriptive, but include incorporation of the historic plaque as specified in EC-07. The intent of the scope was to require the DBTs to develop three design alternatives, within the scope requirements, for the Broadway Mills wall and commemorative display for presentation to the stakeholders.</p>
28	Tremont Salvage
4/15/2010 03:12 PM	<p>Question: Salvaged Material - Tremont Appendix AE-02 indicates a number of items to be salvaged including cap stones along University; stone pavers on University Drive and Crown Ave; corner, cap, and face stones at the stone abutment wall; and 2 stone columns. However, the plans do not indicate where these salvaged items are to be reused. Are they to be stockpiled for a future phase of the work, or used as a part of this phase and if so, where?</p> <p>Answer: Appendix AE-01 and AE-02 indicate existing items to be reused within the project (including pavers and Broadway Mills architectural features) as well as items to be dismantled and stored for future use (including Old Central Viaduct Pier and Abutment Stones on the west side of the Cuyahoga River). Items not to be reused/incorporated into the contract shall be dismantled and stockpiled on site and within the public right-of-way, at a location acceptable to the Department. The intent is to store the old Central Viaduct Pier and Abutment stones in ODOT right-of-way for future use on the reconstructed west slope as part of the future Towpath Trail improvements.</p>
29	ODOT REQUEST - Location of 5-6-2010 Pre-Technical Proposal Meeting
4/20/2010	<p>Cleveland Innerbelt Pre-Technical Proposal Meeting CUY-90-14.90 WB Project 10-3000 Date: May 6, 2010 Time: 9:30 am to 12:30 pm Location: Middleburg Heights Community Center, 16000 East Bagley Road, Middleburg Heights, Ohio 44130</p>
30	ODOT REQUEST - Transcript from 4-7-2010 Utility Meeting
4/22/2010	<p>The sign-in sheet, presentation, and meeting transcript has been posted to: http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Transcripts/Forms/PBTrans.aspx</p>
31	ODOT REQUEST - Additional Traffic Files
4/23/2010	<p>Additional Traffic files from the Innerbelt preliminary development phase have been added to DI-02 in RFP addendum #2. These files are provided to the DBTs as reference information only. The site includes a Word document which explains that the Planning Level traffic files from CORSIM, Synchro, and VISSIM provided are NOT updated to match the Innerbelt preferred alternative approved in the Environmental Record of Decision. Additionally, the HCS files from the approved Interchange Justification Study are also provided.</p>
32	ODOT REQUEST - FTP site - "Refresh"
4/23/2010	<p>When visiting the project FTP site, please either "refresh" your browser, or change your internet settings to check for newer versions of stored pages every time you visit the webpage. This process will ensure that you are viewing the most current page.</p>
33	ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 1
4/23/2010	<p>RFP addendum No. 1 is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum001/</p>
34	Abbey Avenue bridge width
4/22/2010 05:03 PM	<p>Question: Bridge 15- Abbey Avenue Viaduct Width - In Section 14.4.2 of the Project Scope at Bridge Location 15- Abbey Avenue Viaduct, the "Structure horizontal dimensions:" section on page PS-174 indicates "31 feet-0 inches curb-to-curb, two (2) 11-foot 0-inch lanes, two (2) 5-foot 0-inch bike lanes, two (2) 5-foot 0-inch sidewalks". The sum of the widths of the driving lanes and bike lanes is 32 feet 0 inches. Which is required, 31 feet 0 inches, or 32 feet 0 inches? Please clarify.</p> <p>Answer: The proposed curb-to-curb width is 32 feet. The Project Scope will be revised to reflect this in RFP Addendum #3.</p>
35	PCB - need for bridge mounted
4/22/2010 05:10 PM	<p>Question: Removal of Existing Various Ramp Structures, W2, E1, E3 & E5 - Per the Project Scope section 12.2.3 Removal of existing Roadway and Structure Elements, after removal of the various Ramps Structures W2, E1, E3 and E-5, the DBT is to place "portable concrete barrier placed parallel to or diverging from existing I-90". Is this portable concrete barrier to be "Bridge Mounted" barrier?</p>

		Answer: The design of the PCB installation shall be the responsibility of the DBT based on the location.
36	Line style for utility to be removed	
4/22/2010 05:12 PM	Question: Utility Removal Line Style and Level - ODOT does not have a utility removal line style and level in their CADD seed file. Can we create a removal line style and level to use in the proposed utility master file? This line style would look like a series of X's (It would look like this...X X X X X X). It would be drawn in the proposed utility file over referenced existing utilities that are to be abandoned or removed. This would clarify abandonment and removal limits specified throughout the project.	
		Answer: The presentation of the proposed utility work shall be the responsibility of the DBT.
37	CWD waterline	
4/22/2010 05:14 PM	Question: Status of Waterline at GCRTA Crossing - For the following question below, please refer to the RFP as follows: Appendix UT-08 Page 2 titled "East 9th Street" Center section labeled "Roadway from Commercial Road to GCRTA Crossing" Bottom row Question: The 8" water line specified above is owned by CWD and is called out as "active" in the second column. From a recent field it appears to be abandoned. Please clarify with CWD.	
		Answer: Per CWD, the line is abandoned. The utility matrix will be updated in RFP Addendum #3.
38	Bridge Location 5 Removal Limits	
4/22/2010 05:53 PM	Question: Limits of Structure Removal Bridge Location 5 (Ramp E5) - There is a discrepancy regarding removal limits for Bridge Location 5. PS 12.2.3(D) provides that for Ramp E5 (E 14th Street to I-90 WB) the approximate limits of removal of existing shall be "...from the eastern tie-in to existing (approximately Station 3000+00) to the existing pier in the median of southbound E 9th Street..." PS 14.4.2 Bridge Location 5 provides the scope of work as "This Bridge shall be removed". What is the scope of removal for this structure, since the Ramp E5 Structure and Bridge Location 5 are one in the same? Do we remove the bridge in its entirety, or just portions?	
		Answer: Clarification added to Scope Section 12 in RFP Addendum #3.
39	Ontario Abutment Aesthetics	
4/22/2010 05:56 PM	Question: Ontario Abutment Aesthetics - In Appendix AE-02, page L1.2C, the plans at the Ontario Abutment reference detail 2-L3.2. However this detail is for the abutment in Tremont for the 14th Street Extension. In referencing this detail, is ODOT asking for a similar approach with art panels and lettering on this abutment?	
		Answer: The intent for aesthetic treatments on the Ontario Abutment of the Viaduct Bridge is for a colored, textured (formliner) surface. The design concepts shall be consistent / complementary with the treatments for the retaining walls between E. 9th and Ontario and the new I-90 Bridges over E. 9th Street. The DBT shall develop 3 unified options for presentation to the AEM Team. This work will be clarified in RFP Addendum #5.
40	Tremont Artwork	
4/22/2010 05:57 PM	Question: Tremont Artwork - In Appendix AE-02, page L3.2, there is a note that reads "Art panels shall be provided and installed by the DBT. Coordination with Artist(s) for art content shall be through ODOT." Please provide clarification as to the responsibilities of the DBT with regard to the artwork. Are we to provide the panels for the artist to do their work? What material are the panels to be? Who is paying the artist? Is there an approval process the DBT needs to follow with regards to the artwork content? Does the DBT have control over the schedule for when the panels need to be installed?	
		Answer: This work will be clarified in RFP Addendum #5.
41	Railing at Broadway Mills	
4/22/2010 05:58 PM	Question: Railing at Broadway Mills - In Appendix AE-02, page L0.2B, it is indicated that the 2 existing railing panels at the stone abutment wall adjacent to Broadway Mills shall be salvaged, repaired, scraped, painted, and replaced along with new panels. However, this rail does not meet current Uniform Building Code, ODOT standard requirements, or municipal codes for railings, resulting in a liability issue for the DBT. Please provide direction on how to proceed with the railing design to bring it in line with the applicable codes.	
		Answer: This work will be clarified in RFP Addendum #5. New railing will be required.
42	Request for Existing Signal Plans	
4/27/2010 02:12 PM	Question: Signals – Existing Plans - Please provide existing traffic signal plans for the following locations: Ontario/Orange at Eagle, Carnegie, 9th, 14th, 22nd, 30th Broadway at 30th, Rockefeller/Post Office, 37th at Rockefeller/Broadway, E 9th at Bolivar, Carnegie, E 22nd at Carnegie, Cedar, Central, Community College, Orange W 25th at intersections listed in TC-10, section 2.2 I-90 EB and W 25th, 14th & Fairfield, Existing traffic signal interconnect plans for interconnect that connects to any of the intersections above. Information about the existence of detection at these intersections, and if currently in operation.	
		Answer: The available signal plans have been added to the following FTP site. These files will be added to the contract in RFP Addendum #4. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID77332/Traffic_Files/City_Signal_Plans/
43	Signal Interconnect - Carnegie/Ontario/Orange	
4/27/2010 02:16 PM	Question: Signals – Innerconnect - Interconnect – Carnegie/Ontario/Orange area. Scope calls for twisted pair copper cable, but fiber tape identifying marker. (a) Is fiber an alternative? (b) Are there available specs for equipment required in cabinets related to interconnect (switches, termination panels, etc.)? (c) Are there plans for the existing interconnect system in the downtown area? (d) A laptop is noted, but is any system software required?	
		Answer: (a) Fiber optic cable is not allowed per the current contract documents; (b) The DBT shall provide all necessary equipment within the controller cabinet to comply with ODOT standards and provide a fully functional cabinet capable of running the intersection, as required by the contract documents; (c) Available signal plans have been provided, see Prebid Question #42; (d) The computer requirements will be clarified in RFP Addendum #6.
44	Traffic Signal Detection	
4/27/2010 05:42 PM	Question: Signals – Traffic Detectors Detection – some locations specify loops or video, other locations do not. In those cases are either acceptable?	
		Answer: If not otherwise indicated, loop detectors shall be provided. Video detection is only permitted at the intersections specified in the contract documents.
45	Signal Interconnect - W 25th Street	

	4/27/2010 06:05 PM	<p>Question: Signals – Interconnect – W 25th Street See Appendix TC-10. (a) Will the W 25th St interconnect be City or ODOT owned/maintained? (b) Does it cross any other interconnect corridors that it must interface with? (c) TC-10 allows fiber or wireless, are there any specs for system communication (e.g. Protocols/Ethernet, communications to a TOC, equipment required in cabinet, on-street master, etc.).</p> <p>Answer: (a) The West 25th signal system is owned and maintained by the City of Cleveland; (b) This item will be clarified in an upcoming addendum; (c) The DBT shall provide all necessary equipment within the controller cabinet to comply with ODOT standards and provide a fully functional cabinet capable of running the intersection, as required by the contract documents;</p>
46		Traffic Control Signs
	4/27/2010 06:06 PM	<p>Question: Signs – Modified faces For modified sign faces, can existing signs be used in place and modified, or do they need to be upgraded to meet current MUTCD standards (2009) and use Clearview fonts?</p> <p>Answer: For modified sign faces, existing signs shall be replaced with new signs that comply with the 2009 MUTCD.</p>
47		Pavement Resurfacing
	4/28/2010 09:09 PM	<p>Question: Reference PS-124 Section 11.1.11 Pavement Resurfacing for Interstate and Ramps. The text description of this scope defines overlays for the Alternate Route Plans to "be resurfaced by planing 1.5 inches, tack coat and 1.5 inches of surface course." The tabular scope references 1.5 inches of 442, 1.75 inches of 442 and 3 inches of 254. Please clarify.</p> <p>Answer: The first sentence of Scope Section 11.1.11 states that the tabular treatments indicated below shall be completed prior to implementation of the Alternate Route Plan. The last sentence refers to work require after substantial completion and prior to implementation of the Bi-Directional condition.</p>
48		MOT Improvements to East 22nd Street
	4/29/2010 02:37 PM	<p>Question: MOT Improvements to 22nd St Project Scope section 18.8.H calls for E. 22nd St. to be widened and converted to 2-way traffic per Section O prior to implementation of either ARP. Where is Section O? TC-10 describes constructing two new southbound lanes consistent with City of Cleveland roadway design, but shows no section.</p> <p>Answer: The current version of the Scope correctly references Section 12.</p>
49		MOT Resurfacing
	4/29/2010 02:38 PM	<p>Question: MOT Resurfacing SR14 Project Scope sections 18.8.G and 18.8.I call for resurfacing of SR 14 (Broadway and E. 34th St.) and E.14th St. If these improvements are to be done before implementation of the EARP and WARP, who would be responsible for maintenance?</p> <p>Answer: The DBT shall be responsible for maintaining detour routes per Scope Section 18.3.6.</p>
50		MOT IR-490 Rumble Strips
	4/29/2010 02:39 PM	<p>Question: MOT IR-490 Rumble Strips Project Scope section 18.8.B states that rumble strips on concrete shoulders of IR-490 shall be milled and filled prior to implementation of ARP. Appendix MT-02 states that rumble strips may be cleaned and filled. Is either method acceptable?</p> <p>Answer: Either method is acceptable as long as the final product provides a smooth and safe riding surface. The DBT is responsible for maintaining these through the life of the project.</p>
51		MOT Improvements to Alternate Route
	4/29/2010 02:46 PM	<p>Question: MOT Improvements to Alternate Route roadway Project Scope section 18.8.F states that the DBT shall resurface the Alternate Route lanes and shoulders as per Section 11, and provide pavement markings, including RPM's and rumble strips as per Section 17 prior to implementation of each ARP. Section 17 calls for epoxy pavement markings on ODOT facilities. If ARP implementation is for a short duration less than one construction season, could temporary pavement markings as per CMS 614.11 be used. Also, some areas of the detour pavement are in good shape, would the entire ARP need to be milled and filled if the ARP was in use for this short duration? Could existing pavement be used for the short duration, and the overlay be done when the second implementation of the ARP was put into place?</p> <p>Answer: The project scope was developed because of concern over conflicting pavement markings during the ARP. The required overlays were included in the scope to ensure a quality pavement surface during the ARP. Bid as stated in the contract documents.</p>
52		Design Firms & IQF - DBE Requirements
	4/29/2010 08:02 PM	<p>Question: Given that the Design firms and the IQ firm would not typically use ODOT DBE's and that historically that volume would not be included in the minority participation of a project, it is requested that subcontract volume of these categories be excluded from the 15% DBE Goal.</p> <p>Answer: The project's DBE goal is very important to the Department. The DBE Goal is for the entire project, not specifically by subcontract category. (ie. designer, IQF, contractor, etc.) Bid as stated in the contract documents.</p>
53		Bridge 8 Deck Replacement (East 9th Street)
	5/3/2010 03:49 PM	<p>Question: Bridge 8 Deck Replacement Date Project Scope section 14.4.2 states that Bridge 8, I-90 EB over E. 9th St., shall have the deck replaced by December 1, 2011. Appendix MT-01 shows this bridge being reconstructed in Phase 5 of Contract Group 1. Is the December 1, 2011 date correct for this bridge? If it is, would the December 1, 2011 date also apply to Bridge 7, I-90 WB over E. 9th St.?</p> <p>Answer: Please bid as written.</p>
54		NFPA Compliance
	5/3/2010 04:05 PM	<p>Question: NFPA ComplianceThe latest 2008 version of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA 502), Chapter 6, Section 3, says where the distance from an acceptable water supply source to any point on a bridge or elevated highway exceeds 400 ft, the bridge or elevated highway should be provided with a standpipe system. We believe the main viaduct falls into this category. NFPA compliance is not explicitly required in the Project Scope 1.17, but it could be embedded in one of the many documents listed. Should a standpipe system be installed on the main viaduct to comply with NFPA requirements?</p> <p>Answer: A standpipe system per NFPA is not required on any of the bridges in this contract.</p>
55		ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 2

	5/3/2010	RFP addendum No. 2, dated May 3, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum002/ ; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT's Digital Paper website at: http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do
56		Technical Proposal Format - Font
	5/10/2010 07:46 AM	Question: Section 4.15 Format of Technical Proposal of the Design Build Selection CriteriaStates "Font shall be at least 12 point in Times New Roman...Graphics shall conform to the other format requirements listed."Question #1 Are the 30% plans that will be in an appendix required to meet the font requirements?Question #2 If we pull a design graphic or partial plan sheet into the main body of the 75 page technical proposal, is the text on the partial plan sheet required to meet the font requirement?Thanks Answer: Plan sheets provided in the Appendix shall meeting ODOT standard plan sheet requirements. Plan sheet graphics brought into the technical proposal shall be substantially similar to the required font type/size.
57		Oral Interviews
	5/10/2010 07:52 AM	Question: Section 5.0 Oral Interview of the Design Build Selection CriteriaStates "Topics and issues not addressed in the written Technical Proposal shall not be discussed during the oral interview" Question: Can the DBT bring reference material to the oral interview such as design drawings that can be referenced and assist in the answering of any questions during the oral interview? Thanks Answer: The DBT's Technical Proposal can be used as reference material during the oral interview. No new material can be presented to, or accepted by, the interview committee.
58		Technical Proposal Format - Volumes
	5/10/2010 07:55 AM	Question: Section 4.15 Format of Technical Proposals of the Design Build Selection Criteria: Due to the anticipated large number of plan sheets that will be included in the technical proposal submittals, can the technical proposal submittal be broken up into two volumes and bound as two separate volumes? Answer: The Technical Proposal can include volumes. The volumes must meet the sequentially numbered copy requirements. The DBTs are reminded of Section 5.0 of the Selection Criteria which states that DBTs are encouraged to be as concise as possible.
59		Technical Proposal - Plan Sheet Numbering
	5/10/2010 08:00 AM	Question: Section 4.15 Format of Technical Proposals of the Design Buils Selection CriteriaStates "Submit fifty (50) sequentially numbered paper copies..."Can the 30% design plans that will be in the appendix have the sequential copy number only on the cover sheet vs. placing the sequential copy number on every sheet of every copy of the appendix plan sheets? Answer: Bound submitted plan sheets can have the copy number placed only on the cover sheet.
60		Testing Requirements - DBT vs IQF
	5/11/2010 07:13 AM	Question: Please clarify the testing requirements of the DBT Process Quality Control Staff versus those of the IQF. Section 1.18 of the Project Scope lists supplemental specifications for the project, some of which have been modified. SS 898 has been modified to replace "Contractor" with "DBT" and "Department, or Engineer" with "ICQM". The testing responsibilities of this supplemental specification are clear. SS 840 and SS 879 have not been modified in a similar manner. a)Should they be? b)Does "ICQM" replace "Department, or Engineer" in all specifications, supplemental specifications and supplements? Otherwise, please clarify the intent of Sections 2.4.2, 2.6.1.9, and other sections referencing Process Quality Control versus that of Section 2.6.5.24. Answer: a.) SS840 and SS879 will be modified to replace "Contractor" with "DBT" and "Department or Engineer" with "ICQM" in RFP Addendum #4; b) The ICQM does not replace "Department, or Engineer" in all Specifications, Supplemental Specifications, and supplements. Section 2.6.8 addresses this issue where the IQF can replace the Department or Engineer based on the approved QMP.
61		Testing Requirements
	5/11/2010 07:14 AM	Question: Please clarify the term Laboratory Independent Quality Material Testing in Section 2.6.5.17 of the Project Scope. It is not defined elsewhere in the document. What testing comes under this Section? Does this mean that contractor, supplier or producer personnel cannot perform testing using their own certified personnel (e.g. asphalt testing under Item 403, aggregate testing under S 1069, concrete testing under SS 898, etc.)? Answer: The DBT's supplier or producer can perform the testing required for the DBT's QC plan. The Section 2.6.5.17 Testing is the IQF's QV work testing whose methods, volume and frequency are determined by the approved QMP.
62		Mobilization
	5/13/2010 03:15 PM	It is requested that the Department consider providing a mobilization pay item for the project. Answer: Bid as stated in the contract documents. A mobilization pay item will not be added.
63		Scope Section 4
	5/13/2010 03:30 PM	Question: Regarding Section 4 of the Project Scope; Can 1. the Department provide more specific details regarding Project communications meetings with ODOT (section 4.4). How many meetings are anticipated to be held weekly and/or monthly? 2. the Department provide more specific details regarding how regularly the Public Information Specialist will meet with ODOT (section 4.5). How many anticipated weekly and/or monthly meetings? 3. the Department proved more details, ideas, expectations related to items listed in 4.6 - specifically (4.6.3), (4.6.6), (4.6.7), (4.6.8) and (4.6.10)? Answer: The Project Scope outlines the general requirements for Public Information and Communications. The specific requirements will be included in the DBTs Public Information Plan.
64		ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 3
	5/14/2010	RFP addendum No. 3, dated May 13, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum003/ ; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT's Digital Paper website at: http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do
65		ODOT REQUEST - Transcript from 5-6-2010 Utility Meeting
	5/17/2010	The sign-in sheet, presentation, and meeting transcript has been posted to: http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Transcripts/Forms/PBTrans.aspx
66		Widened Bridges - Number of Columns

5/14/2010 02:46 PM	Question: Widened Bridges - Number of Columns Required: The Scope of Services states in section 14.4.2 that "proposed piers for widened structures shall be independent of existing piers." Additionally section 14.4.2 requires that "cap and column piers shall have a minimum of three (3) columns." There are several places on the project that will require one, two or three beam lines. Providing a cap and column pier, which incidentally will match the existing structure type, with 3 columns is difficult and/or impossible. Consideration is requested to allow the pier widening to be founded on cap and column substructures with less than 3 columns. In the case of a widened bridge with only one beam line, consideration is requested to provide a single column concentric with the beam line, with or without a dummy cap appearing to connect to the existing column.
	Answer: See Scope Section 14.2.2 revision included in RFP addendum #3. The intent of Section 14.2.2 is that for the entire width of a bridge, three or more columns shall support the superstructure. The total number of columns at a pier on a bridge would be the new columns plus the existing columns. Three columns are not required under the widened portion of a bridge.
67	RFP Addendum No. 3 - Date
5/14/2010 03:39 PM	Question: RFP Addendum No. 3 Date Please note that the date for RFP Addendum No. 3 on document 103000d is printed as 5/13/2009.
	Answer: The date of RFP Addendum No. 3 should be 5/13/2010. A statement about the correct date will be included in RFP addendum No. 4.
68	Bridge Location 3 – CUY-90-1506 (I-90 Over Kenilworth Ave) - Work Scope
5/18/2010 08:26 AM	Question: Bridge Location 3 – CUY-90-1506 (I-90 Over Kenilworth Ave) According to the Scope Section 14.4.2 this structure is shown as deck replacement and minor widening. Since the new proposed alignment does not follow the existing alignment and the toe of the median barrier will be at a different alignment and location of the existing median, in addition to the complication of providing a transverse cross slope that does not match the existing cross slope on the structure and the location of the new phase construction line with respect to the existing beam locations and also accounting for the change in the profile due to the bearing height combined with the new profile, should the scope of this bridge be revised to be a new structure or new superstructure with modified substructure (The modification of the substructure is necessary to account for the new beam line locations and to resolve issues with future CCG2)?
	Answer: Section 14.4.2, Bridge Location 3 of the Project Scope has been revised in RFP Addendum #4.
69	Bridge Location 15 – CUY-ABBEY-1001M (Abbey Ave Viaduct) - Work Scope
5/18/2010 08:27 AM	Question: Bridge Location 15 – CUY-ABBEY-1001M (Abbey Ave Viaduct) Since this structure is to be widened by approximately 1'-0" to accommodate the 5'-0" bike lane, would this require the scope of work under section 14.4.2 part G & H to be performed on this structure (i.e. the approach slab to be removed and replaced and the removal and replacement of Porous Backfill)?
	Answer: Section 14.4.2, Bridge Location 15, Item D of the Project Scope was modified in RFP Addendum #3 and addresses this issue.
70	ODOT REQUEST - Supplemental Boring Program Logs
5/24/2010	The supplemental borings logs can be found at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID77332/SupplementalBoringSchedule/ These logs were added to the contract in RFP Addendum #5.
71	Alternate Route Plans
5/18/2010 05:04 PM	Question: Regarding pavement markings and delineation for the Alternate Route Plans, if there is an extended period between completion of the proposed initial EARP and/or WARP and implementation of the bi-directional condition what are the requirements for replacement of pavement markings and delineation devices (RPM's and Rumble Strips) prior to final resurfacing and implementation of the bi-directional condition? In other words will the existing traveled lanes of the proposed detour routes have to be put back into their existing configuration (12' lanes, shoulders, etc.) with new epoxy pavement markings, rpm's, and rumble strips at completion of the initial ARP prior to the next ARP implementation or to the implementation of the bi-directional condition?
	Answer: Yes. Bid per the contract documents.
72	Bridge Expansion Joints
5/21/2010 06:13 AM	Question: Mainline Bridge Locations: 1,2,3 7,8,9,10,11 & 12: Some of these structures are scoped for deck replacement or deck replacement with widening, What are the intention of the department on the treatments of the bridge expansion joints? (replace with strip seal, convert to semi-integral if possible). If joint replacement is anticipated than removal of portions of the abutments backwall will be necessary. Please clarify the scope of work.Thanks
	Answer: The DBTs shall determine the appropriate solution, subject to the requirements of the contract documents.
73	Bulkhead Design Requirements
5/21/2010 02:44 PM	Question: Bulkhead Design Requirements Currently, within the CUY-90 14.92 project area, commercial marine terminal operators stockpile aggregate materials behind the east Cuyahoga River bulkhead wall. RW-03 indicates ODOT will be acquiring property adjacent to the new east bulkhead wall. Please provide a maximum transient design load for east side bulkhead wall based on ODOT's anticipated use of this property.
	Answer: ODOT does not intend to allow future material stockpiling on ODOT fee owned property adjacent to the Cuyahoga River bulkheads.
74	Overhead Sign Structure
5/21/2010 03:17 PM	Question: Interference with existing OH Sign Structure at Bridge 12 Reference Project Scope Section 14.4.2, Bridge Location 12, Comments B: "...For the I-77 ramp portion of the structure, the proposed left edge of deck shall match the existing left edge of deck". This requires that the widening of the I-77 ramp will occur to the right side which will require the existing forward abutment to be widened accordingly. There is an existing overhead sign structure immediately past bridge 12 spanning I-90 in both directions which will interfere with this widening. This sign structure as shown on TC-01 sheet 9/24 does not appear to be required to be removed, relocated, or replaced. Will the DBT be permitted to temporarily remove this sign structure and replace the signs with temporary ground mounted signs during the MOT?
	Answer: The detail design of the MOT plan will be the DBT's responsibility.
75	DI-02 Electronic Document Inventory
5/24/2010 02:20 PM	Question: Updated *.dgn files noted in Appendix DI-02 A review of the ODOT ftp site for this project shows a number of changes to files in DI-02, Electronic Document Inventory, that have occurred in Addenda 1, 2, and 3, but the only addenda with new *.dgn or *.dwg drawings are addendum 2 with two AE drawings and addendum 3 with five right-of-way drawings. Specifically there are a number of drawings with a revision date of 4/15/2010 that show up on DI-02 in addendum 3 under BBC&M Engineering, Inc. (BBCM) that we cannot find. Where can we locate these drawings?
	Answer: The DI-02 Electronic files were inadvertently not copied to the FTP site. The files are now located at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum002/Appendix_DI-02_Files/
76	Beam Continuity Weld Retrofit

	5/28/2010 01:57 PM	Question: Beam Continuity Weld Retrofit Section 14.4.2B of the Scope states that "All ends of cover plates and beam continuity welds with splice plates shall be retrofitted." It is unclear what the retrofit is for the "beam continuity welds with splice plates". We believe that the retrofit for this item is to retrofit the ends of the splice plates similar to the retrofit of the cover plates. Please confirm. Answer: Retrofits shall be performed per Section 402.3 of the 2004 Bridge Design Manual.
77		ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 4
	6/2/2010	RFP addendum No. 4, dated June 4, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum004/ ; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT's Digital Paper website at: http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do
78		Pile Driving Records for Existing Innerbelt Bridge
	6/2/2010 09:31 AM	Question: Pile Driving Records for Existing Innerbelt Bridge. Please provide all available driving records for piles installed beneath the existing I-90 Innerbelt bridge and other structures included in the scope of CCG1. Answer: The Department does not have historical pile driving records for CCG1 structures.
79		Design or As-Built Drawings for East Cuyahoga River Bulkhead Walls
	6/2/2010 09:33 AM	Question: Design or As-Built Drawings for East Cuyahoga River Bulkhead Walls. Please provide design or as-built drawings for the existing eastern Cuyahoga River bulkhead walls that fall within the project limits. Answer: The Department does not have design or as-built drawings of the bulkhead walls.
80		Bridge Approach Slab Modifications at Bridge 15
	6/2/2010 09:37 AM	Question: Bridge Approach Slab Modifications at Bridge 15. The revised scope of work for Bridge Location 15 on page PS-176 (addendum 3) paragraph D notes that we are to "repair or replace approach slabs to match bridge retrofits." Please clarify this scope - does this require us to provide an overlay on the approach slab? Will ODOT allow the approach slab to be widened by exposing the outside edges and drilling and grouting dowels and then placing only the widened slab? Answer: The DBTs shall determine the appropriate solution, subject to the requirements of the contract documents.
81		Bridge Location 15 Joint Retrofit
	6/2/2010 09:38 AM	Question: Bridge Location 15 Joint Retrofit. The revised scope of work for Bridge Location 15 on page PS-175 (addendum 3) paragraph B notes that we are to provide "...retrofit and extension of structural joint to match relocated curb line." Will we be permitted to salvage and modify the existing sidewalk sliding plates for re-use? Answer: The DBTs shall determine the appropriate solution, subject to the requirements of the contract documents.
82		Bridge Location 15 As-Built Joint Info
	6/2/2010 09:41 AM	Question: Bridge Location 15 As-Built Joint Info. The revised scope of work for Bridge Location 15 on page PS-175 (addendum 3) paragraph B notes that we are to provide "...retrofit and extension of structural joint to match relocated curb line." Does ODOT have existing shop-drawings or submittal info as to the manufacturer of this joint? There is considerable risk in assuming that an identical extrusion and / or replacement neoprene seals are currently available without the DBT doing time consuming investigation of current fabricators. Answer: The information the Department has on this bridge is contained in Appendix EX-02.
83		Parking Area Bid Reference
	6/3/2010 03:22 PM	Question: Please reference the proposal schedule of prices, in particular Line 6. The description of work for line 6 includes parking areas "Tremont, Fairfield & Downtown". We have assumed the parking lot between the proposed and existing I90 structures to be the "Tremont" parking lot. We have also assumed the lot along Central Viaduct to be the "downtown" parking lot. Please provide clarification as to what work would be included as part of the "Fairfield" parking area. Answer: The word "Fairfield" will be removed from this bid reference in RFP Addendum #7.
84		Request for Design or As-Built Drawings for West Cuyahoga River Dock Wall
	6/6/2010 05:11 PM	Question: Request for Design or As-Built Drawings for West Cuyahoga River Dock Wall The Proposal documents relating to the existing west Cuyahoga River Dock Wall (Appendix file ST-03, all sheets; Appendix file EX-53, sheets 32 and 33; Appendix file ST-04, sheets 38 of 43 and 3 of 5) do not clearly indicate typical sections for the entire existing west dock wall within the CCG1 work area. Please confirm the dock wall section, or provide new design or as-built drawings for the existing west dock wall between approximately Station 134+42 62' R and Work Point 2 shown on Appendix ST-03, sheet 2 of 6. Answer: The information the Department has on this dock wall has been provided to the DBTs.
85		PN 525 Steel Price Adjustment
	6/6/2010 09:15 PM	Question: PN 525 Steel Price AdjustmentThe current version of PN 525 Price Adjustment for Design Build Projects dated 1/15/2010 does not include an adjustment for Category 3 steel items (Prestress and Post tensioning strand)nor Category 4 (Reinforcing Steel). In light of the amount of steel product and long duration of the project, we request the inclusion of Category 3 and Category 4 steel items in this price adjustment clause as was done for recently bid ODOT project 100280 WAR IR 71 14.20. Answer: Bid as stated in the contract documents.
86		Engineer of Record for West Bank Stabilization
	6/7/2010 06:48 PM	Question: Engineer of Record for West Bank Stabilization. Section 9 of the Project Scope clearly directs the DBT to perform a prescribed scope of work at the West Bank: "ODOT is prescribing stabilization construction for the west slope prior to construction of the viaduct bridge. The Stabilization consists of removal of the cold storage building, soil excavation, and installation of vertical and horizontal drains. The DBT shall construct the prescribed stabilization in accordance with the West Bank Grading Plans presented in Appendix GE-01, and Horizontal and Vertical Drains presented in GE-11."ODOT is the engineer of record for the plans and the prescribed designs and sequences they contain. It is our understanding that the West Bank Grading Plans, including the prescribed sequence of work, were developed in order to mitigate slope stability concerns and that our scope of work is limited to the implementation of the prescribed grading plan and sequence of work. The foundations designed to support the bridge on the West Bank are therefore not subject to lateral forces related to slope movements. Would ODOT confirm that this understanding is correct? Answer: The assumption is correct, the foundations are not subject to lateral forces due to slope movements.
87		Existing Original Central Viaduct Overlook Abutment Foundation
	6/7/2010 06:49 PM	Question: Existing Original Central Viaduct Overlook Abutment Foundation. Some foundations for the original Central Viaduct utilized timber mats and battered timber piles. Would ODOT provide documentation on the foundation of the existing original Central Viaduct east (overlook) abutment? Answer: The Department does not have any information on the foundation for the original Central Viaduct structure.
88		Ontario SB full depth pavement limits

	6/9/2010 04:46 PM	Question: Ontario SB full depth pavement limits. Please clarify the full depth pavement limits for Ontario SB from station 32-40. Appendix LD-01 typical section sheet 9/11 shows only the widening being full depth pavement. Appendix PA-02 the shading indicates the entire SB maybe full depth pavement and the project scope section 12.2.1 project limits table 12-3 seems to indicate this as well. Answer: The full depth pavement limits are defined by PA-02 and Project Scope.
89		Ontario/Carnegie MOT closures
	6/9/2010 04:48 PM	Question: Ontario/Carnegie MOT closures. The Ontario and Carnegie intersection is being rebuilt with full depth pavement either concrete or concrete base and asphalt pavement. The 14 day 2 lane reductions per the closure requirements for both Ontario and Carnegie listed in table 18-3 of the Project scope section 18.3.2 will not work. Can ODOT revise these times to be the 180 days listed for Ontario EB(SB)? Answer: The MOT requirements for this intersection will be modified in RFP Addendum #8.
90		ROW Fencing Requirements under the viaduct structure
	6/9/2010 04:49 PM	Question: ROW Fencing Requirements under the viaduct structure. Can ODOT clarify if ROW fencing is required under the viaduct structure both at the west bank and from the Cuyahoga River east to the RTA? If it is required what are the limits for this contract (CCG2 may influence this). Answer: ODOT will not require right of way fencing under the viaduct structure from the east bank of the Cuyahoga River to the GCRTA tracks. The scope was revised in RFP Addendum #6.
91		Ramp A7 Pavement Design
	6/9/2010 04:50 PM	Question: Ramp A7 (aka I-90 WB) Pavement Design Type. Can the DBT have the option to pave Ramp A7 (aka I-90 WB) with full depth asphalt paving per project scope 11.1.1? This "ramp" is approximately 300' long and will be done in conjunction with the mainline asphalt paving. Answer: Ramp A7 is considered to be I90 WB. The pavement composition would be per Scope 11.1.1.
92		Cleveland Division of Water Pollution Control Standards
	6/10/2010 09:39 AM	Question: In the drainage section of the scope, section 13.1.2, Local Facilities, the first line states all plan and design for local facilities are to be prepared in the accordance with the latest standards provided in section 1.17. In section 1.17 there is a list of all the standards to be followed. In this list the only section that refers to the city of Cleveland is subsection F. The two references in this section are Cleveland Water Standards at (http://www.clevelandwater.com/system_overview/standards_details06.aspx) Standards construction drawings (including Drainage Design Standards) at: (http://www.city.cleveland.oh.us/CityofCleveland/home/government/CityAgencies/publicService/Public%20Service%20Publications) From past experience with doing drainage work for the city of Cleveland, Cleveland Division of Water Pollution Control (WPC) has a set of standards not published in the above standards. These standards could have large impacts on the layout of the proposed drainage facilities for the local roads. Does ODOT wish to include the WPC standards or should the project be bid as shown in the RFP? Answer: See the Project Scope and Appendix DR-10 for requirements for City of Cleveland sewers.
93		ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 5
	6/10/2010	RFP addendum No. 5, dated June 10, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum005/ ; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT's Digital Paper website at: http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do
94		Technical Proposal Appendix
	6/11/2010 11:37 AM	Question: Technical Proposal Appendix. Several key positions for the project are listed in the Selection Criteria sections 4.3, 4.5, and 4.7. Can full resumes for each key position be provided in the appendix to the proposal? Answer: Full resumes can be provided in the Appendix, but the technical proposal sections must include the information required in the Selection Criteria.
95		Technical Proposal – Form C2
	6/11/2010 12:24 PM	Question: Technical Proposal – Form C2. Is it permissible to change the layout of Form C2 to an 11x17 page size to conform with the rest of the technical proposal. Answer: Form C2 should be submitted as an 11"x17" page.
96		ODOT REQUEST - Regulated Materials Investigation Report - PCL 602 (Bojacks-aka Terminal Wahehouse/Cold Storage)
	6/14/2010	The HzW Regulated Materials Investigation Report, Appendix EC-25, dated 6/14/2010, can be found at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID77332/RW/Building_Access/ This report will be added to the contract in a future addendum.
97		ODOT REQUEST - Building Access
	6/17/2010	ODOT is working on setting up building access for DBTs during the week of June 28, 2010. The building regulated material reports for these parcels are anticipated to be published the week of June 21, 2010. Additional information on specific access parcels and dates will be published here as details are finalized.
98		Drivability Analysis for Pipe Piles
	6/15/2010 02:11 PM	Question: Drivability Analysis for Pipe Piles ODOT Bridge Design Manual 2007 202.2.3.2.d states that minimum pipe pile wall thicknesses are specified by a formula in CMS 507 and 202.2.3.2.b However, ODOT BDM 2007 202.2.3.2.b indicates that designers are to perform a Drivability Analysis in accordance with LRFD 10.7.8. May we use this Drivability Analysis to also determine the minimum pipe pile wall thickness and capacity in lieu of using the formula listed in CMS 507.06? Answer: Drivability analysis can be used to determine capacity and the minimum pipe pile wall thickness instead of using the formula listed in CMS 507.06. However, the minimum pipe pile wall thickness shall not be less than 0.25 inch, per CMS 507.06.
99		ODOT REQUEST - Regulated Materials Investigation Report - PCLs 619, 621, 700, 700A
	6/21/2010	The HzW Regulated Materials Investigation Report, Appendix EC-26, dated 6/21/2010, can be found at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID77332/RW/Building_Access/ This report will be added to the contract in a future addendum.
100		ODOT REQUEST - Building Access
	6/21/2010	ODOT is working on finalizing access to the following buildings. PCL 602, 614, 619, 621, 625, 700, and 700A. Access is currently scheduled for 6/29/2010 and/or 6/30/2010. Additional information on specific parcel dates and times will be published here as details are finalized with the building owners.
101		DBT Contact Information
	6/22/2010 05:51 PM	Question: Plan Holders List - Is there a way to get our name on the planholders list so that vendors we may have missed contacting know how to reach us? Answer: Please see question #7. If DBTs provide contact information, this information will be published in this question and answer file.
102		ODOT REQUEST - Building Access

	6/23/2010	Specific information related to DBT access to buildings is published at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID77332/RW/Building_Access/
103		Traffic Signals - Broadway
	6/18/2010 09:34 AM	<p>Question: Traffic Signals Per TC-10, section 4.2 there are a variety of traffic signal improvements on Broadway between 14th Street and 27th Street, however, there is no mention of installing communications between these signals (as there is for W 25th Street, E 22nd Street and others). Please confirm that communications are not required for this corridor (or are already in place).</p> <p>Answer: The signals on Broadway from E.37th Street to McBride Ave are interconnected via hard wire twisted pair. This system shall be maintained and no additional signalized intersections will be added to it. Signal interconnect is not currently provided and is not required on Broadway toward downtown Cleveland, except as defined in the project scope for the E.14th Street/Broadway (realigned) intersection.</p>
104		Truck Signing
	6/18/2010 09:35 AM	<p>Question: Signing2. There are a variety of truck information signs (TRUCKS PROHIBITED and TRUCKS 90 EAST) that have been added since the signing concept was developed (TC-1). Do these signs need to remain at the end of CCG1 in the bi-directional condition, or are they removed once traffic is taken off the old Innerbelt bridge?</p> <p>Answer: The truck restriction signs are to be removed in the bi-direction condition. The restriction is necessary when I90 EB is located on the existing Innerbelt bridge.</p>
105		Signing
	6/18/2010 09:37 AM	<p>Question: Signing3. The addition of more signs, or the replacement of existing signs with larger signs will increase the surface area of sign face on many of the existing sign structures. Should we assume that the structures need to be replaced? For example:a. I-490 EB near Broadway there is a cantilever sign for Exit 2A/Broadway OH14. Can we place the supplemental sign on the existing cantilever and fit to the space available?</p> <p>Answer: The existing sign supports can be reused if the supports remain within current design criteria based on the proposed work.</p>
106		Signing
	6/18/2010 09:38 AM	<p>Question: Signing b. I-90 EB west of 44th Street, TC-1 shows adding a plaque for "Downtown Exits, Carnegie Ave, use". This sign also already has a "Trucks I-90 East" plaque. This sign also needs a "Left Exit XXX" plaque. The downtown/Carnegie plaque is shown using very small text. Beyond the fact that this is probably too much information on one sign, using an appropriate text size would increase this panel substantially increasing it from the current height of around 120" to about 204" not including the exit plaque. This would seem to be an awfully tall panel to not be centered vertically on the truss. Should we assume the truss structure needs to be replaced? What is the minimum text size that can be used for the Downtown/Carnegie plaque? This set of signs may also need to be replaced with up arrow signs. As these signs have quite a bit more surface area should we assume the truss needs to be replaced?</p> <p>Answer: The DBT shall determine the appropriate solution, subject to the requirements of the contract documents.</p>
107		Signing
	6/18/2010 09:40 AM	<p>Question: Signing c. I-490 EB ramp to I-77. This set of signs is mounted on a bridge. The new sign will be wider and taller. The bridge is at an angle, so the bracket for the wider sign will have to extend out further and to keep it perpendicular to the roadway and to allow for a higher sign. Can we assume that that new bracketing can be configured to install the new signs on the bridge, or should these signs be installed on a truss in front of the bridge? Should the arrows be centered over the lanes per new MUTCD requirements?</p> <p>Answer: The DBT shall determine the appropriate solution, subject to the requirements of the contract documents.</p>
108		PN 046 - Subcontract Agreement
	6/18/2010 11:44 AM	<p>Question: PN 046 Modified Subcontract Agreements Proposal Note 046 Modified requires the submission of subcontract agreements with the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) that our DBT proposes to utilize to meet our project goals at the time of contract execution with ODOT. The use of a subcontract agreement at this point in time presents some issues that are unique to a design-build project, namely our design is only partially complete. Specific items of work may change in scope and quantity as our design is completed. The use of a subcontract agreement is appropriate when the scope and quantity of work is well defined, but the use of it in the case of a design build project would require modifications that would allow us to drastically change the scope of the subcontract or potentially cancel it completely depending on our final design. We do not feel that a subcontract agreement is the appropriate document to use in this case. We understand and agree with the need to specifically define our commitment to the project DBE goals at time of contract execution with ODOT. We suggest that the requirement to have a signed subcontract be replaced with a Letter of Subcontract Intent identifying the DBE by name, the scope of work, and the value of the subcontract, along with other identifying information. This Letter of Subcontract Intent would be signed by the DBE Subcontractor and the DBT and presented to the Department at time of Contract execution.</p> <p>Answer: See RFP Addendum #7.</p>
109		Plans in Technical Proposal
	6/18/2010 02:48 PM	<p>Question: In Structures Sections 14.3.10 and 14.4.3, it clearly states that, The technical proposal shall be equivalent to 30% plan development. It also lists minimum items that must be included. In the remaining sections of the Project Scope (roadway, drainage, traffic control, maintenance of traffic, etc.), and the Selection Criteria documentation, no specific submittal requirements are given. Outside of those specified in the structure section, is it at the discretion of the DBT's to determine the necessary plans to be included in the technical proposal?</p> <p>Answer: The DBTs must provide enough detail to demonstrate compliance with the Selection Criteria.</p>
110		Hydraulic Analysis
	6/25/2010 02:07 PM	<p>Question: Need for Hydraulic Analysis THE 404 NATIONWIDE PERMIT, SECTION #3, STATES "Replacement vertical bulkheads are not to be placed more than an average of one foot waterward of the intersection of the ordinary high water level of the waterbody and the existing shoreline." Based on our site observations and due to variations in the existing wall line, we anticipate the new bulkheads may be installed up to 12 inches river-side of the existing shoreline, resulting in a MINOR reduction in the Cuyahoga River channel width. Is a hydraulic analysis required per the BDM?</p> <p>Answer: A hydraulic analysis is not required per the ODOT BDM for the concept shown in ST-03. Other governing regulation and permit requirements may apply and require a Hydraulic Analysis depending on additional permitting, final design and construction by the DBT.</p>
111		PN 046 - Subcontract Agreement

6/25/2010 02:12 PM	Question: PN 046 Modified Subcontract Agreements Proposal Note 046 Modified requires the submission of subcontract agreements with the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) that our DBT proposes to utilize to meet our project goals at the time of contract execution with ODOT. The use of a subcontract agreement at this point in time presents some issues that are unique to a design-build project, namely our design is only partially complete. Specific items of work may change in scope and quantity as our design is completed. The use of a subcontract agreement is appropriate when the scope and quantity of work is well defined, but the use of it in the case of a design build project would require modifications that would allow us to drastically change the scope of the subcontract or potentially cancel it completely depending on our final design. We do not feel that a subcontract agreement is the appropriate document to use in this case. We understand and agree with the need to specifically define our commitment to the project DBE goals at time of contract execution with ODOT. We suggest that the requirement to have a signed subcontract be replaced with a Letter of Subcontract Intent identifying the DBE by name, the scope of work, and the value of the subcontract, along with other identifying information. This Letter of Subcontract Intent would be signed by the DBE Subcontractor and the DBT and presented to the Department at time of Contract execution.
	Answer: See Question 108.
112	ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 6
6/25/2010	RFP addendum No. 6, dated June 25, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum006/ ; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT's Digital Paper website at: http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do
113	Form C2 - Registration Number
7/1/2010 09:44 AM	Question: Please clarify what information should be shown on Form C2 in the column titled "Registration Number". Is it the same information for both contractors and consultants?
	Answer: The "Registration/License Number" column will be deleted in RFP Addendum #8. . This information will no longer be required.
114	CPP Coordination
7/1/2010 05:07 PM	Question: We have contacted Cleveland Public Power to coordinate and evaluate impacts and relocation of their facilities for the CCG1 project. They have informed us that they have met with ODOT and have provided all required information for the impacts to their facilities to ODOT for release to the DBT's. They were not willing to meet with the DBT at this time. We anticipate that this communication to the DBT's would be in an upcoming addendum. Please provide information as to whether this information is accurate and when we might see the communication.
	Answer: A conceptual relocation plan for the CPP facilities in the west slope is included in RFP Addendum #7.
115	Ramp A4 Work
7/2/2010 03:09 PM	Question: Based upon our review of the existing drawings from the original Innerbelt construction, it appears that a large electric vault occupies the space between the existing E. 9th Street on-ramp and mainline I-90. When the proposed Ramp A4 alignment is superimposed on the existing plans, the ramp covers this electric vault. Is it the Departments intent that this vault be relocated/replaced as part of this project?
	Answer: The DBT shall determine the appropriate solution, subject to the requirements of the contract documents.
116	Contract Documents
7/6/2010 04:23 PM	Question: Hello, I need to obtain/order plans for project 103000, can someone please contact me and let me know who I need to contact for this, thanks.
	Answer: Contract documents can be found at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Cuy90RFP/ The Office of Contracts in Columbus can also be contacted at: 614-466-3778.
117	Walsh Design Build Team Subcontractor and Supplier Contact Information
7/7/2010 06:57 AM	Walsh Design Build Team Subcontractor and Supplier Contact Information: Contact: Scott Febus; Email: sfebus@walshgroup.com ; Phone: 724-745-6039; Fax: 724-745-6179
118	PN108 Modified Dispute Review Board Process
7/7/2010 01:27 PM	Question: PN108 Modified Dispute Review Board Process - Basis of Payment indicates "The fixed amount shown in the Proposal is included in the Total Bid Amount. This fixed amount is one hundred percent of the Department's estimate of the total cost of all quarterly meetings plus fifty percent of all costs anticipated with Appeals to the DRB and Advisory Recommendations." Currently the EBS file, through EBS Amendment No. 002, does not provide a predetermined dollar amount for this item. Please clarify.
	Answer: The Department has decided to require a paper bid submission and NOT utilize Expedite (EBS files). A revised Proposal, along with a bid form, will be provided in RFP Addendum #8.
119	Project Scope 5.2.5 Materials Management - EBS File
7/7/2010 01:29 PM	Question: Project Scope 5.2.5 Materials Management indicates ""Items used to implement the DBT's regulated material removal activities for Unknown Abatements shall be paid from the encumbered amount included in the proposal as Regulated Materilas Removal and Disposal. This fixed amount represents the Department's estimate of the total cost of the Unknown Abatement activities for these buildings." Currently the EBS file, through EBS Amendment 002, does not provide a predetermined dollar amount for this item. Please clarify.
	Answer: The Department has decided to require a paper bid submission and NOT utilize Expedite (EBS files). A revised Proposal, along with a bid form, will be provided in RFP Addendum #8.
120	EBS File
7/7/2010 01:30 PM	Question: Page 5 of the current EBS file printout contains a line item for Contract Level Site with a Cost/Day, number of days, and a Total. What is the purpose of this line item and is it required to be completed by the bidding contractors?
	Answer: The Department has decided to require a paper bid submission and NOT utilize Expedite (EBS files). A revised Proposal, which will include a bid form, will be provided in RFP Addendum #8.
121	EBS File Amendments
7/7/2010 01:31 PM	Question: Currently there are two (2) EBS Amendments listed on the O-Dot site while six (6) paper Amendments are listed on the project FTP site. Will there eventually be the same number of EBS Amendments equal to the number of paper Amendments for this project?

		Answer: The Department has decided to require a paper bid submission and NOT utilize Expedite (EBS files). A revised Proposal, along with a bid form, will be provided in RFP Addendum #8.
122		Certificate of Compliance
	7/7/2010 01:35 PM	Question: Certificate of Compliance PN 006PN 006 states that no contract shall be entered into unless the bidder possesses a valid Certificate of Compliance with Affirmative Action Programs issued by the State EEO Coordinator. Will valid certificates from the individual members of a joint venture be acceptable or will a certificate in the name of the joint venture be required? Answer: The Department will accept valid certificates from all individual members of a joint venture.
123		Bid Submission
	7/7/2010 01:38 PM	Question: Since this project will not be bid via Bid Express and is a two part Price Proposal, could the Department provide a packet of all forms/information required under the "Price Proposal - Miscellaneous/Acknowledgements : All other documents listed in this proposal note." Currently it is confusing as to what information is included in part two of the price proposal. For example, is the bid bond to be paper with signatures/seals or electronic? On Proposal Page 13 of Addendum 6 it indicates "Do not complete the Miscellaneous or Bid Bond sections", while further down the page it indicates "Bidders must obtain and verify a Bond ID number from the surety. This Bond ID must be entered in the "Bond ID Number" filed in the Bid Bond Section of the Expedite file." Do the paper Supplemental Questionnaire, Certifications, etc. need signatures, corporate seals, etc? Please clarify. Answer: The Department has decided to require a paper bid submission and NOT utilize Expedite (EBS files). A revised Proposal, along with a bid form, will be provided in RFP Addendum #8. Additionally, the Department will provide a "Bidders Checklist" to assist in bid preparation.
124		Selection Criteria 4.4
	7/7/2010 01:39 PM	Question: Selection Criteria 4.4, 9b Phase drawings Selection Criteria section 4.4, 9b, states that the DBT is to provide phase drawings showing construction by phase and method of maintaining traffic for each phase with the Technical Proposal. Is it acceptable to provide summary drawings in the Technical Proposal and more detailed drawings in the Appendix? Answer: Yes.
125		Shared Use Path
	7/7/2010 01:42 PM	Question: Shared Use Path limits along Ontario St Can ODOT clarify the limits of the shared use path along Ontario St for this contract? LD-01 shows the path but the typical sections do not define the limits. Also appendix AE-02 shows all work south of the existing Innerbelt Bridge being part of CCG2. Answer: Appendix LD-01, sheet 14 of 89, shows the limits in plan view to be constructed as part of this contract.
126		Addenda
	7/7/2010 01:42 PM	Question: As of July 7th, the Addenda tab on ODOT Extranet/Groups/Contracts/Construction-BiddingDocs for Project 103000 lists seven (7) Addenda (Addenda a,b,c,d,e,f,g). This does not correspond to the six (6) addendums listed on the project FTP site. Please clarify which are the correct addendums to be acknowledged with the bid submission and consider making both sites match to help prevent a bid irregularity or protest. Answer: Addendum file "a" is dated 2/19/2010 and was issued during the SOQ process. The contents of addendum "a" were incorporated into the RFP documents issued on 3/23/2010. For the Technical Proposal submission, all RFP addenda must be acknowledged.
127		Storm Sewer Structure Over GCRTA
	7/7/2010 03:24 PM	Question: Storm Sewer Structure over GCRTA Project Scope section 14.2.4 states "Steel rolled beams or steel girder bridges shall have a minimum of four (4) stringer lines." This excerpt appears to apply to vehicular structures only. Please clarify if this requirement pertains to the storm sewer structure over the GCRTA. Answer: A structure only carrying the proposed storm sewer over the GCRTA does not need to have a minimum of four (4) stringer lines.
128		MOT Lighting
	7/7/2010 04:28 PM	Question: Clarification request: Pg PS-229 section 18.3 Maintenance of Traffic Requirements, last sentence "The DBT shall maintain or provide lighting for all travelled lanes and pedestrian routes by use of existing, temporary or new lighting facilities". Is it the departments intent to have the DBT light all walkways and roadways covered by the various scopes at all times during the duration of the project? Answer: The DBT is responsible for the operation of existing lighting circuits on all travelled lanes and pedestrian routes.
129		Section 5.2.5 Materials Management
	7/7/2010 05:13 PM	Question: Section 5.2.5 Materials Management in the Project Scope indicates that known or unknown underground storage tanks encountered within the right-of-way shall be decommissioned and removed. The Project Scope further indicates that this work will be compensated via C&MS 109.05 Force Account; however, the Project Scope is silent on payment for the handling of contaminated soils and/or water in the vicinity of a UST. Is handling/removal/disposal of contaminated materials (soils and/or water) encountered as a result of UST removal activities to be paid via force account. Answer: Yes. Bid per the Project Scope.
130		Oral Interviews
	7/8/2010 05:52 AM	Question: In the Oral Interviews, can teams bring in large format boards and/or electronic equipment in order to display material from their technical proposals to assist with answering questions? Answer: Large format boards can be used as long as they only duplicate information contained in the Technical Proposal. The DBTs can utilize a laptop and projector to display information contained on the DVDs/CDs submitted with Technical Proposal. The DBTs can provide their own equipment, or they can utilize a Department laptop and projector. Reference is made to the Department's answer to prebid question #57.
131		RW-01 Right of Way Acquisition Schedule
	7/8/2010 04:50 PM	Question: RW-01 Right of Way Acquisition Schedule Properties (parcels 614,700,634) are not available until November and December of 2011 and each of them are underlain by compressible soils that will have large embankments on them. Since it is expected that preloading and settlement periods will be necessary, can ODOT acquire these properties any earlier? Also does ODOT have any other property acquisition updates in Appendix RW-01? ODOT is currently in acquisition on these parcels. The parcels will be made available as soon as possible. ODOT will issue an updated RW-01 in RFP Addendum #8 & #9.
132		Intermediate Cross Frame Spacing

	7/8/2010 04:55 PM	Question: Intermediate Cross Frame Spacing The ODOT Bridge Design Manual 302.4.3.5 INTERMEDIATE CROSS FRAMES states "For additional intermediate cross frame information, refer to Section 302.4.2.3" 302.4.2.3 is written in the context of rolled sections and limits maximum cross frame spacing to 25' in positive moment regions and 15' in negative moment regions. While the AASHTO 17th ed. limited spacing to 25 ft max, LRFD allows designers to apply design principles to establish the maximum spacing in lieu of the nominal limit for tangent alignments and up to 30' spacing for curved alignments. Following LRFD procedure to design a larger cross spacing is often beneficial in terms of fatigue behavior of the structure, as stated in C6.7.4.1 of LRFD. May the designers use LRFD criteria to design/determine the maximum spacing of cross frames in lieu of the nominal limits stated in BDM 302.4.2.3? Answer: No. Follow the Bridge Design Manual requirements.
133		Bridge 13 – 9th Street over GCRTA
	7/8/2010 05:06 PM	Question: Bridge 13 – 9th Street over GCRTA Scope section 14.2.4 states "All new structural steel shall be painted with the Department's IZEU coating system, per C&MS 514." Is it possible to use uncoated weathering steel for Bridge 13 and the storm sewer bridge over the GCRTA? The BDM 302.4.2.5.a recognizes the reduction in initial cost and maintenance cost if the steel is not painted. Use of uncoated weathering steel over electrified transit tracks would seem to be appropriate. Answer: Bid per the contract documents.
134		Trumbull-Great Lakes-Ruhlin Design Build Team Subcontractor and Supplier Contact Information
	7/8/2010 05:51 PM	Trumbull-Great Lakes-Ruhlin Design Build Team Subcontractor and Supplier Contact Information Trumbull-Great Lakes-Ruhlin Design Build Team Subcontractor and Supplier Contact Information: Contact:Jeff Slezak; Email: TrumbullEst@trumbullcorp.com; Phone: 412-807-2156; Fax: 412-807-2011
135		Bid Submission
	7/9/2010 07:51 AM	Question: Will the Department entertain an alternate main structure with an alternate price and proposal? We feel that this will add to the value generated by the stipends paid by the Department by providing the Department with two possible signature bridge choices for each team or six alternatives and six different price alternatives for the signature bridge. Answer: Bid per the contract documents.
136		Broadway Mills Wall
	7/9/2010 07:53 AM	Question: According to Drawing L2.4 in Appendix AE the bottom of wall elevations (BW) for the Broadway Mills Wall vary from 663.0 to 634.0. At the location where the bottom of wall elevation is shown as 634.0 the proposed grading plan shows the final grading to be approximately elevation 647. Does the bottom of wall elevation at that location needs to be revised to read 647 instead of 634? Answer: The final elevations are responsibility of the DBT. The elevations will be removed in RFP Addendum #8.
137		ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 7
	7/13/2010	RFP addendum No. 7, dated July 13, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum007/ ; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT's Digital Paper website at: http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do
138		I-90 Viaduct Bridge Renderings
	7/12/2010 02:19 PM	Question: I-90 Viaduct Bridge Renderings - CD Labels Selection Criteria section 4.15 requires two CD's of three 11x17 images of the proposed I-90 Viaduct Bridge renderings. This section goes on further to state that these renderings shall not include DBT firm identification or text. Do you want the label on these CD's to include the identification information required by the Proposal or should the label be blank with only the envelope these are submitted in containing the identification information required by the Proposal? Answer: The CD/DVD shall be labeled with the DBT name. As stated in the Selection Criteria, the rendering images must NOT include DBT firm identification or text.
139		EBS File
	7/13/2010 11:49 AM	Question: 7/13/10 11:45 AM The EBS file and two amendment files have vanished from the ODOT website and it currently indicates "No Documents found". Are we to ignore the previously posted EBS files for the project? When will the new files and amendments be posted so we can set-up our estimate accordingly? Answer: The Department has decided to require a paper bid submission and NOT utilize Expedite (EBS files). A revised Proposal, along with a bid form, will be provided in RFP Addendum #8.
140		ODOT Request - Parcel 601 - Scranton Averell
	7/14/2010	ODOT has revised the right of way acquisition for this parcel from a partial acquisition to a full acquisition. As such, the Department is in the process of compiling an addendum to modify the contract documents to reflect this change. Items anticipated to be included in the addendum are: removal of proposed parking on both sides of Abbey, west of the W14th extension(north and south Abbey parking lots); removal of the proposed north parking lot retaining wall; revised grading plan for the west slope; demolition of the existing Parcel 601 building; removal of on-street parking on Abbey; additional sewer removal work along West 15th. The Department anticipates providing DBT access to the building later this month. As the Department will not have a regulated materials report for this structure prior to bid, this structure will be considered an "Unknown Abatement" per Section 5.2.5 of the Project Scope.
141		Section 2.6.4.12 Bridge As-Constructed Submittal
	7/13/2010 10:21 PM	Question: Section 2.6.4.12 Bridge As-Constructed Submittal requires "as-built" design plans prior to opening of traffic. Is it the Department's intent to have "as-built" drawings submitted for only the segments that have been completed at that time? Answer: Yes.
142		Oral Interviews-Subject Matter Experts
	7/14/2010 01:02 PM	Question: Reference SC-24 of SC-35 Section 5.2 Attendees. How many subject matter experts are anticipated to attend the oral interview? Answer: The Department anticipates 20+ attendees attending the oral interviews.
143		Lane/Brayman Design Build Team Subcontractor and Supplier Contact Information
	7/14/2010 02:15 PM	Lane/Brayman Design Build Team Subcontractor and Supplier Contact Information - Lane Brayman Design Build Team Subcontractor and Supplier Information:Contact: Ashley Luke; Email: AELuke@laneconstruct.com; Phone: 203-235-3351; Fax: 203-439-2989
144		Underdrains
	7/15/2010 05:13 AM	Question: The prescribed pavement designs provided in the project scope of services do not show any underdrains. Are they required?

		Answer: Underdrains are required per the contract documents.
145		Section 2.6.2.1 Document Control
7/15/2010 06:33 AM	Question: Section 2.6.2.1 Document Control of the Project Scope requires a very specific database. In particular item F states "Be compatible with ODOT software and useable to ODOT after the Project completion."Is it ODOT's intent that this database will need to be a specialized application developed specifically for this project?Who will own rights to the developed database application after the project is complete? ODOT only or ODOT and the DBT/IQF?	Answer: a) The DBT will be responsible for determining and utilizing a database that meets the contract requirements. b) The database applications would be required to be provided to the Department in order for the database files to be useable after the project completion.
146		Lighting
7/15/2010 07:21 AM	Question: 1. Construction of the new WB I-90 lighting will impact the existing bridge lighting circuit, will the DBT be responsible to restore the circuit? 2. According to the existing plans, the existing lights (to remain) are wired per old ODOT standards. Since the existing circuits will be impacted during construction can they be restored to meet the original standards or does the DBT need to install new circuits to meet the current standards. 3. Scope Section 17.6.2.1 states that luminaires shall be 400 watt high pressure sodium; however, Appendix TC-12 notes that the fixture type needs to be selected in accordance with the roadway class. Does the DBT need to provide 400W lights on all pedestrian, street, and parking lot lights, per the project scope, or should the DBT comply with the CCP standard to use 250W fixtures on collector and local streets? 4.Scope Section 17.6.2.1 lists the underpasses that require underpass lighting; however, some of the new pedestrian paths go underneath WB I-90 (at least in 3 locations). Does the DBT need to provide underpass lighting at those locations. 5. Is the DBT responsible for removing the existing (wood pole mounted) lights on Abbey Ave?	Answer: (1) DBT is responsible for restoring any existing lighting circuit that is disturbed by the construction.; (2) DBT will be required to replace existing lighting that is disturbed in kind; (3) TC-12 provides criteria for CPP street lighting. Local street lighting shall be per CPP standards; (4) Per the scope all new and reconstructed pedestrian facilities shall be illuminated; (5) Per the scope the DBT is responsible for removing all equipment no longer in service.
147		Expedite EBS File
7/15/2010 09:05 AM	Question: Location of Expedite EBS File - PN 019 of the Proposal requires us to submit a copy of the Expedite EBS file and a printout of that file as part of our Price Proposal requirements. Where can we find a copy of the file? The file has been removed from Bid Express and we cannot file a copy of it in the usual place on your website (Contracts page\Bidding Documents).	Answer: The Department has decided to require a paper bid submission and NOT utilize Expedite (EBS files). A revised Proposal, along with a bid form, will be provided in RFP Addendum #8.
148		CPP Relocation
7/15/2010 09:33 AM	Question: In section 6.8.3. of the scope documents it states "The new duct bank shall consist of nine (9) 5" PVC ducts arranged in a 3 x 3 x array. New feeder lines of the same type and capacity shall be installed in the duct per CPP direction". What type and size of wire are we to use for the three 11-kv feeders and the three 2.4-kv feeders?	Answer: This question will be addressed in RFP Addendum #9.
149		Segmental Concrete Curing Time - 1
7/15/2010 09:34 AM	Question: Segmental Concrete Curing Time Section .12 Curing and Loading of the Specifications for QA/QC Concrete for Structures (page 13 of 110) specifies that the contractor is not to shorten the minimum required Method A (7 day wet cure) curing time regardless of strength results. Section Curing, Finishing and Repair of the Specifications for Cast-In-Place Segmental Concrete Bridge Structures on page 46 of 110 states "The top surface of the slab of the segments shall be cured for a minimum of four (4) days." The specification continues to describe curing mats or blankets which would indicate a wet cure application for the four (4) day period. Please clarify the number of days of wet cure required for the top slab of the Cast-In-Place segments.	Answer: This question will be addressed in RFP Addendum #9.
150		Segmental Concrete Curing Time - 2
7/15/2010 09:35 AM	Question: Segmental Concrete Curing Time Section Curing, Finishing and Repair of the Specifications for Cast-In-Place Segmental Concrete Bridge Structures on Page 46 of 110 states "Do not use membrane curing for the segmental concrete bridge unit." Please clarify what type of cure method and duration is required for the webs and bottom slab of the Cast-In-Place segments. Will they also require a wet cure for four (4) or seven (7) days?	Answer: This question will be addressed in RFP Addendum #9.
151		East 9th Street Waterline Relocation
7/15/2010 09:46 AM	Question: The CWD - East 9th Street Waterline Relocation as shown in the conceptual plan in Appendix UT-12 is in an area of known contaminated soils. Will ODOT/CWD require this relocated waterline to be placed in a casing pipe due to the presence of contaminated soils?	Answer: This question will be addressed in RFP Addendum #9.
152		Utility Relocation Costs
7/15/2010 10:53 AM	Question: The following utility issues have come up as a result of the changes provided in Addendum No. 7:Per scope section 6.1-A) Any relocation of public utilities shall be included in the DBT's bid and schedule. 6.1-C) The DBT is responsible for all coordination and schedule risk for relocation of private/investor owned utility facilities, except as described in section 6.4.2 – Deadlines and Delays. • Appendix UT-14 – Memorandum of Understanding with Utilities, only references UT-8 and UT-9. (1) Should the Memorandum also include UT-7, UT-10, and UT-13? • Appendix UT-14 - Memorandum of Understanding with Utilities, has a section specifically dedicated to Dominion East Ohio. Per Section 2a. The DBT will be responsible for all reasonable and verifiable costs associated with adjustment of DEO's FACILITIES on account of the PROJECT, including but not limited to, the cost to design the adjustments and the cost of construction to perform the adjustments. (2) Please clarify if it is the Departments intent for the DBT to include the costs for DEO's relocations in their bid, since DEO is a private utility. • Appendix UT-14 - Memorandum of Understanding with Utilities, has a section for Utility Owner Compensable relocations. Per section B. the DBT will be responsible for all reasonable costs associated with adjustment of its Utilities on account of the PROJECT, including but not limited to, the cost to design the adjustments and the cost of construction to perform the adjustments. (3) Please clarify if it is the Departments intent for the DBT to include the costs for adjustments to the private utilities.	

		Answer: (1) The coordination with utilities includes all potential utility conflicts not only those listed in UT-8 and UT-9; (2) No. Bid per Scope Section 6; (3) No. Bid per the contract requirements in Scope Section 6.
153		DBE Affidavit
	7/15/2010 02:47 PM	Question: PN 013 DBE Affidavit Proposal section PN 013, Modified – Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Requirements, states that the “DBT shall submit an affidavit of its commitment to comply with the DBE participation goals for this project with its proposal.” May we include this affidavit with the Price Proposal part “Price Proposal – Acknowledgements/Miscellaneous” as detailed in PN 019? Answer: Yes submit the DBE Affidavit with the Price Proposal-Acknowledgements/Miscellaneous documents.
154		Existing Viaduct Structure
	7/15/2010 04:10 PM	Question: Noting that there is work currently being performed on the existing viaduct structure; 1. Will the DBT be required to maintain the existing viaduct? 2. If so, when would this maintenance requirement begin and please define anticipated maintenance operations. Answer: The DBT is not required to maintain the existing viaduct structure.
155		Proposed Geotech Instrumentation
	7/15/2010 04:15 PM	Question: Reference GE-01, West Bank Grading Plans, Sheet 33 of 34 containing the Proposed Instrumentation Table, specifically Notes A, B & C. 1. What is the anticipated duration of installation for each proposed instrumentation upon receipt of notification? 2. What are the minimum access requirements for the entity performing the installation? Answer: (1) 3-5 days at each of the 9 locations for installation. (2) Based on use of a rubber tired ATV vehicle, access requirements include a graded dirt road no steeper than 4:1 to each of the 9 locations. A dozer should be available to assist in case of getting stuck. A steeper access grade is possible with the help of a dozer. At each location, a level work area approximately 10' x 30' must be available.
156		ODOT REQUEST - Price Proposal-Acknowledgement/Miscellaneous
	7/19/2010	In the "Price Proposal-Acknowledgement/Miscellaneous", the supplemental questionnaire asks for the dollar value of the contractor's outstanding work. This value is to be based on the sum of the individual contractor's outstanding work. It is not to be the outstanding work of the Joint Venture entity.
157		ODOT REQUEST - Building Access - Parcel 601
	7/19/2010	ODOT has scheduled building access to Parcel 601 for Wednesday, July 28, 2010 at 4 pm. DBTs will be expected to include the cost of building demolition in their bid. As stated in scope section 5, the regulated material abatement will be considered an Unknown Abatement.
158		ODOT Request - DBE Outreach Conference
	7/19/2010	ODOT is hosting a DBE Outreach conference on Tuesday, July 27, 2010 from 3-6 pm in the Rotunda at Cleveland City Hall. A press release can be found at: http://www.dot.state.oh.us/districts/D12/Deputy%20Director/News/Pages/Cleveland%E2%80%99sNewI-90InnerbeltBridgeODOTMakesHistoryWithEstimated\$675MillioninSubcontractingOpportunitiesforNortheastOhioDisad.aspx
159		Bi-Directional Plan
	7/20/2010 12:35 PM	Question: We have discovered what we believe is a conflict between the department’s intent and plans and scope of the project. The plan sheet within LD-01 “Bi-Directional Central Interchange Plan – Temporary Connection” contains information that appears to conflict with LD-06, Functional Plan for Bi-directional condition. Section 12.3 goes into great detail to explain Geometric configurations, LD-06 provides an overview bringing all requirements of the bi-direction configuration together, while the plan sheet in LD-01 goes as far to state that closing E. 9th Street is an option. Understanding that an addendum is forthcoming, could the plan sheet in LD-01 be removed or simply labeled for information only? We believe his would eliminate any conflict and support the Departments intent. Answer: This question will be addressed in RFP Addendum #9.
160		Subcontractor Prequalification
	7/20/2010 05:06 PM	Question: Reference Section 4.11 Prequalification of the Selection Criteria It is our interpretation that the Department is seeking "named" subcontractors for Work Type Codes. To include this information within the Technical Proposal would require selecting subcontractors prior to receiving subcontractor quotations and completing the project estimate. Can terminology such as "Subcontractors prequalified for this type of work will be utilized"? Answer: The DBT is responsible for identifying and prequalifying all subcontractors, prior to the start of work, they wish to use. Bid according to the documents.
161		ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 8
	7/22/2010	RFP addendum No. 8, dated July 22, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum008/ ; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT’s Digital Paper website at: http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do
162		TC-10
	7/23/2010 01:56 PM	Question: Addendum 8 states, "Note that TC-10 has additional signal requirements for the Bi-Directional Condition;" however, there is no change to TC-10 included with Addendum 008. Is this an oversight, or is this simply a reference to the changes made in Addendum 006? Answer: There was no change to TC-10 as a result of Addendum 8. This note was added simply as a cross reference to the signal work contained in appendix TC-10
163		Regulated Material
	7/23/2010 02:01 PM	Question: Please confirm that ODOT will be considered the generator for all hazardous waste encountered on the project and will provide/sign all required manifests accordingly. Answer: Yes.
164		PN 013 Affidavit-1
	7/26/2010 09:46 AM	Question: PN 013 Affidavit - Could the Department please make available a paper copy of the DBE Commitment Affidavit that was added in Addendum 7 and is required with the Price Proposal submission? Answer: There is no ODOT standard form. The DBT shall supply an affidavit as required.
165		PN 013 Affidavit-1
	7/26/2010 09:57 AM	Question: PN 013 DBE Commitment Affidavit - Considering this is Design/Build Project based upon 30% documents, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to define individual DBE's along with committed dollar amounts at the time of bid for areas of work that will take months, if not longer, to design and determine actual quantities. Would the department please consider revising the DBE Commitment Affidavit, which is currently submitted with the Price Proposal, to merely acknowledging a total committed DBE dollar amount with a detailed DBE Subcontracting plan submitted at a later date?

Answer: The DBE Commitment affidavit covers the DBE goal for the duration of the project. The level of detail required to be shown on the DBE Commitment Affidavit needs to match the level of detail known at the time of the Price Proposal submission. It is expected that a DBE Subcontracting plan be submitted at the time of contract execution and that also, will match the level of detail known at that time.

166

Paper Bid Bond Form

7/26/2010 10:05 AM

Question: Does the Department have its own standard bid bond form for paper bids? If so, please provide a paper copy as we are unable to locate one in the Proposal or on the ODOT website.

Answer: The form is located at: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Pages/Prequalification.aspx> Forms-> Bid Bond

167

Addendum No. 9

7/26/2010 10:35 AM

Question: Is there an Addendum No. 9 anticipated? If so, when should we expect it?

Answer: The Department does anticipate issuing RFP Addendum No. 9 in the next few days.

168

ODOT REQUEST - Bidder Checklist

7/27/2010

A "Bidders Checklist" has been posted to the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID85531/Bidder_Checklist/

169

ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 9

7/27/2010

RFP addendum No. 9, dated July 27, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum009/>; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT's Digital Paper website at: <http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do>

170

PN 013 Affidavit-3

7/27/2010 02:33 PM

Question: PN 013 DBE Requirements states " The affidavit shall identify the firms to be utilized, the scope of work, services, or supplies to be provided, the value, the estimated start and completion dates." This information is currently required to be submitted with the bid. Based upon the response to Question 165, what is the difference in the information required in the DBE Commitment Affidavit submitted at bid time versus the DBE Subcontracting Plan that is submitted at the time of contract execution? Please reconsider modifying PN013 so the DBE participation goal can be acknowledged at bid time, possibly with potential areas of DBE participation and potential subcontractors/suppliers, but allowing additional time to identify the named firms and exact dollar values in a DBE Subcontracting Plan.

Answer: The DBT is to determine the level of information provided as part of the technical proposal. The information provided will be used in the evaluation process. The DBE Subcontracting plan submitted after contract execution will be expected to include specific details. See revisions to PN013 in RFP Addendum #10.

171

MOT

7/28/2010 12:47 AM

Question: Based on the Addendum 8 revisions to Table 18.3, "All work on Ontario Street to be completed during Ontario/Carnegie ramp to I-90 westbound/I-71 southbound (existing ramp E-1, proposed ramp A-5) closure" and "All work on Carnegie Avenue to be completed during Ontario/Carnegie ramp to I-90 westbound/I-71 southbound (existing ramp E-1, proposed ramp A-5) closure", is ODOT requiring the DBT to close the Ontario ramp to be able to complete any work on Ontario and Carnegie?

Answer: ODOT is requiring the work on Ontario Street and Carnegie Avenue to be completed according to the Table 18.3 Allowable Closures. However, if the DBT elects to utilize allowable 240 day closure window on the existing Ramp E-1/ proposed A-5 Allowable closure identified in Table 18-2, this local street work is to be completed concurrently.

172

Selection Criteria Section 4.11 (Part J)

7/28/2010 12:51 AM

Question: Is ODOT requiring the DBT's to name specific subcontractors within the technical proposal Part J?

Answer: The DBT is not required to identify their specific subcontractors at the time of Technical Proposal to the Department. However, if the DBT feels this subcontractor identification may enhance their Technical Proposal evaluation, they may choose to include them. The subcontractors are required to be an approved ODOT C-92 Subcontractor prior to the start of the subcontractor's individual item of work.

173

Escrow Bid Documents

7/28/2010 09:21 AM

Question: Reference PN 110 - Escrow Bid Documents, 8. Final Disposition Upon award of the contract, it would seem there would be no use for the unsuccessful teams Escrow Documents and it is requested that language be added to describe the return of the unopened escrow documents to the unsuccessful teams upon award.

Answer: Please bid as stated. The Department will release the escrowed bid documents to the non-awarded bidders no earlier than 10 days after execution of the awarded contract.

174

PN 013 Affidavit-4

7/28/2010 09:35 AM

Question: If the Department still intends to have the PN 013 DBE Commitment Affidavit (naming subs/suppliers and committed dollar values) submitted at bid time, please consider requiring the Affidavit to be included with the "Price Proposal - Bid" instead of with the "Price Proposal - Acknowledgements/Miscellaneous". This would help maintain the confidentiality of the DBT's bid prices until the September 9th opening. If left as is, the Department could easily determine each DBT's Bid Price on August 5th before the technical review even begins. For example, if DBT A submits \$100,000,000 of committed DBE suppliers/subs with a 20% DBE Commitment Amount and DBT B submits \$80,000,000 of committed suppliers/subs with a 15% DBE Commitment Amount, and DBT C submits \$90,000,000 of committed suppliers/subs with an 18% DBE Commitment Amount, the Department would then easily be able to compute each Contractor's Bid Price on August 5th.

Answer: The DBT is not to include specific contract values with the Price Proposal - Acknowledgements/Miscellaneous. Percentages of work can be provided. See revisions to PN013 in RFP Addendum #9.

175

ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 10 - Pending

7/29/2010

The Department is processing RFP addendum no. 10. It is anticipated to be published on 7/30/2010. This addendum will include changes to: Scope Section 1.17 Governing Regulations (add current document dates to several items); Proposal - Updated PN013; Appendix RW-01 - Updated to include parcel clear "yes/no" column; Appendix UT-03 - Added NEORSR WRIR Addendum No. 3 information, which modified sewer work to be completed by NEORSR due to full acquisition of PCL 601;

176

Welded Shear Connectors

7/29/2010 01:09 PM

Question: ODOT Bridge Design Manual, 2007, Section 400 states that "Welded stud shear connectors shall be installed full length on all steel beam or girder bridges in which the deck is being removed and replaced. The stud spacing shall be designed in accordance with AASHTO Section 10.38.5." This is an exceptional and costly requirement especially for structures that are intended to be removed in the near future. Can you clarify whether this provision is applicable to all of this project's deck replacements?

Answer: Bid as stated.

177	ODOT REQUEST - Addendum No. 10
7/30/2010	RFP addendum No. 10, dated July 30, 2010, is posted at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Cuy90RFP/Addendum010/ ; the official addendum letter is posted to ODOT's Digital Paper website at: http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do
178	Jacketed Wire
8/2/2010 11:31 AM	Question: We are looking at bidding on some of the electrical for this project and would like clarification on whether our product can be specified. All of our products are jacketed. Answer: More information is needed to answer this question. Please provide a specific reference to the applicable Scope or Specification section.
179	Oral Interview Schedule - August 27, 2010
8/7/2010 06:17 AM	Question: Please provide the schedule for Q&A on August 27 so that we can make travel arrangements for that date. Answer: An email was sent to each DBT lead on 8-10-2010 with interview time.
180	Escrow Bid Documents
8/9/2010 09:34 AM	Question: We would like to deliver our escrow bid documents to the Department before the end of the week. We have a few questions. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should we print out the Escrow Agreement from the Proposal (Amendment 10) or will the Department provide us a clean copy for execution? Who needs to sign and witness the Escrow Agreement for the DBT, officers of the JV or can other designated individuals from the JV provide the signature and witness signature? Does the sealed container of escrow documents need to be delivered in person or can it be sent by overnight delivery service?
	Answer: 1. Please print; 2. JV Officers must sign. Anyone age 18 or older and of capacity may witness; 3. Use of an overnight delivery service is acceptable.
181	Oral Interviews
8/11/2010 12:27 PM	Question: Will the oral interview be held in the same room as the pre-ATC meetings? For our use in preparation of visual aids (all material will be from the Technical Proposal), could a layout of the room be provided? Answer: ODOT will utilize the same room (District 12 Upper Level Training Center) as the pre-ATC meetings. The room size is 28'+/- x 39' +/- . The layout will be similar to the pre-ATC meetings, with 1 large main table aligned with a projector screen. Additional seating will be provided adjacent to the main table, as available in the room. (Reference is made to previous prebid questions on this topic: 57-130-142)
182	Oral Interviews
8/11/2010 03:21 PM	Question: We have several questions regarding some technical issues with the Oral Interview that will help us prepare to answer your questions. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Department stated in the answer to PreBid Question #130 that the DBT may utilize a laptop and projector to display information contained in the Technical Proposal. We would prefer to bring our own laptop and projector to make sure everything is compatible, but if the Department is going to share the information being displayed with remote sites electronically it would be better to use the Departments equipment. Will the department be sharing this meeting electronically with other sites? Will the department provide us the meeting room dimensions and seating layout so that we may size our large format boards appropriately to the room and the audience. May we bring up to three additional non speaking attendees to view and listen only to the Oral Interview above our allocated ten individuals designated to answer questions?
	Answer: 1. At this time, ODOT expects all participants to be present in District 12. 2. ODOT will utilize the same room (District 12 Upper Level Training Center) as the pre-ATC meetings. The room size is 28'+/- x 39' +/- . The layout will be similar to the pre-ATC meetings, with 1 large main table aligned with a projector screen. Additional seating will be provided adjacent to the main table, as available in the room. 3. No. The DBTs are limited to 10 attendees, as described in Section 5.2 of the Selection Criteria. (Reference is made to previous prebid questions on this topic: 57-130-142)
183	Technical Score Announcement/Price Proposal Opening
8/17/2010 05:56 AM	Question: Can ODOT provide the time and location for where ODOT will announce the technical scores and open the price proposals on September 9, 2010? Answer: Thursday, September 9, 2010, 3 pm in ODOT's Central Office Auditorium.
184	Oral Interviews
8/17/2010 05:54 AM	Question: Oral Interview Questions 1. Will the DBT be allowed time either the day before the oral interview or time prior to each teams assigned interview time slot to allow the DBT to bring presentation materials into the room and set them up? If the DBT is only allowed time to set up before the assigned interview start time how much time will the DBT be allowed? 2. Can the DBT utilize individuals who are not part of the 10 people in the interview to assist in setup of the presentation materials in the room prior to the start of the interview? Answer: (1) Each DBT will be provided 30 minutes of set-up time prior to the Oral Interview and 15 minutes of break-down time after it is complete; (2) Yes;
185	Oral interviews
8/16/2010 04:14 PM	Question: Will a period of time be permitted to set up any supportive materials prior to the commencement of the Q&A session? Answer: Each DBT will be provided 30 minutes of set-up time prior to the Oral Interview and 15 minutes of break-down time after it is complete;
186	Oral interviews
8/25/2010 07:58 AM	Question: Will ODOT please provide a written list of all questions to be asked of each respective team at the beginning of the interview or sooner? If the questions will be handed out at the beginning of the interview, please provide 10 copies. Answer: Yes, a written copy of the questions will be provided to each DBT member at the beginning of the interview.