

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170468

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

CUY-13567 - IR 77-14.35 CCG6A

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 1:19:06 PM

The LEO note on sheet 39 states that a LEO shall be provided during the complete blockage of traffic. With the 15 interchange ramp closures and 3 weekend closures per phase, the 336 HRS for bid item #202 LEO WITH PATROL CAR seems understated. Will the department increase the hours to more closely reflect the LEO hours that will be needed to perform all closures?

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 7:53:02 AM

On page 94 the general summary lists Item 622 – Barrier Transition, APP No. 1 (2 ea) and Item 622 – Barrier Transition, APP No. 2 (2 ea). However, under line 0028, the proposal lists Item 622 – Barrier Transition, APP (4 ea). Please verify that the item for 4 transitions setup in the proposal is to include 2 each of the no. 1's and 2 each of the no. 2's.

The EBS file in the Proposal combined the No. 1 and No. 2, Barrier Transition, As Per Plan quantities. There are two (2) Item 622 - Barrier Transition, As Per Plan No. 1 and two (2) Item 622 - Barrier Transition, As Per Plan No. 2 required for the project. Line 0028 will be deleted and two separate lines will be added.

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 7:25:59 AM

Provide clarification on bolt holes and use of galvanizing or metalizing

The notes on sheet 292 will be revised in Addendum # 2Galvanizing smaller members [Splice plates & X-Frames] will be allowed but oversized holes will not be allowed. It is the fabricators responsibility to ensure there is no excessive build-up of galvanizing in the holes and this must be verified by placing a standard size bolt through all holes If metalized those areas on the inside of holes which are not coated by normal metallizing process may be coated with any paint meeting ASTM A780It is the fabricators responsibility to ensure there is no excessive build-up of metalizing in the holes and this must be verified by placing a standard size bolt through all holes. Oversized holes will not be allowed. In either case the cost of verifying the final size of bolt holes is considered incidental to the item 530

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 5:21:33 PM

What is the existing pavement buildup for East 30th Street? This is needed to estimate the amount of material going in to the full depth rigid repairs.

There is an existing typical section for E 30th St. on sheet 84.

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 9:52:21 AM

The question submitted on 7/26/17 1:26:14 PM was answered in the last sentence that "one additional weekend closure will be added to the Table on Sheet 38/365 in an addendum." Addendum #1 only added one additional weekend to close down I-77 SB, was this the intent or was an additional weekend to be added for I-490 & I-490 & I-77 Ramps along with I-77 SB?

The intent was to provide the 1 additional closure to IR 77 and have 3 weekend closures for the entire interchange

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 9:40:00 AM

On Pg. 99 of 365, there is a chart for Informational purposes that is used to calculate the paid quantity of Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type C1. There is a discrepancy between the number of End Anchorages in the Informational Purposes chart and the actual number. This discrepancy changes the total paid footage of Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type C1. Please Review & revise.

The quantity of "Concrete Barrier, End Anchorage" shown in the "FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY" column was incorrect. The correct quantity was shown under the pay item 622 - Concrete Barrier, End Anchorage, Reinforced, Type C1. This will be corrected and revised sheets (94 and 99) with revised quantities for Item 622 - Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type C1 will be provided in Addendum 2.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/15/2017 9:27:04 AM

The plans currently have phase 2 weekend closures limited to the southbound direction only, is this correct? Can this be revised to include the northbound direction as well for the weekend closures? Allowing only the southbound closure of I-77 will make the crane reach from the southbound side to the northbound side extremely large in Phase 2 when the new structure is built.

The plans have a southbound and a northbound ALTERNATE route for IR 77 traffic with notes that provide for the closure of IR 77. There are local IR 77 DETOURS for both northbound and southbound. We will revise sheets 35 and 38 to allow for the closures of northbound or southbound IR 77 during Phase 2 and include the revisions in Addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 8/15/2017 9:25:29 AM

The plans have detailed out the detour routes for each individual ramp closure without the closure of I-490. The plans have also stated that the I-77 & I-490 ramps can be closed 10 nights in Phase 1 and 15 nights in Phase 2 and shall coincide with the overnight closures I-490. If just a single or double ramp closure is required without the need to close I-490 or I-77, can these ramps be closed down more than the 10 and 15 nights mentioned above as long as other criteria such as the special events restrictions are adhered too? The sentence above with the work coincide implies these ramps can only be closed with the closures on I-490. Closing these ramps on an individual basis will allow for activities to be performed outside of the need to close down I-490 and I-77. These work items for example could include the following: Demo Falsework install and removal, deck saw cutting, deck slab removal, steel removal, pier demolition, structural steel erection, structural steel detailing, pan decking, overhang jack install & removal, deck pours, concrete sealing, painting, etc.

No additional ramp closures will be provided.

Question Submitted: 8/15/2017 8:45:17 AM

In response to the Galvanize/Metallize question submitted on 8/9/17, it stated that "the structure was not designed to use oversized holes". How are we to handle the build up in holes from the Metallizing process, if the holes are not oversized?

See BDM 302.4.1.5.b Alternative Coating Systems – Next to last paragraph – “Metalized coating systems should have field bolted connections rather than field welded connections, but oversized holes are not required.”

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 5:08:06 PM

Addendum 1 revised the Lane Restriction / Closure Charts on sheets 37 and 38 but did not revise the notes on sheets 35 and 36. As a result, there is a discrepancy between the notes on sheets 35 and 36 and the charts on sheets 37 and 38. Please update the notes on sheets 35 and 36 to correspond with the information displayed in the revised charts on sheets 37 and 38.

Sheets 35 and 36 will be revised and included in Addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 8/11/2017 11:25:05 AM

Similar to the current ramp W-S closure for CCG6B, can the ramps be closed for a longer period than overnight? This would be beneficial for the structural steel demolition and erection. A week or so closure at a time would eliminate setting up and tearing down the crane daily.

Additional longer term Ramp closers will not be allowed. Bid as is

Question Submitted: 8/11/2017 10:36:28 AM

Please review Reference #93 and clarify which liquid type is to be used. There are conflicting notes between the Proposal (listing PG76-22) and page #20 (listing PG70-22)

The PG grade should be PG70-22, as per the note on sheet 20 and in the sub summary sheet 33. The General Summary will be corrected in a future Addendum

Question Submitted: 8/10/2017 11:09:04 AM

Closures on 77 and 490 seem to be somewhat addressed. Can individual ramps be closed for extended durations? 5-7 days for demolition and or steel erection? Due to large cranes that can take a minimum 4-8 hours to get hook ready. 10-12 hour work nights are not realistic.

MOT plan notes on sheet 36, 3. IR77 and IR 490 Ramps under IR 77. Listed are specific allowable closures. Additional longer term Ramp closers will not be permitted Bid as is

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/9/2017 2:11:39 PM

The plans indicate to metallize all the steel for the CUY-77-1433 L&R bridges. For a more cost effective option, is it acceptable to galvanize the cross frames and/or splice plates?

It is not acceptable to galvanize the crossframes or splice plates. Galvanized members require oversize holes. The structure was not designed to use oversize holes.

Question Submitted: 8/4/2017 1:33:18 PM

Has an analysis been performed to confirm girder stability prior to the installation of the counterweights? Will the girders need to be tied down at the abutments? Is there any sequencing requirements for counterweight installation?

The contractor is responsible for girder stability during erection. The steel girders will be stable when the entire unit is erected with all crossframes in place. Plan notes regarding tiedowns and concrete placing sequence are located on plan sheets 343, 348, 349, and 350.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 4:40:55 PM

On sheet 89, the plans call for lane arrows and stop lines to be tape. On sheet 33, the subsummary quantities these lane arrows and stop lines as paint. Please clarify if these pavement markings are to be paint, or if reference items for tape will be established.

Revised plan sheets 85 and 89 will be provided in an Addendum for clarification.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 4:39:35 PM

As a follow-up to the question submitted on 7/31/2017 at 2:07:25 PM, 10 total closure nights for the construction in each phase is not sufficient. Closures will be required for multiple work operations with work durations exceeding normal durations due to the configuration of the interchange. In addition, it is not safe or practical to be performing some of these operations on both bridges at the same time. Please increase the number of allowable closures in each phase to 20 each.

The number of closures included in the plan table are based on ODOT's evaluation of construction methods and crane placements that minimize disruption to the traveling public. In the interest of public/worker safety and considering the difficulties of building within the project site. ODOT will revise the allowable closures in each phase to 15 each.

Question Submitted: 8/1/2017 3:22:12 PM

Per CMS 511.04A concrete components with a minimum dimension of 5ft or great is to be considered mass concrete. The footers, caps, and backwalls, all have a minimum dimension greater than 5 ft. however they are called out as QC1 concrete instead of QC4. Can you please clarify whether or not this items should be mass concrete?

The pier caps and pier footings will be changed to a QC4 Pay Item in a future addendum. The backwalls are less than 5 feet thick.

Question Submitted: 7/31/2017 2:08:33 PM

On plan sheet 35, the Maintenance of Traffic Notes for Winter Time Limitations state that, "All existing lanes shall be open to traffic between October 16 and March 31. October 16 shall be considered to constitute an interim completion date and liquidated damages shall be assessed in the amount of \$1,400 /day for each calendar day that all lanes are not open and available to traffic." Please confirm that nightly and / or weekend closures are exempt from these limitations and that the contractor, per the allowable lane closure charts, will be able to utilize nightly and weekend closures for required work.

Lane closures per the District 12 PLCM are allowed during the Winter Limitations

Question Submitted: 7/31/2017 2:07:25 PM

Restrictions for the I-77 Closures can be found on sheet 35. Notes 'a' and 'd' permit the Contractor to close I-77 overnight for 10 nights in Phase 1 and 10 nights in Phase 2. These notes also state that these closures may be in place for both directions of I-77 traffic. Please confirm that the Contractor may close each direction of I-77 traffic for 10 nights in each phase and that these closures may or may not occur on the same night.

The intent was for IR 77 (NB or SB or both as needed) be closed for 10 overnights, corresponding with the 10 overnight closures for IR 490 and the IR490 & IR 77 ramps shown in the Supplemental Lane Restriction/Closure Chart on sheet 37-38.

Question Submitted: 7/31/2017 1:56:10 PM

Does the slip coefficient factor allow for the contact areas of the structural steel bolted connections of the splice plates, cross frames and girders to be shop metallized or are these surfaces not to be metallized?

The contact areas may be shop metallized. The surfaces shall be AASHTO Class C per BDM 302.4.1.14.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/31/2017 1:54:55 PM

Bolts, nuts and washers shall be metallized in the field per the plan notes on sheet 292. All surfaces that are to be metallized need a sharp angular shaped profile per SS845. What is the surface prep required for the bolts, nuts and washers? How is this profile to be achieved for the bolts, nuts and washers in the field? Will galvanized bolts, nuts and washers be acceptable in lieu of field metallizing the bolts, nuts and washers?

Galvanized bolts are acceptable.

Question Submitted: 7/31/2017 1:53:20 PM

Bolts, nuts and washers shall be metallized in the field per the plan notes on sheet 292. Typically, metallized structural steel is supplied with galvanized bolts, nuts and washers that do not require a field metallizing because they are galvanized. Why is ODOT wanting the bolts, nuts and washers to be field metallized per the referenced plan note?

Bolts may be galvanized-- Plan note on Sheet 292 will be revised in a addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/31/2017 1:51:05 PM

Field repairs and touch-ups of the structural steel shop metallizing are as to be directed by the engineer per the plan notes on sheet 292. What is the criteria that will be used to determine if field touch-up or repairs are needed as directed by the engineer? For example, if the back end of hammer strikes the metallized surface the metallized coating will appear scuffed but the integrity of the coating is not damaged, will scenarios such as these require field repairs as directed by the engineer?

Scuffed surfaces will not require repair if the integrity of the coating is not damaged. In all cases the ODOT field engineer will make the determination

Question Submitted: 7/26/2017 1:26:14 PM

The number of complete weekend closures detailed on plan sheet 37 and 38 is inadequate. Please increase the weekend closures in Phase 1 to six and include closing I.R 77. In Phase 2 add three more weekend closures for a total of six and include I.R. 77 in all six. These additional weekend closures are needed because, due to the size cranes required for girder removal and girder erection, weekday overnight closures are not long enough. The assembly/disassembly times on these cranes can easily be 3 hours or more each, this would use up 6 of the available 11 hours of the weekday night closure.

The number of closures included in the plan table are based on ODOT's evaluation of construction methods and crane placements that minimize disruption to the traveling public. There is no need to close IR 77 during Phase 1. All work is on the outside while traffic is maintained on the inside. See plan Sheet 48/365. ODOT does not expect the contractor to be picking and moving steel over the IR 77 traffic. A complete closure (defined essentially as Friday evening to Monday morning) of the entire interchange for 6 weekends seems excessive to accomplish the work in Phase 1. Phase 2 places traffic to the outside on the new bridge while constructing the inside portion of both bridges. Additional closures may be more appropriate for the Phase 2 work considering the difficulties of building within the restrictions shown in the plans. However, it is possible to construct the project within the specified limits. One additional weekend closure will be added to the Table on Sheet 38/365 in an addendum

Question Submitted: 7/19/2017 1:32:11 PM

The sheeting table for cofferdams and excavation bracing, as per plan on sheet 300 is hard to understand and needs to be clarified. Please clarify why Detail 1, 2, 5, & 6 have 3 criteria listed for sheeting specifications but only two applications listed in "protected substructure unit" and "phase of shoring construction" columns. Also please verify the bottom tip elevation for Detail 1; the elevation of 594.00 listed would require nearly a 100' depth of sheeting which does not seem correct.

The Detail 1 Sheeting Bottom Tip Elevation is 654.0, not 594.0. The second line of sheeting properties in Detail 1 and Detail 6 is for the added sheeting shown in Step 8. The second line of sheeting properties in Detail 2 and Detail 5 is for the added sheeting shown in Step 4. Sheet 300 will be revised with corrected and additional information by an Addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/18/2017 8:37:54 AM

The note under Item 607 Vandal Protection Fence, 6 foot straight on plan sheet 292/365 states that the anchors for the vandal fence shall be cast in place or installed in threaded ferrule concrete inserts. Can the anchor bolts be drilled in after the parapets are slip formed as shown on standard drawing VPF-1-90 or is it ODOT'S intent to force the contractor to hand form all 2,020 LF of parapets?

The VPF anchor type shall be as specified in the plans. Anchor bolts cannot be drilled. "

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/17/2017 2:51:41 PM

Following up on the question and answer to the previous prebid question regarding no roadway work can be done until 9-1-18 south of sta 73+25, is it ODOT'S intent to still setup phase 1 MOT per the plans in this area prior to 9-1-18? If not please provide MOT plans for what is allowed.

CCG6B will implement their MOT Phase 2 in early CY2018. This MOT phase will facilitate removal of the Broadway bridge over I77 and construction of a new median pier for the Broadway replacement bridge. The CCG6B contract requires the contractor to be completed with this median work by August 2018. Prior to August 2018, the CCG6A contractor can implement their MOT phase 1 from Station 73+25 ahead. The only deviation from plan sheets 49 and 50 of 365, is the area south of Station 73+25. I77 south of Station 73+25 will be controlled by the CCG6B MOT Phase 2 work zone. I77 traffic will follow the CCG6B Phase 2 work zone and shift away from the median of I77. By Sept 1, 2018, when the CCG6B contractor has finished the I77 median pier work, the section of I77 south of station 73+25 will be made available for the CCG6A contractor to implement the remaining portions of the CCG6A Phase 1 MOT zone as shown on sheets 49 and 50 of 365. This MOT zone will allow the CCG6A contractor to build the outside approach pavement/embankment on the south approach to the bridge.

Question Submitted: 7/13/2017 9:18:02 AM

In the maintenance of traffic plans for phase 1, 2A, 2B, & 2C (sheets 49-68), there is no temporary signage detailed in the plans. The only temporary signage shown in the MOT plans is for detour routes (sheets 69-89) and lane closures (sheets 37-38). Please advise.

Refer to referenced ODOT Maintenance of Traffic Standard Construction drawings for additional MOT signing. Lead-in and end construction MOT signing south of the project will require coordination with the CCG6B contractor per plan note, Coordination with CUY-77-13.80, PID 82388, CCG6B, Design Build Project, on sheet 35.

Question Submitted: 7/12/2017 11:55:45 AM

Does the structural steel that is encased in the counterweight concrete need to have field touchup of the metallizing?

Field touch-up of the structural steel that will be encased in concrete should be performed. The work is covered in the structure note on sheet 11/84 (301) Item 530 – Structural Steel, Misc.: Shop Metallizing and Field Touch-Up of Structural Steel.

Question Submitted: 7/12/2017 11:55:00 AM

The existing plans posted do not include any plans for the parapet and overlay rehabilitation work that was done on this bridge. Please provide.

Additional Existing plans have been added to the Reference Only web site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-13567/REFERENCE%20FILE/>

Question Submitted: 7/12/2017 11:54:00 AM

Can the CCG6B project MOT plans and schedule be provided to understand the coordination required? If so, please post to the ftp site.

See Project reference only files. CCG6B-BU-02 is the mainline and ramp construction and associated MOT. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-13567/REFERENCE%20FILE/>

Question Submitted: 7/12/2017 11:52:47 AM

The coordination note with the CCG6B project on plan sheet 35 states that no work can be done in phase 1 that directly impacts the pavement south of Station 73+25 because of the CCG6B work until September 1, 2018. Does this mean that phase 1 cannot start until September 1, 2018? This would impact the completion date of September 30, 2019.

The pavement approach reconstruction south of Station 73+25 can not begin until after 9/1/2018, as the CCG6B project will be using this pavement for maintenance of traffic to construct the new Broadway bridge during that time frame. CCG6A project work north of this station can begin before this date.

Question Submitted: 7/12/2017 11:51:23 AM

In the construction sequence notes for maintaining traffic on plan sheet 34, it states that the alternate routes must be established prior to starting phase 1 work on I77. One of these routes is Broadway Ave. When is the CCG6B contractor going to close and then reopen Broadway Ave? Does this affect when phase 1 work can begin on this project?

Broadway traffic will be maintained at all times either by use of Broadway Ave or through the use of two way traffic on the proposed frontage road between Broadway and Pershing. The CCG6B work on Broadway does not have an impact on when phase 1 can begin.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/11/2017 8:56:37 AM

Can you please provide the engineers calculations for the level UF?

Quantity Calculations are found on the Bidding documents site on the lower right titled "Plan Sheets and Project Reference Files" Look for CUY-13567 dated 2-17-2017

Question Submitted: 6/29/2017 1:28:10 PM

The Field office bid item quantity is 36 months. The completion date is 10/31/19. please adjust the bid item quantity in the first addendum.

This will be corrected in a future addendum

Project No. 170492

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

HUR-88856 - SR 99-05.82 (PART 1 AND 2)

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 8:46:35 AM

Would the department consider adding a pay item for a cofferdam on Part 2? It seems there is no item set up for water control during construction.

Project No. 170493

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

JEF-94177 - SR 7-19.79

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 10:11:37 AM

Can the Department add a bid item for touch up of the metallized expansion joint, and galvanized structural steel where they are field welded. The 1/2" cross frame connection plates are typically shop welded. This will require extensive metallizing repair.

The Department does not pay separately for repair of the coatings due to fabrication, shipping, construction or welding. It is included in the cost of the respective items per 516.03.

Question Submitted: 8/2/2017 1:13:56 PM

On the typical sections on sheet 3 there is a surface course asphalt specified. However, in the proposal there is no surface course bid item, just two intermediate asphalt bid items. Please clarify what is required.

The pavement buildup should be as specified on the plan typical sections and in the general summary. The proposal is incorrect and will be corrected by addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/31/2017 3:55:19 PM

Based on the MOT drawings for all three phases, the quantity for the 32" PCB and 50" PCB is switched from what is listed in the General Summary. Please verify.

The plan and quantities for the 32" and 50" portable barrier have been verified and no errors in the quantities have been found.

Project No. 170497

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

TRU-101707 - Salt Springs/S Leavitt Rd

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 3:57:31 PM

Would the Department review the Traffic Control Inspector note on page 7. The nature and scope of this project doesn't seem to warrant the added expense of the T.C.I. not being able to have other construction related duties.

The note will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/4/2017 7:02:23 AM

will the department waive the restrictions as set forth in 422.04 considering the date of bid, time required for award and contract signed a federal holiday and the amount of work that needs to be done before the performance deadline. or provide a 2018 completion date so that the restrictions set forth in 422.04 realistically can be met.

The project completion date will be adjusted in a forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170498

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

TUS-91567 - SR 93-03.33

Question Submitted: 8/10/2017 1:06:22 PM

The "service transfer and waterline removal" note on sheet 16 states that there will be an 8 hour shutdown of the water main to transfer/tie in the proposed relocation. If the line is being shut off there is not a need for tapping sleeve and valve, a cut in tee or bend and valve can be used. Can you clarify the what is being required at the waterline relocation and remove tapping sleeves if shutdown is allowed?

Remove Item 638 – 12" x 12" Tapping Sleeve, Valve and Valve Box. Additional information about the means of connection has been added to the Item 638 – 12" Water Main Polyvinyl Chloride Pipe and Fittings, AWWA C900, DR14, as Per Plan Note. These changes will be made by addendum.

Project No. 170502

Sale Date - 9/7/2017

BEL-22778 - IR 470-06.54

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 11:39:42 AM

Will galvanized or metalized pedestals be allowed to temporary support the pier bearings and then be cast into the new pier cap concrete?

The contractor has asked if the temporary supports for the steel beams can be incorporated into the final pier cap concrete. They have proposed galvanizing or metalizing the supports prior to incorporation into the pier cap. ODOT's response: The temporary supports for the steel beams shall NOT be incorporated into the final structure. Galvanizing or metalizing the temporary supports has no influence on the decision for this structure.

Project No. 170508

Sale Date - 9/7/2017

HAM-102061 - VAR Signal Upgrades

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 10:05:08 AM

Ref 6 - Bracket arm, 15' as per plan. Per plan notes on page 3, please be advised the mounting bands are not the adjustable type. Per City of Columbus SCD 4110/4122, mounting bands can vary for each arm but they are not adjustable. Exact ID measurements at the attachment points is required for each bracket arm. Maximum band size is 14.4". Is this ok to quote?

Project No. 170511

Sale Date - 9/7/2017

POR-98381 - SR 261-00.00

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 4:00:26 PM

What are the permitted working times for areas to be treated with GFR? Please advise.

Project No. 170518

Sale Date - 9/21/2017

COS-101405 - BR Cleaning FY 18/19

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 10:22:47 AM

On Plan sheet 10 of 13 Under WORK RESTRICTIONS it states: "Work under project must be completed between October 1st and March 31st to minimize potential impacts to endangered bat species protected under the Endangered Species Act and to Avifauna protected under the migratory bird treaty act." Please clarify if this restricts work to October 1, 2017 - March 31, 2018 or from March 31st 2018 - October 1st 2018. The project has a completion of October 2018.

This work must be done between October 1, 2017 and March 31, 2018. This is to minimize the chances that the project impacts bats and nesting migratory birds. Please bid accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 171057

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

D03-101522 - PR FY2018 (B)

Question Submitted: 7/24/2017 11:46:41 AM

Typically tree removal contracts that do not involve new construction do not require prevailing wage. Can you confirm whether or not this should be bid as prevailing wage?

The tree removal project is for removing trees on future construction contracts, so prevailing wage is applicable for the project. No addendum required.

Project No. 171058

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

LAK-105911 - IR 90-14.67 VSL Signs

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 10:26:23 AM

Item reference 0039, Network Switch points to ODOT supplemental specification 809. There is no mention of requirements for a network switch in the specifications and no TAP listed products. Is there any requirement for the switches such as a lay 2 switch or minimum of 8 ports?

This question will be answered in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 9:42:28 AM

The RWIS material and non-invasive pavement sensor are listed as ODOT furnished and contractor installed. It is understood that these items are to be installed per the manufacturer's specifications. Please provide those specifications and information on these materials.

The Specifications will come from the manufacturer. The vendor representative will provide all necessary support and information and will probably be onsite for installation.

Question Submitted: 7/31/2017 11:05:41 AM

Is catalog information or installation information available for the ODOT furnished material, in particular the DMS signs, variable speed limit signs, RWIS related items, and the non-invasive pavement sensors?

Refer to the "SUBMITTAL, SIGN, 4 X 5, Z BAR MOUNT VSL Sign" PDF detail in the following link for information pertaining to the Variable Speed Limit signs. Refer to "01159657 DMS" and "VF-2420-27x60-66-X DMS" PDF files for details in the following link for information pertaining to the DMS:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-105911/Reference File/Requirements for the installation of the RWIS and non-invasive pavement sensors shall be per the manufacturer's specifications>.

Project No. 171059

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

FUL-100789 - PM-FY2018

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 2:42:56 PM

In years past this project had a specific start date of 4/15 of the same year as the interim completion date of 6/15...Since there is no such start date in this years project, are we able to perform work on Ref#'s 1-8 during the fall of 2017??

Question Submitted: 8/7/2017 10:09:26 AM

The completion date specified in the proposal is 12/1/2017. The interim completion date listed in the plans is 6/15/18. Can ODOT clarify whether the final completion date was intended to be 12/1/18?

The completion date in the proposal is wrong. The correct completion date is 12/1/2018.

Project No. 171060

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

ASD-104284 - PR FY2018

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 10:19:01 PM

Will a tracked excavator be allowed to grab trees and feed chipper on this project?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 10:16:43 PM

Will a tracked excavator be allowed to grab trees and feed chipper on this project?

Question Submitted: 7/24/2017 12:31:55 PM

Due to this being a maintenance contract, in years past, the proposal was not subject to prevailing wage. The specs indicate prevailing wage. Please confirm whether or not this should be bid non-prevailing due to it being a maintenance contract.

Proj 171060 is non-prevailing wage. An addendum is forthcoming.

Project No. 173002

Sale Date - 9/22/2017

CUY-90591 - IR 480-18.42 L&R Deck

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 2:34:24 PM

The design plans for ATR 583 show piezocable axle sensors installed with the loop detectors as part of this ATR station. This axle sensors are not mentioned in the scope of work. Please clarify if the axle sensors are still operational and if they are to be maintain/replaced?

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 2:33:28 PM

The project Scope of Work, in section 17.3.6 requires the ATR pull boxes and conduit be replaced from the westbound outside shoulder through the limits south to the eastbound lanes. The Scope states further that the conduit and cables north of the westbound lanes not be disturbed. Relative to loop detector cabling, the ODOT Standard Specification 632.23 does not allow splicing of any cable or wire except for at the junction of detector wire and lead-in cable. Is the intent for the existing lead-in cable to be pulled out of the existing conduit and reused in the new conduit? Otherwise the lead-in cables will have to be replace all the way to the ATR cabinet to conform to 632.23.

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 8:10:07 PM

In Attachment ST-03, it is clear that the longitudinal limits of Item 601 (crushed aggregate slope protection) are 75' minimum at each abutment location. Please confirm if Item 601 is to extend laterally under all 3 bridges.

Question Submitted: 8/15/2017 1:11:44 PM

LD-01 shows the convergence of the WB Express lanes with the WB through lanes on the west end of the project (approximate Sta 2985+00 to 2988+30) at a merge rate quicker than the 50:1 allowable per the L&D Volume I, Figure 505-1a. Please confirm this is an acceptable design to use for the basic configuration.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 5:51:45 PM

On Page 111 of the DB Scope of Services in section 16.2.1 Item 4 of the Proposed Existing Bridge Drainage Repair Work we are required to sand blast and paint all existing steel downspouts and supporting brackets. It appears that certain areas of the piping and brackets may not be accessible in order to provide blast cleaning to bare metal without removal from the structure. Please clarify if the pipe is to be blast cleaned and painted in place or removed from the structure and replaced after blasting and painting.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 5:46:57 PM

On Page 111 of the DB Scope of Services in section 16.2.1 Item 4 of the Proposed Existing Bridge Drainage Repair Work we are required to sand blast and paint all existing steel downspouts and supporting brackets. However, this work is not found within the description of and of the bid items. Also, it is not possible at the stage to quantify the amount of existing pipe with galvanized coating in "Good condition". We recommend the department add a bid item and quantity for this scope of work.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 3:07:41 PM

On sheet SC-3 of the provided railroad special clauses under the PROJECT SITE MEETINGS it is stated that the meeting will "...establish requirements of working within the railroad corridor." Does the Department know what requirements, if any, beyond what has been provided, will be required by the railroad? For example, some railroads require erection equipment to be rated for 150% of the given load. In the documents provided there is no such requirement. If, after award, the railroad requires conformance to additional criteria beyond those provided how will the design-build team be reimbursed for increased costs to comply with these types of changed conditions?

For technical items not specifically addressed in the Contract documents, CVSR/NPS Construction Agreement or Special Clauses, the DBT shall follow CSX Transportation Construction Submission Criteria. This requirement will be added to Scope section 1.3 in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 12:16:32 PM

Reference ITO Section 4 "Technical Proposals", subsection 4.2 "TECHNICAL APPROACH (PART A)", item 1: Each of the 3 PTI Meetings. Would the department consider revising this requirement to a request to provide a single, final, summary or disposition of all the minimum elements that was provided at each PTI meeting. This would eliminate the need to provide (multiple) deviation reports and possible confusion resulting thereof.

ITO Section 4.2 will be updated in an upcoming addendum. The Technical Proposal narrative will summarize the approach to the design and construction of the elements presented during PTI discussions. The Technical Proposal narrative must identify and explain any substantive deviations from the approach described in the final PTI discussion.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 11:57:14 AM

Determination of design wind loads per AASHTO LRFD 2016 Interim Revisions require assignment of a wind exposure category for the bridge site. What wind exposure category does ODOT require for wind design of the new center structure?

The Engineer of Record must select the appropriate wind exposure category for this project.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 9:06:51 AM

Per the DESIGN-BUILD DBE UTILIZATION PLAN (New) 6/1/2017 Part 1 – Known-at-Bid DBEs are to be submitted with the Expedite Online Submission. Per the DBE Utilization Plan – Part 1 step 2, we are required to include "a description of work that each known DBE will perform". Step 2 also requires the selected DBE has the proper NAICS code to perform that work description. The AASHTOWARE software does not include the ability to add work descriptions or provide NAICS codes for the selected known DBE. Please advise how we are to proceed with the electronic submission.

The DBE Utilization Plan submitted with the AASHTOWARE software does not need to have a work description or NAICS codes for known DBE firms. The Apparent Low Bidder shall provide a description of work that each known DBE will perform on the DBE Affirmation Form due within five (5) calendar days after the bid opening or within five (5) calendar days after signing a subcontract.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 9:05:24 AM

Per the DESIGN-BUILD DBE UTILIZATION PLAN (New) 6/1/2017 Part 1 – Known-at-Bid DBEs are to be submitted with the Expedite Online Submission. If the DBEs Known-at-Bid are selected and the goal is NOT met, the AASHTOWARE software provides an error message that the bid is not complete. AASTOWARE also generates a message stating that the electronic submission may or may not be accepted by the owner. Will the electronic submission be accepted by ODOT with this error in the electronic file?

The AASHTOWARE software message associated with percentage of known DBEs at technical proposal time will not be a cause for rejection of a bid.

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 9:04:09 AM

Per the DESIGN-BUILD DBE UTILIZATION PLAN (New) 6/1/2017 Part 1 – Known-at-Bid DBEs are to be submitted with the Expedite Online Submission. If there are no Known-at-Bid DBE's and no DBE is selected from the DBE list, the AASHTOWARE software provides an error message "At least one DBE List entry must be completed". AASTOWARE also generates a message stating that the electronic submission may or may not be accepted by the owner. Will the electronic submission be accepted by ODOT with this error in the electronic file?

The AASHTOWARE software message associated with percentage of known DBEs at technical proposal time will not be a cause for rejection of a bid.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/11/2017 12:29:58 PM

'Cobra Pipeline Company' was found listed on a gas notification marker south of the bridge, between the canal and West Canal Road and in the right-of-way of Fosdick Road. Does the Department have information regarding presence of facilities by Cobra Pipeline Company? Does ODOT have a contact procedure required to be followed for initiating contact with this company?

SUE Level B utility identification did not find Cobra Pipeline in the project limits. Design Build Scope Section 13.2 Utility Coordination Responsibilities indicates the contact procedures.

Question Submitted: 8/11/2017 12:28:13 PM

In the 'Potential Utility Conflict Matrix' of the RFP, 'B.P.' is listed in the Owner column for two Gas facility IDs; however, 'B.P.' is not listed as a utility provided elsewhere in the RFP documents. Will the Department provide contact information for B.P.?

BP contact information: BP Oil, 4421 Bradley Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44109. (219) 472-2357. Rhonda Boyd-Knight, Rhonda.Boyd-Knight@bp.com

Question Submitted: 8/11/2017 11:41:25 AM

Section 16.2.2 of the project scope indicates the drainage collection scuppers shall be replaced with the same dimensions as the existing scuppers. As scuppers meeting the exact dimensions may require custom fabrication, will it be acceptable to provide a prefabricated unit similarly sized that provides, at a minimum, the same hydraulic properties as those in the original construction plans?

Scuppers shall be the same dimensions as existing.

Question Submitted: 8/10/2017 3:32:20 PM

Would the Department reconsider the answer to the prebid question of July 10 requiring the IQF or their subconsultant to be prequalified in the categories Subsurface Utility Engineering, Geotechnical Testing Laboratory, Geotechnical Field Exploration Services, and Geotechnical Drilling Inspection Services, since these prequalification categories are questionably relevant to the role of the IQF? For the IQF, we recommend waiving the SUE requirement, Geotechnical Drilling, Geotechnical Field Exploration, and Geotechnical Testing Lab prequalifications.

Requirements for the following IQF services will be removed from the ITO document in an upcoming addendum. (Subsurface Utility Engineering, Geotechnical Testing Laboratory, Geotechnical Field Exploration, Geotechnical Drilling Inspection.)

Question Submitted: 8/10/2017 12:31:43 PM

Section 8.1.1 Manuals and Guidelines, of the scope states, "The current edition, including updates released on or before July 31, 2017, of all published ODOT Manuals and Guidelines including, but not limited to the following ODOT Manuals and Guidelines shall be met or exceeded in the performance of the design and construction work required to complete this project." Should the 2nd quarter updates that were released after July 31, 2017 be excluded or included into the scope requirements?

The release date for this project will be updated to August 11, 2017, in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/10/2017 7:54:01 AM

Per CMS 511.01.A, concrete components with a minimum dimension of 5-ft or greater are considered mass concrete. How should this specification be applied to complex shapes? For example, the pier shape detailed in ST-02 has a minimum thickness of 3-ft at the web wall and 5-ft at the columns. Will this shape be considered mass concrete?

Scope Section 16.3.1 will be updated in an upcoming addendum to require piers to use mass concrete regardless of dimensions.

Question Submitted: 8/9/2017 4:44:19 PM

TC-01, Sheets 1, 10, 11, and 12, show proposed signs on existing supports. Scope 17.3.3 implies that all new signs are to be installed on new supports. Can new signs be placed on existing supports as shown in TC-01 if the existing support design is adequate? Can existing signs and associated supports shown in TC-01 that are not impacted by construction or downstream geometric changes remain in place?

Yes, new signs may be placed on existing supports if the existing support design is adequate and the DBT geometric design allows for the existing support to remain and be appropriately located per normal design requirements. Existing signs not impacted by construction may remain in place.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/4/2017 4:10:01 PM

Section 15.3.2.3 of the Scope states that Ramp W98 “will transition to a two-lane exit ramp beyond the ramp nose per Location and Design, Volume 1, Figure 503-5a.” The Scope also states that the number of ramp lanes shown in LD-01 is Basic Configuration. Ramp W98 is shown as a single lane in LD-01 in both plan view and typical section, only widening to match into the existing four lanes at the existing intersection with Transportation Blvd. Please clarify the intended number of lanes and at which station any transitions should begin.

The scope will be updated in an upcoming addendum to reflect a single lane exit ramp transitioning into the existing four (4) lanes at the Transportation Boulevard intersection.

Question Submitted: 8/4/2017 4:08:29 PM

Scope section 17.5.2.1 indicates “The DBT shall maintain the complete interchange lighting at the IR-480 / IR-77 interchange. Existing lighting towers affected by the proposed work shall be removed and disposed of. New lighting towers shall be designed by the DBT to replace any existing lighting towers to be removed.” TC-03 indicates for the same interchange “Existing towers affected by construction will be relocated.” Please clarify.

The scope section 17.5.2.1 requirements are correct. Intent is to relocate affected tower lights to new locations with new tower installations. TC-03 terminology will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 4:39:12 PM

Scope Section 18, Schedule Requirements, references Proposal Note (PN) 107. The Proposal references PN (New); Critical Path Method Progress Schedule For Multi-Season Projects with Cost Loading. Which PN governs?

Scope Section 18 reference will be clarified in an upcoming addendum. The Proposal CPM note is to be used for this project.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 10:30:34 AM

Please reference SOS, Section 12.1, Paragraphs 4 & 5 regarding reserved perpetual rights: It appears that there are other parcels that other than those provided in RW-04 Reserved Perpetual Right of Access Parcel, that are encroaching on the Existing LA-R/W. Is ODOT aware of other parcels under the bridge that have a perpetual right-of-access or leases and will these parcels also be cleared by October 31, 2017? If the items are considered encroachments (none noted in the summary table) will these be removed by the adjacent property owner by October 31, 2017?

ODOT is not aware of any other perpetual right parcels. ODOT will work with property owners to meet 10/31/17 date. Question is unclear on what encroachment items are of concern.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 10:02:42 AM

Section 15.6.3.S requires trench drains be installed in all of the IR 480 through and express lane gore areas. For the eastbound direction on the east end of the project, a trench drain is not shown in the drainage plan, and the grading of this gore differs from the other three in that it has a straight cross slope from the crest of the EB lanes across the EB express lanes without creating a low point. Can the trench drain requirement be waived for this location?

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 10:00:17 AM

Does ODOT have and can you make available any photometric models for the lighting located in this project?

ODOT was unable to find any photometric models for this project.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 9:58:23 AM

Regarding auditor’s parcel number, 571-04-004, Six Cloverleaf Parkway Inc., The property map of the proposed concept plan and the original right-of-way plan show the existing LA-R/W on the north side from approximate Sta 1016+00 to Sta 1020+00 LT, however the auditor’s website does not show the existing LA-R/w. Similarly, the existing r/w for West Canal Road in this location is shown on the ODOT plans but not shown on the auditor’s map. Can ODOT confirm that the ODOT plans are correct?

The ODOT Right of Way plans are correct.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 9:55:39 AM

A bid item for Rigid Paving was added, reference number 0200. There was no addendum posted in Bid Express. Please provide an AASTOWARE addendum to the ebsx file to match Addendum 2.

The ebsx file is in the process of being posted onto bid express. It can also be found on ODOT's Digital Paper website.

<http://contracts.dot.state.oh.us/home.do>

Question Submitted: 8/2/2017 9:42:44 AM

ODOT: Historic report available, "Static and Dynamic Pile Tests in the Cuyahoga River Valley, Interim Report, June 28, 2973"

See FTP link for PDF copy of this report.

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID90591/RFP_Reference_Info/Pile_Report/

Question Submitted: 8/2/2017 7:58:49 AM

Please confirm that the DBE Plan discussion is to be a part of the overall PTI Discussion #3 as indicated in Addendum 2 and not a separate standalone meeting.

The Department will accommodate either of the following approaches to the DBE plan discussion as part of the Proprietary Technical Meeting (PTI) #3. The Department requests advance notice of the DBTs proposed approach, as part of the meeting agenda submission. The DBE plan discussion can occur within the normal PTI #3 meeting agenda. The Department will have appropriate DBE staff present for this discussion. Alternatively, the DBT can choose to have a separate DBE plan discussion, in a separate ODOT District 12 conference room, between appropriate ODOT and DBT staff members. This separate meeting would occur at the same time as each DBTs PTI #3 meeting.

Question Submitted: 8/1/2017 12:47:27 PM

Reference Attachment_DF_Digital_Files_ => Cone Penetration Data: Please explain the data presented in the data files for the seismic cone testing (shear wave and compression wave testing). It is not clear what data the values represent or the units associated with the data. Is the data available in a spreadsheet, without the formatting characters, or in tab-delimited file so that the data can be used in spreadsheet computation?

The spreadsheets included with the original RFP documents need to be replaced with the correct spreadsheets located at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID90591/RFP_Reference_Info/CPT_Data/ The official RFP digital files will be updated in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/1/2017 12:46:45 PM

Reference Attachment_DF_Digital_Files_ => Cone Penetration Data: Please provide net area ratio for the cone, or clarify the whether the tip resistance values provided in the data files are the measured qc values or the total cone resistance, qt, corrected for unequal tip areas.

The tip resistance values provided in the data files are the measured qc values. The net area ratio for the cone is 0.65.

Question Submitted: 8/1/2017 11:39:25 AM

In Section 16.2.1. Bridge CUY-480-1842 L/R Rehabilitation and Repair, the RFP requires "New connectors between existing pipe segments shall be installed. Welded or mechanical connections shall be used where new pipe is installed. All connections shall be watertight." Please clarify if all new connections are required on the existing system, or if connections between new and existing pipe only require new connections.

Attachment ST-01 Bridge CUY-480-1842 L/R Rehabilitation and Repair Plan includes specific locations and a unit price pay item for replacing connectors on existing pipe: Item 518 Structure, Misc.: Downspout Collar Repair.

Question Submitted: 8/1/2017 9:54:49 AM

"RFP Scope of Services Section 16.2.1 Proposed Existing Bridge Drainage Repair item (3) states" New connectors between existing pipe segments shall be installed." Can ODOT please confirm that the intention of this clause is that all couplings and connections used in the existing drainage conduit system that is to remain must be replaced?

Attachment ST-01 Bridge CUY-480-1842 L/R Rehabilitation and Repair Plan includes specific locations and a unit price pay item for replacing connectors on existing pipe: Item 518 Structure, Misc.: Downspout Collar Repair.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/1/2017 9:53:52 AM

) "RFP Scope of Service Section 16.5.3 (g) requires that "The minimum allowable conduit diameter is 14" for the new center structure". Can ODOT please clarify if the minimum 14" diameter applies to the outlet in the scupper itself or only to any longitudinal or vertical conduit runs that are collecting multiple drains? Most standard and commercially available bridge scuppers use a 6" or 8" outlet."

Downspouts integral with scuppers shall have the same diameter as the width of the scupper. Section 16.5.3 (g) will be revised in a future addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/28/2017 5:52:17 PM

Can ODOT verify the end construction date of 10/31/2018 for PID 80974 - CUY-480/Transportation Blvd Widening Project (Attachment EX-23)?

ODOT can not provide an end construction date for this project. The project sale date for PID 80974 is currently unscheduled.

Question Submitted: 7/28/2017 5:51:23 PM

ODOT provided a link to as-built files in response to a previous pre-bid question requesting as-built files for the existing ITS. The link provided points to plans for the CCTV camera locations on I-77 and I-480. However, plans for the ATR station on I-480 and the Weather Station on I-77 are not available at that link. Can ODOT provide as-built plans for these devices?

Historic plans for the CUY-480 ATR have been uploaded to the following FTP site:

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID90591/RFP_Reference_Info/ATR_Info/

The weather station on I77 is adjacent to the recently redecked CUY-77-09.50 bridge. It was not anticipated that this weather station would be impacted by this project.

Question Submitted: 7/28/2017 5:50:16 PM

The camera pole on I-480 WB west of Transportation Blvd. has an AT&T cabinet mounted to the pole. Please clarify what the purpose of this cabinet is?

This AT&T cabinet is for the communication(Internet) connection for the camera to communicate with the ODOT ITS system. Per Scope 17.3.6, the DBT is to coordinate relocation of the AT&T internet connection with ODOT's ITS management staff.

Question Submitted: 7/28/2017 5:49:18 PM

TC-02 Existing ITS Items shows 2 Speed Info Devices on the bridge (1 EB and 2 WB) and a speed info device on I-480 EB west of the Transportation Blvd overpass. These 3 devices could not be located during a field review of the existing ITS. Please clarify if these 3 Speed Info Devices actually exist and the correct locations for them.

ODOT recently changed vendors for roadway speed information. The Speed Info sensors are no longer used and likely have been removed (or are in the process of being removed). The new system does not have any physical sensors on the roadway in this area.

Question Submitted: 7/27/2017 10:32:08 AM

The ITO section 4.4 requires a completed form C-2. Is form C-2 indented to apply only to design Subconsultants and design subcontractors?

Form C-2 shall apply to design Subconsultants and design subcontractors.

Question Submitted: 7/26/2017 3:48:35 PM

ODOT Bridge Design Manual Section 302.4.1.14 states that bolt allowable stresses for painted or unpainted weathering steel surfaces shall be based on AASTHO's values for Class A, Contact Surface, Standard Hole Type. Can Class B faying surfaces in accordance with AASTHO LRFD Bridge Design Specification be used where determined applicable by the design-builder? The reduced slip capacity of the bolts greatly increases the size of all connections increasing maintenance, increasing construction schedule, and provides more capacity than required by AASTHO.

Deviation from Section 302.4.1.14 of the ODOT Bridge Design Manual is not acceptable.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/26/2017 3:47:06 PM

1) RFP Scope of Services Section 16.5.4 (1) states that "Bridge superstructures, joints, bearings and drainage shall be made accessible for inspection and maintenance with catwalks, ladders and platforms in addition to inspection safety climbing rods.". Please clarify if the full length of drainage downspouts running down the pier to the ground need to readily accessible. If not, please clarify what portion of the drainage system shall be made accessible for inspection and maintenance.

Access to drainage cleanouts, hoppers, and troughs shall be provided for maintenance. Access to closed downspouts is not required. Section 16.5.4 will be revised in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/26/2017 1:14:51 PM

Should the beginning station for the proposed rigid pavement listed on sheet 43 of 243 from LD-01 for Ramp W-98 be 143+92.23 to match the beginning station on the top typical on the previous sheet?

Yes. LD-01 will be corrected in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2017 2:18:39 PM

Maintenance of Traffic reference files, specifically MT-01 and MT-03, do not depict contraflow on any scenario. Are contraflow traffic patterns allowed?"

No, contraflow traffic patterns are not acceptable. A scope restriction on the use of contraflow traffic patterns will be added in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/24/2017 2:34:17 PM

SOS 15.4.2.13 requires a PRJ Type A at all structure approach slabs. Typically these are only required where there is concrete pavement. Since there is full depth asphalt and expansion joints at each end of the bridge are these required?

Approach Slab Installation Detail, Type A is required at all approach slabs. The pressure relief joint terminology will be replaced with Approach Slab Installation Detail, Type A in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/24/2017 2:33:08 PM

The proposal details the requirements of the DB DBE Utilization Plan 6/1/2017(pages 3-8). However, ITO sections 4.2 Technical Approach and 5.1 PTI Discussions also describe the DBE Plan. ITO 4.2 and ITO 5.1 state to describe the management responsibility for "designing business development and supportive services activity for all tiers". This component is not listed as a requirement in the proposal note. Please confirm whether this component is required or not as part of the DBE plan and update the contract documents accordingly. Please note discussion of the DBE plan is required for PTI#3.

The statement for describing the management responsibility for "designing business development and supportive services activity for all tiers" will not apply for the DBE plan. This item will be clarified in an upcoming addenda. This item will not be required for PTI Meeting 3.

Question Submitted: 7/24/2017 2:31:51 PM

"The Subsurface Utility Matrix information provided is incomplete. Additional information will be provided with an addendum during the RFP process". When this "SUE-A" matrix is updated:a. Will the location of Test Holes 4A and 4B be identified on both UT-23 and UT-22 so that it is clear as to what lines were determined to be overhead?b. Will information from Test Holes 8, 9, & 10 be provided?c. Will the various waterlines that were not found be investigated further to determine whether or not they exist? If they do exist what information will be provided to show the updated horizontal location?

(a) Test Holes 4A and 4B were non-performed, as it was determined that the line was overhead, along Brecksville Road. (b) Test hole 8 & 10 were provided in Addendum 1. ODOT is still researching information on the 14" DEOG line for test hole 9. Information found will be provided in an upcoming addendum. (c) ODOT currently does not have plans to provide additional pre-bid utility information on other utilities.

Question Submitted: 7/24/2017 2:29:42 PM

Section 1.3 states: "... The owner of the railroad is the National Park Service. The railroad is operated by the Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railway. Coordination with the owner and operator is required. Refer to Attachment RW-03 Railroad Special Clauses for information. Attachment RW-03 states: "The Railroad Special Clauses for the National Park Service and Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railway will be added when completed and available." When will this information be available?

The Department is working to complete coordination with the National Park Service and the Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad as soon as possible. It is anticipated that final versions of the railroad agreement and special clauses will be available in mid August 2017."

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/21/2017 2:30:52 PM

Can ODOT provide delineated drainage areas for the offsite areas contributing to the project?

Offsite contributing drainage areas have not been delineated as part of the pre-bid scope preparation work done by the ODOT project team.

Question Submitted: 7/21/2017 2:29:51 PM

In Attachment UT-02 what does the "yes" and "no" mean in the column titled "Allowed?"?

"Allowed" heading in UT-02 will be revised to "Relocation Allowed" in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/21/2017 2:28:49 PM

Can ODOT provide the "H1601611 - FIG8 - IMPACT MAP.dgn" Environmental file following the Working Units Requirements outlined in section 211.1 of the ODOT CADD Engineering Standards Manual of US Survey Feet?

A conversion to "survey feet" working units will be applied and a new dgn file H1601611-FIG8-IMPACT MAP will be included in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2017 4:55:30 PM

Can the Department provide the bridge deck TIN files referenced in RFP Attachment SU-02?

**Files have been posted to District 12 reference file FTP site.
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID90591/RFP_Reference_Info/Bridge_TIN/**

Question Submitted: 7/17/2017 4:54:35 PM

TIN files 90591XAE003-scaled.tin and 90591XAE005.tin cover the same area from STA. 991+30 to STA. 1045+22 and have varying elevations. Which is the correct TIN file for this area?

TIN file 90591XAE003 is the original ODOT aerial mapping file. There is no data in the valley under the bridges. TIN file 90591XAE005 originated with TIN file 90591XAE003 and was manipulated to add data from other files to complete the information in the valley under the bridges and provide a continuous contour map for the bridge site plan.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2017 10:47:46 AM

Can ODOT provide the coordinates of the No Build Zones. The ODOT-provided pre-bid "H1601611 - FIG8 - IMPACT MAP.dgn" Environmental file has working units of "Feet", while all other .dgn files are set to "US Survey Feet". The "H1601611 - FIG8 - IMPACT MAP.dgn" file has been referenced to some of the other .dgn files, like "90591BD001.dgn" for example, with a scale factor that appears to be similar to the project adjustment factor (PAF). However, when checking the coordinates of an element point within "H1601611 - FIG8 - IMPACT MAP.dgn" and comparing that same point in "90591BD001.dgn", the coordinate of the same element point appears to be different than expected. Can the coordinate system, units of measure, and location of the data contained within the "H1601611 - FIG8 - IMPACT MAP.dgn" be confirmed?

The No-build zones are shown in LD-03 and are drawn in associated dgn sheet files. The project files are developed using project ground coordinates as shown in Appendix SU-01. The environmental file was prepared using State Plane Grid Coordinates. ODOT is not planning on providing specific coordinates.

Question Submitted: 7/10/2017 10:44:29 AM

Section 1.3 of the ITO contains several statements concerning prequalification requirements for the IQF and for IQF work that are not clear. Is the IQF firm (or a subconsultant of the IQF firm) required to be prequalified in the following categories: Subsurface Utility Engineering, Geotechnical Testing Laboratory, Geotechnical Field Exploration Services, Geotechnical Drilling Inspection Services?

Per Section 1.3 of the ITO, Yes. The IQF, or a subconsultant to the IQF, is required to be prequalified in Subsurface Utility Engineering, Geotechnical Testing Laboratory, Geotechnical Field Exploration Services, Geotechnical Drilling Inspection Services. The IQF, or a subconsultant, must also be prequalified in the Roadway items listed, Bridge Design Level 2, and Complex highway lighting.

Question Submitted: 7/7/2017 4:44:08 PM

In Attachment_EX_Existing_Plans_and_Reports, in PDF file EX-16_CUY-480-1842_3D_Finite_Element_Modeling_Report.pdf the E.L. Robinson report references a BARS load rating analysis conducted by ODOT. Please provide this load rating analysis input, output, and report for comparison of our evaluation of the existing bridge loading during construction.

**Available BARS information has been posted to:
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID90591/RFP_Reference_Info/BARS_Files/**

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:42:23 AM

Can ODOT verify the intent is to apply the AASHTO LRFD Load Modifier for Operational Importance = 1.05

The intent is: an operational importance load modifier (η) equal to 1.05 shall be applied at the strength limit states to all components except: railings; concrete slab-type superstructures; and concrete decks on beams and girders. An importance load modifier (η) equal to 1.00 shall be used for all other limit states. For design purposes, assume that the Design ADT will be divided evenly between the three bridges. Use a Design ADT of 71,280 for the new center bridge.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:41:12 AM

Per the scope section 15.6.3.O "The DBT shall determine the necessary amounts of adjustments for existing drainage structures to be retained. All retained existing drainage structures shall be provided with new castings." Does the provision to provide new castings apply only to drainage structures retained and adjusted or to all structures retained weather or not they are impacted by the project?

This item of work will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:39:52 AM

Per Attachment EX-23, it appears the existing storm north of 480 on Transportation Blvd. outlets into the basin on the District headquarters lot. Does this basin have an outlet?

The existing ODOT District office detention basin outlets into an existing pipe that goes under Transportation Blvd. Attachment EX-23 lists this pipe as 42" in diameter.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:38:50 AM

The proposed bioretention areas are shown within existing wetlands. Per the L&D Vol. 2 section 1117.5 the water table must be 1 foot below the invert of the bioretention cell. Wetlands would be indicative of high ground water. Were any site investigations conducted which indicated this site has a acceptable groundwater elevation?

All geotechnical information available to the Department has been provided.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:37:11 AM

Do the no-build zones only apply to the bridge sub-structure construction? Is other ancillary construction allowed within the no-build zones?

Ancillary construction which does not impact the permanent usage of the no build zones nor adds permanent loading may be permitted if the DBT demonstrates negligible impact to the protected facilities.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:35:41 AM

Can ODOT supply the Ordinary high Water elevation (OHWM) of the Cuyahoga River?

ODOT estimates the OHWM elevation to be 587, which is shown on plan sheets in Appendix ST-01 and ST-03. This estimated OHWM elevation has not been officially coordinated with or been approved by any regulatory agency. The elevation shown in the reference plans is for general information use only.

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:34:31 AM

Can ODOT provide the ITS as-built files?

**Available plan information has been posted to:
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID90591/RFP_Reference_Info/ITS_Plans/**

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:31:50 AM

Can ODOT supply the CDSS input files for the ODOT hydraulics program A and any details available for the offsite drainage areas?

**Available CDSS files have been posted as reference information to:
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D12/Production/PID90591/RFP_Reference_Info/CDSS_Files/**

Question Submitted: 7/6/2017 11:03:01 AM

Can ODOT supply NEPA document appendices and Ecological Survey?

NEPA documents can be found on the ODOT EnviroNet website. Information concerning new accounts or website help is available on this web page. <http://ceform.dot.state.oh.us/>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 7/5/2017 11:13:28 AM

Reference the Scope of Services section 15.4.1.9 and the AASHTOWARE EBS bid file. The following quantities do not match: Item 251 Partial Depth Pavement Repair – Scope of Services = 2020 SY, EBS = 2270 SY Item 252 Full Depth Rigid Pavement Removal and Flexible Replacement – Scope of Services = 775 SY, EBS = 780 SY Item 253 Pavement Repair – Scope of Services = 14680 SY, EBS = 14770 SY Please advise which quantities are correct.

The quantities will be corrected in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/5/2017 11:12:29 AM

Reference the Scope of Services section 15.4.1.2, 15.4.2.2 and Attachment LD-01 sheets 11 and 42. Please advise which pay item covers the 12" Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement for Ramp W-98.

A pay item will be added for rigid pavement in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 3:33:59 PM

Due to the size of this project, please consider revising Table 624.02-1, Maximum Total of Partial Payments for Mobilization. This table essentially caps the mobilization bid item to \$2 Million which is less than 1% of the estimated project value. Please consider a 10% value or a higher Dollar amount.

The Department will revise Table 624.02-1 in an upcoming addendum. The amounts will be proportionally increased, but they will not be at the suggested 10% or higher amount.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 1:15:26 PM

"Prior to any construction in the floodplain, the DBT shall compile the necessary information and supporting documentation (calculations, analysis, mapping, drawings) to identify temporary or permanent impacts to the floodplain. The DBT shall meet or exceed all floodplain regulations and requirements. The DBT shall coordinate with the local floodplain administrator. Any additional impacts identified subsequent to approval from the floodplain administrator require the DBT to coordinate with the applicable agencies. a. If the proposed and temporary conditions comply with the ODOT scope of services (as written or amended) and the ODOT L&D, Volume 2 requirements does the project fall under ODOT L&D Section 1005.1.4 ODOT Self-Permit Process and local floodplain coordination outlined therein will suffice? b. Do the Local Floodplain requirements deviate from the FEMA requirements, if so how? Does the Scope of Services as written or to be amended include all floodplain regulations and requirements?"

Both local communities have local flood plain coordinators. The DBT must obtain Flood Plain Development Permits from these local entities prior to the start of construction. This requirement will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 1:14:20 PM

"The DBT shall be responsible for zero increase in the flood elevation due to temporary construction fills, crane pads, staging areas, haul roads, material storage, and equipment storage. ..." a. This zero increase as a temporary condition requirement is also significantly different than the requirements of the Regional General Permit requirements / conditions indicated on the form in the ODOT BDM, Figure 203.5-2, Temporary Construction, Access and Dewatering Activities, Permit Determination Checklist, for the Office of Environmental Services – Waterway Permits Unit (OESWPU), should the Regional General Permit covering Temporary Construction, Access and Dewatering Activities apply instead to the temporary conditions? b. Was the temporary zero increase intended to be applied to the minimum flow (twice the highest monthly flow) instead of the flood elevation? If a and b do not apply to this project then is the zero increase for temporary condition requirement intended to stipulate that the temporary conditions need to comply with the FEMA and Local floodplain regulations as if they were permanent conditions and accordingly the zero increase also only applies to the floodway? If so what is the allowable increase for the floodway fringe?"

ODOT's goal is to eliminate risk of flooding other properties by limiting flood elevation increases for all temporary and permanent conditions relative to this project.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 1:13:05 PM

"...The project shall be designed by the DBT to ensure there is zero increase in flood elevation due to permanent fills, embankment, and new pier construction. a. Does zero increase mean 0.00 feet or 0.0 feet whereby (0.01 to 0.05 feet) rounded to the nearest tenth of a foot to be consistent with the published FIS elevations and survey data collection and mathematical calculation tolerances? b. Does this permanent criterion apply only to the floodway as per FEMA regulation? If so what is the allowable increase for the floodway fringe?

c. Is there a preliminary Bridge Waterway Hydraulic and Scour report or analysis performed and available for either or both the existing and proposed structures? Is the effective hydraulic model available in either "printed output" (in txt or pdf file formats) or "HEC-2 or HEC-RAS data input" file formats?

ODOT's goal is to eliminate risk of flooding other properties by limiting flood elevation increases for all temporary and permanent conditions relative to this project. ODOT has not performed any hydraulic modeling in the preparation of this design build scope of service.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 12:38:08 PM

The first sentence states the DBT shall design and construct all lighting for Department and local facilities within the Project Limits. Some of the lighting is outside of this. Please clarify.

The limits of lighting of design and reconstruction shall be as shown in TC-03.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 11:42:03 AM

The first sentence states the DBT shall design and construct all signing for all roadways within the Project Limits. Are the project limits the limits for replacing signs, extrusheet, ground mounted post supports, and ground mounted beam supports as specified in SOS 17.3.3.1 to 17.3.3.4.

The DBT shall be responsible for redesigning and construction all new signing within the project's Work Limits and all required lead-in signage for replacing signs, extrusheets, overhead supports, ground mounted post supports, and ground mounted beam supports as specified in SOS 17.3.3.1 to 17.3.5. This shall be clarified in an upcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 11:40:53 AM

Project Limits are defined in SOS 6 as Sta 995 to Sta 1039 and in SOS 15.5.4 as the minimum limits of full depth pavement replacement of new pavement. Please clarify.

Project Limits define the minimum limits of mainline centerline full-depth, full-width pavement replacement or new pavement, as applicable.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 11:39:40 AM

Please reference the ITO for RFP as issued on June 8. The last page of the document is labeled as 44 of 59. Please verify that the document as provided is complete and no pages are missing.

The Department has verified that the total number of pages for the ITO for RFP is 44 pages. No pages are missing. The document page numbering will be corrected in an upcoming Addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 11:38:33 AM

Please reference the ITO for RFP, Section 5, specifically in regards to the PTI Meeting No. 3. The dates for the 3rd PTI meeting are August 8/9th (team dependent), and Information requested for this meeting shall be submitted 5 business days in advance, or 8 weeks after the release of the RFP. The Department is requiring that the DBT provide as part of this meeting a Foundation Report Analysis per BDM Section 202.2.3.B. This level of design is well beyond the level of effort ordinarily employed as part of a prudent pursuit effort for a project of this magnitude, and it is unreasonable to request this report within the timeframe requested and with the boring information available. As such, we are requesting that the Department remove the requirement to provide the information as detailed for Proprietary Discussion #3.

The ITO will be revised to the following in an upcoming addenda: "A draft foundation memo and supporting drawings that include an interpretation of the ground conditions and properties as they relate to foundation support, any concerns or anticipated challenges, anticipated foundations and analyses that form the basis of the bid, and a summary of anticipated load testing."

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 11:37:16 AM

Please reference the ITO for RFP, Section 5, specifically in regards to PTI Meeting No. 2. The Department is requesting that the DBT to confirm need for additional right of way. This is clearly in conflict with the scope requirements, section 12.1, which state "All necessary construction work for the project will be performed within the existing right of way". Further, the basic project configuration requires that the DBT stay within the existing right of way. As such, it is presumed that any request for modified ROW should be submitted in the form of an ATC. Please clarify the process for requesting additional ROW, and who is to procure the additional ROW needed.

PTI Meeting #2 requirement 3 (Need for additional right of way, if any) is for the DBT to affirm that the DBT's approach can be constructed within the existing ROW. The potential additional acquisition ROW request (temporary or permanent) would need to be performed through an ATC. The procurement would need to follow all NEPA and CFR requirements. Any additional costs would be determined by following ODOT's acquisition processes, with the Offeror contracting with a prequalified consultant, and the Offeror paying any additional ROW costs.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 9:35:43 AM

Please clarify what is meant by "short term closures" at the Towpath Trail. Is there a time limit range for these closures?

Short term closures at the Towpath Trail shall be interpreted as a period of less than one working shift. The Towpath Trail may not be closed for extended durations. This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 9:31:36 AM

Scope requires two lanes of traffic in each direction on Canal and W. Canal Roads. Both facilities currently have less than two lanes in each direction at the project location. Please clarify the number of lanes in each direction that must be maintained at these facilities.

Canal and W. Canal Road shall have one lane maintained in each direction. This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 9:23:49 AM

Reference Bid Item 614E18000 sequence # 46. Maintaining Traffic Miscellaneous – Replacement Item. Is it the intent of ODOT to bid this item at a Pre-Determined Amount?

The intent is to have the Bid Item established at a predetermined amount. This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 2:05:27 PM

Please clarify expectations for 'Foundation Report Analyses and Recommendations' reporting as part of submittal to ODOT and discussion at Proprietary Meeting #3, shown on ITO Page 30 of 59. This level of reporting is atypical of design-build proposals and expected level of completion at the time meetings occurring during pre-bid. There is inadequate time to complete additional subsurface investigations, analyses, and final reporting that may be necessary for final design. Alternately, we recommend a preliminary foundation memo, supporting drawings, and discussion at Proprietary Meeting No. 3. The information provided would give anticipated foundations and analyses that form the basis of the bid.

The ITO will be revised to the following in an upcoming addenda: "A draft foundation memo and supporting drawings that include an interpretation of the ground conditions and properties as they relate to foundation support, any concerns or anticipated challenges, anticipated foundations and analyses that form the basis of the bid, and a summary of anticipated load testing."

Question Submitted: 6/16/2017 10:45:19 AM

Given ODOT's previous communication regarding the use of the "LiquidFile" system does the Department still wish to utilize the RFP requirement for a printed copy of the PTI meeting documents "One (1) electronic copy (TIF or PDF format) and one (1) printed copy of documentation, including exhibits and drawings, related to the design topics identified for each PTI discussion as described in this Section 5..."

will retain the documentation following the PTI discussion);

Offerors who submit PTI documentation and ATC submittals utilizing LiquidFiles are not required to submit the (1) printed copy of documentation. Submitted information shall be in a format which can be easily printed. If Offerors do decide to utilize the Department's offer of LiquidFiles, Offerors are still required to meet all deadlines. This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda. If utilizing LiquidFiles, Offerors are recommended to contact Eric Kahlig (614-387-2406) to attempt a "trial" transmission and to verify receipt upon PTI or ATC transmittal. Technical Proposals will require submission of paper and electronic copies by the required deadline as defined in the Instruction to Offerors

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/13/2017 9:14:22 AM

ODOT Question: When will the project's waterway permits (Section 404 Individual permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification) be obtained by ODOT?

The approval date for both permits is expected to be by 06/01/2018. This date will be updated in Scope Section 11.2 in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 4/25/2017 11:42:51 AM

The CADD and design data reference files provided to the DBTs appear to be utilizing previously-published ODOT CADD standards. Specifically, what we've been provided utilizes an older version of GeoPak. Current standards outlined on the DRRC website requires the use of Bentley's OpenRoads design software. However, the new standard has a clause, "ODOT recommends completing existing projects using the previously published ODOTstd CADD Standards". Can the DBTs continue to use the provided, older version of GeoPak for pre-bid and post-Award design in lieu of Bentley's OpenRoads? Migration to OpenRoads technology will take some time to make the switch.

Please see the ODOT CADD Standards memo dated April 21, 2017. This project would qualify as a project started with previously published standards. The DBT assumes any risk of the older standards.

Question Submitted: 4/19/2017 3:05:45 PM

In the 1st sentence of the 3rd paragraph of section 5.1 of the Draft RFP-ITO the proposers are instructed that "The PTI discussions are also intended to enable the Offeror to ask confidential questions..." While this venue is certainly appropriate for confidential questions, limiting these questions to the prescribed meeting dates will hinder efficient production of Alternative Technical Concepts. We respectfully request that the Department consider a supplemental method of allowing the submission of confidential questions at times other than the PTI discussions.

To ensure a fair and even implementation of the ATC process, the Department will not consider a supplemental method of allowing the submission of confidential questions at times other than the PTI discussions. The Department is intending, although not required, to provide reasons for any ATC rejection and may provide conditional approvals.

Question Submitted: 4/19/2017 2:53:26 PM

In order to better understand the existing subsurface conditions at the site and the potential impact of the new construction on the existing bridge, we would like to request the following information: •Pile foundation as-built drawings, pile driving records, and/or any other related information (e.g., pile tip elevations). •Steel pile wall thickness and material grade. •Any and all information available regarding pile load tests that were performed.

The record plan information, which has been included in the draft contract documents, is the only historical information that has been found.

Question Submitted: 4/18/2017 8:53:56 AM

Will this project use a green rating system such as INVEST or Envision?

It is anticipated that the project will require sustainability tracking using the FHWA INVEST program. Requirements will be included in the Project Scope issued with the Request for Proposals.

Question Submitted: 2/17/2017 5:27:52 PM

Addendum 1 added Prequalification requirements for specific work class codes. It has not allowed sufficient time to obtain renewal or added work class codes if needed. Are you able to modify the requirement to allow sufficient time for obtaining the work class codes if needed?

Please follow the text in RFQ Section 1.2. The Department will make every attempt to expedite prequalification reviews for this project. Please ensure that prequalification applications are complete and submitted as soon as possible. It is not recommended that Offerors wait until the deadline in the RFQ, but any submitted by that deadline, will be reviewed in an expedited manner.

Question Submitted: 2/16/2017 3:24:15 PM

RFQ Section 2.4 SOQ Submission Requirements requires the Offeror to submit one electronic password protected single file PDF format which restricts copying the text, images and other content. How should the Offeror provide the Department with the password for this electronic file?

Please submit two (2) PDF files as requested in Section 2.4 of the RFQ. ODOT does not need the password for the second PDF file.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/10/2017 3:05:11 PM

For RFQ Part H 2.5.8 project description please define: % of overall work performed for 1) construction project sample; and 2) Design/ IQF project sample.

The presented % of overall work performed shall clearly identify the overall percentage when compared to the contract value, and shall clearly depict the amount of responsibility of the team member. The Department should be able to clearly understand the amount of responsibility for the work being represented (Value and the level of effort).

Question Submitted: 2/10/2017 2:14:45 PM

Is it acceptable to submit the "unbound" version of the SOQ in a 3-ring binder?

Submitting the "unbound" version of the SOQ in a 3-ring binder is acceptable.

Question Submitted: 2/10/2017 2:14:29 PM

Should the page numbering required by RFQ Section 2.5.1 be sequential throughout the entire document or should the numbering start over at the beginning of each Section?

Page numbers should be sequentially numbered throughout the entire document.

Question Submitted: 2/10/2017 8:28:36 AM

Previous ODOT SOQs have required Times New Roman or Calibri 12 pt font, whereas the current project specifies Arial 12 pt. At 12 pt, Arial takes up significantly more space (~10-15%) than the other fonts and is more difficult to read due to its blockier appearance. Would ODOT consider revising the font requirements to Times New Roman or Calibri, or decrease the minimum font size to 11 pt for Arial which puts it more in line with the 12 pts of the other fonts?

Please follow the requirements in the RFQ.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2017 4:15:16 PM

Please clarify the duration of the need for the services of the IQF. Will the ODOT QAM pick up with any quality reviews associated with review of plan revisions, provide input on RFIs, shop drawings, etc. immediately upon Release for Construction submittal, having IQF involvement end with the Release for Construction of each buildable unit?

Design IQF will have to remain for the duration of the project to handle all design related activities. (plan revisions reviews, RFI reviews, show drawing reviews, record plan reviews, etc.) The Department's use of a QAM for this project does not relieve the DBT for design or construction quality requirements.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 4:00:12 PM

Would it be acceptable for the Lead Designer and its Sub-Consultants to include within Form B design-build projects whose Design Phase is substantially completed but are still under construction?

Offerors should provide projects which they believe most demonstrates the highlighted Offeror's capabilities to complete the Work, as required. The Department will evaluate the information and will use this information to assist in its determination of the most qualified Offerors.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:54:02 AM

There is no Part E listed in Section 2.5. Please confirm that Part E is not a required section.

Part E is not a required Section.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:53:46 AM

In regards to the co-locating requirements for the DBT Construction Manager, please clarify that this individual's co-location is during the duration of all construction-related activities.

As stated in Section 2.5.1, the DBT Construction Manager shall be co-located on a full-time basis for the duration of the Project unless modification to the commitment is requested by the DBT and approved by ODOT in its sole discretion.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:53:26 AM

Please clarify Section 2.5.3, part 2.d. Is ODOT referring to the construction of the new bridge or the rehabilitation of the existing structures?

The statement refers to both the new bridge construction and the existing bridge construction.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:53:13 AM

Section 7 of the RFQ states that "Submissions will NOT be accepted after the time specified." Please confirm this time.

The submittal time deadline will be 1:30pm on the date listed in the schedule shown in Section 1.5. This item will be updated in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:53:03 AM

In order to allow better clarity, will ODOT allow an 11x17 foldout page to be used for the Organizational Chart?

Yes, an 11x17 sheet (folded to 8.5x11) will be allowed. The 11x17 sheet will be considered a single sheet for purposes of page count. Content of the 11x17 sheet shall be limited to information directly related to the organizational structure and relationships among the Offeror team. An addendum will be issued to address this issue.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:52:53 AM

For firms that have received a Conflict of Interest Waiver, should a copy of the waiver letter be included in the SOQ? If so, will another section be added?

Yes, include a copy of approved waivers with Part G of the SOQ. An addendum will be issued to include this requirement.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:52:46 AM

There is a contradiction in the prequalification timeframe between RFQ Section 1.2 which states the Lead Contractor and Lead Designer must be prequalified prior to the shot-listing date and draft RFP Section 1.3 which states they must be prequalified one week prior to anticipated award. Please clarify.

The requirements for pre-qualification in Section 1.2 of the RFQ will be updated. An addendum will be issued that provides minimum requirements for pre-qualification. The draft RFP shall not be relied upon at this stage of the procurement.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:52:27 AM

RFQ Sections 2.5.9 and 2.5.10 discuss Parts I & J, however the table in Section 2.5.1 does not list these sections. Please clarify.

The Table in Section 2.5.1 should reflect Part I (Evaluation Forms) and Part J (Liquidated Damages and/or Penalties Attachment). This will be updated in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:52:00 AM

Are the Independent Design Highway Lead (Design) and Independent Structural Lead (Design) intended to be part of the IQF?

Yes, both positions are to report to the Independent Design Quality Manager (IDQM).

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:51:52 AM

Will the Department expand the Part F page count to 23 pages to allow 2 pages per resume? (10 resumes at 2 pages each + 1 page Form A + 2 pages Form B)

Revised Response: 2/9/2017.

The page count will be adjusted to reflect a maximum of 23 pages in Part F of the SOQ. This item will be updated in an addendum.

Original Response:

The page count will be adjusted to reflect a maximum of 23 pages in Parts B-D of the SOQ. This item will be updated in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:51:45 AM

RFQ Section 2.5.2, Item 5 states that the Lead Designer is the firm that employs the DBT Design QC Manager. Should this be the DB Design Project Manager?

For RFQ section 2.5.2, Item 5, the text will be updated in an addendum to reflect that the Lead Designer is the firm that employs the DBT Design Project Manager.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:51:38 AM

RFQ Section 1.1 defines The Offeror as the DBT including the Lead Contractor, Lead Designer, IQF, and subcontractors and subconsultants. Section 2.5.2, Item 3 requests identification of the Offeror's structure. Should this be the structure of the Lead Contractor rather than the Offeror since the Offeror, by definition of Section 1.1, is the entire Design Build Team and not a single entity?

The Offeror includes the Lead Contractor (also considered the DBT or legal entity contracting with the Department to perform the work), Lead Designer, Independent Quality Firm, Sub-Contractors, Sub-Consultants, and any other entities or individuals proposed in the SOQ. Section 2.5.2 is intended to address the structure of the Lead Contractor, the legal entity that will enter into the contract with ODOT. Section 1.1 and 2.5.2 will be updated in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2017 9:51:24 AM

What is the anticipated DBE Goal % on this project?

A DBE goal has not yet been established for this project.

Question Submitted: 2/3/2017 10:04:27 AM

Please provide firms with editable Word documents for Form A - Offeror Information and Form B - Work History Form to submit with Offeror's Statement of Qualifications.

**Editable Word documents have been posted to the FTP site.
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/I-480_ValleyView_RFQInfo/**

Project No. 173016

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

LOR-102520 - IR 90-20.55

Question Submitted: 8/17/2017 3:21:02 PM

Section 14.3 of the scope requires the existing shoulders, consisting of 3" asphalt base with 4" overlay, to be removed and replaced with full depth pavement within any widened sections. Attachment R-4 only shows full depth pavement beyond the existing edge of shoulder pavement and not through the existing shoulder. Please clarify if the existing shoulder pavement through the widened sections is to be replaced with full depth pavement.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 6:09:32 PM

Does the current signal system collect traffic volume data, and if so, in what format, and can this data be provided to the DBT?

The current signal system collects traffic volumes from specific detectors that are assigned to provide information to allow it to run in the "traffic response" mode of operation. The City of Avon can retrieve and print for the designer's use.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 6:08:32 PM

Section 15.4 Part D.1 states that all conduit shall be new. Will the District allow reuse of existing conduit on the bridge?

The existing conduit on the bridge can be reused.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 6:07:42 PM

Since existing pedestrian signal heads and pushbuttons are on existing stain poles which are being replaced with mast arm supports, it implies that all pedestrian signal heads and pushbuttons shall be replaced. This conflicts with the statement in Section 15.4 part F.9. Please clarify.

All pedestrian signal heads and pushbuttons on existing poles affected by the construction shall be replaced with new as indicated in Section 15.4 part F.9 of the Proposal.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 6:06:51 PM

Will the 2015 SR 83 Signal System Analysis study referenced in section 15.4 part F.5 be provided?

**This information, as well as other reference material for the project, can be accessed at the following location:
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LOR-102520/REFERENCE%20FILES/>**

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 6:06:03 PM

Please clarify "signal timing data" referenced in section 15.4 Traffic Signal Special Provision will be provided by the City of Avon. Does this data include existing and historical timings and phasing? Does this data include existing traffic volume thresholds for traffic responsive plans by time of day? Will any of the proposed timing data discussed in scope section 15.4 part F.3 and F.5 be furnished by the city?

Existing signal timing data can be provided to the designer. Historical data is not available. Phasing information is included but it would be up to the designer to field check the directions for each phase to ensure accuracy. A printout of the traffic responsive volume thresholds can be provided to the designer by the City of Avon. New revised timing data discussed in scope section 15.4 part F.3 and F.5 is to be furnished by the designer.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2017 6:04:59 PM

Please clarify the term "Preferences" referenced in the first paragraph of section 15.4 Traffic Signals Special Provision which is to be discussed AFTER award. Can we expect all preferences related to pay items and proprietary materials to be disclosed prior to bid? Will any new preferences disclosed after the awarded bid which impact cost of the signal installation will be open to negotiation?

Please prepare the bids for the project based on the published Proposal, Contract Attachments, and Addenda.

Project No. 173017

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

LAW-104742 - US 52-21.44 Culvert

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 4:10:08 PM

Are there any historical geotechnical borings in the project area for use on this project?

The only known historical borings in the area are the ones from the original construction plans from 1958 posted on the FTP site that is listed in the scope of services. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-13567/REFERENCE%20FILE/>

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 4:09:18 PM

As late fall/early winter weather in the project area typically isn't an issue for this type of work, is there a reason behind the 11/15/17 completion date?

Yes. Please bid as is.

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 11:20:18 AM

Are there exiting radii if so what type

Please resubmit this prebid question with the correct project number.

Question Submitted: 8/16/2017 11:18:34 AM

Does the master need software if so what type

Please resubmit this prebid question with the correct project number.

Question Submitted: 7/25/2017 3:58:35 PM

Can the ftp site information be posted and include any existing CAD/geopak, existing plans, photos, etc?

Project No. 174012

Sale Date - 9/7/2017

PRE-94212 - SR 122-01.53

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 9:45:49 AM

In the proposal and on plan sheet 19/26 documents call out a thickness for the overlay of 1". On all other plan sheets including 25/26 showing the new deck the new overlay is shown as 1 3/4". Hydro-demolition depth is 1". Please clarify.

The depth of the Hydrodemolition is to equal 1" and the overlay thickness is to equal 1.75" for a net of +0.75" on the profile elevation of the deck. The (T=1") on plan sheet 19/26 is referring to the depth of the hydrodemolition.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/14/2017 9:43:49 AM

Quantities for the Hydrodemolition match that of the overlay. However, on sheet 20/26 the limits of the hydro-demolition stop at the 3 FT edge deck removal line. Please confirm if the hydro-demolition should be the whole deck area, or if the quantity needs to be adjusted removing the 3 FT deck edge replacement area?

See forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 177030

Sale Date - 8/24/2017

BEL-101501 - SR 148-17.91

Question Submitted: 8/7/2017 5:07:40 PM

Please provide the intent of the plan note on page 3 ITEM 203 –Excavation “The contractor shall perform the excavation shown in the plan per specification 203 and the current ODOT geotechnical bulletin No. 3 (GB 3)” in particular the reference to Geotechnical bulletin No. 3 (GB 3)

Question Submitted: 8/7/2017 4:27:52 PM

Will ODOT waive the presplitting requirement. There is not enough burden between the presplit line and the existing ground line to achieve an effective presplit.

The requirement for the presplitting will be waived and the quantities related to the presplitting will be removed from the plan by addendum.