**Question Submitted:** 9/3/2019 2:35:15 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

The APP note for CB Reconstructed to Grade on Plan Sheet 17 states that tuck pointing and joint repair is required for these catch basins. No information has been provided regarding the size or existing condition of these structures. There is also a significant quantity related to this item and it is not feasible to investigate/analyze all of these structures prior to the bid. Depending on the condition of these structures, this work could be very costly and bidding contractors have no viable/reasonable means to estimate this work for the bid. Please revise this note or provide additional information so this work can be properly estimated for the bid.

Prior to work, all catch basins labeled as being reconstructed to grade will be reviewed in the field by the Contractor, and City representatives. The amount of work to be performed on each basin will be determined at that time. Catch basins that are determined to have completely failed or need extensive repair work during this review may be removed and replaced under separate item.

**Question Submitted:** 9/3/2019 2:25:36 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

The office calculation spreadsheets provided do not contain all of the needed information. While some data is contained in these spreadsheets they are missing calculations for Items 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12. Please provide this additional office calculation information.

**Calculation information provided**

**Question Submitted:** 9/3/2019 2:17:05 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

Plan Sheet 16 contains a note regarding "PLANED SURFACES". This note limits the duration of time from start of milling to placement of intermediate asphalt. While this requirement alone is difficult because of all the required adjustments and curb/driveway replacements, it does not take into account any needed partial/full depth repairs that may be directed. The scope of pavement repairs is unknown for each section making it impossible to determine if this restraint can even be met. Can that plan note be removed?

**Question answered previously on August 1, 2019.**

**Question Submitted:** 9/3/2019 2:17:05 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

will the wayfaring sign supports be required to have breakaway capability?

According to the details on Sheets 122 and 123, the face of the support pole is a minimum of 7.5’ from the face of the curb. As per ODOT L&D Section 600.2.2 and Figure 600-4, for curbed urban streets with a Posted Speed of 35 MPH or less, aesthetic features are allowed to be 4’ minimum between the curb face and the impact surface of the rigid object. Therefore, the sign supports do not need to be breakaway.

**Question Submitted:** 8/2/2019 3:35:37 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

Can the department add the asphalt quantities(193CY) at the crosswalk locations as the detail on sheet 119 shows that the crosswalk is flush with the surface course and for protection of the concrete the crosswalk is constructed after the surface.

The unit price bid for the Decorative Concrete Crosswalk includes all labor, equipment and material associated to construct the walk.

**Question Submitted:** 8/1/2019 3:54:31 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

Per the plan notes it states that residential drives can only be out of service for 7 days. How is the contractor able to do this with the concrete be specified as QC-1?

Defective concrete residential driveways are to be replaced with Class QC MS concrete, as stated in the first paragraph of the “Item 452-6” Non-Reinforced Concrete Pavement, Class QC MS, as per plan” note on Sheet No. 15.

**Question Submitted:** 8/1/2019 12:39:58 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

Is it possible to change the bid quantity and unit for item 28 Partial Depth Repair (base). This item is used when brick base is encountered on site, and requires the contractor to remove the brick and any remaining asphalt that is above the brick after the roadway has been milled. With no core report available, how is the contractor able to determine the additional amount of replacement material needed above the brick? This item should be bid as a CY item.

**Unit of Item 28 is already shown in CY.**

*** 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.***
The Typical section on sheet 69 for the 255 repair includes asphalt intermediate with the repair. How is the contract able to determine the quantity needed when no core report is available. Additionally, this typical sections calls out 448 Type 2 intermediate, when the plan note on sheet 16 for the partial depth asphalt repairs, call out 19.5mm for repairs less the 3” in depth. Please clarify which type of mix is acceptable, and please provide a separate pay item for this variable depth asphalt since the quantity can not be determined.

Pavement cores report provided on the reference link. The General Note for Item 255, Full depth pavement Repair and Rigid Replacement on sheet 16 does not specify the type of asphalt within the note, and refers to the Detail on sheet 69 for "...the work and material that are included in the unit price for this item".

Please review the plan note on page 16/127 "Planed Surfaces" that states the intermediate course must be placed within 14 calendar days of the pavement planing operation. Note does not make sense for phased construction where milled surfaces will not be exposed to vehicular traffic.

The Contractor will be allowed extend the time between planing and intermediate course at their discretion, provided that the total construction time for each section does not exceed the number of calendar days allowed as per the Construction Phasing Note.

Please clarify conflicting notes for the Partial Depth Repairs and 255 Rigid Repairs between pages 16 and 69. On page 16, the replacement material for the Partial Depth Repairs is specified to be a Type 2, but is labeled as a Type 1 material on page 69. Also, for the 255 repairs, it is called out that a Type 2 material is to be placed over the 255 rigid repair to bring the repair flush with the milled surface. Is this item to be considered incidental to the 255 repair, and what is the thickness of the material?

The quantities for Surface and Intermediate course in the office calculations do not match the bid quantities. Please clarify.

Quantity will be corrected in a forthcoming Addendum.

Were pavement cores taken for this project? If so, will they be made available?

Pavement cores are not available for this project.

Bid item 32 full depth removal and replacement: should the bid item be in cubic yards rather than square? Per the typical and the detail on sheet 69 the depth can range from 9” to 15” at the direction of the engineer?

Item 255 Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement is bid per square yard as per the ODOT CMS.

Bid item 24 CB adjusted to grade APP: Can you please provide a detail? The note on sheet 17 says we are to adjust the casting but are also responsible for milling and asphalt in this area?

Catch Basin Adjusted to Grade, as per plan includes all additional work in order to provide an opening along the curb of at least 6 inches (6") high (as per the note on sheet 17). This includes additional milling of the existing pavement; and asphalt needed to provide required opening height and positive drainage.

Please consider changing the unit of measure for Reference #29 - Partial Depth Pavement Repair (Asphalt Concrete Base), As Per Plan from a SY item to a CY item. Per the Plan Notes on Page 16, this item includes the removal of brick base as well as any remaining asphalt following the 3.25" Pavement Planing. A CY line item would be much more applicable for this item as it will have a large range of depths associated with it. Also, please clarify the material to be used in the repair.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 7/24/2019 4:19:51 PM  Question Number - 0

Please provide AutoCAD files.

**Question Submitted:** 7/24/2019 3:08:04 PM  Question Number - 0

Bid Item 0014 - The General Notes state that these ground monitoring wells are to be adjusted to grade per the requirements of the Owner of the well. Who owns the wells? Where can additional information regarding these wells be obtained?

Ground Water Monitoring Well Information can be found at the following web site: https://apps.ohiodnr.gov/water/maptechs/wellogs/app/

**Question Submitted:** 7/24/2019 1:43:50 PM  Question Number - 0

Bid item 0 curb removed APP: The summary refers you to sheet 14 which has no exact note other than an integral curb note? Sheet 55 has 692' of the plan quantity 840' but i can't find it. Please provide location.

Curb Removed, as per plan is to be used to remove defective curb that is integral to the existing concrete base. The "Integral Curb Removed and Replaced" note on Sheet 14, second paragraph, first three sentences explains what is included in this item.

**Question Submitted:** 7/24/2019 12:18:55 PM  Question Number - 0

Bid item 46 curb type 6: Without being able to see "lengths" of curb removed and replaced the contractors will not know if he can bid slip-form construction or all hand work which is a very big cost difference. Can you provide locations?

Detailed location & quantities of all curb and driveway removal and replacement can be found on the spreadsheet provided previously.(xlsx)

**Question Submitted:** 7/24/2019 12:10:14 PM  Question Number - 0

Bid item 6 curb removed: Without being able to see "lengths" of curb removed and replaced the contractors will not know if he can bid slip-form construction or all hand work which is a very big cost difference. Can you provide stations?

Detailed location & quantities of all curb and driveway removal and replacement can be found on the spreadsheet provided previously.(xlsx)

**Question Submitted:** 7/24/2019 11:59:56 AM  Question Number - 0

Bid item 39 8" reinforced concrete pavement: you have quantified it on sheets 52 through 66 but there is nothing there to show us what we are bidding on? ODOT obviously has areas in mind, can we see what we are bidding on?

Bid Item No. 39 is used for the installation of 8” (commercial) driveway aprons. These are indicated on the plan views by the “DR” bubble.

**Question Submitted:** 7/24/2019 11:54:35 AM  Question Number - 0

Bid item 3 pavement removed APP: you have quantified it on sheets 52 through 66 but there is nothing there to show us what we are bidding on? ODOT obviously has areas in mind, can we see what we are bidding on?

Bid Item No. 3 is used for the removal of existing driveway aprons. These are indicated on the plan views by the “DR” bubble (for drives being removed and replaced) or the “R” bubble with coded notes (for drives being removed and not replaced).

**Question Submitted:** 7/24/2019 11:31:51 AM  Question Number - 0

Bid item 2 pavement removed: The general summary refers you to sheet 117 which refers you to 118,119,120 and 121. the crosswalk removal is included in the item? what are we removing? what is the 40' pavement removed typ talking about on these sheets?

Refer to the "Item 451, Reinforced Concrete Pavement, Misc.: Decorative Concrete Crosswalk” note on Sheet 116, under Part 4 Basis of Payment. When installing the new decorative crosswalks across US 42, the existing pavement will need to be removed. According to record plans (as indicated on Sheets 10 and 12), from the west Parma Hts. Corp. Line at West 130th Street to Sta. 469+20, and then from Sta. 479+19 to Sta. 512+72, there is an existing 40’ wide concrete/brick base; from Sta. 512+72 to the end of the project, the concrete/brick base is 46’ wide. The 2709 sy quantity on Sheet 117 is for this pavement removal.

*** 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:** 7/22/2019 3:22:17 PM  
Per the plan notes the poles that is to be used for the Wayfaring signs, bid item numbers 112 and 113 are to be manufactured by Brandon Industries, per the manufacture’s representative, Brandon Industries cannot provide a pole long enough for this application. Please provide an alternative.

Refer to Plan sheet 124 Sign Notes #3 and contact other manufacturers.

**Question Submitted:** 7/22/2019 2:40:17 PM  
Please provide all office calcs. In the General Summary for Item 202 Pavement Removed, it lists a quantity under office calcs, but the office calcs for pavement removed were not included in the spreadsheet provided on the ftp site. It appears it may be the same for other items as well as the Pavilion office calcs spreadsheet only contains some items and not all.

Information will be made available.

**Question Submitted:** 7/22/2019 2:31:29 PM  
Per plan page 114/127 (addendum A) 2-3” conduits are to be installed between PB4 and PB5 by means of Jacked or Drilled. Is this correct? If correct the plan quantity for bid item #83, CONDUIT, JACKED OR DRILLED 3” should be 212’.

Question will be answered in a forthcoming Addendum

**Question Submitted:** 7/16/2019 3:04:07 PM  
Would The Department please make the office calculations available for the pavement work as noted in the General Summary?

Office calculations for pavement work will be provided. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-105726/Reference%20Files/

**Question Submitted:** 7/10/2019 4:59:19 PM  
Addendum # 1 revised SP-2 on plan page 115 to be a TC-81.21 design 11 signal support. However, pay item # 107 was not changed and is still a TC-81.21 design 12 signal support. Which is correct?

Pay Item should be TC-81.21 design 11. An addendum will be forthcoming to revise pay item.

**Question Submitted:** 7/1/2019 10:34:30 AM  
The unit of measure for Ref. 28-Partial Depth Pavement Repair, As Per Plan is listed as CY in the proposal and SY in the general summary. Please clarify

Question will be answered in an Addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 7/27/2019 3:38:15 PM  
Please clarify the type of temporary vandal fence required on line items #111, #166 & #359. The proposal shows Type A Temporary Vandal Fence but the structure quantity plan sheets (57-64) show Type B Temporary Vandal Fence.

**Question Submitted:** 7/27/2019 11:54:03 AM  
What are the final surface requirements for the 18 inches of bridge deck between the inside face of the new bridge railing and the face of the existing safety curb that is to be removed on the south side of GRE-675-0616?

**Question Submitted:** 7/27/2019 10:52:22 AM  
On 120/137 Section D-D does the outside vertical face of the new bridge railing line up with the existing edge of bridge deck or does the inside sloped face of the new bridge railing line up with the existing face of safety curb?

The outside vertical face of the proposed railing lines up with the edge of the existing deck. The toe/toe clearance on the bridge will increase.

---

*** 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:** 9/27/2019 7:37:41 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

The table on 66/137 has different vandal protection fence post spacing for GRE-675-0616 from that shown on 111/137. What is the correct post spacing?

Construct VPF with the post spacing shown on sheet 66/137.

**Question Submitted:** 9/27/2019 6:54:52 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

In the plan set originally issued for bid section D-D on 66/136 showed a 4” Sawcut. SBR-1-13 also shows 4” Sawcut and on the last page has a note that the contractor has an option to perform full depth sawcut. Addendum 2 changed section D-D on 66/136 to show a full depth sawcut. Will the contractor have the option to choose 4” sawcut or full depth sawcut or is the full depth sawcut required at every deflection joint?

The contractor is to perform a full depth saw cut on all deflection joints as shown on sheet 66/137.

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 9:23:26 AM  
**Question Number:** 0


Yes. See forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 9:18:12 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

Yes. See forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 9/24/2019 7:10:00 AM  
**Question Number:** 0


Yes. Revisions forthcoming

**Question Submitted:** 9/23/2019 2:14:04 PM  
**Question Number:** 0

Under Proposal section 0041 Structure Repair GRE-675-1540R line 0390 is 519E12300 Patching Concrete Bridge Deck - Type B 66.00 SY. The GRE-675-1540 L/R site plan on 129/136 shows about 66 square yards hatched just north of the GRE-675-1540R forward approach slab and the legend on the same page indicates the hatched area is 1.5" pavement planing & AC overlay. There is not concrete bridge deck patching shown for GRE-675-1540. Should proposal line 0390 be changed to 1.5" pavement planning & AC overlay?

Bridge deck patching at this location has been removed from the project. See omission in forthcoming addendum. 1.5" planning and AC overlay work is quantified on in pavement calculations.

**Question Submitted:** 9/23/2019 12:57:50 PM  
**Question Number:** 0

Abutment Section A-A on sheet 85 & 86 says "Removal of Disingrated Concrete Per PN 512". The same sections show 6" minimum depth removal. 512.C says Remove all unsound concrete including all patches other than sound Portland cement concrete, and all loose and disintegrated concrete. Will removal be according to 512.C or to 6" minimum depth?

Remove approach slab concrete to a depth which provides 3/4" clearance below the existing #8 approach slab tie in reinforcement. Based off of existing plans this depth equals 6".
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/19/2019 2:09:48 PM Question Number - 0

Proposed work item 1 on 110/136 says on south parapet replace existing new jersey shape concrete bridge railing with single slope concrete bridge railing. The existing bridge limits are about 412 feet. Estimated Quantities on 61/136 include 876 feet bridge railing removed. Is the existing bridge railing being removed on both the north and the south side or just the south side?

Only the south parapet is to be removed. Quantity will be revised to reflect this.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2019 1:59:07 PM Question Number - 0

Proposed work item 1 on 110/136 says on south parapet replace existing new jersey shape concrete bridge railing with single slope concrete bridge railing. The existing railing on the south side looks like BR-2-67 with safety curb not jersey shape. The face of the existing curb is about 3’ from the edge of the deck. If the back of the proposed single slope rail is flush with the edge of the deck there will be about 1.5’ of deck exposed that is currently under the safety curb and the face of the proposed single slope railing will not line up with the face of the roadway curb adjacent to the bridge. Will additional information be provided for removal of the existing curb/rail and construction of the proposed single slope railing?

Revised details in forthcoming addendum (sheet 111/137) address this. The curb will taper back to existing curb and the gap between the edge of pavement and curb face will be closed with a variable width gutter pan. Remove BR-2-67 and safety curb on south edge of the bridge and reconstruct with single slope barrier per details shown on sheet 120/137 and the common bridge railing details.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2019 8:42:29 AM Question Number - 0

Will any replacement of concrete bridge rail include conduit encased in the rail?

There is existing conduit encased in the rail at GRE-675-0309/0310 which is being relocated as shown on sheet 54. Existing conduit is also encased in the bridge railing at GRE-675-0616 but the utility it is carrying is no longer in service so conduit will not be included in the new bridge railing.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2019 8:18:59 AM Question Number - 0

Proposal Section 0008 Structure Repair GRE-675-0148L and 0009 Structure Repair GRE-675-0148R both include 12 feet of 202E38000 Guardrail Removed. The structure quantities for GRE-675-0148L and GRE-675-0148R on plan sheet 57/136 do not have 202 38000 Guardrail Removed but do include 12 feet of 202 38500 Bridge Railing Removed for each structure. Should proposal line 0112 and 0123 be 202E38500 Bridge Railing Removed instead of 202E38000 Guardrail Removed?

Bid item as shown in the plans. The proposal line items will be changed with addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2019 11:47:04 AM Question Number - 0

Pavement Calculations on plan sheet 50 include Base Removed with 6 inch thickness. On the same page the existing pavement is identified as 3/75” asphalt over 9” P.C.C. Is Base Removed for 6” of aggregate or soil below the P.C.C.?

Base removed at this location is for the removal of 6” of aggregate base under the PCC. (The material and thickness of the subbase were obtained from the original construction plans)

Question Submitted: 9/18/2019 11:18:24 AM Question Number - 0

On plan sheets 98/136, 99/136, 101/136, 102/136, 104/136 and 105/136 the plan view has a hatched area between 25’ and 100’ long indicated to be full depth flexible pavement. On the corresponding profile view all the full depth flexible pavement is shown 25’ long. What are the limits of full depth flexible pavement at these locations?

The hatched area indicates Full depth pavement replacement as well as pavement milling and resurfacing work. Full depth pavement replacement is 25′ long directly behind the rear approach slab and directly in front of the forward approach slab. Minor profile adjustments will be necessary outside of the full depth replacement sections. A variable depth Intermediate AC quantity is provided on the pavement calculations sheet 50 to accommodate the profile adjustment work.

Question Submitted: 9/17/2019 3:43:51 PM Question Number - 0

Between US-35 and exit 15 I-675 has 4 lanes in both directions. The permitted lane closure website and the chart on 16/136 only identify 2 lane and 3 lane configurations. What number of lanes in this area during what times will the contractor be permitted to close?

The contractor is permitted to close 3 lanes leaving 1 thru lane open from 9pm - 6am on weekends and weekdays where there are 4 existing thru lanes.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/16/2019 10:57:09 AM  Question Number - 0
Railroad Coordination (Structure No. GRE-675-1720R) on plan sheet 8/136 refers to Norfolk Southern Special Provisions for the Protection of Railway Interests. Will a copy of Norfolk Southern Special Provisions for the Protection of Railway Interests be provided for this project?

The bid documents will be updated to include Railroad special provisions and the railroad coordination note will be revised in the general notes to eliminate contradicting information.

Question Submitted: 9/16/2019 8:21:15 AM  Question Number - 0
Plan sheet 1/136 indicates no railroad involvement and there are not railroad notes in the Proposal but plan sheet 131/136 shows work less than 20 feet from railroad tracks at GRE-675-1720. Will railroad insurance, railroad flagging or any special requirements for work over or near railroad right of way be part of this project?

See Railroad Coordination (Structure No. GRE-675-0.00) note in General notes section for requirements.

Question Submitted: 9/16/2019 8:04:18 AM  Question Number - 0
Estimated Quantities for GRE-675-1540R on 58/136 include 66 SY Patching Concrete Bridge Deck – Type B. This work is not shown with the other work at GRE-675-1540 L/R on plan sheet 129/136. Is Patching Concrete Bridge Deck – Type B part of the work at GRE-675-1540 and if so where is it required?

Patching is not part of the work for GRE-675-1540R. See forthcoming addendum for omission.

Question Submitted: 9/16/2019 7:38:42 AM  Question Number - 0
Estimated Quantities for GRE-675-0309 on 58/136 include 25 SF Patching Concrete Bridge Deck – Type A. The Proposal includes 25 SY Patching Concrete Bridge Deck – Type A for GRE-675-0309. There is a similar mismatch of units for GRE-675-0310. What is the correct quantity and unit for Patching Concrete Bridge Deck – Type A at GRE-675-0309 and GRE-675-0310?

Bid item as shown in the Proposal line items (Unit is in SY).

Question Submitted: 9/16/2019 7:38:42 AM  Question Number - 0
Notes for several structures reference Proposal Note 512 – Patching Concrete Bridge Decks. Will Proposal Note 512 with the applicable date be added to the bid documents?

The bid documents will be updated to include PN 512

Question Submitted: 9/16/2019 6:38:04 AM  Question Number - 0
What are the maintenance of traffic requirements for GRE-675-0822 single lane ramp from Colonel Glenn Highway to northbound I-675 when gravity fed resin is to be applied?

Perform lane closure for GRE-675-0822 single lane ramp per the permitted lane closure table. PLCT states that complete single lane ramp closures for structure work items are permitted from 9pm to 6 am. 15 minute short duration complete closures for single lane ramps are permitted from 12am to 5 am.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2019 3:10:12 PM  Question Number - 0
It appears 514 bid items Grinding Fins, Tears, Slivers From Existing Steel and Final Inspection Repair were omitted from the proposal.

See forthcoming addendum with the addition of 514 bid items Grinding fins, tears and slivers from existing steel and Final inspection repair.

Question Submitted: 8/30/2019 12:01:40 PM  Question Number - 0

Bridge parapet removal is required at GRE-675-0512L&R, GRE-675-0520L&R and GRE-675-0533L&R. It is to be paid under 202E38500 Bridge Railing Removed. See forthcoming addendum for addition of pay item.

Question Submitted: 8/30/2019 11:42:55 AM  Question Number - 0
Plan sheet 100/136, 103/136 and 106/136 show type A installation for approach slabs. How will this work be paid?

Type A installation will be paid under 526E90010. See forthcoming addendum with addition of pay item.

*** 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: 8/30/2019 9:43:36 AM  Question Number - 0
In the proposal lines 0101, 0137, 0155, 0171 and 0219 are item 509E20000 Reinforcing Steel, Replacement of Existing Reinforcing Steel. The corresponding items on plan sheets 57-59/136 are 509E20001 Reinforcing Steel, Replacement of Existing Reinforcing Steel, As Per Plan. Will work under these items be required to comply with the as per plan note?

Work will be required to comply with the as per plan note. Bid the item as shown in the plans. The proposal line item quantity will be changed with addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/30/2019 8:45:29 AM  Question Number - 0
Proposal Line #22 - 301 Base is showing 934 CY. The general summary and plans are showing 467 CY. Please clarify.

Bid item as shown in the plans. The proposal line item quantity will be changed with addendum. Another mismatch is on Proposal Line #26. Item code should read 806E00100 for the Joint density spec. Typical section call-out will be changed with addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/28/2019 8:37:31 AM  Question Number - 0
Line item 20 in the proposal shows 1.25" pavement planing. Should this be 1.5"? Please clarify.

Bid item as shown in the plans. The proposal line items will be changed with addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/28/2019 8:34:30 AM  Question Number - 0
Proposal line number 21 shows Pavement Planing (D=3.25"). The typical sections show pavement planing at 3.75". Also, there appears to be no 1.5" pavement planing in the typical sections legend. Please correct the call out and legend item for 1.5" planing on page 5 of plans. It is currently referencing 9" of 301 base, instead of pavement planing.

Bid item as shown in the plans. The proposal line items will be changed with addendum. Callout #5 on sheet 5 should reference 1.5" pavement planing. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/13/2019 9:49:05 AM  Question Number - 0
With the large amount of sub work on this job, would ODOT please consider knocking down the current work type percentage by Prime that is currently shown at 50%? Thank you for this consideration

The work type percentage by prime will lowered to 40%. Please see forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 8/13/2019 8:39:25 AM  Question Number - 0
Please post office calcs for structure items.

Structure Quantity office calcs can be found on ODOT's ftp site at the URL: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/94254/

Question Submitted: 8/9/2019 8:12:49 AM  Question Number - 0
Section E-E on 66/136 shows #5 and #6 GFRP longitudinal reinforcing for the concrete railing on the bridges. The Reinforcing Schedule on 68/136 and 69/136 includes X401 GFRP reinforcing for structures GRE-675-0059, GRE-675-0219, GRE-675-309, GRE-675-310 and GRE-675-0445. X401 GFRP reinforcing is not included in the Reinforcing Schedule for GRE-675-0616 or GRE-675-0737 on 70/136. Are #4 GFRP reinforcing bars required at the joints for all the bridge parapet on this project?

X401 GFRP reinforcing for bridges GRE-675-0059, GRE-675-0219, GRE-675-309, GRE-675-310 and GRE-675-0445 is to only be placed at the joint before the transition section as shown on sheet 66/136. The 4’-6" lengths of X401 GFRP are not to be placed at the deflection joints on the bridge at any bridge location. GRE-675-0616 and GRE-675-0737 do not require any X401 GFRP reinforcing at the transition section.

Question Submitted: 8/9/2019 8:11:59 AM  Question Number - 0
Is the bridge railing and 14’ bridge railing transition shown on 66/136 part of 511E34412 Class QC2 Concrete With QC/QA, Superstructure?

The bridge railing and 14’ bridge railing transition shown on 66/136 are part of 511E53014 CLASS QC3 CONCRETE, MISC.: SUPERSTRUCTURE CONCRETE WITH QC/QA, AS PER PLAN NOT part of 511E34412 Class QC2 Concrete With QC/QA, Superstructure.

Question Submitted: 8/9/2019 8:11:25 AM  Question Number - 0
Is the 2'-10" wide approach slab shown on section A-A through D-D on 66/136 part of 511E34412 Class QC2 Concrete With QC/QA, Superstructure?

The 2'-10" wide approach slab shown on section A-A through D-D on 66/136 IS part of 511E34412 Class QC2 Concrete With QC/QA, Superstructure.

*** 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.
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Question Submitted: 8/9/2019 8:10:44 AM  Question Number - 0

Class QC3 Concrete note on 55/136 says the mix is to include micro-silica. At what rate is micro-silica to be included in the QC3 mix?

The QC3 Mix should not include micro-silica admixture. The verbiage in the note is incorrect and will be omitted with addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/9/2019 8:10:10 AM  Question Number - 0

Sequence of Construction GRE-675-0309/0310 on 15/136 says no work is permitted to occur, and all lanes shall be open to traffic from the start of the Thanksgiving holiday period through the end of the New Year’s holiday period. What date is the start of the Thanksgiving holiday period and what date is the end of the New Year’s holiday period?

This is a multi-year project so no exact dates can be given. The note will be revised by addendum to read: "NO WORK IS PERMITTED TO OCCUR ON INDIAN-RIPPLE ROAD AND ALL LANES SHALL BE OPEN TO TRAFFIC FROM 6:00 AM THE WEDNESDAY BEFORE THANKSGIVING THROUGH 6:00 AM THE DAY FOLLOWING NEW YEAR’S DAY."

Question Submitted: 8/8/2019 12:52:04 PM  Question Number - 0

Please post existing structure plans.

Existing structure plans can be found on ODOT's ftp site at the URL:

Question Submitted: 8/2/2019 9:56:11 AM  Question Number - 0

When will the plans be available for download?

Public advertisement for the project is scheduled for 8/08/2019.

Project No.  190470
LUC-88084 - IR 475 Intchng & Wdn Phase 3 (PART 1, 2, 3)  Sale Date - 10/10/2019

Question Submitted: 9/27/2019 9:37:42 AM  Question Number - 0

Part 3- The maintenance of traffic subsummary on sheet 18 has quantity for Item 614 Asphalt Quantity for Maintaining Traffic referenced on sheets 19 & 21. Sheets 19 & 21 shows the quantity as Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A. Please clarify which is correct. There is no Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A set up on part 3 of this project.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2019 9:28:23 AM  Question Number - 0

Part 2– The maintenance of traffic subsummary on sheet 33 states the 100 CY of Item 614 Asphalt Concrete for Maintaining Traffic is on sheets 34-42. There is no reference made to the item on sheets 34-42. Please clarify how Item 614 Asphalt Concrete for Maintaining Traffic is to be used.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2019 9:22:57 AM  Question Number - 0

The note on Part 1 plan page 9/354 regarding “Item 606 – Cable Guardrail” mentions a 4’ wide “no mow strip”. However, it does not provide any additional details on the type of material required or thickness of the no mow strip. This note also does not specifically say if the no mow strip cost is incidental to the “Cable Barrier W/Concrete Line Post Foundation” or if it should have its own pay item. Additionally, the typical sections on page 6/354 do not show a no mow strip, and detail A of that page would make it appear that a 4’ wide no mow strip would partially overlap the proposed compacted aggregate along the inside shoulder. We would ask that you provide the following: 1) the required type of material including thickness, 2) clarification on how the no mow strip will be paid, and 3) a typical section showing this no mow strip.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2019 9:20:01 AM  Question Number - 0

1. Please review the extended splitter detail and the top sheet typical section for McCord road on Plan Sheet 8/119 for Part 3. Both details indicate asphalt surface, intermediate and base course placed between the Type 6 curb which differs from the same type of application on Dorr Street Part 2. It would appear that the material placed between the curb for the splitter island should be a thicker lift of 304 aggregate base.

*** 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.***
Addendum 2 added ref 1002 Compacted Aggregate with a quantity of 617 CY. The revised general summary page (44/354) lists a quantity of 115 CY. Which quantity is correct?

Ref 625 has a quantity of 3,225 CY of Traffic Compacted Surface, Type C. This quantity seems excessive. It's about 100 cy per road or driveway.

Sheet 19 shows rumble strip removal and paving as part of Stage 2 MOT. Can ODOT verify the quantities that Contract 190427 is currently replacing. It appears SB is already included in 190427 but not Sta. 408+15 to Sta. 430+00 in the NB.

The rumble strip removal and paving in Contract 1090470 is for the removal of the inside shoulder rumble strips for Stage 3. Inside shoulders rumble strips removals are not included in the Contract 190427.

Ref 762 is Class QC1 Concrete, Headwall. The plans show a 42” HW-2.2 headwall. Shouldn't this be item 602 Concrete Masonry?

On sheet 300 at station 1178+49 the plan sheet calls out a valve box on the 8” gate valve, but the sub summary calls out a 5’ dia. Water manhole. Which item should be included, the valve box or the 5’ water manhole?

On sheet 300 at station 1178+26.00 the plan sheet shows a 4’ dia. Water manhole, but on the sub summary they call out a 5’ dia. Water manhole. Which size is correct?

Parts 2 and 3 each have a bid item for Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B. Per 615.10 shouldn’t there be a corresponding Roads for Maintaining Traffic bid item for Part 2 and 3?

Item Roads for Maintaining Traffic will be add in an upcoming addendum

Part 1 plan sheet 1/354 as updated with addendum 2 does not provide a date for the 800 supplemental specifications. Please advise what date is to be used.

SS 800 date is 7/19/2019. The title sheet will be updated in an upcoming addendum.

In the project reference files for part 2, the project index file list that the file 99737_XC001.dgn will contain the cross sections for Dorr Street. This file is missing the cross sections from 1157+50 to 1182+00. Will the department please provide a revised CAD file that contains the balance of the cross sections?

Updated Part 2 and 3 CADD files have been posted as of 9/26 at 11:53 AM. You will find what you are looking for in ..Geopak\BaseMaps\Addendum1-DGL folder. I believe you are looking in a previous version of the posted zipped CADD files. Thanks!

Bid item 353- Settlement Platform, 4 each: plan sheet 21/488 notes give 8 locations. Please review and revise quantity as needed.

Updated General Summary sheet will be part of an upcoming addendum

*** 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

Sheet 285/488 of part 2 under the heading Tapping Valves: the note states that tapping sleeve and valves shall be installed by the City at the contractors expense. The Water General Notes explains in detail what work the City will perform and what work the contractor is to perform. Is the contractor required to pay all of the City's permits for them to perform this work? These permits can be very expensive. These permits are usually worked out between the City and ODOT. Please clarify.

Sheet 86/119 of part 2 shows the proposed waterline crossing both McCord and Dorr. Can Dorr and McCord be closed separately for two days each to install this water main? If not please provide an MOT plan to accomplish this work. Also, please provide a temporary pavement detail for the trench repairs.

A previous question was answered stating that storm and sanitary crossings will require temporary pavement repairs in phase 1A and these repairs will be paid under the respective storm and sanitary items. Are waterline crossings treated this same way?

Part 2 plan sheet 36/488 calls for a contingency quantity of 194 SY of pavement for maintaining traffic, type A to be carried to the sub-summary for existing shoulder conditions not suitable for traffic. We don’t see a bid item for this, only Type B (Ref. 631), please review.

The subsummary (Sheet 33/488) is correct. This contingency quantity is to be Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B.

Part 2 plan sheet 36/488 calls for 450 SY of Item 253, Pavement Repair to be carried to the general summary for use prior to the MOT phases. We don’t see a bid item for this, please review.

Updated General Summary sheet will be part of an upcoming addendum.

Page 134/354 references that the existing lighting should be maintained. The only bid item for maintaining existing lighting is shown under part 2 of this project line item 0544. Should part 1 and part 2 maintenance of existing lighting be combined under line item 0544? Or is there a different line item number to use for maintaining existing lighting on part 1?

The omission of ITEM 625 SPECIAL - MAINTAIN EXISTING LIGHTING located on page 134/354 is an error and will be added to part 1 in a forthcoming addendum. Thanks!

Bid item 338- Pavement Removed: this item includes 633 sy of pavement on existing Joyce Lane. Please provide existing pavement typical section with defined material depths.

Bid item 338- Pavement Removed: a portion of this item is for removing existing IR-475 outside shoulders to tie in new ramps. Part 2 pavement existing pavement sections for ramps refer contractor to part 1 for pavement typical sections for pavement to be removed. Part 1 typical sections show these areas to be 6”-8” asphalt. By specification, this isn’t pavement removal and furthermore bid item 339 is for "Pavement Removed, Asphalt". Please review and revise quantities accordingly.

*** 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.***
Bid items 638 and 639 - pipe removals in part 3: there are several inconsistencies and errors in these two bid items. Several drainage runs to be removed are 30" diameter but in the wrong bid item, drainage runs along both Dorr and McCord to be removed but not accounted for, water main removals along McCord which are set for removal but are called out in cross section sheets 64-67 as "plugged", and water services are to be removed per addendum 1 (sheet 83) which are adjacent to new services which are to be drilled/bored. Please review these inconsistencies and errors and revise plans/quantities as needed.

Sheet 25/488 refers to specified settlement periods for the Phase 1C embankments. The general notes do not indicate a specific settlement period. What is the duration of the settlement periods for each ramp?

Part 2 page 122 of 488. Please provide invert elevations for storm runs D-110A & D-111. They do not appear to be given. Also, run D-110A is called out as “Type B” pipe in the sub-summary, but on plan sheet 122 it is shown as “Type C” pipe. Please advise as to which type you would like this run included.

The information for CB 3A at Ref. D-110A is as follows: Station 1152+80.62, 110.46’ Rt. Dorr; grate elevation = 637.42; flowline 12” southeast = 632.42. The information for MH 3 at Ref. D-111 is as follows: Station 1152+90.00, 117.94’ Rt. Dorr; rim elevation = 639.40; flowline 15” southwest and northeast = 629.37; flowline 12” northwest = 632.06. Pipe run D-110A is to be Type B pipe.

Please verify the quantity for reference 711 6” Concrete Traffic Island

Updated sheets will be part of an upcoming addendum.

Part 3 page 33 of the plans states 8” Non Reinforced Concrete Pavement, Class QC1, 10” Thick. Please clarify or provide a detail for this.

The part of the description stating ‘10” thick is wrong and is removed. All concrete for this pay item is to be 8” thick.

On Part 3, page 5 of the plans the typical sections show #22 as 6” concrete walk app Decorative Stamped, there is no pay item for this please clarify. Also #12 is 4” walk APP and #21 is 4” Walk APP Decorative stamped but there is only 1 APP item, please clarify

On Sheet 5/119, bubbles 12 (Item 608 – 4” Concrete Walk, as per plan) and 22 (Item 608 – 6” Concrete Walk, as per plan, Decorative Stamped) are not used and are to be removed. On all typical section Sheets 5-9/119, all references to bubble 21 (Item 608 – 4” Concrete Walk, as per plan, Decorative Stamped) are to be 4” thick.

On Part 3 page 5 of the plans shows Type B1 Curb and Gutter APP in the typical sections, there is no pay item for this type of curb. Please clarify

Bubble 13 on Sheet 5/119 should read ‘Item 609 – Combination Curb and Gutter, Type 2, as per plan’. Detail B on Sheet 9/119 continues to apply. Updated subsummary and general summary sheets will be provided in an upcoming addendum.

For bid ref 503,504 and 726, the plans call for steel davit style light poles. Will ODOT accept aluminum?

yes, aluminum is acceptable

On page 404 out of 488 (phase 2), there are specifications called out for the bollards. Is there a preferred manufacturer for these bollards and if so, which manufacturer?

There is no preferred manufacturer for this work.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 9/23/2019 1:41:14 PM  Question Number - 0

For Bid Ref 094, will Eaton's VERD-M-A0385-D-8-T3-20X-7030-AP be considered as an approved equal to the specified luminaires as listed on plan page 134/354 - Part 1? Additionally, will a 7-Pin Receptacle be required for this Ref Item, since it will have a dimming driver?

VERD-M-A0385-D-8-T3-20X-7030-AP will not be accepted as an approved equal. The spacing that these luminaires would require exceeds what ODOT is willing to accept for the layout given in the plans. (this was determined using VERD-M-A0385-E-U-T3-7030-AP.ies). Secondly, ODOT is seeking individual internal field-adjustable potentiometer dimming at each light. We do NOT want dimmers that operate from a central control system that use a photocell socket on top of each luminaire (which I believe uses 7-pin as the question might be referring to). Thanks!

**Question Submitted:** 9/21/2019 10:31:33 AM  Question Number - 0

Please see plan sheet 151/354 of part 1. For all walls with 6” underdrain pipe, the #8,#9, or #89 stone is paid for under bid items 63 and 416 6" UNCL UD W/ GEOTEX FAB. How is the #8,#9,or #89 stone paid for walls 10A, 10C, 11B, 11C, and 11E since these walls do not have 6” underdrain?

After reading "BASIS OF PAYMENT", first paragraph on SCD NBS-1-09, the stone will be covered under bid item 136, SPECIAL - NOISE BARRIER. Because the stone mentioned in the question is not separately itemized, consider the material a necessity to complete the noise barrier work.

**Question Submitted:** 9/20/2019 3:44:03 PM  Question Number - 0

Could the Department please provide soil borings for the noise walls?

**Question Submitted:** 9/20/2019 2:49:47 PM  Question Number - 0

Stage-1 of Project #190470 is Contract # 190427, which has a completion date of 10/15/19. Project 190470 maintenance of traffic notes requires the start of Stage-2 at the completion of Project 190427. Stage-2 of Project 190470 requires the immediate construction of 2 Emergency Pull-offs prior to setting Stage-2 traffic zones. We believe after award and construction of Emergency Pull-offs, winter weather will not allow Stage-2 traffic zones to be set until Spring of 2020. This would make the required project schedule extremely difficult if not impossible to complete. Will ODOT consider adding Emergency Pull-offs required by Project #190470, Part 1 to existing Project #190427? This would allow implementation of Project 190470, stage-2 construction in the fall of 2019, thus creating a more realistic work schedule in order to achieve the substantial completion date.

The emergency pull-off are include with Project #190427. The item for Emergency pull-off in Project #190470 includes the signing, striping and removal of the emergency pull offs.

**Question Submitted:** 9/20/2019 2:33:42 PM  Question Number - 0

Are there 4a Utility Notes/Plans available?

An 4A Utility note will be included in an upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 9/20/2019 12:06:30 PM  Question Number - 0

PDF plans were made available on the FTP site to reflect the changes made with addenda A & B. Will the department also provide a corresponding set of CADD files?

**Question Submitted:** 9/20/2019 10:59:34 AM  Question Number - 0

The response to the question submitted on 9/10/2019 4:37:50 PM states that the revised CAD information reflecting the pavement changes in Addendum #1 were posted to the ODOT FTP site. In review of the currently posted information the CAD files a reflective of the original plans prior to any addendum and pavement changes. Could the department please provide the up to date current data set inclusive of the addendum changes?

The files are now posted ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-88084/

**Question Submitted:** 9/19/2019 11:37:06 AM  Question Number - 0

Plan sheet 427/488 of Part 2 does not provide the lengths of the drilled shafts for wall 11F. Please update this plan sheet with the drilled shaft lengths.

An updated sheet will be included in an upcoming addendum.

*** 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

1. The Civil drawings indicate bubble #11 in the typical section for the center medina on sheet 10/488 is to be 4” walk below the proposed brick pavers shown. The same typical section also indicates 10.25” of 304 aggregate is to be placed below the 4” concrete walk and brick pavers. It appears that there are no pay quantities for these 2 items. However, the landscape drawings (sheet 403) indicate that the brick paver bid item is to include the concrete base, aggregate base, and other misc. items. Please verify and/or consider adding or revising existing bid items to account for the quantity of concrete and aggregate base to be placed below the brick pavers.

The aggregate base is quantified on Sheet 57/488. The 4” concrete is included as part of the brick pavers (see basis of payment note on Sheet 403/488). Updated sheets will be included in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2019 3:07:48 PM Question Number - 0
1. The Civil drawings indicate bubble #11 in the typical section for the center medina on sheet 10/488 is to be 4” walk below the proposed brick pavers shown. The same typical section also indicates 10.25” of 304 aggregate is to be placed below the 4” concrete walk and brick pavers. It appears that there are no pay quantities for these 2 items. However, the landscape drawings (sheet 403) indicate that the brick paver bid item is to include the concrete base, aggregate base, and other misc. items. Please verify and/or consider adding or revising existing bid items to account for the quantity of concrete and aggregate base to be placed below the brick pavers.

The aggregate base is quantified on Sheet 57/488. The 4” concrete is included as part of the brick pavers (see basis of payment note on Sheet 403/488). Updated sheets will be included in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/17/2019 6:13:07 PM Question Number - 0
Part 3 waterline plans were updated in addendum 1 but none of the revised quantities shown in the sheet 83 subsummary were never updated in the addendum and EBS. Please revise.

General summary updated sheet will be provided in upcoming addendum with these revised quantities. In addition, on Sheet 11/119 the note for Item 638 – 1” copper service branch, as per plan also includes 1-1/2” copper service branch, as per plan.

Question Submitted: 9/17/2019 5:39:43 PM Question Number - 0
For Bid Ref 533 & 735, will Eaton’s UFLD-C25-E-U-66-S-BK-7030-10K be considered as an approved equal to the specified luminaires as listed on plan pages 355/488 - Part 2 and 102/119 - Part 3, respectfully?

Yes, the proposed luminaire would be an approved equal.

Question Submitted: 9/17/2019 5:26:28 PM Question Number - 0
For Bid Ref 094, will Eaton’s VERD-M-S0385-E-8-T3-10-7030-4B be considered as an approved equal to the specified luminaires as listed on plan page 134/345 - Part 1?

It is the plan intent to have the Part 1 luminaires (Bid Ref 094) dimmable at each individual light pole. The options shown on 134/354 are the options that the "approved equal" should be able to duplicate. For the Luminaire in the prebid question, is the "5" in "S0385" supposed to be an "A"? Please, verify the catalog no. of an "equal" luminaire and resubmit the question. Thank you!

Question Submitted: 9/17/2019 5:14:24 PM Question Number - 0
For Bid Ref 503, 504, & 726, the plans call for SS-916 Powder Coat. Will Millerbernd's Millerbond Paint System, which is a SS-916 wet paint system, be considered an approved paint option for this project?

Either wet coat or dry (powder) coat system may be used, provided it meets the performance requirements of ODOT Supplemental Specification 916 and is supplied by a Certified Supplier per ODOT Supplement 1091, 1093 or 1094.

Question Submitted: 9/17/2019 10:22:49 AM Question Number - 0
Part 3 drainage- there are a few locations for which drainage structures are incorrectly called out or lack information. Plan sheet 44 ref. D31 and sheet 50 ref. D39 are part of bid item 692 (CB 2-3) but are called out on the plan sheets as CB 2-2A. Sheet 44, ref. D-25 (CB 3A) and D-32 (MH#3) each lack TC/INV elevation information. Please review, provide, and revise as needed.

Ref. D-31 and D-39 are both to be Catch Basin 2-2B. An updated subsummary will be provided in an upcoming addendum. The information for CB 3A at Ref. D-25 is as follows: Station 105+23.73, 76.70’ Rt. McCord; grate elevation = 645.83; flowline 12” southeast = 641.83. The information for MH 3 at Ref. D-32 is as follows: Station 1128+88.91, 88.47’ Lt. Dorr; rim elevation = 646.30; flowline 12” north and southeast = 640.02.

Question Submitted: 9/16/2019 2:11:41 PM Question Number - 0
Part 3 bid items 665 and 666: please provide dimensions of the 601B and 601C on sheet 82/119 at the detention ponds as owner quantities don't appear to be correct as well as providing a bid item for the #511 Class C Headwall item called out on subsummary sheet 35/119.

Dimensions for the rock channel protection are as follows: for D-22; 10’ x 8’ x 2.5’ deep; D-25; 5’ x 2.25’ x 2.5’ deep. Rock channel protection for D-26 is 11 CY. The dimensions of rock channel protection for D-26 is 22’ x 6.5’ x 2’ deep. Bid item for the #511 Class C Headwall can be found on sheet 29/199 under the Miscellaneous Structure heading.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 9/16/2019 1:26:19 PM  Question Number - 0
Part 1, plan sheet 304, Structure LUC-475-0753: the “Piles Driven to Bedrock” note provides the pile order length. The quantities on sheet 307 do not reflect the order length listed in the note. What is the correct order length? Also please verify the driven quantities.

The plan sheets will be updated with the correct length in an upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 9/16/2019 9:49:35 AM  Question Number - 0
Part 1- plan sheet 7 typicals show proposed center lane of IR-475 being reconstructed full depth near the two mainline structures. Plan sheet 20 shows same 12' wide proposed center lane being milled and resurfaced. Plan sheet 13 calls out Pre-stage 3 for resurfacing of what is shown on sheet 20. MOT drawings do not show provisions for when full-depth reconstruction (if any) in this 12' lane would be done. Please verify if these middle-lane transitions into and out of the bridge are to be constructed full-depth or resurfaced and if full-depth, please provide MOT information.

The middle lane is being reconstructed full depth at the bridges at the locations shown on sheet 7. MOT typicals do not specifically show a detail of the full depth area, however the temporary traffic control plans for stage 2 (sheets 27 & 29) and stage 3 (sheets 37 & 39) accommodate the part width construction of the full depth pavement area. The resurfacing area on sheet 20 refers to the center lane within the proposed resurfacing area outside of the full depth pavement area.

**Question Submitted:** 9/16/2019 8:00:05 AM  Question Number - 0
Please review the Pavement Calculations for errors to the resurfacing portion of this project. It appears widths and directions are wrong. Typical section on sheet 8/354 show NB 213+70 to 274+64 being 25' Pavement calculations show this station on the SB and at 58' width.

The typical sections and quantities will be updated in a upcoming addendum to match the resurfacing limits shown in plan view.

**Question Submitted:** 9/15/2019 4:14:41 PM  Question Number - 0
1. It appears the item shown as bubble #23 (6" Non-reinforced concrete pavement stamped APP) for all 4 ramps on Part 2 of the project have been excluded as a pay item and do not exist in the pavement calculation sheets for the ramps. See Ramp typical sections on sheets 12, 13, 16, and 17 of 488 and the pavement summary for the ramps on sheets 53-56/488. Please review and confirm.

The ramp typicals that show bubble #23 should read #12. The correct bubble reference is #12, Item 608 - 4" concrete walk decorative stamped, as per plan. The associated quantities are tabulated near the bottom of sheet 59/488.

**Question Submitted:** 9/15/2019 3:52:02 PM  Question Number - 0
Please confirm whether the 19" of 304 shown in the between the 2 lanes of concrete pavement and in the center of the ramp typical sections has been included in the pavement summary. See Typical Section Ramp B on sheet 13/488 for Part 2 as an example.

The correct depth of 304 Aggregate Base is 21". An updated quantity will be included in the upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 9/15/2019 3:46:31 PM  Question Number - 0
1. It appears that the APP notes for the Stamped concrete pavement, sidewalk and curb items for Part 2 are missing. The landscape plans indicate to see specifications on sheet 21 which do not include them either. Please review and confirm.

The landscape plans that refer to sheet 21 should be sheet 20. The APP notes can be found on sheet 20/488.

**Question Submitted:** 9/13/2019 5:16:23 PM  Question Number - 0
1. It appears that the item shown as bubble #23 (6" Non-reinforced concrete pavement stamped APP) for all 4 ramps on Part 2 of the project have been excluded as a pay item and do not exist in the pavement calculation sheets for the ramps. See Ramp typical sections on sheets 12, 13, 16, and 17 of 488 and the pavement summary for the ramps on sheets 53-56/488. Please review and confirm.

The correct depth of 304 Aggregate Base is 21". An updated quantity will be included in the upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 9/13/2019 5:16:23 PM  Question Number - 0
Please verify and indicate the quantity of aggregate base to be placed behind the curb shown in the detail for the center median typical section on sheet 10/488 for Part 2. To be more specific, the agg base between the curb & gutter and the single slope d wall.

Updated quantities will be included in the upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 9/13/2019 4:14:41 PM  Question Number - 0
After a review of the pavement summaries for part 2 and the typical sections for part 2 Aggregate Base items it is difficult to verify the 10.25" of aggregate base below the brick pavers item has been accounted for in the typical section for the center median on Sheet 10/488. Please verify

The depth listed on the typical section (sheet 10/488) should read 11.25". The quantity has been accounted for and is listed on sheet 57/488 in the Aggregate Base 11.25" column.
Bid items 342 and 343: There are large amounts of pipes to be removed which are significantly below the proposed subgrade. Given the phasing and time frame of the completion dates, will ODOT allow the contractor to fill these runs with LSM in lieu of removing and backfilling?

ODOT will not allow the contractor to fill the pipes to be removed with LSM in lieu of removing and backfilling.

Bid item 487: 16” Steel Pipe Encasement, Open Cut: plan sheet 298, ref. WM-30 calls for 31’ worth for which a horizontal bend is required. Is it ODOT’s intent to require an 8” DI pipe bend inside a 16” steel casing bend or can the casing terminate prior to the bend?

New water main subsummary sheets will be provided that address this question in an upcoming addendum.

Bid item 487- 16” Steel Pipe Encasement, Open Cut: plan sheet 298, WM-31 calls for 130’ to be installed from the new 8” water main to point where it gets capped. Plan sheet 220 cross-section shows four vertical bends on this casing and 8” waterline inside. There is a dimension of 79’ between vertical bends which goes under the pavement. The remaining 41’ of this requires four vertical bends, which can be very difficult to install as well as finding available casing pipe bends which these can fit in. Is it the intent to require the contractor to install 8” waterline bends inside 16” steel casing bends or is it the intent to only need 79’ of casing instead of the 130’ called out in the subsummary?

New water main subsummary sheets will be provided that address this question in an upcoming addendum.

Bid items 485, 486, and 494 in part 2 water works have descriptions on plan sheet 284. The directional bore bid item 494 is bid as 14 each and per plan note says that the City of Toledo will supply copper and perform the taps. Bid items 485 and 486 for these same water services are paid for by the foot. There appears to be a duplication in the bid items, as bid item 494 appears to provide all work needed for the other two items. Please review plan notes and revise bid items as needed.

The note on Sheet 284/488 for Item Special – Directional Bore for Waterline Taps has changed. The statement that the copper will be supplied by the City of Toledo has been removed. The remainder of the note, as well as bid items 485, 486, and 494 remain unchanged.

The response to question submitted on 8/16/19 @5:03:34 PM states that along with Addendum A an update to the CAD files will also be provided. Can the department please provide this information for the contractors?

The files are now posted. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-88084/

With the revisions in addendum 1 to the MOT general note it is clear the milestone completion dates for Dorr St., McCord Rd, and exit ramps. Does this also mean the work on I-475 has no additional milestones prior to project completion so long as the Dorr Street exit is opened prior to July 25th, 2021?

In an upcoming addendum, this question will be addressed in the MOT.

Our question is on MOT/Access for I-475 over Hill Ave. bridge work. The only reference found for Hill Ave is Paragraph 4 under Item 614, Maintaining Traffic, Plan Sheet 11/354, which does not detail any MOT/Access to work. Would ODOT please detail the MOT and access for Hill Ave.

In a forthcoming addendum a note will be added to Maintenance of Traffic Notes for providing contractor access within the existing guardrail along Hill Ave. Work is to be included in the lump sum contract price for Item 614 Maintaining Traffic

Bid Items 0174 and 0216 Crushed Aggregate Slope Protection for Bridges 0648 appear to have quantities that are over stated. Please confirm area of work and bid quantity.

The plan quantity is correct for crushed aggregate slope protection for both structures. The crushed aggregate slope protection shall be continuous on the slope between the northbound and southbound structures.
Bid item 456- Inlet, #3D, As Per Plan: general summary shown on plan sheet 49/488 says to refer to plan sheet 410/488 for "as per plan" information. No information exists on plan sheet 410. Please provide "As Per Plan" information.

As per plan information for this inlet is located on Sheet 19. The general summary (plan sheet 49/488) is updated as part of an upcoming Addendum.

Bid item 457- Manhole, #1: subsummary plan sheet 75/488 shows both of these manholes located on plan sheet 116/488 (Ref. D-67 and D-69). We cannot locate these manholes. Please provide more information or if these don't exist, then please delete the bid item.

Ref. D-67 and D-69 were removed as a part of Addendum #1. The quantity for Manhole No. 1 on subsummary plan sheet 75/488 no longer applies. The quantity is revised as part of an upcoming Addendum.

Part B plan sheet 87: this plan sheet shows quantities for several sanitary sewer items which have been combined with drainage items. Please set up bid items for the sanitary work.

Sanitary items were not correctly labeled on the plan and profile sheets (plan sheets 134/488 and 135/488). Ref. No. labels are added to these sheets and are a part of an upcoming Addendum.

In part B- plan sheet 25/488 calls for watermain and storm sewer construction in phase 1A which includes drainage crossovers. No bid items have been set up for restoration of pavements affected by installed lines. Please add corresponding bid items for pavement restoration.

Storm and sanitary crossovers can be constructed by either bore/drill or part width open cut (or a combination of both). Temporary pavement restoration as a result of these installations is to be included in the contract price bid for the pertinent sanitary and storm sewer items.

The detention pond depicted on page 283 (part 2) does not reflect any earthwork quantities sent to the earthwork summary. Based on the profile section on sheet 283, this is all new excavation. Can the department please quantify this earthwork and provide the contractors a bid item for payment?

Updated earthwork quantities are included in an upcoming addendum.

The detention pond depicted on page 82 (part 3) does not reflect any earthwork quantities sent to the earthwork summary. Based on the profile section on sheet 82, it appears there is a significant amount of earthwork on those existing slopes. Can the department please quantify this earthwork and provide the contractors a bid item for payment?

Updated earthwork quantities will be included in the upcoming addendum.

None of the cross sections through the roundabouts reflect earthwork quantities along Door St. or the cross-road. It appears the earthwork summary has missed these quantities in our review. Can the department please confirm the earthwork quantities?

Updated earthwork quantities are included in upcoming Addendum.

On Bridge #0648 we have a question regarding bridge barrier aesthetics. Plan Sheets 36 & 37/51 show aesthetics on only one run of bridge barrier which is left barrier on Southbound Bridge, is this correct? Plan Sheet 36/51 refers you to Sheet 43/51 for aesthetic details, Sheet 43/51 only shows aesthetic in section view without details, please provide information on aesthetics and limits

The LUC-475-0648 L&R structures will not require any aesthetic treatments. Plan sheets will be updated in a forthcoming addendum to remove all references to aesthetics.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/30/2019 7:51:38 AM  Question Number - 0
Part 1- plan sheet 14: for the emergency pull-offs, no size is given for the temporary signage required for these areas. Please provide the required sizes.

A general design for the emergency pull-off signs have been provided in an upcoming addendum for the fabrication of the signs. The design includes the overall dimensions of each sign and the letter height and alphabet series that is to be used. The sign legends in these designs shall be modified to match the sign legends as shown in the project plans.

Question Submitted: 8/29/2019 9:45:35 AM  Question Number - 0
Ref: Bridge LUC-475-0648, plan 36/51 (sheet 286) describes Crossframes (Type 3) to be per STD DWG GCD-1-96 (for example). Q: Should all bridge crossframes, like referenced, be in accordance with revised standard drawing GSD-1-19?

Revisions will be coming in a forthcoming addendum to update GSD-1-96 to GSD-1-19.

Question Submitted: 8/27/2019 3:52:53 PM  Question Number - 0
Plan sheet 14 shows details for emergency pull-offs required in stages 2 and 3. In stage 2 the pull-off temporary pavement is 16' wide. The MOT typical section on sheet 18 shows 2' of shoulder where the pull-offs are located. Is the contractor to construct 16' wide temporary pavement or 14' wide temporary pavement to get 16' from the temporary edge line?

The contractor will not have to construct the emergency pull offs. The pull offs are being constructed with PID 110212(Proj. No (019)0427 which has a completion date of 10/15/19.

Question Submitted: 8/27/2019 1:22:16 PM  Question Number - 0
Bid item 311 Aggregate Base is for berming the inside shoulders in phase 2. The typical sections on sheets 6 and 7 show a 2' wide installation of 617 compacted aggregate against the finished shoulder. There is no bid item for #617 aggregate. Please account for how this additional berming after the surface course will be accounted for.

Typical Sections have been revised to show the station limits and thickness of the 617 Compacted Aggregate. The pay item and quantity for this item has been added to the general summary in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/27/2019 10:40:46 AM  Question Number - 0
Bid item 13 Borrow- the plan quantity of 7359 cy in Part 1 is shown on plan sheet 154. Per CMS 203.02C, this is to come from approved sources located outside the construction limits. Is borrow material allowed to come from Parts 2 and 3 of the project and is there a need for this bid item in the first place?

After analyzing the 3 parts and considering the question at hand, ODOT has decided to remove the borrow quantity from the job. The change will be reflected in an addendum. Thank you.

Question Submitted: 8/26/2019 4:25:36 PM  Question Number - 0
Part 2 plan sheet 22 of 488, second column discusses Dust Control and calls Item 616, Water with a quantity of 800 M. Gallons. Reviewing bid items for part 2, we find no item covering this work. Will ODOT please add this bid item to Part 2 pricing schedule?

Quantity has been added in Addendum #1

Question Submitted: 8/26/2019 3:11:20 PM  Question Number - 0
Part 2, sheet 25 of 488 list Phase 5 (McCord Rd) to be a 60 day closure prior to project completion of July 25th, 2021. This would place this phase beginning sometime in May of 2021. Phase 4 is a 90 day closure to happen prior to the McCord roundabout. This work doesn't have sufficient time to be completing in 2021 and the inclusion of surface course dictates it needs to be completed prior to October 31, 2020. Part 1, sheet 11 of 354 states contractor shall ensure all 6 lanes of I-475 are constructed and open to traffic prior to the opening of any Dorr St. interchange ramps. Is it the department's intent to have parts 1 and 2 complete through surface course by October 31, 2020?

The following MOT revisions will be forth coming in an addends as follows: 1) Phase 4 closure period is revised to a 60* day closure period 2) Phase 5C closure period is revised to a 45* day closure perioda. *Durations based on recently completed projects of similar nature 3) Phase 5A shall be constructed concurrently with Phase 24) Phase 5B shall be constructed concurrently with Phase 35) Phase 5C may be constructed prior to Phase 4, however Phases 5c and Phase 4 cannot be constructed concurrently. 6) Part 1, Sheet 11/354, 2nd column, 4th paragraph, “The contractor shall ensure all 6 lanes of 475...open to traffic prior to opening Dorr St Interchange” will be removed from the project plans. 7) Part 1, Page 11/354, 2nd column, 5th paragraph, “All work shall be completed by 6/30/21...” will be removed from the project plans.

*** 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.
Plan sheet 61 at station 327+03 calls for 21 FT of 12” Type C, but on plan sheet 173 at station 11201+06 it calls out 15” Type C. Will ODOT please clarify the size of the conduit?

D:1,13,14,17,18,22,25 and 38 should all be 15” Type C. An addendum is forthcoming to address the issue. Good catch

Parts 2 and 3 of the plans call for detours but no Detour Signing bid items have been set up. Will ODOT be handling all detour signs or will the contractor be responsible for the detour signs? Please verify who is responsible for detour signs and how they will be paid.

Detour signing is to be provided by the Contractor. Any MOT items of work not individually itemized are to be included in the lump sum item, 614 Maintaining Traffic, LS.

Bid item 62-6’ Shallow Pipe Underdrains: On plan sheets 60 and 61, references U-9, U-10, U-27, U-28, U-31 and U-32 are on the northbound outside. If these are to be done during phase 3 along with other outside pavement work, then MOT plan sheets 36 and 37 do not have the zone extended far enough to accommodate construction of these underdrains. Please verify if these underdrains get constructed and/or update the MOT plans to accommodate construction.

Underdrains are to be installed only in the locations of full depth shoulder work. Proposed underdrains outside of the full depth shoulder work has been removed from the plans and the subsummary and general summary have been revised to reflect these changes in an upcoming addendum.

Part 1, includes temporary pavement markings, Bid Items 327 thru 330 requiring specification 740.06, Type I (removable preformed marking tape). To maintain project schedule with an award in early November, the contractor will install Stage 2 traffic control as defined by plan sheets 24 thru 33 immediately. Based upon time of year, we do not believe pavement markings utilizing removable tape is a good option. Will ODOT provide Work Zone Pavement Marking Bid Items utilizing paint per specification 614? In addition, due to time of year, if reapplication of 614 Pavement Markings is required, will ODOT pay for this additional application of Temporary Pavement Markings?

The 614 pay items for the Maintenance of Traffic Stage 2 work zone markings have been revised from 740.06, Type I (removable tape) to 642 Paint. CM&S 614.11A states “Acceptability and Expected Duration. The Engineer will evaluate the markings according to the performance parameters contained in Supplement 1047, Appendices C, D and E. Repair or replace the markings when the numerical rating is six or lower for Daytime Color (Appendix C), or a composite rating of 6 or lower for Night Visibility (Appendix D), or five or lower for Durability (Appendix E). Repair or replace unsatisfactory markings immediately and at no additional cost to the Department, if the markings were in place for 120 calendar days or less. The Department will compensate under the applicable contract pay item for work zone pavement marking for the ordered replacement of worn markings after 120 calendar days under traffic.” If the Engineer’s evaluation requires additional application(s) of markings, ODOT will compensate the contractor as stated in CM&S614.11A. Quantities for additional applications are not included in the plans and will be as directed by the Engineer.

Plan sheet 12 of 354, calls out Item 614 MAINTAINING TRAFFIC MISC: EMERGENCY PULL OFF, specifically what is included for payment, stage 2 – inside shoulder work and stage 3 – outside shoulder work. Plan sheet 14 of 354, provides detail for this work. The detail for “Inside Work Area – Stage 2, calls out Temporary Pavement. Reviewing the bid items included with Part 1 of the plans, I see no provisions to pay for the Temporary Pavement required by the typical section. Will ODOT please clarify the type of Temporary Pavement and how it will be paid?

The pavement for the emergency pull off were included with PID 110212 (proj number (019)0427). That project has a completion date of 10/15/19.

Bid Item #390 – Special Concrete Brick Pavers, called out on Part 2 plans, sheet 47 of 488, General Summary. Plan sheet directs viewer to plan sheet 362, Lighting Subsummary, no mention of Special Concrete Brick Pavers on this sheet. Will ODOT please clarify where in the plans to look for Special Brick Pavers?

The general summary sheets that currently direct to Sheet 362 (lighting sub-summary) should instead direct to Sheet 388 (landscape sub-summary)
It appears that a great deal of the CADD information has not been included with Part 2 & 3 information posted today. The folders are present however are without any information. Could the department please provide Roadway Basemap, Cross Sections, Existing .tin, and GPK files for parts 2 & 3?

For parts 2 and 3, the district expects to submit an addendum late next week (week of Aug 26) reflecting design changes. The updated CADD files will be posted at that time.

Project defines a completion date of 10/31/2021. Anticipating an award of mid-November, 2019, a project duration of approximately 23 months is foreseeable. Bid Item 771 – Field Office, Type C defines a bid quantity of 50 months. If the project is only 23 months in length, 50 months for this bid item seems excessive. Will ODOT please confirm the quantity for Bid Item 771 – Field Office, Type C?

Stage 1 was sold as project (19)0427, which has a contract completion date of 10/15/19.

Could the department please provide the digital CAD information, existing structure plans, and office calculations on the ODOT FTP site as is typically provided?

The files are now posted. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-88084/

Project No.  190471
CUY-88348 - IR 90-24.10/24.63

Project No.  190472
ASD-90912 - US 224-11.12

Project 190472, currently, requires 7% DBE goals. The are 9 total bid items, and most of these are self performed items for a specialty contractor. Would ODOT, respectfully, consider reducing or removing the DBE requirements from the project?

The goal will not be changed. If the bidder is unable to meet the goal, submit Good Faith Efforts as described in Proposal Note 013.

It appears as there is 14 CY of Rock Channel Protection Type B w/ Filter called out on the plans. Can a base bid item be added for this work?

The bid item will be added. An Addendum is forthcoming.

Will a man entry spray applied application be allowed for the Conduit renewal using spray applied structural liner be allowed for this project.

No. Per SS 833, "Spray apply the cementitious or geopolymer material by centrifugally casting." No Addendum required.

Option C lists a 54" casing pipe per ss-837. Would other 54" ss-837 liner pipes like ss-938 or 707.12 be acceptable for bid on this option?

No. Option C is to be 54" casing pipe. No Addendum required.
### Project No. 190473
ATH-92326 - SR 690-04.74

**Question Submitted:** 9/20/2019 1:56:46 PM  
**Question Number:** 0

Sheet 9 shows 1/2” milling thickness. Sheet 10 shows 1-1/2” milling thickness. Which is correct?

**Question Submitted:** 9/18/2019 9:50:25 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

Will the use of portable traffic signals be allowed?

**Question Submitted:** 9/16/2019 9:09:47 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

If available, please provide the soil boring information for this project.

The historic soil borings can be found on the ftp site ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/ATH-92326/Reference%20Files/

### Project No. 190475
COL-105254 - SR 11-22.70

**Question Submitted:** 9/4/2019 6:37:37 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

During dwall replacement. How is the contractor to protect the existing piers? Please add item for shoulder closures, portable concrete barrier and attenuators.

The Contractor shall provide protection to the exposed existing bridge piers. As stated in the Maintaining Traffic, as Per Plan note on sheet 5, “The Contractor is responsible for designing the maintenance of traffic scheme.” and “Payment for providing … portable concrete barrier, barrier reflectors, object markers, work zone impact attenuators, … shall be included in the lump sum price bid for Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, as Per Plan.” No additional items will be added to the plans.

### Project No. 190476
COL-103504 - US 30-11.58

**Question Submitted:** 9/18/2019 7:54:42 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

In your opinion, is groundwater probable? (CMS 611.06)

Please refer to the boring logs.

**Question Submitted:** 9/18/2019 7:53:25 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

Is premium backfill required under the pavement where existing pipe is removed?

Locations where an existing pipe is removed under the pavement shall be backfilled in accordance with the specification.

**Question Submitted:** 9/18/2019 7:52:20 AM  
**Question Number:** 0

Will there be any requirement for Geotextile Fabric in conjunction with the undercut and granular backfill items?

No requirement for Geotextile Fabric is required in conjunction with the undercut and granular backfill.

**Question Submitted:** 9/17/2019 4:48:16 PM  
**Question Number:** 0

According to the soil profile data provided, from approximately STA 615+00 to STA 621+50 the underdrains will be constructed within rock. Please adjust the plan quantity for base pipe underdrain to reflect this change and add an item for rock cut underdrain via addendum.

The underdrains constructed between station 615+00 and 621+50 are within the area that is being undercut and backfilled with granular material. This undercut includes the area where the underdrains will be constructed therefore no quantity for rock cut underdrains is required.

*** 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.***
On plan page 6/86 in regards to the A+B schedule, is the intent of the A+B for the entire duration of the project to be 75 days or is the A+B just for the road closure of 75 days. With the amount of work 75 days to complete the entire project does not seem reasonable.

The A+B schedule is for the duration of the detour only (75 days) not for the entire project. The wording on sheet 6/86 will be updated in a forthcoming addendum.

In reviewing the soils borings provided, we are anticipating that blasting may be needed to achieve the required grades. If blasting is permitted, will the State consider adding the necessary bid items that go with the blasting (Blasting Consultant, Pre-Blast Surveys, Hydrologist)

The Department does not anticipate the need for blasting. However, if the Contractor elects to blast all requirements of the specification (pre-splitting, pre-blast survey, blast consultant, noise control, vibration control, and hydrologist) will be required and should be included in the cost of the excavation.

Will a cut off wall per DM-1.1 be required under 601 on the inlet and outlet of the 68" x 106" conduit?

No cut off walls will be required for the 68" x 106" culvert.

It is unclear what material is being installed on the shoulder for phase 1 PCB installation. Please clarify what material is required to be placed prior to PCB installation (embankment, compacted agg, pavement for MOT, etc.).

The material being placed during Phase One for the placement of the PCB is embankment. Please refer to the MOT typical sections, cross sections, and notes for quantities.

Addendum 1 dated 9/10/19 provided soil profile sheets for this project. However, provided on the ftp site is an entire plan set (which includes soil profile sheets at the end). Please confirm that no other changes were made to plan sheets 1-86 and that the only change was the addition of soil profiles.

Addendum #1 added the soil profile sheets only. No other changes were made.

The cover sheet of the plans and plan sheets 23-29 indicate that soil borings were taken for the project. They are not included in the plans. We are requesting a copy of the soil borings for the project.

The soil profile sheets will be added in a forthcoming addendum.

The folder(s) for the link provided do not include Office Calcs. Please add the "Office Calcs" to the Directory for this project.

The office calcs have been posted to the ftp site ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/COL-103504/Reference%20Files/

Could the Department please provide a link to the "Office Calcs"?

The office calcs have been posted to the ftp site ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/COL-103504/Reference%20Files/

Since there is so much repair and linear grading to do within the 14 days between milling and paving, would ODOT consider performing the repairs before milling since it is only a 0.75" mill?

ODOT will allow the selected contractor to perform pavement repairs prior to milling the existing surface. Any additional labor, material, equipment, or incidentals needed to complete pavement repairs not performed as per the plan and contract documents, i.e. the sacrificial surface of the performed pavement repairs, will not be compensated to the contractor by the department. No addenda required.

*** 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.
Should the pavement planing be switched to 897 Pavement Planing instead of 254 Pavement Planing since it is only 0.75”?

ODOT intends to maintain pavement planing by use of Item 254. The material type and thickness of the proposed surface course, along with the adhesion of the proposed surface course to the milled surface, have been taken into account in this response. No addenda required.

I worded the first question in correctly. MT-95.41 show a single right lane closure of two lanes in the same direction. The MOT plan shows closing both lanes in the same direction and shifting in to the left lane of the other direction which is what TA-32 depicts this.

The MOT plan references MT-95.41 which is a Two-Lane Closure on a Multi-Lane Highway. There are only two lanes in each direction. This looks more like Typical Application-32 out of the O MutCD would apply.

MT-95.41 depicts the closure of the right lane of a 4 lane highway. The Typical Application-32 from the OMUTCD would apply when closing the left lane.

Flashing arrow boards are required where a lane drops per MT-95.41 even when not shown on plans.

The work zone striping items are specified as paint items, with the small & short duration work zone can these items be given the option of paint or tape?

It is the districts preference that the work zone striping be performed using paint for durability of the traffic markings.

Sheet 12 of 12 Section A-A shows the sidewalk moment slab and existing pavement interface. There are no items to remove or replace the bituminous pavement and sub-base that will be disturbed when the existing sidewalk and curb is removed. How is this work paid for?

Refer to CMS 202.05 and exercise care in excavation.

After a site visit, it was noticed that there is existing temporary plastic barrier wall on the sidewalk closing of the sidewalk. Who will be responsible to remove this barrier? Does it have to be saved? How will the removal of this barrier be paid?

A plan note will be added in the forthcoming addendum.

The Estimated Quantities on Pg. 6/12 has an estimated quantity for Work Zone Center Line, Class I, this item has not been carried to the general summary or to the proposal. Please create a bid item for Work Zone Center Line, Class I.

An addendum will be issued to address this question.

The existing long line pavement markings are 740.02 traffic paint.

*** 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.
Please clarify the desired location of Loose Stone/Fresh Gravel signs on this project. MT 97.10 and MT 97.12 are referenced on the title sheet. MT 97.10 notes that signs shall be placed on the chip sealed roadway in advance of the project, every half mile, and for signing of side roads intersecting the work area. MT 97.12 references CMS 422.09 which notes signs are to be placed in the advanced warning area and just beyond each intersecting road throughout the activity area.

Signs shall be placed per CMS 422.09.

1) Please clarify what the intent is of the final paragraph on Item 422 Chip Seal APP note on sheet 5. Full rate work zone center lines are required at the end of every day. Are you requiring that a separate temporary center line be placed before the work zone can progress down the road? Liquid will not be setup to allow for sweeping of loose stone until the end of each day. Are the yellow reflective tabs placed by the striping contractor on last year's chip seal projects considered adequate center line delineation after they have been chip sealed over? Please clarify on which roads cones along the center line will be required and which they will be omitted due to width.

3) Due to its width, please consider allowing closure of SR 197 for placement of chip seal full width.

   1 - Temporary Reflectors are acceptable centerline delineation for unflagged chip seal work zones.  
   2 - Cones shall be used per MT-97.12.  
   3 - Full closure of SR197 is not permitted.

It appears this project qualifies for "Proposal Note 534 - Asphalt Binder Price Adjustment" but the note is not listed in the project proposal. Will the department please update the proposal accordingly.

REF 20 Removal Markings shows as Item 645 in the bid pamphlet but plan sheet 9 calls it out as Item 644. Which is correct? Also, the plans show 5.22 to 6.18 as being a mill and fill so will removal of markings be necessary there? The quantity includes this area.

REF 9 - Compacted Aggregate - The proposal and general summary list a quantity of 223 CY. The pavement calculations on pages 8 and 9 list a quantity of 829 CY. Which is correct?

See forthcoming addendum
**Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions**

**Question Submitted:** 9/5/2019 4:30:51 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

REF #8-Fine Graded Polymer, 1.25" - The quantity in the proposal and in the General Summary is 316 CY which calculates to a depth of 1.50". The pavement calculations on Page 9 show this item to have a depth of 1.50" but the quantity associated with it is 264 CY which calculates to a depth of 1.25". Which depth and quantity is correct?

*See forthcoming addendum*

**Question Submitted:** 9/4/2019 2:34:31 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

The plans that are online are incorrect. If you download project 190485 you get the title sheet for project 190490 and the plan sheets for 190485. Likewise if you download project 190490 you get the title sheet for project 190485 and the plan sheets for 190490. Also when you download project 190488 you get the title sheet for 190488 but the plan sheets for some other project that I can't figure out.

*See addendum #1 for corrections*

**Project No. 190486**  
HUR-90902 - SR 162-04.13  
Sale Date - 9/26/2019

**Question Submitted:** 9/10/2019 9:44:00 AM  
**Question Number - 0**

Plan page 3A states construction will begin after July 1. The completion date is August 21. This does not allow 60 days for construction.

The mussel survey referenced on page 3A was to be completed in the field season (environmental term) prior to the initiation of the project construction. That means the survey would occur after July 1 of 2019, and it has been completed. The July 1 date in this note is informational only for the mussel survey and is not a restriction on construction for this project. No plan change or addendum required.

**Project No. 190488**  
MAD-105546 - US 62-00.00, MAD/FAY-SR 207-00.00/00.00  
Sale Date - 9/26/2019

**Question Submitted:** 9/24/2019 11:38:58 AM  
**Question Number - 0**

The plans for ODOT 190488 have not been corrected contrary to what the addendum says.


**Question Submitted:** 9/19/2019 2:30:57 PM  
**Question Number - 0**

Please clarify the Work Zone Center Line Class III, 642 Paint. General Summary in the Plans shows 11.05 Mile. Proposal shows 11.05 Mile The Plan Note on P/S 12 of 35 calls out a total of 18.12 Miles of WZ Center Line, Class III, 642 Paint.

A total of 18.12 miles is the correct quantity. Please see forthcoming addendum.

**Project No. 190493**  
SUM-81632 - IR 77/VAR-24.28/VAR  
Sale Date - 9/26/2019

**Question Submitted:** 9/5/2019 10:02:12 AM  
**Question Number - 0**

The plans online are incorrect. Downloading the plans for 190488 includes the title sheet for 190488 and show 35 plan pages. The pages that follow are for FRA-62-8.54 and include 59 pages.

The correct plan sheets will be posted. Please see forthcoming addendum.

**Project No. 190488**  
SUM-81632 - IR 77/VAR-24.28/VAR  
Sale Date - 9/26/2019

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 8:33:15 AM  
**Question Number - 0**

since the grade of the pavement is raised will the contractor need to transition before and underneath the multiple overhead bridges to maintain the existing clearance. If so please provide a detail for this transition area.

A detail showing an additional milling of 1.5" under the structures will be provided at the preconstruction meeting.
Per ODOT’s quantities provided for saw cutting it is evident that the amount of full depth pavement repairs is around 625 locations. It is physically not possible to perform the full depth and partial depth repairs within the stated 7 days of cover time and adhere to the lane closure chart schedule. Can the department change the performance of the full depth repairs prior to pavement planning? Can the department change the amount of time required to cover the milled surface? Can the department provide the contractor with additional lane closure time?

Does ODOT have an indication of how many of the 251 and 253 repairs will be transverse and how many will be longitudinal?

Will any of the 251 or 253 repair quantity be used on the ramps?

Given the substantial quantity of both 251 Partial Depth Repairs as well as 253 Full Depth Repairs, as well as the early contract completion date of 08/31/20, would the Department be willing to consider either extending the 7 day time limitation on the exposed milled surface to 14 days, or, state that the repairs shall be done prior to performing the Pavement Planing operations.

Should bid items for temporary striping be added to this project? With the time limitations for work to be accomplished, it does not seem prudent for the permanent striping contractor to have to come out daily to perform their work. Will No Edge Line signs be acceptable?

WOO-23-3385L is listed in the addendum as having restrictions to only be performed over the weekend. Is this correct or was it inadvertently listed with the I-475 detour ramp structures?

The PLC report for SLM 0.00-25.91 (attached) details only 2 lanes per direction, therefore the only option permitted is taking I-75 from 2 lanes down to 1. A pre-bid question has stated an addendum will address the timeframes taking I-75 from 3 lanes down to 1. Also, clarification is required for the timeframes that are allowed for taking I-75 from 3 lanes down to 2.

Please consider allowing double lane closures during the week as well. The majority of the structures have three lanes, working only weekends will not be very efficient.

Do we need Railroad Iris on this project? All work is on top of bridges.

Yes.

*** 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:** 9/16/2019 5:31:28 PM  Question Number - 0
The curing time for the sealer is a minimum 6 hrs. Which leaves not much time in order to be productive. Has ODOT consider extending the traffic limitation times or changing the material over to SRS product.

> An addendum will be issued to slightly revise the timeframes for which the sealing work can be completed. Generally on I-75 between SLM 0.00 and 19.03, the timeframes for taking I-75 from 3 lanes to 1 will be the following: 8:00 PM Friday to 9:00 AM Saturday and 7:00 PM Saturday to 10:00 AM Sunday. Most other timeframes will remain the same. The material will remain gravity-fed resin.

**Question Submitted:** 9/13/2019 2:11:45 PM  Question Number - 0
Can an ODOT approved HMWM Resin be used as an alternate to the specified Gravity-Fed Resin for treating the concrete bridge decks? Both products are crack and concrete sealers.

> The gravity-fed resin material must meet the requirements of C&MS 705.25 and must be on the Department’s Qualified Products List.

**Project No. 190495**  
ASD-108920 - SR 3-06.81  
Sale Date - 9/26/2019

**Question Submitted:** 9/24/2019 9:28:29 AM  Question Number - 0
Can ODOT Add PN 534 to this project?

> Proposal note will be added by addenda

**Question Submitted:** 9/23/2019 1:41:15 PM  Question Number - 0
Please advise if Grade A-36 is acceptable for the Level Uf item.

> ASTM A709 Grade 36 or 50 will be required for Item 513 - Structural Steel Members, Level UF, As Per Plan. No addendum required.

**Project No. 190501**  
ERI-105587 - Deck Overlay  
Sale Date - 10/10/2019

**Question Submitted:** 9/11/2019 1:57:55 PM  Question Number - 0
The Structural Steel Members, Level UF, As Per Plan is for joint repair, and should be a 516 item, not a 513 item. Please correct.

> As shown in the plans, the intent is to use Item 513 to replace a section of the existing joint that was previously removed. The Item 513 - Structural Steel Members, Level UF, As Per Plan note allows field fabrication of the steel with as-built drawings. Upon review, the proposed Item 513 will remain in the plan. No addendum required.

**Question Submitted:** 9/3/2019 2:08:50 PM  Question Number - 0
There are traffic loops present at the intersection of SR 3 & SR 95. This project is set up for 254 milling at 1.75" deep in this area. Does ODOT want bid items added to replace loops in case of damage from milling?

> The existing signal loops at the intersection of SR3/SR95 were removed and replaced with radar detection in the summer of 2019. No addendum required.

**Project Submitted:** 9/16/2019 2:08:50 PM  Question Number - 0
Please advise where the detail for the vertical extensions (size and width of bars) is located.

> Bars for vertical extensions on sheets 13 & 14/20 are to be 1” x 3”. This info has been included in addendum 1.

*** 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:** 9/9/2019 4:33:43 PM   **Question Number - 0**
Regarding plan notes on sheets 6, 7, and 8, there is a discrepancy between notice of closure signs detailing '45 days' and maintaining traffic notes stating '30 days' for closures. Clarify. Maintaining traffic note also states a disincentive will be assessed but does not specific amount. Clarify.

**Question Number - 0**

**Question Submitted:** 9/23/2019 1:08:42 PM   **Question Number - 0**
Item 255 Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement has Class QC MS in the description and on the typical. The APP note says RRCM is to be used, please clarify if using QC MS or RRCM for this repair.

**Question Submitted:** 9/11/2019 4:50:33 PM   **Question Number - 0**
The rumble strip detail on sheet 14 of 123 shows rumble strips 15' wide and 11' wide, on previous ODOT projects the detail showed these as saw cut with a 4" width at up to a 1/4" depth with a spacing of 12" between strip. Would the department consider that for this project?

**Question Submitted:** 9/6/2019 9:48:04 AM   **Question Number - 0**
The sidewalk limits are not clearly defined in the plans. Are the 27" & 32" concrete pull boxes to be installed behind or in the sidewalk. If in the walk, please add items for sidewalk removal and replacement.

**Question Submitted:** 9/19/2019 11:34:00 AM   **Question Number - 0**
Can ODOT spec. 725.052 sch.80 be used for Ref:4 and 5, this is used for boring. And Ref:2 and 3 stay 725.051 which is in the bid items

**Question Submitted:** 9/16/2019 2:27:05 PM   **Question Number - 0**
1) There is no pay item for the 24 fiber drop cable. 2) Plan sheet 53 calls out the removal of a strain pole and cabinet and there is no pay item for this.

*** 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.***
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Submitted</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2019 11:40:36 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Item #128 - for the railroad crossing flashing light &amp; gate system, where is the electrical power coming from? Who will pay for the power company line drop charge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 5:00:34 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Item 129: Plan sheet 38 calls for High Early Strength Acceleration to be added to the Flowable Fill under the crossing. What PSI is required in the acceleration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 4:57:44 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Item 129: Plan sheet 38 shows 2 each 6&quot; PVC Signal Conduits and 1 each 4&quot; Drainage Pipe. Are those to be paid for and included in the price of this crossing item or is there a separate pay item for these conduits/pipes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 2:19:51 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Item 129: On page 37/93 Proposed Plan shows &quot;Signal D&quot;. However, it does not show up on Track &amp; Cable Plan Sheet 1 of 13. So, has &quot;Signal D&quot; been eliminated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 2:14:46 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Items 122 &amp; 124: We did not find any profile in the plans for the proposed top of rail elevation and grade. Please provide a profile showing the grade and elevation of the proposed and existing top of rail including vertical curves, grades, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 2:11:13 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Bid Item: There is a wash out to be repaired between station 3224+00 and 3225+00 in the proposed alignment of Track 101. How will this be repaired? How will this be paid for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 2:05:20 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Items 122 &amp; 124: We recommend that no existing tie plates be reused in this project due to the variety of types and quality of the existing material. We suggest using a consistent same size Double shoulder tie plate with the same spike punching and same cant through out the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 1:59:50 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Items 122 &amp; 124: What type of rail are we to supply: Relay, New IQ, New Prime? Does it have to be domestic rail?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 1:56:40 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Item 124: What type of Cross ties are to be supplied by the contractor? Such as: New 7&quot; IG, New Grade 5, Grade 5-4 mix these are all 7&quot; x9&quot; x8'6&quot;??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019 1:58:26 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regarding Item 129 (as it pertains to 128): What type of insulated joints are to be supplied, at what locations? Are they going to be welded in?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 1:54:43 PM  Question Number - 0

Regarding Items 122 and 124: What is the required type of rail anchors, the quality (new or relay), what is the anchor pattern?

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 1:52:46 PM  Question Number - 0

Regarding Items 122 and 124: What is the spiking pattern in the turnout and track? The pattern on page 38/93 shows 6 spikes per plate which is excessive and can harm the integrity of the ties just like putting too many nails too close together in a stud.

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 1:49:11 PM  Question Number - 0

Regarding Item 122: What is the requirement on welding rail joints in the turnout and also joints at the frog and at switch points.

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 1:46:34 PM  Question Number - 0

Regarding ITEM 122: The turnout shown on plan sheet 39 identifies an RBM Frog, but does not show guard rails. Please clarify if frog guard rails are required and specify the guard rails if so.

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 1:37:22 PM  Question Number - 0

Regarding ITEM 122: Please provide a specification on the turnout covering info on what kind of switch material are we to supply, what type of frog, switch points (How long and what type), brace plates, Heel blocks and plating behind the heel blocks and under the frog, what size regular tie plates, what kind of switch stand and what color targets on switch stand.

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 1:31:51 PM  Question Number - 0

Regarding Item 0123 Turnout Removed: Plans 37/93 show 2 Turnouts being removed (one #8 and one #10), but the bid quantity indicates only 1 EA. Please clarify the quantity to be removed and the item that both will be paid under.

**Question Submitted:** 9/25/2019 1:27:02 PM  Question Number - 0

Regarding Items 121, 123, 125: Please clarify if OHI-Rail or the contractor retains all rail, ties, otm, and crossing materials removed from the existing tracks. If OHI-Rail keeps it, where should it be stored?

**Question Submitted:** 9/23/2019 3:24:03 PM  Question Number - 0

Line 12 204E45000 Proof Rolling; With the phased construction, short areas of full depth pavement replacement, and the limited site space available, it does not appear that there is sufficient room to effectively operate this equipment to meet the specification. Is there another method that can be utilized for this item that is more suited to the site and limited areas to be proof rolled?

*In areas too small for standard proof rolling equipment other methods will be allowed.*

**Question Submitted:** 9/17/2019 8:50:30 AM  Question Number - 0

Please add office calcs for the structure items.

The office calcs are: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LOG-103823/REFERENCE%20FILES/In the LOG-103823-CADDFiles/Design/Structures/LOG540_165C/EngData

**Question Submitted:** 9/17/2019 7:11:44 AM  Question Number - 0

Per the highway lighting note on sheet 2/26, how will the replacement of the highway lighting cable, and 2" conduit on the structure be paid? Could ODOT create a bid item for these items?

*Items for the highway lighting work will be added in a forthcoming addendum.*

***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: 9/17/2019 7:09:46 AM Question Number - 0
How will traffic control for the bridge painter on the S.R. 540 bridge deck be handled? More than likely this bridge painting will take place after the 30 day closure. Would ODOT consider adding 1 each impact attenuator and approximately 240 LF of PCB to close the North East lane and shoulder of S.R. 540 since there are two lanes in that direction on that side of the bridge to allow a staging and safe work space for the bridge painter?

Maintenance of Traffic details and associative quantities will be added in a forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 9/17/2019 7:05:54 AM Question Number - 0
To what extent does the tar from the existing waterproofing on S.R. 235 need removed? On past projects 100% of the tar has needed removed; however, those projects had a bonding grout overlay put on the deck. With the installation of an asphaltic waterproofing (type 3 waterproofing) will the contractor be allowed to leave some tar on the existing box beams?

The question is correct in that the language regarding asphalt removal was incorrectly used for this project. An addendum will be processed to revise the note in the text to be more in line with traditional asphalt removal on a prestressed box beam structure.

Question Submitted: 9/17/2019 7:04:11 AM Question Number - 0
A plan note on the bottom right hand corner of plan sheet 3/26 talks about removing unbonded variable thickness for the S.R. 540 deck. There is no bid item for removal of existing overlay, and no bid item for removal of unbonded concrete. Does the S.R. 540 bridge deck have an existing overlay? If so please create these pay items, if not please remove the note.

The note on plan sheet 3/26 will be removed in an forthcoming addendum

Project No. 190508
MAH-94140 - IR 76/VAR-01.30/VAR

Question Submitted: 9/27/2019 3:32:43 PM Question Number - 0
Are the Partial Depth Pavement Repair and the Full Depth Pavement Repair quantities correct? After reviewing the project, the Full Depth Repair quantity seems very large and the Partial Depth Repair quantity seems very small. Could they have been switched? Please review and advise.

Project No. 190510
PIK-106088 - SR 220-12.24 OH17-01

Question Submitted: 9/27/2019 4:10:24 PM Question Number - 0
Can a Pay Item be added for the waterline removal?

Project No. 190513
ROS-100863 - US 35-25.02 / JAC-US 35-01.79

Question Submitted: 9/6/2019 11:31:39 AM Question Number - 0
Will the areas of microsurfacing that are only receiving the surface course be applied at the 18 pound per square yard application or the 22 pound per square yard application?

The areas receiving the micro-surfacing surface course only will be applied at the 22 pound per square yard as per the Construction and Material Specifications 421.11.

Project No. 190521
OTT-103927 - Magee Marsh Resurf

Question Submitted: 9/27/2019 4:02:58 PM Question Number - 0
On sheet 8 regarding the RCP Typical, is the intent to remove the brush and place RCP on existing bank or does the existing bank need to be cut to a desired slope prior to placing RCP?
Currently, there is no Linear Grading and or pavement repair quantities setup for the parking areas & roads shown on sheets 10-13. Is the intent not to perform any of this work in these areas or are we to assume this work may be performed.

On sheet 9, is the intent to remove and reset the parking blocks in the parking lots designated to be fog seal? It appears no quantity is set up for this section.

On sheet 9 regarding Road 1, the last +/-1000 ft or so the road is currently closed and looks to be in poor shape. Is the intent to pave this section or abandon this section?

Please provide existing structure plans.

Please consider adding PN 534 to this project.

We are requesting the design of a construction joint between the normal outside edge of bridge deck and the overlook decks. This will allow placement of the bridge deck by standard means and methods. The pier diaphragms will also require a construction joint at the edge of deck with a design. Please refer to Plan Sheets 102 and 105 of 137.

Will ODOT allow Stay-In-Place Forms for the bridge deck?

Stay-in-place forms shall not be used on this structure.
We have a question regarding the “Temporary Access Fill” as shown on Plan Sheet 85/137 and Special Provision – Waterway Permits Conditions Section 11. Sheet 85/137 shows the TAF completely across the river with a top elevation of 592.5 (OHWM EL = 588.20). Section 11 states several design items that have to be performed prior to installation of TAF. Does information for the TAF on Sheet 85/137 include requirements for design in Section 11?

Project No.  194026
FAY-94169 - US 62-04.65

Question Submitted:  9/23/2019 3:51:59 PM  Question Number - 0
Plan sheet 50/67 "Framing Plan" shows span 3 length of 48'-9 7/8" lg. If this is the case the last beam would be 40'-8 7/8" lg. to C/L Brg. not 38'-8 3/4" lg. Which is correct?

The beam dimension in span 3 on Framing Plan Sheet 50 of 67 is shown correctly as 38'-8¾".

Question Submitted:  9/18/2019 11:21:38 AM  Question Number - 0
Would the state allow changing the entire structure to W21x211 and eliminating 3 of the 4 field splices? This would greatly reduce the fabrication cost.

The Department will not allow changing the entire structure to W21x211.

Question Submitted:  9/16/2019 12:02:27 PM  Question Number - 0
General Summary on Plan Sheet 12 calls out 1323 SY of Item 254 3” Pavement Planing. Plan Sheet 15 also calls out the same QTY for this bid item. The Proposal only shows 962 SY for Bid Line Item 0045 - 254E01000 Pavement Planing, Asphalt Concrete 3” Max. Please clarify.

The quantity shown for Item 254-Pavement Planing, Asphalt Concrete 3” Max. =1323 SY is shown correctly on plan sheets 12 & 17. The quantity shown in the Proposal for Bid Line Item 0045 - 254E01000 Pavement Planing, Asphalt Concrete 3” Max. is incorrect. The proposal will be revised. Please see forthcoming addendum.

Project No.  194027
STA-98383 - SR 43/VAR-12.78/VAR

Question Submitted:  9/19/2019 10:51:06 AM  Question Number - 0
item 125 at STA 43-2679 is a t1 int while the plans show a t2 int. which is correct?

This will be corrected in upcoming addendum

Project No.  194029
HAN-105573 - SR-SR 12-20.83

Question Submitted:  9/20/2019 3:50:55 PM  Question Number - 0
TEST

Project No.  197050
WAR-108179 - SR 123-05.58

Question Submitted:  9/19/2019 12:16:33 PM  Question Number - 0
Can you please specify what costs the contractor should anticipate to be in pay item 0011-Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing. Page 9 is the only reference to this item. Is this for the TAF?

Plan note for Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing will be added in forthcoming addendum

*** 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:** 9/17/2019 9:39:39 AM  Question Number - 0

With the project bidding on 9/26/19, and the award date being 10/3/19 and with a typical 2-3 week turn around on contracts, and the pre-con being scheduled after the signing of contracts it would be anticipated that this project would not start prior to the week of 10-28-19 leaving 2 weeks to complete prior to the interim completion date of 11/15/19. In order to allow a reasonable time frame to build the project will the department please revise the interim completion date to 12-13-2019.

**The interim completion date will be revised to 11-24-19. See forthcoming addendum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>197052</th>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>MRG-110854 - SR 266-02.73</th>
<th>Sale Date - 9/26/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question Submitted:** 9/20/2019 10:58:57 AM  Question Number - 0

Culvert cross sections on Sheet 7 show additional embankment to be installed bringing the slope to a 2:1 on both sides of SR266. Can the department add a pay item for embankment?

**Prebid will be answered with addendum 2**

**Question Submitted:** 9/19/2019 9:14:22 AM  Question Number - 0

Can the department please verify the quantity for reference # 23 Low Strength Mortar Backfill (Type 2), to be utilized for bedding and backfill below the invert of the new pipe.

**The low strength mortar goes from the bottom of the pipe to the top of the pipe as per the detail on sheet 8 of 12. LSM is used for the whole length of the pipe.**