

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180349

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

WOO-100460 - /LUC CSX RR brdg

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:50:14 PM **Question Number - 0**

Is the existing 4 foot diameter waterline below the river bottom or laying on the river bottom?

The 4' water line is below the river bottom. At the closest pier, the 48" water main is approximately 55 feet away and 26 feet deeper than the pier. Installation method was boring using Tunnel Boring Machine thru bedrock and installed in a steel liner plate tunnel

Question Submitted: 6/5/2018 10:48:34 AM **Question Number - 0**

Could you please post the original plan sheets for the structure if the are available.

The existing plans were previously posted per Pre-Bid question #4

Question Submitted: 5/29/2018 4:05:08 PM **Question Number - 8**

LUC CSX RR Bridge: Questions regarding the mussel survey / relocation task associated with in-stream work: A) Prevailing Wage - We would like to confirm that the topside work and underwater diving work required for the mussel survey and salvage/relocation will be prevailing wage, and not classified as professional services since this is a mussel relocation / salvage and not just a scientific study. Also because bid item under general contractors.B) We would like to confirm that the diving needs to conform to OSHA standards (29 CFR Part 1910, Subpart T – Commercial Diving Operations) and not exempt under the scientific diving exemption, since the river has zero visibility and scientific diving cannot be completed in zero visibility.

A) The work associated with the mussel survey is covered under Davis Bacon and is subject to prevailing wage.B) Construction and trouble-shooting task are traditionally associated with commercial diving and are not included within scientific diving.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2018 9:50:52 AM **Question Number - 7**

Addendum 1 notes replaced sheets 4, 6, 8,9 & 10. They will not open. Is there another option?

The Department was able to download/open the PDFs from the following FTP site link <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-100460/> in both Internet Explorer and Chrome. Please try a different internet browser.

Question Submitted: 5/10/2018 9:40:49 AM **Question Number - 6**

A prebid is scheduled for 5/22/18 at 9:00 am at this district 2 office. Will there be a site visit following the meeting at the office? If not, can we schedule a site visit? Are contractors able to walk out, on the bridge to visually inspect the items to be salvaged?

No site visit is scheduled following pre-bid meeting..Contractors may visit the site at their convenience. Please remain within the Right of Way as shown on the plans. Note that the gate and R/W fence along SR-65 is Turnpike Property. Stay to the right of the fenced in area to access the forward abutment area. Contractors may not walk out on the bridge as access to the superstructure is blocked at both abutments.

Question Submitted: 5/3/2018 12:10:03 PM **Question Number - 4**

Can the existing bridge drawings be provided?

Existing plan will be uploaded to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-100460/>

Question Submitted: 5/1/2018 12:30:07 PM **Question Number - 3**

dbe.bin file, I can't get this to open.Also what time are the bids due?Is there a pre-bid or walk thru meeting?

A pre-bid meeting is scheduled for May 22, 2018 at 9:00 AM in the ODOT district 2 office. Bids are due 10:00am on June 7, 2018. For issues with the dbe.bin file, please call Dan Stacy at 614-466-8691.

Question Submitted: 4/27/2018 1:51:19 PM **Question Number - 2**

The Additive Alternate note on sheet 2/10 states that the not to exceed budget number is listed on the front of the proposal, however, the proposal available to download does not contain this information. Can ODOT please provide this budget amount?

The project budget is \$2,200,000.00.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 4/25/2018 3:38:35 PM **Question Number - 1**

Is there a pre bid meeting scheduled for this project?

A pre-bid meeting is scheduled for May 22, 2018 at 9:00 AM in the ODOT district 2 office.

Project No. 180355

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

FRA-79668 - IR 70-16.18

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 9:43:39 AM **Question Number - 0**

The EBS file for Item 104 shows a description of SPECIAL SEALING DRAIN AND SCUPPER CLEANING - 216 SY. Item 105 shows STRUC DRNG, MISC, MISC: CLEAN BACKWALLS AND ABUTMENT SEATS - 14 EA. These do not match the other items in the bid. These items appear to be correct in the general summary. Please clarify the correct description and quantity for these items.

In the EBS file, the item codes, basic item descriptions (i.e., "SPECIAL-SEALING" AND "STRUCTURE DRAINAGE, MISC."), units and quantities are correct for line items 104 and 105. Please bid as specified in the plans.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 10:06:37 AM **Question Number - 0**

Addendum #5 removed the median inlet remove/replace for reference D6. As a result, it is no longer necessary to remove the median wall. Item SPECIAL - MAINTAIN EXISTING LIGHTING and Item 622 - PORTABLE BARRIER, 50" should no longer be required on this project. Please review these items.

Some work is still required at median inlets. These items could still be utilized.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:46:08 PM **Question Number - 0**

The Median Drainage Structures note on sheet 12 states that the eastbound I-70 inside lane and shoulder is to be closed for the drainage structure work. Will barrier wall need to be placed on westbound I-70 due to the removal of the median wall?

Drainage Structure D6 on Sheet 21 is no longer being removed and replaced. Drainage Structure D6 will be repaired per ITEM 519 - PATCHING CONCRETE STRUCTURE, AS PER PLAN allowing the barrier to remain in place. The median barrier and raceways located within shall not be disturbed. Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:43:12 PM **Question Number - 0**

The details on page 7 show 2 runs of raceway and 1 run of multicell in the existing median barrier. Is there active fiber in the multicell that needs to be temporarily maintained and permanently restored at the end of the project? If so, please provide the number of runs of existing fiber, the size, splicing locations and any downtime restrictions.

Drainage Structure D6 on Sheet 21 is no longer being removed and replaced. Drainage Structure D6 will be repaired per ITEM 519 - PATCHING CONCRETE STRUCTURE, AS PER PLAN allowing the barrier to remain in place. The median barrier and raceways located within shall not be disturbed. Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:20:31 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please clarify if the ITS fiber optic cable being replaced due to the new median barrier inlet at station 194+72 may be spliced at any existing ITS junction box or only at existing cabinets. This is not addressed in answers to previous questions or SS 809.

Drainage Structure D6 (at station 194+72) is no longer being removed and replaced. Drainage Structure D6 will be repaired per ITEM 519 - PATCHING CONCRETE STRUCTURE, AS PER PLAN, allowing the barrier to remain in place. The median barrier at this location should not be disturbed. Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:14:17 PM **Question Number - 0**

Will the department consider revising the scope of item #41 – Inlet, Misc.: Median Barrier Inlet 3B, Type B1, As Per Plan, and provide an alternative that allows the existing barrier and approach slab to be left in place? Under the current plan the contractor will be required to disconnect the ITS and remove the existing fiber optic cable, remove and replace the existing inlet with associated barrier wall and portions of the approach slab, then run the fiber optic cable back through the multicell and reconnect it to the existing system. The maintenance of traffic plans require all of this work to occur within one weekend which is not feasible without temporarily relocating the ITS which will be very expensive and is only needed due to the barrier through the inlet being replaced.

Drainage Structure D6 on Sheet 21 is no longer being removed and replaced. Drainage Structure D6 will be repaired per ITEM 519 - PATCHING CONCRETE STRUCTURE, AS PER PLAN. The median barrier at this location should not be disturbed. Please see forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 5:49:05 PM **Question Number - 0**

The plan insert sheets related to the barrier median inlet at station 194+72 do not address the fact that this inlet is located in an approach slab. Please provide details for the median barrier inlet through the approach slab plus the limits of removal and restoration.

Drainage Structure D6 on Sheet 21 is no longer being removed and replaced. Drainage Structure D6 will be repaired per ITEM 519 - PATCHING CONCRETE STRUCTURE, AS PER PLAN. Details for the approach slab are no longer needed.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 5:27:31 PM **Question Number - 0**

There is a mandoor and a junction box on the eastbound side of the inlet at station 194+72 of I-70. These are not addressed in the plans. Is a new mandoor and junction box required?

Drainage Structure D6 on Sheet 21 is no longer being removed and replaced. Drainage Structure D6 will be repaired per ITEM 519 - PATCHING CONCRETE STRUCTURE, AS PER PLAN allowing the barrier to remain in place. The median barrier at this location should not be disturbed.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 5:05:14 PM **Question Number - 0**

The details on page 7 show 2 runs of raceway and 1 run of multicell in the existing median barrier. Is there active fiber in the multicell that needs to be temporarily maintained and permanently restored at the end of the project? If so, please provide the number of runs of existing fiber, the size, splicing locations and any downtime restrictions.

There is existing ODOT and City of Columbus fiber in the median barrier of I-70 throughout this project. Existing plans will be posted for reference. For ODOT downtime restrictions/requirements, refer to SS809, as noted on Sht. 6. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-79668/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 3:10:48 PM **Question Number - 0**

The Median Drainage Structures note on sheet 12 states that the eastbound I-70 inside lane and shoulder is to be closed for the drainage structure work. Will barrier wall need to be placed on westbound I-70 due to the removal of the median wall?

The last paragraph of the "MEDIAN DRAINAGE STRUCTURES" note on sheet 12 states the following: "WORK AT EACH DRAINAGE STRUCTURE LOCATION SHALL BE COMPLETED EITHER IN ONE NIGHT (IN WHICH CASE PORTABLE BARRIER WOULD NOT BE NEEDED) OR ON A WEEKEND. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE DRAWINGS OF PROPOSED DRAINAGE STRUCTURE WORK AREAS (INCLUDING MOT) IN ADVANCE TO THE ENGINEER FOR APPROVAL. IF MEDIAN BARRIER MUST BE REMOVED TO REPLACE THE CATCH BASIN, MOT WILL NEED TO BE SET UP ON BOTH SIDES OF THE FREEWAY (EASTBOUND AND WESTBOUND). NOTE THAT CFN 250702154 (D6) IS IN AN APPROACH SLAB. ADDITIONAL LABOR AND MATERIALS MAY BE REQUIRED FOR THIS WORK. CONTRACTOR SHALL PREPARE IN ADVANCE ACCORDINGLY, SO AS NOT TO CAUSE DELAYS IN THE WORK AT THIS LOCATION." Per the note, removal of the median barrier wall will require MOT on both sides of the freeway. It is the intent that a short, but sufficient, section of Portable Barrier with a Work Zone Impact Attenuator would be placed on the westbound side to protect the opening created by the removal of the median wall. This is anticipated only at drainage structure CFN 250702154 (D6). It is not anticipated that work required for perform the ITEM 611 – INLET RECONSTRUCTED TO GRADE for drainage structure CFN 250702144 (D2) will require removal of the median wall or work on the westbound side of the freeway.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 1:39:00 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please reference D2 and D6 on plan sheet 21. Is it intended to remove and replace the concrete median wall as a part of the inlet work?

Reference No. D2 will be corrected in a forthcoming addendum. Reference No. D6 is intended to remove and replace the barrier median inlet and the concrete median barrier wall as part of the inlet work; please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 11:51:32 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please reference the drainage subsummary on Sheet 17. Reference No. D2 shows Item 202 Catch Basin (1 EA) or Inlet removed and Item 611 Inlet Reconstructed to Grade (1 EA). Please clarify the intent of the work for this inlet.

Reference No. D2 will be corrected in a forthcoming addendum. The existing drainage structure has four bricks and mortar missing beneath the grated portion on the I-70 EB side of the median catch basin. The intent of the work at this drainage structure is to reconstruct the portion of the structure beneath the grate to grade.

Question Submitted: 6/4/2018 9:06:39 AM **Question Number - 0**

Ref. No. 51 are listed as delineator, bracket mounted. Please confirm if these are bracket mounted or post mounted.

The delineators are to be post ground mounted. Ref. No. 51 listed as delineator, bracket mounted will be revised to "DELINATOR, POST GROUND MOUNTED" in a forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/15/2018 6:04:45 PM **Question Number - 1**

Addendum # 1 has a link to revised plan pages that seem to be for a different project. Can the correct link be given for the plan pages for this projects revisions.

The link is: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-79668/>

Project No. 180382

Sale Date - 7/12/2018

SUM-76721 - SR 8-07.60 (PART ONE AND PART TWO AND PART THREE)

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 11:10:08 AM **Question Number - 0**

Would the department consider adding weekend closures/detours for the installation of the culvert at STA 1227+24.86?

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 3:52:12 PM **Question Number - 0**

Sheet #856 denotes "Rock cut underdrain, See detail on sheet 62" Sheet #62 does not show a detail for the rock cut. Please advise.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 12:45:00 PM **Question Number - 0**

Per "noise wall general notes and details" all concrete panels are to be fabricated in vertical forms. We believe that due to the necessity to match existing walls made prior to this requirement, especially with a "rolled ashlar" finish, that the vertical form requirement should be waived for the reflective panel(s). Please confirm.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 12:13:30 PM **Question Number - 0**

Per the 2018 edition of NBS-1-09, all precast panels are to be fabricated in vertical forms. We believe that absorptive panels should be exempt from this change, as it is not possible to cast a composite absorptive panel vertically. We understand the need for a high quality finish on the residential side and intend to meet this as specified. Please confirm.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 10:31:11 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please provide a separate bid item for the 4" drainage conduit specified for the noise wall in Part 2 of the plans so it can be quantified instead of making it incidental to the noise wall bid items.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 10:28:41 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please verify that the maximum operating height listed in the Airway Clearance note on sheet 61 is correct.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 3:00:09 PM **Question Number - 0**

For the 10" non-reinforced concrete pavement, class qc1 with qc/qa, where is it anticipated this will be used? An as directed quantity of 143 sy pretty specific.

The 143 SY of Item 452 is provided for the pavement restoration for the pipe installations (note on sheet 64) for the pipes that are being replaced within the segments of the existing pavement at the Season's Road interchange that had been recently constructed and are to remain (outside the sawcut line of the ramp terminals for the speed change lanes). Pipes are shown on Sheets 448, 450 and 456.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 12:42:58 PM **Question Number - 0**

Can the pavement engineer calcs be provided? The only calcs given are for the different options (flexible or rigid).

All pavement calculations are included in the "76721 OFFICE CALCS.pdf" file on the ODOT ftp site. There are 53 total pages within the document. The first subset (26 pages) are the pavement calculations for the pavement options (flexible and rigid calculations). The second subset (27 pages) is the base bid pavement calculations including the cement stabilization quantities independent of the optional bid locations. A subsummary is located at the beginning of each of the two subsets.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 8:03:04 AM Question Number - 0

For the Type 4-C Curb, the proposal has 944 ft. The General summary on page 375 has 11 ft and the engineer calcs have 933 ft. What is the correct quantity?

The total quantity of 944' is correct for Item 609 – Curb, Type 4-C, As Per Plan. There is 11' in the base bid and 933' in each of the pavement options (flexible and rigid) for a total of 944'.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 3:57:27 PM Question Number - 0

Can crossover be placed using concrete in lieu of asphalt?

For crossover construction, concrete may be placed in lieu of asphalt for the temporary crossover provided that a smooth driving surface, adequate drainage and final pavement restoration is provided as per the intent of the "Crossover Construction and Removal Note". No additional compensation will be provided and all costs associated for crossover construction and the subsequent removal and pavement restoration shall be included in the lump sum price bid for Item 615, Roads for Maintaining

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 3:56:12 PM Question Number - 0

In the maintenance of traffic notes under "ramp closures/Blossom Music Center coordination" it states, "no closures will be permitted between Memorial Day and Labor Day". This conflicts with the phasing of work and the total calendar time limitation allotted for ramp detours. For example, Ramp D has a 120-day closure and is supposed to close NB entrance to S.R.8 immediately following phase shift. The 120 days will go past Memorial Day. Similar conflicts apply for other ramps. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 3:55:17 PM Question Number - 0

Based on the engineer calcs and the typical sections it appears that the intent is to have the underdrain backfill 6" (+/-) above the soil stabilization and 6" into the aggregate base (304). Please confirm that is still the projects intent.

Yes, that is the project intent that the underdrain trench extends to the top of the 304.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 1:17:31 PM Question Number - 0

Will ODOT Allow SS937 Type A as an alternate for the slipline pipes

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 11:04:57 AM Question Number - 0

Can the existing structure drawing be provided for the Hudson Drive bridge (SUM-8-0801)?

Please see the following FTP site link.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/SUM-76721/Reference%20Files/Hudson%20Drive%20Bridge%20Existing%20Plans/>

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 11:03:06 AM Question Number - 0

Will PN 555 be required for the multiple structures that will only have approach slabs replaced?

PN 555 will not be required for the structures where only the approach slabs will be replaced.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 3:14:25 PM Question Number - 0

Pages 115-116 has quantified 28,897 lf of 32" PCB with the designation "PB". This PCB has already been set in a previous phase as 50" PCB,APP. Will the stretch of wall that won't be moved between Phases 2 & 3 be paid for twice?

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 3:05:30 PM Question Number - 0

Phase 2 typical section on page 119 shows a "CONSTRUCTION DRUM" on the newly constructed Southbound passing/inside lane adjacent to the existing Southbound middle and driving lanes that are maintaining traffic. The plan views of Phase 2 on pages 224-283 appear to show 32" PCB in this location as do the subsummaries on pages 102-104A. Could you please confirm if the Construction Barrel shown on page 119 should be shown as 32" PCB? If it is 32" PCB then wouldn't it be the same 32" PCB that is itemized in the subsummary for Phase 3?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:35:03 PM **Question Number - 0**

Phase 1 typical section on page 119 shows 50" PCB in the Southbound direction and 32" PCB in the Northbound direction. The subsummary on pages 90-92 indicate 32" PCB is placed Southbound and 50" PCB is placed Northbound. Please Clarify.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 1:12:01 PM **Question Number - 0**

Reference #50 Barrier Transition, is the length supposed to be 20' per plan insert sheet 879 or use the given stationing (per plan sheet legend) at each location? Example: begin barrier transition to the begin approach slab station.

The Barrier Transition is to be 20' in length per the plan sheet 879. There are quantities of Type B and B50 barrier provided for the gaps from the end of the Barrier Transition to the approach slab stations listed (barrier details on plan insert sheet 886 and listed on the typical sections). The 0801 and 0842 structures are constructing new median barrier on the structures and a transition note (no pay item and not referencing the Barrier Transition Detail on sheet 879) is on the plan to transition the roadway median barrier to meet the proposed structure median barrier at the approach slab,

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 1:52:54 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please provide the existing drawings for the SUM-8-0801 and SUM-8-0842 structures. They do not seem to be included on the FTP site for this project.

Please see the FTP site link.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/SUM-76721/Reference%20Files/76721-Existing%20Plans/>

Question Submitted: 6/7/2018 12:36:17 PM **Question Number - 0**

Can the engineers calculations be provided?

Please see the FTP site link.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/SUM-76721/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 2:54:23 PM **Question Number - 0**

The Emergency access gates that are to be installed are called out to be one every one-mile ADBE. With the job being 5.7 miles one way is the estimated quantity of 8 enough? Also, is that 8 each (current quantity) per phase or for the entire job? Will the gate locations change throughout the phases of construction?

The quantity of access gates is going to be revised in the upcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 2:45:01 PM **Question Number - 0**

What date is to be used for the permitted lane closure chart?

There is not a more recent version of the PLCC than 2016. That is what we use. The use of the PLCC will be clarified in the upcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 2:43:13 PM **Question Number - 0**

The proposal calls out 11/1/2020 as the completion date for the project. However, the field office is for 72 months. Is the completion date still 11/1/2020?

The completion date will be revised in the forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 2:36:48 PM **Question Number - 0**

Per the MOT notes on page 72/1146 the lane restriction for the "Pre-Phase 1" work is "9 pm until 6 am". On page 73/1146 under "lane closures" it refers to the permitted lane closure chart for "Pre-Phase 1 and phase 5. The permitted lane closure chart allows a single lane to be taken from 6 pm to 7 am for portions of the job and no time restrictions for a single lane closure on other portions throughout the project. Please clarify which note to use for the "Pre-Phase 1" work.

This will be clarified in a forthcoming addenda

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/31/2018 2:57:45 PM **Question Number - 0**

Following the response to question number 2: Please clarify how the problem of the truck snagging on the posts during rollover is addressed, as this is a potentially deadly element of a TL-4 crash event.

The system has been designed in accord with ODOT and AASHTO guidelines for TL-4 impacts loading, heights, and distributions. Alternate extreme event scenarios (similar to the truck snagging mentioned) are not specifically considered in the AASHTO design specifications have not been considered due to the statistical probability of occurrence and costs associated with accommodating all possible scenarios. Please refer to AASHTO 15.8.4 and C15.8.4 for text describing conditions considered.

Question Submitted: 5/31/2018 2:57:12 PM **Question Number - 0**

Following the response to question number 2: Please clarify whether the wall system is to be only designed or designed and tested to the TL-4 standard, and how the fiberglass panels, as part of the wall system, are expected to "withstand a TL-4 impact load."

Per AASHTO Section 15, the noise wall system does not require testing if designed in accord to 15.8.4. No references in the plans are made for the panels to specifically "withstand" the TL-4 impact load as suggested.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2018 3:55:07 PM **Question Number - 2**

On sheet 26/34 "general notes NOISE WALL MOUNTED TO BRIDGE NO. SUM-8-0959" the design specifications state that the posts and anchorages shall be designed to withstand a TL-4 level impact load. Please clarify whether the entire wall should be TL-4 rated or if only the posts and anchorages need to be crash-tested, excluding panels.

The entire wall system shall be designed in accord to AASHTO TL-4 design

Question Submitted: 5/9/2018 9:38:31 AM **Question Number - 1**

Will there be a pre-bid meeting for this project?

No

Project No. 180383

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

ASD-98242 - /RIC MICRO FY2019

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 9:55:06 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please clarify the note on Sheet 8 regarding 897 Planing and the payment for the work described in the second paragraph of this note. In addition to butt joints, it reads that it will be used to smooth surface irregularities on the pavement repairs. Please clarify what this quantity (from Sheet 12) is based on and how it will be paid.

897 quantity is provided for butt joints at structures and ends of paving, and where engineer directs to smooth surface irregularities at pavement repairs.No Addendum Required.

Project No. 180384

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

ATH-96632 - US 33-15.60

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 3:09:06 PM **Question Number - 0**

The ODOT response to the most recent question regarding the duration of the detours also included a sentence that phase 2 and 5 could not be performed simultaneously. Will this be addressed in an addendum since answers to pre-bid questions are not considered a part of the contract documents? There are several other answers to pre-bid questions that have not been addressed in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 9:00:31 AM **Question Number - 0**

Clarification is required for the maintenance of traffic as per plan notes pertaining to the ramp closures during Phase 2 and Phase 5. No ramp closure restriction, closure times, or time tables are provided under the 'Maintenance of Traffic, APP' note, construction sequence or notification of traffic restrictions on the General Notes sheet 2-3. The notice of closure sign detail shown on the detour map sheets 5-6 shows, in reduced font, 'for 14 days'. Is it the intent that this '14 days' is applicable to the detours for Phase 2 & 5 or are these signs samples only? If so, has the Department considered enough time for these are the two largest phases with 3-4 pour sequences per respective phase each with adjacent placement restrictions and cure times?

14 days is the correct closure times for phases 2 and 5. The District has considered the time allowed and feels that the work can be completed in the 14 day time frame. Phase 2 and 5 (ramp closure phases) cannot be constructed simultaneously.

*** 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: 6/15/2018 3:11:44 PM **Question Number - 0**

Detour route is given but signage and locations have not been provided in the plans. Please clarify. How are the detours to be paid?

District 10 forces shall sign the detour.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 3:11:10 PM **Question Number - 0**

Previous ODOT 848 overlay projects have allowed for APP modification to the cure times for projects completed under shortened or weekend work windows. For these projects the 848 cure period is reduced to 24hr wet cure and obtaining the strength requirements before opening to traffic. Would the Department consider adding this as per plan note to these project documents?

ODOT does not wish to waive the cure times.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 3:10:35 PM **Question Number - 0**

Regarding the completion date revision in Addendum No. 1, has the Department taken into consideration the 848.30 specification stating 'Do not schedule overlays to be placed for the time period from October 16th to March 31st'? Considering a reasonable execution of the contract, posting the required notice of traffic restrictions and then the completion of a six-phase construction sequence, has the Department allotted enough time in the schedule to complete the project prior to the 848 October 15th restriction, or was the Department assuming phasing sequence through November 30th? With the critical work being the MOT and 848 Overlay, what work is the Department anticipating being completed between October 15th and November 30th? Is the Department going to waive the October 15th restriction? Please review the intent behind the completion date revision.

ODOT feels that the overlay work can be completed by Oct deadline. The department has no intent to waive the Oct 15th deadline. Sealing of concrete surfaces will need to be completed after the over.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 8:16:46 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please review the DBE goal percentage on this project. The overlay work is ninety percent of the project and there are no certified DBE hydrodemolition subcontractors or certified DBE latex modified concrete suppliers. A more realistic percentage on this project would be five percent.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 3:07:42 PM **Question Number - 0**

The structures on this project which are to receive new sealer have previously been sealed. Will the department be adding a pay item for this removal of existing sealer per PN 552?

There is no PN552. ODOT will only require the cleaning of the surface to the 100 grit sandpaper as per the CMS 512.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 8:10:46 PM **Question Number - 0**

The overlay quantities (and the subsequent related items) for structure number ATH-33-1560L/R appear to be over stated. Please confirm.

Project No. 180385

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

BUT-91864 - SR 747-03.11

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 12:04:05 PM **Question Number - 0**

As per all ODOT projects with radar for traffic signal detection, ITEM 632E90500 Signalization Misc.: Unlash and relash messenger wire, per ft. is present. I do not see this item on this project. Was it left out, or is it incidental to the radar?

The unlash and relashing of the messenger wire is included with the radar pay items, As Per Plan.

Project No. 180387

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

CLE-103755 - SR 32-02.72 (PART 1 AND PART 2)

Question Submitted: 6/7/2018 1:24:07 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 85 Clermont County Curb and Gutter. On plan sheet 99 it shows two pieces of this curb at the intersection. One piece is 30 feet the other is 49 feet. But the summary sheet 76 has the second piece listed as Curb type 4C.

This quantity will be updated in the forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/31/2018 4:13:06 PM **Question Number - 0**

Phasing of the job requires the contractor to work at night per the permitted lane closure table. Will the noise ordinance noted on pg. 6/286 be waived?

There are no noise restrictions for this project. This note will be removed. See forth coming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/31/2018 4:01:30 PM **Question Number - 0**

Will the geotechnical report be made available?

The Soil Profile for the project will be added by addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/31/2018 3:58:46 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please add a pay item for the petroleum contaminated soil that is noted on pg. 8/286.

These pay items will be added. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/31/2018 3:57:06 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please add a pay item for the mow strip associated with the cable barrier.

This item will be added. See forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 180388

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

CLI-94237 - /WAR GCS FY2018

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 4:06:35 PM **Question Number - 0**

Can ODOT please correct the quantities on sheet 8 of the plans to match the proposal?

See forthcoming addendum. Quantities will be revised on sheet 9.

Project No. 180389

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

DEL-91146 - /FRA-SP-FY19

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 10:25:24 AM **Question Number - 0**

Is reinforcing required for the MS and QC1 repairs equal or under 10' in length?

No – reinforcing is not required in the MS or QC1 repairs.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 11:36:03 AM **Question Number - 0**

Does ODOT expect contractor to perform full depth repairs using RRCM on I-70 section of project along with 3" asphalt overlay within the time restrictions from 8pm to 6 am to re-open to traffic? Cure time on RRCM will range from 4-6 hours, not leaving a lot of time to perform any significant amount of repairs before performing asphalt overlay. The intent to use RRCM is to re-open to traffic by morning. Does ODOT expect asphalt overlay to be done during this time, since concrete will be 3" below existing asphalt surface? Please clarify

Addendum A issued on 6/6/18 eliminated the 3" asphalt surface on Reference items 0007 and 0010. The intent is to bring concrete repair up to match adjacent asphalt.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 11:12:27 AM **Question Number - 0**

The plans indicate placing MS concrete for full depth repairs on I-70 for outside lane, as well as a 3" asphalt overlay. However, lane restrictions indicate having to re-open lane by 6 am. How does ODOT expect to get cure time on Medium Set concrete to re-open to traffic in only a few hours? Should not this lane remained closed for allowable cure time (MS - 24 hours) prior to asphalt overlay?

Forthcoming addendum will revise lane closure restriction from 3 to 2 lanes to allow single lane closure thru weekend on FRA-70 section of project. The Class MS repairs will need to be done during this timeframe. Regarding the 3" asphalt overlay that was removed in Addendum A issued on 6/6/18. Intent is for concrete repairs to be brought up to match existing asphalt pavement elevation.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180390

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

FRA-105463 - IR 70-07.63 (PART ONE, PART TWO AND PART THREE)

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 5:29:53 PM **Question Number - 0**

On Sheet 13/279, Item 614 Maintaining Traffic Misc. Bridge Deck and Pavement Patching: The note states that the cost for each item shall be \$10,000.00. The fixed amount shown in the proposal is included (as any other bid items) in the total bid amount. Can you please setup the fixed amount total in the EBS file?

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 3:16:05 PM **Question Number - 0**

The 12.5MM APP PG 88-22 quantities does not match up between the General Summary and the quantities given on sheets 48, 50 and 52, could this please be clarified.

Please refer to Addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 3:36:12 PM **Question Number - 0**

The Level UF repair items requiring web repairs normally require CVN testing, 15 Lbs @ 40 Deg. This is not mentioned anywhere I can find in the plans. Please advise if NO CVN testing of the web repair plates is required.

CVN testing of the web repair plates will be required.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 1:06:32 PM **Question Number - 0**

REF 56 - Asphalt Concrete Misc: Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, 12.5mm Mix - according to the typical section, this material is to be placed on the ramps. However, the material is not quantified on the quantity sheets for the interchanges. Please clarify these locations.

The quantity will be provided in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 1:43:49 PM **Question Number - 0**

REF 389 is listed as .02 LF instead of MI and the line width is listed as 8" but 12" would be typical with 6" edge lines. Please review and adjust if necessary.

Will be addressed via forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 9:30:54 AM **Question Number - 0**

The quantities for Item 255- Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement, Class RRCM, Class A & B, are paid for by the square yard. However, the Subsummary on Sheet 32 has the quantities calculated by the Cubic Yard. Please convert the bid item quantities to the square yard per CMS Item 255.10.

Will be addressed via forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 4:29:02 PM **Question Number - 0**

Page 47 / 77 Part 1 in the legend shows Item 253 - Pavement Repair on Ramp B. There is no bid item for Item 253.

Will be addressed via forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 3:37:39 PM **Question Number - 0**

The quantity sheets on Pages 48, 50 and 52 show quantities for Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, 19mm, Type A (446) (1.75"). No bid item exists for this work. Please add bid item.

Item will be added via forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 3:19:38 PM **Question Number - 0**

Page 42 / 77 Part 1 - please check quantities for planing, 12.5mm and anti-segregation equipment. The subtotals do not equal quantities shown. Also, there is nothing on plan sheet 41 that corresponds to P-6 or P-7 in the table on page 42.

Will be addressed via forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180391

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

FRA-105137 - US 270-29.39/30.60CD

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 10:46:14 AM **Question Number - 0**

Is it really the intent that all the guardrail is installed by the alternative guardrail placement (Ref. No. 13)?

Yes, bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 3:19:02 PM **Question Number - 0**

Will there be a pay item for "Special - 512E72510 EACH TEST PATCH" as described in the plans or is this work to be included in the price of the Epoxy Waterproofing Overlay?

Please see forthcoming addendum for additional pay items.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 9:40:51 AM **Question Number - 0**

Per the plan notes on sheet 10/71 for Item 690 – Misc: Concrete repairs, the contractor does not have enough information to bid this item. Depending on the repair details and locations, the closure periods and MOT required will be impacted. Can the Department please provide more details and locations for these repairs or be willing to exclude these items and address via a change order post bid if necessary?

Refer to sheet 35 of the plan for superstructure parapet repair location. All other repair locations shall be "AS DIRECTED BY THE ENGINEER". Bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 9:37:12 AM **Question Number - 0**

Per the plan note on sheet 15/71 in regards to MOT for bridge repair work, what will the Department require for a MOT submittal? Will the MOT design submittal need to be stamped by a PE or is a conceptual plan referencing standard drawings sufficient?

The plan note will be adjusted to clarify via forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 11:54:35 AM **Question Number - 0**

REF 54, 55, 83 & 84 quantities seem to reflect the amount of letters on pavement instead of the amount of words on pavement. Please review.

The plans and proposal quantities will be adjusted to reflect the correct quantity via forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 1:27:14 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please contact manufacturer for proper design of the polymer modified joint detail on page 51/71. The detail as shown with twin 8" plates will lead to joint failure. Plates should be omitted from plan as there is no joint gap being bridged.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2018 11:34:21 AM **Question Number - 0**

For the asphaltic plug joints, the detail shows 2 plates to be installed, is the plate size the standard 8" width plate?

Yes, the steel plate referenced shall meet provisions of supplemental spec 846 as specified on sheet 51/71.

Project No. 180392

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

HAM-101199 - Norwood SRTS SR 561 2015 (PART ONE AND PART TWO)

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:37:27 PM **Question Number - 0**

The solar powered LED enhanced school crossing assembly has a note on plan page 5, part 1 and plan page 5 part 2 that specifies a 4-1/2" outside diameter pole with a breakaway base. This type of pole has a threaded shaft and the corresponding base is not a 20" height that is shown on the drawing detail. The drawing details shows a 20" base which would be used with a tapered plate base pole. Additionally, ODOT SCD 83.20 has a note # 5 that states that poles with a loading in excess of 8 EPA should be the tapered style pole and base. Also, is the 20" height base correct. This refers to the older 1975 national standard height that was changed to 17" in 1985? While the older style is still available new standard drawing suggest that new installation should be 17"? Can the type of pole and base required be clarified. Is note # 5 for SCD TC-83.20 not applicable for this item on this project even though the EPA is exceeded?

See forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 12:09:03 PM **Question Number - 0**

Pay Item 25 is for a rectangular rapid flashing beacon that is not present in the plan set. Instead, the plan set has an LED enhanced sign on part 1 plan page 5. Is an RRFB required? If so, should pay item 96 also be an RRFB in part 2 instead of an LED enhanced sign? Please issue an addendum clarifying the requirements for these.

See forthcoming addendum

Project No. 180393

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

HAM-106469 - /CLE-Conduits FY19

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 10:41:00 AM **Question Number - 0**

On page 5 of plans it states that "traffic shall be maintained per the permitted lane closure map" for structure HAM-50-0276 but US 50 in not listed in the permitted lane closure table on ODOT's web site. What hours are lane closures permitted for this structure?

A minimum of one lane in each direction shall be maintained on US 50 at all times by use of the existing pavement.

Project No. 180395

Sale Date - 7/12/2018

MAD-88613 - US 40-06.64

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 8:28:45 AM **Question Number - 0**

Can you clarify the structural steel grade and field painting? Revised plan sheets in Addendum #3 call for weathering steel and only painting 10' of beam ends at abutments, but painting quantity was revised to 5,470 SF. Does the entire bridge get painted? If so, is weathering steel still required?

Please see forthcoming addendum. Weathering steel will not be required.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 7:12:35 PM **Question Number - 0**

Are the steel beams to be weathering steel now that they are to be completed painted? There was not an Addendum changing the steel beam material type.

An addendum will be issued to change the steel beam material type.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 1:07:57 PM **Question Number - 0**

The plans originally called for painting of 10' at each end of the beams. Is this still the case? The field painting quantity has been changed from 702 sqft to 5,470 sqft.

All structural steel in the left bridge superstructure will now be painted.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 11:51:02 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please verify the details, and Note 3 on sheet 72/26 requiring L8*4*1/2. Std Drawing EXJ-5-93 is referenced, which requires L7*4*1/2.

The existing angle, which is L8x4x1/2, will need to be matched.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 10:25:42 AM **Question Number - 0**

On page 44, item 526-Reinforced approach slabs: The note on this page states the parapets & transitions are to be included in the approach slab item. There is a bid item for class qc2 concrete bridge deck-parapet(including approach slabs). Where are the parapets & transitions on the approach slab to be paid? With the approach slab or with the bid item provided by ODOT? Please clarify

Yes, the parapets and transitions are to be included in the approach slab item. The parapets and transitions on the approach shall be paid under Bid Item 526 E 25011 on sheet 28/76 - General Summary and 45/76 - Bridge Estimated Quantities.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 10:21:16 AM **Question Number - 0**

On page 8 per notes under heading :Pavement for maintaining traffic, class B, APP-Is the 1000sy of pavement repair to be included in item 614 or 615. The description states both. Please clarify.

Please see forthcoming addendum. The 1,000 SY of pavement repair will be deleted.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 10:17:41 AM **Question Number - 0**

Page 6 of the drawings references a field office type a but no did item is provided. Please provide a bid item for field office type a or clarify need for office.

There is no need for a field office on this project. Please see 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: 6/14/2018 4:38:37 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid Item 122 Elastomeric Bearing pads is bid per SF, should this not be a per EA item? Can ODOT please change to per EA.

Please see forthcoming addendum; units will be revised to EACH.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 2:40:17 PM **Question Number - 0**

For the partial painting of the steel plans call to prime in the shop then paint in the field. There is no bid item for intermediate coat of paint will ODOT create a an intermediate paint item?

Please see forthcoming addendum for an additional bid item for the intermediate coat; the quantity for the finish coat will also be revised.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 12:39:34 PM **Question Number - 0**

For Structure 40-0664L will ODOT please add a bid item for unclassified excavation for the abutment work, or where is the excavation and backfilling to be paid?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 9:26:47 AM **Question Number - 0**

Is it ODOT's intent to only have the Approach Slabs at Structure 0664L QC/QA tested per the bid item descriptions for both structures?

The deck of Structure 0664L should also be QC/QA tested; plan notes and bid item will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 3:46:47 PM **Question Number - 0**

It appears that for the abutment demolition on 40-0664L the existing vertical rebar in the abutment seats and piers are to remain. Can ODOT confirm this. If they are to remain would ODOT allow the contractor to saw cut the removal lines and drill and grout rebar at their own expense.

The existing vertical rebar in abutment seats and piers are to remain as shown on the plans. No saw cut of rebar along the removal lines and drilling and grouting of rebar will be allowed for existing rebar. As shown on the plans, only the additional bars are allowed to be drilled and grouted.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 2:24:14 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please create a roads for maintaining traffic item for the earthwork associated with the temporary pavement.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 2:20:16 PM **Question Number - 0**

Will ODOT please consider creating a pavement repair item for the 1000 SY of Type B Pavement Listed on plan sheet 8, since the nature of the work is different than the rest of the the temporary type B pavement?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 12:06:49 PM **Question Number - 0**

Is the concrete apron required for the CB 8's on this job. It does not seem to be depicted in the plan and profile drawings. Please clarify if the concrete apron is required or not?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 7:00:31 AM **Question Number - 0**

Plan Sheet 63, shows four possible splice locations, splice 1, splice 2, and two optional splices, will ODOT allow the contractor at their option to choose any of the splice locations, all, 1, 2, or 3 as the contractor sees fit?

The Contractor can use any or all splice locations as shown in the sheet # 63/76.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 1:16:18 PM **Question Number - 0**

Page 9/76 shows temporary portable barrier to protect workers. This barrier is not in the summary so is it incidental or will it be added and will this barrier require work zone impact attenuators

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 10:35:23 AM **Question Number - 0**

MAD-040-0664L Ref 92 Structural Steel Members, Level 1, can the Level 1 please be clarified. This is a multi-span structure that requires splices.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 9:07:44 AM **Question Number - 0**

Page 73/76 and 74/76 are showing S bars on the plans but these bars are not carried to the summary. Are these bars incidental or will they be added.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/29/2018 9:40:09 AM **Question Number - 1**

SBR-1-13 states that for the entire length of single slope concrete bridge railings, the project plans shall show the locations of deflection joints. Where are these located in the plans.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 180396

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

MAR-102332 - US 23-01.85/02.04

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 11:47:54 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please clarify your MOT intent on Sheet 8/111. The contractor cannot start the project until 8/1/18, after the Ironman Competition. With the Holiday Notes, this leaves us 31 calendar days to construct the crossover, demo and reconstruct 2 structures and return traffic to the original 2 lane, 2 way traffic in time for Labor Day. The same applies to 2019 with Holidays.

See forthcoming addendum for clarification on MOT Notes.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 7:47:36 AM **Question Number - 0**

Are the existing structure drawings available to be posted on ODOT's website?

The existing structure plans can be downloaded at:

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MAR-102332/Reference%20Files/>

Project No. 180397

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

MED-79790 - IR 71-06.06 PM

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 8:36:38 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please provide more information for Reference 1, Partial Depth Repair. Specifically, lane and SLM location and if the repairs are transverse or longitudinal.

Pavement repairs will be identified and marked per plan note for Maintenance of Traffic for Marking Pavement Repairs. Plan note for Item 614 – Maintaining Traffic: General is being updated to clarify that lane closures are to comply with PLCM. Plan note for Maintenance of Traffic for Ramp Closures is being updated to clarify that Lane Closure Disincentive also applies to the ramps. An Addendum is forthcoming.

Project No. 180398

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

MEG-91742 - SR 124/SR 143-36.88/08.25

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 5:11:08 PM **Question Number - 0**

REF 14 is listed as Item 642 but plan sheet 8/8 shows this as Item 644. Which is correct?

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 8:30:34 AM **Question Number - 0**

The plan cover sheet and proposal describe railroad involvement on this project. Please add a bid item for Railroad Insurance Bond.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180399

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

MOE-84539 - SR 26-16.33

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 5:04:52 PM **Question Number - 0**

Current CMS standards require backplates for vehicular signals unless specifically noted otherwise. These free swinging signals do not appear to have backplates in the plan details. However, the plan details do not specifically state that backplates are not required. Can a clarification be given if backplates are required with the vehicular signals in pay item 50.

Back plates cannot be installed on 4 way signals. There are no back plates required for this project.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 2:17:41 PM **Question Number - 0**

Is a bracket arm to be included in ref# 56 combination strain pole? If so please verify bracket arm length required.

The bracket are length is 25' as shown on the pole name on sheet 18.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 9:00:28 AM **Question Number - 0**

PAVEMENT REPAIR NOTE ON PAGE 5 OF PLANS STATES THAT 3" OF ASPHALT INTERMEDIATE TYPE 1 IS TO BE USED. JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT IT SHOULD NOT READ ASPHALT INTERMEDIATE TYPE 2. PLEASE CLARIFY.

Yes, the Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 1 is correct.

Project No. 180400

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

MOT-97667 - SR 725- 19.75

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 10:13:15 AM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 116- Irrigation Booster Pump and System Relocation: addendum 3 revised drawings and notes. Is the contractor only responsible for removals per revised note on sheet 207 or is the contractor responsible for relocation of appurtenances since locations were eliminated by revised plan sheet 213? Please clarify as this is confusing given the bid item calls for "Relocation".

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 9:40:27 AM **Question Number - 0**

Is it ODOT's intent to abandon in place the existing lead-in cable, pull boxes and conduit for the existing loops on this project?

Yes, the existing lead-in cable, pull boxes and conduit for the existing loops will be abandon in place.

Project No. 180401

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

MRG-96644 - SR 266-00.00

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 8:23:44 AM **Question Number - 0**

Due to the late selling date and time of year for a 2-lane resurfacing along with District 10 selling all their slip jobs and drilled shafts would ODOT consider delaying the completion date for this project until November 15, 2018?

The District feels that the completion date for this project shall remain as is.

Project No. 180403

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

RIC-87721 - IR 71-06.39/10.77

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 4:22:46 PM **Question Number - 0**

Sheet 29 indicates that Proval reports will be available as reference files. We do not see those on the ftp site. Will ODOT include those reports on the ftp site?

ODOT currently has information for the outside lanes for each structure. CentralOffice is processing this data and it will be available to all contractors this afternoon(6/19/2018) or tomorrow. Central Office will then collect ProVAL data on all lanesat the end of this week, which will then be processed and made available to theselected contractor.No addendum required.FTP site for the existing reports:ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D03/87721/ProVal/

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 11:36:16 AM **Question Number - 0**

•Please clarify the repair notes on sheet 8. If a contractor performs a repair 4.5" deep measured from the existing pavement (2.5" measured from the planed pavement) is this paid as a 251 or 253 repair, is 301 or 442 19mm mix required, and what depth of repair is included for payment? Please consider re-writing this note for clarity.

An addendum is forthcoming removing it and making other modifications.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 11:35:04 AM **Question Number - 0**

The callouts in the typical sections for Item 442 asphalt surface, Item 806 asphalt surface, and Item 442 anti-segregation equipment appear to be confused. Please review and clarify ODOT's intent.

An addendum is forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 11:33:58 AM **Question Number - 0**

Addendum #2 changed the binder type from PG 64-22 for Ref. No. 74, 87, and 101, but did not change the binder type for item 116, 133, or 146. Is this correct?

ODOT is in the process of reviewing this. It may be included in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 11:33:09 AM **Question Number - 0**

Sheet 11 indicates that the contractor is to provide lane closures for ODOT to mark and inspect pavement repairs. The contractor has no control over the number of closures or length of time these closures will be needed. Please provide an estimated number of closures or shifts of lane closures which ODOT intends to utilize so contractors can accurately bid this work. Alternatively, create a bid item of lane closures per each for use by the engineer.

An addendum reflecting this is forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 11:31:54 AM **Question Number - 0**

The plans include several requirements for permitted lane closures, but also include a statement that the length and duration of lane closures shall be at the approval of the engineer. In order to prepare a reasonable bid and reduce the likelihood of a dispute on the project, will ODOT confirm that contractors will be permitted to leave a lane closed throughout the week as long as all requirements of the contract are met?

As long as all requirements of the permitted lane closures, individual agreements, and standard construction drawings are met, the means and methods of MOT is up to the contractor and project engineer.No addendum needed.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 11:29:17 AM **Question Number - 0**

Item 253 Pavement Repair is comprised of two distinct types of work in two distinct locations of the project. 1400 CY of repair is to be performed over 60 lane miles between RIC-71-10.77 and ASD-71-0.04 and allows 301 mix to be placed in one lift up to 6" thick. 616 CY of repair is to be performed over 26 lane miles between RIC-71-6.39 and RIC-71-10.77 and requires both 301 and 12.5mm mix placed in separate lifts and will require the edges to be sealed since this area is not surfaced. Also, the notes on sheet 24 indicate that the 644 striping damaged or removed in this area must be replaced in kind and is incidental to the 253 repair item in this area. The cost of these two types of repair will not be the same. Due to the likelihood of the quantities of one or both types of repair changing, would ODOT please create separate bid items for the two types of 253 repair? This would provide a fair basis for compensation and reduce the likelihood of a dispute on the project

An addendum splitting these items is forthcoming.

Project No. 180405

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

SHE-106289 - /AUG-IR 75-00.00/00.00

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 4:46:12 PM **Question Number - 0**

Based on the sale date, award date and material procurement please review project completion date requirements.

Completion date will remain at 10/26/18.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180406

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

TRU-94114 - SR 534-13.26

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 11:29:55 AM **Question Number - 0**

ITEM 20 STATES 441 ASPHALT INTERMEDIATE COURSE TYPE 2, APP. VARIABLE DEPTH 0" TO 1.5". THE INTENT IS TO CORRECT THE CROWN BY LAYING A VARIABLE DEPTH MAT. THE STONE IS TOO LARGE AND WILL CRACK WITH A TYPE 2 MIX IN THIS APPLICATION. PLEASE CONSIDER CHANGING THE INTERMEDIATE MIX TO A TYPE 1 MIX.

An addendum will be issued to address.

Project No. 180407

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

WAR-101201 - Franklin SRTS 2015

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 11:13:00 AM **Question Number - 0**

Addendum # 1 addressed the base height requirement on the specified pedestal pole. However, the as per plan note still specifies that a 4-1/2" aluminum pedestal with breakaway base be provided which conflicts with note 5 of Standard Construction Drawing TC-83.20 where a tapered pole would be required due to the 8 EPA loading limit being exceeded in place of a 4-1/2" aluminum pedestal. Is note 5 of SCD TC-83.20 not required to be met for this project?

See forthcoming addendum. The note in question will be revised by stating to provide a 14 foot conventional light pole with a breakaway base per HL-10.13 and 24" diameter x 6' deep foundation. Applicable standard drawings will be added to the title sheet.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 9:18:33 AM **Question Number - 0**

Would the department consider allowing an RRFB in place of the specified LED enhanced sign crossing. The FHWA has issued a blanket approval for IA-21 use in Ohio for these types of applications.

This project shall install the LED enhanced sign crossing and not an RRFB.

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 9:03:41 AM **Question Number - 0**

The solar powered LED enhanced school crossing assembly has a note on plan page 5 that specifies a 4-1/2" outside diameter pole with a breakaway base. This type of pole has a threaded shaft and the corresponding base is not a 20" height that is shown on the drawing detail. The drawing details shows a 20" base which would be used with a tapered plate base pole. Additionally, ODOT SCD 83.20 has a note # 5 that states that poles with a loading in excess of 8 EPA should be the tapered style pole and base. Also, is the 20" height base correct. This refers to the older 1975 national standard height that was changed to 17" in 1985? While the older style is still available new standard drawing suggest that new installation should be 17"? Can the type of pole and base required be clarified.

See forthcoming addendum. The sign detail included in the plans should have shown the 14-foot pedestal height to include the height of the breakaway base. Therefore, the overall pole height, including the base, should be 14 feet. The 20-inch height shown in the detail for the breakaway base is to be disregarded.

Project No. 180408

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

WOO-101007 - SR 64-00.39 Roundabouts

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 4:01:45 PM **Question Number - 0**

The 24"x16" waterline connection shown on sheet 218 of the plans does not indicate the material type of the existing 24" waterline. We are assuming it is 24" Ductile Iron Pipe.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 12:33:20 PM **Question Number - 0**

In response to recently-posted Addendum 6, ODOT revised quantities but there are still no revised plan sheet attachments showing subsummary sources of quantity for the Portable Barrier item (ref. 256) and related Barrier Reflector/Object Marker bid items. Without the subsummary sheet by phase, there are not proper means to calculate the PCB item as to the amount of wall to be trucked in, amount shifted, amount stored, and amount rehandled- all of which affect the unit cost of the PCB bid item. Please provide revised subsummary sheets so this bid item can be properly calculated and if it cannot be done in time please delay this bid.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 10:48:27 AM **Question Number - 0**

It is within 24 hours of the bid and there are several unanswered bid item quantity error issues (some significant quantity errors) for which the responses have been that they would be answered in addendum 6. Please delay this bid to give contractors ample time to address making revisions pending the forthcoming addendum.

Addendum 6 has been posted.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 9:20:39 AM **Question Number - 0**

Will the Department allow the Temporary Sidewalks to be constructed with concrete per 608.03 in lieu of asphalt?

Yes.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 8:17:52 AM **Question Number - 0**

The increased Portable Barrier quantity listed in PBQ 6/19/18, 3:32:21 pm will have the effect of increasing the quantities for Reference #244 - Barrier Reflector, Type 1, and Reference #245 - Object Marker, One Way, by a corresponding 60%. Please correct these quantities prior to bidding this project.

The quantities for line items 244 and 245 will be revised in Addendum 6.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 8:11:56 AM **Question Number - 0**

Will the department consider using Type 1 (448) & Type 2 (448) in lieu of 12.5mm (446) & 19mm (446) for the BGSU parking lot due to the small quantity?

These items shall be bid as per the plan requirements.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 7:31:20 AM **Question Number - 0**

Reference 246, Maintaining Traffic, Misc Temporary Sidewalk plan quantity is overstated by more than 20%. Error appears to be with the following bubble qtys. TP4A - Not shown on the plans. TP5 - Overstated by approximately 900 SF. Please correct the quantity prior to bidding this project.

The Department believes the quantity for line item 246 to be correct. TP4A is shown on plan sheet 34.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 7:22:11 AM **Question Number - 0**

Reference 240, Impact Attenuator, Unidirectional, is understated by over 30%. Please correct quantity prior to bidding this project.

The quantity for line item 240 will be adjusted in Addendum 6.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 3:32:21 PM **Question Number - 0**

Plan quantity for Reference #256, Portable Barrier, 32" is significantly understated. The sum of your bubble quantities on plan sheets 25-27 equals 9290 LF, but your bid quantity is 5630 LF. There are multiple individual errors in the summary tables as well. PB2 - Sheet 25/354 No quantity listed. PB4A - Sheet 25/354 Quantity shown in table, but no PB4A bubble on the plans. PB6 & PB7 - Sheet 26/354 Quantities listed in wrong column and not carried to page summary. ELW3 - Sheet 27/354 Quantity of PCB shown. Doesn't exist. Please correct these tables and the bid quantity.

The quantity for line item 256 will be revised in Addendum 6.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 2:05:34 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid items 104 (1" Polyethylene Service Branch) and 114 (Water Service Reinstatement): Bid item 104 contains four locations, 2 of which are new services to roundabouts, 1 as service to the relocated pump station, and 1 to an existing business east of IR-75. Bid item 114 has a quantity of 3 each which excludes the east roundabout. The language to bid item 114 on plan sheet 206 calls for payment to be split out over the two items which do not cover time and fittings to reinstate one of the services. Please either remove bid item 114 or change the quantity to correctly match up to what is actually getting reinstated (and not what is new).

The quantity for line item 114 will be revised in Addendum 6.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 1:04:49 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 116- Irrigation Booster Pump and System Relocation: addendum 3 revised drawings and notes. Is the contractor only responsible for removals per revised note on sheet 207 or is the contractor responsible for relocation of appurtenances since locations were eliminated by revised plan sheet 213? Please clarify as this is confusing given the bid item calls for "Relocation".

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 1:03:53 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 116- Irrigation Booster Pump and System Relocation: addendum 3 revised drawings and notes. Is the contractor only responsible for removals per revised note on sheet 207 or is the contractor responsible for relocation of appurtenances since locations were eliminated by revised plan sheet 213? Please clarify as this is confusing given the bid item calls for "Relocation".

Contractor is only responsible for removal as stated in the note.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 10:56:37 AM **Question Number - 0**

Item 690 Special - 4" Roadway Paver and 2" Decorative Paver plan notes on sheet 20 call for a setting bed/leveling course out of washed natural sand or crushed stone. The typical section details on sheet 17 call for a 3/4" bituminous asphalt setting bed placed on neoprene-modified asphalt adhesive. Please clarify which option is to be included on the concrete base and below the pavers.

The 4" pavers shall be placed per the details on sheet 17 using the asphalt setting bed. The 2" pavers can be placed on a 1" limestone screening bed.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 9:56:00 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please check your quantity for Reference 260, Unclassified Excavation APP. The plan quantity is grossly understated when accounting for the work shown in the plans behind the existing abutments and along the face of the wingwalls.

The Department believes the quantity for unclassified excavation, as per plan to be correct. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 9:06:20 AM **Question Number - 0**

Based on your answer to PBQ 06/19/18, 6:54:45am, please clarify the Departments interpretation of C&MS 108.06 with respect to Phases that have durations of less than 30 days. i.e. Phase 1B - 14 days, Phase 2C - 7 days, Phase 3 - 19 days, and Phase 4 - 2 days. How many days does the Department expect the Contractor to absorb without extension being granted in these Phases? A more reasonable approach would be to grant an extension based on the actual days lost for these short duration Phases that have severe associated damages tied to them.

The Department will grant extensions to the completion date due to weather as defined in C&MS 108.06. The Department will calculate the number of anticipated lost work days by pro-rating Table 108.06-1 for each phase duration.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 8:56:14 AM **Question Number - 0**

With short durations allowed for the completion of the structure phases, will the Department allow the concrete sealing work to be performed utilizing lane closures after the bridge is opened to traffic? With hand formed parapets, 7 day cure period, 10 day air dry requirement, and vandal fence there simply isn't enough time in a 60 day closure period to accomplish all of this work. There is a 30 day window in July 2019 when this work could be accomplished.

Yes, lane closures for concrete sealing work will be allowed. Pedestrian traffic must be maintained at all times.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 7:30:56 AM **Question Number - 0**

Plan sheet 207, right column under "Irrigation Notes": last sentence states contractor shall be certified to work on Toro Sentinel Irrigation systems. If this is criteria for performing work, then please provide a list of all local, ODOT prequalified contractors who are certified or remove this note.

The contractor installing the irrigation system does not need to be prequalified by the Department. Any contractor can perform \$800,000 worth of work with the Department in a given calendar year without be prequalified.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 6:54:45 AM **Question Number - 0**

With short durations in Phases 1B, 3 and 4 will the department grant weather extensions on a day for day basis?

The Department will grant extensions to the completion date due to weather as defined in C&MS 108.06.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 5:48:18 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 118- 4" Irrigation line: Subsummary sheet ends quantity of 950' at station 27+00 on sheet 213. The line continues on plan sheet 214 and quantity isn't included. Please revise this quantity error.

The quantity for line item 118 - 4" irrigation line will be changed to 1,081 FT in Addendum 5. The quantity for line item 117 - 16" Water Main will also be changed to 3,890 FT in Addendum 5.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 3:47:12 PM **Question Number - 0**

After contacting numerous suppliers we have been informed that they are unable to locate River Rack in the 3"-4" size described in the note on plan sheet 20. The largest they are able to find is 1.5" to 2". Is this size acceptable or is there a supplier the designer had in mind who is able to provide river rock of this size and quantity?

The Department would still prefer the river rock in the 3"-4" size, however, if it can be proven that it is not available, the smaller size (or rock of a different type) would be acceptable.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 3:26:04 PM **Question Number - 0**

Per plan sheet 22/354, Phase 1A is to begin on September 3, 2018, and end on November 21, 2018, in order to give the contractor 80 days to construct Phases 1A & 1B. Since this closure period is starting on a holiday and ending the day before a holiday, are there any special restrictions on either date in terms of what work can be performed?

There are no additional restrictions for SR 64 other than those specified in the plans. All lanes of I-75 shall be open to traffic on September 3, 2018 and November 21, 2018.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:34:44 PM **Question Number - 0**

The proposed 16" water main on plan sheets 212-13 runs under the turf reinforced maintenance drive. The trench detail on plan sheet 222 calls for granular backfill when under pavements. Does this portion of the water line need to have granular backfill or earth backfill?

The portion of the 16" water main that is under the turf reinforced maintenance drive does not require granular backfill.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 2:13:50 PM **Question Number - 0**

Plan sheet 210 has a designated cross-hatched area around station 71 for pavement and curb/gutter replacement due to waterline installation. No bid item for pavement materials or for pavement repair have been set up. Please set up responsive quantities.

The quantities for the appropriate pay items for replacement of the pavement and curb are accounted for in the pavement quantity calculations.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 1:49:35 PM **Question Number - 0**

The prebid question submitted on 6/13/2018 concerning the disincentives being lowered from \$ 75,200 per day was answered the disincentives will be adjusted in addendum #3. We have received addendums #3 and #4 and do not see this change has been made.

The disincentives were adjusted with plan sheet revisions in Addendum 3. Plan sheet revisions from Addendum 3 can be found at the following location: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-101007/101007-AddendumC-16RevisedSheets.pdf>

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 1:46:26 PM **Question Number - 0**

The existing bridge drawings on the FTP site are in .dgn format. Please furnish the drawings in either .tif or .prn format.

The existing structure plans are in pdf format on the ftp site at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-101007/Reference%20Files/Existing%20Structure%20Plans/>

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 1:44:39 PM **Question Number - 0**

Ref # 284 Railing, Conc Parapet, standard drawing BR-2-15 states on sheet 5 under basis of payment the reinforcing steel is included for payment in the lineal foot price of the railing. Sheet 337 shows the same reinforcing steel is included for payment in Ref # 261 Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel. Which is correct?

The reinforcing steel for the railing should be included with line item 284 - Railing, Concrete Parapet with Chain Link Fence, As Per Plan. The quantity for Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel will be changed to 196,978 LB in Addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 1:42:09 PM **Question Number - 0**

Ref # 267 Class QC1 Concrete w/ QC/QA, Footing: the pay quantity appears to be double the correct quantity, please revise.

Agree. The quantity will be revised in Addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 11:47:13 AM **Question Number - 0**

Can ODOT post the Asbestos inspection report to the FTP site.

**Please see the FTP site link.
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-101007/Reference%20Files/>**

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 11:33:17 AM **Question Number - 0**

Can the Department please clarify in the MOT plan sheets which areas are designated for temporary pavement and which areas are designated for temporary sidewalk? The same shading is used for both items.

The temporary pavement and temporary walk quantities are itemized in the subsummary tables on sheets 25-27 and labeled with "TP" bubbles on the plan sheets.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 11:24:43 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please provide more detail/sections for the 4" temporary asphalt walk. Referring to 608.04 does not provide the material make up.

The asphalt concrete walk buildup shall consist of 4" of asphalt on top of 4" compacted aggregate base. Materials shall conform to C&MS 608.02.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 11:23:56 AM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 108- Water Work, Misc. 16" Butterfly Valve: the last sentence of the sheet 207 plan note calls for placing these in manholes. Are the precast manholes incidental to this bid item? Same question applies for bid item 139 Automatic Air Release Valve in Manhole, as both of these items are worded in the proposal differently than bid item 140 which in its description states "and manhole". Please verify if manhole structures are incidental to valve bid items.

The cost of the manholes required for the butterfly valves shall be included with line item 108 - Water Work, Misc.: 16" Butterfly Valve. The cost of the manholes required for the automatic air release valves shall be included with line item 139 - Special - Automatic Air Release Valve in Manhole.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 10:33:05 AM **Question Number - 0**

QC1 concrete is listed as QC/QA, but has only 50 cyd total and approach slabs are not QCQA. Would the department consider not performing QCQA on QC1 and change approach slabs to QC/QA?

Project shall be bid according to plan.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 10:13:32 AM **Question Number - 0**

Sequencing of Work Descriptions on sheet 22/354 contradict the hatched area to be constructed on the Maintenance of Traffic plan sheets 31-59/354. Please review and correct.

The hatched areas shown are approximate work limits and may be adjusted to accommodate the progress of the Contractor.

Question Submitted: 6/18/2018 9:33:12 AM **Question Number - 0**

Reviewing the cross-sections, it appears excavation and embankment will be required for the temporary pavement along the south edge of SR 64/105. How is this work to be paid? Will a Roads for Maintaining Traffic item be added? Also please provide estimated quantities of excavation and embankment.

An item for Roads for Maintaining Traffic will be added in Addendum 5. The estimated quantity for excavation for this item is 201 CY. The estimated quantity for embankment for this item is 449 CY.

Question Submitted: 6/17/2018 7:55:41 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 127, 10" Type B Sanitary: of the 63' total quantity, 53' shown on plan sheet 212 is called out as Type C on the plans and isn't under pavement. Please correct this bid item and set up a new one for what should be 10" C.

An item will be added in Addendum 5 for 10" Conduit, Type C, As Per Plan, For Sanitary. The quantities for 10" conduit will be as follows: 25 FT - 10" Conduit, Type B, As Per Plan, For Sanitary & 38 FT - 10" Conduit, Type C, As Per Plan, For Sanitary.

Question Submitted: 6/17/2018 12:22:51 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 120- 18"B Sanitary Sewer: detail on sheet 219 calls for #411 backfill when pipe is under or within 5' of pavement. The majority of this will be under the multi-use path, which will not have standard roadway traffic. Given the extreme depth of the sanitary, backfilling with granular will be very expensive. Will ODOT please change this specification to the standard ODOT 611 specification instead of making granular backfill a requirement per this detail?

The sanitary sewer shall be bid according to the plans.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/16/2018 10:52:09 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 132- BG Manhole Type 3-4: Sanitary subsummary on sheet 208 calls out 2 each on plan sheet 218 and only 1 is shown on that sheet. Please give stations for each of the two or if there should only be one then please review and revise quantity.

The quantity for the Item 611, Manhole, Misc: BG Manhole Type 3-4 shall be "0" on plan sheet 218. The total quantity for line item 132 shall be 6 Each. The subsummary and general summary sheets will be revised in Addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2018 10:38:50 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 124, Rock: plan sheet 19 note gives a contingency of 2100 cy of rock excavation within water and rock sanitary trenches and also notes that trench widths are as indicated in plans and specifications. Plan sheet 219 gives a sanitary trench detail indicating limits of payment to be maximum of 12" horizontal outside of pipe diameter. For the 18" sanitary and 16" watermains, the theoretical trench widths based on plan details (sheets 219 and 222) are not realistic with the true trench width using trench boxes given the depth of the pipe. Please provide calculations to give the contractor ample opportunity to figure how much of this quantity is outside theoretical trench width or please change the note to pay for all rock excavation based on OSHA-approved trench box width limits.

The top of rock, sanitary and water line elevations are provided in the sanitary and water plan and profile sheets. The Department will compensate the Contractor for the rock excavation limits provided on plan sheets 219 and 222. Any additional rock excavation that is to be performed as per the Contractor's means and methods shall be incidental to the conduit item.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 4:50:46 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid items 70 through 73 and 80 include large size pipe and elliptical pipe as well as bends and #4 manholes. Payment is by the foot for the pipe and by each for the bends and #4 manhole. From hand takeoffs, it appears that the 84"A item on sheet 196 includes the bends in the pay length but the 48x76 item on sheet 198 excludes the bends in the pay length. Please verify for both if the bends count for footage as well as that of the MH-4 pieces.

The length of pipe shown in the plans is correct. The length provided includes the bends and manholes. The payment for the bends and manholes are for the additional cost to construct the bends and manholes beyond the cost of the pipe.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 3:11:20 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please clarify the plan note for the method of measurement for the glass fiber reinforced wrap system on sheet 310/354. Will the dept pay for the surface area of the column or the square footage of material used including overlaps?

As stated in the plan note on sheet 310/354, the Department will pay for the glass fiber reinforced wrap system as per SF of pier surface area covered. No additional compensation will be made for any required overlaps.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 3:05:00 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 70, 84" Conduit, Type A: Plan sheets 196 and 197 specify the pipe to be RCP 706.02, however the proposal and EBS don't have the type of pipe specified. Please verify if this is to be limited to RCP or open to all types of pipe materials.

The conduit shall be 706.02. A revised general summary sheet will be issued in Addendum 5.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 2:39:16 PM **Question Number - 0**

Your answer to pre-bid question 06/14/18, 1:33:09pm listed a note to be included with Addendum #3 regarding the 4" temporary sidewalk. Per the note all necessary earthwork and base is to be included with the sidewalk for payment. In Phase 2A, significant earthwork will be required to maintain a 4' sidewalk at either end of the bridge (see Sheet 44/347). Please provide a cross section showing the temporary sidewalk at each end of the bridge, along with acceptable sloping/grading so that the incidental earthwork quantities can be calculated.

Phase 2A, sheet 44 shows a temporary walk just north of the just constructed permanent multi-use path. The temporary walk amounts to a 2'-8" widening of the path inside the already constructed path's five foot wide graded shoulder. This does require some temporary grading because the temporary walk cross slope of 0.02 is less than the grades shoulder's 8:1 cross slope. The difference amounts to a few inches vertically to be worked out in the rounding. The amount of embankment is very minimal. Due to this very small amount of earthwork, we do not believe specific cross sections are required.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2018 12:32:33 PM **Question Number - 0**

Question dated 6/14/18 regarding office calculations.

The Level UF steel is not included in the calculations. Please advise where this information can be located.

Please see the following FTP site link.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-101007/Reference%20Files/>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 3:02:52 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid Item 57 - Concrete Masonry, where does the excavation for the cast-in-place headwalls get paid for?

The excavation for proposal line item 57 is included for payment with Item 602, Concrete Masonry, as per CMS 602.03.A. If any rock is encountered, payment for that excavation will be made per the general note on plan sheet 19.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 1:40:38 PM **Question Number - 0**

Under the Phase 4 Mot note shown on sheet 22, the Contractor is to conduct final surface paving to be completed at night between the hours of 7pm to 6am over two nights. Is the intent to maintain traffic through the Roundabout / Ramps while the surface course is being placed or will a full closure be allowed? If the Roundabout / Ramp lanes need to stay open while paving, there is not enough room to allow traffic (especially truck traffic) to travel around the paving operation in the Roundabout / Ramp lanes.

The Department will allow a full closure of each roundabout during final surface paving. However, if feasible, ramp turning movements shall be maintained.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 1:33:09 PM **Question Number - 0**

Bid item 264- Temporary Sidewalk, 4" thick: cannot find detail or description on MOT plans sheets. What type of material is required for this?

A note for the temporary sidewalk will be issued in Addendum 3. The note is as follows: "This item shall include all labor, material, equipment and incidentals necessary to construct and remove a temporary 4" asphalt concrete walk conforming to CMS 608.04 as located in these plans. This item shall also include all necessary earthwork and/or base course under the temporary walk."

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 1:22:32 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please verify the quantity for Line Item number 254 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic. The Proposal has 530sy, but if you add up the quantities for temp pavement for sheets 25 thru 27 the quantity is 1388sy.

The total quantity for proposal line item 254 - Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B should be 1,388 SY. The quantities on plan sheet 27 were not carried to the subtotal or general summary. The quantity will be revised in Addendum 4.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 12:13:29 PM **Question Number - 0**

Plan sheet 61- General Subsummary for Pavement- none of the items have any reference for checking quantities. Please provide engineer quantity spreadsheets or subsummary sources by plan sheet.

Please see the FTP site link. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-101007/Reference%20Files/Office%20Calcs/>

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 10:38:47 AM **Question Number - 0**

1. After a review of the design file information posted, it appears that the office calc's were not included. Would the department please provide the office calculations for the project?

Please see the FTP site link.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-101007/Reference%20Files/Office%20Calcs/>

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 4:22:19 PM **Question Number - 0**

Though we do understand the sensitivity to traffic restrictions/durations and the impact to the various stakeholders involved with the project, we respectfully request that the disincentives be lowered to more reasonable values, especially those called out in Phase 1A and 1B. The same impact can be created with damages that are far less than \$75,200.00 per day.

The disincentives will be adjusted in Addendum 3.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 10:24:07 AM **Question Number - 0**

Can ODOT post the existing bridge plans to the FTP site?

Please see the FTP site link.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-101007/Reference%20Files/>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/12/2018 12:57:39 PM **Question Number - 0**

1. The infields of US 6 and IR 75 were were recently used as home for thousands of yards of dirt and concrete pavement on a previous ODOT project. Is that material available for use on the current project bidding? If so, may the area be test dug?

The material in the infields of US 6 and I 75 is available for the Contractor to use as embankment on project (18)0408. All requirements of C&MS 203 shall be met in the event this material is used as permanent fill. The Department will not assess the \$0.50 per cubic yard as stated in C&MS 107.11 for any material used from this location. The area may be test dug, however, a permit must be obtained from the Department prior to completing any test digging. The permit can be obtained at the following location: http://www.dot.state.oh.us/districts/D02/District%20Two%20Permit%20Documents/Permit_Application_MR-505.pdf

Question Submitted: 6/7/2018 2:51:03 PM **Question Number - 0**

Page 324 says to paint a three foot strip of the bottom flange on six beams at two locations. Where is the remainder of the 4,342 SF located?

The quantity includes painting the fascia beams as indicated on sheet 325.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2018 7:46:42 AM **Question Number - 0**

Are the design files available for this project? If so can they be posted to the ftp site?

**Please see the design files on the following FTP site link.
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-101007/Reference%20Files/>**

Question Submitted: 5/29/2018 9:42:41 AM **Question Number - 1**

The proposal lists a completion date of 11/15/19, however the Sequence of Construction note on sheet 22/354 lists very specific date ranges that show all work being completed in late July 2019. Is the completion date of 11/15/19 correct, and that is the only constraint on the contractor?

The proposal completion date will be changed to 7/31/2019. The specific date ranges listed on sheet 22/354 still apply. An addendum is forthcoming to change the proposal completion date.

Project No. 180412

Sale Date - 7/12/2018

BRO-106927 - US 68-44.48 Safety

Question Submitted: 6/5/2018 7:55:12 AM **Question Number - 0**

There is a pay item for ground rod 1 each. each flashing sign will also require a ground rod. will ODOT add this qty?

Signs will be on drive posts with no ground rod. Bid as shown.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2018 7:52:38 AM **Question Number - 0**

Would ODOT change the 4" rigid metal conduit for the jacked or drilled to 625.052 Poly?

No. please bid the plan as shown.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2018 7:50:19 AM **Question Number - 0**

Would ODOT change the 2" & 4" rigid metal conduit on the project to PVC conduit?

No. please bid the plan as shown.

Project No. 180418

Sale Date - 7/12/2018

GRE-105643 - PPS FY 2019

Question Submitted: 6/20/2018 11:52:58 AM **Question Number - 0**

In response to recently-posted Addendum 6, ODOT revised quantities but there are still no revised plan sheet attachments showing subsummary sources of quantity for the Portable Barrier item (ref. 256) and related Barrier Reflector/Object Marker bid items. Without the subsummary sheet by phase, there are not proper means to calculate the PCB item as to the amount of wall to be trucked in, amount shifted, amount stored, and amount rehandled- all of which affect the unit cost of the PCB bid item. Please provide revised subsummary sheets so this bid item can be properly calculated and if it cannot be done in time please delay this bid.

*** 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

Project No. 180419

Sale Date - 7/12/2018

HAM-98533 - SR 126-13.73/14.06/14.34

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 3:56:47 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please post office calcs if they are available?

Question Submitted: 5/29/2018 11:09:30 AM **Question Number - 1**

Please post existing structure drawings.

The existing structure drawings have been placed on the ODOT FTP website at the following location:

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-126-1373_1406_1434%20PID%2098533/Existing%20Structure%20Plans/

Project No. 180435

Sale Date - 7/12/2018

LOG-105327 - SR 274-12.24

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 7:26:47 AM **Question Number - 0**

With the weather limitations of spec 424 and the sale date of this project, would the department consider extending the completion date into 2019?

Project No. 180446

Sale Date - 7/20/2018

LAK-105029 - VROOMAN ROAD (PART 1 AND PART 2)

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 3:04:31 PM **Question Number - 0**

The proposal calls out 10/15/2019 as the completion date for the project. This cannot be correct for the amount of work on this job. The field office bid item is for 60 months. Please extend the completion date.

Project No. 181036

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

D11-97463 - LG-FY2019

Question Submitted: 6/11/2018 9:43:17 AM **Question Number - 0**

Will an AEL autobahn series LED be acceptable for pay item 27, Luminaire Conventional Solid State (LED), As Per Plan, IES-III_M-SC, equivalent to 200W HPS Lamps (120 Volt)

The Department would accept an AEL Autobahn series LED as an equivalent for Pay Item 27.

Project No. 183005

Sale Date - 7/12/2018

LOG-105438 - /UNI/FRA-33-Smart Mobil Ph2

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 9:48:45 AM **Question Number - 0**

Ecological - Line shall be a minimum of 5' below ecological resource (streams & wetlands) and pullboxes located outside of resource. If that is not possible due to max spacing requirements, can you give us a better understanding of what will be required in the ecological

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 9:27:01 AM **Question Number - 0**

Hazardous Materials. Section 9 of the scope states that excavations in "Highly Regulated Sites" shall be avoided. However, due to max spacing requirements for pull boxes, that may not be possible. Can you give us a better understanding of what the requirements would be if an excavation was required?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 9:23:45 AM **Question Number - 0**

Section 11 of the Scope of Services indicates that existing right-of-way lines shall be located based on ORC 4733-37. 4733-37-02, section B, states in part that "the survey shall be based on a field investigation of the property". Additionally, 4733-34-03, section A states, in part, that "The surveyor shall set boundary monuments so that... each corner of the property and each referenced control station will be physically monumented". Is it the States intent on this project that all parcels adjoining the proposed route be surveyed and monumented OR can the DB team use existing records (County GIS and plans) to establish the existing R/W along the proposed corridor? There are more than 300 parcels adjacent to the proposed improvement.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 7:38:22 AM **Question Number - 0**

ODOT Design Build Scope of Services Document, pg 23 of 31. "The duct shall be connected together via manufacturer recommended connectors/procedures and routed through each pull box" Are duct splices allowed between HH locations with the use of manufacturers splicing/coupling accesories/equipment?

No, conduit can not be spliced between pull boxes.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 3:50:41 PM **Question Number - 0**

32" and 48" PB; Are concrete pads required at all PB locations?

Yes

Question Submitted: 6/13/2018 3:42:18 PM **Question Number - 0**

Who is responsible for damaged/blocked existing conduits? How will the contractor be compensated for repairs?

If there is a blockage/damage of existing Dublinlink Conduit that is to be utilized by Project, Dublinlink would be responsible for repairing. The existing conduit along Industrial Parkway was installed last summer and each inner duct was BB tested prior to acceptance. The conduit installation is warranted until 9/15/18. If the contractor discovers a blocked/damaged inner duct in this section that should be brought to attention of ODOT. ODOT will coordinate with Union County and Design Build Contractor to determine appropriate means to address blockage. Any extra work requested of the Design Build Team to repair a blockage of an existing conduit would be considered an extra work change order and would be negotiated with the Design Build Team for compensation.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 12:01:42 PM **Question Number - 0**

16.5.2 states: "The Local Route must provide connectivity for local public agencies as well as private communications along its length. Demarcation points to be provided in 16.5.8". 16.5.8 lists only the TRC and the MDC. Please confirm that no other connectivity and/or access is expected along the route.

The termination points of fiber are at TRC and MDC and the other connectivity between those two termination points would come from tie-ins to be constructed under a separate future contract. The future tie-ins would connect at pullbox locations to be constructed as part of this Project 183005 contract.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2018 12:00:15 PM **Question Number - 0**

We would like to visit the Metro Data Center and the TRC. Please provide names/numbers of the parties we are to contact to arrange.

The contact for the Metro Data Center is: Jim Hayes Office: 614-408-9064 Mobile: 614-332-2760 Contact for the Telecom Building at East Liberty is: Nick Hegemier Office: 614-387-4099 Mobile: 740-272-8462

Question Submitted: 6/4/2018 2:10:23 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please provide building details and equipment layout for the structures at each end of this project.

The information for the Metro Data Center end of the project can be found in the as-built plans for the US-33 Fiber constructed last summer. This info can be found at: [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D06/download/US-33_Smart_Mobility_Corridor/Local_Route/Attachment_A/ODOT/Construction/US-33%20Route%20Fiber%20Optic%20Construction/As-Built%20Fiber/The East Liberty end of project \(Telecom Building\) as-built](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D06/download/US-33_Smart_Mobility_Corridor/Local_Route/Attachment_A/ODOT/Construction/US-33%20Route%20Fiber%20Optic%20Construction/As-Built%20Fiber/The%20East%20Liberty%20end%20of%20project%20(Telecom%20Building)as-built) information can be found at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D06/download/US-33_Smart_Mobility_Corridor/Local_Route/Attachment_A/ODOT/Construction/US-33%20Route%20Fiber%20Optic%20Construction/As-Built%20Telecom%20Building/

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/4/2018 1:56:33 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please provide As-Built drawings for the Route 33 installation (ODOT 173008). If As-Built are not available at minimum please provide the APPROVED construction plans.

All of this information was to have been included with Attachment A reference material however there was a technical issue and that information was not available. That issue has been corrected and ALL attachment A reference documents are now available. Specifically, the As-built information for the recent US-33 Fiber build (in CAD and PDF format) can be found at:

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D06/download/US-33_Smart_Mobility_Corridor/Local_Route/Attachment_A/ODOT/Construction/US-33%20Route%20Fiber%20Optic%20Construction/As-Built%20Fiber/

Question Submitted: 4/9/2018 9:38:03 AM **Question Number - 8**

Is the Transcript available from Pre-SOQ Meeting?

Yes, see following website: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Transcripts/Forms/PBTrans.aspx>

Question Submitted: 4/6/2018 11:29:54 AM **Question Number - 7**

Are page numbers allowable within the bottom 1" margin?

Yes, page numbers in bottom margin are allowable.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2018 11:27:17 AM **Question Number - 6**

The RFQ says that we do not need to show ODOT Prequals in Section 1.2. However in Part F it says to show the prequals. Please advise which is correct.

The DBT is required to submit a list showing which DBT members meet each of the required prequalifications. The DBT IS NOT required to submit background evidence showing that particular prequalifications have been met as Department has that information readily available.

Question Submitted: 4/6/2018 11:22:59 AM **Question Number - 5**

2.5.2 Section 9 states "A statement that the Offeror will comply with the Department's DBE and OJT goals for this Contract, and will comply with the Department's Nondiscrimination policy." However, there is no goal stated in the RFQ. Please inform the goal percentage ASAP as SOQs cannot be completed without this information.

At this time, the Department has not established the DBE goal for the Project. As a point of reference, the Department has recently awarded and completed a Project very similar in nature. The referenced project is Project 17-3008 (LOG/UNI/FRA-33-Smart Mobility PID 103719) and the DBE goal for the referenced project was 6%. The Department has not established the goal for this project (PID 105439 - LOG/UNI/FRA-33-Smart Mobil Ph2) and Offerors are cautioned as every project is evaluated separately while considering the overall status of the statewide availability of DBE firms. Some past and future similar projects' goals may not be equal.

Question Submitted: 3/28/2018 11:32:06 AM **Question Number - 2**

Will the attendee detail list from the Pre-RFQ meeting on March 26th be published?

Yes, a list of attendees and meeting transcript will be posted following meeting.

Question Submitted: 3/26/2018 1:39:40 PM **Question Number - 1**

In the RFQ, it states that a firm needs to be certified in TRAFFIC SIGNAL DESIGN: Basic Traffic Signal Design, Traffic Signal System Design and HIGHWAY LIGHTING DESIGN: Limited Lighting Design, Complex Lighting Design. Is there something that I am missing? I this is just for the installation of the of the fiber network between the Dublin Metro Data Center (MDC) and the intersection of US-36/SR-4/Collins Ave, or is there more to it then that, with traffic signal integration and lighting integration?

This project is for installation of Fiber network between Dublin MDC and East Liberty Telecom Building. ODOT Does not have a specific Designer Prequalification requirement for Fiber Optic Network design and instead includes Fiber Optic Design under the Traffic Signal and Highway Lighting Prequalification's. We encourage any interested firms that don't hold these prequalification's to either partner with another firm that does hold these prequals or obtain these prequalifications.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 183006

Sale Date - 8/30/2018

MAD-107109 - IR 70-08.62 Major Rehab

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:26:22 AM **Question Number - 0**

If recycled concrete pavement is allowed to be used as 304 aggregate base, does recycled concrete has to meet all 304 specifications, or just 304 Gradation?

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:22:45 AM **Question Number - 0**

The Drainage Scope spreadsheet included in Attachment G has columns entitled "Proposed Work due to Culvert Rating" and "Required Treatment". Can you clarify that the Drainage Scope only requires the items listed under "Required Treatment" and the items listed under "Proposed Work due to Culvert Rating" are not required?

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:21:39 AM **Question Number - 0**

Will the existing approach slab need to be replaced at MAD 70-12.63 and MAD 70-13.86? Scope mentions repairs treat and seal "new" approach slabs and existing bridge deck with Item 512 Sealing of Concrete Surfaces (Non-Epoxy).

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:20:18 AM **Question Number - 0**

The earth berm described in scope section 8.2, pay item 203E98500 needs to be further described. With the base at 20' wide and the height at 10' we would be building a triangle shape with no rounding at the top and 1:1 side slopes. The earth and sod would quickly erode and the rounding at the top would occur naturally.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:18:47 AM **Question Number - 0**

The ODOT letter dated March 13, 2018 to Thom Slack from Craig Landefield with the subject line MAD-70-8.62 (PID 107109) Pavement Type Re-Analysis Approval states, "Because this pavement design includes the structural benefit of global chemical stabilization it is very important that the stabilization be performed as designed with no changes in construction". Does this mean the contractor is to perform global stabilization and not perform any testing to determine where sulfates might be higher?

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:15:24 AM **Question Number - 0**

Would a design exception be approved for reduced graded shoulder width on the mainline if the justification was simply the cost?

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:13:37 AM **Question Number - 0**

Is it required to design build the full graded shoulder width on the ramps per L&D vol 1, figures 301-3e & 303-1e or use the reduction for long guardrail post?

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:11:14 AM **Question Number - 0**

Will ODOT provide the traffic counts that are needed in order to calculate the required storage lengths at the various ramp terminal intersections or will the project simply match the existing storage lengths provided?

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:09:57 AM **Question Number - 0**

The Scope mentions design exceptions in an appendix. No appendix was provided for this.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:08:09 AM **Question Number - 0**

Are any improvements planned for US 42 ramps A or D and for SR 29 ramps C or D?
If the answer is yes, we would need record plans for current US 42 ramps B & C and for SR 29 ramps C or D.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:04:52 AM **Question Number - 0**

Will there be any temporary r/w or work agreements to allow room for r/w fence replacement that is usually 1' inside existing r/w?

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 2:21:15 PM **Question Number - 0**

Scope Section 5 was changed in the Addendum 1 Word file but not in either PDF. Please clarify which document is correct.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 2:20:24 PM **Question Number - 0**

Will the Department consider re-inserting the allowance of recycled pavement for use as 304 and as a sound mound into the project, as per the original Scope of Services?

No, this work will not be included in the current Scope of Services.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 2:16:48 PM **Question Number - 0**

In order to ensure that all scope modifications are adequately captured, will the Department release a new full version of the scope with all changes from the original proposal redlined?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 2:15:23 PM **Question Number - 0**

The Addendum 1 Word file removed the Scope Section 8.2 note about using recycled pavement as 304 base, in fact the Word file doesn't even indicate that this statement previously existed. This change is not indicated in either of the PDF files provided. Will a complete revised official scope be provided?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 2:04:28 PM **Question Number - 0**

The Addendum 1 Word file removed the Scope Section 8.2 note about using recycled pavement to build a sound mound, in fact the Word file doesn't even indicate that this statement previously existed. This change is not indicated in either of the PDF files provided. Will a complete revised official scope be provided?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 2:03:07 PM **Question Number - 0**

There are substantial changes made to Section 14.3 of the scope shown in the Word file provided with Addendum 1. These changes are not provided in either of the PDF files which only included select pages from the scope. Will a complete revised official scope be provided?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 2:00:25 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please provide Attachment K-1 indicating the anticipated pavement repair areas.

Information will be posted for bidders.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 1:59:21 PM **Question Number - 0**

The typical sections provided in Attachment K-2 indicate an overlay project which contradict the pavement selection document in Attachment J-2. Please clarify the pavement requirements for the project.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 1:55:54 PM **Question Number - 0**

Scope 8.1 states to use the current edition of manuals and guidelines including updates released on or before the award date. Please modify this to the date of the RFP release.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 183007

Sale Date - 7/12/2018

ERI-106817 - SR 60-03.87

Question Submitted: 6/22/2018 8:40:59 AM **Question Number - 0**

Can ODOT provide the electronic HY-8 file used to analyze the 108" culvert?

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 7:21:02 PM **Question Number - 0**

Please clarify Field Office, A or Field Office, B for this project.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 7:20:22 PM **Question Number - 0**

For the open cut excavation alternative, can MGS guardrail be installed where existing is impacted and tie into existing guardrail?

Question Submitted: 6/21/2018 9:11:20 AM **Question Number - 0**

Can ODOT provide any available survey CAD information?

Project No. 187033

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

JEF-101457 - SR 151-12.10 (PART ONE AND PART TWO)

Question Submitted: 6/14/2018 8:54:18 AM **Question Number - 0**

The plan note for Item 615, Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B, As Per Plan state a requirement for flexible pavement. Will this then be left in place or removed?

Item 615, Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B, as Per Plan shall be removed per CMS 615.08 and not left in place.

Project No. 187036

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

GUE-107863 - US 40-14.31

Question Submitted: 6/19/2018 12:38:21 PM **Question Number - 0**

Will the Critical Work Completion Date of August 10, 2018 be adjusted for the time required to be awarded the contract, the site testing and inspection requirements, a design to be prepared and submitted to ODOT for an approval? Also the time required to perform the work. A 3 week notice is also required for maintaining traffic.

THE PORTION OF PLAN NOTE ON SHEET 8 "ITEM 614 MAINTAINING TRAFFIC" CONTAINING NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR STARTING WORK ON THE PROJECT HAS BEEN REVISED AS BELOW. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT, IN WRITING, A SCHEDULE OF OPERATIONS TO THE DISTRICT DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND RECEIVE APPROVAL 1 WEEK BEFORE WORK IS STARTED ON THE PROJECT. THIS WILL MATCH THE REQUIREMENT STATED IN THE PLAN NOTE "NOTIFICATION OF ROAD CLOSURE OR RESTRICTION".

SEE THE FORTHCOMING ADDENDUM.