

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170393

Sale Date - 6/29/2017

FRA-104799 - IR 71-9.62/9.71 (PART 1)

Question Submitted: 6/26/2017 11:08:21 AM

After developing a detailed CPM schedule for the project we find both the interim and final completion dates to be unrealistic given the number of phases and the scope of work required. The north end of the project, including the area around Greenlawn Ave, requires three (3) major work phases that must occur sequentially after the pre-phase 1 work is complete. Accounting for typical weather, and including significant overtime, an aggressive interim completion date would be no earlier than 10/1/2020 along with a final completion date of 6/30/2021. Please revise the completion dates to achievable dates as described above.

Question Submitted: 6/26/2017 9:05:42 AM

If the new cross-pipe to be bored and jacked at 475+16 is to be installed in Phase 1 to maintain drainage from the median area, based on the phasing the Type F conduit outlet pipe is not constructed until Phase 3. Please advise.

The conduit is necessary for median drainage as noted. The Type F conduit will conflict with the special benching needed for the widening. Contractor shall maintain drainage from the end of the bored pipe over the side slope until the slope is widened and the Type F conduit installed while protecting the slope from erosion.

Question Submitted: 6/26/2017 8:57:56 AM

For the cross-pipes to be bored and jacked at 481+90 and 490+40, based on the phasing is it the intent to bore from the median to daylight in Phase 1 in order to maintain drainage and then install inlets D-13 and D-15 in Phase 2 by removing a portion of the steel carrier pipe?

Yes, that is the intent.

Question Submitted: 6/26/2017 8:44:44 AM

Are the new cross-pipes to be bored and jacked at stations 481+90, 490+40, 475+16, and 707+39 required to be completed in their entirety in Phase 1 in order to maintain drainage from the median area?

These pipes are to be completed to the point where positive drainage from the median is accomplished.

Question Submitted: 6/24/2017 1:57:01 PM

The bid item description for the floodwall concrete (Item 486) references Class QC1 Concrete. The notes on sheet 1084 state that all concrete shall have a minimum compressive strength of 4,500 PSI at 28 days. Class QC1 Concrete is for 4,000 psi minimum compressive strength and Class QC2 Concrete is for 4,500 psi minimum compressive strength. Can the Department clarify the required concrete strength and class for the floodwall.

Item will be revised to be QC2 with a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 5:18:55 PM

Based on the answer provided to the question submitted on 6/20/2017 @ 2:11:02 PM, can the department confirm that contractors can bid the project assuming that the plans identify the locations where a temporary pavement wedge is needed to account for traffic and or drainage concerns, and if additional wedges are needed throughout the project, those would be paid by change order?

Contractor should assume an asphalt wedge is needed anytime traffic must cross a joint between existing and new pavement.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 3:57:58 PM

Note on sheet 32 of 1720 for item 614, Maintaining Traffic Misc: Bridge Deck and Pavement Patching states that the cost of this item shall be \$200,000 inferring that this item is a pre-determined amount. However the electronic bid file is not set up this way. Please clarify.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 1:04:59 PM

As follow up to the question posted on 6/21/2017 @ 7:38AM regarding Ref #444 WORK ZONE GUARDRAIL; Can the department confirm that ITEM 444 - WORK ZONE GUARDRAIL will be used to pay for the temporary guardrail quantities required in the plans?

The intent was for this item to be included with Item 615 ROADS FOR MAINTAINING TRAFFIC, AS PER PLAN. Reference #444 will be deleted in a forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 11:49:46 AM

As a follow up to the Question asked on 6/15/17 @ 9:58 AM, (which was addressed in addendum 7 as Q&A #17); Based on the answer provided, the volume of the pavement has already been deducted from the pay volumes for excavation on the cross-sections so as a result, the pavement volume adjustments were correctly deleted from the excavation subsummary calculation. Where will removal of the asphalt shoulders be paid for since it isn't in the cross-section volumes? At this point the volume of the asphalt pavement is covered anywhere. Shouldn't there be a separate pay item for removal of asphalt pavement?

Excavation of asphalt shoulders is included in the excavation quantity. Please see forthcoming addendum for an adjustment added to the quantity.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 4:15:54 PM

Q&A #25 in addendum #7 and the associated changes to plan sheet 160 do not address the original question. The question was reference to Phase 1A. The Phase 1A issue is best depicted by the typical section shown on plan sheet 161. Sheeting will be needed to hold up the Phase 1A (median) construction from approximately station 671+00 to 701+00. Please advise.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 3:53:21 PM

bid items 128 thru 132 call for type B conduit bored or jacked. Is 748.06 Steel Casing Pipe acceptable for these bid items?

See note on Sheet 23 for Item 611 – Conduit Bored or Jacked

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 1:56:16 PM

Will the Department allow the use of stay-in-place metal decking for the beam and girder brides on this project?

Stay in place forms are not permitted.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 1:56:11 PM

The detail on Sheet 1006/1720 for Item 622 – Concrete Barrier, Single Slope Type C1, As Per Plan, depicts a barrier wall height that varies from 8 feet to 9.6 feet. Construction of a C1 median barrier wall of this height in a single pour will results in a tremendous expense to the department and will add considerable time to the schedule. Will the department allow a horizontal construction joint to be placed mid-height when building this barrier?

A construction joint in the middle of the barrier will not be permitted.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 10:27:39 AM

Concerning Bid Item #879 - Special - Utility Coordination and Relocation: We cannot find the plan note outlining the scope of the bid item. Please advise.

See note 14 on Sheet 1086.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 10:15:12 AM

Based on the long duration of the project, the high traffic volumes on I-71, and the amount of temporary signage called for in the plans, should pay items be added for replacement signs and drums?

Items for replacement signs and drums will be added in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 10:10:45 AM

Page 30/1720 includes a note describing requirements for Temporary Work Zone Markers on Concrete Surfaces, and refers to a pay item with a quantity of 160 each. The proposal does not include an item for Temporary Work Zone Markers on Concrete Surfaces. Please advise.

It is the same item regardless of surface, Item 614 Workzone Raised Pavement Marker. The note will be modified and the quantity will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 10:01:01 AM

The plans do not provide any information regarding the electricity provided by the overhead utility line in conflict at the Greenlawn Ave Bridge. We have left several messages with the utility company and have yet to receive a response. Will the Department please provide the electrical power requirement for this overhead line, similar to what was provided at Frank Road (see note on plan sheet 1571/1720), so that the Contractor can accurately size the generator(s) required should this line need to be taken out of service during various construction activities?

The line is operating at 15kva.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 7:45:00 AM

Regarding your response to the question posted on 6/19/17 regarding median mounted light tower foundations. CMS does distinguish between light tower foundations (HL20.21) and median mounted light tower foundations (HL20.24). Reference ODOT 150249 FRA, biditem #157 (light tower foundation, 36" x 30') and biditem #158 (median mounted light tower foundation). Please add biditems in both Part 1 and in Part 2 for median mounted light tower foundations.

An additional item for median light tower foundations will not be added to the plans. Median barrier when required is included in the cost of the foundation per CMS 625.22. Quantities in the plans for light tower foundations are correct.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 1:34:38 PM

The existing typical sections for the project depict 9" of reinforced concrete pavement installed during the original construction of I-71 underneath the current asphalt surface. What type of reinforcement does the existing pavement contain; wire mesh, rebar matting, continuous reinforcing bars... etc.? It is important for the contractor to know this information because the cost of removal can vary widely depending on the type of reinforcement.

Bidders should assume mesh reinforcement.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 11:12:33 AM

Addendum #2 revised the description of line items #453 and #454 for temporary barrier reflectors to match the new descriptions for permanent 626 Barrier Reflectors. Since CMS 626 is significantly more expensive we would like for ODOT to clarify its intent on this item. Is it the department's intent to install the temporary barrier reflectors following the same standards as CMS 626 or will the temporary reflectors continue to be installed per CMS 614?

SS800 doesn't indicate the meaning of Types 1-5 for 614 which is why the plans are showing CMS 626.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 10:23:39 AM

There are multiple lanes of traffic running in each direction on both Frank Road and Greenlawn Ave. Please provide the allowable lane restriction windows (i.e. When can Greenlawn Ave be reduced from two lanes in each direction to one lane in direction.) for both Frank Road and Greenlawn Ave.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 10:01:46 AM

Bridges 1061 LT & RT both show removal and patching of the existing abutment breastwalls but there is not a bid item for Patching concrete surfaces. Please add a bid item for each bridge in the next addendum.

An item for patching will be added in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 9:39:54 AM

On sheets 15/24_1385/1720 through 17/24_1387/1720, the bearing plates are shown as 7"x7"x1" and bear against HSS 8"x6"x 5/8" and HSS 9"x7"x 5/8" walers. These plates seem to be undersized. The 7" dimension will not extend over both perpendicular legs / sides of the HSS sections. Thus, the compression forces will not bear directly, uniformly and simultaneously on both "Side walls" of the waler section. Allowing for some typical eccentricity the bearing plates should be at least 1/2 inch wider than the HSS Waler. The design of the thickness of a bearing plate does not seem to be covered in ODOT SS 866, but the PTI DC 35.1-14, "Recommendations for Prestressed Rock and Soil Anchors," 6.10.1 - Anchorage section recommends, "Bearing plates bearing on steel plates or wales shall be designed for extreme fiber bending stress less than the yield strength of the steel bearing plate at 95% F (PU) of the prestressing steel. Therefore the plate thickness is dictated by the maximum loading which is based on the tendon ultimate capacity, not the Tieback Design Load. Please check the calculations relative to plate size, and clarify.

Plate sizes will be increased in a forthcoming addenda

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 9:21:46 AM

In the General Notes on sheet 1/24_1371/1720, Item 866 "GROUND ANCHORS, AS PER PLAN", "THE WORK CONSISTS OF FURNISHING, INSTALLING AND PROOF TESTING TIEBACK ANCHORS ... IN ACCORDANCE WITH ODOT SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIFICATION 866 EXCEPT THE BAR TENDON SIZE HAS BEEN SPECIFIED." The project drawings: sheets 15/24_1385/1720, 16/24 AND 17/24 do not show anchorage covers, and show the ends of the anchors encased in concrete. Does the concrete cover of the tieback anchorages shown on 16/24 and 17/24_1387/1720 eliminate the anchor covers?

Anchor covers are not required.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 9:09:52 AM

As a follow up to question asked on 6/15/17 about "Encapsulated Tieback Detail" on sheet 13/24-1383/1720 that was partially answered.

The void around the anchor will not be limited to inside the HSS member but will extend behind the wall to the bottom end of the trumpet. Does the design require the void zone "behind" the HSS to be filled? If so what material(s) would be acceptable fill?

Not all elements of the wall were included in the referenced detail. See details on sheet 1387 as well. Behind the bearing plate is a void inside the HSS tube, a wedge plate and the sheet pile. Expectation is the grout shown on sheet 1383 will go to the back of the sheet pile.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 7:43:13 AM

Per Reference Item 1008 Asphalt Concrete Base, PG64-22 and the typical section legend on sheet 6/504 of Part 2, the base course of asphalt is required to be a 301 material. However the general notes on sheet 21/504 regarding a contingency quantity of asphalt base, and in the pavement calculations listed on Sheet 49/504, the base asphalt is required to be a 302 material. Please clarify which Asphalt Concrete Base material the Department requires on Part 2 of the project.

Please refer to items included in the latest addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 7:38:38 AM

Ref. 444 Work Zone Guardrail, summarized on sheet 37/1720 of the plans covers temporary guardrail runs (totaling 11,747) as called out in the MOT plans. However, the note for Roads For Maintaining Traffic, APP on plan sheet 32/1720 lists a quantity of 11,153 lf of Guardrail and Anchor Assemblies that are incidental to Item 615 Roads for Maintaining Traffic. Are these guardrail quantities in addition to the quantity given in Ref. 444 or should the note on sheet 32/1720 be revised to say that temporary guardrail is covered in Ref 444 Work Zone Guardrail? Also, can the department clarify if the temporary Anchor Assemblies and Bridge Terminal Assemblies are incidental to Ref. 444 Work Zone Guardrail or Item 615 Roads for Maintaining Traffic?

The work zone guardrail and assemblies were intended to be incidental to 615 Roads for Maintaining Traffic. The total listed on sheet 37 should have been carried to sheet 32.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 5:28:47 PM

Are there existing plans available for the Gatewell and Floodwall?

Floodwall As-built plans will be provided in a forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 2:11:02 PM

There are several locations on the project where phased construction creates uneven pavement where existing pavement is bound on both sides by new pavement built at a higher elevation. As an example, refer to the MOT typical sections on plan sheets 293 and 294, along with the profile on plan sheet 562. As you can see, the existing pavement in the middle will be lower than the adjacent new pavement on either side. Asphalt pavement will need to be overlaid in this area to eliminate uneven pavement and to eliminate the risk of ponding water. Currently there is no pay item to cover this work. Would the department consider adding a separate pay item for ASPHALT CONCRETE FOR MAINTAINING TRAFFIC to cover this cost?

Using the profile grade to see the difference in proposed and existing elevations anywhere other than at the baseline will be misleading in that the existing and proposed cross slopes are different. It is anticipated that these areas can be constructed using the temporary pavement wedges called for in the plans. Please see the note on sheet 28 for temporary pavement wedge.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 4:50:39 PM

As a follow up to the question asked on 6/6/17 at 5:33 PM, regarding Phase 3A closure period for the 270 EB exit ramp to I71 NB; the cure period for stabilized subgrade exceeds the allowable closure period. Please advise.

This location clearly meets the criteria for when Cement Stabilized Subgrade would be non-performed as it is a small area with a short duration MOT.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 3:33:58 PM

This is a repost of a question posted on 6/14/17 because the answer provided was in reference to a different question: Sheets 199-201 show phase line sheeting along Southbound I-71 in order to construct the Phase 2 work area due to the increase in profile elevation thru this section. The same profile elevation difference will occur during Phase 1A construction. Shouldn't there also be phase line sheeting in Phase 1A (Sheets 160-162) to hold up the newly constructed lanes during Phase 2?

Plans for Phase 1A will be updated in next addendum to show sheet wall from Phase 1 remaining in place for Phase 1A.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 3:07:49 PM

The note on plan sheet 32/1720, 3rd column, 2nd paragraph from the bottom, states that millings from pre-phase 1 shall be used to backup the PERMANENT PAVEMENT AND SAFETY EDGE OF THE TEMPORARY PAVEMENT. Please provide a detail for the permanent pavement and clarify which bid item covers this cost.

The note in question is a standard note. The paragraph referred to is for berm installations which, for this project, is only applicable to the temporary pavement.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 3:06:56 PM

The detail on plan sheet 34 for Safety Edge says that the material used to backup the safety edge is incidental to ITEM 441 ASPHALT CONC. (SAFETY EDGE). There is no such item in the proposal. Please clarify.

As noted on sheet 32, construction of the temporary pavement safety edge is incidental to Item 615 Roads for Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan. The detail on Sheet 34 has been updated accordingly.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 2:10:55 PM

On sheet 33, there is a note for item 611, CONDUIT, TYPE B, AS PER PLAN. In the note it says this item is intended to be used for temporary Type B conduits that connect sections of slotted drain for MOT drainage purposes. There is no slotted drain called out or itemized in the plans. Should this note be removed?

The Item 611, Conduit, Type B, As Per Plan is for the Longitudinal Trench for MOT Drainage (Item 614 – Maintaining Traffic, Misc.: Longitudinal Trench For MOT Drainage). See the note for the trench drain directly above the note for the conduit. This item is quantified in the drainage subsummary in the MOT plans under the Item 611-Drainage Structure, Misc: Longitudinal Trench, As Per Plan. The note sheet was updated to revise the item callout from Item 614 – Maintaining Traffic, Misc.: Longitudinal Trench For MOT Drainage to Item 611-Drainage Structure, Misc: Longitudinal Trench, As Per Plan to match the drainage subsummary sheet; and the drainage subsummary sheet and general summary sheet were updated to revise the item callout Item 611 – Drainage Structure Misc.: 6" Cross Drains, As Per Plan to Item 611 – 6" Conduit, Type B, As Per Plan to match the notes sheet.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:39:00 PM

In reference to the note on plan sheet 22/1720 titled WATERWAY PERMIT COORDINATION; can the department confirm that it will be obtaining the Waterway Permit?

Permit has been applied for and is expected by the first of July.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:32:54 PM

Due to the proximity of the Scioto River, it is possible that construction could impact the floodway which in turn could add significant time and expense to the project. Can ODOT provide a link to the 404 permit and CLOMR information so that we can better understand the special provisions and limitations associated with any fill or temporary fill within the floodway/floodplain limits or below ordinary high water for the statutory river?

A hydraulic study was completed that determined that the project would not impact the 50 or 100 year flood elevation.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:23:01 PM

The Part 1 plans for median barrier from Station 443+00 to 711+04 indicate installation of (21) Median Light Tower Foundations. Part 1 - Biditem 2020 captures (8) of these locations, but they are mislabeled as Standard Light Tower Foundations, 36"x25'. The remaining light tower locations appear to be intended for payment within the Part 2 Lighting Quantities, but the Part 2 Plans have not been updated to reflect the installation of median barrier foundations. Please review the lighting plans and quantities for Part 1 and 2, and provide proper Biditems to distinguish between Median Light Tower Foundations and Light Tower Foundations located outside of the barrier.

Items for Light Tower Foundations do not distinguish between standard and median barrier locations. The items as stated in the plans are correct. Section 625.22 of the CMS states that the section of concrete barrier is included in the cost of the foundation when a barrier is needed. Part 2 includes all lighting in the 71/270 interchange including foundations.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:21:41 PM

The Overhead Sign Supports 'S-12' at Station 452+45 and 'S-15' 462+00 are shown on Sheets 316-317 in the Part 2 Plans. Each sign has (2) Concrete Barrier Median Foundations, located in the Part 2 – Concrete Barrier, Type C and the Part 1 – Concrete Barrier, Type B1. Please create biditems for the Concrete Barrier Median Overhead Sign Support Foundations at these locations.

Items and quantities will be revised to include the Concrete Barrier Median Foundations in a forthcoming addenda.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:20:46 PM

As a follow-up to the questions submitted regarding the overhead utility near proposed pier 1 of the Greenlawn Ave Bridges, Notes 4 and 9 on sheet 1086 are conflicting. Note 4 prohibits the de-energizing of this line while Note 9 states that the DOP will coordinate all outages unless the Contractor has been given prior approval to do so. Please clarify if outages of this line will be permitted, and if so, provide the allowable duration(s) and associated fees. Please note that OSHA Standard 1926.1408.d prohibits and part of the load or crane to be below an energized power line.

Notes 4 and 9 are not in conflict. Note 4 addresses bidding assumptions and Note 9 identifies responsibility for coordination. It is the Department's position that the lines have been raised enough to allow construction to occur safely within the clear distance provisions of OSHA Standard 1926.1408.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:20:25 PM

As a follow-up to the questions submitted regarding the overhead utility near the forward abutment of the Frank Road Bridges, Notes 4 and 9 on sheet 1086 are conflicting. Note 4 prohibits the de-energizing of this line while Note 9 states that the DOP will coordinate all outages unless the Contractor has been given prior approval to do so. Please clarify if outages of this line will be permitted, and if so, provide the allowable duration(s) and associated fees. Please note that OSHA Standard 1926.1408.d prohibits any part of the load or crane to be below an energized power line.

Notes 4 and 9 are not in conflict. Note 4 addresses bidding assumptions and Note 9 identifies responsibility for coordination. It is the Department's position that the lines have been raised enough to allow construction to occur safely within the clear distance provisions of OSHA Standard 1926.1408.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:17:06 PM

Questions from manufacturer: The deadman bar tendon schedules on plan sheets 1392 and 1394 of 1720 indicate a tendon diameter of 1.27", and the maximum lock-off loading among all of the tendons is 62 kips. 1.27" seems to be an odd size, and we would have to upsize to the next available diameter. If a diameter of less than 1.27" can be proven to be sufficient for the load requirements, would the department allow that lesser diameter to be used?

The 1.27" diameter is the conversion of a 32mm bar provided by DYWIDAG. This is equivalent to a 1 1/4" nominal diameter bar tendon which is what is required for the wall.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2017 4:06:12 PM

The specification for the pay item 1066 luminaire, underpass, solid state (LED), As Per Plan, Asymmetric, 480 V, (Alternate 1) has a plan note on plan page 342 of 504 or Part 2 which states the light distributions shall be as shown in the plans. This information appears to be missing. Additionally, the required lumens is not specified. Can the department advise where this information can be found or release an addendum with this information?

The manufacturer and model for the luminaires stated in the lighting general note are from the ODOT's approved/qualified products list and should contain the necessary information/specification.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2017 4:03:26 PM

The specification for the pay item 1042 luminaire, conventional, solid state (LED), As Per Plan, Asymmetric, 480 V, High Output has a plan note on plan page 341 of 504 or Part 2 which states the light distributions shall be as shown in the plans. This information appears to be missing. Can the department advise where it can be found or release an addendum with this information?

The lighting plan legend on Sht 365 of 504 indicates the lighting symbol and associated distribution (Symmetric = Type V; Asymmetric = Type III). The proposed lighting in the median are symmetric and most of the ones along the ramps are asymmetric. None of the proposed lighting are "long and narrow" distribution. The distribution is also in the lighting analyses. In addition, the number of "B"s indicate the number of luminaires.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2017 2:01:05 PM

Sheet 997 sealing of concrete barrier. Is all barrier to be sealed. If so, how is it to be paid?

Sealing of mainline concrete barrier will be removed from the typical sections in a forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2017 1:48:41 PM

The embankment X-slopes toward ramp F on sheet 741-743 is shown to be 3:1, however Sheet 855-857 show it to be 2:1. Which one is the right X-slope?

Sheets 855-857 are correct. Sheets 741 and 742 will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/16/2017 10:01:36 AM

Reference 521 is a bid item for clearing and grubbing at FRA-71-1234C, but it appears that the limits shown on structure plan sheet 1395/1720 are already shown in the I-71 plan/profile sheets (sheet 581). Therefore, we question the necessity of a separate item under Reference 521.

This item covers additional clearing necessary to get to the ends of this culvert to facilitate the cleanout and joint repairs.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 11:33:15 AM

With respect to "Encapsulated Tieback Detail" on sheet 13/24-1383/1720, the annular space outside of the Trumpet / inside the borehole - between the back face of the Bearing Plate and the grout inside the bore hole up to the bottom end of the trumpet. There are no tieback legend numbers pointing to this space. This design detail appears to permit a void. Please clarify if this is acceptable. Or does the design require this zone to be filled? If so what materials would be an acceptable fill?

This is the space inside the HSS member and a void is acceptable.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 11:24:35 AM

In the phasing of Part 2 (sheet 400 for example), there are multiple callouts for drainage structures to be built without local depressions and then coming back and constructing the local depression in a later phase. Please add a bid item for this work similar to the other temporary drainage items to capture this cost.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 11:20:49 AM

There are 6 locations (444+00, 475+16, 529+89, 595+96, 688+29, and 692+47) where a new inlet will be constructed in the median in Phase 1/1A and the outlet constructed in a later phase. Water will have no where to drain to when traffic is placed in the median at these locations. How will drainage be maintained in these locations?

444+00, 529+89 and 688+29 are replacing an existing pipe in the same location and will have the old pipe to outlet to. 692+47 is called to be bored and jacked across the remaining pavement. 475+16 and 595+96 will be revised to bored and jacked in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 11:13:55 AM

On sheets 76 and 161 there are callouts (DR1) to place CB-6 tops on top of the inlet bases temporarily due to the traffic pattern in a later phase. There is no biditem setup for this work. Please add an item similar to the other temporary drainage items to pay for this work.

This work was intended to be part of Item 615 Roads for Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan. Note on sheet 32 revised in next addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 10:41:51 AM

On Part 2 the Proposal, General Summary and Typical show a quantity of 25,298 CY of 301 Asphalt Concrete Base, but the Pavement Estimated Quantities sheets 50-53 call out for Item 302. Could ODOT clarify that this items is either 301 or 302.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 10:41:03 AM

Part 2 Sheet 336/504 shows signal support foundations with as many as 6-3" & 3-2" conduits tying into them. These foundations cannot support that many conduit 90's within the anchor bolt circle. Please advise whether this is an error or what the expectations are for conduits in the foundations.

To clarify the labeling, only lines items with the word "conduit(s)" spelled out are actual physical conduits. For example, "{3}-3" CONDUITS, (1)-2" CONDUIT" means a total of 4 conduits. Line items with the initial "C" are cable groupings/contents in each conduit. For example, "(1)-2"C (1)-INTERCONNECT" specifies a cable grouping inside a conduit.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 10:36:00 AM

Part 2, Sheet 333/504: Quantities for Conduit, 3", 725.04 and Conduit, 3", 725.04, Jacked or Drilled do not seem to be correct, possibly reversed, when looking at sheet 336/504. Please review and revise for bid item quantities.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 9:57:29 AM

Reviewing the cross-sections for the project; it appears that the existing pavement and shoulders have been excluded from the cross-section end area and volume calculations. These cross-section values are then carried to the earthwork sub-summary sheets on 490 and 491. However, the earthwork sub-summary sheet on p. 491 already contains two adjustments for asphalt and concrete excavation reduction which total approx 75,000 cy. Please verify that the volumes for the existing pavement and shoulder reduction have not been "double-counted" for Reference item 0023 Excavation.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 9:55:06 AM

Reference Item 0008 Gutter Removed is setup in the proposal with a unit of measure in FT, but the values for the item shown on the sub-summary pages are shown as SY. Which is the correct unit of measure for the item?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 7:19:59 AM

3. Reference Item 492 appears to be for the epoxy coated reinforcing steel in the cast-in-place deadman slabs at Retaining Walls 1 and 3. However, the notes for the deadman slabs on sheet 1371 indicate that epoxy coated reinforcing steel is incidental to the concrete. Please review and provide clarification.

Agree, it is called out as incidental to the concrete. Item will be removed in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 7:19:27 AM

The quantity for Reference Item 494 appears to be significantly understated. Please review.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 7:19:08 AM

The quantity for Reference Item 493 appears to be understated. Please review.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 5:28:47 PM

With the bid date occurring on 6/29/17, DBE affirmations required by PN013 will be due on 7/4/17 which is a holiday. Because of the holiday weekend immediately following the bid date, would the department consider extending the due date for affirmations to 7/7/17 so that subcontractors have adequate time to respond to the affirmation requests?

The due date for affirmations will be changed to 7/5/17; please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 5:21:51 PM

Sheets 199-201 show phase line sheeting along Southbound I-71 in order to construct the Phase 2 work area due to the increase in profile elevation thru this section. The same profile elevation difference will occur during Phase 1A construction. Shouldn't there also be phase line sheeting in Phase 1A (Sheets 160-162) to hold up the newly constructed lanes during Phase 2?

Plans for Phase 1A will be updated in next addendum to show sheet wall from Phase 1 remaining in place for Phase 1A.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 5:16:23 PM

On Sheet 23/1720 under Reference Item 174 Pavement Repair, As Per Plan note, it is described that the 1.5" Item 442 – 12.5 MM Asphalt Concrete surface course that is placed on Frank Rd. as part of the repair is to be performed under the (446) density specification, while the 1.5" Item 442 – 12.5 MM Asphalt Concrete surface course that is placed "on ramps" is under the (448) density specification. Due to the irregularity of the areas and nature of this type of work, please change both 12.5 MM Asphalt Concrete Surface Course items to fall under the (448) density specification.

Please see forthcoming addendum. Note will be revised to make all surface course asphalt in pavement repair use 448 for density.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 5:15:11 PM

On sheet 23/1720 under Reference Item 174 Pavement Repair, As Per Plan note, it is called out that some of the 12.5 MM Asphalt Concrete Surface is to be placed "on ramps". Please describe which ramp or ramps this surface course item will be used for on the project.

Please see the plans sheets for Frank Road and the Frank Road ramps.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 5:13:41 PM

Reference Item 519 – Performance Test, is set up with a quantity of 9 each. The notes on plan sheet 1371 and the quantity sub-summary on sheet 1372 only account for 6 each performance tests for the tiebacks at Walls 1 and 2. Please clarify what the three remaining performance tests are for.

Item will be updated in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 5:09:23 PM

Reference Items 505 – 518 are for the Deadman Bar Tendons at Retaining Walls 1 and 3. The descriptions for each of these items reference tendon length. The lengths referenced in the descriptions for each of these 14 items do not correspond to the total tendon lengths shown in the Deadman Bar Tendon Schedules on plan sheets 1392 and 1394. In addition, the tendon schedules on sheets 1392 and 1394 only show 12 different tendon lengths. Please clarify this discrepancy.

Quantities will be updated in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 5:08:59 PM

Reference Items 505 – 518 are for the Deadman Bar Tendons at Retaining Walls 1 and 3. The descriptions for each of these items reference tendon length. The lengths referenced in the descriptions for each of these 14 items do not correspond to the lengths referenced in the descriptions for the proposed Deadman Bar Tendon Anchor items on sheet 1371. Please clarify this discrepancy.

Quantities will be updated in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 5:08:28 PM

Reference Items 505 – 518 are for the Deadman Bar Tendons at Retaining Walls 1 and 3. The quantities for these items sum to a total of 99 each. The Deadman Bar Tendon Schedules on plan sheets 1392 and 1394 show 122 each total Deadman Bar Tendons. Please review and clarify the quantity discrepancies.

Quantities will be updated in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 7:17:40 AM

The wale connection section for the HSS tubes at Walls 1 and 2 in the area of tieback anchorages show a bolted connection between the HSS tube and the sheet piling. To make this bolted connection on the back side of the sheet piling, the Contractor will need to excavate the back side of the sheet piling. It is not typical to make excavations in the tieback anchor unbonded zone areas. Please clarify if it is the Department's intent for the Contractor to make this connection or provide a revised connection detail.

It is the Department's intent that the waler be securely attached to the sheet pile.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2017 3:20:14 PM

The quantity sub-summary for Retaining Walls 1-3 on plan sheet 1372/1720 does not correspond with the quantity general summary on plan sheet 461/1720. The quantities for Reference Items 492, 493, 494, 495, 497, 498, 501, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 512, 513, 515, 517, 518, and 519 are different in each summary. Please clarify and issue revised plan sheets in the next addendum.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2017 3:20:03 PM

Does the Department's quantity for Reference Item 496 include the volume in the belly of each pair of sheet piling where the porous backfill thickness width would be greater than the 2' typical width shown in the details on sheet 1384/1720?

Quantity includes porous backfill in "belly of each pair of sheet piling."

Question Submitted: 6/13/2017 2:10:36 PM

Will the department add a line item for Construction Access Points to be paid for on a per EACH basis given that approved locations for each phase have already been identified on sheet 36?

As stated in SCD 103.10, access locations shown in the plans may be relocated or additional locations added as approved by the Engineer with all cost included in the Lump Sum item for Maintaining Traffic. A separate line item will not be added. Please bid accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 3:59:54 PM

Are bidders permitted to collect additional soil boring information to supplement the information provided in the bidding documents?

Bidders may collect additional information. They must apply for a permit through the District office. Soil boring backfill must conform to the Specifications for Geotechnical Exploration, and operations must conform to allowable lane closure times.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 12:45:06 PM

Sheet 24 calls for 10" Conduit, Type B and 10" Conduit, Type C with 100 ft for each. There are no bid items set up for this. Please add appropriate bid items.

Items will be added in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/9/2017 2:51:35 PM

Sheets 1063-1065 Detail the Gatewell; Is ODOT willing to accept a precast alternate? Is the access hatch 30x36"? Would standard manhole steps be acceptable for the exterior steps? If not will ODOT specify a step?

ODOT would be willing to accept a precast alternate provided the dimensions, reinforcement, and details included in the plans are provided. The access hatch is 30X36 as shown on sheet 1065. Standard manhole steps using cast iron as indicated on sheet 1064 is acceptable.

Question Submitted: 6/9/2017 7:58:27 AM

As a follow up to the question and answer dated 6/6/2017 7:52:47 AM regarding Asbestos Abatement; the quantity is unknown and cannot be determined prior to removal. Would the department consider changing the quantity from 1 LS to 30 SF so that the contract can be adjusted based actual quantities performed?

Quantity to remain lump sum but note will be revised to provide the assumptions made and also references to the asbestos report for additional information.

Question Submitted: 6/9/2017 7:29:07 AM

Will all portable concrete barrier in the median from STA 583+25 to 587+50 as shown on sheet 117 be required to be anchored to the pavement or does the department intend for standard drawing MT-101.80 to be used in securing portable barrier wall to the permanent median wall?

PCB shall be anchored per MT-101.80. Plan Sheet 117 will be revised in a future addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2017 4:49:14 PM

The Bid quantity for Bid item 748 Treating Bridge decks with SRS includes the area of the approach slabs. Is this ODOT'S intention or should the bid quantity be changed to just include the bridge deck area?

It is ODOT's intention that the approach slabs be treated.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2017 4:13:07 PM

Item 614 - Maintaining Traffic, Misc: Milling of Pavement Step note on page 32 - can the width and depth of the proposed pavement step be clarified?

Width and depth of proposed milling is that needed to develop overlapping longitudinal joints in the pavement required per SCD BP-3.1.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2017 3:20:09 PM

The note on plan sheet 28/1720 states that temporary pavement wedges are incidental to the Lump Sum Maintaining Traffic item. The phasing on this project will require substantial temporary wedging. Because of the significant expense associated with the temporary wedging a separate pay item is warranted. Would the department please add a separate pay item for this scope of work?

A separate item will not be added. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2017 2:48:52 PM

On plan sheet 22 in Part 1 of the plans, the Waterway Permit Coordination note states, "A waterways permit shall be obtained for the project prior to project construction. No in-stream work shall be performed until this permit is obtained." On plan sheet 19 in Part 2 of the plans, the Waterway Permit Coordination note states, "A waterways permit shall be obtained for the project prior to project construction." Has the Department applied for this waterways permit and if so, when will it be made available to the Contractor?

Permit has been applied for and is expected by the first of July.

*** 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: 6/8/2017 2:09:03 PM

Plan sheet 32 includes a note with informational quantities of sheet piling required to accommodate phased construction. Because the sheet piling quantity is substantial and the possibility exists for these quantities to vary based on actual conditions, would the department consider adding a separate pay item to cover each of the sheet wall locations?

A separate quantity will not be provided. The sheet piling in the note is incidental to Item 615 Roads for Maintaining Traffic. The actual quantity required will be a reflection of the Contractor's means and methods. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2017 10:44:31 AM

What are the allowable time frames for short term closures related to bridge construction activities (bridge demo, beam erection, etc.) for I-270, Frank Rd, and Greenlawn Ave.? Will signed detours be required for the short term closures or will Portable Changeable Message Signs be used to establish detour routes?

Short-term closures are defined as 15 minutes in Standard Construction Drawing MT-99.60. Signed detours are not required for this type of operation. See notes 7 and 8 on the drawing for more information about the use of PCMS to give advance warning to drivers.

Question Submitted: 6/8/2017 10:04:00 AM

Sheet 22 of 1720 General Notes states: Any tree removal must take place between April 1 and September 30 regardless of bat habitat. Sheet 25 of 1720 General Notes states: No trees shall be removed from April 1 to September 30. Please clarify which is correct.

The note for tree removal on sheet 25 is correct.

Question Submitted: 6/7/2017 8:13:28 PM

Section D-D, STA 362+00 on sheet 439 shows 15' of proposed pavement already constructed prior to Phase 4. The section of roadway from STA 360+59 to 364+96 approx. 65 ft to 80 ft right of I-270 centerline does not appear to be constructed before Phase 4. Will the department clarify when this portion of roadway is to be constructed?

This should be done in phase 4. Work area on sheets 438 and 439 will be revised accordingly in a future addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/7/2017 10:27:15 AM

Bid item 600 bridge deck parapet quantity appears to be substantially overstated. Please revise in the next addendum. The quantity on plan sheet 1574/1720 shows 138 cy. Is it ODOT'S intent to include the parapet concrete on the approach slabs in this bid item? Typically the parapets on the approach slabs are incidental to the approach slabs. Please advise.

While bid item 600 is for 1061L and sheet 1574 is for bridge 1279L the question regarding parapets is valid. Quantities for parapets on the approach slab are included in Item 511 Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, Bridge Deck (Parapet) unless stated differently in the plans (1148 & 1174)

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 6:08:05 PM

The note on plan sheet 25/1720 titled "ITEM 206 CEMENT STABILIZED SUBGRADE, 12" DEEP, AS PER PLAN" states that the 528,737 sy is for use as directed by the engineer. This introduces uncertainty for what amounts to a tremendous cost project and it also effects multiple other bid items related to the stabilization. Is it the department's intent to perform global stabilization on the areas calculated except for the three situations listed in the note on plan sheet 25/1720?

It is the Department's intent to perform global chemical stabilization, except where conditions warrant non-performance. The intent of this note is to identify three likely conditions that could require non-performance of the chemical stabilization, and to direct the project to follow the procedures outlined in CMS 204 where chemical stabilization is non-performed.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 5:38:07 PM

In phase 3A, the I-71 NB exit ramp to Frank Road can only be closed for 5 days according to the narrative on plan sheet 26/1720. How can pavement removal, excavation, 304 base, underdrain, and concrete pavement all be completed in 5 days? Please lengthen the closure period at this location to a reasonable length of time.

It is important that this ramp remain open as much as possible. The work area is small and the schedule is aggressive. The closure period will not be changed. Please bid accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 5:33:24 PM

In phase 3A, the 270EB exit ramp to I71 NB can only be closed for 3 days according to the table on plan sheet 27/1720, and the narrative on plan sheet 26/1720. How can pavement removal, excavation, cement stabilization, cure time for stabilization, 304 base, and asphalt pavement all be completed in 3 days? Even if the Cement Stabilization is removed in favor of undercutting at this location, 3 days is still not reasonable. Please lengthen the closure period at this location.

It is important that this ramp remain open as much as possible. The work area is small and the schedule is aggressive. The closure period will not be changed. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 4:11:50 PM

Bid item 484 description states that the section modulus of the Stay in place sheeting is a min of 30 in³/wlf. The plan sheet number 1084/1720 Structural Note # 17 states that the section modulus minimum is to be 48.5 in³/wlf. Which is correct? Please adjust one or the other in the next addendum.

Both values are correct. One value is for retaining walls supporting the highway fill. The other is for the floodwall. To make it clearer, the items will be re-described as "As Per Plan A" and "As Per Plan B" in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 3:59:45 PM

For REF 146 – Catch Basin Reconstructed to Grade, will the concrete apron around the existing catch basin need to be removed and reconstructed? If so, will the payment for the removal/new apron be included in this item?

Removal of the concrete apron is covered in R-4 as shown on sheet 847 of the plans. Replacement of the apron is incidental to the catch basin reconstruction as indicated in SCD CB-3.2.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 3:57:46 PM

Sheet 32/1720 describes varying types of Item 615, Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class B, APP. These types have varying widths, depths, replacement material, etc, but are all combined into one large reference item (Reference Item 475: Pavement for Maintenance of Traffic, Class B, APP). In order to provide accurate unit prices for the various types of pavement repairs selected, would the department please create separate reference items for each type or repair treatment?

Item 475 will be split into 4 items as noted in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 1:11:45 PM

Question regarding Bid item 484 sheet piling left in place. A more economical sheet pile section (LB Foster PZC 26) could be used if the section modulus of 48.4 in³/wlf can be allowed. It is a hot rolled sheet pile. Can this sheet pile section be used?

While the section modulus is very close and the moment of inertia is better, the PZC 26 is deeper than the modeled PZ 35. This would require an increase in the floodwall thickness which in turn requires USACE approval. The requested pile section may not be used.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 9:27:07 AM

The plan note on sheet 24/1720 titled FLOODWALL CONSTRUCTION references the Section 408 permit, and says no work can be done on the floodwall until the permit is approved. What is the status of this permit and what approval date should contractors base their bids on?

The 408 permit is awaiting signature. Contractors should base their bid on the permit being approved prior to the bid date.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 9:16:16 AM

Plan note on sheet 26/1720 titled SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION states that "The following phases must be completed in order , non-concurrently." Due to the length of the project and the complexity of the phasing at the interchanges, it would benefit the project schedule if certain work phases could occur concurrently or possibly in a different order. Can the sentence referenced be modified to say "The following phases must be completed in order , non-concurrently, unless approved by the engineer"

Additional phase is not required. Any element of the project may be revised with the approval of the Engineer.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 8:51:42 AM

Plan Sheet 24/1720 includes a note titled Field Office Type C, APP that modifies the Office requirements. However, line item 1283 for Field Office in both the proposal and EBS file does not include APP in the description. Please advise.

Line item #1283 will be revised in a forthcoming addendum to include As Per Plan

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 7:53:05 AM

Is the existing 72" pipe shown in Part 2 shown on sheet 63/504 the area listed for the asbestos and remediation work listed on sheet 275/504?

Yes

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 7:52:58 AM

Sheet 275/504 Item Pipe Removed, over 24" (7 LF). No location for this work is provided. Please advise?

This work is part of the REMOVE AND REPLACE 72" CONDUIT TO FIRST JOINT labelled on sheet 274/504.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 7:52:47 AM

Sheet 275/504 Item Special – Asbestos Abatement. This item is currently listed as 1 LS and a known quantity of 30 SF is listed on this sheet. Should the item be changed to 30 SF?

The quantity of 30 SF is only an estimation of the amount of asbestos to be abated, not a physical measurement. To be sure that all abatement is covered, the lump sum quantity is used with this estimated quantity for reference only in bid preparation.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 7:52:30 AM

Sheet 275/504 Item Special details what is to be expected of the work. It mentions 109.02 for payment of any remediation necessary on the existing pipe. 109.02 does not clearly identify and measure what items will be required for remediation?

In the note on this sheet and the same note on sheet 416/504 the 109.02 should be 109.05 which will be revised in a forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 7:52:20 AM

Sheet 21/504 Item 204 Excavation of Subgrade APP, Item 204 Granular Embankment 491 CY. Bid item 899 is listed as Embankment APP. Should the bid item description be changed?

The item referred to on Sheet 21/504 (Item 204 Granular Embankment 491 CY) correlates to Bid item 903. This bid item happens to have the same quantity but is a different item than Bid item 899. The item descriptions are correct as is.

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

Sheet 23/1720 Item Special – Pipe Cleanout 1500 LF. This does not currently have a bid item or description of the work. Please advise?

This is line item # 0018. The note on sheet 23 in part 1 will be revised to match in a forthcoming addenda. The note adequately describes the work.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 7:51:58 AM

Sheet 23/1720 Item Special – Fill and Plug 15" conduit. This does not currently have a bid item or description of the work. Please advise?

This is line item #0017 of the proposal. The descriptions on sheets 456, 463 and 473 will be revised to match in a forthcoming addendum. The note adequately describes the work.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 3:06:38 PM

Sheet 665 calls for 24" Type F and Sheet 511 summarizes it as 24" Type F. There is no bid item setup for 24" Type F. It appears REF 121 21" Type F was created for this run. Please clarify.

This item will be revised to 24" Conduit, Type F... in a forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/31/2017 3:49:13 PM

We cannot open the office calcs folder on the ftp reference file site. Please check.

**The folder is on the FTP site.
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-104799/Reference%20Files/
The site appears to be opening correctly. Please try Google Chrome as a web browser.**

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/30/2017 4:43:23 PM

On Sheet 26 of the plans, the MOT notes state "Phase 2A ramp replacements include the SB exit and NB entrance ramps at Greenlawn Ave. These closures shall also be limited to 30 days max." Can the department please clarify if this is one 30 day closure to complete both ramps together or if each ramp can be closed for 30 days?

Each ramp may be closed for 30 days within Phase 2A. These closures may be implemented concurrently, separately or overlapping. The MOT Plan (sheets 267-268) and Detour Plan (sheets 276-277) illustrate these ramp closures as concurrently in place. If completed separately, only applicable temporary traffic control shall be in place, and the partial MOT set-up shall be approved by the Engineer.

Question Submitted: 5/30/2017 4:37:01 PM

Sheet 1471 of bridge FRA-1-1061L says the deck slab quantity is estimated based on a haunch thickness of 2". There is a subsequent note saying the haunch thickness was measured at the centerline of the beam, from the surface of the deck to the bottom of the top flange minus the deck slab thickness. Should this read ... from the surface of the deck to the TOP of the top flange...? Otherwise the haunch is nearly zero over the W36x256 beams taking into account the thickness of the top flange. The other steel beam bridges have a similar note that needs reviewed.

The note(s) will be changed in a forthcoming addenda to read ...from the surface of the deck to the TOP of the top flange.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2017 3:18:46 PM

The quantity of 15,766 SY is listed as Temporary Pavement Class A, APP on page 43, but is listed as Temporary Pavement Class A with no APP designation in the General Summary on page 462. Which is correct?

The "As Per Plan" for Item 615 - Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per plan on Part 1, Sheet 43 will be removed in a forthcoming addenda.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2017 8:26:03 AM

Regarding the power line near Pier 1 of the bridge over Greenlawn Ave; this line will be in conflict with and/or in extreme proximity to multiple bridge construction operations. When will outages be allowed for this line?

Please refer to Part 1 sheets 1086 through 1109 for the Utility Notes and Details.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2017 8:25:51 AM

In reference to the overhead power line near Pier 1 of the bridge over Greenlawn Ave; what is the proposed elevation of the power line after it has been raised?

Please refer to Part 1 sheets 1086 through 1109 for the Utility Notes and Details.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2017 8:25:41 AM

Another question regarding the overhead power line near the forward abutment of the Frank Road; the utility note on sheet 47/97 of the proposal simply states "Overhead lines will be raised". The line will be in conflict with and/or in extreme proximity to excavation, pile driving, concrete forming and placement, steel erection, and temporary shoring operations. As an alternative to raising this line, could it be relocated 150 feet up-station of the forward abutment in order to allow for safe construction of the bridge?

Please refer to Part 1 sheets 1086 through 1109 for the Utility Notes and Details.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2017 8:25:25 AM

In reference to the overhead power line near the forward abutment of the Frank Road; the utility note on sheet 47/97 of the proposal simply states "Overhead lines will be raised". The line will be in conflict with and/or in extreme proximity to excavation, pile driving, concrete forming and placement, steel erection, and temporary shoring operations. In order to comply with OSHA requirements, all of the above activities will require this line to be shut down. When will outages be allowed for this line?

Please refer to Part 1 sheets 1086 through 1109 for the Utility Notes and Details.

Question Submitted: 5/25/2017 8:24:53 AM

The overhead power line near the forward abutment of the Frank Road structure creates many constructability issues. The utility note on sheet 47/97 of the proposal simply states "Overhead lines will be raised". The line will be in conflict with and/or in extreme proximity to excavation, pile driving, concrete forming and placement, steel erection, and temporary shoring operations. What is the proposed elevation of the line after it has been raised?

Please refer to Part 1 sheets 1086 through 1109 for the Utility Notes and Details.

*** 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: 5/4/2017 2:34:36 PM

Please make the electronic drawing files available

Design files have been posted to the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-104799/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 5/3/2017 10:31:09 AM

The reference files for this project do not include electronic design files. Please make the electronic design files available.

Design files have been posted to the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-104799/Reference%20Files/>

Project No. 170412

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

ASD-101523 - TSG FY2017

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 1:48:44 PM

Items 103 & 108 have a plan quantity of 12 each. The quoted Opticom system only requires one (1) receiver per intersection. Will the contractor get paid per direction of traffic (12 each) or only by the number of receiving units installed (3 each).

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 12:58:00 PM

The plans state that the preemption is to be compatible with the existing equipment or the contractor should supply new vehicle transmitters incidental to the cost of the preemption. In order to bid a compatible system with the current vehicles, the contractor needs to know if the current system is light, sound or radio and the current manufacturer. If a different system is supplied, how many vehicle transmitters need to be supplied?

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 5:58:57 PM

Addendum 4 stated that plan sheets 6,8, 17 were changed but the link to the new plan sheets does not have revised plans for addendum 4. Page 17 contains an unknown plan note change that does not allow this item to be bid properly. We were expecting that these would be issued by now. Can this project be delayed so these changes can be issued to all bidders?

Addendum 4 revised sheets have been posted to the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/D03-101523/>

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 3:12:38 PM

Bid Ref. 24 & Bid Ref. 25 both call for 2-way vehicular signal heads. The plan detail and summaries show 1-way vehicular signal heads. Please clarify which is correct.

The plans will be corrected to show the 2-way vehicular signal heads. An addendum is forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 6/2/2017 7:54:40 AM

Can you add a pay item for ground rods, each new foundation will need one. Also can you add a pay item for intersection removed, the intersections on sheets 14, 17 will have removal items. Also can you check the trench and conduit quantities on plan sheet 14, does not look like either was picked up to the new ped foundations.

Ground rods will be added. Item will be added to pay for removal of existing signal heads & components as directed by the Engineer. Quantities will be increased for items related to powering the Ped Signal Heads at the Sugarbush intersection. An Addendum is forthcoming.

Project No. 170421

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

ASD-87720 - IR 71-00.00

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 8:05:01 AM

Ref. 28 WZ Lane Line CL3 & Ref 29 WZ Edge Line CL3 - Both items appear to be under quantity and only having enough for 1 application. Shouldn't two applications be needed, one after pavement planning and after the surface course?

Ref. 30 WZ Channel Line Class 3 - This item has a quantity of 31,876 LF. Please advise where this quantity is to be used.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:13:29 PM

Page 10 – Item 424 FG Polymer Asph Conc, Type B – states that a MTV, MTD or a Remixing Paver is to be provided for “all paving operations”. Per CMS 401.13, Anti-Segregation Equipment – Use anti-segregation equipment on “all mainline lanes of the traveled way” including express lanes, collector-distributor lanes, continuous center turn lanes, acceleration/deceleration lanes and ramp lanes. Per CMS 401.13 shoulders are not included. Are the shoulders on this project included? Please clarify.

The use of a MTV, MTD or a Remixing Paver is not required for the shoulder paving operations. This will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 9:47:54 AM

Reference the plan notes for Item 251, Partial Depth Pavement Repair on sheet 10, is the requirement to use PG 70-28 in the 19 mm mix a misprint? Normally use PG 64-28 or PG 70-22 binder in 19 mm mix.

The asphalt binder will be revised to PG64-28 for both the 301 and the 19mm mix. An addendum is forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2017 2:32:48 PM

Can the department please clarify the anticipated amount of partial/pavement repairs in the Ramp A, B, C, and D locations. Ramp work can be very time consuming performing the work half width at a time.

The existing pavement buildup on the IR 71 ramps is a full depth flexible pavement. The vast majority of the pavement repairs on the ramps will be longitudinal due to the existing pavement buildup. The exact locations, sizes, and quantities of the pavement repairs on the ramps will be determined in the field by ODOT project personnel. No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 1:48:53 PM

Items 251/253– Partial Depth Repairs/Full Depth Repairs – plans call for the repairs to be completed “after” the Class A fine pavement planing. This project also has PN420 smoothness spec for the pavement. Will ODOT consider performing the repairs before the milling and paving due to the PN 420 spec?

Items 251/253 - Partial Depth Repairs/Full Depth Repairs will be performed prior to the pavement planing operations. This will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 1:21:43 PM

Item 251 – Partial Depth Repairs – plans state quantity is based on 3’w x 3”d and be able to perform repairs 2’ wide. Does ODOT have an idea how many repairs will be longitudinal and how many will be transverse? Does ODOT have intentions on doing any repairs 2’ wide?

The existing pavement buildup on IR 71 is a full depth flexible pavement. The vast majority of the pavement repairs will be longitudinal due to the existing pavement buildup. The exact locations, sizes, and quantities of the pavement repairs will be determined in the field by ODOT project personnel. No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 7:39:21 AM

Page 10 - Interim Completion Date - Plans state; All work South of US250 is to be completed with "Final Markings" before an interim completion date of October 15, 2017. Does the final markings include RPM's or can they all be placed in 2018?

According to C&MS, 108.07.D., RPMs are required safety items if the roadway section involved had RPMs before the project started. The RPMs are to be considered "Final Markings" and shall be completed by the interim completion date of 10/15/17. No addendum required.

Project No. 170422

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

AUG-100915 - MICRO FY2018

Question Submitted: 5/31/2017 8:16:39 AM

As per page 6 of the plans the Stop-Bar Radars are to be installed at the intersection on US33 & SR185. This intersection was not found. Is this work to be performed at US33 & SR385?

Yes. The Stop-Bar Radar location table should read US-33 & SR-385. The table will be corrected in a forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170423

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

AUG-91005 - IR/ALL-IR 75-03.08/00.00

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 5:37:33 PM

The Plan Note on Page 3 under Item 254- Pavement Planing, Asphalt Concrete does not address the shoulder. We assume that the shoulders can be milled ahead and left closed as long as the drop-off is protected with drums per MT-101.90. Please clarify.

In the notes on sheet 3, "mainline" refers to all pavement including thru travel lanes and shoulders of IR-75.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 3:44:51 PM

The scope of work for STR AUG-75-0310 cannot be completed during the current permitted lane closure times per sheet 4. By increasing the elevation of the existing bridge deck by > 3.5" a centerline drop-off issue will prevent you from opening the lane to traffic and both lanes cannot be completed under the current restrictions.

The bridge is getting a total of 3-1/4" asphalt. The detail on sheet 12 shows it being placed in 2 lifts with a transition area on each side. The two lifts will need to be staggered with adjacent lanes and shoulders to meet the dropoff policy.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 3:34:59 PM

Ref #16 806 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, 12.5MM Type A, As Per Plan includes 708 CY for the 4 mainline bridges. This quantity should be separate Ref # for 442 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, 12.5MM Type A, 448. Density should not be applicable to these CY

Areas within bridge limits and of variable thickness are considered excluded areas (see Supplemental Spec 806.06.A) from density lots. A revision to the Item 806 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, 12.5MM, Type A, As Per Plan note will be forthcoming in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/1/2017 11:50:05 AM

The proposal calls for item numbers 43 and 45 to be polymer modified joints for use on structure IR 75-03.10L and IR 75-03.10R. However, the general summary sheet 6 shows the item to be saw and seal joints. Plan sheet 12 shows and existing polymer modified joint, but note 10 in legend shows saw and seal. Please clarify which item is to be used.

AUG-75-0310 R & L will not be getting new polymer modified expansion joints. The plans are correct showing only waterproofing and sawing and sealing. The proposal will be revised in an upcoming addendum.

Project No. 170424

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

COL-102341 - US 62-4.86

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:58:33 PM

Is it the intent of the plans to pave straight line through the project, with the exception of additional width in curves?

The intent of the plan is to apply the microsurfacing treatment to the existing paved surface at the widths shown in the plan, along with additional widths in the curves. Side roads approaches and driveways are not included with this plan.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 7:34:40 AM

References 1,2,3 and 4, there seems to be new curb ramps at the locations listed in plans are they going to be replaced?

The quantities for curb ramps at locations 1, 2, 3, and 4 shall be included with the Contractors bid.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 2:09:22 PM

For the Tower City Bridges

Would the state consider D.S Brown's SSCM Strip seal as an alternate to Watson Bowman's Fabrospan System?

Please resubmit this question with the correct project number (170425).

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170425

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

CUY-95557 - TOWER CITY BRIDGES

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 3:38:49 PM

The specified joint system (Fabrospan) is a type of joint used/produced in Ontario. It is proprietary and possibly not made in the United States. What is an equivalent, US produced joint system that would be allowed on this project, thus preventing a proprietary specification?

The proprietary product specified in the plans has been approved for use on this project.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 2:01:02 PM

Would the state consider D.S Brown's SSCM Strip seal as an alternate to Watson Bowman's Fabrospan System?

No

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 9:44:32 AM

Bid item 1 as described on plan sheet 11 is for FS concrete used in critical areas that need to be opened for MOT access. The note states that this item is to be used in lieu of the overlay 847 item. The 847 item is measured by the square yard and bid item 1 is set up in cubic yards. Should bid item 1 unit of measure be in square yards? On past projects, bid item 1 was set up to handle only the additional costs associated with the FS concrete in lieu of the MSC. This unit of measure for this item could then remain in cubic yards and the contractor would be paid for the cubic yards of FS concrete used in localized areas to handle any additional costs associated with the FS mix design. The contractor would still be paid for the 847 square yard bid item in this scenario.

Bid accordingly

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:34:05 PM

The majority of roadway expansion joint replacements are partial depth replacements as detailed on plan sheet 59/129. Existing plans show the original expansion joint box outs being 7" deep and the details are showing 10" deep which means we are going 3" into the existing concrete deck. It is unknown how much existing deck is below this and if it is structurally sound. How do we handle a situation where the deck below the proposed box out is not structurally sound – temporary protection and forming will be required?

The existing deck below the blockout consists of non-structural fill concrete of varying thickness with existing steel anchoring bars holding an existing end plate which are to remain (see detail C, Sheet 59). This existing plate is shown overlapping the joint armor, so no forming will be required in all partial depth replacement areas meeting that detail. Forming will be required in all full-depth repair areas (see detail B, Sheet 59).

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:33:17 PM

The construction sequence notes on plan sheet 19/129 for phase 3 & 4 allow the contractor 120 days per phase in the third construction season (2019). Work most likely cannot start until around April 1 and with 240 days of construction completion would be around the end of November 2019. We request that the project completion date of 9/30/2019 be revised to 11/30/2019 for substantial completion.

In a forthcoming addendum the completion date will be changed to November 15, 2019. Also, 115 calendar days will be allotted for the completion of each construction phase.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:32:31 PM

Some of the existing building joints have covers that are caulked to the existing sidewalks or the joint armor itself is caulked to the existing sidewalk that is to be removed. Who is responsible for recaulking or repairing these areas?

These joints/covers are property of the private owner. Reference C&MS 107.10 for contractor's responsibilities for restoration.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:31:08 PM

Placing a microsilica concrete overlay over a deck treated with HMWM is not something we have seen before. The contractor cannot be responsible for any issues with the overlay bonding to the existing HMWM treated deck with this design specification change. Please advise.

The contractor is to follow the plan notes and details for HMWM.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:30:20 PM

SS 847.22 requires overlays to be grooved per 511.17. There are both roadway and sidewalk sections being overlaid. Is this grooving required on both surfaces?

The 511.17 grooving is only required on the roadway wearing surface. The sidewalk surface shall have a broom finish.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:29:32 PM

The scope of work notes 3 and 5 on plan sheet 7 of 129 also states the microsilica overlay is to be placed on the sanded HMWM surface or Type B waterproofing. SS 847.20 requires the microsilica concrete overlay to be surface prepped prior to placement of the overlay. Is this requirement being waived since this operation will damage the HMWM and Type B waterproofing surface?

The contractor shall be required to perform a final cleaning with compressed air prior to placement of the microsilica overlay to ensure no dust or debris is present.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 2:28:11 PM

The scope of work notes 3 and 5 on plan sheet 7 of 129 states that after removal of the asphalt and sidewalk concrete that the deck surfaces shall be scarified and then clean the deck of dust and debris, water blasting shall not be used. Is the intent of this note to waive the surface prep requirements for the HMWM as stated in 512.04(B)? Please advise.

No, the intent is to have a cleaned and uncontaminated surface prior to application of the HMWM, in accordance with 512.04(B). Water blasting shall not be used as an alternate surface cleaning method.

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 11:20:04 AM

A previous question asked for clarification of the GCRTA track outages. It was replied that it is the contractors responsibility to coordinate. However, GCRTA must be willing to permit outages during work items on the critical list. There is a big difference between coordination and being issued timely outages. Is there an agreement with GCRTA that these outages must be issued during critical work activities?

Reference the GCRTA Special Clauses and the note on plan sheet 10, 'GCRTA Requirements', last paragraph, "It is the contractors responsibility to coordinate weekend outages with GCRTA months in advance of the proposed outage."

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 11:12:27 AM

Addendum 1 required a GCRTA railroad protective insurance policy. Will there be a specific pay item for this policy?

It is bid reference number 6.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

6/15/2017 9:11:02 AM

1. The scope of work notes 3 and 5 on plan sheet 7 of 129 states that after removal of the asphalt and sidewalk concrete that the deck surfaces shall be scarified and then clean the deck of dust and debris, water blasting shall not be used. Is it the intent of this note to waive the surface prep requirements for the HMWM as stated in 512.04(B)? Please advise.
2. The scope of work notes 3 and 5 on plan sheet 7 of 129 also states the microsilica overlay is to be placed on the sanded HMWM surface or Type B waterproofing. SS 847.20 requires the microsilica concrete overlay to be surface prepped prior to placement of the overlay. Is this requirement being waived since this operation will damage the HMWM and Type B waterproofing surface?
3. SS 847.22 requires overlays to be grooved per 511.17. There are both roadway and sidewalk sections being overlaid. Is this grooving required on both surfaces?
4. Placing a microsilica concrete overlay over a deck treated with HMWM is not something we have seen before. The contractor cannot be responsible for any issues with the overlay bonding to the existing HMWM treated deck with this design specification change. Please advise.
5. Some of the existing building joints have covers that are caulked to the existing sidewalks or the joint armor itself is caulked to the existing sidewalk that is to be removed. Who is responsible for recaulking or repairing these areas?
6. The construction sequence notes on plan sheet 19/129 for phase 3 & 4 allow the contractor 120 days per phase in the third construction season (2019). Work most likely cannot start until around April 1 and with 240 days of construction completion would be around the end of November 2019. We request that the project completion date of 9/30/2019 be revised to 11/30/2019 for substantial completion.
7. The majority of roadway expansion joint replacements are partial depth replacements as detailed on plan sheet 59/129. Existing plans show the original expansion joint box outs being 7" deep and the details are showing 10" deep which means we are going 3" into the existing concrete deck. It is unknown how much existing deck is below this and if it is structurally sound. How do we handle a situation where the deck below the proposed box out is not structurally sound – temporary protection and forming will be required?

This question has been resubmitted as seven separate questions to answer the questions more expediently and maintain simplicity and clarity.

Question Submitted:

6/14/2017 9:33:03 AM

During the walk-thru, representatives of Tower City gave the impression that after completion of the project, it will have a water tight surface. Are they aware that the existing building joints that leak prior and during construction will continue to leak after construction unless they too are replaced?

Yes

Question Submitted:

6/14/2017 9:28:15 AM

Is there a bond breaker between the existing sidewalk and the deck structure?

The presence of a bond breaker cannot be confirmed.

Question Submitted:

6/12/2017 4:38:39 PM

After the removal of the existing asphalt and eliminator waterproofing, HMWM is to applied to the existing concrete. Is the HMWM to serve as the waterproofing until the micro-silica is placed or will additional protection be required?

HMWM is not intended to waterproof the deck. On sheet 10, reference the note 'Structure Drainage Misc.: Interim Drainage'

Question Submitted:

6/12/2017 4:26:25 PM

With the sidewalk against the existing building lines to be removed, what is to keep the existing building line compression seals without any armor plate from being disturbed. The compression seals will not be able to retain its width. Who is responsible for the cost for replacing compression or other non-constrained building joints that will be disturbed during the sidewalk replacement work?

The sidewalk removal limits may be adjusted by the project engineer based on field conditions to allow the existing compression seals to remain in place. Compression seals that may need to be replaced will be addressed post bid.

Question Submitted:

6/12/2017 4:16:28 PM

Addendum 1 refers to the Design-Build Contractor to be responsible for the technical coordination and drawing review and that work can not proceed until the GCRTA has acknowledged approval of the project. As this is not a DBC contract, who is responsible for the items listed in the overview?

The term "design build contractor" will be replaced with "contractor." A revised Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority Special Clauses will be provided in a forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 4:08:05 PM

Sheet 10, column 2, paragraph states that there will be three weekend complete track outages to perform abutment repair work. With 450 trains daily, when is it anticipated that these outages will occur?

On plan sheet 10 under the note 'GCRTA Requirements', reference the last paragraph, specifically, " It is the contractors responsibility to coordinate weekend outages with GCRTA ..."

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 3:58:42 PM

Sheet 12, column 1, paragraph 4 states, "All areas under the deck must be protected from falling debris." Does this mean the entire structure for all five structures needs to have 100 percent false work installed?

Includes all areas affected by the work.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 3:53:29 PM

Item 2 under limitations of Operation on Sheet 29 states that the removal of asphalt and concrete will be restricted to weekend or night shifts. Will this include such work items as the scarification required reach the specified existing concrete surface profile?

The Limitations of Operation note is on sheet 9 of the plans. Item 2 includes all removal of asphalt and concrete.

Question Submitted: 6/7/2017 1:14:00 PM

Please provide the office calculations for the Level UF, and Level 3 steel.

Requested office calculations are now posted on the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-95557/>

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 10:20:23 AM

Reference #116 Portions of Traffic Island Removed appears that it should be Remove Steel Curb Plate 1503 FT as called out on sheet 47/129 and in the calculations provided. Please clarify.

An upcoming addendum will correct the pay item to Item 202 - Removal, Misc.: Remove Steel Curb Plate 1503 ft

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 10:14:39 AM

Reference #16 Concrete Traffic Island appears to duplicate what is included in Reference #104 & 159. please clarify.

An upcoming addendum will correct the quantities for these reference numbers.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 8:52:22 AM

Bid items #99, #153, #192 & #226 Special – Patching Concrete Structures, Bridge Decks with QC2 Concrete units of measure are indicated to be paid in square feet in both the Proposal and Estimated Quantities plan sheets. The plan note on sheet 17/129 indicates this work to be paid by the square yard. Please clarify which unit of measure these bid items will be paid.

The unit of measure for these items is square feet. The plan note will be corrected in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 8:10:35 AM

When will the Prebid site visit meeting take place

A pre-bid site visit has been scheduled for June 13, 2017, at 10:00 am. Meet in the mall management office conference room at 230 W. Huron Road, Cleveland, Ohio.

The management office is located on the lowest level right outside of the entrance into JACK Casino. All participants should bring safety vests and hard helmets.

Question Submitted: 5/31/2017 8:24:11 AM

Please provide the railroad information required for the railroad protective liability insurance for the GCRTA.

GCRTA information will be provided in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 5/31/2017 8:17:29 AM

Can ODOT schedule a prebid walkthrough of the properties below the bridge affected by the work that are inaccessible?

A pre-bid site visit has been scheduled for June 13, 2017, at 10:00 am. Meet in the mall management office conference room at 230 W. Huron Road, Cleveland, Oh. The management office is located on the lowest level right outside the entrance into JACK Casino. All participants should bring safety vests and hard helmets.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 5/31/2017 8:13:46 AM

Can ODOT post the existing plans to their ftp site?

All existing plans are now posted on the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-95557/>

Project No. 170426

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

ASD-96730 - MICRO FY2018

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 7:27:01 AM

Please indicate a proposed breakdown of transverse vs. longitudinal repairs for Ref. 3, 251 Partial Depth Pavement Repair and Ref. 4, 253 Pavement Repair. There is a large difference in cost between the two methods.

Exact locations and quantities of transverse and longitudinal pavement repairs will be determined in the field by ODOT project personnel.

Project No. 170430

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

HOC-84538 - SR 328-05.93

Question Submitted: 6/8/2017 11:36:13 AM

Proposal states completion date of 9-1-17. Pg 3/8 of plans states there is an interim completion date of 10-1-17 for HOC374 and cannot start HOC328 until 4-1-18. The overall completion date need to be adjusted to reflect the construction sequence.

Refer to Addendum 1.

Project No. 170432

Sale Date - 6/29/2017

FRA-100737 - IR 70/VAR-8.62/VAR

Question Submitted: 6/26/2017 2:02:22 PM

Standard Drawing BP-2.5 requires reinforcing mesh for all repairs greater than 10 ft in length or for Class FS repairs that will be opened to traffic within 24 hrs of placement. However, Addendum #4 requires reinforcement for all repairs. Please clarify if reinforcing mesh will be required for repairs less than 10 ft in length that will not be open to traffic within 24 hrs of placement.

Include reinforcing mesh in all concrete repairs.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 11:08:44 AM

I guess my previous question was not specific enough. Is mesh reinforcement required for concrete joint repairs?

Mesh Reinforcement will be required at all concrete repair locations.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 4:21:39 PM

Per ODOT Spec 255.02 the RRCM mix can take up to 6 hrs to reach a flexural strength of 400 psi which is needed prior to opening the pavement to traffic. There are areas called out on the unauthorized lane use table, specifically for the collector-distributor lanes from Livingston to Noe Bixby, where a lane closure is only permitted for 6 hrs from 11 pm to 5 am. After accounting for the 6 hr cure time this leaves no time to setup/teardown the traffic zone, perform removals, drill/install dowels and pour back the repair. Please provide additional time for lane closures in this section.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/16/2017 4:16:08 PM

The note on page 8 of the plans regarding ITEM 646 - EPOXY PAVEMENT MARKINGS states that "THIS ITEM OF OWKR SHALL BE PERFORMED IN CONJUNCTION WIHT ITEM 255 - FULL DEPTH REMOVAL AND RIGID REPLACEMENT, CLASS RRCM, AS PER PLAN AND SHALL BE COMPLETED WITH IN THE SAME WORKING DAY." It appears that the 255 Rigid Repairs will be diamond ground after completion of the repairs, which would presumably destroy the markings. Will it be acceptable to temporary stripe the 255 Rigid Repairs the same night the repairs are completed, and then do the permanent striping upon completion of the diamond grinding?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/16/2017 10:42:36 AM

Is reinforcement required for the concrete joint repairs?

Reinforcement as per Standard Construction Drawing, B.P. 2.1 – Longitudinal Pavement Joints & B.P. 2.2 - Transverse Pavement Joints, is required.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 10:47:16 AM

This project has various depth of concrete to be patched full depth. The line item FULL DEPTH SAWING SAWING includes all depths. Can ODOT create line items for the different depths as the pricing will be different?

The Contractor shall bid the item, Full Depth Pavement Sawing according to plan.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 10:35:16 AM

The ingress/egress note on sheet 9 prohibits entering and exiting the worksite during peak hours from 5 AM to 9 AM and 3 PM to 6 PM. There are cases on both 70 and 270 when the unauthorized lane use table permits work during these peak hours. If the contractor follows the unauthorized lane use table will they be held to the requirements of the ingress/egress note?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 10:34:08 AM

There are many repairs on the outside lane of 270 southbound through the interchange with US 33. Please provide time frames for possible ramp closures.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 10:33:18 AM

On 270 northbound and southbound there are repairs around the interchange with 70 where there are two express lanes in the center and collector-distributor lanes (1 northbound and 2 southbound) on the outside. However, the unauthorized lane use table only provides a scenario for reducing 270 from 2 to 1 lanes in this section. Will this area be treated similar to the section south of Noe Bixby with similar times for maintaining 1 and 2 lanes?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 10:32:08 AM

On 270 northbound and southbound there are repairs in the 3-lane section north of Noe Bixby. However, the unauthorized lane use table only provides a scenario for reducing 270 from 2 to 1 lanes in this section. Will the lane closure requirements in the 3-lane section south of Noe Bixby apply to the 3-lane section north of Noe Bixby?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 10:31:10 AM

Sheet 13 shows two repairs in the outside lane (F) at SLM's 45.63 and 45.42. These are within the area of 270 northbound where lane F is the single collector-distributor lane at the interchange with US 33. Please provide timeframes when the ramps at US 33 can be closed to complete the repairs in the collector distributor lane.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 10:30:18 AM

The sawcutting note on sheet 7 states: "Sawcutting of joints shall only be done when the lane adjacent to the joint being cut is closed." How will this be treated in 2-lane sections when sawing is performed between the two lanes as the contractor is not permitted to close all lanes.

When performing work on a 2-lane section the contractor shall refer to MT-101.90 (Note #8) and CMS 255.08.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 10:29:18 AM

Sheet 21 shows multiple full slab repairs in lane E at SLM 15.50. A similar situation is found on sheet 22 in lane A at SLM 15.56, 15.53, and 14.83 and in lane B at SLM 15.25. In order to accurately estimate the quantities of individual dowels versus dowel baskets, please clarify if the multiple repairs at the noted SLM's are continuous repairs or individual full slab repairs.

When the SLM's are the same and the COMMENT column notes "Full Slab" the repair is intended to be continuous.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170433

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

MEG-104084 - US 33-24.31

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 8:35:39 AM

Can the Ref 15 QC1 Concrete Repairs be brought up to the surface?

The concrete repairs shall meet the existing surface. Please see General Notes for smoothness requirements.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:52:41 PM

Is the Class 1 temporary intended to be used after the Concrete Pavement Patching operation, or is the Class I temporary intended to be used after the Diamond Grinding operation and then removed prior to application of the 646 epoxy pavement marking?

The temporary pavement markings shall be used where needed for patches or potentially diamond ground segments. The Item 646 pavement markings have been replaced with Item 642 pavement markings. Please see Addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 10:12:04 AM

Can the Department verify that the existing pavement marking is 646 epoxy and removal of existing pavement marking is not required to apply new 646 epoxy pavement marking, or does the Department intend that the existing pavement markings must be removed prior to application of the 646 permanent epoxy striping?

Question Submitted: 5/16/2017 8:11:09 AM

The job is advertised as having Diamond Grinding on it but I do not see any breakdown of locations or Quantity.

Diamond Grinding may apply to this project based on smoothness. The Surface Smoothness note on sheet 3 will require diamond grinding if the surface variations do not meet the plan note.

Project No. 170436

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

MOT-100974 - SR 123-00.00

Question Submitted: 6/13/2017 7:14:35 AM

Is it possible to get the ADDT Traffic Count on this job?

For the project assume less than 1500 trucks. Traffic counts will be added in a forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 170441

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

PRE-91931 - SR 503-0.00

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 12:51:06 PM

Plan note on sheet 9/87 states all work south of SLM 5.58, Bridge 503-11.07, and pavement repairs should be complete by 10/15/2017. Regarding the bridge this would place an August 1st start date for the 75 day closure, there are some lead time items, bearings, expansion joints etc. that will have a hard time making this date. Will ODOT consider allowing the bridge to be built in spring 2018? or extend the date to the end of November 2017 to allow for lead time item fabrication? Also is there any consideration to moving the date for the drainage and roadway work in West Elkton as contractor will be pushed to complete with a contract not coming until the end of June with purchase orders and other lead time for drainage structures to do the drainage work.

No additional extensions will be provided.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 10:59:36 AM

PLEASE ADVISE IF ANY WELD TESTING (RADIOGRAPH ON CP, MAG PARTICLE ON FILLET, ETC.) WILL BE REQUIRED WHERE NEW BEARING LOAD PLATE IS ESSENTIALLY TAKING THE PLACE OF THE BOTTOM FLANGE VIA COMPLETE PENETRATION WELD. THANKS.

Weld Testing shall be performed as per 2016 CMS 513.25(B).

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/18/2017 8:45:40 AM

Please confirm that the concrete note for QC-2 concrete that was added via addendum applies to the approach slabs as well. The approach slabs are not listed as per plan, but the note clearly states that the same concrete mix should be used in diaphragms, and approach slabs. This bridge does not have abutment diaphragms, so that does not matter, but simply confirm that the note does include the approach slabs and that the micro silica adder, corrosion inhibitor, and fiber mesh are required in the approach slabs per the note added in the addendum?

YES - See PN 033 - 04/18/2008 - AS PER PLAN DESIGNATION

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 11:53:20 AM

Please provide the office calculations for the Level UF.

The calculations for the Level UF are as follows: ITEM 513 - STRUCTURAL STEEL MEMBERS LEVEL UF AS PER PLAN Unit weight of end crossframes = 9.80 lb/ft Number of proposed end crossframe locations = 8 each Length of each end crossframe group = 19.40 ft Weight of proposed end crossframes = 1520.96 lb Total Quantity = 1600 lb

Question Submitted: 5/31/2017 3:32:33 PM

On plan sheet 12 the window contract calls for only 30 days for the redeck of bridge PRE-503-1170. This duration is unattainable simply due to curing periods. Demolition including sawcutting, railing removal, deck removal and backwall removal will take at least 1 week. Then between 2 lifts of backwall curing, deck cure, and approach slab cure you have nearly 1 month of curing time frames. This does not include any time to do any work on the structure. A more reasonable duration would be 75 days.

An addendum will be forthcoming to address the window contract duration.

Project No. 170446

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

MRG-102785 - SR 607-00.76

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 1:39:10 PM

wh0cd637169 prednisolone without prescription adalat without prescription viagra pharmacy

Resubmit question following the instruction at the given link:

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Pages/PBQs.aspx>

Project No. 170451

Sale Date - 7/13/2017

HIG-101739 - US 62-06.35

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 12:53:09 PM

What are the intentions on compaction on the 2 ft. trench of the full depth repair?

For Item 253-Pavement Repair, As Per Plan, the first lift of 301 should be compacted "using suitable compaction equipment as the Engineer directs." See CMS 2016 253.03. The following guidance is provided in CMS 401.16 "...areas not accessible to rollers, thoroughly compact the mixture with hot, hand tampers or with mechanical tampers. On depressed areas, the Contractor may use trench rollers or rollers fitted with compression strips." The final lift of 301 should be flush with the adjacent existing pavement and compacted conventionally, See CMS 2016 253.03 for direction.

Project No. 170454

Sale Date - 7/13/2017

LUC-102791 - IR 280-03.47 VGCS lighting

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 4:43:44 PM

New mounting bracket shown on Sh29 &30 show bracket mounted to barrier wall. At what height above existing deck is unit mounted. Need to extend new wiring. Will SS Box mounted to deck with splice sbe acceptable

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 4:36:05 PM

After site visit need clarification for mounting Type EA fixtures. Details on Sh 27 &28 not clear with existing installation

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 11:12:57 AM

Is CPM schedule required

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 10:52:26 AM

Project completion of 10/24/2017 would not be possible need to design lighting system and fixtures preliminary information it will take 60-90 days before work on project could start

Project No. 170462

Sale Date - 7/13/2017

UNI-94145 - US 33-24.56/FRA-US 33-0.00

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:41:05 PM

On page 20 of the plans under the (Construction Sequence) note: has a item 625 - bracket arm but there is no pay item for bracket arm. Is there to be bracket arms? I do not believe their is room for them on the poles.

No bracket arms will be installed.

Project No. 170464

Sale Date - 7/13/2017

WOO-101003 - SR 199-29.10 Carronade Rdabt

Question Submitted: 6/9/2017 4:01:38 PM

Sheet 10/50 explains that there is 45 calendar days to build the roundabout. 45 days would not be enough time to complete all of the work as it is currently proposed. Stabilization would require a cure period in which no work could be completed during this time. Would the department consider using a granular subgrade improvement instead of the stabilization? Please review and respond.

Project No. 173002

Sale Date - 9/22/2017

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

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

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

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

“Prior to any construction in the floodplain, the DBT shall compile the necessary information and supporting documentation (calculations, analysis, mapping, drawings) to identify temporary or permanent impacts to the floodplain. The DBT shall meet or exceed all floodplain regulations and requirements. The DBT shall coordinate with the local floodplain administrator. Any additional impacts identified subsequent to approval from the floodplain administrator require the DBT to coordinate with the applicable agencies.

a. If the proposed and temporary conditions comply with the ODOT scope of services (as written or amended) and the ODOT L&D, Volume 2 requirements does the project fall under ODOT L&D Section 1005.1.4 ODOT Self-Permit Process and local floodplain coordination outlined therein will suffice?

b. Do the Local Floodplain requirements deviate from the FEMA requirements, if so how?

Does the Scope of Services as written or to be amended include all floodplain regulations and requirements?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

"The DBT shall be responsible for zero increase in the flood elevation due to temporary construction fills, crane pads, staging areas, haul roads, material storage, and equipment storage. ..."

a. This zero increase as a temporary condition requirement is also significantly different than the requirements of the Regional General Permit requirements / conditions indicated on the form in the ODOT BDM, Figure 203.5-2, Temporary Construction, Access and Dewatering Activities, Permit Determination Checklist, for the Office of Environmental Services – Waterway Permits Unit (OESWPU), should the Regional General Permit covering Temporary Construction, Access and Dewatering Activities apply instead to the temporary conditions?

b. Was the temporary zero increase intended to be applied to the minimum flow (twice the highest monthly flow) instead of the flood elevation?

If a and b do not apply to this project then is the zero increase for temporary condition requirement intended to stipulate that the temporary conditions need to comply with the FEMA and Local floodplain regulations as if they were permanent conditions and accordingly the zero increase also only applies to the floodway? If so what is the allowable increase for the floodway fringe?

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

"...The project shall be designed by the DBT to ensure there is zero increase in flood elevation due to permanent fills, embankment, and new pier construction.

a. Does zero increase mean 0.00 feet or 0.0 feet whereby (0.01 to 0.05 feet) rounded to the nearest tenth of a foot to be consistent with the published FIS elevations and survey data collection and mathematical calculation tolerances?

b. Does this permanent criterion apply only to the floodway as per FEMA regulation? If so what is the allowable increase for the floodway fringe?

c. Is there a preliminary Bridge Waterway Hydraulic and Scour report or analysis performed and available for either or both the existing and proposed structures?

Is the effective hydraulic model available in either "printed output"(in txt or pdf file formats) or "HEC-2 or HEC-RAS data input" file formats?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

will retain the documentation following the PTI discussion);

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

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Page numbers should be sequentially numbered throughout the entire document.

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

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

Please follow the requirements in the RFQ.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part E is not a required Section.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Revised Response: 2/9/2017.

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

Original Response:

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

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

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

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

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

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

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

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

What is the anticipated DBE Goal % on this project?

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

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

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

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

Project No. 177023

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

HOL-101528 - SR 60-02.56

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 3:22:28 PM

The drilled shaft quantity looks to be overstated. Kindly review.

The contractor has asked that ODOT review the drilled shaft quantity in the plans. They were concerned the plan quantity is overstated. Since this is a Type C Emergency project, the exact location of the existing ground line has not been surveyed. The contractor shall bid the plan quantity. All quantity adjustments based on the actual field conditions will be made according to CMS 104.02.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 1:47:48 PM

Based on the bid items provided it seems that the intent of the plans is to leave the temporary pavement in place. Please confirm.

As stated in the note on Sheet 5, the Pavement for Maintaining Traffic is to remain in place.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 1:45:08 PM

The overhead power lines look like they will interfere with the installation of drilled shafts and soldier pile. Will these lines be relocated or de-energized? What is the voltage of these lines?

As stated in the note on Sheet 3, the Contractor and ODOT will work with the Utility Companies to mitigate impacts to the project.

Project No. 177025

Sale Date - 6/22/2017

MEG-103479 - SR 124-63.42

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 10:47:26 AM

Being that there is no line item in proposal for Detour Signing, is it the intent that the contractor shall be responsible for detour signing? A map of the detour route is provided, however there is no indication of desired signing. If it is ODOT's intent for contractor to do detour signing, will a breakdown of necessary signage be provided?

ODOT will perform the detour signing. The contractor will be responsible for erecting and maintaining road closed signs, barricades and lights per SCD MT-101.60 as outlined on sheet 5.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 178010

Sale Date - 6/29/2017

LUC-86926 - IR 75-2.34 Indiana Av Brdg

Question Submitted: 6/26/2017 4:27:59 PM

Following completion of our detailed pre-bid schedule, it becomes apparent that the current completion date is unattainable. Additional time will be necessary through mid-summer of 2019 to complete the superstructure work; including the bridge deck, sidewalk, parapets and roadway tie-ins and other associated items of work. Please consider extending the completion date to mid-summer of 2019, at a minimum.

Question Submitted: 6/26/2017 2:32:49 PM

Revised plan sheet 73 issued as part of Addendum #5 still contains a note that does not allow the slipforming of the bridge parapets. An earlier pre-bid answer was provided that said this note would be removed and that slipforming would be allowed. Will this note be modified on a future addendum?

Question Submitted: 6/26/2017 2:12:36 PM

Please explain the quantity difference between Line Item 182 - Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall and Line Item 190 Aesthetic Surface Treatment. Shouldn't these quantities match?

Question Submitted: 6/24/2017 12:03:13 PM

Temporary sheeting walls 1A and 2A are installed adjacent to I-75 Southbound Lanes. A single lane I-75 zone will be required for safety during the installation and remove of the walls. If this work is performed at night during the allowable time for zones you will be in violation of the City of Toledo Noise Ordinance, will daytime I-75 zones be allowed for this work?

The contractor will need to request a waiver from the City of Toledo's Noise Ordinance so the work can be completed per the permitted lane closure times.

Question Submitted: 6/24/2017 11:54:43 AM

Should the fill place in front of the MSE Wall be granular due to temporary pavement in front of walls?

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 4:24:02 PM

Addendum 4 modified notes regarding the videotaping of existing overflow tunnel and interceptor sewers on plan sheet 10. The note says to record sections of these in "near proximity" to described work on the project. Plan sheet 56 shows an 84" interceptor running parallel west of IR-75 as well as a 24" line under Indiana Avenue west to east from west of IR-75. The same sheet also shows a 48" and 60" brick sewer at the intersection of S.15th and Indiana. Since the videotaping is part of a Lump Sum bid item, please define what limits of what lines we need to have videotaped so costs can be accurately included in this project.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 1:56:45 PM

How does the Mesh mount to the vandal fall and protection fence?

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 1:08:13 PM

Plan sheet 48 shows 178 s.y. worth of 615 temporary pavement from 129+50 to 131+60.89. The office calculations show permanent pavement being built up to station 129+50, as well as 1257.88 sy pavement removed from 124+99.39 to 131+60.89. Given this is a transition into a widened pavement, wouldn't it make sense to leave this temporary pavement in place?

The temporary pavement from Sta. 129+50 to Sta. 131+60.89 must remain in place when construction is complete. The pavement removed quantity accounts for the removal of the existing pavement where the permanent and temporary pavement is to be constructed. The pavement calc spreadsheet shows pavement removed down to Sta. 131+60.89 to account for the small sliver of pavement to be removed from Sta. 129+75 to Sta. 131+60.89.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 11:17:19 AM

Plan sheet 63 shows the waterline alignment being 3' off the edge of the new concrete walk to the center of trench. City of Toledo Construction Standard plan sheet 43 (Waterline Trench Details) calls for granular backfill if any portion of the trench is within a certain distance from edge of pavement. Does this distance also apply to edge of sidewalk?

Granular backfill is required for the distance to the edge of pavement, it is not required to apply to the edge of walk.

Question Submitted: 6/23/2017 11:10:43 AM

Plan sheet 63 gives waterline information. Note #1 says that city of Toledo reconnects to existing waterline. Does contractor or city provide fittings for connections at each end?

We will answer this question by addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 4:26:13 PM

Bid Item #7- Traffic Islands Removal: owner plan quantity appears to be understated per what is shown on "office calculations" as compared to what is onsite. Please review and revise the quantity.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 2:38:25 PM

An item for a Pressure Relief Joint, Type B is shown on page 26/121 but was not included on the EBS file.

The item will be added by addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/22/2017 1:16:56 PM

On Plan Sheet 18 of 121 under the 'EXISTING RUBMLE STRIPS' note it states that the milling & filling of existing rumble strips on I-75 is to be included in the Lump Sum for Maintaining Traffic. Is it the intent of the department to not re-cut the rumble strips on I-75 after the work is complete, because there is no bid item for rumble strips? Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 5:22:57 PM

Should there be a bid item added for removal of existing concrete slope protection at abutments?

The work for the concrete slope protection removal is included with Item 202 Structure Removed, As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 5:04:08 PM

Based on AS-2-15, should an item for a pressure relief joint type B be provided per BP-2.4?

A pressure relief joint is required beyond the forward abutment at Washington Street Ramp C. The pay item for a Type B joint at Washington Street is included in the roadway general summary in the "PAVEMENT" section. All other locations are flexible and do not require joints.

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 1:42:12 PM

There are several drainage bid items (conduit and structures) that are "As Per Plan" referring to notes on sheets 7 and 8 to refer to City of Toledo standards. Part of the City's standards (Part A Standards 2017) on page A-30 calls for deleting ODOT CMS requirements for 611.04B through 611.04D. Please verify that these are or not required for all "APP" drainage items that apply to City of Toledo specifications.

There are 3 different types of drainage items referenced on sheets 7 & 8. See further information below.- Catch Basin/Manhole Miscellaneous- Conduit, As Per Plan- Catch Basin No. 8, As Per Plan
Catch Basin/Manhole Miscellaneous: These are simply City of Toledo standard structures. They should conform to all City of Toledo standards, including page A-30 referenced below.
Conduit, As Per Plan: These are conduits installed as part of the City of Toledo drainage systems. They are "as per plan" because the City of Toledo limits the acceptable pipe materials more restrictively than ODOT does. See page 8 of the General Notes. They should conform to all City of Toledo standards, including page A-30.
Catch Basin No. 8, As Per Plan:

These are standard ODOT structures that will need get covered and buried (as described in the note) to be unearthed in the future LUC-75-1.10 project. Page A-30 of the City of Toledo standards indicates that the City of Toledo does not require the contractor to submit an installation plan, construction inspection forms, or performance reports for their drainage facilities, as required for ODOT facilities. Thus, the contractor, for this City system, need not comply with those 3 requirements for all Catch Basin/Manhole Miscellaneous items and all Conduit, As Per Plan items.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/21/2017 1:10:13 PM

Bid Item 29, Foundation Test Pit needs clarified. This is our interpretation of this item:

STEP 1-Excavate a trench with the following dimensions = total width of subgrade x 3' deep x 5' long (Bid Item#29, paid by the hour).

STEP 2-Engineer will evaluate.

STEP 3-Backfill with either embankment (paid as Bid Item #27 or #28) or granular material type B (paid as Bid Item #32).

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 3:36:23 PM

Per the details on sheets 72 & 121 the sheet pile walls 1C & 2B are located 28' from the back face of the MSE wall. We have plotted the proposed location of the 60" bore & jack pipe and have found the its location is directly under the proposed sheet pile wall. We assume that the existing 60" pipe in front of the MSE wall will be removed prior to MSE wall construction since the note on sheet 116 states that it is to be removed for MSE wall installation. Please advise.

There is limited working space for the sheeting wall relative to the sewer, thus its location was determined and shown on Sheet 120. Stations and offsets for the placement of the temporary sheeting wall are shown on sheet 120 of 121. There is a bend in in the wall at Sta. 306+41.68.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 11:05:58 AM

In the MSE Wall Bid Items SGB Inspection and Compaction Testing is not included. Will ODOT add this bid item?

The pay item will be added by Addenda.

Question Submitted: 6/20/2017 9:47:09 AM

To expand on a previous question, Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, APP: Contractor Designed Maintenance of Traffic (page 16 of 121) seems to indicate that the contractor's MOT plan should supplement current notes, plans, and quantities provided in the current drawing set. Will adjustments be made to existing bid items by the contractor's MOT plan (i.e., law enforcement officer, replacement signs, replacement drums, pavement for maintaining traffic, etc.). Will all adjustments/overruns resulting from the Contractor's design be recognized and paid for in the respective bid items listed under the maintenance of traffic section (line items 149 to 171)?

No, include any quantities, materials, labor and equipment needed in the Contractor Designed Maintenance of Traffic, As Per Plan into the lump sum bid item. Any additional items needed will not be paid as additional pay items or overruns.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 3:20:39 PM

Bid items 83 and 84: Will ODOT allow the contractor to bore/jack a 0.50" ungalvanized casing pipe conforming to 748.06 containing joints with a circumferential fully penetrating B-U4B weld performed by an ODOT-approved field welder and allow the installed casing pipe to be the storm water conveyance pipe (without requiring hydrostatic testing) as has been allowed on several projects on the IR-75 corridor in northwest Ohio?

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 3:18:05 PM

1. Regarding the temp fence shown on top of the as per plan portable concrete barrier on sheet 77 and 78 in the project plans. Please provide more direction regarding the type, height and fastening guidelines to be used and installed. The as per plan note seems to be missing which may have provided this information.

Question Submitted: 6/19/2017 1:16:23 PM

Bid items 34 and 195 are both same ODOT specification and description but differing plan notes (one being in the roadway section with notes on plan sheet 10 and one in the structure section with notes on plan sheet 74). Is this a need for two separate bid items with different specifications or to have one consolidated bid item with unified specifications?

We will officially add a second bid item and clarify by Addendum with new plan sheets.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/15/2017 4:25:44 PM

Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, APP: Contractor Designed Maintenance of Traffic (page 16 of 121) seems to indicate that the contractor's MOT plan should supplement current notes, plans, and quantities provided in the current drawing set. Does this mean that quantity adjustments made to existing bid items by the contractor's MOT plan (i.e., portable concrete barrier, line striping, impact attenuators, etc.) will be realized and paid for in the respective bid items?

No, include any quantities, materials, labor and equipment needed in the Contractor Designed Maintenance of Traffic, As Per Plan into the lump sum bid item.

Question Submitted: 6/14/2017 4:48:32 PM

Information regarding Temporary Sheeting Walls 1D and 2C is missing from the plan documents. Please provide the minimum required section modulus and minimum embedment depth for Wall 1D, among with the minimum required section modulus for Wall 2C.

We will revise the details of the temporary sheeting walls by Addendum.

Question Submitted: 6/13/2017 1:38:41 PM

Reviewing Maintenance of Traffic General Notes, specifically page 16 of 121, column 4, Item 614, MAINTAINING TRAFFIC, AS PER PLAN CONTRACTOR DESIGNED MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC PLAN, it notes some details have been provided for Indiana Ave and Washington Street Ramp C. Specifically, reviewing the Portable Barrier 32 inch, plan sheet 20 of 121, calls for 520 feet of wall from station 298+80 to 311+60. The Portable Barrier Wall is shown on plan sheet 22 beginning on Ramp C, approximately station 126+00 and ending on Indiana Ave at 311+60. Beginning station 298+80 does not seem to fit. Please clarify. In addition, should the Portable Concrete wall begin on ramp C where the work begins?

Portable concrete barrier sheet changes are included on Sheet 20 (revised by future addendum). In reference to the final question asking about the begin portable barrier location along Ramp C; in addition to the notes on sheet 16, please refer to the portable barrier notes on Sheet 17 of the plans. Note that the contractor designed MOT will likely increase the quantities for portable barrier and other items not otherwise shown or quantified in the plans.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 3:53:04 PM

Plan sheet 10 of 121, second column, first paragraph, "VIDEO INSPECTION/RECORDING OF OVERFLOW TUNNEL AND INTERCEPTOR SEWERS", requires the contractor to employ an experienced underground video inspection firm to perform a before and after video recording of the existing overflow tunnel and interceptor sewers in close proximity to the work. How will this work be measured and paid?

The pay item is listed on Sheet 10 as ITEM 208 VIBRATION CONTROL AND MONITORING, AS PER PLAN, but it is out of place. We will revise the sheet by Addenda to clear this up.

Question Submitted: 6/12/2017 3:39:12 PM

There are 54 piles in the rear and forward abutment with an order length shown in the plans (73/121) as 110'. Total furnished length should be 5,940 LF based on the information given, however the General Summary (76/121) lists a quantity of 5,800 LF of 14x73 piling furnished. Which is correct, the order length or the General Summary?

There is a plan issue. We will release revised drawings by Addenda to clarify.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 3:27:08 PM

In evaluating the schedule for this project, a duration of 13 months is not attainable based on a starting date of August 2017. The nature of the work that would need to be completed during the winter months, specifically MSE wall construction, is not possible. The completion date should be extended to allow the Contractors to have the entire 2018 construction season to complete the project. Will the Department extend the completion date to allow the appropriate time required to complete the work?

The completion date will be moved to 9-30-18. The Department prefers to keep the completion schedule. This bridge is in poor condition and we prefer to avoid extending this project.

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 3:20:58 PM

This project is very complex, with requirements for Contractor designed MOT and large quantities of temporary shoring and sheeting to analyze. Will the Department consider delaying the project letting date to allow Contractors necessary time to review and estimate this project?

The project will be moved to the June 29, 2017 letting.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 6/6/2017 3:13:47 PM

The proposal contains PN 109 - Dispute Resolution Advisor Process. Does the Department actually intend to implement the DRA process on this project?

The proposal note PN 109 - Dispute Resolution Advisor Process shall be removed from this contract.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 11:32:06 AM

The Structure General Notes on sheet 73/121 state that the bridge deck parapet can not be slip-formed. In light of the fact that similar notes on Projects 140268, 140485, 140536, and 160059, were modified to allow slip-forming of the parapets will ODOT change this note and allow the Indiana Avenue parapets to be slip-formed as well?

Yes

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 11:24:37 AM

The proposal states that the completion date for this project is 06/01/2020, but the General Summary and Line 242 in the proposal both list a quantity of 13 months for the Field Office. Which is correct?

The completion date will be revised to 9-30-18.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 11:17:53 AM

Under the DETOUR ROUTES / EXISTING TRAFFIC SIGNAL ADJUSTMENTS note on sheet 16/121 it states that "Payment for all labor, equipment and materials to adjust signals along detour routes shall be included in the lump sum contract price for Item 614, Maintaining Traffic." Is this correct? If so, what work does the Department or City of Toledo anticipate the Contractor performing? This work has traditionally been performed by COT forces after proper notice and coordination.

The City of Toledo will be performing this work.

Question Submitted: 6/5/2017 11:13:07 AM

Can copies of the existing bridge plans and office calculations be posted online?

**Please see the FTP site link:
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-86926/>**