

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170530

Sale Date - 11/2/2017

CUY-87628 - IR 90-26.16/VAR

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 3:09:31 PM

Comparing the median gutter final deck elevations between EB and WB in the deck screed tables provided, the following is observed. Bridge 2616 has approximately 1" difference. Bridge 2639 has 2.4" difference. Bridge 2674 has 0" difference. Based on this, is the bid item for diamond grinding added in addendum one for 2674 necessary? Also sheets 163,164,166,167 of Addendum 1 (for bridge 2639) do not appear to be correct considering the 2.4" difference in final deck elevation will carry thru to the approaches. Please review.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 11:05:13 AM

The quantity for References 301, 303, 305 Wearing Course Removed added in Addendum 1 appear to be significantly overstated. Could the Department please review and revise?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 11:03:25 AM

The quantity for References 92, 142, 185 Unclassified Excavation, APP appear to be significantly overstated. Would the Department consider adjusting these to Lump Sum in order to eliminate pay quantity discrepancy?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 11:01:23 AM

The quantity for References 94, 144, 187 Dowel Holes appear to be significantly overstated. Could the Department please review and revise?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 10:58:39 AM

The quantity for References 87 & 182 Port of Str Remvd, APP Timber Subdecking appear to be overstated. The quantity reflects the total deck, but only part of the deck is currently false decked. Could the Department please review and revise?

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 8:25:11 AM

Note on Sheet 135/222, bottom right of page states "Existing End Crossframe Gusset Plate to Be Replaced Per GSD-1-13." This is typically part of the EXJ-4-87 joint. Please confirm where the pay item is.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 3:19:11 PM

Please post the roadway drawings from the original construction of the median barrier for this section. Looks to be included in the 1975 project that also upgraded the median barrier on the bridges.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 2:25:51 PM

Please provide MOT details for the closing of lanes and ramps for the surface streets. Several operations will require MOT with the most significant being paint.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:38:41 PM

The note on sheet 11 describes the work required for Ref 44 Lighting, Misc.: Replace Conduit In Parapet, but it does not call out maintaining the circuits during construction. The structure plans show these locations to be "active tower lighting". Will the contractor be required to maintain the tower lighting circuit(s) during construction?

The existing tower lighting cable runs under the bridge and is hung between the cross frames. It is a direct buried cable that comes out of the ground around the abutment and then under the beams. This conduit is to be maintained by the contractor until the new conduit is placed.

*** 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: 10/17/2017 9:05:07 AM

Given the required phasing, please consider extending the completion date so that painting can be finished in 2020.

Completion date will be extended, see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 8:43:51 AM

Remove ref item 210. This structure is being converted to semi-integral.

Agree. Reference item 210 will be removed with the forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 1:37:09 PM

Replacement of Deteriorated End Crossframes on Sht 112 – Please clarify the “Type C” designation for GSD-1-96. This designation is not shown on the standard drawing.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 1:36:24 PM

Please clarify what members are to be paid under Ref# 105 - Structural Steel Members, Level UF.

The cross frames and bolted stiffener angles are to be paid under Ref# 105 - Structural Steel Members, Level UF. Clarification will be provided in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 1:35:43 PM

Please define the work desired for Ref# 128 – Reset Bearing. This work is not defined in CMS section 516. Is the plan quantity of 16 each correct? Plans identify 8 each locations.

Clarification will be provided in the forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 9:25:25 AM

Please provide exact office calculations for the Fatigue Retrofits. They are not listed on the ODOT site.

Fatigue retrofit details and pay items are being revised. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 9:39:36 AM

Please advise the exact quantity of plates AT PHASE LINE (starred on sheets 132 and 171. Lower left side of plan page.)

Fatigue retrofit details and pay items are being revised. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/12/2017 7:54:35 PM

Due to numerous questions, please consider revising the pay unit to per pound for the Fatigue Retrofits.

Fatigue retrofit details and pay items will be revised. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/12/2017 10:14:54 AM

Please consider revising response to Prebid Question submitted on 9/19/2017 at 11:49 AM in regards to Type A and Type 2 Waterproofing.

The Type A Waterproofing for the approach slabs is considered as an incidental to Item 526 per standard drawing. Waterproofing for construction joints is Type A waterproofing unless noted otherwise. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 4:31:26 PM

On page 171 a border is around what should be included in the pay item Structural Steel, Misc.: Fatigue Retrofit for piers 1 and 3 (top right). This detail shows both top and bottom cover plate retrofits. Page 170 indicates that only top cover plate retrofits are to be performed at piers 1 and 3 at this location. Please clarify.

Fatigue retrofit contingency pay items will be removed. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 11:30:57 AM

Add items for subgrade prep and aggregate base beneath the approach slabs.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 10:28:02 AM

Line item 106 appears to only account for the beam weights. Where are we to account for the field splice plates, and stiffeners?

Quantity for line item 106 will be corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 10:20:32 AM

How is traffic to transition from the roadway to the structures since we are including a temporary wedge of deck concrete in the median on E185th and Neff in the WB direction? Please clarify details for temporary pavement required throughout the project in the median for MOT and subsequent restoration.

See addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 9:47:06 AM

Please add a pay item to the Neff Road structure for diamond grinding the deck and approach slabs as it is on E185th.

Pay item for diamond grinding at Neff Road bridge was added in Addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 9:41:41 AM

For the fatigue retrofit detail shown on sheet 207 is the additional length (5'-0") outside the border to be paid as directed along with the shim plates? This would mean the contractor is paid both the required and as directed quantity. Please clarify.

Fatigue retrofit details and pay items are being revised. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 9:23:15 AM

On page 171 a border is around what should be included in the pay item Structural Steel, Misc.: Fatigue Retrofit at pier 2. This detail shows both top and bottom cover plate retrofits. Page 170 indicates that only top cover plate retrofits are to be performed at pier 2. Is pier 2 actually going to have both top and bottom retrofits? If so, then the bid quantity needs increased by 34 each. If not, correct the detail on page 171.

Sheet 171 will be revised to eliminate contingency pay items for fatigue retrofits. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 1:52:42 PM

Fatigue Retrofit Note on sheets 112, 153, and 190 states "All or a portion of "Item 513 – Structural Steel, Misc.: Fatigue retrofit, as Directed by the Engineer" may be non-performed at no additional cost to the State." Due to the tight schedule on the project, this material will need to be onsite. It is not feasible to fabricate the steel and order bolts (testing required by ODOT for TE-24) after the Engineer has determined need. Would the department consider paying for the material and shipping costs of these materials per 109.05 in case the materials are not needed?

Contingency pay items will be removed from plans. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 1:51:56 PM

Fatigue Retrofit Note on sheets 112, 153, and 190 discuss surface prep prior to installation as being blast cleaned to near white condition. Is a 514 primer required after surface prep?

Prime coat is not required. These are friction connections to remain unpainted at the faying surfaces.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 1:50:14 PM

Fatigue Retrofit Note on sheets 112, 153, 190: Note states "At deck construction phase lines, the retrofit on each side of the phase line will be considered one location." Since each side is considered one location, the plan quantity is short the number of phase line locations. If the intention is to pay for retrofits "on both sides of the phase line as one location", please clarify the note.

Both sides of the phase line are considered one location.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 11:23:53 AM

Ref 2 Pavement Removed, Asphalt includes removal of the temporary pavement. Removal of temporary pavement is typically incidental to item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A (REF 79). Could Ref 2 Pavement Removed, Asphalt be eliminated?

Removal of temporary pavement is incidental to Item 615, Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A. See forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/6/2017 1:39:59 PM

Please add the temporary concrete pavement wedge to the deck concrete quantity and add bid items to grind out the wedge prior to the median barrier placement. And remove the portion of the note on page 115, 155 and 192 that indicates this work is incidental to 614.

The concrete wedge is placed with the deck and the concrete quantity is included with the deck concrete quantities. Quantity for diamond grooving will be included with forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/6/2017 1:04:47 PM

Please extend the pavement marking quantities both permanent and temporary to construct the project and remove the notes throughout the plans that indicate various pavement markings are incidental to item 614, "Maintaining Traffic"

Bid as shown and noted in the plans.

Question Submitted: 10/6/2017 12:03:45 PM

Please add bid items for the installation, removal and pavement repair of the type 2 slotted drain described in Note 3 on page 24/222. Also provide bid items for the installation, removal and pavement repair of the outlet pipes as well as the location of where the outlet pipes ties into the existing storm drainage system.

Bid as per plans.

Question Submitted: 10/2/2017 5:00:44 PM

Reference sheet 92 of the plan. A pay item for "ITEM 659 - SEEDING AND MULCHING, AS PER PLAN:..." is identified. No such pay item is listed in the proposal or the ebs file.

Seeding and Mulching pay item will be corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/2/2017 1:47:00 PM

The Barrier Single/Slope B1 and C1 quantities do not reflect the each items (inlets, anchors, barrier transitions) that are paid separate and length of the structure that the parapet is paid under the bridge quantities.

See forthcoming addendum with correct barrier pay items.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2017 9:21:26 AM

Following up on the pre-bid question submitted on 9/12/17 regarding Item 622 Barrier, Misc.: Modify Barrier. It is still unclear as to the method that will be acceptable for the runs of portable barrier with traffic maintained on both sides. The answer to the question says the method shall be determined by the contractor, but the note on sheet 14 says the method shall be approved by the Engineer. Please provide more detail on the method to be performed as we do not know what the Engineer will accept. If there is not acceptable method determined pre-bid, please consider removing the bid item and performing as extra work so the method can be mutually agreed upon during construction.

The Engineer will approve any method that blocks the flow of water and does not create a snag point/traffic hazard.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2017 9:09:11 AM

In response to ODOT's answer to prebid question of 9/18/2017 at 10:18:35 AM: The existing median wall from site visit appears to be the older MC-type standard median wall where the wall section is doweled into the foundation. Trying to remove the wall without either damaging the foundation or leaving exposed vertical dowels is easier said than done. The answer about having a pay item for pavement for maintaining traffic only applies for the 127 s.y. worth where E.185th meets the Westbound on-ramp and doesn't apply to the median. Given these scenarios, please consider setting up quantities for pavement for maintaining traffic to account for removal and replacement of median wall foundations.

See forthcoming addendum for revised concrete median removed, as per plan note and additional pavement for maintaining traffic quantities.

Question Submitted: 9/22/2017 8:27:55 AM

Please consider revising response to Prebid Question submitted on 9/19/2017 at 11:43:48 AM in regards to preformed elastomeric compression joint seal pay items.

Preformed elastomeric compression joint seal is required for approach slab and will be considered incidental per standard drawing AS-1-15. Per standard drawing, all the following items will be considered incidental to item 526: incidental items listed in 526.08, preformed expansion joint filler and joint sealer at approach slab joints, the Type "A" or "E" waterproofing, and the preformed elastomeric compression joint seal at the bridge limit end of the approach slab. See forthcoming addendum.

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

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/20/2017 10:51:26 AM

Please respond to the Prebid Question submitted on 9/12/2017 at 11:23:27 AM in regards to Item 622 Barrier, Misc.: Modify Barrier.

Sand bags are acceptable provided they are placed to prevent storm water from passing under the barrier and shall not be placed on the traffic side of barrier. Sand bags are not acceptable for barrier runs with traffic maintained on both sides. Method of adjusting portable barrier shall be determined by the contractor as described on sheet 14.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2017 3:07:16 PM

Sheets 149,186,222 list the rebar for the bridge parapets (railing, transitions, median). There is a note saying the weight is for reference only. Should the rebar be included in the Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel bid items?

The reinforcing steel for the railing and median barrier should be included with epoxy coated reinforcing steel items. This will be corrected with the forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2017 11:49:09 AM

Ref 104, 153, 196 are Type A Waterproofing. If this is at the approach slab, it is incidental to the approach slab. Did the designer intend for this item to be Type 2 waterproofing at the phaseline joints? If so please review bid items and quantities and revise if needed.

The Type A Waterproofing is for the approach slabs and will be included as an incidental to Item 526 per standard drawing. Waterproofing for construction joints will be revised to Type 2 waterproofing. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2017 11:43:48 AM

REF 120, 164, 207 Prefomed Elastomeric Compression Joint Seal items seem to be duplicated with Armorless Prefomed Joint Seal items. Should these three reference items be eliminated?

No, the Compression joint Seal Item is to be placed at the approach slab joint immediately adjacent to the bridge. The Armorless prefomed Joint Seal is to be placed at the sleeper slab end of the approach slab. Bid as per plans.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2017 9:57:41 AM

The quantities for REF 121 Armorless Pref Jt Sl and REF 122 Armorless Pref Jt Sl, APP seem to be flipped. Could the Department please review?

Quantities will be corrected in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 4:44:34 PM

Please clarify the sequence of construction for the approach slab median Phase 1 and Phase 6 work. Is there a joint of any kind in between EB and WB approach slabs similar to the deck? Also, please clarify qty of Mechanical Connectors shown on sheet 147 for the approach slabs. They seem significantly overstated.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 4:36:23 PM

Sheet 115 appears to show Phase 1 poured back as a single pour for EB/WB. Sheet 118 Phase 6 shows the contractor removing the temp crossframes and sawcutting between EB/WB. Plan note 4 under Item 511 on sheet 111 says to construct the median deck phase as one unit, with no median joint. Sheet 139 shows the EB/WB and says Phase 1 EB and Phase 1 WB shall be placed under two separate deck pours. The section shows GFRP bars and 1" PEJF in the joint. Please clarify the sequence of work for Phase 1 and Phase 6 deck. Should the note regarding two deck pours and detail showing PEJF on sheet 139 be eliminated?

Sheet 139 will be revised. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 10:25:30 AM

There is an asphalt overlay on the existing approach slabs of all three structures. Typically this is paid for under a wearing course removed item or with the roadway pavement planning item. Please clarify where the removal of asphalt on the approach slabs is to be paid.

Wearing course removed will be added to the plans. See forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 10:18:35 AM

Bid item 2- Concrete Median Removed, 2150 ft.; there are several issues with this item. First of all median removed is a per square yard unit price and not a per foot price. Second of all, there is no concrete barrier removed to match the intent of the item. Finally, there are no bid items of what is to fill the void of the removed barrier wall foundation (temporary pavement, asphalt pavement, or concrete pavement) so that traffic can run on it during phases 2-5. Please review this bid item as well as what to do about the created median void and answer in an addendum.

Per the ODOT 2016 Item Master, Item 202E30500 is a Linear Foot item. The Concrete Median Removed item is the removal of the median barrier. The intent is for the contractor to remove the barrier only as necessary to allow for maintenance of traffic. It is not the intent for the contractor to remove the existing concrete pavement or foundation below the median barrier. There is a separate pay item for pavement for maintaining traffic which is to be used where necessary including the median removal areas. See forthcoming addendum that will revise the concrete median removed item to an "as per plan" pay item with a clarifying note.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 10:14:25 AM

In the bridge phase removal details on sheets 115-118, 155-158, and 193-195, some of the runs of barrier wall are called out with "no anchors". These same runs of barrier are quantified in the subsummary on sheet 18 as Item 622, Portable Barrier, 32", Bridge Mounted or Portable Barrier, 50", Bridge Mounted, As Per Plan. Since no anchors are required for these sections of barrier wall, will the quantity be changed to Item 622 Portable Barrier, 32" and Portable Barrier, 50", As Per Plan?

No, bid as per plans. Bridge mounted barrier is required whether it is anchored or not anchored on the bridges and approach slabs as indicated in the plans. 50" height will be established with glare screens on 32" portable concrete barrier as indicated in the plans.

Question Submitted: 9/12/2017 11:23:27 AM

Plan note on sheet 14 regarding Item 622 Barrier, Misc.: Modify Barrier says that the contractor shall make adjustments to portable barrier to prevent storm water from passing under the barrier. Will sandbags placed along one side of the barrier be sufficient for this item of work? If not, could the Department please provide an alternative method?

This question is being looked into and a response is forthcoming.

Project No. 170551

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

COL-102371 - SR 11-11.14

Question Submitted: 9/13/2017 9:08:03 AM

Plan note on page 6 requires 32 pounds/sy total agg on level and surface courses. What poundage required on surface only? (Shoulders)

In areas that only required the placement of a Microsurfacing, Surface Course and not a Leveling Course, C&MS 421.10 shall be followed, using an application rate of 21 to 24 pounds per square yard.

Project No. 170553

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

HIG-92789 - CR 5-14.29 & SR 73-15.15

Question Submitted: 10/5/2017 2:41:34 PM

Can the CAD files be provided for this project?

Project No. 170555

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

SHE-99375 - SR 571/SR 721-06.61/11.04

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:58:01 PM

Items 37 and 38 indicate QC/QA testing. Due to small quantity (total of 14 CY for both), will only 1 set of lab cured cylinders be needed on the project?

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 10:46:05 AM

Pg. 29/55 Under Proposed Work Note 7 States to Refurbish All Abutment Rocker And Pier Fascia Bolsters. There is not a bid item to Refurbish any bearings. Please advise.

Strike the text referencing refurbishing the bearings in note 7 on sheet 29/55 and note 3, under Additional Bridge Rehabilitation on sheet 33/55. There are no changes to bid items.

*** 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: 10/11/2017 3:13:09 PM

Please add line items for the new Bridge Terminal Assemblies shown on plan page 27.

Bridge Terminal Assembly item will be added to the plan. An addendum will be forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 10/3/2017 9:35:05 AM

Plan sheet 9/55 has a note limiting the detour to 14 days on S.R. 721, on sheet 10 the notice sign shows 21 days. Will ODOT allow a 21 day closure (this is preferred). Can ODOT please clarify if the closure limit is 14 days or 21 days? Similar projects have had the 21 day limit and is almost necessary for all the minor work items and curing periods that must occur during the closure.

A 21 calendar day closure will be permitted on SR-721. An addendum will be forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 10/3/2017 9:32:10 AM

Please add a bid item for construction layout staking.

A bid item for Construction Layout Stakes and Surveying will be added by a forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 10/3/2017 8:17:40 AM

REF # 59 Drip Strip has a plan quantity of 270 LF, this only covers the bottom piece of the drip strip that runs the length of the deck. Will ODOT please add in the top pieces for over the top of the piers and at the guardrail post locations to the quantity.

The quantity of Ref 59 Drip Strip will be increase in an upcoming addendum.

Project No. 170556

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

OTT-101093 - /SAN Deck Sealing FY18

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 1:44:05 PM

Will ODOT require all pavement markings on the 21 structures to be removed? If so, can you provide estimated qtys for the installation of the new pavement markings?

Question Submitted: 9/27/2017 1:39:27 PM

Structures 5 thru 11 are on the 4 lane section of SR 2 in Ottawa County. APP note on sheet 3/25 lists daytime lane restrictions for SR 2. This note contradicts the ODOT Permitted Lane Closure page where there are no restrictions reducing these locations from 2 lanes to 1 lane. Please clarify.

The timeframes stipulated in the Maintaining Traffic note on plan sheet 3 supersede any permitted lane closure times on the ODOT website.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2017 1:29:33 PM

The first 4 structures in Ottawa County on SR 2 consist of 2 lanes. The APP note on sheet 3/25 allows a 6 hour daytime work window between 9 AM and 3 PM. C&MS spec 512.06D requires a 6 hour cure time on the resin before traffic is allowed on it. Is it your intent that this work be performed at night with flaggers using Std. Dwg. MT101.60? If so, will temporary signals be allowed in lieu of flaggers for worker safety since this is a historically dangerous stretch of SR 2?

The intent is that the work on these structures be completed at night. Lane closures shall be as per MT-97.10. As an alternative, the Contractor may use temporary signals as per MT-96.11 except drums shall be used in lieu of portable barrier. MT-101.60 does not apply to these structures.

Project No. 170559

Sale Date - 11/2/2017

SCI-102381 - US 52-19.01

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 5:18:31 PM

Item 1-Pavement Removed; The unit of measure should be SF not SY?

Item 21-Asphalt Concrete Surface 12.5mm, Type A(448); Quantity is understated? Sheet 9 of 17 is calculated at 1 1/4" & Sheet 10 of 17 did not calculate a quantity for the 12.5mm needed on the 3 1/4" Milling?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 3:30:23 PM

On ref# 17 RRCM is specified as the concrete to be used for the rigid replacement. Can this be replaced with regular fast set concrete. We are having difficulty finding a supplier that can supply this material and if they are able to supply it I am told it will be a very high premium.

The Pavement Design Manual recommends using RRCM instead of the QC FS (fast set) because there have been problems due to the rapid and significant drying shrinkage with the fast set. Please bid the project as per plan.

Question Submitted: 9/25/2017 11:20:11 AM

Can you please confirm the Full Depth Sawing quantities compared to the SY for the Full Depth repairs? There is 24,553 LF of sawing for 264 SY repairs. This seems like a calculation error.

This question will be addressed by addendum.

Project No. 170560

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

SUM-100823 - MCRO FY2018(B)

Question Submitted: 10/12/2017 1:44:42 PM

Note #8 on plan sheet 4 states "All transverse joints shall extend across the full lane and shoulder width and each lane shall be free from uneven longitudinal joints." Is this note intended for microsurfacing?

That sentence does not apply. This note is standard however, this sentence will be taken out on all future microsurfacing jobs.

Project No. 170561

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

UNI-101246 - US-US 33/SR 287/SR 739-00.00/00.00/00.28

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 12:48:10 PM

Plan notes on sheet 70/84 instruct not to disturb ODOT lighting or conduit which is just behind the existing guardrail posts. New MGS guardrail will require the new posts to be moved back to match the existing alignment. Please provide details of how we are to install the new guardrail?

Installation of guardrail posts should follow the Utility Note found on Sheet 8/84. If the location of the ODOT conduit requires the posts to be installed in the same position as existing, the alignment of the guardrail may be shifted slightly closer to the roadway to accommodate.

Question Submitted: 10/3/2017 10:08:09 AM

Item 253 - Pavement Repair - APP - the note on page 9 / 84 states the average depth of removal is 13" but requires 13" of 301 and 6" of #304 for the repair. Please clarify the typical section of a 19" depth of repair materials in the 13" removal excavation.

The average depth of pavement removal shall be 19". Revised note on sheet 9/84.

Project No. 170562

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

WAR-81627 - /GRE-US 42-Culverts

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 10:29:24 AM

In regards to the question:

On WAR 42-2119, the ditch clean up includes significant cuts to get positive drainage out of the pipe. Is there survey work on the ditch to make sure we can get drainage? Also, do you have a detail of the max slopes that are acceptable to the ODOT in the area?

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 2:13:41 PM

Previous survey work has not been completed at this location. It is the contractor's means and methods on how to determine positive drainage has been achieved. The maximum side slopes for the ditch are 2:1. There is no maximum longitudinal slope, as long as positive drainage is achieved. No addendum required.

There is about a 4' cut required at the outlet of the pipe. There is no way of knowing if positive drainage can be achieved, hence the pipe filled with sediment. This ditch runs flat all the way to the river(beyond the ROW). Will the contractor be responsible if positive drainage cannot be achieved due to existing flat elevations?

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 2:13:41 PM

On WAR 42-2119, the ditch clean up includes significant cuts to get positive drainage out of the pipe. Is there survey work on the ditch to make sure we can get drainage? Also, do you have a detail of the max slopes that are acceptable to the ODOT in the area?

Previous survey work has not been completed at this location. It is the contractor's means and methods on how to determine positive drainage has been achieved. The maximum side slopes for the ditch are 2:1. There is no maximum longitudinal slope, as long as positive drainage is achieved. No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 10/12/2017 9:59:16 AM

Item 0049 42" Conduit Bored & Jacked - TyA. 707.02. Can we use a 42" casing as final drainage structure 748.06 ungalvanized?

Ungalvanized steel pipe can be used per CMS 748.06. See forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 170563

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

WYA-100745 - SR 53-06.20

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 11:35:02 AM

It appears the Wearing Course Removed, Ref 37, quantity is substantially high. The deck and approach length is 93.5' x 34' wide = 353.22 SY. Please review quantities and adjust.

The quantity for Item 202, Wearing Course Removed, Ref 37, will be revised in a forthcoming addendum. The addendum will include a revised plan sheet and the quantity will be revised to the following: 341 SY of ITEM 202E23500 - WEARING COURSE REMOVED

Question Submitted: 9/29/2017 9:35:01 AM

For the Type A Assemblies plan sheet 30/30 and the standard drawing show 6" underdrain, underdrain outlet piping, and precast reinforced concrete outlets. Please clarify if all these items are to be included and incidental to the Type A Assembly bid item. If not where are they to be paid?

The plans and related bid documents include an Item 526, Type A Installation (Type of approach slab installation) and the plans title sheet and plan sheet 20 of 30 note Standard Construction Drawing AS-2-15 shall be referenced. Please refer to this noted Standard Construction Drawing, Sheets 1-14, for details on what is included in payment for Item 526, Type A Installation. No addendum or plan change is required. Bid the project per the plans, bid documents and other related items, such as Standard Construction Drawing AS-1-15.

Question Submitted: 9/29/2017 9:32:39 AM

Plan sheet 7 shows the intended detour route but no signage required. Will ODOT be signing the detour route or is it the responsibility of the contractor? If it is the responsibility of the contractor please provide the signage legend required.

ODOT will sign the Official Signed Detour for SR 53. No addendum or plan changes are needed. Bid the project per the plan and related bid documents.

Project No. 170566

Sale Date - 11/30/2017

LOR-82632 - US 20-22.19

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 1:09:46 PM

On plan pages 70/1073 and 701/1073 this note or a slight variation of appears, "AT THE FOUNDATION LOCATIONS PROVIDE HYDRO-DEMOLITION OR OTHER NONDESTRUCTIVE MEANS TO ENSURE THE PROPOSED FOUNDATION LOCATIONS ARE CLEAR OF UNDERGROUND OBSTRUCTIONS. ONCE IT IS DETERMINED THE LOCATION IS CLEAR THEN THE FOUNDATION MAY BE INSTALLED. IF AN OBSTRUCTION IS ENCOUNTERED, NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IMMEDIATELY IF ANY FOUNDATION LOCATION NEEDS TO BE ADJUSTED, THE ENGINEER WILL DETERMINE THE REVISED LOCATION LOCATIONS". How will the contractor be compensated for their lost time if an underground obstruction is encountered and the excavation is abandon for a new location?

SUE information has been provided for the permanent foundation locations and the Signal Support Foundation, As Per Plan note on page 701/1073 indicates the method for possible adjustments of location. The contractors should include anticipated costs in this item based on the data provided. The temporary signal pole foundation costs associated with page 70/1073 are to be included in the lump sum for maintaining traffic. No changes or addendum needed.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 4:23:23 PM

The proposal has a quantity of 33 each for bid reference number 243, "SIGNAL SUPPORT FOUNDATION, APP" but the total TC-81.21 SIGNAL SUPPORTS listed on the proposal (ref #'s 247-248 & 250-259) is only 32 each. It appears the 2 each of the TC-81.21 Des-11 signal supports noted on page 708/1073 was not carried to the traffic signal subsummary on page 704/1073. Please review.

The proposal quantity of 33 EACH for bid reference number 243, "SIGNAL SUPPORT FOUNDATION, APP" is correct. The proposal quantity for bid reference number 251, "SIGNAL SUPPORT, TYPE TC-81.21, DESIGN 11" should be six (6) EACH. The quantity from page 708/1073 was carried to the traffic signal subsummary on page 704/1073 incorrectly. Corrected data will be provided in the forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 3:34:55 PM

Why isn't there a bid item for either "TRENCH IN PAVED AREA" or "CONDUIT, JACKED OR DRILLED, 3" in section 0007 LIGHTING as there is in section 0009 TRAFFIC SIGNAL of the proposal? Conduit for both lighting and traffic signals are install in basically the same location in the pavement.

All lighting conduit is anticipated to be trenched in either outside pavement areas or when the existing pavement areas are removed since the new lighting does not have to be functional at all times. The signals must be functional at all times so any conduit across the street portions of pavement is jacked or drilled or trenched in paved area so this work can be completed regardless of the phase of maintaining traffic. No change or addendum required.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 3:16:52 PM

Can the TEMPORARY traffic signal support foundations (TC-81.10) be installed using SCD TC-21.10 01-15-2015?

The TEMPORARY traffic signal support (TC-81.10) foundations are to be installed using SCD TC-21.20 (dated 7-15-16) as stated in the plans. No change or addendum required.

Question Submitted: 10/7/2017 2:24:01 PM

Sub Summary Calculations for Pavement Removed, Asphalt 55,853 SY don't appear to have been included in the "Office Calcs". Can the Department provide these?

Additional files for Quantities- Supplemental Pavement which include the office calculations for pavement removed have been added to the .ftp site for this project. No addendum required.

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LOR-82632/REFERENCE%20FILES/10_Office_Calculations/

Question Submitted: 10/3/2017 10:11:38 AM

Are the office calculations listed in the General Summary for various Bid Items available?

Additional files, including the office calculations, have been added to the .ftp site for this project. No addendum required.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LOR-82632/REFERENCE%20FILES/82632-ReferenceFiles/>

Question Submitted: 10/2/2017 10:58:25 AM

Ref # 185 calls for 3" Rigid Conduit. Was this suppose to be 725.05 plastic?

No. The 3" conduit under Reference #185 is to be 725.04 rigid galvanized steel conduit and fittings. No changes or addendum required.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 7:08:37 AM

When will plans be posted. The link has been up for a while but it doesn't work. Please advise.

The file size for the construction plans is very large. The Office of Contracts is working on a solution to solve the issue. No addendum is required.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170567

Sale Date - 11/16/2017

WOO-92088 - /LUC-SR 64-12.03/0.00 Bridge

Question Submitted: 10/20/2017 11:30:08 AM

Plan sheet 15 of 214, "Section 4F, Identified Section 4(F) Properties Commitments, paragraph #7, calls for the contractor to install fencing around Memorial Park and the former Waterville Public School Property, except for the boundary along the river. Will ODOT provide a drawing detailing the location and limits of the proposed fencing?

Question Submitted: 10/20/2017 11:26:34 AM

Plan sheet 15 of 214, "Section 4F, Identified Section 4(F) Properties Commitments, paragraph #7, calls for the contractor to install fencing around Memorial Park and the former Waterville Public School Property, except for the boundary along the river. Cost to be included in cost of Item 624 Mobilization. Is the required fencing permanent or temporary?

Question Submitted: 10/20/2017 9:15:49 AM

Will ODOT provide the office calculation for Bid Item 0018 Subgrade Compaction?

Question Submitted: 10/20/2017 8:54:58 AM

Review of Bid Item 0015 Excavation along River Road, SR 64 and SR 65, it appears Bid Item 0020 Pavement Removed area has not been deducted from the excavation area. Will ODOT confirm quantity for Bid Item 0015 Excavation?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2017 9:49:09 AM

Regarding the dowel holes for the precast pier end caps shown on sheet 154/214 of the plans, referenced note 4 states mechanical splices by means of grout filled steel sleeves with frusto-conical geometry filled with a non-shrink grout (etc.). Does this note direct the contractor to use grout filled mechanical rebar splices or can 510 dowel holes be utilized? If grout filled mechanical splices are required, to which vertical bars in the pier stem do these mechanical splices connect and can the Department provide additional details of this type of splice?

The intent of the design is to anchor the PP1001 bars coming from the precast end caps into the pier. Grout filled mechanical rebar splices are to be used to allow for the use of grout ports. The system is to be provided as sleeves that are cast into the pier to meet the development length of the reinforcing and not as mechanical splices and thus are not attached to vertical bars in the pier stem.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 4:10:18 PM

The majority of the forward and rear abutments will be built on fill. How will the general note " Item 503 Unclassified excavation, APP", (Sheet 141/214) apply in regards to granular backfill behind abutments.

The general note "Item 503 Unclassified Excavation, APP" applies to all backfill material (type and lift height) placed under Item 503 outside of the limits of porous backfill.

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 11:38:52 AM

Can the Asbestos reports be made available for contractor use for demolition of the buildings?

The asbestos reports were included in Addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 9:07:05 AM

Please disregard question from 10/10/17 9:37 AM, found plan note 142/214.

Noted.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/10/2017 9:37:21 AM

Question regarding sculpture designation for pilasters at substructure units, see Plan Sheet #171/214. On Sheet 171 there is a Sculpture Pattern Chart, can not find designations on chart referenced in plans. please clarify patterns required at substructure units for pilasters.

As indicated in the note for Item 511 - Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, Bridge Deck, As Per Plan on plan sheet 142/214, the sculptures have been donated to the City of Waterville and are to be picked up by the Contractor at the City's office. Details of the sculptures can be found at the following website: <https://www.carruthstudio.com> by searching for the sculpture pattern numbers provided on plan sheet 171/214.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 1:23:02 PM

Referencing 10/5/17, 2:55 PM question/ answer. Having reviewed office calcs. we have a large difference in the haunch quantity, used the 2" beam haunch as shown on plan sheet 171/214.

The 2" haunch thickness shown on plan sheet 171/214 is a minimum haunch thickness. The haunch of each beam varies by location. The table on plan sheet 179/214 shows the actual haunch thicknesses at tenth points along the beam. The note on plan sheet 179/214 states that "the quantity includes a variable haunch thickness that provides an allowance for beam camber and additional sacrificial haunch thickness." The original quantity calculations included the haunch at its maximum thickness. The quantity for line item 247 - Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, Bridge Deck, As Per Plan will be revised in Addendum 3 to 1,761 CY to account for the average haunch thickness.

Question Submitted: 10/6/2017 10:44:54 AM

Plan note "Item 203 Embankment, As Per Plan" on plan sheet 140 states "Place and compact embankment material in 6 inch lifts for the construction of the approach embankment between stations 632+95.45 to 633+95.45 and 4+58.99 to 5+58.99". Will the Department be providing an updated reference item for "Embankment, As Per Plan"?

Embankment, As Per Plan will be added to the earthwork quantities and removed from the Embankment quantity in Addendum 3. The quantity for Embankment will be updated with Addendum 3. The quantity for Embankment will be 39,941 CY and the quantity for Embankment, As Per Plan will be 10,324 CY. The quantity for Excavation will also be revised in Addendum 3 to 12,343 CY.

Question Submitted: 10/6/2017 10:43:20 AM

Plan sheets 154 & 155 provide the pier dimensions. Base on the dimensions in the plans will concrete associated with the piers fall under Item-511A. "Mass Concrete Requirements"? If so will the Department be providing an updated reference item for Class QC 4 Mass Concrete?

Upon review, the concrete for the piers does fall under the mass concrete requirements of C&MS 511.04.A. The quantity for the piers above footings will be changed to item 511E45603 – Class QC4 Mass Concrete, Substructure with QC/QA, As Per Plan in Addendum 3. All requirements of C&MS 511.04.A shall apply to this item.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2017 2:55:53 PM

On Plan Sheets 162 and 164/214 Note #3 states cast in place panel cap QC2 Concrete should be included with precast arch panel for payment. Our quantity check indicates this concrete may have been included with Bid Item 247 QC2 Bridge Deck APP. please clarify.

The Department has verified that line item 0247 - Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, Bridge Deck, APP does not include the cast in place panel cap QC2 Concrete.

Question Submitted: 10/3/2017 10:41:12 AM

Plan Sheet 154/214 shows form liner for piers. Assume the form liner is not required on the end radius and pier cap/beams seats. please confirm.

The textured surface shall cover the entirety of the pier including the end radius within the vertical extents of DIMENSION "L" on sheet 154/214. The "pier cap/beam seats" shall not have the textured surface.

Question Submitted: 9/29/2017 3:05:46 PM

What type of bridge deck finish will be required for the 7' Sidewalk and the 12' Shared Use Path?

The 7' sidewalk and 12' shared use path shall receive a broom finish as per C&MS 511.16 and shall be cured as per C&MS 511.14.A. Bridge deck grooving shall not be performed on the sidewalk or shared use path.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/29/2017 3:02:54 PM

Will Proposal Note-555 only apply to the bridge deck between the interior pedestrian handrails?

Proposal Note 555 shall only apply to the portion of the bridge deck between the interior steel tubular barriers (driving lanes and 4' shoulders). The smoothness of the 7' sidewalk and 12' shared use path shall conform to C&MS 511.16.

Question Submitted: 9/29/2017 2:26:01 PM

Addendum #1 included the Waterway Permit. Does ODOT's attachments to the permit and Plan Sheet 3/214 satisfy the design requirements in Section #11 of the permit, if the causeway layout shown on Sheet 3/214 is used?

The Temporary Access Fill (TAF) and construction sequencing shown on Sheet 3/214 complies with Section 203.5 of the ODOT Bridge Design Manual (2007). However, this is not intended to be a final design of the TAF as stated in Section 203.5, "A contractor's means and methods of construction will dictate the TAF required for a project." The TAF shown is for the purposes of permitting only and is intentionally oversized per Section 203.5 to eliminate delays in permitting. This does not alleviate the contractor from supplying their project specific design per the requirements of Section #11 of the permit.

Question Submitted: 9/29/2017 10:19:16 AM

Addendum #1 revised the general note on Sheet 140/214 "Item 202 Structure Removed, Over 20 Foot Span APP"; to include removal of existing bridge. The second paragraph of this note still reads "The use of explosives, headache balls, and/or hoe ram type equipment is prohibited." Since this note now applies to the existing bridge all of these methods may be necessary to remove the bridge. Will ODOT remove the above mentioned restrictions?

The Structure Removed, Over 20 Foot Span As Per Plan note will be revised in addendum 2 to prohibit the use of explosives. Headache balls and hoe ram type equipment will be allowed.

Question Submitted: 9/21/2017 12:31:41 PM

Bid item #18, SUBGRADE COMPACTION is quantified on sheet 42 of the general summary with an office calculation quantity. The office calculation quantity appears to be incorrect and referencing an office calc. number for GEOTEXTILE FABRIC. Will the department please verify or revise quantities for bid item #18 SUBGRADE COMPACTION and item #23 GEOTEXTILE FABRIC?

The quantity for line item 0018, Subgrade Compaction, should be 14,715 SY. The quantity will be revised in Addendum 1. The quantity for line item 0023, Geotextile Fabric, is correct.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 3:38:37 PM

On plan sheet 15/214 in the paragraph for Permits, Waterway Permits Commitments it says the waterway permit "shall be attached to the plans" Will ODOT make the Waterway permit available to the contractor?

The Waterway Permit Conditions will be issued in Addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 2:36:36 PM

Can the 1988 plans for the existing bridge deck replacement be furnished for contractor use?

The 1988 bridge plans have been added to the ftp site located at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-92088/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 2:35:15 PM

If demolition of the school building on parcel 30T is not included in this project when will it be removed?

The demolition of the school building was completed in the Spring of 2017.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2017 2:34:04 PM

Plan Sheet 197/214 shows a Temporary take for building demolition, construction access and material storage for 48 months for Parcel no 30T. Currently the demolition of this Brick School building is not included in this project. Is it the ODOT'S intent to include it? If so a bid item needs to be added for it.

The demolition of the school building was completed in the Spring of 2017 and is not part of this project. Parcel 30-T may be used by the Contractor for construction access and/or material storage through September 2020. If the parcel is used for construction access and/or material storage, it shall be returned to a condition equal to that existing before use.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/15/2017 10:39:53 AM

On Plan Sheet 140/214 under the Design Loading Note, loading includes "Stay in Place Forms: 0.015 KSF". On Plan Sheets 141 & 142/214 under note Item 511 - Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, (Bridge Deck) APP: it states the contractor will have to perform a redesign for the additional dead load of the SIP forming system. Per the Design Loading Note on 140/214 it appears the dead load for the SIP form system is included in the plan design. Please clarify the contractor's requirements if using an SIP form system?

The beams have been designed to accommodate a SIP form loading of 0.015 KSF, however, since the use of SIP forms is at the option of the Contractor this loading has not been included in the calculation of the dead load deflections, variable haunch thickness, or screed elevations that are provided in the plans. The Contractor is still responsible for the design to accommodate SIP forms if used. If a loading of 0.015 KSF or less is used, the current beam design is sufficient, but should be verified by the Contractor.

Question Submitted: 9/14/2017 10:50:31 AM

Bid Item 238 Structure Removed, Over 20 Foot Span, APP; is described in Basis of Payment as plaques salvaged. Bid Item 239 Portions of Structure Removed, APP; is described in Method of Payment as removal of existing wing wall prior to proposed construction. These are the only structure removal items in the plans/proposal, see Plan Sheet 140/214. Will ODOT add a bid item for removal of the existing bridge with general notes applying to the removal?

The removal of the existing bridge shall be included in line item 0238. The note for Item 202, Structure Removed, Over 20 Foot Span, As Per Plan will be updated in Addendum 1 to reflect this. The as per plan designation is to specify that the builders plaques are to be salvaged.

Question Submitted: 9/12/2017 4:52:10 PM

Plan Sheet 14/214, "Ecological Agency Coordination Comments" Note #6 addresses drilled shafts for piers. Bridge design drawings show piers with footings keyed into rock, please clarify.

Ecological Agency Coordination Commitment note #6 shall be deleted from the plans. A revised plan sheet 14 will be issued with Addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 9/12/2017 4:43:04 PM

Can drawings of existing bridge be made available?

Existing bridge plans are located at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-92088/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 9/11/2017 1:48:54 PM

Are the CAD files/design files and office calculations available?

DGN files and additional office calcs have been posted to the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-92088/Reference%20Files/>

Project No. 170568

Sale Date - 11/2/2017

ALL-87188 - SR 65/SR 81-08.02/11.34

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 12:47:54 PM

Bid Item 136, can this item be increased to provide compensation for moving the signals at SR 65 and Norther Ave.?

Bid item 136 will not be increased. Per a plan note on sheet 105, titled "ITEM 632 - SIGNALIZATION, MISC.: UNLASH AND RELASH MESSENGER WIRE", the relocation of the signals heads is included with this item. However, there is an error in the title of this note and the related item. In a forthcoming addendum, the title of the note will be edited to "ITEM 632 - MESSENGER WIRE, MISC.: UNLASH AND RELASH MESSENGER WIRE", and the pay item in the note will be revised to ITEM 632 "MESSENGER WIRE, MISC.: UNLASH AND RELASH MESSENGER WIRE".

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 12:33:04 PM

please reference plan page 14, Note 7 Maintenance of Traffic Signal Installation, paragraph 10. This paragraph sets limits on outages due to construction. Can this paragraph be removed or modified to allow adequate time for pole removal and re installation as well as signal and controller work with the intersection MOT being by stop sign?

The subject paragraph will not be removed. In a forthcoming addendum, the duration of "..FOUR HOURS..." mentioned in the subject note/paragraph will be revised to "FIVE HOURS". There will be no other revisions to the subject note/paragraph. Off-duty law enforcement officer with patrol car will remain required while the signal is out of service and until it is operating again.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/11/2017 12:26:56 PM

Ref. 144 Signal Support Foundation, can the Department provide existing signal support design information so the proper foundation can be bid?

Question Submitted: 10/5/2017 8:11:54 AM

1. After a review of the MOT notes/plans and when considering the volume of traffic moving along SR 65 and the various intersections, will ODOT consider adding a Workzone Traffic Supervisor line item for the project? It seems as though this would be of benefit to the traveling public, ODOT, and the contractor.

Per ODOT guidelines, the Worksite Traffic Supervisor is intended to be used on Interstate or Interstate look-alike projects. This item is not recommended or necessary for this project. A Worksite Traffic Supervisor item will not be provided. There are no plan changes, and no addendum is needed.

Project No. 170574

Sale Date - 11/2/2017

HOC-93884 - SR 56-06.23

Question Submitted: 10/6/2017 11:23:36 AM

Please remove PN555 from the proposal as it does not apply to this type of project.

Project No. 170578

Sale Date - 11/2/2017

MOT-95662 - Wilmington Pike 0.00

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 2:14:03 PM

would it be possible for ODOT to work out of the Lyons Road ODOT office instead of the contractor supplying/renting a field office for the project?

No. ODOT will not work out of the Lyons Road ODOT office.

Question Submitted: 10/12/2017 1:51:29 PM

The signal support mechanical damper has a note on plan page 6 which lists several approved models one of which is Hubbel 6072014. It was our understanding that the central office recently tested this model and was no longer accepting it use in these types of applications. Is the specification correct that it is acceptable for use on this project?

The Hubbel 6072014 device will be removed from the list of acceptable devices in the Signal Support, Mechanical Damper for TC-81.21 Mast Arm note.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2017 4:12:43 PM

For Bid Ref 13 & 14, will Eaton's Navion or Verdeon, as listed on SS-813, be considered as an approved equal?

Eaton's Navion or Verdeon shall be considered an approved equal if the simplephotometric template shows that they are equivalent to one of the three proposed luminaires listed in the plans.

Project No. 170579

Sale Date - 11/2/2017

PIK-87181 - SR 124-07.40 Brdg Replace

Question Submitted: 10/20/2017 10:46:00 AM

To what elevation should piers DP7-DP24 of Temporary Wall A be removed?

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 5:30:36 PM

There are no details for attaching guardrail to the arched culvert. Please provide.

The guardrail does not attach to the culvert. There is sufficient cover over the culvert. See sheet 51.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/10/2017 11:45:19 AM

Will a bid item be added for rock excavation?

An addendum will be issued to change the unclassified excavation item to 503E21330 LS UNCLASSIFIED EXCAVATION, INCLUDING ROCK AND/OR SHALE.

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 8:20:41 AM

Please clarify Note #7 on plan sheet 53 of 76. Is there concrete to be placed below the rock channel protection (for the full width of the RCP) to the bottom of the footings? Can a detail be provided showing the location of the concrete backfill?

Note 7 on plan sheet 53 will be deleted by an addendum.

Question Submitted: 10/5/2017 9:26:07 AM

Will a bid item be added for the removal of the existing approach slabs?

A bid item will be added for the removal of the existing approach slabs. See forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 170582

Sale Date - 11/2/2017

WAS-93848 - IR 77-04.73

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 10:19:59 AM

Is there a specific reason as to why the completion date cannot be moved to the end of October? Bridge painting season ends at the end of October so shouldn't a bridge painting project end then as well?

Completion date will remain the same as specified in the proposal.

Question Submitted: 9/28/2017 1:10:49 PM

Please post existing plans for all structures.

Existing plans have been posted to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WAS-93848/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 9/26/2017 1:08:44 PM

Regarding the project completion date would the Department please consider extending it to October 31st. to coincide with the end of the bridge painting season?

The completion date shall remain as is.

Project No. 170587

Sale Date - 11/30/2017

MAH-80192 - IR 680/SR 164-Interchange (PART 1)

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 9:17:30 AM

Please provide the dgn files for this project.

The DGN files are available. The files can be found here: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MAH-80192/Reference%20Files/DGN/>

Question Submitted: 10/2/2017 8:05:58 AM

Is this project for Part 1 only? The plans have Part 1 information but the proposal shows items for Parts 1,2 & 3. Please advise.

This project consists of 3 Parts. Plans for all 3 Parts are available in the plan PDF.

Project No. 170597

Sale Date - 11/16/2017

MOT-99623 - IR 70-03.34

Question Submitted: 10/20/2017 12:41:40 PM

What are the limits of line 0194 203E10000 Excavation and line 0195 203E20000 Embankment?

Question Submitted: 10/19/2017 10:07:58 AM

Proposal does not include any connector kits. Please advise.

An addendum is forthcoming to address this omission.

*** 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: 10/19/2017 8:53:51 AM

Where is the 5 inch thick preformed expansion joint filler used?

This is for the expanded polystyrene filler at the abutments in between the beam seats and the semi-integral diaphragms. It should be incidental to the superstructure concrete per SICD-1-96. An addendum is forthcoming which will remove this pay item.

Question Submitted: 10/19/2017 7:49:17 AM

Please consider extending the closure period on this project to at least 180 days.

The road closure period will be increased to 150 calendar days. An addendum is forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:48:57 PM

Is it ODOT's intent to reuse the existing signal support foundation located on page 74 of the plans for SP-2 the TC-12.30 design 9 combination pole? It looks as if the existing pole is in the exact same location.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:15:44 PM

The existing plans posted on ODOT's website only contain a rehab job done under the 2010 specs. Can the original plans for the structure be posted to the website or made available?

**The original plans for the structure in located on ODOT's website: MOT-70-02731962
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-99623/Reference%20Files/**

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:14:23 PM

Will ODOT consider extending the completion date into 2019 for the bridge painting and sealing. With the amount of work to be completed including all the ornamental work and deck striping it is very unreasonable to complete the painting in 2018 especially by Sept. 30th. Please institute an interim completion date for the construction allowing painting and sealing to be done in the 2019 season.

The Completion date will remain 9/30/18.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:12:42 PM

Please confirm the notes on sheet 8/136 for the short duration closures and permitted lane closure times. It appears no lane closures are allowed on Thursday and Friday nights. This will affect demolition, erection, bridge striping, painting, and more than likely other activities in an area where the permitted lane closure tables has lengthy times allowed for single lane closures on all nights during all season. Please re-visit this decision as this will greatly impact the projects costs and schedule.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:09:37 PM

Please look at the type D barrier item and add any end sections or end anchors that may be needed and decrease the footage of the type D barrier item.

An addendum is forthcoming to correct these quantities.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:08:35 PM

Please consider allowing 180 days for the closure. Similar bridges of this nature have allowed and needed 180 to 210 days. This bridge will take even more time than those due to the large amounts of formliner and decorative pieces. The bridge also has a sidewalk on it which is an extra week of work and curing. Additionally all parapets require form liner which make all of them hand set parapet where slip forming cannot be used which takes more time. Lastly almost all of the demolition and erection work must occur over traffic which requires night work and cannot be expediated or double shifted to help make the schedule faster. Please consider lengthening the closure duration as with curing time frames, ornamental work, and traffic influences 120 days cannot be met.

The road closure period will be increased to 150 calendar days. An addendum is forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 1:03:03 PM

Will threaded connections in the reinforcing steel be allowed at the construction joint between the sidewalk and left parapet?

No

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 12:47:09 PM

Detail 1 on 118/136 shows a vertical construction joint between the left parapet and the sidewalk 3 inches from the face of the left parapet? Section B and C on 126/136 do not show this vertical construction joint but only a horizontal construction joint between the sidewalk and parapet. Is the vertical construction joint shown on Detail 1 required and if so is it required on both the superstructure and approach sidewalk and parapet?

The vertical construction joint is required to avoid placing a CJ within lettered portion of the formed parapet. The vertical CJ is not required on the approach slab.

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 11:37:28 AM

Does line 205 CLASS QC2 CONCRETE WITH QC/QA, BRIDGE DECK (PARAPET) include the sidewalk on the bridge?

Line 205 CLASS QC2 CONCRETE WITH QC/QA, BRIDGE DECK (PARAPET) does include the quantity for the sidewalk on the bridge.

Question Submitted: 10/16/2017 5:58:43 AM

The Department's ftp site contains 99623-Reference Files.zip. In this file there are two shortcuts MOT-70-02731962 and MOT-70-03101988 in the Existing Plans folder. The shortcuts are to locations not available. Will the Department add the files to the ftp site in place of the shortcuts?

The MOT-99623 Reference File.zip has been updated and the MOT-70-02731962 and MOT-70-03101988 are now available.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-99623/Reference Files/>

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 1:37:37 PM

Will the existing plans and office calculations be made available on the Departments ftp site?

Existing plans are available on the following site:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-99623>

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 1:31:05 PM

The drainage subsummary on 22/136 includes 10 feet of 12" Conduit Type C and 79 feet of 12" Conduit Type F for D-6 at 37+50 left. The 37+50 cross section on 36/136 shows 85 feet of 12" Conduit Type F and no type C. Are the types and lengths shown on 36/136 correct?

An addendum is forthcoming to correct these quantities.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 11:16:47 AM

Sheets 25/136 and 49/136 show HW 1.1 for the outlet of the 24" conduit at station 28+13. Standard Drawing HW-1.1 revised 1/18/2013 does not provide dimensions for headwalls on 24" diameter conduit. Will dimensions and quantities be provided?

Yes, an addendum is forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 11:15:14 AM

Are end anchorages required for the Type D Single Slope Concrete Barrier? If so, will a bid item be added?

Yes, an addendum is forthcoming.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 11:14:24 AM

Field-Painting of Existing Signs and Posts on 7/136 says preparation per SSPC SP-2 or SP-3 may be required at the direction of the Engineer for which no additional payment will be made. Will the Department consider changing this note to pay for preparation other than SSPC SP-1 according to 109.05?

No. The work shall be performed to the District's satisfaction an in accordance with the notes on sheet 7/136 in general, but specifically with regards to surface prep and containment.

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 11:13:05 AM

A note on plan sheet 7/136 requires field painting existing signs and sign posts. Will certified bridge painters be required for field painting existing signs and sign posts.

No, certified bridge painters are not required for the post and sign field painting work, however the work shall be performed to the District's satisfaction and in accordance with the notes on sheet 7/136 in general, but specifically with regard to surface prep and containment.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 171068

Sale Date - 11/2/2017

LUC-104115 - VGCS FY18 Maint

Question Submitted: 10/4/2017 6:40:55 PM

For the Davit Style Light Poles, Bid Ref 003 thru 011, will Millerbernd's Stainless Steel Davit Poles be considered as an approved equal to the specified Aluminum Davit Poles. Millerbernd's Stainless Steel poles carry a 25 year warranty.

The Millerbernd Stainless Steel Davit Poles would be considered an approved equal if all other requirements of the contract can be met, including, but not limited to, meeting the material requirements of C&MS 725.21 and verifying bolt circle diameters. If stainless steel is chosen, they shall have a No. 4 outside finish so as to match the existing mainspan stainless steel sheathing.

Project No. 171073

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

ASD-104284 - PR FY2018

Question Submitted: 10/13/2017 10:05:46 AM

In regards to the 400 trees in the previous question and their locations would you be able to provide mike markers in addition to states routes so that specific trees can be looked at?

No more specific information is available than the County, Route, and SLM's listed in the plan.No Addendum Required.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2017 6:13:01 AM

In regards to the answer to the prebid question dated 10/5/17, which specific locations make up the 400 trees, per specified location? There will be a price difference depending on specific location and proximity of the trees to each other

400 trees to be removed are located along:ASD – US 250, SR 511CRA – SR 19, 103, 602ERI – SR 60HUR – US 20, 250LOR – SR 18, 57, 58, 113, 252, 301, 511MED – SR 3, 18, US 42, SR 57, 83, 252, 301RIC – US 42WAY – SR 3, US 30A, SR 57, 83, US 250 No Addendum Required

Question Submitted: 10/9/2017 1:20:09 PM

In regards to the answer to the prebid question dated 10/5/17, which specific locations make up the 400 trees, per specified location? There will be a price difference depending on specific location and proximity of the trees to each other

400 trees to be removed are located along:ASD – US 250, SR 511CRA – SR 19, 103, 602ERI – SR 60HUR – US 20, 250LOR – SR 18, 57, 58, 113, 252, 301, 511MED – SR 3, 18, US 42, SR 57, 83, 252, 301RIC – US 42WAY – SR 3, US 30A, SR 57, 83, US 250 No Addendum Required

Question Submitted: 10/5/2017 6:33:59 AM

The location sheet 23 of 25 indicates that there are 2371 (12-24 inch trees) and the bid form has 400. Please clarify which is correct.

Per plan note on sheet 4/25 for ITEM 690 MISC.: TREE REMOVED , VARIOUS SIZES, PER SPECIFIED LOCATION, quantities are provided for:400 EACH MISC.: TREE REMOVED, 12" TO 24" SIZE, PER SPECIFIED LOCATION. The remainder of the total trees listed as 12"-24" size on sheet 23/25 will be removed by others. No Addendum Required

Project No. 173018

Sale Date - 10/19/2017

MAH-103014 - SR 11-13.41

Question Submitted: 10/18/2017 9:35:15 AM

The AASHTOW program will not load for Project MAH10301. It states Amendment Error. All other projects work fine.

The Amendment Error has been corrected. There should be no Amendment files to upload for this project. Only the EBS file should be available to upload.

Question Submitted: 10/12/2017 10:33:14 AM

Regarding the previous question on the Field Office, could the District at least give us a maximum number of months to include in our bid? As the item is stated now, the time is open ended and we cannot properly quantify the the number of months to have in our proposal.

As per Section 7 of the Scope of Services the Field Office must be operational at least 1 week prior to construction activities starting and be functional through the end of construction activities.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/8/2017 2:18:10 PM

Can the District provide any existing survey/topographic MicroStation files or will all mapping be the responsibility of the DBT?

As per the Scope of Services Section 14.1 the Department is only responsible for providing the Survey Control, all remaining survey will be the responsibility of the DBT. Attachment A of the Scope of Services contains the Survey Control and no additional information will be provided.

Question Submitted: 10/3/2017 10:46:32 AM

Please add a bid item for Field Office, Type B as is required by section 7 of the scope.

A separate pay item for the Field Office will not be provided. It is incidental to the Contract, the DBT must bid appropriately.

Question Submitted: 9/29/2017 4:11:58 PM

Are pier seismic pedestals required?

Refer to Section 301.4.3 of the Bridge Design Manual for the requirements for Seismic Design.

Question Submitted: 9/29/2017 4:09:30 PM

Are semi-integral diaphragm guides required

Refer to Section 303.2.2.7 of the Bridge Design Manual for requirements

Question Submitted: 9/27/2017 1:55:48 PM

Earthwork & seeding quantities are not required at any time as noted in 18.1?

Quantity calculations are not required to be shown in the plans, BUT the work must be performed on the Project..

Question Submitted: 9/27/2017 1:54:04 PM

Are 2:1 side slopes acceptable?

Beyond the Graded Shoulders (Scope of Services Section 14.4.1.5) 2:1 slopes are acceptable.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2017 1:53:11 PM

What type/size of sub-surface pavement drainage is required if any?

None is required.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2017 1:52:30 PM

2) If the drainage flow off the ends of the bridge to the existing curb inlets is less than 0.75 cfs and the spread is within the allowable 6.0 feet, can the existing curb inlets be re-used without performing an analysis of the existing drainage system?

The existing system must be checked to ensure it has capacity for the calculated flows. Per Section 14.5.2.2 of the Scope of Services the existing Curb Inlets may be reused if not impacted by construction activities. If the Curb Inlets are within the new Full Depth Pavement area they will be required to be replaced.

Question Submitted: 9/27/2017 1:51:26 PM

What is the extent/limits of the existing drainage system is to be analyzed?

Within the Project Limits

Question Submitted: 9/26/2017 12:45:49 PM

"The scope is not clear what the grading requirements are behind the curb in section 14.4.1.5. Can the grading slope away from the curb and if so, what is the maximum slope?"

Section 14.4.1.5 will be revised to "5. The graded width of the shoulders behind the curb within the new Full Depth Pavement will match the Sidewalk Width on the Bridge. Bridge and the slope of the graded shoulder is required to be 4% sloping upward from the back of the curb." in a future Addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/8/2017 1:56:15 PM

Would the Department please review the Detour Duration of 60 days? After reviewing the schedule for a similar project, it seems that a duration of 60 days is not adequate to perform the work as per the scope.

The Detour Duration has been reviewed and it will not be revised.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/5/2017 11:42:12 AM

Is Section 15.1 Design and Construction Requirements of Structure MED-76-1143L&R just mislabeled?

Yes, it is mis-labeled, it should be MAH-11-1341. This will be revised in a future Addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/5/2017 11:35:35 AM

Section 13.4 of the scope requires coordination with MAH-11-8.46, PID 84658. Please provide more information on this project. (06/05/17 was not a sale date and MAH 84658 does not show up on the ftp site.)

The PID is wrong in the Scope, the correct PID is 83042 and the Project Sale Date was 05/25/2017. This will be revised in a future Addendum.

Question Submitted: 8/30/2017 8:46:51 AM

Can the Department provide any existing plans, HEC-RAS information, soil borings available for this structure?

All of the available information is on the ODOT FTP server at the FTP Address shown on the cover sheet of the Proposal.

Project No. 173019

Sale Date - 11/30/2017

MOE-95288 - CR 29-00.32

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 2:04:00 PM

Please provide a copy of the Department's application for the Waterway Permit.

The type of waterway permit for this project is a Regional General Permit that the Department has the authority to self-issue. There was not a separate application. The Waterway Special Provisions contains all of the waterway requirements

Question Submitted: 10/17/2017 2:02:53 PM

Given that a significant portion of the top of existing west footing is exposed, and given that there are large cracks and horizontal offsets between the wingwalls and the west abutment stem, we do not believe that the existing abutment can reasonably be assumed to provide permanent scour protection with no compromise to the service life of the structure. We respectfully ask that the Department state that the existing abutments may not be reused in any way, including as scour protection retaining a shorter abutment.

The Engineer of Record is responsible for evaluation of the site and designing a project that complies with the scope and the referenced design standards within it. The Department will review the proposed plans and will approve or reject the plans depending on compliance with the scope requirements.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2017 8:30:33 AM

How was the 60' right-of-way in the 95288_BR001.dgn cad file attachment determined?

The road right of way was established from the center of the roadway pavement.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2017 8:30:06 AM

who is paying for utility relocations?

Responsibility for utility relocation costs are determined by what type of right of way an individual utility is using. A utility using the road right of way by permission of the County for example is subject to relocating their facilities at their own expense. A utility with their own easement predating the roadway for example would be entitled to compensation for relocation with payment coming from the County's project budget.

Question Submitted: 10/10/2017 8:29:33 AM

1. Will the Department allow the existing abutment be left in place as scour protection for the new bridge?

The existing abutment can be left in place if the proposed design demonstrates that the abutment is being used to comply with the scour requirements of the Bridge Design Manual and it would not compromise the service life of the structure.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/10/2017 8:28:58 AM

1. Will the Department allow the existing abutment be left in place as scour protection for the new bridge?
2. Who is paying for utility relocations?
3. How was the 60' right-of-way in the 95288_BR001.dgn cad file attachment determined?

Question Submitted: 9/6/2017 1:08:01 PM

Can the department provide a truck percentage for the project to be used to decide pavement course thicknesses in the Simplified Pavement Designs for Short Projects table?

No known truck percentage information is available at this time. However, the route does not and is not anticipated to serve significant oil and gas traffic.

Question Submitted: 8/31/2017 9:03:04 AM

Can the Department provide all available existing information (existing plans, existing borings, HEC-RAS/existing hydraulic data)?

No existing plan set, boring information, or HEC-RAS/hydraulic data is available for this Design-Build project.

Project No. 183001

Sale Date - 2/23/2018

-101566 - LUC-2-18.62

Question Submitted: 9/20/2017 10:20:32 AM

Reference paragraph 2.4 SOQ Submission Requirements. This paragraph states "Submit one two (2) electronic files of the SOQ". Please clarify the number of electronic files required.

Please submit one electronic file.

Question Submitted: 9/15/2017 11:50:09 AM

Reference Section 1.2 of the RFQ. This section states the Lead Designer shall meet the prequalification requirements listed in the draft RFP. What are these requirements?

Question Submitted: 9/15/2017 11:25:29 AM

Reference RFQ Section 2.5.A.9. Reference is made in this section to ODOT's DBE and OJT goals for this contract. Can these goals be provided?

Question Submitted: 9/15/2017 11:22:16 AM

Reference RFQ Section 1.2. This section references the draft RFP is provided in Part G of the RFQ. Can this be provided?

The RFQ is currently under development and will not be available for approximately 3 weeks. We will post the RFQ as soon as possible.