

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170607

Sale Date - 12/14/2017

CUY-85146 - SR 21-10.04L

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 10:57:40 AM

Can the Department make the full geotechnical report available for this project?

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 8:57:55 AM

Addendum 3 added a Construction Noise note on sheet 8 that says power-operated equipment is not to be operated between the hours of 9am and 7am. Some of the work including Demo, Beam Erection, and others are required to happen during night operations due to traffic restrictions. Please clarify.

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 4:48:08 PM

How does the contractor submit a bid through AASHTOware if they are not meeting the DBE goal set forth but intend on submitting a good faith effort. AASHTOware bid submission software will not allow a bid to be submitted without meeting the DBE goal.

**The software warns if the DBE goal is not met, but the bid can still be submitted. Please contact Tina Collins (614-466-2314) or Dan Stacy (614-466-8691) in the Office of Contracts for further questions with this issue.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 2:37:57 PM

Can the DBE goal be proportionally reduced since there is a large dollar amount in GeoFoam (\$2M +/-) that can only be supplied by non-DBE vendors.

**No, the DBE goal cannot be reduced. If the goal is found to be unable to be met through DBE participation, the bidder must provide documentation demonstrating its Good Faith Efforts it made to try to obtain the goal. Reference PN 013 for details and GFE Guidance.**

**Good Faith Effort Guidelines:**

**<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ODI/SDBE/DBE%20Goal%20Forms/Contractors%20Good%20Faith%20Efforts%20Guidelines.pdf>**

*Question Submitted:* 12/4/2017 11:10:55 AM

Will PN 555 be required for this project? Currently it is not noted.

**PN 555 will not be required on this project.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/28/2017 3:52:57 PM

On Sheet 11, there is a note that states pre-phase 1, phase 1 & 2 are in the 2017 season and phases 3 & 4 are in 2018 season. Please revise or remove this note.

**This will be corrected in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/28/2017 11:28:48 AM

Please verify the quantity for RN 77 - Asphalt Intermediate Course, Type 1 (Under Guardrail). The typical sections detail this pavement under the guardrail to be 4' wide along I-77, but the Office Calculations used a width of 32.81 ft for Stations 535+62.79 to 540+37.73 LT. The plan quantity should be 104 CY instead of 231 CY.

**Quantities will be revised in a future addendum**

*Question Submitted:* 11/28/2017 9:46:09 AM

Which pay item are the bidders to include the actual exploratory work for manhole at station 28+48 and associated road repair?

**Payment for exploratory work to be included in pertinent 611 Conduit items- Payment items for road repairs have been added. See future addendum Sheet 10 notes**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/27/2017 1:18:45 PM

Phase 3 construction of the remaining portion of the wingwall will include a footer excavation and construction adjacent to the shoulder of 77 at least 4' lower than the roadway. Can the department extend the portable concrete barrier item and related MOT items to protect this work?

**It was assumed the work could be completed behind the GR.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/27/2017 10:27:33 AM

Detail E on Sheet 3 calls out 254 Pavement Planing, 1.5" to be 18" wide but the Office Calculations and quantity reflect 2' wide. Please clarify and revise the intent of this detail.

**Planning quantities will be revised on Sheet29/100. See forthcoming addendum**

*Question Submitted:* 11/27/2017 9:50:30 AM

Sheet 50 indicates 343 feet of 24" type B conduit, which appears to be in the shoulder of 77. It appears there are no quantities to repair the roadway. Please provide a trench repair detail for this work and indicate if the repair quantities are to be included with the pipe or revise the pavement quantities. Also there is not a cross section of this area to determine if the new pipe will conflict with the existing underdrain along 77. Can the department provide additional details?

**Pavement restoration quantities on sheet 10/100 will be revised. See forthcoming addendum. See typical Section on Sheet 7. I-77 under drain will not be impacted**

*Question Submitted:* 11/24/2017 10:35:50 AM

Sheet 74/100 Deck Placement Design Assumptions says that the design assumes an eight wheel finishing machine with a maximum wheel load of 1.26 kips for a total machine load of 10.09 kips. BDM 302.2.7.2.c requires the designer to assume a max wheel load of 2.2 kip + 0.012 kip for each additional foot of machine length required above 36 ft. The total machine load of 10.09 kips shown in the plans may be close to field conditions, but when the machine/carriage is on one side of the deck, the 1.26 kip/wheel is not reasonable. Please review the design and increase to the BDM specifications.

**The revised maximum wheel load is 2.53 k. Machine weight is unchanged. A revised note on sheet 74/100 will be provided in a future addendum**

*Question Submitted:* 11/24/2017 10:34:48 AM

The CUY-21-1004L has nearly a 51 degree skew and will be setup and poured with a Bidwell on the skew. There is over 5 inches of anticipated dead load deflection in these girders. With that said, has the designer considered the effects of differential deflection in the girders with respect to the crossframes in place? We have typically seen details in the plans on crossframe installation sequence with temporary support with this type of heavily skewed bridge. The only note in the plans that we've located is on sheet 86/100 that requires the contractor to temporarily brace the girders near the ends. Please review what needs to occur away from the ends.

**Note 2 on Steel Details sheet 88 has been expanded to mention the oversized holes and not fully tightening the bolts until all the girders are erected**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 3:31:00 PM

Will the state consider adding a construction joint in the retaining wall as depicted in section A-A sheet 57?

**The contractor's question did not state a location in his/her request on where to add a construction joint in the retaining wall. After review of Section A-A on sheet 57, a construction joint shall be added at the toe of barrier along ramp G-1 and the contraction key shall be extended to this joint. Section A-A will be revised in the forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 10:04:52 AM

It is unlikely the work in pre-phase 1 can be completed in one weekend. In addition the exploratory work to determine existing flowline elevations and precast structure depth will need to be completed weeks before the actual storm work to enable the precast to be built. Can the Department increase the closure time frame and add a time frame for the exploratory work?

**Pre-Phase 1 can be done over one weekend detour. The expectation is that the contractor would locate and uncover the buried manhole, survey the existing inverts, pipe sizes and materials to verify plan information, and then patch any pavement until the replacement is to be installed. This work would be expected to be completed with a temporary work zone using flaggers and take only a few hours not warranting a detour.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/22/2017 8:52:08 AM

Please verify the quantity of RN 33 - Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type C. The plan quantity is 257 LF, but with deductions for the Type B End Section, the No. 3 Inlet & the Type C End Anchorage, the pay quantity should be 242 LF.

**Agree that length of End Section and End Anchorages shall be deducted from Concrete Barrier linear feet pay quantity. Quantity will be verified and corrected in forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/21/2017 1:50:59 PM

The existing bridge appears to have a concrete overlay. We could not locate the existing plans showing the overlay work on the .ftp site. Could the Department please provide those plans or show us the location of that overlay work in the plans provided?

**We do not have any record plans of a Concrete overlay. For bidding purposes assume a 2 1/2" overlay and bid accordingly. Removal of Concrete overlay WS is not paid for separately.**

Question Submitted: 11/20/2017 3:25:39 PM

Sheet 50/100 lists 24" Type B conduit with a total of 393 LF which matches the bid quantity. The individual runs total 343 LF. Please clarify which quantity is correct and adjust REF 61 24" Conduit Type B as needed.

**Quantity of 24" Type B conduit will be corrected in forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/20/2017 3:18:28 PM

The work listed in the pre-phase 1 has plan notes on sheet 10. These notes say to locate, identify inverts etc. prior to ordering the proposed drainage items. This must be done well in advance of the pre-phase 1 ramp closure(s). Will a separate ramp closure be allowed for the investigative work spelled out on sheet 10? How will additional detour / ramp closures be paid?

**The expectation is that the contractor would locate and uncover the buried manhole, survey the existing inverts, pipe sizes and materials to verify plan information, and then patch any pavement until the replacement is to be installed. This work would be expected to be completed with a temporary work zone using flaggers and take only a few hours not warranting a detour.**

Question Submitted: 11/20/2017 3:17:21 PM

Sheet 11, pre-phase 1 construction lists work to be completed in "a" weekend. Evaluating this work, it appears that two weekend closures are required to construct the storm sewer. Can at least one and perhaps two weekend closures be added for the pre-phase 1 work listed?

**Pre-Phase 1 consists of installing approximately 317 FT of storm sewer, which we would like done over one weekend detour. Additional investigation work is expected to be completed without a detour as addressed separately.**

Question Submitted: 11/17/2017 2:05:30 PM

Ref. 103 & 104 - Conventional HPS Light Fixtures: With a completion date of Mid 2019 it is unclear whether this material will be available as lighting manufacturers change over to all LED production. Would the project consider changing these items to LED equivalents or at the very least add alternate bid items for the LED equivalent light fixtures?

**Conventional HPS fixtures will be used. Bid -As-Is**

Question Submitted: 11/17/2017 11:45:17 AM

Please add a pay item for the masonry collar on sheet 54/100

**The call-out for a masonry collar on sheet 54 refers ODOT Std. Dwg. DM-1.1. In the notes on the std. dwg. It states that the cost of a masonry collar used to join two pipes is included in the cost of the conduit.**

Question Submitted: 11/15/2017 11:20:59 AM

Can the DGN/CAD files be made available for this project?

**Reference files have been posted to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-85146/Reference%20Files/>**

Question Submitted: 11/14/2017 11:45:21 AM

Ref. Pay Item 'Approach Slabs T=17", as per plan': Are the transition railings that attach to the parapet walls incidental to this item? Will the parapet walls get an epoxy urethane sealer? If so, is that incidental to this item?

**Parapets & transitions and sealing of surfaces are included with Item 526 APP. This will be included in a forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/14/2017 10:32:32 AM

Please add a pay item for 'Wearing Course Removed' in regards to the bridge

**Wearing Course Removed will not be added for the existing bridge deck. Only removal of asphalt WS is paid for separately**

Question Submitted: 11/13/2017 9:31:56 AM

Please include the Utility Note section as part of the bid specification.

**Utility Note will be added in forthcoming Addendum**

Question Submitted: 11/7/2017 3:50:55 PM

Ref item 'Asbestos Abatement' - Since no asbestos was found during the March 2016 survey, what is the contractor supposed to bid in this item? Sheet 74 gives an explanation of the item but its still unclear since no ACM was found.

**bid includes two tasks1. Complete and submit EPA form2. Provide a asbestos inspector on site during the demo.Bid price does not include removal of any asbestos material found, since this would not be fair to expect Contractor to bid on a unknown. If asbestos is found the removal cost will have to be negotiated as a change order**

Question Submitted: 11/7/2017 9:32:45 AM

Plan sheet 54, \*depth from existing plan information contractor to uncover... (see lower left corner of sheet). Can you clarify the "adjust flowline" if necessary? Can you provide a description of the work if necessary? How will this be paid?

**Refer to the "as per Plan" note on sheet 10. Payment to verify plan information is included in the cost of "as per Plan" items. If field elevations are different from the plan information, adjust the elevations in accordance with field information prior to ordering the precast structure.**

Question Submitted: 11/7/2017 9:31:45 AM

Item 202 -Pipe removed < 24". R2 on sheet 33 is 80 lf. The cut from existing grade to the existing invert is 20'. Please verify this is the correct depth. As an alternate to removal of this pipe, can it be plugged and filled in lieu of removal? The invert info was generated from sheet 54.

**See the note at the lower left of sheet 54. The existing manhole is buried and it is shown per the existing plan. Nearly half of R-2 will conflict with D-1 installation as shown on sheet 39. Plug and fill non-conflicting pipe would be acceptable.**

Question Submitted: 11/2/2017 1:07:21 PM

Please provide record drawings for the existing bridge to be demolished.

**Reference files are provided on the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-85146/>**

Question Submitted: 11/2/2017 9:59:15 AM

Add a pay item for "PILE DRIVING EQUIPMENT MOBILIZATION" for the retaining wall

**Pay Item for Pile Driving Equipment Mobilization for the retaining wall will be added in a forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/1/2017 3:16:03 PM

Based on the 12" CIP pile furnished lengths in the Pile Design Loads note on sheet 74 of 100, the total quantity for furnished 12" CIP piling should be 16,230 LF. Please verify the quantity for RN 168 - 12" CIP Concrete Piles, Furnished.

**Future Addendum will revise Sheet 76/100 to Piles Driven to 15,390 ft and Piles Furnished to 16,230 ft**

Question Submitted: 11/1/2017 3:02:49 PM

The 12" CIP Piling estimated pay lengths shown on sheet 72 of 100 are different than the lengths used in the structure quantity calculations. Please provide the correct estimated driving lengths of the 12" CIP piling for both the main abutments and all of the wing walls by means of revised drawings and addendum.

**Pile pay lengths will be revised in future addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170622

Sale Date - 12/14/2017

CRA-94382 - SR-SR 4-00.00

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 1:26:30 PM

REF 23 shows the quantity as 7.8 MI however plan sheet 9 shows the quantity as 13.4 MI. Please review.

**Reference 23 - Item 614 - Work Zone Center Line, Class III, 642 Paint should be quantified as 13.4 miles. Addenda forthcoming.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 10:28:34 AM

Ref # 2 Monument box adj to grade. Qty 55 each. After a site visit we are not able to locate the boxes as described on plan sheet 6. Could ODOT look into this item.

**The quantity and locations of monument boxes listed on sheet 6/11 were obtained using both field observations and via research of existing right of way plans kept in the district (see plan note EXISTING PLANS on sheet 4/11 for more information). It is understood by district staff that prior paving operations throughout the district resulted in existing monumentation being buried by pavement layers. It is the intent of Item 623 – Monument Box Adjusted to Grade to adjust the existing exposed and buried monument boxes in the locations listed in the plans to the proposed final grade. No addendum required.**

Project No. 170623

Sale Date - 12/14/2017

CUY-95557 - TOWER CITY BRIDGES

*Question Submitted:* 12/9/2017 2:13:09 PM

The testing of the expansion joints require the joints be exposed to 1.5 inches of water. With a slope of 3/16" and a 34 width, the water at the curbs will be over the sidewalk. Is this intent of the water testing note?

*Question Submitted:* 12/9/2017 2:07:49 PM

Completing phase 3A in a period of only thirty (30) days seems impractical and not feasible. Will ODOT consider increasing this duration to at least sixty days?

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 4:18:21 PM

Completing phase 3A in a period of only thirty (30) days seems impractical and not feasible. Will ODOT consider increasing this duration to at least sixty days?

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 4:11:55 PM

Where and how is the traffic detoured during the installation of both the expansion joint glands and the water test?

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 4:08:52 PM

It is anticipated that at best one expansion gland can be installed in a day. There are 18 joints alone on Huron Avenue and 17 on Prospect. This will require complete closure of the Huron bridge for at least 18 days and 17 days for Prospect just for installation and addition time for water testing. Complicating matters, if the joints do not pass the water test, it has to be repaired and once again subjected to a 24 hour flood test. The drawings are not clear on how long each bridge structure can be closed in order to install and be test these joints.

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 2:44:32 PM

Ref. 48 Removal of Pavement Marking:  
Are the pavement markings widths consistent or varying?

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 10:19:44 AM

We would like to propose a bolt down joint similar to what is called out in the plans. We were wondering if it would be considered an approved equal. To whom should I send our drawing for approval?

**The contractor shall bid on the expansion joint system as specified in the plans.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/28/2017 10:25:17 AM

Please provide office calculations for all steel repairs. Primarily the quantity for Level UF Category U.

**The office calculations for the steel repairs can be found at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-95557/Reference%20Files>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2017 10:08:56 AM

Will there be a pre-bid site visit for this project?

**A pre-bid site visit has been scheduled for November 29, 2017, at 10:00 am.**

**Meet at 250 W Huron Road, Cleveland, Ohio, 2nd floor, office portion of the Ritz building.**

**All participants should bring safety vests and hard helmets.**

**Project No. 170624**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

D01-104649 - Signals FY18

*Question Submitted:* 12/10/2017 5:20:18 AM

Plan page 3 has an "as per plan" note for the damper that allows the hubbell 607 series damper to be supplied for this item. Is it correct that that model will be allowed? It was our understanding that the central office tested this device earlier this year and concluded that it was not capable of performing the intended function satisfactorily and would no longer be approved. Please clarify.

*Question Submitted:* 12/10/2017 5:13:36 AM

Is item 38 a duplicate of item 39? Both items are for mast arm dampers.

**Project No. 170625**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

DAR-100930 - MICRO FY18

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 3:28:06 PM

The Coordination of Work plan note on page 3 of the plans states that microsurfacing on DAR-49 SLM 6.16 to 8.92 until BR. DAR-49-0794 has been completed. BR. DAR-49-0794 has an interim completion date of 7/31/18; However, project 170625 also has a completion date of 7/31/2018. Please clarify.

**The completion date will be revised to 8/31/18. An addendum is forthcoming**

**Project No. 170626**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

FRA-76420 - SR 315-00.49

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 4:10:46 PM

The plans call for Item 645 and/or Item 647 on concrete surfaces throughout the project. Station 106+50 to 109+50 looks to be a concrete surface but plan sheets 105 & 106 call for Item 644. Please clarify which material will be used for this section.

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/8/2017 1:37:26 PM

Realized that I forgot to include note about PMJ question an hour ago. These calculations are for one direction, so total quantity likely 60 CF for the NB and SB structures FRA 315-00.49. While both the NB and SB FRA 315-00.59 and FRA 315-00.67 structures would each have 48CF total quantity. Please verify.

Question Submitted: 12/8/2017 12:41:23 PM

The addendum quantity for the PMJ's REF items 110, 112 and 114 is incorrect. These would require 5" or more depth which is impossible on concrete deck before getting into reinforcing steel.

The original plan quantity was likely correct for a single joint of 2.5" depth on 315-00.49, which would be 30 CF total for 2 joints on the structure. The other bridges (315-0.59 and 315-0.67) have no current joints and engineer likely used 2" minimum for depth but again only accounted for single joint, which gives 12 CF quantity. Quantity would double to 24 CF on both of these. Please verify quantities.

Question Submitted: 12/8/2017 7:46:21 AM

Ref 35 Item 423 Crack Seal - has to bid by the sy but plan sheets 32,52,53,54 & 56 show qty by feet.

Question Submitted: 12/5/2017 11:47:32 AM

Is the contingency quantity of Item 251 – Partial Depth Pavement Repairs solely to be used on the ramps called out on Sheets 72-75 or will there be repairs on mainline SR 315 as well? There is a significant cost difference depending on the number of locations where repairs are performed.

**The contingency quantity is for all repairs on both the ramps and the mainline SR 315.**

Question Submitted: 12/4/2017 11:25:30 AM

The ramp typical section on Sheet 3 shows 617 Compacted Aggregate Berm on Ramp S-J only. The ramp details on Sheets 72-75 has quantity for berm on every ramp. Please clarify which ramps will require berm.

**Please see forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/4/2017 10:04:32 AM

The construction noise note on sheet 14 states that power-operated construction-type devices cannot be operated from 11PM to 7AM. The lane use table on sheet 19 states that lane closures are not permitted between 5AM to 10PM. Please clarify the allowable working hours for this project.

**Please see forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2017 11:26:22 AM

With the wide range of work types on this project, will the Department lower the Work Type Percentage Performed by Prime from 50%?

**The Work Type Percentage Performed by Prime will be reduced to 40% in a forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/28/2017 9:32:07 AM

Please review the items associated with the Railroad Removal and back fill on SR 315C. Item 36 - 442 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate, 19MM (446), APP should no longer be necessary with the addition of Item 41 - 253 CMSC Item 259 Permanent Pavement Replacement (Type I or V).

**Please see forthcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/27/2017 10:32:55 AM

There should be a Bid item for 6" Conc. Walk for 780 SF per sheets 52 thru 57. Bid items 23, 24, 25 all should be bid as EACH not Square Feet. Bid item 39 Straight Curb, the quantity should be 180 FT more than the proposal per sheets 52 thru 57. There should be a bid item for Curb and gutter for 55 FT. as per sheet 52.

**Please see forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/8/2017 3:35:04 PM

There is no line item for Item 644 transverse line but transverse lines are shown on sheets 123 & 124. Please review.

**Please see forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/8/2017 3:29:52 PM

REF 61 & 81 list Crosswalk as 20" wide lines however the plan drawings look to be 10" wide. Please review.

**Please bid as specified.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/7/2017 1:44:23 PM

Item # 846E00110 Polymer Mod Asph Exp Jt SystemsStructure FRA-315-0049 has a plan quantity of 15 CF but that doesn't seem to be enough quantity based on the locations (note 4) on sheet 129 of 137. Structure FRA-315-0059 & FRA-315-0067 has a plan quantity of 12 cf & 15 cf. Neither bridge show where the Asphalt plug exp dam is to be placed. Would the department please revisit the bid item quantities, location and verify the quantities and locations. Also, would the department provide a detail showing the depth of the new asphaltic plug jt.

**Please see forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 170627**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

GUE-93017 - IR 77-17.70/VAR (PART 1 AND PART 2)

*Question Submitted:* 12/7/2017 8:33:09 AM

Will ODOT allow the parapets on the project to be slip formed?

**Slip forming the parapets is permitted by C.&M.S. 511.08. Please bid accordingly.**

**Project No. 170630**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

LOG-98633 - /SHE-SR 47/SR 66-22.94/08.34

*Question Submitted:* 11/27/2017 1:20:08 PM

For the composite fiber wrap item the pay quantity appears to cover 1 wrap around the existing CIP pile. Plan notes call for 2 wraps of the material. Will the quantity be adjusted for the 2nd wrap, or are all wraps considered incidental to the SF coverage area?

**PN 519 defines the measurement of the FRP composite system to be the number of square feet of the element being wrapped. The plans set the requirements for the FRP composite system. Therefore, the plan quantity is correct and the number of layers indicated in the plans are considered incidental to the quantity per PN 519. No adjustment of plan quantity is necessary.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 11:47:21 AM

Will ODOT consider making a cofferdam item for both structures to facilitate causeway needs and any de-watering required for the fiber wrap and pile encasements shown on the two structures?

**Yes. An addendum is forthcoming to add the cofferdam pay item.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 11:45:54 AM

On the S.R. 66 structure, the plans call for fiber wrap of the existing pier column piling. The existing piling is a steel tube pile with a steel exterior. Plans depict the pile as concrete exterior. Will a fiber wrap work on the existing steel pile or should this item be changed to a pile encasement item?

**The plans detail the proposed composite fiber wrap to be placed on the steel shell of the existing cast in place piles. No plan revision is needed.**

**Project No. 170631**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

LOR-84589 - BP FY2018

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 11:36:41 AM

Please advice where the epoxy sealing for the pier wrap sections are to be paid?



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 170632

Sale Date - 12/14/2017

MAH-101043 - SR MCRO FY2018

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 3:56:37 PM

There is a bid item of 100 sys of pavement repair as directed, on a project with 237,795 sys and 3 locations. This is extremely expensive work, would the department consider deleting this item from the project, and perform with state forces?

**We need to have the item in the plan in case it is needed before paving.**

Project No. 170633

Sale Date - 12/14/2017

MOT-88775 - SR 48-13.20

*Question Submitted:* 12/10/2017 6:11:49 AM

Pay item 70, Vehicular Signal Head, (LED) 5 section, 12" Lens, 1 way aluminum, as per plan has a pay item and is listed on the sub summary on plan page 53, but is not shown as required in the details for this page. Is it required? If so, where is this signal being located?

*Question Submitted:* 12/10/2017 6:10:06 AM

Pay item 69, Vehicular Signal Head, (LED) 1 section, 12" Lens, 1 way aluminum, as per plan has a pay item but cannot be found as required in the plan set. Is this an error? If not, where is it located?

*Question Submitted:* 12/10/2017 6:08:52 AM

Sign Flat Sheet (item 66) has a quantity of 17 square feet in the proposal. Is that correct? It appears only 7.5 square feet are required for sign 3 on plane page 51. The other signs are being removed. Please clarify.

*Question Submitted:* 12/10/2017 6:07:46 AM

Sign Hanger Assembly, Span Wire (item 65) has a quantity of 2 in the proposal. Is that correct? It appears that only sign S3 on plan page 51 requires this item. Please clarify.

*Question Submitted:* 12/10/2017 5:38:59 AM

Can clarification be given for the requirement of the decorative light pole (item 24). Plan page 57 has an as per plan note that states the pole should be type IV per city drawing # 14A-17113. This is a round tapered style pole. The note also states that the pole should be Union Metal Empire Series B2359-16-B2-Y2 which is a fluted style pole. Is the intention to a non-fluted pole but with an empire series base and twin arm? Or is a fluted pole required?

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 4:37:23 PM

For Bid Ref 029, the Eaton Marquis luminaire Series that was specified has been discontinued. Will Eaton's Galleon, GWC Series be considered as an appropriate replacement.

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 11:30:42 AM

Access for bridge deck form removal is very difficult. The use of galvanized Stay - in - Place metal decking for the interior bays of the bridge deck would be very beneficial to the contractors and considerably reduce the cost of the bridge deck concrete work.

**Galvanized steel or any other material type, stay in place forms, shall not be used.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 11:13:32 AM

There is very limited room at each end of the bridge from which to work a crane. Which power wires and support cables will be removed? Specifically at the south end of the bridge, there are support cables that run from the bridge diagonally across main street towards Monument.

**The location of RTA lines during construction has been posted to the ftp site at:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-88775/Reference%20File/>**

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 11:14:11 AM

Will ODOT allow the signal at Riverview and Main to be removed and set-up with a stop sign on Riverview? The existing signal span wire causes lots of issues with steel erection and demolition.

**No**

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 11:11:37 AM

Will ODOT allow nightly closures for structural steel demolition and steel erection, and not have it mandated weekend work? If the steel demolition and erection must be weekend work per the closure note please at a minimum extend the bridge painting to 2020 as more time will be required for this.

**No. The structural steel demolition and steel erection will remain weekend work. The Project Completion Date will not be extended into 2020 for bridge painting.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 10:46:50 AM

The constructability study details added stiffeners and supplemental bearing supports. Can a pay item be added to compensate for this necessary work? (This prebid question has been resubmitted because the answer has been revised.)

**An addendum is forthcoming. A note will be added to clarify this concern.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 6:22:05 AM

What is the maximum permissible peakparticle velocity at 10 feet from the sanitary interceptor?

**The contractor should use any necessary precautions they can to prevent damage to the sanitary interceptor. Damage to this line would have significant financial and environmental impact. The interceptor carries the sanitary flow for Dayton and the northern half of Montgomery County (37 MGD). This is not a "what is the minimum I have to do" line. Each contractor should carefully consider how they will mitigate the risk.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/4/2017 10:10:52 AM

It appears the 1954 Original Soil Borings provided are from before the current structure was constructed. The surface elevations for the borings are below where temporary support of excavation will be required for this project. The MOT-75-12.82 soil investigation provided was taken about 1,600 feet away from this project. Will the Department provide information about the soil currently behind the existing abutments so that bidders can evaluate temporary support of excavation required for this project?

**No, there is no information available for the soil behind the existing abutments.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2017 10:19:30 AM

We concur with another bidder's pre-bid question. Please allow for nightly closures of the structure and weekend closures of the structure outside of the restricted dates for all construction activities. Numerous materials and material staging will require use of the existing deck for decking, pier work, structural steel work, demolition work, rebar placement throughout the duration of the job. Nightly closures will also help allow for more expedited steel demolition and erection as there are 8 restricted weekend dates per year, and inclement weather will surely remove some other possible weekends from work. Please allow nightly closures to occur anytime for any need of the contractor.

**An addendum is forthcoming to revise the wording of the weekday night closures from "bridge deck pours" to "bridge concrete pours".**

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2017 10:13:42 AM

The plan note on sheet 72 about no permit being obtained for the job directly conflicts the note on sheet 5 about allowing abutment storm sewer repairs by "foot" to occur. Work to fix the 36" and 48" storm sewers is required below the OHWM of 731.00. Please address if work is allowed below the OHWM to do the storm sewer work as required in the projects that is below 731.00

**The "On Foot" work to repair the storm sewers is not considered instream work. These repairs are allowed and are not considered to be in conflict with the no instream work note.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:15:38 PM

MOT note on sheet 6/149 states weekday closures shall only be permitted for bridge deck pours, and weekend closures shall only be permitted for beam removal and new beam erection. Can these notes be worded to allow other work activities during these time frames? Due to overhead signal wires at both abutments that remain in place, materials will need to be handled from the adjacent structure. Concrete for the pier cap extensions will need placed from the adjacent structure as well. Due to a lack of access from below the structure, the Department should expect near nightly closures from Phase 1, Step 2 on in order to safely access the work.

**The 2nd paragraph of the Item 614, Maintaining Traffic note on Sheet 6/149 will be revised to replace "BRIDGE DECK POURS," with "BRIDGE CONCRETE POURS,". An addendum to the plans is forthcoming.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:13:46 PM

If errors are found in the constructability study, will additional work required to enable the existing and new structures to accommodate the loads be compensated? For example, if additional counterweight is required on the Grove TMS9000E because the crane's block and rigging were not included in the pick weight, will the department provide revised calculations and pay for additional stiffeners if required? Another example would be the crane shown setting on the forward abutment approach slab when overhead signal lines are directly in this location. The crane will need to set in the span similar to span 1.

**The constructability study is included for informational purposes only in an effort to assist the contractor with analysis. The constructability study is not a contract document and does not relieve the responsibilities of the contractor outlined in the C&MS.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:12:25 PM

Since the Department's consultant has the existing and new structures modeled, will the Department have their consultant run revised calculations if errors are found in the constructability analysis?

**The constructability study is included for informational purposes only in an effort to assist the contractor with analysis. The constructability study is not a contract document and does not relieve the responsibilities of the contractor outlined in the C&MS.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:10:07 PM

The constructability study details added stiffeners and supplemental bearing supports. Can a pay item be added to compensate for this necessary work?

**Yes. An addendum is forthcoming to include this work.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:08:49 PM

The "No Waterway Work" note on sheet 72/149 states there will be no work below OHWM (731.0). Would dressing up the river corridor to pre-existing condition, as required by note on sheet 5/149, be allowed under this note?

**The "No Waterway Permit" indicates that no planned work below OHWM is permitted. The restoration of the Dayton River Corridor note is to cover unforeseen disturbances.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:07:25 PM

The "No Waterway Work" note on sheet 72/149 states there will be no work below OHWM (731.0). Is any river bank disturbance allowed?

**No.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:05:37 PM

The "No Waterway Work" note on sheet 72/149 states there will be no work below OHWM (731.0). Does this note preclude leveling a crane pad along the bank of the river at low flow times?

**The "No Waterway Work" note prohibits leveling a crane pad along the bank of the river.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:04:20 PM

The "No Instream Work" note on sheet 5/149 states "No construction equipment...may be "placed" below the OHWM". Is this intended to prevent any use of equipment such as cranes, manlifts, concrete pumps, etc below the structure? The OHWM reaches from face of abutment to face of abutment. The same note discusses "staging" of equipment and materials between the levee and trail. Please explain the difference between staging and placement so that we can better understand allowable access and utilization of land needed in order to complete the work.

**Yes, the note is intended to prevent large equipment below the structure. The use of the area between the levee and the trail may be utilized by light equipment and tools, with a short term land use permit from the MCD, while actively working. No equipment or tools shall be left unattended in this area.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:03:39 PM

The "No Instream Work" note on sheet 5/149 states "No construction equipment...may be "placed" below the OHWM". Is this intended to prevent any use of equipment such as cranes, manlifts, concrete pumps, etc below the structure? The OHWM reaches from face of abutment to face of abutment. The same note discusses "staging" of equipment and materials between the levee and trail. Please explain the difference between staging and placement so that we can better understand allowable access and utilization of land needed in order to complete the work.

**Yes, the note is intended to prevent large equipment below the structure. The use of the area between the levee and the trail may be utilized by light equipment and tools, with a short term land use permit from the MCD, while actively working. No equipment or tools shall be left unattended in this area.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 4:01:47 PM

Sheet 72 states no waterway permit shall be obtained for this project. No work in the river or below the OHMW (elev 731.0) , will SIP metal forms be allowed for the bridge deck concrete?

**No**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 3:37:15 PM

Will the Department make an area or areas near the project available for the contractor to store material and equipment and to use for field offices?

**As with all ODOT projects, ODOT is open to the use of its right of way for staging, subject to the discretion of the ODOT Construction Engineer and the requirements of CMS 107.10.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 12:29:06 PM

Ref. Item 146 Form liner, the plans suggest three different vendors on page 73 of 149 and state form pattern to be shown on page 69/76 and 70/76. But these pages only show where block-outs for the railing. What pattern is required? please clarify.

**The dimensions shown in Sheets 69/76 and 70/76 are to be used to prepare the formliner to form the blockout pattern of the bridge railing. The formliner surface is smooth without any specific texture or pattern.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2017 1:11:22 PM

Can ODOT confirm on the constructability analysis that the weights shown are the weight of the girder (existing or new) only? It appears this is the case checking a handful of them. If that is only the girder weight and does not include any block, rigging, etc. needed for the lift there are numerous cases in the constructability analysis where the crane, weight, and radius shown do not work and it will fail. Can ODOT please confirm the weight shown in appendix 4, 5, 6, & 7 are the true value of the steel girder only with no extra considerations for lifting brackets or crane block?

**The lifting operation analyses in the constructability report consider both girder weights and overall crane weights. As noted in the General section on Page 1 of Appendix 1, the constructability analyses were based on: 1. All crane-related dimensions, weights, load capacities, and specifications used for calculations and analyses in the report are based on the Grove TMS9000E Product Guide from the Manitowoc web site. 2. All crane outrigger pad loads used for calculations and analyses in the report are calculation results taken from the Outrigger Pad Load Calculators provided in the Manitowoc web site. 3. The framing analyses performed in the report were per AASHTO LFD method with safety factors of  $\gamma = 1.3$  and  $\beta = 1.0$ . Also note that the MDX framing analyses in the report were analyzed in 2D system instead of line girder analyses which always lead to more conservative results with higher distribution factors specified.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2017 1:05:43 PM

Will ODOT please make the calculation and design files (more than likely MDX girder files) on the existing structure used to create the constructability analysis for contractor's information only?

**No.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2017 10:36:51 AM

Page 132 calls out for scuppers to be Neenah R-3952 or equivalent. I would like to submit the EJ 5840Z/M scupper assembly for approval. I

**Construction submittals are to be submitted to the ODOT Project Engineer by the awarded Contractor.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/17/2017 2:48:06 PM

Please provide existing bridge estimated quantity sheet for the Main Street Bridge over Great Miami River

**The existing bridge estimated quantity sheet has been posted at:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-88775/Reference%20File/>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/13/2017 8:14:23 AM

Item 509, Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel, As Per Plan on 72/149 says field bend and/or field cut the reinforcing steel designated in the plans, as necessary, in order to maintain the required clearances and bar spacings. How will this item be measured?

**The item is to be measured in pounds as indicated in the note and the pay item. This is a standard note. The plans indicate which bars this effort may be required in the reinforcing steel list sheets.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/13/2017 6:52:30 AM

Will the Department make all soil information available to bidders?

**The soil information is located at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-88775/Reference%20File/>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/6/2017 8:25:30 AM

Plans show 5'+/- existing fence at the south east corner of the bridge to be removed for reuse but do not include a note or detail for reuse of the fence. What are the requirements for reuse of this fence?

**A forthcoming addendum will add notes regarding the reuse of the fence.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/6/2017 8:02:50 AM

The sub-summary on 28/149 includes 275 ft curb removed and 2,499 sf walk removed. Line 0003 Walk Removed has a quantity 275 sf and line 0004 Curb Removed has a quantity of 2,499 ft. It appears these quantities have been transposed.

**An addendum is forthcoming to correct these transposed quantities.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2017 9:48:46 AM

The Existing Structure Plans and Constructability Study note on 72/149 says plans of the existing structure and the constructability study prepared for this project are available at the District 7 office. Will these documents be made available on the Department's ftp site?

**The existing Structure plan and Constructability Study can be found at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-88775/Reference%20File/>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2017 9:48:00 AM

The Building Demolished, As Per Plan note on 43/149 says the asbestos report will be included in the reference files. Where can we access this document?

**The Asbestos Report is located at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MOT-88775/Reference%20File/>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2017 9:47:10 AM

The Short Term Land Use Permit note on 5/149 says the application for the permit will be posted to the ODOT Office of Contracts website. Where can we access this document?

**The Short Term Land Use Permit can be accessed on the Miami Conservancy District's website at [https://www.mcdwater.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Short-Term-Land-Use-Permit-Application-static\\_no-print-or-reset.pdf](https://www.mcdwater.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Short-Term-Land-Use-Permit-Application-static_no-print-or-reset.pdf)**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/3/2017 9:46:14 AM

The Protection of Sanitary and Water Facilities note on 5/149 says any work being performed on the substructure that may cause vibration within 10 feet of the 48" water main or the sanitary interceptor must include vibration monitoring. What is the maximum permissible peak particle velocity at 10 feet from the 48" water main and at 10 feet from the sanitary interceptor?

**The recommended vibration amplitude for the water main is 2.0 in./sec. The contractor should use any necessary precautions they can to prevent damage to the 48" water main and sanitary interceptor. Damage to either line would have significant financial and environmental impact. The interceptor carries the sanitary flow for Dayton and the northern half of Montgomery County (37 MGD). The water main is the primary water supply for the southern half of Montgomery County, and is coming out of the booster station at a high pressure. These are not "what is the minimum I have to do" lines, each contractor should carefully consider how they will mitigate the risk.**

Question Submitted: 11/3/2017 9:45:30 AM

The Protection of Sanitary and Water Facilities note on 5/149 says the contractor shall avoid locating cranes and heavy equipment over the lines unless adequate precautions are in place. What surface loading (how many pounds per square foot) will constitute "adequate precautions"?

**The Contractor should use any necessary precautions they can to prevent damage to the 48" water main and sanitary interceptor. Damage to either line would have significant financial and environmental impact. The interceptor carries the sanitary flow for Dayton and the northern half of Montgomery County (37 MGD). The water main is the primary water supply for the southern half of Montgomery County, and is coming out of the booster station at a high pressure. These are not "what is the minimum I have to do" lines, each contractor should carefully consider how they will mitigate the risk.**

Question Submitted: 11/3/2017 8:55:30 AM

Can field splices #1, #3, #6 & #8 be considered as Optional Field Splices? In lieu of bolted field splices, shop welded splicing, would be utilized, per specifications.

**No. It should be noted that there is very limited construction access underneath the bridge. The erection of the new girders is expected to be performed from the top of the existing bridge and partially finished new bridge. The existing structure plans and Constructability Study will be provided, for informational purposes only. The proposed field splices are mandatory in order to limit the lift weight on the cranes during the girder erection operation so as not to damage the existing superstructure and new superstructure.**

**Project No. 170634**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

MUS-95447 - /PER-SR 93-00.00/17.89

Question Submitted: 12/7/2017 9:49:30 AM

Item 2-Pavement Repair: Sheet 2/25 has the unit in SY & sheet 25/25 shows the unit in CY? Please clarify what unit pavement repair should be bid as.

**The correct unit for Pavement Repair is CY. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 170637**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

STA-101042 - SR MCRO FY2018(C)

Question Submitted: 12/5/2017 4:01:02 PM

There is a bid item of 50 sys of pavement repair as directed, on a project with 147,936 sys and 2 locations. This is extremely expensive work, would the department consider deleting this item from the project, and perform with state forces?

**We need to have the item in the plan in case it is needed before paving.**

**Project No. 170638**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

BUT-102165 - SR 748-01.14

Question Submitted: 12/5/2017 3:13:22 PM

There are several locations, such as x-section 67+82, where the proposed 1:1 open cut slope enters the roadway. In areas where pavement rehabilitation is required due to the use of the 1:1 slope, please clarify where this item will be paid.

**The Item 503 – Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing note on Sheet 22/38 details the requirements for the contractor regarding the assumed 1:1 cut slope.**

\*\*\* 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:* 12/5/2017 3:12:08 PM

Supplemental Specification 878, referenced on the cover sheet of the plans, details payment will be made under Items 840, 867, or 878. However, none of these pay items are included in the project. Please clarify if this specification is required and where it is paid.

**SS878 is not applicable to this project.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/28/2017 2:13:37 PM

On page 3 of the drawings under the last section(Staging Areas and Seeding): it states "...staging areas shall be kept on the west side of SR-748 away from the streambank..."I do not see any construction limits on the west side of SR-748. Are they to be provided or will ODOT or the contractor be required to purchase property(technically in the ROW)?

**ODOT does not provide construction limits for staging areas. It is up to the contractor to locate staging areas given the restrictions listed in the plans.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/28/2017 2:09:41 PM

I did not see any 401 or 404 permits in the bid package? Are there any USACE 401 or 404 permits issued for this project? If not-are they required? IF required whom is to pay for the permits. Page 3 of the drawings state "All applicable 404 & 401 CWA requirements will be followed for this project".

**We are still awaiting approval of the waterway permit. The 404 permit and Special Provisions will be provided via addendum prior to sale. There are no fees associated with the permit.**

**Project No. 170639**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

**SUM-101828 - Columbia Rd (Richfield)**

*Question Submitted:* 12/7/2017 10:28:13 AM

Plan Note for the 9" Reinforced Concrete Pavement indicates Reinforcing to be 1.5#/CY Fiber Mesh, is this in addition to the requirements of 451.08 wire mesh, or in lieu of use of wire mesh?

**The fiber reinforcing is in-lieu of wire mesh.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/7/2017 9:41:51 AM

Will the asphalt driveway to be removed require any embankment?

*Question Submitted:* 12/7/2017 9:37:58 AM

The quantity for asphalt drive removal appears to be significantly incorrect. please verify the quantity provided

*Question Submitted:* 12/7/2017 9:36:26 AM

What is the thickness of the existing asphalt drive to be removed?

*Question Submitted:* 12/7/2017 9:12:26 AM

please provide the depth for the 4" unclassified 4" underdrain item to be installed on Columbia rd.

*Question Submitted:* 12/7/2017 8:12:39 AM

Under which item will the contractor be compensated, for the removal of existing base/sub-base for the installation of the 12" aggregate base on Columbia rd?

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 3:56:58 PM

Since this is such a short project with sections that must be skipped for maintaining traffic would ODOT consider waiving 451.13 and 451.14 for the 9" Concrete Pavement

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/6/2017 2:33:41 PM

the pavement replacement in phase 1 is shown to be inclusive the existing curb.is the lane width as shown on the typical section of the right lane incorrect or is the pavement quantity to be replaced incorrect or should there be a type 6 curb instead of 2-A?

Question Submitted: 12/6/2017 6:44:07 AM

On the bottom of plan page 31/34 this note appears "THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM A CONDUIT CLEANING AND CABLES REMOVED TASK AS DIRECTED. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONFIRM THAT THE CONDUIT IS SOUND AND WILL SUPPORT THE INSTALLATION OF THE NEW SIGNAL CABLES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT ENGINEER OF ANY DEFICIENCIES FOUND WITHIN THE EXISTING CONDUIT RUNS. THE PROJECT ENGINEER WILL AUTHORIZE ANY REPAIRS, AS NECESSARY. The conduit this note is referring to is locating under SR-21, repairing this conduit would entail pavement removal, lane closures etc. How would the contractor be paid for the engineer's authorized repair?

**The final sentence of the plan note will be deleted. The contractor will simply notify the project engineer of an deficiencies found.**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2017 4:53:19 PM

Given the project limits, Item 25 Water and Item 26 Mowing seem to be excessively high. Are these quantities correct?

**The quantities shown are sf and gallons, not MSF and MGal. A correction will be issued in an addendum.**

**Project No. 173000**

**Sale Date - 12/21/2017**

CUY-96833 - IR 490/SR 10-02.09/19.28

Question Submitted: 12/8/2017 10:10:48 AM

6.7 Regulated Material states that "The DBT shall prepare and implement a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan per the requirements of 40 CFR Part 112 that provides specific guidance for managing, handling, and disposing of Regulated Materials that may be encountered within the Right-of-Way and for protecting the health and safety of all on-site personnel and the general public." Will the SPCC Plan need to address regulated materials other than oils? Will the SPCC Plan be limited to addressing above ground storage > 1,320 gallons and buried storage > 42,000 gallons?

Question Submitted: 12/4/2017 9:16:50 AM

The latest AASTOWARE EBS file, Line Number 0046, Indicates a quantity of 49.1 Months for Item Code 619E16021, Field Office, Type C, APP. This does not match the current pay item list as provided in Addendum 21 which indicates a quantity of 40 Months. Please advise the correct bid quantity for this item.

**The quantity for Item Code 619E16021, Field Office, Type C,APP will be updated to 49 months in an upcoming Addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2017 3:06:50 PM

The latest AASTOWARE EBS file, Line Number 0046, Indicates a quantity of 49.1 Months for Item Code 619E16021, Field Office, Type C, APP. This does not match the current pay item list as provide in Addendum 21 which indicates a quantity of 40 Months. Please advise the correct bid quantity for this item.

**The quantity for Item Code 619E16021, Field Office, Type C,APP will be updated to 49 months in an upcoming Addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/22/2017 3:35:00 PM

Please confirm, based on the answer provided to the Prebid Question submitted on 11/20/2017 10:41:22 AM, that the DBT is only responsible for existing building foundation removals if they are impacted by the new work.

**Existing building foundation removals shall be performed in accordance with ODOT Construction and Material Specifications which require foundation removal to a minimum of 1 foot below the grade of the surrounding area, unless additional removal is required to complete the project work.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 2:45:40 PM

In Addendum #21, in sections 14.2.CC and 15.2.H it states that "A ten-foot minimum horizontal clearance is required between new sewers and waterlines per Ohio EPA, while an eight-foot minimum horizontal clearnace is required with an eight-foot minimum horizontal clearnace required with other underground utility. Where the above clearances cannot be provided, the DBT shall submit justification for reduced clearances for approval by regulatory and maintaining agencies. Ductile iron pipe shall be utilized for the entire pipe run (structure to structure) for any approved clearances of 18" or less." Does this requirement hold true for the new waterlines being constructed on the same existing alignment and/ or in the same trench as the existing waterlines that are parallel to and within 10' of an existing combined sewer? (i.e. we are not going to have to offset the proposed lowered section of watermain from the existing portion just because we are currently adjacent to a combined sewer?). Also, do we need to show these correctly on the plans with the proposal to be considered responsive with Addendum #21 or can a plan note be added to acknowledge the change for purposes of submitting the plans in the Technical Proposal?

**The 10ft and 8ft offsets, are required where feasible regardless of the new waterline alignment or placement. For isolated watermain lowerings, required to eliminate conflicts with other project work elements, substandard offsets are acceptable subject to maintaining and regulatory agency approval. The ductile iron requirement for sewers only applies to offsets of 18" or less. For the purposes of the technical proposal, the Conceptual Plans are not required to show the final location of waterlines. This will be determined during final design.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 11:46:45 AM

Reference is made to Section 3.1 of the ITO for RFP wherein it is established that the Technical Proposal is due on December 21, 2:00 pm, or four (4) hours after the price submission is due. As you are aware, the technical proposal is required to include commitments to the NSLE community, both in name and percentage, and the NSLE commitments are also a major evaluation factor of the proposal. Due to the length of time necessary to incorporate the commitments, produce the final documents and deliver them to ODOT, quotes from the NSLE community provided late the night prior or on the morning of the bid will not be considered in our commitments. Given the time of year, NSLE subs and vendors are limited on resources, and many have expressed concern regarding getting quotes out in a timely manner to be considered in the final price proposal. We are requesting that the due date for the technical proposal is modified to Friday, December 22, 10:00 am to allow the teams to consider quotes from the NSLE community right up until the price is due. This will optimize the usage of NSLE subs and vendors and promote and accurate and complete representation or our commitments in the technical proposal.

**The technical and price proposal due dates and times will remain as advertised.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 10:41:46 AM

The Pay Item List and EBSx files provided with Addendum 20 switched the descriptions of Items 0024 and 0025 from the PDF pay item list provided on 03/22/2017, however the addendum 20 'biditem changes' language does not indicate this switch. Please clarify.

**The descriptions of items 0024 and 0025 in the Pay Item List and EBSx file provided with Addendum 20 are correct although the change was not included in the "Bid Item Changes" included in the cover letter.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 10:41:18 AM

Addendum 20 provided a Pay Item List which no longer includes Item 0009 - Special - Drainage Alternate. The EBSx file still contains this item. Please clarify if Item 0009 is to be included in the bid.

**The EBSx file is correct. Item 0009 - Special - Drainage Alternate is required.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2017 8:05:08 AM

Pursuant to ITO section 4.6.1, the contractor is required to achieve the 2% New, 2% Small, 6% Local, and 10% Edge for a minimum 20% NSLE goal. Pursuant to ITO section 4.6.2, the minimum number of committed business is identified per each category of NSLE. Pursuant to ITO section 4.8.1, bonus points are available for edge commitments as a percent of the contract. Pursuant to ITO section 4.8.2, bonus points are available for additional firm utilization above the requirements of 4.6.2. Can a firm who meets several NSLE categories be used to meet the goals as it relates to percent committed and number of committed firms, so long as they only apply to one category per each ITO section. For example, can a firm who meets the categories of Edge and New, be utilized to meet the goal for Edge pursuant to 4.6.1 and 4.8.1 AND can this firm be used in the count for committed New category (NOT EDGE) pursuant to 4.6.2 and 4.8.2?

**No. As described in section 4.6.1, commitments shall not apply to more than one Goal. This evaluation will be carried through to all evaluation criteria, including the Technical Proposal evaluation in response to section 4.8.1. A named committed firm shall only be counted as identified in the Technical Proposal response Sub-category D.3.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 10:41:42 AM

Addendum 20 added Appendix EN-15 which is 608 individual pictures of miscellaneous waste and a map of where the pictures were taken, with no quantification of the waste items. Scope Section 6.7.7 was also added and requires that the DBT's base bid include the removal of the superficial wastes shown in EN-15. The unit price bid items established appear to only be for additional waste not identified in the photos. It is impossible to quantify and bid the removal of miscellaneous waste at 608 locations in the amount of time provided, and the quantification of what exists when the photo was taken vs. what may be dumped afterwards will be extraneous work for both the DBT and ODOT after award. We request the Department pay for all superficial wastes, including those shown in EN-15, in the unit price items established by Addendum 20.

**The DBT's bid should have already required the disposal of the superficial wastes within the project footprint in order to construct the project. Addendum 20 clarifies that this work is included in the DBT's base bid and requires the initial removal of these items so that tracking of additional dumping can be readily quantified to minimize extraneous work by the DBT and ODOT. Addendum 20 also provides estimated quantities and pay items for ongoing illegal dumping activities. The photos are included to aid the documentation of illegal dumping activities that occurred after the bid submittal and before the initial removal of superficial wastes. The Department will not separately pay for the superficial wastes present on site and identified in EN-15."**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 10:41:22 AM

Addendum 20 modified Scope 13.2.7.1 to state that the DBT is responsible for removal of existing foundations, utilities and other site improvements that are in conflict with our work and provided a link to historic mapping identifying previous buildings. As there is no way for the DBT to accurately determine the underground extent of existing facilities either from historic mapping or site visits, we request Section 13.2.7.1 be modified to make the DBT responsible for removals impacted by our facilities only to the extent that they can reasonably be identified prior to the bid by visual inspection of the site.

**The Department will not provide separate compensation for the removal of previous building/site pavements, foundations and utilities since the extent of these removals will be dependent upon the DBT's design. Typical building demolition only requires supporting wall removal to 1' below finished grade, so while building foundations may not be visible at ground surface, they may be encountered within the project footprint and should be included in the DBT's bid. Residential structures demolished under the OC2 contract that are within the OC3 footprint, did include complete removal of the supporting walls, foundations and floor slabs, with utility removals to the limits of the existing building.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 10:14:09 AM

Per Addendum 20 revision in Section 19.5.3.F, accent lighting shall be provided at parapets in addition to pylons. There is no further description found in the contract documents regarding the required accent lighting in parapets. No details for parapet accent lighting are found in AE-02. We request that the Department clarify the accent lighting requirements.

**The reference to parapets was added to Section 19.5.3.F to account for the parapet mounted Reno light columns. No additional parapet accent lighting is required.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 10:13:45 AM

The "Pedestrian Use Sidewalk" sign cannot be found in the OMUTCD, TEM, or City of Cleveland standard drawings. What size is this sign to be?

**The "Pedestrian Use Sidewalk" with arrow is a special sign and shall be 18" x 18".**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 10:13:29 AM

Per Section 19.5.2.A.1, DBT is to coordinate with CCP to size and construct concrete pads for new transformers (5). Can ODOT provide a size to be used for bidding this item?

**For the purpose of the bid, the DBT shall assume 6' x 6' reinforced concrete transformer pads with 3'-6" frost footings. The DBT shall coordinate final pad dimension requirements with CPP during plan development.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 10:13:13 AM

Scope Section 19.2.6.A states "No pedestrian accommodations at Quadrant and OH-10 intersection." Does this refer only to at grade facilities (curb ramps, crosswalk) or is the proposed pedestrian bridge over OH-10 to be removed?

**The pedestrian bridge is required per Section 16. Scope Section 19.2.6.A refers to sidewalks, curb ramps, cross walks and pedestrian signal heads, which do not apply to this signalized intersection.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 10:12:54 AM

Regarding Scope Sections 14 & 15: Is it necessary to provide separate storm and sanitary profiles for every run, including those that can be shown clearly on the roadway profile and/or cross sections?

**The Department is requiring that each sewer run have a profile cut along its length. Showing a sewer profile on a cross section for a lateral crossing is acceptable, as is showing a longitudinal sewer on the roadway profile sheet. Each of these situations provides a separate sewer profile cut along the length of the pipe and allows the department to review the clearances to existing/proposed utility crossings/ roadway features. The DBT shall not superimpose lateral sewer profiles over the longitudinal sewer profiles since these skewed profiles are not cut along the length of the pipe and therefore clearances to utilities are not easily reviewed.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 10:12:31 AM

Sections 14.2.CC and 15.2.H state that storm/sewer runs are to be 10' from UG water and 8' from all other UG utilities. This is very restrictive at the intersections of OH-10 with existing crossing roads as there are already a substantial number of UG utilities here. Please clarify the intent at these locations?

**The Department established the clearance requirements based on regulatory and maintaining agency policy. The DBT's design shall provide the minimum clearances where feasible. The Department recognizes that the due to existing conditions, these clearances may not always be feasible, therefore Section 14.2.CC and 15.2.H allow the DBT to submit justification to the approving/maintaining agencies for substandard clearances when required. This is further clarified in Addendum 21.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/15/2017 2:33:33 PM

There is a discrepancy within the ITO on what the date and time of submission is for the technical and price proposals. Section 1.2 says, "Tech and Price Proposals Due Thursday, December 21, 2017 - 2:00 pm", Section 3.1 says, "The Technical Proposal shall be submitted on or before Friday, December 21, 2017 at 2:00 pm", Section 3.3 says, "The Price Proposal will be submitted using the Bid Express website in accordance with the process described in PN 019 and PN 097 (102.06 – Preparation of Bids) on or before 10:00 am on Friday, December 21, 2017." Friday, December 21, 2017 is not a real date. Should the date be Thursday, December 21 or Friday, December 22? Is the Bid Express Price Proposal due at 10 AM on the date of submission and the Technical Proposal and sealed/paper Price Proposal due at 2 PM on the date of submission?

**This will be corrected in the next addendum. The correct submittal date is Thursday, December 21, 2017. The times of day shown in the ITO are correct as written, with Bid Express due at 10:00AM and Technical Proposal and sealed/paper Price Proposal due at 2:00 PM.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/15/2017 2:14:05 PM

There is a discrepancy between the Scope and ITO in regards to Substantial Completion and Project Completion. Page 19 of the Scope was updated in Addendum 20 to make Substantial Completion 11/1/21 and Project Completion 6/30/22; Page 3 of the ITO still has Substantial Completion as 11/1/20 and Project Completion as 6/30/21. Are the updated dates in the Scope the correct contract dates?

**This will be corrected in the next addendum. The correct dates are 11/01/2021 (substantial completion) and 6/30/2022 (final completion).**

*Question Submitted:* 11/15/2017 2:09:27 PM

Pursuant to payment for the Diversity, Inclusion, and Outreach Consultant (DIOC). Would ODOT consider creating an allowance for this scope to compensate the DIOC?

**The Department will not create a separate allowance for DIOC compensation.**

*Question Submitted:* 6/1/2017 10:19:56 AM

A question was submitted on 5/15 regarding the substantial completion date. With the proposals now due in just over two weeks, will the Department please provide a timeframe for their response to this question?

**Per Addendum No. 20 dated November 3, 2017, in Scope Section 1.1, the substantial completion date has been revised to November 21, 2021. The Project completion date has been revised to June 30, 2022. The changes to these revised dates were missed in the Instructions to Offerors (ITO) for Addendum No. 20. The completion dates in the ITO will be corrected in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 5/15/2017 3:39:33 PM

The Department has now delayed the proposal due date as well as anticipated award for the project a total of four months from the dates originally published. However, the required substantial completion date has not been adjusted, effectively reducing the allowable construction duration for the project by 4 months. This reduction places unreasonable schedule risk on the design-builder, particularly in consideration of the many MOT restriction limitations specified in Section 20.3.2 of the project scope. We are respectfully requesting that the Department consider changing the substantial completion date to July 1, 2021 to offset the delay in the anticipated award of the project and to provide reasonable duration to construct the project while accommodating MOT limitations as required.

**Per Addendum No. 20 dated November 3, 2017, in Scope Section 1.1, the substantial completion date has been revised to November 21, 2021. The Project completion date has been revised to June 30, 2022. The changes to these revised dates were missed in the Instructions to Offerors (ITO) for Addendum No. 20. The completion dates in the ITO will be corrected in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 5/15/2017 9:28:06 AM

Given the now four-month delay to the bid submittal, we respectfully request that ODOT increase the stipend amount. The duration of the RFP period has doubled from the original four-month duration. This extended period has substantially increased pursuit costs including: - Extended engagement of the prebid team resulting in increased design, estimating, and proposal preparation expenses - Having key personnel committed to the project who cannot be assigned a substantial role on other projects - Cost of financing the prebid effort for an extended duration

**Per Addendum No. 20 dated November 3, 2017, the Stipend amount has been increased from \$800,000 to \$1,000,000.**

*Question Submitted:* 5/13/2017 12:41:59 PM

Are we able to substitute an angle 8 x 6 x 1/2 or 9 x 4 x 1/2 in lieu of the bent plate on the diaphragm support?

**This question needs further clarification before a response can be provided. The specific bent plate/diaphragm support needs to be identified. Also, it is unclear if the question pertains to a scope section detail or if it is in reference to an ODOT Standard Drawing.**

*Question Submitted:* 4/8/2017 9:43:50 AM

PN097, Section 107.12 requires any Subcontractor of the Lead Contractor providing in-house professional services to carry \$5M of Professional Liability Insurance. Since the IQF will not be applying their professional seal to drawings, does this requirement apply to them? If it does apply to the IQF, then we request that the Department allow the same language that is provided for the Lead Contractor in that the professional liability coverage obtained by the IQF shall protect against the acts of its lower tier subconsultants. Otherwise, this prohibits some consultants from participating in the project as they cannot obtain sufficient coverage amounts on their own.

**The Department interprets the IQF as performing in-house professional services for the Design-Build Team. The Design-Build Team may also be legally the same as the Lead Contractor. The Department will not prohibit the IQF from obtaining a policy which provides coverage to lower tier subconsultants, but also will not require an extended coverage policy in this regard.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/29/2017 4:36:57 PM

Will ODOT's response to remove any mention of a community service project within the ITO be reflected in an Addendum?

**Yes, the community service project requirement included in the ITO will be removed in a future addendum. The Department anticipates this addendum to be released on April 7, 2017.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/24/2017 2:44:53 PM

Please reference Section 4.7 of the ITO for RFP in regards to Contractor Pre-qualifications. We are requesting verification of the Department's intentions in providing subcontractor's for each "Work Type Code". It is likely that the offeror will be receiving Subcontract pricing until just before the bid is turned in through Bidx. However, the prequalification information must be included in the proposal, which needs to be printed long before pricing is finalized. Does the Department expect the Offeror to commit to a specific Subcontractor for each Work Type Code not maintained by the Offeror? Or is it acceptable to put "Prequalified Subcontractor" or other similar general designation?

**The Department expects the DBT to name, where feasible, the subcontractor expected to perform the work type. As allowable options in the Project Scope may eliminate the need for an individual work type and/or prequalification category, the Short-listed Offeror shall either have the necessary prequalification for that work type or be able to subcontract the work. The Department anticipates the majority of the major work items will have predetermined subcontractors and anticipates the named committed subcontractors be demonstrated, but providing "Prequalified Subcontractor" (or similar) will not cause a Technical Proposal to be non-responsive. The Department will require a designer be named for all the prequalification categories.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 3/24/2017 9:24:13 AM

Addendum 15 notes that the completion date changed to June 30, 2021. Is this a change to the Substantial Completion Date, as the Project Completion Date was already June 30, 2021 per Scope Section 1.1?

**The Substantial Completion Date and Project Completion Date in the scope are correct. The intent of stating the Project Completion Date in Addendum #15 was to formalize the change that was made in Addendum #6.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/22/2017 12:44:37 PM

The Proposal issued for this project states that The Date Set for Completion is November 1, 2020. The Project Scope states "The substantial completion date for the project is November 1, 2020. The Project completion date is June 30, 2021." Please clarify which is the correct completion date for the project.

**The Project completion date of June 30, 2021, as stated in Section 1.1 of the Project Scope is the correct completion date. No addendum will be issued for this clarification.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/22/2017 11:52:18 AM

Insurance Comments to Prime Contract, Paragraph 107.12". The current spec indicates that the ERP start date is required to be "date of Final Acceptance and Payment". Industry Standard start date of an Extended Reporting Period under a Professional Liability policy is the date of "Substantial Completion" since this is an objective date and a milestone under most Design-Build contracts. Further it is our understanding that per Ohio Code the Statute of Repose in Ohio runs 10 years "from the date of Substantial Completion for such improvement". We would respectfully request that the insurance specifications be revised to change the date at which the Extended Reporting Period of the Professional Liability policy begins to the Date of "Substantial Completion".

**The Department will not change insurance requirements. Please provide the specific project professional liability policy as requested in the Contract.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/22/2017 9:17:41 AM

Section 3.iii of the ITO, which can be found on page 35 of 59 mentions to identify a community service project. The SOS does not mention a requirement of a service project. Please advise.

**The DBT shall disregard any mention of a community service project within the ITO.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/19/2017 11:28:27 AM

A response to a question on 02/27 stated that the EBS file would be updated to add more specificity to the item descriptions. For example Items 23, 24, and 25 all have the same description and the same Item Number 611E97910. There are multiple duplications like this in the file and with no corresponding paper copy it's difficult to ensure that we are bidding the correct work in each item. Will a revised EBS file be provided?

**A "Pay Item List" that is associated with EBS Amendment No. 010x can be found at the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/OC3/BidListing/>**

*Question Submitted:* 3/19/2017 10:30:45 AM

PN110 requires Escrow Bid Documents to be submitted by the low two bidders the day after the bid opening. Please confirm that the bid opening date referred to in PN110 is May 18, 2017.

**Addendum 15 revised the bid opening date to Thursday, June 8, 2017. Per PN 110, the low two bidders shall submit Escrow Bid Documents the day after the bid opening (June 9, 2017).**

*Question Submitted:* 3/17/2017 4:53:24 PM

The answer to the prebid question on 03/02/2017 regarding waterlines across E. 55th states that they shall remain in service unless outages are granted by CDW. To date, CDW has been non-responsive to our requests for prebid coordination. Attachment MT-02 does not show temporary relocation or maintenance of these waterlines during construction, indicating that CDW may have given ODOT or HNTB direction that outages could occur. Has ODOT already coordinated outages of these lines and can the information provided in MT-01 be relied upon for bidding purposes?

**The Department did not obtain formal direction from CWD but typically allows water transmission mains to be taken off of service during the non-pumping seasons from Labor Day to Memorial Day. The DBT will need to maintain water supply to GCRTA's facilities adjacent to E. 55th Street including train maintenance/transit police north of the project by use of existing temporary/relocated waterlines. The DBT will need to obtain concurrence from GCRTA if these facilities can be back-fed from the north.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 3/17/2017 11:50:16 AM

Phase II analytical data indicates there are multiple locations where chemical concentrations in soils exceed the US EPA's Regional Screening Levels (residential). The Ohio EPA uses these RSLs as a basis for determining when a soil becomes a regulated waste, and can not be re-used as fill. In addition, there are multiple locations in which the total metal concentration exceeds 20 times the characteristic hazardous limit based on toxicity (40 CFR 261.24). This means these soils could potentially be hazardous wastes, and will be required to be handled and disposed as such if excavated without additional supporting TCLP analysis. It was reported that some of these locations were scheduled for additional TCLP re-sampling in February 2017. Will these TCLP analysis be made available prior to the bid deadline?

**TCLP analysis will not be available prior to the bid deadline. Remaining analytical results will be provided to the successful DBT. See Appendix EN-14 (Section 3 Supplemental ESA Phase II Report).**

*Question Submitted:* 3/16/2017 12:33:30 PM

Will the Department be issuing another addendum?

**Yes, the Department will be issuing another addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/16/2017 9:37:30 AM

Section 5 of the Scope of Services (SOS) has not been updated with the additional requirements that addendum 12 added in the ITO and PN 098. Paragraph 3 in section 5.4 of the SOS states the POC shall present the draft DIOP to various project personnel and stakeholders. Should this presentation not be led by the DIOC?

**Section 5 will be updated in a future addendum to be consistent with ITO and PN098. The POC shall present the draft DIOP to various project personnel and stakeholders.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/14/2017 4:42:52 PM

Scope Section 16.9 states that all retaining walls from begin work to Kingsbury Run Bridge and along Quadrant Roadway shall utilize the parapet and fence details from AE-02 and shall have a parapet and fence extending over the entire length of the retaining walls. Please clarify the parapet requirements as it relates to this. AE-02 Sheet 2/11 shows a 2'-10" barrier with 6' vandal fence. Sheet 10/11 shows a 5' coping on top of the walls. Is the intent that the 2'-10" barrier sit on top of the 5' coping? Does the fence on the retaining walls need to include the RENO light columns? Does the fence on the retaining walls need to include the radius steel plate shown on every 4th post on sheet 2/11 in AE-02? We understand this question is being submitted after the cutoff date, however some suppliers are just now starting to review the project and raise questions.

**Parapets and architectural fencing per the details on sheet 2 of 11, of AE-02, are required on all retaining walls west of Kingsbury Run Bridge. This parapet will be placed on top of the wall coping. The portion of the detail on sheet 10 of 11 that does not show the parapet atop the retaining wall would apply for retaining walls east of the Kingsbury Run Bridge. The radius steel plate is an element of the architectural fencing per AE-02 and is required for architectural fencing placed on retaining wall parapets. Reno light columns are not required on retaining wall parapets. Reno lights are only required on bridge parapets. The scope will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/12/2017 12:19:09 PM

Scope 16.5.P states that all fence anchors shall be cast into the parapet. This effectively prohibits slipforming of the parapets. Will the Department allow the anchors to be drilled and grouted and is slipforming allowed on this project?

**No. All anchors must be cast into the parapet.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/12/2017 11:38:22 AM

This question was previously submitted on 03/01/2017 but was not posted to ODOT's list: Is the DBT required to provide all splice kits for both CPP "hot splices" to tie the new system and the DBT's other splices within the new system?

**Yes, the DBT supplies all splice kits for the project. The DBT will perform all splicing except for the "hot splices" to the existing circuits which will be performed by CPP using splice kits provided by the DBT.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 3/6/2017 6:50:29 PM

Can ODOT please clarify the response provided to the previous prebid question asked on 3/2/2017: Is the contractor to assume a cost for UST removal for properties where it is mentioned that a UST is likely present? If so what assumptions are we to make on contents and size?

**The following is the correct response to this prebid question:**

**Properties with Known USTs will be clarified in a future addendum. Abatement, excavation, and handling activities associated with Known Regulated Materials shall be included in the Proposal price. See Scope Section 6.7.1.1.**

**DBT assumptions regarding the contents and size of Known USTs shall be based on the data and results provided in the Scope, Appendix EN-01 (Section 3 Phase II ESA Reports), and Appendix EN-14 (Section 3 Supplemental Phase II ESA Report).**

*Question Submitted:* 3/6/2017 6:47:17 PM

Can ODOT please clarify the response provided to the previous prebid question asked on 3/2/2017: Is the contractor to assume all impacted soils are non-hazardous solid waste?

**The following is the correct response to this prebid question:**

**See Scope Section 6.7: "The term 'Regulated Materials' includes Hazardous Waste." Known Regulated Materials are defined in Scope Section 6.7.1.1.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/6/2017 6:46:11 PM

Can ODOT please clarify the response provided to the previous prebid question asked on 3/2/2017: Regarding the environmental scope, is the contractor only responsible to manage soils that are within the right of way and directly affected by our work?

**The following is the correct response to this prebid question:**

**See Scope Section 6.7.5: "The removal and/or remediation of Regulated Materials shall be limited to only those materials that are disturbed as part of the DBT's construction activities or indicated elsewhere in the Contract Documents. Further corrective measures or remedial action shall not be required."**

*Question Submitted:* 3/5/2017 3:04:53 PM

Would the Owner consider having a 10 year total, policy term and extended reporting period, on the Designer's Professional Liability policy requirement? A 10 Year extended reporting period is not commercially standard and may be difficult/and or expensive to procure on a project of this duration.

**Please provide the specific project professional liability policy as requested in the Contract.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/3/2017 10:40:46 AM

What size conduits are required for the Verizon duct bank on the NS Bridge?

**Conduit sizes shall be coordinated with the utility owner.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/3/2017 10:40:37 AM

What size conduits are required for the T-Cubed duct bank on the NS Bridge?

**Conduit sizes shall be coordinated with the utility owner.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 8:22:36 PM

RW-04 shows permanent R/W being purchases from GCRTA for their Parking lot. The near STA 28+50 Left is shown less than 1' from the proposed wall along OC Blvd. Since proposed walls are not allowed to extend outside R/W, please provide sufficient R/W for this wall.

**Minimum tree lawn widths were reduced from 15 feet to 12 feet at this location as part of Addendum 8. RW-04 is provided as reference and was not updated to reflect this change.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 8:20:24 PM

Instructions to Offers', Section 4.4.1 Design and IQF (Part B) Content, Item 4. Submit conceptual plans, states to include the following: iii. Project vertical profiles and geometry coordinated with the horizontal alignments. Please clarify what specific Location and Design Manual Volume III plan sheets you are asking to be included to satisfy this requirement.

**Project vertical profiles and geometry shall include preliminary plan and profile sheets for OH-10 and intersecting roadways and shall include horizontal and vertical alignment and curve data. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 4:14:11 PM

Is the contractor to assume a cost for UST removal for properties where it is mentioned that a UST is likely present? If so what assumptions are we to make on contents and size?

**Properties with Known USTs will be clarified in a future addendum. Abatement, excavation, and handling activities associated with Known Regulated Materials shall be included in the Proposal price. See Scope Section 6.7.1.1.**

**DBT assumptions regarding the contents and size of Known USTs shall be based on the data and results provided in the Scope, Appendix EN-01 (Section 3 Phase II ESA Reports), and Appendix EN-14 (Section 3 Supplemental Phase II ESA Report).**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 4:14:01 PM

Is the contractor to assume all impacted soils are non-hazardous solid waste?

**See Scope Section 6.7: "The term 'Regulated Materials' includes Hazardous Waste." Known Regulated Materials are defined in Scope Section 6.7.1.1.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 4:13:52 PM

How is the contractor to assume to manage impacted groundwater that may be encountered during work?

**See Scope Section 6.7.5: "The DBT shall conduct all excavation, dewatering, temporary stockpiling and/or containerization, handling, transport and disposal of all Regulated Materials in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations."**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 4:13:41 PM

Regarding the environmental scope, what is the contractor to assume for extents of remediation when there are several clean borings and one boring showing a VAP exceedance?

**See Scope Section 6.7.5: "Where material is excavated between two adjacent sample locations . . . the greater concentration each chemical of concern shall be assumed for the entire area between the sample locations."**

**The DBT may conduct additional sampling to further delineate areas of Regulated Materials. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 4:13:32 PM

Regarding the environmental scope, is the contractor only responsible to manage soils that are within the right of way and directly affected by our work ?

**See Scope Section 6.7.5: "The removal and/or remediation of Regulated Materials shall be limited to only those materials that are disturbed as part of the DBT's construction activities or indicated elsewhere in the Contract Documents. Further corrective measures or remedial action shall not be required."**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 4:06:22 PM

The response provided to Question 2/27/2017 7:58:07 AM does not match the question. The question is in regards to the signatures required and the fact that there does not appear to be a letter required with the Price Proposal. The response appears to deal with the NSLE commitment documentation, which does not need wet signatures nor is it included with the Price Proposal. Please clarify.

**The signature in question is for Form A-1, which is to be included within F.1: Appendix 1 – Administrative Submittal. There is no separate letter required with the "Sealed Version" of the Price.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 3:52:52 PM

Please provide the ADTT's for all sidestreets as they are not provided in Attachment TC-05. These are required to determine the pavement composition per Scope 12.1.3.

**The DBT shall assume 6% ADTT for all roadways. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 3:16:31 PM

There are 6", 8" and 30" waterlines under E. 55th Street. Can these lines be temporarily cut and capped during construction?

**The DBT shall maintain waterlines in service unless outages are granted by the City of Cleveland Division of Water.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 3:16:22 PM

There are 12" and 16" waterlines that cross the existing E. 89th Street bridge. It is not possible to maintain these lines during complete removal of the existing structure and construction of the new pedestrian bridge. Can these lines be temporarily cut and capped during construction?

**The DBT shall maintain waterlines in service unless outages are granted by the City of Cleveland Division of Water.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 2:15:49 PM

Professional Liability Insurance - The RFP requires 10 years of extended reporting period following substantial completion. Is this type of insurance commercially available?

**Yes.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 2:15:31 PM

The RFP states that "The DBT shall obtain a "Silver" sustainability rating using FHWA INVEST or Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure Envision rating criteria, based on a joint DBT/Department scoring workshop." 1. What, if any, review mechanism does ODOT expect the DBT to use to verify the project's sustainability performance according to the selected rating system (INVEST or Envision)? 2. Is it sufficient to use an internal review team independent from those establishing and incorporating the sustainability activities into the design and construction processes or, where available (i.e. in the case of Envision), does ODOT expect a true third-party verification and award of the Silver target rating? 3. Aside from quarterly sustainability reports to track progress, what other documentation of the achievement of the various criteria does ODOT expect as a deliverable for this task?

**"INVEST and Envision have different requirements. The DBT shall follow regulations set forth with whichever program they utilize.**

**The Department anticipates an internal project review team consisting of representatives of the Contractor, the Designer, the IQF, and the Owner (ODOT). The internal project review team should appropriate members of the team, not involved in collecting the data used for scoring. An independent third party verification is not necessary for INVEST. ENVISION requires a third party. The DBT shall provide all documentation necessary to support the scoring which may vary depending on the item being scored.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/2/2017 7:12:46 AM

The updated Addendum 10 Scope does not define cable install between the new and existing manholes at the eastern and western pavement limits of Woodland Avenue. Is the DBT to assume there is no need for cable in these conduits?

**Correct, cabling is not anticipated between the new and existing manholes at the eastern and western pavement limits of Woodland Avenue.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:28:38 PM

The updated Addendum 10 Scope does not define cable install within the replaced East 79th Street or East 89th Street conduit systems. Is the DBT to assume there is no need for cable in these?

**Scope Section 7.8.2 describes the required cable relocations on East 79th Street and East 89th Street. A new reference document will provide a visual representation of the cabling described in the scope which is only within a portion of the duct system on each roadway.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 8:28:21 PM

Addendum 10 updated the Scope to reflect cable requirements for underground relocations using the verbiage "within the new conduits." Is the number of cables required per conduit or total to be distributed equally amount the conduit? For example, south side of I-490 is to have three 5-inch conduits and six 4/0-1C-CU-15kV cables within the new conduits, so is this a total of six or 18 4/0-1C-CU-15kV cables?

**The total in the example given would be 6 new cables - three cables for circuit 302C and three cables for circuit 309C.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 8:28:02 PM

Sheet 3/23 is duplicated twice in UT-07 as PDF pages 4 and 5. Pleas provide Sheet 4/23.

**UT-07 will be revised in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 8:27:51 PM

Scope Section 7.9.1 requires the DBT to "design and construct six 5-inch concrete encased PVC conduits along the new alignment of OH-10" and Scope Section 19.5.4 requires the DBT to construct a conduit system with "4 – 2inch conduits, accompanied by 2 – 5 inch supplemental conduits" along both sides of the roadway. Addendum 10 added to Scope Section 19.5.4 that "The DBT shall construct the two 5-inch conduits as part of the duct bank along OH-10". Is the TOTAL of 5 inch conduits to be 8 or 10? Can the two 5-inch conduits described in 19.5.4 be counted as 2 of the 6 – 5inch conduits described in 7.9.1? Please provide a sketch to clarify the Department's intent.

**The total number of 5" conduits is ten. The 2 - 5 inch conduits described in 19.5.4 can not be counted as two of the 6 - 5 inch conduits. A detail of the lighting conduit is provided in TC-08. which does not include the separate 6 - 5 inch conduit CPP ducts.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 8:27:39 PM

May the provisions of ODOT's Seismic methodology be applied to the design of the Norfolk Southern structure over OH-10, or are AREMA Chapter 9 Seismic provisions required?

**The design of the Norfolk Southern structure over OH-10 shall be in accordance with AREMA Chapter 9 Seismic Design for Railway Structures.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 8:27:23 PM

The 2016 Interims to the AASHTO LRFD specifications changed the fatigue category for cross frame welded connections from a Category E to a Category E'. Traditionally, cross frame members are welded to gusset plates, with bolted connections to girder stiffeners. For curved bridges with cross frames that are designed as main structural members, it is highly unlikely to meet the E' stress threshold with welded connections, resulting in very costly bolted connections between the crossframe members and the connection plates. We understand that ODOT has permitted use of Category E thresholds for crossframe member connections in accordance with the previous AASHTO provisions. Would ODOT consider acceptance of welded cross frames connections that meet Category E in lieu of Category E'?

**No, the Department will not accept welded cross frames connections that meet Category E in lieu of Category E'.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 8:27:10 PM

The Scope states: "A single substructure foundation shall have no less than four drilled shafts." Can this be waived for pedestrian structures?

**Yes. The Department will allow less than four drilled shafts for pedestrian structures. This will be modified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 8:26:56 PM

Please specify the existing conductor materials associated with the updated CPP information so the DBT can determine appropriate splice kit needs at all tie-ins.

**The Department does not have information regarding existing conductor materials.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 8:26:44 PM

Scope Section 7.9.1 states "The conduit system along OH-10 shall tie to existing/proposed conduits at intersecting roadways with new manholes and shall also include new concrete encased PVC conduits on intersecting roads as required to tie together existing and proposed conduit systems. Please specify the required size and number of conduits for this work.

**The required size and number of conduits along intersecting roadways is described in Section 7.8.2**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:26:32 PM

Per Addendum 10 updates, Scope Section 7.8.2 requires the DBT to install a new manhole on the west side of East 75th Street. Is it acceptable for the DBT to install the new manhole on the east side of the street since this is the side on which the aerial is being redirected underground?

**The scope will be revised in a future addendum removing the specific location of the manhole.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:26:17 PM

Per Addendum 10 updates, Scope Section 7.8.2 requires removing the existing underground ducts within the pavement replacement limits on Woodland Avenue. How does the Department intend for the DBT to terminate/leave access to the existing underground ducts beyond the project's pavement replacement limits?

**The DBT shall terminate and cap the existing ducts at the pavement replacement limit and abandon the existing ducts within the adjacent manhole. New lateral crossings of Woodland Avenue will connect from the existing manholes to the new duct system along the north side of Woodland Avenue.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:26:03 PM

UT-05 was updated in Addendum 10 with new CPP lines but there was no updated narrative in Scope Section 7.8.2 to reflect these changes. Will the Department be providing guidance on what measures the DBT needs to perform at these locations? Some examples include underground CPP on the east side of E. 55th Street (UT-05 pg 1/15) as well as all the Triplex linework (UT-05 pages vary).

**UT-05 is a reference document of the existing electric facilities. Scope Section 7.8 describes the new overhead and underground work the DBT is responsible for but is not a narrative of all removal work. For example, the existing overhead electric on the east side of E. 55th Street, as shown in UT-05, is for street lighting but not included in Scope Section 7.8 since underground lighting circuits will be utilized on E. 55th Street.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:25:47 PM

Scope Section 19.3.2.J requires that the "DBT shall provide design calculations showing the existing overhead sign supports are not overloaded by the proposed signage." Can the Department please provide existing sign structure calculations in order for the DBT to perform this design check with proposed signage as requested?

**Available record construction plans will be provided in a future addendum. The Department will not supply existing sign structure calculation.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:25:31 PM

Scope Section 19.3.2.I requires that the "where existing overhead sign supports are reused, the existing vertical clearances shall be maintained or improved." In order for the DBT to adhere to this requirement, can the Department please provide existing clearances?

**Available record construction plans will be provided in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:25:13 PM

Scope Section 19.2 states the intersection of E. 55th Street & Quadrant is "reconstruct signal" but Scope Section 19.2.1.1 states "A. Remove existing traffic signal installation and B. Provide new mast arm signal installation." Please specify the Departments requirement at this intersection. If not to be reconstructed to the new E. 55th Street & Quadrant final location, may the DBT use for the temporary traffic signal required on sheet 4 of 8 in MT-02? If reuse is allowed (for permanent or temporary purposes), will the department provide mast arm and pole design calcs in order for the DBT to confirm the design loading will not exceed maximum allowable.

**The DBT shall remove the existing signal at E. 55th & Francis and construct a new signal at E. 55th & the proposed Quadrant Roadway. Reuse of the existing signal installation is not permitted for either permanent or temporary purposes.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:24:55 PM

It is assumed that the signals at the intersection of 55th and I-490/Bower are to be removed as part of this project but it is not listed with other signal work in Project Scope Section 19.2. Please confirm or clarify the Department's intent at this location.

**The signal installation at E.55th and I-490 shall be removed by the DBT. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 8:24:27 PM

Per the response to the Prebid question on 2/6/17 at 7:40:04 AM, the DBT is required to add the 3 supplemental route shields and associated cardinal directions to sign AE. Please confirm the cardinal directions associated with each of these supplemental signs because it is not legible in Appendix TC-07.

**The three cardinal direction signs are: 77 South, 71 South and 90 West.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:30:52 PM

In 16.3.4.3.C, the revised scope states that piles not driven to bedrock are limited to the ultimate bearing values listed in the BDM in Section 202.2.3.2.b. The limits in this section generally ensure that piles can be driven with a pile hammer with an energy rating of 42 kip-ft. This is appropriate for design-bid-build projects because a 42 kip-ft hammer is commonly available. For a design build project, the DBT should be allowed to match the pile and pile hammer to the soil conditions to optimize the capacity of the pile. Since the DBT's pile drivability analysis will ensure that the pile can be driven to the desired capacity, and since the DBT is ultimately responsible for the successful installation of the pile it designs anyway, will ODOT remove the limit on pile UBV stated in Section 16.3.4.3.C of the scope?

**The Department will waive the scope language in 16.3.4.3, Paragraph C, "For pile sizes included in the BDM, the ultimate bearing values for piles not driven to refusal on bedrock shall not be greater than the tabulated values listed in BDM Section 202.2.3.2.b." This will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:20:19 PM

In response to the language added to scope section 19.3.2.C in Addendum 8, the new overhead signs containing the "Opportunity Corridor Blvd" destination are anticipated to be unusually large. In order to adequately analyze the existing overhead sign structures for potential reuse, please supply existing plans and "as built" for the existing structures as well as when they were constructed and any structural fatigue that should be assumed.

**Available record construction plans will be provided in a future addendum. The Department will not provide assumptions regarding structural fatigue.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:20:04 PM

Project Scope 16.3.6 Superstructure says that "In addition to the requirements of Section 302.1.4.3 of the 2007 BDM, all exposed concrete surfaces of beams, diaphragms, and end diaphragms of prestressed concrete I-beam bridges shall be sealed per Item 512." Please clarify the definition of "all exposed concrete surfaces" as typically only the fascias of the exterior beams which are exposed to traffic and the elements are sealed.

**Yes, all exposed surfaces, not just fascia beams, shall be sealed.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:19:37 PM

Scope 16.3.2 Bridge Removals says Deck Concrete shall be removed only by lift methods. Could this requirement be waived for NS RR over vacated Grand Avenue considering there is no traffic under this structure?

**The requirement to remove deck concrete only by lift methods will be waived for NS RR over vacated Grand Avenue. Scope Section 16.3.2 will be modified in a future addendum**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:19:26 PM

Section 16.3.4.1.F states "... a minimum of five percent of production drilled shafts per retaining wall, that are 4 feet or larger in diameter shall also be tested by crosshole sonic logging (CSL)." However, soldier pile walls often use rolled beam sections for reinforcing rather than rebar cages. The large steel section would interfere with the signal path between CSL tubes. Please clarify that the CSL requirement in 16.3.4.1.F does not apply to drilled shaft retaining walls which contain rolled steel sections for reinforcing.

**Drilled shaft retaining walls with rolled steel sections for reinforcing that extend the full length to the tip of the drilled shaft are excluded from requirements of TIP and CSL testing. Scope will be updated in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:19:05 PM

Can the header, footer, margin, and page numbering requirements in the Technical Proposal be waived for inclusion of approved ATCs in Appendix F.11 and the documentation of NSLE commitments in Appendix F.9? Otherwise these documents would need to be shrunk to fit a reduced allowable paper area?

**Margin requirements on portions of the technical proposal Appendices which are to include externally created supplemental documents & ATC inclusion can be ignored. While not absolute, the Department asks page numbering be maintained to facilitate review. The Department will not be issuing an addenda for this variance.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:18:52 PM

ITO Section 5.6 requires that copies of approved ATCs be included in the Technical Proposal. Does the entire copy of the ATC need to be included or would a copy of the ODOT response be sufficient?

**Acknowledgement of the ATC's inclusion into the Technical Proposal by including the Department's response is sufficient.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:18:41 PM

Regarding the 3' undercut required in Scope 10.2.6, does the 10% assumed area of subgrade per the previous prebid response include areas of temporary pavement and/or railroad sub-ballast?

**No, Scope Section 10.2.6 applies to permanent pavement areas.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:18:25 PM

Regarding the 3' undercut required in Scope 10.2.6, is this measured from the bottom of the asphalt/concrete or the bottom of the 304 base?

**Undercut depths are measured from the bottom of the pavement structure which includes the Item 304 aggregate base.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:18:13 PM

ITO Section 4.6.1 for Part D lists subsections 1 through 4. The table showing the distribution of points for Part D on Section 4.6.2 only lists 3 sub-categories. Other Tech Proposal sections have points listed for all questions asked. Please clarify the point distribution for Part D in relation to the four individual sub-categories requested in 4.6.1.

**Part D evaluation criteria items 1 and 2 within Section 4.6.1 will be combined and included as subcategory D1 in a future addendum. Per the ITO, six points are allocated to sub-category D1 (Organizational roles, responsibilities, and qualifications/experience of the DIOC and Key Personnel).**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:17:50 PM

ITO Section 3.3 requires the Technical Proposal to use "Times New Roman font or similar." Please clarify if Calibri is considered similar.

**The font type to be used in body of the Technical Proposal is to be Times New Roman font 12.0 pt. This will be clarified in an addenda.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 5:01:34 PM

Please reference Prebid Question & Response 1/6/2017 4:17:10 PM. The Department responded that "NEORS is presently evaluating existing sewer capacities within the Project area" in regards to the pre-bid question about the downstream capacity of the storm-only sewers. Can the Department provide this information when available?

**The Department will supply this information when available. However, this may not be available until after Technical/Price Proposals are submitted.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 4:59:39 PM

Scope section 7.8.2 (addendum #10) states that the DBT shall relocate and replace existing aerial and associated poles on the North side from western pavement replacement limit to the eastern pavement limit. The following sentence states that the same aerial shall be converted to underground from western pavement replacement limit to eastern pavement replacement limit. Please clarify.

**The limits of the overhead and underground CPP work along Woodland Avenue will be clarified in a future addendum. A new reference document will provide a visual representation of the replacements described in the scope.**

*Question Submitted:* 3/1/2017 4:47:54 PM

Addendum #10 stated that Kennedy Avenue may be closed for up to 45 days in Scope section 20.3.2. However, per the additional requirements access to Ken Johnson Rec Center via Kennedy Avenue shall be maintained at all times. Please clarify.

**Although Kennedy Avenue may be closed for up to 45 Days, local access along Kennedy Avenue shall be maintained to the Ken Johnson Rec Center.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 4:46:25 PM

Scope Section 2.5.3.4 Released for Construction states, "The DBT shall provide detailed quantity estimates for all Work that requires quality sampling or testing and all materials subject to price adjustments." Scope Section 2.5.3.5 As-Built Submittals states, "As-Built Documents shall include quantities for the Work associated with each Buildable Unit. Quantities shall be grouped in accordance with Location and Design Manual, Volume 3, Section 1307.....to properly identify all quantities." Please clarify what quantities should be provided at each submission and if the quantities submitted with As-Built should be in a typical Design Bid Build sub-summary level, except with actual As-Built quantities.

**The level of quantities shall be similar to the sub-summary level in a DBB Project, to demonstrate quantities for the subject RFC plan set for items which require and have specific testing and sampling frequencies. For further guidance, consult ODOT's Manual of Procedures and Sampling and Testing manuals if the DBT wants further guidance to determine minimum testing, sampling and reporting frequencies. At RFC, it is acceptable for these to be provided in an electronic format (Excel). Quantities are not necessary in the Interim or Final submittal. Quantities shall be updated and incorporated into the As-built drawings per the L&D Vol 3.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 4:44:06 PM

Reference Scope Section 16.3.6. Please clarify if the intent of the handrail system is to include a safety cable and a handrail or just a handrail.

**The Department does not require safety cable as part of the handrail system.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 3:45:13 PM

UT-07 Item 625 on Sheets 3 & 4 of 25 requires that, "All existing materials indicated on the plans to removed shall be offered to CPP for their use. All materials not accepted by CPP shall become the property of the contractor and shall be removed from the site and properly disposed." Scope section 6.7.1.1 Known Regulated Materials says that transformers on overhead CPP lines are known to be regulated materials. Since there is no way to accurately estimate the percentage of transformers CPP will take back nor the quantity of regulated material (especially PCB containing fluid), can ODOT create an allowance for the disposal of the transformers or should the DBT assume disposal of all transformers. If disposal, what should the DBTs assume for the volume of regulated materials, including PCB containing fluids?

**The Department will not provide an allowance for the disposal of transformers or any assumptions regarding the percentage of transformers or the volume of regulated materials.**

Question Submitted: 3/1/2017 2:43:27 PM

Are there any existing plans for the bridge carrying the Norfolk-Southern tracks over Grand Avenue? The only information provided in the RFP documents is on sheet 5 of 38 of the NS Track Work Plans that are part of the LD-01 Section 3 Conceptual Plans.

**The Department is not in possession of record plans for this bridge.**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 5:43:00 PM

Please confirm that only firms being utilized to meet the NSLE goals are required to be included on Form C2.

**Form C-2 will not be required. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 5:42:47 PM

ITO Section 4.6.1.4 states that the Offeror shall name the businesses committed to meet the NSLE goals. Later in the same section it states that Appendix 9 shall include a summary identifying the committed firms, their function and percentage committed. Additionally, Form C2 requests similar information. Is this list of NSLE firms to be included in three separate places?

**The intention is that information included in Appendix 9 will respond to the request in ITO Section 4.6.1.4. A future addendum will remove Form C-2 as a requirement to the Technical Proposal.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 2/27/2017 10:43:35 AM

Pertaining to the question submitted on February 8 at 6:02:52 AM "Are the minimum footcandle illumination values specified in SOS 19.5.2 minimum maintained average values (consistent with IES RP-8) or minimum point values (which would result in average maintained illumination values that are significantly higher than IES RP-8 recommendations)?" The response given was "The minimum footcandle illumination values specified in ScopeSection 19.5.2 are not based on IES RP-8. The requirement is 1.4 footcandles minimum, calculated with a 0.7 maintenance factor." Please clarify this response. Is 1.4 candles the minimum point value requirement? Given a 3:1 average to minimum ratio required by scope, the target average value for lighting would be 4.2 foot candles (average) on corridors, and 8.4 foot candles (average) at intersections. Is that the intent of the scope?

**Yes, 1.4 candles is the minimum point value requirement.**

**Yes. This criteria is higher than the IES RP-8. However, as with the RP-8, the 3:1 average to minimum ratio is a maximum value. The actual average to minimum will likely be less. For example the average to minimum ratio may be in the range of 2.5:1, but it cannot exceed 3:1.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/27/2017 10:40:36 AM

For comparison purposes, can ODOT provide approved point-by-point photometric calculations for OC-1 and OC-2? Also, can ODOT provide the photometric design criteria that was used for OC-1 and OC-2 (e.g., average, uniformity, intersection lighting criteria, etc.).

**OC2 photometric calculations will be provided as a reference document in a future addendum since the lighting will overlap OC3.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/27/2017 10:39:55 AM

Can the DBT assume that the proposed galleon fixture layout will be approved if the photometrics nearly meet the established design criteria, to the maximum extent possible?

**The Department will allow a reasonably small deviation from the criteria in isolated locations. The Department maintains and reserves its authority to determine the definition of a reasonably small deviation.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/27/2017 10:37:21 AM

The proposed Galleon fixture at the proposed fixture mounting height, as specified in the scope, does not appear to allow the photometric design requirements to be met. Given that the scoped photometric requirements may not be met for this project, using the prescribed fixture, what process will be utilized in final design to resolve this scope conflict?

**The Galleon fixture will meet the lighting requirements with a 30 foot mounting height and an opposite arrangement. It may be necessary to space the poles closer than the nominal 150 foot spacing. Note: only the traveled pavement is calculated for the roadway design.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/27/2017 10:37:06 AM

The proposed Galleon fixture at the proposed fixture mounting height, as specified in the scope, does not appear to allow the photometric design requirements to be met. Given that the scoped photometric requirements may not be met for this project, using the prescribed fixture, what process will be utilized in final design to resolve this scope conflict?

**The Galleon fixture will meet the lighting requirements with a 30 foot mounting height and an opposite arrangement. It may be necessary to space the poles closer than the nominal 150 foot spacing. Note: only the traveled pavement is calculated for the roadway design.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/27/2017 8:10:50 AM

Will the Department consider adding Unit Price items for Law Enforcement Office with Patrol Car for Assistance and for Enforcement. These items were used on recent ODOT project 163019 - Cuy/Sum I-77 Design Build.

**No, a Unit Price items for Law Enforcement Office with Patrol Car for Assistance and for Enforcement will not be added.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/27/2017 7:58:17 AM

ITO Appendix A has a checklist item that states "Are the letters accompanying the Technical and Price Proposals signed by all persons constituting the DBT in blue ink?" Section 3.2 requires signature by "an individual with signature authority for the contracting firm." Please clarify that the signature on Form A is from the Lead Contractor, and not all members of the DBT.

**The signature in question is for Form A-1, which is to be included within F.1: Appendix 1 – Administrative Submittal. The signature required on Form A-1 is from an individual who signature authority of the legal entity contracting with the Department, also known as the Design Build Team. This could be from the Lead Contractor if the Lead Contractor is the firm entering into contract with the Department.**

\*\*\* 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: 2/27/2017 7:58:07 AM

ITO Appendix A has a checklist item that states "Are the letters accompanying the Technical and Price Proposals signed by all persons constituting the DBT in blue ink?" What letter is to be provided with the Price Proposal?

**The Appendix A statement concerning the letters should be construed as the following: "Is there documentation accompanying the Technical and Price Proposals confirming participation of NSLE firms as required per 4.6.1 4?"**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 7:34:47 AM

What is the Basis of Payment for the IQF services? There will be a significant up-front cost for creation of the DQMP, procedures, databases, etc... Will the DBT be able to invoice the Department for this portion of the IQF services as they occur?

**The DBT will be able to invoice the Department for this portion of the IQF services as they occur with proper and supporting documentation, per the Contract.**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 7:34:32 AM

Will the Department add a separate pay item for the IQF costs or should they be included in the Design Items?

**The costs involved with the IQF shall be incidental to the Design Efforts. The DBT shall include the IQF costs with the Design efforts.**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 7:34:25 AM

Many of the Item descriptions on the .EBSX file are truncated to the point where it's impossible to tell what the item is. For example, the description for Item 0005 is "Special" which is also used for Items 0048 and 0049. Since the paper copy of the Item List does not match the .EBSX file there is no way for us to double check the biditem structure. Please update the .EBSX file to contain more detailed descriptions.

**The .EBSX file will be corrected in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 7:34:12 AM

Item 0041 - Dispute Resolution Board does not have a Unit Price provided nor even a box to be able to fill one in on the .EBSX file. The Pay Item list provided with Addendum 6 lists this allowance as \$60,000. Please update the .EBSX file.

**The .EBSX file will be corrected in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 7:34:00 AM

Regarding the .EBSX file, typically the allowance/contingency items would contain both a Quantity and a Unit Price. For example Biditems 0005, 0007, and 0048 do not have Unit Prices filled in, and 0007 does not even have an editable box to include a price. Please update the .EBSX file.

**The .EBSX file will be corrected in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 7:33:41 AM

Will the Department accept projects on the Work History Form in Tech Proposal Appendix 8 from dedicated subcontractors or subconsultants?

**The DBT shall provide the projects which best demonstrate the team's ability. The Department will consider the applicability of the project and the role of the represented firm in the Department's evaluation.**

Question Submitted: 2/27/2017 7:33:29 AM

Are the projects listed on the Work History Form in Tech Proposal Appendix 8 to be the same projects provided on Form B in the Statement of Qualifications?

**The projects listed on the Work History Form in Tech Proposal Appendix 8 are not required to be the same projects provided on Form B in the Statement of Qualifications.**

Question Submitted: 2/23/2017 8:43:28 AM

The UT-01 Utility Matrix spreadsheet posted with Addendum 10 will not open. It appears that the file may be corrupted. Please review and repost the information.

**UT-01 will be provided in a future addendum**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 2/22/2017 9:28:55 AM

When will remaining walk throughs be scheduled that were discussed in the response to the Prebid Question submitted on 1/10/2017 at 11:06:20 AM?

**ODOT has scheduled a walkthrough for the commercial property located at 2685 E. 79th Street (R/W Plan Parcel 2281-WD; Map ID No. 5). A table with this property number and key map can be found on ODOT's ftp site at the following link: [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/OC3/WalkthroughInfo\\_02282017/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/OC3/WalkthroughInfo_02282017/)**

**The walkthrough is scheduled for Tuesday, February 28, 2017 between 8:30-11:30 AM. Each person entering this property will be required to present a signed release form (see ftp site) to the ODOT representative at the site before entering the property. Each person will also be required to sign the sign-in sheet provided by the ODOT representative.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/21/2017 3:17:37 PM

There are many used junk tires and large piles of trash scattered around the project, who is responsible for removing them?

**The DBT is responsible for removing trash/debris within the project right of way limits throughout the duration of the project.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/21/2017 3:16:56 PM

There is a large pile of crushed brick, dirt and shredded wood located near station 88+00 and 90+00 of future OC Blvd. The material is unsuitable to be used as fill material. Who is responsible for removing this material? Has the material been tested for any hazardous content?

**Stockpiled construction materials and construction debris will be removed through the right of way settlement process. LD-08 will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/21/2017 3:16:02 PM

In reference to scope section 19.3.2, Level 1 signing is specified for signs on E 55th Street (locations U, X, V, W). Per OMUTCD Table 2E-2, level 3 is the appropriate signing level for E 55th Street (Multi-lane Conventional Road) for Advanced Entrance Direction and Entrance Direction signs. Please confirm that level 1 signing is the desired level.

**Level 3 signing shall be used for the replacement signs on E. 55th Street. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/21/2017 3:15:18 PM

In reference to signs A and B shown in Appendix TC-07, the OMUTCD would normally require exit only panels for these signs. It is assumed that this requirement is disregarded due to the presence of other junctions prior to the I-490 interchange. Please confirm that exit only panels are not required for these signs. Also, can the down arrow be removed from sign A in lieu of locating the arrow off center on the sign or requiring relocation on a new support at an alternate location?

**Exit only panels shall not be utilized due to the presence of other exits prior to I-490. Acceptance regarding use of and placement of the down arrow or position of the sign relative to the lane shall be at the Department's discretion. However, sign/arrow placement will not require relocation of the Dynamic Message Sign.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/21/2017 3:14:20 PM

Please clarify the replacement limits of the 16" sludge force main on East 55th St. Is the intent to replace from southern pavement limit to northern pavement limit along E55th or just what is necessary to construct the bridge?

**In Section 7.8.13 the DBT is responsible for replacing the length of the 16" sludge force main impacted by the project, as designed by the DBT.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/21/2017 3:13:13 PM

The response received for the prebid question asked on 1/13/17 at 7:46:06 AM does not address the pylon on the trailing end of the WB direction (i.e. the rear left corner of the bridge). Is it the Department's intent not to protect this pylon even though it will fall within the 8 foot offset?

**The pylon at the rear left corner of the bridge will not require protection since the near face of the pylon will be flush with the adjacent parapet face.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 2/20/2017 8:22:00 AM

In Section 14.2.J of the RFP, it states the method of abandoning any existing conduits in place, (i.e. construct bulkheads and fill the pipe with C&MS Item 613 or sand). What will be the required exact limits of the conduit abandonment per this method - will it just be the portions needed to construct the proposed storm/ combined sewer, or will it be the full extent of the pipe within the project limits, or will it be between existing structures (i.e. MH to MH) even if they fall outside the project limits?

**The DBT shall bulkhead and fill all abandoned conduits to the full extent of the project right of way limit. This will be clarified in a future addendum**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:15:36 PM

Regarding the requirements to undercut 100% of the full depth pavement areas in Scope 10.2.6, there is language which states the stabilization depth may be adjusted or non-performed to accommodate utilities. For bidding purposes, what percentage of the project can the DBT assume will be allowed to be non-performed? It seems that most of the City street intersection areas have numerous utilities that would be impacted by the undercutting.

**The DBT shall assume that 100% of the full depth pavement areas shall be undercut.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:15:27 PM

A prebid question asked on 12/01/06 regarding an allowance for the additional 3' of undercutting in Scope Section 10.2.6 was answered that 10% of the subgrade area would be the responsibility of the DBT and would be clarified by addendum. This change has not occurred in the Scope documents yet. Please modify the scope accordingly in a future addendum.

**The Department will revise subgrade requirements in a future addendum. For bidding purposes, the DBT shall assume excavation of subgrade and granular replacement (undercut) over the entire pavement area. For locations with demonstrated bedrock within the subgrade, the DBT shall assume a two foot undercut. For non-bedrock areas, the DBT shall assume a three foot undercut for 20-percent of the subgrade and 12 inch undercut for the remaining 80-percent subgrade area. The actual depth may be varied by the DBT during final design, and by doing so, the DBT assumes all subgrade risk. Some locations may not require stabilization, but the DBT then assumes all subgrade risk if this assumption is followed. For bidding purposes, the DBT is also to assume that 5% of the undercut areas will fail upon proof rolling and require re-stabilization and shall be considered incidental.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:15:10 PM

Regarding the \$10M PL Policy, will the Department consider allowing reduced limits for sub-consultants who are performing a minor portion of the design? There are many smaller firms that cannot obtain a \$10M policy, and this condition will restrict the use of some NSLE firms. We would like to reference the CCG2 project as an example that had language that allowed for lower insurance amounts based on the amount of the design contract.

**The limits of coverage for the Professional Liability Policy will remain. The Department is not requiring each individual subconsultant to carry an individual Professional Liability policy, but is requiring that the Project to carry a coverage. The professional liability coverage shall protect against any negligent act, error or omission arising out of design or engineering services performed by the Lead Designer or its lower tier design Subconsultants.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:14:59 PM

Proposal Note 097, Section 107.12 currently requires a \$10M Project Specific PL Policy. Will the Department consider allowing this coverage to be provided with a Practice Policy?

**The Project Specific Professional Liability policy will be required.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:14:47 PM

Regarding the Sustainability "Silver" rating required in Scope Section 1.9, is ODOT anticipating that the Project Development Module of the rating system is the one being used, similar to CCG2?

**If the DBT uses the FHWA INVEST tool, the "Project Development Module" would be utilized.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:14:37 PM

Please clarify if utilities carried on structures are permitted to be supported from above with overhead supports, not connected to the deck, rather than supported from below.

**Utilities shall be supported from below using cross frames or other utility supports. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:14:29 PM

The Pay Item List provided with Addendum 6 has columns for Unit Price and Bid Amount. Our understanding is that BidX is used to submit the electronic bid and the paper copy is to be printed from the .EBSX file. Is the Pay Item List provided by ODOT by addendum required to be filled in and submitted?

**The paper copy is to be printed from the EBSX file and included with the "Sealed Version" submittal. The Pay Item List provided by ODOT by addendum is not required to be filled in nor submitted.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:14:20 PM

The current .EBSX file posted on BidX does not match the biditem structure on the Pay Item List provided with Addendum 6. There are several discrepancies with items being placed in different Sections. Additionally, the biditem numbers are out of order in the .EBSX file due to the Section numbering. Please reconcile these documents and clarify the current biditem structure.

**The .EBSX file posted on BidX has the correct bid item structure. The Pay Item List provided with Addendum No. 6 was prepared before the bid item structure was revised.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:14:00 PM

If the intent at Sign AF in TC-07 is to update the existing sign to include the OH-10 shield and cardinal direction, please provide sign design information for butterfly sign supports so the DBT can provide required design calculations (per Scope requirements 19.3.2.J) to show it is not overloaded. The design for butterfly sign supports is not available in existing design manuals.

**Available record construction plans will be provided in a future addendum. The Department will not supply additional design information.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:13:52 PM

Please clarify the intended work on Francis Avenue between E. 55th Street and E. 57th Street. PA-01 shows pavement resurfacing, but the street dead ends before connecting to E. 55th Street. Can the entire segment be removed between E. 55th & E. 57th?

**A stub of Francis Avenue west of E. 57th Street shall remain and be resurfaced to the limits shown on PA-01 in order to maintain access to utility facilities and a driveway between E. 55th and E. 57th Street.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/17/2017 1:13:43 PM

The information provided in 19.3.2 N & O requires coordination with the City (No Parking - regulatory zones) and GCRTA (bus stop sign design) for the local sign requirements. Can ODOT provide the requirements, or provide a quantity to be bid upon?

**"No Parking" and GCRTA bus stop sign requirements will be clarified in future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/10/2017 11:16:26 AM

Please provide a blank project specific design-build agreement for this project.

**The Department is providing an actual contract example for a value-based DB project. It can be found here: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/divisions/contractadmin/Contracts/SignedKs/163000sc.pdf>**

*Question Submitted:* 2/9/2017 4:34:39 PM

Section 19.2.6 of the scope states "pedestrian accommodations shall be provided on all approaches of signalized intersections within the Project limits." 12.2.13 clarifies that all new curb ramps provided must meet ADA requirements. Based on guidance from the statement in section 19.2.6, please confirm that curb ramps are not required at unsignalized intersections such as Lisbon Rd Sta. 17+15 (at Buckeye Rd) and Grand Ave. Sta. 10+25 (at Buckeye Rd).

**Curb Ramps are required for all approaches of signalized intersections. Curb Ramps are also required at the continuation of sidewalk and multiuse path crossing of local roadway intersections (i.e., no unsignalized pedestrian crossings of OH-10 or other arterial roadways). This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/9/2017 4:32:52 PM

Per Addendum 8, typical sections on page 16/361 depict a revised offset to the walls that encroaches into the clear zone without protection. Please confirm if either an exception is required or if protection is to be provided via barrier or guardrail. As this is part of the basic configuration, will ODOT be responsible for the design exception if required?

**Barrier protection and design exceptions are not required for clear zone encroachments for low speed curbed urban facilities. The scope identifies barrier protection requirements at bridges to protect drop-offs and blunt ends within 8' of the travelled way.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/9/2017 1:02:43 PM

Reference is made to Section 4.3 of the RFQ and Section 6.2 of the ITO for RFP for the referenced project. Is it necessary to submit to ODOT a request to change all named personnel stated within the SOQ (including those named in the narrative or on the organization chart), or just the key personnel as defined in the RFQ.

**The Shortlisted Offeror shall submit a request if intending to change any named personnel identified within the SOQ (including those named in the narrative or on the organization chart) prior to submittal of the Technical Proposal. The Department will review and determine whether to authorize a change. The Department will be reasonable in the acceptance to submitted changes of non-key personnel. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 2/8/2017 5:17:10 PM

If the CPP information can't be obtained should the DBT assume installing the Duct Bank only and CPP will install all the cabling and circuits.

**CPP work will be clarified in Addendum 10.**

Question Submitted: 2/8/2017 5:14:16 PM

RFP 7.8.2 states that for new wiring to be installed by DBT, "CPP or a CPP-approved contractor shall make all splices and terminations of the new feeder lines installed by DBT to the existing feeder lines in the finished facilities". Please confirm that these splices/terminations will be part of CPP's work and not the DBT.

**CPP will only make the "hot splices" to tie the new system to the existing system. The DBT is responsible to make all other splices within the new system.**

Question Submitted: 2/8/2017 5:09:46 PM

The RFP mentions various overhead and underground relocations (7.8.2). No details are given on the existing type, size, and quantity of conductors for aerial or underground existing CPP facilities. In addition, no details are given on the existing size and quantity of underground conduits within the ductbanks. The existing CPP record drawings provided with the RFP contain limited information, and do not have any details on the large majority of the CPP existing facilities. DBT requests that CPP provide additional information on the existing facilities to be relocated, including the following: Type, size and quantity of conductors (overhead and underground) and Type, size and quantity of conduits within ductbanks (underground)

**CPP work including required overhead and underground conductor sizes, duct requirements (quantity and size), and overhead power specifications and details will be included in Addendum 10.**

Question Submitted: 2/8/2017 5:08:10 PM

During the relocation of the sludge force main at East 55th Street, Can the line be taken out of service and if so how long?

**In accordance to Scope Section 7.4.7 the DBT is responsible for maintaining CWD, CPP, NEORS, and GCRTA facilities throughout construction, which includes all necessary temporary bypass provisions. The DBT shall coordinate potential force main outage durations with NEORS. Previous coordination between the Department and NEORS indicated that the sludge force main may only be taken out of service to make temporary bypass and permanent tie-in connections.**

Question Submitted: 2/8/2017 6:04:26 AM

SOS 19.2.11 and SOS 19.5.2A3 require power services to be provided using CPP. At Kinsman Road there is no CPP power shown in this area. Please clarify if CPP is going to provide power to this area or if CEI could be used.

**If CPP does not have power service available at specific intersections then it will be acceptable to obtain power service from CEI.**

Question Submitted: 2/8/2017 6:02:53 AM

Are the minimum footcandle illumination values specified in SOS 19.5.2 minimum maintained average values (consistent with IES RP-8) or minimum point values (which would result in average maintained illumination values that are significantly higher than IES RP-8 recommendations)?

**The minimum footcandle illumination values specified in Scope Section 19.5.2 are not based on IES RP-8. The requirement is 1.4 footcandles minimum, calculated with a 0.7 maintenance factor.**

Question Submitted: 2/8/2017 6:01:55 AM

Are the 2-5" supplemental conduits included in the lighting duct bank required on E 55th Street and the Quadrant Road?

**The supplemental conduits shall extend along the Quadrant Roadway and terminate at pull boxes at E. 55th Street. This will be clarified in Addendum 10.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 2/6/2017 6:34:41 PM

Has ODOT been able to obtain the additional information on CPP infrastructure per the prebid questions on 11/29/16 at 9:19:14, 9:23:37, 9:26:21, 9:32:20, and 9:35:38 AM and 11/10/2016 8:19:37 AM?

**CPP work will be clarified in Addendum 10.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/6/2017 6:33:09 PM

Can ODOT please provide an updated construction schedule for OC2 and the Great Lakes Construction DBT given the requirement to coordinate construction and maintenance of traffic between OC3 and OC2?

**As a courtesy to the bidders to assist in coordination of projects, the Department has placed the latest OC2 Schedule at the following link:**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/OC3/ReferenceSchedule/>**

**The Department makes no claims to its accuracy or completeness of information, nor does it guarantee the represented project work will complete in the timeframes shown.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/6/2017 7:40:52 AM

Can the MOT electronic files (plans and basemaps) be made available?

**Electronic files will be provided as a reference document in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/6/2017 7:40:23 AM

Please specify the regulations that determine what Major Guide signs should be used for the closure. The TEM, SCD and SDM do not provide sufficient information to get the signs "Approved by the Department" W19-1; W20-H13; W20-3?

**Scope Section 20.3.2.4 will be modified to require the sign legend of "I-90 CLOSED AT E. 55TH ST" at the specified locations in addition to the level 1 signage requirement.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/6/2017 7:40:14 AM

Does anywhere that states "Opportunity Corridor Blvd" as the destination (instead of E 55th St) need to also include the SR-10 shield and cardinal direction text?

**Yes, the route shield and cardinal direction shall be incorporated.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/6/2017 7:40:04 AM

19.3.2.C states "supplemental route shield signs and cardinal direction signs mounted to existing overhead signage or other sign supports shall not be used in lieu of new overhead signage." Does this mean that existing signs such as location "AE" with these mountings need to have all that information added to the new sign in addition to the SR-10 shield and cardinal direction text?

**Yes, these signs need to have supplemental route shield and cardinal direction information added.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/6/2017 7:39:50 AM

Does the text on overhead signs marked for replacement in TC-07 that state "TO I-90 WEST" or "ALT I-90 WEST" need to be placed on new signs? Do supplemental signs mounted to existing signs for replacement that state "TRUCKS I-90 EAST" need to have this text included on new signs?

**The addition of "ALT I-90 WEST" messages are not required on the new permanent signage. "To I-90 WEST" messages shall be included on the new permanent overhead signage where such references exist today. Truck detour/alternate route signage do not need incorporated into the permanent overhead signage.**

*Question Submitted:* 2/6/2017 7:39:36 AM

TC-07 shows that at location "S" the middle and right sign on the truss at the Orange Ave - I-77 SB Entrance Ramp need to be updated. Although both these lanes do allow a driver to access the exit ramp approaching location "P" (E 55th St/I-490 Split) the current intent of the signage appears to be to keep I-77SB traffic in the left lane and those taking the E 55th/I-490 split to stay in the right lane. Should the SR-10 shield and cardinal direction text only be added to the right sign then? If no and both of these signs at location "S" are to be updated to include the SR-10 shield and cardinal direction text, does the middle sign need updated to also include shield and text for I-490 TO I-77 as well since it too can be reached from both lanes at this point?

**Only the right sign of location "S" will be required to have the SR-10 shield and cardinal direction text.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 2/1/2017 8:54:07 AM

Will the department make available existing foundation plans for the buildings scheduled to be demolished? Particularly the buildings viewed during the 1-24-17 walk-thru?

**No, the Department is not in possession of existing building plans including foundations.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/31/2017 2:13:36 PM

Can the sign-in sheets from the building walk-throughs held on January 24 & 25, 2017 be made available.

**Sign-in sheets from the building walkthroughs held on January 24 & 25 can be found on ODOT's ftp site at the following link: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/OC3/WalkthroughInfo/>**

*Question Submitted:* 1/27/2017 5:04:08 PM

In reference to sign O shown in Appendix TC-07, mounted on the cantilever support, the existing sign does not meet current TEM requirements for the down arrows to be within 2' of the center of the associated lane. Even with a maximum possible cantilever arm length, the replacement sign and support could not meet this requirement for the existing lane geometry. Will an exception be made to the TEM requirement for arrow placement and the requirement for pull through signs on I-77 SB in this case (consistent with the current signage)? Also confirm that a distance message will not be required on sign N (consistent with current signage but inconsistent with OMUTCD and TEM guidance).

**Signs "O" and "N" included in TC-07 are structure mounted cantilever guide signs. The Department's intent is to update the destination legend. The Department's intent is not to modify the existing bridge, therefore, the arrow placement requirements, pull through signage, and distance message requirements within the TEM and OMUTCD shall not apply to these signs. This will be clarified in a future addendum**

*Question Submitted:* 1/27/2017 5:00:26 PM

Scope Section 2.5.3.2 Interim and Final Design Submittals defines the review times for City of Cleveland owned utility and each affect utility as 20 workdays. Scope Section 7.4.2 Scheduling of Utility Work defines the review times for DBT prepared utility facility relocation plans as 42 days. Which of these two workflow process (and associated durations) should be used for the design and review of public utilities.

**Review times within Scope Section 7.4.2 will be modified from 42 Days to 20 Workdays and the compliance review will be modified from 14 Days to 10 Workdays in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/24/2017 5:03:19 PM

Per 15.6.2, it is stated that the weir and a restrictor plate in the regulator shall be field adjustable. Can the department provide additional requirements to make those items field adjustable.

**The DBT shall coordinate the field-adjustable weir and restrictor plate requirements with NEORSB during the final design.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/24/2017 5:02:30 PM

LD-08 indicates site clearing for numerous parcels. Are we to assume that conditions as shown in the provided cad topo file (96833BC001.dgn) are accurate and any existing drives/walks/pavement shall require pavement removal as part of this site clearing indicated in LD-08?

**The cad topo file provided (96833BC001.dgn) is a reference document. The DBT will need to assess the current conditions. Unless otherwise stated within the Contract Documents, the DBT shall remove any existing drives/walks/pavement as part of the site clearing requirement. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/24/2017 8:47:39 AM

Addendum No. 8 states that all revisions described have been placed on the ftp site at <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-96833/>

but I do not see these revisions.

**The ftp site has been updated with addendum 8 revisions. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-96833/>**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 1/24/2017 8:39:57 AM

When will the Addendum 8 revisions be posted to the ftp site?

**The ftp site has been updated with addendum 8 revisions. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-96833/>**

*Question Submitted:* 1/23/2017 8:18:25 PM

Will NSLE credit be counted for all levels of subcontractors, subconsultants and providers being utilized, including 2nd and 3rd tier firms?

**NSLE credit will count for 2nd tier subcontractor and subconsultant firms only.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/23/2017 8:15:20 PM

PN 99 references OAC 5501:2-3-08. Will there be consideration for an exception to the requirements of item (B) with regard to the \$5 Million project cap for non-qualified firms?

**No exception will be considered.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/23/2017 7:00:46 PM

Please clarify whether the DBT is required to construct an entirely new drop structure to the existing invert of the existing 60" sewer or whether the DBT may remove a portion of the existing drop structure (labeled "Drop to DWO" on Figure 2 of Appendix DR-11) and build a proposed drop structure on top of the remaining portion of the existing drop structure).

**The drop structure at this location may be reused if the DBT determines to the satisfaction the NEORS that the structure is structurally sound, provides sufficient hydraulic capacity and maintains accessibility and functionality, including baffle wall and step configuration.**

**This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/23/2017 7:00:32 PM

The following changes from Addendum 7 present conflicting design information. Section 19.2.5 Vehicle Signal Heads states for M that "A minimum of two signal faces per approach shall be required. On approaches with two or more primary through lanes, one overhead signal head shall be required for each lane" and Q states "For protected/permissive operation of 5-signal heads, the location of the signal head shall be over an extension of the channelizing lane." Based on M is it to be understood that each through lane on OH-10 shall have its own signal head as well as a separate signal head for the turn lanes. For example, would OH-10 eastbound at 75th require 4 vehicular heads (one 3-signal head for each of the 3 through lanes and one 3-signal protected turn head for the left turn only lane) or 3 vehicular heads (one 3-signal head for 2 of the through lanes and one 5-signal protected/permissive left turn head controlling the 3rd through lane and left turn only lane)?

**Each through lane shall have a signal head. When an adjacent turn lane is present, a five-section signal head can be shared by the two lanes and shall be located on the channelizing line between the through lane and the turn lane .**

**For example, at eastbound E. 75th Street, 3 vehicular heads are required, one 3-section head centered over the right through lane, one 3-section head centered over the middle through lane, and one 5-section head on the channelizing line between the left through lane and the left turn lane.**

**This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/23/2017 7:00:19 PM

The provided preliminary Phase 1 track alignments in LD-01 show that the CL of the Main 2 Track is 11.5' from the edge of the First Energy Transmission pole (LD-01, page 378, sheet 16/38). The provided survey shows the concrete foundation of the pole is ~5' in diameter. Has the 11.5' clearance from the pole to the CL track or the 10.5' clearance of the concrete foundation to the CL of the track been approved by FirstEnergy and Norfolk and Southern? Did they specify a minimum clearance that would be acceptable for this project during the temporary phasing, as the minimum horizontal clearance is 13' in the NS Public Projects Manual unless approved by the Railroad Engineer? Is there any additional crash protection required?

**The offset to the pole has been part of the track relocation design throughout the preliminary plan review coordination with Norfolk Southern. The offset is greater than minimum Ohio state statute but will need approval by NS during design. NS will dictate the need for additional crash protection during the design phase.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

1/20/2017 9:46:34 AM

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of section 4.6.2, Part D evaluation, of the ITO, states the DIOC and the DB Diversity/Outreach Lead Manager will be evaluated. Paragraph 2 of section 4.6.1 of the ITO states to "identify and describe the role and responsibility for the DB Diversity/Outreach Lead Manager and the Contractor Diversity/Outreach Lead Manager". Should the Part D evaluation also include evaluation of the Contractor Diversity/Outreach Lead Manager, a stated "Key Personnel" position?

**Section 4.6.2 of the ITO will be updated in a future addendum to include evaluation of the Contractor Diversity/Outreach Lead Manager.**

Question Submitted:

1/19/2017 7:27:07 AM

Below is a re-post of the question posted on 1/17/17 at 12:21 PM.

Per Scope Section 10.2.6 Subgrade Stabilization and the ODOT response to question #128, our interpretation of the scope is

1) 80% of the subgrade area, at the discretion of the contractor, will either be

a) Chemically treated subgrade to a depth of 16" OR

b) Excavated (15" for estimating purpose per Scope 10.2.6) and replaced with Granular Material Type B; ODOT will pay for additional undercut greater than 15"

2) 20% of the subgrade area will be excavated and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid. The 20% is assumed to be broken out as follows

a) 10% will be classified as Unsuitable Subgrade and excavated 36" and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid (per Scope 10.2.6, GB-1, and response to question #128); ODOT will pay for additional 36" undercut and replace if needed in the field and any additional geogrid required above 10% of the subgrade area

b) 10% will be excavated (15" for estimating purpose per Scope 10.2.6) and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid; ODOT will pay for additional undercut greater than 15" and additional geogrid if needed above 10% of the subgrade area

Is this the correct interpretation of the scope?

Question Submitted:

1/18/2017 10:14:19 AM

The online PDF version of question 1/17/2017 12:21:43PM is not legible. Several of the percentages are covered. Can the Department please review and repost?

**Below is the question posted on 1/17/17 at 12:21 PM.**

**Per Scope Section 10.2.6 Subgrade Stabilization and the ODOT response to question #128, our interpretation of the scope is**

**1) 80% of the subgrade area, at the discretion of the contractor, will either be a) Chemically treated subgrade to a depth of 16" OR**

**b) Excavated (15" for estimating purpose per Scope 10.2.6) and replaced with Granular Material Type B; ODOT will pay for additional undercut greater than 15" 2) 20% of the subgrade area will be excavated and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid. The 20% is assumed to be broken out as follows a) 10% will be classified as Unsuitable Subgrade and excavated 36" and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid (per Scope 10.2.6, GB-1, and response to question #128); ODOT will pay for additional 36" undercut and replace if needed in the field and any additional geogrid required above 10% of the subgrade area**

**b) 10% will be excavated (15" for estimating purpose per Scope 10.2.6) and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid; ODOT will pay for additional undercut greater than 15" and additional geogrid if needed above 10% of the subgrade area**

**Is this the correct interpretation of the scope?**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 1/17/2017 12:21:43 PM

Per Scope Section 10.2.6 Subgrade Stabilization and the ODOT response to question #128, our interpretation of the scope is 1. 80% of the subgrade area, at the discretion of the contractor, will either be chemically treated subgrade to a depth of 16" OR b. Excavated (15" for estimating purpose per Scope 10.2.6) and replaced with Granular Material Type B; ODOT will pay for additional undercut greater than 15" 2. 20% of the subgrade area will be excavated and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid. The 20% is assumed to be broken out as follows a. 10% will be classified as Unsuitable Subgrade and excavated 36" and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid (per Scope 10.2.6, GB-1, and response to question #128); ODOT will pay for additional 36" undercut and replace if needed in the field and any additional geogrid required above 10% of the subgrade area b. 10% will be excavated (15" for estimating purpose per Scope 10.2.6) and replaced with Granular Material Type B with a layer of geogrid; ODOT will pay for additional undercut greater than 15" and additional geogrid if needed above 10% of the subgrade areas is this the correct interpretation of the scope?

**The option for using a chemically stabilized subgrade will be removed in a future addendum. The previous response to Prebid Question 128 is no longer applicable.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/13/2017 7:49:35 AM

On the NW corner of E55th and I-490, west of parcel 2001, LD-01, RW-11 and provided cad files all show LA and Ex RW cutting through an existing parking lot and building, with the appearance of an encroachment on ODOT LA. EX-27 provides existing plans for a GCRTA substation built in 2001. These plans appear to show that it was intended a 50' strip of property 245' long was to be purchased from ODOT. Currently, temporary only exists along parcel 2001 and none around the parking lot encroachment. Please clarify if the LA should follow occupation and what was shown in EX-27. If so, please provide updated temporary limits for DBT to properly construct Walls and Storm Sewer through this area.

**Terms of the agreement allowing the GCRTA substation occupation of the I-490 L/A is under research. The substation building, parking lot, site utilities, and other appurtenances shall not be disturbed during construction without GCRTA authorization. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/13/2017 7:48:27 AM

Addendum 7 updated Section 14.2 E&F. Please clarify if sumps and traps are required for Cleveland maintained catch basins that outlet into a storm only sewer, per the City of Cleveland standard construction drawings.

**Per City of Cleveland Division of Water Pollution Control, sumps and traps are required on all catch basins, including those that outlet to combined sewers and to storm-only sewers. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/13/2017 7:47:29 AM

Please reference Scope Table 19-2; Appendix LD-01. OH-10 at E. 79th St. NB left and right turn lanes are specified with minimum lengths of 450' in Table 19-2. The typical sections on 79th St. call for a 250' right turn lane (as also shown in the plan). It appears that a 450' NB right turn lane would also require additional right-of-way. Please resolve the discrepancy between Table 19-2 and Appendix LD-01.

**Required minimum turn lane lengths shown in Table 19-2 will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/13/2017 7:46:06 AM

Addendum 7 updated Section 601.1.1 (1.) "Obstacles" in the Scope Table 13-1, indicates that pylons and parapets with offsets less than 8 feet shall be protected. Addendum 6 introduced a 5 foot sidewalk to the left side of the OH10 over Kingsbury Run bridge. According to the details in AE-02, the face of the parapet on the bridge is to tie into the face of the aesthetic pylons. If placed according to AE-02, the pylon will be within the 8 foot offset distance in Table 13-1 and will require protection that will obscure the visibility of the pylon from OH-10. If the pylon at the rear left end of the bridge is placed a minimum of 8 feet from the toe of curb, there is not sufficient proposed ROW for the Pylon and retaining wall. Please provide clarification for the placement of the pylons on the left side of the referenced bridge, as this situation of providing protection is not addressed in the AE-02 scope document and there is insufficient ROW to eliminate the need for protection.

**A concrete barrier wall shall be installed to protect the WB approach end of the pylon adjacent to the 5-ft sidewalk on the left side of the OH-10 bridge over the Kingsbury Run. The aesthetic treatment on the pylon at this location will be revised to accommodate the concrete barrier wall. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:*

1/13/2017 7:44:51 AM

The changes to Scope Sections 18.1.1.3 and 18.1.1.4 included in Addendum 7 indicate "Pylons, architectural parapet, and architectural lighting shall only apply to the outside of the structure. The DBT shall construct 42" single slope barrier with architectural railing for inner parapet." Please clarify the term "railing" in the second sentence, as Section 18.1.A refers to "Architectural fencing, railing, and parapets", which would indicate that railing is different from fencing.

**The ornamental parapets of OH-10 Eastbound and Westbound bridges over GCRTA Blue and Green Lines apply to the outside shoulder parapets. The architectural fencing applies to the outside and inside shoulder parapets. The definition of "railing" will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:*

1/10/2017 11:06:20 AM

Can an update be provided on the building walk-thrus discussed in Prebid Question #89?

**ODOT has scheduled walk throughs for the structures on the commercial properties listed below on the dates and times listed. A table with property numbers and key map of the structure demolitions can be found on ODOT's ftp site at the following link: :**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/OC3/WalkthroughInfo/>**

**Tuesday, January 24th**

**Property 8,9: 9am-11am**

**Property 6,7,10: 9am-2pm**

**Wednesday, January 25th**

**Property 1: 9am-10am**

**Property 12, 13, 14, 15, 16: 10am-2pm**

**Each person entering these properties will be required to present a signed release form that will cover all properties visited for that day.. A separate signed release form will be required for properties visited on the second day. Copies of the release form can be found on the ftp site at the link above.**

**Walk throughs for properties 5 & 11 will be scheduled at a later date.,**

**This information will also be sent directly to the three shortlisted offerors.**

*Question Submitted:*

1/10/2017 11:06:06 AM

Will the Department allow a mound to be constructed within the infield bounded by OC Blvd and Quadrant Road?

**The Department will not allow a mound within the infield bounded by OC Blvd and Quadrant Road. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:*

1/10/2017 11:05:58 AM

Will the Department allow the infields at I-77 and I-490 to be used as waste sites for this project?

**No, the Department will not allow the infields at I-77 and I-490 to be used as waste sites for this project. Other concurrent Department Projects may be utilizing these areas.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 11:05:40 AM

Numerous prebid questions were asked regarding prebid communications with third-party utilities. The typical answer has been "Communications with the group specifically named could be acceptable, but the Department reserves the right to later determine if the communications were inappropriate. The Department will not be responsible or liable for any information gathered during procurement and will not be responsible for ensuring confidentiality of this group" What is the Department's expectation of the DBTs prebid if we are obligated to coordinate location, schedule, and cost with the railroads and utilities to generate our proposal, but the Department is also stating that in doing so we are at risk of these communications being deemed inappropriate? Where is the line drawn?

**Prebid communications with third parties could be considered inappropriate if it is determined that any communication was used to attempt to influence the evaluation of a reviewer of any proposal.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 11:05:02 AM

Scope 20.3.2.3 requires restriping of the detour routes as determined by the Department. The durability of the temporary striping is dependent on many factors including weather and traffic (which will be affected by numerous regional construction projects). There is no way for the DBT to accurately estimate the amount of restripes needed. Will the Department provide contingency quantities for this work or consider it extra work when directed by the engineer?

**The DBT is responsible for maintaining the striping of detour routes. The Department will not provide contingency quantities.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 11:04:52 AM

The response to prebid question #85 (as numbered in the Addendum 7 attachments) stated that ODOT will clarify the DBT's maintenance responsibilities via a future addendum. So far, the only clarification is to limit the responsibility to non-interstate routes and remove the dust requirement. The remaining scope still poses a significant risk to the DBT because there is no way for us to know the existing condition or the traffic impacts that multiple construction projects in the region will have on these roads. This requirement still places an undue amount of risk on the DBTs and we request that ODOT reconsider adding pay items for repairs which can then be directed by the Engineer.

**The DBT is responsible for maintaining the detour routes specified in the Scope. The Department will not provide additional pay items.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 11:04:40 AM

Table 20-1 indicates that Kennedy Avenue can be closed in the "Additional Requirements", however there is no closure duration provided in the "Closures" column. Please provide the closure duration.

**Kennedy Avenue may be closed for up to 45 Days in total. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:38:52 AM

The RR-01 agreement states that Passenger and Freight train operation is 40 mph, and the scope states that tracks shall be designed to 45 mph. Passenger rail on the corridor generally goes 55 mph. What should the temporary and final design speed of the tracks be?

**Norfolk Southern has directed ODOT to use 45 mph for the track design speed. This applies for both passenger and freight operation in this corridor.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:38:40 AM

Given the minimum turn lane lengths, several intersections would be affected. For example, extending the Kinsman NB left turn lane to the adequate 390' would enter into the E. 69th intersection. Extending Buckeye NB left turn lane would enter into the E. 89th intersection. Should the lane lengths be revised?

**Required minimum turn lane lengths shown in Table 19-2 will be revised in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:38:33 AM

Please clarify the required curb side barrier treatment for the Kinsman Road bridge. The proposed work will impact the current "bull nose" end treatment on existing barrier. It is our understanding that the bull nose detail does not meet ODOT standards.

**The DBT shall replace the existing curbside barrier end treatment for the Kinsman Road bridge "in kind".**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:38:24 AM

Will the Department consider a waiver of BDM S2.5.2.6.3 that requires the application of AASHTO LRFD span-to-depth ratios if deflection criteria is met?

**The Department will not consider a project wide "blanket" waiver of BDM S2.5.2.6.3.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:38:16 AM

Project Scope Section 19.2.1.1 states in item B to "Provide crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and push buttons on all three approaches." but on the west side of E. 55th Street there are no curb ramps shown. Please clarify if curb ramps, pedestrian signal heads, and push buttons are needed here.

**Curb Ramps, pedestrian signals, and pushbuttons are required for all three approaches.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:38:04 AM

Along E 89th street the DBT is to relocate existing aerial facilities and associated poles to the north side of the bridge. Per record plans this appears to only be lighting fixtures which is required in the scope to be designed along the pedestrian bridge. Please clarify if existing aerial facilities and associated poles may be removed and replaced with the proposed lighting instead of being relocated.

**CPP work along E. 89th Street will be clarified in Addendum 10.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:37:53 AM

Please clarify if future wearing surface of 60psf is required on pedestrian bridges.

**The future wearing surface loading of 60 psf is not required on pedestrian bridges.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:37:44 AM

UT-05 identified CPP conduit running along the E 89th street bridge from approx. STA 19+40 to approx. STA 24+85 (per UT-05 stationing which was not updated with Addendum 6) but there is no mention in the Scope of underground or bridge mounted CPP relocation on the east side.

**CPP work along E. 89th Street including structure mounted conduits will be clarified in Addendum 10.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:37:36 AM

Will UT-01 and UT-05 be updated to reflect the change in alignment numbering along E 89th Street?

**UT-01 and UT-05 will be updated in a future addendum to reflect the change in alignment numbering along E 89th Streets made in a previous addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:37:26 AM

Confirm that the pole and mast arm lengths are adequate for the extended west approach at 93rd Street signal head placement. There are no poles and mast arms in 98695BG001.dgn of DI-02.

**The East 93rd Street/OH-10 traffic signal is being constructed as part of OC Section 2, including signal heads on all four approaches. Section 3 DBT shall install loop detectors on the eastbound approach, incorporation signal interconnect, and perform signal timing changes. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/10/2017 9:37:18 AM

On the North side of 490 there is underground CPP conduit. This is not identified in the scope for relocation. Will this require relocation or be a reconstruct to grade situation.

**ODOT lighting circuits north of I-490 were incorrectly identified as CPP owned. These will be impacted by construction and require the DBT to relocate. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted:

1/10/2017 9:31:50 AM

"Section 1.5 – Basic Configuration states all Work shall be consistent with the Basic Configuration and that lane widths as shown in the typical sections of Appendix LD-01 are also part of the Basic Configuration. Section 1.6 – Design Designation and Maintaining Agency states the Work shall be done in accordance with the standards of the designated maintaining agency. Table 1-1: Design Designations and Maintaining Agencies specifies the City of Cleveland as the maintaining agency for OH-10 from 600' west of Quadrant Rd to end of Project. Section 13.1 – Government Regulations states Table 13-1 indicates changes to the Department Location and Design Manual (L&D), Volume 1 that govern this Project. Table 13-1: Location and Design, Volume 1 Revisions specifies that additional widening values in Figure 301-5c shall be provided per Section 3.01.3 – Traveled Way Widening on Highway Curves. Lane widths shown in the typical sections of LD-01 vary throughout the corridor. Absent City of Cleveland Standards related to traveled way widening on curves please confirm all East and Westbound lane widths shown in LD-01 do not require additional widening. For example, the 11' lanes on curves 5, 7 and 12 with radii equal to or greater than 4 degrees."

**The lane widths included in LD-01 were developed based on Department minimum lane widths (11' effective through lane, 10' effective turn lane, 1' paved gutter adjacent to curb). Lane width transitions are present at transitions between curbed and uncurbed sections, at lane additions and drops, and at transitions to existing.**

**Additional lane widths were provided to accommodate the WB-62 design vehicle along the quadrant roadway.**

**Based on the centerline geometry within LD-01, the Department determined that the WB-62 design vehicle could be accommodated along OH-10 without infringing on adjacent lanes. Therefore, the Department determined lane widening was not required on OH-10.**

Question Submitted:

1/9/2017 3:09:28 PM

This is in reference to the question posted on 11/9/2016 and 11/1/2016 regarding Kinsman Rd. The ITO and RFP Section 1.1 added Kinsman Rd. in Addendum #6, which is now a pay item. ODOT's reply to the question posted 11/1/2016 states the conceptual drawings in ST-01 do not comply with the scope in Section 16-2. The reply also states the work is limited to the southwest quadrant of the bridge where the deck and approach slab will be modified to eliminate the E. 66th Street curb return. Sheet 44 of 361 of the conceptual roadway plans, LD-01, appear to match the scope description per ODOT's response on 11/1/2016 instead of the structure site plan shown in ST-01 since the site plan shows the curb at another location outside the existing bridge limits. Please confirm the intended scope matches what is shown on sheet 44 of 361 in LD-01.

**The DBT shall design in accordance with the Project Scope. Basic Configuration Appendix LD-01 is more current than the Reference Appendix ST-01 .**

Question Submitted:

1/9/2017 11:38:59 AM

Norfolk Southern's Public Projects Manual requires that the abutment width for railroad bridges with multiple tracks to be designed to accommodate 14'-0" shoulders (both sides), measured from the centerline of the nearest track. Does this mean that the body of the abutment must be wide enough to support an embankment of the stated width, or may the wingwall/retaining wall adjacent to the abutment body be used to provide the 14'-0" supported width? In other words, would it be acceptable if the expansion joint between the abutment body and the adjacent wingwall/retaining wall is located closer than 14'-0" to the track centerline, provided that the combined abutment/wall system is sufficient to retain the embankment?

**The body of the abutment must be wide enough to support the 14 foot shoulder width (i.e., wingwalls/retaining walls beyond the 14 foot width).**

Question Submitted:

1/9/2017 11:36:46 AM

Norfolk Southern's Public Projects Manual requires caissons/drilled shafts located within the live load influence zone to be protected by a casing and designed for the full railroad surcharge using the Boussinesq Equation in accordance with AREMA. We interpret this to mean that drilled shafts or caissons located within the live load influence zone will require permanent casings so that the shaft concrete is protected while it cures. Is this the correct interpretation?

**Drilled shafts or caissons located within the live load influence zone will require casings to remain in place until the shafts or caissons reach design strength.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/6/2017 4:48:49 PM

Appendix AE-02, Sheet 10/11 depicts the architectural requirements for retaining walls. Please clarify that the use of MSE walls on the project will be acceptable as they will introduce panels joints into the architectural scheme.

**Additional panel joints required by MSE wall construction are acceptable provided the pilasters, coping, and horizontal rustifications are provided in accordance with AE-02.**

Question Submitted: 1/6/2017 4:43:36 PM

The response to Question #69 (as numbered in Addendum 7 attachments) states that the maximum overhang is 4'. Please clarify that this is measured from the edge of beam or girder flange.

**The overhang is measured from the centerline of the fascia beam or girder to the deck edge.**

Question Submitted: 1/6/2017 4:37:22 PM

For the Type 2 OJT which carries a local residency requirement from Wards 4, 5, & 6; we request that this be modified to include students at both Case Western Reserve and Cleveland State regardless of whether they live in the three specified Wards. Since both schools lie within the specified Wards, it makes sense to provide the maximum opportunities for these students to participate in the project OJT program.

**Type 2 OJT for Wards 4, 5 & 6 may include any student from any University, if that student is a resident of Wards 4, 5 or 6. This specific OJT is intended to provide additional training opportunities for residents of the aforementioned Wards which are impacted by the project.**

Question Submitted: 1/6/2017 4:27:26 PM

Scope 10.2.6 states we shall complete one of the following subgrade stabilization methods, chemical or undercutting. Is the DBT to use a combination of both methods to allow for field conditions encountered? For example high sulfate content, fatty clays, and debris at subgrade level are not good conditions for chemical stabilization. If these are encountered ODOT require the DBT to perform the undercutting method? As there is no way to determine the limits of each type of stabilization prior to the bid we request that the Department provide direction for quantifying each for bidding purposes.

**The chemically stabilized subgrade method will be removed from Scope Section 10.2.6 (Subgrade Stabilization) in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/6/2017 4:17:30 PM

Section 14.2.4.1 was amended in Addendum 6 to state, "Drainage areas contributory to combined sewers shall not be credited toward project treatment percentages for quantity or quality." Please clarify whether the water quality treatment percentage for the portion of the project draining to storm-only sewers in the post-construction condition shall be based on the overall project EDA or the project EDA minus the post-construction project area contributory to the combined sewers.

**The EDA used for calculating the project water quality treatment percentage shall be the total area contributory to storm-only sewers; any area directly contributory to combined sewers shall be removed from the EDA calculation. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 1/6/2017 4:17:10 PM

The department has provided responses to several questions related to outfall to NEORSD storm-only systems. In each case the response has been that the impacts are based on the DBT Design and will need coordination with NEORSD. While we agree the impacts will be based on the DBT design, the existing downstream system reserve capacity is not dependent on the DBT design and is not presented in any of the materials provided to date. Please provide the acceptable flow rate increase to each storm-only connection point shown in LD-01 to clarify water quantity requirements for all bidders.

**The Department is not in possession of existing sewer capacity. It is the Department's understanding that NEORSD is presently evaluating existing sewer capacities within the Project area.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 1/5/2017 5:00:19 PM

Can ODOT please provide a sample Value-Based Design Build Agreement?

**Opportunity Corridor Section 2 (Project 163000) is a Value-Based Design-Build project. The contract for that project can be found at the following link:**

**<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/divisions/contractadmin/Contracts/SignedKs/163000sc.pdf>**

*Question Submitted:* 1/4/2017 9:15:10 AM

In Addendum 7, Sections 18.1.1.3 and 18.1.1.4 state pylons shall only apply to the outside of the structure. Does this imply that pylons are required on the median side of the EB & WB bridges? Also, does Section 18.1.1.1 imply that pylons are not required on the bridge over Kingsbury Run ravine?

**Pylons are not required on the median side of the EB and WB Bridges over GCRTA Blue and Green Lines. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

**Four pylons are required on the bridge over the Kingsbury Run ravine.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/4/2017 9:13:35 AM

"Concerning pending Phase II ESA's, please clarify which properties will have completed assessments by bid time. Should a property with some information but with pending bore holes/assessments be considered ""unknown"" if not completed and provided by addendum? If partially assessed properties are to be considered ""known"" how are quantities to be determined?"

**The Department is currently performing the remaining Phase II Environmental Assessments. Completed Phase II ESAs will be provided as soon as they are available. Known Regulated Materials shall be limited to the information included in the Contract Documents at the time of Bid. For properties where partial information is provided, any Regulated Materials identified in the Contract Documents at the time of Bid shall be considered Known Regulated Materials, while pending testing shall be considered Unknown Regulated Materials. Additional Phase II ESAs performed after Bid will be considered "Unknown Regulated Materials".**

*Question Submitted:* 1/4/2017 9:09:43 AM

Please clarify reference to clause (b) in Scope Section 6.7, 3rd bullet. "Any substance, product, waste, or other material of any nature whatsoever which may give rise to clause (b) or any other statutory or common law..."

**Clause (b) refers to the second bullet within this section stating ""Any substance, product, waste or other material of any nature whatsoever that exceeds maximum allowable concentrations for elemental metals, organic compounds or inorganic compounds, as defined by any Governmental Rule"". This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/4/2017 9:01:49 AM

Per section 1140-4.2.3 of the Traffic Engineering Manual (TEM): "For an LED lighting system, the designer shall strive to find three interchangeable solidstate (LED) luminaires". The ODOT section of lighting, west of E. 55th Street, will be designed with fixtures conforming to Supplemental Specification 813, per project scope. Will the TEM requirement to design for three eligible manufacturers be waived for this project, since it is design-build?

**The TEM requirement to design for three eligible manufacturers will be waived.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/4/2017 9:00:23 AM

In section 19.5.3 of the project scope, Item D "Cross Street Lighting", the scope states that "Cross street lighting shall comply with CPP standards". Does CPP have a standard light fixture for wood poles? Should the design team assume that the fixture will be the same LED Galleon as ODOT has specified and required for OH-10; GAN AF 07 LED U T3R BZ 800 4N7?

**Revised illumination criteria based on functional class and adjacent land use was provided in Addendum 7. The fixtures will not be the same LED Gallion required for OH-10. The Department is coordinating LED light standards with CPP and will provide requirements in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 1/4/2017 8:59:17 AM

The existing and proposed drainage areas for the project were provided by the Department. When these areas are laid overtop of each other it is evident that the proposed areas do not include all of the existing offsite drainage area (i.e. See S/ SE side from Sta 111+00 to Sta. 119+00 and the SE corner of Rawlings Street/ OC Boulevard from Sta. 83+00 to 86+00). Are we to design the drainage system to accommodate ALL of the drainage area OR are we to assume that the offsite drainage areas will be developed and proper storm water management will be used? Is this the reason for the overall upsizing of the storm sewer (within the limits identified in the RFP) by one size after the design is completed?

**The drainage system shall accommodate all contributing overland flow based on the DBT's design. Sewer upsizing requirements within the Contract Documents was included to accommodate potential increases in drainage area resulting from future adjacent development.**

*Question Submitted:* 1/4/2017 8:56:41 AM

LD-08 Site Specific Requirement indicates the placement of temporary chain link fence in multiple locations. Please confirm that it is NOT ODOT's intention to use temporary construction fencing per Item 614 and provide more detail as to the actual requirements of this fence? Shall it meet the specifications of Item 607 Fence, Type CL, Type CLT, or other?

**The temporary chain link fence shall be Type CLT per Item 607. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/21/2016 10:23:03 AM

Scope Section 16.3.6 requires a three-coat paint system on steel girders and crossframes and references Section 18 for color requirements. Section 18 does not appear to have any specific color requirements for steel painting. Please clarify.

**Color requirements will be added to AE-02 in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/21/2016 10:22:50 AM

Scope Section 16.3.6 requires a three-coat paint system on steel girders and crossframes. Does this requirement apply to steel rolled beams?

**Yes. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/21/2016 10:22:24 AM

Please clarify the level of staffing required to co-locate by the lead designer and IQF during Design and whether design or IQF subconsultants would also be required to co-locate? Section 1.12.1 of the Scope lists "DB Design Project Manager\*" and "Design IQF Project Manager\*" with the following note for each "\*Lead Designer or Design IQF staff." Would the note mean the Lead Structure and Lead Roadway Engineer are required to be co-located? What is defined as "IQF Staff"?

**The DB Design Project Manager and Design IQF Project Manager shall be co-located during the design phase. It is recommended that the IQF lead Structures reviewer, Lead Roadway reviewer, DB Lead Structures Designer, and Lead Roadway Designer be co-located during the design phase, but is not required. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/20/2016 3:01:00 PM

Instructions to Offerors, Paragraph 4.3.1, Part 1.iv states that the Organizational chart shall include both contracting relationships between members of the DBT and relationships and responsibilities between key personnel and other known project roles. Is it the Department's intentions to have to two separate organizational charts, one for the organizational structure of the team members, and a separate one for relationships between key personnel?

**A single organizational chart including the various elements described in Part 1.iv is required.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/20/2016 3:00:11 PM

Instructions to Offerors, Paragraph 4.3.1, Part 1.iv.e states that the organizational chart shall include the Drainage Design/Construction leads. The Bridge, Roadway and Drainage Construction Leads and the Drainage Design Lead are not identified as key positions. Please clarify the Department's intent in asking for named persons beyond the key personnel. If these leads will be considered in the evaluation, will the Design Builder be afforded the ability to include their respective resumes in the appendices.

**In accordance with the definition for DB Lead Roadway Engineer within Section 4.1, the DB Lead Roadway Engineer is the design lead for drainage elements (as well as roadway). Construction leads for bridge, roadway and drainage are not required to be named. However, the organizational chart shall address the position and relationships within the organization of these positions. Resumes of the construction leads for bridge, roadway and drainage will not be considered in the evaluation.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/20/2016 2:59:26 PM

Instructions to Offerors, Paragraph 4.3.1, Part 1.iv.b states that the organizational chart shall include the contracting relationship between the DBT and known subcontractors/subconsultants with leads for each firm identified. Given the magnitude of the project and the NSLE commitment requirements, the number of known subcontractors/subconsultants will be significant. Further, the DBT is required to submit commitment letters signed by both the DBT and the NSLE firm as part of appendix 9. Is it intended that the org chart show all subcontractors/subconsultants that the DBT is committed to or just those considered major participants?

**The organizational chart shall include known subcontractors/subconsultants who are committed, major participants, and key to the successful completion of the Project. Depicting NSLE committed firms is not required.**

Question Submitted: 12/20/2016 2:24:43 PM

Please reference Scope 19.3.2.I. Can overhead signs be placed off-center, vertically, on an existing support truss/arms, in order to maintain the vertical clearance requirements?

**Yes, if an existing support truss/arms can be reused, the centroid of the sign may be offset a maximum of one foot vertically from the center of the support. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/20/2016 2:23:39 PM

Scope 19.2.10 states: "Interconnect conduit shall be at least 3-inches and shall not be shared with other types of cable." Scope 19.5.4.A states: "2-2 inch traffic conduits shall be included in the same concrete encasement on one side of the roadway." Please clarify if the interconnect is to be placed in one of the 2-2" traffic conduits. If interconnect is to be placed in 2" conduit, also resolve conflicting statements on required pull box sizes in Scope 19.2.10 ("Pull Boxes (17" x 30") shall be provided for the interconnect conduit.") and Scope 19.5.4.G ("Pull boxes for 2-inch signal circuits shall be 13 inches x 24 inches.")

**The interconnect cable shall be placed in one of the 2-2" traffic conduits included in the duct bank. The pull boxes used for the traffic interconnect conduits shall be 17"x 30". This was clarified in Addenda 4 and 6.**

Question Submitted: 12/20/2016 8:11:47 AM

Does the Contractor's Consultant Information need to be submitted through the ODOT website for this project or is the Technical Proposal information sufficient?

**Naming of the DBT's consultant's and subconsultants is to occur in the DBT's Technical Proposal. The naming of the consultant or subconsultant on the Office of Contract's website is not necessary.**

Question Submitted: 12/20/2016 8:10:16 AM

Section 10.2.1 of the scope says the DBT shall obtain additional borings as needed per ODOT's SGE to establish all geotechnical design parameters. If the DBT decides the available boring information is sufficient to establish all geotechnical design parameters for their design, will ODOT require additional borings to meet the boring location requirements in the SGE? For example, will borings be required at every substructure unit for bridges, according to SGE 303.7.1?

**The need for additional geotechnical information, i.e., borings, is determined by the Designer of Record. Interpretation and interpolation of geotechnical conditions between boring locations provided shall be at the sole risk of the DBT. The Designer must follow the standard of care ordinarily exercised by members of the engineering profession practicing under similar conditions at the same time and locality, and perform any additional explorations in accordance with the Specifications for Geotechnical Explorations (SGE). The DBT runs the risk of not being able to prove that the subsurface or latent physical conditions at the site differ materially from those indicated in the Contract Documents if SGE requirements and standard of care are not adhered, thereby assuming the costs associated with encountering a claimed condition.**

Question Submitted: 12/15/2016 12:05:09 PM

Will ODOT assume "Generator" status for any and all contaminated or hazardous material encountered? Will ODOT sign the transportation manifests for the contaminated or hazardous materials?

**ODOT assumes responsibility as the Generator for the wastes. However, the Contractor is a co-generator and is listed as the facility operator responsible for handling the waste in the RCRA Subtitle C form. ODOT assumes the role as site Owner/Generator. ODOT will sign the manifest as the Generator. The manifest are to be filled out by the Contractor. Once the material has been disposed of, a duplicate of the manifest (with all appropriate signatures i.e. transporter, receiving facility) is required to be submitted back to the Engineer.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/15/2016 11:53:17 AM

Per Section 20.3.2.4, the I-490 Closure Detour requires the I-90 Westbound entrance ramp from Prospect Ave become an add lane carried through to the I-77 exit from I-90. It states that "the DBT shall investigate pavement spread and hydraulic gradelines of I-90 WB drainage for the modified lane configuration to ensure acceptable levels of operation" Can the department please provide the existing plans for this segment of I-90 so that this area can be evaluated? Also, note from the L&D Volume 2, Section 1010 Maintenance of Traffic Drainage, "a minimum dry lane width of 10 feet for each travelled lane is required... for a 2-year design frequency." Being within a superelevated section, with a minimum of 10 lanes, and with only 1 to 2 feet to an adjacent bridge abutment, this requirement may not be feasible for the entire extent of the segment. Will the Department waive this requirement at these locations?

**The Department will be implementing the temporary add-lane on I-90 through a separate project. This will include shoulder replacement and signing and pavement marking improvements. At the completion of the OC3 Project, the DBT shall restore signing and pavement marking to the present (pre-add-lane) conditions. This shall include mill and fill operations where pavement marking revisions are performed. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/15/2016 11:49:37 AM

Per Section 14.2.3.2 Storm Sewer Inspection of the scope, do the video inspection and cleaning requirements apply to the large combined sewer and interceptor pipes? What, if any, are the pipe size limitations, (i.e. over a 48" pipe size, these requirements are not applicable unless the contractor's operations are at fault)?

**Video inspection requirements apply to the large combined sewer and interceptor pipes that could be impacted by the DBT's work. The Department will clarify pipe cleaning requirements in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/15/2016 11:48:07 AM

Per Section 14.2.K of the scope it states "the DBT shall remove sediment and debris from existing drainage conduits and drainage structures as follows: 1) Any drainage structure to which the DBT connects, 2) Any drainage structure receiving runoff during construction from areas disturbed by the Work, 3) The adjacent drainage conduit extending from the structure identified in conditions (1) or (2) to the next downstream drainage structure." Does this include the combined storm sewer system including the large interceptor pipes, or only catch basins and the lateral pipes? What, if any, are the pipe size limitations, (i.e. for combined sewers, only under a 24" pipe size unless the contractor's operations are at fault)?

**Drainage structure cleaning requirements include more than just the catch basins and laterals but not necessarily all large diameter pipes. The Department will clarify pipe cleaning requirements in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/15/2016 11:43:58 AM

Per Section 14.2.4 of the scope it states "Treatment design for post-construction BMPs shall follow the procedures described in L&D Volume 2, Sections 1115, 1116, and 1117." Per the L&D, Volume 2, Section 1117.3.3 Design Check Discharge (for Extended Detention), it states that "a design check discharge with the frequency of a 10-year event shall be used." However, the NEORSR requirements (Attachment DR-04) state in Section 3.1 that storm events up to the 5-year, 24-hour event shall demonstrate that storage volume shall be satisfied and that for the 5-year and up to the 25-year, 24 hour event the maximum post-development release rate shall be equal or lesser than the existing conditions peak discharge. We are assuming that all ODOT water quality/ quantity basins (and other quantity BMPs) used also for NEORSR detention must be designed to the stricter of the above regulations. Is this correct?

**NEORSR requirements apply when outletting to combined sewers. ODOT quality/quantity criteria apply when outletting to storm only systems.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/14/2016 7:37:55 AM

Paragraph 5 of section 4 of section 4.6.1 of the ITO states "Firms listed as an ODOT certified SBE at the following link at the time of Technical and Price Proposal submittal can only qualify towards the 2% SBE goal if the firm is a construction or a construction-related consultant services firm." Paragraph 8 of section 4 of section 4.6.1 of the ITO states "Committing businesses to meet the Small Business goal who are on the Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Program list will not require further evidence of eligibility for the company. It is not required that committed businesses be on the certified list prior to Technical Proposal submittal, but will be required to be certified prior to performing work as an SBE if performing work as a Small Business. The SBE firm must perform 100% of the total cost of its contract with its own work force. Prequalification requirements for firms identified as Small Businesses for the Project will be in accordance with OAC 5501:2-3-08(A)(1)." Paragraph 5 states firms on the qualified list at the time of the proposal submittal will only qualify towards the 2% goal while the middle of paragraph 8 states it is not required that committed businesses be on the certified list prior to the technical proposal submittal. Please clarify if committed SBE's need to be on the list prior to the submittal of the proposal.

**If utilizing a firm on the ODOT SBE list, the firm must be either a Construction or a Construction-related consultant service firm to count towards the goal; vendors and suppliers on the ODOT SBE list will not be counted towards the SBE goal. If utilizing a Construction or a Construction-related consultant service for the SBE Goal that is not on the ODOT SBE list and the firm is a DBE, at the time of Technical Proposal submittal may qualify as an SBE only if the annual receipts for the firm averaged over the most recent three years does not exceed \$15 million for construction or \$7 million (construction related consultant services). If the firm is a Construction or a Construction-related consultant service firm but is not on either the DBE or the ODOT SBE list at time of Technical Proposal submittal further evidence will be required to be certified prior to performing work as an SBE to qualify.**

Question Submitted: 12/13/2016 10:53:09 AM

Section 4.1 of the ITO/RFP requests resumes in the Technical Proposal for the Key Personnel, but does not specify which appendix the resume for the Design IQF Project Manager goes in. Please update the Technical Proposal requirements to provide this direction.

**The Design IQF Project Manager's resume shall be included in Appendix 3.**

Question Submitted: 12/13/2016 9:23:36 AM

ITO Section 4.4.1 states: "Submit Conceptual Plans for the structures. The Conceptual Plans will be provided as Appendix 7 to the Technical Proposal. The Conceptual Plans shall contain the following:" Please clarify why the first sentence refers to Conceptual Structure Plans when the list of Conceptual Plans contains Structure Plans among other disciplines such as Roadway Drainage and MOT?

**The Conceptual Plans provided in Appendix 7 must contain the items listed in Section 4.4.1. This includes but is not limited to structures.**

Question Submitted: 12/13/2016 9:21:48 AM

Scope Section 20.3.2.4 states: "The DBT shall modify I-90 Westbound so that the entrance ramp from Prospect Avenue to I-90

Westbound enters as an add lane to create 4 lanes on I-90. Four lanes shall be continued to the I-77 exit from I-90 where the outer lane becomes a single lane exit to I-77 and 3 thru lanes continue on I-90. The DBT shall remove and replace existing shoulder pavement on I-90 to accommodate the new lane usage. The DBT shall also investigate pavement spread and hydraulic grade lines of I-90 westbound drainage for the modified lane configuration to ensure acceptable levels of operation per the governing regulations." Please provide clarification as to why Hydraulic Grade Line should be a part of the criteria if traffic is being placed on the existing shoulder?

**The Department will be implementing the temporary add-lane on I-90 through a separate project. This will include shoulder replacement and signing and pavement marking improvements. At the completion of the OC3 Project, the DBT shall restore signing and pavement marking to the present (pre-add-lane) conditions. This shall include mill and fill operations where pavement marking revisions are performed. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/13/2016 9:19:30 AM

Addendum 6 revised the Bridge Typical Section in ST-05 which widened the bridge by 2' and added a 5' Walk for the OH-10 over Kingsbury Run Ravine Bridge. No revisions were included in LD-01 or the cad files to accommodate the necessary transition of walk or additional width due to this change.

**The CAD files provided in DI-02 and the conceptual plans provided in LD-01 are for reference only and will not be updated to reflect these changes. Short-listed Offerors shall design the structures in accordance with the contractual elements in appendix ST-05. Note that the 5' (walk) on the bridge is not intended to be a sidewalk, but is to create curbed separation between the traveled way and parapet. Sidewalk shall not be utilized on the approach roadway therefore basic configuration elements within the typical sections of LD-01 remain unchanged.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:53:20 AM

Scope Section 7.8.2 requires aerial CPP lines to cross new OH-10 via underground facilities. Are the private utilities (CEI, AT&T, etc) held to this same requirement? Please clarify the scope.

**Private utilities are not subject to this requirement. However, ODOT is encouraging private utility owners to convert to an underground utility infrastructure in conjunction with the project or to install provisions to support future conversion to underground (i.e., empty conduits under OH-10 intersection crossings).**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:52:06 AM

Reference Appendix TC-07 / Scope 19.3.2.C. For overhead signs that will be updated with the OH-10 route shield, is the existing destination text of "E 55th St" to be maintained (even though it will no longer be the primary destination road)? If not, is it to be replaced with an alternate destination?

**E.55th Street will no longer be the primary destination to be included on the signage. The Department is currently coordinating the destination information. The DBT shall assume "Opportunity Corridor Blvd" as the destination signage in their bid when determining required sign sizes. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:50:38 AM

Section 3.3 of the ITO states that Part F.6 of the Technical Proposal is to include the Preliminary CPM Schedule & Narrative within Appendix 6. Section 4.3.1.5 of the ITO states, "The preliminary CPM schedule will be submitted in Appendix 6 of the Technical Proposal." Section 4.3.1.6 states, "Submit an overall preliminary CPM Schedule describing the planned sequence of work. This narrative shall correspond to the submitted preliminary CPM Schedule in Appendix 6." Is the intent to have two CPM narratives (one in the Project Management section of the Technical Proposal and one in the Appendix or just one overall narrative located in the PM section. Please clarify the quantity of schedule narratives required within the Technical Proposal and their respective location throughout.

**The CPM Schedule narrative referred to in Section 3.3 and Section 4.3.1.6 are the same. DBTs shall include this narrative in Part F.6 of their Technical Proposals. The Department will score the CPM schedule and narrative as part of the Project Management section, as described in Section 4.3.2.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:48:42 AM

Reference Scope Section 19.3. Please confirm that existing overhead lane control signs that are impacted by construction can be replaced with ground mounted lane control signs.

**Regulatory lane use signage at intersections where required shall be ground mounted. Note, the City of Cleveland limits the use of lane use control signs to non-standard conditions (i.e., double left, exclusive right, and trap conditions). This will be clarified as part of a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:47:33 AM

Please reference Appendix TC-07 / Scope 19.3.2.C. Appendix TC-07 identifies overhead signs (U, V, W, and X) as requiring replacement in conjunction with Scope 19.3.2.C ("The DBT shall design, furnish and install replacement major overhead guide signage for all major overhead guide signage removed."). E 55th Street will no longer intersect directly with I-490/I-77. The OMUTCD does not indicate a need for overhead guide signs on a secondary road as E-55th Street will be in the proposed condition. Please specify the type and layout of interstate guide signage required on E 55th Street and the Quadrant Road.

**Overhead guide signage will be required along E.55th Street. The details of the signage and locations will be clarified as part of a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:45:42 AM

Please clarify if the existing trees on the east side of E 59th are to remain or be removed?

**Trees along the east side of E. 59th Street shall be replaced if impacted by the DBT's work. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:44:37 AM

Please reference Scope Section 1.6. ODOT is the maintaining agency for 490 from begin project to a point 600' west of the Quadrant Road. Are the storm sewers in this section to comply with ODOT or City of Cleveland requirements for the alternate drainage bid item?

**Drainage items within the specified limits shall follow ODOT standards, however, sumps and traps are required at all catch basins that outlet to combined sewers. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:36:34 AM

Please reference Scope Section 14.1. Can the large and deep sewers around E 55th that are being abandoned as part of the regulator relocation that are not being removed in the excavation be abandoned in place or do they need to be filled and plugged?

**All sewers to be abandoned shall be filled and plugged per the scope.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:34:51 AM

Please reference Scope Section 18.2. On OC2 mulch was placed in the medians. Can ODOT clarify if they want to topsoil and seed the medians or use mulch?

**Per Scope Section 18.2, all exposed soils not covered by hardened surfaces or other landscaping shall be seeded and mulched with Class 1 seed or sodded, at or before the completion of the project.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:32:40 AM

Please reference Scope Section 18.2. Please clarify if trees are intended to be planted on the outside of the western 490/OC Blvd section in front of the retaining walls?

**Yes. Trees shall be planted in all buffer areas including tree lawns, border areas with no walks, and curbed median islands along OH-10 and the Quadrant Roadway. Trees shall be omitted along OH-10 and interchange ramps from begin project to 1000 feet east of the begin project limit. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:31:28 AM

Please reference Scope Section 18.2. Please clarify if trees are intended to be planted on the outside of 490 where there are no walls?

**Trees shall be planted in all buffer areas including tree lawns, border areas with no walks, and curbed median islands along OH-10 and the Quadrant Roadway. Trees shall be omitted along OH-10 and interchange ramps from begin project to 1000 feet east of the begin project limit. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:30:30 AM

Please reference Scope Section 18.2. Please clarify if trees are intended to be planted in the median on 490 from the western project limits to the quadrant road?

**Trees shall be planted in all buffer areas including tree lawns, border areas with no walks, and curbed median islands along OH-10 and the Quadrant Roadway. Trees shall be omitted along OH-10 and interchange ramps from begin project to 1000 feet east of the begin project limit. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:29:13 AM

Please reference LD-01. There is an existing retaining wall with railing on the northwest corner of the East 89th Street Bridge and continues to Frederic Ave. The wall runs to the west along Frederic Ave. Is there any repair or replacement work to be done to this retaining wall?

**No repair or replacement work is anticipated on the existing retaining walls along E. 89th Street and Frederick Avenue north of the E. 89th Street bridge. The west railing shall be removed from the structure to Frederick Avenue. The DBT shall install a new right-of-way fence from the new E. 89th Street Pedestrian Bridge to Fredrick Avenue. The fencing shall be located immediately adjacent to the wall. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:11:12 AM

Please reference scope section 19.2. Is the existing traffic signal and Buckeye Road and E 89th Street to be removed (and replaced with stop sign control)?

**Yes, the existing signal at E. 89th Street and Buckeye Road shall be removed and the new intersection shall be stop sign controlled on the E. 89th Street approach. E. 89th Street south of Buckeye Road will be converted from one-way to two-way operations. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:08:17 AM

Please reference Scope Section 19.2.1.8. At OH-10 and Woodland Avenue, will the pedestrian crossing across the WB right turn slip lane require signalization?

**Yes, the pedestrian crossing across the WB right turn slip lane will require signalization. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 12/12/2016 9:06:25 AM

Please reference scope section 19.2.10 and proposed interconnect. Where will the proposed interconnect be tied in with the existing? Are there existing interconnect plans?

**There is no existing interconnect. The proposed interconnect will connect all proposed intersections with OH-10 between the Quadrant Roadway and Quincy Avenue to form a new system. Existing conduit between E. 93rd Street and Quincy Avenue will be constructed as part of the Opportunity Corridor Section 2 Project. Plans are not available at this time.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/9/2016 11:27:28 AM

In Section 10.2.6. of the Project Scope, two options for subgrade stabilization are given. Understanding that the Department may prescribe additional undercut during proof rolling, if the DBT selects and performs one of these options, does the DBT carry any risk for future performance of the overall pavement section, including subgrade. If the DBT does carry additional risk, what are the limits of this risk?

**As on other ODOT projects, the DBT maintains responsibility for pavement defects due to poor workmanship.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/9/2016 10:31:45 AM

Per Section 20.3.2.4, the I-490 Closure Detour requires the I-90 Westbound entrance ramp from Prospect Ave become an add lane carried through to the I-77 exit from I-90. Please confirm that the add lane (4th lane) is to be accommodated under existing structures (Carnegie Ave, Cedar Ave, & E22nd St) by means of restriping the existing shoulders and lanes to accommodate 4 lanes of MOT traffic, rather than making any modification to the existing structures.

**The existing structures are not to be modified.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/9/2016 10:30:16 AM

Per Section 1.5 of the Project Scope, all work shall be consistent with the Basic Configuration, including the centerline horizontal and vertical elements. Does this mean that though Table 1-1 establishes a 30mph design speed for the Quadrant Rd, the design geometry with the conceptual plans should be followed, even though it does not satisfy the 30mph design criteria within ODOT L&D Vol 1? Will the design team be required to a design exception though this is part of basic configuration?

**Minimum design speeds for roadways, excluding OH-10, interstate, and interstate ramps, shall meet design criteria for the posted speed limit. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/7/2016 4:19:28 PM

It appears that one of the goal requirements is to facilitate On the Job Training (OJT) for both "blue collar -20,000 hours" and "professional service -10,000 hours" related type work. In addition, the RFQ specifically states – "The project will have a yet to be specified professional services on the job training (OJT) requirement for residents of Cuyahoga or Lorain County". Can you please elaborate more on these two items – from the standpoint of what's ODOT's current expectation related to these activities?

**Specific minimum requirements for On-the-Job training can be found in Proposal Note 98 (Addendum 2), Instructions to Offerors Project Expectations section (Addendum 6), and Section Project Scope Section 5 (Addendum 6). There is not an OJT goal specifically for residents of Cuyahoga and Lorain Counties.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2016 5:33:12 AM

Scope Section 19.6 specifies that surveillance cameras are to communicate over a wireless network. What existing network or head-end facility will the proposed wireless network connect to and by what means? What additional equipment, if any, will the DBT need to furnish/install in order to complete head-end connectivity? Who will configure and test the wireless network equipment?

**The DBT shall install a camera at each signalized intersection. The DBT shall install a power cable and a Cat5 communication cable from the camera to the signal controller cabinet, but shall not provide any network connectivity. The City will provide all network connectivity and equipment.**

**This will be clarified in Addendum 10.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/5/2016 5:31:45 AM

There has been a Pre Bid question regarding the posting of Right of Way Plans and we understand they are forthcoming in an Addendum. We would like to request at least the Legal Descriptions or a table describing the intentions for each Temporary Parcel on each property can be released to the DBT's. Especially, with what is to be considered proposed work by the DBT and what is considered cost to cure for the property owners. Examples: Temporary at Parcel 2002 at E 55th intersection appears to impact existing parking, but nothing is shown in LD-01 as to the DBT's responsibility to replace parking or details for repair of the parking lot. Temporary on Parcels 2420 and 2429 along E89th, can permanent grading extend into Temporary or is this just for access and construction of Structure?

**Contract document Appendix LD-08 (Site Specific Requirements) includes details for work to be performed at each parcel by the DBT. LD-08 also describes any items to be provided outside of the DBT contract through the real estate settlement. Addendum No. 6 includes revised details for work responsibilities at Parcel 2002. Only temporary grading for construction access and bridge construction shall be allowed on parcels 2420 and 2426 (updated parcel number 2429). This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/5/2016 5:30:19 AM

It appears that the CAD files that contain the cross section basemaps for the proposed temporary shoo fly tracks and permanent tracks, which are associated with the proposed NS bridge were not included with the RFP CAD files, can the file or files be provided to the shortlisted teams? 96833\_XC010.dgn appears to be the file for the sections, but file is blank.

**CAD files that contain the cross section basemaps for the proposed temporary shoo fly tracks and permanent tracks associated with the proposed NS bridge will be included in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/5/2016 5:28:19 AM

There are existing retaining walls to the east and west of the proposed NS bridge that are within the new roadway alignment and are to be removed. We are requesting all existing information available on these walls, and in particular, the foundations, so that we can accurately estimate the cost of demolition and any modifications?

**The Department was unable to obtain record drawings for the existing retaining walls through past coordination with Norfolk Southern.**

Question Submitted: 12/5/2016 5:23:23 AM

Reference NS's Underpass Grade Separation Design Criteria, Item 3.8 states that vandal fencing shall be provided for all underpass structures in urban areas, and standard details are provided within the Public Projects Manual. NS details are different than the pedestrian fencing provided in AE-02. We would like to know, for the NS bridge only, are we to follow the NS fencing details or do we need to follow the fence requirements stated in AE-02?

**Vandal fencing shall be provided using the aesthetic fencing described in AE-02, modified to accommodate Norfolk Southern handrail requirements. Bridge parapet (curbing) shall be per Norfolk Southern requirements. Architectural lighting shall not be used. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/5/2016 5:21:57 AM

The pier enhancement details sheet 11 of AE-02 Enhancement Plans states that the pier cap depth will be 2ft +/- and that the pier width will be 4'-0". The only bridge with a pier in the roadway is the NS bridge. Due to the larger railroad loading and NS's design requirements maintaining these dimensions is not feasible. We would like to know if these two dimensional requirements can be waived and AE-02 updated.

**The pier cap depth and pier width may be adjusted as required to meet design requirements for the specific application (roadway or rail bridge). This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/5/2016 5:20:08 AM

PA-01 and LD-10 combined call for the removal and reconstruction of E 59th. LD-01 does not include any details for this reconstruction. Please provide plan, profile, cross sections and typical sections to define how to reconstruct.

**Reconstruction of E.59th Street is included due to potential sewer redirection. The intent is to match existing geometry therefore, no plan, profile, or cross sections were developed. A typical section is included in LD-01.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/5/2016 5:18:31 AM

As a follow up to the answer provided to the Pre-Bid question asked on 11/9/2016 7:12:59 PM, Scope Section 14.2.3.4 states "The allowable design discharge shall be calculated to the satisfaction of NEORS and the Department. Detention facilities shall be provided where discharges would exceed allowable discharge rates." The statement "satisfaction of NEORS and the Department" is too vague and does not provide any definable direction and/or specifications to determine the amount of detention required for the project.

**Impacts to the existing sewer systems are dependent on the DBT's design (i.e. amount of flow to combined sewers versus storm only outfall as well as number of storm only outfalls utilized). The DBT will need to evaluate impacts to the existing down stream sewer system specific to their design and provide flow data to the Department and NEORS to determine if detention is required.**

Question Submitted: 12/2/2016 9:07:49 AM

Will the Department consider applying a life cycle cost adjustment to the full depth flexible and rigid pavement options for OH-10?

**No. The Department will not consider applying a life cycle cost adjustment to the full depth flexible and rigid pavement options for OH-10.**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2016 5:09:36 PM

Please clarify property rights below the E. 89th bridge. Is there existing right-of-way for existing substructure footings or do existing footings encroach upon GCRTA and Norfolk Southern property?

**E. 89th Street lies in a dedicated 60' city street right-of-way which pre-dates the railroad. The railroads occupy the public right of way per City ordinance(s).**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2016 5:09:26 PM

Can ODOT coordinate for a site visit of GCRTA property at the proposed Kingsbury and Blue/Green bridges?

**The Department is currently coordinating with GCRTA and will communicate available times once determined.**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2016 5:09:19 PM

Please confirm the Turn Lane Lengths of Quadrant Ave NB left turn lane. Table 19-2 shows minimum 300', but graphics provided in DI-02 show 260'.

**The Quadrant Roadway shall be constructed with four continuous lanes between E. 55th Street and OH-10 to provide future flexibility to accommodate varying operational needs. The turn lane lengths of Quadrant Ave NB left turn lanes will be revised to 225' and 175'. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2016 5:09:11 PM

Please confirm the Turn Lane Lengths of Quadrant Ave WB left turn lane. Table 19-2 shows minimum 440', but graphics provided in DI-02 show 412'.

**"The Quadrant Roadway shall be constructed with four continuous lanes between E. 55th Street and OH-10 to provide future flexibility to accommodate varying operational needs. The turn lane length of Quadrant Ave WB left turn lane at E. 55th Street will be revised to 400'. This will be clarified in a future addendum."**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2016 5:09:03 PM

Please confirm the Design Speed of E. 55th Street. LD-02 shows 40 MPH, but sag curve shown on Page 77 of LD-01 only meets 35 MPH criteria per L&D Vol 1 Figure 203-6E.

**Minimum design speeds for roadways, excluding OH-10, interstate, and interstate ramps, shall meet design criteria for the posted speed limit. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2016 5:08:50 PM

Scope 16.3.6 states that "Exterior mounting of utilities on fascia beams/girders is prohibited." Will the Department consider waiving this requirement for the NS bridge over OC Blvd?

**No. Exterior mounting of utilities on fascia beams/girders is prohibited.**

Question Submitted: 12/1/2016 5:08:40 PM

Can piers be located in the OC sidewalk section under the NSRR bridge over OC Blvd?

**No, piers can not be located in the OC sidewalk section under the NSRR bridge over OC Boulevard.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2016 5:08:34 PM

Scope Section 13.2.2 - Maurice and Belford Ave. resurfacing: Does E. 55th need to be resurfaced south of Maurice up through the Belford Ave intersection?

**No. E. 55th does not need to be resurfaced south of Maurice up through the Belford Ave intersection.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2016 5:08:24 PM

Scope Section 16.3.7 requires a 1" monolithic wearing surface on all bridge decks. Please clarify that this requirement does not apply to the NSRR bridge since it will be ballasted.

**The monolithic wearing surface requirement shall only apply to roadway and pedestrian bridge decks. This will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2016 5:08:14 PM

LD-01 sheet 46 shows a 72" box culvert crossing the OC mainline at approximately 58+00. We have not been able to locate any information on this line. Can the Department please provide existing plans including depths of the sewer?

**Available record drawings have been provided in Appendix UT-04 (Section 3 – Record Sewer Plans) including A-534, A-811, A-942, R-395, and R-440. Record drawings were not able to be located for portions of the culvert system. The Department performed additional field investigations and surveys. In-pipe survey reports are included in Appendix DR-02 (Sewer Survey Reports).**

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2016 5:07:56 PM

Scope 10.2.5 states that where Unsuitable Subgrade is encountered within 3' of the bottom of pavement the unsuitable material shall be removed to the 3' limit and replaced with Granular Material. There is no way for us to estimate how much unsuitable material will be encountered on the project. We request that the Department provide a contingency pay item for this work or provide direction via addendum of what quantity the DBTs shall assume for this work.

**Subgrade remediation of the first 10% of the subgrade area will be the DBT's responsibility. Subgrade remediation exceeding 10% of the subgrade area will be computed and paid to the DBT. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2016 11:34:44 AM

The DBT would like to request a copy of the Cleveland Water Department GIS Map of their system in the area.

**The Department is currently coordinating with the Cleveland Water Department to obtain these files. If the Department obtains the files, they will be provided in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2016 11:32:19 AM

Per 19.5.4 4-2", 2-5" conduits shall be in a duct bank on each side of the roadway and 2-2" conduits shall be in the duct bank on one side only, How many and what size conduits shall the DBT assume will be in each parapet of the mainline bridges?

**Two 2" conduits shall be provided for each street light on each side of the road. Two separate 2" conduits shall be provided for each architectural light on each side of the road. Two 2" conduits shall be provided for signal interconnect. The above may be located within either the parapets and/or sidewalk areas. The two 5" conduits on each side of the roadway may be supported under the bridge deck.**

**Pull boxes shall be installed for street light and signal interconnect. Pull boxes for the 5" conduits do not need installed on the bridges, provided that they are located immediately outside each approach slab.**

**This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/1/2016 11:31:07 AM

RFP Section 16.3.3f states that "expansion joints shall not be located over piers". Does that requirement apply to the Norfolk Southern bridge?

**The requirement of Section 16.3.3f, which states that no expansion joints shall be located over piers, shall apply to roadway and pedestrian bridges only. Scope Section 16.3.3f will be revised in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 9:35:38 AM

Reference Scope Section 7.8.2. Please provide the size, number and contents of the existing CPP underground conduits along I-490 for Utility Matrix Conflict ID No. 1, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

**The Department is coordinating with CPP. Additional underground facility information will be provided in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 9:32:20 AM

Reference Scope Section 7.8.2. Please provide the size, number and contents of CPP existing underground conduits along East 79th St from station 15+30 – 21+71 LT. The record drawings provided in appendix UT-04 are not clear.

**The Department is coordinating with CPP. Additional underground facility information will be provided in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 9:26:21 AM

Reference Scope Section 7.8.2. The scope states that CPP's underground ducts shall be replaced along E93rd St. Will this work be completed by the DBT in Opportunity Corridor Section 2?

**Underground ductwork along E. 93rd Street is not included within this contract. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 9:23:37 AM

Reference Scope Section 7.8.2. Please provide the size, number and contents of the CPP proposed underground conduits along Woodland Ave from station 28+00 – 39+00 RT.

**The Department is coordinating with CPP. Additional underground facility information will be provided in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 9:19:14 AM

Reference Scope Section 7.8.2. Please provide the size, number and contents of CPP existing underground conduits along Buckeye Rd from station 25+50 – 36+15 RT. The record drawings provided in appendix UT-04 do not provide specifics.

**The Department is coordinating with CPP. Additional underground facility information will be provided in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 8:58:54 AM

For OH-10 & Quadrant Roadway intersection, scope 19.2.1.2.A states "Provide crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and push buttons on all three approaches." There are no sidewalks at this intersection. Are pedestrian features (including curb ramps) to be provided?

**No, pedestrian amenities shall not be constructed at the OH-10/Quadrant roadway intersection. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 8:58:14 AM

Scope 19.2.12.E states "Two loops shall be installed per lane, one located immediately behind the other". Are there detailed requirements for loops, including dimensions, type, shape, and spacing?

**Loop detector details will be provided in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 8:57:24 AM

Scope 19.2.5.M states "The number, type, and placement of signal heads shall be per the OMUTCD (i.e., one head per lane for primary movements; ..." The OMUTCD only requires that "a minimum of two primary signal faces shall be provided" on any approach. Additional heads are optional recommendations per the OMUTCD for approaches with speeds of 45mph or higher. Please confirm that only two primary signal heads (including one five section head where applicable) are required on approaches with two or more primary through lanes or specify the required number of heads.

**A minimum of one signal head per thru lane is required. The scope will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 8:56:25 AM

Scope Section 19.2.5.Q states "For protected/permissive operation of five-section signal heads (either left- or right-turn), the location of the signal head shall be over an extension of the channelizing line." There are instances where the left turn lane will be separated from adjacent through lanes by a painted buffer. Where shall the five section head be located in this case?

**For instances where the left turn lane will be separated from adjacent through lanes by a painted buffer, the five section head shall be located at the midpoint of the buffer. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 8:55:27 AM

Scope Section 19.2.12.D states "Loop detectors shall be used in all approach lanes at the new and reconstructed signalized intersections, with the exception of the OH-10 through lanes." Based on the provided Synchro files, there are left turn lanes on OH-10 that will be operated without a dedicated left turn phase. Please confirm that loops are not required in left turn lanes on OH-10 that do not have a dedicated left turn phase.

**No. Loop detectors shall be used in all approach lanes at the new and reconstructed signalized intersections, with the exception of the OH-10 through lanes. This will provide flexibility to accommodate operational needs.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/29/2016 8:53:57 AM

Scope Section 16.3.6.7 indicates that the four stringer line minimum requirement of Section 16.3.6 is waived for this bridge. The last sentence of the seventh paragraph of Section 16.3.6 states utilities shall not be located in outermost beam bays. Because the E. 89th Street pedestrian bridge will be carrying utilities, please clarify the conflicting scope verbiage if less than four stringer lines are used.

**The requirement of Section 16.3.6, which states "Utilities shall not be located in outermost beam bays" shall be waived for E 89th Street Pedestrian bridge, if only three beams were used. Scope Section 16.3.6.7 will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/25/2016 9:04:39 AM

Addendum #4 modified the last paragraph of Scope Section 16.3.6 and eliminated the restriction of the use pot bearings, spherical bearings, and disc bearings. However, the paragraph above the modified paragraph was not changed and indicates that elastomeric bearings with internal laminates shall be used. Please clarify whether the intent of this sentence is to mandate the use of internal laminates when using elastomeric bearings, or whether elastomeric bearings shall only be used throughout the project.

**"The mentioned paragraph will be revised in a future addendum as follows:**

**"If used, elastomeric bearings with internal laminates shall be designed based on a selected durometer of either 50 or 60. Field welding of beam or girder to the load plate shall be controlled so that the elastomer is not damaged. In addition, the elastomer shall not be subjected to a temperature greater than 300 degrees Fahrenheit." "**

*Question Submitted:* 11/23/2016 3:31:43 PM

Referencing Scope Section 19 - Lighting, within the project limits, the lighting transitions from the ODOT lighting levels to the OH-10 lighting levels, is there a desire for a gradual transition between the lower lighting levels as required by ODOT and the high lighting levels along Opportunity Corridor?

**No, transition lighting is not necessary.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/23/2016 3:27:59 PM

In sections 19.5.2 (C)(2) and 19.5.3 (D)(2) of the RFP, it is indicated that "Luminaires shall be mounted to the power poles." There are several cross streets in the project area where existing overhead power poles are not present. Is the intent to install wood light poles with overhead power feeds in this area? If not, what is the criteria for equipment for these streets?

**The intent is to utilize existing and/or relocated power poles to support light fixtures where possible thereby reducing the number of poles along the roadways. A lighting illumination criteria (by functional class/land use) and wiring configuration (overhead versus underground) will be provided in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2016 2:30:25 PM

1.7 EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS states that: "No employee, member, agent, or advisor of any potential or submitting Short-listed Offeror shall have any direct or indirect ex parte communications regarding this Project with any representative of the Department, staff or advisors or representatives of the City of Cleveland or its departments or agencies, Short-listed Offerors or consultants involved with the procurement, except for communications expressly permitted by the Bid Documents." Are communications with representatives from the Cleveland Water Department or Cleveland Public Power or Water Pollution Control permitted?

**Communications with those groups specifically named could be acceptable, but the Department reserves the right to later determine if the communications were inappropriate. The Department will not be responsible or liable for any information gathered during procurement and will not be responsible for ensuring confidentiality of those groups.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/22/2016 2:29:22 PM

Please reference 14.2.3.4. The scope states, "The DBT shall obtain approvals of appropriate agencies for outfall locations. For connections to existing sewers owned by agencies other than the Department, the DBT shall obtain approval of the governing agency and meet applicable permit requirements." Can the Department concur or clarify our understanding of when the NEORSR requirements apply? If we tie directly into a City of Cleveland combined sewer or storm sewer that is located in a NEORSR service area (i.e. the sewer ultimately empties into an NEORSR combined sewer and/or interceptor), will we still need to address detention and volume requirements as per the NEORSR?

**The connection to combined and sanitary sewers shall meet NEORSR requirements (no increase in peak flow). This could require detention. Storm only outfall will require flow rate analyses to ensure capacity of the receiving pipe system. This also may require detention.**

Question Submitted: 11/22/2016 2:26:35 PM

There are existing drainage area maps for the project included with the RFP. However, there does not seem to be any drainage calculations of the existing storm/ combined sewer system included. Can the Department please provide all available existing drainage analyses and calculations completed for the project? This includes times of concentration for any of the drainage areas, flow rates, CDSS files, and any other existing analyses.

**CDSS files were provided in Addendum 4.**

Question Submitted: 11/22/2016 2:24:42 PM

Can the Department please post any available existing plans of the NEORSR regulator S-10?

**S-10 existing plans were included in UT-04 (Section 3 – Record Sewer Plans). The existing plans R-440, R-537, and inspection reports were all included in the attachment for regulator S-10.**

Question Submitted: 11/22/2016 2:23:52 PM

It is unclear what shall be included in the bid Item 690 - CPP Power Distribution (Local), please clarify.

**The bid Item 690 - CPP Power Distribution (Local) is for betterment items such as new ducts and vaults along the new alignment portions of the project per Scope Section 7.10. B. Relocation of existing CPP facilities required by the project should be included in the "non-local" bid item.**

Question Submitted: 11/22/2016 2:22:45 PM

Regarding the reply to the question submitted on 11/9/2016 at 10:45:14 AM on the vertical and horizontal clearances to the GCRTA Blue and Green tracks, the GCRTA criteria could not be found on their website. Since GCRTA staff are not allowed to be contacted, please provide either a link to where the criteria is located or provide a PDF of the criteria in a future addendum. We would like to know if the GCRTA criteria design requirements for the crash wall at the piers are any different than AREMA's.

**The GCRTA Clearance Diagram will be provided as Appendix RR-06 (GCRTA Clearance Diagram) in a future addendum. GCRTA follows AREMA design criteria for crash walls. The Department is coordinating with GCRTA and the required horizontal clearance will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/22/2016 2:21:09 PM

For the 89th St. pedestrian bridge, the preliminary site plan in Appendix ST-01 by HNTB shows NSRR tracks crossing under the proposed bridge at Sta. 20+50 (+/-). Currently there are no existing tracks along this alignment, only railroad ties. Is the required horizontal clearance to be from the NS/RTA line or to the adjacent GCRTA line located approx. 18 ft. to the north?

**Please note that Appendix ST-01 is for reference only. The Department is coordinating with GCRTA and the required horizontal clearance will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/22/2016 2:19:59 PM

Will ODOT determine acceptance of design optimizations or potential ATC's regarding utility companies or can the DBT contact the individual company?

**ODOT will determine design acceptance & optimizations within the limits of the design and contract requirements and the current agreements (if any) with the utilities. If contacts are made which are within the allowances of the bidding documents, any design assumptions and design decisions made by the DBT based on pre-award contacts with 3rd parties will not be the responsibility of the Department and will not be a basis for a change to the contract.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2016 2:18:46 PM

Will ODOT allow MSE wall tie-back straps behind a wall to extend into an easement, whether temporary or permanent?

**MSE wall tie-back straps behind a wall may extend into a permanent easement, provided utilities are not present. MSE wall tie-back straps may not extend into a temporary easement.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/22/2016 2:17:00 PM

Reference Norfolk Southern's "Public Projects Manual", Appendix H.2, Item 3.7, for trails passing under NS bridges that a canopy roof shall be constructed to protect users from a 50 lb. weight dropped from the bridge deck. This overhead protection is to extend 15'-0" beyond the outside edges of the railroad bridge. This requirement was not stated in Chapters 8 or 16 of the RFP scope nor the NS Railway Agreement. Will this be required and if so, what type of canopy would be acceptable? Would there be any aesthetic requirements?

**A canopy roof or other protective structure is not required.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/21/2016 11:40:50 PM

Reference is made to Scope Section 19.2.1 which states, "Provision of protected and protected/permissive left turns shall be based upon safety and/or capacity." This is subjective. What specific quantitative criteria should be used to select left turn operation (i.e., number of opposing lanes and/or volumes, delay)?

**All left turn lanes in the corridor are provided with 5-section heads and loop detectors per 19.2.5.R and 19.2.12.D. The DBT shall develop its phasing plan for each intersection based on 19.2.17. The presence of the 5-sections and loop detectors at each left turn lane allows the City of Cleveland to change the phasing to accommodate future traffic needs with out investing in any infrastructure.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/21/2016 11:37:48 PM

Scope Section 19.2.10 states "The maximum distance between pull boxes shall be 250 feet." In Scope Section 19.5.4, it is stated that "Pull boxes shall be spaced at a maximum of 300 feet." Is the maximum distance between pull boxes 250 or 300 feet?

**Pull boxes for signal interconnect shall be spaced at a maximum distance of 250 feet, while pull boxes for supplemental conduit shall be spaced at a maximum distance of 300 feet and located midway between adjacent light poles. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/18/2016 1:51:19 PM

Reference is made to Section 1.7 of the Instructions to Offerors. Please clarify restrictions in communications with the Department. Is it acceptable to have communications with Department Personnel that are not involved with this procurement or the evaluation of the shortlisted offeror's proposals? By Example, can we communicate with department personnel regarding questions/clarifications on the 2015-2016 ODOT Disparity Study?

**As the Project is under procurement, direct communications with ODOT personnel concerning information referenced in the bidding documents would not be proper as ODOT personnel will be performing Proposal evaluations. Please submit any needed clarifications through the Prebid Website.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/18/2016 1:50:21 PM

Reference is made to Section 1.7 of the Instructions to Offerors. Please clarify restrictions in communications with the "staff or advisor or representatives of the City of Cleveland or its departments or agencies". Is it acceptable to have communications with personnel that are not involved with this procurement or the evaluation of the shortlisted offeror's proposals? Specifically, can we communicate with personnel from CPP, CEI, and Cleveland Water Department in regards to their facilities for the purpose of understand impacts and relocation requirements?

**Communications with those groups specifically named could be acceptable, but the Department reserves the right to later determine if the communications were inappropriate. The Department will not be responsible or liable for any information gathered during procurement and will not be responsible for ensuring confidentiality of those groups.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/18/2016 1:49:09 PM

Reference is made to Section 1.7 of the Instructions to Offerors. Can the DBT communicate with personnel from the NEORSR regards to their facilities for the purpose of understand impacts and relocation requirements?

**Communications with the group specifically named could be acceptable, but the Department reserves the right to later determine if the communications were inappropriate. The Department will not be responsible or liable for any information gathered during procurement and will not be responsible for ensuring confidentiality of this entity.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/18/2016 1:48:10 PM

Reference is made to Section 1.7 of the Instructions to Offerors. Please confirm that the DBT can communicate with personnel from the RTA in regards to their facilities for the purpose of understand impacts and restrictions?

**Communications with the group specifically named could be acceptable, but the Department reserves the right to later determine if the communications were inappropriate. The Department will not be responsible or liable for any information gathered during procurement and will not be responsible for ensuring confidentiality of this entity.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/18/2016 1:46:49 PM

Please reference previous Question Submitted 11/10/16 at 8:18:25 am. Please confirm that the DBT is expected and allowed to communicate with the City of Cleveland Water Department prior to award of the project. If this is not acceptable, please provide the allowable shutdown periods as originally requested.

**Communications with the group specifically named could be acceptable, but the Department reserves the right to later determine if the communications were inappropriate. The Department will not be responsible or liable for any information gathered during procurement and will not be responsible for ensuring confidentiality of this group.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/18/2016 1:37:14 PM

Please reference Section 5 of the Instructions to Offerors. Please provide an address and to whom ATCs shall be submitted. Can they be emailed with a hard copy provided separately?

**ATCs shall be submitted similar to and the address indicated in section RFP/ITO Section 3.1 with the required copies per Section 5.2, except the cover should indicate Confidential – Alternative Technical Concept.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/11/2016 5:06:05 PM

Please reference Scope Section 16.3.5.1. The scope indicates that the northern abutment shall keep an offset to the NS tracks that is greater than or equal to the offset of the existing abutment. The preliminary site plan included in Appendix ST-01 for the E. 89th pedestrian bridge shows embankment placed in the both end spans, which places the embankment closer to the NS tracks. Please clarify the scope language to mandate that the physical abutment itself is not to be placed closer to the NS track, or whether it is intended that the physical abutment and embankment are not be placed any closer to the existing NS tracks.

**The scope will be revised to reflect that the physical abutment and embankment are not to be placed any closer to the existing NS tracks. This will be clarified in a future addendum. Note that ST-01 is a reference document, and does not reflect the current scope.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/11/2016 11:12:21 AM

Scope Section 14.2 states: Pavement catch basins shall be spaced to limit the spread of flow on the traveled lane (considered to be 11 feet wide) based on a total allowable spread of 10 feet. Please confirm that the total allowable spread is 10' into the traveled lane.

**For mainline OH-10 and other roads with multiple lanes in each direction, the spread of flow on roadways and bridges shall be 10' maximum. For other single lane roadways and bridges, L&D standards will apply. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 2:09:51 PM

Will the Department schedule walk-thrus of the commercial properties to be demolished?

**Yes, the Department will schedule walk-thrus for commercial properties when possible.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 2:00:33 PM

Regarding PN097, Section 104.02.B Differing Site Conditions, it states that the first \$500,000 of direct costs and associated impact will be the responsibility of the DBT. This will require each of the Offerors to add a substantial amount of money to our bids, is it truly the intent for the Department to not participate directly in the first \$500,000 of costs for Differing Site Conditions?

**Yes, the DBT shall be responsible for the first \$500,000 of direct costs and associated impact due to differing site conditions.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 1:55:42 PM

Regarding Scope 7.4.6, in the case that the utility work will be paid for by the Department, please confirm this payment is directly from the Department to the utility company and this cost does not need to be included in the Offeror's bid.

**Compensable utility work performed by the utility shall be paid directly to the utility by ODOT.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 1:53:24 PM

Please clarify what Biditem 20 - Special Drainage (Alternate Bid Item) is to be used for.

**The alternate bid will be to construct the pipe using city standards. The scope will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 1:49:39 PM

Scope 20.3.2.3 states that during the time traffic is detoured, the "DBT shall maintain the detour routes, including bridge deck surfaces, in a condition that is reasonably smooth and free from holes, ruts, ridges, bumps, dust, and standing water." It also requires the DBT to restripe detour routes at the discretion of the Department. These requirements are extremely broad considering the detour routes include interstates and major arterial roadways. It is not reasonable to place all these requirements into a Lump Sum bid given that the Offeror has no way to determine the existing condition of the facilities nor are we in control of how they are used during the time that the detours are in place. There will be numerous other local construction projects which will impact the traffic using these detour routes, so how would the Department ever gauge the impact of OC3 vs. that of other projects on the routes? We request that if the Department wishes for the Offeror to maintain the routes that they establish unit price bid items for the work, similar to what the Department has provided on past projects.

**No, the Department will not provide unit price bid items for detour route maintenance. ODOT will clarify the DBT's maintenance responsibilities via a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 1:41:52 PM

Scope 20.3.1 states that LD's for closures shall be \$50/minute, maximum of \$10,000/day. This may be appropriate for the I-490 closure but does not seem proportionate for some of the sideroad closures. We ask that ODOT consider the user value of each road and set more appropriate amounts for the less traveled streets.

**The scope will be revised to reflect separate disincentives based on roadway volumes. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 1:40:42 PM

It has been our experience on several projects that many utility companies will not provide relocation durations to bidders prior to the award of the project. In order for each Offeror to have the same relocation information, we request that ODOT provide assumed durations for the known utility relocations. This keeps all bidders on a level playing field and minimizes risk to both the bidders and the Department.

**The Department maintains that utility relocation durations are dependent upon the DBT construction operations. Scope Section 7 (Utilities) includes the requirements for the DBT to perform necessary coordination to determine durations for inclusion in the Progress Schedule. Section 7.4.3 describes the procedure for utilities that fail to relocate in a timely manner.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 1:37:53 PM

ITO Section 4.6 requires commitment letters to be signed by both the Offeror and each business used in meeting the subcontracting goals. While we fully appreciate and support the importance of diversity and inclusion, we have found that it is a massive effort to get signatures from a multitude of subcontractors and have these incorporated into the technical proposal. This takes our attention away from closing out other areas of the bid at a critical time. Technical Proposal Appendix 9 requires a summary of the committed firms, their function, and the % committed. We believe this summary serves the same purpose to commit the Offeror to utilizing the listed firms, therefore the commitment letters are redundant. We request that the Department consider removing the requirement to include signed commitment letters in the technical proposal.

**DBTs shall submit confirmation of participation in the project from NSLE firms. This may be in the form of emails, faxes, or letters from the NSLE firm, and must include the percentage of the project committed to each NSLE firm.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2016 1:28:58 PM

Confirm location of crown in E 55th Street pavement. Sheet 21 of LD-01 shows the crown 5-ft left of the centerline and PGL, but Sheet 1 of ST-05 shows the crown at the centerline and PGL.

**The location of the crown shall be determined by the DBT. The crown location shown in LD-01 is not part of the Basic Configuration. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 1:28:48 PM

Confirm Degree of Curvature of NSRR Curve Main 2-3B. Sheet 20/38 (RR Plans) in LD-01 lists a 1^00'00" degree curve, but the graphics provided in DI-02 show a 1^30'00" degree curve.

**The location of the crown shall be determined by the DBT. The crown location shown in LD-01 is not part of the Basic Configuration. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 1:28:41 PM

Confirm Length of Entry and Exit Spirals for NSRR Curve Main 2-3A. Sheet 19/38 (RR Plans) in LD-01 lists 155' and 217', but the graphics provided in DI-02 show 186' and 248'.

**The Length of Entry and Exit Spirals for NS Curve 2-3A are 186' and 248' respectively per the graphics supplied with DI-02.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 1:28:25 PM

Confirm Degree of Curvature of NSRR Curve Main 2-3A. Sheet 19/38 (RR Plans) in LD-01 lists a 3^45'00" degree curve, but the graphics provided in DI-02 show a 4^05'00" degree curve.

**The Degree of Curvature of NS Curve 2-3A is 4^05'00" per the graphics supplied with DI-02.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 1:28:13 PM

Attachment LD-01 is missing the multi-use path profile in the following locations: OC Blvd 32+00 to 40+00 and Quadrant Rd 105+50 to 107+50. Can the Department provide these profiles?

**The multi-use path profile will be provided at those locations in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 1:28:02 PM

Can the Department provide the photos from the links that exist in Attachment RW-01?

**The links in attachment RW-01 were created by the Right-of-Way consultant as part of an internal tracking process for title research documents. No photos are available. A revised RW-01 with the links removed will be provided in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 1:27:51 PM

When will the Department be providing complete Right-of-Way plans noted in Attachment RW-04?

**The preliminary plans are currently in review. Final Right-of-Way plans will be provided in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 8:19:37 AM

Please reference Scope Section 7.8.2. Please provide information regarding the CPP existing 6x5" conduits along E55th St detailing the contents of the existing conduits, utility matrix conflict ID 29. Also, please provide the size, number and contents of the existing underground conduits along E55th St, utility matrix conflict ID 30, from station 10+25 – 13+32 38' LT.

**ODOT is coordinating the number and size of existing and proposed CPP conduits. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 8:18:25 AM

Please reference Scope Section 7.4.2. The scope requires that the DBT consider special scheduling requirements of utilities such as peak load periods. Along E55th St can the 30" water main be shut down for an extended period of time during construction? If permitted, how long can the 30" water main be shut down for and when would the shutdown be allowed (i.e. November through April)? Please advise.

**The DBT shall coordinate allowable outages with the City of Cleveland Division of Water.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 8:17:12 AM

Please reference Scope Section 7.8.1. Along E55th St, the scope states the existing 8" waterline shall be replaced by a new 8" waterline. Reference document UT-08, plan sheet 1 of 4, depicts a proposed 12" waterline. Please advise as to whether a new 8" or 12" waterline is required along E55th St.

**The 8" waterline shall be replaced with a 12" waterline. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/10/2016 8:11:58 AM

Reference is Made to TC-07. Some existing overhead signs that will be associated with the WB SR-10 route overlapping with I-77 have not been identified for redesign/replacement, including the "I-77 NORTH / Downtown / EXIT ONLY" sign on WB I-490 (just west of 55th). Please confirm whether or not this and any other signs need to be updated with SR 10 route designations

**TC-07 will be updated to include additional signs in a future 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:* 11/9/2016 8:32:28 PM

Please reference the Lighting Basemap and DI-02. The lighting basemap was provided with the SOQ but is not provided with the RFP.

**The lighting basemap will be provided as a reference document. Note that the lighting does not reflect the latest roadway configuration.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 8:30:46 PM

Reference is made to the project specific language regarding CMS Section 107.12 as represented on Pages 35 and 36 of the RFP. The specification states "Commencing on the date on which the Department issues the initial Request for Proposal, the Design Build Team shall provide and maintain or cause its Lead Designer to provide and maintain professional liability coverage, through a specific project professional liability policy....." However, the specification goes on to state that "the policy shall have a retroactive date no later than the date on which the final Request for Proposal documents are issued.....". We assume that the Department is NOT requiring a PSPL policy to be provided at the bid stage, but rather that the policy inception date will be the date upon which the contract is awarded, with a retroactive date back to the date when the final RFP documents were issued. Please clarify the intent of the RFP.

**The intent of the RFP is for the awarded DBT to have a Project Specific Professional Liability policy which will ensure liability coverage for work which may have occurred during the RFP phase, therefore the awarded DBT's policy must ensure coverage extending back to cover any design work performed during the bidding stage. The inception date will not be dictated by the Department, but evidence of the Policy providing the required coverage must be provided prior to the payment of the first pay estimate as per PN097.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 8:28:27 PM

Please reference ODOT BDM 302.4.1.7. Will deck slab overhangs over 4'-0" be allowed, as the BDM uses passive language (i.e. the word "should") to limit the overhang?

**Four feet is the maximum overhang allowable. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 8:27:05 PM

Please reference 16.3.1 / Table 16-1. Will survey shots of the top of the GCRTA catenary poles be provided?

**No, the DBT will be responsible to obtain any additional survey information.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 8:24:53 PM

Please reference 16.3.1 / Table 16-1. Is there a minimum vertical clearance above the top of the GCRTA catenary poles structures? It appears that some of the GCRTA catenary poles have vertical extensions with electric above the horizontal arms.

**Clearance with new or relocated catenary supports and feeder cables are being coordinated with GCRTA. The requirements will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 7:24:50 PM

Please reference project scope 16.3.4.1C. Scope States: 16.3.4.1C. One demonstration drilled shaft shall be provided for each bridge or retaining wall structure utilizing drilled shafts. It shall be constructed by the "Wet Construction Method," per ODOT 2016 Construction and Material Specifications Item 524.04.B. Installation of production drilled shafts shall not begin until the completion of testing and Department acceptance of the demonstration drilled shaft at the subject structure. Is the Department requiring that drilled shafts be constructed using the Wet Construction Method per 524.04.B only, or are other methods also acceptable inclusive of Dry Construction Method (524.04.A), Temporary Casing Construction Method (524.04.C) and Permanent Casing Construction Method (524.04.D)? If so, please verify that the demonstration shaft per location should be consistent with the proposed construction type.

**Demonstration drilled shafts are only required if wet construction method is used for a given site. Other drilled shaft methods are acceptable. Note that the demonstration drilled shaft language was revised in Addendum 4.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 7:22:07 PM

Please reference Project Scope 14.2.4.1 and DR-04. Scope states: "Post construction BMPs shall be provided for runoff collected directly into a storm sewer system meeting the thresholds as stated in L&D Volume 2, Section 1115." and "For separated storm connections to a CSO pipe or receiving water, the District will only accept stormwater control measures that provide water quality treatment for 100% of the project area whether the project is defined as redevelopment or new development". These two requirements conflict, please clarify.

**Water quality treatment shall be per ODOT requirements. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 7:19:57 PM

Please reference Project Scope 16.6. Scope states: "The allowable spread of flow along bridge gutter lines shall be as calculated in the ODOT Location and Design Manual, Volume 2." Per Scope, Table 14-1, spread requirements are revised, making the spread for the bridge structures more restrictive than the pavement. Please clarify the spread requirements.

**For mainline OH-10 and other roads with multiple lanes in each direction, the spread of flow on roadways and bridges shall be 10' maximum. For other single lane roadways and bridges, L&D standards will apply. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 7:17:26 PM

Please reference Project Scope 14.2.3.4. Scope states: "NEORS is replacing the pipe network downstream of E. 79th Street, therefore a detention requirement is not anticipated for this outfall" Is this release from the detention requirement related only to the flow rate required per NEORS and/or the Department into storm only sewers per 14.2.3.4, and therefore treatment still required per ODOT L&D Volume 2?

**Yes, water quality treatment is still required per ODOT L&D Vol. 2. Although detention is not anticipated the DBT is required to submit flow rate data to NEORS for concurrence. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 7:12:59 PM

Please reference 14.2.3.4 and DR-04. Scope states: "The allowable design discharge shall be calculated to the satisfaction of NEORS and the Department." and "The NEORS reserves the right to require additional peak rate and/or volume controls. A more restrictive allowable discharge rate than that stated above may be required due to downstream capacity issues and/or to ensure no increases in flow at specific CSO locations. The Applicant is encouraged to contact the District early in the project development process to determine if the project is located in a critical CSO area and will be required to meet more restrictive criteria." Restrictions on flow into outfalls into existing storm only sewers are not clear, please clarify.

**The DBT shall evaluate the capacity of the receiving sewers at each storm-only outfall based on the existing and proposed conditions. Note that the requirement referenced from DR-04 is only applicable to combined sewer systems, not storm-only outfalls.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 7:08:44 PM

Please reference RFP Sections 101.03, 102.02, 105.04. Bid Documents definition and several other places throughout the RFP, there is mention of Special Provisions which are part of the bid documents. Please provide the Special Provisions document to the prospective bidders.

**This is a generic reference to Contract Documents. There are no ODOT Special Provisions presently identified for this project.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 7:05:09 PM

Please reference TC-08. Scope states: LUMINAIRES FOR DECORATIVE LIGHTING SHALL BE MANUFACTURED BY COOPER GALLEON GANAE07LEDUT3RBZ7004N7. The specified model number does not appear to be current and may have changed since Cooper was acquired by Eaton. Please provide an updated number.

**The model number has been updated to GAN AF 07 LED U T3R BZ 800 4N7. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 7:00:05 PM

Please reference Project Scope 6.4.1. Scope states: Noise walls have been identified in two areas.....Final Decision about weather to build the walls or not will not be made until public involvement is complete. Can the anticipated date for public involvement meeting be provided along with anticipated heights and lengths anticipated for the walls?

**Noise Barriers 3 and 4 are currently under consideration and being coordinated with the affected property owners, see EN-10 (Reevaluation of the EIS). ODOT is coordinating individually with property owners regarding the decision about whether to build noise walls. The coordination is anticipated to be complete in December 2016. For details regarding the anticipated heights and lengths for Noise Barriers 3 and 4, see the Opportunity Corridor Noise Analysis Report (December 2012) in Appendix EN-07 (Draft EIS Appendix B – Disk2).**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/9/2016 6:54:26 PM

Please reference Project Scope 19.1. Scope states that cases where guidance provided in the MUTCD conflicts with the OMUTCD, the OMUTCD shall govern unless specifically directed otherwise. Please confirm that conformance with the OMUTCD is only required for "Standard" ("shall") statements and that Guidance, Option, and Support statements are not applicable unless otherwise stated in the scope

**Per PN 97, Section 104.011 (Design of the Project), "Interpret all references to guidelines, recommendations and considerations within applicable design manuals as minimum requirements except when specifically excluded within the Scope of Services. Perform recommended evaluations if not provided by the Department."**

Question Submitted: 11/9/2016 6:49:42 PM

Please reference Project Scope 19.3.2-1. Scope states: A minimum vertical clearance of 17 feet shall be maintained between the bottom of the sign and the highest pavement elevation at all overhead sign locations. Do all existing signs, including signs on supports outside of the project area that may be replaced as part of this project, meet this requirement? If not, please confirm that for replacements on existing supports (and adjacent signs on the same support) will only need to maintain the existing clearance if currently less than 17'.

**Where new supports are required, a 17' clearance shall be provided. Where existing supports are reused, the existing clearance shall be maintained or improved. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/9/2016 6:35:41 PM

Please reference Project Scope Table 14-1 Location and Design Manual, Volume 2 Revisions. Table 14-1 includes revisions to Section 1009.2.1 of the ODOT L&D Volume 2, however Section 1009.2.1 is no longer in the L&D Manual, Volume 2, as of the July 2016 revision. It was moved to the Pavement Design Manual. Please clarify the contract scope.

**The standards were moved from the L&D Vol. 2 to the Pavement Design Manual. The references to these standards will be updated in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/9/2016 6:28:41 PM

Please reference Appendix ST-05, Appendix AE-02, Scope 18.1, ODOT BDM 305.4. Scope Section 18.1 and 18.1.1 indicate that the VPF for the OH-10 (L and R) over GCRTA Blue and Green Lines is to be the aesthetic fencing shown in Appendix AE-02. Confirm that the aesthetic fencing is compliant with LRFD 15.8 loading per ODOT BDM Section 305.4 for the fence immediately adjacent to traffic.

**The VPF, since it is mounted on crash tested and approved barrier, doesn't have to be designed for vehicle impact forces. The DBT shall design the fence for dead load, in addition to wind load in accordance with AASHTO LRFD Section 3.8. The wind area shall be the actual area of the welded wire fabric within a given panel. Also, restraint cables shall be installed to tie the fence posts, fence panels, ornamental lights, and the welded wire fabric panels, such that, if a post breaks off in a vehicle impact, the post on the opposite ends of the failed one will support the suspended panels and post. The suspension cable shall be designed for four (4) times the dead load of the fence section suspended to avoid parts of the fence breaking away and falling on the traffic below the bridge in case of a crash. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/9/2016 6:26:06 PM

Please reference Appendix ST-05, ODOT BDM 209.2. The median barriers shown in the bridge typical section for the OH-10 over GCRTA Blue and Green Lines and the left barrier for the OH-10 over Kingsbury Run Ravine in Appendix ST-05 are aesthetic vertical faced barrier with rustications adjacent to traffic. Per ODOT BDM 209.2, bridges with heights of 25 feet or more above the lowest ground line, concrete deflector parapets should be used. Confirm that single slope barrier per ODOT SBR-1-13 is required for the barriers not behind sidewalk.

**42" single slope barrier will be used for these locations. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/9/2016 6:22:17 PM

Please reference Scope 1.1 and 16.2, and Pay Item List. The scope document mentions that the Kinsman Road over GCRTA bridge will require minor deck and parapet work in Section 16.2; however, the Kinsman Road over GCRTA bridge work is not mentioned on page 2 of 60 of the Instructions to Offerors for RFP or Scope Section 1.1, and is not included in the Pay Item List.

**The Kinsman Road Bridge will be added to the list of structures in the ITO, as well as a pay item. This will be reflected in a future addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 10:59:24 AM

The RFP (Proposal Pg. 42) indicates that firms listed as an ODOT certified SBE, or as an ODOT certified DBE will qualify for SBE credit on this project. Will SBE's certified through other agencies (ie. Cleveland Small Business CSB, Cuyahoga County SBE, etc.) also qualify for SBE credit, or should they be referred to apply for ODOT SBE certification?

**No, SBE's certified through other agencies (ie. Cleveland Small Business CSB, Cuyahoga County SBE, etc.) will not qualify for SBE credit on this project. Heavy highway construction and engineering firms that are not certified with ODOT as a DBE or SBE would be considered for the SBE goal upon confirmation that the firm meets the requirements set forth in PN 99. The ITO/Selection Criteria document will be revised in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 10:56:37 AM

Can ODOT make available the CAD modeling files that were used in the RFP design? The proposed DTM and the modeling files are not available in the currently provided RFP information.

**LD-12 (Section 3 CAD Modeling Files) was provided as reference with Addendum 4.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 10:55:22 AM

Can ODOT make available "for information use only" the geotechnical investigation on Opportunity Corridor Sections 1 and 2 including the geotechnical design recommendations (foundations, slopes, and retaining wall design), the final boring logs and the laboratory test results (i.e. shear strength, compressibility, permeability, corrosion, CBR)?

**GE-02 (Section 2 Geotechnical Report) was provided as a reference document. This is the only information ODOT will be providing.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2016 10:45:14 AM

In Appendix ST-01, the minimum vertical and horizontal clearances to the GCRTA Blue and Green tracks are shown on the partial bridge site plan for the bridge over CGRTA B&G tracks as 17'-0" and 14'-0", respectively. The 17 ft. minimum vertical clearance is also stated in the scope (Table 16-1). These clearances are different than what is shown in AREMA. What specification or regulation are these minimum clearances stated?

**The 17'-0" minimum vertical clearance listed in Table 16-1 was coordinated with GCRTA and takes precedence over requirements found in documents listed in the governing regulations. The DBT shall provide horizontal clearances per GCRTA criteria. ST-01 is a reference document and the DBT shall not rely on the information included within the attachment.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/7/2016 8:19:35 AM

Can the Department please provide all of the .gINT files for the project?

**The OC3 .gINT files will be provided as reference files with a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/4/2016 7:39:10 AM

The title sheet for Addendum 1 lists a letting date of March 17, 2017 and the title sheet for Addendum 2 lists a letting date of March 16, 2017. Neither of these match the previously stated date of February 17, 2017. Please clarify the dates.

**The letting date is 2/17/2017. This will be corrected in a forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2016 4:50:27 PM

The link provided to access the Addendum 2 attachments does not work. Will the attachments be placed at the same link as the Addendum 1 attachments?

**Attachments for addendum 2 have been posted. Please use the following link: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-96833/Addendum2/>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2016 11:41:13 AM

"11.1 reference to sections 19.2.10 (says use one conduit designated for traffic in the duct bank, that shall be 3") and 19.5.4 (states 2-2" conduits for traffic shall be used). Which is correct?"

**Scope Section 19.5.4 is correct. 2-2" conduits shall be included in the conduit bank for traffic use. The scope will be updated in a future addendum to clarify this.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2016 11:35:14 AM

The RFP (16.6) requires a minimum 0.30% longitudinal grade on all structures for drainage. The proposed top of rail on the preliminary bridge plans (Sht. 21/30 from LD-01) is shown at a 0.12% grade. Is the intent to use variable depth ballast across the bridge, or will a 0.12% longitudinal deck slope be adequate? Is this requirement only to be applied to roadway structures?

**The 0.30% longitudinal grade from Section 16.6 applies only to ODOT highway bridges. The NS rail bridge will fall under NS requirements, which do not state a minimum deck slope. NS approval will be required regarding the longitudinal grade on railroad bridges. A constant ballast depth is desirable across the bridge. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2016 11:30:52 AM

The alignment file 96833BK001.dgn has two different stationing for Main 1 track (at 20 scale and 50 scale). Please confirm that the tick marks and stations at 50 scale are incorrect. Also, note that the two tracks are shown at 36'-0" centers at the bridge location (again, the track plans show 14'-0" centers). Are track cross-sections available for Phase 2 & 3 (only Phase 1A & 1C were provided)? Are alignments available for all track phases? Also, please confirm that station and elevations shown on the Plan & Profile (Sht. 20/38 from LD-01) are correct.

**The 50-scale alignment in 96833BK001 is incorrect. This file will be updated in a future addendum. The cross sections provided show the grading work associated with constructing the embankment to support each phase. All the embankment is constructed in Phase 1A and 1C so cross sections were not developed for Phase 2 and 3 because only the tracks are shifting. Alignments for all track phases are available in 96833\_NS-ALI.dgn. The stations and elevations on Sheet 20/38 are correct.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2016 11:27:46 AM

There is some discrepancy between the RFP, Bridge Concept Plans, and the Track Work Plans in regards to the final bridge and track configuration. The concept bridge plan (Sht. 20/31 from ST-01) shows a twin structure with the two main tracks at 36'-0" centers. The RFP (16.3.6.6), bridge cross-section (shown in ST-05) and track plans (Sht. 20/38 from LD-01) seem to require a single 4-track structure (64'-0" out-to-out) with main tracks spaced at 14'-0" centers in the final (Phase 3) configuration. Please clarify.

**The configuration in ST-01 was developed before coordination with Norfolk Southern was completed. ST-01 is a reference document and the DBT shall not rely on the information included within the attachment. The DBT shall design the structure in accordance with the scope and ST-05.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/3/2016 11:25:08 AM

In the RFP Section 16.3.6 on page 16-7, states girder depths greater than 5'-0" will require an inspection handrail system. Would this also apply for prestressed girder superstructures?

**An inspection handrail system is not required on prestressed concrete girder superstructures.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:13:10 PM

Can the Department provide CAD files associated with drawings in ST-01?

**CAD files from ST-01 files will be provided. These files reflect the conceptual design drawings and do not necessarily comply with the requirements in the Contract Documents.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:12:56 PM

The Level 3 Communications contact located in section 7.3 does not match the contact in appendix UT-01 Utility Matrix. Please clarify which contact is correct.

**Michael Clifford and Doug Holloway are the correct contacts. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:12:48 PM

The AT&T Corp. contact located in section 7.3 does not match the contact in appendix UT-01 Utility Matrix. Please clarify which contact is correct.

**Greg Belew is the correct contact. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:12:39 PM

The AT&T contact located in section 7.3 does not match the contact in appendix UT-01 Utility Matrix. Please clarify which contact is correct.

**James Janis is the correct contact. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:12:29 PM

The Cleveland Division of Traffic contact located in section 7.3 does not match the contact in appendix UT-01 Utility Matrix. Please clarify which contact is correct.

**Dimitri Szynal is the correct contact. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:12:20 PM

The CDWPC contact located in section 7.3 does not match the contact in appendix UT-01 Utility Matrix. Please clarify which contact is correct.

**Elie Ramy is the correct contact. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:12:04 PM

The NEORSD contact located in section 7.3 does not match the contact in appendix UT-01 Utility Matrix. Please clarify which contact is correct.

**Charles D. Cofield is the correct contact. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:11:51 PM

Regarding Scope 13.2.2, does E. 55th need to be resurfaced south of Maurice up through the Belford Ave intersection?

**No. E. 55th does not need to be resurfaced south of Maurice up through the Belford Ave intersection.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:11:42 PM

There is no existing survey (BC001) south of E. 55th St. and Bragg Rd. Can supplemental survey be provided by ODOT which covers the Maurice and Belford Ave. resurfacing?

**The DBT will be responsible for obtaining survey and mapping at these locations.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:11:28 PM

Regarding Appendix DR-01, can the CDSS electronic files be provided?

**Electronic files will be provided as a reference document in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:11:17 PM

Scope 16.2 states that Kinsman Road over GCRTA shall receive minor deck and parapet work, however the site plan provided in ST-01 shows a redecking and widening of this structure. Please provide a detailed scope of the requirements for this structure.

**ST-01 includes partially completed conceptual design drawings for structures developed prior to finalization of Scope Section 16 (Structures). These conceptual design do not necessarily comply with the current Scope requirements. The DBT shall design and construct the structures based on Scope Section 16 (Structures). At this location, the work is limited to the southwest quadrant of the bridge where the deck and approach slab will be modified to eliminate the E. 66th Street curb return. Note that ST-01 is for reference only.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:10:58 PM

There appears to be a typo in the first paragraph of Scope 6.7.1.2. The reference should be to Section 6.7.1.1 rather than 6.6.1.1.

**That is correct. The reference should be to Section 6.7.1.1. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:10:47 PM

Per Scope Section 1.11, the DBT is responsible for obtaining permits not already obtained by the Department. Can the Department provide a list of the permits they have or will obtain?

**The Department has not obtained any permits for this project. The DBT is responsible for obtaining all required permits that are necessary to complete the project unless identified in the Contract Documents.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/1/2016 1:10:31 PM

Appendix ST-01 does not contain plan sheets for all bridges and walls and only provides a portion of the site plan for the Kingsbury Run Valley bridge. Can the missing plans be provided?

**ST-01 includes partially completed conceptual design drawings for structures developed prior to finalization of Scope Section 16 (Structures). These conceptual design plans do not necessarily comply with the current Scope requirements. The DBT shall design and construct the structures based on Scope Section 16 (Structures). Note that ST-01 is for reference only.**

\*\*\* 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: 11/1/2016 1:10:17 PM

Should Form D-1 be updated to include projects by the IQF?

**Form D-1 will be revised in an upcoming addendum as follows: "List three projects completed by the Lead Contractor, three projects completed by the Lead Designer, two projects completed by the IQF, and two projects completed by the Diversity, Inclusion & Outreach Consultant with a brief description of each project."**

Question Submitted: 11/1/2016 1:10:04 PM

The OJT requirements listed in the Proposal are different from those listed on page 3 of the ITO/RFP, specifically in that the Proposal requires OJT from Wards 4, 5, & 6 while the ITO/RFP broadens it to Cuyahoga and Lorain Counties. Please clarify.

**Type 2 OJT employees must be residents of Wards 4, 5, and 6 as required in the Proposal. The ITO will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 11/1/2016 1:09:47 PM

Both the ITO and the Project Scope states that the "anticipated" substantial completion is November 1, 2020. Can the Department confirm if November 1, 2020 is the substantial completion date?

**November 1, 2020 is the Substantial Completion date.**

Question Submitted: 11/1/2016 1:09:27 PM

The table on ITO/RFP Page 5 lists the Tech Proposal deadline as February 16, 2017 at noon. The answers to the prebid states February 17, 2017 at 2:00. Please update the table.

**Addendum 1 revised this table to reflect February 17, 2017 at 2:00 pm, which is the correct data.**

Question Submitted: 11/1/2016 1:09:06 PM

The bid form provided with the Proposal lists the completion date as 11/01/2020 which corresponds with the Substantial Completion date provided in the ITO/RFP. Should the Completion Date in the Proposal be changed to the Project completion date of June 30, 2021?

**The date shown on the bid form represents the Substantial Completion date, November 1, 2020. As the question stated, the Final Completion date is June 30, 2021.**

Question Submitted: 10/25/2016 9:38:36 AM

The first two ATC meetings are scheduled on ODOT letting dates (11/3 and 11/17). Would ODOT consider moving these ATC meetings to different dates in order to alleviate conflicts with members of the DBT who may be bidding on ODOT projects in these lettings?

**The ATC Meetings will be held as currently scheduled.**

Question Submitted: 10/20/2016 4:19:04 PM

ITO 1.5 Under "Advertisement." The link identified for the document inventory is not valid. Please identify correct link for document location?

**The link shown in the ITO/RFP section 1.5 Advertisement is incorrect. All current Appendices can be found at the link found on the front page of the Proposal, which is the following: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-96833/Attachments>.**

Question Submitted: 10/20/2016 3:01:50 PM

ITO 3.3. Under "Price Proposals." States that Price Proposals are to be submitted on Bid Express "by 10:00 am on January 19, 2017." Please amend the proposal submittal date to February 19 at noon.

**The Technical Proposal and the sealed Price Proposal shall be submitted on or before Friday, February 17, 2017 – 2:00 pm. The Price Proposal shall be submitted using the Bid Express website in accordance with the process described in PN 019 and PN 097 (102.06 – Preparation of Bids) on or before February 17, 2017 - 10:00 am. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

Question Submitted: 10/20/2016 2:58:36 PM

ITO 3.1. States that the "Technical Proposal shall be submitted on or before January 19, 2017 at 10:00 AM." Please amend the proposal submittal date to February 19 at noon.

**The Technical Proposal and the sealed Price Proposal shall be submitted on or before Friday, February 17, 2017 – 2:00 pm. The Price Proposal shall be submitted using the Bid Express website in accordance with the process described in PN 019 and PN 097 (102.06 – Preparation of Bids) on or before February 17, 2017 - 10:00 am. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 10/11/2016 6:35:23 AM

Can the Department provide the anticipated location of the ATC meetings? Will they be held at Central Office, the District, or another location?

**The ATC Meetings will be held at the District 12 office.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/3/2016 11:49:45 AM

Reference is made to the revised RFP schedule as announced in the Short-Listing Notification letter issued on September 29, 2016, and more specifically, the relatively short duration between the issuance of the Final RFP and the first One-on-One meeting with ODOT. We are respectfully requesting that ODOT release a Draft RFP at the earliest possible time prior to the issuance of the final RFP. This will provide teams a preliminary understanding of the Department's intended performance requirements and prescriptive elements and allow us to start detailing ATC concepts prior to the release of the final RFP documents. ODOT has issued draft RFPs on previous DB pursuits.

**The RFP will be issued on October 20, 2016, as scheduled. There will be no early release of a draft RFP.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/17/2016 2:04:05 PM

Can information for the August 12th subcontractor informational meeting be posted?

**The sign-in sheets and the PowerPoint presentation can be found at the following links:**

**<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ODI/Outreach/MeetingDocs/Signin%20Sheet.pdf>**

**<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ODI/Outreach/MeetingDocs/OC3%20Subcontractor%20Informational%20Presentation.pdf>**

*Question Submitted:* 8/13/2016 8:27:54 AM

1.2.5.9 Part H and 2.5.10 Part I – Tech Experience Attachments – Evaluation Forms – We will be submitting example design and construction projects with similar value and scope of work that were done for ODOT and various other DOT's and entities that are DB and PPP's. Scores are not always provided for these projects by the various DOT's since work is often for a concessionaire or other entity. We also may have projects that are DBB but have not received scoring. It appears by the requirement that you were expecting only ODOT projects where a C-95 or CES is available or similar documentation from other DOT's. We request that the requirement for the evaluation forms similar to C-95's and CES be removed and that the projects stand on their merit confirmed by the references provided.

**Offerors should provide any evaluation materials which are available and/or can be obtained. Providing technical experience examples which do not have Evaluation Forms will not cause the SOQ to be deemed non-responsive. The Department will be contacting references to verify information, including performance, and to confirm the lack of availability for evaluation forms. No addenda will be issued.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/11/2016 4:07:36 PM

RFQ 2.5.4 Part C requests an organizational chart showing the "chain of command" of the anticipated roles. Is this chart intended to show the organization of the firms that are part of the Offeror, or is this chart supposed to show individual personnel that will be assigned to the project?

**The "chain of command" should demonstrate the DBT's planned internal and external reporting structure of its entities (including subcontractors, subconsultants, and anticipated internal roles), the organization of Key Personnel (demonstrating the respective firms and duties), and the intended duties of other anticipated roles (which could include known named persons, subcontractors, or subconsultants) key to the success of the Project. The Organizational Chart should demonstrate that all key elements needed for the success of the Project will be adequately addressed throughout the Project's duration.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/10/2016 11:17:25 AM

The Major Work Types Summary Document and presentation given at the Pre-SOQ Meeting stated there are 34 sites where ESA Phase II work is in development. What will the DBT be responsible for?

**All ESA Phase II work is currently being done through a separate contract. The reports identifying the results and recommendation will be provided as contractual attachments for the Shortlisted Offeror to determine bids. Any location where information is not provided will be handled separately and paid for through a force account.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 8/10/2016 11:13:07 AM

Will the price proposal be due the same day as the technical proposal?

**Yes, similar to the approach on the Opportunity Corridor Section 2 (OC2) procurement, the price proposals will be required the same day through the electronic bid system, Bid Express. In addition, ODOT will require a copy on a CD, DVD, or flash drive in a sealed envelope for use during the Ratings Announcement. Exact times have not yet been determined and will be detailed in the RFP.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/10/2016 8:33:35 AM

Please post a link to the presentation and sign-in sheet from last week's Pre-SOQ/Industry Open House meeting.

**<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Transcripts/Forms/PBTrans.aspx>**

*Question Submitted:* 8/8/2016 11:47:59 AM

During the Pre-SOQ meeting held on Aug 2 2016, a Mandatory MatchMaker/Outreach event was discussed. Please provide date and location information.

**The mandatory Matchmaker/Outreach event for the Shortlisted Offeror's for the CUY IR 490/SR 010 02.09/19.28 project (Opportunity Corridor 3 – Proj. 17-3000) will be held on Oct 18th 2016 (8:30am – 12:00noon) at the Ohio Bureau of Workers Compensation building, 4800 East 131st Street; Garfield Heights, Ohio.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/4/2016 10:57:52 AM

Will the Department accept projects on Form B from dedicated subcontractors or subconsultants? Since these firms are part of the defined Offeror per ITO/RFQ Section 1.1 they are committed to the project and allowing inclusion of their representative projects may allow the team to more inclusively demonstrate our capabilities.

**Offerors may submit firms that are part of the defined Offeror for Form B. An upcoming addenda shall clarify.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/4/2016 10:57:23 AM

The RFQ states that the stipend amount is "anticipated" to be \$800,000. The fluctuation in this amount from the Industry Notice to the RFQ makes it difficult to finalize teaming arrangements. Can the Department commit that the stipend amount will not be lowered any further?

**The amount in the Industry announcement was provided as a courtesy to show our intent on providing a Payment for Preparation of a Responsive Design Concept. This was revised in the official Request for Qualifications and the Department does not foresee decreasing the amount as advertised in the RFQ.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/3/2016 6:27:01 PM

Form B (page 29 of 31 of the RFQ) states that "Projects listed must be completed or substantially completed." For the three projects to be listed for the Offeror's Lead Designer and the two projects for the design IQF, would it be acceptable to list projects for which the design, but not necessarily the construction, is complete? Given that demonstrating experience with large, complex projects – many of which have long construction durations – will be required, we believe that this milestone would better reflect the conclusion of the designer's involvement in the project.

**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:* 8/3/2016 12:05:11 PM

Per Page 4 of the RFQ, "The Department will implement the following requirements for a combined 20% Subcontractor goal on OC3:" Does the Department intend this to mean ONLY Subcontractors or will valid Suppliers be counted toward these goals? If so, to what extent as a percentage of their supply value?

**With the exception of suppliers, participation by firms performing a commercially useful function that also meet the goal requirements will count 100% toward attaining the goals. Participation by suppliers performing a commercially useful function will be based on the value of the material provided and will count 60% toward attaining the goals. The Department reserves the right to change the participation allowance upon issuance of the RFP and any subsequent addenda.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 8/3/2016 11:00:49 AM

Section 2.5.4 of the RFQ requires the DB Rail/Utilities/City Coordinator to be a P.E. and also requires co-location on a full-time basis for the duration of the Project. Can the P.E. requirement be eliminated or replaced with a different requirement (such as a specified number of years of experience in rail/utility/city coordination?)

**An addenda will clarify that the DB Rail/Utilities/City Coordinator must be an Ohio P.E. at the time of Award or have seven (7) years of verifiable experience applicable to the position.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/3/2016 10:59:35 AM

Form B specifies that all projects must be complete or substantially complete. Can the Department amend this requirement so allow projects that will be complete by the end of the year?

**No. Projects included on Form B must be either complete or substantially complete at the time of SOQ submittal.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/3/2016 10:58:00 AM

Section 2.5.1 of the RFQ specifies 1-inch margins. Would it be acceptable to place all narrative text within the 1-inch margins, but place header/footer information in the margins (such as page number, Offeror name, name of project, etc.)?

**Yes, but any attempt to expand upon the narrative within the margins may be considered non-responsive.**

*Question Submitted:* 8/3/2016 10:56:03 AM

Section 2.4 of the RFQ specifies that the Offerors should submit one unbound version of the SOQ. Would submission within a 3-ring binder, where the binding is not permanent, be acceptable?

**Yes, this would be appropriate and meet the intent of the unbound copy.**

**Project No. 173020**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

MEG-98755 - CR 29-00.17

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 10:51:39 AM

WILL THERE BE A REFERENCE ITEM FOR THE FIELD OFFICE, OR IS IT INCIDENTAL

**The Department will not need a field office for this project.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/21/2017 6:53:17 AM

- 1) Could the department provide any available survey data or CADD files?
- 2) Has a hydraulic analysis of the existing structure been performed?

*Question Submitted:* 11/6/2017 10:53:18 AM

The attachments do not appear to be placed on the ftp site. Could they be posted?

**The attachments are now available for review. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MEG-98755/Attachments/>**

**Project No. 174018**

**Sale Date - 12/14/2017**

LOR-88875 - SR 511-03.12

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 9:59:30 AM

There is a quantity for "Wearing Course Removed" listed in the general summary. Based on the Pavement Subsummary calcs, it appears that this item is for pavement removal. Please clarify. Thank you.

**Wearing course removed is incorrect for the work to be done. This Item will be deleted and an Item added for Pavement Removed as part of the forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 9:51:33 AM

The quantity listed for Excavation in the general summary (1131 cy), does not match the quantity added up from the roadway and channel cross sections (1258 cy). Please verify the excavation quantity. Thank you

**The excavation quantity on the General Summary is incorrect and will be corrected on the forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 9:38:41 AM

There is an item for "Excavation, As Per Plan" listed in the structure estimated quantities. There are no plan notes describing what this item is for. Please clarify the intent of this item. Thank you.

**The Item for Excavation, As Per Plan will be deleted and a new Item 503 Unclassified Excavation will be added to clarify this work under the forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 9:31:03 AM

Please review the quantity for Aggregate Base for the approach slabs. It appears that the quantity is understated. Thank you.

**The quantity for aggregate base for the approach slabs is incorrect. It will be corrected as part of the forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/5/2017 11:37:48 AM

Per AS-2-15 (Type A) the Polymer Modified Asphalt Joint System is to be paid separately under Item 846. No pay item has been included. Please clarify how this work is to be paid.

**Item 836, Polymer Modified Asphalt Expansion Joint System will be added to the Bridge Summary and Proposal in an upcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 12/4/2017 2:30:49 PM

Line 36, SIGN SUPPORT ASSEMBLY, POLE MOUNTED, AS PER PLAN, Can You Please Clarify the AS PER PLAN

**The Sign Support Assembly, Pole Mounted, As Per Plan item is incorrect for this installation. We will delete this item, clarify the sign installation work, and add an item for a ground mounting post under the forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 180002**

**Sale Date - 1/25/2018**

LOR-92013 - US 6-09.67

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 1:56:35 PM

Please advise if the original as-built Plans/Drawings or any previous rehabilitation plans will be made available to the Bidders.

**Existing Plans will be posted to the following link shortly: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LOR-92013/Reference%20Files/>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/28/2017 10:43:36 AM

Good morning Jim, We need answers on what size hydraulic cylinders are required. Can you please help me with this? I don't see any process for sending in questions. Have a good day, Cathy

**The leaf cylinder is shown on Sheet M6 as 9.00" rod and 16.00" bore, and the system is described in detail in the Machinery Special Provisions.**

**Project No. 180005**

**Sale Date - 1/11/2018**

AUG-99864 - /MER/MIA-VAR

*Question Submitted:* 12/8/2017 2:32:34 PM

The website link in the design files section for the existing plans files is a shortcut link and does not include any files. Please repost the existing plans folder.

**Project No. 180015**

**Sale Date - 1/11/2018**

GEA-80963 - US 422-13.04 Intersection

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 11:47:06 AM

Should the software be separate from the controller and have the controller sent to central to be installed and tested there

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 183000

Sale Date - 6/21/2018

HAM-104667 - IR 75 - 03.84

*Question Submitted:* 11/13/2017 6:32:29 PM

Should the page numbering be sequential throughout the entire SOQ or should it start over in each section?

**Though not specifically stated in the RFQ, the Department's preference is to have each section numbered individually as opposed to sequentially from beginning to end. Either method of page numbering will be accepted.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/10/2017 12:25:23 PM

Section 2.4 states "Submit one (1) unbound version of the SOQ..." Is a three-ring binder considered unbound?

**The unbound version of the SOQ may be placed in a three ring binder.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/9/2017 3:18:32 PM

Will an addendum be published to modify the RFQ and address the concerns of the latest prebid questions?

**Please see Addendum No.1 published 11/8/2017.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/8/2017 8:46:28 AM

Page 8 of the RFQ, addresses Contractor Prequalification (Section 1.2.2). The table located on page 8 has three categories of prequalification work types. The third category "Other Prequalification Categories – Not required @ RFQ, Includes but not limited to:", lists several work type codes that are occupied by specialty subcontractors; for example, work type 26 Structural Steel Painting. This would be similar to contractors that perform guardrail, signs or electric, and it would not provide the best value to the Department if the Offeror were to team with these subcontractors at the time of SOQ. The subsequent paragraph directly under the table states that prospective firms that are not yet prequalified in those areas specifically required above, furnish the Department with a properly completed prequalification application within one week after the "SOQ Submission" date. It is clear that both the first and second category require the prequalification to be in place at the time of RFQ. Can the Department please clarify if the Offeror will need to be prequalified in those work type codes that are listed in the third category?

**Please see Addendum 1**

*Question Submitted:* 10/31/2017 6:30:32 AM

On Page 15 of the RFQ, item 2.5.3-2 references structure HAM-74-1908R which is the structure that is being re-decked along with other superstructure repairs. Please clarify the location of the new bridges referenced under 2.a. as 1908R is not a new build.

**Per Section 15.3 of the Draft Design Build Scope the HAM-74-1908R structure can be re-decked along with other required structural repairs OR a new bridge can be constructed. (See Section 15.3.14).**

*Question Submitted:* 10/30/2017 4:55:54 PM

Rehabilitation of structures HAM-74-1840, HAM-74-1852, and HAM-74-1892 is not mentioned in the ITO/RFQ Project Expectations; however, it is included in the Draft Scope of Services. Please clarify whether or not the structure rehabilitations are anticipated to be part of the HAM-75-3.84 project.

**At this point in time all work, as defined in the Draft Design Build Scope, will be part of the project.**

*Question Submitted:* 10/30/2017 7:54:33 AM

RFQ Section 1.2.1 lists 'Environmental Services' under the subconsultant prequalifications. There are 13 sub-categories under Environmental Services. Which of these sub-categories must the design team be prequalified for?

**See forthcoming addendum**

*Question Submitted:* 10/27/2017 2:50:02 PM

Will the Department please post the CAD files?

**Cad files can be found here:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/>**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 10/27/2017 2:41:17 PM

Will the Department please post existing plans for the I-74 corridor?

**The I-74 existing plans can be found here:**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Existing%20Plans/74/>**

*Question Submitted:* 10/26/2017 9:36:51 AM

Reference is made to Section 1.2 of the DRAFT Scope which lists existing plans in a table as well as a link to the ODOT ftp site. The following existing plans could not be found: 08c1489 08c3039 08c1392 08c3036 (PID 76257) Please provide these files.

**All requested items have been uploaded to the FTP site as listed in the draft scope. please note: PID 76257 is 08C2859 08C3039 should be 08C3093 (Ped bridge)**

*Question Submitted:* 10/26/2017 9:35:49 AM

Reference is made to Section 10 of the DRAFT Scope which states that all environmental commitments shall be completed per the environmental document and is followed by a link to a 2008 Environmental Assessment which was not finalized at that time. Please provide the latest version of: 1. Environmental Commitment Notes 2. Results of the ESA Phase II 3. Rule 13 Permit

**At this time, no Rule 13 is required (the landfill locations are outside of the project limits). The Environmental commitments are listed on page 24 of the EA. Phase II ESA Concurrence and environmental documents are at the link below: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/environmental/>**

*Question Submitted:* 10/25/2017 11:09:45 AM

RFQ page 8/35 currently requires the Lead Contractor to be pre-qualified for Work Type 22, Level 3 Bridge. The RFQ continues to include a reference to requirements governing changes in the Offer's team and Key Personnel in Section 3.2, Requirement to Keep Team Intact and 4.3, Requirement to Keep Team Intact - Post Award. Taken in their entirety, Section 3.2 and 4.3 prohibit changes to certain parties, specifically including named subcontractors. The Department expressly retains the sole discretion to authorize a change to a named subcontractor. In light of the above, can the requirement to provide Work Type 22, Level 3 Bridge, be altered to apply to either the Lead Contractor or a currently pre-qualified, named subcontractor? Doing so would not materially erode the Department's current position relative to ensuring the team members meet the current pre-qualification requirements while not precluding potential Lead Contractor's from pursuing the project.

**RFQ Section 1.2.2 Contractor Prequalification will be modified to allow either the Lead Contractor or Named Subcontractor – Prequalification @ RFQ Required for Work Type Code 22 – Level 3 Bridge. Each Offeror must ensure the composition of their team including but not limited to Lead Designer, Lead Contractor, Key Personnel, Named Subcontractor, etc. are exclusive to one another and no other Offeror's team as it relates to RFQ Section 4.1 - Conflict of Interest. The Lead Contractor must still perform equal to or greater than 50% of the work per RFQ Section 1.2.2.**

**Project No. 183001**

**Sale Date - 2/23/2018**

**LUC-101566 - SR 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?

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*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.**

**Project No. 183002**

**Sale Date - 1/25/2018**

**MRW-99792 - CR 15-05.01**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 9:01:31 PM

Can the HEC RAS files used for preliminary sizing be made available to DBT?

**The HEC RAS files will be added to the project ftp site for reference only. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MRW-99792/Reference%20Files/>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/30/2017 9:00:15 PM

Is SUL prequalification required for designer?

**SUL pre-qualification is required. DB Scope will be revised with clarification in forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 7:24:39 AM

6.  OS section 11 states that "Monument assemblies shall be installed as depicted in Right-of-Way plans". No proposed monuments are currently shown in the right-of-way plan. Will the DBT be responsible for the construction of any monument assemblies?

**Monument Assemblies shall be installed in coordination with the Morrow County Engineer in the proposed full depth section at Sta. 1262+00 and Sta. 1270+00 in accordance with ODOT SCD RM-1.1. DB Scope of Services Section 11 will be revised in forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 7:23:45 AM

5.  Will tree removal as shown in the r/w plans be performed by others or included in this project?

**The County has not marked individual trees and stumps for removal. Unless specifically designated as "Do Not Disturb" in the plans, remove all trees and stumps within the construction limits under the lump sum bid for Item 201 Clearing and Grubbing. DB Scope of Services Section 12.2 will be revised in forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 7:20:22 AM

4.  the DBT responsible for the new water service line under the roadway near 262+25?

**No. It will be installed See Utility Note No. 4 in Attachment E. The Water Service will be installed by DELCO Water. The DBT will be responsible for coordination with DELCO to ensure the location of the Water Service is not disturbed with the roadway construction.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 7:19:03 AM

3.  OS section 14.10.C states "No proposed foreslopes shall be steeper than 3:1". Preliminary plan typical sections show 2:1 max. Since these appear to conflict, which is required?

**The proposed roadway foreslopes shall not be steeper than 3:1 as indicated in the cross sections. All other graded slopes shall not be steeper than 2:1. DB Scope of Services Section 14.10 will be revised in forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 7:17:24 AM

2.  What are the station limits for the sub-grade stabilization?

**The stabilization shall be performed within the entire project limits. The station limits are as identified in the preliminary plan typical sections, and the DB Scope of Services Section 14.3 will be revised in forthcoming addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

*Question Submitted:* 11/20/2017 7:15:32 AM

1. Will the DBT be required to perform pavement design per ODOT Pavement Design Manual using the CBR of 7 stated in the Geotechnical report or can we build what is shown in the preliminary plan typical sections?

**The pavement buildup shall designed/constructed as indicated in the preliminary plan typical sections. DB Scope of Services Section 14.3 will be revised in forthcoming addendum.**

*Question Submitted:* 11/16/2017 1:59:42 PM

Will ODOT make CAD files available?

**CAD files will be posted with reference material. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MRW-99792/Reference%20Files/>**

*Question Submitted:* 11/13/2017 9:28:51 AM

Could the attachments and engineering files and design files please be uploaded to the website?

**Files have been posted to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MRW-99792/Attachments/>**

**Project No. 183003**

**Sale Date - 2/1/2018**

**MED-14821 - N Carpenter Road**

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 7:48:52 AM

In the first paragraph of Attachment E, it states that "These utility facilities shall remain in place or be relocated within the limits of the project as set out below by others." It then proceeds to list seven private utility owners, but no mention is made of any relocation being performed. Is the DBT to assume that no relocation of these facilities is anticipated or required since it is not "set out" in the Utility Note?

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 7:35:58 AM

Due to the level of utility involvement on this job would ODOT consider adding unit price items for this work?

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 7:35:06 AM

Section 13.2 shows a maximum duration of 240 days for all detours. Does this 240 days include the 2-21 day closures on Grafton Road when only eastbound traffic will be maintained?

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 7:32:24 AM

Please provide all electronic files including base maps.

*Question Submitted:* 12/6/2017 7:31:27 AM

Please setup an item for 832 - Temporary Erosion Control. No allowance is currently setup for this.

*Question Submitted:* 12/4/2017 3:23:16 PM

Section 2 of the scope shows a prebid meeting at a tbd date. Please provide the time and date of the prebid meeting. If the department elects not to have a prebid meeting please modify section 8.1 to include updated specifications released on or before the date of project advertisement.

*Question Submitted:* 12/4/2017 3:21:39 PM

There is a biditem setup for a Field Office, Type A (24 months) but section 7 of the scope calls for a Field Office, Type B. Please clarify.