Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No.  200093
DEL-106090 - SR 37-09.07

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 10:48:47 AM  **Question Number - 2**

Can Proposal Notes 520 and 534 be added to the proposal for this project?

PN520 and PN 534 will be added to the bid proposal; please see forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/8/2020 4:59:41 PM  **Question Number - 1**

Please provide item for trench drain removal or add note stating that the removal of the existing trench drain is to be included with proposed Trench Drain with Standard Grate.

The item description for Item 839 – Trench Drain with Standard Grate will be updated to an As Per Plan item, and a note will be added to the detail stating that the proposed trench drain will include the removal of existing trench drain. Please see forthcoming addendum.

---

Project No.  200121
RIC-93455 - US 30-09.26

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2020 5:04:32 PM  **Question Number - 93**

Bid items 512 and 513 call for 36” into BR and 42” drilled shafts above BR, respectively. The plans show a 42” rock socket and a 48” drilled shaft. If incorrect, please correct the bid items.

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2020 12:43:04 PM  **Question Number - 92**

The plan notes for bridge 1219 (sheet 1346) indicate a minimum pile wall thickness of .375”. However, the notes for the adjacent retaining wall 78 (sheet 980) have no such requirement. An ultimate bearing value of 214 kips is specified on sheet 980, making the wall thickness of .250” sufficient. Given the close proximity of the bridge and the wall, should the wall thicknesses be the same for both?

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2020 10:25:56 AM  **Question Number - 91**

For the Light Pole, Conventional Supports, Bid Ref 212-215, please clarify if these supports are to be supplied with ODOT’s standard Conventional Truss Style Bracket Arms. All Bid Documents and General Summaries indicate as such; however, on plan pages 1163 & 1164, under the LEGEND, the description for these reference items are: New Conventional Light Pole, Davit Style.

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2020 10:21:02 AM  **Question Number - 90**

For Bid Ref 218 & 220, please verify quantity required. It appears there are (4)Ref 216 supports whose foundations are mounted on a structure at: Sta 567+98.50 - page 1253A, Sta 598+98.00 - page 1314A, Sta 600+76.75 - page 1314B & Sta 644+20.40 - page 1404

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2020 8:39:26 AM  **Question Number - 89**

Please respond to Prebid Question 72 originally tendered 3/20/2020 at 3:38:30 PM.

This luminaire is not an acceptable substitution. Luminaire is over-bright and does not meet uniformity requirements.

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2020 8:37:58 AM  **Question Number - 88**

Please respond to Prebid Question 71 originally tendered 3/20/2020 at 3:37:03 PM.

This luminaire is not an acceptable substitution. Power requirements are too high, and fixture does not meet uniformity requirements in illumination.

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2020 8:35:58 AM  **Question Number - 87**

Please respond to Prebid Question 70 originally tendered 3/20/2020 at 3:36:00 PM.

This luminaire is not an acceptable substitution. Power requirements are too high to be considered equal, and illumination uniformity does not meet requirements.

---

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
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Question Submitted: 3/27/2020 8:34:09 AM  Question Number - 86
This luminaire is an acceptable substitution on this project.

Question Submitted: 3/27/2020 7:57:20 AM  Question Number - 85
Plan sheet 43 Earthwork For Maintaining Traffic notes given “for information only” volumes of excavation and embankment. Please provide calculations and/or notes as to how these quantities were derived so we can verify takeoffs.

The earthwork calculations pdf "93455_RIC-30-9.26-MOT-Earthwork _Calcs.pdf", for information only, is provided at the following ftp site:ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D03/93455_Reference_Docs/

Question Submitted: 3/26/2020 2:33:26 PM  Question Number - 84
As requested in pre-bid questions 66 and 75 it cannot be stressed enough that the winter restrictions each year are causing preliminary scheduling pains. The amended beginning of season start provided in the answer to question 75 delivers some relief and is appreciated. Preliminary scheduling still requires near unrealistic resource assignments, productions and crew shifts to work in the limited, seasonal windows. Would the Department consider opening the winter calendar to allow the project to work activities throughout the winter? At a minimum, would the Department allow phase 5 to work into the winter through the 2021 and 2022 calendar season? Phase 5 would have traffic out of contra-flow patterns and be the most favorable MOT scenario for wintering over while allowing opportunity for some work to progress.

The interim completion dates will not be extended.

Question Submitted: 3/26/2020 12:57:20 PM  Question Number - 83
There is a given amount of temporary pavement to be installed beyond the project limits in both directions and both sides, and in some cases the proposed temporary pavement is wider than the existing shoulder. Excluding the removal of the temporary crossovers, will ODOT allow the remaining temporary pavement beyond the project limits to remain in place or will the contractor be required to remove temporary pavement to original shoulder width?

The temporary pavement outside of the project limits will be permitted to remain in place.

The barrier quantity still appears to be overstated in the addendum 3 plans. Is it perhaps that the run PB501 is in the same location as PB301 and only 140lf will be paid in lieu of the 14540 lf shown?

The barrier quantity will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/26/2020 9:56:37 AM  Question Number - 81
On sheet 950 the OHWM is roughly 10 ft above the 78” conduit that is to be installed. Is this correct?

The plan elevation will be changed in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/25/2020 4:47:47 PM  Question Number - 80
Addendum #3 changed the letting date to 4/4/2020 which is a Saturday. Is this correct?

This is a typographical error and is not correct. The bidding date remains 4/2/2020 as indicated in subsequent addendums.

Question Submitted: 3/25/2020 4:14:21 PM  Question Number - 79
Phase 5 requires the contractor to pave the 302 Asphalt Concrete Base, APP (302 density spec) and the 19mm Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course (446 density spec) before the median barrier wall is installed. This area has very limited access, narrow paving widths which include several concrete footers and foundations for drainage and lighting structures to pave around. All of this will limit the amount of asphalt that can be placed with a paver. Would ODOT consider waiving the density requirements and using 448 acceptance in these locations instead?

No density cores shall be taken in phase 5. Proper Compaction will still be required in this phase. Plans will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.
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Referring to Contract Sht. 1339 of 1669, the limited room to place a reinforcing strip for Temp. MSE Wall 3 is less than 0.7H, base to height ratio. The industry minimum strip length for MSE walls is 8 ft. or 0.7H, whichever is longer. Is a 7'-10" reinforcing strip length allowed for Temp. MSE Wall 3?

The 7'-10" reinforcing strip length is acceptable.

Drawing number 1427 shows a section modulus for temporary sheeting of 72.54 in^2/ft grade 50. There is not a sheet pile manufactured with an elastic section modulus this high. Is this correct?

The plans will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

The typical sections call for 6" base pipe underdrain with geotextile fabric. Pay item 111 calls for 6" base pipe underdrain. If fabric is required, please change the pay item to 6" base pipe underdrain with fabric wrap.

Geotextile fabric will be added to the plans in a forthcoming addendum.

I concur with the contractor who submitted question 66. With the complexity of the work, 7 month season is too aggressive. In this same 7 month period from April 1 to November 1 we are required to account for 35 days of weather impacts. For this reason and the other factors listed in question 66 make this schedule unrealistic. Please consider relaxing the schedule for this project.

The project construction seasons will be revised to begin March 1 from April 1 in a forthcoming addendum.

Addendum #1 states that all crossframes are Type A as per GSD-1-19. As per GSD-1-19 crossframes for rolled beams 36" of less are Intermediate Diaphragms (channel diaphragms) as shown on page 2/4 of GDS-1-19. Is the intent to use Type A diaphragms (angle diaphragms) or Intermediate Diaphragms (channel diaphragms)?

The intent is to use Type A – angle crossframes. This does not requires a plan change.

Bid items 284 and 286 appear to have incorrect quantities based on the foundation at station 691+00 westbound, which by specification should be included in item 286 and not 284. Please review and revise as required.

A plan change to revise the sign foundation quantity will be made by addendum.

REF. 229 calls for underpass fixtures with 39 Watts / 3,140 lumens, Type III distribution, 3000k color temp, and 480 volts. Please advise if GE Lighting’s EWNB LED high mast fixture with 44 Watts / 4,300 Lumens, Type III distribution, 3000k color temp, and 347-480 Volts is considered an approved equal to what’s specified in the plans. GE Part #EWNB-H-A3-7-30-1-N-GRAY-LR-001

This luminaire is not an acceptable substitution. Luminaire is over-bright and does not meet uniformity requirements.

REF. 228 calls for a low mast fixture with 319 Watts / 42,000 lumens, Type V distribution, 3000k color temp, and 480 volts. Please advise if GE Lighting’s ERHM LED high mast fixture with 365 Watts / 47,000 Lumens, Type V distribution, 3000k color temp, and 347-480 Volts is considered an approved equal to what’s specified in the plans. GE Part #ERHM-02-H-50-VW-7-30-N-1-4B-GRAY-R-005

This luminaire is not an acceptable substitution. Power requirements are too high, and fixture does not meet uniformity requirements in illumination.

REF. 227 calls for a low mast fixture with 209 Watts / 31,000 lumens, Type V distribution, 3000k color temp, and 480 volts. Please advise if GE Lighting’s ERHM LED high mast fixture with 280 Watts / 37,600 Lumens, Type V distribution, 3000k color temp, and 347-480 Volts is considered an approved equal to what’s specified in the plans. GE Part #ERHM-02-H-40-VW-7-30-N-1-4B-GRAY-R-005

This luminaire is not an acceptable substitution. Power requirements are too high to be considered equal, and illumination uniformity does not meet requirements.

*** 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.

Friday, March 27, 2020 5:58:09 PM
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**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 3:34:54 PM  
**Question Number - 69**

REF. 226 calls for a conventional luminaire with 130 Watts / 16,700 Lumens, Type III distribution, 3000K color temp, and 480 Volts. Please advise if GE Lightings ERL2 LED cobra head fixture with 140 Watts / 17,300 lumens, Type III distribution, 3000K color temp, and 347-480 Volts is considered an approved equal to what’s specified in the plans. GE Part #ERL2-H-18-C3-30-1-GRAY-GILR-053

This luminaire is an acceptable substitution on this project.

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 9:29:53 AM  
**Question Number - 68**

Plan sheet 50, note L calls for both sides of the rock cut to be performed in phase 1. The Eastbound side will have barrier wall protection but there are no provisions for safe zone protection on the Westbound side in phase 1. Please review phasing requirements for Westbound rock cut and specify how/what/when for phasing work and MOT provisions.

Note L will be modified in a forthcoming addendum. The rock excavation will be completed in Phase 4 so the operation is protected by MOT details and quantities already included in the plan.

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 8:11:05 AM  
**Question Number - 67**

Please add bid items for the lighting conduits to be installed thru the bridge median walls on bridges 1074, 1135, 1219 and the bridge over the RR at station 653+00. The plans call for 2 - 4" conduits to be installed b/t transition J boxes, but there are no pay items. This would not fall under barrier wall incidental items.

A pay will be added to the plans in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 11:29:08 AM  
**Question Number - 66**

1. Given the complexity of the multiphase construction, of which access is limited by MOT patterns of adjacent roadways, coupled with the contractual requirements for winter shut down between November 1st and April 1st, and the requirement to remove girders and set girders on Friday and Saturday Nights only, the seven month construction season is too aggressive. When considering limited access, limited space, cure times, the logistics of multiple mobilizations, completing the required work in the time allotted is impractical. Will the department consider revising the contract schedule requirements.

The Department will not revise the contract schedule requirements.

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 9:37:06 AM  
**Question Number - 65**

Per the answer to question 51, are bidders to assume all rock is able to be conventionally excavated. All rock breaking, hoe-ramming, etc. to be excluded and compensated for if deemed necessary during construction.

The Item 203 Excavation pay item does not specify what methods are used to remove the rock. From the soil borings, it appears that a hoe-ram or rock breaking would be necessary to excavate this material. Blasting, per Item 208, is not permitted on this project. This response will be contractualized in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 7:50:18 AM  
**Question Number - 64**

Bridge 1135 has a bid item for 24 dowel holes which are at the abutments. There are also 16 dowels at the piers for Phase 1A. Should these be added to this bid item too?

The number of dowels will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 7:45:57 AM  
**Question Number - 63**

Section 0015 for Wall 7B does not have a pile mobilization. Please add.

Mobilization will be added in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/18/2020 4:32:51 PM  
**Question Number - 62**

The transverse sections for bridges RIC-30-1074, RIC-30-1135, RIC-30-1219 and RIC-30-1266 all show the bridges being constructed using vertical haunches, will standard ODOT haunches be allowed? If the answer is no, will the department allow form hangers to extend past the edge of the flanges and remain exposed?

The bridge haunches will be built vertically per the plans. Form hangers will be permitted to extend past the flange and remain exposed; however, all deck hangers not encased in concrete shall be galvanized per 711.02. This requirement will be added to a forthcoming addendum.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
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**Question Submitted:**  3/18/2020 11:41:30 AM   **Question Number - 61**

Per office calculations sheet 35/38, the pavement removal on SR 39 appears to be overstated. Per plan sheet 460, full depth replacement begins at station 693+00. Office calculations have full width removal of SR 39 beginning at 686+85. Please review and revise removal quantities.

  **Revisions will be made in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:**  3/18/2020 10:48:34 AM   **Question Number - 60**

At what point can SR 545 ramps R/RR/RL be permanently shut down? There are various closures called out in phases 1 through 7 per the sequence of construction notes.

  **Entrance Ramp RL will be closed in Phase 1 and is never reopened. Exit Ramp RR is closed in phase 3 and is never reopened.**

  Several ramp signs that were covered in previous phases were not indicated to be covered in subsequent phases. There will be minor plan changes required for this work in a future addendum.

**Question Submitted:**  3/18/2020 10:20:17 AM   **Question Number - 59**

The asphalt surface course for the entire project currently requires acceptance according to Item 447 – Asphalt Concrete with Joint Density, which is typically intended for multi-lane highways. Does ODOT intend to require joint density testing on all side roads or will another surface item using Item 448 acceptance be established for these areas?

  **The 447 Spec will be used on the mainline US 30 pavement, including the acceleration and deceleration lanes at the ramps to the gore areas. The plans will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:**  3/17/2020 12:07:06 PM   **Question Number - 58**

The Office Calculations Sheets 29 and 30 for removals appear have included the lengths of existing bridge to be removed/filled in as well as RIC-30-1219 between stations 639+98L/R and 652+30L/R. Please review and revise pavement removal quantities as needed.

  **The plans will be changed in a forthcoming addendum to match the Office Calculations.**

**Question Submitted:**  3/17/2020 9:35:33 AM   **Question Number - 57**

The Fence Plan calls out 3 locations for a Type 4 Crossing. Will the 601 Concrete Paved Gutter be considered incidental to this? If so, what length of paved gutter will be required.

  **Two of the three will change to type 3 crossings – no quantity changes, but a plan change. One will remain a type 4, but the existing paved gutter is already noted as “do not disturb”. No plan or quantity changes for this crossing. Changes will be made in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:**  3/17/2020 9:29:54 AM   **Question Number - 56**

Ref 178 Anti-Segregation Equipment is currently setup for all of the 12.5MM Surface, Type A (447). In some past jobs, this item has been setup to only contain the area from edge line to edge line and also included the intermediate course. Please clarify ODOT’s intent.

  **The Anti-Segregation Equipment is set up for the full width of the 12.5MM, Type A (447) material only as shown in the plan. It will not apply to the intermediate course. No plan revisions are needed.**

**Question Submitted:**  3/13/2020 10:41:33 AM   **Question Number - 55**

Can The State provide any information on the MEDEIRA HOLDINGS Rail Line shown at CL STA. 611+00?

  **No information is available on the Medeira Holdings track. The rail line appears to be non-functional and does not require a railroad agreement to work on the bridge overhead. No temporary right-of-way takes to allow access onto this property were made on behalf of the project.**

**Question Submitted:**  3/12/2020 12:33:02 PM   **Question Number - 54**

Plan sheet 446 ref. R9 shows an existing 27" RCP being plugged and filled. Cross-sections on sheet 499 also specify it to be plugged and filled. However plan sheet 447 calls for it to be removed, and this quantity of 167' has been carried to the general summary for bid item 13 (Pipe Removed, over 24"). Please verify if the pipe is to be removed or to be plugged and filled.

  **The pipe should be plugged and filled. The plans will be changed in a forthcoming addendum.**

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
On Sheet 42 the note for “US 30 Pavement Markings on the Surface Course” says to use Class III Pavement Markings when placing the surface course on US 30 and the ramps. The note goes on to provide quantities for this work, however these quantities are listed as Class I, not Class III. These quantities are also included in the bid item totals for Class I. Please add bid items for the Class III Pavement Markings and remove the quantity from the Class I totals.

The Class III will be removed from the note. The quantity tables are correct. The plans will be changed in a forthcoming addendum.

In response to question 22 the department stated the permanent wall will be constructed in 3a as per a note on sheet 51. However, the MOT shown on sheet 166 in this area prevents the construction of the center wall since westbound traffic is driving against portable barrier that is occupying the space necessary to construct the permanent wall. This condition exists from 554 to the tie in at 555+20.

The remainder of the median barrier from approximately station 554+00 to 555+20 can be constructed in Phase 5. Phase 5 on plan sheet 238 will be revised by extending towards the west the hatched work area and portable barrier on the westbound direction side of US 30. The proposed lane shift and pavement markings also will be shifted to the west to accommodate this revision. A plan revision is required and will be included in a forthcoming addendum.

Please respond to the Prebid question #27 originally tendered March 4, 2020 at 9:54:44 AM.

The plan notes on sheet 35 define limits where rock of a stable nature is not to be removed. Outside of these limits, rock will be removed to conform the rock faces to the proposed cross sections. The design intent is for Item 203 Excavation only. Item 208 Rock blasting is not permitted. The reasons behind this include: 1) The Department is confident that the strength of the rock is low enough that the rock can be excavated. 2) The rock is moderately to highly fractured according to the boring logs. 3) There isn’t enough burden to blast this slope as configured in the plans – we’d either be extending the cut line back to maybe beyond proposed R/W or be left with an over steepened slope that looks a lot like the one we have.

The lighting legend on plan sheet 1163/1669 shows a 3” galvanized rigid conduit in the median barrier wall. This is contradictory to SCD RM4.3 which calls for a 4” PVC lighting conduit along with the 4” Multicell conduits which are incidental to the Barrier Wall.

The contractor will have to determine the required traffic devices from the MOT Standard Construction Drawings and the OMUTCD. The plans will not be amended.

In reference to prebid question #30, the department’s response did not address the winter of 2020-2021 where Ph. 2 markings will need to be removed and re-striped in the existing lane configuration according to the “winter time limitations” note on sheet 42. Please add quantity for the winter re-striping between Ph. 2 and Ph. 3.

The “Pavement Markings After the First Year of Construction” at the top of sheet 42 lists the quantities required.
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Question Submitted: 3/10/2020 11:01:50 AM  Question Number - 47
Plan sheet 53, SR 39 Work: Paragraph 4 says that SR 39 phase F is to be constructed in year 3, overall phase 7. Plan sheet 112 shows ramp GR/GL being closed during phase F. Plan sheets 267, 268, and 278 show old ramp G being closed during phase 6. Plan sheets 293, 294, 305, and 306 show ramp G being open in phase 7. The notes and plans are in conflict on which phase ramp G gets rebuilt. Please verify if ramp G gets closed and rebuilt in phase 6 or phase 7 as well as verifying what mainline phase SR 39 phase F gets built in.

Question Submitted: 3/10/2020 9:21:51 AM  Question Number - 46
Plan sheet 384- ref. U12: There is no quantity shown for the 6" Base Pipe Underdrain and corresponding Outlet. Plan sheets 410 and 412 show an underdrain. Please review and revise the quantities as needed.

A change to the quantities will be incorporated into a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2020 3:10:44 PM  Question Number - 45
MOT Cross-Section Sheets for phases 3 (sheets 153-155) and 6 (sheets 266 and 267) show work being built to 30' off center line of US 30 pavement. The typical section on sheet 13 shows outside edge of pavement at 29.405' off center. There is an underdrain just outside of edge of pavement without dimension off edge of pavement. Please clarify if the underdrain in each direction to be installed in phases 3 and 6 or in phase 4 and 7.

A plan note permitting the contractor to shift the UD away from the cut line towards the outside of the shoulder slightly per equipment requirements will be added by addendum. This will permit both shoulder underdrains to be installed in the same phases of construction. This will happen in Phase 3 and Phase 7.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2020 3:00:35 PM  Question Number - 44
Bridge RIC-30-1219 on sheet 1363 shows rear 12" CIP abutment piling to be encased, sheet 1367 shows the same 12" CIP tiles to be encased in a 14” sleeve. What are the specifications for the 14” sleeve and where will payment for the 14” sleeves be made?

The sleeve specifications and payment will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2020 2:57:32 PM  Question Number - 43
Bridge RIC-30-1236 shows concrete slope protection on plan sheet 1426 and on the quantity recap sheet 1428. The proposal shows Ref 590 to be Crushed Aggregate Slope Protection, which is correct?

The proposal item 590 will be changed to concrete slope protection to match the plans in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2020 2:53:30 PM  Question Number - 42
CMS spec 524 Drilled Shafts and note 6 on of plan sheet 1325, state that drill shaft rebar is incidental to the drilled shaft items. However, the drilled shaft rebar was included in the epoxy coated rebar bid item quantity. Please clarify where rebar is to be paid or adjust the epoxy coated rebar in bid item 489 for bridge RIC-30-1135.

The plans will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/9/2020 10:22:09 AM  Question Number - 41
Please consider revising the APP note for the 50" portable concrete barrier to allow 32" portable barrier without glare screen when traffic is only on one side of the barrier.

The 50" barrier is specified to minimize driver distractions, such as observing construction activities adjacent to the travel lane, in the relatively narrow MOT lanes. The plan will maintain the 50" barrier.
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**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 10:19:36 AM  
**Question Number - 40**

The rock excavation at from station 656+00 to 664+00 L&R will require blasting. Please include items for Pre-splitting, Pre-blast condition surveys, Blasting consultant, and vibration control and monitoring.

  The design intent is for Item 203 Excavation only. Item 208 Rock blasting is not permitted. The reasons behind this include:
1. The Department is confident that the strength of the rock is low enough that the rock can be excavated.
2. The rock is moderately to highly fractured according to the boring logs.
3. There isn’t enough burden to blast this slope as configured in the plans – we’d either be extending the cut line back to maybe beyond proposed R/W or be left with an over steepened slope that looks a lot like the one we have.

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 9:23:25 AM  
**Question Number - 39**

Only bridge 1074 has included steel points for h-pile. Do bridges 1135 and 1236 require points as well?

  The rock is weaker at the 1135 and 1236 bridges. These will not require the addition of steel points. No plan change is required.

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 9:12:46 AM  
**Question Number - 37**

Ref no 570 includes the diaphragm concrete. This quantity should be moved to ref no 567 under the superstructure.

  The plan quantity will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 9:10:01 AM  
**Question Number - 36**

Drilled shaft rebar shown on sheet 1322 is included in ref no 489. This should be incidental to ref nos 512 and 513.

  The plans will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2020 4:59:11 PM  
**Question Number - 35**

Bid item 123- 21" Conduit, Type C: There is a run shown on plan sheets 462, 928, and 1204 (181' run) which is in the slope beneath the existing overhead bridge piers and abutments. The work will need to be done prior to bridge reconstruction work. Clearance and slope stability could be an issue if the contractor tries to open-cut this run. Will ODOT consider setting up a bid item for boring and jacking of this 21" line?

  This run of conduit will be added to the "jack and bore" locations in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2020 2:55:03 PM  
**Question Number - 33**

Bid item 121- 18" Conduit, Type B: There is a run shown on plan sheet 430 (Ref. D4, 196 feet) that per phasing would need to be installed in up to 5 phases with a maximum depth of over 33' below grade. Will ODOT consider setting up a bid item for boring and jacking of this 18" line?

  The work will be revised to include a "jack and bore" item in a forthcoming addendum.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
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Question Submitted: 3/6/2020 12:55:04 PM  Question Number - 31
Per the note on Sheet 1510, Ref 57 Fence, Type CLT, APP includes clearing and herbicide for the new fence. This is a significant length of fence and the clearing is typically not incidental to the fence. Please add a bid item for Fenceline Clearing.

The "As Per Plan" designation describes the required width of clearing and application of herbicide to cut stumps only. Clearing and grading for the fence is performed in accordance with CMS 607.03 under this pay item. The length of fence is to receive Fenceline Seeding and Mulching; applying herbicide the full length of the fenceline is not specified. No plan changes or additional pay items are required.

Question Submitted: 3/5/2020 12:30:06 PM  Question Number - 30
Plan subsummary sheet 69 gives quantities for work zone pavement markings in phases 1-7. It appears that restriping work to original or proposed alignments for winter time wasn’t included. Please review and revise as needed.

The pavement markings from Phase 5A should remain in place over the winter so the markings will be changed from 614 to 642. The overall quantity will be the same. This will be changed in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/5/2020 12:13:40 PM  Question Number - 29
Plan sheet 49, note I calls out for SR 39 full depth reconstruction to be completed before bridge work on SR 30 begins in phase 3. The maintenance of traffic drawings for SR 39 show in all phases that existing ramp J is closed. Plan sheet 51, Phase 3 note L indicates that ramp J gets closed at this point. Please verify if ramp J at the 30/39 interchange gets during all SR 39 roadway work or if it closes at the beginning of phase 3.

Note L on sheet 51 will be revised to remove the phrase “permanently close Ramp J and” in a forthcoming addendum.

Addendum 1 added a Density Specification to some of the 302 Asphalt Concrete Base item, which broke the original quantity into "As Per Plan" and standard items. Have the original Pavement Calculations sheets, posted on the District’s ftp site for information only, been updated to reflect this change?

The updated pavement calculation information has been posted at:

Plan sheet 35 has notes relating to the rock excavation that the contractor is not to remove rock of a stable nature at the toe of slope. Plan sheets 681-692 show significant slope and top cuts that based on the existing physical conditions could require blasting to meet design slopes and elevations. Is it the intent/assumption of the owner/designer that all of this cut is loose rock which can be removed without blasting and will ODOT consider setting up CMS 208 bid items for Presplitting and Pre-Blast Condition Survey?

The question is being researched and will be responded to in a future Prebid Question.

Bid item 376- LEO with Patrol Car: ODOT has set up a quantity of 360 hours based on notes on plan sheet 47. From past experience on highly-phased/multi-year projects, this quantity appears to be understated. Please review and revise the estimated quantity to one more in line with past similar projects.

The plan quantity will be revised to 2,500 hrs in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/4/2020 9:29:45 AM  Question Number - 25
Plan sheet 47, third column contains a note titled "Drums and Maintenance of Traffic Standard Construction Drawings" which puts the burden on the contractor to determine proper drum spacing as well as determining proper zone signing (as opposed to normal procedure of the designer providing this). Many of the SCD’s have designs which depend on design speeds. Please provide design speeds for all mainline and side road zones so that each bidder can properly quantify all drum and signing needs.

Refer to the following information for determining the roadway design speeds:Sheets 161 and 172 note the legal speed limits on US 30. Use these speeds for all other MOT requirements on US 30. Sheet 54 SR 545 Work, third paragraph notes tapers designed for 40 mph. Use this speed for all other MOT requirements on SR 545.Use the legal speeds designated on sheet 3 for all other side roads for MOT requirements.

*** 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:** 3/2/2020 5:37:47 PM  Question Number - 24

The phase 1A demo for Bowman Street bridge, sheet 1274/1669 or 5/56, refers to detail "H" on sheet 6/56. The detail did not print onto sheet 6/56. Please verify or provide detail "H"

Plan Detail "H" will be provided in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/2/2020 5:31:08 PM  Question Number - 23

The barrier pay item appears to be overstated. For example, many runs are counted as pay items in phases even when they do not shift in position from a previous phase. Is the state going to pay for barrier in each phase even when it does not shift? If not, should the quantity be reduced by +/-80,000 lf to reflect this? Please verify.

The barrier that is not shifted from a previous phase is not to be paid for again. The quantity will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/2/2020 4:56:15 PM  Question Number - 22

There appears to be a missing traffic phase. In Phase 3B the traffic is shown to be against the portable barrier from 555+20 to the west on sheet 176, then in the next phase (4) on sheet 206 traffic is shown driving against permanent barrier with no opportunity given to construct that section of permanent wall. Please verify?

The permanent barrier in question is to be built on Phase 3A. MOT Phase 3 – Note R (sheet 51) says ... “and construct the pavement and median section”. This is intended to include the permanent median barrier. Plan sheet 166 - MOT Phase 3A shows the area where the median barrier would be constructed as hatched indicating construction in this phase. Plan sheet 176 - MOT Phase 3B labels the permanent barrier. No plan change is required.

**Question Submitted:** 3/2/2020 4:43:27 PM  Question Number - 21

Most of the barrier is shown to be 50" APP even when locations do not split bidirectional traffic. In many locations, is it the intent of the state to pay for 50" APP PCB when 32" PCB would be sufficient?

Use the 50" barrier where specified in the plans.

**Question Submitted:** 3/2/2020 4:23:31 PM  Question Number - 20

The jacking and temporary support item for Br. 1212, Ref 617, is setup to alleviate differential settlement approaching 0.5 inch or greater. Since this is work will be performed as directed by the engineer and impossible to accurately quantify pre-bid will the Department consider changing the units of measure from Lump Sum to Each?

The unit of measure will be revised to EACH in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 2/29/2020 2:35:19 PM  Question Number - 19

Plan sheet 392- excavation subtotals for plan sheets 682 and 683 are incorrectly stated on this sheet. The totals also carry to the general summary and result in an incorrect excavation total quantity. Please review and revise.

The Department has reviewed the quantity and did not find an error. Please resubmit the question with additional detail for re-analysis.

**Question Submitted:** 2/27/2020 10:03:01 AM  Question Number - 18

Plan sheet 40- Under the "Permitted Lane Closure on US 30" note- third paragraph has a disincentive note with the disincentive fee in the amount of $XXX per minute. Please define and revise the disincentive fee.

The note is worked with the information provided on Sheet 39. The note on sheet 40 will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum as follows: "US 30 LANE CLOSURE DISINCENTIVE – THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE ASSESSED A DISINCENTIVE FEE IN THE AMOUNT SHOWN IN THE LANE VALUE CONTRACT ON SHEET 39 WHEN LANES ARE CLOSED TO TRAFFIC DURING TIMES DESIGNATED AS “LANE CLOSURE NOT PERMITTED” ON THE ODOT PLCM WEBSITE AT http://plcm.dot.state.oh.us."

**Question Submitted:** 2/25/2020 1:57:23 PM  Question Number - 17

No information is given in the proposal for Norfolk Southern Railroad insurance requirements. Please provide.

Additional information on the NS Railway insurance requirements will be provided in a forthcoming addendum.

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

Question Submitted: 2/25/2020 8:34:19 AM  Question Number - 16
Ref Nos 526 and 527 for 12” pipe pile APP do not match the quantities in the summary table on sheet 1347. The quantities on sheet 1347 appear to be correct. Please change.

The plan quantities will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/25/2020 8:27:29 AM  Question Number - 15
Ref No 517 is for 289 ft of 8’ VPF APP. The plans show this to be 6’ VPF. Please change to the correct fence type.

The plans correctly depict 6’ Vandal Protection Fence. The description in proposal reference number will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/24/2020 1:20:06 PM  Question Number - 14
Plan sheets 758-773 (Cross Sections for SR 545) appear to have greatly overstated fill and embankment quantities between stations 52+50 through 59+50 and 65+50 through 77+00. Please review these and revise fill and embankment quantities as necessary.

Quantities will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/19/2020 4:48:06 PM  Question Number - 13
Plan sheet 661 cross-section at station 605+00 shows 22 sf as the fill area for that station. This area appears to be greatly understated, for which will affect the embankment bid item volume. Please review and revise the fill area and embankment volume as necessary.

A revised quantity will be presented in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2020 3:26:01 PM  Question Number - 12
The beam splice detail for Field Splice No. 2 & 3 on the westbound bridge on Sht 1461 calls out the Outside Plate as 2’ 6” long in View K2-K2 but it is dimensioned at 3’ 1” and called out as 3’ 1” in the detail view. Please advise.

The beam splice dimensioning will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2020 3:23:29 PM  Question Number - 11
Beam L on Br. 1135 has temporary Type C crossframes installed between it and the existing fascia beam in Phase 1A. In its final condition the framing plan shows Type B crossframes between it and proposed Beam K. Is it the departments intent that the Type C connection plates are removed and replaced with Type B connection plates or can a detail showing how the proposed Type B crossframes are to be connected to the Type C connection plates be provided?

The connections for the crossframes will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2020 3:20:28 PM  Question Number - 10
The phase construction details on Sht 1208-1211 for Br. 1074 do not agree with the phasing call outs on the Westbound framing plan on Sht 1237. The phase construction details show the Westbound bridge both being constructed in three phases each but the framing plan on shows two phases. Please advise.

The construction phasing will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2020 3:18:08 PM  Question Number - 9
A number of the notes on the pages associated with the structural steel cross frames for Br. 1135 and Br. 1219 instruct you to use GSD-1-96 for intermediate crossframe details. Can the Department confirm that these notes should reference GSD-1-19?

The crossframe information will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2020 3:15:43 PM  Question Number - 8
The weld symbols on the majority of the elastomeric bearings call out all-around welds instead of just flat welds between the flange and the load plate. Is it the department’s intent to have the contractor to place a weld around all 4 sides of the load plate to the flange?

The "weld all around" symbol will be removed from the connections in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2020 3:13:09 PM  Question Number - 7
GSD-1-19 states that for completely shop painted, metalized, or galvanized systems, a Type ‘A’ or ‘C’ crossframe shall be used. Br. #1074, #1135, #1219, & #1236 are all called out to be shop painted yet they all are shown to use Type ‘B’ crossframes. Please advise.

The crossframe information will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2020 3:09:56 PM  Question Number - 6

The framing plans on Sht 1237 for Br. 1074 calls out Type 4 crossframes between Beam F and G. The transverse section on Sht 1247 calls them out as Type C crossframes. Please advise which type is correct? If Type C crossframes are correct the notes on GSD-1-19 state that Type C crossframes shall not be used when the beams are less than 4 ft deep and the overhangs are greater than 2 ft, which is the case on this structure. The angle size of L3x3x5/16 called out for the Type 4 crossframes also does not appear to be in line with the angle sizes called out on GSD-1-19.

*The crossframe information will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2020 9:34:14 AM  Question Number - 5

Will the department allow the new beams on Structures #1074, 1135, 1219, and 1236 to be furnished with only the prime paint applied in the fabrication shop and the remaining two coats applied in the field after construction of the bridge? The requirements of this project; including the temporary lateral supports, number of overhang jacks due to the job’s phasing, and the use of proposed beams in a temporary widening condition on Br. 1135, will inevitably lead to extensive damage to the paint system and repair work on almost every beam. Applying the intermediate and finish coats in the field will provide the department a continuous paint system that should perform and look better while reducing the overall cost and amount of disturbance to the traveling public.

*Please see the forthcoming addendum. The plans are being revised for the coating system from a 3-coat shop painting to a shop prime and two field-applied coating system.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2020 7:56:10 AM  Question Number - 4

Please make the Office Calculations and Existing Drawings available.

*The information has been posted at the following sites:*ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/RIC-93455/Reference%20Files/ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D03/93455_Reference_Docs/

**Question Submitted:** 2/11/2020 12:00:22 PM  Question Number - 3

Bid item 409- Pavement for MOT, Type A: the only reference to the plan quantity of 76,593 sy is a short note on plan sheet 43. Given the size of the bid item, will ODOT please provide a subsummary and/or calculations of the bid item?

*A subsummary of the item for reference only information has been posted at the following location:*ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D03/93455_Reference_Docs/93455_RIC-30-9.26_MOT_TEMP_PAVEMENT AREAS.pdf

**Question Submitted:** 2/6/2020 2:39:05 PM  Question Number - 2

The Reference Files don't appear to be available. Can a link to the files and the Office Calcs be provided?

*The information has been posted at the following site:*ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/RIC-93455/Reference%20Files/

**Question Submitted:** 2/6/2020 2:26:44 PM  Question Number - 1

Reference noise barrier plans, sheet 971. Please clarify why the post data table omits design cases given on sheet 8/13 in NBS-1-09.

*Additional data will be provided in a forthcoming addendum.*

---

**Project No.  200159**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRA-105523 - IR-IR 70/IR 71-12.68/14.86 (Proj 4R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sale Date - 4/16/2020**

---

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2020 9:44:59 AM  Question Number - 48

The note on plan sheet 700 for Item 511 Load Distribution Slab states that the item shall include the concrete construction as detailed in the plans including furnishing and placing reinforcing steel. Please provide a bar list for the required reinforcing steel for the load distribution slab.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

The is little direction provided in the plans on where some of the following items are to be paid; DOP Electrical Conduits, L6x4x1/2 LLH Utility Support, Supplemental WT6x25 DOP Utility Support, DOP Pullbox Support, and Sign Support Brackets. Can the Department please clarify?

Notes for payment of the 6" DOP utility conduits and related bridge hangers mounted on bridge FRA-70-1321A are shown on Electrical sheet 921/1815. Payment for all other structural steel supports on bridge FRA-70-1321A including the L6x4x1/2 LLH Utility Support angle welded to intermediate crossframe assemblies, the supplemental WT6x25 DOP Utility Support and associated stiffener connection plates, and the DOP Pullbox Structural Supports and associated stiffener connection plates are included for payment with ITEM 513 - STRUCTURAL STEEL MEMBERS, LEVEL 5.

Please provide quantities of Portable Concrete Barrier Wall (REF 652) and temporary striping to shift traffic in order to construct three overhead sign trusses shown on sheets 1029 and 1030. Please update the permanent striping quantities for this work as well putting traffic back in their current alignment.

Per SS 840.09 12" of Granular Type C is to be paid for under Foundation Prep bid items. This project has separate biditems for Item 203 Granular Type C. Please clarify by adding a note to the plans that Granular Type C will not be included in Foundation Prep and is to be paid for under the Granular Type C bid items. Alternatively, eliminate the Granular Type C bid items.

Correct. ITEM 203 – GRANULAR MATERIAL, TYPE C should have been included with ITEM 840 – FOUNDATION PREPARATION for payment. The item has been removed and the plans revised to clarify that it is included with ITEM 840 – FOUNDATION PREPARATION, for payment. This applies to Walls 4W5, 4W6, 4W10, 4W11, and 4W12. These revisions will be included with an addendum.

Sheet 1746 shows 112,635 lb of reinforcing steel in the approach slabs. That quantity is included in REF 1158 Reinforcing Steel. Based on standard drawing AS-1-15, the approach slab rebar is typically paid for in the approach slab item. Could the Department clarify if the rebar is to be paid for in REF 1158 or incidental to the approach slab item (REF 1182)?

Due to the uniqueness of the approach slab on this structure, the quantity for the reinforcing steel is NOT incidental to the approach slab item. The reinforcing steel quantity of 112,635 lbs is included with the reinforcing steel quantity (REF 1158).

The details for the overhead sign shown in the plans for wall 4W12 on sheets 847 and 856 conflict with the sign details on plan sheets 1032 & 1061. Please update plan sheets 1032 and 1061 to match what is shown in the 4W12 plans.

Question Submitted: 3/23/2020 9:42:02 AM  Question Number - 42
On sheet 146, there is temporary pavement and temporary guardrail shown. This temporary pavement is not quantified on sheet 81 and there is no item set up for temporary guardrail. Please review.

Question Submitted: 3/20/2020 10:33:02 AM  Question Number - 41
For structure FRA-70-1282R (ref 888-889) it appears the pile length quantity for driven is based off of 60' and not the 55' called out on sheet 1228. Please confirm.

Quantities for FRA-70-1282R references 888 (steel piles furnished) and 889 (steel piles driven) will be updated in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 3/20/2020 9:10:02 AM  Question Number - 40
In an upcoming addendum Sheet 1759 will reference Sheets 906 and 909.
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**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 9:09:31 AM  Question Number - 39

Sht 1712 shows a partial section of the utility ducts through the crossframes which does not depict any conduit racks on the strut of the intermediate crossframe. Can the Department confirm that the conduit racks are only to be installed on the L5x3x1/2 Utility Support angles as shown on Sht 1713.

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 9:08:43 AM  Question Number - 38

Sht 1713 contains a Signal Conduit Support Detail and a COC Conduit Support Detail. The Signal Conduit Support Detail calls out horizontal supports placed as required by the owner. This details show a L4x4x3/8 horizontal strut supporting two 2” signal conduits with 1/2” diameter U-Bolts. The COC Support Detail is called out as Location to be verified by City of Columbus. This detail shows a L5x3x1/2 placed level supporting a 4” duct with 3/4” diameter U-Bolts. Are these additional supports not currently depicted in the framing plan or is the intent to use the proposed intermediate crossframes and utility supports already shown on the framing plan? Are these conduits the proposed conduit for signal and pedestrian poles shown on the framing plan? If so which locations are the 2” signal conduits and 4” duct? Where is the installation of these conduits and U-Bolts to be paid?

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 9:07:39 AM  Question Number - 37

Plan sheets 198 – 205 of 1815 detail a 1:1 cut slope, which on sheet 198 is noted as ‘exc. limit for wall 4W12’. Traffic will continue to use Ramp C3 while it’s embankment slope is in this risky condition. Also, your proposed cut slope of 1:1 will not be permitted by OSHA for construction of wall 4W12. Please provide a constructible solution.

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 12:49:45 PM  Question Number - 36

Could the Department please post the Engineer’s quantity calculations for the bridges and retaining walls?

*The quantity calcs have been posted to the reference files folder located here: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-105523/Reference%20Files/

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 12:49:25 PM  Question Number - 35

Regarding PBQ #5, could the Department provide the non-contractual 404 application ahead of the April 1st date?

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 12:49:02 PM  Question Number - 34

In the note for “worksite traffic supervisor” on sheet 76 of the plans, it says that the WTS is paid under the lump sum for maintaining traffic. Will the department add a bid item for this work paid by the month as done in previous ODOT projects of this size and duration?

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 12:48:39 PM  Question Number - 33

Plan sheet 70 Item 615 – Special – Temporary Roads and Pavements lists shoulder reconstruction work and says cost shall be included in the LS. Could the Department assign estimated quantities for this item?

**Question Submitted:** 3/18/2020 4:05:13 PM  Question Number - 32

Please confirm which quantity is correct for the 48" Drilled Shafts into bedrock. The 40 ft on the estimated quantities or given elevations on drawings 21 and 22?

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:54:44 AM  Question Number - 31

Could the Department please provide the min. modulus required for walls TS2, TS4, TS5, and TS6?

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2020 9:09:31 AM  Question Number - 30

Please confirm which quantity is correct for the 48" Drilled Shafts into bedrock. The 40 ft on the estimated quantities or given elevations on drawings 21 and 22?

The 40’ length should be 16’. The 4’ rock socket lengths shown on the plans are correct. The quantity for 524E94904 Drilled Shafts, 48” Diameter, Into Bedrock for structure 1301A will be updated in an upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:54:44 AM  Question Number - 31

Could the Department please provide the min. modulus required for walls TS2, TS4, TS5 and TS6?

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:54:44 AM  Question Number - 31

Could the Department please provide the min. modulus required for walls TS2, TS4, TS5 and TS6?

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:54:44 AM  Question Number - 31

Could the Department please provide the min. modulus required for walls TS2, TS4, TS5 and TS6?

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:54:44 AM  Question Number - 31

Could the Department please provide the min. modulus required for walls TS2, TS4, TS5 and TS6?

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:54:44 AM  Question Number - 31

Could the Department please provide the min. modulus required for walls TS2, TS4, TS5 and TS6?

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:54:44 AM  Question Number - 31

Could the Department please provide the min. modulus required for walls TS2, TS4, TS5 and TS6?

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:54:44 AM  Question Number - 31

Could the Department please provide the min. modulus required for walls TS2, TS4, TS5 and TS6?
The Mound Street and Front Street intersection work requires full depth concrete pavement and brick paver work to be done in quadrants with 4 way traffic needing to be maintained through here. Please provide an MOT plan for each phase that shows any signal modifications, temporary striping, pedestrian detours and etc required for each phase of work.

**Intersection work at Mound/Front will be added to the MOT phasing plans and details in an upcoming addendum.**

**Bid item 241 – Conduit, Misc.: Sewer Video Inspection plan notes on sheet 69 do not provide any flow data for the lines to be inspected. Can flow data be provided for the lines to be video inspected?**

No flow date is available. The sewers should be able to be video inspected without bypass pumping. However, a contingency bid item will be provided for bypass pumping in a future addendum.

**Bypass Pumping is detailed to be included in bid item 245 – Special – COC 18” Conduit, C905 pipe. Does the City of Columbus have any additional details to provide for the bypass pumping required? In ODOT Project 200002, bypass pump pick up and discharge points were provided prior to bid time. Can the required pick up and discharge points be provided? Will any laterals need to be bypassed pumped from any cleanouts, if so can these locations be provided? In addition, can the high and low flow rates be provided for the lines to be bypassed in this item?**

No flows are available. For bidding purposes please assume full flows for the 18” sanitary that needs to be rerouted. There are not any active taps for the section that is being rerouted. The Liberty Place apartments on the SE corner of Short/W. Fulton are served via a separate system that connects to the Franklin Main sewer further south of the project. The only connections to this 18” sewer are on the west side of Short Street. The City is requiring the flow be picked up at the existing manhole on Short St at Sta. 11+25.55, 4.9’ LT. The manhole location will be added to the general notes on Sheet 69 in an addendum.

**Bid item 241 – Conduit, Misc.: Sewer Video Inspection (Sheet 69) lists the sewer lines that are going to require video inspection; OSIS, Franklin Main, Peters Run / Southside relief outlet repairs and Peters Run Branch Southern Relief Sewer as areas in which this bid item will be utilized. No plan details are provide for anticipated limits of inspection, access points and required MOT for this work. Can additional plans and or details be provided to properly estimate this work?**

The limits of inspection coincide with the construction limits, and the access points for inspection are the nearest manholes. DOSD mapping will be included in an upcoming addendum to show manhole locations. MOT shall be setup as per City of Columbus SCD 1550.

**REF Sheet 694 Item 511 - QC2 Concrete, Misc.: Floodwall says this item shall conform to CMS 511, Including QC/QA. Could the Department add "with QC/QA" to the biditem description as this is the indication that the item includes QC/QA testing per CMS 511.04.**

The note on sheet 694 states that QC/QA is to be included. No changes will be made to the plans.

**On Wall 4W2, can you please confirm that the Structural Steel, Level 4 is ASTM A709 Grade 50 and that there will be no coating applied to this material? There are no notes on the plans indicating that there is a coating system. If ODOT does want these girders to be coated, we would suggest one coat of inorganic zinc primer. Please advise.**

The structural steel is ASTM A709 Grade 50. No coating will be needed.

**ON Wall 4W2, can you please confirm the weight of the Structural Steel Members, Level 4? The weight on the plans is 1,114,151 LBS; however, we believe that the weight is much less than this.**

The weight for Item 513 - Structural Steel Members, Level 4 at Wall 4W2 should be 325,363 LBS. Quantity will be updated in the plan and proposal in a future addendum.
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**Question Submitted:** 3/12/2020 3:51:26 PM  Question Number - 23

Plans pages 1208 through 1210 appear to indicate special finishing requirement on concrete sidewalks and driveways. Please provide details and indicate where this will be paid for.

*The special finishing with buff wash and seeded aggregate are only for Front St between the Fulton and Livingston intersections. In a future addendum this will be clarified in the plan notes.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:09:14 PM  Question Number - 22

Plan page 582 has notes regarding Ref # 60 Walkway, Misc 6”x6” Concrete Pavers – 2449 sf. The note in top left of page says “Concrete Base, Aggregate Base, and Subgrade Compaction shall be included in item 608 - Walkway, Misc 6”x6” Concrete Pavers”. However, Ref # 183 6” Concrete Base, Class QC 1P – 273 sy is set up specifically for the base under these same 6”x6” pavers, see plan view on page 629, typical sections page 44, and office pavement calculations page 18/18. Should the cost of the 6” Concrete Base be excluded from Ref #60?

*The note at the top of page 582 regarding Ref #60 Walkway, Misc 6”x6” Concrete Pavers – 2449 sf is correct. Concrete Base, Aggregate Base, and Subgrade Compaction shall be included in Item 608 – Walkway, Misc 6”x6” Concrete Pavers, as noted in 608.03. The quantity of Ref # 183 6” Concrete Base, Class QC 1P will be adjusted in a future addendum to delete payment under Ref # 183. The pay item 6” Concrete Base will be removed from the general summary and proposal in a future addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:08:46 PM  Question Number - 21

Ref # 0205 – Curb Misc: Columbus 18” Sandstone Curb – 141ft is set up in the Bid Proposal. However, we cannot find it in the General Summary, Sub Summaries, or Pavement Calculations. Please clarify where this item is to be used, including plan notes and details.

*Ref # 0205 – Curb Misc: Columbus 18” Sandstone Curb – 141ft will be removed from the proposal in an upcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:07:33 PM  Question Number - 20

The signal pole support details on Sht 1719 call out for a L6x4x1/2 to be welded to the stiffener plates. Can the welding details for these angles be provided?

*The welding details of the L6x4x1/2 to the stiffener plates will be provided in the revised sheet 1719 in an upcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:07:06 PM  Question Number - 19

The weld symbol shown on Sht 1713 for AEP Utility Support Detail calls out the fillet welds between the utility support and 3/8in x 5in connection plate to be shop welded. We are assuming these should be field welded. Please clarify.

*They should be field welded. The field weld symbol will be added in an upcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:06:26 PM  Question Number - 18

Currently we are assuming field painting the utility supports for Bridge 1395C is included in the painting biditems provided. Could the Department please confirm or give direction on where this is to be paid?

*The painting of the utility supports will be paid with references 1170, 1171 and 1172.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:05:38 PM  Question Number - 17

The framing plan for Br. 1395C on Sheet 1708 calls out Intermediate Crossframes and Utility Supports. It appears the designer used a breakline to differentiate but this doesn’t seem to be consistent nor noted based on crossframe spacing provided. Can the Department please clarify which members are Intermediate Crossframes (Paid by LB in REF 1168) and which members are Utility Supports (Paid in LS Items REF 1183/1184)?

*New sheets with better labeling will be included in an upcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:05:09 PM  Question Number - 16

Plan sheet 62 is not provided. Could the Department please verify this sheet is not used or provide via addendum?

*Sheet 62 is “not used” as listed within the Sheet Index on Sheet 2.*
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**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:04:50 PM   **Question Number - 15**
The approach slab notes on this project note that the concrete parapets and rebar are included in Item 526 Reinforced Concrete Approach Slabs for payment. This is not in line with Standard Drawing AS-1-15 nor current ODOT practice in recent years. Could the Department please ask the designer to modify the plans and biditems accordingly?

*This design was scoped years ago and at this time it would be cost prohibitive for the department to pay for this restructuring of the contract. If the way the payment is being made is unclear and/or will lead to inequity between bidders please restate the question so we can fix anything that needs fixed without incurring unnecessary cost.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 5:03:48 PM   **Question Number - 14**
Could the Department make the HEC RAS hydraulics files available?

*HEC RAS hydraulic files are posted.*

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 9:25:14 AM   **Question Number - 13**
Note 615 – Special – Temporary Roads And Pavements, Sheet 70, States To Use SCD MT-95.30, However It Is More Likely That The Existing Shoulders Have Reinforced Concrete Pavement, See Note C Sheet 22. If That Is The Case Utilizing SCD MT-95.30 Is Not Feasible And 32” Temporary Barrier Might Be Required; Could ODOT Clarify Whether Or Not Reinforced Concrete Would Be Encountered In The Areas Listed Under The Plan Note?

Sheet 49 accurately depicts existing conditions, which are full depth asphalt shoulders and reinforced concrete in the traveled lanes. The note on sheet 70 will be revised and the statement “THE EXISTING SHOULDERS SHALL BE REPLACED WITH A BUILDUP MATCHING THE EXISTING LANE PAVEMENT WHERE TRAFFIC WILL USE THESE SHOULDERS DURING CONSTRUCTION” will be removed. The shoulder typical section on sheet 22 currently shows a full-depth shoulder rebuilding with underdrains, stabilization, and aggregate base. This will be revised to show a 9” milling of existing asphalt pavement and placement of 7.5” of 302 and 1.5” of surface course onto the existing 301 base course, which shall be constructed as per SCD MT-101.90 with nightly lane closures. This work will be paid under Item 615 - Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A, As Per Plan.

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 9:02:43 AM   **Question Number - 12**
Note 615-Roads For Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan, Sheet 77, States That This Item Shall Be As Directed By The Engineer, And The Payment Shall Be At The Contract Lump Sum Under Reference 644. Could ODOT Assign Estimated Quantities For This Item?

Bid item 0644 615E10001 – Roads for Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan (LS) will be removed from the plans and proposal in a future addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 9:01:41 AM   **Question Number - 11**
Note Temporary Fence, Sheet 73, States That This Item Shall Be Included In Item 614 - Maintaining Under Reference 1223. Could ODOT Assign Estimated Quantities And Separate Reference Number For This Item?

A separate pay item will be added by addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/5/2020 4:50:00 PM   **Question Number - 10**
Plan sheet 66, Endangered Bat Habitat Removal note says no trees shall be removed from April 1 through September 30. The contractor will need to clear trees along the Scioto River in order to gain access. There is also a Clearing and Grubbing note on sheet 53 that says no trees are specifically marked for removal. Does the Department have another contract in place to remove trees for access by April 1, 2020? If not the project could see a delay in critical path thru the river bridge work.

There is a separate contract to remove trees. The Contractor is almost finished with the work, but will be absolutely done by March 31. Stumps and brush will be left in place, and bidders should make a site visit after the 31st to assess the level of effort required to complete the clearing.

**Question Submitted:** 3/5/2020 1:52:16 PM   **Question Number - 9**
Sheet 77 provides notes for Biditem 625 Maintaining Traffic, Misc. Bridge Deck and Pavement Patching. In the notes it says the item shall be bid at $1.00. This item isn’t fixed at $1.00 in the proposal file. Should this be a fixed item and if so, please correct in the bid file.

The Proposal will be updated via addendum to fix the item at $1.00.

*** 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.***
Phase 2 sequence of construction notes on sheet 83 tells the contractor to remove the 70E/71N exit ramp to Front Street. This closure is needed in order to start the work on wall 4W4 and the rear abutment of the Ramp C5 bridge to CBD (FRA-70-1390C). This triggers the 365 day closure duration for that ramp to get opened back up, which carries $5,000/day LD’s. The plans show this ramp opening up after Phase 4, which fulfills the Interim Completion Date of 6/1/22 on sheet 70. Completing Phases 2 - 4 in 365 calendar days is not reasonable considering Phase 3 requires Short Street to be re-opened before Front Street demolition and rear abutment construction can begin. Please extend the closure duration to match up with the interim completion date (730 days).

The allowable time between the closure of the I-70E to Front St ramp and the opening of the I-70E to Fulton St ramp will be changed to 28 months in an upcoming addendum. The $5000/day in liquidated damages will remain the same.

The proposal includes special clauses for CSX Railroad, but not Norfolk Southern. Could the Department provide the NS special clauses so we can obtain RR Protective Liability Insurance quotes?

The special clause for Norfolk Southern will be addressed in a future addendum.

The Waterway Permit and 408 Permit are listed on Sheet 1 one of the plans as part of the Special Provisions. We cannot locate these documents. Could the Department please provide?

The 404 Waterway Permit will be the Regional General Permit, but we will not be able to post the contractual 404 until April 1. The main provisions of the 408 Floodwall Permit are covered in the Emergency Action Plan and the USACE SOP on levee compaction. We will post any other special provisions April 1.

Line # 342 is a 75 KVA Single Phase Pad Mount Transformer. Can you please specify the Primary and Secondary voltages? There are also no notes regarding the Pad Mount Transformers. Thank you.

The 75kVA transformer located on Front Street for the irrigation box will have 120/240V secondary voltages. The 75kVA transformer located on Livingston Avenue has a 240/480V secondary voltage. The primary voltage should be 14,400 Grd Y / 8320 V – a total two primary bushings for a single-phase loop feed. GPD will add the voltages to the plan sheets for the padmount transformer located on Front Street. The voltage for the transformer located on Livingston Avenue can be found on sheet 922B. Notes for the Padmount Transformers will be added to the General Notes as an addendum.

Please provide the geotechnical reports for the project.

The geotechnical reports will be posted for bidders.

In order to facilitate construction, would the Department allow SIP deck forms to be used on this project? In particular SIP forms would improve constructibility of the FRA-70-1321A Scioto River Bridge.

The Department will not allow SIP deck forms to be used on this project.

Could the Department please provide the Pavement Calculations in Excel format?

Calculations in Excel format will be posted for bidders.

*** 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.****
### Project No. 200160
**ATH-99578 - SR 56-10.57**

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 8:32:20 AM  |  **Question Number:** 1

Could you provide some guidance for performance of this incentive/disincentive project relative to current uncertainties in labor and materials availabilities due to coronavirus. It appears that the goal for this project is to complete while school is out of session. Those dates would be uncertain at this point as well?

**Impacts to Incentive/Disincentive dates will be addressed per the applicable contract clauses, specifically those within CMS 108.06. The date limitations found within the existing plans will be a bid condition.**

### Project No. 200162
**CLI-108417 - /WAR-SR 350-08.97/01.56**

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2020 8:03:11 AM  |  **Question Number:** 3

Will the 3/26/2020 letting be delayed due to the current stay at home order?

**The Department remains committed to the timely delivery of the Capital Program. The scheduled upcoming lettings will continue as maintaining the Transportation system is considered an Essential Activity.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 1:32:03 PM  |  **Question Number:** 2

There is an Endangered Bat Habitat Removal Note. Are there any trees that will need to be removed inside the project limits? If so, will the completion date be moved to accommodate for the removal?

**There do not appear to be any trees that will need to be cleared within the project limits. The completion date does not need to be adjusted.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/4/2020 1:22:47 PM  |  **Question Number:** 1

Sheet 11/20 - CLI-350-0897 has Pipe Removed >24". This quantity does not match the linear footage of the 72" x 44" box culvert. However, sheet 15/20 - WAR-350-0156 shows the box culvert being removed under "Structure Removed - LS". Please clarify the removal items and quantities.

See upcoming addendum. Structure Removed (LS) will be added to CLI-350-0897 to account for portion of culvert that is concrete box. Pipe Removed >24" to remain for removal of CMP arch portion of culvert.

### Project No. 200163
**CUY-96673 - IR 90-09.70 L&R Paint**

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 7:14:26 PM  |  **Question Number:** 7

Plan sheet 3 of 8 states that the contractor shall maintain a minimum of 15.75 feet vertical clearance at all times when trains are operating. Plan sheet 7 of 8 has a chart showing required vs. actual minimum vertical clearances. This information is contradicting. What is the minimum allowable vertical clearance above tracks? Above electric lines?

**Per Note 1 on sheet 7/8, the chart and details shown on that sheet is taken from existing drawings and shall be used for information only. See sheet 3/8 for the minimum vertical clearance. See Railroad Agreement and OSHA requirements for any work close to the electric lines.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 9:10:08 AM  |  **Question Number:** 6

This question is a follow up on Q&A #5. To be clear, the weekend outages contemplated in the project plans do not apply to all of the tracks. Is that correct?

**This is correct.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2020 4:20:50 PM  |  **Question Number:** 5

Sheet 3 of 8 of the plans states that there will be 3 weekend outages to be used by the project to work within the GCRTA ROW. Is the entire track envelope on this project to be considered GCRTA? There seems to be some confusion related to that in the previous prebid questions and answers.

**The six railroad lines belong to the following railroad company, from west to east:1: NS Ind. Siding.2 and 3: GCRTA Redline.4 and 5: NS Chicago Line.6: NS Ind. Siding. All lines are active.**

---

*** 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:** 3/20/2020 5:24:37 PM  Question Number - 4
Are there any as-builts/existing structure drawings available for this project?

**Existing plans have been posted.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/12/2020 2:45:43 PM  Question Number - 3
The revised plans have allowed for a third weekend outage of the GCRTA tracks. However, the 100-120 freight trains per day plus 4 passenger trains per day on the Norfolk Southern tracks have not been addressed. Furthermore, the GCRTA tracks are located in between the four NS tracks, negating the GCRTA outages. How is ODOT going to address this issue with the Norfolk Southern tracks?

**Since the Letter Agreement for this Project was executed in April of 2018, the entire rail industry has seen a reduction in traffic on many of their lines running through the State, and running fewer (but longer) trains, including NS’s Chicago Line, which is still running the 4 Amtrak trains, with freight traffic now averaging about 60-65 trains/day. The RR’s do not provide a ‘schedule’ as trains basically operate when needed, so ODOT is unable to provide a firm schedule. Usually starting late Sunday thru Tuesday there is some slight reduction of train traffic on the Chicago Line. NS will normally work w/the Contractor involved on any OH bridge project if dedicated track time is needed for certain tasks, assuming the Contractor can be flexible in his activities of work.**

**Proposal note states up to 120 trains per day for Norfolf Southern RR which averages out to 5 trains per hour. Can ODOT get any more info from Norfolk in regarding to a more accurate schedule? Are there certain days, weekends, and nights that the train traffic is less?**

**Since the Letter Agreement for this Project was executed in April of 2018, the entire rail industry has seen a reduction in traffic on many of their lines running through the State, and running fewer (but longer) trains, including NS’s Chicago Line, which is still running the 4 Amtrak trains, with freight traffic now averaging about 60-65 trains/day. The RR’s do not provide a ‘schedule’ as trains basically operate when needed, so ODOT is unable to provide a firm schedule. Usually starting late Sunday thru Tuesday there is some slight reduction of train traffic on the Chicago Line. NS will normally work w/the Contractor involved on any OH bridge project if dedicated track time is needed for certain tasks, assuming the Contractor can be flexible in his activities of work.**

**Regarding plan page 2 – Maintain Existing Lighting, please provide additional details for the Unknown Cable attached to the girder flange. Who owns this utility? Is it active? Is it energized? Can it be removed? It appears to be in NS horizontal clearance restrictions.**

**We have contacted NS and many other possible utility companies. Nobody claimed the ownership of the cable. This cable should be temporarily lowered for the painting of the bottom flange. The cost for the temporary relocation has been included on the plan.**

**Project No. 200164**

**CUY-103165 - LG FY2020**

**Sales Date - 3/26/2020**

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 4:48:00 PM  Question Number - 6
For Bid Ref 34, will Cooper Lighting’s CST-8-4-D-8-T5-7030-20X-SS-AP-U81898 be considered as an approved equal to the specified items. The Luminaire Product Family is listed on ODOT’s SS-813.

**The Cooper low mast luminaire noted in the prebid question is on the Office of Roadway Engineering approved list and thus can be considered an approved equal. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 4:46:43 PM  Question Number - 5
For Bid Ref 33, will Cooper Lighting’s CST-8-6-D-8-T5-7030-20X-SS-AP-U83940 be considered as an approved equal to the specified items. The Luminaire Product Family is listed on ODOT’s SS-813.

**The Cooper high mast luminaire noted in the prebid question is on the Office of Roadway Engineering approved list and thus can be considered an approved equal. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 4:38:05 PM  Question Number - 4
For Bid Ref 32, will Cooper Lighting’s VERD-***-D-U-T3-7030-4B be considered as an approved equal to the specified items. Luminaire Product Family is listed on ODOT’s SS-813.

**The Cooper conventional luminaire noted in the prebid question is on the Office of Roadway Engineering approved list and thus can be considered an approved equal. Please bid accordingly.**

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

Question Submitted: 3/20/2020 4:24:50 PM  Question Number - 3
For Bid Ref 35, would Cooper Lighting's WKP-6B-LED-E-U-GL-AP-10K-7030-B-DU90020-WG/WPPL Luminaire be considered as an approved equal to the specified item. Luminaire Product Family is listed on ODOT's SS-813

The Cooper underpass luminaire noted in the prebid question is on the Office of Roadway Engineering approved list and thus can be considered an approved equal. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 3/19/2020 1:12:20 PM  Question Number - 2
Regarding the new pole foundations – ODOT Standard Drawing HL-20.11 Note 6 states the reinforcing steel may be assembled in cages by approved welding of bars / welding of the reinforcing steel required or are tied connections acceptable for the cages?

The reinforcing steel cages may be assembled by welding, per note 6 on Standard Drawing HL-20.11, or by tied connections.

Question Submitted: 3/13/2020 4:45:34 PM  Question Number - 1
REF. 35 calls for an underpass luminaire with 72 watts, 6,400 lumens, 3000K color temp, 240 Volts, Type III distribution & wire guard. Please advise if GE Lighting's EWNB LED underpass fixture with 120-277 Volts, Type III Distribution, 6,200 lumens / 58 Watts, and 3000K color temp with a WG-EFN wire guard is considered an approved equal to what is being specified in the plans. GE Part #EWNB-0-B3-7-30-1-N-GRAY-R-001

The GE underpass luminaire noted in the prebid question is on the Office of Roadway Engineering Approved List and thus can be considered an approved equal. Please bid accordingly.

Project No. 200165  
CUY-106932 - SR 175-07.30  
Sale Date - 3/26/2020

Question Submitted: 3/24/2020 4:52:18 PM  Question Number - 2
The typical sections show 6 inch underdrains up against the backside of the pavement and integral curbs. The stone making up these underdrains will be damaged during the pavement removal and rigid replacement process. Could the Department provide bid items to restore the damaged underdrains?

This area can be filled with soil. The underdrain will still function. This method has been used in the City's repair programs.

Question Submitted: 3/24/2020 4:36:45 PM  Question Number - 1
Sections of full depth pavement removal and rigid replacement have a 6 inch integral curb attached. Per CMS curbs are covered under specification section 608 and should have a pay item by the foot. Could the Department provide a bid item for this work?

The curb replacement is included in the item 255 As Per Plan. It is referred to in the plan note.

Project No. 200166  
D07-102074 - BP-FY20 (A)  
Sale Date - 3/26/2020

Question Submitted: 2/28/2020 8:35:18 AM  Question Number - 1
The existing plans zip file for these structures are shortcut folders and can not be opened, please repost.

Existing plans has been added to the reference files for this project. They are located at:ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/D07-102074/Reference%20Files/

Project No. 200167  
D07-99859 - BP-FY20 (B)  
Sale Date - 3/26/2020

Question Submitted: 3/17/2020 12:30:04 PM  Question Number - 4
The answer provided for question 3 was incorrect on the scupper VERTICAL EXTENSIONS. This is not for lengthening, this is for vertically extending or RAISING the top of the scupper. Please advise where the detail for the EXTENSION is shown.

There is no raising of the top of the scuppers listed/identified/noted in the plans. There are 2 pay items on the SHE-75-1347 regarding scuppers. The first, “Scupper, Vertical Extension” is for replacing the bottom of the 3 corroded scuppers identified on the plan view of Sheet 31 and detailed on Detail A on Sheet 34. The second, “Scupper, Lengthening” is for extending the bottom of the remaining 9 scuppers on the bridge below the bottom of the bottom beam flanges, as detailed on the Half Transverse Section on Sheet 34.

*** 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:**  3/17/2020 9:24:20 AM  Question Number - 3
Please advise where the required "raise" for the 3 scupper vertical extensions are shown.

*It is assumed that the question is referring to the scupper lengthing on the SHE-75-1347 structure due to deterioration. Locations are detailed on sheet 31, with details on sheet 34, Detail A. All other scuppers on SHE-75-1347 are to be extended as noted on sheet 31, Half Transverse Section. There is no scupper raising.*

**Question Submitted:**  3/12/2020 1:11:42 PM  Question Number - 2
What size pipe is required for the proposed scupper extensions?

*The diameter of the pipe is a standard 6 inches*

**Question Submitted:**  2/27/2020 2:58:47 PM  Question Number - 1
MOT on page 11 shows portable barrier on the inside shoulder being placed directly against existing median barrier. Please advise why this barrier is being placed.

*Referenced portable barrier is provided to sufficiently anchor tarps down during painting.*

**Project No.  200173**
HIG-105095 - SR 41-02.02  Sale Date - 3/26/2020

**Question Submitted:**  3/23/2020 11:10:41 AM  Question Number - 2
Is a field office required on this project? If so, has ODOT obtained an off-site location for the trailer? Due to estimated project duration - it does not seem as though it is logical.

**Project No.  200174**
HOC-106654 - Main Street Sidewalk  Sale Date - 3/26/2020

**Question Submitted:**  3/20/2020 2:28:57 PM  Question Number - 1
The soil boring provided is on the opposite side of the existing culvert from the proposed crossing. During our site investigation, we believe that the planned bore & jack path may encounter rock. Will additional consideration be given if rock is encountered?

**Project No.  200175**
LAK-110298 - IR 90-13.63 VSL Upgrade  Sale Date - 3/26/2020

**Question Submitted:**  3/14/2020 10:13:38 AM  Question Number - 1
Please clarify the general note for street lighting on plan sheet 14/19. Is the contractor required to submit new electrical drawings, stamped by a professional electrical engineer for the proposed lighting that is shown on plan sheets 15 thru 19? Bid items already exist for the lighting system.

*The contractor does not have to submit stamped lighting drawings. The sealed construction plans provided by the city's consultant are sufficient.*

**Question Submitted:**  3/20/2020 9:40:35 AM  Question Number - 9
Per this plan note found on page 4/53 "SEEDING AND MULCHING SHALL BE APPLIED TO ALL AREAS OF EXPOSED SOIL BETWEEN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY LINES, AND WITHIN THE CONSTRUCTION LIMITS FOR AREAS OUTSIDE THE RIGHT-OF-WAY LINES COVERED BY WORK AGREEMENT OR SLOPE EASEMENT." will the contractor be responsible for seeding and mulching any and all exposed soil in areas outside of the work limits but are inside of the right-of-way lines?

*It is the intent to Seed and Mulch on any disturbed areas.*

**Question Submitted:**  3/20/2020 9:35:19 AM  Question Number - 8
Plan sheet 53 includes a detail for Directional Bore under the Roadway. IR 90 & three local roads under IR 90) For the 3 roadway bridges that require the duct to be directional bored under the local road under the IR 90 over pas, would a bridge attachment for the pipe, as shown for the three bridges crossing water ways be considered for these crossings?

*It is the District preference to have the bridge crossings as designated in the plans.*
Is there any direction for the location or number of end to end splices for the 48F trunk cable? With the exception of SE-01 and SE-11, there is no provisions for end to end splicing on the trunk cable.

Refer to the splicing detail on plan sheets 12 through 14. Follow SS 804 and SS 904.

The Bid tab sheet shows a quantity of 10ft for the 72F and 730ft of the Blown fiber. Given the manufacturer minimum qualities for ordering, is it possible to substitute the 48F cable for these applications?

It is acceptable to our office to use 48 SM in lieu of 24 SM. It is also acceptable, but not preferred, to use two 48 SM in lieu of one 72 SM.

Plan sheets 18, 20 and 36 show an UG utility of 4.7' or less, but the plan notes don't call the crossing for the duct at these locations as "jack or drilled". There is also an unidentified storm sewer pipe on plan sheet 36. What is the minimum cover/separation for the duct to be placed over these UG storm/sewer pipes?

Refer to Note 1 on page 36.

Duraline product specifications allow for splicing in the 4-way duct and have accessories for splicing the duct. Is splicing allowed on 4-way duct on this project installation?

Deferring to SS 804 B.1., Micro-duct pathways is expected to consist of complete runs between pullboxes without splicing.

Bid Item #0008, CONDUIT, MISC.: 4", DIA., 4-WAY MULTICELL, calls for a 4" Multicell conduit to be install per plan as shown on page 52/53. In lieu of the 4” Multicell will ODOT allow the installation of a vacant 4” conduit (either rigid galvanized or fiberglass) in the manner shown on page 52/53 with a MICRO-DUCT 4 CELL PATHWAY (the same conduit used in bid items 0021 & 0022) installed inside of the 4” conduit? The cost of the Micro-Duct 4 Cell Pathway would be incidental to the 4” conduit.

The proposed solution would be acceptable. The outer material should be rigid per CMS 725.04 as the plans state.

This was intended to be a customized product.

Bid Item #21, “MICRO-DUCT PATHWAY, 4 CELL PATHWAY” is to be installed by either trenching or plowing but there is not a bid item for this work. How is the trenching/plowing being paid?

Per SS 804.19 the cost is incidental to the installation.

Will the department require PCMS to alert motorists of the short term closures required for blasting?

No traffic signals are to be used.
Question Submitted: 3/21/2020 10:46:10 AM  Question Number - 7
In regards to haul roads, most the access points to the bike path are township roads that have a 12 ton gross limit posted on them. Will any of these township roads made available to be used to haul a typical load of 35 tons for ingress / egress to the bike path?

Approved haul roads for the project are as follows:
- Martin-Williston Road (TR-7)
- Camper Road (TR-4)
- Opfer-Lentz Road (TR-214)
- Witty Road (TR-50)

Existing load postings on these roads do not apply to work associated with this project. The Contractor may haul typical loads of 35 tons for ingress/egress to the bike path on the listed roads. The Contractor shall route haul trucks and equipment deliveries in an efficient manner to limit the haul length and duration of hauling activities on these roads. C&MS Section 105.13 is applicable for work associated with this project.

Question Submitted: 3/19/2020 12:14:52 AM  Question Number - 6
Please disregard the previous question (5) below regarding the seeding. That question was intended for a different project. It was not intended for 200179.

Question # 5 disregarded.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2020 7:44:49 PM  Question Number - 5
The seeding quantities listed on plan sheet 4 and sheet 7 are way out of balance. With the seeding covered under a lump sum we have no interest quoting the seeding on this project as currently bid.

Question asked of the wrong project. See pre-bid question 6.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2020 8:53:05 AM  Question Number - 4
What is the voltage in the electric lines running along the North side of the bridge over the Portage River? Can these lines be temporarily de-energized?

The electrical line is 12.4kV. It cannot be de-energized.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2020 8:40:13 AM  Question Number - 3
Would stay-in-place metal deck forms be permitted?

Stay in place forms should not be used.

Question Submitted: 3/18/2020 8:36:01 AM  Question Number - 2
Are existing plans available for the structures?

No existing plans are available.

Question Submitted: 3/12/2020 10:38:24 AM  Question Number - 1
REF. 55 - 48" word on pavement - Quantity appears to be understated. Please review and advise.

The quantity for Ref. 55 should be 18 Each instead of 10 Each (Word on Pavement, 48”). See forthcoming addendum.
**Project No. 200182**

WAY-102770 - US 250-19.26

**Sale Date - 3/26/2020**

**Question Submitted:** 3/25/2020 2:59:43 PM  
**Question Number - 2**

Based on the field office bid item quantity, it seems that ODOT intended to provide the contractor 9 months to build this job. As stated in a previous question, the contractor will only realistically have 6 months to build the project based on the bid date and current completion date. Will ODOT be revising the quantity of the field office bid item?

**The pay item will not be revised. The completion date will not be moved. No addendum required.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 3:10:08 PM  
**Question Number - 1**

Will ODOT extend the completion date on this project until 11/30/20 due to the late letting on this project and the phased nature of this work. By the time the job is awarded and a pre-construction meeting is held it will be May before the job can be started.

**The current schedule is aggressive, but constructable. The completion date will stay as October 31, 2020. No addendum required.**

---

**Project No. 200183**

WOO-101242 - US 6-21.02 Resurfacing

**Sale Date - 3/26/2020**

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 11:45:52 AM  
**Question Number - 11**

ref# 33 item 642 Center Line, Type 1 should be 4.34 mi, instead of 8.68 mi?

**The centerline will need to be painted in both directions after the installation of centerline rumble stripes. The department has reviewed the quantity and found it to be correct.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2020 9:10:23 AM  
**Question Number - 10**

It appears there is no PN 520 Fuel Price Adjustment or PN 534 Binder Index Adjustment included in this proposal. Will the department consider adding these two items to the proposal?

**PN 520 Fuel Price Adjustment and PN 534 Binder Index shall be added to the proposal in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 10:44:29 AM  
**Question Number - 9**

Can you add an item for pipe removed, pipe abandoned, catch basin removed, and concrete masonry?

**Quantities for Item 202 Pipe Removed, 24” and Under, Item 202 Special – Fill and Plug Existing Conduit, Item 202 Catch Basin Removed, and Item 602 Concrete Masonry shall be added to the general summary in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 3:22:17 PM  
**Question Number - 8**

The road closure due to structure replacement will impede with hauling resurfacing material to and from the project, and there is not ample time to perform resurfacing work between opening the road by 7/30 (required per plan) and completing the project by 8/31. Will ODOT consider extending the completion date to 9/30?

**The contract completion date will be extended to 9/30/20 via a forthcoming addendum. The 30 day closure period for the work associated with the WOO-6-2225 structure shall still take place between 6/15/20 and 7/30/20.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/18/2020 2:10:35 PM  
**Question Number - 7**

Measurement for Ref No. 19, Pavement Repair is in Square Yards. Plan calculations on sheet 6 expresses quantity in Cubic Yards. Please check to see which is correct.

**The calculations shown on sheet 6 are correct. The item code and units shown on the general summary shall be revised to Item 253e02000, Pavement Repair, 1085 CY in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/18/2020 1:09:34 PM  
**Question Number - 6**

Does the 208 Vibration Monitoring Item include monitoring of all 4.42 miles of the project during all construction activities, or is this item limited to the construction limits and activities of the WOO-6-225 structure replacement?

**The Item 208 Vibration Monitoring pertains to the work associated with the WOO-6-2225 structure replacement.**

---

*** 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:** 3/10/2020 2:38:35 PM  
**Question Number - 5**

REF 35 - 646E2000 Rail Road Symbol  Would the Department consider allowing Item 647 Heat Fused Preformed Thermoplastic Pavement Marking to be used.

The following items shall have their item codes revised on sheet 6/29 and in the general summary in a forthcoming addendum:

- Item 644 Stop Line, Type 1: 77FT
- Item 644 Railroad Symbol Marking: 2 Each

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 2:33:14 PM  
**Question Number - 4**

There are no pay items listed in proposal or general summary for items listed on sheet 8/29. WZ Marking Signs, WZ Center line Class I Replacement Sign, Replacement Drum. The quantity listed for WZ Marking sign appears to understated. The quantity listed for WZ Center line Class I appears overstated. Please advise.

Quantities for the following items on sheet 8/29 shall be revised in a forthcoming addendum:

- Item 614 – Work Zone Marking Sign: 28 Each
- Item 614 – Work Zone Marking Center Line, Class 1: 15 Mile
- Item 614 – Replacement Sign: 5 Each
- Item 614 – Replacement Drum: 5 Each

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 9:23:32 AM  
**Question Number - 3**

On sheet 8 of plans there is a note for work zone markings with a quantity of 15Mi of work zone center line class I. However I do not see this as a bid item. Can this be added to the proposal?

WORK ZONE CENTER LINE, CLASS 1 was added in Addenda 1 dated 3/19/2020.

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 12:13:11 PM  
**Question Number - 2**

Will soil borings be provided to help identify any potential for rock excavation at the proposed box culvert construction area?

Soil borings were not performed for the culvert replacement. Excavation shall be paid under Item 503e11100 Unclassified Excavation. Should the contractor encounter rock during excavation, removal shall be paid as per C&MS 109.05.

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 12:02:25 PM  
**Question Number - 1**

Will a pay item be added to address excavation from the bottom of existing pavement elevation to subgrade, for the intersection reconstruction at Wayne Rd.?

An addendum shall be issued for the project adding Item 203 Excavation quantities between Stations 1171+50 and 1173+00 for the intersection at Wayne Road and shall include a typical section for the Wayne Road pavement reconstruction.

**Project No.** 200184  
ATB-108817 - Culverts FY2020

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2020 4:31:53 PM  
**Question Number - 5**

For the 54" Headwall will the department allow a pre-cast headwall

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2020 7:12:54 AM  
**Question Number - 4**

Is this bid date going to remain 3/26?

The Department remains committed to the timely delivery of the Capital Program. The scheduled upcoming lettings will continue as maintaining the Transportation system is considered an Essential Activity.

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 11:24:42 AM  
**Question Number - 3**

The previous answer to our request for a map showing the location of the 60" dia scope directed us to a website to use the PID# to search. The PID # 108817 wasn't an option to search by. Please provide an updated link or drawing showing the 60" dia location.

https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/map?pids=59883

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2020 4:36:11 PM  
**Question Number - 2**

Will the Owner confirm whether the 60" Dia spray rehab work is 100’ (as shown on drawing 11) or 35’ as shown in bid schedule?

The quantity for the rehab work is 100ft. The column that the 35 is in is not the quantity column in the proposal.

*** 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.***
Will the Owner provide maps showing the location of 60" spray rehab?

A map of the location can be found using https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims by entering the PID in the search by PID.

**Project No.  200185**

CUY-109249 - BH FY2020 Wearing Surface

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2020 4:35:04 PM  Question Number - 1

Will the Owner provide maps showing the location of 60" spray rehab?

A map of the location can be found using https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims by entering the PID in the search by PID.

**Project No.  200191**

HEN-111101 - US 6-12.47 Heat Straighten

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 12:14:54 PM  Question Number - 3

The 5 day closure does not allow enough time to perform the repairs and paint the structure. Please consider allowing single lane closures to perform the repairs and use the closure to paint the structure.

The allowable closure duration will be extended to 7 consecutive calendar days via a forthcoming addendum. Single lane closures with flaggers and/or temporary signals will not be allowed due to the close proximity of the entrance/exit ramps at the US 6/24 interchange.

---

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
The project shall be bid to complete the work within the 5 day allowable closure timeframe established in the plans.

Please establish a bid item for Item 630E97700 Signing Misc.: Sign Support Assembly, Wood Post Mounted (Approximately 50 each). This item is required to mount many signs onto a single wood post, which is indicated at many locations on this project. An additional item 630E79500 Sign Support Assembly, Pole Mounted (Approximately 30 each) can be expected to be needed on the project as well. Both of these items will avoid the need to add the items by change order at a later date.

Project No. 200193
SAN-101130 - SIGN FY2020
Sale Date - 3/26/2020

Project No. 200196
CRA-102635 - SR 19-26.18
Sale Date - 4/9/2020

Could the asbestos inspection be made available online?

Project No. 200197
CUY-108655 - IR 271-10.24 Noise Barrier
Sale Date - 4/9/2020

Please verify quantities for both Ref #36 – Special – Noise Barrier (Reflective), Concrete and Ref #37 - Special – Noise Barrier (Reflective), Fiberglass. It seems that the quantities in the plans and proposal are overstated. The quantities in the plans appear to be measured from the highest elevation and lowest elevation at any given post at any stepped post location. This height at the stepped posts are taller than the actual adjacent panels. Please review and revise these quantities.

The pre-bid question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.

Regarding item 620E700 - the detail on sheet 7 appears to be a stand alone post on a small base not a continous curbing/separater system as is usually used with this pay item. Is the intent to just have a single stand alone delineator be used? If so, what are the requirements for minimum width of the delineator? For instance, the delineators used on the continuous curbing systems are large diameter (5"+) The glue down flex posts are smaller at 2" or less.

The intent of the proposed traffic separator posts are to be stand-alone on individual bases spaced at 50’ as per the plans. Continuous curbing was not chosen due to drainage considerations of the higher speed facility. The width requirements would be as per manufacturers specifications for stand-alone single base applications.
### Project No.  200211

**STA-106135 - SR 21-21.30**

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2020 11:56:05 AM  
**Question Number - 4**

Question Counter 3: Below pre-bid submitted: will the department allow form hangers to extend past the edge of the flanges and remain exposed? Please note District is reviewing response provided to above pre-bid question and will respond once resolved.

---

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 9:21:41 AM  
**Question Number - 3**

The transverse sections for bridge STA-21-2130 show the bridge being constructed using A vertical haunch, will standard ODOT haunches be allowed? If the answer is no, will the department allow form hangers to extend past the edge of the flanges and remain exposed?

Please follow transverse section as shown on plan with vertical haunches. Form hangers will be permitted to extend past the edge of the flanges and remain exposed

---

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 9:10:40 AM  
**Question Number - 2**

References 77 and 78 are not QC/QA was this the intent?

Please follow items as shown on plan

---

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2020 2:58:20 PM  
**Question Number - 1**

Would the State consider lowering the DBE goal of 10%? With little work outside of a prime that is a DBE the 10% will be difficult to achieve.

ODOT will not lower the DBE goal. Prime contractor will need to submit Good Faith Efforts if unable to meet the DBE goal. This process is referenced in Proposal Note 13

### Project No.  200213

**WAR-109049 - SR 63-IORY**

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 4:31:21 PM  
**Question Number - 1**

Plan page 11 shows several of the vehicular signals are to have “blank” lens. What is meant by this? The lens are part of the LED that fits into the signal and only come with colors. Additionally it is not recommended to not install an LED and leave the opening uncovered. Can a clarification be given as to what is to be provided for this?

The appropriate lens color should be placed in the space that is designated as blank. The contractor shall not connect any conductors so that the lens noted as “blank” will not be lit at any time.

---

**Question Submitted:** 3/17/2020 8:30:23 AM  
**Question Number - 2**

Can ODOT confirm that both courses of the Double Chip Seal are intended to utilize Type A material?

As per C&MS 422.09: When placing a Double Chip Seal, the 1st course is Type A gradation, and the 2nd course is Type B gradation.

---

**Question Submitted:** 3/17/2020 8:25:40 AM  
**Question Number - 1**

Would ODOT consider omitting the second sentence of CMS 422.01 and the requirements of 422.12 in their entirety, deleting the 2 year warranty?

No. Bid plan as shown.

### Project No.  202001


**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 9:55:55 AM  
**Question Number - 9**

What is the engineer’s estimate for this project?

The Department does not post the Engineer’s estimate until after bid opening

---

*** 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.***
Is sand an appropriate backfill material for the house demolition?

Per the Item 202, Building Demolished, As Per Plan note the backfill will be with Item 611 Structural Backfill which references 703.11 not 703.16.

Item 202, Building Demolished, As Per Plan states Basements will be filled and compacted with structural backfill according to CMS 203. Please clarify it is the intent of this note to utilize CMS 703.16 Suitable Materials for Embankment Construction and compacted per CMS 203.

The EBS File is currently not available on the ODOT website. Is this correct and if so when will the EBS be available?

This project is open to all bidders, prequalified and non-prequalified, and is bidding at www.bidexpress.com. Please see Addendum #1 for detailed information.

Please confirm there are no trees which have bat date restrictions within the limits of removal area.

An MOT plan is not included in the drawings provided. Are there any lane closure restrictions on U.S. 62? Will the contractor be allowed to restrict Eastbound and Westbound traffic down to one lane to allow for construction equipment work space. And will the contractor be allowed to close Gross Ave., St. Elmo, and Rowland Ave. to local traffic only with Type III barricades without a detour?

An addendum will be issued to clarify

The plans state on Pg. 4 of 19 that the contractor shall obtain a sanitary disconnect permit from the Stark County Sanitary Engineering Dept. at a cost of five dollars $5.00 Each. The Sanitary Engineering Dept. stated they are $30.00 per each permit. Please confirm the accuracy of the permit cost stated in the plans.

The department has an agreement with Stark County Sanitary Engineering dept. that the cost will be $5 for this project.

I located the file on the FTP site for surveys, but there are only 27 surveys included in the zip file. How do you want us to bid the other sites or do you have surveys for those as well?

As asbestos reports become available, the department will continue to update the FTP reference site with new reports.

Where can we view the asbestos surveys for the buildings to be demolished?

the available asbestos reports can be found on ODOT’s FTP site. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/

Scope Section 10.3.B requires EB I-74 shoulders to be replaced full depth from SLM 18.15 to BR 1892. However, 10.3.I states that shoulders reconstructed by PID 104667 do not need replaced. PID 104667 BU 14 demonstrates portions of I74 EB median shoulders being reconstructed. This does not align with the answer to Question #93 stating that the I74 EB median shoulders were being non-performed. Please provide clarification as to the work required for the I-74 EB median shoulders.

*** 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:** 3/26/2020 12:43:08 PM  Question Number - 98

Scope section 10.3.2 requires the Access Road to be asphalt. However, MCE 5A Buildable Unit 13 shows the asphalt pavement limits being generally for the access road drive apron with the remaining part of the access road being Item 304 8” aggregate base on Item 206 cement stabilization. Can ODOT confirm that the asphalt pavement limits per 10.3.2 for the Access Road are limited to the drive apron?

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 12:25:01 PM  Question Number - 97

Appendix G1 provides Inclinometer readings through 09-30-2019. Is it possible to have more current data provided?

The inclinometers will be read in the near future. The updated information will be added to the scope by addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 12:21:47 PM  Question Number - 96

Per the scope of services Section 1.1, and further clarified in prebid question #89, the design speed for WB 74 is 60 mph. The original construction plans of WB 74 was designed for 60 mph for both horizontal and vertical alignments. However, design standards have significantly changed since the original construction. Current standards require a stopping sight distance that is approx. 100’ longer, as well as a height of eye that is 1-ft lower (from 4.5’ to 3.5’). With the proposed reconstruction of WB 74 in PID 83723, a 60 mph design speed was used for the vertical alignment, and a 50 mph design speed for the horizontal alignment. This design equated to a SSD of 53 mph for the inside shoulder on WB 74 (on HAM-74-1908L). PID 83723 also provided for a larger radius on the horizontal curve, as well as a widened inside shoulder of 8.25’ on HAM-74-1908L. The proposed barrier was designed as 42” tall. Had the SSD been met for this curve (60 mph) in PID 83723, and with a 42” high barrier, the inside shoulder would have had to been widened to 15.4’. With this project (PID 104668), the DBT is required to make adjustments to the existing profile and structure (which is to remain) to achieve the 60 mph design speed for both horizontal and vertical alignments. To account for the 60 mph SSD, the inside shoulder must be increased to approx. 18’ to meet current design criteria (570’ per L&D Volume 1, Figure 201-1). Is it ODOT’s intent to construct an 18’ wide inside shoulder on HAM-74-1908L to meet SSD criteria? If not, Section C309.4.3.1 of the BDM states, “on bridges where the 42-in Single Slope (SBR-1-20) barrier system causes a stopping sight distance (SSD) issue, 36-inch New Jersey (BR-1-13) barrier can be used”. Will ODOT consider using the BR-1-13 barrier on HAM-74-1908L, in lieu of constructing additional substructure/superstructure to reduce the required width of the inside shoulder?

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 4:27:18 PM  Question Number - 95

Department Update: The Department is providing the following in regard to the procurement schedule for Project 20-3000, Mill Creek Expressway 5B.

The Department will be issuing an addendum to delay the remaining procurement schedule for Project 20-3000 (Mill Creek Expressway Phase 5B) due to the decline in revenue caused by the COVID19 crisis. This delay will permit the Department to continue to deliver other projects on-time and minimize impacts of these new fiscal constraints. The following procurement dates will be revised. Intermediate Technical Proposal Submission deadline: Thursday, May 21, 2020. PTI Meeting Date (approximately): May 28, 2020. Final Technical and Proposal Due Date: Friday, June 19, 2020. The Anticipated Successful Offeror will be announced on (or approximately) Thursday, July 2, 2020. Anticipated Award will be approximately Monday, July 13, 2020. The deadline for ATC submission process will not be extended.

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 1:13:01 PM  Question Number - 94

Can ODOT provide a Photometric file (.VSL) for the Proposed 5A Lighting along EB I.R. 74 and I.R 75?

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 9:53:42 AM  Question Number - 93

Per section 10.4.1.L.6, 6” underdrains are to be placed on both sides of median barrier. The 5A project is placing new underdrain at the edge of shoulder along I74 EB. Is the 5B DBT required to replace the newly constructed underdrain?

The underdrains were non-performed with the non-performance of the full depth replacement of the EB74 inside shoulder from station 995+46 to 1018+78.

*** 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.***
Appendix O3 depicts areas of work available May 2021. Portions of these areas will need clearing and grubbing before starting construction activities. However, due to the Indiana Bat restriction, clearing would not be able to begin until October 2021. Will the Department allow Appendix O3 clearing and grubbing activities to occur during the October 2020 – March 2021 clearing season so construction activities may begin in May 2021?

Appendix O3 will be updated to allow the clearing to happen between March 1- March 31. See forthcoming addendum.

In response to question #12, are the Duke relocation plans completed and can they be provided along with elevations the wires are being raised to?

see forthcoming addendum. appendices N2, N3, and N4 have been added.

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%205/

Scope section 10.5.2 requires chemical stabilization for all new full-depth roadway areas. Please clarify that the contractor can follow ODOT Geotechnical Bulletin 1 in terms of alternate stabilization methods where full depth roadway sections are too narrow for stabilization equipment.

The scope is clear that chemical stabilization is a requirement. Alternate subgrade treatments will not be considered. The DBT shall make provisions to chemically stabilize the subgrade in areas of less width than the equipment proposed for use. Include the proposed method to stabilize the narrow areas in the stabilization submittal required per CMS 206.03.

Please clarify the design speed for westbound I-74. Scope Section 1.1 indicates a design speed of 60 mph for I-75/I-74, but Section 10.2.A includes a reference to 50 mph design speed for a portion of northbound I-75 to westbound I-74.

The design speed for westbound I-74 is 60 mph per Section 1.1 from SLM 17.80 to SLM 19.47 as identified in Section 2. Section 10.2.A.1.iii references a 50 mph design speed of Ramp S, which begins after the exit terminal from mainline I-74.

Scope Section 10.2.C.iv was added in Addendum #3 in regards to the ROW near Ramp O/75 SB Exit. Will the Department clarify the limits of ROW being obtained for the slope easement?

The Department is in the process of obtaining rights to construct in the existing slope easement.

Scope Section 11.1.U for all bridges states that if weathering steel is used, the fascia girder should be painted. However, each individual bridge scope section specifies that all new and existing structural steel is to be painted. These scope sections appear to be in conflict. Is the use of weathering steel with fascia girder painting allowed for new steel?

See forthcoming addendum. 11.3.2.3 and 11.3.5.3 will say: Paint the new structural steel IZEU per CMS 514, or utilize weathering steel meeting the painting requirements of 11.1.U. The topcoat of the paint shall be Federal Color 595B-34058 (Dark Green).

Scope Section 9.5.8 refers to pavement marking repairs on existing pavement. Does this apply to just existing pavement markings or does all temporary striping on existing pavement also require pavement repairs?

Section 9.5.8 will be deleted in the forthcoming addendum.

Regarding ITO 5.3.b.iii, superstructure transverse sections. Is it the Department’s intent for the DBTs to include the transverse sections for new Ramp O and Ramp R structures as indicated in section ii only, or for all bridges on the project?
**Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions**

*Question Submitted: 3/16/2020 8:51:02 AM  Question Number - 84*

Section 6.4 and Appendix W included a hydraulic report and HEC-RAS models prepared by TranSystems. Can ODOT clarify whether the model used in Appendix W was the effective FEMA model?

The effective FEMA model was the basis for the models that were ultimately used. The effective FEMA model was converted and named Duplicate Effective Model. The effective/Duplicate FEMA model was missing existing I-74 bridges, so a Corrected Effective Model was made. The Proposed Conditions Model was built from the Corrected Effective Model. All of this is detailed in the Hydraulic Report in Appendix W.

*Question Submitted: 3/16/2020 8:50:32 AM  Question Number - 83*

Referring to RFP Scope Section 10.2.O, can ODOT clarify how the Access Road is intended to extend to WB I-74? Per Appendix A reference document, a 15-foot paved right shoulder width, in the direction of travel on I-74 WB, is shown on I-74 WB (between HAM-75-0440 and the Access Road). This 15-foot shoulder is, however, tapered to 10’ on PID 104667 project (BU-14 AFC plans). For PID 104668 project, is a 15-ft paved right shoulder width on this section of WB I-74 required (i.e. east of the Access Road; and connection to PID 104667)?

A 15ft shoulder is required to get to the Access Road. west of the access road the shoulder is to tapper down to 10ft.

*Question Submitted: 3/16/2020 8:49:43 AM  Question Number - 82*

Referring to RFP scope Section 10.2.D.4, can ODOT clarify the proposed lane configuration at Prang Street/Elmore Street intersection. Are left turns required to and from Prang Street? Elmore currently has concrete median islands which would prohibit left turn movements, however the scope does not address work along Elmore.

The final condition is to match what is proposed in the PID 83723 plan by Transsystems.

*Question Submitted: 3/13/2020 4:49:33 PM  Question Number - 81*

The response to PBQ #65 addresses scope increases as a result of changes to 104667 documents. How will the Department communicate substantive changes to the 104667 documents which effectively reduce scope for 5B? If the changes are not communicated, one team has a clear and unnecessary advantage over the other two teams.

All substantive changes will be communicated with all teams.

*Question Submitted: 3/13/2020 11:48:59 AM  Question Number - 80*

Scope section 12.2.B.2 states the following “No reused extrusheet signs will be accepted. This includes all signs on the mainline and interchange ramps”. However, according to the provided HAM-75-3.84 plans (BU-19) new signs are being installed for the existing Ramp O exit from IR-75 Southbound configuration. Will the department allow the reuse of these signs at the new locations required by the changed ramp O and IR-75 configuration?

See forthcoming addendum. Extrusheets installed with PID 104667 may be reused.

*Question Submitted: 3/13/2020 11:47:16 AM  Question Number - 79*

For the pedestrian bridge, HAM-74-1875, is a handrail required where vandal protection fence is provided?

hand rails should be constructed based on the requirement in L&D Vol 1 section 300.

*Question Submitted: 3/13/2020 11:46:31 AM  Question Number - 78*

Is the 12’ curved vandal protection fence required on the approaches for the pedestrian structure HAM-74-1875?

The vandal protection fence is required on the approaches.

*Question Submitted: 3/9/2020 3:41:03 PM  Question Number - 77*

In response to Question 69, will the Department provide a plan and profile for the new bore location?

The proposed bore location has been moved to 20ft south of CSO 21. The plan and profile will be provided in the next addendum.

*Question Submitted: 3/9/2020 3:39:54 PM  Question Number - 76*

In response to Question 59, will the Department provide the PID 83723 impacts while the current waterway permit draft is finalized? With the PTI submittal forthcoming and a draft permit not coming for 30 days, we need information to adequately respond to ITO Section 5.3.b.v about crane locations in relation to Mill Creek.

See forthcoming addendum. The link below will take you the permit determination documents and the re-evaluation. Also included is a list of environmental commitments.

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%205/Appdx_Z_03232020/
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 12:25:23 PM  Question Number - 75
Can the Department clarify if the railroad reviews listed in section 1.3.1.E are 90 calendar days or 90 work days?

**Railroad reviews are 90 calendar days.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 12:23:22 PM  Question Number - 74
Please confirm the required face to face of parapet (roadway width) for the pedestrian bridge over I-74 and approach spans/roadway adjacent to the overhead pedestrian bridge. Please note that Transystem plans indicate a 14’-0” face to face of parapet with an overall out to out width of 16’-0”.

**14ft face to face of the parapet is acceptable. see changes to section 11.3.5 in the forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 11:40:33 AM  Question Number - 73
PBQ #46 response is that plans for the landslide repair are to be completed in one buildable unit encompassing all work including MOT and reviewed in 5 working days. Please confirm that this buildable unit will require a Stage 1, Stage 2 and AFC submission each with a 5 day review.

**Yes this BU will require a stage 1, stage 2, and AFC submittal.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 11:37:48 AM  Question Number - 72
In an effort to protect the Indiana and Northern Long Eared bats, clearing of trees is limited to a timeframe of October 1st thru March 31st. The Project Scope requires the Landslide repair work to be completed no later than December 1, 2020. Since the Project will not be awarded until June of 2020 the clearing will not be permitted to begin until October 1, 2020, leaving minimal time to complete the Landslide repair work. Will ODOT to have the trees removed in this area prior to March 31, 2020 so the landslide work can begin when the Project is awarded or allow additional time for completion of the repair work?

**see forthcoming addendum the Colerain Beekman Landslide interim completion date section will read as follows: Colerain Beekman landslide Interim Completion Date: 02/01/2021. All landslide work completed except for full depth pavement replacement and permanent pavement markings. Failure to complete the required work by the time specified shall result in a disincentive in the amount of $3,200 per day being assessed for each day the work remains incomplete. . Work shall commence by 10/01/2020. Failure to commence the work by 10/01/2020 shall result in a disincentive in the amount of $3,200 per day being assessed for each day the work does not commence after 10/01/2020. Coordinate the slide repair work with HAM-75-3.84 and all aspects of this current project.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/5/2020 5:40:37 AM  Question Number - 71
Scope sections 11.3.1, 11.3.2, 11.3.3, 11.3.4 and 11.3.6 refer to bridge barrier constructed per SBR-1-13 (Rev. Jan. 2020). On ODOT’s standard bridge drawings page the latest revision to SBR-1-13 is 7/20/18 but SBR-1-20 on the same page is dated 1/17/20. Which concrete bridge railing standard drawing applies to this project?

**see forthcoming addendum. The “SBR-1-13 (Revised January, 2020)” should be updated in the scope to read “SBR-1-20 dated 1/17/20”**.

**Question Submitted:** 3/5/2020 5:34:23 AM  Question Number - 70
BDM section 303.2 states “Where sidewalks, pedestrian, and/or bicycle bridges are intended to be used by maintenance and/or other incidental vehicles, include an H15-44 vehicle, as shown in BDM Figure 303-2, in the design loading”. Is H15-44 loading required for the pedestrian structure HAM-74-1875?

**H15-44 loading requirements are not required for the pedestrian bridge.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/4/2020 7:18:32 AM  Question Number - 69
Will ODOT please provide an update on the underground detention requirement/ construction near CSO 21 on MCE 5a?

**The detention system in the MCE 5a project is being replaced with a bore under the Rail Road for a direct outlet into the Mill Creek. This proposed conduit will be parallel to the existing 78” MSD outfall from CSO 21 and approximately 25ft to the north.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:44:21 AM  Question Number - 68
Scope Section 10.3.1 states all ramp pavement and shoulder shall be constructed full depth. Can the department clarify exactly which ramps are to be reconstructed and the start/end station limits?

**See addendum 3 for clarifications.**

*** 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.***
Scope Section 10.3.I states that full depth pavement reconstruction is not required if already reconstructed full depth on PID 104667. Please clarify the limits of full depth reconstruction of PID 104667.

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:43:55 AM  Question Number - 67

Limits of full depth construction on PID 104667 are shown on BU-14.

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:42:28 AM  Question Number - 66

We understand that project 104667 BU #13, 14, and 26 are not RFC’d. These Buildable Units have multiple implications and mesh points with the current 104668 project. Are we to use the plans currently provided to form a basis of bid? If so, when will be the last date to receive updates to these BU’s order to finalize our designs for a bid basis?

The Offerors shall use the 104667 Buildable Units, as shown. The Buildable Units as shared at the date of PTI Documentation (Intermediate Technical Proposal) Submission Deadline shall be the basis of bid.

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:41:36 AM  Question Number - 65

If further revisions are made to RFC Buildable Units for PID 104667 which effect this project (PID 104668), how will these effects be handled, by change order?

The status of PID104667 design as depicted in the available Buildable Units (regardless of the BU status) as provided at the date of PTI Documentation (Intermediate Technical Proposal) Submission Deadline shall be the basis of bid. Substantive changes made to project PID 104667 after the PTI Documentation (Intermediate Technical Proposal) Submission Deadline shall be considered a Differing Site Condition (as defined in 104.02) except when it can be demonstrated that an Offeror was aware, or reasonably should have been aware, of a potential design revision to PID 104667 made after the PTI Documentation (Intermediate Technical Proposal) Submission Deadline. This will be in an upcoming addenda.

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:40:24 AM  Question Number - 64

For the purposes of PN110, the Escrow Documents shall be submitted 2 business days after the deadline for Technical and Price proposal submittals. However, the PN110 of the ITO still requires Escrow Bid Documents to be submitted the business day after the bid opening. Will the Department update PN110 to match the prebid response?

For the purposes of PN110, the Escrow Documents shall be submitted 2 business days after the deadline for Technical and Price proposal submittals as identified in the Instruction to Offerors. This will be reflected in an upcoming addenda, but no revisions will be made to PN110.

**Question Submitted:** 2/26/2020 8:56:55 AM  Question Number - 63

Can ODOT provide further clarification and guidance on the shoulder widths along I-74 WB?

L&D requirements for shoulder width shall be determined on a directional basis. Left-side shoulder widths (while referencing the direction of travel) for I-74WB shall be ten feet for all sections with 3 or more immediately adjacent lanes. Ten feet shall be fully developed by the end of all merging tapers. Left-side shoulders (when referencing the direction of travel) for I-74WB shall be no less than four feet for all section with 2 or less immediately adjacent lanes.

**Question Submitted:** 2/26/2020 8:08:49 AM  Question Number - 62

Please post the submittal register listing of all Buildable Units from Phase 5A.

The submittal registry is for reference only and is at the link below:
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%203/Appendix/Appendix_A1/

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 4:01:47 PM  Question Number - 61

“In response to prebid question 27, the “191022_183000_BU-14_AFC PLANS_SUBMITTAL.pdf” page 54 of 417 shows an existing “SH” easement along the right side of I-75 SB from approximately sta. 255+60 to sta. 257+50 (north of the existing billboard sign). The easement doesn’t appear to be shown in Appendix A right of way plans or any CAD files that have been provided by the Department. Can ODOT provide the right of way plans, legal descriptions, and CAD file(s) for this existing SH easement?”

The question is referencing parcel 332 SH. The requested information is at the link below:
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A%203.85%20final%20plans%20Transystems/Parcel_332_SH/
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 4:00:36 PM  Question Number - 60

Referring to the environmental re-evaluation, does seasonal restriction on in-stream work apply to this project?

Seasonal restrictions for in-stream work do not apply. Only Cutting restrictions for Indiana Bat/Northern Long Eared Bat. All tree removal will occur between October 1 and March 31.

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 3:59:48 PM  Question Number - 59

When will the finalized waterway permit and new Wetland Special Provisions be available for the project that state the current impact limits allowed under the permit? What impact limits can we assume in the meantime?

The finalized waterway permit and special provisions are under development. We anticipate having a draft version of the special provisions within 30 days. The waterway permit is assuming the worst case scenario by mimicking the PID 83723 impacts.

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 8:29:52 AM  Question Number - 58

Per Addendum #2, scope Section 11.3.2.7 states that the Ramp R/Ramp O structure, "shall be designed to accommodate the fourth (proposed) rail road track." Based on Appendix A1, MCE Phase 5A RFC BU10, sheet 3 of 29 it is undetermined where the fourth railroad track is located. Will the Department clarify what the required offset distance from existing centerline of RR to centerline of planned future track and clearance to bridge substructure units?

The fourth (proposed) railroad track is clearly represented on sheet 1980/2327 of Appendix A. The proposed 4th railroad track will be 15ft (centerline to centerline) of existing eastern most railroad track. All portions of all permanent, above grade structures shall be a minimum of 33ft from the centerline of the existing eastern most railroad track. A minimum 23ft of vertical clearance shall also be provided over the proposed 4th railroad track.

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 8:28:56 AM  Question Number - 57

In response to pre bid question 41, per scope Section 2, the project limits for HAM-74 begin at SLM 17.80. This appears to be approximately sta. 955+00 WB (from Appendix A). Can ODOT confirm the SLM/project limits for both I-74 EB (median) and I-74 WB?

see forthcoming addendum. I-74 WB limits are correct SLM 17.80. Additional information on EB I-74 was added to sections 10.2.G and 10.3.B, to clarify that the concrete median barrier and median/inside shoulder is to be replaced started at approximate SLM 18.15 (where the concrete median barrier starts).

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 8:28:25 AM  Question Number - 56

In response to pre bid question 41, per scope Section 2, the project limits for HAM-75 begin at SLM 4.04. This appears to be approximately at sta. 211+00 to 262+00 (from Appendix A). Can ODOT confirm the SLM/project limit for I-75 SB?

I-75 work limits in the Design Build Scope of Services are correct.

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 11:54:54 AM  Question Number - 55

Scope Section 12.4 does not specify the type of lighting fixture (HPS or LED). Are HPS or LED fixtures required?

LED fixtures are required.

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 11:50:24 AM  Question Number - 54

Addendum 2 revised Scope 11.3.4.9 requiring HAM-74-1852L abutments to be converted to semi-integral. PID 104667 replaces the 1852L bearings. Abutment conversion will increase the dead load due to the weight of the diaphragm and approach slab. This additional load cannot be carried by the bearings as designed in PID 104667. Will bearings be required to be replaced or will the abutment conversion requirement be eliminated?

See forthcoming addendum. Bearings are required to be replaced with the semi-integral conversions.

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 5:57:28 PM  Question Number - 53

Can ODOT provide additional details regarding the Ramp O tie in with IR-75 SB? Please clarify how the addition of the 4th lane on IR-75 SB is going to accommodate Ramp O with the existing ROW.

If the design does not meet the required deceleration length per L&D Vol 1 section 500, an ATC should be submitted for further evaluation.
Please provide a status set of all 5A (PID104667) buildable units, regardless of the status, with the understanding they are for information only. The CADD files do not provide enough information to fully understand the details of the 5A plans, which are currently being developed by another shortlisted offeror.

BU26 AFC (ODOT stamped) BU14 AFC (outstanding comments being addressed) BU13 AFC (outstanding comments being addressed) The three BU’s mentioned above can be found at the link below. These are for reference only. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A1%20MCE%205A%20RFC%20and%20base map/MCE%205A/RFCs/

Per section 11.3.5 of the scope, a 12’ high fence is required. Is the intent to follow the Standard Drawing VPF-1-90 details for a 12’ VPF or is the intent to modify this detail to ensure the top of the fence is 12’ above the deck?

The intent is to have a fence configuration similar to PS-1 post section in Standard VPF-1-90 sitting on BR-2-15 railing.

Scope section 10.2.A.1 states that access to Beekman interchange shall be on Ramp S and "barrier separated" from mainline I-74 in a braided condition. Section 10.2.C.1 states that "no access" from Ramp O to west bound I-74 shall be permitted. Are Ramp O and Ramp S required to be separated by a barrier wall to meet the "no access" and "barrier separated" requirements?

See forthcoming addendum. Braiding of the ramps shall be achieved by using concrete barriers and attenuators as required. The intent is to physically prevent the weave using concrete barrier.

Scope section 10.2.D states that local streets shall be reconstructed per PID 83723 in concept. An additional right turn lane has been added at the intersection of Colerain Ave and Spring Grove Ave since these concept plans were developed, as well as a modular block wall. Can the dual right turn lane be reduced to a single right turn and the block wall be removed?

No reduction in city streets is permitted. The dual right turn shall remain.

As noted in L&D Manual - vol. 2 Drainage Design, Section 1010 Maintenance of Traffic Drainage will the District be requiring evaluation of MOT for drainage? If so, is a 2 year design frequency to be used for spread calculation as noted or will the District be providing a different frequency?

Maintenance of Traffic Drainage per section 1010 of L & D Vol 2 shall be followed.

Scope Section 2 designates 12/2/2020 as the interim completion date for "All landslide work completed." Will the department further define or clarify what all elements of the landslide remediation shall be completed by the interim completion date?

See forthcoming addendum. The landslide interim completion date requirements will read as follows: Colerain Beekman landslide Interim Completion Date: 12/1/20. All landslide work completed except for full depth pavement replacement and permanent pavement markings. Failure to complete the required work by the time specified shall result in a disincentive in the amount of $3,200 per day being assessed for each day the work remains incomplete. Coordinate the slide repair work with HAM-75-3.84 and all aspects of this current project.

Based on the project anticipated award date of 6/1/20 and an interim landslide completion date of 12/1/20, there will be insufficient construction time due to required design and prescribed review time periods. Will the department reduce the required review time period, number of reviews, or a combination of the two for the Buildable Unit related to landslide remediation work in order to allow for an adequate construction period?

See forthcoming addendum. The Colerain Beekman landslide repair work shall have one complete buildable unit encompassing all work and MOT required to be completed by 12/1/2020. ODOT will review this single BU in 5 working days.

*** 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: 2/7/2020 10:51:42 AM  Question Number - 45
With regards to setting the proposed bridge span over the railroad, are there any future tracks that need to be accommodated? If so, can ODOT please provide the necessary information about the planned location of any future track(s) (i.e. outline the offset distance and side from existing centerline of RR to centerline of planned future track(s))

Accommodations for a fourth track are required. See PID 83723 sheet 1980/2327 for reference.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2020 10:51:06 AM  Question Number - 44
Can ODOT provide the design criteria for the Ramp O vertical sag curve geometry near I-75 SB (Sta 1041+00 to Sta 1046+00) as depicted on sheet 462 of 2327 in Appendix A?

See forthcoming addendum. The following will be added. If a vertical sag curve is required on Ramp O between the Ludlow overpass and the rail road it shall have a stopping sight distance design speed of 25 MPH or greater. Stopping sight distance shall be mitigated using highway lighting.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2020 9:33:08 AM  Question Number - 43
Scope section 11.3.1.8 lists work to be completed on 1908L "if the westernmost span is to remain." Sub-bullets C and D are specific to the Forward Abutment (east abutment). Should C and D fall under item 8? Will these items be required regardless of the DBT's solution for the westernmost span?

See forthcoming addendum. C and D are now items 16 and 17 and are to be completed regardless of the solution for the westernmost span.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2020 9:29:03 AM  Question Number - 42
Scope Section 10.3.H states "All ramps within the project limits will receive the same treatment as the mainline. a. All ramp shall be replaced and constructed full depth." Are ramps to be replaced full depth or are they to receive the same treatment as mainline? Will ODOT provide a schematic showing the intended limits of ramp reconstruction?

All ramps shall receive the same pavement treatment as mainline. All shoulders are to be replaced and constructed as full depth.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2020 9:27:52 AM  Question Number - 41
Scope Section 10.3, bullets A, B, and C reference lane and shoulder construction or reconstruction. These items seem to conflict with each other. In particular, Bullet C states that shoulders be constructed or reconstructed full depth within the project limits. This conflicts with bullets A and B. It is also noted that the project limits in Section 2 include I-75 SLM 4.04 to SLM 4.96. Please clarify the intent of pavement and shoulder construction on I-75 and I-74.

See forthcoming addendum. Clarifications to Section 10.3 have been made.

Question Submitted: 1/27/2020 2:22:40 PM  Question Number - 40
Per Scope Section 10.2.B.1, Ramp R is designated with 40 mph design speed. Section 10.6, Appendix Q provides a stopping sight distance design exception for Ramp R. However, the equivalent stopping sight distance is not consistent with the horizontal curves noted in Appendix A. Appendix Q also denotes 45 mph design speed for Ramp R. Will ODOT be updating Appendix Q for Ramp R?

Previous design exceptions were approved for a conceptual geometric configuration in layout. Previous design exceptions are being provided for reference only. Design final configuration and geometric layout as per the Contract Documents. Appendix Q will not be updated. This was revised in Addenda 1.

Question Submitted: 1/27/2020 2:22:02 PM  Question Number - 39
Per Scope Section 10.2.C, Ramp O is designated with 40 mph design speed. However, Appendix Q as noted in Section 10.6 does not include a horizontal stopping sight distance design exception for Ramp O’s 532.98’ horizontal curve. Will ODOT be updating Appendix Q?

Previous design exceptions were approved for a conceptual geometric configuration in layout. Previous design exceptions are being provided for reference only. Design final configuration and geometric layout as per the Contract Documents. Appendix Q will not be updated. This was revised in Addenda 1.

Question Submitted: 1/27/2020 2:21:44 PM  Question Number - 38
Considering I-74 is proposed as a 5-lane section, can ODOT provide median shoulder width criterion. (ODOT L&D notes criteria for 4-lane and 6 or more lanes sections).

see forthcoming addendum for design criteria clarification.

*** 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:** 1/27/2020 2:21:14 PM  Question Number - 37

Referring to Scope Section 10.2.A.1, can ODOT provide the design speed for Ramp S?

*see forthcoming addendum for design speed clarifications.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 11:31:21 AM  Question Number - 36

Section 305.1.3.A of the new ODOT 2020 BDM states that “The angular rotation caused by differential settlement between adjacent substructures shall not exceed 0.004 radians.” Can ODOT clarify if this section of the BDM is referring to settlement between adjacent piers which in turn causes angular rotation of the bridge superstructure (steepleing or flattening the longitudinal grade of the bridge deck)?

*BDM Section 305.1.3.A is intended for new foundation elements and does not relieve the designer from ensuring the superstructure is properly analyzed and designed for the induced load effects caused by differential settlements. An example of the angular rotation would be a line drawn from the rear abutment to pier 1 and a second line drawn from the rear abutment to pier 1 after settlement. The angular difference between the two lines in radians needs to be less than 0.004. The same concept would be repeated at each substructure unit relative to its adjacent substructure unit and ending at the forward abutment.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 11:30:47 AM  Question Number - 35

For Bridge HAM-74-1892, the scope (Section 11.3.6.6) states that there shall be a minimum vertical clearance of 15'-6” provided over Elmore St. The RFC drawings for the current Phase 5A project (included in Appendix A1) show that the minimum required vertical clearance over Elmore St was 14'-6” (see plan sheet 83/120 in BU-3 RFC package). Is the 15'-6” required vertical clearance over Elmore St that is stated in Section 11.3.6.6 (page 83 of 103 of the scope) correct?

*This requirement will be deleted. No reduction in existing vertical clearance will be permitted. See forthcoming addendum*

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 11:30:14 AM  Question Number - 34

For Bridge HAM-74-1852, the scope (Section 11.3.4.7) states that there shall be a minimum vertical clearance of 15'-6” provided over NB Beekman St. The RFC drawings for the current Phase 5A project (included in Appendix A1) show that only 15’-5” of vertical clearance is being provided at the HAM-74-1852R bridge (see plan sheet 43/120 in BU-3 RFC package). Furthermore, the Phase 5A RFC drawings call-out a required vertical clearance over Beekman of 14’-6”. Is the 15’-6” required vertical clearance that is stated in Section 11.3.4.7 (page 80 of 103 of the scope) correct?

*This requirement will be deleted. No reduction in existing vertical clearance will be permitted. See forthcoming addendum*

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 11:29:57 AM  Question Number - 33

For Bridge HAM-74-1840, the scope (Section 11.3.3.6) states that there shall be a minimum vertical clearance of 15'-6” provided over SB Beekman St. The RFC drawings for the current Phase 5A project (included in Appendix A1) show that only 15’-3” of vertical clearance is being provided at the HAM-74-1840R bridge (see plan sheet 2/120 in BU-3 RFC package). Furthermore, the Phase 5A RFC drawings call-out a required vertical clearance over Beekman of 14’-6”. Is the 15’-6” required vertical clearance that is stated in Section 11.3.3.6 (page 79 of 103 of the scope) correct?

*This requirement will be deleted. No reduction in existing vertical clearance will be permitted. See forthcoming addendum*

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 11:29:07 AM  Question Number - 32

Bid items 007 and 032 are both setup for ITEM 832 CONSTRUCTION EROSION CONTROL. What is the difference between these two bid items?

*Bid item 007 is for general erosion control. Bid item 032 is for erosion control if/when contaminated soils or hazardous materials are found.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/22/2020 4:21:21 PM  Question Number - 31

Scope Section 9.5.8 calls out existing pavement to be repaired as Item 251 – Partial Depth Pavement repairs (3” depth) at all pavement marking removal locations for Maintenance of Traffic. Is newly-resurfaced pavement (within the last year), considered existing pavement and subject to the requirements of Scope Section 9.5.8?

*All pavement is considered existing pavement.*

*** 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: 1/22/2020 8:50:19 AM  Question Number - 30
Referring to Scope Section 10.2, please provide all design and CAD/CAE related files for the proposed roadways (Ramp R, Ramp O, Ramp S, I-74WB, etc.) listed in Section 10.2.

All cad files from PID 83723 [design by Transystem] are at the link below in the .zip file. This includes Ramps R, O, and S, along with WB I-74 files. These are for reference only.

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A%203.85%20final%20plans%20Transystems/Sheets/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/

Question Submitted: 1/22/2020 8:49:54 AM  Question Number - 29
Can the department confirm the duration of the required temporary easements shown in Appendix A?

The duration for all temporary RW is 36 months from when we enter the property.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2020 8:49:27 AM  Question Number - 28
Can the department confirm that all proposed right of way shown in Appendix A has been acquired or will be acquired by the Department?

All RW has been acquired. The Department is still working with the railroad to finalize the agreements and obtain the right of entry.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2020 8:48:43 AM  Question Number - 27
Can the department confirm that all existing or acquired right of way, either by the department and/or the MCE 5A DBT, is currently shown in Appendix A, Volume 7?

All RW has been acquired. and is shown in Appendix A, Volume 7.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2020 8:48:13 AM  Question Number - 26
Appendix A1 contains some PDF drawings of MCE 5A Buildable Units. Can the department provide all MCE 5A BUs noted as complete for ODOT Approved AFC Plans?

All ODOT Stamped RFC plans/Buildable Units have been provided to date. As more BUs are stamped by ODOT they will be uploaded.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2020 8:47:25 AM  Question Number - 25
Appendix A1, MCE 5A denotes IR 75 NB to IR 74 WB as a directional roadway with a design speed of 50 mph. Can the department please clarify the limits of the directional roadway(s) and design speed(s) for MCE 5B?

see forthcoming addendum for clarification on design speeds/designations and locations.

Question Submitted: 1/20/2020 11:35:07 AM  Question Number - 24
PN110 requires Escrow Bid Documents to be submitted the business day after the bid opening. Will the Department consider modifying this to 2 business days after the Bid Opening to allow for compiling of larger volumes of documents due to Design-Build? Additionally, with the bid on a Friday we would currently be forced to work over the weekend to submit on Monday.

For the purposes of PN110, the Escrow Documents shall be submitted 2 business days after the deadline for Technical and Price proposal submittals as identified in the Instruction to Offerors. Note: The Technical and Price Proposal Due date is not equivalent to the date of Bid Opening. Bid Opening does not occur until the Scores Announced date.

Question Submitted: 1/20/2020 11:34:29 AM  Question Number - 23
Is PN 129 for Flexible Start Window Contract intended to be utilized for this project?

PN 129 is intended to be utilized on the project. PN129 shall apply to identified full closures.

Question Submitted: 1/20/2020 11:34:00 AM  Question Number - 22
Scope Section 9.2.2. MOTPE #1, is this 6 weekends for 75NB to 74WB and another 6 weekends for 75SB to 74WB?

The 6 weekend closures shall close I-75 north bound and south bound to I-74 concurrently. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/20/2020 11:33:20 AM  Question Number - 21
The proposal contains PN 108 Dispute Resolution Board and PN 109 Dispute Resolution Advisor. Is it intended to have both DRB and DRA on the project or will one of the items be deleted?

The Project will utilize PN 108 Dispute Resolution Board. PN 109 (Dispute Resolution Advisor) shall be removed from the contract.

*** 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:** 1/20/2020 11:32:52 AM  Question Number - 20

The Proposal lists the project's completion date as 8/1/23 and the ITO and Scope list the project completion date as 8/1/24. Please clarify which date is correct.

The Completion Date is 8/1/2024. The date in the ITO/RFP and Scope is correct.

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:32:24 AM  Question Number - 19

Scope Section 2 states that landslide repair work interim completion date is 7/31/21 and listed in the next paragraph as 12/1/20. Please clarify which date is correct.

Landslide work shall be completed by 12/1/2020. See forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:29:46 AM  Question Number - 18

Scope Section 8.4.3 states that utility information is only current as of August 2017. Can this information be updated by the department?

The list will be updated based on the MCE 5A utility list (see forthcoming addendum). DBTs can also call in an OUPS ticket to further identify/verify utility in the area.

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:29:08 AM  Question Number - 17

Scope Section 10.3.B requires EB I-74 shoulders to be replaced full depth from structure 1840 to 1892. This scope seems to overlap with the 183000 HAM-75 Ph 5A scope. Is this work intended to be included in the 203000 HAM-74 Ph 5B project?

see forthcoming addendum. This section will be changed to only require the median/inside shoulder be replaced with MCE 5B at this section on EB I-74. This is due to the fact that the median wall is being replaced with 5B and to prevent re-work.

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:28:38 AM  Question Number - 16

ITO Section 6.5.7 requires Offeror to name subcontractors for work types not being self-performed for each pre-qualification category (for Work Type Codes 4, 5, 10, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 34, 39, 53). With this being a design build project, the design and planned means and methods for construction will not be fully developed upon submission of our price. As such, the scope of services cannot be fully defined, making it premature to name specific subcontractor(s) at bid time. As you know, the Offeror must use pre-qualified subs to perform the work. We are requesting that the Department allow the Offerors to insert the words “Prequalified Subcontractor” in lieu of naming specific subcontractors for work that it does not intend to self-perform. This was previously allowed on the the 183000 HAM-75 Ph 5A design-build project.

The Department will allow the Offerors to utilize "Prequalified Subcontractor" or "Prequalified Subconsultant" as applicable except when the Offeror identified a Subcontractor or Subconsultant for work Work Type Codes and/or Designer Prequalifications. If applicable, subcontractors or subconsultants named in the SOQ shall be shown under the expected work type.

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:27:43 AM  Question Number - 15

Scope Section 9.5.7 indicates that existing impact attenuator rental is the DBT responsibility upon signing the contract. Can the department provide the owner of the impact attenuator and the current rental rate for the attenuator?

Owner is A&A Safety Rental Rate is currently $4.41/day in accordance with the Allowable Rates for Owned Equipment Not Listed in BlueBook that is maintained by the Office of Construction Administration. It can be found on their webpage.

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:27:14 AM  Question Number - 14

Scope Section 8.5.1 states that, "The DBT is responsible for verifying the actual location of all underground utilities...." However, Section 8.8 states that Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) is not required unless necessary by the DBT. Isn't a SUE investigation required due to Section 8.5.1 language?

It is the responsibility of the DBT to verify the location of the all utilities by any means deemed necessary, incidental to the project. ODOT is not requiring SUE and is not providing a pay item for SUE.

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:26:31 AM  Question Number - 13

Scope Section 8.4.3 indicates that Duke Energy's work to raise wires will be completed by 6/30/21. Can the department specify exactly which set of wires are being raised? We are aware that some wires were already raised for the Phase 5A work.

For MCE 5A Duke on raised lines over I-74. This was accomplished by installing two 195ft poles on either side of I-74. The existing tower north of the new poles (between the new poles and the Ludlow overpass) will be replaced, the tower on the west side of the Mill Creek (between the Mill Creek and the substation) will be replaced. The next tower to the north (near the old Police Station on Ludlow) will be replaced. All wires on the existing towers are being raised.

*** 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:** 1/20/2020 11:26:14 AM  Question Number - 12
For the Duke Energy wires being raised can the department provide an elevation that the wires are being raised to?

Final design by Duke Energy will be completed by March 1, 2020. Upon completion of final design, the elevations will be available. The conceptual KMZ file has been provided at the link below as Appendix N1, for REFERENCE ONLY.

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%201/Appendix%20N1/

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:24:58 AM  Question Number - 11
Will the department please provide a time and location for the DBE Matchmaker event on 2/1/20?

The DBE Matchmaker will be on 2/11/2020 at 9:30am. Event location: 3458 Reading Rd, Cincinnati, OH 45229

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:24:11 AM  Question Number - 10
Page 15 and 16 of 45 in ITO Section 4.1 contain reference errors, "Section Error Reference Source Not Found". Please indicated correct reference

The "Section Error Reference Source Not Found" is because Section 3.1 is referenced on the original Word document but there is no Section 3.1 in the posted ITO/RFP. Where "Section Error Reference Source Not Found" is listed, it should read Section 3 which describes how to either postmark ATCs or use LiquidFiles. There are no subsections to Section 3.

**Question Submitted:** 1/17/2020 4:44:37 PM  Question Number - 9
In addition to the basemap provided in Appendix A1 can the department please provide the CAD/CAE and survey (.dtn or .tin) files from the current HAM-74/75 Phase 5A project?

Department will be providing MCE 5A cad drawing, for reference only as it cannot be verified by the department. see forthcoming addendum

**Question Submitted:** 1/15/2020 3:12:32 PM  Question Number - 8
Can the Department provide the LiquidFile email address for the PTI Discussion, ATC, and Technical Proposal submittals, please?

LiquidFile invites will be sent to each individual Offeror. The established user accounts will be used to exchange PTI Discussion, ATC, and Technical Proposal submittals information with the Department.

**Question Submitted:** 11/27/2019 6:59:13 AM  Question Number - 7
Can the Department provide the landslide exploration report at the Colerain/Beekman location?

Please see the following ftp site link ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Colerain-Beekman_slide/

**Question Submitted:** 11/14/2019 8:30:35 AM  Question Number - 6
Regarding the response to prebid question #3, will the Department accept projects representing the capabilities of the Design Team, in which the design is substantially compete but construction is on-going or yet to be completed?

Please provide projects where Work is substantially complete and the project is available for use as intended by the contract. This applies to both the Offeror's Lead Contractor or Sub-Contractors and Offeror's Lead Designer or Sub-Consultants

**Question Submitted:** 11/13/2019 3:30:56 PM  Question Number - 5
Can the Department post the presentation and transcript as well from the MCE 5B Project; HAM-74-18.01 Mandatory Pre-SOQ meeting on 11/7/2019?

The presentation is available on the following FTP site link. The transcript will be made available once the Department receives possession ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/PRE_SOQ_MEETING/

**Question Submitted:** 11/12/2019 2:37:50 PM  Question Number - 4
Can the Department post the sign-in sheet from the MCE 5B Project; HAM-74-18.01 Mandatory Pre-SOQ meeting on 11/7/2019?

The sign in sheet from the mandatory Pre-SOQ meeting on 11/7/2019 for the MCE 5B project can be found on the following FTP site link ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/PRE_SOQ_MEETING/

*** 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:** 11/7/2019 2:50:43 PM  Question Number - 3

Section 2.5.9 of the ITO states “Projects should be completed or substantially completed.” Can this language be revised to “At least 50% of Contractor’s or Designer’s work should be complete.”?

The current Request for Qualifications language will remain in regard to the content of technical experience attachments. Please provide projects where Work is substantially complete and the project is available for use as intended by the contract.

**Question Submitted:** 11/7/2019 1:32:12 PM  Question Number - 2

Section 2.5.9 of the ITO states “Projects should be completed or substantially completed.” Can this language be revised to “At least 50% of Contractor’s or Designer’s work should be complete.”?

The current Request for Qualifications language will remain in regard to the content of technical experience attachments. Please provide projects where Work is substantially complete and the project is available for use as intended by the contract.

**Question Submitted:** 11/1/2019 4:16:58 PM  Question Number - 1

Will the Department allow for Organizational Charts as requested in RFQ Section 2.5.4.1 to be on one 11"x17" sized sheet, folded to 8.5"x11” size, and count as a single sheet for the purposes of page count?

The Department will not allow Offerors to place the organizational chart on a 11”x17” sheet. The Department allows the opportunity for Offerors to include a narrative to describe the interactions between positions, functions of shown intended roles, and other planned team integrations techniques. Graphics, tables and figures which include text to describe the graphics, tables, and figures may use a smaller font size but shall remain legible. The abuse and excessive use of graphics, tables, or figures text to unreasonably expand the content of the SOQ (as determined by the Department) may be grounds for rejection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Sale Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203001</td>
<td>4/9/2020</td>
<td>PIK-110036 - CR 84-04.60 Brdg Replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Submitted:** 3/10/2020 2:56:09 PM  Question Number - 1

Can the Department please provide the existing CAD/CAE and survey (.dtn or .tin) files for Pik-CR84-0460 Thanks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Sale Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207009</td>
<td>3/26/2020</td>
<td>BEL-110384 - SR 647-01.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Submitted:** 3/18/2020 12:29:00 PM  Question Number - 1

Plans state that A&A Safety’s signals are currently in place on the project. Does the current signage/MOT devices in place belong to ODOT or A&A?

The current temporary signals are owned by A&A Safety and are being rented. The current signs are owned by ODOT.

---

*** 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.***