

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180233

Sale Date - 4/19/2018

SAN-95769 - US 6-22.69 Resurf

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2018 2:15:21 PM **Question Number - 6**

What is the intent to only place half of the 19MM Intermediate Course with anti-segregation equipment per the plan note on page 7?

**The intent is to evaluate the segregation potential of the modified 19.0mm gradation by placing conventionally using end dumping method and comparing to the placement with anti-segregation equipment.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2018 9:42:57 AM **Question Number - 5**

It appears by Maintaining Traffic notes on sheet 10 the intent is to have the intermediate course placed by 11/15/18 and then place the surface in 2019. With the placement of the surface course 2019, this means Preparing Subgrade for Shoulder Paving /Linear Grading and Compacted Aggregate items will be performed two times. Will payment be made for performing this work in both 2018 and 2019?

**Preparing Subgrade for Shoulder Paving, Linear Grading and Compacted Aggregate have been increased to cover the placement prior to the intermediate course (based on 3 1/4" depth) and then the placement of the surface course (based on 1 3/4") during the following year. Per an upcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2018 9:42:23 AM **Question Number - 4**

Will Class I temporary striping be required on the intermediate asphalt over the winter periods? If so, is this cost to be incidental or will there be a pay item added?

**Per an upcoming addendum. Quantities have been revised to place Class I temporary striping after intermediate course has been placed and will not be incidental. Class II Center Line and Class III Stop Line have been revised for after the surface course has been placed.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2018 9:16:47 AM **Question Number - 3**

With the surface course projected to be placed in the Spring of 2019, how will ODOT pay for the striping that will be required to get this project through the winter?

**Per upcoming Addendum. Quantities have been revised to place Class I temporary striping after the intermediate course has been placed. This will not be incidental. Class II Center Line and Class III Stop Line have been revised to be placed after the surface course has been placed.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 6:42:53 PM **Question Number - 2**

Regarding Line Item 1 Pavement Removed, what is thickness of removal required?

**The thickness of pavement to be removed is 6".**

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2018 9:31:55 AM **Question Number - 1**

Can Item 37 be changed from 9.5mm to 12.5mm since the slag could be absorbent and require a SSD on the GMM as per SS 1036?

**Per upcoming Addendum, Item 37 has been changed to Item 442, Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, 12.5mm, Type A(446), As Per Plan and the note has been revised on sheet 6.**

Project No. 180246

Sale Date - 5/17/2018

MAD-25596 - /PIC-IR 71-04.56/00.00

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:17:45 AM **Question Number - 0**

Please review the quantities for Item 255 - Full Depth Pavement Sawing on Sheets 89-95. Per ODOT CMS 255, the Department will measure the quantity of perimeter full depth saw cuts. Based on the number of repairs listed and the assumption that contingency quantities could be multiple repairs (ie. 40 SY contingency could be 2 separate 20 SY repairs), the length of sawing calculated is very understated.

**Quantities will be revised in a forthcoming addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 10:11:18 AM **Question Number - 0**

Can the department please provide a link to the Office Calcs?

**Please see the following FTP site link.  
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MAD-25596/>**

\*\*\* 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:** 3/30/2018 9:41:08 AM **Question Number - 0**

Have the trees and brush been cleared on the project prior to the April 1 deadline?

**Yes, the trees and brush have been cleared within the project limits at the three bridge locations (Mud Run, Dyer Road and Bradford Creek) in order to meet the April 1 endangered species requirements. Item 201 - Clearing and Grubbing will remain in the plans to cover other areas of the project, as needed.**

**Project No. 180247**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

ATH-106635 - HVS Railway Phase 4

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2018 8:08:17 AM **Question Number - 1**

on page 19 of the plans under hardware notes, can a 3/4"x 10" washer head drive spike be used in place of the 3/4"x 10" lag with ogee washer?, there is no option to att. a file, I can send a spec. sheet if needed.

**Project No. 180252**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

CUY-98600 - BH FY2018 Misc

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 7:59:36 AM **Question Number - 3**

Response to question regarding wall thickness of pipe is in error. 6" pipe has an OD of 6-5/8", and is available in only the following wall thicknesses: .109", .134", .28", and then goes to extra heavy wall. Please correct.

**The intent is to provide a 7" outer diameter pipe with a thickness of 3/16" for an inner diameter of 6 5/8". Tubing per ASTM A513 requirements is available and is produced in Ohio by various suppliers.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 11:28:15 AM **Question Number - 2**

page 34/65, scupper extension calls out for 6 5/8" id piping by 3/8" wall. After checking piping specifications, I do not see any piping that fits the size required

**Callout is in error. Required pipe wall thickness is 3/16" not 3/8" thick.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 11:19:29 AM **Question Number - 1**

This project lists 514 specification requirements. With the square footage of surface preparation and painting which must be done, does the painting contractor need to have SSPC QP 1 & QP 2 certification to perform the work?

**Yes, structural steel painting shall be per 514 specification.**

**Project No. 180254**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

FRA-93446 - IR 71-18.64 Noise Walls

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 10:01:48 AM **Question Number - 10**

Plan sheet 32/34 calls for the contractor to shotcrete the sub-facia after the LSM has been formed, poured and stripped and prior to placing the new CIP concrete facing. Please advise which item this shotcrete sub-facia is to be included with or if it will be required.

**Sheet 32/34 will be revised to delete the shotcrete requirement. Please see forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 9:35:47 AM **Question Number - 9**

ODOT 511, class QC1 concrete, substructure, 15 cy. To use 15 cy would mean that 66 panels would be replaced. Is this ODOT intention and would these require the helical anchors. Please clarify

**This work generally consists of replacing cracked MSE wall panels and replacing voids behind the wall with LSM at approximately six (6) locations along Howard Street. Specific locations will be determined during the on-site kickoff meeting. The quantity will be reduced to 5 CY. This pay item should include the number of helical anchors needed to complete the repairs at these locations. See revised sheets in forthcoming addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 9:27:54 AM **Question Number - 8**

Page 33/34 has 16 helical anchors to repair the wall. ODOT states that these anchors shall have a 6 inch blade diameter. ODOT indicates that we are to drill a 3 in hole (TYP) for these anchors. How are we to install this anchor in this size hole. Please clarify

**The intent of the detail shown on sheet 32 is that the anchor is installed after the panel has been removed, then the facial repairs are made. No hole is required to be drilled.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 11:35:12 AM **Question Number - 7**

Please provide details for the fence post connections for on top of the existing MSE retaining wall as this is not detailed on standard drawing F-1.1.

**The gates are to be installed directly adjacent to the top of the wall and installed as the note is written on sheet 34 utilizing standard drawing F-1.1.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 9:36:22 AM **Question Number - 6**

In reference to the estimated quantities on plan sheet 18 of 34 for Wall #2 (W-2), the fiberglass panel quantity for this wall is overstated and the concrete panel quantity is understated based on the stationing provided on plan sheet 3 of 34 indicating the limits of fiberglass panels and concrete panels. Please check and adjust the quantities as needed.

**The quantities have been revised. Please see revised sheets in forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 3:08:19 PM **Question Number - 5**

Please provide the engineer office calculations of the bid quantities.

**The department does not have office calculations for this project and request the contractor to provide unit pricing based on the plans.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 10:43:28 AM **Question Number - 4**

Page 3/24 says to reseal the back side of existing barrier using 512-SEALING OF CONCRETE SURFACES. There are existing coatings to be removed to apply the new coatings. Will ODOT add a pay item for removal or is it incidental to the coating

**A pay item for the removal of existing coatings will be added to the plans. See revised sheet in forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 7:44:32 AM **Question Number - 3**

Project plan sheet 32 shows helical anchors installed for repair option #2. Page 33 shows soil nails installed at various locations along the wall. Do the helical anchors shown in the plans on sheet 32 equal the soil nails on page 33? Which bid item are the anchors to be paid under?

**Sheet 32/34 has been revised to indicate the helical anchors are included in the unit price for Item 511, Class QC1 Concrete, Substructure, As Per Plan. The soil nails referenced on sheet 33/34 are not required for the repairs on this project. The purpose of sheet 33/34 is to show acceptable locations of the helical anchors for the repaired wall. Please see forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2018 1:29:25 PM **Question Number - 2**

Page 4/34 ITEM 608 for both concrete and fiberglass panels after panels are removed the webs and flanges shall be abrasively cleaned before installing the new panels. Some of the posts are galvanized. What level of clean is ODOT looking for

**The department expects the level of cleaning to include the removal of dirt and debris, excess rust, and prior wall fragments that may remain in the web and inside flanges of the posts after removal of the existing noise panels.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2018 3:46:45 PM **Question Number - 1**

Page 33/34 shows retaining wall repairs. Please give a station or location of this repair. Visiting the site we are not sure where this is located

**The work is along the Howard Street MSE walls and will be covered by the items and quantities identified and listed in the plans. This work generally consists of replacing cracked MSE wall panels and replacing voids behind the wall with LSM at six (6) locations along Howard Street. Specific locations will be determined by the Project Engineer.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Project No. 180255**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

FRA-91897 - SP FY18(P)

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 2:26:25 PM **Question Number - 2**

There was no work zone pavement marking quantities added with all of the additional work from Addendum 1. Please review and update quantities.

**The intent at Location 3 is for the permanent pavement markings to be completed with resurfacing of each area.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2018 2:58:40 PM **Question Number - 1**

Bidder Advisory - Owner to be adding significant work to this project.

**ODOT plans to add significant work to this project via a forthcoming addendum. Resurfacing of the east 70/71 interchange in Franklin County will be added to the project.**

**Project No. 180256**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

FUL-101272 - US 20-10.77 Resurfacing

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:13:11 AM **Question Number - 3**

Asphalt Concrete for Driveways is specified with 70-22 liquid. Is this correct or should 64-22 be used?

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:10:54 AM **Question Number - 2**

Are Item 253 Pavement Repairs to be done prior to or after milling?

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 1:51:57 PM **Question Number - 1**

Please describe the kind of work that you want done to the Rounded End Section, line 11. Does it need to be replaced and if so, what size is it?

**The Rounded End Section shall be replaced per MGS-1.1. Rounded End Section item is in the General Summary.**

**Project No. 180257**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

FUL-102801 - SR 66-03.97 resurfacing

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2018 2:14:26 PM **Question Number - 1**

Asphalt Concrete for Driveways is specified in the note on Plan Sheet 4 as having PG 70-22 liquid. Is that correct, or should it be PG 64-22?

**The plan is correct. It should be PG 70-22 liquid**

**Project No. 180259**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

KNO-92968 - US 36/VAR-10.14/VAR

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:08:42 AM **Question Number - 2**

How is the 5" Concrete Trough under the 8" Stamped Crosswalk on page 38 going to be paid?

**Per the note on Sheet 5, the concrete trough is included for payment under pay Item Special, Decorative Crosswalk in SY. Please Bid Accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 9:26:48 AM **Question Number - 1**

Ref 14, Manhole Reconstructed to Grade, has a total quantity of 12ea. They are listed in the plans at locations 1h & 1i. 7ea for h location & 5ea for i location. After field investigations we can not find any sanitary or storm manholes that need reconstructed. Please verify the exact locations of manholes to be reconstructed and the extent of repair or depth of reconstruction needed for each manhole. The cost of reconstruction of manholes can be very expensive and with 12 ea to perform this could place unnecessary cost in the bid without proper information. Please clarify the need for this item and or supply additional details for proper costing of work.

**See sheet 4 for the location of the manholes to be reconstructed to grade. This pay item was used due to the uncertainty of the manhole condition for placement of a new top and could require partial rebuild of the manhole. 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

Project No. 180262

Sale Date - 4/19/2018

LUC-99662 - SR 184-00.35 Resurf/Storm Swr (PART 1 PART 2 AND PART 3)

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 9:50:52 AM **Question Number - 23**

Page 5 states that pavement operations are to be done at night. Please clarify if Full Depth Pavement Repairs (a very noisy operation) are to be done at night.

**Yes, repairs will be done at night**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 2:30:31 PM **Question Number - 22**

Please post the existing sewer profiles.

**Please see the FTP site link below.**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-99662/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 10:47:41 AM **Question Number - 21**

Will Low Strength Mortar backfill also be required for the waterline trenches and the casing bore pits?

**Please use ODOT Specifications**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 10:21:31 AM **Question Number - 20**

Considering the provided start date, the amount of utility and concrete work to be completed, and the temperature requirements of polymer liquid asphalt placement, can day time planing and asphalt paving work be considered as acceptable for the project?

**No, night time temperatures can be attained during construction period.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 10:12:42 AM **Question Number - 19**

As currently outlined in the MOT plan, the amount of days provided to complete Part 1 Phase 2A (planing, pavement repairs, and asphalt paving) is significantly less than the amount of time required, especially when considering the mandated night work allowable work times. Can the amount of days be reconsidered and lengthened?

**No. Please bid per plan.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 10:06:59 AM **Question Number - 18**

Should the SWPPP Plan cost be included under a different item or will it be added as a separate reference item?

**No SWPPP Plan is required**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 10:05:27 AM **Question Number - 17**

For the concrete barrier wall and guardrail work near the Central Ave exit ramp, what kind of MOT will be required and will this be day or night work?

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 10:03:23 AM **Question Number - 16**

Under which reference will the asphalt pavement replacement be paid for the Talmadge exit ramp work? What will the pavement replacement section need to be for said exit ramp?

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 10:00:51 AM **Question Number - 15**

In order to bid the drainage work at the Talmadge exit ramp, the casting and invert elevations will be needed.

**The sewer profile was added to the site for reference only.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 9:49:34 AM **Question Number - 14**

The casing bores at Normandy, Countryside, & Flanders will require a minimum 28' long bore pit to push pieces of 10' casing pipes and 38' to push 20' pieces. Will some of the private property be permitted for use in boring?

**NO private property will be permitted for use in boring.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 8:44:56 AM **Question Number - 13**

In what Phase will the flexible and rigid pavement repairs be completed under?

**Pavement repairs will be completed under Phase 2A**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 8:42:36 AM **Question Number - 12**

Does the low strength mortar pipe trench backfill detail apply to all Type B and Type C drainage pipe on Part 2 work? Will this same backfill requirement apply to Part 1 work?

**Pipe trench detail applies to all Type B & Type C drainage pipe on Part 2. Use ODOT Specifications on Part 1.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 2:36:49 PM **Question Number - 11**

Bid item 51 surface course 9.5MM TY A is being called for use in driveways. Is this the mix that ODOT intends to use? a surface course 64-22 would be recommended.

**Yes, this is the mix ODOT intends to use.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 10:35:09 AM **Question Number - 10**

Part 1 includes a bid item for full depth sawing. Is full depth sawing incidental to the bid items in part 2 or will an item be added?

**Part 2 full depth sawing will be incidental.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 3:25:44 PM **Question Number - 9**

Given the small quantities and scope of work, would the DOT consider using 301 in lieu of the 302 on Part 2 of the project?

**Please bid as is**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 10:00:30 AM **Question Number - 8**

Are the Item 253 Pavement Repairs to be done prior to pavement planing?

**Yes, Item 253 Pavement Repairs are to be done prior to pavement planning.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:41:39 AM **Question Number - 7**

Sheet 6/6 Can proposed elevations for pipe FL. and Rim be provided for MH-1 and MH-2?

**Please bid as is, field verify during construction**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:39:25 AM **Question Number - 6**

Sheet 11/22 D-20 has no proposed elevations for pipe FL or Rim elevation?

**Structure D-20 is a removal and replacement of an existing storm manhole with flowlines and rim elevations matching existing. The existing information for this structure is provided in the profile for Existing Storm Manhole 281.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:38:11 AM **Question Number - 5**

Sheet 22/45 D-13 is listed as type C pipe, this is pipe is under the roadway should it be type B pipe?

**Change made per Addendum No.2.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:36:35 AM **Question Number - 4**

Sheet 17/45 list Reference D-6 as type C pipe, on sheet 10 this is listed as type B pipe?

**Change made per Addendum No.2.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:35:27 AM **Question Number - 3**

Sheet 17/45 shows a Reference D-3, but no D-3 is shown on the drainage Sub-summary?

**Change made per Addendum No.2.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:34:08 AM **Question Number - 2**

Sheet 10/45 shows a call out for a Reference No. D-1 for sheet 17, on sheet 17 there is no Reference D-1 shown?

**Change made per Addendum No.2.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:31:37 AM **Question Number - 1**

Sheet 6/45 (Sequence of Construction) (Phase 1) (paragraph 1) please provide the construction drawings for the installation of the PCB?

**Change made per Addendum No.2.**

**Project No. 180264**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

MAH-99797 - SR Culverts FY2018

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:41:55 PM **Question Number - 1**

Good afternoon,

I am writing with the request to obtain any CAD base-map or digital design data files that may be available for the SR-309 Grade Separation Project in Marion, OH (PID# 90264).

Mosser Construction utilizes computer-aided takeoff and modeling methods to provide accurate and competitive project bids. In addition to the PDF plan set, any of the following file formats will greatly be appreciated:

Alignments & Profiles – XML or KCM (LandXML preferred)  
Design Layout – DGN or DWG  
Existing Ground DTM – XML, DGN or DWG (LandXML preferred)  
Design DDM – XML, DGN or DWG (LandXML preferred)  
Cross Sections – XML, GEN, DGN or DGW (LandXML preferred)

**Project No. 180265**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

MED-92920 - SR 57-00.00

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 8:25:06 AM **Question Number - 3**

Please ignore question 2, did not check addendum 1 first.

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 8:01:53 AM **Question Number - 2**

On sheet 18/23 Maintaining Traffic For Structures, traffic control as per standard MT-96.11 using portable concrete barrier is specified. There are no bid items for portable concrete barrier. Please clarify.

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:45:35 PM **Question Number - 1**

Can the department please specify the widths of the pavement for maintaining traffic at structures MED-57-0216 and MED-57-0265 and also if they will remain in place or not

**The Department has determined that the average widths for each section of temporary pavement is 4 ft. The contractor will be permitted to leave the temporary pavement in place. No addendum required.**

**Project No. 180266**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

MEG-100777 - SR 124-55.890

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 2:14:59 PM **Question Number - 12**

Can the Existing plans be provided for these bridges?

**Please see the following FTP site link.**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MEG-100777/Reference%20File/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 9:40:26 AM **Question Number - 11**

I used the wrong project number on my first question, sorry, I would have deleted the question had I known how to do it. Page 17/26 shows a flange repair of 11/16" x 3 1/5" x 30". Is it acceptable to supply 3/4" plate?

**¾" plate will be acceptable.**

\*\*\* 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:** 4/9/2018 10:34:48 AM **Question Number - 10**

Since the existing PG Grade of the existing asphalt is unknown, please advise what type is acceptable for the Pavement for Maintaining Traffic item.

**The pavement for maintaining traffic shall be in accordance with CMS 615.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 10:33:48 AM **Question Number - 9**

Please review the 5" intermediate stiffener calculation for Structure MEG-124-5589 as shown on Plan Page 12/26. It appears the stiffeners may have been counted twice.

**The number of 5" stiffeners appears to be correct in the plans. Please bid the quantity shown in plans.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 10:33:02 AM **Question Number - 8**

Is power available for the Work Zone Traffic Signal and the Temp Work Zone Lighting required for structure MEG-124-5589?

**There is a power line that runs along the east side of SR 124**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 2:58:40 PM **Question Number - 7**

What is the intent of the permanent left lane closures required on the Vinton County structures? The contractor staging area is shown to be located in the median behind guardrail and portable concrete barrier, negating the need for permanent work zones.

**It is anticipated that the proposed work areas shown on sheets 7, 8 and 9 will not be adequate to park all vehicles and/or equipment during working hours. The lane closures provide extra space for these items. All vehicles and equipment are to be removed from the roadway during non working hours.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 2:55:35 PM **Question Number - 6**

Are portable signals and portable light plants acceptable alternatives to the Work Zone Signals and Work Zone Lighting as described in the plans?

**Portable signals are acceptable. Portable light plants are not acceptable.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 2:54:24 PM **Question Number - 5**

Will the Pavement for Maintaining Traffic be left in place after structure work is complete or is it to be returned to existing conditions? What is the PG content of the existing asphalt?

**The pavement for maintaining traffic is to be left in place. The PG content of the existing asphalt is not known.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 2:52:58 PM **Question Number - 4**

Should Pavement for Maintaining Traffic be placed on both ends of the structure? It appears the same shoulder makeup where the pavement is being placed on the south end is on the north end shoulder as well.

**Pavement for maintaining traffic is not required on the north end of the structure. The existing shoulder is wider there.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 2:51:05 PM **Question Number - 3**

Does the railing get painted on the MEG-124-5589 structure?

**The railing will not get painted on the MEG-124-5589 structure.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 2:49:54 PM **Question Number - 2**

Please advise if the existing plans requested on March 9 will be posted.

**Please see the following FTP site link for existing plans.**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MEG-100777/>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2018 10:34:53 AM **Question Number - 1**

Please provide existing structure plans for the structures on this project.



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Project No. 180268**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

SCI-102149 - SR 73-19.63

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 11:51:29 AM **Question Number - 1**

For Ref. No. 35 how do you get the electric service from the existing warning arrow to the advanced warning sign? There are no plan details of what exactly is included in this item? It appears that there are 6 signs that are LED enhanced based on plan page 14? Please provide additional details.

**Project No. 180271**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

STA-96346 - US 62-24.90

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 1:16:10 PM **Question Number - 2**

Where is the location of the 8640.67 SY of 8" concrete pavement?

**This question has been answered by Addendum #3.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2018 8:59:00 AM **Question Number - 1**

Ref 163 - Pole arm truss design per HL-10.11 or is it a single member pipe arm with decorative underbrace scroll per image on page 243?

**The Pole arm should be a single pipe member with decorative underbrace scroll as per the detail on sheet 243 and not the standard HL-10-11 design.**

**Project No. 180272**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

SUM-94126 - US 224/SR 532-14.84/00.00

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2018 10:18:36 AM **Question Number - 1**

Please review reference #14 Partial Depth Pavement Repair, The proposal is 2,900 CY the plan page 5 is 2,900 SY.

**Addendum will be issued to clarify.**

**Project No. 180273**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

WAS-92911 - SR 618-00.89

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 9:32:32 AM **Question Number - 2**

for your job 180252, page 17/26 asks for a flange repair of 11/16" x 3 1/2" x 30", is 3/4" plate acceptable?

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 8:52:36 AM **Question Number - 1**

Are there any existing roadway plans available that specify if the existing 9" Concrete Pavement is reinforced or not?

**Yes. The original plans call for 9" reinforced Portland cement pavement.**

**Project No. 180276**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

CAR-98502 - GR-FY2018

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 4:37:40 PM **Question Number - 1**

The pay idem list 2ea. Impact Attenuator, type 2 (Bidirectional), As per plan, 55 mph, 26". No where does it list or show what the attenuators will be connection to? Concrete wall, what type and width? If guardrail, what type and width?

**The type and width of the Impact Attenuator are addressed, as stated, in the Item 606 - Impact Attenuator, Type 2, (Bidirectional), as per plan, 55 MPH, 26" note on sheet number 2. The Contractor may use a design speed of 55 MPH and a hazard width of 26 inches for estimating purposes only, but shall be required to field verify the speed (in MPH) and the hazard width (in inches) for each location identified for replacement by the engineer. The Contractor shall not order the new impact attenuator until the design speed and hazard width has been approved by the engineer.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180277

Sale Date - 5/17/2018

LUC-93594 - IR 75-01.10 (PART 1 AND PART 2)

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 2:02:06 PM **Question Number - 72**

On plan pages 1290 & 1291 it states in the notes that parapets on approach slabs are included with the approach slab bid item, but in looking at the computation sheets from the designers the approach parapets are included in the parapet bid item ref. 846 . Please clarify.

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 11:18:03 AM **Question Number - 71**

Sheet 1070/1820 gives a rebar table for the drilled shafts and we cannot confirm the quantity given for the DS1101 bars. Please check this quantity.

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 11:15:51 AM **Question Number - 71**

Sheet 1058/1820 (3/44) under item 503 cofferdams indicates for us to bid the "design shown on the plans". We find no design shown on the plans - please clarify

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 11:13:43 AM **Question Number - 71**

Sheet 1058 of 1820 (3/44) tell us that no pile driving may occur until the embankment is built. The new abutment is in an existing embankment area - please clarify.

The note also states that no pile driving can be done until the new spill slope is completed which would cause a major temporary support of excavation to occur. if this is the intent, please design and show the temporary support of excavation.

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 9:00:22 AM **Question Number - 71**

Ref # 39 Embankment, as per plan has a note on sheet 44 requiring the material to be placed and compacted in 6" lifts. The cross sections on sheet 634 -637 show the location to be at the abutments of the Dorr Street bridge. Plan sheet 1671 typical abutment excavation diagram shows this material to be item 203 embankment, 706.16 type C. The item 203 embankment, as per plan note on sheet 1670 states place and compact embankment material in 6" lifts for the construction of the approach embankment 703.16, type C. Is this embankment material, as per plan required to be 706.16, Type C?

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 8:57:07 AM **Question Number - 70**

In response to Question #52 with respect to the Office Calculations. Only the bridge/structure calculations were provided in the file(s) posted. None of the typical roadway item calculations were included in this data set. We also understand the design surfaces are not available. Is it possible to obtain an existing TIN surface for both segments of the project?

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 8:13:31 AM **Question Number - 69**

on sheet 1101, three runs of temporary sheeting are shown. The two runs at the abutments are detailed on sheet 1111 but the run between the rear abutment and pier 1 is not detailed. Please provide a design for this sheeting

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 8:00:54 AM **Question Number - 68**

Question #12 directions the contractor to the FTP site for Office Calculations. Reviewing the FTP site, it appears there are a lot of directories listed. Opening these directories, minimal information is provided. In addition the office calculations for the Roadway Items has not been provided. Will ODOT please provide the Roadway Office Calculations as called out on the General Summary?

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 1:42:09 PM **Question Number - 67**

We are having issues confirming the concrete quantities for Pay Item 756. What are the pay limits for the abutment secant wall facing for this Item. Is it the 8" facing or does it include the area between the shafts?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 12:47:17 PM **Question Number - 66**

Note 6 on sheet 809 states "the top of noise barrier and upper and lower horizontal rails shall be parallel to profile grade".

The wall elevation on sheet 815 shows that the top of wall (and presumably the rails, but please confirm) maintain a horizontal elevation and generally consistent elevation, jumping up once in a 12" increment, which does not parallel the profile grade of the bridge. Please confirm which sheet correctly represents the intended construction.

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 12:37:02 PM **Question Number - 65**

On plan page 1159 the estimated quantities for the drilled shafts shown on the estimated sheet does not match quantities in the proposal for these bid items, please check.

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 12:25:43 PM **Question Number - 64**

Reference item 545, since asbestos inspections have already been performed, are these 10 additional inspections required for the same 10 structures that have already been inspected?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 12:19:22 PM **Question Number - 63**

Reference items 544 and 545, can the department please provide the asbestos inspection reports to help determine the date the inspections were performed and who performed the inspections?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 10:43:17 AM **Question Number - 62**

Please consider a 2-3 week delay in regards to the sale date of the project. This request is respectfully submitted as a result of information currently missing and required to accurately estimate numerous bid items for the project (see questions 51 and 52). The missing information noted in questions 51 and 52, lack of answers to over 60 pre-bid questions, and the pending changes coming as referenced in the pre-bid questions to future addendums are why such a request is being made. A delay at this point would seem to benefit both ODOT and the numerous contractors, subcontractors, suppliers, and consultants attempting to estimate a unit price for over 1200 bid items that are a part of the project.

**The Department will answer this question by addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 9:36:13 AM **Question Number - 61**

For Bid Item 752 Epoxy Reinforcing Steel the Engineer has left off the quantity for the abutments. Plan Quantity is 521,279 lbs and should be 547707 lbs

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 4:27:27 PM **Question Number - 60**

on Sheet 1111/1820 a sheet pile section with a section modulus of 43.9 and a moment of inertia of 656.2 is required. The heaviest domestic sheet PZ-40 more than meets the section modulus with 60.7 but the moment of inertia is only 490.85. The moment of inertia required seems to be out of line with the section modulus. Could you please check these requirements?

**The large moment of inertia is intended to control deflections. Skylinesteel has several products that meet these requirements. The contractor may also design their own solution at no additional cost to the Department for review.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 3:11:50 PM **Question Number - 59**

On plan pages 1244 & 1245 is shows 2 runs of HMWM resin 4' wide. How is this to be paid for?

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 2:57:45 PM **Question Number - 58**

Please check Bid Items 699 & 746, Approach Slabs Removed. They are significantly understated

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 1:55:09 PM **Question Number - 57**

3. Sheet 1668 shows the limits of wick drain field. Note 4 discusses pay limits and notes that payment for the granular material or prefabricated drainage layer outside of the MSE wall limits is paid for in item 203 wick drain (REF 1023). There is significant cost in this item so please clarify the depth of the sand blanket.

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 1:52:54 PM **Question Number - 56**

2. The Staged Construction of Embankment and MSE notes on Sheet 746 (Note 2) discuss over-excavation and the contractor installing a dewatering system that will maintain groundwater levels/pressures below the elevation of undercut bottom. This system shall be installed and operated for the duration of the excavation and backfill operation. Where is this work to be paid? Is this work to be included in the Wick Drain bid item (REF 564)?

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 1:50:19 PM **Question Number - 55**

Plan sheets 742-744 show sheeting in front of MSE Wall 2. There is no Cofferdam bid item in Section 16. Please clarify where this sheeting is to be paid.

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 1:27:52 PM **Question Number - 54**

The bid item quantity for bid item 845 Drilled Shafts, CSL testing is 16 EA. There are 65 drilled shafts on this bridge. We assume that ODOT wants a CSL test for each drilled shaft. Please revise in the next addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 1:17:45 PM **Question Number - 53**

Bid item quantities in EBS for bid items 839, 840, 841, 843 of bridge LUC-75-0167 LT do not agree with the quantities on plan sheet 1159/1820. The quantities on the plan sheet appear to be correct. Please revise in the next addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 5:19:54 PM **Question Number - 52**

In the digital information provided we are still missing the GPK alignment information for the 93594 component as well as any of the surface information. ODOT has also not provided any of the Roadway office calculations. Please confirm if this information will be provided to the contractors.

**We have requested the GPK files. ODOT does not have a surface file. This project design pre-dated open-roads. Which roadway calcs are you missing. We provided a pdf with the office calcs?**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 2:34:19 PM **Question Number - 51**

The following information is missing from the design files: #1-I75/SR25 Existing Ground Surface(s), #2-PID 93594 geopak file, #3-proposed surfaces for both PID's. Could this information be added to the ftp site?

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 1:34:10 PM **Question Number - 51**

Bid item 175- Catch Basin, #3: this bid item appears to be understated by 1 each as there are 2 of these shown on plan sheet 306 but only 1 carried to subsummary and summary sheets. Please review and revise as needed.

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 8:01:09 AM **Question Number - 50**

sheet 1116 shows the cast in place concrete facing on the drilled shafts. The WWF4x4 -W4.5x4.5 is stated as incidental to the concrete. There are AF401 dowels shown drilled into the face of the drilled shafts. There is no note stating they are incidental to the concrete. Please add a bid item for the dowels.

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 7:59:31 AM **Question Number - 49**

Ref 780 and 781 are for drilled shafts, the chart on sheet 1108 showing the the weight of the rebar. The total appears to be showing the weight of 1 bar of each type and low by a over 93,000 lbs. Please correct the table.

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 7:57:49 AM **Question Number - 48**

Ref 782 and 783 are for drilled shafts, the chart on sheet 1115 showing the the weight of the SP403 rebar spirals appears to be low by a factor of almost 12. Please correct the table.

**Table will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 7:56:17 AM **Question Number - 47**

sheet 1070 shows the cast in place concrete facing on the drilled shafts. The WWF4x4 -W4.5x4.5 is stated as incidental to the concrete. There are AF401 dowels shown drilled into the face of the drilled shafts. There is no note stating they are incidental to the concrete. Please add a bid item for the dowels.

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 7:54:30 AM **Question Number - 46**

Ref 735 and 736 are for drilled shafts, the chart on sheet 1070 showing the the weight of the SP403 rebar spirals appears to be low by a factor of almost 12. Please correct the table.

**Table will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 7:52:04 AM **Question Number - 45**

Ref 706 and Ref 751 are for steel points or shoes on 12" CIP Pipe piles. The piles are not going to rock, please delete these two reference numbers.

**District will utilize steel points or shoes due to drivability concerns.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 12:31:09 PM **Question Number - 44**

Bid Item 641 seems be significantly under stated. From cross sections we get a little over 800 cy. Please check and advise

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 10:12:02 AM **Question Number - 43**

on Sheet 568/1820 cross section 81+50 it shows the Limits of MSE Wall Quantities to include the embankment area outside of the Select Granular Fill Limits. This is the only section that this is called out. There are no embankment quantities listed in this MSE wall 7 pay items. On the typical section of MSE Wall 7 on sheet 772/1820 it calls for the Foundation Prep. granular to be 2' min. Are the areas that will require more than 2' and if so what are the limits. There are also no details on the Wick drains as to the area required, limits of Sand Drainage Layer or anticipated lengths of the drains

**Sheet 568/1820 will be updated to show that the embankment area outside the select granular fill limits is not included with the MSE wall quantities. On sheet 773/1820, the 2' minimum is specified because additional depth may be required to allow the sand blanket to properly drain. The plans have been revised to label the estimated wick drain length and to show wick drains within the foundation preparation limits in section A-A on page 773. See pages 769 and 770 for foundation preparation limits. Revised details forthcoming in upcoming addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 9:50:09 AM **Question Number - 43**

Reference Pier 5A for bridge LUC-75-0167L. The location of the Stage 2 construction Joint appears to be located under the existing bridge that is maintaining SB I-75 traffic. The drilled shaft # 26 & cannot be built this stage and is not needed for deck construction to maintain I-75 SB traffic during stage 3 construction. Please revise the location of the pier cap construction joint in the next addendum.

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 9:46:35 AM **Question Number - 43**

Walls 2, 3, & 4 specify a wall embedment from the top of leveling pad to the bottom of the finished slope in front of the wall (refer to Section A-A on Contract Sht. 747 of 1820). What is the wall embedment from the top of leveling pad to the finish grade at the front face of MSE panel?

**The embedment on the plans is measured at a distance 4'-0" from the face of the wall for walls 2, 3, and 4. The embedment at the face of the wall must be greater than the embedment 4'-0" away from the wall to ensure that water will drain away from the wall.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 4:41:55 PM **Question Number - 43**

Bid item 149- 30" Conduit Type B: This 100' run of pipe crosses Collinwood Blvd. in an area that isn't going to be rebuilt. Is restoration of this pavement and sidewalk considered incidental to this bid item or will ODOT please set up quantities (area or volume) for pavement restoration?

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 4:07:36 PM **Question Number - 42**

The "Item Special - Settlement Platforms" note (Sheet 1485/1820) discusses two stage construction with waiting periods for the MSE wall of bridge LUC-75-0175. The waiting periods are not specified. Could the Department please provide the waiting periods or adjust the plan notes as necessary?

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 2:01:06 PM **Question Number - 41**

Sheet 746/1820 discusses staged construction of MSE Wall 2. Please clarify the duration of waiting periods between Stages.

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 8:58:27 AM **Question Number - 40**

Please provide the Structure Type Study and the Geotechnical Study performed by the Department for this project.

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 9:52:36 AM **Question Number - 39**

On sheet 746/1820 for RW2 under Wick Drain Notes it calls for a sand Blanket is to be installed. There is no details as to thickness or a pay item for this item. Also, there is no detail as to the layout of the wick drains. The same question applies to RW 7

**For wall #2, the "sand blanket" referenced on page 746/1820 is the same as "item 203 Granular embankment" shown on page 747/1820. See section A-A and notes 4, 5 and 6 on page 747 for details and payment of this item. Wick drains are laid out at 3' c/c as shown on sheet 747. Per section A-A, the wick drains are installed within the limits of the wall excavation. See pages 742 – 745 for wall excavation limits. For wall #7, the thickness of the sand blanket or item 203 granular embankment is shown on page 773/1820 as being 2' minimum. There is a note in the legend on page 773 clarifying the payment of this item. The wick drain spacing is shown on page 771. The plans have been revised to show wick drains within the foundation preparation limits in section A-A on page 773. See pages 769 and 770 to see foundation preparation limits. Additional clarification will be made on upcoming detail in Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 9:07:18 AM **Question Number - 39**

It seems that Ref. No. 555, Wall Excavation is significantly understated. Please Check & advise

**Wall Excavation quantity will be revised in a forthcoming addendum to 1,115 CY**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 8:58:48 AM **Question Number - 38**

On page 746/1820, under staged construction of Embankment paragraph 8 states that a waiting period is required to allow the foundation soils to consolidate to 90% of primary consolidation prior to placing final pavement. A waiting period of 2 years is estimated to achieve 90% consolidation. This pavement is shown being completed in phase 1a of the MOT and this period is only 270 days. How can we meet this schedule with this 2 year waiting period controlling the final pavement placement

**The estimated wait period for Wall #2 is approximately 1-2 months. (Without the wick drains, the estimated wait period is 2 years as currently stated in the plans.) The plans will be revised accordingly in upcoming Addenda.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 3:52:39 PM **Question Number - 38**

On sheet 1015/1820 under the limits of excavation & backfill detail, Granular Material, Type B is called out behind the proposed abutment excavations. It appears that this quantity was not carried into the roadway quantities as indicated by the notes. Will the Department pay for the actual volume of Granular Material, Type B required to backfill the excavation beyond the limits of item 503, unclassified excavation?

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 1:04:14 PM **Question Number - 38**

Ref 253 decorative light pole - What is pole design? Cannot locate in plans.

Ref 254 post top 16' light pole - Is this pole design ATON16?

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 11:27:04 AM **Question Number - 38**

when you made available the existing structure drawings for LUC-75-0167 L&R and LUC-75-0187G the estimated quantity sheets were missing. Could you please make these plan sheets available?

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 5:12:06 PM **Question Number - 37**

On detour signing sheets 237-242, there is a note stating "Place advance detour sign assemblies 1000' prior to locations of regular detour sign assemblies shown on map, use M5-1L(R)-30 in place of M6-1L(R)-30." Is the M5-1L(R)-30 sign and assembly required in every instance where there is a M6-1L(R)-30 sign shown?

**Everywhere an M6-1 L(R)-30 is specified, a 1000' prior to that there should be an M5-1 L(R)-30 with an assembly instead installed instead of M6-1 L(R)-30.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 4:58:20 PM **Question Number - 36**

On plan sheet 60/1820, Liquated Damages – How did ODOT determine this significant disincentive value of \$50 per minute? Since ODOT is placing such a significant value on completion, will ODOT pay an incentive for early completion at the same cost of \$50 per minute?

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 2:11:55 PM **Question Number - 36**

On sheet 1015/1820, Item 202 Structure Removed APP - The note states that removal of conflicting piles is to be included in the costs for the removal of the existing bridge. Can the Department please provide an item for removal of the existing piling to address the potential conflict, in lieu of the contractors guessing which piles may need to be removed?

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 12:01:48 PM **Question Number - 36**

The plan note on sheet 1671/1820 Item 690 – AT&T Duct Bank includes a statement that AT&T shall be granted a minimum of 60 days to complete their utility transfer upon completion of the new duct bank. We assume that any time beyond 60 days required for AT&T to complete the transfer will be considered as excusable delay days for scheduling purposes and the assessing of liquidated damages. Is this correct? If not, please define the maximum amount of time AT&T will be granted to complete the transfer. In addition, Level 3 also has utilities in the AT&T duct bank on Dorr St. Is the transfer of their utilities included in the minimum 60 day period discussed above? If not, please provide a duration for the completion of their transfer as well.

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 11:59:25 AM **Question Number - 35**

The Steel Plates plan note on sheet 63/1820 states that existing road plates on the Dorr St bridge are to be returned to ODOT once removed. In order to properly price this item of work more information is needed. A) Our recollection is that approximately 11 each plates 1"x6'x18' were placed into the deck in 2015. However, we believe there were other plates already in place on the deck at that time. Please provide the number, size, and approximate location of all of the road plates on the deck. B) In order to bid this item we need to know where ODOT will take possession of the plates. Simply stating that they are to be taken to a location designated by ODOT does not provide sufficient information. C) Is the Contractor responsible for the unloading and stockpiling of the plates at the designated location, or will this be handled by ODOT?

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 11:56:12 AM **Question Number - 34**

Reference 102, Item 659 Topsoil has a bid quantity of 17,653 CY. Based on our pre-bid survey, we think it is entirely possible that the project will not be able to produce a quantity of 17,653 CY of material that will meet the topsoil requirements outlined in C&MS 659. Will ODOT compensate the Contractor for using on site material regardless of test results, or will a contingency quantity of Item 653 Topsoil Furnished and Placed be added to the bid to establish unit prices in the event that topsoil needs to be brought to the site?

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 10:36:32 AM **Question Number - 33**

1. on plan page 1583 under item 630 special: form liner, under basis of payment paragraph it states "payment for this work shall be made at the unit price bid for item 511", but there is a pay item (ref 1017) for the form liners in the proposal, please clarify.

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 10:21:34 AM **Question Number - 33**

On plan sheet 1583/1820 under item: 530 special: form liner the first sentence states pier columns only but plan sheet 1596 shows form liner on caps also, please clarify?

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 6:11:33 PM **Question Number - 32**

Will ODOT assume "Generator" status for any and all contaminated or hazardous materials encountered? Will ODOT sign the transportation manifests for contaminated or hazardous materials?

**ODOT is the generator. The contractor fills out the manifests and our engineer signs them. We cannot give disposal firms indemnification if the contractor has them fill out the manifests.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 6:00:32 PM **Question Number - 31**

Will the department consider extending the bid date by several weeks given the magnitude and complexity of this project?

**At this time the Department would like to hold the schedule sale date.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 8:15:41 AM **Question Number - 30**

Can the department please review the quantity for Ref # 1003? The quantity of shear studs looks to be understated.

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 8:11:54 AM **Question Number - 29**

The Framing Plan for Br. 0199 on Sht 1634 gives the impression that there are to be crossframes installed at Piers 2 & 3 but there are no details for a Pier crossframe provided. Please advise.

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 8:01:20 AM **Question Number - 28**

The bearing weld size for the Abutment Bearings on Br. 0584 are called out as 1/4" in the bearing detail on Sht 1695 but they are listed as 5/16" in the Bearing Data table on the same page. Please clarify.

**Bearing Detail on sheet 1695 will be corrected to show 5/16" weld. This will be revised in upcoming Addenda detail.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 7:57:17 AM **Question Number - 27**

The ATT Conduit Support details on Sht 1694/1820 have conflicting information. The Top and Bottom Brace are shown as L6x6x7/8 but the top brace is called out as a L6x6x3/4 in the AT&T Conduit Section and the Note calling on the 7/8" dia hole in the horizontal leg of the support angle. Please clarify the correct angle size.

**Callout will be corrected to show 6x6x7/8" on sheet 1694. This will be addressed on upcoming Addenda revision.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 8:54:28 AM **Question Number - 26**

Retaining Wall #7 (MSE) plan sheet 771 shows wick drains but the section on sheet 773 does not. Could the plans be revised to show the wick drains including estimated lengths similar to sheet 747 Retaining Wall #2?

**Plan sheet 773 has been revised to include these details and will be issued in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 8:51:53 AM **Question Number - 25**

Retaining Wall #7 (MSE) has a 2' min undercut. Reference 642 for that wall is Foundation Preparation which is a 1' undercut per SS840. Should this bid item be changed to Item 840E22001 Foundation Preparation, APP to be in line with the remainder of the project and SS840?

**Agree that the item should be changed to as per plan. A revised detail and modification to the bid item is forthcoming in upcoming Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 3:17:36 PM **Question Number - 24**

On page 1671/1820, it states that installation of the new conduit must occur after completion of the end diaphragm concrete pour but before the placement of the bridge deck formwork. Pages 1701 & 1702/1820 state that the diaphragm concrete must be placed after the deck concrete in the adjacent span or concurrently. Please clarify the correct sequence.

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 1:46:39 PM **Question Number - 23**

Drawing 1688/1820 shows seismic pedestals with rub plates. These are typically paid for under the Semi-Integral Diaphragm Guide, there is no bid item for the guides. Please add a bid item for the Semi-Integral Diaphragm Guides.

**Will add 511E33501 Each Semi-integral Diaphragm Guide, As Per Plan pay item to the estimated quantities. Revision forthcoming in upcoming Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 1:45:03 PM **Question Number - 22**

Drawing 1670/1820 states under the heading deck placement design assumptions that the maximum distance from the centerline of the fascia girder to the face of the safety handrail of 48". The next paragraph states the maximum distance is 65". Which is correct?

**65" is correct. We will remove 48" from note on sheet 1670. Revised sheet detail will be forthcoming on upcoming addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 1:43:29 PM **Question Number - 21**

Drawing 1670/1820 states the use of SIP forms is not permitted on this structure. Drawing 1672/1820 states that SIP forms are permitted on this structure. Which is note is correct?

**We will remove the note prohibiting SIP forms on sheet 1670. Sheet revision will be forthcoming on upcoming Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 1:41:44 PM **Question Number - 20**

Drawing 1653/1820 shows railing mounted to the top of the concrete moment slab. Where is this railing paid for?

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 1:38:56 PM **Question Number - 19**

Drawing 1665/1820 shows dowel holes for new concrete cap on the existing abutment and retaining wall. Where are these dowel holes paid for?

**The dowels are included in the reinforcing table on sheet 1658. Item 510E10000 Dowel Holes with Nonshrink, Nonmetallic Grout will be added by Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 1:37:10 PM **Question Number - 18**

Drawing 1665/1820 shows the new concrete cap for the existing abutment and retaining wall. Where is this concrete paid for?

**The quantity for the concrete cap is included in item 511E43512 Class QC1 Concrete with QC/QA, Abutment Including Footing.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 11:24:55 AM **Question Number - 17**

On Plan Sheet 52/1820 under the Asbestos Abatement Note, Bridge #LUC-246-0584 Dorr St, is the transite pipes referring to the duct bank or the fiber conduits embedded in the sidewalk and bridge deck?

**Part 4 of LUC-246-0584 Dorr St. is referring to the duct bank. Direction regarding the conduits embedded in the sidewalk and bridge deck is provided in the other parts of this same note, both the duct bank and the conduits embedded in the sidewalk are believed to contain asbestos.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 9:55:38 AM **Question Number - 17**

Will AT&T supply conduit material, if not is contractor to supply? See plan note on Sheet 1671/1820 under Item 690 – AT&T Duct Bank.

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 9:45:44 AM **Question Number - 16**

Referencing Plan Sheets 1671 & 1694/1820 (Dorr St.); is the additional structural steel and conduit supports for AT&T included in the structural steel bid quantity?

**Yes, the additional weight for AT&T supports was included in the Structural Steel Quantity. Will deduct from overall steel quantity and revise plan detail in an upcoming Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 9:22:44 AM **Question Number - 15**

Bid item quantities for bid items 855 & 856 appears to be over stated. Please revise in the next addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 5:02:25 PM **Question Number - 14**

Plan sheet 1670/1820 Bridge 0584 Dorr St., General Note Item 526 Approach Slabs APP:This note includes Sealing of Concrete Surfaces with Approach Slabs APP. Plan sheet 1709/1820 Bridge 0584 Dorr St. Note #2 says Sealing of the Approach Slab is to be included with Item 512 Sealing of Concrete Surfaces for payment; please clarify.

**Will revise note on sheet 1670 and remove sealing from Item 526 and make necessary adjustments to bid accordingly. Revised detail will be coming in upcoming Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 4:30:33 PM **Question Number - 13**

Plan sheet 1670/1820 Bridge #0584 Dorr St., General Note Item 507 – Prebore and Field Locate Piles:In this note it states if existing piling conflicts with design piling “The contractor is to submit a revised footing plan, at no cost to department”. The redesign of the footing and pile layout should be done by the department, this is not the responsibility of the contractor. Please review.

**Plan note on sheet 1670 will be revised to clarify direction. The revised details will be provided on an upcoming Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 4:10:08 PM **Question Number - 12**

It appears that the Roadway Excavation bid item 37 does not include the Excavation between the existing Bridge 75-0167LT & RT abutments and the proposed abutments. We assume it is not to be included in the Bridge Unclssified Excavation bid items 795 & 853. Please revise bid item 37 bid quantities in the next addendum.

**The excavation quantity between the existing and proposed bridge abutments for LUC-75-0167 L&R in included with the Erie St cross-section quantities (sheets 662-663).**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 2:00:42 PM **Question Number - 12**

Could ODOT office calculations and digital .dgn or .dwg CAD files be provided to aid in the takeoff of this project for the Contractors?

**Please see the design files on the following FTP site link.**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-93594/Reference%20Files/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 12:56:41 PM **Question Number - 12**

Can the bridge rehabilitation project that changed the shape of the parapets/curb to the current be posted to the ftp site?

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 12:26:19 PM **Question Number - 12**

Is all approach slab concrete for the entire project to include QC/QA? Currently the bid items are not consistent. Line Items 738, 785, 846, 1015, and 1063 do not include QC/QA, while the other structure line items include QC/QA. Please clarify.

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 12:20:06 PM **Question Number - 12**

Bid items 231 and 235: the waterline shown on plan sheet 789 is to be built with an open cut casing across Washington Ramp D over two phases of work (phase 3 and phase 4) with the existing waterline removed. Building the line this way will require making a temporary connection at phase line since traffic must be maintained. Please review this design and/or MOT plan and consider changing the bid item to bore and jack and if changed please define which phase it would need to be done.

**The waterline casing is being revised to being bored and jacked under Washington Ramp D. Revised plan details and bid items will be included with an upcoming Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 12:09:28 PM **Question Number - 11**

Bid items 230 and 233: the waterline shown on plan sheet 788 is to be built with an open cut casing across IR-75 over three phases of work (phase 2, phase 3, and phase 4) with the existing waterline removed. The roadway is going to be lowered such that trying to build this in phases will leave connections too shallow as well as making temporary connections at phase line. Please review this design and consider changing the bid item to bore and jack and if changed please define which phase it would need to be done.

**The waterline casing is being revised to being bored and jacked under I-75. Revised plan details and bid items will be included with an upcoming Addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 10:52:25 AM **Question Number - 10**

There are several 611 bid items which are for "Conduit, Bored or Jacked". Will ODOT allow the contractor to bore a steel pipe conduit which can be both the carrier and casing pipe or does the contractor have to bore the casing pipe and then thread the carrier pipe? Several major ODOT projects have allowed the steel casing/carrier pipe method to be performed in the past.

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2018 4:40:12 PM **Question Number - 9**

1. Please provide the office calculations for the project.

**Office calculations can be found on the following FTP site link.**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-93594/Reference%20Files/>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2018 8:24:52 AM **Question Number - 8**

Note under Item 202 Str Removed over 20 ft span APP on plan sheet 1155/1820 states that the "Contractor shall remove existing footing and piles at proposed piers 10 and 12 as necessary for drilled shaft installation." Typically ODOT will have a bid item with a quantity of piles to be removed. It appears that there may be 5 piles to remove on Brg 75-0167L but not sure on brg-75-0167R since there is nothing shown on Pier 10 drawing. Please add a bid item for Pile removal with a quantity.

**Question Submitted:** 3/28/2018 9:29:43 AM **Question Number - 7**

The FTP site link that was provided under the pre-bid question dated 3/26/2018 3:04:04 PM, only includes the existing bridge plans. When will the design files be posted?

**Please see the design files on the following FTP site link.**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-93594/Reference%20Files/>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/27/2018 1:32:42 PM **Question Number - 6**

In the MOT general notes sheet 60 it states stage 2A is to begin 15 days prior to the end of stage 2. Stage 2A/2B are scheduled to last a total duration of 45 days, overlap the end of phase 2, and be completed before phase 3. The bar schedule on sheet 62 is consistent with this 45 days. Should phase 2 begin 45 days prior to the end of phase 2 instead of 15 days? Please clarify.

**The Department acknowledges some inconsistencies stated in the plan. We are currently making some revisions to the MOT which will be released in an Addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2018 3:11:16 PM **Question Number - 5**

References 470/471 are for bridge mounted/moment slab mounted noise barrier. The reference item descriptions end by saying "... (By PID 93592)". Plan sheets 741 (MSE Wall 1), 1042 (Bridge 0130L) and 1091 (Bridge 0139L) reference the noise wall, but the plan sheets for the noise wall details on sheets 841 and 842 say "Being Prepared by WOO/LUC -75-30.70/0.00 Project (PID 93592)". Is there any work to do for this noise barrier on this project or should References 470/471 be deleted?

**Originally, earthwork preparation only was planned for PID 93594 for these noise barriers and the barriers themselves were planned for PID 93592. This is changed. The Department is currently completing noise barrier details. The details and quantities will be added by a future addendum to project 180277 (PID 93594).**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2018 3:04:04 PM **Question Number - 4**

Please post the design files to the FTP site.

**Please see the design files on the following FTP site link.  
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-93594/Reference%20Files/>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2018 1:17:15 PM **Question Number - 4**

Bid item 1260- Field Office, Type C APP has an owner quantity of 72 months, which appears to be overstated given the sale date and completion date. Please review and revise this quantity.

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2018 12:38:25 PM **Question Number - 3**

Proposal states completion date is 9/30/2021. Schedule and MOT notes on plan sheets 60-62 indicate completion date is 9/30/2022. Please clarify the correct completion date.

**The schedule in the MOT notes on sheet 62/1820 is for informational purposes only. The Department is revising the Proposal Contract Completion Date, the new Contract Completion date will be provided with an upcoming Addenda along with some MOT stage/sequence adjustments. Even with a revision to the contract completion date, the dates displayed on the MOT sheet 62/1820 is still information only and may not match the Contract Completion Date. It is the responsibility of the Contractor to develop the actual construction schedule to complete the project by the Contract Completion Date.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2018 8:14:30 AM **Question Number - 2**

Please post the existing bridge drawings to the FTP site.

**"Please see the design files on the following FTP site link.  
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-93594/Reference%20Files/>"**

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2018 3:54:52 PM **Question Number - 1**

Have the design files been uploaded to the ftp site?

**ODOT does not have design (CAD) files for this project.**

**Project No. 180282**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

CUY-105933 - Prospect Ave

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:33:08 AM **Question Number - 1**

If PCB is required, please add an bid item for this work?

**The need for PCB is not anticipated for this resurfacing project.**

**Project No. 180283**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

CUY-97322 - US-US 322-05.78 Signals

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 5:35:55 PM **Question Number - 1**

For the line item 0102 Alternate 1, Central System - how many software licences are required under this pay item?

**Only a single installation of the Centracs central system under Alternate 1 needs to be provided, but the system should include a sufficient number of intersection licenses to incorporate all traffic signals being reconstructed with this project.**

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180284

Sale Date - 5/3/2018

DEL-91905 - Crackseal PPM FY18

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 10:48:04 AM **Question Number - 3**

Thank you for your prompt response. Can you explain why type II or type III is required prior to microsurfacing? Especially with a given timeframe of 2024. I know type IV has been successful prior to microsurfacing in other states. I'm just trying to determine if it's really necessary for a distributor to bid this project or not. Thank you.

**It is the District's intent to crackseal using Type II or Type III with this particular project. Potentially we will be microsurfacing this location by FY24 or earlier.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2018 4:56:45 PM **Question Number - 2**

Gentleman, It has been an ODOT policy to utilize a higher specification material in lieu of a lesser quality material. We believe the industry would recognize the ODOT 423 Type 1 or Type 4 sealant a significant upgrade over the field blend Type 423 2 or 3. It also takes the quality control from the contractor and puts on the manufacture. I have never seen ODOT test the amount of fiber in the field blend. Note even sure it can be done. Many DOT's have moved away from field blend. Most of the ODOT projects bid over years have mostly been the ODOT Type 4 which is a polymer modified sealant with 2% polyester fiber. This would give the District a polymer modified asphalt with low temperature flexibility and 40% of the fiber they specified. Please consider the change to a better ODOT 423 Type 4 sealant. Please look what other districts are utilizing. Sincerely Bill Leahy

**The Department plan to perform a microsurface on DEL/MRW 71 in the near future (as long as the MYWP logic remains the same). Because of this, we must use a Type II or III crackseal material.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/1/2018 9:44:24 AM **Question Number - 1**

For this project type II or type III is specified. Would you accept the more durable ODOT type IV? It's quality control is much more consistent than a field blended type III for sure. Thank you.

**The Department uses Type II or Type III when we plan to microsurface within the next few years. Currently, the MYWP plans to micro DEL/MRW-71 in the sections being cracksealed by 2024. Hence, the types of crackseal have been specified as Type II or III.**

Project No. 180285

Sale Date - 5/3/2018

FRA-76420 - SR 315-00.49

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 10:38:24 AM **Question Number - 2**

The General Summary on Sheet 29 shows (4) EA, but Subsummary on Sheet 36 shows (2) EA Detectable Warnings, Type D. Please confirm the quantity of Detectable Warnings, Type D.

**Will be addressed via forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2018 11:36:05 AM **Question Number - 1**

The plans and proposal show reference to 421 Microsurfacing. Is this still a part of this project?

**No Microsurfacing in this project. References will be removed via forthcoming addendum.**

Project No. 180287

Sale Date - 5/3/2018

HAM-98767 - SR 4-04.31 City of Wyoming

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 10:13:05 AM **Question Number - 4**

Typical Sections for the Project and Saw Cutting locations on the General Summary shows all Curb Removal be saw cut one foot in front of the existing curb. Is this necessary if the pavement is to be removed, either lane width wide or full width? Is it a requirement to remove the curb separate from the pavement?

**ODOT has reviewed the question and please bid as per the contract documents**

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 8:16:22 AM **Question Number - 3**

The plan note on pg. 84/205 requires planter boxes to be removed and re-set. Please add a pay item for this.

**A pay item has been added for planter box removed and reset. See forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 10:07:20 AM **Question Number - 2**

Please review the quantity for Item 608 - Curb Ramp. The Pavement Subsummary on Sheet 69A does not include area for CR-1, and the summation of areas listed does not equal the total quantity.

**CR-1 has been added to Sheet 69A and the total quantity has been revised. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:49:51 PM **Question Number - 1**

Item 69 is listed in the Proposal as Curb, Type 4C, As Per Plan, but the plans do not include details that identify how this curb is modified from standard BP-5.1. Please provide additional information regarding the "as per plan" designation.

**The "As Per Plan" was removed from the item. No detail is necessary. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 180288**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

HAN-103972 - US 68-05.10 Arlington Phase 1

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2018 8:21:42 AM **Question Number - 7**

Along the right side of the new roadway from Sta. 409+16 to Sta. 419+00 the new 12-inch and 15-inch drainage conduits are to be installed under the proposed concrete curb and gutter. There are existing utility poles that are approximately 1-2 feet off the existing right edge of pavement. Will these existing utility poles be relocated prior to construction? If not, will ODOT coordinate with the utility companies to have these poles held and/or braced during construction? The excavation of the 12-inch and 15-inch drainage conduit may cause the existing poles to lean and/or significantly move.

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2018 8:20:53 AM **Question Number - 6**

The "Proposal" document and Addendum No. 2 do not list the numerous overhead utilities that cross existing US 68. There are approximately 20 locations that an overhead utility crosses existing US 68. Will these overhead utilities be relocated prior to construction? If not, will the ODOT coordinate with the utility company to have the existing utility disconnected?

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2018 8:20:08 AM **Question Number - 5**

In the "Proposal" document and Addendum No. 2 there is a gas line conflict listed in the documentation. Is the existing waterline at approximate Sta. 408+25 in conflict with the construction of the 30-inch drainage conduit? Will the waterline remain active or be relocated by others?

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 9:39:56 AM **Question Number - 4**

Can the Department provide geotechnical used for the project?

**A copy of the Geotechnical Report for this project is available on the following FTP site.  
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HAN-103972/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 8:47:38 AM **Question Number - 3**

Plan sheet 15/27 at approximate Sta. 419+50 left states "Encroaching sign to remain". This sign will be in conflict with the installation of the proposed 30-inch drainage conduit. Will the Department add a bid item for sign removal, storage and reinstallation?

**In a forthcoming addendum, a removal and reset bid item will be added.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 8:37:18 AM **Question Number - 2**

Plan Sheet 3/27 depicts 6-inch underdrain behind the proposed curb and gutter. The cross section plan sheets depict the proposed 15-inch and 12-inch drainage conduits beneath the proposed curb and gutter along the right side of the new roadway. The location and depth of the underdrain and drainage conduits are conflicting. Will the Department consider moving the location of the 6-inch underdrains long the right side of the roadway?

**Per a forthcoming addendum, a note clarifying the underdrains can be placed in the same trench as the 12" and 15" drainage conduits has been provided in the plans.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 4:18:22 PM **Question Number - 1**

On Plan sheet 5/27, plan note states "Road may not be closed to through traffic until July 1 due to coordination of detour with another project 120 day consecutive calendar day closure." Since July 4th Holiday is on a Wednesday and due to the holiday traveling restrictions, will the Department adjust the start date for the 120 closure to July 9 and adjust the project completion date accordingly?

**Per a forthcoming addendum, the completion date will be moved to November 10, 2018. Please note there are no holiday restrictions in this plan and the 120 day closure restriction still applies. The roadway cannot be closed until after July 1, 2018 due to coordination of closures with another project.**

**Project No. 180289**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

JAC-92011 - US 35-11.00

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 9:25:57 AM **Question Number - 1**

Pg 3/23 of plans states to apply 705.04 joint sealer, Detail B in SCD AS-1-15. Detail B on AS-1-15 Note #1 is stating preformed elastomeric joint seal. Please confirm which seal to use.

**Plan intent is to use 705.04, Hot Applied, Joint Sealer.**

**Project No. 180301**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

WAS-95320 - Marietta River Trail Ph.5

**Question Submitted:** 3/28/2018 4:48:09 PM **Question Number - 1**

As a follow up to Question 6 regarding RFP Section 1.3 Prequalifications, it is still unclear as to why the prequalifications are required for Highway Lighting, Subsurface Utility Engineering, and Roadway. Referencing the Project Scope section of the RFP, page 3/7 states for Project (18-3001) "Portions of the plans and specifications will be prescriptive, including all the details and requirements to construct that particular element of the project, similar to typical design-bid-build projects. Other portions of the work elements will be performance based or 'non-prescriptive', and these elements will require additional final design detailing by the Contractor's engineer." There appear to be no "non-prescriptive" elements listed in this section that would require the requested prequalifications in section 1.3 for Highway Lighting, Subsurface Utility Engineering and Roadway. Is there an aspect of the scope that is missing, or does the Department expect additional design beyond the prescriptive elements already provided?

**Project No. 180302**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

WIL-102827 - US 6/SR 191-02.96/09.87

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 2:37:14 PM **Question Number - 2**

Why would you have 647 hot tape items set up for Ref#s 59,60,61 if you already have 644 thermoplastic items for this job? Would you consider justing using either 644 or 647 on this project?

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 10:38:21 AM **Question Number - 1**

Please correct ref# 68 bid unit or quantity. Right now it states .37 FT of work zone Channelizing Line

**Project No. 180303**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

BRO-102567 - TR 35-00.06

**Question Submitted:** 4/17/2018 7:33:37 AM **Question Number - 1**

After a site visit no clearing of possible bat trees has been performed. What is ODOT's plan for removal

**It was reported that the trees definitely were cleared.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Project No. 180305**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

ASD-103119 - TSG FY2018 (A)

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2018 1:35:38 PM **Question Number - 1**

In the RFQ, it states that a firm needs to be certified in TRAFFIC SIGNAL DESIGN: Basic Traffic Signal Design, Traffic Signal System Design and HIGHWAY LIGHTING DESIGN: Limited Lighting Design, Complex Lighting Design.

Is there something that I am missing? I this is just for the installation of the of the fiber network between the Dublin Metro Data Center (MDC) and the intersection of US-36/SR-4/Collins Ave, or is there more to it then that, with traffic signal integration and lighting integration?

**Project No. 180315**

**Sale Date - 5/17/2018**

ATH-93962 - Signal FY 2018

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 3:49:20 PM **Question Number - 1**

This project shows a 10/1/18 completion date. Because of the lead times associated with signal material, particularly poles, this completion date is not realistic. Please consider a alter completion date.

**Project No. 180323**

**Sale Date - 5/17/2018**

MAR-90264 - SR 309-19.59

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 9:58:59 AM **Question Number - 1**

Plan page 161 of 262 shows a Pressure Relief Joint Type B at station 87+85. We can not find a pay item for this Pressure Relief Joint. Please clarify.

**Pressure Relief Joint, Type B pay item will be added in forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 180337**

**Sale Date - 5/17/2018**

CUY-98816 - LG FY2018

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 9:27:38 AM **Question Number - 1**

Please clarify all aluminum light pole designs required per SCD HL-10.11 for location No. 1 on plan pages 23, 24 and 25.

**The department wants all conventional light poles for location no. 1 of this project to be fabricated of aluminum per the general note on sheet 4/33 of the plan.**

**Project No. 180344**

**Sale Date - 6/14/2018**

CLA-83663 - 70/72-10.55/6.50

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 3:43:59 PM **Question Number - 1**

Will the existing structure plans and office calculations be added to the contract attachment pages?

**Project No. 183000**

**Sale Date - 6/8/2018**

HAM-104667 - IR 75-03.84

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 8:17:03 AM **Question Number - 180**

Scope Section 16.1.A.a states "At the start of this contract...". Is the start of the contract considered at award, when the first MOT phase is implemented, or when physical work begins on I-75 and I-74.



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 8:16:25 AM Question Number - 179

Scope Section 16.1.A.a calls out the application of 646 Spray Thermoplastic. Item 646 is Epoxy marking, not Spray Thermoplastic. Please clarify what material is required.

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 8:14:25 AM Question Number - 178

In regards to question 140; given the requirements placed on the DBT within scope section 12.5 and the discrepancies between the provided utilities files, we respectfully request that an item for SUE be added to the contract.

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 3:26:40 PM Question Number - 177

1. There is 200' of 30" Cincinnati MSD sewer to be lined but I cannot find it on a print anywhere. Please provide print number.

2. The MSD spec calls for the liner to be GRP CIPP UV cured liner. Would a conventional heat/steam cure be acceptable for this application?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 1:46:34 PM Question Number - 176

After reviewing the ODOT-OES IOC for the Phase II ESA (dated 11/20/2011), it appears that several of the items mentioned in Section 9 (Hazardous Materials), specifically "Work involving non-regulated materials" and "Work involving hazardous waste", will not be needed as part of this contract. Is this correct?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 1:45:30 PM Question Number - 175

ITO Section 5.9, minimum element 2 item (r.) " Deck cantilever dimension Merge to I-75 location and geometry". Is this a clerical error an intended to be two separate items to be addressed?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 1:38:53 PM Question Number - 174

SOS section 20 does not include a document key type. Can ODOT please provide indicating which documents are contract documents, reference documents, and documents that depict elements of the basic configuration?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 1:36:21 PM Question Number - 173

In regards to Hopple Street SB Off-Ramp (Ramp A) being widened to two lanes, is it ODOT's intent to just add pavement on the current alignment/geometrics to provide for the two-lane ramp?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 1:26:47 PM Question Number - 172

In regards to Hopples Street SB Off-Ramp (Ramp A) being widened to two lanes, is it ODOT's intent to just add pavement on the current alignment/geometrics to provide for the two-lane ramp?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 1:25:34 PM Question Number - 171

Due to the prebid questions related to the median shoulders north of Ludlow (PBQ's 54, 141, 148 and 150) and previous ODOT plans for the median shoulders identifying their composition as 3" of asphalt on 9" of concrete, does ODOT intend that the existing median shoulders north of Ludlow (STA 250+00) to the northern project limits (STA 290+00 of the Mitchell St project, PID 82278) be removed and replaced?

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 2:38:40 PM Question Number - 170

ITP/RFP Section 5.9 requires the following item to be presented with the PTI submittal: "8. The anticipated approach for transverse access of piers and abutment seats to allow for inspection access of all bearings."

This appears to be a carry-over from the Cuyahoga I-480 PTI requirements in which the bridge required specialized access. Since the HAM-75 bridges are relatively basic highway structures and do not require specialized access, can Item 8 be removed from the PTI submittal list?

**Question Submitted:** 4/18/2018 2:36:51 PM Question Number - 169

In regard to Cincinnati Street Railway Colerain Avenue Substation (HAM-7628-40) property (near station 214+00), the response to pre-bid question #107 indicates "...no new Right of Way at this resource. If the resource is potentially impacted by any construction activities, it will have to be re-coordinated with SHPO." However, the 2008 EA states, "Minor property impacts are required." The LGT plan also shows installing Wall 18 near this property, with temporary right-of-way. The Section 4(f) documents do not address this property. Can ODOT clearly describe what "minor impacts" are permissible on this property as suggested in the EA?

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 12:05:11 PM Question Number - 168

Will the Department consider increasing the stipend amount to account for the added project scope, including the 75-SB Hopple Exit, and the significant scope revisions within Addendum 8 which was issued after 10 of the 14 weeks of design was completed? This has been done on previous projects when scope has been added or significantly changed.

**While the Department appreciates the effort being put forward, the Department is unable to increase the predetermined stipend amount**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 11:22:34 AM Question Number - 167

Will Temporary Construction Easements be provided along the Left side of I-75 from Station 252+00 to 265+00?

**No additional temporary construction easements or temporary RW is being provided.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 11:22:16 AM Question Number - 166

There is an existing billboard at approximately I-75 Station 255+62 LT. This billboard is in conflict with the proposed improvements. Will this billboard be removed by others?

**The billboard is not being removed.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 11:19:49 AM Question Number - 165

Please reference the R/W file provided in response to PBQs 151 and 146. By maintaining the established centerline of Curve 4 and 10 ft wide shoulders per the proposed design exception as previously discussed in PBQs, the recent R/W acquisition by the Department still does not provide sufficient right-of-way for the work. For example, the roadway width, not including additional width for necessary retaining walls, still extends beyond the LA R/W between approximately 254+50 and 255+67. Additional R/W purchase is required. Does ODOT intend to purchase additional right of way in this location and others with similar conditions along the project limits?

**No additional RW is being purchased. The DBT has the ability to utilize the previously purchased RW at the base of Mt. Storm.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 9:39:39 PM Question Number - 164

In response to PBQ 72, has ODOT decided if the SB IR 75 ramp to Hopple Street is to be converted as a two lane exit or is a change coming via an addendum?

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 9:38:45 PM Question Number - 163

Per the Scope of Services 1.2 states "ODOT has provided the previously designed plans for the Mill Creek Expressway (MCE) Phase 5 (PID 83723). These plans are for reference only." Per Scope of Services section 6, "The contractor shall provide for the furnishing of materials, construction and completion in every detail of all the work described in the Conceptual Documents in order to fulfill the intent of the contract." The conceptual plans which are the revised LG&T plans (PID 104667) do have in some cases significant differences. Can ODOT please clarify between these two statements?

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 9:37:22 PM Question Number - 162

As a follow-up to Question Number 72, Scope of Services 14.2.1.7 states the DBT is to convert the SB I-75 exit ramp to Hopple St into a dual lane exit. Currently the pavement is a single lane with a 16' ramp with 6' and 3' shoulders. To provide a 2-lane ramp, pavement widening and ramp re-alignment is required. The files that ODOT has provided do not include any updated survey, drainage or tin files from when this area was constructed, and there have been no electronic files provided. Can ODOT please provide the appropriate files and design criteria so that the DBT can adequately develop the ramp widening details?

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 5:10:50 PM Question Number - 161

Additional clarification is needed for SOS 14.2.1.6. Can ODOT confirm the location of the shoulder tapering from 15' to 10', as depicted in Appendix A, is fixed regardless of the Ramp P geometry?

**The location is not fixed. The 15ft shoulder may extend further towards the RR but the taper shall not start any closer to the HAM 75 0440 structure than shown in Appendix A.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 5:08:37 PM Question Number - 160

In ODOT response to pre-bid question 112, both the response and graphic provided denotes only Ramp P is considered a directional roadway. Addendum No. 8 makes no reference to this pre-bid response. Will ODOT be including the response to pre-bid question 112 into the SOS?

**Addendum 8 clarified this by including the following: There have been multiple Prebid questions regarding the design designations for EB I-74 to SB I-75 and NB I-75 to WB I-74. The scope changes are different than the answers to the prebids. See revisions to the following sections for clarification: 1.114.2.1.514.2.1.6**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 4:57:53 PM Question Number - 159

ITO/RFP Section 5.9 outlines the information required to be submitted for the PTI discussions. Items 7 and 9 both require responses to the Offeror's SOQ commitments and the language is nearly identical. As these appear to be redundant requests, can Item 7 be removed?

**Item 7 will be deleted in the forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 10:56:54 AM Question Number - 158

Per the Scope of Services for GCWW work, we are to follow the scope requirements per 12.9.1 and 12.9.2. To clarify the extent of the work required, is the DBT only required to repair/replace/relocate facilities that are directly impacted by the proposed work of PID 104667?

**Only impacted facilities are to be relocated. An impacted facility also includes any area where the facility does not meet the requirements in section 12.9.2.I.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:03:42 AM Question Number - 157

With Addendum 6, SOS 15.3.C the Transverse Section Roadway Width was reduced from 74'-0" Toe/Toe Each Direction to 71'-0", and the recent pre-bid questions and SOS changes to 14.2.1.5.C and 15.3.A in Addendum 8. Can ODOT confirm the median and outside shoulder widths required for I-75 (NB & SB)?

**The median and outside shoulder widths are to meet standard unless otherwise noted in the scope.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:03:24 AM Question Number - 156

Appendix A depicts the I-75 Curve 5 as a 2 degree curve with a maximum superelevation of 0.0333 FT/FT which is less than 50 mph. Per the SOS 1.1 I-75 design speed is 60 mph. The maximum superelevation of 2 degree curve at 60 mph is 0.045 FT/FT. Can ODOT please confirm that a design exception (superelevation rate) is not required for curve 5?

**A design exception for curve 5 superelevation is not required.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:02:48 AM Question Number - 155

Regarding pre-bid question 125 and the design exception for curve 4. Can ODOT confirm a design exception (horizontal SSD) is not needed for the I-75 NB/Ramp E merge area where the outside shoulder is 8ft along the concrete barrier?

**Horizontal stopping site distance is based on a combination of the radius, the offset to the center of the lane, and the design speed.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 9:02:32 AM Question Number - 154

With changes to the SOS 14.2.1.5.C and 15.3.A, Can ODOT confirm that the existing maximum superelevation rate of 0.0.83 FT/FT depicted on the Appendix A Site plan for the HAM-74-1908R structure is still acceptable?

**The intent is to match the existing superelevation rate on HAM-74-1908R. Once the design exception is approved, it will be posted.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 8:55:41 AM Question Number - 153

The project scope requires a paved gutter at the top of an MSE wall to collect drainage from a slope behind the wall (Section 14.5.18 and Section 14.6.4), but does not address drainage for any other wall types. Are there specific drainage requirements for other retaining wall types?

**Section 14.5 - 15 was revised to remove any mention of MSE walls. This section will now pertain to all types of retaining walls. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:46:59 PM Question Number - 152

Pursuant to PBQ's 116 and 117 as well as Addendum 08 SoS; can the department please clarify Railroad agreement process. SoS 1.4 - "Railroad Coordination" - second paragraph indicates "The Department will enter into Standard Construction Agreements with the Railroad. The DBT's operations shall be conducted in accordance with these agreements...". The third paragraph indicates "Railroad Coordination, including the processing and execution of Railroad Agreements, is handled through the State Rail Coordinator at Central Office". Addendum 08 SoS 1.4.1.5 indicates "The DBT is responsible for obtaining any additional railroad agreements that may be needed to complete the required work." The language appears contradictory, as the department has generally handled Railroad Agreements on past ODOT projects.

**Section 1.4.1.5 as added in addendum 8 will be deleted in the forthcoming addendum. Unless there is a dramatic change in the scope, an additional RR Agreement is not anticipated, but if required the DBT will have to work through ODOT to get the agreement.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:45:37 PM Question Number - 151

Regarding Question No. 138, can ODOT please provide the limits and electronic files for the additional R/W that is being acquired along SB I-75?

**The file at the link below will show the additional RW being acquired once it is referenced into the basemap.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/RW/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:44:58 PM Question Number - 150

There are numerous references to existing full depth pavement and full depth shoulders. The pavement and shoulder build up in the projects limits vary greatly in depth, as well as composition. Do the shoulders have to be the same depth as adjacent pavement to be considered full depth, or is there a minimum pavement thickness/composition that ODOT will allow to be considered full depth on the shoulders even if it is less than the adjacent pavement depth?

**A full depth shoulder is to have the same pavement makeup as the travel lanes.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:44:18 PM Question Number - 149

Per Section 14.2.1 Item 1.b, "All superelevation elements shall meet design standards". Per Item 14.3 Item 3.c, "Existing full depth pavement may be salvaged and resurfaced" from Sta. 250+00 to the northern project limits on IR 75. Per Item 14.3 Item 15, the pavement make-up for Resurfacing includes a mill and fill of 3.25". Is it ODOT's intent to resurface this stretch of IR 75 with 3.25" of mill and fill since it is full depth and thus can be salvaged, or to alter the superelevation rates and transitions via wedge courses to meet design standards?

**The intent is to resurface this section of IR-75 with a minimum of a 3.25" mill and fill. A wedging pavement makeup will be provided in the forthcoming addendum to allow for correction of the superelevations. In the final condition the pavement thickness shall meet or exceed the existing condition.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:43:40 PM Question Number - 148

Per Section 14.3 Item 2.a, "All shoulders within the project limits are to (be) constructed or reconstructed full depth". Per Item 6 Scope of Work, the project limits are from SLM 2.4 to SLM 5.7. Is it the intent of ODOT to replace the median and outside shoulders within the project limits identified in Item 6? If not, what are the limits of shoulder construction?

**Per section 14.32. All shoulders within the project limits are to be constructed or reconstructed full depth. Exclude Hopple resurfacing areas ( See section 14.3.1) All shoulders, excluding the Hopple Street Resurfacing are to be full depth.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:43:00 PM Question Number - 147

Per Section 14.3 Item 3.c, existing full depth pavement may be salvaged and resurfaced north of Sta. 250+00. The existing median shoulder cross slopes are less than 4% (originally constructed at 2%) and in some areas are 0%. The superlevation transition rates in this area were originally calculated for 3 lanes, which will now be widened to 4 lanes and thus have different transition lengths. This would require significant wedging to correct the cross slopes and transition rates to meet the latest requirements of the L&D. Per Section 14.3 Item 15, there is no variable asphalt course. Is it the intent of ODOT to correct the substandard cross slopes and transition rates in this area via wedging? If so, what is the intended asphalt item for this wedge course since it was not identified in Section 14.3 Item 15? Note that sheet 172/288 in the Appendix A reference document shows a full depth pavement section sitting on top of the existing pavement at Sta. 254+00 left. If ODOT's intent is to resurface the existing pavement areas, can the existing crown point remain in its existing location or does it need to shift to a lane line to accommodate the wider, proposed median shoulder width.

**A variable asphalt course will be provided in the forthcoming addendum. All cross slopes, superelevations, and crown locations are to be corrected with this project.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 3:10:56 PM Question Number - 146

Referring to PBQ 138 & 139, will ODOT please provide a detail showing the dimensions and types of ROW ODOT is acquiring on the outside of SB I-75. This information is needed so we can complete the layout and phasing of the final design elements.

**The file at the link below will show the additional RW being acquired once it is referenced into the basemap.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/RW/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 9:30:39 AM Question Number - 145

A new back-wall is required at the two Beekman bridges and the Elmore bridge. However, this is not required at the 1908R bridge. Is this correct?

**The backwalls on HAM-74-1908R are to be replaced down to the beam seat. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 9:29:51 AM Question Number - 144

SoS 15.3.G-6. "Graffiti fed resin treatment for deck and approach slab." Typically, gravity fed resin is a requirement for deck repairs. However, EB is a new bridge deck, and note 2 (within the same section) states no surface treatment on WB. Can the Department please clarify where the gravity fed resin is to be used?

**This will be removed from the scope in the forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 9:27:12 AM Question Number - 143

SoS 15.3.E-2. Please confirm the Department wants the DBT to mill & fill WB-74 from approximately STA 900 to 1002 (Stations per 83723) at the beginning of the project and again at the end of project to repair MOT scars.

**Correct. This sections is to be milled and filled at the beginning of the project and again at the end to repair MOT scars.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 7:06:06 PM Question Number - 142

Can ODOT please provide the latest rating report for the HAM-74-1908R Structure?

**The requested rating report can be found at the link below.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 7:04:53 PM Question Number - 141

The existing, median shoulder pavement depth on IR 75 from Sta. 250+00 to the north end of the project is less than the depth of pavement of the mainline lanes. From Sta. 250+00 North, we are unclear if ODOT classifies the existing median shoulders as full depth, or if they can be salvaged and resurfaced. Does ODOT consider the existing median shoulders full depth? Or is ODOT's intent in Section 14.3 Item 3.b "Provide full depth shoulders (width per standard)" to reconstruct the median shoulders utilizing the pavement make-up as established in Section 14.3 Item 15?

**A full depth shoulder is to have the same pavement makeup as the travel lanes. An existing shoulder is not considered full depth, unless it have been recently reconstructed or has pavement cores showing otherwise. The median shoulder is to be reconstructed as stated in section 14.3 using the pavement makeup provided.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 4:06:35 PM Question Number - 140

Existing utilities have been provided in multiple files; masterbu100.dgn and the AutoCAD files representing Appendix\_MM-CSO\_21\_100% Drawings 7-6-17.pdf (04-P&P.dwg, 06-P&P.dwg, 08-P&P.dwg). There are existing utility location discrepancies between what is shown in materbu100.dgn and what is shown in 04-P&P.dwg, 06-P&P.dwg, and 08-P&P.dwg. What file(s) should be used for the existing utility locations to prepare the Technical Proposal?

**Per section 12.5 The DBT shall be responsible for independently obtaining their own verification of all of the project utility locations within the confines of their work. Per Section 12.5.1 The DBT is responsible for verifying the actual location of all underground utilities including type, number and depth. The DBT shall obtain the underground utility information from the utility owners via means such as, but not exclusive to, contacting OUPS, requesting record plans and/or digging test holes on the facility. No additional compensation will be made to the DBT. Per Section 12.5.2 The DBT is responsible for verifying the actual location of all overhead utilities including type, number, and elevation of lines and all above ground utility facilities. No additional compensation will be made to the DBT.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 3:59:42 PM Question Number - 139

Referring to PBQ No. 138, additional right-of-way is also required to enable construction of I-75 SB (approximately Sta 284 to Sta 285)-- outside of I-75 SB. Please confirm whether ODOT will also consider acquiring additional right-of-way at this location (I-75 SB Station 284 to Station 285) – outside of I-75 SB

**Additional RW on the outside of I-75 SB from STA 284 to 285 is not being acquired.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 8:12:58 AM Question Number - 138

Will ODOT consider obtaining ROW for the pinch point between station 255+00 to 257+00 on I-75 SB to facilitate construction on the outside of SB I-75 to meet the widening requirements per the Scope?

**ODOT is currently in the process of obtaining additional ROW for this area and is anticipated to be available for use by November 15th, 2018. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 8:08:04 AM Question Number - 137

In regards to question 132 concerning hazardous material and subsequent response, will the Department reconsider its response?

**In regard to question 132, the Department is clarifying its response. ODOT maintains the "Generator" status for all hazardous materials encountered. ODOT will sign the manifest as the Generator. As the Contractor is responsible for classifying and testing the material, the Contractor is responsible for the development/filling out of the manifest (and its accuracy).**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 8:01:58 PM Question Number - 136

Given the 6 addendums plus another on the way, and the over 130 prebid questions asked, which ultimately affect the prebid design effort; respectfully, will the department consider increasing the Stipend?

**While the Department appreciates the effort being put forward, the Department is unable to increase the predetermined stipend amount.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 8:00:58 PM Question Number - 135

Can the department please provide the Construction Plans for the Ludlow Bridge over I-75.

**The requested plans can be found here.**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Existing%20Plans/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 8:00:07 PM Question Number - 134

In ODOT's response to PBQ 130, "IR 74 to WB IR 75" is referenced. Was ODOT's intent to state NB IR 75 to WB IR 74 shall have 10' inside and 10' outside shoulders?

**The response to PBQ 130 was incorrect. The intent is for NB IR 75 to WB IR 74 to have 10ft inside and outside shoulders.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2018 10:09:05 PM Question Number - 133

Can the existing storm system be reused with necessary adjustments and extensions for areas north of STA 250+00 where pavement salvage is allowed?

**No. The storm system will be replaced when the median barrier is replaced.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2018 10:54:53 AM Question Number - 132

Will ODOT assume "Generator" status for any and all contaminated or hazardous materials encountered as well as signing the transportation manifests for the contaminated or hazardous materials?

**The Contractor is to be listed as the Generator on the Waste Manifest.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:27:23 PM Question Number - 131

Are the auxiliary major guide signs (e.g. Cultural Interest/Generator Signs) shown in PID 83723 a requirement for this project? Please clarify for what types of signs are required in the signing scope.

**See forthcoming addendum. The following has been added to section 16. All auxiliary major guide signs shown in PID 83723 and are within the project limits on I-75 and on EB I-74 between STA 984+00 and the merge with I-75 are required to be installed with this project.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:23:46 PM Question Number - 130

In ODOT's response to PBQ 100, the inside shoulder width for two-lane roadway (IR74 to SB IR 75) is to be 10' wide which is in excess of the 4' shoulder width per the L&D. Is it the intent of ODOT to utilize a 10' inside shoulder on the two-lane roadway from IR 75 to WB IR 74?

**Yes. The two-lane roadway (IR74 to WB IR75) shall have 10' shoulders.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:23:08 PM Question Number - 129

In ODOT's response to PBQ 100, the inside shoulder width for two-lane roadway (IR74 to SB IR 75) is to be 10' wide which is in excess of the 4' shoulder width per the L&D. Is it the intent of ODOT to utilize a 10' inside shoulder on the two-lane roadway instead of a 4' shoulder that would meet design criteria?

**Yes. The two-lane roadway (IR74 to SB IR75) shall have 10' shoulders.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:22:13 PM Question Number - 128

In ODOT's response to PBQ 100, the HAM-74-1908R structure is to have a minimum deck width of 65' to accommodate 2-10' shoulders and 3-12' lanes which would only require 56' of deck width. Is it ODOT's intent to have a 65' deck width in lieu of the 56' that is needed to carry the defined typical section?

**Yes. The minimum deck width shall be 65' even though this is greater than the width needed to accommodate the shoulder and lane widths.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:05:37 PM Question Number - 127

Please confirm that advance guide signing for multi-lane exits having an optional exit lane that also carries the through route will utilize down arrow signage as shown in the 83723 Stage 3 Plans as opposed to the diagrammatic signage required by the OMUTCD.

**For NB I-75 to WB I-74 provide the advance guide signing for multi-lane exits with an option lane as show in the plans from PID 83723 and PID 76257.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:05:03 PM Question Number - 126

SoS 15.3.A #1 requires a new composite deck for 1908R. This requirement, however, is not stated for the other bridges where the decks are being replaced. Are new composite deck slabs required for all bridges with deck replacements? If so, please revise the scope to include this requirement.

**See forthcoming addendum.**

**The HAM 74 1840, 1852, and 1892 bridges are also required to have new composite decks.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:04:24 PM Question Number - 125

Is the I-75 curve 4 Design Exception (referenced in PBQ 71) intended to maintain the existing inside shoulder width of 6'? If not, the only way to stay within the LA R/W (as indicated in PBQ 96), would require I-75 to shift considerably into the Mount Storm Park property including new 14' inside shoulders which would preclude reusing existing pavement north of STA 250+00.

**The design exception for Curve 4 is for the horizontal stopping site distance using exiting curvature and 10ft shoulders per section 14.2.1.1.a. The DE will posted upon final approval.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:03:29 PM Question Number - 124

Please see PBQ 55. This question was not answered nor can we find any revisions to the SoS which address this. Can the Department please clarify these requirements?

**Scope changes per addendum 6 changed section 14.5.10 to read as follows:**10. All existing storm sewer conduits and structures shall be removed except for those conduits and structures shown in Drainage Appendix B. a. Pipes 10 inches through 24 inches in diameter or rise with less than 3 feet of final cover shall be removed or filled; with more than 3 feet of final cover they may be abandoned in place. b. All conduits 24 inches or greater that are not incorporated in the final design can be removed or abandoned per CMS 202. Abandoned conduit shall be filled with Item 613 LSM and the DBT shall include methods to verify complete filling of conduit to be abandoned. c. If an existing conduit is to be extended: 9.c.a: The proposed extension shall match the size, type, and material of the existing conduit. 9.c.b: The existing conduit shall be removed to a manufactured joint so the bell and spigot ends of the existing and proposed conduits connect per CMS 611.08.9.c.c: A masonry collar per DM-1.1 is required at the joint between the existing and the proposed. d. Existing manholes cannot remain in service if the proposed roadway alignment results in the existing manhole being located in the pavement. e. Existing manholes that will not be incorporated in the proposed design with less than 4.5' of cover shall be removed per CMS 202. Existing manholes that will not be incorporated in the proposed design with more than 4.5' of cover shall be removed or abandoned per CMS 202.

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:02:41 PM Question Number - 123

SoS 16.1 Part A.a. Is it the Department's intent to restripe with Spray Thermoplastic on the concrete Hopple ramps as well?

**See forthcoming addendum. Section 16.1.A.a has been revised to have ITEM 642 Traffic Paint on the concrete surfaces.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:02:13 PM Question Number - 122

Will the Department provide RFC drawings for the MSD work shown in Appendix MM or is the DBT responsible for this?

**All MSD work as defined in the scope is the responsibility of the DBT. Buildable Units as defined by the scope shall be developed by the DBT and follow the review process to get to Released for Construction (RFC) plans. Additional clarifications will be added to the scope.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:01:43 PM Question Number - 121

ITO Section 5.9, PTI #3.b. Are the profiles and cross sections requirements intended for the walls only or are they intended for the roadway?

**The intent is for cross sections of the retaining walls and the roadway section to be provided. This will be clarified in the ITO. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:00:51 PM Question Number - 120

PID 83723 requires HPS fixtures, is this the Department's intent?

**Yes, HPS fixtures are required.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:00:22 PM Question Number - 119

SoS 16.2 states signs installed under PID 76257 can remain. Can signs installed under PID 82278 also remain?

**See forthcoming addendum. Signs under PID 76257, PID 82278, and PID 82284 can remain.**



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 11:59:36 AM Question Number - 118

SoS 16.2 is unclear as to the specific requirements of signing (similar to the previous lighting PBQs) for this project. For instance, Section 16.2 does not address signage requirements for I-74 in any regard; Is the intent to replace only the signs affected by the proposed construction work on EB 74? Can existing sign structures be reused? Please clarify.

**See forthcoming addendum: The following clarifications will be made. See forthcoming addendum. 16.2.A.a.i All required flat sheet signs on I-75 shall be replaced and on new supports. 16.2.A.a.ii All required flat sheet signs on EB I-74 shall be replaced and on new supports. The limits are start at STA 984+00 and end at the merge with I-75. Any signs impacted by MOT shall be replaced with a new sign and on a new support. 16.2.B.b.i All extrusheet sheets on within project limits on I-75 and EB I-74 from STA 984+00 to the merge with I-75 shall be replaced with this project. 16.2.C.a.i All ground mounted post supports within the project limits on I-75 shall be replaced. 16.2.C.a.ii All ground mounted post supports on EB I-74 shall be replaced. The limits are start at STA 948+00 and end at the merge with I-75. Any signs impacted by MOT shall be replaced with a new sign and on a new support. 16.2.D.a.i All ground mounted beam supports within the project limits on I-75 shall be replaced. 16.2.D.a.ii All ground mounted beam supports on EB I-74 shall be replaced. The limits are start at STA 984+00 and end at the merge with I-75. Any signs impacted by MOT shall be replaced with a new sign and on a new support. 16.2.E.a.i All ground mounted beam supports within the project limits on I-75 shall be replaced. 16.2.E.a.ii All ground mounted beam supports on EB I-74 shall be replaced. The limits are start at STA 984+00 and end at the merge with I-75. Any signs impacted by MOT shall be replaced with a new sign and on a new support.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 11:29:26 AM Question Number - 117

Reference appendix "R" the Railroad agreement. Article V of the agreement allows a crossing across the RR. SoS section 1.4.1.4.H specifically states no temporary at-grade crossings will be allowed. Near Sta. 290+00, at the required Jack and Bore location, access will need to be provided for the receiving pit and installation of the end treatments. Please clarify

**See forthcoming addendum. The DBT is required to obtain a RR Agreement to complete this work. For CSX, go to:**

**<https://www.csx.com/index.cfm/customers/value-added-services/property-real-estate/permitting-utility-installations-and-rights-of-entry/For NS>, go to: <http://www.nscorp.com/content/nscorp/en/real-estate/norfolk-southern-services/wire-pipeline-fiber-optic-projects.html>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 11:27:47 AM Question Number - 116

Reference appendix "R" the Railroad agreement. It appears this agreement was executed for the removal and replacement of the of the decks and parapets for the 1908 structure. Is there a separate agreement for the proposed Jack and Bore locations which are a significant distance north of the 1908 Structure?

**See forthcoming addendum. The DBT is required to obtain a RR Agreement to complete this work. For CSX, go to:**

**<https://www.csx.com/index.cfm/customers/value-added-services/property-real-estate/permitting-utility-installations-and-rights-of-entry/For NS>, go to: <http://www.nscorp.com/content/nscorp/en/real-estate/norfolk-southern-services/wire-pipeline-fiber-optic-projects.html>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/28/2018 12:39:30 PM Question Number - 115

Pursuant to ODOT's response on prebid question 112, the proposed design speed on the northbound I-75 to westbound I-74 roadway is to be designed for 60mph (interstate highway). In reviewing the existing adjacent project plans, the northbound I-75 to westbound I-74 roadway associated with Hopple Street project had four horizontal curves designed for speeds between 45 and 50 mph and would suggest this was designed as a directional roadway consistent with Transystem's reference documents. Designing for interstate highways (60mph) will require the removal and replacement of the full depth pavement installed on the northbound I-75 to westbound I-74 in the Hopple Street project just completed. Is it ODOT's intent to have the northbound I-75 to westbound I-74 roadway designed for 60 mph (interstate highway)? if not 60 mph, what is the required design speed for this roadway?

**The design speed for NB I-75 to WB I-74 is 50mph. The design speed for EB I-74 to SB I-75 is 50mph. This has been clarified in scope section 1.1. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2018 11:39:50 AM Question Number - 114

Can ODOT please provide the plans for, or more specifically the exact location/coordinates of the proposed Duke towers.

**Duke Energy has provided the following information based on their conceptual design. The structure heights and locations are subject to change without notice. The provided information can be found at the link below. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Duke%20Information/>**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2018 9:19:31 AM Question Number - 113

The scope states in 14.2.1.7 that the Mitchell Avenue project widened the roadway to accommodate a south bound fourth lane but did not stripe it in. PID 82286 will stripe the south bound I-75 lane to STA 324+00 (Begin taper on sheet 450/611). This fourth lane shall continue down to tie into the Hopple Street Project. Can ODOT please provide a link to the 82286 plan set and Please clarify the work limits of the restriping north of the project to the PID 82286 striping limits. Is it the intent of the project to provide MOT Clean-up/Resurfacing of the entire south bound I75 from 324+00 to the north project limits, or is it to only replace the edge line with a lane line and add a new edge line?

**The requested plans are at the link below:[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Existing%20Plans/The full width mill and fill is required to clean up MOT](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Existing%20Plans/The%20full%20width%20mill%20and%20fill%20is%20required%20to%20clean%20up%20MOT). From the northern limits of the MOT cleanup to approximately STA 324+00 on SB I-75 the edge line is to be removed and replaced with a new lane line and a new edge line is to be added, creating the fourth lane.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2018 9:16:18 AM Question Number - 112

Can ODOT please clarify where the directional roadway ends and I-74 westbound begins.

**An exhibit to clarify what the Department defines as a directional roadway has been uploaded to the link below. Only Ramp P is considered a directional roadway/<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2018 9:14:46 AM Question Number - 111

Can ODOT please clarify the requirements for MOTPE#3? There is no indication of shoulders being required during this MOT phase, only an 11 foot lane is required. Are shoulders required and if so what is their width?

**Shoulders are required according to SOS 13.2.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2018 8:40:33 AM Question Number - 110

ITO section 4.3 require the DBT to provide a prequalification for BRIDGE DESIGN, Level 2 Bridge Design with level 3 sub-factor(s). Assuming a level 3 sub-factor(s) would be required, how should this be presented in the Tech Proposal? According to the Consultant Prequalification Requirements and Procedures manual, the specific level 3 experience should be listed in the resume. Should we just list each sub-factor that applies to our specific design?

**The DBTs' committed Lead Consultants meet the requirement of Level 2 Bridge Design with level 3 sub-factor(s). Re-affirming the DBT's commitment to utilize the named Lead Consultant will fulfill this requirement. Include a re-confirmation statement in the Technical Proposal to fulfill the requirement and no further information will be required**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 4:44:51 PM Question Number - 109

SoS 8.4.1 states "When the Record Drawing plans are completed the Consultant shall professionally endorse (sign and seal) the title sheet..." As written, extreme oversight by the EOR would be required, especially to meet 8.4.1a and 8.4.1b, which is atypical for the industry and we do not believe is necessary or ODOT's intent. Please revise this requirement to be similar to the language from the recent ODOT CUY-480 ITO as noted below:

"The formal Record Drawings with no markups shall have a signed verification stamp on the title sheet from the Designer and the Contractor that all known changes have been incorporated into the Record Drawings."

**The Scope of Services will be revised to allow the DBT to submit red-lined drawings certified by the Contractor to depict field changes to the Released for Construction drawings. The DBT's consultant must then incorporate the red-line changes into the formal Record Drawings and seal the formal Record Drawings. The formal Record Drawings shall be clean with no markups and shall include all red-lined changes. The DBT must incorporate internal procedures to ensure the field changes meet all contract requirements.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 3:40:36 PM Question Number - 108

Referring to the Department's response to Question 53, the Drainage Report as posted on the ftp site contains a Drainage Report as "PDF" only. Please provide also the data input/output CAE electronic files used for the hydrologic/hydraulic calculations (inlets, spreads, ditches, storm sewers, culverts, detentions, etc.) as referenced in the Drainage Report.

**The requested files are at the link below:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/drainage/>**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 3:39:34 PM Question Number - 107

The LG&T plans show "cultural resource protection areas" in the Mt. Storm Park. The 2008 EA says these are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Another cultural resource site is the Cincinnati Street Railway Substation. Please provide the status of these sites, and environmental commitments (protection measures/mitigation) that are needed?

**For Mt. Storm Park, ODOT coordinated with the Cincinnati Park Board and received a 4(f) de minimis determination, provided the conditions outlined are met. See the documents posted in the link below. The Cincinnati Street Railway it was presented to SHPO on 2/28/2008 that there would be no new Right of Way at this resource. If the resource is potentially impacted by any construction activities, it will have to be re-coordinated with SHPO.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/environmental/4f/>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 3:38:40 PM Question Number - 106

Please provide a list of properties in the project area that require hazardous materials (Phase II ESA) studies, and possible remediation? Who will be responsible for Phase II ESA studies/remediation plans?

**The list has been uploaded to the link below.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/The DBT would be responsible for studies/remediation's on any of the applicable sites.](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/The%20DBT%20would%20be%20responsible%20for%20studies/remediation's%20on%20any%20of%20the%20applicable%20sites.)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 3:37:53 PM Question Number - 105

What are the requirements of the Mt. Storm landscape plan, as mentioned in RFP Section 14.9 Landscape?

**The Mt. Storm landscape plan is to be followed. Any area that is disturbed with the new or temporary right-of-way shall provide landscaping per the landscape plan. The intent is not to disturb existing vegetation only to plant to new plants. Each DBT is required to get their landscape plan approved by the park board.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 3:36:56 PM Question Number - 104

Please confirm that the Mill Creek and Stream 4, as labeled on the RFQ LG&T plans, are the only regulated waters in the project area and project scope that will require a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit?

**The special provisions document has been uploaded to the link below. [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/see forthcoming addendum.](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/see%20forthcoming%20addendum.)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 3:36:10 PM Question Number - 103

Please provide an update on the status of the NEPA re-evaluation/environmental commitments?

**The NEPA re-evaluation is in process and is expected to be completed mid-April.No new environmental commitments are expected.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 3:35:27 PM Question Number - 102

Addenda 5 added deflection criteria for temporary retaining walls. The deflection criteria of 1 inch for temporary walls is more restrictive than the deflection criteria of 2 inches for permanent walls contained in Appendix G. The 1 inch deflection criteria will control for any temporary walls with an exposed height over 8'-4". This would be most, if not all, temporary retaining walls. Please change the deflection criteria for temporary walls to match the one for permanent walls or explain why the Department is requiring a more stringent requirement for temporary retaining walls than for permanent retaining walls.

**The deflection criteria outlined in the Scope will remain a design requirement. Further explanation of the wall deflection criteria is not necessary.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 3:34:40 PM Question Number - 101

Please provide gINT files available for the geotechnical information.

**The gINT files are not available.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 2:58:40 PM **Question Number - 100**

We need clarity for the required shoulder widths on I74 EB from the Elmore Street bridge (1892) across the 1908R structure to the Ramp P diverge. The existing I-74 EB shoulder and roadway widths do not meet current L&D requirements, which are part of the contract. For instance, SoS 15.3.G states Bridge 1892 will have a roadway width of 52'6" AND will be designed per the L&D Manual which requires a roadway width of 56'. Please revise the scope to include reference(s) to the Design Exception(s) ODOT is preparing for the bridges and the full depth pavement repair section.

**Per Section 15.3.G the roadway width is 52'-6" (toe to toe) and the proposed bridge deck shall not be less than the existing width. The Department is in the process of obtaining the required design exception. See forthcoming addendum. The changes to the scope will require the inside shoulder on EB I-74 to taper to 10ft starting at the eastern edge of the 1892R bridge deck. The 10ft inside shoulder shall be continued through the 1908R structure. The outside shoulder in this area shall be 10ft. The HAM 74 1908R structure shall have a minimum bridge deck width of 65ft and shall include at minimum a 10ft inside shoulder, 3-12ft travel lanes, and a 10ft outside shoulder. After the Ramp P diverge the bridge and roadway shall have a minimum width of 46ft and contain at a minimum a 10ft inside should, 2-12ft travel lanes, and a 10ft outside shoulder. The 10ft shoulders and 2-12ft lanes shall continue to until the intersection with I-75. ODOT is in the process of obtaining required design exceptions.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 10:42:47 AM **Question Number - 99**

Addendum 7 removed the 3D Analysis requirement from section 5.9 – PTI Discussions. However, the 3D Analysis is still listed as a requirement for the Technical Approach in Section 4.5. Is this correct?

**The requirement for the 3D analysis is to be completely removed from the ITO. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/21/2018 8:53:34 AM **Question Number - 98**

"See Questions 87, 64, 49, and 48 as well as SoS 16.3 – a. The lighting scope is still unclear as we are required to provide lighting per PID 83723, which is in a similar location to PID 104667, but is a completely different project and does not apply to PID 104667. Please consider revising 16.3–a to the following or something similar: "Provide new lighting in accordance with the TEM on both directions of I-75 from STA 204+00 to STA 294+50 (Stations per Appendix A). Provide new lighting in accordance with the TEM on both directions of I-74 from STA 990+00 to the terminus with I-75 (Stations per Appendix O). All new bridges and bridges with new decks will require new under-deck lighting per the TEM."

**Duplicate question.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2018 2:00:57 PM **Question Number - 97**

See Questions 87, 64, 49, and 48 as well as SoS 16.3 – a. The lighting scope is still unclear as we are required to provide lighting per PID 83723, which is in a similar location to PID 104667, but is a completely different project and does not apply to PID 104667. Please consider revising 16.3–a to the following or something similar: "Provide new lighting in accordance with the TEM on both directions of I-75 from STA 204+00 to STA 294+50 (Stations per Appendix A). Provide new lighting in accordance with the TEM on both directions of I-74 from STA 990+00 to the terminus with I-75 (Stations per Appendix O). All new bridges and bridges with new decks will require new under-deck lighting per the TEM."

**See forthcoming addendum. Changes to the scope will be made to incorporate the following: The median barrier on I-75 shall be replaced for the length of the project (excluding any barrier installed with the Hopple Street Project or the Mitchell Avenue project). Type B1/C1 shall be used. On I-75 new median lighting is required. All lighting and illumination requirements shall be met. On EB I-74 new lighting shall be installed on the outside and/or in gores starting at STA 1002+00 and shall continue through the interchange with I-75. The new lighting on the outside shall provide adequate lighting and illumination for EB I-74. Any existing median lighting shall not be considered in the lighting calculations and shall remain in place.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2018 5:56:38 PM **Question Number - 96**

Section 11 of the scope states All necessary construction work for the project will be performed within the existing right of way. Appendix A shows three (3) areas where the construction limits fall outside the existing right of way. The approximate locations are I-75 LT stations 216+64.8 to 216+71.4, 255+32.6 to 256+75.3, 284+18.9 to 284+81.6. Please provide the right of needs for these locations.

**216+64.8 to 216+71.4 – At this location the EX LA RW meets the EX RW on Colerain Ave. The work within the Colerain Ave EX RW is permitted. No additional information is required. 255+32.6 to 256.75.3 – Appendix A is a reference set of plans and is not required to be followed exactly. Adjustments may be required by the DBT to complete the work within the EX RW. 284+18.9 to 284.81.6 - Appendix A is a reference set of plans and is not required to be followed exactly. Adjustments may be required by the DBT to complete the work within the EX RW.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2018 5:54:46 PM **Question Number - 95**

Section 14.6.3 of the scope requires all final cut and fill slopes to remain within the permanent right of way. Appendix A shows the construction limits for a permanent final cut slope contained within temporary easement 332T. Is permanent right of way required for this cut slope?

**Final grading is permitted in 332T.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2018 5:53:40 PM **Question Number - 94**

Per pre-bid question 43, temporary easements 332T, 332T1, 332T2, 332T3, and 332T4 have been acquired. Please confirm all of the Temporary Easements shown in Appendix A been acquired and for what duration?

**The document titled "332 RE 214 Temporary Easement.pdf" at the link below was provided in the answer to Pre-bid question 43. In this document on page 1 of 3 the document was filed on 10/14/14. On page 2 of 3 said document states "The duration of the temporary easement herein granted to the Grantee is 36 months immediately following the date on which the work described above is first commenced by the Grantee, or its duly authorized employees, agents, and contractors."ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2018 5:52:29 PM **Question Number - 93**

Section 11 of the scope states The Consultant will identify and show all right of way encroachments on the construction plans at the Conceptual Review Submission. Please provide the requirements for the Conceptual Review Submission?

**Encroachments are to be identified in the first submission of each BU.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2018 5:51:27 PM **Question Number - 92**

Please confirm that all the proposed right of way and easements shown in Appendix O have been acquired by ODOT and are available to use in Appendix A?

**All right of way has been acquired or we have Right of Entry on all parcels in Appendix O.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2018 3:45:44 PM **Question Number - 91**

See question 84. "This requirement" was not defined in the question or the answer. Is this meant to be the 3D Analysis, deck pour sequences, plan for transverse access of piers, or another requirement? Please clarify.

**The requirement under question, which has been removed with addendum 6, is in section 5.9 of the ITO and was required as part of the Proprietary Technical Information Discussion.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2018 3:44:00 PM **Question Number - 90**

SoS 13.2.1 Permitted Lane Closure Times lists a 2 and 3 lane section on I-74. The current Permitted Lane Closure Times on ODOT Website states that the section of I-74 between Montana and I-75 is a 2 lane section. Please verify that a 2 lane section is the only case required on I-74 or clarify why a 3 lane section is specified in the scope.

**I-74 does have a 3 lane section, in both directions, as specified in SoS 13.2.1. The Permitted Lane Closure Times on the ODOT website is in error. Comply with the scope documents.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2018 7:47:25 AM **Question Number - 89**

In the IMS, figure 6-2 depicts 3 lanes NB under existing ramp P. Is this the intent of the project, or is the offerors to follow the lane use diagrams as shown in IMS figure 5-1 & 5-2?

**Lane use diagrams are to be followed.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/12/2018 4:18:54 PM **Question Number - 88**

SoS 15.1 item 17 states "New Bridge decks shall not have bridge mounted PCB attached to them." Unanchored PCB per ODOT Design Data Sheet PCB-DD requires a 6 foot or more clear distance from the edge of deck for bridge decks crossing over active roadway, railroads and/or recreational areas. To maintain the required number of lanes on I-74 and I-75 and maintain a 6 foot clearance on new bridge decks, this will greatly increase the number of MOT / bridge construction phases and likely create a situation where we cannot build the decks without significant over-widening. Please clarify the district intentions for anchoring PCB on bridge decks.

**No bridge mounted PCB is permitted on a new bridge deck.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2018 2:01:39 PM **Question Number - 87**

Please provide the lighting analysis files (i.e., Visual) for PID 83723.

**[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Lighting/The requested files can be found at this link.](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Lighting/The requested files can be found at this link)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2018 7:26:43 AM **Question Number - 86**

Section 14.2 – Drainage: Referring to the drainage design MicroStation files “bd001.dgn” and “bd002.dgn”, and in reference to Appendix O, Sheets 446 and 866, the two drainage design MicroStation files (“bd001.dgn” and “bd002.dgn”) show different layouts for the detention basin for storm flow system L outfalling near I-74 Sta 1032+60. Please clarify which of the designated MicroStation design file(s) is to be used for the proposed the detention basin

**See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2018 7:23:29 AM **Question Number - 85**

Referring to the Department’s response to Prebid Question 11, the ftp site provided contains some CAD files but there are still missing pertinent CAD/CAE files for Appendix A and Appendix A-1. Please provide the following:• MicroStation CAD files for Appendix A-1 (plan and profile)• Geopak gpk files for Appendices A & A-1 (horizontal and vertical alignments)• Cross sections – Geopak criteria input files used to develop the cross sections, as depicted in Appendix A”

**the criteria gpk files for Appendix A can be found here:ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/Sheets/Design-Build/Appendix A-1 is only a sketch to show an example of a potential, possible alternative. No criteria files, profiles, or cad files are available for this appendix.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/8/2018 10:55:37 AM **Question Number - 84**

We do understand why this requirement was requested for the recent CUY-480 Design-Build proposal but for the HAM-74-1908R structure we do not understand the need for the additional costly engineering effort. The existing HAM-74-1908R structure is not unique or complicated nor does the existing acceptable load rating capacities create a concern. Unless there are some existing structural issues such as existing cracked members or other defective details we request that this requirement be waived. Please provide any information of any damaged members or other structural issues that have not been published that may have required the requested analysis. The risk of not overstressing the existing structure more than the “normal loading conditions” will remain that of the DBT and the final calculations along with a three-dimensional grid analysis will be performed during the final design phase.

**This requirement will be removed. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:57:25 PM **Question Number - 83**

See Question 42. This requirement requires a level of effort beyond the nature of the standard Alternative Technical Concept process. It is not the industry standard to develop MOT drawings or KMZ files at this extremely early stage of the design process. Please remove Item #s 13 & 14 from the ATC submittal.

**If it is deemed Not Applicable in the ATC, please note accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:55:28 PM **Question Number - 82**

SoS 15.3.G states the proposed toe to toe roadway width as 52'7" for the 74 bridge over Elmore. The intent appears to be to replace the bridge deck and maintain the existing deck width. According to the L&D manual a 3 lane section now requires a 10' median shoulder(vs existing 6') which would require extensive bridge and roadway widening. Please clarify.

**See forthcoming addendum for clarification.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:54:31 PM **Question Number - 81**

Please clarify what type of median parapet is required for the three 74 bridge re-decks at Beekman & Elmore. Should we match the existing, use a 50" single slope, or use a 57" single slope per SCD SBR-2? This will affect the roadway width for these bridges

**See forthcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:53:02 PM **Question Number - 80**

SoS 15.3.E states the proposed toe to toe roadway width as 42'7" for 74 bridge over Beekman SB which appears to be incorrect as SoS 15.3.F states 41'10" for the similar 74 bridge over Beekman NB. Please Clarify.

**See forthcoming addendum**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:52:21 PM **Question Number - 79**

Can new drainage pipe installed in the Hopple Street project be reused for this project? Specifically what is shown on Hopple St plan sheets 263 & 307. SoS 14.5.9 states that all drainage and structures are to be removed except for what is shown in appendix B. However this drainage does not appear in appendix B.

**see forthcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:51:26 PM **Question Number - 78**

Appendix A show no work on 74 EB from station 1043 to Bridge 1908R. Does this pavement need to be replaced? If so, please modify the RFP detailing requirements.

**See forthcoming addendum for clarifications to the work that is required in this area**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:49:48 PM **Question Number - 77**

See Question 50. How can the DBTs price this work pre-bid if the analysis is to be performed post-bid? Please consider using an allowance for this item.

**See forthcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:49:07 PM **Question Number - 76**

See Question 21. Please edit the language so that the Lead Designer and their sub-consultants are not responsible for temporary engineering as this should be the responsibility of the contractor.

**See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:48:01 PM **Question Number - 75**

SOS 16.5.9, Are ramp meters required? If so, please provide more details so we can determine if additional ramp widths are required.

**No new ramp meters are required with this project. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:47:33 PM **Question Number - 74**

SoS 15.3.A, Item #8 – Please clarify if the intent is to install new scuppers and downspouts at their existing locations on the new bridge deck or can the DBT prepare a deck drainage analysis to determine the required number and location of scuppers and downspouts based on the proposed conditions?

**see forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:46:22 PM **Question Number - 73**

Please provide the complete bridge inspection reports for the HAM-74-1908R structure.

**The requested inspection reports can be found at the link below:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Structural%20preliminary%20design%20reports/inspection%20report/>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:44:19 PM **Question Number - 72**

The scope of Services 14.2.1 states that the Hopple Street ramp shall be converted to a dual exit ramp with a dedicated exit only plus a second diverge lane. The IMS narrative of the preferred alternative, page 32, Figures 5-1 and 6-1b describe a single lane ramp from SB I-75 to Hopple Street. The currently completed HAM-75-2.30 project constructed a single lane ramp from SB I-75 to Hopple Street with walls. Please clarify intentions or remove the requirement in the Scope to build a dual exit ramp as it conflicts with the IMS and recently built plans.

**ODOT is currently evaluating this requirement in the scope. If a change is needed an addendum will be issued.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:42:54 PM **Question Number - 71**

SoS 14.2.1.c.i states Curve 4 (per Appendix A) shall meet or exceed the existing curvature. Is a design exception required for a DBT to use this curve and if so, is ODOT going to provide this?

**ODOT is in the process of getting a design exception for the existing curvature of curve 4.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:39:49 PM **Question Number - 70**

Scope of Services Section 14.3.4 references a section of roadway on I-74 EB between 1892R and 1908R that is to be replaced. There is no pavement section provided. Is the intent for the DBT to determine pavement depths? If not, please provide the typical section in Appendix A - LG&T plans.

**See forthcoming addendum. 14.3.4 says "Lanes and shoulders on east bound I-74 between the approach slabs of HAM-74-1892R and HAM 74-1908R shall be replaced full depthThe full depth section is provided in the design build scope of services in section 14.3. The table is labeled "full depth (pavement and shoulders)"**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:38:33 PM **Question Number - 69**

There are two maintaining traffic bid items reference # 22 & 51. Should Ref # 51 be deleted?

**See forthcoming addendum. reference 51 will be deleted.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:37:48 PM **Question Number - 68**

Please add a bid item for RR Protective Insurance.

**See forthcoming addendum. The pay item will be added.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:36:02 PM **Question Number - 67**

Ramp E is currently depicted as crossing outside the LA R/W line and onto Parcel 328. Please clarify if that is the intent and/or if accommodations are being made to keep the interstate ramp within the LA R/W line.

**Parcel 328 between Central Parkway and the EX-LA line under question is public RW and can be used for RAMP P. This is the same area that Temp Ramp E was constructed on with PID 76257.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 2:22:53 PM **Question Number - 66**

Scope Section 10 (Environmental) states that "all environmental commitments shall be completed per the environmental document." The project Environmental Assessment document refers to noisewalls to be constructed at several locations throughout the corridor, however the project Scope of Services contains no other mention of noisewalls. Are Noisewall to be constructed as part of this project? If so, please provide some additional design and construction guidance as part of the Scope of Services document.

**Noisewalls will be constructed with MCE Phase 5B and are not required with this contract.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 1:49:14 PM **Question Number - 65**

Scope section 14.3.10 regarding the pavement construction limits for IR-74 is confusing. The Stationing referenced applies to IR-75. The Stationing depicted on the Appendix A LGT plans for IR-74 runs from approx 1037+00 to 1055+00. The stationing referenced in the note is from 228+31 to 231+85. Please clarify

**See sheet 305 from the Hopple Street Plans PID 76257. Duplicate question.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 1:47:14 PM **Question Number - 64**

As a follow-up to pre-bid question #49; the scope remains unclear as it pertains to the project limits for I-74 and the ramps. Scope Section 14.2.1.1 states that Appendix A LGT plans may be followed. The LGT plans depict no work on IR-74 EB between Bridge 1908R and Sta. 1043+00; is this acceptable?

**See forthcoming addendum for clarification.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 1:12:43 PM **Question Number - 63**

Regarding the temporary and permanent fencing requirements that are outlined in Scope Sections 15.1.26 and 15.3; For both temporary and permanent fencing, is there a maximum gap between structures (measured transversely across the roadway) that should be used to determine whether or not fencing is required?

**See forthcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 1:11:01 PM **Question Number - 62**

Please provide additional clarity to the temporary and permanent fencing requirements that are outlined in Scope Sections 15.1.26 and 15.3; For new or rehabilitated bridges that are scoped to received permanent fencing, can the fencing start and stop as the bridge goes over each undercrossing roadway so long as the criteria in ODOT BDM 305.3 is satisfied?

**see forthcoming addendum**



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 1:09:49 PM **Question Number - 61**

Please provide additional clarity to the temporary and permanent fencing requirements that are outlined in Scope Sections 15.1.26 and 15.3; For new or rehabilitated bridges that are scoped to receive permanent fencing, is permanent fencing required on both the outside and median side of bridges?

**See forthcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 1:08:55 PM **Question Number - 60**

Please provide additional clarity to the temporary and permanent fencing requirements that are outlined in Scope Sections 15.1.26 and 15.3; For bridges that will be rehabilitated or replaced using staged construction, at what stage of construction does the temporary fencing need to be installed (i.e. install it on existing bridge parapets when construction commences or install it on PCB barrier as the PCB is installed)?

**See forthcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 3/6/2018 1:07:46 PM **Question Number - 59**

Scope 13.3.1 states that a Work Zone Speed Limit Revision number WZ-45062 has been approved for the project. Can the department provide details as to what the approved MPH speed limit reduction will be?

**The WZ-45062 file can be found here: [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/See TEM sections 1203-2.9, 640-18, and 642-24 for information regarding qualifying criteria and warranted work zone conditions and factors. Also see TEM Table 1297-7](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/See%20TEM%20sections%201203-2.9,%20640-18,%20and%20642-24%20for%20information%20regarding%20qualifying%20criteria%20and%20warranted%20work%20zone%20conditions%20and%20factors.%20Also%20see%20TEM%20Table%201297-7)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/1/2018 11:38:54 AM **Question Number - 58**

As related to ODOT's Design-Build Scope of Services, Section 18.2, please advise on ODOT's current position for the use of consultant support services for the Quality Assurance for Design and the for the Quality Assurance for Construction.

**All design reviews will be performed by ODOT. A consultant construction inspection contract is on the May programatic.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/1/2018 11:38:10 AM **Question Number - 57**

ODOT's Design-Build Scope of Services, Section 18.2, paragraph 4 states that "The Department shall have the discretion to dictate the level of Design review." Please define the specific details for level of review process that ODOT will follow.

**The Department will review DBT supplied plans, specifications and supporting documents at the several stages of plan development review required by the Project Proposal. The Department may choose to not review or may choose to request additional information, as appropriate, depending upon the quality and substance of the submissions. The Department intends to only request information as deemed appropriate to ensure the DBT has done due diligence in performing the design. The Department's review is not intended to replace the DBT's proper QC/QA procedures, but it will perform the level of review which is appropriate at the stages of plan development.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/1/2018 11:36:34 AM **Question Number - 56**

Scope section 15.3.C states that the transverse section for structure HAM-75-0440 should have a toe-to-toe width of 74'-0". This appears to be wider than needed based upon requirements in the L&D manual for lane and shoulder widths on interstates. Please confirm the toe-to-toe width for this structure.

**See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/1/2018 11:35:06 AM **Question Number - 55**

Scope section 14.5.9 states that all existing storm sewer and structures are to be removed. Does this apply to I-75 mainline north of Ludlow where the pavement and median shoulders can be salvaged?

**see forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/1/2018 11:33:54 AM **Question Number - 54**

Scope section 14.3.2 states that all shoulders within the project limits are to be reconstructed. Is this the case for the median shoulders north of Ludlow where the median barrier does not need to be replaced and where only resurfacing is required if mainline I-75 pavement can be salvaged?

**See forthcoming addendum. The intent is that only areas of full depth pavement reconstruction will also have full depth reconstructed.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/23/2018 11:11:01 AM **Question Number - 53**

Section 14.5 – Drainage: Please provide Drainage Report including drainage calculations/hydrologic & hydraulic models associated with the design plans depicted in Appendices A, A1, B, C, D and O

**The final report is at the link below.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Drainage/>If you are unable to find the file at the link above, delete you cache.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/23/2018 11:07:45 AM **Question Number - 52**

Section 15.1.7 of the scope states "Non-redundant designs are not permitted." Section 14.6.5 states that bridge foundations with less than 4 drilled shafts are considered non-redundant, and foundations with less than 4 drilled shafts, a 20 percent reduction is applied to each drilled shaft. These two scope requirements conflict. Are non-redundant drilled shaft foundations allowed? Please clarify.

**Section 15.1.7 relates to the bridge superstructure requirements. Section 14.6.5 is specific to the proposed bridge foundations. Thus, non-redundant foundations are permitted as long as the requirements of 14.6.5 and LRFD are met.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 1:34:36 PM **Question Number - 51**

How are the ATC meeting agendas to be submitted? Is email acceptable or should they be submitted through LiquidFiles or hard copy?

**Per section 5.2 of the ITO:The Short-listed Offeror shall clearly identify each individual portion of the ATC proposal that is a proposed change to the Bid Documents. Submit one (1) electronic copy (TIF or PDF format) copy of each ATC and one (1) printed copy to the address to which Technical Proposals are to be submitted, as shown in Section 3.1. The one (1) printed copy is not required if the Short-listed Offeror submits using ODOT LiquidFiles.Meeting agendas can follow the same process. If you want to use Liquid files, ODOT can send you the link.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 10:27:21 AM **Question Number - 50**

Per SoS 15.3.A.9.g.ii. Please clarify when and how the analysis gets paid. Please also clarify when and how the structural upgrades get paid.

**i.The cost of the analysis is incidental to the project.ii.The cost to modify the pier in order to bring it up to an HS-20 capacity will be paid for separately under: ITEM 530E99040 Special - Structures Pier 5 Strengthening. The scope will be changed so the item matches the proposal Line 0040. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 9:58:45 AM **Question Number - 49**

Addendum 4 revised the SLM project limits for I-75 (see scope section 6). The project limits for the other roadways on the project are less clearly defined. Can the Department provide the project station limits at all termini including ramps? Are we to follow the Appendix A roadway limits?

**Per scope section 6 "Work length shall be determined by the DBT".No additional limits will be provided, it is the responsibility to determine the work limits based on the requirements of the scope.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 9:42:35 AM **Question Number - 48**

Per SoS 16.3, Please clarify what lighting work, if any, is required on I-74.

**See section 16.3.a.All lighting that was proposed in 83723 shall be part of the project and the lighting limits . If the alignment is different an analysis is required to show that the lighting has been relocated to a location that will meet ODOT illumination requirements.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 9:39:15 AM **Question Number - 47**

Per SoS 14.3.10, The stationing provided (228+31.46 to 231+85.71) lists station limits only found on I-75, however the opening statement references I-74. Please clarify the scope language.

**The stationing is correct and can be found on PID 76257 page 305.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 9:32:23 AM **Question Number - 46**

Per SoS 1.2, please provide a link to the Mitchell Ave plan set (HAM 75-5.58 - PID 82286) which are referenced throughout the Scope. The table in Section 1.2, last row, seems to mention Mitchell and Hopple together. The FTP site does not have folders for the Mitchell Project.

**Folder 08C2689 has been uploaded to the FTP site.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Existing%20Plans/>**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 9:30:28 AM **Question Number - 45**

Per SoS, Section 14.6.4. The General Wall Notes state "all retaining walls, whether temporary or permanent, shall be designed to limit the top of wall deflection to be less than 1% of the exposed wall height." However, within the Temporary Retaining Walls section it is stated that "Temporary retaining walls... the top of wall deflection shall be less than 1". Please clarify the requirements.

**Temporary walls shall be designed such that the maximum top of wall deflection will be the lesser of 1% of the wall height or 1".**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 9:25:02 AM **Question Number - 44**

Reference SoS, 14.2 Item 2. Please provide the station limits we should analyze.

**Per section 14.2.2.a "It is the DBTs responsibility to verify the limits of concrete barrier that were constructed with PID 76257. This analysis is incidental to the Roadway Pay Item." The Hopple Plans have been provided to verify the project limits.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 9:24:01 AM **Question Number - 43**

The Appendix A - LGT plans depict Temporary Easements in the plans and x-sections starting around STA 252+75. Please provide CAD basemaps and descriptions of the easements. Please indicate the status of timing on the Temp Easements. Clarify Scope of Services Section 11 - Right of Way which states that necessary construction will be performed within the existing Right of Way.

**There have been two files added to the ftp site. These files will define location and duration. 332 RE 214 Temporary easement and 332 CH SS Easements Please note that a recent MSD project placed sewer lines within the subsurface easement areas.**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/>**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 9:00:37 AM **Question Number - 42**

Addendum 4 added language requiring KMZ files as part of ATC submittals. This requirement seems to be out of place and would be more applicable to the PTI submittal. Should it be moved to that section of the ITO requirements?

**In the ITO Section 5.2.1 1. Description: Provide a detailed description of the ATC including specifications and conceptual drawings. Conceptual drawings are to also be provided in KMZ Files. These requirements will also be added to the PTI Submittal.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2018 3:48:05 PM **Question Number - 41**

Per the latest addendum, the HAM-75-5.58 plans were to be uploaded to the ftp website. We are unable to locate these files, can ODOT please verify location and upload if necessary?

**Folder 08C2689 has been uploaded to the FTP site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Existing%20Plans/>**

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2018 10:04:05 AM **Question Number - 40**

Does TEM note 642-22 WTS need listed under Scope section 13.3.1 with the list of other TEM Notes?

**See forthcoming addendum Yes 642-22 will be added**

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2018 10:03:21 AM **Question Number - 39**

Are detour routes to be considered impacted by MOT and require resurfacing per scope 14.3.6, or will resurfacing not be required if striping alignment is not altered and pavement is not scarred?

**Detour routes are no considered "impacted by MOT" if the striping and alignment are not altered and the pavement is not scarred.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2018 10:02:23 AM **Question Number - 38**

Scope 14.3.6 states that all pavement impacted by MOT shall be resurfaced. Is this to be limited to only impacted lanes, just impacted pavement areas, or full roadway width and shoulders no matter where the pavement scar is located?

**Full roadway width and shoulders no matter where the pavement scare is located are to be resurfaced. See revisions to SOS 13.5.3**

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2018 9:15:40 AM **Question Number - 37**

Please verify the abutment bearings on WB bridges over Beekman St (HAM-74-1840 & HAM-74-1852) are to be replaced. Scope items 15.3.E.3 and 15.3.F.4.

**The scope is correct. All bearings (EB and WB) are to be replaced.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2018 9:14:03 AM **Question Number - 36**

Is there a geotech report for the PID 83723 project?

**Additional geotech information and all of the final reports have been uploaded.**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Appendix/Appendix%20G/>

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 4:36:12 PM **Question Number - 35**

Reference Question 9. Sheet 65 of 65 in Volume 7 of Appendix O shows 2 parallel aerial easement lines to the left of EX I-74 EB baseline approximate station 1035 to 1036. These lines along with another unlabeled line segment do not form a closed boundary. This area does not show up on the Railroad plat. Please provide a better detail or shaded areas depicting the limits that I-74 EB structure and roadway must be within to not impact RR ROW.

**A marked up version of the original RR Plat has been uploaded to the FTP site.** <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/File Name orig RR Plate.pdf>**The red outlined area is the aerial easement. The green area represents the two lines in question and is a sewer easement under the RR.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 4:30:59 PM **Question Number - 34**

Please provide the survey information listed in Scope Section 14.1 - ODOT Survey Responsibilities.

**All survey data has been provided on the ftp site.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 4:30:31 PM **Question Number - 33**

Per PTI Requirement #5, please clarify structure numbers requiring the draft foundation memo.

**This requirement is for any bridge with foundation work.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 1:00:33 PM **Question Number - 32**

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 which would then also provide the weekend (due to a Thursday opening) to assemble the documents?

**No modifications to this requirement in PN110 will be made.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 12:59:22 PM **Question Number - 31**

There is a reference to New, Small, Local, and EDGE goals in ITO Page 71/158 (Section 105.19 Value Engineering Change Proposals). Should this reference be removed?

**The NSLE language is to be removed.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 12:58:30 PM **Question Number - 30**

There appears to be missing information in the middle of Page 67/158 (Section 105.04 Coordination of the Contract Documents) of the ITO. Please provide any missing information.

**see forthcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 12:56:34 PM **Question Number - 29**

ITO Section 3.3 states to "submit two(1) paper copy of the Technical Proposal". Please clarify how many copies are required.

**Two (2) paper copies are to be submitted.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 12:55:27 PM **Question Number - 28**

ITO Section 1.12 states that NEPA approval is anticipated prior to issuance of the Final RFP. Has NEPA approval been received?

**The project has NEPA approval, the environmental re-evaluation is currently underway and should be completed soon.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 12:54:18 PM **Question Number - 27**

In order to give as much consideration as possible to potential subcontractors up to the bid time, will it be acceptable in the Contractor Prequalification Section of Technical Proposal Part B to state that an ODOT Prequalified Subcontractor will be utilized rather than naming a specific firm?

**This is acceptable.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2018 10:14:12 AM **Question Number - 26**

What is the design year/traffic for this project?

**the design year is 2030. See section 1.1 for traffic data.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2018 10:12:19 AM **Question Number - 25**

What is the minimum design speed that can be used on the ramps?

**See Scope section 14.2.1 for Ramp P design criteria. All other ramps are the meet the criteria as defined by the Location and Design manuals.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2018 10:10:36 AM **Question Number - 24**

What design criteria can be used for vertical geometrics, rolling or hilly?

**rolling**

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2018 10:08:56 AM **Question Number - 23**

The scope (14.2.1) states that the alignment on I-75 may be followed as shown in the LG&TS set of plans (Appendix A: PID 104667), as long as all design criteria are met. The scope (15.3.C) also states that we are to use the horizontal alignment provided in PID 83723. Please clarify which is correct.

**Section 15.3.C incorrectly states "Use horizontal alignment provided in PID 83723"**

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2018 10:01:46 AM **Question Number - 22**

For the technical approach, the scope states to submit plan and profile sheets in engineering format. Can these plans be submitted in scroll plots?

**Scroll plots can be submitted in addition to the plan and profile sheets in engineering format.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 4:07:47 PM **Question Number - 21**

PN 097, Section 104.011 is written such that the Lead Designer performs the Temporary design portions of the project which is usually not the case. Typically the contractor or a specialty consultant (hired by the contractor) do the temporary portions, such as erection or demolition plans. Please revise this section so the Lead Designer is not responsible for temporary design.

**PN-097 section 104.11 states "The Lead Designer and subconsultants will provide all necessary services to design all permanent and temporary portions of the Project..."**

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 3:54:06 PM **Question Number - 20**

Regarding the PTI meeting requirement #7. Please provide the load factors and load combinations that are to be used for the dead and live loads for the construction condition and the live load factor that should be used for the normal HS20 loading condition that will set the limit.

**The load factors and load combinations would need to follow the appropriate AASHTO Specifications. The existing bridge will follow the Table of Coefficients Gamma and Beta listed in AASHTO LFD Standard Specifications Table 3.22.1A and the new structure will follow the Load Combinations and Factors listed in AASHTO LFRD Table 3.4.1-1.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 3:45:09 PM **Question Number - 19**

Regarding the PTI meeting requirement #3, please provide the necessary survey/TIN file data to develop wall cross sections. Additionally, at what length interval should cross sections be provided?

**the TIN is here:ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/CAD%20Files/Geopak/Other CAD files can be found here:ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/CAD%20Files/Cross sections should be every 25ft.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 3:43:05 PM **Question Number - 18**

PTI meeting requirement #4 requires several items regarding placement of concrete decks on existing and new structures. Please clarify if this requirement is intended for all bridges on the project or only for structures HAM-74-1908R and HAM-74-1908S (Ramp P).

**This requirement is for HAM-74-1908R, HAM-74-1908S, and HAM-75-0440.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 1:52:06 PM **Question Number - 17**

Scope of Services 20 – Index of Appendix lists Appendix T 171024\_Full but it is not found on the ftp site. Please post to the ftp site and provide a link.

**There is no Appendix T and will be deleted from SOS 20. Appendix R as referenced in Section 1.4.1 will be added to SOS 20 and is currently on the FTP site.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 1:48:12 PM **Question Number - 16**

Reference is made to Question 5 posted previously. ODOT's response takes you to the ftp site and the Appndix folder which shows Appendix\_S\_1852\_repairs.pdf. Appendix S is not listed in the Scope of Services, Index of Appendix. Please advise where this applies to the scope.

**Appendix\_S\_1852\_repairs.pdf applies to Section 15.3.F Requirements for HAM-74-1852.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 1:27:04 PM **Question Number - 15**

Reference is made to ITO page 54 of 159 (the PN 097), which describes 'basic configuration' and contract documents that are found in the Document Inventory. Please provide the Document Inventory, as it is not found referenced in any other part of the ITO or SOS. If it is the same as the SOS 20 - Index of Appendix, please clarify.

**SOS 20 - Index of Appendix is considered the Document Inventory. All appendices are considered contractual documents.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 12:52:52 PM **Question Number - 14**

Please provide the Microstation and Geopak files, including sheet files, for Appendices A and A1. Specifically, please include CAD and Geopak files for the new Ramp P configuration and the revised I-75 baseline. Previously posted information only show the alignments from PID 83723 which are no longer relevant.

**These will be provided as soon as they are available.2/23/18all sheet files and all microstation files have been uploaded for the original and the LGT plans have been uploaded.ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/**

**Question Submitted:** 2/12/2018 8:08:38 AM **Question Number - 13**

Addendum 3 states that the schedule in the RFP/ITO has changed and the Scope of Services and ITO have been revised. These documents were not attached to the Addendum nor are they currently posted on the .ftp site. Please provide the revisions.

**Question Submitted:** 2/8/2018 6:48:06 PM **Question Number - 12**

Can the addendum (dated 9/4/09) and the original HAM-75-0440 L/R Structure Type Study (dated 12/17/07) be made available? The Preliminary Design Report for this structure, previously made available (dated 3/28) references these documents.

**requested files are at the link below:ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Structural%20preliminary%20design%20reports/STS/**

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:39:19 PM **Question Number - 11**

Please provide a link to the proposed reference CAD & GPK files. Currently the scope does not provide a direct reference to these files.

**ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/**

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:37:39 PM **Question Number - 10**

Please provide the aerial photography files and TIN file for the existing topography surveyed.

**ODOT uses the OSIP and LiDAR data from the website below.http://ogrip.oit.ohio.gov/ProjectsInitiatives/OSIPDataDownloads.aspxtin files have been added to the following linkftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/CAD%20Files/Geopak/**

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:36:42 PM **Question Number - 9**

Please Provide a RR Plat or a better detail of the right of way and easement lines for the 1409E structure over the railroad. With the information provided, it is difficult to tell if the RR ROW will be impacted.

**See the RW plans in Appendix O, volume 7.ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:35:24 PM Question Number - 8

Section 12.4 of the scope requires the DBT to update the utility conflict matrix. However, this document was not provided in the appendices. Please provide.

**Appendix M provides an example. The DBT is responsible for using a similar spreadsheet or an improved spreadsheet that shows at a minimum the criteria provided in Appendix M**

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:33:33 PM Question Number - 7

Please provide a copy of the Approved IMS, mentioned in ITO 5.3, which affects evaluations of ATCs.

**The IMS is at the link below. <http://www.i75millcreekexpressway.com/archive.htm>**

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:32:04 PM Question Number - 6

Please provide updated NEPA Documents.

**The approved environmental documents from 2008 are provided on the MCE website as stated in section 1.2. <http://www.i75millcreekexpressway.com/archive.htm> An environmental document re-evaluation is currently underway. At this time no additional environmental commitments are anticipated.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:30:51 PM Question Number - 5

Please provide the Index of Attachments.

**Appendix have been provided at the link below. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/>**

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:30:22 PM Question Number - 4

Please update the FTP site referenced in section 1.2 of the Scope of Services. The majority of the folders have been left blank.

**The ftp site has been updated and the files have been re-uploaded.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2018 4:29:38 PM Question Number - 3

Please provide the CSXT Construction Submission Criteria, last revised on February 23, 2015 as referenced in section 1.4.1.e in the Scope of Services.

**See Appendix R**

**Question Submitted:** 11/13/2017 6:32:29 PM Question Number - 1

Should the page numbering be sequential throughout the entire SOQ or should it start over in each section?

**Though not specifically stated in the RFQ, the Department's preference is to have each section numbered individually as opposed to sequentially from beginning to end. Either method of page numbering will be accepted.**

**Question Submitted:** 11/10/2017 12:25:23 PM

Section 2.4 states "Submit one (1) unbound version of the SOQ..." Is a three-ring binder considered unbound?

**The unbound version of the SOQ may be placed in a three ring binder.**

**Question Submitted:** 11/9/2017 3:18:32 PM

Will an addendum be published to modify the RFQ and address the concerns of the latest prebid questions?

**Please see Addendum No.1 published 11/8/2017.**

**Question Submitted:** 11/8/2017 8:46:28 AM

Page 8 of the RFQ, addresses Contractor Prequalification (Section 1.2.2). The table located on page 8 has three categories of prequalification work types. The third category "Other Prequalification Categories – Not required @ RFQ, Includes but not limited to:", lists several work type codes that are occupied by specialty subcontractors; for example, work type 26 Structural Steel Painting. This would be similar to contractors that perform guardrail, signs or electric, and it would not provide the best value to the Department if the Offeror were to team with these subcontractors at the time of SOQ. The subsequent paragraph directly under the table states that prospective firms that are not yet prequalified in those areas specifically required above, furnish the Department with a properly completed prequalification application within one week after the "SOQ Submission" date. It is clear that both the first and second category require the prequalification to be in place at the time of RFQ. Can the Department please clarify if the Offeror will need to be prequalified in those work type codes that are listed in the third category?

**Please see Addendum 1**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 10/31/2017 6:30:32 AM

On Page 15 of the RFQ, item 2.5.3-2 references structure HAM-74-1908R which is the structure that is being re-decked along with other superstructure repairs. Please clarify the location of the new bridges referenced under 2.a. as 1908R is not a new build.

**Per Section 15.3 of the Draft Design Build Scope the HAM-74-1908R structure can be re-decked along with other required structural repairs OR a new bridge can be constructed. (See Section 15.3.14).**

**Question Submitted:** 10/30/2017 4:55:54 PM

Rehabilitation of structures HAM-74-1840, HAM-74-1852, and HAM-74-1892 is not mentioned in the ITO/RFQ Project Expectations; however, it is included in the Draft Scope of Services. Please clarify whether or not the structure rehabilitations are anticipated to be part of the HAM-75-3.84 project.

**At this point in time all work, as defined in the Draft Design Build Scope, will be part of the project.**

**Question Submitted:** 10/30/2017 7:54:33 AM

RFQ Section 1.2.1 lists 'Environmental Services' under the subconsultant prequalifications. There are 13 sub-categories under Environmental Services. Which of these sub-categories must the design team be prequalified for?

**See forthcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 10/27/2017 2:50:02 PM

Will the Department please post the CAD files?

**Cad files can be found here:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/>**

**Question Submitted:** 10/27/2017 2:41:17 PM

Will the Department please post existing plans for the I-74 corridor?

**The I-74 existing plans can be found here:**

**<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Existing%20Plans/74/>**

**Question Submitted:** 10/26/2017 9:36:51 AM

Reference is made to Section 1.2 of the DRAFT Scope which lists existing plans in a table as well as a link to the ODOT ftp site. The following existing plans could not be found: 08c1489 08c3039 08c1392 08c3036 (PID 76257) Please provide these files.

**All requested items have been uploaded to the FTP site as listed in the draft scope. please note: PID 76257 is 08C2859 08C3039 should be 08C3093 (Ped bridge)**

**Question Submitted:** 10/26/2017 9:35:49 AM

Reference is made to Section 10 of the DRAFT Scope which states that all environmental commitments shall be completed per the environmental document and is followed by a link to a 2008 Environmental Assessment which was not finalized at that time. Please provide the latest version of: 1. Environmental Commitment Notes 2. Results of the ESA Phase II 3. Rule 13 Permit

**At this time, no Rule 13 is required (the landfill locations are outside of the project limits). The Environmental commitments are listed on page 24 of the EA. Phase II ESA Concurrence and environmental documents are at the link below: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/environmental/>**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 10/25/2017 11:09:45 AM

RFQ page 8/35 currently requires the Lead Contractor to be pre-qualified for Work Type 22, Level 3 Bridge. The RFQ continues to include a reference to requirements governing changes in the Offer's team and Key Personnel in Section 3.2, Requirement to Keep Team Intact and 4.3, Requirement to Keep Team Intact - Post Award. Taken in their entirety, Section 3.2 and 4.3 prohibit changes to certain parties, specifically including named subcontractors. The Department expressly retains the sole discretion to authorize a change to a named subcontractor. In light of the above, can the requirement to provide Work Type 22, Level 3 Bridge, be altered to apply to either the Lead Contractor or a currently pre-qualified, named subcontractor? Doing so would not materially erode the Department's current position relative to ensuring the team members meet the current pre-qualification requirements while not precluding potential Lead Contractor's from pursuing the project.

**RFQ Section 1.2.2 Contractor Prequalification will be modified to allow either the Lead Contractor or Named Subcontractor – Prequalification @ RFQ Required for Work Type Code 22 – Level 3 Bridge. Each Offeror must ensure the composition of their team including but not limited to Lead Designer, Lead Contractor, Key Personnel, Named Subcontractor, etc. are exclusive to one another and no other Offeror's team as it relates to RFQ Section 4.1 - Conflict of Interest. The Lead Contractor must still perform equal to or greater than 50% of the work per RFQ Section 1.2.2.**

**Project No. 183001**

**Sale Date - 5/10/2018**

LUC-101556 - SR 2-18.62 Dehumidify

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 4:41:11 PM **Question Number - 23**

In regards to sheet 32/93, Hold-Down Retrofit, Paragraph 5 in the right column says "field bore a maximum hole diameter of 4 25/64" with a surface finish of R125 for the new 4 3/8" pins." Typically this bore tolerance would be for a machine shop with a CNC and lathe. Is it anticipated to take the existing ropes to a machine shop to achieve this tolerance?

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 3:57:06 PM **Question Number - 22**

In regards to the Aesthetic Lighting and further discussions with Paramedia (Lighting Control Integrator), they believe the intent for the Aesthetic Lighting was to only have the Main Cable Luminaires as Type 'A' Fixture, while the Deck Edge Luminaires were intended to be a 360 degree shining luminaire. Currently the contract plans call for all luminaires to be Type 'A'. Please clarify.

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 11:56:57 AM **Question Number - 21**

The Cable Wrap Skewmaster's projection from the surface of the main cable has a distance of about 17" including the outer edge of a full roll of wrap. The new messenger cable will need to be at least 20" high from the surface of the main cable for the skewmaster to effectively and safely clear the messenger cable for wrapping operations. Please advise.

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 11:01:10 AM **Question Number - 20**

In accordance with the contract drawings, when one of the sidewalks are closed to pedestrians we are required to setup detour signs to direct pedestrians on where to cross the road to the open sidewalk. However, there are two active access stairs on either side of the bridge which provides access to those sidewalks. When a sidewalk is closed, the stair will also need to be closed. Please provide details on how to direct/detour pedestrians around the access stairs.

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 8:57:10 AM **Question Number - 20**

In regards to the Aesthetic Lighting along the sidewalk's edge, sheet 30/93, please provide additional details such as locations to mount the lights along the sidewalk edge, how to attach it directly to the bridge and mounting bracket details.

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2018 8:01:51 AM **Question Number - 19**

Network Security. SP16, clause 16.2.5, final paragraph states " Protect the SCADA and data network from unauthorized external users. Isolate the network from any external network utilizing a firewall configured to ODOT's network security requirements." Please provide details of ODOT's network security 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:** 4/20/2018 8:00:18 AM **Question Number - 19**

Anchorage Fans. SP14, clause 14.2.3.1, paragraphs 1 and 2 suggest that all 4 Anchorage Chambers have existing circulation fans, whereas our site visit showed that only the 2 East Side Anchorage Chambers had circulation fans. Given the layout and access door location, is the intent to fit circulation fans to the 2 West Side Anchorage Chambers to remove stratified air layers? The fans at the east Side are installed at the highest point within the Chambers, which provides the most efficient circulation, but installing the Fans at the highest point in the West Side will make them difficult to access for maintenance. If fans are to be installed at the West Side, where should they be located?

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 1:06:40 PM **Question Number - 18**

Will the Contractor be permitted to store equipment and/or materials in a closed lane during non-working hours?

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 8:36:37 AM **Question Number - 18**

In regards to Drawing 30/93, the aesthetic lighting power and data conduits are shown to be attached to the suspender ropes in lieu of the cable band light fixture assembly. Please provide additional details on how it is to be attached and distance down from the main cable to coordinate with the main cable access platform. The suspender ropes will have increased vibration compared to where it is attached now. Please advise.

**The design of the aesthetic lighting attachment detail is currently being revised and will be provided in a forthcoming addendum. It is not the intent for the lighting power and data conduits to be attached to the suspender ropes.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 4:49:12 PM **Question Number - 18**

The Dehumidification Building items shown in SP13 and the Contract drawings contain a substantial amount of architectural details. Has ODOT has obtained approval of these details from MetroParks? If not, will the DB Team be responsible for obtaining this approval directly or will ODOT handle the coordination through a third party agreement? Has MetroParks made a commitment to review times?

**ODOT has obtained preliminary approval for the architectural details shown in the plans. ODOT will handle the coordination of the final approvals and will provide responses within a 30 day review period.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 3:54:07 PM **Question Number - 17**

The Scope of Work Document, page 3/7 Delivery Schedule lists a substantial completion milestone of June 1, 2019 to have the dynamic lighting system to be fully functional. Was it the Department's intention that tower light refurbishment included in this date?

**The tower lighting refurbishment shall be completed by the interim completion date of June 1, 2019.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 3:52:54 PM **Question Number - 17**

The Scope of Work Document, page 3/7 Delivery Schedule lists a substantial completion milestone of June 1, 2019 to have the cable wrap installed. Was it the Department's intention that all wrap work be complete at this time including leak testing (which would require dehumidification building & equipment, piping, sensors, sleeve installation, etc), AND have the main cable temporary work platforms removed by this date?

**The substantial completion date will be changed to an interim completion date which will require the dynamic lighting system to be installed, commissioned and fully operational by June 1, 2019. All other work, excluding the operation and maintenance period, shall be completed by May 1, 2020.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 3:36:20 PM **Question Number - 16**

Can the department provide any CAD files available for "LD-01 LUC-2-1862 PID No. 101556 Project 183001 Final Tracings" from the contract documents?

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2018 9:53:07 AM **Question Number - 15**

As a follow up to Question 6 regarding RFP Section 1.3 Prequalifications, it is still unclear as to why the prequalifications are required for Highway Lighting, Subsurface Utility Engineering, and Roadway. Referencing the Project Scope section of the RFP, page 3/7 states for Project (18-3001) "Portions of the plans and specifications will be prescriptive, including all the details and requirements to construct that particular element of the project, similar to typical design-bid-build projects. Other portions of the work elements will be performance based or 'non-prescriptive', and these elements will require additional final design detailing by the Contractor's engineer." There appear to be no "non-prescriptive" elements listed in this section that would require the requested prequalifications in section 1.3 for Highway Lighting, Subsurface Utility Engineering and Roadway. Is there an aspect of the scope that is missing, or does the Department expect additional design beyond the prescriptive elements already provided?

**The intent of the engineering pre-qualifications (Roadway, Subsurface Utility Engineering) was to accommodate the construction of the Dehumidification Access Drive. The proposed drive location is defined on plan sheet 11 of 93. Potential utility conflicts are also shown on the same plan sheet, specifically the buried fiber optic line positioned and labeled "do not disturb" just north of the proposed dehumidification building. The contractor is required to call Ohio Utilities Protection Services (OUPS) and other utilities noted in the plans prior to excavating work. The proposed drive access work can be considered "prescriptive" and as such the pre-qualifications for the Design Build Team are not required. The Lighting Prequalification pertains to the entire Dynamic Lighting System which is proposed for the structure. The lighting system is described and detailed in the plan set and is also considered "prescriptive". The Lighting prequalification for the Design Build Team is not required.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2018 2:15:05 PM **Question Number - 15**

Does the Department have any other pics of the Anthony Wayne Structure?

**The department has posted additional pictures at the following location: [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/Luc-2-1862\\_AWB\\_Ref/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/Luc-2-1862_AWB_Ref/)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2018 1:01:57 PM **Question Number - 14**

Does the Department have photographs from recent inspections and/or construction showing tower conditions, anchorages, tie downs, cable bands, etc?

**Teams shall refer to the bridge As-Built drawings. Teams are strongly encouraged to make arrangements with the Department for a site visit to take sufficient photographs and measurements, and to make arrangements with the Department to examine any existing inspection records relating to the condition of the cable bands, cables and anchorages, as they deem necessary, to prepare their proposals to perform the work. A number of photographs taken in 2017 and previous years will be provided.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2018 12:57:41 PM **Question Number - 13**

Does the Department have more recent information on the condition of the cable bands, cables, anchorages, etc than what is shown EX-11 which is dated 2008?

**Teams are strongly encouraged to make arrangements with the Department to examine any existing inspection records relating to the condition of the cable bands, cables and anchorages, as they deem necessary to prepare their proposals to perform the work. A number of photographs taken in 2017 will be provided for information only and as requested in Q14.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/5/2018 12:06:58 PM **Question Number - 12**

Referencing the plans and SP 14 -Does the Department have any information on the internal cable volume or ACH rate?

**The void ratio within the cable is not known. The nominal cable diameter is indicated on the contract plans but the contractor is required to measure and confirm the diameter of the cable and determine the void ratio. Typically, void ratios in parallel wire cables constructed by aerial spinning are around 22% between cable bands and 20% under cable bands. The ACH rate is not known and the air flow at the injection points may vary depending on factors such as the air tightness of the wrapping and sealing materials. Typically, injection air flows equivalent to a rate of 4 air changes have been used to size injection fans on previous projects.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/5/2018 12:05:51 PM **Question Number - 11**

Referencing the plans and SP 14 - Does the Department have any information on the volume of each anchorages, or the anchorage construction such as the thicknesses of the walls, ceilings and floor?

**Teams shall refer to the bridge As-Built drawings. Teams are also strongly encouraged to make arrangements with the Department for a site visit to take sufficient photographs and measurements as they deem necessary to prepare their proposals to perform the work. For information, the four anchor chambers are currently dehumidified by an Ebac CS60 dehumidifier unit at the bottom of each chamber: <https://www.sylvane.com/media/documents/products/ebac-cs60-dehumidifier-product-brochure.pdf>**

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2018 10:35:46 AM **Question Number - 10**

In SP14 – DEHUMIDIFICATION PLANT AND EQUIPMENT -- Section 14.2.2.2 states the construction of the plant room to provide the following minimum U values: External walls: 0.038 btu/ ft<sup>2</sup> deg F. Roof: 0.024 btu/ ft<sup>2</sup> deg F. Floor: 0.031 btu/ ft<sup>2</sup> deg F Internal walls: 0.038 btu/ ft<sup>2</sup> deg F Are these values are the controlling values for coefficient of heat transmission that are to be used in the design and detailing of the dehumidification building, including both the garage and equipment/ plant room.?

**These are the controlling values for coefficient of heat transmission that are to be used in the detailing and construction of the dehumidification building in the Plant Room only. The garage space does not need to meet the same parameters as the Plant Room.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2018 10:30:20 AM **Question Number - 9**

In SP13 – BUILDING HOUSING DEHUMIDIFICATION PLANT AND GARAGE -- Section 13.1.2.2 states to provide a plant room consisting of roof and walls with a minimum U value of 25 btu/ ft<sup>2</sup> deg F. Was this intended to be an R value instead of a U value?

**No. The value shown in 13.1.2.2.2 is intended to provide general guidance for the minimum value of the coefficients of heat transmission for the Plant Room. Per the specifications, section 13.1.2.2, refer to SP14 for specific details on the requirements for the values of the coefficients of heat transmission for the Plant Room. The design for the plant room is shown on the contract drawings. To meet performance requirements as specified in SP14, ensure the plant room is detailed and constructed sufficiently air tight to effectively function as a plenum chamber for the cable dehumidification process air.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2018 10:17:26 AM **Question Number - 8**

In SP14, Item 14.3.9 Operation & Maintenance Period, (Pg 23 of 27), reference is made to “replacement of ALL sensors in the plant room, on the main cables and anchorages” at the end of the maintenance period and to ANNUALLY “carry out air leak testing of the whole system, including soap spray testing of the main cable wrapping, cable band sealants, and injection / exhaust sleeves”. These items add significant cost. Please confirm these items are required.

**Answer – Part 1: Yes, it is the intent of the specifications that all sensors in the plant room, on the main cables and anchorages be replaced at the end of the maintenance period. It is also the intent that all filters be replaced as well. The following excerpt from the specifications applies: >>>At the end of the maintenance and monitoring period, replace all filters and sensors on the full dehumidification system with new. (This means all sensors in the plant room, on the bridge and in the anchorages). Undertake a full service and lubrication of the system. Verify the system is operating within the design parameters.<<< Answer – Part 2: Yes, it is the intent of the specifications that there are annual air leakage tests of critical components of the dehumidification system. The following excerpt from the specifications applies: >>>Before the end of the maintenance and monitoring period, carry out air leak testing of the whole system, including soap spray testing of the main cable wrapping, cable band sealants, and injection and exhaust sleeves, and repair as necessary to maintain system efficiency. In addition, repeat air flow trials. Include for undertaking an annual soapy water air leakage test of the whole of the cable wrapping system, include cable band end seals, sealants and injection and exhaust sleeves. If leaks are identified repair as necessary to ensure air leakage is prevented to maintain system efficiency. Include also for undertaking a soapy water air leakage test on the whole of the system at the end of the Maintenance and monitoring period.<<<**

**Question Submitted:** 2/26/2018 12:38:44 PM **Question Number - 7**

SP16, Section 16.2.1.2 Wiring. This section states we must “obtain UL listing of installed plant room”. Please confirm that this is correct as we believe this would be difficult to achieve on the proposed plant room. All panels and equipment will already have a UL number applied at purchase.

**The requirement for UL listing for the installed plant room in situ is not required. This does not relieve the detailers and installers from providing UL listed components for the Plant Room.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2018 11:00:19 AM **Question Number - 6**

RFP Section 1.3 Prequalification states that in addition to the RFQ requirements, a minimum of one design consultant firm that meet EACH prequalification category below for design work. 1. Roadway2. Subsurface Utility Eng.3. Bridge Design4. Soils/geotech5. Highway lightingThe scope of work does not appear to have changed from the original RFQ to the final RFP. Can the Department explain why items 1, 2, 4, and 5 above have been added as a requirement for the design consultant?

**The additional prequalification categories were included for the roadway in the park, the foundation for the building and the utilities in the vicinity of the building.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2018 3:00:20 PM **Question Number - 5**

Form C-1 DBT Information lists an Independent Quality Firm near the bottom of the page. Will an Independent Quality Firm be required for this project?

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2018 2:28:26 PM **Question Number - 4**

Reference RFP Section 4.2 Technical Approach. Item number 4 in this section asks the DBT to address the identified betterments within the Offeror's SOQ, as identified by the Department.

If this is applicable, will the Department provide these betterments?

**Question Submitted:** 2/15/2018 8:31:29 AM **Question Number - 3**

Reference Question 2 regarding final RFP files. ODOT's response to this RFI indicates 20 files should be on the FTP site. Please double check that files EX-03 and EX-09 are posted. Thanks.

**The documents should now be available on the FTP. If you are still not able to access these documents, please send in another question. Thanks.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/13/2018 11:10:30 AM **Question Number - 2**

The email informing us of the final RFP instructed us to disregard any previous draft information and retrieve the new information from the postings and attachments.

The final RFP lists an ODOT FTP site on page 138/144. This FTP site contains 19 files at the time of the RFI. The previously released draft documents contained 44 files. Many files appear to be missing in the final version, including the plans (LD-01 LUC-2-1862 PID No. 101556 Project 183001 Final Tracings).

Should we use the draft files from the 1/5/18 release if they were not re-released on 2/12/18?

**The Department inadvertently omitted the following Appendices: EX-03, EX-04, EX-05, EX-06, EX-07, EX-08, EX-09, EX-10, EX-11, GE-01, GE-02, GE-03, GE-04, GE-05, GE-06, GE-07, LD-01, SP1, SP2, & SP3. These are now posted on the FTP link provided in the Proposal. Users are advised to refresh the web browser's cache to ensure the added appendices are visible. The 1/5/18 versions are not applicable**

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2018 11:38:35 AM **Question Number - 1**

This project is posted for the 5-10-18 let date but the proposal is the same ITO / RFQ document dated 9-6-17 from a prior letting date and includes a schedule that has the bids being opened in March of 2018. Is this a re-advertisement of the previous project or something new? When will the proposal document be updated?

**The revised proposal dated January 5, 2018 will be released on February 12, 2018. The Department will be issuing this Request for Proposal (RFP) to only the following Short-listed Offerers: American Bridge Company and Kiewit Infrastructure Company.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 9/20/2017 10:20:32 AM **Question Number - 4**

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

**Please submit one electronic file.**

**Question Submitted:** 9/15/2017 11:50:09 AM **Question Number - 3**

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

**Question Submitted:** 9/15/2017 11:25:29 AM **Question Number - 2**

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

**Question Submitted:** 9/15/2017 11:22:16 AM **Question Number - 1**

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

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

**Project No. 183004**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

**MED-14821 - N Carpenter Road**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2018 8:56:09 AM **Question Number - 37**

Will the DBT be responsible for paying any fees to the Medina County Department of Sanitary Engineering as part of the design and construction of this project? If so, please provide a list of these fees.

**The DBT will be responsible for the fees. Please contact the Medina County Sanitary Sewer Dept. for to determine what they are.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:09:23 AM **Question Number - 36**

Scope Section 16.4 on Traffic Signals, states "The DBT's Base Bid shall only include modifications to the Grafton Road/Fire Station Driveway traffic signal necessary to restore full operation." Please define "full operation" and any anticipated modifications?

**Clarification will be provided in the next addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:08:59 AM **Question Number - 35**

Scope Section 14.10 on Permanent Drives refers to "...in no case shall the new profile exceed the proposed drive profile in Attachment B by more than 1%". Numerous drives on the project have changed type, width and composition over the years since the original plans were complete. Tying drive way grade criteria to a proposed design could create an issue in design and limit the flexibility given to the DBT. Can the design for driveways be tied to ODOT drive criteria only?

**Please bid as is.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:08:28 AM **Question Number - 34**

Scope Section 14.10 on Permanent Drives refers to meeting City of Brunswick and ODOT criteria. Can you provide City of Brunswick Drive criteria?

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:07:38 AM **Question Number - 33**

Regarding the design year criteria required for inlet spacing: a 2 year design is required per the L&D Volume 3 Section 1103.2, a 5 year design was used for the Appendix B plans with justification included in the drainage criteria file provided (sht 12 of 19), and a 25-year 24-hour design is required per the Brunswick Codified Ordinance 1236.09 (6) E. It appears that per the Scope the 25 year design year is required for spacing calculations. Please confirm.

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:07:10 AM **Question Number - 32**

The storm sewer systems have relatively short Time of Concentrations between from 10-30 minutes. Using the rational method and local rainfall intensity between 4-5 in/hr, it is very unlikely that a 10-year 24-hour and 25-year 24-hour storm would have any impact on the design of the storm drain system as required per Brunswick Codified Ordinance 1236.09 (6). Please confirm the need to calculate the 10-yr 24-hr and 25-yr 24-hr analysis and if required what documentation would be submitted to show this low intensity storm event does not cause surcharge and meets HGL limitations.

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:06:47 AM **Question Number - 31**

Original PBQ 34 submitted on 1/18/2018 10:59:49 AM, referenced what drainage criteria should be used for BMP. The answer was "The intent is for post-construction BMP to be designed per ODOT L&D Volume 2. Storm water quantity controls are not required." The current Scope Section 14.5 on Drainage has not been updated to reflect this response.

**The note will be updated on the next addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:06:04 AM **Question Number - 30**

Addendum 1 added information in Scope Section 10 on an environmental document will be included as an attachment. Can ODOT please post this attachment?

**Yes, the next addendum will include the environmental document as an contractual document.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:05:35 AM **Question Number - 30**

Scope Section 6 specifies Completion date for the project is August 15, 2020. This date remains as it was prior to the project delay. Will ODOT consider moving this date to the later in 2020 to maximize the construction season?

**Please bid as is.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2018 2:00:29 PM **Question Number - 28**

The left turn lanes being added to Carpenter Road at the intersection with Grafton are going to put the existing sanitary main within the footprint of the pavement. Will the contractor be required to relocate the existing sanitary in this area so that it is outside the footprint of the pavement?

**No. the sanitary sewer within the footprint of the pavement is allowed, although not preferred.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2018 2:26:12 PM **Question Number - 27**

Submitting question to resupply link to sulfate report.

**[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/MED%20N\\_CarpRd2/SulfateReport/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/MED%20N_CarpRd2/SulfateReport/)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 3:03:59 PM **Question Number - 26**

Based on the requirements in section 12.4 - Utility Coordination, is the DBT to include in the base bid all cost to relocate storm, water, and sanitary lines on Grafton Road to accommodate the additive alternate even if the additive alternate is not awarded?

**Water and sanitary work on Grafton Rd. should not be included in the base bid. The next addendum will provide water and sanitary sewer work items for the alternate bid. Storm sewer for Grafton Rd. should be accounted for in the Drainage section of the alternate bid. Section 12.4 will be revised in the next addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 11:16:17 AM **Question Number - 25**

This question is in response to Question Number 19 and the answer provided. We believe this needs to be reviewed further and consideration given to adding this bid item as requested. The work required to widen Grafton Rd. as part of the AA1 portion of the project will have an impact on the existing watermain; therefore, we feel that a bid item to account for this watermain work needs to be provided. The watermain work could be significant depending upon what CWD requires.

**A bid item for the additive alternate section for sanitary sewer and water line work will be added by the next addendum for contractors use.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 10:30:08 AM **Question Number - 24**

Many of the changes made to the scope in addendum 1 were not noted on the red-version either by highlighting or a line in the left margin. Please mark up the red-line version appropriately in the future.

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2018 10:17:21 AM **Question Number - 23**

Section A of GB1 requires a subsurface exploration to be performed. Will the department allow the contractor to use the subsurface exploration provided in Attachment D for this purpose?

**Attachment D is allowed; and is sufficient for subsurface exploration as it pertains to Section-A of GB1.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 8:28:35 AM **Question Number - 22**

In section 20 "Index Of Attachments", attachment C is dated 2/20/2018 but the date on the file provided in the ftp site is 11/28/2017. Can you please provide the link to the latest version of Attachment C

**Attachment C will be revised to include the most current version of the Typical Sections in the next addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 4:37:58 PM **Question Number - 21**

Please add a bid item for PERMANENT EROSION CONTROL in the AA1 section of the proposal for the Grafton Rd. alternate work.

**Permanent Erosion Control will be added to the additive alternate section on the next addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 2:08:26 PM **Question Number - 20**

Please add a bid item for SPECIAL - SANITARY SEWER in the AA1 section of the proposal for the Grafton Rd. alternate work.

**We do not foresee any sanitary sewer work required to construct the additive alternate.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2018 2:07:12 PM **Question Number - 19**

Please add a bid item for SPECIAL - WATER WORKS in the AA1 section of the proposal for the Grafton Rd. alternate work.

**We do not foresee any water work required to complete the construction of the additive alternate.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 3:15:33 PM **Question Number - 18**

What is the purpose of item #24 - Non Perform Additive Alternate? In the EBS file the price is frozen.

**The additive alternate on this project is a list of items (#10 through #23) that will be performed or the alternative (#24) will be to non-perform all of those items. It costs nothing to non-perform work, of course, so the non-perform alternate is fixed-priced at \$0.01 for all bidders. (It's set at \$0.01 because zero pricing is not acceptable at any time.)**

**The electronic bidding software calculates the lower alternate, which is the non-perform item for this project, into the bid total.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:42:08 PM **Question Number - 17**

Section 14.6.G of the scope requires the DBT to remove and dispose of abandoned utility poles resulting from fiber optic relocation. In the same section it also states that the fiber optic cable is currently a third-party attachment on existing utility poles. Since the fiber optic is a third party attachment will the utility or the DBT be responsible for removing the abandoned poles?

**If relocation of these poles are necessary, then removal of the existing poles would be the responsibility of the pole owner. It will be the responsibility of the design/build team to coordinate this work per Section 12 UTILITIES, of the Design/Build Scope.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:41:12 PM **Question Number - 16**

On page 12 of the conceptual plans provided in Attachment B, the only temporary striping shown is for the outside edge line in phase 3. Will temporary striping be required along the barrels in phases 3 & 4? What about along the curb in phase 4?

**Temporary edge line striping will be required along the barrel line. Temporary edge line is not required along the curb.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:39:52 PM **Question Number - 15**

Will the contractor be responsible for paying the City of Cleveland Water Department for the inspection and testing services along with the various fees discussed in Attachment F?

**Yes, The contractor will be responsible for paying the City of Cleveland Water Dept.'s inspection and testing services and various fees.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:39:07 PM **Question Number - 14**

For the purposes of developing the subgrade stabilization design can the soils report provided in Attachment D be utilized?

**For the purposes of developing the subgrade stabilization design the DBT shall follow; SUPPLEMENT 1120 MIXTURE DESIGN FOR CHEMICALLY STABILIZED SOILS.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:36:52 PM **Question Number - 13**

Chapter 1236 of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances discusses various fees in section 1236.14 and a bond in section 1236.15 associated with the Stormwater Management Plan. Is the contractor responsible for these costs?

**Neither the bond or fees in section 1236.14 and 1236.15 will be charged by the City.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:35:52 PM **Question Number - 12**

Chapter 1234, section 1234.08 of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances states that the City Engineer may require the SWP3 to include a soils engineering report. Will this be required?

**A soils engineering report will not be required for this section of the Brunswick CO.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:35:09 PM **Question Number - 11**

Is the bond associated with the SWPPP discussed in chapter 1234, section 1234.12 of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances required as part of this project?

**This bond will not be required.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:34:09 PM **Question Number - 10**

Are the fees discussed in chapter 1234, section 1234.11 of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances waived under the note in section 8.8 of the scope? If not, please provide a schedule of the associated fees.

**The fees in this section will be waived.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:33:09 PM **Question Number - 9**

Does new traffic signal timing need to be developed for the two traffic signals on this project?

**New traffic signal timing is required for Grafton Road. New traffic signal timing will not be required for Boston Rd.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:32:20 PM **Question Number - 8**

What is the anticipated Traffic Signal work at Carpenter & Boston Intersection?

**We only anticipate some traffic detector work as a result of the proposed North Carpenter Road construction.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:30:50 PM **Question Number - 7**

Are the general notes and specifications included in the "Brunswick City Wide Signal Upgrade" documents(2008) the most current standards for traffic signals/interconnect or are there newer notes/specifications available?

**Use current ODOT Specification for the design of the signals and interconnect.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:29:31 PM **Question Number - 6**

Section 16.4.F indicates that the overhead signal cabling and wiring is prohibited. Is overhead power service cabling acceptable?

**Overhead power service is acceptable.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:28:25 PM **Question Number - 5**

The scope does not indicate any lighting work to be performed on this project, however it appears that an existing wood pole with luminaire will be impacted by the intersection widening at Carpenter and Grafton Roads. How should this work be accounted for?

**The luminaires along North Carpenter are owned and maintained by First Energy, along with all others in the City. Relocation of the pole and luminaire at the southeast corner of North Carpenter and Grafton will therefore need to be included in the utility relocation scope prepared by First Energy, as will the luminaire that is connected to the power pole on the northwest corner (if this pole needs to be relocated.)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:26:18 PM **Question Number - 4**

Section 8.1 of the scope calls for current manuals, guidelines, specifications, standards and ordinances to be used including updates released on or before the date of the prebid meeting. Since no prebid meeting is setup for this project please will January 8th be used as the cutoff instead as this was the date of the prebid meeting when the project was originally advertised?

**The next addendum will revise Section 8.1 date to read "3/8/18" (the date scope was submitted to Central Office.)**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2018 2:25:21 PM **Question Number - 3**

Please update Attachment C to the most current version under the previous advertisement.

**Attachment C will be revised to include the most current version of the Typical Sections in the next addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/28/2018 10:55:17 AM **Question Number - 2**

Bid reference 35, Field Office Type B appears to have an underestimated quantity. It currently shows 2 Months, please review.

**The next addendum will show a total of 24 months for Bid reference 35, Field Office Type B.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2018 3:44:29 PM **Question Number - 1**

Previously when this project was posted, there were several changes made to the scope of services during the pre bid questions process. Some of these changes included adding test holes, adding disincentives to the MOT, removing the Stage 3 review requirements, etc. It seems that the current scope of services is the original scope of services before these changes were made. Is what is currently posted the correct scope of services?

**You are correct, this is the old scope. The new/current scope will be published with an addendum. Thank You for bringing this to our attention.**

**Project No. 183005**

**Sale Date - 7/12/2018**

LOG-105438 - /UNI/FRA-US 33-Smart Mobility Ph2

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

Is the Transcript available from Pre-SOQ Meeting?

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

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

Are page numbers allowable within the bottom 1" margin?

**Yes, page numbers in bottom margin are allowable.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

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

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

**Project No. 184012**

**Sale Date - 5/3/2018**

GAL-106051 - US 35-15.70

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2018 4:48:15 PM **Question Number - 1**

Would ODOT allow, as an alternative, a Solid Wall HDPE Liner Pipe meeting 707.34 and/or a profile wall HDPE Pipe meeting 707.35 in lieu of 748.06?

**ODOT will not allow any alternates for the 740.06 pipe, due to loading requirements and opening restrictions.**

**Project No. 185001**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

JEF-106776 - US 22-05.90

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 12:02:34 PM **Question Number - 7**

Addendum # 2 EBS file. During checking of the EBS file for bidding the project we have encountered that when we use Option A the file is green checked but if we use Option B it is now red. Could you check EBS file?

**There are 3 amendments included with the electronic bidding file. Make sure all of them are applied. If you still have questions, please contact Dan Stacy at 614-466-8691.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 8:44:04 AM **Question Number - 6**

The Work Zone Lighting System Item was loaded under the wrong option.

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 3:15:30 PM **Question Number - 5**

Previous question submitted (#4) stating Level 1, should say "Please consider modifying the Level 2 to Level UF....."

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 12:29:27 PM **Question Number - 4**

Please consider revising the Level 1 to Level UF. This work requires CVN tested beam and cutting to length & width. This type of work has previously been supplied on other ODOT projects as Level UF. Materials Management can confirm.

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 11:03:02 AM **Question Number - 3**

A test of the EBS file currently indicates that bid items for Option #1 and #2 will both be added together in the total bid (not one or the other). Please confirm that this is the intent and that the engineer's estimate will be reflective of that fact.

**The electronic bidding file requires one option or the other to be bid. It gives an error if both options are bid.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 11:00:31 AM **Question Number - 2**

Option B will require more than one day to accomplish cutting out the beam window and welding in the new window. There does not appear to be any MOT notes allowing for protection of the temporary supports that will be required.

**The District agrees that Option B will not be able to be completed within the detour restriction timeframe provided in the MOT notes. This restriction will be removed via addendum, allowing the detour to remain in effect overnight as needed for beam repair operations. Lighting for the intersection of U.S. 22 and C.R. 22A will also be accounted for with the forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2018 5:12:34 PM **Question Number - 1**

from field review of impact damage to Beam #1, it does not appear that section of EX. 33WF118 can be heat straightened...specifically field splice location. It appears that section of EX. 33WF118 needs to be replaced as well back to location (12) depicted on sheet 11/14. Please review and provide clarification

**In response to the pre-bid question, ODOT has performed another internal review of the collision damage and project plans. The internal review has determined the project is constructible as shown in the plans. No changes will be forthcoming as a result of the pre-bid question or the subsequent review. Bid the project as is.**

**Project No. 188006**

**Sale Date - 4/19/2018**

CUY-106690 - IR 480-25.03

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2018 8:18:40 AM **Question Number - 15**

In ODOT's review of question #11, consider revising the completion date to 10/31/2018

**Completion date to remain as specified.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 4:37:30 PM **Question Number - 14**

Will ODOT allow short term lane closures outside of the Phase 2 & 3 work window for performing such work as mechanical grooving and epoxy urethane sealing?

**Short-term lane closures outside of what is shown in the plans shall be per District 12's Permitted Lane Closure Times.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 4:31:27 PM **Question Number - 13**

item 526 approach slab requires mechanical grooving per 511.17. Since only approach slabs are being performed and no deck work, will ODOT require grooving to be performed?

**Bridge deck and approach slab top surface shall be grooved in the transverse direction to match existing bridge deck to remain. The Contractor may elect to finish approach slab and partial bridge deck surfaces with transverse tining per CMS 451.10.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 4:30:54 PM **Question Number - 12**

item 526 approach slab requires mechanical grooving per 511.17. Since only approach slabs are being performed and no deck work, will ODOT require grooving to be performed?

**Bridge deck and approach slab top surface shall be grooved in the transverse direction to match existing bridge deck to remain. The Contractor may elect to finish approach slab and partial bridge deck surfaces with transverse tining per CMS 451.10.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2018 4:28:31 PM **Question Number - 11**

Due to the sequence and linear nature of the approach and structure repairs during Phase 2 and Phase 3, we request that ODOT consider revising the work window to a minimum of 45 calendar days for both Phase 2 and 3. Path of work is inclusive of removals, jacking and bearing replacement, diaphragm guide placement and cure, integral abutment placement and cure, deck end placement and cure, sleeper slab placement and cure, approach slab placement and cure, parapet placement and cure, asphalt, and guardrail. in our estimate the pouring of each lift and required cure time alone would not yield a 30 calendar day completion. Please review

**Phase 2 and Phase 3 closures shall be limited to 30 days as noted in the plans. Construction joint between concrete deck and end diaphragm will be revised to an optional construction joint per forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 2:12:45 PM **Question Number - 10**

Where is the quantity located for ref no 76 wearing course removed under the bridge items? Removal of pavement sections outside of the existing approach slabs are included under ref no 2 pavement removed.

**Item 202E23500, Wearing Course Removed (Ref No 0076) will be deleted from the plans. Existing concrete overlay on bridge deck and approach slab to be included in items 202E11201 and 202E22900, respectively. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2018 11:57:47 AM **Question Number - 9**

On sheet 8 there is a note describing a WORK ZONE QUEUE DETECTION WARNING SYSTEM, AS PER PLAN. The note refers to Supplemental Specification 896. Supplemental Specification 896 deals with concrete pavement with warranty. No where in that specification does it mention a WZ Queue Detection Warning System. What is this system and where can one find the specifications for it?

**Active SS 896 Dated 7/21/2017 is titled Work Zone Queue Detection Warning System and is the appropriate Supplemental Specification.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 1:35:06 PM **Question Number - 8**

A quantity for subgrade compaction has not been included for the area under the proposed barrier or the approach slab area. How is to be paid? Only area for the full depth pavement replacement has been included in bid item.

**The estimated quantity for Item 204 – Subgrade Compaction is included under the proposed barrier. From Sta. 64+14.56 to Sta. 64+39.56 and from Sta. 66+65.06 to Sta. 66+90.06 the average width is equal 43.5' which includes the distance from the centerline to edge of pavement plus 18". An additional estimated quantity of 607 SY of Item 204 – Subgrade Compaction will be added to account for subgrade compaction under the approach slab. The total project estimated quantity of Item 204 – Subgrade Compaction is 1094 SY. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2018 1:32:11 PM **Question Number - 7**

How is removal of concrete barrier from sta. 64+39.56 to 64+69.56 and from 66+35.06 to 66+65.06 to be paid? The quantity of concrete barrier removal was included for the full depth pavement removal area but not the quantity between the existing approach slabs.

**An additional quantity of 60 FT of Item 202 – Concrete Barrier Removed will be required to account for the barrier removed from Sta. 64+39.56 to Sta. 64+69.56 and from Sta. 66+35.06 to Sta. 66+65.06. The total project estimated quantity of Item 202 – Concrete Barrier Removed is 110 FT. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2018 9:15:35 AM **Question Number - 6**

Regarding Question & Answer #2 - plan sheet 35 of 56 details slope protection 6" thick typical on the slope area and 4" thick typical in the sidewalk area. In the forthcoming addendum, would ODOT consider clarifying the proposed quantity with separate bid items for each typical?

**All replaced concrete slope protection areas shall be 6 inches thick regardless of existing concrete slope protection thickness. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 1:55:45 PM **Question Number - 5**

MOT general note #1 (7 of 56) states 2 lanes each direction shall be maintained during construction. It continues to state, however, single lane closure is permitted for 30 days. Phase 2 APP maintains 1 lane westbound and phase 3 APP maintains 1 lane eastbound. Does the stated 30 days apply to phase 2 and 3? Is it 30 days for phase 2 and 30 days for phase 3 or is it 30 days total for phase 2 & 3? With the multiple concrete lifts and required cure times 15 days per phase is not sufficient time to construct and cure the proposed work. Please clarify.

**In a forthcoming addendum sheet 7 will be revised to clarify it is 30 days for Phase 2 and 30 days for Phase 3.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 1:42:05 PM **Question Number - 4**

Temporary jacking and shoring is required for the construction of the pier cap extension and bearing replacement. Access for the jacking system will require the removal and replacement of the adjacent sidewalk. How is the removal and replacement of sidewalk to be paid?

**In a forthcoming addendum the item 516 Jacking and temporary support of superstructure as per plan note will be revised to clarify that removal and replacement of any sidewalk and or concrete slope protection beneath the bridge removed or damaged to facilitate the contractors temporary support operations will be considered incidental to Item 516 and not paid separately. Any existing concrete slope protection requiring replacement at the beginning of the project as directed by the engineer prior to the contractor beginning work will be paid for separately at the contract unit price bid.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 1:35:53 PM **Question Number - 3**

No cubic yard quantity has been included for item 304 aggregate base under the proposed approach slab areas. Quantity has only been included for the full depth pavement areas.

**Please see forthcoming addendum for corrected quantity of Item 304.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 1:31:49 PM **Question Number - 2**

601 slope protection repair has been included as a lump sum item. Area depicted on the plans (33 of 56) is the entire west and east slope area and is as directed by the engineer. No as per plan notes provide any description of what the contractor is to repair. Consider changing the item to a unit price for contingency quantities as directed by the engineer or measured quantities for estimating.

**In a forthcoming addendum the 601 slope protection will be revised to a square yard bid item.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2018 1:24:20 PM Question Number - 1

No bid item has been included for the phase line excavation bracing. Please verify how this work is to be paid.

**A forthcoming addendum will include a bid item for cofferdams and excavation bracing.**