Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No.  200002  
FRA-105453 - IR 71-17.46 (Proj 3B)

Question Submitted:  2/18/2020 3:52:16 PM  
Question Number - 47

For Bid Ref 0707, Lighting, Misc.: Broad Street Luminaire, with all of the components, ie: Driver, DMX 3 Dimmer, LED Strip Lights, being UL Listed, will MET Listing be acceptable for the complete luminaire assembly?

Yes, MET Listing will be acceptable for the complete luminaire assembly.

Question Submitted:  2/17/2020 4:18:01 PM  
Question Number - 46

It appears that Ref # 296 - 3/c 500 MCM 15kV cable w/1-350 600V neutral should be approx. 800' instead of 210' Please advise.

Question Submitted:  2/17/2020 2:06:47 PM  
Question Number - 45

For the Broad Street Luminaire Aesthetic Enhancements does the fabricator need to provide a UL Listed product. Since no Fabricator/manufacture or contact name is provided will the project accept a custom made, to the project product that is not UL listed

The product must be UL listed.

Question Submitted:  2/15/2020 4:29:11 PM  
Question Number - 44

There are 12 aesthetic luminaires atop precast towers on the bridge. After exhaustive effort we are unable to find anyone to provide these, even as prototypes, since the expense associated with UL listing/testing is prohibitive for such a small quantity. Please either identify the product you had in mind or waive UL requirements to enable us to purchase and assemble component parts into something resembling the apparent intent.

The fixtures used on the Long St bridge are manufactured by SPJ lighting, and carried a following labels: •	 "ETL- Standard Wet Label •	 "C-ETL" The same label should be acceptable for Broad Street as well as the 5-year warranty that is required of the entire aesthetic lighting system.

Question Submitted:  2/14/2020 8:44:29 AM  
Question Number - 43

Please clarify Addendum #4, Ref.#695. The quantity was changed from 11,088 lf to 4074 lf. I believe this quantity should have been changed to 7014 lf. Ref.#677 is 4074 lf of 4" fiberglass conduit across the Broad St Bridge. The remainder of the original 11,088 lf should be Ref.695, 4" fiberglass conduit encased between manhole #390a and manhole #1801, per plan sheets #512 & #513.

Ref #695 should be 7,014 ft. Sheets 512 and 513 and the General Summary will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted:  2/13/2020 4:12:43 PM  
Question Number - 42

In the estimating process it has become evident that during phase 2A on 71, there is inadequate room to build the N5,N6, and cap capable walls. The distance from the face of walls to traffic only allows for a proper excavation layback and no room for any equipment to subsequently build the walls. Thus shoring and will be required to provide added space for equipment. In what bid items would the cost for the required temporary shoring be included?

As indicated in the plans and proposal documents, payment for temporary shoring is included under Item 503 - COFFERDAMS AND EXCAVATION BRACING, AS PER PLAN. This item is provided in the estimated quantities for N5, N6 and the Cap Capable Walls as proposal Ref 0576, 0608, and 0681, respectively. See notes on sheets 701, 732, and 763. No changes will be made to the plans or proposal documents as a result of this pre-bid question.

Question Submitted:  2/13/2020 2:12:42 PM  
Question Number - 41

On page 844 thru 845 the Broad Street Luminaire qty 12 in the Aesthetic Enhancements is shown in great detail but no manufacture or fabricator name or contact information is provided. Please provide the name or contact so pricing can be obtained.

It is at the discretion of the contractor to identify a fabricator who is able to provide product(s) that meet the specifications outlined in the plans. No contact information will be provided.

Question Submitted:  2/12/2020 5:20:40 PM  
Question Number - 40

Sheet 14 has a note on the top right referencing an optional Bid Item for Roller Compacted Concrete which does not exist in the Proposal. That same note on sheet 14 references General Notes for RCC on sheet 127, which do not exist. Appears this note on Sheet 14 is mistakenly included in this plan set. Please clarify.

The Roller Compacted Concrete note on sheet 14 will be removed in an upcoming addendum.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.
In review of the sanitary work included in this bid, we have several “special” bid items as noted on sheets 191 and 480. No notes have been included in the plans or proposal for what is to be included in these items. Most of the items are paid as Lump Sum. The item number references 690 but no ODOT supplemental specification is available to cover the items listed. Please advise.

As shown on Sheet 191 (General Summary), the notes for these “special” items are provided on sheet 474 of the plans.

Question Submitted: 2/10/2020 6:12:15 PM  Question Number - 38
The existing pier and abutment footings for both FRA-40-1351 and FRA-40-1352 appear to be in conflict with the new construction since I-71 profile is being lowered. There are no notes detailing removal limits other than CMS 202. Please clarify if the footings are to be removed.

The intent was that removals of existing abutments and piers would extend at least as deep as the bottom of proposed aggregate base in pavement areas. In an upcoming addendum, notes will be added to further clarify the removals.

Question Submitted: 2/10/2020 6:11:46 PM  Question Number - 37
Where is removal of the concrete slope protection under the FRA-102-0000 (FRA 40-1352) Broad Street Ramp Slab Bridge to be paid?

Removal of the existing concrete slope protection under the Broad Street Ramp Slab Bridge will be quantified and paid under Item 202 – Pavement Removed and included as part of an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/10/2020 6:11:22 PM  Question Number - 36
The existing plans provided do not show the retaining walls north of the FRA-102-0000 (FRA 40-1352) Broad Street Ramp Slab Bridge. Could the existing retaining wall plans be provided? Also, since the ramp is not part of the bridge, where is the retaining wall removal paid?

A pay item for item 202E11000 – Structure Removed (Lump) will be included in a future addendum to clarify the removal of Walls F and G. The original retaining wall plans have been added to the Reference Files folder here: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-105453/Reference%20Files/

Question Submitted: 2/10/2020 6:10:08 PM  Question Number - 35
The existing plans provided for FRA-102-0000 (FRA 40-1352) Broad Street Ramp Slab Bridge are original and do not show the rehab. The rehab would have included removal and replacement of the parapet. Could the rehab plans be provided?

The rehabilitation plans for this bridge are not available.

Sheet 118 depicts temporary pavement to be installed during MOT phases 2A/B/C. The temporary pavement shown for IR-71 SB traffic utilized in phase 3 runs through the existing Ramp R-2. The installation of this temporary pavement will require approximately 2,000 CY of excavation beyond the planned grades to properly lay back the slope into the existing R-2 ramp fill. Additionally, during phase 4; approximately 2,000 CY of embankment will be needed to restore the Ramp R-2 to its new proposed grades. Will the initial excavation and the replacement embankment be paid for in separate items or will it be incidental to ROADS FOR MAINTAINING TRAFFIC?

A bid item for Road for Maintaining Traffic has been added to the plans. See upcoming addendum.

Bid item 26 REMOVAL MISC.: WALL REMOVED unit of measure is EA in the proposal/bid file. Plan sheet 416 shows a unit of measure in FT. Should the UM be FT? Please clarify.

The correct unit of measure for Ref 0026 is FT, which is show on sheet 416. The general summary and proposal document will be revised to reflect the correct unit of measure in an upcoming addendum.

Plan sheet 763 Note Item 511 – QC2 Bridge Deck PPT says prior to constructing any of the concrete parapet, including the pilasters and pylons, the contractor shall cast the parapet, pilaster and pylon test pieces required in the FRA-71-1735 (Town Street) Bridge Plans and meet the approval standards therein. Please provide the requirements for the test pours as the Town Street Bridge Plans are not part of the contract documents.

The requirements for the parapet, pilaster, and pylon test pieces will be added to the note on sheet 763 in an upcoming addendum.
Plan sheet 791 shows LSM and a 6” concrete slab in the windows of the piers. Note 1 says this shall be included with QC/QA, Pier Above Footgs, APP. This has typically been a separate biditem on past projects (511 6” Concrete Slab and 613 LSM Backfill (Type 1). Please clarify if this work is incidental to the Pier Above Footings biditem and if the concrete and/or LSM will be paid as quantity in the biditem.

The LSM and 6” slab are included in the Pier Above Footings, as per plan item, as discussed in Note 1 on Sheet 791. The Contractor should assign his bid costs accordingly. No changes will be made to the plans.

Plan sheet 58 says a limited asbestos survey was performed with no structural elements identified as having detectable asbestos fibers. Plan sheet 763 requires the contractor to perform asbestos testing on bridge 1352. Could the Department please confirm an asbestos survey is required and confirm where it is paid.

The note on sheet 58 is in regard to the Broad Street Bridge (FRA—040-1351). The note on sheet 763, titled “ITEM 202 STRUCTURE REMOVED, OVER 20 FOOT SPAN, AS PER PLAN (FRA-040-1352)”, applies to the existing Ramp bridge from Broad Street to IR-71 Northbound. The note is clear in saying that the asbestos testing work is included in this pay item. No plan changes are required.

The precast retaining wall option on this project shows minimum 10” thick wall panel (Sheet 710). Would the Department consider allowing a structural thickness less than 10” for use on the project as a Value Engineering?

The department will not allow a structural thickness less than 10” for the precast retaining walls. The plans will remain unchanged due to this prebid question; please bid as specified. Please note that VECP’s are not allowed to be considered prior to bid unless a change is requested in which ODOT would receive the entire savings.

Is there a general note or supplemental specification for reference no’s 380 thru 390, Item 645 Pavement Markings Inlaid with Contrast and 645 Pavement Marking Misc. Groove for Inlaid Pavement Markings? What pavement marking item(s) is the groove for?

Item 645 Pavement Markings Inlaid with Contrast and 645 Pavement Marking Misc. Groove for Inlaid Pavement Markings should be installed per City of Columbus CMS 645 and City of Columbus SCD 1645. The groove item is intended to be used for dotted lines and channelizing lines. The traffic control notes and plans will be revised to include this information via an addendum.

Biditem 133 Manhole Reconstruct to Grade, APP provides plan notes on sheet 60 and a profile for the manhole (D704) on sheet 440. Plan note on sheet 60 discusses removing the manhole to the limits shown in the plans. Sheet 440 appears to show the removal limit at elev. 771.50. CMS 611.10.C details a much further scope of work indicating removal to the spring line and replacement. Is it the scope of work to only remove the manhole to elevation 771.50 per plan sheets 60 and 440?

The scope of work is to remove the manhole to the elevation shown in the plans, as per the note on sheet 60. No plan changes are required.

Sheet 67 provides notes for Biditem 558 Maintaining Traffic, Misc. Bridge Deck and Pavement Patching. In the notes it says the item shall be bid at $1.00. The fixed amount shown in the proposal is included (as any other biditems) in the total amount. At the bottom of the note is shows $90,000 EACH. This item isn’t fixed at $1 in the proposal file. Should this be a fixed item and if so, please correct in the bid file.

Bid Item 558 will be “fixed” at $1 in the bid proposal file. Please see forthcoming addendum.

Sheet 152 shows road closed signs and barricades located at the intersection of Jefferson Ave and Broad St. Do the parking meters on both sides of Jefferson Ave from Broad St to Avon Place need to be maintained?

As shown on Sheet 103, Jefferson Ave. will be fully closed from Broad Street to Avon Place, so the parking meters will not be maintained (in service) during this time. The “Parking Meter Out of Service Fees” on sheet 63 provides details for how the contractor should handle meters out of service. The plans will remain unchanged due to this prebid question.
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**Question Submitted:** 2/8/2020 9:12:20 AM  Question Number - 24
There appears to be a missing “Portions of Structures Removed As Per Plan” bid item. The APP note on plan sheet 56 states “the following quantity has been carried to the general summary for use at the locations specified above.” The only portions of structures removed bid items are in the wall plans and these do not reference the note on plan sheet 56. Please add a bid item for the wall removal work on plan sheet 56.

“Item 202 – Portions of Structure Removed, As Per Plan” will be added to the General Summary in an upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 2/6/2020 3:28:52 PM  Question Number - 23
A plan note on sheet 61, “Unrecorded Active Sanitary Sewer Connections”, states that the continuance requires a ROW permit and may also require NPDES permit from the Ohio EPA. The ROW use permit is also listed on sheet 60 for continuance of “Unrecorded Storm Water Drainage”. How will it be determined if a NPDES permit for any sanitary connections be required? Who is responsible for obtaining the ROW and/or NPDES permits?

ALL SANITARY AND SANITARY WASTEWATER CONTINUANCE MAY ALSO REQUIRE A NPDES PERMIT FROM THE OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY” will be removed from the Unrecorded Active Sanitary Sewer Connections note on sheet 61. Both notes, the Unrecorded Storm Water Drainage note on sheet 60 and the Unrecorded Active Sanitary Sewer Connections note on sheet 61, will be revised in an upcoming addendum to provide further clarification on the processes of obtaining the Right of Way Permits and associated required documentation.

**Question Submitted:** 2/3/2020 2:42:25 PM  Question Number - 22
The Deck Placement Design Assumptions on sheet 763 are not consistent with recent ODOT Bridge Design Manuals. The finish machine and wheel weights are lower than anticipated. BDM indicates designer should assume a maximum wheel weight of 2200 lbs + 48’ x 12 lbs/lf (additional truss) = 2276 lbs/wheel. Could the Department please review and adjust the plan note?

The value of 1.36 kips for the maximum wheel load on sheet 763 will be revised to 2.70 kips, and “the total machine load of 10.9 kips” will be removed from the note. Please see forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 2/3/2020 2:41:45 PM  Question Number - 21
Sheet 615 shows 3” conduit crossing the previously constructed Long St./Elijah Pierce intersection at a diagonal. The bid items do not include a jacked and drilled option for this work. Is this run expected to be open cut with pavement restoration (including brick pavers) or will the Department add a bid item for 3” conduit jacked or drilled?

Item 625 – Conduit, 3”, 725.051, will be reduced by 131’, and a pay item of 131’ for “Conduit, 3”, Jacked or Drilled, 725.051” will be added in an upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 2/1/2020 11:15:31 AM  Question Number - 20
Facilitated Partnering (Departments Share) is a fixed-amount biditem (REF 741). It appears that PN 111 - Facilitated Partnering is not part of the proposal. Please add PN 111 via addendum or delete the biditem.

PN 111- Facilitated Partnering will be added to the proposal in an upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 1/31/2020 11:20:44 AM  Question Number - 19
I would like to request that Greenline Mfg. be listed as an approved alternate for the Type B and Type c planters for this project. Newpro Containers are sales representatives for Greenline; https://www.greenlinemfg.com/ Nate Wall 317 760 4402 Thank you

Greenline Mfg. will not be added to the list at this time.

**Question Submitted:** 1/30/2020 12:31:35 PM  Question Number - 18
The quantities for Ref. 695 AT&T Fiberglass Conduit and Ref. 727 appear to include the length across the Broad St. bridge. The fiberglass conduit across the bridge is already quantified in Ref. 675 through 677. Could the Department adjust quantities for Ref. 695 and 727 to account for the bridge conduit already incorporated in separate bid items?

The quantities for Ref 695 and 727 will be reduced to 7014 ft and 2660 ft, respectively in an upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 1/30/2020 12:31:19 PM  Question Number - 17
Could the Department please clarify note in the bottom right corner of sheet 656? We cannot locate the bubbled line items that are referenced.

The note is referring to items bubbled 441, 443, 444, and 446 on sheet 656.
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**Question Submitted:** 1/30/2020 12:30:58 PM  Question Number - 16
Sheet 767 shows 16 EA Anchor Bolt Assemblies Embedded in Concrete (4 for light poles and 12 for the Broad St. luminaires). Ref. 674 has a quantity of 4 EA (for the light poles) and Ref. 254 has a quantity of 4 EA (for the light poles). Could the Department please adjust the quantity for Ref. 674 to 12 EA and change the description to reference Luminaires (Not Light Pole)? Also please adjust sheet 767 as necessary.

The proposal document Ref 674 will be revised to match sheet 767 as “LIGHT POLE ANCHOR BOLTS, MISC.: ANCHOR BOLT ASSEMBLIES EMBEDDED IN CONCRETE BRIDGE DECK FOR LIGHT POLES AND LUMINAIRES”. Additionally, the quantity, will be revised to 16 instead of 4 in an upcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 1/28/2020 7:58:23 AM  Question Number - 15
Plan sheet 55 provides work duration limits on work that affect Parcels 23, 61, and 62-64. These parcels are not listed in the plans. Please provide the appropriate plan sheets that show the locations of these parcels.

The updated r/w plans have been added to the reference folder at ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-105453/Reference%20Files/

**Question Submitted:** 1/28/2020 7:58:01 AM  Question Number - 14
The Proposal Utility Note and plan sheet 53 say AT&T crews will perform removal and abatement of the existing AT&T duct bank and associated materials. Plan sheets 512 and 513 say “Contractor” to remove asbestos wrapped ducts from abutment to abutment. Could the Department please clarify who is to perform the asbestos abatement and update plan notes accordingly?

AT&T will perform the asbestos abatement and removal of existing ducts. Sheets 512 & 513, as well as the utility note, will be revised in an upcoming addendum to provide clarification.

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 5:48:04 PM  Question Number - 13
Sheet 796 show the 3/8” plate shop welded to the structural steel, but says it’s included for payment with the conduit support brackets per Note 3 (REF 655). Since the 3/8” plate is shop welded to the girder, could it be made part of REF 653 Level 4 Structural Steel and pay quantity updated accordingly? This would keep it separate from the steel support angles installed in the field.

The 3/8” plate shown on sheet 796 is provided solely to support the utilities carried under the Broad Street Bridge. This item was quantified separately so that it could be tracked in the appropriate funding split on the project. As suggested in the pre-bid question, including the plate as part of REF 653 would complicate the invoices to utilities. The plans will remain unchanged as a result of this pre-bid question.

**Question Submitted:** 1/23/2020 1:23:24 PM  Question Number - 12
Please review quantities for REF 569 and 570. They appear to be transposed in the proposal/bid file based on quantities listed on general summary sheet 196.

REF 569 and 570 are transposed in the Proposal. This will be corrected by addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 1/22/2020 6:59:52 PM  Question Number - 11
Plan note Item 512 – Sealing of Concrete Surfaces (Epoxy Urethane) on Sheet 57/881 states that epoxy-urethane sealer is incidental to the barrier bid items. It is also noted on sheet 516. Item 512 Sealing is a large cost and not typically incidental to barrier wall items. Could the Department make a separate biditem for Epoxy Urethane Sealer (SY)? This would be in line with other sealing work on the project as well as other projects within the Columbus Crossroads area.

A separate SY pay item for 512- Sealing of Concrete Surfaces (Epoxy Urethane) will be added by addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 1/21/2020 7:16:39 AM  Question Number - 10
Regarding Ref. No's 707 & 708, please provide the contact information for the fabricator that manufactured the luminaire lighting and the polycarbonate illuminated screenwall for the Long Street Bridge Project. Per the plan notes, the Broad Street Bridge is to match Long Street.

The Long Street Bridge Trellis Luminaire fabricator was SPJ Lighting, Inc. Contact info for the polycarbonate illuminated screenwall manufacturer for the Long Street Bridge Project was 3Form (website: www.3form.com; 3Form Ohio representative: Susan Studer; email: susan.studer@3form.com; phone: 859.653.4069)

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
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Question Submitted: 1/13/2020 2:34:06 PM  Question Number - 9
REF 380; 381; 386; 389; 390 are called out as Item 645 inlaid with contrast however the City of Columbus typically has these auxiliary pavement markings on concrete surface applied using Item 647 with contrast. Please review.

In an upcoming addendum the following changes will be made:
- Ref 390 will be removed.
- Ref 380 Change to Item 647 (B90) with contrast.
- Ref 381 Change to Item 647 (B90) with contrast.
- Ref 386 Change to Item 647 with NO contrast.
- Ref 389 Change to Item 647 with NO contrast.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2020 10:34:50 AM  Question Number - 8
On pg 228 the plans call out barrier run B1 to be Type C Barrier, APP but the summary sheet on pg 227 says B1 is Type D, APP. The typical section on pg 319 show the barrier wall being Type C, APP. Could you revise the summary sheet to reflect barrier run B1 as Type C Barrier, APP?

The roadway subsummary corresponding to plan sheet 228/881 is found on sheet 231, not 227. Roadway subsummary sheet 227 covers the roadway quantities for plan sheets 224 and 225. The barrier run B1 on subsummary sheet 227 is correctly quantified as a type C1, APP barrier (referring to plan sheet 224). Barrier run B1 on plan sheet 228 is correctly quantified as a type D, APP barrier on subsummary sheet 231.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2020 12:29:35 PM  Question Number - 7
This note is part of the fire alarm system general notes on page 539. The second paragraph states, "removal of the existing tunnel alarm equipment, including but not limited to the DMS signs,......". The plans only indicate removing the existing DMS signs associated with the fire alarm system and replacing them with a static sign and flashing red beacons. Is it ODOT's intent to remove and replace the fire alarm equipment in the tunnel, or leave in place and only upgrade the signs associated equipment as indicated on the plan pages?

The existing fire alarm detection hardware in the tunnel and the existing fire alarm controller and cabinet is existing to remain. The intent of the plan is for the contractor to provide and install all other equipment which is necessary to convert the system from a DMS based system to a static flasher system. The existing “working portion” of the system, consisting of the fire detection hardware in the tunnel, the control cabinet, and the DMS sign closest to the tunnel will be maintained by the contractor until the full static flashing sign system is fully operational. The contractor will be permitted to remove the “non-working” equipment at any time during the project, as approved by the engineer. An addendum will be released to replace the plan note on Sheet 539, to clarify this work. The addendum will also delete the “Maintenance of Tunnel Fire Alarm DMS Signs” note on Sheet 62.

Question Submitted: 1/6/2020 9:36:37 AM  Question Number - 6
Will ODOT please consider reducing the work type percentage performed by the prime from 50% to 30%?

The work type percentage will remain at 50%

Question Submitted: 1/3/2020 10:59:29 AM  Question Number - 5
The dimensions of the neoprene provided in the description for Bid Item 662 do not agree with the dimensions shown in the plans on Sheet 799/881. Please clarify.

The item description should read ELASTOMERIC BEARING WITH INTERNAL LAMINATES AND LOAD PLATE (NEOPRENE) (1'-4” x 1'-0” x 2 7/16” PAD W/ 1'-5” x 1'-1” x 2 1/8” STEEL LOAD PLATE) (WT: 21). This will be revised by addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2020 10:58:57 AM  Question Number - 4
The temporary fence note on sheet 62 requires chain link fence when and where directed by the Engineer and cost is incidental to maintaining traffic. Since we have no way of quantifying pre-bid where the Engineer will require this fence during construction, could the Department make a separate bid item by the lineal feet for this work? Otherwise, please define the locations/quantities and remove the note “When and Where Directed by the Engineer-in-Charge”.

A separate bid item by lineal feet will be added in a future addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/27/2019 11:44:37 AM  Question Number - 3
Sheet 3/881 Sheet Index lists Soil Profiles, but the soil profiles are not provided with the plan set. Could the soil profiles be provided via Addendum?

Soil Profiles will be added to the plan set in an upcoming addendum.

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

**Question Submitted:** 12/27/2019 11:39:47 AM  Question Number - 2
Could the existing bridge plans be provided on the ODOT .ftp site?

The existing bridge plans have been added to the reference folder at ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-105453.

**Question Submitted:** 12/23/2019 10:50:09 AM  Question Number - 1
Can the pavement calculations be provided or uploaded to the ODOT ftp site?

Pavement calculations have been posted to ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/FRA-105453.

**Project No.** 200025  **Sale Date - 2/27/2020**
MED-94440 - SR 303-13.90/14.96

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 8:15:09 AM  Question Number - 26
Please confirm if the Soldier Piles are galvanized

The Soldier Piles required for the retaining wall construction are not galvanized.

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 7:11:56 AM  Question Number - 25
Will there be any more addendum's for this project or scope changes covering the granular embankment concerns expressed?

An addendum for this project regarding the embankment and granular embankment concerns will be forthcoming.

**Question Submitted:** 2/11/2020 1:24:01 PM  Question Number - 24
Addendum four eliminated Ref 0065 and added 0202 by the pay unit of "LS". This puts a lot of risk directly on the contractor by eliminating the original pay item. The corresponding item No. for this work (ref 0202) is listed as 203E98500. The current 203 specification does not allow payment by the "LS", Granular Embankment is paid by the CY. Please revise

**Question Submitted:** 2/10/2020 12:24:26 PM  Question Number - 23
Please provide the example Lagging Sketch referenced in Prebid question #22.

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 6:41:07 PM  Question Number - 22
How is the hardwood lagging to be installed between the soldier piles at the steps in the wall facing? These facing steps are located at the center between two soldier piles. Please provide additional wall/lagging details for these locations.

Additional to the previous District response to this question, an example sketch has been attached for clarification.

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 6:39:50 PM  Question Number - 21
Plan 28/60 notes that the construction layback shown is not indicative of what is to be built and the contractor shall exercise their own means/methods, and this is paid under 503 Unclassified Exc, App. Plan 29/60 notes (and qty's are given elsewhere) that Granular Mat'l Type B and Granular Mat'l As Per Plan shall be used behind the retaining wall. If it’s up to the contractor to dictate means and methods for excavation then it’s possible the Qty's for All Granular Backfill Mat'l will vary from the Qty's provided/bid. Please clarify if the paid Granular Qty's can exceed the plan Qty's since the excavation is per contractor's means and methods.

The items and plan notes associated with the example construction layback for the solder pile and lagging wall installation shown in the plans will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 2/3/2020 2:56:29 PM  Question Number - 20
Addendum 3 has been posted, however the remainder of the office calculations have not. Can The State please provide these? With the road tapers (averages) and excavation limits there are quantities in the bid schedule and plans that are not lining up.

The roadway and structure office calculations are located within the CADDFiles.zip file located at the following location:ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MED-94440/Reference%20Files/.
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**Question Submitted:** 2/3/2020 2:31:18 PM  Question Number - 19

The construction limits shown for the retaining wall excavation does not allow for enough room to provide an adequate ramp for the driller. Please extend the limits to allow for a 5:1 ramp into the benched excavation.

The exact configuration of ramps and benching is to be determined by the contractor. The option shown in the plans is one feasible solution, but if additional grading is needed for an individual piece of equipment this would fall under contractor means and methods. The pay items for the excavation and embankment associated with the wall are being modified to LS items for this reason. The contractor's work shall remain within construction limits and right of way shown.

**Question Submitted:** 1/21/2020 10:54:43 AM  Question Number - 18

The exact configuration of ramps and benching is to be determined by the contractor. The option shown in the plans is one feasible solution, but if additional grading is needed for an individual piece of equipment this would fall under contractor means and methods. The pay items for the excavation and embankment associated with the wall are being modified to LS items for this reason. The contractor's work shall remain within construction limits and right of way shown.

**Question Submitted:** 1/17/2020 2:25:40 PM  Question Number - 17

The plan note on sheet 26/60 for Item 503 Unclassified Excavation, As Per Plan specifies slope requirements for the construction laybacks at the proposed retaining wall. Plan sheet 28/60 shows the grading plan at the retaining wall with the required slopes/laybacks per the note on page 26. However, the plan note at the lower right hand corner on page 28 that states this is one scenario for construction layback. This note also states the drawing on page 28 provides a constructible option for layback area. Please clarify if the contractor can design their own option for access and laybacks to build the wall as the note on page 28 suggests or will ODOT require the slopes/laybacks to be constructed per the note on page 26. (Basically, the note on page 26 gives the contractor no option regarding slope layback, while the page 28 note gives the contractor an option.)

The items and plan notes associated with the example construction layback for the solder pile and lagging wall installation shown in the plans will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 1/17/2020 2:00:44 PM  Question Number - 16

The Unclassified Exc APP for the retaining wall based on the plans and utilizing a 5:1 ramp slope for drill rig access is approx. 6000-cy. The two types of granular embankment qty's are much less than this, and it understood that all embankment in this area shall utilize the two types of granular material per the plan notes, please clarify your qty's.

The items and plan notes associated with the example construction layback for the solder pile and lagging wall installation shown in the plans will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 1/17/2020 1:58:39 PM  Question Number - 15

The plan quantity for Reference Item 10, Item 203, Excavation is 1,361 CY on the General Summary sheet 11/60. The quantity for Reference Item 10, Item 203, Excavation is 1,361 CY in the project Proposal. The quantity for the Reference Item matches between the plan and project Proposal. Please clarify this discrepancy.

**Question Submitted:** 1/17/2020 1:44:47 PM  Question Number - 14

The office calcs uploaded were for landscaping items and barrier reflectors. Can the state provide the rest of the roadway and structure office calcs?

The roadway and structure office calculations are located within the CADDFiles.zip file located at the following location: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MED-94440/Reference%20Files/.

**Question Submitted:** 1/14/2020 2:56:46 PM  Question Number - 13

Where is the existing asphalt pavement on structure 13.90 get paid to be removed?

The 13.90 structure is a buried pipe. The existing pavement removal on the roadway section above the pipe is paid for under Item 203 in the roadway quantities.
Plan 28/60 notes that the construction layback shown is not indicative of what is to be built and the contractor shall exercise their own means/methods, and this is paid under 503 Unclassified Exc, App. Plan 29/60 notes (and qty's are given elsewhere) that Granular Mat'tl Type B and Granular Mat’tl As Per Plan shall be used behind the retaining wall. If it's up to the contractor to dictate means and methods for excavation then it's possible the Qty's for All Granular Backfill Mat'tl will vary from the Qty's provided/bid. Please clarify if the paid Granular Qty's can exceed the plan Qty's since the excavation is per contractor's means and methods.

The layback scenario is a feasible solution, and the related estimated quantities are provided as a basis for bid values. If quantities are exceeded, the additional material would be paid at the unit bid price established in the bid. However, ODOT reserves the right to reject requests for additional payment where means and methods substantially increase these quantities beyond a reasonable measure. The Engineered Drawings required by CMS 501.05 shall include the layback means and methods proposed along with contractor’s estimate of earthwork, and the layback approach shall be subject to approval. No guarantees of payment for additional quantity are made if prior approval for the excavation layback solution to be used is not obtained.

How is the hardwood lagging to be installed between the soldier piles at the steps in the wall facing? These facing steps are located at the center between two soldier piles. Please provide additional wall/lagging details for these locations.

The timber lagging can be installed in this area by bearing the timber against the back of the front-facing flange on the low side, and angled to bear behind the midpoint of the shaft on the high side. A small amount of additional concrete would be required for the facing due to the angle. If longer lagging is needed for this area, the additional length of lagging due to the skew shall be incidental to the cost of Item 610E50010 Retaining Wall, Misc.: Timber Lagging, and the additional concrete volume will be paid with the rest of the facing concrete based on unit cost price for material quantity accepted in place for Item 511E46010 Class QC1 Concrete.

Alternatively, if permanent steel casing is used, a steel angle may be welded to the casing to provide bearing, and would be incidental to the Timber Lagging item. Additional methods may be acceptable, and fall under contractor means and methods provisions.

Please provide the office calcs for both the roadway and structures.

Please see the following FTP site linkftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MED-94440/Reference%20Files/

Please confirm the plan note on page 37/60 which indicates the existing 14" CIP pier piles need to be removed entirely, rather than 1' below proposed grade.

The Item 202 plan note on page 37/60 regarding the removal of the existing pier piles for the MED-303-1496 bridge will be revised to allow for cutting the piles off two (2) feet below the existing stream bed elevation. This revision will be covered in a forthcoming addendum.

Regarding the soldier pile retaining wall details on sheet 32 of 60, there are 7/8" diameter x 6" long threaded studs welded to the flanges of the soldier piles. Do the studs have to be threaded or can standard industry shear studs be used? Please advise.

Threads are not required; standard shear studs may be used.

Regarding the removal of the existing pier piles for bridge MED-303-1496, would the Department consider allowing the pier piles to be cut off two feet below the existing stream bed elevation instead of extracting the piles in their entirety?

The removal of the existing pier piles for the MED-303-1496 bridge will be revised to allow for cutting the piles off two (2) feet below the existing stream bed elevation. This revision will be covered in a forthcoming addendum.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 1/10/2020 9:45:40 AM  
**Question Number - 6**

Regarding the existing sheet piling wall to be removed near Sta. 52+77, 25’ Rt, please provide the overall length of the existing wall, the length of wall to be removed, the length of the existing sheet piles and the existing sheet pile section.

*Pay Item 202E11000 is for structure removed for the full length, and is a lump sum item. Existing information is limited and is indicative of the existing structure and the proposed work, but should be considered tentative and approximate. Base removal upon recognition of the uncertainties described above and upon a pre-bid field examination of the existing structure. The contractor is referred to CMS Sections 102.05 and 105.02.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/9/2020 5:00:48 PM  
**Question Number - 5**

Would the Department consider painting in the shop only the primer on the structural steel and field painting the intermediate and finish coats?

*The structural steel painting will be revised to the prime coat being applied in the shop and the intermediate and finish coats applied in the field. This revision will be covered in a forthcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/8/2020 4:39:13 PM  
**Question Number - 4**

Can the Department make available the HEC-RAS files for this project?

*Please see the following FTP site link: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MED-94440/Reference%20Files/*

**Question Submitted:** 1/7/2020 2:14:33 PM  
**Question Number - 3**

In lieu of a three coat shop paint system for the structural steel, would the Department consider changing the structural steel protection system to metalizing? Metalizing is far more durable than the three coat paint system and would eliminate the field painting at the bolted cross frame connections.

*Please provide bids using the proposed 3 coat shop paint system.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/6/2020 9:21:03 AM  
**Question Number - 2**

In lieu of a three coat shop paint system, would the Department consider changing the structural steel protection system to weathering steel based on the potential damage that may occur to the paint system during beam erection, the abutment diaphragm forming & stripping and the bridge deck & overhang forming and stripping?

*The District typically avoids using weathering steel over waterways (especially low clearances) or damp areas. The moisture doesn’t allow the patina to form correctly, jeopardizing the integrity of the protective coating. The contractor shall use care to minimize the damage to the shop painting; however, the plans include touch-up painting in the event the coating is damaged.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/2/2020 10:35:05 AM  
**Question Number - 1**

On sheet 43/60 clarify if note 5 is meant for the anchor rods or note 6. Sheet 46/60 calls out 2” holes for 1 1/4” bolts. Also on sheet 43/60 clarify "SUPPORT BOLT DIMENSION A" unable to locate DIMENSION A call out.

*Sheet 43/60, Abutment Section Details: Callouts for Notes 4 & 5 on Sections A & B were revised to refer to Notes 5 & 6, respectively and will be included in Addendum 1. Dimension “A” is on both Sections A & B, under the W44x230 beam—no addendum required for this item.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 4:51:39 PM  
**Question Number - 14**

The APP Note for Item 253, Pavement Repair states the estimated quantity of Item 253 Pavement Repair (5,000 sy, Bid item 32) will be at a minimum of 4 ft x 4 ft x 4 in deep. Are the repairs to be 4 in deep from the existing or planned surface?

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 1:28:02 PM  
**Question Number - 13**

The APP note on page 17 modifies the 19 mm asphalt mix. This note states 64-22 can be used if 25% or less RAP is used. The description for this mix is listed in the general summary as - Asphalt concrete intermediate course, 19 mm, Type A (448), As Per plan, 64-28. Can you confirm that 64-22 is allowed per the APP note?

*PG64-22 is acceptable per the APP note.*

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 9:28:31 AM  Question Number - 12

Pay item # 59 is for a quantity of 17, 20' bracket arms. Plan pages 70 & 72 detail a quantity of 7 of these arms as 18' not 20'. Which is correct? Can an addendum be issued to clarify this matter.

See forthcoming addendum. The bracket arm is 20'.

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2020 3:13:13 PM  Question Number - 11

On sheet 74/147 the bearing detail shows field drilling 1” vent holes. What is the purpose of these vent holes? Typically vent holes are only put in when the abutment is being constructed new or being converted to a semi-integral abutment and the bearings will be encased in concrete. These bearings are simply replacing the old bearings and will be open to the elements. By drilling these holes we are only adding fatigue points that water will get into and rust the bearing and bottom flange of the existing steel. Can these vent holes be eliminated?

See forthcoming addendum. The bearings are designed for a future conversion to semi-integral abutments. The Department recognizes the difficulty in field drilling the vent vertical vent holes at this stage while the end cross-frames are still in place. As such the plans are being updated to remove the vertical field drilled vent holes from this contract as the best time to drill these holes will be on the future rehabilitation when the end cross-frames are no longer present.

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2020 11:51:24 AM  Question Number - 10

Would ODOT please consider making a bid item for vandal fence removed and replaced on the 70-0632 bridge? Plan notes on sheet 78/147 talk about it being incidental to the structure removed, but we feel this item of work would be better served with it’s own bid item should additional removal lengths be required.

See forthcoming addendum. The pay item 202E75267 - VANDAL PROTECTION FENCE REMOVED AND RESET, AS PER PLAN will be added.

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2020 10:32:22 AM  Question Number - 9

Multiple Bridges have an item for epoxy injection. All of these injections are shown in the plans to be on the deck area as labeled in the plans. Are these locations on the top of the deck or underside of the deck?

See forthcoming addendum. Injections are on the top of the deck.

**Question Submitted:** 1/28/2020 8:46:43 AM  Question Number - 8

The interim completion note on page 24 states all pavement repairs are to be completed by October 15th 2020, and all resurfacing started must be completed through the surface course and include the 621 Raised Pavement Markers. The pavement repair note on page 17 states all repairs are to be resurfaced within two weeks. The interim completion note on page 24 does not seem to require all of the resurfacing to be completed in 2020 (only resurfacing that has been started). In order to comply with the interim completion note of completing all pavement repairs in 2020 and the pavement repair note of resurfacing all pavement repairs within two weeks, all of the surface will need to be completed in 2020. How much pavement repair and resurfacing is required to be completed in 2020?

See forthcoming addendum. The intent of the interim completion note is to perform all pavement repairs in the first season. The contractor has the option to perform as much or as little resurfacing in the first season; however, any resurfacing performed must be completed including the surface course and permanent RPMs. The second season the contractor will perform all remaining resurfacing. The 253 Pavement Repair note on sheet 17 will be revised.

**Question Submitted:** 1/17/2020 1:32:17 PM  Question Number - 7

What are the concrete mix requirements for the Type A Installation and Type C Installation? Are they to be QC-2 per the standard drawings, or are they to be the modified QC-3 similar to the bridge deck and approach slabs?

You are correct in that the approach slabs are to match the decks QC3 concrete per 526.02. For the Type A and C Installations concrete, it will be acceptable to use either the standard QC2 at a minimum or the structures QC3 that is in the deck and approach slabs.

**Question Submitted:** 1/17/2020 1:21:10 PM  Question Number - 6

Will ODOT consider a 14 day closure and detour for the 70-1541 structure as the parapet work required will compromise the parapets, fencing, and require forms to be left on the front side of the bridge for a short duration. This would be similar to the work being done on the 70-0632 Pence Shewman Bridge which has a 14 day closure.

See forthcoming addendum. The Department has considered the request. The plans will be revised to close and detour the structure PRE-70-1541 for 14 days to complete work at this location.

*** 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.***
What is the pavement build up under the approach slabs at both the 320-0117 structure and the 726-0428 structure? We are assuming both will get subgrade compaction and 304, but will the undercut and type C granular material be required under the approach slabs?

Sheet 15 of the contract documents illustrates Typical Sections for both SR 320 and SR 756. The Typical Sections illustrate the roadway pavement buildup and identifies the undercut necessary. The Typical Sections also provide the approach slab limits, in which the concrete approach slab would replace the pavement buildup. The item 304 aggregate base and undercut illustrated in the Typical Sections applies to the approach slab limits.

For the 320-0117 Structure please clarify how the fiberwrap quantity will be paid. It appears from the quantity given ODOT would like 3 wraps. Per the PN 519 spec ODOT will pay the surface area of concrete regardless of number of wraps. Can ODOT please clarify how payment will be made and how many wraps are required?

See addendum R1. See revised sheets 101 and 108. The fiberwrap will be paid for based on the surface area of the pier. The confining stress has been provided on sheet 108. The number of wraps will be based on the product selected.

Will ODOT allow the contractor to pour the parapet on Structure 320-0117 as a 42" parapet? Plans call for a 36" straight faced parapet.

A 36" parapet must be constructed per the plans. A 42" parapet will not be permitted.

Please verify the quantity for REF 120, we believe it to be 77 CY, not 777 CY.

The requested items will not be added. Storage of equipment is considered part of the contractor’s means and methods. The contractor should bid accordingly.

Following the release of addendum 6 dated 2/20/20, it appears clear that the department now acknowledges the need to construct at least a portion, if not all, of phase 2 and 3 in the spring of 2021. However, no winterization notes or quantities have been added (other than for the field office item). This would suggest that maintenance of traffic via the proposed one-lane, two-way pattern w/ signals may remain in place throughout the winter. Please confirm. If this is not the department’s intent, please provide additional notes/quantities for winterization via addendum.

Is the entire area under the proposed approach slab subject to specification 503.08 backfill requirements of 203 Granular Material Type B?

The entire area under the proposed approach slab is subject to CMS 503.08 backfill requirements for Item 203 Granular Material Type B.

Plan note sheet 41/91 Item 203 embankment, as per plan requires material to be placed in 6" lifts at forward abutment 127+79 to 129+34 contradicts with plan note sheet 42/91, center column, 5th paragraph, place at least 12" of fill over the top of the blocks before beginning compaction. This is the area between the proposed abutment and the existing abutment. Please clarify.

The first lift on top of the Geofoam blocks is to be 12" thick before compaction is to take place. Any remaining fill layers above that first layer shall be installed and compacted in 6" lifts.

*** 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.***
Due to the lead time required for the fabrication of the beams, work limitations caused by 87 train-per-day traffic, the minimum 4-week utility delay built into the phasing, the 45-day approval period for railroad insurance, and minimum 30-day submittal review period by NS Railroad, the project completion date of 10/31/2020 is not feasible. Please revise the completion date via addendum. In addition, please provide provisions for winterization of the bridge and applicable maintenance of traffic notes and/or bid item adjustments.

The completion date will be changed in a forthcoming addendum.

Due to railroad involvement, phasing of traffic, utility downtime and beam/piling delivery the October 31 completion date is unbelievable. Please consider revising the completion date.

The completion date will be changed in a forthcoming addendum.

Will the State change the completion date of this project to at least 11/30/2020? Given the railroad involvement and 87 trains a day, the 4 weeks of utility relocation on the critical path and the late availability of the structural steel, the completion date of 10/31/2020 is unattainable.

The completion date will be changed in a forthcoming addendum.

Plan sheet 42 provided with addendum 3, does not include the changes made to that sheet in addendum 2. Please clarify.

The incorrect sheet was used in Addendum 3. The revisions in addendum 2 still hold. Sheet 42 will be corrected in a forthcoming addendum.

Considering the schedule of the project, regarding the 4a notes for AT&T, comcast and charter, it appears that they currently relocating their facilities to the left side of the roadway, the new poles appear to be within the benching zone for phase 2 work. Will the utilities be relocating the poles back to the right side after phase 1 in their 2 week time frame? If so that would require the contractor to have the new conduit on the structure, diaphragms placed and backfilled and the embankment work complete before the utilities can start their final relocation. Can the State provide clarification on the 4a utility work, so that the contractors can establish a prebid schedule for this project. The utility work directly impacts the project schedule and what work items can be performed concurrently with the utility work.

The intent of the utility note is to have the contractor contact AT&T, Comcast, and Charter 2 weeks prior to the need for them to perform the temporary work and remove the conflict with phase 1 construction. The temporary utility work is to take 2 weeks to complete. Once phase 1 is complete and the conduit placed on the structure for the utilities to move into, the contractor is again to contact the utilities 2 weeks prior to needing this work completed. The final utility work is again going to take 2 weeks to complete. Once this utility work is complete, the poles will no longer be in conflict with the phase 2 benching.

Please clarify the work to be paid under Reference 58 Temporary Shoring given that the plans required a temporary MSE wall (for what appears to be the same purpose) to be paid under Reference 108.

The temporary sheeting paid under Reference 58 is for any additional sheeting required beyond what is specifically shown in the plans.

The railroad special clauses in the proposal states that all boom equipment shall cease operation while a train is passing. This note specifically includes pile driving. However, the guidelines later state that only operating equipment within 25’ of centerline of track shall cease work during a train passing. This would imply that pile driving equipment can remain in operation if more than 25’ from centerline (the proposed piling is no closer than 31’-6 1/4” from CL of track according to horizontal clearances provided on sheet 39/91). Please confirm that pile driving operations can proceed continuously given the clearance from the railroad.

The pile driving equipment can remain in operation when more than 25’ from the centerline of the tracks contingent upon the Contractor being able to demonstrate to and receiving approval from NS that the drill rig is stable, and does not have the potential to tip over/fall within the clearance envelope of the operating track while in operation.
The railroad special clauses in the proposal lists a total of 87 trains per day that will travel through the jobsite. However, there are no other indications as to time of day, day of week, interval between trains, etc. that provide any insight on how/when the contractor should expect higher or lower train traffic volume. Given the restrictions the contractor must adhere to for work above and along the railroad, additional information, such as a schedule of train traffic, is requested to clarify when the contractor can anticipate the ability to complete substantial construction activities.

**Question Submitted:** 2/6/2020 10:41:58 AM  
**Question Number - 11**

The contractor will need to contact the railroad for any additional information.

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2020 12:38:34 PM  
**Question Number - 10**

Can a standard sloped haunch be used when forming the bridge deck? If vertical haunches are required will galvanized deck formwork hangers be required?

A sloped haunch shall not be used when forming the bridge deck; the sides of the haunch shall be vertical as shown in the plan. The deck formwork hangers shall be galvanized. A note will be added to the plan specifying this, and Item 511 - Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, Bridge Deck will be made "As Per Plan". These changes will be made in forthcoming Addendum #3.

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2020 10:43:38 AM  
**Question Number - 9**

The contractor is responsible for contacting AT&T, Comcast, and Charter Communications 2 weeks prior to the need of relocation work. It is the contractor’s responsibility to make these contacts in order to properly coordinate the work.

**Question Submitted:** 1/30/2020 10:45:45 AM  
**Question Number - 8**

The contractor is responsible for contacting AT&T, Comcast, and Charter Communications 2 weeks prior to the need of relocation work. It is the contractor’s responsibility to make these contacts in order to properly coordinate the work.

**Question Submitted:** 1/30/2020 9:11:54 AM  
**Question Number - 7**

The contractor is responsible for contacting AT&T, Comcast, and Charter Communications 2 weeks prior to the need of relocation work. It is the contractor’s responsibility to make these contacts in order to properly coordinate the work.

**Question Submitted:** 1/30/2020 8:48:07 AM  
**Question Number - 6**

The contractor is responsible for contacting AT&T, Comcast, and Charter Communications 2 weeks prior to the need of relocation work. It is the contractor’s responsibility to make these contacts in order to properly coordinate the work.

**Question Submitted:** 1/29/2020 2:50:36 PM  
**Question Number - 5**

Please advise if 6 temporary conduit supports are required, as shown on sheet 45/91. Also, please advise if these can be of any grade of material, since they are temporary. The number of permanent conduit supports is also needed. It appears to be 6 also.

There should be a temporary utility support at every crossframe of the existing structure in the west bay during Phase 1 removal. This would equate to 16 temporary utility supports during Phase 1 removal. These temporary crossframe supports are paid for under Item 625 – Conduit , 4", 725.04, As Per Plan. Refer to sheet 45 of 91 for more details. Contractor is to refer ODOT Standard Drawing GSD-1-96 Revised 7/19/2002 for direction on the material type. For Phase 1 Construction, there should also be a permanent utility support at every crossframe of the new structure in the east bay. This would equate to 6 utility supports during Phase 1 Construction. These permanent crossframe supports are paid for under Item 625 – Conduit , 4", 725.04, As Per Plan. Refer to sheet 46 of 91 for more details. Contractor is to refer ODOT Standard Drawing GSD-1-96 Revised 7/19/2002 for direction on the material type.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 1/29/2020 11:24:12 AM  
**Question Number - 4**

The Department has stated via the pre-bid questions that stay-in-place (SIP) forms would not be allowed for use on this project. Assuming this pertains to traditional metal corrugated SIP forms, would the department consider allowing the use of transparent stay-in-place forms that provide visibility to the bottom of the bridge deck?

*Stay-in-Place (SIP) forms will not be allowed on this project.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/27/2020 3:47:53 PM  
**Question Number - 3**

There is a plan note on sheet 42 regarding reference 72 EPS Geofoam Fill, where 4 different grades of geofoam are called out (EPS22, EPS29, EPS39, EPS46). However, it is not specified which of these grades is required for this project. Please specify the correct grade of geofoam.

*Sheet 42/91 should have stated that the grade of the Geofoam Fill shall be EPS29 for the project. The plans will be revised by addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 8:58:09 AM  
**Question Number - 2**

Ref# 107 Polymer Modified Asphalt Expansion Joint System I do not see a detail anywhere in the plans showing how many lf of joint, depth of joint or width of joint. Can you please let me know those dimensions or where I can find them?

*As per SCD AS-2-15, Polymer Modified Asphalt Expansion Joint Systems (PMAEJS) shall be placed at the approach slab/flexible asphalt pavement interface for Approach Slab Installation Type A. The width and thickness of the PMAEJS is stated on sheets 1 & 2 of SCD AS-2-15.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/21/2020 8:58:14 AM  
**Question Number - 1**

There does not appear to be any note regarding the use of stay-in-place forms to construct the deck on this project. Due to the high train traffic and minimal available clearance, will SIP forms be permitted? Please confirm.

*Stay-in-Place (SIP) forms will not be permitted on this project.*

---

**Project No.** 200055  
FRA-107773 - US 33-04.35  
**Sale Date - 2/27/2020**

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 4:07:25 PM  
**Question Number - 5**

What is the status of the project sale date?

*The project will be delayed from the February 13th sale date to the February 27th sale date.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2020 3:21:43 PM  
**Question Number - 4**

Ref #62 & 63 as per plan note calls for the bracket arms to be field adjustable. In order to provide and quote the correct size bracket arm clamps, please provide pole type/design and typical bottom clamping location on the structures.

*Existing pole information will be provided via forthcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/4/2020 3:55:51 PM  
**Question Number - 3**

Will the Department please clarify their intent of line item 0016 - Preparing Subgrade for Shoulder Paving. There is no safety edge set up on this project which is where Preparing Subgrade for Shoulder Paving would be required.

*Revised typical sections will be provided via forthcoming addendum. Intent is to provide safety edge as per Standard Drawing BP-3.2 in areas where the proposed pavement buildup is greater than 1.5".*

**Question Submitted:** 1/27/2020 11:10:44 AM  
**Question Number - 2**

On page 17 the beginning SLM in the second row from the bottom appears to be incorrect in the calculations. It is currently listed as 7.38 and should be 8.10. This is resulting in all of the quantities in that row to be overstated.

*Plan sheets will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 1/27/2020 11:07:02 AM  
**Question Number - 1**

Typical 1 on page 3 of the plans indicate 1.50" pavement planing and 1.50" of asphalt surface, Type 1, PG64-22. The calculations for areas listed as Typical 1 on page 17 indicate a 3.00" planing and 1.75" of Type 2 and 1.25" Type 1. Which is correct?

*Plan sheets will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.*

---

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
Will ODOT allow the disposal of waste/excavated material within the right of way of Stringtown interchange?

Waste or excavated materials from the project shall not be disposed of in the Stringtown Interchange infields.

Ref# 69 Polymer Modified Asphalt Expansion Joint System quantity is 33CF. The joint appears to be in concrete so I would assume the joint is 2” deep 20” wide and 80 feet long which comes to 22.22 CF. How is 33CF calculated?

The Item 846 - Polymer Modified Asphalt Expansion Joint quantity is calculated as follows: 2 bridge ends x 40' bridge width x 1.67' joint width x 0.25' joint depth = 33 cf.

The plan states the use of a hoe ram is prohibited for structure removal. On similar projects we have sawed the deck, piers and abutments in half, creating two bridges, then used hoe rams to remove the portion not carrying traffic. Would this method of removal be acceptable on this project?

The use of hoe rams will be permitted for the demolition of the bridge not carrying traffic only if the contractor fully saw-cuts through the deck, piers and abutments of the existing bridge and creates two separate bridges. The Item 202 plan note will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

As shown on plan pages 3, 7, & 8, the intersections will be resurfaced with surface course asphalt (T = 3/4'') and intermediate asphalt (T = 1 1/4'') 10 feet beyond the edge line or as directed by the project engineer.

CAN YOU CLARIFY THE 424 SURFACE REQUIREMENTS? IS THIS TYPE A (446) OR TYPE A (448)?

Please review CMS 424.08 for acceptance requirements.

Since the Department will not add bid items for the pavement markings, can you advise what type of markings will be required for the replacement?

The permanent markings shall be Item 642 - (Lane Line or Edge Line), 6'', Type 1

Will the Department allow daily lane closures for prep work such as rigging and steel repairs at 33-1431L/R prior to August 1?

No lane closures will be permitted before August 1.

*** 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.***
Can the Department add bid items for the work zone striping items and the eventual replacement striping? There are no typical sections provided and it appears there may be some shifting involved with the portable barrier wall. We cannot get pricing on these items without a clear scope of work that will be required.

All work zone striping and permanent striping shall be paid for under Item 614 - Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan. See notes on sheet 3

For the concrete barrier walls, is the whole length specified in the plans required to be used with a barrier wall, or will equipment being blocked from roadway with barrier wall and a taper of cones/barrels the rest of the required length suffice?

The entire length of portable barrier specified in the plans is required.

For bridge ATH-33-14.31, the plans state that you are not allowed to close lanes until August 1st. Will a temporary lane closure be allowed before August 1st as long as the lane is re-opened each day?

Temporary lane closures will not be allowed before August 1st.

If a TAF plan is required for this project can you provide Hydraulic Data for each culvert location

There are 4 culvert locations on this project. Will four TAF plans be required or will one plan for all be accepted

Will a TAF plan be required for this project.

The 15" conduit D-025 is shown on plan sheet 50 going through the concrete barrier and into an existing manhole that is located in the I.R. 71 Northbound left lane, outside of the construction limits. Please extend the construction limits and add pay item quantities for the concrete barrier and pavement removal and replacement. Please address the maintenance of traffic on I.R. 71 Northbound for this work.

Please review the Reference #6 – Embankment. The total earthwork chart on page 77 states that there is 507.2 CY of embankment through the cross-sections of the project; however, the sum of the embankment cross-sections is only 9.2 cubic yards. Please review and revise the embankment quantity.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
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**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 10:04:15 AM  Question Number - 11

Item 143 Class QC1 Concrete, Misc.: Precast Concrete Lagging with QC/QA, As Per Plan requires field QC/QA adhering to ODOT C&MS 455 for an item that is to be provided by an ODOT certified precast concrete supplier per Supplement 1073. The ODOT precast concrete certification program for Supplement 1073 includes quality control as part of the certification process. Please clarify if Item 143 requires field QC/QA pursuant to ODOT C&MS 455.

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 2:12:33 PM  Question Number - 10

Please explain the painting on Refs 147 and 148. The plan note for the Intermediate Coat says to paint all exposed steel while the plan note for the Finish Coat says paint front face pile flange. Yet the quantities for both items are the same? Please advise.

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 1:34:44 PM  Question Number - 9

The Drainage Subsummary sheet shows quantities for Item 605 – 6” Shallow Pipe Underdrain with Geotextile Fabric in front of the retaining wall (UD-03, UD-05, and UD-07). Per the Typical Section and the Retaining Wall Plans, this drainage pipe quantity is already accounted for under Item 518 – 6” Perforated Corrugated Plastic Pipe, APP - 1088 LF. Please review and reduce the quantity for Item 605 - 6” Shallow Pipe Underdrain with Geotextile Fabric and Item 611 – 6” Conduit, Type F for Underdrain Outlets accordingly.

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 1:43:34 PM  Question Number - 8

In order to streamline the retaining wall construction, please allow galvanized piling to be utilized in lieu of the shop prime, field intermediate and finish coat painting system.

Please bid per the contract documents.

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 1:27:40 PM  Question Number - 7

Please add a bid item for 503 Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing.

A bid item for Item 503-Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing has not been included in the plans. Bid project per basis of payment in CMS 503.10.

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 1:21:43 PM  Question Number - 6

Please clarify if the "as per plan" note for Item 503 "Unclassified Excavation" is the plan note titled "Excavation" on plan sheet 111/128.

This item will be addressed in an addendum. Yes, the plan note on sheet 111/128 is the Unclassified Excavation, As Per Plan note.

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 1:16:10 PM  Question Number - 5

Please modify the "Construction Access" note on plan page 11/128 to include an additional construction access for the deceleration lane widening and retaining wall, from I.R. 71 Southbound at approximately STA 165+00.

This item will be addressed in an addendum. The Department will consider additional construction access requests for the deceleration lane widening and retaining wall work.

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 12:57:53 PM  Question Number - 4

Can the department please clarify why they have a quantity for Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel for the precast panels but on sheet 122/128 Note 4 reads that the steel for the wall is incidental to the Concrete, Misc.: Precast Concrete Lagging. Also where will the steel on sheet 121/128 for the Drilled Shafts. Misc.: 42” O.D. Soldier Pile foundations be paid for?

The panel reinforcing steel will be paid separately as detailed in the plans. A revised plan note will be included in an addendum to remove the incidental pay item language. For the Drilled Shafts, Misc.: per 524.17, the reinforcement is incidental to drilled shaft pay item.

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 11:59:32 AM  Question Number - 3

Due to the distribution of work required on this project please reduce the "Work Type Percentage Performed by Prime" to 30%.

The Work Type Percentage performed by the Prime will remain at 50%.

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
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**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 10:14:09 AM  Question Number - 2
Please specify the depth and material type for Ref#59 Pavement Repair or consider changing to a Cubic Yard unit of measure in lieu of Square Yard.

This item will be addressed in an addendum. Item 253 will be replaced with an Item 251 pay item.

**Question Submitted:** 2/17/2020 4:03:36 PM  Question Number - 1
Would the department consider providing more specific details for item 253 pavement repairs in regards to anticipated size and depth of repairs. If not would the dept consider changing it to a Cubic Yard pay item.

This item will be addressed in an addendum. Item 253 will be replaced with an Item 251 pay item.

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 3:49:43 PM  Question Number - 11
Notes appear to require the WTS (worksite traffic supervisor) can ODOT please create a bid item for this.

A bid item will not be created. The closing paragraph of the WTS note, on sheet 12, indicates the WTS is included in the Lump Sum Maintaining Traffic item. This is in accordance with updates to the TEM.

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 10:51:25 AM  Question Number - 10
For the S.R. 562 bridge please add a rebar item and quantity for the 499 lbs of rebar shown on sheet 83/86.

509 pay item is being added for the rebar. Please see forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 2:36:52 PM  Question Number - 9
Will the department please publish the office calcs.?

They can be found here: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/94224/bid

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 12:10:46 PM  Question Number - 8
Can ODOT provide the jacking loads for CLE-32-1058.

The actual jacking loads are not available. Although conservative, one could use the bearing max loads from the original plans. The rear abutments bearing are R200's, pier B500 and the forward abutment are R150 bearings.

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 12:06:18 PM  Question Number - 7
Will ODOT reconsider the road closure time frame for CLE-131-0036. The nature of the work and amount of work that needs to be performed during road closure requires more than 28 days to complete.

ODOT will revise the closure duration of CLE-131-0036 to 35 days. This will be reflected in the closure period that is stated on sheet 8 in the MOT notes and on sheet 12 in the lane use table. See forthcoming Addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 12:03:52 PM  Question Number - 6
Will ODOT reconsider the road closure time frame for the CLE-32-1058 Batavia Rd. structure. The nature of the work, and amount of work that needs to be performed on this bridge during road closure will require more than 28 days to complete.

The closure duration is being revised to 50 days. Please see forthcoming addendum.

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 8:59:37 AM  Question Number - 5
Will ODOT reconsider the MOT time frame for the HAM-50-1976 Freeman Ave. structure. We are requesting a permanent single lane closure in either direction leaving a single lane still open. The nature of this work will create large voids/gaps in the bridge deck at the joints with depressions for the concrete removal. Stopping/starting each night with a new lane closure with the hole in the deck will not facilitate quality work, and will create a safety issue to the contractor and traveling public.

It was anticipating steel plates would be used to maintain a safe driving surface until the repairs were completed.
Can the engineers calculations be posted for Ref#106 - Structural Steel Rehabilitation?

Weight of HP12X53 section = 53.00 lb/ft
Length of beam support = 43.10 ft
Total length of support columns = 10.39 ft
Total weight of HP12x53 sections = 2835.12 lb
Number of steel load plates = 9 each
Volume of load plate = 0.17 ft^3
Unit weight of steel = 490.00 lb/ft^3
Total weight of steel load plates = 749.70 lb
Total Quantity = 3585 lb

For the CLE-131-0036 Please confirm that the fiber wrap is to go to the top of the pier footers and not simply 1 to 2 FT below grade? If excavation to the footers is required we ask that guardrail items be added for the center pier as the existing guardrail and type T end assemblies will need to be removed as they will be within the excavation, and at piers 1 & 2 the d-walls will need removed as they will be within the excavation as they are directly above the footers. This will also require extensive shoring.

The FRP is to extend down to the existing ground line. The plans are being updated to clarify and the quantity is being checked. Please see forthcoming addendum.

For the CLE-131-0036 can the department move the interim completion date due to lead time availability for the new expansion joint required? This needs to be the end of the 2020 construction season or set-up for a summer 2021 work at this site and final completion date extended to accommodate that.

The final completion date of the project is being moved out to August 31, 2021 to allow this structure to be construction either in the summer of 2020 or 2021. Please see forthcoming addendum.

For the CLE-32-1058 can the department move the interim completion date due to lead time availability for the new expansion joint required? This needs to be the end of the 2020 construction season or set-up for a summer 2021 work at this site and final completion date extended to accommodate that.

Getting this bridge raised this summer is very important to the State and locals. To help with the construction, the closure duration is being increased to 50 days with the Interim Completion date being moved back to September 30th, 2020. Please see forthcoming addendum.

If the design test load is specified as 75 kips, with proof test loads of 1.5xDTL and performance test loads of 2xDTL, can a #14 GR75, threaded bar, or equivalent HBSN, be used for production soil nails in order to meet these loads?

While we agree that the planned nail length and spacing will stabilize the bin wall, based on FHWA GEC CIRC 007 guidance, the ultimate bond strength for sand and gravel material on average is 18 psi. This equates to a design load of 20 kips and a max test load of 40 kips for a 20-ft nail. In order to achieve the 75 kip design load, if required, can the nails be extended longer than 20-ft? Alternatively, would an ultimate bond strength of 18 psi be acceptable?

What is the reasoning behind the design test load of 75 kips? This exceeds the yield of the #8 GR75 threaded bar (Sheet 81).

*** 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.***
Borings B-007-0-16 through B-010-0-16 (Sheets 6 and 12-15 of the geotechnical plans) indicate granular material directly in the area of soil nail installation. Due to this material, it is unlikely that drillholes will stay open to allow installation of the soil nail bars without the use of temporary casing to prevent the holes from collapsing. Drilling with casing results in much slower production and higher associated costs. An alternative is hollow bar soil nails (HBSNs), which are designed to be installed in collapsing hole conditions. HBSNs are drilled using grout as the drilling fluid, which supports the drillhole as the bar is installed. HBSNs used will have equivalent properties to solid bar specified in the current design. Will HBSNs be accepted as an alternative bar type?

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 10:04:11 AM  
Will there be live traffic on the ramp during installation of the soil nail wall or will the ramp be closed during construction? Will night shift construction be required?

**Project No.** 200095  
FRA-107796 - SR-SR 104-00.00  
**Sale Date -** 2/27/2020

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 3:43:17 PM  
In the General Notes for Item 253 Pavement Repair, As Per Plan (sheet 8/33) has a contingency quantity of 1007.4 SY but the item is bid in CY. Please clarify the units for this item. In the General Notes (sheet 7/33) for Item 251 - Partial Depth Pavement Repair, Type A, As Per Plan calls for a 3" depth repair, but on the repair pavement calculation sheet (14/33) they call out a 6" depth. Please clarify.

**Question Submitted:** 2/13/2020 4:09:45 PM  
REF 21 - Partial Depth Pavement Repair, APP - The notes on Page 7 propose a 3" deep repair for this item. The table on Page 14 proposes a 6" deep repair. Which is correct?

**Project No.** 200097  
GEA-103163 - Maple Highlands Trail II  
**Sale Date -** 2/27/2020

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 8:35:06 AM  
Will the department add an allowance for erosion control

**Project No.** 200099  
GRE-107120 - SR 444-04.60  
**Sale Date -** 2/27/2020

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 11:40:47 AM  
Would ODOT consider lowering the percentage of work performed by the prime contractor from 50% to 30% for this project?

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 11:15:14 AM  
Would ODOT consider lowering the percentage of work performed by the prime contractor from 50% to 30% for this project?
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**Question Submitted:** 2/13/2020 2:18:49 PM  Question Number - 4
Sheet 20/72 shows for the 12" and the 15" pipe to be 706.02 pipe, is the 706.02 pipe type required.

*See forthcoming addendum. The reference to 706.02 will be removed.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/11/2020 2:31:12 PM  Question Number - 3
The pipe and structure quantities appear to be incorrect - please confirm.

*The quantities will be reviewed. Can more specific information regarding the quantities be provided?*

**Question Submitted:** 2/11/2020 2:27:52 PM  Question Number - 2
Sheet 64 and 65 - 12" RCP and 12" Type B. Can Type B be utilized where specified on the profiles, or must all pipe be RCP?

*See forthcoming addendum. All references to RCP will be replaced with Type B.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/11/2020 2:26:44 PM  Question Number - 1
Can the geotechnical report be provided.

*The geotechnical report has been posted to the FTP site as a reference document. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/GRE-107120/Reference%20Files/*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>200100</th>
<th>Sale Date - 2/27/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAM-110111 - IR 75-16.42R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 2:47:43 PM  Question Number - 3
Can ODOT provide the office calculation for the 614 MOT items?

*The MOT calculations have been placed on the ODOT FTP website at the following location: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-1642R_PID%20110111/*

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2020 7:38:58 AM  Question Number - 2
The Lane Value Contract Table says See Permitted Lane Closure Map for HAM IR-75 restricted time period but there is no Permitted Lane Closure Map in the plans. Where is the Permitted Lane Closure Map?

*The Permitted Lane Closure Map is located on the ODOT website http://plcm.dot.state.oh.us as listed in the Permitted Lane Closure Times plan note.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/5/2020 7:37:24 AM  Question Number - 1
The Lane Value Contract Table says See Permitted Lane Closure Map for HAM IR-75 restricted time period. Will the Department provide a detailed permitted lane closure table specific to this project as has been provided for other projects using permitted lane closures for major items of work (example attached)?

*The department will not provide a detailed permitted lane closure table in the plans. The Permitted Lane Closure Map is located on the ODOT website http://plcm.dot.state.oh.us as listed in the Permitted Lane Closure Times plan note.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>200101</th>
<th>Sale Date - 3/12/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEN-106428 - Elm St Brdg Replace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Submitted:** 2/17/2020 12:23:51 PM  Question Number - 2
Are existing plans available?

*Plans for the existing structure are not available.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/13/2020 10:02:13 AM  Question Number - 1
Where are the sidewalks on the approach slabs to be included for payment?

*The sidewalks on the approach slabs shall be included with line item 58 - Item S26E10000, Reinforced Concrete Approach Slabs for payment.*

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
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**Project No. 200103**  
LAW-102043 - SR 7-00.66 Rockfall  
**Sale Date - 2/27/2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Submitted:</th>
<th>2/4/2020 5:04:44 PM</th>
<th>Question Number - 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As a follow up to the answer to Question No. 1, can you elaborate more on the scope of clearing that will be performed under Project 19-1051. Will the trees just be cut and dropped or will they all be removed from the project? Also, will the stumps be removed or will they be left?

Plans for project 19-1051 can be downloaded from: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D09/P%26E/Pridemore/LAW-7-0.66%20(PID%20111327)/. Trees greater than 3 inch diameter and 6 feet height will be cut 6 inches above the ground and disposed of off the project. The stumps will remain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Submitted:</th>
<th>2/3/2020 4:51:35 PM</th>
<th>Question Number - 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Regarding the item "Portable Barrier, 50" APP" There is not a current standard drawing for 50" Wall under the new ODOT wall spec. Precast companies are no longer allowed to make old spec wall, and do not have a current standard to build new wall. Please advise on how to acquire 50" wall that will meet ODOT spec for this project.

Per the title sheet and as per plan note, standard drawing RM-4.1 dated 7/21/17 could be used but the newest version dated 1/17/20 may also be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Submitted:</th>
<th>1/31/2020 3:50:29 PM</th>
<th>Question Number - 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Being that this project falls within the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-Eared Bat Habitat, we have concerns about getting the project cleared and possibly clearing an area that may be needed to dispose of waste materials, prior to April 1st of this year, with the established date of October 31, 2020. set for completion.

Project 19-1051 was sold on 12/12/19 to remove the trees on this project. The work limits will be cleared by April 1st.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Submitted:</th>
<th>2/20/2020 10:08:16 AM</th>
<th>Question Number - 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On pages 11 and 12 there is reference to doweling bars into the existing abutments but there is no pay item for dowels. If this is the case, are we allowed to saw cut the abutments horizontally at the specified elevation?

See forth coming Addendum for Item 510 - Dowel Holes with Nonshrink, Nonmetallic Grout. Yes the abutment can be saw cut.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Submitted:</th>
<th>2/14/2020 1:37:58 PM</th>
<th>Question Number - 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ref. 50,Railing(Twin Steel Tube, As per plan shows a spacer block on plan sheet 14 which does not show a detail. Will this be a W6x25,6"x20" block?

Yes, use a W6x25 blockout. See forth coming addendum for added details for clarification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Submitted:</th>
<th>2/4/2020 11:35:34 AM</th>
<th>Question Number - 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please review reference 31, Item 897 Pavement Planing, asphalt concrete, Class A. The designer notes for Class A fine planing prior to placing a single, thin asphalt concrete course of 1-1/4" or less. This project specifies a 2" mill and 2 course of asphalt.

An addendum will be issued to revise pavement planing item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Submitted:</th>
<th>2/21/2020 8:47:38 AM</th>
<th>Question Number - 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

REF 34 - Pavement Planing, Class A - The quantity in the proposal is 12692 SY. The quantity in the pavement calculations subtotals on Page 19 is 112634 SY. Which is correct?

This will be taken care of with addendum forthcoming.

---

### 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.
Can PN 520-Fuel Price Adjustment and PN 534-Asphalt Binder Price Adjustment be added to the proposal for this project?

This will be taken care of with addendum forthcoming.

Item 837E10000. Will the DOT allow 707.34 and 707.35 (HDPE liner pipes) as alternates to the already listed options for liner pipes.

Yes, 707.34 and 707.35 will be permitted for the proposed liner pipe.

How will the asphalt be tested on the ramps since they are excluded from joint testing under 447.06A.

The acceptance methods shall comply as shown on the subsummary on page 18 of the plans. Regarding the ramps with 447 acceptance, as per 447.06, the joints on the ramps are excluded from testing, however, the rest of CMS 447 still applies to these ramps.

What are the lane restrictions going to be on SR 21 north of SR 261? The permitted lane closure chart does not included any information for this section.

This section of highway is not covered by the permitted lane closure chart. For this section of highway, please refer to note 8 on page 6 of the plans.

The long line striping quantities in the proposal do not match the plans in both part 1 and part 2.

Please provide specifics. The general summary plan pages match the proposal.

The quantity in the proposal for Ref. No. 94 - Channel Cleanout is 452 FT. The plan note on sheet 24 of 31 states that this work is to clean the channel to the state right-of-way. There is only about 35 ft. of channel on each end of the structure between the structure and the right-of-way. Can you clarify what is included in the 452 ft?

An addenda will be coming to correct this issue.

Will an item for a MTV be setup on this project, since the surface paving is night work?

The stamped crosswalk typical does not show a 12' white line boarder. This does not appear to be included in the 644 crosswalk quantities. Will the 12' white line be excluded?

See forthcoming addendum. The 12" wide white line borders will be incidental to the Item 644 Pavement Marking, Misc.: Crosswalk Line, As Per Plan pay item.
Hello,

Since Stargrid is no longer manufactured I would like to submit our HaTelit G50 as an approved equal for the project. Please see the attached data sheet. HaTelit® G 50 is an asphalt reinforcement composite which combines continuous filament high-strength fiberglass with a lightweight non-woven. This biaxial composite is pre-coated with bitumen (Like Stargrid) to strengthen and enhance the bond with the new asphalt overlay, ensuring shear strength between the new and old pavement. HaTelit® G 50 combines with the new asphalt layer to also increase the tensile and flexural strength of the overall pavement structure improving life-cycle performance of the investment in your new hot mix asphalt overlay. HaTelit® G 50 is used on medium distressed pavement conditions for optimum performance.

An addendum is forthcoming to revise the Pavement Overlay Fabric Composite plan note.

Question Submitted: 2/20/2020 2:59:23 PM  Question Number - 6

Ref. 64, Work Zone Center Line, Class III, appears to be overstated by 18 miles. Please advise.

An addendum is forthcoming to revise the quantity.

Question Submitted: 2/19/2020 10:07:14 AM  Question Number - 5

The Stargrid pavement overlay fabric specified for Ref. 51 is no longer produced or available. Suppliers have recommended TenCate Mirafi MPG4 as an alternative. Please advise.

An addendum is forthcoming to modify the Pavement Overlay Fabric Composite plan note.

Question Submitted: 2/17/2020 9:31:17 AM  Question Number - 4

Page 9 – Sequence of Paving Operations – Plan notes call out for a Work Zone Edge Line – there is not a bid item for this for this work – please clarify.

An addendum is forthcoming to add a work zone edge line bid item to the project.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2020 9:48:54 AM  Question Number - 3

It appears as though the quantity for Ref. 7, Embankment, did not correctly carry over from the calculations on Sheet 18 (503 CY) to the General Summary and Proposal (1003 CY). What is the intent for this item? It is not shown on the typical or addressed in a plan note.

An addendum will be forthcoming to remove this item from the project.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2020 9:44:46 AM  Question Number - 2

It appears as though the quantity for Ref. 6, Excavation was not correctly carried over from the calculations on Sheet 18 (13,807 CY) to the General Summary and Proposal (14,307 CY)

An addendum will be forthcoming to address the quantity error.

Question Submitted: 2/19/2020 4:48:06 PM  Question Number - 13

Plan sheet 661 cross-section at station 605+00 shows 22 sf as the fill area for that station. This area appears to be greatly understated, for which will affect the embankment bid item volume. Please review and revise the fill area and embankment volume as necessary.

A revised quantity will be presented in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2020 3:26:01 PM  Question Number - 12

The beam splice detail for Field Splice No. 2 & 3 on the westbound bridge on Sht 1461 calls out the Outside Plate as 2’ 6” long in View K2-K2 but it is dimensioned at 3’ 1” and called out as 3’ 1” in the detail view. Please advise.

The beam splice dimensioning will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.
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**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2020 3:23:29 PM  
**Question Number - 11**

Beam L on Br. 1135 has temporary Type C crossframes installed between it and the existing fascia beam in Phase 1A. In its final condition the framing plan shows Type B crossframes between it and proposed Beam K. Is it the departments intent that the Type C connection plates are removed and replaced with Type B connection plates or can a detail showing how the proposed Type B crossframes are to be connected to the Type C connection plates be provided?

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2020 3:20:28 PM  
**Question Number - 10**

The phase construction details on Sht 1208-1211 for Br. 1074 do not agree with the phasing call outs on the Westbound framing plan on Sht 1237. The phase construction details show the Westbound bridge both being constructed in three phases each but the framing plan on shows two phases. Please advise.

*The construction phasing will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.*

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2020 3:18:08 PM  
**Question Number - 9**

A number of the notes on the pages associated with the structural steel cross frames for Br. 1135 and Br. 1219 instruct you to use GSD-1-96 for intermediate crossframe details. Can the Department confirm that these notes should reference GSD-1-19?

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2020 3:15:43 PM  
**Question Number - 8**

The weld symbols on the majority of the elastomeric bearings call out all-around welds instead of just flat welds between the flange and the load plate. Is it the department’s intent to have the contractor to place a weld around all 4 sides of the load plate to the flange?

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/14/2020 3:13:09 PM  
**Question Number - 7**

GSD-1-19 states that for completely shop painted, metalized, or galvanized systems, a Type ‘A’ or ‘C’ crossframe shall be used. Br. #1074, #1135, #1219, & #1236 are all called out to be shop painted yet they all are shown to use Type ‘B’ crossframes. Please advise.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please make the Office Calculations and Existing Drawings available.

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

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

Question Submitted: 2/11/2020 12:00:22 PM Question Number - 3
Bid item 409- Pavement for MOT, Type A: the only reference to the plan quantity of 76,593 sy is a short note on plan sheet 43. Given the size of the bid item, will ODOT please provide a subsummary and/or calculations of the bid item?

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

Question Submitted: 2/6/2020 2:39:05 PM Question Number - 2
The Reference Files don't appear to be available. Can a link to the files and the Office Calcs be provided?

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

Question Submitted: 2/6/2020 2:26:44 PM Question Number - 1
Reference noise barrier plans, sheet 971. Please clarify why the post data table omits design cases given on sheet 8/13 in NBS-1-09.

Additional data will be provided in a forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 200125
CLE-100907 - WAR Culverts FY20 (A) (PART 1 AND PART 2) Sale Date - 3/12/2020

Question Submitted: 2/21/2020 1:56:10 PM Question Number - 2
There are 6 culvert locations on this project. Will four TAF plans be required or will one plan for all be accepted.

Question Submitted: 2/21/2020 1:00:43 PM Question Number - 1
Will a TAF plan be required for this project.

Project No. 200144
PIC-105025 - SR 674-10.19/10.35 Sale Date - 3/12/2020

Question Submitted: 2/21/2020 1:49:40 PM Question Number - 2
Will ODOT have the clearing of BAT trees completed as the contractor can't start the project till the end of the school year.

Question Submitted: 2/21/2020 12:58:12 PM Question Number - 1
Will a TAF plan be required for this project.

Project No. 203000
HAM-104668 - IR 74-18.01 Sale Date - 5/8/2020

Question Submitted: 2/20/2020 8:29:52 AM Question Number - 58
Per Addendum #2, scope Section 11.3.2.7 states that the Ramp R/Ramp O structure, "shall be designed to accommodate the fourth (proposed) rail road track." Based on Appendix A1, MCE Phase 5A RFC BU10, sheet 3 of 29 it is undetermined where the fourth rail road track is located. Will the Department clarify what the required offset distance from existing centerline of RR to centerline of planned future track and clearance to bridge substructure units?

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the design does not meet the required deceleration length per L&D Vol 1 section 500, an ATC should be submitted for further evaluation.

Please provide a status set of all 5A (PID104667) buildable units, regardless of the status, with the understanding they are for information only. The CADD files do not provide enough information to fully understand the details of the 5A plans, which are currently being developed by another shortlisted offeror.

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

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

No reduction in city streets is permitted. The dual right turn shall remain.
Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/7/2020 10:53:44 AM  Question Number - 48
As noted in L&D Manual - vol. 2 Drainage Design, Section 1010 Maintenance of Traffic Drainage will the District be requiring evaluation of MOT for drainage? If so, is a 2 year design frequency to be used for spread calculation as noted or will the District be providing a different frequency?

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

Question Submitted: 2/7/2020 10:52:58 AM  Question Number - 47
Scope Section 2 designates 12/2/2020 as the interim completion date for "All landslide work completed." Will the department further define or clarify what all elements of the landslide remediation shall be completed by the interim completion date?

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

Question Submitted: 2/7/2020 10:52:30 AM  Question Number - 46
Based on the project anticipated award date of 6/1/20 and an interim landslide completion date of 12/1/20, there will be insufficient construction time due to required design and prescribed review time periods. Will the department reduce the required review time period, number of reviews, or a combination of the two for the Buildable Unit related to landslide remediation work in order to allow for an adequate construction period?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
Scope Section 10.3, bullets A, B, and C reference lane and shoulder construction or reconstruction. These items seem to conflict with each other. In particular, Bullet C states that shoulders should be constructed or reconstructed full depth within the project limits. This conflicts with bullets A and B. It is also noted that the project limits in Section 2 include I-75 SLM 4.04 to SLM 4.96. Please clarify the intent of pavement and shoulder construction on I-75 and I-74.

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

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

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

Per Scope Section 10.2.C, Ramp O is designated with 40 mph design speed. However, Appendix Q as noted in Section 10.6 does not include a horizontal stopping sight distance design exception for Ramp O’s 532.98’ horizontal curve. Will ODOT be updating Appendix Q?

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

Considering I-74 is proposed as a 5-lane section, can ODOT provide median shoulder width criterion. (ODOT L&D notes criteria for 4-lane and 6 or more lanes sections).

see forthcoming addendum for design criteria clarification.

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

see forthcoming addendum for design speed clarifications.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**All pavement is considered existing pavement.**

**Question Submitted:** 1/22/2020 8:50:19 AM  Question Number - 30

Referring to Scope Section 10.2, please provide all design and CAD/CAE related files for the proposed roadways (Ramp R, Ramp O, Ramp S, I-74WB, etc.) listed in Section 10.2.

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/22/2020 8:49:54 AM  Question Number - 29

Can the department confirm the duration of the required temporary easements shown in Appendix A?

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/22/2020 8:49:27 AM  Question Number - 28

Can the department confirm that all proposed right of way shown in Appendix A has been acquired or will be acquired by the Department?

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/22/2020 8:48:43 AM  Question Number - 27

Can the department confirm that all existing or acquired right of way, either by the department and/or the MCE 5A DBT, is currently shown in Appendix A, Volume 7?

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

*** DISCLAIMER - Prebid questions and answers provided are for informational purposes only and are not part of the Bid Documents. If a question warrants a revision to the Bid Documents, the Department will issue an addendum.***
Appendix A1 contains some PDF drawings of MCE 5A Buildable Units. Can the department provide all MCE 5A BUs noted as complete for ODOT Approved AFC Plans?

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

Appendix A1, MCE 5A denotes IR 75 NB to IR 74 WB as a directional roadway with a design speed of 50 mph. Can the department please clarify the limits of the directional roadway(s) and design speed(s) for MCE 5B?

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

PN110 requires Escrow Bid Documents to be submitted the business day after the bid opening. Will the Department consider modifying this to 2 business days after the Bid Opening to allow for compiling of larger volumes of documents due to Design-Build? Additionally, with the bid on a Friday we would currently be forced to work over the weekend to submit on Monday.

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

Is PN 129 for Flexible Start Window Contract intended to be utilized for this project?

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

Scope Section 9.2.2. MOTPE #1, is this 6 weekends for 75NB to 74WB and another 6 weekends for 75SB to 74WB?

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

The proposal contains PN 108 Dispute Resolution Board and PN 109 Dispute Resolution Advisor. Is it intended to have both DRB and DRA on the project or will one of the items be deleted?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:26:14 AM  Question Number - 12

For the Duke Energy wires being raised can the department provide an elevation that the wires are being raised to?

Final design by Duke Energy will be completed by March 1, 2020. Upon completion of final design, the elevations will be available. The conceptual KMZ file has been provided at the link below as Appendix N1, for REFERENCE ONLY.
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%201/Appendix%20N1/

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:24:58 AM  Question Number - 11

Will the department please provide a time and location for the DBE Matchmaker event on 2/1/20?

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:24:11 AM  Question Number - 10

Page 15 and 16 of 45 in ITO Section 4.1 contain reference errors, "Section Error Reference Source Not Found". Please indicated correct reference

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 11/7/2019 2:50:43 PM  Question Number - 3
Section 2.5.9 of the ITO states “Projects should be completed or substantially completed.” Can this language be revised to “At least 50% of Contractor’s or Designer’s work should be complete.”?

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

**Question Submitted:** 11/7/2019 1:32:12 PM  Question Number - 2
Section 2.5.9 of the ITO states “Projects should be completed or substantially completed.” Can this language be revised to “At least 50% of Contractor’s or Designer’s work should be complete.”?

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

**Question Submitted:** 11/1/2019 4:16:58 PM  Question Number - 1
Will the Department allow for Organizational Charts as requested in RFQ Section 2.5.4.1 to be on one 11”x17” sized sheet, folded to 8.5”x11” size, and count as a single sheet for the purposes of page count?

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

*** 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.***
### Question Submitted: 2/21/2020 9:01:45 AM  Question Number - 2

In response to earlier pre bid question. The pavement marking note in this plan requiring permanent markings every day conflicts with the intent of specification 614.11, it also conflicts with plan items for 614.04 Work Zone Marking Signs. 614.11 and 614.04 are part of the specifications to make projects manageable and buildable. These specifications are used to resurface miles of roadways why are they not acceptable for this project. Since most contractors do not own their own pavement marking equipment has ODOT considered the difficulty and expense this note is causing to the project. This note will cause a hardship on any contractor not owning striping equipment. Please consider changing this note and following the requirements set up in ODOT’s CMS.

**An addendum is forthcoming to remove the note.**

### Question Submitted: 2/20/2020 8:37:07 AM  Question Number - 1

Concerning plan notes maintenance of traffic. Note 8 concerning permanent pavement markings. This note is in conflict with the specifications and the contract documents. The contract contains pay items for work zone marking signs. This note makes the project unbuildable. Will the contractor be permitted to follow ODOT’s specifications and use temporary striping as needed at their own costs to build the project?

**According to CMS 512.06, traffic is not permitted onto decks with gravity-fed resin until the decks are tack free and dry. CMS 642.04 states that the pavement markings shall be applied when the surface is clean and dry. Please provide specifics as to where the conflicts are with the plans.**