

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180041

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

HAM-84492 - IR 275-39.81

Question Submitted: 2/19/2018 9:09:47 AM **Question Number - 82**

Note 5 on Sht 369 and 375 states that the contractor shall measure the deck thickness from the top of the overlay to the top of the stringer prior to fabrication. To obtain this measurement traffic will need to be in phase and the existing modular joint will need be removed. At this point there is a 20 week lead time on the finger joint material and fabrication which have a drastic impact on the project's schedule. Please advise how the contractor is to follow this note and still meet the project's current completion date.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 4:07:37 PM **Question Number - 81**

The quantities on Ref 464 & 502 for the 8" downspouts on the Combs Hehl bridge seem to be misstated. Can the department please review and revise these quantities?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 1:54:10 PM **Question Number - 80**

Can additional details; spacing, number of studs per row, etc, for the 3/4" x 4" studs that are to be applied along with the compression seal joints on the Combs Hehl Bridge be provided so an accurate quantity can be determined?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 8:20:48 AM **Question Number - 79**

CMS 255.09 states, 'The Department will measure the quantity of Full Depth Pavement Sawing by the number of feet of perimeter full depth saw cuts in the complete and accepted work.' Sheet 13 of the General Notes indicates that saw cutting is incidental to the Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement, but the plans do not provide the exact dimensions of each repair. Please provide a bid item for Full Depth Pavement Sawing to compensate the sawing required for pavement removal throughout the project.

The contractor is responsible for laying out the repair areas, thus the saw cutting will remain incidental.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 11:17:28 AM **Question Number - 78**

According to section 513.20 – B of the CMS, coatings are to be removed where the proposed angle is bolted to the existing stringer and girder as detail on sheet 318. Do coatings need to be removed for the proposed welded connections shown on page 318?

The coatings need to be removed at the proposed weld locations prior to welding.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 11:16:55 AM **Question Number - 77**

The bid item for painting on reference numbers 409 and 434 is described as field painting of damaged structural steel. Where is payment for painting the new structural steel shown on page 318?

Payment for the painting of new structure steel is included in pay item 514 – Field Painting of Damages Structural Steel, As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 11:16:24 AM **Question Number - 76**

Will the field office number of months be adjusted for the new completion date?

The field office quantity was changed to 30 months with Addendum No. 4.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 10:46:00 AM **Question Number - 75**

Would metalizing in lieu of galvanizing on the finger joints be acceptable?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 10:18:04 AM **Question Number - 74**

There are several large alternates on this project. When submitting bids on line, the DBE coverage is based off of the base bid. If alternates are awarded, there is the possibility that the DBE dollars turned in at bid time may be insufficient to cover the project goal if alternates are awarded. Please explain how ODOT will handle this situation.

Please review the 'Projects Awarded on Alternates' section in Proposal Note 013 in the proposal.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:41:37 PM **Question Number - 73**

Will this project be delayed to the next sale?

Yes. This project will be delayed to the March 8th, 2018 sale. Expect officail notice to be sent tomorrow morning, 2/13/18.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:37:11 PM **Question Number - 72**

Please clarify Addendum 3 items of work below. Reference items 127, 148, 544, 546, 547 are in the revised bid item section but appear to have no changes. Are there any changes to those items? Reference items 468 and 506 show units in SY but should be in CY. Reference 645 Structures Work Access was added in Section 14 HAM-275-4136. The notes in the plans on sheet 293 pertain to work access for the alternate items in Sections 15 & 17. What cost should be included in REF 645 or should it be removed?

Reference items 127, 148, 544, 546, and 547 - There are plan split changes associated with these pay items. See general summary. The total quantity has not changed. Reference items 468 and 506 should be CY. These items are correctly listed as CY in the plans. This will be clarified in a forthcoming addendum. Reference 645 will be deleted in a forthcoming addendum. All quantities and notes shown in the plans are correct.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 2:57:12 PM **Question Number - 71**

The full depth pavement repairs are constructed to match the existing pavement depth and later milled with the resurfacing operations. Is joint sealing required for the full depth repairs?

Joint sealing is not required for full depth repairs.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 10:22:24 AM **Question Number - 70**

The finger joints are called out to receive a galvanized coating. The results from the finger plates and embedded/bulkhead plates being dipped into an 840 degree hot tank may cause dramatic distortion to the finger spacing as well as bowing the embedded/bulkhead plates. This is going to result in excessive straightening after galvanizing. Would Grade 50W steel and paint be acceptable in lieu of galvanizing?

Grade 50W steel and paint is not an acceptable substitute over galvanizing.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 10:14:09 AM **Question Number - 69**

Pavement for Maintaining Traffic call outs TP-1 and TP-2 shown on sheet 33 appear to be in direct conflict with existing light poles, lighting conduit, and electric pull boxes. Will department please advise as to what should be done with the lighting work in order to install the temporary pavement?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 9:55:24 AM **Question Number - 68**

Plan sheets 368 & 374 of 387, Detail 1, Finger Joint Cut Detail. Detail 1 shows the bottom of the tooth at 2" diameter and the top of the tooth at a 1 3/4" diameter. That leaves an 1/8" gap (kerf) between fingers. After galvanizing this gap will be reduced to a maximum of 1/16". This "kerf" is going to cause fit-up and fabrication issues. Can the state please revise to a larger "kerf"?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/11/2018 12:36:59 PM **Question Number - 67**

The semi-integral diaphragm guides on bridges 3985 L&R have the diaphragm guide rebar included in the abutment rebar chart (Sheet 188). Typically this bar is incidental to the diaphragm guide bid item. Please clarify where this rebar is to be paid. Also, the sub-total and totals do not add up. Please review.

See forthcoming addendum. The reinforcing steel list and estimated quantities will be revised.

Question Submitted: 2/10/2018 12:32:25 PM **Question Number - 66**

Sheets 292 and 336 reference the "Maintenance of Traffic Plans, including Temporary Railing Details". We could not locate temporary railing details in the MOT plans. Could the Department please clarify these notes?

There is no temporary railing in this project.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/10/2018 12:15:27 PM **Question Number - 65**

Sheets 11 & 187 discuss fencing the perimeter of environmentally sensitive areas. Sheet 187 shows 5 trees and OHM of Three Mile Creek. It's clear that the trees get fenced, but do the limits shown of Three Mile Creek get fenced? Also, is this incidental work to the job or paid under SS832 Erosion Control since there is a pay item for construction fence in that spec?

See forthcoming addendum. Only the trees require fencing. Work must stay above the Ordinary High Water mark of Three Mile Creek. Fencing should be paid with Item 530 Special – Structures Work Access.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 5:59:59 PM **Question Number - 64**

Regarding question #49 on FRP pipe, 518.06 states "...reinforced thermosetting resin pipe, 707.80.", can be used. Please confirm the 518.06 specified materials can be used.

If the plans do not call for a specific material for the application in question, then the approved materials listed in the C&MS can be used. This follows the order of documents per 105.04 of the C&MS.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 2:25:58 PM **Question Number - 63**

On sheets 28 and 37 of plans there are large lead in signs designated as specials but no dimensions are given. Can the Department provide the dimensions for these signs?

See forthcoming addendum. Dimensions will be provided.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 1:29:51 PM **Question Number - 62**

The note for WZ RPM, APP on sheet 19 states that resurfacing in the transition areas shall be paid under the appropriate bid items, however, Pavement Calculations on sheets 80-82 do not cover the transition areas. Additionally, the permanent pavement markings on sheet 121 do not account for any striping beyond the project limits. Please add quantities for work within the transition areas.

See forthcoming addendum. Payment for resurfacing within the transition area shall be paid for under the lump sum price for Item 614 Maintaining Traffic, As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 1:28:59 PM **Question Number - 61**

After Phase 5, traffic will be required to be in its final configuration before completing the pavement planning, asphalt intermediate and surfaces courses. Please add WZ Striping quantities to put traffic in its final configuration after Phase 5 is complete. Also add quantities for Class III markings on the intermediate and surface courses during Phase 6 work.

See forthcoming addendum. Quantities will be revised.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 1:28:27 PM **Question Number - 60**

Addendum 1 added a line on sheet 27 and notes on sheet 15 for shifting traffic in Phase 5, however, there are no Work Zone Striping quantities given. Please add quantities to shift traffic as required in Phase 5.

See forthcoming addendum. Quantities will be revised.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 1:27:51 PM **Question Number - 59**

Addendum 1 added a note saying that the Contractor shall complete all field painting structural steel on the Combs-Hehl structures (Including the Ohio Approach, HAM-275-4136L/R.) in Phase 5. Phase 5 shifts traffic into Phase 2 configuration for EB and Phase 4 configuration for WB. This shifts traffic to the outside of EB and WB. When is the contractor to paint the field/spot painting on the outside of the through truss shown on sheets 351-353?

See forthcoming addendum. Phase 5A will be added to the plans to shift traffic to the inside of the structure.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 12:42:41 PM **Question Number - 58**

SUBGRADE COMPACTION quantity appears to be missing for Ramp O Intersection work as detailed on sheet 111. Will the department please clarify whether this work is required in this area or not?

See forthcoming addendum. Quantities will be revised.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 12:42:23 PM **Question Number - 57**

Items for SUBGRADE COMPACTION, PROOF ROLLING, and AGGREGATE BASE do not appear to be quantified for work pertaining to the approach slabs which are removed and replaced throughout the project. Will the department please add quantities for this work to the respective bid items?

See forthcoming addendum. Quantities will be revised.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:57:14 AM **Question Number - 56**

SS848.20 discusses options for disposal of hydro-demolition wastewater. One of the options is land application on public ROW. It says this option is only available when the contract identifies the specific disposal location in the plans. The Designer Notes in the back of the spec also discusses identifying a location for disposal and identifying it in the plans. Since no location is provided in the plans, should our bid include either hauling to a recycling facility or NPDES permitted facility (options 2 or 3) as listed in the spec? If we figure methods 2 or 3, this may increase cost. It would be in the best interest of the Department to identify locations on site for disposal of waste water in order to get the most economical pricing.

Since the contract does not identify a specific disposal location, bids should assume one of the other two options for wastewater disposal.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:26:53 AM **Question Number - 55**

Is the painting work for refurbishing bearings discussed on sheets 291 and 322 limited to repairing damage caused by the tie down work, or is the intent to clean and paint the bearing from bottom of beam to top of pier/abutment?

The intent is to clean and paint the entire bearing assembly (bottom of beam to top of beam seat) at locations as determined in the field by the engineer. Since cleaning and painting will be required due to the tie down welding work, it made sense to clean and paint the entire bearing while at it. An estimated quantity was provided for bidding purposes, though the final number will be as determined in the field.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:26:27 AM **Question Number - 54**

Please confirm the only collector replaced on HAM-275-3985 L/R, sheets 180 and 181, is the right collector on the right bridge. The other 3 systems appear to only get new support angles bolted to the existing stiffeners.

The only collector to be replaced is the one on the right bridge as this is the only one that has disconnected itself from the bridge.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:25:58 AM **Question Number - 53**

Note on sheet 179 discusses contractor verification for HP post height. Does The Department anticipate the HP post being beveled, or is a square cut post acceptable for the designed bearing?

The Department does not anticipate the HP post being beveled.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:25:41 AM **Question Number - 52**

Note on sheet 145 for Item 513 Structural Steel, Misc.: Pencil Abrasive Blasting, Grinding and Non-Destructive Testing states payment shall be made for each cleaned area per side of the girder. Is each "cleaned area" one complete crack, or is each "cleaned area" one end of a crack?

See forthcoming addendum. Each end of a crack will receive a single 2" stress relief hole and each side of the girder will receive Pencil Abrasive Blasting, Grinding and Non-Destructive Testing. Quantities will be revised.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:25:05 AM **Question Number - 51**

Note on sheet 145 states 514 Field Painting of Damaged Structural Steel is to repair paint damage caused by crack repair. Welding of the stiffeners will damage paint coating as well. Where does the paint repair for this work get paid?

See forthcoming addendum. The 514 field painting of damaged structural steel, as per plan note on sheet 145 will be revised to include paint repair for this work.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:24:45 AM **Question Number - 50**

Sheet 261A details a Collision Repair FC2-2 and shows heat straightening. There is a bid item for grinding but nothing for heat straightening. Where is the heat straightening work to be paid?

Heat straightening is not needed. See note number 4 on sheet 261A.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 8:16:54 AM **Question Number - 49**

District 8 has previously allowed the use of FRP downspouting. It was used successfully on project 150555. Please advise if this can be used on this project also.

C&MS 707.75, Glass-fiber-reinforced polymer mortar pipe is permitted for Type B and C Conduits under C&MS 611 and is currently not approved under Item 518 Drainage for Structures. The 150555 project that was referenced was for maintenance work on bridges that will be demolished when the Brent Spence project receives funding. The bridges on this current project have a significantly longer service life left in them so the materials used under 518 will follow the plans and C&MS which don't currently have 707.75 as an approved material.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 5:08:24 PM **Question Number - 48**

Due to the extensive containment required to spot paint the truss structures, we request the completion date be changed one month to October 31, 2019.

The completion date will be revised to 8/31/2020 with the upcoming third addendum. Please note that the completion date was previously changed to 6/1/2020 with the first addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 4:36:49 PM **Question Number - 47**

Will ODOT pay for any required railroad flaggers? If not, can a bid item be added for railroad flagging?

Yes, ODOT will pay for the railroad flaggers. The railroad will invoice ODOT directly.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 11:29:54 AM **Question Number - 46**

Kentucky expansion joints are typically supplied Red Oxide primed, and slider plates are galvanized. Please confirm this is acceptable. Standard drawings EXJ-4-87 is referenced on sheet 367/387. Only the strip seal and extrusion from the EXJ-4-87 standard drawing apply to this joint.

Unless otherwise stated in the contract, all of this project is to use Ohio's specifications as this is an Ohio administered project. With that said, the coating system of the expansion joints are to follow Ohio's C&MS 516.03.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 10:40:25 AM **Question Number - 45**

The pre-phase 1A notes for the left bridge on plan sheet 342 requires the scuppers are in working order. Where is this item paid?

See forthcoming addendum. This will be paid under Item 614 Maintaining Traffic.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 10:22:37 AM **Question Number - 44**

Please review the qtys for Existing Conc Overlay Removed Bid Items 472 and 510. They appear to include milling through the expansion joint removal limits (Item 202). Is the intent to mill through the expansion joint removals? If not, please adjust the qty down to deduct these areas or clarify sheets 344-347.

See forthcoming addendum. The intent is not to mill through the existing expansion joints. Quantities will be revised.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 4:22:16 PM **Question Number - 43**

Bridges HAM-275-4109L&R appear to be missing bid items for Existing Concrete Overlay Removed, 1.75" thick for the approach slabs. Please review.

See forthcoming addendum. The existing approach slab does not have an existing concrete overlay. Quantities related to approach slabs will be revised.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 2:38:40 PM **Question Number - 42**

Please consider adding a lump sum bid item for the two structures that have the add alternate bid items for structural steel repair and field painting (HAM-275-4136 L/R) . There is significant cost to access these work areas and making it incidental to the structural steel and painting items will create large unit price items. These skewed unit prices will create issues if the final quantities change from the plan quantity.

See forthcoming addendum. A lump sum pay item will be added for work access.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 12:03:29 PM **Question Number - 41**

Bridge Sutton Rd calls for the ends of the beams to be blasted and primed before being encased. Does contractor need to contain area ? Also can ODOT show limits on how far out the blasting and priming should take place like other structures have ?

The contractor needs to contain the blast area per C&MS 514.13.D.-Containment/Waste Disposal QCP #4. The note for this work on sheet 192/387 states, "The ends of beams B1 through B15 to be encased within the abutment diaphragms are to be blasted per 514.13 and painted with organic zinc prime coat prior to encasement..." The limits of the proposed abutment diaphragms that will be encasing the beam ends are shown on sheet 218/387 which has the diaphragm face flush with the abutment breastwall face.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 4:01:00 PM **Question Number - 40**

The piers on multiple structures have vines growing on them. Is this work incidental to the sealing item or clearing item?

Removal of vines is incidental to the sealing item. CMS 512.03F states: Remove dust, dirt, oil, wax, curing compounds, efflorescence, laitance, coatings and other foreign materials from surfaces to be sealed.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 11:49:29 AM **Question Number - 39**

Note 4 on 203/387 says existing longitudinal and transverse reinforcing in the bridge deck to be removed to 3 feet from the abutment is to remain. Section D-D on 218/287 shows new transverse reinforcing. Is the existing transverse reinforcing to be reused or replaced?

See forthcoming addendum. Transverse reinforcing is to be reused as we want to place new transverse reinforcing steel in around the joints.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 8:07:32 AM **Question Number - 38**

Per the Item 255 plan note on page 13, resurfacing of these patched areas shall take place within two weeks of performing the repair work. The pavement section detail on sheet 13 implies the concrete will be replaced full depth to match the adjacent asphalt surface. If this is the case, why the requirement for resurfacing within two weeks? In areas of the contraflow, the concrete will have to be placed to the elevation of the existing asphalt. In areas outside of the contraflow, concrete can be place at 10 inches. Please clarify.

This note will be revised in addendum number 2. The requirement to resurface within two weeks is being removed.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 7:59:36 AM **Question Number - 37**

Addendum number one added a bid item for RRCM Item 255. This quantity was setup to be used in the areas of MOT contraflow. The approximate length of these areas are 4,000 feet in length, sans the structures and approach slabs. Field verification shows that the current joint spacing is 20 feet. Taking 4,000 feet and the 20 foot joint pattern gives us 200 patches in one direction, thus 400 patches in total. This is assuming every joint will be replaced. Assuming the standard joint repair length of 6 feet with a 12 foot lane width gives us a single patch of 8 square yards. Assuming 400 patches at 8 square yards gives a total of 3,200 square yards. Addendum one added a quantity of 6,000 square yards for work in the contraflow areas. In order to achieve the plan quantity of 6,000 square yards, the patch removal length would have to average close to 12 feet. This would leave only 8 feet of the original pavement between patches. If it is the intent to replace every joint with the standard joint repair minimum length, please adjust the quantity to the more realistic 3,200 square yard quantity.

After reviewing this prebid question, the Department's opinion is that the quantity currently shown in the plans is a good approximation of the amount of Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement, RRCM, As Per Plan that will be needed outside the work areas covered by the MOT phasing.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 7:53:35 AM **Question Number - 36**

The trough for the finger joint is called out as 1/2" thick, this will almost be impossible to bend, could the thickness of the trough be changed to 1/4 or ideally 1/8" thick?

See forthcoming addendum. Troughs will be revised to size down to 1/4" neoprene troughs.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 7:44:51 AM **Question Number - 35**

Per the Item 255 plan not on page 13, the contractor shall field inspect and mark all joints and/or pavement slabs requiring replacement. Since the pavement is overlaid with asphalt, how will the ODOT Engineer and contractor determine what to mark?

The contractor is to use experience and judgment to locate, mark, and record all areas to be repaired where cracking is visible through the asphalt. The plan quantity for pavement repair shall be distributed throughout the project.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 3:26:00 PM **Question Number - 34**

Bridges 3985,4063,4109 and 4136 all have notes requiring Macro Synthetic Fibers in the deck, approach slabs, parapet, and overlay concrete. Will the Department require the same requirements in the Kentucky Approach and Combs Hehl bridges? If so, please clarify in an addendum.

The HAM-275-3985 , HAM-275-4063, HAM-275-4109, and HAM-275-4136 bridges have micro-fibers in the overlays and macro-fibers in the deck, approach slab, and parapet concrete mixes. The Combs Hehl and Kentucky Approach bridges are the maintenance responsibility of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and do not have fibers incorporated into their mixes.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 2:16:36 PM **Question Number - 33**

Can the Dept. please release existing concrete compressive strength data for the structures requiring hydrodemolition? ICRI Guideline 310.3R(2014) indicates that the rate of removal is inversely proportional to the compressive strength and cost is directly proportional to the compressive strength. This requested data will assist the hydrodemolition companies in properly bidding this work from the standpoints of both cost and production rates. Thank you.

There were not any compression strength tests performed on any of the bridge deck cores on the project.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 8:51:06 AM **Question Number - 32**

Plan sheets 144,191,233,291 and 334 have a note under Item 512 Sealing of Concrete Surfaces, APP that says existing sealer shall be removed prior to application of epoxy-urethane sealer. The Department has Item 512 Removal of Existing Coatings for this type of work. Could the Department please adjust the sealing bid items so there is no confusion with these work items and conventional bid item setup is maintained?

The Designer's method of including the cost of removing the existing sealer with an As Per Plan sealer pay item is acceptable. No changes to the plans or pay items are anticipated with this Prebid question.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 1:43:56 PM **Question Number - 31**

The detail on Sheet 13 for Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement, Class QC1, depicts reinforcement installed in the 6' repairs. According to SCD BP-2.5, reinforcement is required for all repairs greater than 10' in length or repairs that are opened to traffic in 24 hours. Is reinforcement required for the QC1 repairs?

See forthcoming addendum. Reinforcement will be required per BP-2.5.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 11:19:43 AM **Question Number - 30**

Addendum 1, A10 says Rumble Strips do not exist, however they do exist in the concrete pavement between stations 1313+00-1298+50. Since traffic will be utilizing the shoulders, see for example sheet 67 in phase 4, existing Rumble Strips need to be milled and filled on EB and WB shoulders. If ODOT decided to do that please note if they need to be re-established.

The existing rumble strips in Kentucky are to remain undisturbed. There are no existing rumble strips in Ohio.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 11:02:32 AM **Question Number - 29**

Addendum 1, revised plan sheet 15, under Phase 5 it calls to maintain traffic on Eastbound as per phase 2 and on Westbound as per phase 4, where would the counter flow lane be on EB or WB? Is the intention to maintain traffic as per the final configuration?

The Phase 5 intent is to shift eastbound traffic as shown in phase 2 and shift westbound traffic as shown in Phase 4; all traffic will be shifted onto the shoulder, there will be no contra flow lane. This will provide a staging area on the Combs-Hehl bridge to complete phase 5 work.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 8:47:59 AM **Question Number - 28**

Addendum no. 1 stated the two lane portion of the contraflow will use QC1 for the concrete repairs. There are phases, in between the cross overs, where the only way to get to the middle lane is a short term lane closure per the permitted lane closure times. As an example of one such area please look at phase 3 and 4 station 2059+00 - 2080+00. How will QC1 be placed in the middle lane in areas like this?

See forthcoming addendum. The Item 255 plan note on sheet 13 will be revised.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 5:30:28 AM **Question Number - 27**

Bonding New Concrete To Previously Placed Concrete on 333/387 calls for new concrete to be bonded to previously placed concrete with ASTM C881 Type V. Will this be required between QC1 and QC2 concrete shown on 361/387 sections A through E or just were proposed concrete is placed against existing concrete?

The intent is for the bonding product to only be applied where new concrete is being placed in contact with existing concrete (in place prior to this project). This would not include the CJ between QC1 & QC2 concrete referenced on sheet 361/387.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 5:25:55 AM **Question Number - 26**

Section B-B and note 11 on 367/387 indicate new ¾" x 4" welded stud shear connectors on the existing beams. Will a pay item be added for 513 Welded Stud Shear Connectors?

See Addendum 1. The "as per plan" note in the structure general notes for the joints on sheet 335 was revised to include studs and armor.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 4:20:15 PM **Question Number - 25**

Addendum 1 added a pay item for Full Depth Removal and Rigid Replacement, CL QC1. This item now allows the contractor to perform the pavement repairs while in phase, behind the portable barrier. As a result of this change, will the department please consider removing the requirement of performing the repairs within two weeks of resurfacing as noted on 13/387?

The requirement for performing repairs within two weeks of resurfacing will not be removed from the plans.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:15:07 AM **Question Number - 24**

The typical proposed scupper plan and sections on plan sheet 363 show a portion of the bridge deck about 3' x 4' to be replaced full depth with the scuppers. It does not appear that this was included in the quantity for Class QC2 Concrete, Superstructure. How will replacement of this concrete be paid?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:14:14 AM **Question Number - 23**

The notes on plan sheets 342 and 343 say to anchor bridge barrier a minimum of 5' beyond the limits of full deck and backwall removal. Where the deck is to be removed full depth for joint replacement is the bridge barrier to be anchored for the width of the deck removal plus 5' in both directions?

Yes, the bridge barrier is to be anchored for the width of the deck removal plus 5' in both directions.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:12:04 AM **Question Number - 22**

Plan sheet 189/387 and several other sheets for the 4063L and 4063R structures show temporary shoring between phases at the abutments. No design for the shoring is provided and no soil information for these areas has been provided. Will soil information (borings) be provided for these areas so bidders can evaluate the temporary shoring requirements?

Boring information has been added to the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HAM-84492/Reference%20File/>. Soil boring information is also available publicly at <https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims>

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:10:38 AM **Question Number - 21**

Item 503, Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing As Per Plan on 144/387 says the contractor may prepare an alternate design to support the sides of the excavation. Will soil information (borings) be provided for these areas so bidders can evaluate the temporary shoring requirements?

Boring information has been added to the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HAM-84492/Reference%20File/>. Soil boring information is also available publicly at <https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims>

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:09:31 AM **Question Number - 20**

Plan sheet 172/387 shows 2" field drilled holes in the girder web at the girder ends where reinforcing steel will pass through the girder as shown on section A plan sheet 178/387. It appears these holes have been included in the 2" Stress Relief Hole quantity. Will these holes be paid as 513E95030 2" Stress Relief Holes?

See forthcoming addendum. A note will be added to sheet 172 of 387 indicating the 2" holes to be drilled in the girder webs is included with Item 511 – Class QC2 Concrete With QC/QA, Superstructure , As Per Plan.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:07:21 AM **Question Number - 19**

Section A on 168/387 shows type 2 waterproofing 4'-0" wide on the back of the joint between the existing and proposed wing walls. Does this extend the full length of the joints?

See forthcoming addendum. The waterproofing extends the full length of the joint. Quantities will be revised to reflect this.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:06:03 AM **Question Number - 18**

Notes on plan sheets 159-163 call for exposed ends of existing reinforcing steel to be coated according to 509. 509.09 says Use patching material of the same composition and quality as the original coating. Will the Department provide information about the composition and quality of the original coating of the existing reinforcing steel or provide details about what coating will be acceptable for coating the existing reinforcing steel?

See forthcoming addendum. The notes will be revised to list several allowable products or equal as approved by the Engineer.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:04:56 AM **Question Number - 17**

Structure removal plans including 159-163, 209 and 250 call for exposed ends of existing reinforcing steel to be coated. Will ends of existing reinforcing to be covered by new concrete be considered "exposed" with regard to these notes?

Only the portions of the reinforcing that is not encased in concrete will be considered exposed.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:04:01 AM **Question Number - 16**

The second paragraph of the Portions of Structure Removed, Over 20 Foot Span, As Per Plan note on plan sheet 144 refers to cleaning existing exposed reinforcement and says existing reinforcing steel does not have to have a bright steel finish. Notes on plan sheets 159-163 call for exposed ends of existing reinforcing steel to be coated according to 509. 509.09 says Prepare the surface to a near white metal. What are the cleaning and preparation requirements for existing reinforcing steel?

The As Per Plan requirements override the 509.09 requirements in the CMS per 105.04.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:01:51 AM **Question Number - 15**

The Herbicide For Weed Control note on 146/387 says each successful bidder must be licensed by the State of Ohio Department of Agriculture as a commercial applicator. Will the Department consider changing this note to allow non-licensed bidders to use licensed subcontractors for this work?

See forthcoming addendum. The prime or sub-contractor performing the work must be licensed.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 6:00:26 AM **Question Number - 14**

Will the Department make all borings and soil information for this project available on the ftp site?

**Boring information has been added to the ftp site: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HAM-84492/Reference%20File/>.
Soil boring information is also available publicly at <https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims>**

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 5:58:45 AM **Question Number - 13**

Will excavation and/or embankment be required for the temporary pavement shown on plan sheet 32 and 33? If so, will the Department provide cross sections so bidders can quantify the work?

Excavation will be required to place the temporary pavement; cross sections will not be provided.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 5:57:30 AM **Question Number - 12**

The maintenance of traffic subsummary on 27/387 says 1,240 feet of bridge mounted portable barrier is included in the 24,350 foot total for 32" portable barrier. What are the limits of the bridge mounted portable barrier?

Bridge mounted PB limits are shown in the structure plan sheets.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 5:55:36 AM **Question Number - 11**

The temporary trough note on 15/387 says "Modifications will be needed to the existing scuppers to make sure water adequately drains from the trough. Upon completion of the phases where troughs are required and prior to the placement of concrete overlay, the contractor shall restore the existing scuppers to their previous condition." What modifications to the scuppers will be required and what means of restoring the scuppers will be required?

The note does not provide exact details as the modification needs to fit field condition, but the intent is for the side of the scuppers to be modified/partially removed to match the shape of the adjacent temporary trough with any effected grate bars removed. The basic concept is similar to the scupper modifications that were done in the mid 1960's when scuppers had bulb angles. Since the scuppers are made from weldable steel, the anticipation means for restoring the scuppers would be welding. Sheet 328 of 432 of the HAM-275-38.76 original plans has a good detail of the existing scuppers.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 5:54:42 AM **Question Number - 10**

The Environmental Commitments note on 11/387 says the contractor shall protect environmentally sensitive areas identified on sheet 118. Sheet 118/387 identifies 5 trees and a 50' radius around each tree. What are the requirements for protection of these areas?

See forthcoming addendum. The note will be revised on sheet 11 to add that a perimeter shall be set with construction fencing.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 12:47:43 PM **Question Number - 9**

Plan sheet 13 of 387 gives a quantity for longitudinal pavement repair but only a detail for transverse pavement repair areas. What is the detail for the longitudinal pavement repair locations?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2018 1:14:03 PM **Question Number - 8**

What is the existing asphalt & concrete pavement thickness on the project?

Existing pavement depths will be detailed in the forthcoming addendum. Existing pavement consists of 3" asphalt concrete, 10" reinforced concrete, and 4" bituminous aggregate base.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2018 1:12:26 PM **Question Number - 7**

On page 5 (Note and callout #6) says Item #304-6" aggregate base, PG64-22(unless otherwise shown). Is this supposed to say just #304 base? Please define #304 base with PG64-22? No reference is given in the C&MS under item #304.

Yes, this should say only Item 304 - 6" aggregate base. PG64-22 will be deleted in the forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2018 10:33:06 AM **Question Number - 6**

Page 17/387 on the plans have a note about the existing rumble strips. Where are these located?

See forthcoming addendum. Rumble strips do not exist in the existing pavement This note will be removed.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2018 6:47:04 AM **Question Number - 5**

The Combs Hehl and the Kentucky approach bridges do not call QC-QA concrete. Is this correct or is all concrete in superstructure to be QC-QA concrete.

See forthcoming addendum for revisions to concrete pay items.

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

In order to determine the volume of concrete required for the pavement repairs, can the depth of the existing pavement be provided?

Existing pavement depths will be detailed in the forthcoming addendum. Existing pavement consists of 3" asphalt concrete, 10" reinforced concrete, and 4" bituminous aggregate base.

Question Submitted: 1/5/2018 4:18:27 PM **Question Number - 3**

The Permitted Lane Closure Times and Unauthorized Lane Use Table on page 16 does not allow a time frame for a one lane nightly closure in the existing 3 thru lane section. It does allow for a two lane closure nightly in this same area. Can a one lane nightly lane closure in the existing three thru lanes section be allowed?

See forthcoming addendum. The table will be revised to allow a one lane nightly closure in the existing 3 thru lane section.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/5/2018 4:13:33 PM **Question Number - 2**

Item 255 Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement Class QC1 includes concrete spec 499 QC 1. This concrete will not reach the allowable strength to open to traffic in the amount of time allowed by the lane closure policy. Is QC 1 the proper concrete?

See forthcoming addendum. A quantity for Item 255 – Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement, RRCM, As Per Plan will be added to the plans to address this issue.

Question Submitted: 1/5/2018 2:03:30 PM **Question Number - 1**

Page 367/387 shows the KY armored edge. There is not a pay item for this or is it considered part of the structural expansion joint. Please clarify.

See upcoming addendum. This will be included for payment in the expansion joint pay item.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2018 7:34:48 AM **Question Number - 4**

Can ODOT please make available on line the existing bridge drawings.

Existing bridge plans have been uploaded to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HAM-84492/Reference%20File/>

Question Submitted: 1/3/2018 7:28:46 AM **Question Number - 3**

Page 310/387 shows a typical existing barrier section and states to remove 6" in front of the barrier by hand but above it shows 1'. Please clarify.

See forthcoming addendum. The correct dimension is 1'. The removal by hand chipping requirement will be removed from the note.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 10:04:11 AM **Question Number - 2**

Page 181/387 the notes state that the pipe and fittings shall be galvanized. The support angle is to be welded to the stiffeners. Is this angle to be galvanized or painted. If painted how will the repair after welding be paid

See upcoming addendum. A revised detail will be provided showing bolted connections to the existing stiffener instead of welds. The angle is to be galvanized.

Question Submitted: 12/19/2017 4:15:50 PM **Question Number - 1**

Due to the multiple work types, each of considerable size, in order to complete this project (structural steel rehab, painting, hydro demolition, pavement repair, MOT etc.) will the department consider reducing the work type percentage performed by the prime contractor?

The Work Type Percentage Performed by the Prime Contractor will be reduced from 50% to 40% in a forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 180047

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

CRA-94147 - SR 98-07.87

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 2:55:04 PM **Question Number - 32**

The revised plans that were issued in Addendum #5 on 2-12-15 deleted the mainline sanitary sewer from the project. The proposal form still includes line number 0036 for Manhole, No 3, APP (Sanitary). Shouldn't this item be deleted from the project?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 9:25:29 AM **Question Number - 31**

Please be advised that the following items have not been updated in the EBS file yet.1. 15" Conduit, Type B APP - Encased2. 24" Steel Pipe Encasement, Bored or Jacked.Thank you.

those items were deleted in the anticipation of the addendum that will be posted today.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 9:20:16 AM **Question Number - 30**

In an answer to a pre bid question regarding the completion date, it was stated that the completion date will be extended. I do not see a revised date in any of the addendums. Will the completion date still be revised?

Addendum No. 4 extended the completion date to 10/15/18.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 2:37:37 PM **Question Number - 29**

What are the dimensions of Item 605 4" Shallow Pipe Underdrain with Geotextile Fabric, As Per Plan ?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 2:35:20 PM **Question Number - 28**

Are you going to add a Reference item for 15" Conduit, Type B, Concrete Encased ?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 2:16:14 PM **Question Number - 27**

Per question #19 a monument quantity was going to be added in an addendum. Is this still the case or are we to include with the construction staking item?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 2:14:26 PM **Question Number - 26**

As stated in question #8, the quantity has not been adjusted to a total of 9 per the revised general summary.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 2:09:58 PM **Question Number - 25**

A bid item for the 15" conduit, type B encased is still not present on the revised bid form.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 2:07:21 PM **Question Number - 24**

Why was the steel pipe encasement item deleted from the contract? Is this not required anymore?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 9:43:18 AM **Question Number - 23**

Does the City of Bucyrus have any existing video of the combination sewer that the contractor can have access to before the installation of the proposed sanitary sewer?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 7:13:21 AM **Question Number - 22**

Please be advised that the quantities and new plan sheets still haven't been updated on the BidX website.

The BidX website has been updated.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 9:32:31 AM **Question Number - 21**

Will the iron castings for the storm and sanitary structures on the project follow standard ODOT drawings or will City of Bucyrus castings be required?

City of Bucyrus castings will be required. See Sanitary Sewer General Notes on Page 14.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 3:24:43 PM **Question Number - 20**

Can you please provide details regarding how the combined sanitary sewer flow is to be bypassed across the railroad tracks at Station 23+55? Will the sewer bypass line need to be bored or directionally drilled underneath the tracks?

This area was the cause of the latest project delay. The design consultant is currently verifying a pipe size of the combined sanitary/storm sewer. This design is likely to change. We let you know when we know more.

Question Submitted: 1/25/2018 1:52:48 PM **Question Number - 19**

Sheet #114 has 12 monument assemblies and 14 reference monuments to be set but were not carried to the general summary. Are these to be installed as part of the contract?

These are to be installed as part of the contract. An Addendum will add these items of work.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:15:08 PM **Question Number - 18**

Does the new 15" sanitary sewer need to be encased in concrete?

partially. the next addendum will clarify. Next addendum will come out in the next couple of days.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 10:08:01 AM **Question Number - 17**

Oh Sheet 40 structures D-10 and D-12 are listed as 2-2B catch basins, should they be MH No. 3 structures instead?

D-10 and D-12 on sheet 40 are correct as 2-2B catch basins.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 1:11:26 PM **Question Number - 16**

For the jack and bore inside of the existing steel pipe encasement. What is the current carrier pipe materials and what type of materials have been installed between the carrier pipe and the existing steel encasement? If concrete encasement has been installed this will not be able to be jack and bored. Please advise.

I'm not completely clear on the question. There is no existing steel pipe encasement. The material of the existing 36" pipe under the R/R is concrete. This pipe is combination Sanitary/Storm sewer that will be used to accept the 24" steel encasement with the 15" Sanitary conduit inside of the 24" encasement. The next addendum will attempt to clarify.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 9:25:02 AM **Question Number - 15**

In order to obtain a cost for the Railroad Insurance can the department please provide the previous information requested in regards to the rail information for the Chicago, Fort Wayne & Eastern Crossing. Once the information is received this usually takes several days for the insurance companies to provide a quote.

The number of trains operating through the improvement is estimated to be: 20 Passenger trains per day @ 10 miles per hour. 2 Freight trains per day @ 10 miles per hour. An addendum will be processed that includes the Chicago, Fort Wayne & Eastern Crossing 'Special Clauses' in the proposal. 0 Passenger trains per day @ 10 miles per hour. 2 Freight trains per day @ 10 miles per hour.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 9:16:07 AM **Question Number - 14**

In reference to the department's answer for question #4 on 1-6-18, is the casing pipe to be paid for under the jack & bore item or is the jack and bore item set up for the 15" storm sewer.

The next addendum will add a pay item for the 24" encasement pipe which will include the price of the 15" sanitary sewer pipe.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 8:34:52 AM **Question Number - 13**

There are no perm pavement replacement items for the pipe under the roadway. Should this be included in the pipe costs, or will you add new items for this work?

permanent pavement replacement is included in the pipe cost.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 8:29:34 AM **Question Number - 12**

On sheet 41 in the profile it shows the 15" Sanitary Sewer installed in a 36" casing, what is the 15" storm sewer to be installed in?

The 15" storm sewer is an open cut. This item refers to the installation of the storm conduit at the railroad crossing. see sheet 107 for addition details.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 4:44:51 PM **Question Number - 11**

How does the department plan to maintain sewer service to the 78 houses as the combo sewer is removed and reinstalled? considering the new sewer will need to be tested before being put into service? Does the department know what sort of flow comes from the 4" Force main at the end of the project?

The main line will not be air tested. The 4 inch force main has variable flow.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 2:35:30 PM **Question Number - 10**

where are the specs/details for bid item 0031 Conduit Bored or Jacked APP located

A plan note on the next addendum will clarify the bored or jacked item.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 7:45:55 AM **Question Number - 9**

Please review the concrete step item, the quantity appears to be short.

The next addendum will be revise the concrete step 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.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 11:20:48 AM **Question Number - 8**

Structure D-5 is counted as a 2-2B catch basin on the sewer sub summary (sheet #16E) According to the prints the structure is actually a storm manhole on sheet #39. Quantities will need to be adjusted accordingly.

Quantity will be adjusted on next addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 11:12:50 AM **Question Number - 7**

General note on sheet #13 states that the 15" sanitary conduit needs to be encased in concrete due to the proximity of the existing main. Is this for all of the quantity or when the 15" is within 10' of the existing watermain?

A new item for the 15" sanitary conduit encased in concrete will be added with the next addendum. Sheet 41 will be revised for clarification.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 2:22:33 PM **Question Number - 6**

Given the fact that the proposed sanitary sewer is installed in the same trench as the existing combined / sanitary sewer, existing sanitary connections will be hooked to the new sewer as they are encountered thus introducing live flow. Therefore, the specified air test and manhole vacuum test cannot be performed. Please advise.

In lieu of an Air test the City will conduct a post construction video inspection. The man hole vacuum test remains required.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 10:04:21 AM **Question Number - 5**

Is there a soils report available for the project

A soil report is not available for this project.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 8:22:38 AM **Question Number - 4**

For reference item #0027 15" Conduit APP, refers to page 12 for the APP note - it appears as if this note is missing or miss labeled as 6" APP, please provide clarification. The APP note for the 6" states that a 20" steel casing pipe shall be placed thru the existing 36" pipe. Is the intent to leave the existing 36" in place and thread the new 15" PVC pipe thru it inside of a 20" casing pipe, or can the existing 36" be removed and replaced with the 15" in the same location?

The note was mislabeled for the 6" APP. This will be revised with the next addendum. The intent is to have steel casing pipe be inserted within the existing 36" pipe. The 36" pipe is to remain because this is the section that runs under the railroad tracks. The void between the 36" pipe and the steel casing pipe is to be filled with low strength mortar. Then, the proposed 15" sanitary is to be inserted within the steel casing pipe. The thought behind inserting a pipe within a pipe is to ensure that the 15" sanitary is set within a structurally solid pipe, which should occur with inserting the steel casing and the low strength mortar fill

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 9:40:50 AM **Question Number - 3**

This project involves 2 rail crossings. Railroad info is provided for the Norfolk Southern Rail crossing encountered in the mill & fill portion, But no info is provided for the Chicago, Fort Wayne & Eastern Crossing. Please provide info on this crossing (number of trains, speed, required flaggers, etc.)

The number of trains operating through the improvement is estimated to be: 20 Passenger trains per day @ 10 miles per hour. 2 Freight trains per day @ 10 miles per hour. An addendum will be processed that includes the Chicago, Fort Wayne & Eastern Crossing 'Special Clauses' in the proposal.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 7:55:03 AM **Question Number - 2**

Is the completion date of 8/27/2018 a firm date?

We've discussed the completion date and the work to be done. The next addendum will extend the completion date.

Question Submitted: 1/5/2018 1:40:39 PM **Question Number - 1**

Line Item 61 Curb Ramp Type C is modified but there is no description or detail of the modification. Please clarify.

A plan note will be added on page 12 of the next addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2018 11:16:56 AM **Question Number - 18**

Regarding plan sheet 110 - a railroad crossing is shown on this plan as new and to be constructed but it is not in a project pay item for constructing a new railroad crossing. There is a bid item for removing a crossing, but not for constructing one, so please explain.

The new crossing will be constructed by others. Part of the removal of the existing crossing pay item on this project is to coordinate with the contractor installing the new railroad crossing.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/2/2018 3:04:48 PM **Question Number - 17**

How is the existing 36" combined sanitary/storm to be terminated at the 42" stone arch? Can a short stub of the 36" be left sticking out of the arch and plugged, or does it need to be completely removed?

A short stub of 1-3 feet can be left sticking out of the arch and plugged.

Question Submitted: 1/2/2018 2:56:25 PM **Question Number - 16**

What type of pipe material is the existing 36" & 15" combined sanitary/storm sewers that are being removed?

The existing pipe material for the combined sanitary/storm sewers vary.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 12:13:43 PM **Question Number - 15**

Notes under Pavement Restoration for Drainage Structures and Conduit Installations state that the cost of TEMPORARY pavement restoration for all utility installations shall be included in the unit price of conduit. There is no detail for temporary pavement restoration. Are bidders to assume that this note should read All pavement restoration for utility installation shall be included in the unit price of conduit? In addition, is it necessary to have 2" of 441 in the trench pavement repair? All of the storm, sanitary and water work will be completed prior to any resurfacing, which will cover all of the pavement repair from utility installation. This pavement repair could be completed with just 301 or 452.

Yes, All pavement restoration for utility installation shall be included in the unit price of the conduit. Pavement repair can be completed with just 301. An addendum will be processed to clarify this note.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:50:08 AM **Question Number - 14**

Typical sections show saw cutting 1' inside the existing edge of pavement for curb installation. Is the removal of this one foot strip of pavement to be included in the item for Curb Removed? The Pavement Removed quantity does not appear to include all of this pavement removal.

The pavement removal quantity for the saw cutting 1' inside the existing edge of pavement will be added to the pavement removed quantity.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:43:10 AM **Question Number - 13**

There are two existing timber retaining walls, one at approx. sta. 17+60 RT, and one at approx. sta. 18+50 RT, that are to be removed. The removal quantity of these two walls does not appear to be included in Removal Misc.: Remove Existing Retaining Wall. Please review.

A note in Removal Misc.: Removal Existing Retaining Wall will be added to clarify.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:38:29 AM **Question Number - 12**

Please confirm that the residential and commercial drive apron removal is being paid for under Pavement Removed.

Residential and commercial drive apron removal is being paid for under the Pavement Removed Item.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:34:43 AM **Question Number - 11**

The majority of the new sanitary sewer is being installed in the same location as the existing combined sewer, requiring the removal of the existing at the same time as new installation. Is there any flow information available for the existing sewer to help determine what kind of bypass pumping equipment may be needed?

No flow information is available.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:28:53 AM **Question Number - 10**

Will a preformed expansion joint filler be required between the new curb and 12" non reinforced concrete pavement?

A preformed expansion joint filler will not be required between the new curb and 12": non-reinforced concrete. An APP note will be added to clarify.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:26:19 AM **Question Number - 9**

On sheet 13 of 128, there is a note for Fill & Plug Existing Conduit. There is no pay item set up for this work, and no specific locations called for its use. Please clarify where it is to be used at and how it will be paid.

A pay item for Fill & Plug existing conduit will be added to the plan via addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:17:51 AM **Question Number - 8**

Item 638 Replace Lead Water Services APP, is being paid on a per foot basis and is to include all items needed (corp stops, shut offs, curb boxes). Can an estimated number of services be generated so that all the misc. items that have to be included in the per foot price be accurately quantified?

Please bid the item 638 Replace Lead Water Service APP as described. The quantity and location of this item is varies.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:11:35 AM **Question Number - 7**

There are three sets of concrete steps to be removed between sta. 15+00 and 17+00. Is the removal of these steps to be paid under Concrete Steps, Type A?

a step removal item will be added via addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:06:50 AM **Question Number - 6**

Please clarify the APP note of Item 452 - 12" non reinforced concrete pavement APP, as there do not appear to be any locations where the 12" concrete pavement in over 1' in width.

the intent for 452-12" non reinforced concrete pavement, APP is for along curb installation and radii pavement extension; the plan will be updated to include locations for clarity.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 11:03:25 AM **Question Number - 5**

Sheet 13 of 128 has a plan note for 15" Conduit Type B, Concrete Encased. There is no pay item set up for this work, and no specific locations called out where it is to be used. Please clarify where this item of work is to be used at and how it will be paid.

an item for 15" Conduit Type B, Concrete Encased will be added to the plans and location specified.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 10:56:32 AM **Question Number - 4**

The typical sections show aggregate of some kind under the new curb, but material type (aggregate base or underdrain aggregate), and thickness is not called out anywhere. Please clarify the material type and thickness of aggregate under the curb.

the aggregate under the curb will be removed from the plan and typical section corrected.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 10:50:26 AM **Question Number - 3**

The Curb Type 6, APP is to be modified to have a 4" reveal. Is the curb to maintain an 18" height with a 4" reveal, or is the intent to have a curb with a 16" height like a Type 4-C curb?

The intent is 16 inches high; plans will be updated to call out Type 4-C curb.

Question Submitted: 12/28/2017 10:42:27 AM **Question Number - 2**

The typical sections show 4" of aggregate base under the new concrete walk. The quantity of aggregate base provided in the general summary does not reflect this. Please review.

The aggregate base will be removed from typical section and will not be required for the concrete walk.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 12:28:24 PM **Question Number - 1**

Item 43 is listed as Partial Depth Pavement Repair (442) in the proposal and is listed the same way in the plans. However the general notes say to use 301 material. Please clarify if 442 or 301 mix is to be used for this item.

Please use Item 442 for the Partial Depth repairs. The 301 item is for the use of Item 253 full depth repairs.

Project No. 180071

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

PUT-93645 - SR 65/SR 109/SR 613-15.58/05.87/07.20

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 9:59:25 AM **Question Number - 3**

Addendum No. 3 added applicable railroad special clauses to the project. Is ODOT going to add a Ref # for a Railroad Bond?

Per a forthcoming addendum, a bid item will be added to the project for Item 100E00300, PREMIUM ON RAILROADS' PROTECTIVE PUBLIC LIABILITY AND PROPERTY DAMAGE LIABILITY INSURANCE, LS.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180082

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

MUS-97346 - CR 32-0.00

Question Submitted: 2/16/2018 1:54:08 PM **Question Number - 11**

The rebar list on plan sheet 177/192 shows that approximately 910 lbs of the rebar in the 517 railing which is on the approach slab is included in bid item 202 509 Epoxy rebar. The barlist quantity of 23,300 lbs should be adjusted to 23,390 LB. The 910 LB of rebar is either incidental to the 517 railing or bid item 234 526 Approach Slabs. Please adjust in the next addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/16/2018 10:29:52 AM **Question Number - 10**

Should Item 202E98000 be a pda per drawing 7 of 192?

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 12:59:11 PM **Question Number - 9**

Will the department reconsider the use of galvanized stay in place forms for the interior bays of the bridge deck? Depending on the information provided in the waterway permits stripping of falsework and protection of the existing waterway may be difficult based on what type and amount of disturbance is allowed within the waterway.

No, the owner of the bridge does not want stay in place forms. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 9:35:41 AM **Question Number - 8**

The answer to prebid question # 6 states that "A draft version of the waterway permits conditions will be made available to the contractors by February 28th, 2018." Can it be made available sooner? There is a fair amount of work to do after that information is made available. The permit affects alot of the way that the bridge is going to be built. To put this part of the estimate on hold for 2 more weeks seems unnecessary since the permit application has already been submitted. Can an addendum be issued with just this information? It will help all contractors bidding this project.

The Department is working on getting the draft version sooner than the 28th asstated in prebid question #6. Once the Department receives the draft version of the permits they will be made available to the contractors. Please see <http://www.Irh.usace.army.mil/Portals/38/Users/007/87/1287/LRH-2016-00803-MUS%20Drawings.pdf?ver=2017-11-09-115110-317> for the drawings submitted to the USArmy Corp of Engineers. Please see <http://wwwapp.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/401Applications/MUS32ODOT/> for the 401/404 application information that was sent to the Ohio EPA.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:24:10 AM **Question Number - 7**

It appears that the trees in the project ROW have been cut down and are still on the ground, on the slopes of the intake channel, in the water of the intake channel etc. The trees in the water of the intake channel are in the way of the proposed 114" diameter pipe that gets installed under the proposed embankment. Is it the intent of ODOT to leave the Right of Way in its current state or will the clearing contractor be removing all the trees that were cut down prior to the project bidding?

The right-of-way will be left in its current state. Plan Item 201 Clearing and Grubbing shall be used by the contractor to remove the brush and trees that are down on the ground. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:11:23 AM **Question Number - 6**

Can the 404 permit application information be made available to the contractors even if its not been approved by the USCOE yet. This will give the contractors time to respond to it so the bid wont have to be delayed incase the permit doesn't get approved until just before the bid date.

A draft version of the waterway permits conditions will be made available to the contractors by February 28th, 2018.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:50:49 PM **Question Number - 5**

The contract drawings outline that the contractor is to obtain the NPDES permit. Has the permit already been obtained by the department and the contractor needs to apply as a co-permittee or has no permit been obtained and the contractor will be required to obtain the full permit on behalf of the department?

The permit has already been obtained by the department and the contractor will need to apply as a co-permittee as detailed in Supplemental Specification 832. Please see forthcoming addendum for plan clarification.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/25/2018 3:58:35 PM **Question Number - 4**

The Intake Channel next to the Lock appears to serve no purpose. Why is a 114" diameter pipe being installed under the embankment on the new CR 32 alignment? This pipe could cost \$300,000.

The pipe is required as part of the environmental permitting process. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 5:05:40 PM **Question Number - 3**

Can Galvanized Stay - in - Place metal deck forms be used on the interior bays of the bridge deck?

Stay-in-place deck forms will not be allowed. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 10:18:43 AM **Question Number - 2**

Paragraph 17 on plan sheet 9/192 states that the waterway permits will be included in the plans. They are not currently included in the plans. Please provide them for the contractors.

ODOT is still in the process of getting the waterway permits. Once obtained they will be added by addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 1:54:12 PM **Question Number - 1**

Can the existing bridge plans be made available to the contractors?

Files have been posted to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/MUS-97346/Reference%20Files/>

Project No. 180087

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

CLA-94672 - SR 41-26.75/26.93/29.18

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 9:23:45 AM **Question Number - 5**

Ref. number 79 states that the box culvert size is a 14'x6' conduit for structure CLA-41-2918, however, plan sheets 57-59 show that the box culvert size is a 12'x6' conduit for structure CLA-41-2918. Can you clarify that the proposal is incorrect and Ref. number 79 should show that the box culvert size is a 12'x6' conduit?

The proposal is incorrect, the proposed CLA-41-2918 structure is to be a 12'x6' conduit. An addendum is forthcoming to correct the proposal and general summary.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 10:12:23 AM **Question Number - 4**

Project plans show the guardrail installation directly above the 6" water main. Is this feasible?

It is feasible to set post per the details and references provided in the plans.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 1:21:03 PM **Question Number - 3**

Sheet 10 shows the pavement markings as thermoplastic (644) but REF #35 and #36 are shown as paint (642). Which is correct?

The correct pavement marking type is Item 642 as shown on sheet 11

Question Submitted: 1/12/2018 11:57:25 AM **Question Number - 2**

The office calc's that are posted do not include the data for bid items 28, 29, 30 and 31. Please post this information.

Quantities for bid items 28, 29, 30, and 31 have been revised in an upcoming addendum. Office Calculation will be posted.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2018 6:58:20 AM **Question Number - 1**

Page 13/70 indicates that there is portable barrier with an impact attenuator. How are these items to be paid or will ODOT add pay items for these.

An addendum is forthcoming to include the required pay items.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180118

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

HAM-91826 - IR 71-08.42

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 2:01:24 PM **Question Number - 17**

HAM-71-6.86 PART 2 Page 217/253, General notes states that epoxy coated may be omitted over the length provided for threading the nut against the bearing plate. It is clearly stated that the soil nail bars are to be epoxy coated. Are Hex nuts, washers, studded bearing plates and welded wire mesh to be epoxy coated?

The hex nuts, washers, bearing plats and welded wire mesh are to be provided as detailed on Sheet 217 of 253. Epoxy coating of these items is not a plan requirement.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 10:48:38 AM **Question Number - 16**

Ref 100 - plans do not summarize complete pole designs. Page 328 - poles require medain mount base? What is pole height and length of arms? Page 329 and 330 - poles mounting at grade on on structure? T-bases required for any designs?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 1:48:57 PM **Question Number - 15**

Due to the multiple work types, each of considerable size, in order to complete this project (structural steel rehab, painting, hydro demolition, MOT etc.) will the department consider reducing the work type percentage performed by the prime contractor?

The prime percentage will remain at 50%.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 4:56:27 PM **Question Number - 14**

HAM-71-1068L/R - Please review the scope in regards to the reinforcing steel at the phase construction joint in the bridge deck and approach slab. Plans detail a proposed lap length (Deck #5 Bar = 2'-10"; App Slab #5 Bar = 2'-6") for all S5 bars at the construction joint. The distance provided between the the edge of proposed deck and existing deck in phase 1 or 3 respectively does not allow for the proposed lap length to protrude without being bent. What is ODOT's intent with the proposed lap length? Will the contractor have to bend all bars or should mechanical connectors be utilized. On sheet 396/441, a 3'-0" closure pour note is labeled at the R.A. This is the only location in the HAM-71-1068L/R plan sheets. Is this in error?

The design intention is to bend the bar up during the phase construction and bend down in the final condition. The closure pour call out is not correct on the sheet. This will be deleted in a future addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 1:01:11 PM **Question Number - 13**

Bid item 910 - Anti-Segregation Equipment has a bid quantity of 25,180 CY. On sheet 24 it states that the bid item is for all asphalt concrete courses of uniform thickness in accordance with 401.12. The bid item 970 is asphalt concrete surface with a uniform thickness, but the quantity does not appear to be included in the total. Will the department consider revising the bid quantity to include the anti-segregation equipment for the final surface course.

See forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 5:32:54 AM **Question Number - 12**

Abutment backwall details on 377-380/441 indicate proposed top elevations for the backwalls but not the existing beam seat elevations. Will beam seat elevations for HAM-71-1068 R/L be provided so bidders can calculate the vertical dimensions of the backwalls?

see forthcoming addendum. A table of the beam seat elevations for use during bidding will be provided. All elevations will need to be field verified by the contractor prior to commencement of work or ordering of materials.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:46:39 PM **Question Number - 11**

What are the vertical dimensions of the wingwalls below the parapets shown on abutment wingwall details on 382/441 through 385/441 and the corresponding wingwall sections on 386/441?

The details on the referenced sheets are based on existing plan dimensions. Existing plans for this structure are available.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:09:50 PM **Question Number - 10**

The expansion joint plan, sections B and C and note 2 on 359/441 indicate removal of portions of the existing HAM-71-0970 L/R concrete parapet for replacement of expansion joints. If this concrete is to be replaced will replacement details and method of payment be provided?

The cost of replacing the concrete is included in the Item 516 - Structural expansion joint including elastomeric strip seal, as per plan, per plan notes 2 and 3 on sheet 359

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:04:35 PM **Question Number - 9**

Proposed work item 5 on 353/441 says patch parapets and substructure per item 519. Pages 354 through 356 identify substructure areas to be patched but no parapets. Will plans indicating areas of HAM-71-0970 L/R parapets to be patched per item 519 be provided?

Specific locations of patching will not be provided. Locations of the parapet patching will be determined in the field during construction and will be as directed by the engineer. A quantity has been established and included for bidding purposes.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 1:22:20 PM **Question Number - 8**

A note on 339/441 says existing structure plans are on file at District 8 and are available for reference. Will the existing structure plans be made available on the Department's ftp site?

The existing structural files are at the link below.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-71-8.42-PID91826/Existing%20Plans/>

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 1:17:25 PM **Question Number - 7**

Part 2 page 6 of the plans under the construction noise note does not allow power operated construction type of devices from 7am – 7 pm. This will eliminate any daytime work. Would the department reconsider this note and allow daytime work to take place?

See forthcoming addendum. The note should read 7pm-7am to limit the noise during the night time hours. Noise restrictions do not apply for work being performed in the LA-RW.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 1:14:39 PM **Question Number - 6**

Page 24 of the plans the first paragraph states repaired areas must be planed and resurfaced in two weeks. Does placing the intermediate course count as "resurfaced"? Or does the surface course need to be placed within two weeks?

This requires that the repaired areas be planed and back to an acceptable driving surface within two weeks.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 11:10:01 AM **Question Number - 5**

Page 24 of the plans the third paragraph under "Item 252 Full Depth Rigid Removal and Flexible Replacement" states the payment will be based on the number of Cubic Yards. The pay item is in Square Yards. Which unit will be used?

Payment will be per the CMS, in square yards.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 11:08:14 AM **Question Number - 4**

Part 2 page 8 under "Water Permitting" references an Army Corps of Engineers permit. Can this permit be made available?

The permit will be made available once it is received.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 11:06:53 AM **Question Number - 3**

Page 24 of the plans requires hot joints between the surface course mainline pavement lanes. One cold joint is allowed in the four or more lane sections. How will traffic be maintained in order to pave 3 lanes of pavement in the three lane section in order to provide hot joints between the surface course mainline pavement lanes?

Once cold joint on a lane line and one on the edge line is also acceptable for the three lane section.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 11:05:24 AM **Question Number - 2**

Page 31 of the plans under Earthwork for Maintaining Traffic includes a note to evaluate the need for temporary road undercuts. Who will pay for the evaluation? How will any required undercuts be paid?

See forthcoming addendum. The last paragraph of this note will be removed. A geotechnical evaluation will not be required.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 11:03:36 AM **Question Number - 1**

Page 31 of the plans under Item 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic Class A APP a pavement composition for the item is given. This pavement section includes 6" of 304 aggregate base. The third paragraph of this note states "all other requirements of 615 shall apply." Does this mean the option to use 2.5" of 302 in lieu of 6" 304 (as stated in spec 615) is acceptable?

The pavement composition listed in the note is required. The use of 2.5" 302 in lieu of 6" 304 is not acceptable.

Project No. 180120

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

CLE-103594 - CR 98-00.11

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 3:42:45 PM **Question Number - 3**

Pay item #19 is for a decorative sign post that holds a solar panel, 30" x 30" W11-2 sign and 24" x 12" W16-7P sign. There is a detail on plan page 7 that requires the lower sign to be 7' from the ground. The specified 10' pole for this item is not tall enough to allow this. Additionally spacing for the solar panel to pointed to the south needs to be accounted for. Please advise on what the proper size pole should be to allow for all of this.

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 3:32:04 PM **Question Number - 2**

The base bid RRFB assembly has a pushbutton mounted on a square ground post. Is that correct? Typically pushbuttons are mounted on a pole so the wiring can be ran inside the pole?

See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/3/2018 9:20:58 PM **Question Number - 1**

Alternative items 0018 and 0020 call for RRFB assemblies. Due to the recent removal of the RRFB interim approval, will there be an addendum released to revise this item?

See forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 180122

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

CUY-85530 - IR 480-19.21

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 10:55:51 AM **Question Number - 3**

Plan Sheet 10 under Staging Areas states "No Staging area shall be permitted along IR-480 between the start of the project and Granger Road Interchange." Please clarify that this includes the median and as well as the outside shoulders.

No staging areas shall be permitted within ODOT Right-of-way between the limits provided in the plan note. Please bid accordingly.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 1:39:30 PM **Question Number - 2**

The planing note says the milled surface shall be covered in 7 days and the repair note says repairs to be performed after planning. The combination of these 2 notes and the time restrictions will severely limit the contractors production and cause unnecessary transverse joints. Please consider changing the repairs to be performed before the planing.

Pavement repair notes will be revised in forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 180123

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

CUY-80966 - NORTH COAST HARBOR PED BR

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 9:47:18 AM **Question Number - 12**

Addendum No. 1 was issued on 2/9/2018 but no EBS amendment file has been posted to ODOTs website for upload into AASHTOWare. Please provide this EBS file.

The EBS amendment has been posted to Digital Paper.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 5:57:25 PM **Question Number - 11**

For Bid Ref 047, Will Sternberg's A850SRLED-59-3ARC45T3-MDL03-A-CDR be considered as an approved equal to the specified luminaires?

GE Evolve LED Avery Streetdreams, Holophane Washington LED Acrylic Postlight II, or approved equal shall be used. Fixtures from other manufacturers than listed on sheet 26 are acceptable as long as the fixture has comparable performance and aesthetic. Bid as is

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 4:12:24 PM **Question Number - 10**

In reference to the modified plan notes from addendum #1, LEO's shall be onsite for all deliveries. Please clarify the responsibilities of the LEO that is to be onsite for all deliveries.

LEO Primary Function is Public Safety. Responsibilities include directing traffic to make sure all contractor delivery vehicles make it safely through the entry point at the Guard Shack and leaving the gate area, coordination with regular police car patrols into the park and event holder security plan and personnel.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 4:11:18 PM **Question Number - 9**

Please clarify who is to pay for the LEO's that are now required to be onsite for all deliveries as stated in addendum #1.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 4:42:45 PM **Question Number - 8**

A question was submitted 5/16/17 for the original bid 170353 of this project: Plan sheet 14/143 in the Maintaining Traffic, Misc: Boat Traffic note states that the USCG may allow a channel closure between January 1 and March 15. Will ODOT/USCG/CITY allow a channel closure during the summer for erection of this bridge? A response from ODOT stated that "January to March closure was previously determined as possible, but does not preclude closures at other times". Please confirm that closures of the channel may be allowed at times outside of January 1 to March 15 as previously stated but not incorporated into the rebid of this project.

As stated in Maintaining Traffic, Misc.: Boat Traffic note on sheet 14/143, closures of the channel during any time of year shall be coordinated with the USCG and City of Cleveland. Need for closure shall be forwarded to USCG no later than 60 days prior to requested date. January to March closure was previously determined as possible, but does not preclude closures at other times. Lee Soule, Coast Guard, lee.d.soule@uscg.mil (216) 802-6085, will be setting up hard date closure requests on both ends (on-site contractor and marine interests) to minimize the impacts to both.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 4:33:47 PM **Question Number - 7**

Is a building permit required for this project? If so, please confirm that the Engineer of Record has submitted plans to the City of Cleveland's Building Dept for review and advise on the cost of such permit. This question was submitted and responded to for the original bid 170353 but has not been incorporated into the rebid plan documents. Please provide the information requested.

A Building Permit is Required. The Plans were submitted to Building and Housing for review. For bidding purposes use \$300 for the cost of the permit

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 4:29:36 PM **Question Number - 6**

Reference Spec 169000-1.6B, please confirm that an Ohio Registered PE does not need to stamp every submittal within the electrical scope of supply, and will only need to stamp the Major Electrical Equipment (MCC, Switch Gear...), General Arrangement Drawings, Installation/Layout Shop Drawings, and Termination/Pt-to-Pt Shop Drawings - as these drawings will incorporate all devices and equipment. This question was submitted and answered from the original bid for 170353 and has not been incorporated into this bid. Please confirm.

Ohio Registered PE does not need to stamp every submittal within the electrical scope. Standard electrical equipment manufacturer drawings and/or literature (MCC, power panel, motor, lights, switches, etc.) do not require Ohio Registered PE. Ohio Registered PE stamp is required for installation shop drawing developed by Contractor or Contractor's system integrator agent, which includes layout/assembly/installation drawings of equipment, components terminal boxes and terminations drawings, schematic diagrams, point-to-point interconnection wirings with cable tags and termination identification for field installation. The Ohio Registered PE stamp also apply to custom design and fabricated equipment (Bridge Control Cabinet, HPU control relay/PLC panel, operator control console, etc.) that are not standard off-the-shelf product

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 1:41:43 PM **Question Number - 5**

At the proposed forward abutment, existing sheet piling is at the north face and west face of the finger pier. This existing sheet piling is in the proposed footer and abutment. Please clarify.

Based on field survey, conflict is not anticipated between the proposed forward abutment and existing sheet piling walls at the finger pier.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 1:42:18 PM **Question Number - 4**

Reference specification section 169000-1.2.B.3 page 2 references ANSI/NFPA 780 - Installation of Lightning Protection Systems. No Lightning Protection System is shown on the bid drawings or included in the proposal as a bid item. Please confirm there is no Lightning Protection System as part of this project.

There is no lightning protection system other than lightning arrester on the incoming service, surge protection device on the motor control center, and grounding of bridge structure and operator building to the grounding electrode(s) as already included in the electrical items

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 12:38:25 PM **Question Number - 3**

Sheet 14 - 614 Maintaining Traffic, APP restricts deliveries to Voinovich Park and Finger Pier to be made prior to 8:00 AM, Monday-Sunday. Sheet 15 - Plan Note #3 also restricts deliveries to be made prior to 8:00 AM, and places further restrictions on semi/trailer access. Can you please clarify if "deliveries" as used in these notes only refers to equipment or materials delivered by semi/trailer, or are ALL deliveries (including concrete, aggregates, dump trucks, etc) restricted to overnight hours?

Sheet 14 & 15 will be revised by addendum to clarify

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 9:19:03 AM **Question Number - 2**

Reference 16900-2.26 CCTV; Please allow the use of Axis Cameras in lieu of Samsung CCTV. This will allow for public savings to the Owner. Please approve.

Drawing E42 indicates Samsung SNP-6320H or approved equal shall be used. Cameras from other manufacturers are acceptable as long as the camera has comparable performance as specified in the plans and special provision. Bid as is.

Question Submitted: 1/31/2018 8:35:39 AM **Question Number - 1**

The quantity of Item 93 - PVC coated lead blocks was increased from the previous bid from 80,000 up to 131,000 lbs. Please provide how many 82 lb blocks vs. 50 lb blocks will be required (as was provided in the previous bid).

Use approximately 75,000 lbs as 82 LB blocks and the balance in the 50 lb blocks.

Project No. 180127

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

CLE-102536 - MCRO-FY2018

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 11:21:37 AM **Question Number - 2**

I just wanted to make sure that the completion date is 6/30/2019 as the proposal states and that it was not a mistake that should be 6/30/2018.

The completion date of 6/30/2019 is correct.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:03:13 AM **Question Number - 1**

Will the Department issue an addendum to reflect the specification change for the Item #421 Microsurfacing dated 1/19/18 as they did for project #180057 in the 1 February Letting.

Project No. 180128

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

ATH-98284 - EXTRUSHEET SIGN FY2018

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 8:21:53 AM **Question Number - 1**

Along with DMS signs, will ODOT be providing any Z-bar and/or mounting hardware with them?

The Zee bar is provided by the manufacturer. Please see the last sheet of the plans, Detail A (it's a shop drawing from the manufacturer).

Project No. 180129

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

DAR-97246 - SWEITZER ST.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 12:36:26 PM **Question Number - 2**

Is the type 2 gutter thickness standard ODOT 9"T or is it Greenville 7.75"T as it appears in the typical?

The typical is not drawn to scale. The type 2 combination curb and gutter is the standard ODOT type curb.

*** 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: 1/11/2018 7:54:12 AM **Question Number - 1**

Plan pages 18 through 24 and pages 61 through 73 will not print out for this project.

Project No. 180130

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

FRA-93136 - US 33-09.33

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:49:35 AM **Question Number - 2**

Plan sheet 9/57 shows details for Manhole Reconstructed to Grade, APP and note 6 states payment for this item will be made at the contract unit price per each for Item 611-Manhole Reconstructed to Grade, As Per Plan but there is not a pay item included for this work. Please confirm if the intent for payment of this item was to be made under Line Item 0111 - Manhole Adjusted to Grade, APP.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 10:16:34 AM **Question Number - 1**

Please add pay items for excavation, embankment and the additional seeding and mulching quantities on page 49 of the Addendum #1 plans.

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 180131

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

GEA-92071 - US 422-16.38

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 2:20:10 PM **Question Number - 23**

Would the Department clarify the limits of Epoxy Urethane sealing of the substructure? Please see Sht. 66. Also as there is existing coatings on the abutments and wingwalls is the removal of ex. coatings incidental to the proposed sealing, or would the department set up a coating removed item.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 4:52:55 PM **Question Number - 22**

Will 611.12 performance inspection and 611.13 conduit/drainage structure evaluation be required for the temporary drainage items?

Performance inspections and evaluations will not be required for these Temporary Drainage Items

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 10:41:08 AM **Question Number - 21**

Does the TAF design as detailed in the plans provide for the "Standard Temporary Discharge" (discharge equal to twice the highest monthly flow without producing a rise in the backwater)?

The TAF design with 4-24" culverts does provide adequate conveyance to carry twice the max monthly flow without creating a rise in the backwater.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 9:56:59 AM **Question Number - 20**

A note on sheet 9/74, under ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, states that no asbestos containing material was identified on the bridge following an asbestos survey. However, a bid item has been set up for asbestos abatement. Please clarify if there is asbestos to be removed on the structure.

The note will be revised via addendum to indicate this pay Item is only for filling out and submitting the OEPA Demolition form

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 11:48:38 AM **Question Number - 19**

Please confirm the TAF as detailed in the plans has gone through the Waterway Permits Conditions article 11 submittal process and can be implemented without additional submittals and approvals.

. The contractor must provide ODOT with the items outlined in conditions 11, as the original plan for the TAF (which is the case for all projects with TAFs) was not developed to the level of detail required for construction. The contractor must work within the parameters of the fill quantities authorized in the special provisions and meet the flow requirements outlined in the condition, but has flexibility on how they design and construct the TAF.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 3:30:45 PM **Question Number - 18**

Has the Department considered all of the available options (precast or steel) to reconstruct the bridge deck? Will value engineering proposals be permitted that changes the deck design? Other deck designs would certainly be a method to have a chance at completing the work in one season.

Alternate Superstructures can be proposed as part of VECP process but existing structure is a 3 sided framed bent and any proposed superstructure replacement must be designed to be integral (moment and translation fixity) with the abutment walls. Bid-As-Is

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 1:11:45 PM **Question Number - 17**

Will the District allow the deck and approach slabs to be finished with hand screeds instead of a Bidwell? It is highly unlikely that a Bidwell can be utilized and perform as the deck cross section depicts. Also, there is no room to run the Bidwell with the current MOT setup. Please consider adding PN555 and this alternate deck finishing option to achieve the best possible finished product with an acceptable ride.

District will not allow hand finish screeds and PN 555 will not be added

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 3:00:24 PM **Question Number - 16**

Has the Department considered installing MOT crossovers and reconstructing the superstructure half at a time?

The contractor can propose Alt MOT as part of the VECP process but Bid-As-Is

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:58:49 PM **Question Number - 15**

No dowel details are provided at the construction joints of the bridge deck. How is the reinforcing to be continued at these joints? Please clarify or provide doweling details via addendum.

Dowels will be added to the mechanical connectors and the plan sheets updated via addendum. The quantity of reinforcing steel will change as a result.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:57:58 PM **Question Number - 14**

What is the normal water flow elevation of the Grand River at this site? Also, what is the stream bed elevation of the river at this site?

The Ordinary High Water Mark for the Grand River is shown on Sheet 55/74, as 1071.17. The stream bed elevation here is 1067.95.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:56:06 PM **Question Number - 13**

Please define the term "flow line" as shown on the profile section on page 55/74.

From the ODOT L&D Volume 2 Glossary of Terms: "Thalweg – The lowest bed elevation in a natural channel cross section. Also used in reference to the profile line extending down a channel along the lowest bed elevation."

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:54:56 PM **Question Number - 12**

What measures/methods are to be taken to divert flow within the River to allow for concrete patching of the existing abutments down to the flow line? Please advise.

This is Contractor determined means and methods.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:52:47 PM **Question Number - 11**

As shown on sheet 62, a W24x146 support beam and a W27x84 spacer beam are used for support in addition to slab forming. However, there is a void left near both ends of the bridge that leave the sloped deck forming unsupported. Please provide additional details illustrating how the forming in these areas is to be supported.

Detail is Conceptual- No other design details will be provided

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:48:33 PM **Question Number - 10**

How will a Bidwell run when pouring each of the phases? Can the Bidwell be run on the existing deck for phase 1? Where shall the Bidwell run and men work when pouring phase 2? Please advise.

These are Contractor determined means and methods but Yes, the Bidwell can rest on the existing deck during Phase 1 pouring. In Phase 2 the Bidwell can run on the 1' width behind the PCB. Flagging may be required for contractor access.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:46:58 PM **Question Number - 9**

With regard to the HP14x73 struts shown on sheet 62, are these struts needed in the area of deck removal only? Also, what elevation are the struts to be placed, and how will the struts be anchored? Please clarify and provide required details.

The elevation of the strut is 1' below the removal limit as shown in the plans. Yes, the struts are needed in the area of deck removal only.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:46:05 PM **Question Number - 8**

Please provide a transverse section of the proposed shoring as the current plan sheet is too vague to construct.

Shoring Details are conceptual and not intended as Shop Dwgs for Construction

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:45:15 PM **Question Number - 7**

Please provide complete details with dimensions of the TAF as shown in the plans and the allowable amount of fill permitted in the stream per the waterway permit. More TAF details are needed, especially since the designer has determined how to shore the new slab deck.

Top of fill and Pipe size values will be given in forthcoming addendum. No other TAF information will be provided

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:43:35 PM **Question Number - 6**

No size is provided for the temporary TAF pipes shown on sheet 62. What size pipe is to be used?

The pipe size will be shown on a revised sheet 62

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:42:36 PM **Question Number - 5**

Regarding the provided shoring plan, has the temporary access fill been analyzed to handle the load of the shoring/concrete deck as depicted in the contract plans? In addition, to what elevation shall the TAF be placed? Due to the nature of the in-stream shoring plan, will the TAF be constructed above the 100-year flood plain to avoid any potential high-water events? This information is necessary so that shoring heights can be determined.

The TAF shall be placed to 1'-0" above OHWM per the Bridge Design Manual. OHWM is at EL. 1071.17, so the TAF shall be placed to EL. 1072.17. Sheet 62 will be updated to reflect this. Remaining Design responsibility of Contractor.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:41:21 PM **Question Number - 4**

As an alternative to the provided temporary shoring design, will shoring materials be permitted to be anchored into the existing abutment walls? Please advise.

Temporary Shoring may be anchored to the existing Abutments. Details subject to the approval of the ODOT Engineer

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:40:17 PM **Question Number - 3**

A plan note on sheet 56 indicates that the provided temporary shoring design on sheet 62 may be used and constructed by the contractor. However, a note on sheet 62 states that the provided plan is schematic only, and that the contractor shall submit a design for the temporary shoring. Please clarify whether the contractor may use the provided shoring design or if the contractor is required to submit their own design.

The details shown on sheet 62 are conceptual only and the Contractor is required to complete the design or provide a alternate design as per CMS 501.05

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 2:38:42 PM **Question Number - 2**

Plan notes indicate that in stream work cannot begin before June 30, 2018. This restraint leaves only four months for construction and project completion as the TAF will be needed to perform most construction activities on this job. Please review and extend the proposed completion date to allow adequate construction time.

Waterway Permit Restrictions are from April 15 to June 30. Anticipated Contract award is end of Feb. If Contractor elects to use a Temp Access Fill for shoring it could be placed before April 15 th. The detail and notes on Sheet 62 do not preclude the Contractor from using a Shoring system anchored to the Existing Abutments and spanning the 40 ft +_ opening avoiding or minimizing the impacts on the stream. The project completion date will be extended to 11-15-2018

Question Submitted: 1/12/2018 11:56:59 AM **Question Number - 1**

Could the Department please provide the TAC Plan Sheet referenced in Note 4 Sheet 62/74?

Sheet 62/74 will be revised- Note reference to TAC will be removed. See future addendum

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180132

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

BEL-100999 - /MUS-SR 265/SR 376-04.59/00.00

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 6:56:04 PM **Question Number - 3**

On page 4 of the general notes, it states that traffic shall not run on a milled surface.(typical note in District 5) however, the next sentence reads that the bridges shall not be subjected to this note unless the adjacent pavement is being treated as such? In this case the entire project does not get milled throughout. The question is whether or not the bridges are to be treated as a true mill/fill or is the contractor allowed to mill and clean the bridge to wait for the mainline pavement to be placed with the rest of the project?

The note on page 4 allows the contractor to mill all bridges shown on page 12 prior to mainline paving. Please bid accordingly.

Project No. 180134

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

HAM-103505 - SR 126-19.40

Question Submitted: 2/10/2018 5:39:06 PM **Question Number - 8**

By adding Ref 200 Temporary Fence this will restrict the contractor from doing the re-movables and pouring the concrete back. With reduce work area on the right side of the structure the contractor needs to set in a closed lane on SR 126 working over the barrier to pick existing parapet and pour the concrete back for the deck section and parapets for both side. But with the vandal fence in place now the contractor will need to hand set the parapets and pump the concrete into the forms and pump the deck widening section also. The contractor will also need to close lanes on IR 71 to place concrete pumps. Is this what the department had envision when this addendum was added?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 1:53:27 PM **Question Number - 7**

Will there be a pay item added for Anti-Segregation Equipment for this project or will this be incidental to the asphalt item?

Anti-Segregation equipment is not required on this project. No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 10:53:13 AM **Question Number - 6**

Plan page 87 shows 220' of trench. Within the 220' is 75' of Jacked or Drilled. Is this incidental to the trench pay item?

75' of Jacked or Drilled conduit needs added to the plans. See forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 3:10:32 PM **Question Number - 5**

Please clarify Ref. #172 VPF is to have Truss Rods at End Panels per VPF-1-90 and not every space, as shown in Typical Elevations on Sheets #100 and #101.

The parapet elevations show a nonexclusive representation of the VPF to give the height, type, and limits of the fence. Diagonal truss rods shall be installed only at end panels and panels adjacent to deck expansion joints. Since the illustrations of the VPF are representative only, the components of the fence shall be fabricated and installed in accordance with the details on the standard construction drawings. No addendum required.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 1:58:04 PM **Question Number - 4**

Pay item 125 is described as "controller item misc.; model 170 with 332 cabinet and accessories". This does not match the controller spec on plan page 83. The plan spec requires "controller unit, type 2070E with ASC3 software, with cabinet, (by type), As Per Plan. Can an addendum be issued to clarify what controller requirements are correct.

See forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 2/3/2018 9:47:55 AM **Question Number - 3**

Will the department please upload the office calcs for this project.

Files have been placed on the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HAM-103505/Reference%20File/>

Question Submitted: 1/31/2018 12:19:34 PM **Question Number - 2**

The existing bridge deck is tined. Will the state require grooving the overlay area or can it be tined to match the existing.

The overlay should be tined to match the existing bridge deck. See forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 7:39:34 AM **Question Number - 1**

Would ODOT consider using concrete as an alternate for the asphalt base PG64-22? If this is an acceptable alternate please clarify class of concrete and thickness required.

ODOT will not consider changes to the type or buildup of permanent pavement. No addendum required.

Project No. 180135

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

HAR-93753 - SR 53-10.55

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 8:19:50 AM **Question Number - 4**

The plans call for a composite or polymer blockout for the MGS Bridge Terminal Assembly, Type 1. The two companies listed as ODOT approved suppliers for MGS blockout don't make blockout for MGS bridge terminal assemblies. Please provide approved supplier for polymer blockout or switch to standard wood blockout.

At this time, ODOT District One is not aware of an approved supplier for the polymer blockouts for the MGS Bridge Terminal Assembly, Type 1. Per this addendum, the plan note for ITEM 606 – MGS BRIDGE TERMINAL ASSEMBLY, TYPE 1, AS PER PLAN will be revised to allow wood blockouts if no approved alternative blockouts exist for the MGS BTA, Type 1.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 11:11:03 AM **Question Number - 3**

Line Item 35 calls for QC/QA concrete for 61 yards, but on Sheet 15 the quantity for 511 QC2 concrete does not include QC/QA. Does the department intend for the concrete to be QC/QA?

In a forthcoming addendum, Ref Item 35, Item 511, Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, Superstructure will be changed to Item 511, Class QC2 Concrete, Superstructure. The quantity of 61 CY will remain unchanged.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 12:54:49 PM **Question Number - 2**

Will PN 555 Surface Smoothness for Bridges and Approaches be required on this project?

No. The plans and related bid documents do not reference PN 555 and there is no intentions to provide or require PN 555, Surface Smoothness for Bridges and Approaches. There will be no plan changes or addendum required. Bid the project per the plans and related bid documents.

Project No. 180136

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

HAR-98218 - SRTS Kenton

Question Submitted: 1/31/2018 3:40:43 PM **Question Number - 1**

Bid item 27 Crosswalk, APP needs to be changed to polyester (643) per plans sheet 3.

Bid Item 27, Item 642, Crosswalk Line, As Per Plan will be changed to Item 643, Crosswalk Line, As Per Plan, in a forthcoming addendum. The quantity of 403 FT will remain the same.

Project No. 180137

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

HEN-102763 - SR 281-00.00 Resurf

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 9:11:57 AM **Question Number - 2**

The narrow lane widths on SR281 will not allow enough width for cones and a full lane of traffic during a one lane closure. Will the Department consider using Standard Drawing MT-97.11 rather than MT-97.12 for a flagger closing of 1 lane during paving?

Due to the project being a Federal Funded project, MT 97.12 shall be used.

Project No. 180138

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

HIG-93785 - US 50-06.76 Brdg Replace

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 7:28:59 PM **Question Number - 7**

The Pre-Phase stage in the maintaining traffic sequencing calls for MT95.45 to close shoulder to allow for guardrail to be removed and temporary pavement to be installed. This would require setting PCB on the existing 2' shoulder. To allow enough clearance from the existing lane the PCB would be past edge of pavement. Can this work be completed under temporary signals with westbound US 50 land closure?

An addendum will be issued to clarify the MOT requirements for the pre-phase construction.

*** 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: 2/7/2018 8:27:30 AM **Question Number - 6**

Are there plans available for the existing bridge and retaining walls that could be posted online?

Files have been posted to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HIG-93785/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 10:26:24 AM **Question Number - 5**

will the department please upload the office calcs for this project.

Files have been posted to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/HIG-93785/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 9:16:35 AM **Question Number - 4**

On sheet 19 ref R9 is 364' of Pipe Removed over 30". This pipe is not shown on crosssections and appears partially fall under existing pavement that will not be removed. Can size and approximate depth of this pipe be provided and can it be filled in place in lieu of removal?

You apparently refer to R8 which is PIPE REMOVED, OVER 24". This pipe is shown in the cross sections as a 30" pipe. The existing condition of the pipe is uncertain. Remove the pipe.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:49:50 PM **Question Number - 3**

There is a quantity of (6) ea. in the proposal set up for Work Zone Lighting System. How is this item being quantified. There is two locations set up for Phase 1 & 2, there are 2 locations set up for 3 & 4. Where are the remaining locations to be installed?

This question will be addressed in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:24:40 PM **Question Number - 2**

There is a quantity of (4) ea. Work Zone Traffic Signal set up in the proposal. Is the intent to pay for one temporary signal per Phase? One location is set up for Phases 1 & 2. One location is set up for Phases 3 & 4. Please advise.

This question will be addressed in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 10:49:09 AM **Question Number - 1**

Page 44/64 has the pay length of the CONDUIT TYPE A at 66' while the actual length is 76'as shown on page 51/64. Please clarify.

The correct quantity is 76'. An addendum will be issued shortly.

Project No. 180139

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

JEF-95564 - SR 7-00.20

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:54:21 PM **Question Number - 2**

The quantity for wearing course removed is 1,840 SY. The dimensions on page 25 for the wear course removed are 80' x 23' (1,840 SF). The wear course item quantity should be 205 SY. This change will also affect the tack coat and A/C Surface quantities.

The Item 202 - Wearing Course Removed quantity of 1,840 Sq. Yd. on sheet 25 is incorrect along with the Item 407 – Tack coat and Item 442 – Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, 12.5 mm, Type B (446), As Per Plan quantities. These changes are anticipated to be made in Addendum Number 1.

Project No. 180140

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

LAW-83064 - US 52-02.17

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 3:16:41 PM **Question Number - 1**

JUST REALIZED THERE IS NO BID ITEM FOR THE 848 VARIABLE THICKNESS MATERIAL ONLY WHICH IS PART OF THE 848 SPEC

Project No. 180142

Sale Date - 3/22/2018

LUC-85266 - SR 25-07.82 Bridge

Question Submitted: 2/11/2018 6:01:10 PM **Question Number - 49**

Bid Item 135 description does not agree with pole 4-1 description on Sh 140

The bid item description listed in the proposal matches the description on plan sheet 140.

*** 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: 2/9/2018 8:11:20 AM **Question Number - 48**

Will revised drawings be released before the bid for new beam splice locations and beam splice details ?

Yes, revised drawings will be issued in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 10:55:19 AM **Question Number - 47**

During Phase 4, the plans call out to remove temp pavement to the edge of permanent pavement in order to install curb and gutter. Would the department allow the temp pavement to be left in place for the 2' between permanent and the gutter?

The temporary pavement may be left in place provided that the buildup of the temporary pavement matches that of the proposed permanent pavement.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 10:04:50 AM **Question Number - 46**

For the VPF on the bridge, plan sheet 176 calls out PS-1 post. Which base plate (BP-3 or BP-4) is required? Neither base plate is called out. Please clarify.

Per ODOT Standard Drawing VPF-1-90, BP-3 base plate shall be used for BR-2 barriers.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 9:56:44 AM **Question Number - 45**

At the end of the existing wing wall on the Northeast sector there is an existing stone wall. Plans do not address/show this wall, please identify work involved with existing stone wall.

Removal of the existing stone wingwall in the Northeast corner shall be included with Line Item 173 - Structure Removed for payment.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 5:22:49 PM **Question Number - 44**

Pay Item 142 requires an Eagle M50 controller to be supplied. The city of Toledo is also using Econolite controllers. Would an addendum be issued to allow Econolite controllers

The description of the traffic signal controller will be revised in Addendum 4 to also allow an Econolite controller.

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 2:51:58 PM **Question Number - 43**

Can the State owned property at 802 Mill St be used for a field office location? If so, will any fees be assessed for its use?

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 2:13:51 PM **Question Number - 42**

Will permanent casing be required for the caissons? Note #2 on Sheet 172/214 details a minimum 5/8" thickness for drilled shafts in their final in-service condition.

Permanent casing will not be required. The plan note will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/3/2018 10:03:27 AM **Question Number - 41**

Plan Sheet 19/214 in MOT Section B, calls for removing 4' of the existing bridge and approach median. After removal plan states place concrete overlay. Please define type of concrete overlay, quantity and where it should be included for payment?

Payment for this is included with Line Item 166 - Roads for Maintaining Traffic under the second item "ASPHALT CONCRETE OVERLAY AT THE LOCATION OF THE CONCRETE MEDIAN REMOVAL", as shown on plan sheet 13. The overlay should be 3" asphalt instead of concrete.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 4:44:21 PM **Question Number - 40**

WZ Pavement Marking quantities are set up to restore markings to their existing configuration in areas outside of the proposed pavement limits. However, the proposed pavement markings only cover the area within the proposed pavement limits. Are the WZ markings sufficient for these areas? If not, how will the proposed pavement markings be paid for outside of the proposed pavement limits?

Permanent pavement markings to restore the existing markings between the proposed project limits and the proposed work limits at the completion of the project will be added in a forthcoming addendum. The quantities will be based on the Maintenance of Traffic design presented in the plans and are to be placed as directed by the Engineer.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 4:42:52 PM **Question Number - 39**

The "Temporary Pavement Markings" note on sheet 13 states to use "removeable" markings outside of the proposed pavement limits. Is the intent of this note to require temporary tape on surfaces that do not get resurfaced in this project? This project is required to be in phase during the winter season. Will tape be required over the winter season?

The resurfacing limits at the South project limits will be revised in a forthcoming addendum. Temporary tape will not be required on the project.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 4:41:14 PM **Question Number - 38**

The number of trains stated in SC-1 is 89 trains per day, that is an average of 3.7 trains every hour passing through the project. Note 13I states no equipment or load movement within 25' or above a standing train or railroad equipment. Note 13J states that all operating equipment within 25' of track must halt operations when a train is passing. Will the contractor be able to schedule the necessary amount track time during false deck installation and removal, bridge demolition, steel erection, deck forming and stripping and deck concrete placement operations?

Work shall be bid to comply with the railroad special clauses in the proposal. The Contractor shall bid the work anticipating that trains may stop under the bridge and no work within 25' of the stopped train may take place. In the event rail traffic exceeds that given in the special clauses on a regular basis, time extension requests may be submitted to the Project Engineer as per C&MS 108.06 for review and consideration for approval. Special attention should be directed to C&MS 108.02.F in that mitigation of any issue, whether caused by the Department, Contractor, third-party or intervening event is a shared contract and legal requirement.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 4:39:22 PM **Question Number - 37**

The railroad special clauses on sheet SC-1 states the number of trains passing through this location is 4 passenger trains at a max speed of 79 mph and 85 freight trains at max speed of 60 mph. Trains have been observed parked under the bridge, please verify the number of trains and speeds. Will the contractor be allowed to proceed with construction activities within 25' of the track centerline when trains are stopped under the bridge? If not, will additional calendar days be added to the completion for lost days?

Work shall be bid to comply with the railroad special clauses in the proposal. The Contractor shall bid the work anticipating that trains may stop under the bridge and no work within 25' of the stopped train may take place. In the event rail traffic exceeds that given in the special clauses on a regular basis, time extension requests may be submitted to the Project Engineer as per C&MS 108.06 for review and consideration for approval. Special attention should be directed to C&MS 108.02.F in that mitigation of any issue, whether caused by the Department, Contractor, third-party or intervening event is a shared contract and legal requirement.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 4:20:25 PM **Question Number - 36**

How is the wearing course removed on the deck and approach slabs paid for? Shouldn't there be a pay item for this?

An item for wearing course removed on the deck and approach slabs will be added to the contract in Addendum 4.

Question Submitted: 2/1/2018 10:08:43 AM **Question Number - 35**

Expanding on Question #32, if the end span beams were changed from W33x201 to W33x263 matching the center span the bolted splices could be relocated. This will allow beam lengths to be roll in one piece from mill. Received additional information the maximum one piece from mills may only be approximately 115LF.

The Department has confirmed that 130 LF sections of the W33x263 are able to be produced by steel mills. The center section (W33x263) will be reduced in length by moving both field splice #1 and #2 closer to the piers and will result in an overall segment length of 130 LF. The field splices will also be redesigned. Plan sheet changes will be issued in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/31/2018 11:08:31 AM **Question Number - 34**

Sheet 44 & 52 call out an area to have 2" milling and temporary overlay at the crossover. It doesn't not appear that this area has been included in the Pavement for maintaining traffic item. What item is this work to be paid under?

The 2" pavement planing and temporary pavement overlay areas shown on plan sheets 44 & 52 are included with Line Item 166 - Roads for Maintaining Traffic. This work is part of the first item in the note for Roads for Maintaining Traffic on plan sheet 13.

Question Submitted: 1/31/2018 10:58:33 AM **Question Number - 33**

Please verify the quantity for 19MM intermediate. After reviewing the office calculations, its appears that the 12.5MM and 19MM were calculated using the same lift thickness.

The incorrect lift thickness was used in the calculation of the 19MM intermediate course. The quantity will be revised to 532 CY in Addendum 2.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/31/2018 8:29:24 AM **Question Number - 32**

The structural steel Beam Elevation is shown on Plan Sheet 174/214. The center section of the W33x263 is 145'-11" long, steel fabricators have informed us steel mills will roll the W33 at a maximum of 130LF. Will ODOT allow Field Splice #1 to be move into the center section between the piers, allowing all W33 Section lengths less than 130LF ?

N&SRR construction and maintenance requirements do not allow splices to be located in between the piers due to the location of future tracks. The center section (W33x263) will be reduced in length by moving both field splice #1 and #2 closer to the piers and will result in an overall segment length of 130 linear feet. The field splices will also be redesigned. Plan sheet changes will be issued in a forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 9:54:51 AM **Question Number - 31**

Pre-Bid Question # 12 ODOT added dowel holes for the crashwall to pier column connection. Will ODOT add dowel holes for bridge deck to inside railing connect as shown on Sheet 186/214 Section B-B. Believe dowel A801 in Section B-B should be S801.

Dowel holes for the inside railing connection have been added to the quantity. The bar mark call out has been updated. Revised plan sheets will be issued in Addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 8:10:26 AM **Question Number - 30**

Sheet 11 under petroleum contaminated soils lists the work involving petroleum contaminated soil to be 400 gal and the bidform states the quantity is 400 ton, which is correct?

The unit should be "ton" instead of "gal" on plan sheet 11. A revised plan sheet 11 will be issued with Addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 8:08:48 AM **Question Number - 29**

Sheet 10 under asbestos abatement lists the quantity to be removed as 20 cy of material and the bidform states the quantity is 20 CF, which is correct?

The asbestos abatement will be changed to a lump sum item in Addendum 2. Revised plan sheets 10 and 86 will be issued in Addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 8:07:04 AM **Question Number - 28**

Sheet 11 environmental work states no clearing of trees between April 1 and September 30 due to the Indiana Bat and Northern Long Eared Bat. Sheet 8 shows 11 trees between 18" and 48" to be removed. Can the note be changed to allow the clearing to be completed this season?

All trees that meet the definition of bat habitat have been, or will be, cut down prior to March 31st. The Contractor will still be responsible for removing the felled trees, stumps and smaller brush from the project, however, there are no time restrictions for the completion of this work.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 7:55:15 AM **Question Number - 27**

The detail on page 7 shows the Curb, Type 2-B as 11.25" tall which is the same height as the adjacent asphalt. Should this be 17.25"?

Type 6 curb should be used in place of the Type 2-B, and it should be standard height. Revised plan sheets 3, 7 and 87 will be issued with Addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 7:52:10 AM **Question Number - 26**

Based on the plan quantities it appears that the curb/curb & gutter will be measured and paid separately in front of the curb ramps. Please clarify if this is the case or if the curb/curb & gutter will be paid as SF of curb ramp.

The curb/curb and gutter within the curb ramp area is included in the payment for the curb ramp as stated in SCD BP-7.1. Curb/curb & gutter in front of curb ramps would be excluded from curb/curb & gutter quantities. Curbs around Curtis St. intersection were overlooked and will be added in Addendum 2. A revised plan sheet 87 will be issued with Addendum 2 indicating updated quantities.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 2:34:39 PM **Question Number - 25**

The curb on the intersecting streets is setup as Curb, Type 2-B. Per standard drawing BP-5.1, this is generally used when the proposed curb is sitting on concrete base. Please clarify

Type 6 curb should be used in place of the type 2-B. Revised plan sheets 3, 7 and 87 will be issued with Addendum 2.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 2:32:04 PM **Question Number - 24**

The curb step detail on pages 4 and 5 shows the curb and gutter as 11.25" tall, measured from the top of the curb. Should this dimension apply to the gutter thickness only? Please clarify.

The 11.25" dimension is for the gutter plate thickness only. The dimension shown on plan sheets 4 and 5 should read 17.25". Revised plan sheets 4 and 5 will be issued with Addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 10:00:59 AM **Question Number - 23**

On sheet 46/214 the plans call for an asphalt overlay of the area where the existing concrete median is to be removed. How is the asphalt overlay work to be paid for?

The asphalt overlay at the location of the concrete median removal shall be included in Line Item 166 - Roads for Maintaining Traffic as indicated on plan sheet 13.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 9:34:05 AM **Question Number - 22**

Bid Item # 15 Roadway Excavation quantity does not include the slope area between the abutments and piers, on previous ODOT projects this quantity has been included in roadway excavation. Plan notes do not address this area, reviewing office calculations it appears this excavation may be included in Unclassified Excavation APP lump sum. Please review, we believe this excavation should be included in the roadway item as done in the past.

The excavation between the proposed abutments and existing abutments shall be included in Line Item 178 - Unclassified Excavation, As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 12:57:34 PM **Question Number - 21**

On plan page 150/214 it shows an existing floor at elevation 614.40, how thick is this floor that needs removed?

A report titled "LUC-85266 Remnant Canal Lock Exploration Report.pdf" can be found on the ftp site at: [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/This report details all information known about the existing structure floor that is to be removed.](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/This%20report%20details%20all%20information%20known%20about%20the%20existing%20structure%20floor%20that%20is%20to%20be%20removed)

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 12:50:26 PM **Question Number - 20**

Does the existing sheet pile located in front of existing concrete abutments get cut off to the abutment removal line of elev. 594?

The existing sheet pile located in front of the existing concrete abutments should be removed to the limits of Item 202 Structure Removed, Over 20 Foot Span, As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 12:42:38 PM **Question Number - 19**

The plan notes states that we are to protect tracks from loose stones, concrete etc. falling onto RR, what is the minimum clearance from the center of tracks to the temp. structure needed to keep rock from falling onto tracks during abutment demo?

Track clearances are provided in the Railroad Special Clauses which are included as part of the proposal.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 12:31:52 PM **Question Number - 18**

On plan page 150/214 is shows an existing floor at elevation 614.40, how this is this floor that needs to be removed?

A report titled "LUC-85266 Remnant Canal Lock Exploration Report.pdf" can be found on the ftp site at: [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/This report details all information known about the existing structure floor that is to be removed.](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/This%20report%20details%20all%20information%20known%20about%20the%20existing%20structure%20floor%20that%20is%20to%20be%20removed)

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 10:57:54 AM **Question Number - 17**

Can pavement calculations be made available?

The pavement calculations can be found on the ftp site at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 1/25/2018 12:33:07 PM **Question Number - 16**

on plan page 187/214 it shows the form liner for on the inside parapet, will a mock up panel be required for this, and if so how will this be paid for?

A test panel shall be constructed for approval by the Engineer. Payment for the test panel shall be incidental to Line Item 187 – Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, Bridge Deck (Parapet), As Per Plan.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/23/2018 2:23:04 PM **Question Number - 15**

The inside railing Stage 1 reinforcing steel has mechanical connectors at top of deck, which will allow bridge deck finishing machine to pass over and continue to edge of deck, thus finishing the entire deck in Stage 1. Understand this is for MOT. Would ODOT add mechanical connectors to inside railing Stage 2 allowing the finishing machine to travel to edge of deck not having to stop at reinforcing steel for inside rail? See plan Sheet 186/214 & 215.

Using mechanical connectors on the inside railing in Stage 2 is an acceptable alternative that may be proposed by the Contractor during construction.

Question Submitted: 1/23/2018 10:56:28 AM **Question Number - 14**

On plan page 186/214 note #3 directs you to SBR-1-13 for sawcut details. In looking at the sawcut details it points out the use of 1/2" diameter GFRP bars, are they going to be required on the inside railing item?

The GFRP bars at the sawcuts are not required for the inside railing item.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 5:20:37 PM **Question Number - 13**

Sheet 99 is missing from the downloaded PDF.

Plan sheet 99 is available on the downloadable plan set available at the Office of Contract Sales website.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 2:56:22 PM **Question Number - 12**

Plan Sheet 141/214 shows P517 reinforcing doweled into pier columns for crashwalls. Will ODOT add a bid item for Item 510 Dowel Holes or are they incidental to another item ?

A quantity of 520 Dowel Holes with Nonshrink, Nonmetallic grout will be added to the plans in Addendum 2.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 2:48:51 PM **Question Number - 11**

We understand that the contractor is responsible for any design to the bridge components when using SIP forms. Given the beam sizes (W33) and beam spacing (8'-9"), has the designer included any additional dead load to support the use of SIP forms? If not, can the electronic design files be made available to the contractor to verify if the beam sizes and spacing shown on the plans can support the SIP alternative (dead load of the SIP forms plus the weight of the additional concrete)?

The beams were designed to accommodate an additional Stay In Place Form Dead Load of 0.015 KSF. This dead load however, was taken back out when reporting the camber and deflections shown in the plans.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 10:37:50 AM **Question Number - 10**

Is the formliner which is shown on plan page 187/214 and is to be used on front face of barrier on bridge incidental to ref 187?

The formliner that is shown on plan sheet 187/214 shall be used on the front face of the parapet. All work associated with the parapet formliner shall be incidental to Line Item 187 – Class QC2 Concrete with QC/QA, Bridge Deck (Parapet), As Per Plan.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 3:37:54 PM **Question Number - 8**

On plan page 150/214 it shows several buried structures to be removed, are there any available drawings showing these structures?

The buried structures to be removed are locks from the Miami-Erie Canal. A lock exploration report has been placed on the ftp site at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 2:15:23 PM **Question Number - 7**

On plan page 146/214 it has listed 63 lf of prebored holes APP with reference to structure sheet 14, but there is nothing shown or noted on sheet 14 referring to prebored holes. Please Clarify.

The sheet reference in the estimated quantities table should be to structure sheet 13/56. There is a note on structure sheet 13/56 for prebored holes.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 12:58:05 PM **Question Number - 6**

Could the existing structure drawings be made available?

The existing bridge plans have been posted to the ftp site at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 10:12:25 AM **Question Number - 5**

Regarding Ref. 39 Asbestos Abatement, the plan notes on sheet 10 indicate that a copy of the asbestos report will be given to the contractor at the pre-construction meeting. Please provide the survey report prior to the bid if available, so that we know what type of material is being removed.

The asbestos inspection reports for the LUC-25-0792 structure and the building on Parcel 14 will be issued in Addendum 1.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 10:10:44 AM **Question Number - 4**

The bid item description for Ref. 146 indicates a 1-story brick commercial building and parking lot on parcel 18. The plan notes on Sheet 10 imply that there are multiple buildings, but give an address of 7 City Park Ave., which appears to be a single building on sheet 206 on parcel 14, at the intersection of City Park and Anthony Wayne Trail. Please clarify whether this is the only building, or if there are others.

There is only a single building to be demolished as part of the contract, as shown on sheet 206, parcel 14, at the intersection of City Park and Anthony Wayne Trail.

Question Submitted: 1/12/2018 3:27:32 PM **Question Number - 3**

Will ODOT make available to bidders existing bridge drawings.

The existing bridge plans have been posted to the ftp site at: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/>

Question Submitted: 1/10/2018 11:11:46 AM **Question Number - 2**

The proposal for this project includes 5 separate reference items for the work involved with the Temporary Shoring walls. References 176, 177, 182, 204, and 205. To remain consistent with past practices, and allow for alternate wall designs all of these items should be incidental to Reference 177.

Line Items 176, 182, 204 and 205 will be removed in Addendum 1. All work associated with the temporary shoring walls shall be included in Line Item 177 - Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing.

Question Submitted: 1/8/2018 10:01:24 AM **Question Number - 1**

Can the existing bridge plans be made available?

Office Calculations have been posted at the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LUC-85266/Reference%20Files/>

Project No. 180144

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

MIA-95925 - US 36-11.34

Question Submitted: 2/3/2018 11:00:08 AM **Question Number - 2**

There is currently no field office bid item for this job, does ODOT wish to have a field office Type B on this job?

A forthcoming addendum will add this pay item.

Question Submitted: 2/1/2018 7:31:40 AM **Question Number - 1**

Would the district consider extending the completion date on this project to 10/31/18 to take full advantage of the 2018 construction season?

No. Bid per plan.

Project No. 180145

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

MOT-102303 - BP FY18

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 10:02:05 AM **Question Number - 11**

Will the dept consider a revised traffic plan to utilize temp traffic control instead of perm traffic control. Temp traffic will only be utilized during night time restrictions within districts times listed. causing less impact on public.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 3:13:51 PM **Question Number - 10**

For bridge MOT-675-0233 the MOT note on page 5 does not match the drawings on page 41-42. The notes say to close only the shoulders with portable concrete barrier while the drawings show actual lane closures with portable concrete barrier. There is not a drawing for stage 2 of this structure. Is it safe to assume that MOT stage 2 on page 5 is to be followed? Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:40:29 PM **Question Number - 9**

How will rain/ lost days days effect your consecutive per bridge ?

Weather days are to be handled as outlined in the C&MS 108.06.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:34:18 PM **Question Number - 8**

Does closing the adjacent lanes at night count toward your consecutive days ?

As listed in the plans, all work to be completed in each phase utilizing MOT with duration restrictions is subjected to that phase's duration restrictions.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:29:49 PM **Question Number - 7**

Please add more days in your consecutive days per stags WITH ALL BRIDGES in order to complete work TURN KEY.

Bid per plan.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:25:32 PM **Question Number - 6**

Bridge No 75-0259 and 75-0261 have higher clearance then other bridge. Why cant we deck these bridges with a platform system for access prior New plan notes says not over live traffic with any vertical restrictions.

Bid per plan.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 7:01:27 PM **Question Number - 5**

Traffic Control : Why can't the contractor use rapid deployment method over the traveling lanes at night during the permitted lane closers ?

Bid per plan.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 6:51:45 PM **Question Number - 4**

Under Traffic sequences does the consecutive days allowed included rigging and containing the structure ?

The times listed in the plans are for the duration of all necessary work to complete each stage.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 1:14:20 PM **Question Number - 3**

Please provide maximum heights needed for traveling traffic under each structure on project.

Painting is to be done behind detailed traffic control. No reduction to the existing vertical clearances will be allowed as part of this project. Addendum will be forthcoming to modify the note on sheet 5 for clarification.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 11:42:21 AM **Question Number - 2**

Please provide stations on the maintenance of traffic drawings. This is needed to estimate how much striping removal is required for all the stages of traffic.

Sufficient dimensions and details are included in the plans to estimate this quantity.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 12:12:20 PM **Question Number - 1**

Maintenance of traffic notes sequence of construction : Is it mandatory to follow the plan sequence of construction per stages and the use of barrier wall on the entire project?

Yes. Bid per plan.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180146

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

MOT-97242 - SR 235-01.77 R

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 2:21:24 PM **Question Number - 4**

The "Proposed Minimum Vertical Clearance" is 16.90' as noted on page 27/47 of the plan sheets. How much can the Vertical Clearance be reduced during construction to allow for the falsework needed to form the exterior edge of the deck slab and provide a platform for the screed?

The permitted temporary vertical clearance on this project will be the Required Minimum Vertical Clearance listed in the plans. An addendum is forthcoming to clarify, include a notification to the Special Hauling Permits Section if the vertical clearance is lowered from the Existing Minimum Vertical Clearance, and to limit the location of beam inserts.

Question Submitted: 2/1/2018 8:22:40 AM **Question Number - 3**

The note on page 3/47 of the plan sheets has a maximum height of 88 feet for construction equipment. Is this elevation based on an elevation above the S.R. 235 proposed bridge deck? If so, can the contractor exceed this height if working from the I.R. 70 ramp 16.9 feet below the new bridge? (I.e. for beam removal and erection)

The 88 ft. maximum height for construction equipment is based off an elevation on S.R. 235 of 861.00. The maximum equipment height of 88 ft. can be exceeded if equipment is set on the ramp below the bridge. The equipment must stay under an elevation of 949.00 with no coordination necessary with the airport owner. If equipment is above elevation 949.00, coordination is necessary per the plan note.

Project No. 180147

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

MOT-103055 - CS Washington Church Road

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 4:37:06 PM **Question Number - 1**

On page 4 of the plans, it describes the partial depth repairs, but not the depth. Can that please be given?

The quantity is based on a 3" (three inch) repair depth from the planed surface. A note will be provided on revised plan sheet.

Project No. 180150

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

POR-102352 - MCRO FY2018(B)

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:06:47 AM **Question Number - 1**

Will the Department issue an addendum to reflect the specification change for the Item #421 Microsurfacing dated 1/19/18 as they did for project #180057 in the 1 February Letting.

An addendum will be filed to reflect this

Project No. 180151

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

SAN-102035 - SR 53-06.02 sgnl Sfty

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 2:23:26 PM **Question Number - 2**

Pay item 28 is for a cabinet, type TS-2, As Per Plan. Is a controller to be provided by the contractor with the cabinet? The As Per Plan note on plan page 6 does not give any details on the controller. Can additional information be provided on if this is required and if so what type?

As indicated in the Cabinet, TS2, AS PER PLAN note, the controller will be supplied by the district.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 10:58:32 AM **Question Number - 1**

plan page 6 has a note for 632 Combination signal supports, TC-81.21. In the note plan calls for a design 13 pole and a design 11 arm. The design 11 arm goes to 45' max. length. Two plan poles exceed that. Please review and correct

Design 11 was removed from the note. The note is to show there is a light pole extension on the pole.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180152

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

SHE-102052 - Main St-SR 65-05.47

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 6:21:29 PM **Question Number - 4**

For the Decorative lighting, will Sternberg be considered an approved equal to the specified Holophane items? Ref 015 - Sternberg's Agusta Pole 4214FP5/DBA/FH series Ref 022 - Sternberg's G77LED/996/4L40T3 series Ref 038 - Sternberg's 1914LED/3L40T3/MDL06 series

No

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 6:00:01 PM **Question Number - 3**

For the Signal Supports, bid ref 058-062, will Millerbernd be considered as an approved equal to the specified Valmont product?

No

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 6:34:30 AM **Question Number - 2**

Does ODOT have any additional details on the size and type of the UST? Can we get a copy of the Phase 1 or 2 ESA? Neither of these locations have tanks listed with BUSTR.

Two orphaned curb-side tanks are assumed present and the project should be bid as such. Tanks at the site would date from 1920s to 1970s. No other details regarding the tanks are available. No Phase 1 or 2 ESA was completed.

Question Submitted: 1/11/2018 7:47:22 AM **Question Number - 1**

Plan sheets 7 through 10 will not print for this project.

Project No. 180153

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

SUM-87286 - IR 271-06.62

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 12:19:51 PM **Question Number - 6**

The Permitted Lane Closure table for this section of I-271 does not indicate that a lane closure is NOT permitted at any time of the day but there is a note underneath the table that states "NB- all lanes open between 6am to 10am and between 4pm to 6pm, Monday thru Friday SB- all lanes open between 3pm and 6pm, Monday thru Friday". Please verify that all lanes must be open for these specific times.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 9:20:46 AM **Question Number - 5**

Plan sheet 16/17 shows the damaged area of steel to be located at the east fascia beam. Following a site visit it looks like the damage is on the west fascia beam. Are there 2 damage locations?

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 1:42:30 PM **Question Number - 4**

Plan sheet 15/17 has a Jacking & Temp Support As per plan, note that references repairs in Table 3 and table 5. I am unable to find any Table 3 or Table 5 in the plans. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 2:12:31 PM **Question Number - 3**

The time limitation for traffic on a milled surface is 3 days per sheet 5 and the repair items 251 and 255 are to be performed after the pavement planing per sheet 4. 3 days is not enough time to perform these items of work and still get the paving done. Please change the allowable time frame for traffic on a milled surface to 14 days.

The time frame and plan notes will be adjusted in an upcoming addendum to better coordinate the work.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 2:15:29 PM **Question Number - 2**

Please provide the office calculations for the Level UF. They are not listed on the FTTP site.

On the FTP website, please see the calculations for "portions of structure removed, APP (secondary members)." Quantity for extrusion repair was field measured.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 10:48:39 AM **Question Number - 1**

Please provide existing structure plans for SUM-8-12.71

Existing plans have been submitted. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/SUM-87286/Reference%20Files/>

Project No. 180154

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

TUS-98266 - SR 416-09.85

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 2:05:50 PM **Question Number - 1**

Can the concrete repairs be performed during day time work hours?

The concrete repairs can be performed during daytime work hours as long as 1 lane of traffic in each direction is maintained at all times.

Project No. 180156

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

CLA-97956 - SMOOTH FY2018

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 7:53:51 AM **Question Number - 4**

Due to the high production of the 617 berm item, can the plan note restricting the work zone to maximum of 2 miles be removed for this item?

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 9:59:27 AM **Question Number - 3**

Will short term closures be allowed for paving the ramps or will traffic be required to be maintained during this process?

Short term closures will be permitted for ramp paving work. A note will be added to the plans to restrict work on the ramps between the hours of 8pm and 6am, 7 days a week.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 9:23:06 AM **Question Number - 2**

Is it ODOT's intent to abandon in place all of the existing loop detector lead-in cable, pull boxes and conduit for the existing loop detection?

These items will be abandon in place.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 8:47:55 AM **Question Number - 1**

Pay item 37 calls our (stop-bar and advanced radar detection) this pay item should say (stop-bar radar detection)

Pay Item 37 (stop-bar and advanced radar detection) will be revised in an upcoming addendum.

Project No. 180161

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

CAR-102338 - SR 9-14.61

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:09:05 AM **Question Number - 1**

Will the Department issue an addendum to reflect the specification change for the Item #421 Microsurfacing dated 1/19/18 as they did for project #180057 in the 1 February Letting.

The Department will not issue an addendum for the Item 421 - Microsurfacing specification change. The current Title Sheet for the project has a Supplemental Specification 800 date of 1/19/18 which includes the Item 421 - Microsurfacing specification change.

Project No. 180162

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

CLA-94791 - Enon Main St Improvements

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 9:09:35 AM **Question Number - 1**

Ref 48 - In effort to calculate loading, what is length and width of banner.

The banner is to be 18"wide by36"tall. An addendum adding these dimensions to sheet 47 is forthcoming.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180167

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

GEA-85217 - SR 528-16.48

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 3:33:12 PM **Question Number - 2**

HOW IS THE CONTRACTOR PAID FOR THE EXCAVATION REQUIRED TO INSTALL THE 304 AGGREGATE BASE?

Excavation quantity will be provided in forthcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 3:32:11 PM **Question Number - 1**

HOW IS THE CONTRACTOR PAID FOR MILLING OF BUTT JOINTS AT CROSS STREETS AND INTERSECTIONS?

Pavement Planing will be provided for butt joints in forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 180168

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

HIG-101462 - CR 1159 (Harry Sauner Rd.)

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 9:38:48 AM **Question Number - 1**

The pipe run from Structure 3 to HW 2.1 @ STA 34+00 RT is listed in the general summary and sub-summary as Type B pipe. However on the storm sewer profile sheet as well as Plan & Profile sheets this run is listed as Type C. Please clarify which type this run of pipe should be.

Item 611E04600 12" Conduit, Type C is correct. Addendum will be forthcoming.

Project No. 180174

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

MOT-100962 - US 35/US 40-04.05/11.69

Question Submitted: 2/16/2018 7:59:24 AM **Question Number - 1**

Is it ODOT's intent to abandon in place all of the existing loop detector wire, pull boxes and conduit for the existing loop detection at the intersection of US40 & Fredrick Pike where the radar detection is being installed?

Yes abandon all existing detection cable, boxes, conduit, etc...

Project No. 180180

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

SUM-94117 - SR 91-VAR

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 11:11:40 AM **Question Number - 1**

The time limitation for traffic on a milled surface is 3 days per sheet 7 and the repair item 251 and the shoulder and wheel track repair are to be performed after the pavement planing per sheet 5. 3 days is not enough time to perform these items of work and still get the paving done. Please change the allowable time frame for traffic on a milled surface to 14 days.

We will revise this note to 7 days on sheet 7 via addendum

Project No. 180181

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

TRU-97934 - Tibbetts Wick (CR-28)

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 11:07:09 AM **Question Number - 2**

With regard to the office calcs link provided, it appears the pavement calculations are missing at least one page. Could the Department please review this.

District concurs with the contractor. One page of the office calculations is missing. The reference (zip) file will be revised to add the page.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 2:37:01 PM **Question Number - 1**

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

Reference Files have been posted: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/TRU-97934/REFERENCE%20FILE/>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 180182

Sale Date - 3/8/2018

WOO-97012 - SR 579-00.00

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 4:26:16 PM **Question Number - 4**

Can the department make existing structure drawings available on the FTP site?

Existing structure drawings are made available. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/WOO-97012/Reference%20Only/>

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 2:08:27 PM **Question Number - 3**

It appears that Item 202 wearing course removed is not show in the typical sections, but only shown in the sub summary. Please update the typical sections to reflect this and specify a depth of removal.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 3:16:56 PM **Question Number - 2**

Question #1 asked for an extension of the completion date, but it does not appear that Addendum #1 has provided a new completion date. Please issue another addendum to address this issue.

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 11:15:40 AM **Question Number - 1**

This project bids on March 3, 2018 with a completion date of July 1, 2018 and a 60-day road closure. All lanes must be open to traffic on Easter and Memorial Day. This leaves a window of April 2 to May 29 to complete the project. To be awarded, get a signed contract, have a preconstruction meeting, get materials and be ready to start on April 2 does not seem possible. Could the completion date be changed so that the project could start after July 4th?

Please see forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 181014

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

OTT-101240 - /SAN-SR 590-04.02/06.55

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 4:29:00 PM **Question Number - 1**

This project includes bid item 209 linear grading. Please explain the intended use of this bid item. CMS section 422.06 surface preparation, paragraph 2 states to remove all existing pavement markings except 740.02(traffic paint), other than removal of RR symbols, are there any other pavement markings that require removal.

It is used in the area prior to placing Item 617 Compacted Aggregates.

There are no other pavement markings that require removal

Project No. 181016

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

D01-103424 - HS FY18

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:41:03 PM **Question Number - 1**

1) Being there are no off road spraying listed in the plan, does that mean there will be no fence line spraying as well?

Correct, there will be no fence line spraying. Bid the project per the plans and related bid documents and items. No addendum or plan change is required.

Project No. 181018

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

FRA-106168 - EXPO FY18

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 1:11:20 PM **Question Number - 4**

For the #511 Perimeter Curb Planing, is there a particular method that ODOT prefers? Micro milling or horizontal saw cutting?

The plans call for self-propelled planing equipment and the finished surface shall meet the approval of the engineer in the test section. Horizontal saw cutting will not be permitted.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 10:54:55 AM **Question Number - 3**

Is trackless tack permitted?

Trackless tack is permitted.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 10:54:32 AM **Question Number - 3**

In regards to the pavement striping for Project #181018, is there a specific preference for 642 Type 1 or 2?

642 Type 1 or 642 Type 1a as outlined in the application charts in the CMS.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:39:50 PM **Question Number - 1**

Abutment backwall details on 377-380/441 indicate proposed top elevations for the backwalls but not the existing beam seat elevations. Will beam seat elevations for HAM-71-1068 R/L be provided so bidders can calculate the vertical dimensions of the backwalls?

We believe this prebid question is intended for a different project, as PID 106168 is for a District 6 EXPO project.

Project No. 181019

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

PIK-100439 - SR 32-VAR

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 2:55:16 PM **Question Number - 1**

Will this project require temporary work zone paint? There is no quantity given, and does ODOT anticipate any problems with 642 waterbased permanent paint sticking to surface treatments applied to the decks, or does the surface need waterblasted prior to permanent paint application?

Project No. 182001

Sale Date - 2/16/2018

SHE-102616 - D07 SHE FS Salt & CCS

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 3:57:21 PM **Question Number - 13**

Will the upcoming addendum reduce the percentage of self-performed work from 50% to 10%?

After review, the Work Type Percentage Performed by the Prime Contractor shall remain at 50%.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 1:20:24 PM **Question Number - 12**

Since this is not the typical heavy highway project and more like a general trades project, could the percentage of work self-performed by the bidder be dropped to 10% or less?

After review, the Work Type Percentage Performed by the Prime Contractor shall remain at 50%.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 11:00:20 AM **Question Number - 11**

Upon further investigation and site visit it appears we need direction on what panel the electrical feed for the new salt buildings is coming from, as it doesn't appear to be shown on the prints. Can this be provided so the run can be accurately figured?

The electrical feed will come from the electric panels in the Existing Building Electrical Room located on the inside wall where note 4 is tagged to on sheet 31.

Question Submitted: 1/29/2018 9:42:19 AM **Question Number - 10**

Due to the nature of this project involving more building trades and less heavy highway work types, coupled with the fact that bidders are not required to be pre-qualified...Can the work type percentage performed by prime be reduced from 50% to 10% or less?

After review, the Work Type Percentage Performed by the Prime Contractor shall remain at 50%.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 9:34:49 AM **Question Number - 9**

Does ODOT have an approved supplier/manufacturer list for the fabric salt buildings? If so can one be provided as can't seem to locate a list online. Can you please clarify?

ODOT does not have a list of approved fabric suppliers. Refer to the specification on sheet 12.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 9:17:56 AM **Question Number - 8**

On page 30 note #2 is this note used and trying to depict an existing feed line from existing EDP2 to existing EP? Please clarify if this is all existing.

The EDP2 feeder is existing.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 9:12:15 AM **Question Number - 7**

Please clarify which is correct on sheet 29 the W4 fixture calls for a 50W input but using a 150W LED. Can you clarify if this is correct. As typically we don't see the lamp more than the input Wattage.

The W4 fixture is a 150 Watt fixture. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 9:01:54 AM **Question Number - 6**

On Page 29 the fixture schedule shows Type W4 as 120V. Typically these are 10-32VDC. We can't find a 120V in this fixture. Can you please clarify what is desired and if 120V is desired please provide manufacturer.

Light fixture Type W4 should be a Hubbell FLL-1505K-U-K or approved equal. This is 120V, 150 Watt fixture, IP 65 rated. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 8:54:25 AM **Question Number - 5**

Can you please provide clarification on what is supposed to be single pole and 3 way switching of the lights in the 2 areas, as on page 29 it doesn't appear to clearly define them.

All switches should be 2-way. Two (2) 3-way switches are needed at door between the new addition and the existing building. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/26/2018 8:48:10 AM **Question Number - 4**

On Page 30 - electrical the panel schedule shows an outside light circuit as 208 volt, Page 29 light fixture shows type W1 as 120V, Which is correct?

Outside light circuit is an existing circuit that is 208V. Type W1 is a new light fixture at 120V. Connect W1 fixtures to 120V circuit. This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/25/2018 1:13:03 PM **Question Number - 3**

Sheet 26 & 27 show mechanical/HVAC to take place in the building addition. Yet the bid form doesn't appear to have a bid item for the Mechanical work. Is this work to be included in our bid and if a bid item will not be added what item number would you like the mechanical to be included in on the bid?

A bid item for mechanical/HVAC work will be added to the plans in an upcoming addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/25/2018 9:32:11 AM **Question Number - 2**

Can you please clarify the completion date as the spec booklet states 10/20/18. However, the plans show on sheet 7 a date of Oct 30th for substantial & Final of Nov 30th. Can you confirm which is correct?

The completion date for the project is 10/20/18. The dates shown on sheet 7 will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.

Project No. 182003

Sale Date - 2/16/2018

MER-96138 - Co Garage FS F/B Lean To

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 3:29:37 PM **Question Number - 1**

Ref #12 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 1, (448)= 570 CY. Plan Sheet #4 shows a design thickness of 4.5" for the Type 1 Intermediate. With no 301 Asphalt Base Course and no Type 2 Intermediate Course we feel Type 1 Intermediate may not be the best material for the application.

The intermediate course will be revised to Type 2 in a forthcoming addendum.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 182006

Sale Date - 3/9/2018

RIC-102607 - New Salt Yard

Question Submitted: 2/16/2018 3:06:51 PM **Question Number - 1**

Total disturbed area is 1.18 acres. Will the contractor be required to have a SWPPP written and project inspected per Supplement 832

Project No. 183000

Sale Date - 6/8/2018

HAM-104667 - IR 75-03.84

Question Submitted: 2/19/2018 9:15:40 AM **Question Number - 37**

Please verify the abutment bearings on WB bridges over Beekman St (HAM-74-1840 & HAM-74-1852) are to be replaced. Scope items 15.3.E.3 and 15.3.F.4.

Question Submitted: 2/19/2018 9:14:03 AM **Question Number - 36**

Is there a geotech report for the PID 83723 project?

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 4:36:12 PM **Question Number - 35**

Reference Question 9. Sheet 65 of 65 in Volume 7 of Appendix O shows 2 parallel aerial easement lines to the left of EX I-74 EB baseline approximate station 1035 to 1036. These lines along with another unlabeled line segment do not form a closed boundary. This area does not show up on the Railroad plat. Please provide a better detail or shaded areas depicting the limits that I-74 EB structure and roadway must be within to not impact RR ROW.

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 4:30:59 PM **Question Number - 34**

Please provide the survey information listed in Scope Section 14.1 - ODOT Survey Responsibilities.

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 4:30:31 PM **Question Number - 33**

Per PTI Requirement #5, please clarify structure numbers requiring the draft foundation memo.

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 1:00:33 PM **Question Number - 32**

PN110 requires Escrow Bid Documents to be submitted the business day after the bid opening. Will the Department consider modifying this to 2 business days after the Bid Opening which would then also provide the weekend (due to a Thursday opening) to assemble the documents?

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 12:59:22 PM **Question Number - 31**

There is a reference to New, Small, Local, and EDGE goals in ITO Page 71/158 (Section 105.19 Value Engineering Change Proposals). Should this reference be removed?

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 12:58:30 PM **Question Number - 30**

There appears to be missing information in the middle of Page 67/158 (Section 105.04 Coordination of the Contract Documents) of the ITO. Please provide any missing information.

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 12:56:34 PM **Question Number - 29**

ITO Section 3.3 states to "submit two(1) paper copy of the Technical Proposal". Please clarify how many copies are required.

*** 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: 2/15/2018 12:55:27 PM **Question Number - 28**

ITO Section 1.12 states that NEPA approval is anticipated prior to issuance of the Final RFP. Has NEPA approval been received?

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 12:54:18 PM **Question Number - 27**

In order to give as much consideration as possible to potential subcontractors up to the bid time, will it be acceptable in the Contractor Prequalification Section of Technical Proposal Part B to state that an ODOT Prequalified Subcontractor will be utilized rather than naming a specific firm?

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 10:14:12 AM **Question Number - 26**

What is the design year/traffic for this project?

the design year is 2030. See section 1.1 for traffic data.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 10:12:19 AM **Question Number - 25**

What is the minimum design speed that can be used on the ramps?

See Scope section 14.2.1 for Ramp P design criteria. All other ramps are the meet the criteria as defined by the Location and Design manuals.

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 10:10:36 AM **Question Number - 24**

What design criteria can be used for vertical geometrics, rolling or hilly?

rolling

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 10:08:56 AM **Question Number - 23**

The scope (14.2.1) states that the alignment on I-75 may be followed as shown in the LG&TS set of plans (Appendix A: PID 104667), as long as all design criteria are met. The scope (15.3.C) also states that we are to use the horizontal alignment provided in PID 83723. Please clarify which is correct.

Section 15.3.C incorrectly states "Use horizontal alignment provided in PID 83723"

Question Submitted: 2/14/2018 10:01:46 AM **Question Number - 22**

For the technical approach, the scope states to submit plan and profile sheets in engineering format. Can these plans be submitted in scroll plots?

Scroll plots can be submitted in addition to the plan and profile sheets in engineering format.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 4:07:47 PM **Question Number - 21**

PN 097, Section 104.011 is written such that the Lead Designer performs the Temporary design portions of the project which is usually not the case. Typically the contractor or a specialty consultant (hired by the contractor) do the temporary portions, such as erection or demolition plans. Please revise this section so the Lead Designer is not responsible for temporary design.

PN-097 section 104.11 states "The Lead Designer and subconsultants will provide all necessary services to design all permanent and temporary portions of the Project..."

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:54:06 PM **Question Number - 20**

Regarding the PTI meeting requirement #7. Please provide the load factors and load combinations that are to be used for the dead and live loads for the construction condition and the live load factor that should be used for the normal HS20 loading condition that will set the limit.

The load factors and load combinations would need to follow the appropriate AASHTO Specifications. The existing bridge will follow the Table of Coefficients Gama and Bata listed in AASHTO LFD Standard Specifications Table 3.22.1A and the new structure will follow the Load Combinations and Factors listed in AASHTO LFRD Table 3.4.1-1.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:45:09 PM **Question Number - 19**

Regarding the PTI meeting requirement #3, please provide the necessary survey/TIN file data to develop wall cross sections. Additionally, at what length interval should cross sections be provided?

**the TIN is here: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/CAD%20Files/Geopak/Other CAD files>
can be found here: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/CAD%20Files/Cross sections should be every 25ft>.**

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 3:43:05 PM **Question Number - 18**

PTI meeting requirement #4 requires several items regarding placement of concrete decks on existing and new structures. Please clarify if this requirement is intended for all bridges on the project or only for structures HAM-74-1908R and HAM-74-1908S (Ramp P).

This requirement is for HAM-74-1908R, HAM-74-1908S, and HAM-75-0440.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 1:52:06 PM **Question Number - 17**

Scope of Services 20 – Index of Appendix lists Appendix T 171024_Full but it is not found on the ftp site. Please post to the ftp site and provide a link.

There is no Appendix T and will be deleted from SOS 20. Appendix R as referenced in Section 1.4.1 will be added to SOS 20 and is currently on the FTP site.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 1:48:12 PM **Question Number - 16**

Reference is made to Question 5 posted previously. ODOT's response takes you to the ftp site and the Appndix folder which shows Appendix_S_1852_repairs.pdf. Appendix S is not listed in the Scope of Services, Index of Appendix. Please advise where this applies to the scope.

Appendix_S_1852_repairs.pdf applies to Section 15.3.F Requirements for HAM-74-1852.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 1:27:04 PM **Question Number - 15**

Reference is made to ITO page 54 of 159 (the PN 097), which describes 'basic configuration' and contract documents that are found in the Document Inventory. Please provide the Document Inventory, as it is not found referenced in any other part of the ITO or SOS. If it is the same as the SOS 20 - Index of Appendix, please clarify.

SOS 20 - Index of Appendix is considered the Document Inventory. All appendices are considered contractual documents.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 12:52:52 PM **Question Number - 14**

Please provide the Microstation and Geopak files, including sheet files, for Appendices A and A1. Specifically, please include CAD and Geopak files for the new Ramp P configuration and the revised I-75 baseline. Previously posted information only show the alignments from PID 83723 which are no longer relevant.

Question Submitted: 2/12/2018 8:08:38 AM **Question Number - 13**

Addendum 3 states that the schedule in the RFP/ITO has changed and the Scope of Services and ITO have been revised. These documents were not attached to the Addendum nor are they currently posted on the .ftp site. Please provide the revisions.

Question Submitted: 2/8/2018 6:48:06 PM **Question Number - 12**

Can the addendum (dated 9/4/09) and the original HAM-75-0440 L/R Structure Type Study (dated 12/17/07) be made available? The Preliminary Design Report for this structure, previously made available (dated 3/28) references these documents.

requested files are at the link below: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Structural%20preliminary%20design%20reports/STS/>

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:39:19 PM **Question Number - 11**

Please provide a link to the proposed reference CAD & GPK files. Currently the scope does not provide a direct reference to these files.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:37:39 PM **Question Number - 10**

Please provide the aerial photography files and TIN file for the existing topography surveyed.

ODOT uses the OSIP and LiDAR data from the website below.<http://ogrip.oit.ohio.gov/ProjectsInitiatives/OSIPDataDownloads.aspx> tin files have been added to the following link:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/CAD%20Files/Geopak/>

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:36:42 PM **Question Number - 9**

Please Provide a RR Plat or a better detail of the right of way and easement lines for the 1409E structure over the railroad. With the information provided, it is difficult to tell if the RR ROW will be impacted.

See the RW plans in Appendix O, volume 7.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/>

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:35:24 PM **Question Number - 8**

Section 12.4 of the scope requires the DBT to update the utility conflict matrix. However, this document was not provided in the appendices. Please provide.

Appendix M provides an example. The DBT is responsible for using a similar spreadsheet or an improved spreadsheet that shows at a minimum the criteria provided in Appendix M

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:33:33 PM **Question Number - 7**

Please provide a copy of the Approved IMS, mentioned in ITO 5.3, which affects evaluations of ATCs.

The IMS is at the link below. <http://www.i75millcreekexpressway.com/archive.htm>

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:32:04 PM **Question Number - 6**

Please provide updated NEPA Documents.

The approved environmental documents from 2008 are provided on the MCE website as stated in section 1.2.<http://www.i75millcreekexpressway.com/archive.htm> An environmental document re-evaluation is currently underway. **At this time no additional environmental commitments are anticipated.**

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:30:51 PM **Question Number - 5**

Please provide the Index of Attachments.

Appendix have been provided at the link below.<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/>

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:30:22 PM **Question Number - 4**

Please update the FTP site referenced in section 1.2 of the Scope of Services. The majority of the folders have been left blank.

The ftp site has been updated and the files have been re-uploaded.

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 4:29:38 PM **Question Number - 3**

Please provide the CSXT Construction Submission Criteria, last revised on February 23, 2015 as referenced in section 1.4.1.e in the Scope of Services.

See Appendix R

Question Submitted: 11/13/2017 6:32:29 PM **Question Number - 1**

Should the page numbering be sequential throughout the entire SOQ or should it start over in each section?

Though not specifically stated in the RFQ, the Department's preference is to have each section numbered individually as opposed to sequentially from beginning to end. Either method of page numbering will be accepted.

Question Submitted: 11/10/2017 12:25:23 PM

Section 2.4 states "Submit one (1) unbound version of the SOQ..." Is a three-ring binder considered unbound?

The unbound version of the SOQ may be placed in a three ring binder.

Question Submitted: 11/9/2017 3:18:32 PM

Will an addendum be published to modify the RFQ and address the concerns of the latest prebid questions?

Please see Addendum No.1 published 11/8/2017.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 11/8/2017 8:46:28 AM

Page 8 of the RFQ, addresses Contractor Prequalification (Section 1.2.2). The table located on page 8 has three categories of prequalification work types. The third category "Other Prequalification Categories – Not required @ RFQ, Includes but not limited to:", lists several work type codes that are occupied by specialty subcontractors; for example, work type 26 Structural Steel Painting. This would be similar to contractors that perform guardrail, signs or electric, and it would not provide the best value to the Department if the Offeror were to team with these subcontractors at the time of SOQ. The subsequent paragraph directly under the table states that prospective firms that are not yet prequalified in those areas specifically required above, furnish the Department with a properly completed prequalification application within one week after the "SOQ Submission" date. It is clear that both the first and second category require the prequalification to be in place at the time of RFQ. Can the Department please clarify if the Offeror will need to be prequalified in those work type codes that are listed in the third category?

Please see Addendum 1

Question Submitted: 10/31/2017 6:30:32 AM

On Page 15 of the RFQ, item 2.5.3-2 references structure HAM-74-1908R which is the structure that is being re-decked along with other superstructure repairs. Please clarify the location of the new bridges referenced under 2.a. as 1908R is not a new build.

Per Section 15.3 of the Draft Design Build Scope the HAM-74-1908R structure can be re-decked along with other required structural repairs OR a new bridge can be constructed. (See Section 15.3.14).

Question Submitted: 10/30/2017 4:55:54 PM

Rehabilitation of structures HAM-74-1840, HAM-74-1852, and HAM-74-1892 is not mentioned in the ITO/RFQ Project Expectations; however, it is included in the Draft Scope of Services. Please clarify whether or not the structure rehabilitations are anticipated to be part of the HAM-75-3.84 project.

At this point in time all work, as defined in the Draft Design Build Scope, will be part of the project.

Question Submitted: 10/30/2017 7:54:33 AM

RFQ Section 1.2.1 lists 'Environmental Services' under the subconsultant prequalifications. There are 13 sub-categories under Environmental Services. Which of these sub-categories must the design team be prequalified for?

See forthcoming addendum

Question Submitted: 10/27/2017 2:50:02 PM

Will the Department please post the CAD files?

Cad files can be found here:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/CAD/>

Question Submitted: 10/27/2017 2:41:17 PM

Will the Department please post existing plans for the I-74 corridor?

The I-74 existing plans can be found here:

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/Existing%20Plans/74/>

Question Submitted: 10/26/2017 9:36:51 AM

Reference is made to Section 1.2 of the DRAFT Scope which lists existing plans in a table as well as a link to the ODOT ftp site. The following existing plans could not be found: 08c1489 08c3039 08c1392 08c3036 (PID 76257) Please provide these files.

All requested items have been uploaded to the FTP site as listed in the draft scope. please note: PID 76257 is 08C2859 08C3039 should be 08C3093 (Ped bridge)

Question Submitted: 10/26/2017 9:35:49 AM

Reference is made to Section 10 of the DRAFT Scope which states that all environmental commitments shall be completed per the environmental document and is followed by a link to a 2008 Environmental Assessment which was not finalized at that time. Please provide the latest version of: 1. Environmental Commitment Notes 2. Results of the ESA Phase II 3. Rule 13 Permit

At this time, no Rule 13 is required (the landfill locations are outside of the project limits). The Environmental commitments are listed on page 24 of the EA. Phase II ESA Concurrence and environmental documents are at the link below: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM-75-3.85/104667/environmental/>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 10/25/2017 11:09:45 AM

RFQ page 8/35 currently requires the Lead Contractor to be pre-qualified for Work Type 22, Level 3 Bridge. The RFQ continues to include a reference to requirements governing changes in the Offer's team and Key Personnel in Section 3.2, Requirement to Keep Team Intact and 4.3, Requirement to Keep Team Intact - Post Award. Taken in their entirety, Section 3.2 and 4.3 prohibit changes to certain parties, specifically including named subcontractors. The Department expressly retains the sole discretion to authorize a change to a named subcontractor. In light of the above, can the requirement to provide Work Type 22, Level 3 Bridge, be altered to apply to either the Lead Contractor or a currently pre-qualified, named subcontractor? Doing so would not materially erode the Department's current position relative to ensuring the team members meet the current pre-qualification requirements while not precluding potential Lead Contractor's from pursuing the project.

RFQ Section 1.2.2 Contractor Prequalification will be modified to allow either the Lead Contractor or Named Subcontractor – Prequalification @ RFQ Required for Work Type Code 22 – Level 3 Bridge. Each Offeror must ensure the composition of their team including but not limited to Lead Designer, Lead Contractor, Key Personnel, Named Subcontractor, etc. are exclusive to one another and no other Offeror's team as it relates to RFQ Section 4.1 - Conflict of Interest. The Lead Contractor must still perform equal to or greater than 50% of the work per RFQ Section 1.2.2.

Project No. 183001

Sale Date - 5/10/2018

LUC-101556 - SR 2-18.62 Dehumidify

Question Submitted: 2/15/2018 8:31:29 AM **Question Number - 3**

Reference Question 2 regarding final RFP files. ODOT's response to this RFI indicates 20 files should be on the FTP site. Please double check that files EX-03 and EX-09 are posted. Thanks.

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 11:10:30 AM **Question Number - 2**

The email informing us of the final RFP instructed us to disregard any previous draft information and retrieve the new information from the postings and attachments.

The final RFP lists an ODOT FTP site on page 138/144. This FTP site contains 19 files at the time of the RFI. The previously released draft documents contained 44 files. Many files appear to be missing in the final version, including the plans (LD-01 LUC-2-1862 PID No. 101556 Project 183001 Final Tracings).

Should we use the draft files from the 1/5/18 release if they were not re-released on 2/12/18?

The Department inadvertently omitted the following Appendices: EX-03, EX-04, EX-05, EX-06, EX-07, EX-08, EX-09, EX-10, EX-11, GE-01, GE-02, GE-03, GE-04, GE-05, GE-06, GE-07, LD-01, SP1, SP2, & SP3. These are now posted on the FTP link provided in the Proposal. Users are advised to refresh the web browser's cache to ensure the added appendices are visible. The 1/5/18 versions are not applicable

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 11:38:35 AM **Question Number - 1**

This project is posted for the 5-10-18 let date but the proposal is the same ITO / RFQ document dated 9-6-17 from a prior letting date and includes a schedule that has the bids being opened in March of 2018. Is this a re-advertisement of the previous project or something new? When will the proposal document be updated?

The revised proposal dated January 5, 2018 will be released on February 12, 2018. The Department will be issuing this Request for Proposal (RFP) to only the following Short-listed Offerers: American Bridge Company and Kiewit Infrastructure Company.

Question Submitted: 9/20/2017 10:20:32 AM **Question Number - 4**

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

Please submit one electronic file.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/15/2017 11:50:09 AM **Question Number - 3**

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

Question Submitted: 9/15/2017 11:25:29 AM **Question Number - 2**

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

Question Submitted: 9/15/2017 11:22:16 AM **Question Number - 1**

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

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

Project No. 183003

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

MED-14821 - N Carpenter Road

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 11:04:38 AM **Question Number - 54**

The updated typical section provided in Addendum 7 appears to have changed the sidewalk widths for the east approach on Grafton Rd., it now shows a 6' width. Everywhere else is 5' widths. Originally the typical section in this area was for 5' walks and the bridge has 4'6" sidewalks. Please clarify if 6' is now required, or this is an error and should be 5'.

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 10:32:53 AM **Question Number - 53**

The Project is now showing up as deferred. What is the status/future of this project?

North Carpenter Rd. will be re-scoped to include Grafton Rd. as a additive alternate. We hope to make the changes soon, re-advertise for a short period and sell it by the first part of May or end of April.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 9:19:27 PM **Question Number - 52**

As a follow up to pre-bid question #39, please clarify the difference between bid item #8 Maintaining Traffic-1 LS and bid Item #18 Maintaining Traffic-1 LS ???

One of these will be deleted in the next scope.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 1:42:48 PM **Question Number - 51**

Addendum 6 advises that Attachment C has been replaced. Please provide the location of this revised information.

The typical section was missed. An addendum is being processed to capture it.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 12:25:10 PM **Question Number - 50**

Will the department be providing an update to Attachment C (typical sections)? This is not available through the link provided in Addendum #6.

they were missed. Another Addendum will be processed to pick them up.

Question Submitted: 2/7/2018 11:55:16 AM **Question Number - 49**

This is a follow up to the question asked 1/19 regarding relocation of utility poles in conflict with the proposed walk. The answer indicated that the department "may" allow local shifting around the poles. The majority of the poles north of Grafton are in conflict with the proposed walk. Is it the intent for all of these poles to be relocated? A clear answer is needed in order to accurately price the relocation of the interconnect.

The Department will favor a solution that reduces or eliminates pole relocation and remains to be aesthetically pleasing and follows design standards, rather than maintaining the offsets on the typical section.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 3:17:22 PM **Question Number - 48**

It has been previously addressed that the January 8th prebid meeting transcripts and sign-in sheet would be posted to the Department's Prebid Meeting Transcripts page. Please confirm the questions and responses provided at this meeting will be issued to bidders.

It's now posted on our Prebid Meeting Transcripts web

page:<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Transcripts/Forms/PBTrans.aspx>

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 3:13:32 PM **Question Number - 47**

Where the DBT is responsible to lower water mains where the new road profile elevation lowers and existing water main pipe cover becomes less than required by CWD, is it required that the DBT maintain ten feet of horizontal clearance between the new water main and the proposed storm sewer and/or other existing sewers? As CWD standards dictate: water mains shall be laid at least 10 feet horizontally from any existing or proposed gravity sanitary or storm sewer, sewer manhole, or sewer force main.

The DBT is responsible following all utility standards and specification while designing/building this project.

Question Submitted: 2/2/2018 3:13:05 PM **Question Number - 46**

With reference to the Pre-bid Question Number 44 and ODOT's response, it is noted that on past ODOT DB projects, the Record Drawing Title sheet does require a "verification stamp" from the designer and contractor stating that all changes have been incorporated. This is different from a professional engineer's stamp and seal. As written, the responsibility for recording field modifications is on the EOR., who has no authority or field decision making responsibility after plans have been released for construction or perhaps outside of a submitted RFI. It also brings into question whether there is a conflict of interest for the EOR to perform such field observations which could imply quality and quantity inspection. It is unreasonable and perhaps uninsurable to require the EOR to inspect and perform field observation should his/her engineer stamp and seal be required. Is it the intent of ODOT to use the verification stamp or to require the EOR to stamp and seal the Record Drawings?

Question Submitted: 1/30/2018 4:44:49 PM **Question Number - 45**

Will this project be considered a re-development project in regards to water quality and post construction BMPs?

Yes, it will be considered a re-development project in regards to water quality and post construction BMP's.

Question Submitted: 1/25/2018 8:36:44 AM **Question Number - 44**

Section 8.4 requires that Record Drawing Title Sheet be signed and sealed by the Consultant. With reference to other Design Builds in Ohio, there is never mention that the consultant is required to seal the Record Drawings. Once they plans are RFC'd, we lose the ability to control decisions made in the field so our seal should not be affixed. Please clarify.

The Contractor is responsible for employing a prequalified Consultant to prepare the plans and employ the Engineer of Record. The DBT shall employ internal processes to ensure the Project is built to the requirements of the Engineer of Record and should have process to include subsequent field required modifications. The requirement of the Consultant to seal the Record Drawings has been a requirement and is standard on the majority of Design-Build projects in Ohio.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 2:14:53 PM **Question Number - 43**

The scope allows for (two) 21 day westbound traffic closures/detours to construct the northern and southern halves of Grafton Road, respectively (while maintaining one-way eastbound traffic). Has the Department taken considerations for the large quantity of roadway construction (400 ft to the east and 450 ft to the west of the intersection) in this time frame? Within these 21 day restrictions, has time been allotted for five days of cure time for cement subgrade stabilization or for three days of cure time for the concrete pavement?

An addendum will adjust two 21 day closure/detour to a two 30 day/closures.

Question Submitted: 1/24/2018 1:45:24 PM **Question Number - 42**

The proposed typical sections for the two lane and three lane with sidewalk scenarios for Carpenter/Grafton Roads depict fixed dimensions within the Right of Way limits and for sidewalk, curb and roadway center line. It was discussed previously, that proposed walks could be installed around existing conflicting utility/light poles. Should the sections be updated to allow for some flexibility should this be necessary?

The Department may allow local shifting around the utility poles within the conflicted areas. The DBT shall anticipate the majority of the offset be maintained for the sidewalk, except at specific localized areas.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/23/2018 10:26:59 AM **Question Number - 41**

On pages 161 to 165 of the conceptual plans provided in Attachment B, "No Parking Any Time" signs are shown. Will the Department require these signs? If so, what spacing shall they be at?

The signs are required. The spacing should be determined by the design build team.

Question Submitted: 1/23/2018 9:36:11 AM **Question Number - 40**

The Prebid Questions show the bid date for this project as Feb. 15 not Feb. 1. Is the bid date being changed?

The project is delayed per addendum. The new bid date is 2/15.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 3:48:55 PM **Question Number - 39**

Please clarify the difference between Bid Item 8: Special - Maintaining Traffic - 1 LS, and Bid Item 18: Maintaining Traffic - 1 LS.

One of these will be deleted with the next proposal.

Question Submitted: 1/22/2018 11:28:00 AM **Question Number - 38**

Has it been confirmed that there is sufficient right of way in order for Grafton road to be widened to allow for the left turn lanes? Per scope section 14.4, Eastbound Left length is to be 400 ft. This would impact the existing embankment for the western approach of the Grafton road overpass of I-71. The existing right of way appears to be at the toe of the existing embankment slope. Please confirm slope requirements and Grafton Rd right of way limits.

The next addendum will clarify the max. slope at 2:1 instead of 4:1. With this revision the turn lanes on Grafton will fit within the existing R/W.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 9:24:08 AM **Question Number - 37**

Scope Section 14.5 states "Drainage Design, including Phase 2 storm water regulations, shall be in accordance with Chapter 1236 Storm Water Management in City of Brunswick Codified Ordinances"? If post construction storm water controls have been revised to follow ODOT L&D Volume 2 per answer to pre-bid questions, what sections, if any, of Chapter 1236 are applicable to the storm sewer design? Also, will the Scope Sections be updated to capture the chain of pre-bid questions regarding drainage?

the next addendum will revise Section 14.5 Drainage: will specify which section of the Storm Water Management in City of Brunswick Codified Ordinances apply to this project.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 8:56:09 AM **Question Number - 36**

Section 14.6.G of the scope requires the DBT to remove and dispose of abandoned utility poles resulting from fiber optic relocation. In the same section it also states that the fiber optic cable is currently a third-party attachment on existing utility poles. Since the fiber optic is a third party attachment will the utility or the DBT be responsible for removing the abandoned poles?

The utility company that owns the poles will be responsible for removing the abandoned poles.

Question Submitted: 1/19/2018 8:53:44 AM **Question Number - 35**

Most of the utility poles are within the limits of the proposed walk. Is it the intent to relocate all of the poles in conflict with the limits of the proposed walk or will the offset between the walk and back of curb be adjusted to avoid the poles?

The Department may allow local shifting around the utility poles within the conflicted areas. The DBT shall anticipate the majority of the offset be maintained for the sidewalk, except at specific localized areas.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 10:59:49 AM **Question Number - 34**

If storm water quantity controls are not required for the project per the response to pre-bid question #15 dated 1/15/18, what portions of Chapter 1236 of the City of Brunswick Codified Ordinances are required to be followed with the drainage design as prescribed in the Scope Section 14.5 which states "Drainage Design, including Phase 2 storm water regulations, shall be in accordance with Chapter 1236 Storm Water Management in City of Brunswick Codified Ordinances"? Chapter 1236 does not give criteria for designing post construction BMP that address quantity only. Is it the intent that post construction BMP design follow the ODOT L&D Manual, Volume 2? Chapter 1236 also provides design criteria for storm sewer sizing and catch basin spacing that specifies storm durations thereby requiring design by volume as opposed to the industry standard of designing with the peak runoff. At the January 8th pre-bid meeting, it was stated that no more Right of Way will be acquired for the project. If quantity controls are required according to City of Brunswick Codified Ordinances, storage will be required. The current Right of Way limits are insufficient in order to account for additional storage/detention. Please clarify the intended design criteria.

The intent is for post-construction BMP to be designed per ODOT L&D Volume 2. Storm water quantity controls are not required.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 10:25:59 AM **Question Number - 33**

Are the minimum lateral offset requirements for curbed, urban, low speed (35 mph or less) roadways, as defined in ODOT L&D 600.2.2 (Urban Lateral Offsets), acceptable for general application throughout the project area in lieu of the clear zone requirements defined in ODOT L&D Figure 600-1E?

The intent is to utilize urban lateral offset for general application on this project.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 10:25:15 AM **Question Number - 32**

Please clarify the requirements for the submissions as stated in Scope sections 18.3 for Stage 1 and 18.5 for Stage 2? Section 18.3 makes no mention of a BU, but Section 18.5 does. Is the intention to submit the entire project for Stage 1 and then break up into BU's if we choose, or can the project be broken up into BU's and be submitted on their individual path through Stage 1, Stage 2 etc?

The Buildable Unit limits should be defined with the Stage 1 submittal. The intent is for the definition of the Buildable Unit to apply and be used in all Stages. As per Section 19, Buildable Units are portions of the projects which can be designed, reviewed and built with only limited controls and assumptions coming from the design of other portions of the project. The Department requests that once the DBT decides on how they intend to submit the buildable units package, the same package should be maintained and submitted through all submittal steps to help speed processing.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 10:24:34 AM **Question Number - 31**

In Scope Section 18.5 the table mentions 2 half size plans are to be submitted with Stage 2 to each affected utility or railroad company, with a bold note above that adds an exception "that each affected utility company shall receive one full size (22"x34") plans". Please clarify the intention. Do we submit one full size to each utility company or one full in addition to the two half in the table?

The DBT shall submit one full size plans in addition to the two half size sets for a total of three plan sets.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 10:23:09 AM **Question Number - 30**

In Scope Section 12.4.3 Scheduling of Utility Relocation Work reference is made to DBT designed relocation plans, the utility company has 28 calendar days to review and compliance reviews are 14 calendar days. These conflicts with the Design Reviews specified in Scope Sections 18.3 and 18.5 in which we are submitted with Stage 1 and Stage 2 plans to be reviewed. Please clarify if these are separate submittals or if they coincide with the Stage 1 and 2 submissions, if the durations are used to when we will expect to have comments from utilities?

It is recommended for clarification and speed, utility relocation plans should be separate specific submittals. Utility specific relocation plans shall follow the review periods as defined 12.4.3. If a Buildable units contains utility relocations, review times shall follow the durations as defined in 12.4.3 for the Stage 1 submittal and shall require a Stage 2 submittal.

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 10:22:30 AM **Question Number - 29**

In Scope Section 11 reference is made to a "Conceptual Review Submission" for right of way encroachments. Please clarify the word "Conceptual". There is no specific mention in the Scope which defines this submission. The only submissions listed are for Stage 1, Stage 2 and Construction.

Scope Section 11 will be revised to "The Consultant will identify and show all right of way encroachments on Stage 1 Plan Review Submission."

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 8:49:55 AM **Question Number - 28**

Please provide a copy to bidders of the sign-in sheet of attendees at the January 8th Pre-bid meeting.

The transcripts and sign in sheet were given to Central Office today to post. Once posted you should be able to see them at the following web address: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Transcripts/Forms/PBTrans.aspx>

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 8:48:22 AM **Question Number - 27**

Will questions that were asked at the January 8th Pre-bid meeting be posted and responded to on ODOT's Prebid Questions for 183003?

you will be able to see the pre-bid question and answers at website below once posted.: <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/ContractAdmin/Contracts/Transcripts/Forms/PBTrans.aspx>

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 8:43:51 AM **Question Number - 26**

Per the scope and proposed typical sections, subgrade stabilization with cement has been prescribed for roadways. According to Geotechnical Bulletin GB1, "...the subgrade of the entire project shall be stabilized (globalstabilization), except where it is determined that soil with sulfate content greater than 3,000 parts per million (ppm) is present." Have soils been tested for sulfate content, according to Supplement 1122, Determining Sulfate Content in Soils?

Yes. See attached link to sulfate report for informational purposes only.
ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/MED%20N_CarpRd2/SulfateReport/

Question Submitted: 1/18/2018 7:59:07 AM **Question Number - 25**

Is the DBT responsible for Quality Control and inspections?

Since this is an ODOT-let project, ODOT will be responsible for the Construction Engineering, inspection and quality control during construction.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 9:05:50 PM **Question Number - 24**

Is the contractor required to pay for the inspection services of the Cleveland Water Department? If so, please provide the hourly rate as it is not provided in the water works notes.

The contractor is to pay for inspection services of the Cleveland Water Department. All rates and charges should be determined by the contractor.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 9:11:14 AM **Question Number - 23**

Who will be providing the design reviews for both ODOT and the City of Brunswick? Will a consultant be providing the reviews and if so, whom?

Design reviews will be coordinated by ODOT.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 9:09:09 AM **Question Number - 22**

Section 18.6 requires that the DBT resolves all previous comments to the satisfaction of the Department before the DBT submits the approved for construction plans. Please specify the duration of the Department and City of Brunswick have to review the review comment dispositions to the previous comments.

The DBT shall prepare a "Disposition of Comments" on the intended method of how the DBT will properly address the Stage 2 Comments in the Final Plan submission. The Department will respond within 7 calendar days to the Disposition of Comments (accept / reject). This note will be added to section 14.5 in the next Addendum.

Question Submitted: 1/17/2018 9:03:50 AM **Question Number - 21**

Section 18.6 references review comments from the "final plan review submission". However, there is not a final plan submission or stage 3 listed in the scope. Please clarify.

"final plan review submission" is equivalent to the Stage 2 plan submission. The next addendum will clarify in section 18.6.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 10:46:58 AM **Question Number - 20**

Was the lowering of the 300mm waterline shown on plansheets 68 & 69 completed during the Healey Creek culvert construction?

Yes, the lowering of the 300mm waterline was completed during the Healey Creek Project.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 9:18:24 AM **Question Number - 19**

Was the lowering of the 300mm waterline shown on plansheet 45 completed during the Plum Creek culvert construction?

Yes, the lowering of the 300mm waterline was completed during the Plum Creek project.

Question Submitted: 1/16/2018 8:18:24 AM **Question Number - 18**

Please clarify the following as listed in 14.10 of the Scope of Services: 'Proposed left turn lane on North Carpenter Road at Boston Road shall not be constructed with this project'. Should this section of roadway be constructed at the 28 ft width two-lane scenario, as shown on the Proposed Typical Section?

Yes 28 feet wide, this section of road should be constructed under the "Two Lane" or the "Two Lanes salvaging existing sidewalk @ Boston Rd." typical section.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 1:21:40 PM **Question Number - 17**

Is it the department's intention to answer all questions with an addendum? If so when can we expect these answers?

An addendum will be published later this week only answering pre-bid questions that change the scope of the project.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 1:18:25 PM **Question Number - 16**

Can the DBT utilize the storm water ponds adjacent to the roadway to help reduce the storm water runoff, and improve water quality?

No. Storm water quality controls will need to be implemented within the project limits, and no storm water quantity controls are required.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 1:16:17 PM **Question Number - 15**

Given the limited increase in runoff volume, will the DBT be required to implement both storm water quantity and quality controls, or just storm water quality?

Only storm water quality controls are required. No storm water quantity controls are to be implemented.

Question Submitted: 1/15/2018 10:40:43 AM **Question Number - 14**

According to the L&D manual the recommended width of sidewalk is 5 ft. As discussed during the prebid meeting the existing walk is 4 ft. Is it the intent to leave walk in place that does not meet current standards? If so, please specify the exact limits of existing walk to remain in place as the typical sections in Attachment C do not provide these limits and just reference a typical section near Boston Road. Also, please provide the limit where the proposed walk ends on the east side of Carpenter Road.

An addendum will clarify that the existing sidewalk within the project limits is to be removed and replaced at 5' width, except as follows: There should be no new walk installed between Sturbridge and Boston. The new walk on the east side of Carpenter should terminate at the proposed crosswalk on the north side of Sturbridge. The existing walk on the west side of Carpenter should remain in place north of Sturbridge, with no new walk installed in that area except as needed to access the new crosswalk.

Question Submitted: 1/13/2018 3:04:29 PM **Question Number - 13**

On page 12 of the conceptual plans provided in Attachment B, the only temporary striping shown is for the outside edge line in phase 3. Will temporary striping be required along the barrels in phases 3 & 4? What about along the curb in phase 4?

temporary striping will not be required along the barrels in phases 3 & 4 or the curb in phase 4.

Question Submitted: 1/11/2018 2:52:12 PM **Question Number - 11**

A portion of Grafton Rd. both east and west of North Carpenter was recently constructed. After a review of the existing plans found in Attachment A it does not appear these plans were provided. Can these plans be made available?

Question Submitted: 1/9/2018 5:03:07 PM **Question Number - 10**

Will the contractor be responsible for paying the City of Cleveland Water Department for the inspection and testing services along with the various fees discussed in Attachment F?

Yes, the contractor will be responsible for paying the City of Cleveland Water Dept.'s inspection and testing services and various fees.

Question Submitted: 1/9/2018 4:40:42 PM **Question Number - 9**

For the purposes of developing the subgrade stabilization design can the soils report provided in Attachment D be utilized?

Yes, Attachment D can be used for developing the subgrade cement stabilization. As stated in the scope, depth can be no less than 16".

Question Submitted: 1/6/2018 6:40:54 PM **Question Number - 7**

Chapter 1236 of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances discusses various fees in section 1236.14 and a bond in section 1236.15 associated with the Stormwater Management Plan. Is the contractor responsible for these costs?

These fees and bond will not be required.

Question Submitted: 1/6/2018 6:20:14 PM **Question Number - 6**

Chapter 1234, section 1234.08 of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances states that the City Engineer may require the SWP3 to include a soils engineering report. Will this be required?

A soils engineering report will not be required for this section of the Brunswick CO.

*** 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: 1/6/2018 6:14:37 PM **Question Number - 5**

Is the bond associated with the SWPPP discussed in chapter 1234, section 1234.12 of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances required as part of this project?

This Bond will not be required.

Question Submitted: 1/6/2018 6:12:36 PM **Question Number - 4**

Are the fees discussed in chapter 1234, section 1234.11 of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances waived under the note in section 8.8 of the scope? If not, please provide a schedule of the associated fees.

Fees in this section will be waived.

Question Submitted: 1/5/2018 8:39:25 AM **Question Number - 3**

On sheet 75 of Attachment B Metric drawings, 550mmx856mm Type C 706.04 and 675mmx1050mm Type C 706.04 are listed, but those pipe sizes are not listed in the general summary. Are the two pipe sizes listed on sheet 75 correct?

The pipe sizes on sheet 75 are believed to be correct although it is the responsibility of the DBT to verify the pipe calculations.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2018 5:02:21 PM **Question Number - 2**

Please confirm that roadway improvements (pavement, utilities, etc) should continue over the Plum Creek and Healey Creek culvert crossings.

Roadway improvements should continue over Plum and Healey Creek culverts.

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

Please clarify topsoil thickness. 14.8 in the scope of services lists 3". The proposed typical sections show 4".

please design for 4 inches of topsoil. Addendum forthcoming to correct scope.

Question Submitted: 1/4/2018 11:25:02 AM **Question Number - 31**

In section 14.5 under drainage, it states that the DBT shall replace a 30"x50" sewer crossing of N. Carpenter Rd and a 42" downstream culvert. Could you provide the station numbers for this work and any information on restoration requirements?

The 30"X50" sewer crossing and 42" downstream culvert are located at station 1+897 on the metric plans.

Question Submitted: 1/3/2018 11:06:21 AM **Question Number - 30**

What clear distance will be required between hydrants and the edge of temporary pavement?

To be determined by the DBT.

Question Submitted: 1/2/2018 3:13:45 PM **Question Number - 29**

Please specify the limits of pavement removal and replacement for the streets that intersect North Carpenter Road. The only intersecting street addressed in the scope is Grafton Road.

Please see the intersection details in the Metric Plans.

Question Submitted: 12/27/2017 12:01:58 PM **Question Number - 28**

Will the DBT be responsible for the complete survey of the project or will ODOT provide the survey data to the successful DBT?

The DBT will be responsible for the complete survey of the project.

Question Submitted: 12/27/2017 11:59:57 AM **Question Number - 27**

Is the intent to replace the pavement on Grafton Road completely or can the existing pavement remain and just widen as needed. What is the pavement build up for Grafton Road?

Grafton Road pavement should be replaced completely within the limits of the turn lanes. The Proposed pavement build-up for Grafton is the same as North Carpenter. See typical sections.

Question Submitted: 12/22/2017 2:18:14 PM **Question Number - 26**

Please provide the drainage area maps and calculations that were used for Attachment B: existing Metric Plans.

As requested. Follow the link below.ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/MED%20N_CarpRd2/DrainInfoForRef/

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/21/2017 1:36:40 PM **Question Number - 25**

Section 14 Existing sidewalks are not addressed. Shall they remain and be tied into proposed walks or be removed and replaced?

Sidewalks should be removed and replace per Attachment C; the typical sections.

Question Submitted: 12/21/2017 1:13:22 PM **Question Number - 24**

ATTACHMENT A,N Carpenter Rd Report 4-28-14.pdf on Page 9 of 12 under Drainage Design Standards: Will storm sewer need to be resized from those in the current plans to a 5-year storm recurrence interval where downstream systems would have been designed to convey a 5-year storm recurrence interval? If so, what downstream systems would have been designed to convey flow from a 5-year storm recurrence interval?

The storm sewer system in the metric plans will need to be verified by the design-build team with today's standards and calculations with the requirement of the design-build team also identifying the downstream systems that would not accept the a 10 year storm recurrence interval from this project.

Question Submitted: 12/21/2017 11:34:59 AM **Question Number - 23**

Section 14.4 of the scope states the DBT shall construct the roadway according to Attachment C. The widening required by section 14.4 and minimum of 4:1 slopes in Attachment C will force the work limits outside of the existing right of way on Grafton. Will the Department be acquiring additional right of way for the required widening?

An addendum will address the max. 4:1 slopes. The intent is to design this project within the limits of the existing R/W.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 8:25:42 AM **Question Number - 22**

Have the underground utilities been identified previously? Will a utility map CAD file be provided to the DBT?

The underground utilities have been identified, see Attachment E (utility note.) However, a utility map CAD file is not available.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 8:23:36 AM **Question Number - 21**

What is the time limit for the relocation of overhead utility lines? Is the utility relocation time part of the overall construction duration of the project?

Yes, utility relocation is part of the overall construction duration of this project.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 8:18:06 AM **Question Number - 20**

Under Section 11 of the SOS, ROW parcels 104 and 105 are not associated with the Healy Creek culvert work. These takes will still be needed for the roadway work in addition to north portion of parcel 113, will these temporary easements be available for the roadway work?

The temps on parcels 104, 105 and 113 were activated in 2013 when the Healey Creek Culvert project was constructed. The DBT will need to design around those parcels as indicated in the scope.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 8:03:45 AM **Question Number - 19**

Does new traffic signal timing need to be developed for the two traffic signals on this project?

There will be no protective arrows on Grafton signal so you can the existing timing.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 8:00:30 AM **Question Number - 18**

What is the anticipated Traffic Signal work at Carpenter & Boston Intersection?

We only anticipate some loop detector work.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 7:58:33 AM **Question Number - 17**

Are the general notes and specifications included in the "Brunswick City Wide Signal Upgrade" documents(2008) the most current standards for traffic signals/interconnect or are there newer notes/specifications available?

Use Current ODOT Specification for the design of the signals and interconnect.

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 7:54:25 AM **Question Number - 16**

Section 16.4.F indicates that the overhead signal cabling and wiring is prohibited. Is overhead power service cabling acceptable?

Overhead power service is acceptable.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/20/2017 7:42:04 AM **Question Number - 15**

The scope does not indicate any lighting work to be performed on this project, however it appears that an existing wood pole with luminaire will be impacted by the intersection widening at Carpenter and Grafton Roads. How should this work be accounted for?

The luminaires along North Carpenter are owned and maintained by First Energy, along with all others in the City. Relocation of the pole and luminaire at the southeast corner of North Carpenter and Grafton will therefore need to be included in the utility relocation scope prepared by First Energy, as will the luminaire that is connected to the power pole on the northwest corner (if this pole needs to be relocated)

Question Submitted: 12/18/2017 12:26:21 PM **Question Number - 14**

The completion date in the proposal is 7/31/2020 while the completion date in section 6 of the scope is 8/15/2020. Please clarify.

The completion Date will be 8/15/2020. Addendum will revise the proposal.

Question Submitted: 12/18/2017 9:06:03 AM **Question Number - 13**

A Pre-bid Meeting is scheduled on Monday, January 8th for the subject project at The City of Brunswick, City Hall at 4095 Center Rd. , Brunswick OH 44212. The meeting will start at 1PM and end by 3PM. The meeting will be held in the council chambers.

A Pre-bid Meeting is scheduled on Monday, January 8th for the subject project at The City of Brunswick, City Hall at 4095 Center Rd. , Brunswick OH 44212. The meeting will start at 1PM and end by 3PM. The meeting will be held in the council chambers.

Question Submitted: 12/15/2017 1:10:36 PM **Question Number - 12**

We appreciate that the District provided all available CADD drawings and understand that they are for information only. Is there a surface drawing or data file available that the DBTs can reference during the bid preparation?

Question Submitted: 12/14/2017 2:30:50 PM **Question Number - 11**

Are there electronic basemap files for survey, drainage, proposed improvements, signals, etc. and is there a corresponding gpk file with the existing and proposed geometry? These have not been provided with the electronic files that are currently available.

Question Submitted: 12/11/2017 2:00:49 PM **Question Number - 10**

• Scope of Services section 6 and Attachment C refer to proposed sidewalk. Can the District please clarify/update Scope section 14 to specify the limits of proposed sidewalk work?

Question Submitted: 12/11/2017 1:58:55 PM **Question Number - 9**

• 183003a refers to a MED-14821-GENSUM.xlsm. Can the District please direct the DBTs to this file's location?

Question Submitted: 12/11/2017 1:57:40 PM **Question Number - 8**

• Does the District have any CADD files that can be provided to the DBTs or will all survey, alignment development, R/W line work, etc. be the responsibility of the successful team?

ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Construction/MED%20N_CarpRd/The Department of Transportation is providing this information for reference information only at the request of a pre-bid question. The Department does not warrant any of this information and users shall be cautioned to not depend on accuracy or viability. This information is being provided as a courtesy for the ODOT Project bidders on project 18-3003, PID 14821, MED-North Carpenter Rd.

Question Submitted: 12/11/2017 1:56:15 PM **Question Number - 7**

• Bid Item 0019 requires a Field Office, Type A. Scope of Services section 7 requires a Field Office, Type B. Please clarify which should be provided?

Field Office, Type B is required. An addendum will address this.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 12/11/2017 1:54:53 PM **Question Number - 6**

• Scope of Services section 12.8 requires SUE Level B for all utilities and services and SUE Level A as required by the DBT's design. Please consider providing a Bid Item to cover the Level A test holes

ODOT will give a quantity for Level-A test holes in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 12/6/2017 7:48:52 AM **Question Number - 5**

In the first paragraph of Attachment E, it states that "These utility facilities shall remain in place or be relocated within the limits of the project as set out below by others." It then proceeds to list seven private utility owners, but no mention is made of any relocation being performed. Is the DBT to assume that no relocation of these facilities is anticipated or required since it is not "set out" in the Utility Note?

It is the responsibility of the design build team to determine and coordinate the utility relocation. See Section 12 of the Design Build Scope for details.

Question Submitted: 12/6/2017 7:35:58 AM **Question Number - 4**

Due to the level of utility involvement on this job would ODOT consider adding unit price items for this work?

Question Submitted: 12/6/2017 7:35:06 AM **Question Number - 3**

Section 13.2 shows a maximum duration of 240 days for all detours. Does this 240 days include the 2-21 day closures on Grafton Road when only eastbound traffic will be maintained?

The 2-21 day closures while Grafton Road maintains eastbound traffic will not be included in the 240 day duration.

Question Submitted: 12/6/2017 7:32:24 AM **Question Number - 2**

Please provide all electronic files including base maps.

Question Submitted: 12/6/2017 7:31:27 AM **Question Number - 1**

Please setup an item for 832 - Temporary Erosion Control. No allowance is currently setup for this.

Question Submitted: 12/4/2017 3:23:16 PM **Question Number - 2**

Section 2 of the scope shows a prebid meeting at a tbd date. Please provide the time and date of the prebid meeting. If the department elects not to have a prebid meeting please modify section 8.1 to include updated specifications released on or before the date of project advertisement.

Question Submitted: 12/4/2017 3:21:39 PM **Question Number - 1**

There is a biditem setup for a Field Office, Type A (24 months) but section 7 of the scope calls for a Field Office, Type B. Please clarify.

Project No. 184006

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

STA-87284 - US 30-00.00

Question Submitted: 2/5/2018 3:27:42 PM **Question Number - 1**

Please confirm the existing scuppers have a "4" outlet pipe", as noted on sheet 7/12.Note 4 references Std Drawing SD-1-69, which utilizes 6" pipe.

The existing scuppers are 4" as noted on sheet 7/12.

Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 187005

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

MEG-107062 - SR 124-55.30

Question Submitted: 2/13/2018 3:33:19 PM **Question Number - 3**

Based on table B "Discharge and Fill Quantities of the Special Provisions for Waterway Permits included in Addendum #1 only allows for 2.4cy of temporary fill in the Ohio River and 25cy of temporary fill in Long Run. These quantities limit the options for cofferdams for water control. Without bore logs we cannot determine what options are possible for cofferdams. Can bore logs be provided?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 5:00:23 PM **Question Number - 2**

The waterway permit restricts in stream work in the Ohio River from March 15 to June 30. With the completion date set at June 1, temporary water control structures to be removed from the Ohio River before the completion date. Can the completion date be extended?

Question Submitted: 2/9/2018 4:48:40 PM **Question Number - 1**

Can bore logs for this project be made available?

Project No. 188002

Sale Date - 2/15/2018

CRA-106348 - US 30-07.51

Question Submitted: 2/6/2018 3:30:47 PM **Question Number - 1**

What is the jacking and support line item referring to? There does not appear to be a reason to jack and support this structure? please advise.

The jacking and support item was added to the plans to cover all the means/methods if the contractor wanted to relieve any stresses on the element prior/during the heat straightening work. No addendum required.