

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Project No. 070387

Sale Date - 9/21/2007

Question Submitted: 7/10/2007

Question Number: 1

There are 6 bridges that have 885 Warranty Structural Steel Painting. We understood that warranty painting only applied to projects where the painting contractor was the prime. Structure Ref MOT-75-1366 665, 666 MOT-75-1393 782, 783 MOT-75-1396 816, 817 MOT-75-1401 842, 843 MOT-75-1433 876, 877 MOT-75-1462 911 - 914 Will these items be changed to a non-warranty specification?

The 885 items will be changed to 514 by addendum.

Question Submitted: 7/17/2007

Question Number: 2

Are the electronic files available for this job?

<http://www.dot.state.oh.us/contract/dgn.htm>

Question Submitted: 7/19/2007

Question Number: 3

Can you post the existing plans?

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/plans/070387>

Question Submitted: 7/25/2007

Question Number: 4

After our initial review of ODOT 387-07, we would like to respectfully request that the control be reduced from 50% to 40%. Once we sub out the bridges, bridge painting, electrical, signs, and guardrail we are below the 50% control. Lowering the control would allow for more bidders and a more competitive price.

The Dept respectfully declines to change the percentage.

Question Submitted: 8/1/2007

Question Number: 5

1.) With reference to the Maintenance of Traffic drawings, specifically the details A & B showing the strengthening and widening on sheet 107 of 1811, we have the following question. a.) In most cases there are no x-sections indicating what the department requires at the various locations, is the department going to provide this information to the contractor and more importantly, where some of the existing slopes exist at a 2/1 and the detail calls for widening the slope approx. 7' to 8' and extending a slope fill, it is imperative that we have x-sections for all work required since a portion of these temporary roads have to be constructed at night and it appears that if some of the slopes were extended down at even a 2/1 slope they would encroach on existing traveled lanes. b.) Some of the existing grades where shoulder widening is called for along I-75 there are no x-sections shown, will the department provide this information. c.) Besides the LS quantities shown for temporary roads, will the department provide information as to how they arrived at these estimated quantities. 2.) Is there x-sections available for Lawn Street. 3.) Does the RTA have a definitive plan for supporting their trolley lines under Main Street.

Question Submitted: 8/18/2007

Question Number: 6

On page 297 of the plans, the pavement quantity calculations reference to "office calcs", under the sheet number columns. Can these "office calcs" be made available for review?

The consultant pavement calculations are available on the ftp site; see "75927 Pavement Calculations.pdf". <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/plans/070387/>

Question Submitted: 8/20/2007

Question Number: 7

On plan sheet 50 under Embankment As Per Plan, Structure No. MOT -75-1393 lists 26,988 cy of AS Per Plan Emb. Plan B. We cannot find the stations or the quantity of emb. shown for this area, please verify and or clarify this quantity of material.

Question Submitted: 8/21/2007

Question Number: 8

Bid item 230 is for a 1" air release. We cannot find a detail for this item. Drawing 1055I shows a detail for a sampling station. Are there sampling stations on this project? If there are, where are they located. The detail shows 3/4" copper on the profile view and 1" copper on the plan view. Which is correct? Will a bid item be provided?

Question Submitted: 8/21/2007

Question Number: 9

Bid item 230 is for a 1" air release. We cannot find a detail for this item. Drawing 1055I shows a detail for a sampling station. Are there sampling stations on this project? If there are, where are they located. The detail shows 3/4" copper on the profile view and 1" copper on the plan view. Which is correct? Will a bid item be provided?

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/21/2007

Question Number: 10

Allowable Bearing Capacity for MSE walls shown on Sheet 791 of the Contract Drawings for Walls 3, 13, 14, 16 and 18 are not sufficient at some of the locations. Please advise. See below for actual locations. Allowable Bearing Capacity for Wall 3 from Wall St. 67+50 to 68+25 is limited to 4,700 psf. The actual pressures for this 34.5-ft. high wall (at St. 68+25) based on 70% strip length approaches 6 ksf. The strip length required to reduce bearing pressures to 4,700 psf is 48-ft. We request an adjustment of the allowable bearing capacity for Wall 3 from Wall St. 67+50 to 68+25. Allowable Bearing Capacity for Wall 13 from Wall St. 91+00 to 95+00 is limited to 3,100 psf. The actual pressures for the tallest portion (at St. 95+00) with in this section based on 70% strip length approaches 4,100 psf. The strip length required to reduce bearing pressures to 3,100 psf is 30-ft. We request an adjustment of the allowable bearing capacity for for Wall 13 from Wall St. 91+00 to 95+00. Allowable Bearing Capacity for Wall 14 from Wall St. 107+00 to 111+15 is limited to 3,300 psf. The actual pressures for the tallest portion (at St. 110+75) with in this section based on 70% strip length approaches 4,200 psf. The strip length required to reduce bearing pressures to 3,300 psf is 42-ft. We request an adjustment of the allowable bearing capacity for for Wall 14 from Wall St. 107+00 to 111+15. Allowable Bearing Capacity for Wall 16 from Wall St. 222+50 to 223+50 is limited to 2,900 psf. The actual pressures with in this section based on 70% strip length and 2-ft. provision for future wall height 3,500 psf. The strip length required to reduce bearing pressures to 2,900 psf is 22-ft. We request an adjustment of the allowable bearing capacity for Wall 16 from Wall St. 222+50 to 223+50. Allowable Bearing Capacity for Wall 18 from Wall St. 148+00 to 149+00 is limited to 2,700 psf. . The actual pressures for the tallest portion (at St. 148+00) with in this section based on 70% strip length approaches 4,000 psf. The strip length required to reduce bearing pressures to 2,700 psf exceeds 40-ft. We request an adjustment of the allowable bearing capacity for Wall 16 from Wall St. 148+00 to 149+00.

Question Submitted: 8/22/2007

Question Number: 11

Ref 2 Pavement Removed, APP is shown in typical section on Plan Sheet 12 and called out in the Existing Legend as 9"-11" variable depth reinforced concrete pavement. Are we correct to assume that the concrete pavement is reinforced with wire mesh and not reinforcing steel, since it was not called out as continuously reinforced pavement? If there is continuously reinforced concrete pavement to be removed, please give limits since this removal is considerably more expensive.

Question Submitted: 8/22/2007

Question Number: 12

It is our understanding that ODOT has leased Parcels 416 & 420 for the project. Can these parcels be used for field office, laydown area and storage of materials?

Question Submitted: 8/22/2007

Question Number: 13

On plan sheet #50, the note for embankment, as per plan shows stations requiring 6" lifts. WE are having trouble quantifying this work, are there any sections available to show these areas? Also. The stationing for Ramp E2 lists sta. 175+70 to 176+70, however, Ramp E2 begins at Sta. 569+93 and ends at 600+28, please clarify.

Question Submitted: 8/23/2007

Question Number: 14

The note on sheet 1350 for Abutment concrete states that the formliner used to create the simulated stone surfaces on the forward abutment will be included in Item 898. The note on sheet 1351 for Formliner states that it is paid for separately. A quick check of the plan quantity appears to agree with the note on sheet 1351 that all formlined surfaces are paid for separately. Please clarify the conflict between the notes on sheets 1350 and 1351.

Question Submitted: 8/23/2007

Question Number: 15

1. The temporary widening of the structure over Main Street shows cast in place single slope barrier on top of the approach slabs with precast portable concrete barrier used off the approach slab. Will the Department allow the use of precast PCB on the approach slab as well; provided that it is anchored to the approach slab? 2. The temporary widening of the structure over Main Street shows cast in place single slope barrier on the newly widened portion. Will the Department allow the use of precast PCB for this application; provided that it is anchored? 3. Bridge 1346R has numerous references to placing low strength mortar behind the abutment incidental to unclassified excavation, however there is a bid item for 613 Low Strength Mortar Backfill which would appear to meet this need. Please clarify. 4. Since this is a temporary application, would a tined surface be allowed in lieu of bridge deck grooving for Bridge 1346R inclusive of the approach slabs? 5. Please provide details for how to attach the new cross frames to the existing steel beams on bridge 1346R. 6. Sheet 1264 for bridge 1347 has a note on the upper left that states "Exist SB Structure (To Be Removed by Others)". The notes on the phasing sheets 1268-1271 indicate that this structure is removed under this contract. Please clarify. 7. Will galvanized steel Stay in Place forms be allowed for use in the bridge deck forming? 8. The concrete beam bridge bearing pedestals are included with the beams for payment and field welded to both the beam sole plate and the bearing load plate. The steel beam bridge bearing pedestals are included with the bearings for payment and shop welded to the structural steel. This causes problems with shipping the structural steel. We request that all pedestals on the project, regardless of structure type, be included with the bearings for payment and that no shop welding to the beams be specified. 9. Addendum #2 states to remove all references to SS885, but failed to modify the ODOT item numbers from 885 to 514.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/23/2007

Question Number: 16

We have looked thru all the existing plans that are on the ftp site but have not found: 1. Keowee Street Plans (the plans that are there are for an overlay or safety upgrade project or something). 2. Existing retaining walls F, G, H. They all have to be removed. Wall F is at Approx I-75 Sta 403+50 near pump station. Wall G is at approx sta 804+50 - 806+25 Ramp E5. Wall H is at approx station 86+00 Ramp E4. Please provide these plans or tell us what to assume for removals.

**The District has placed two additional sets of existing plans on the ftp site for the project.
Ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/plans/070387/**

Question Submitted: 8/23/2007

Question Number: 17

A previous question was answered on ODOT's website regarding reduction of required percentage of work by the prime contractor from 50% to 40%. ODOT respectfully declined to reduce the percentage. Will ODOT permit the successful contractor to purchase materials such as wall panels, granular backfill, structural steel, etc. in order to increase his percentage of work performed and still subcontract their erection and placement? Is this truly work performed?

CMS 108.01, paragraph 2, says: "The Contractor's percentage of the total Contract Price includes the cost of materials and manufactured products purchased by the Contractor, but not the cost of materials and manufactured products purchased by subcontractors." However for purposes of awarding a contract, upon opening the bids, the analysis of the apparent low bid will need to show that the contractor is capable of performing at least 50% of the work. Purchased materials and products for line items for which the contractor is not prequalified will not applied at the time of the analysis for award.

Question Submitted: 8/23/2007

Question Number: 18

1) Is the volume of Pre-Cast members subtracted from the pay quantities. (ie. pier diaphragm concrete?) 2) Sheet 1525/1811 shows existing piling to be completely removed. There is no line item to pay for this work like at the other bridge locations. 3) Will ODOT consider adding a line item for the access that will be required for the river bridges?

Question Submitted: 8/24/2007

Question Number: 19

Per the notes on plan sheet 1772, the expansion joint extension is to be included with Structural Steel Members, Level 3 for payment (Ref. 900). Normally, horizontal extensions are paid as a separate 516 item. Please add a bid item specifically for the extensions.

Question Submitted: 8/24/2007

Question Number: 20

Plan Sheet 2/1811 lists supplemental Spec 898 dated 7/21/06 but the notes in the bridge plans date that spec 7/16/04. Please clarify which spec 898 is to be used for the project.

Question Submitted: 8/29/2007

Question Number: 21

Under the basis of payment in The special provision "Piling Misc.: Soldier Piles" it states that Waterproofing Type 2 will be paid for by ODOT. There is not a bid item for this. Please clarify or add another bid item.

Question Submitted: 8/3/2007

Question Number: 22

Where is the information regarding the As Per Plan for Manholes Abandoned for bid item 0237 under the Sanitary Sewers?

Question Submitted: 8/3/2007

Question Number: 23

It appears that the general summary & Proposal has not included the bid items 8", 12" & 30" Pipe Abandoned and Filled with Grout as they appear on sheet 1050. Please advise if these items will be added to the proposal.

Question Submitted: 8/30/2007

Question Number: 24

Some of the Temporary retaining walls need to be removed. Are the contractors to include the removal in the temporary retaining wall bid items?

Question Submitted: 8/30/2007

Question Number: 25

Note # 5 on plan sheet 1003/1811 and 1004/1811 states that soldier piles shall be predrilled to elev 742. The elevation view of the wall shows only a portion of the piles get predrilled. It appears that piles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 on plan sheets 1003 and 1004 should all be predrilled. Please clarify.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/30/2007

Question Number: 26

1. Will the department allow the use of permanent galvanized metal stay in place forms for the interior bays of the decks on the two bridges over the Great Miami river (#1367 & 1367W)? Stripping temporary wood forms from these decks particularly over the water spans will add to the time the causeways must remain in the river at each location. Because the causeways are limited in area & width this slows the construction of both bridges overall. There may also be a considerable cost savings in the use of the SIP forms over temporary wood forms because these two bridges are so large. 2. The drawings for bridges 1367 & 1367W show "temporary sheet piling" at piers #1 & 7 for bridge 1367W (ref drawings 1517, 1518, 1525, 1527, 1534, 1540, 1541, & 1543) and piers #1 & 8 for bridge 1367 (ref drawings 1410, 1411, 1416, 1418, 1428, 1429, 1443A, 1444 & 1446). All of these piers are outside the normal limits of flow of the Great Miami River or areas that will require causeway construction. Is the contractor free to use any conventional sheeting method with department review & approval prior to construction in these areas or is (steel) sheet piling the only acceptable method that will be allowed in these locations?

Answer: The Department will not allow the use of stay in place forms. Answer: The Contractor may modify the temporary shoring in question, as the design of this shoring is his responsibility. However, he must use a vertical shoring system (as opposed to a laid back open cut), which meets the intended purpose of protecting Riverside Drive on the South (West) end of the bridges and the bike path / levee on the North (East) end of the bridges.

Question Submitted: 8/30/2007

Question Number: 27

Is there any additional technical information or design criteria available for the 880 Warranty Pavement?

This is not specific to this project and difficult to understand what is desired. The contractor may want to contact his local Asphalt Trade Association for generic questions, or formulate questions specific to this project.

Question Submitted: 8/31/2007

Question Number: 28

Some of the structures on this project have notes which state that the stability of the superstructure is the responsibility of the contractor during erection and deck placement. What are the allowable tolerances of the superstructure members for alignment and rotation after deck placement and cure?

Question Submitted: 8/6/2007

Question Number: 29

The Level 6 structural steel members, hybrid girders is to be weathering steel, Grades 50W and HPS70W. The estimated quantity sheet 1639 of 1811 has pay items for field painting intermediate and finish coats. Does this mean that the structure is to shop prime painted even though weathering steel is being used ?

Question Submitted: 8/6/2007

Question Number: 30

1.) There is a plan note on sheet #59 regarding Detour Signing which states that this shall be paid as per Item 614 Detour signing, however, there is not a proposal item for this.2.) Ref. Nos. 247 & 248 make reference to an as per plan note, but we have not found one in the plans. Please clarify.3.) The completion date in the proposal is 11/15/2010, however, the Maintenance of Traffic staging plan indicates that all work will be completed in four stages with each stage being a construction season. Please clarify.

Question Submitted: 8/8/2007

Question Number: 31

1. The bid quantity for RN 857, 12" CIP Reinforced Concrete Piles - Furnished, is 300 LF less than the plan note length totals (Rear Abutment: 60 piles @ 40' each, FWD Abutment: 60 piles @ 40' each = 4,800 LF) on sheet 1704 of 1811. Please verify the order lengths and bid quantity. 2. For Bridge MOT-75-1433, there are discrepancies between the estimated piling lengths shown on sheet 1702 of 1811 and the estimated lengths shown on the pile layout sheets (1711 thru 1714 of 1811). Which estimated lengths are correct?

Question Submitted: 8/8/2007

Question Number: 32

Can the original bridge plans be made available for:1. Existing 75-1392R NB 75 over existing Ramps N-15/N-17 & under WB SR 4. 2. Existing SR 4 WB over NB 75 & over existing Ramps N-15/N-173. Existing 75-1436 75 over Keowee St.4. Existing 75-1466 75 over Leo St. The existing plans that are currently provided for these bridges only show deck overlay,parapet and wingwall rehab work.

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/plans/070387>

Question Submitted: 8/8/2007

Question Number: 33

Can the existing drawings for Retaining Walls A,B,C,D,E,F,G be made available online?

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 8/9/2007

Question Number: 34

We request that Proposal Note 104 "Value Engineering Change Proposal - Construction Costs and Time" be added by Addendum.

We are prohibited from specifying Proposal Note 103 or 104 Value Engineering due to the requirements/conditions for use of Proposal Note 123 Lump Sum Minus Contract.

Question Submitted: 9/10/2007

Question Number: 35

1. Plan sheets 891 of 1811 through 906 of 1811 all show MSE wall excavation limits that are covered by the Wall Quantities. These limits are defined by excavating a 1:1 slope from original ground to the bottom of the Type C Granular material used for the Foundation Preparation. On approximately 75 % of the excavations the slope of 1:1 will not work and will be against OSHA Regulations for a Type C Soil. OSHA Standards say the a 1 ½: 1 slope needs to be used. Therefore Quantities for Bid item 475 "Embankment" and 485 "Wall Excavation" Overrun. We assume that the quantities will be adjusted by change order. Please clarify in an addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 36

The note for construction noise on sheet 48 states that the engineer must direct all work which will impact the City of Dayton Noise Ordinance. The Maintenance of Traffic plans state that the Department expects the contractor to work weekends and nights in order to complete the project in a timely manner. Obviously this project will require significant night and weekend work. Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that the engineer will allow work to occur which may impede the noise ordinances due to the complexity of this project.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 37

On sheet 72, there is a note referring to Main St. that states, "Right side reconstruction may require some utility relocation". Please clarify this note. What utilities may need to be relocated? Who is responsible for relocating these utilities? Who will be paying for the relocation? When can these utilities be relocated so that they do not impact the project schedule?

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 38

Sheet 1528C and the special provisions show a demonstration shaft to be performed with Bridge 1367W. The notes indicate that there is a rebar cage in this shaft, however no details are provided. What is the rebar configuration required for the demonstration shaft? Is this rebar incidental to Biditem 742?

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 39

Section A-A on sheets 1528 and 1419 call out 24 sets of 2-DS10001/DS1002/DS1003 for the drilled shaft vertical rebar. Are these bundled bars? If so, the number of bars listed in the bar schedule appears to be half of what it should be. Example, Pier 2 on sheet 1528 - 24 sets x 2 bars x 5 shafts = 240 each x 2 lengths of 35'-8" = 480 each required. Please verify and correct the plan sheets if incorrect.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 40

This project has a considerable quantity of temporary impact attenuators, which will be in place for entire construction seasons in some cases. If an impact attenuator is damaged on the job and the contractor is unable to obtain compensation from the motorist, will ODOT compensate the contractor for the additional cost? If not, this is a large risk that the contractor will have to assume at bid time, which will greatly increase the cost of that item. Since this has become a point of dispute on many projects, we would like to suggest that ODOT add a biditem on this project for replacement temporary impact attenuators similar to the biditems for replacement drums/signs.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 41

Several addenda discuss the conduits in the bridge parapets, however we are still unclear where this is to be paid. Has clear direction been given as to where the payment for the 2" electrical, 3" ITS, or 4" ITS conduits in the bridge parapets are to be paid for? If so, please point it out again and if not, please clarify.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 42

There are several outstanding prebid questions submitted for this project which have yet to be answered. Some of which the Department has had since August 21. The responses to these questions will have a tremendous impact on the pricing of our work including solicitation of material and subcontractor pricing as well as preparation of an effective prebid schedule. The following unanswered questions will have the most notable impact: a) Revised utility note forthcoming per Addendum 3b) Response to MSE Allowable Bearing Capacity question submitted on 8/21 and passed over in Addenda 4 and 5c) Clarification of the inclusion of numerous incidental items into Item 615 Maintenance of Trafficd) Clarification of dates for work performed on adjacent Stanley Avenue Projecte) Clarification of interim completion date for Diversion 7 since it does not work as shown in the plansf) Response to our questions #1-12 submitted on 9/5g) Clarification of MSE Wall excavation limits to comply with OSHA Standardsh) Assumptions to make for type of reinforcement in existing pavement to be removedi) Assumptions to make for tolerances in analyzing the stability of the structures during constructionThe Department can not reasonably expect the contractors to react and properly account for the responses to these questions unless they are answered immediately. Additionally, time needs to be provided for follow-up questions if the responses are not clear to the bidders. Please provide an addendum today clarifying all remaining issues on this project.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 43

Per the Lump Sum Minus Contract Table on sheet 60, all work shown on sheet 68 as "Construction Critical to Next Traffic Phase" for Stage 1 must be completed by October 31, 2008 to receive the maximum incentive. The first objective in the middle column on sheet 68 states 'open ramp D4 by first quarter of second construction season.' This would be the beginning of 2009, which is in conflict with the note on sheet 60 since most of the work on Ramp D4 is within the 'Critical' work listed on sheet 68. Additionally, the note for Construction Available During Winter Months on sheet 68 lists 'All work commenced during Stage 1' as being available in the winter, which again contradicts the note on sheet 60. Please clarify specifically what work must be completed in each construction season to obtain the incentives.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 44

1. If the contractor elects to perform work listed as 'Available' during a construction phase and this work requires maintenance of traffic other than or additional to what is specifically shown for that phase, we assume unless clarified by addendum that he will be compensated for the additional work to maintain traffic2. Due to the staged construction of many of the bridges on this project, we will assume unless clarified by addendum that Structural Steel Painting and Concrete Sealing are not included in the work that is required to be completed prior to the Lump Sum Minus Incentive Dates.3. Sheet 58 lists an interim completion date of 30 calendar days for Diversion 7 as shown on sheet 197. This diversion is not only required for the roadway tie-in of new Ramp E2 to the existing ramp; it is also required to install MSE Wall No. 8 and the Forward Abutment of Bridge 1393. Temporary sheeting as detailed in the bridge plans on sheet 1600 impacts the existing ramp. The ramp will need to be restricted to one lane from the time that this sheeting is installed to build the MSE wall until the ramp including bridge is open and the additional tie-in work in Phase 5 is completed. 30 calendar days is unrealistic. We request that the interim completion date for this work be removed.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 45

Addendum #4 added PN107 for the Critical Path Schedule. Section D.2. states that 'any float generated due to the efficiencies of either party is not for the sole use of the party generating the float' and 'no time extensions will be granted nor delay damages paid unless a delay occurs which impacts the project's critical path, consumes all available float and extends the work beyond the Contract Completion Date.' This is extremely unfair to the contractor. For example, if the contractor chooses to allocate resources early in the project to get ahead due to other upcoming work, he would be penalized if there were a changed condition on this project. See below for an example:There is a \$1,000,000 incentive for Stage 1 construction if completed by 10/31/08 with \$50,000 per day lost for every calendar day after that. If the contractor works efficiently and generates 15 calendar days of float in the schedule at the beginning of the year, the spec requires that this float is shared. Then if we run into extra work or delays that take 10 days to resolve, the Department will have used 2/3 of the float generated by the contractor; leaving 5 days of float remaining. Now say at the end of the year we are less efficient than planned and lose 10 days on our own accord, we will be 5 days past the incentive date, costing us \$250,000[Contractor generates 15 days float; ODOT uses 10 days float; Contractor uses 5 days float (remaining after ODOT got to it first); Contractor loses 5 days @ \$50,000 = \$250,000 even though we completed all the original contract work 5 days early]This would be unfair to the contractor and can not possibly be the intent of the note. Unless clarified by addendum, we will base our bid on 'shared float' only being applicable to the final completion date and not to any of the interim completion dates, including but not limited to, those carrying Lump Sum Minus incentives.

Question Submitted: 9/11/2007

Question Number: 46

Our questions relate to the noise barrier item.1. Can manufacturers approved spans be utilized, on Wall 1, ie: 24 feet on center, where feasible, or is the post spacing restricted to the plan layout?2. Measurement for payment: All current ODOT projects pay for wall area as defined from bottom of wall to top of panel/coping, including what is buried below ground. Will measurement for payment be adjusted to reflect current ODOT practice?3. We assume that the reflective noise barrier item is strictly for the supply and installation of the transparent panel sections?4. Can post spans be increased on wall 2 if the transparent sections can be provided in a larger span than indicated on the drawings?Thank you, I realize this is after the 8 day period for submitting pre bid questions, but we were unable to review plans and specifications until today....hope you can answer these as it appears another addendum is forthcoming....

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/12/2007

Question Number: 47

Re: Noise Barrier # 2: Can you please define the required design wind pressure for the transparent section of barrier, so we may design the thickness of the transparent sheet accordingly. Posts 1 thru 19 are structure mounted on the parapet, and we would assume a pressure of 35 Lbs/Sq ft for these sections. The balance of the precast posts on the sleeper slab could be interpreted as ground mounted in which case we could use 25PSF. Please confirm the appropriate design wind pressure for all bays, 1- 101 on Wall 2. Design wind pressure has a direct influence on the thickness of the sheet, and affects costing. Thanks

Question Submitted: 9/12/2007

Question Number: 48

The unit price table only reflects absorptive noise barrier panel quantities for Wall 1. Wall 2 has approximately 5000 sq ft of absorptive noise barrier that is not accounted for in the unit price tables. Please add this to the bid item for absorptive barrier.

Question Submitted: 9/12/2007

Question Number: 49

The unit price table only reflects absorptive noise barrier quantities for Wall 1. Our takeoffs match the current pay item for Line Item 0931, for Wall 1. Wall 2 has approximately 5000 sq ft of absorptive noise barrier, below the transparent barrier, that is not accounted for in either of the 2 noise wall pay items. The reflective panel item, Line 932, 12,576 sq ft., matches our takeoffs for the transparent wall area on wall 2. Please add 5000 sq ft to the estimated quantities for absorptive noise barrier.

Question Submitted: 9/12/2007

Question Number: 50

The unit price table only reflects absorptive noise barrier quantities for Wall 1. Our takeoffs match the current pay item for Line Item 0931, for Wall 1. Wall 2 has approximately 5000 sq ft of absorptive noise barrier, below the transparent barrier, that is not accounted for in either of the 2 noise wall pay items. The reflective panel item, Line 932, 12,576 sq ft., matches our takeoffs for the transparent wall area on wall 2. Please add 5000 sq ft to the estimated quantities for absorptive noise barrier.

Question Submitted: 9/12/2007

Question Number: 51

1.) Per the response to the question of the Holophane pole listed a few additional issues need clarification. The pole has 2 base size's. The requirement of Domestic Steel/Iron has not been addressed as waving QPL has not addressed this issue. The manufacture state's that you can not galvanize Cast Iron parts. The base would be Cast Iron and shaft could be Steel or Iron.

This answer will be included in addendum #6. Changes to the plans are: 1) 1200/1811 Lighting Plan General Notes a) Item 625 Light Pole, Decorative, As Per Plan: Remove "Holophane North Yorkshire Series" and add "Union Metal National Series except Design B1927." b) Revise the first part of the last paragraph to read as follows: If of steel, the pole shall be hot dip galvanized but not if of iron. The pole shall be factory finished in black to match the luminaire. The finishing system shall be suitable for the environment in which the pole is to be located. The pole shall be 12'-6" from the bottom of the mounting base to the bottom of the luminaire tenon. The anchor bolts shall properly anchor the pole to the structure and fit within the space allocated within the pilaster. c) Retain as the final paragraph the current "payment" sentence. Both Spring City and Union Metal offer poles of domestic steel. A product needs to be on the appropriate QPL before either the product or its paperwork arrives at the job site but not before award. Spring City is in the process of getting on the QPL. Steel and iron are acceptable, however aluminum is not. This is different than the response which we gave to this prebid question the first time.

Question Submitted: 9/13/2007

Question Number: 52

Line item 932 is based upon quantities for wall 1 only. Line item 931, estimated quantity of 12,576 sq ft is for the transparent panels only (reflective), and does not provide for approx. 5,000 sq ft of absorptive pre cast panels at the bottom of the barrier. Please adjust pay items accordingly to provide for the additional 5,000 sq ft of absorptive panels on wall 2.

Question Submitted: 9/13/2007

Question Number: 53

Light Poles are listed in the Proposal for Ref #273 as being AONB50. The proper designation for these poles should be ALM50 unless the luminaires called for are wrong. Please advise whether it is the poles or the luminaires whose designation needs changed.

Thank you for pointing this out to us. Because this issue is relatively small compared to the total value of the project, we will not delay the sale of the project in order to issue an addendum.

Question Submitted: 9/13/2007

Question Number: 54

In addendum 6 issued today Q56A the revised answer. Since there is no criteria for the items listed in the original question, in the 2005 CMS ODOT Construction and Material Specification 725.11 subnotes A thru G that meets what is requested in the plans such as ballast type, wattage of lamps, listed descriptions of material (DECORATIVE, FLOOD LIGHT, UNDERPASS B, AND WALL SCONCE). We will assume that all we have to submit to get on QPL list is the plan note listed catalogue numbers, description, and or a approved equal by the engineer. What is the appropriate QPL if lamp and Ballast are either not listed or have size constraints to ballast size of 725.11 C.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addendum addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/14/2007

Question Number: 55

Regarding addendum no. 6 The Union Metal pole you have selected consists of a split cast base that wraps around a steel base plate style pole. What size is the pilaster that the poles are going on? We need what bolt circle will fit. Will there be room for the 25" diameter 43" tall base to sit on the pilaster? We can't quote on this without knowing the size constraints of the pilaster.

The intent is to provide a slender decorative pole, which can be mounted on a 12" bolt circle as shown in the plan. If the Union Metal Pole can not be custom fabricated to meet that requirement, then the contractor can substitute with an "Approved Equal" pole, as described in the plan note on Sheet 1200. The bid should be based on the plan requirement to supply a pole which fits on the design bolt circle -- and specifically can be mounted on the standard bridge pilaster as detailed on sheet 1309.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2007

Question Number: 56

1.) Ref No 465, 466, and 467, have no corresponding bid item for an OHSS Foundation. 2.) There are a sizeable number of large overhead mounted signs that are indicated to be ground mounted during various phases of construction under Item 614 Maintaining Traffic. Interpretation of temporary ground mounted supports is not always consistent from job to job. Can these signs be mounted on wood posts, or will steel breakaway beams be required?

A1: both the foundation and the subsequent removal of these temporary signs are included in the pay item "OVERHEAD SIGN SUPPORT (TEMPORARY), TYPE XX, AS PER PLAN." A2: Steel supports will not be required, wood is acceptable so long as it is NCRP compliant, whenever it is located in a clear zone.

Question Submitted: 9/18/2007

Question Number: 57

Since the job has been postponed, please revise the units for item 203 to l.f.

Question Submitted: 9/19/2007

Question Number: 58

Addendum #5 adds an Overhead Sign support type TC 15.115. We cannot find any info on where this structure is to be used. Please clarify the span and sign locations. Also, which 7.65 Design 8 is deleted?

Please see the revised sheets linked to Addendum #6.

Question Submitted: 9/4/2007

Question Number: 59

Reference is made to the laminated elastomeric bearings for bridge 75-1347 (REF # 578) and bridge 75-1347-E (REF # 603). Note # 6 on page 1295 and page 1337 says the HP 12 x 53 steel support pedestal shall be "supplied by the structural steel fabricator". This will not happen. The structural steel fabricators will always exclude this from their quotes to the contractors. The laminated elastomeric bearing manufacturers will gladly include the HP 12 x 53 steel support pedestal in their prices. Please state this change in an addendum to clear up both pay items.

Question Submitted: 9/4/2007

Question Number: 60

In addendum no. 3, you clarify the median barrier PVC sizes to be one 3" PVC duct for Lighting and one 4" PVC duct ITS. But you failed to recognize the bridge PVC requirements as shown. The following 5 bridges show 4" Multicell ducts in the bridge and approach slab median barrier: 1. Bridge MOT-75-1347 --> plan sheets 1296, 1297, 1310, 1311. 2. Bridge MOT-75-1367 --> plan sheets 1473, 1501. 3. Bridge MOT-75-1393 --> plan sheets 1626, 1629. 4. Bridge MOT-75-1396 --> plan sheets 1660, 1668.

5. Bridge MOT-75-1433 --> plan sheets 1748, 1749. It is understood that these PVC ducts are paid in their respective concrete bid items, but do you want multi-cell duct or 3" and 4" PVC non-multi-cell ducts???

Question Submitted: 9/4/2007

Question Number: 61

Ref 84, 119815 sy Geogrid. No specs for this geogrid is found in the plans.

Question Submitted: 9/4/2007

Question Number: 62

In Addendum #4 pre-bid question #19 was answered "Reinforced concrete pavement refers to steel reinforcements including wire mesh or deformed bars". There is a tremendous difference in the cost of pavement removal with wire mesh versus deformed bars. In order to correctly price this work, limits for pavement removal with deformed bars should be given.

In reviewing the original plans dated 1956, the typical section refers to 9" Reinforced Portland Cement Concrete Pavement Item T-71. Does this indicate mesh or deformed bars?

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/5/2007

Question Number: 63

1. Sheet 1419A states that the causeway will be built to elevation 728.50 prior to installing the drilled shafts on bridge 1367. The top pay limit for these shafts is below the top of causeway elevation. How will the Department pay for the extra drilling required between the causeway elevation and the top of shaft elevation? 2. Can the contractor combine deck and diaphragm pours shown on sheet 1474 if a retarder is used in the diaphragm concrete to ensure that adjacent spans are loaded prior concrete set in the diaphragm? 3. Can the contractor combine deck and diaphragm pours shown on sheet 1566 if a retarder is used in the diaphragm concrete to ensure that adjacent spans are loaded prior concrete set in the diaphragm? 4. Using the elevations provided on sheet 1528, it appears that Reference Number 739 should have a quantity of 1,845 lf instead of the current plan quantity of 1,776 lf. 5. The pier plans for Bridge 1367W have notes that state the contractor has the option to square the ends of the pier footings with all costs associated with this option being at the contractor's expense. It appears however, that the plan quantity for pier footing concrete already accounts for the additional volume to square the ends of all piers, even piers 3, 4, and 5 which do not have an option in the bid. Please clarify how this item will be paid. Will the contractor be permitted to square the ends of Pier 3, 4, and 5 which are not currently shown with this option? 6. Note 524.03 on sheet 1610A references a demonstration shaft, however there are no specific requirements for a demonstration shaft on Bridge 1393. Please confirm that the only demonstration shaft on the project is on Bridge 1367W. 7. Please verify the weight of the pier spiral rebar for bridge 1401. It appears that the calculations on sheet 1700 are incorrect. 8. Plan sheets 70 and 71 show that Phase 5 is in Stage 2 and Phase 6 is in Stage 3. The title blocks of Sheets 212 thru 218 call out Phase 6 as being in Stage 2. It appears from the winter season work note on Sheet 70 that Phase 6 is in Stage 3 and the plan layout sheets are incorrect, please verify. 9. Section F-F on sheet 169 appears to be incorrect. According to the I-75 Southbound cross section as station 356+00 there is no permanent MSE wall on the outside of the ramp as shown in Section F-F. Section G-G on sheet 169 appears to be more accurate. 10. Unless items and quantities are added by addendum, we assume that any items such as curbs, sidewalks, pavement, etc. on sideroads that are required to be removed or rehabbed by the construction of this project will be paid for by change order. This has been done on several other recent projects. 11. Sheet 72 has a note which states 'prior to the start of all construction, a minimum of six temporary poles and cable supports must be provided for RTA electric buses trolley lines.' This note falls under the Main Street maintenance of traffic. Please provide the location of these temporary poles and verify that they will not interfere with the new permanent construction. Where is this work to be paid for? 12. Does the department intend to post the prebid meeting minutes for this project?

Question Submitted: 9/5/2007

Question Number: 64

Please clarify the interim completion table on sheet 58. The second item in the table shows 30 calendar days for ramp E2. Is this 30 days the ramp is to be closed or a deadline for work to be completed in this area? If the 30 days is for completion of work, what criteria will be used to determine completion? Please clarify the intent of the durations on the fourth item (ramp E5, phase 5) and the seventh item (ramp E5, phase 8) as well.

Question Submitted: 9/5/2007

Question Number: 65

Section F. of the causeway notes on sheet 1521 for Bridges 1367 and 1367W states that 'the exterior of the causeways and pier work pads shall be protected by steel sheet piling.' This requirement has not previously been used and is a significant cost to the project. This project will require multiple causeway configurations which will change between substructure installation, beam erection, and superstructure construction. Due to schedule requirements, the contractor will need to work on both the Ramp Bridge and the Mainline Bridge concurrently which will increase the amount of material required thereby significantly increasing the cost. Additionally, the permits included in the contract documents do not appear to require sheet piling. Will the Department consider eliminating the requirement for lining the perimeter of the causeway with sheet piling and merely require the contractor to comply with the Corp permit?

Question Submitted: 9/6/2007

Question Number: 66

Addendum #4 added 3 parcels to be demolished. The plan notes state that demolition of the structures shall be complete and all debris and material disposed offsite by November 30, 2007. Two of those parcels are still in use with their occupants conducting business. When will these structures be available to the contractor to begin asbestos abatement and demolition? We are concerned that enough time will be available for permits/notifications, abatement, and demolition prior to November 30.

Kens Kars and MetroDoor are to be vacated by Oct. 19.

Question Submitted: 9/6/2007

Question Number: 67

Per page 1202, Item 625, ref 295, ref 296, ref 297, ref 298. 1.) the plans note refers, In Addition To The ODOT Construction and Material Specifications Requirements, Item 625. Which refers to section 725, which refers to subsection 725.11 A thru G. None of the listed manufactures are on the ODOT's QPL listing by Materials Management. There is not a subsection for Underpass Type B, Decorative, Acorn Style, Wall Sconce, and Flood Light Architectural. Since CMS/QPL is a requirement how do you meet ODOT's requirement's on section 725.11? 2.) ref 296, 297, and 298 show lamp wattages that are not in 725.11 B, 70 watt metal halide and 100 watt metal halide. The ballast for this type of fixture using a 240V may not meet ODOT 725.11 C. please advise? 3.) ref 295 Underpass Type B, neither manufacture are listed are on the QPL. The plan calls for equal as approved by the engineer, which would govern, supplying a manufacture that has QPL Listing or intent of design?

The items referenced in the question will be owned and maintained by the City of Dayton. The requirements to meet ODOT material specifications and listing on the QPL are therefore waived for these items. See also Response to Q56.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation

Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/6/2007

Question Number: 68

1.) Plan page 1200, item 625 ref. 264 Light Pole, Decorative, as per plan. Neither manufacturer listed in the plan note are on the ODOT Materials Management QPL Listing. 2.) The plan note calls out the poles by manufacturer and by product design. It neglects to address pole size, pole diameter, pole taper, smooth or fluted, base size, and any accessory's on the poles. 3.) Since ODOT is concerned about Iron/Steel of domestic sources, 1 of the manufactures listed provides the same series listed in Aluminum. Since ODOT is concerned about corrosion and wants the poles galvanized prior to painting, aluminum would provide the same protection with a more standard custom product.

Answer: a. The pole will be owned and maintained by the City of Dayton. The requirement for the pole to be listed on the ODOT QPL is waived for this item; b. The pole height will be 12.5', as stated in the plan note on Sheet 1200. The Holophane pole will be catalog number NY13/17. The pole taper, fluting, base size, and accessories shall be as shown (standard) in the product catalog. Custom fluting or dimensions will not be required -- however the bolt circle for the pole must match the bolt circle on the pilaster, as stated in the plan note; c. The material for both poles shall be steel -- per City of Dayton requirements. Aluminum poles will not be permitted for this item.

Question Submitted: 9/6/2007

Question Number: 69

The note on plan sheet 1084/1811 for Rigid Overhead Sign Support Foundation APP states that we are to include removing 90 feet of barrier and replacement with the 10' special median section and 40' transitions on each side. This is not normal practice. Usually there are bid items for the barrier removal and the transitions. Please add bid items to cover this work so that bidders do not overlook these requirements.

Question Submitted: 9/6/2007

Question Number: 70

Addendum 4 revised the maintenance of traffic to allow for southbound access from Stanley Avenue via Ramp N-10. This prohibits the construction of MSE Walls 16, 17, and the widening of Bridge 1462 over Leo Avenue during the revised Phase 1A. The plan sheets provided in the addendum state that the work on Project 070387 will be concurrent with Project MOT-75-14.60. When will these phases of Project 14.60 be constructed? Unless clarified by addendum, we will assume that the work on Project 070387 which is impacted by the maintenance of Ramp N-10 will not be included in the Lump Sum Minus Incentive for Stage 1 since we have no control over the timing of this work.

Question Submitted: 9/7/2007

Question Number: 71

The waterline and sanitary specifications indicate that the City of Dayton will perform various items of work such as cutting & plugging existing lines, installing tapping sleeves etc. but, even though several calls have been made along w/ requests for what these costs may be, we have not been able to receive this information. The City of Dayton has informed us that they need to meet w/ Odot on these items. Can Odot provide this information along w/ any inspection costs that we may incur.

Question Submitted: 9/7/2007

Question Number: 72

The specified Decorative Light Pole and Decorative Luminaire (Bid Ref. 264 & 296) detailed on plan pages 1200 and 1202 are not found on the ODOT QPL/Certified Supplier list of approved materials. Also, the specified Luminaire, Underpass Type B (Bid Ref. 295), Luminaire, Misc.: Architectural Flood Light, As Per Plan (Bid Ref. 297) and Luminaire, Wall Sconce, As Per Plan (Bid Ref. 298) detailed on plan page 1202 are also not found on the ODOT QPL/ Certified Supplier list of approved materials. We will bid this project with the assumption that these specified items DO NOT need to be on the QPL/ Certified Supplier Approved List to incorporate them into the project since they are specified in the plans. Please give a list of QPL/ Certified Supplier listed items of work by addendum if our assumption is not correct.

Question Submitted: 9/7/2007

Question Number: 73

The estimated quantity for Reference #736, Pipe downspout, including specials is given as 311 feet. According to the details shown on sheet 1583 of 1811 I calculate about 125 feet. This quantity is for the downspouts at Piers 1 and 7. Are there any other pier locations that have downspouting and if so where are they shown? Please review and advise if a corrected quantity is required.

Question Submitted: 9/7/2007

Question Number: 74

Bid item 65 622 Concrete Barrier, Type B1 2786 FT. On plan sheet 313 it shows the stationing of three pieces of Barrier, Type B1. These pieces are actually Type D, as per Typical section sheet 27. You need to subtract 875 ft from the type b1, and add 875 ft to type D. Bid item 199 609 Curb, Type 6 10439 FT. On plan sheet 550 and 551 there is a total of 524 feet of Curb, Type 6. This quantity is not included in the bid item. On plan sheet 554 there is a 17 foot piece that is also not counted. You need to add 571 feet to this bid item.

Question Submitted: 9/7/2007

Question Number: 75

There needs to be bid items for End Anchors as per RM 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5. There needs to be bid items for End Sections as per RM 4.6.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.

Ohio Department of Transportation Prebid Questions

Question Submitted: 9/7/2007

Question Number: 76

Referring to sheets 194 and 1219, the notes read that median barrier removal, replacement, and all associated lighting replacements are to be incidental to 614 Maintaining Traffic, APP. This is a very significant cost to be included in the lump sum. Normally, this work would be separated into separate bid items. Please revise the bid items to include this work.

Question Submitted: 9/7/2007

Question Number: 77

The note on plan sheet 62/1811 titled "ITEM 615 – ROADS FOR MAINTAINING TRAFFIC" lists several extensive cost items related to construction of the temporary roads that are incidental to this pay item but the item is not AS PER PLAN in the proposal. Included are items such as temporary drainage including concrete barrier protection and temporary sheeting, relocating and or adjusting water meters, manholes, catch basins, inlets, signs, lighting features, landscaped areas. Can separate pay items be added for these items? If these items remain part of Item 615, should the item be designated As Per Plan? Can quantities be provided, as information only, to help define the scope of work involved?

Question Submitted: 9/9/2007

Question Number: 78

Sheet 58 lists an interim completion date of 30 calendar days for Diversion 7 as shown on sheet 197. This diversion is not only required for the roadway tie-in of new Ramp E2 to the existing ramp; it is also required to install MSE Wall No. 8 and the Forward Abutment of Bridge 1393. Temporary sheeting as detailed in the bridge plans on sheet 1600 impacts the existing ramp. The ramp will need to be restricted to one lane from the time that this sheeting is installed to build the MSE wall until the ramp including bridge is open and the additional tie-in work in Phase 5 is completed. 30 calendar days is unrealistic. We request that the interim completion date for this work be removed.

All prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, materialmen and all others who have an interest in these prebid questions and answers are advised that these items are being provided for informational purposes only and are not part of the bidding documents. If a question warrants a clarification, the Department will issue an addenda addressing the request for clarification to all plan holders. If the Department believes that the bidding documents adequately address the request, the contractor will be advised accordingly.