

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	1	Addendum 3 revised the Selection Criteria document to eliminate the Pre-ATC Meetings. These meetings would have provided an invaluable and timesaving confidential discussion between ODOT and the DBT of the proposed concepts. The public forum for pre-bid questions is not the proper tool for proprietary/original concepts. The communication will likely be so guarded so as to not give away the idea, that this process will not be efficient or effective. Will ODOT consider putting these meetings back in or allowing another venue for confidential, ATC related questions and answers?	12/3/2010 16:11	ODOT will not be conducting pre-ATC meetings. All ATC submissions as well as all resulting ATC correspondence will be kept confidential until the winning Design Build Team is announced. Final determination for all ATC's will be accordance with Section 6.6 of the Selection Criteria.
113000	2	Pavement Design Report Will ODOT please provide the pavement design report including ESAL counts and subgrade CBR values assumed for the recommended pavement sections included in PV-01 Pavement Composition - Mainline Ramps & Directional Roadways.pdf in the RFP?	12/8/2010 22:36	Information can be found at -> ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/FRA-71-1776-PavementDesign.pdf
113000	3	DGN Files for Bridge Type Study Will ODOT please provide DGN files for the bridge drawings included in the Abbreviated Structure Type Study that was included in the RFP?	12/8/2010 22:34	Information can be found at -> ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/
113000	4	Page 11 of the Project Proposal requires that a PN013 DBE Affidavit be included in the "Price Proposal – Acknowledgements/Miscellaneous" submission. PN013 as provided on Page 24 of the Proposal does not provide the affidavit form. Since the DBE firms have not actually performed any work up to this point, is it even necessary to submit this form? If the affidavit is required, please provide the proper form.	12/14/2010 14:55	Affidavit is located at -> http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/EqualOpportunity/DBE/OCC-100-DBE-Affidavit.doc
11300	5	Request for dgn files Could you please make available the following Microstation dgn files • Appendix RD-04 – Jack Gibbs Parking Lane • Appendix RD-05 – Curb ramp Type and Location	12/15/2010 7:31	The curb ramp appendix RD-05 was put together in pdf format. There is not a dgn or dwg file with the curb ramp information shown on it. RD-04 Information can be found at -> ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/Fra77639-Appendix-RD-04.zip
113000	6	In the revised 104.02B Differing Site Conditions, found on page 70 of the Proposal, it is stated "The first \$250,000 of direct costs and associated impact will be the responsibility of the DBT". We read this to be the DBT will be responsible for the first \$250,000 for the project (events cumulative), not per instance. Is this understanding correct?	12/16/2010 02:17 PM	Yes, the DBT is responsible for the first \$250,000 of direct cost (events cumulative) for the duration of the project.
113000	7	1. Section 6.7.1.2 refers to Appendix UT-06 for AEP distribution proposed plans. UT-06 only states that the relocation plans are under development. Please confirm when plans will be available. 2. Please provide the following missing raster files for the microtunnel information recently posted. • M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-001-0.pdf • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-002-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-003-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-004-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-005-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-006-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-007-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-008-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-009-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-010-0.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Boring Program\Final Logs\CTL boring logs.pdf] • [M:\proj\0221\1004\01\geotechnical\Microtunnel\Basemaps\DXF sticks\dlz b-287-1 log.pdf]	12/20/2010 8:53	1. These will be posted when finalized. 2. ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/Microtunnel-Boring-Logs/

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	8	<p>The DBT must employ an Independent Quality Firm (IQF) who will be responsible for verifying and documenting all quality related data for the Department including:</p> <p>A. Design B. Testing C. Inspection D. Geotechnical investigations E. Environmental activities F. Maintenance of Traffic plans G. Survey Verification H. Computer database of materials testing results</p> <p>We would like clarification regarding the following points:</p> <p>1. What is considered 'quality related data' with regards to Geotechnical investigations (section 2.1 element D) and what would be considered for verification and documentation for a geotechnical monitor?</p> <p>2. If the IQF inspection and testing efforts are considered the definitive verification and documentation for acceptance of the work, why is it required for the PQC staff to be qualified and experienced to the same level as IQF staff? Results of PQC tests are to be used by the contractor to control the work up to the point of acceptance are of little value relative to the final acceptance of the work. Only the tests performed by the IQF should be considered valid for acceptance. Requiring duplicate certified testing organizations appear to be duplication of effort that should be avoided.</p> <p>3. Please clarify what is considered "Point of Acceptance" for the various products that will be incorporated into the project. For example, reinforcing steel, concrete, granular embankment, asphalt, electric wiring, light standards, traffic signals, topsoil, plant material (not an exhaustive list but instead a sampling of 'products')</p>	12/20/2010 16:29	<p>1) Answer: The IQF must verify that geotechnical investigations are in conformance with the ODOT Specifications for Geotechnical Explorations (SGE), including, but not limited to: Documentation of field and office reconnaissance, including sources, photographs, maps, sketches, and notes, per SGE Section 300. Placement, type, depth, sampling interval, and Exploration Identification for soil borings (or other exploratory methods), per SGE Section 300. Drilling (or other exploration methods), sampling, and field testing, per SGE Section 400. Installation and monitoring of Geotechnical Instrumentation per SGE Section 500. Laboratory testing and visual classification per SGE Section 600. Reporting per SGE Section 700.</p> <p>2) Answer: Follow the requirements of Project Scope, Section 2.</p> <p>3) Answer: See Project Scope Section 2.6.2.8.13 and CM&S sections 105 and 106.</p>
113000	9	<p>The DBT must employ an Independent Quality Firm (IQF) who will be responsible for verifying and documenting all quality related data for the Department including:</p> <p>A. Design B. Testing C. Inspection D. Geotechnical investigations E. Environmental activities F. Maintenance of Traffic plans G. Survey Verification H. Computer database of materials testing results</p> <p>We would like clarification regarding the following points:</p> <p>1. What is considered 'quality related data' with regards to Geotechnical investigations (section 2.1 element D) and what would be considered for verification and documentation for a geotechnical monitor?</p> <p>2. If the IQF inspection and testing efforts are considered the definitive verification and documentation for acceptance of the work, why is it required for the PQC staff to be qualified and experienced to the same level as IQF staff? Results of PQC tests are to be used by the contractor to control the work up to the point of acceptance are of little value relative to the final acceptance of the work. Only the tests performed by the IQF should be considered valid for acceptance. Requiring duplicate certified testing organizations appear to be duplication of effort that should be avoided.</p> <p>3. Please clarify what is considered "Point of Acceptance" for the various products that will be incorporated into the project. For example, reinforcing steel, concrete, granular embankment, asphalt, electric wiring, light standards, traffic signals, topsoil, plant material (not an exhaustive list but instead a sampling of 'products')</p>	12/20/2010 16:31	<p>1) Answer: The IQF must verify that geotechnical investigations are in conformance with the ODOT Specifications for Geotechnical Explorations (SGE), including, but not limited to: Documentation of field and office reconnaissance, including sources, photographs, maps, sketches, and notes, per SGE Section 300. Placement, type, depth, sampling interval, and Exploration Identification for soil borings (or other exploratory methods), per SGE Section 300. Drilling (or other exploration methods), sampling, and field testing, per SGE Section 400. Installation and monitoring of Geotechnical Instrumentation per SGE Section 500. Laboratory testing and visual classification per SGE Section 600. Reporting per SGE Section 700.</p> <p>2) Answer: Follow the requirements of Project Scope, Section 2.</p> <p>3) Answer: See Project Scope Section 2.6.2.8.13 and CM&S sections 105 and 106.</p>

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	10	<p>1. On page 16-9, under section 16.4.7, the note states that "work zone pavement markings shall be reapplied at least once per year or as directed by the Engineer. Reapplication of work zone pavement markings shall be performed prior to each over-winter condition." It would be less subjective if the department would remove the "or as directed by the engineer" note and refer back to specification 614.11 which defines the acceptability and expected duration of the work zone pavement markings.</p> <p>2. Please clarify note 16.9.3 in the project scope that defines the lane closure policy for Cleveland avenue. Currently, the note says the DBT may have lane closures during the designated allowable time frames at a rate of \$250 per lane per day (June 1 – September 30) and \$500 per lane per day (October 1 – May 31), and outside of the designated allowable time frames at a rate of \$300 per hour per lane. Is it ODOT's intent to charge a lane rental rate inside the 2-week period to widen Cleveland Avenue?</p> <p>3. Upon review of the table in Section 16.4.5 about Message boards we have the following question: a. For all the places designated as ADV in that chart there is nothing that states how many days in advance the boards are to be placed. Please clarify.</p>	12/20/2010 17:39	<p>1) Answer: No change.</p> <p>2) Answer: Yes. Lane rental rates apply any time a lane is closed inside the allowable lane closure times including the 2 week period to complete the widening. If a lane is closed outside the allowable lane closure times then the disincentive of \$300/hr/lane applies.</p> <p>3) Answer: PCMS displaying advanced notification message shall be placed 6 days in advance. Will clarify in a future addenda.</p>
113000	11	Considering that size of this project, will ODOT consider adding an allowance for the Construction Sediment & Erosion Control where the Erosion Control items would be paid for at the established SS832 unit prices? This has been done on other ODOT Design/Build projects and helps eliminate potential conflicts of interest during construction.	12/21/2010 13:09	Answer: No. The SS-832 (Modified) will be used .
113000	12	<p>1. Per Section 1.8, please provide the engineering plans for Project 3 – I-71 East Trench.</p> <p>2. The current design shows 12' shoulder on left and 4' shoulder on right of the EB I-670 fly-over structure. Please verify FHWA/ODOT approval of this bridge section. If not, please clarify the requirements.</p> <p>3. Do the scope requirements in Section 10.2.3 Item 2 overrule scope requirements in Section 10.2.4 Item 8?</p>	12/21/2010 15:41	<p>1) These plans will be posted.</p> <p>2) Answer: The shoulders as shown are necessary to achieve the horizontal sight distance requirements, as provided in section 10.5.2 (C).</p> <p>3) Answer: Yes. This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.</p>
113000	13	Is there a list of firms that have previously worked for the Department on this project? Is there a conflict-of-interest waiver process?	12/22/2010 14:28	<p>A generic letter (FRA-71-670 DB Generic Letter - Conflict of Interest.doc) sent to known firms can be found at the following link: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Fra71-670/SOQ</p> <p>This outlines the waiver process.</p>
113000	14	<p>1. Section 11.4.5 of the Project Scope dictates the DBT's are to show in plan the Maintenance of Traffic provisions necessary to complete the microtunneling operations. It then refers to Section 16.8 for ramp closures when developing these plans. Section 16.8 provides no information south of Broad Street for use in completing this plan. Please clarify.</p> <p>2. Section 11.4.5 of the scope, last paragraph states the DBT's are to verify the tunnel alignment does not conflict with the proposed structures in future East Trench project and East Interchange project. Due to the limited time frames pre-bid and expected review times do the verification, we assume this will be done post-bid, with necessary changes addressed at that point. Please verify.</p>	12/22/2010 15:38	<p>1) This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.</p> <p>2) The step 7 plans for the East Trench project and The East Interchange project will be posted. DBTs are responsible for verifying that their designs do not conflict with Projects 2 and 3.</p>
77369	15	Is there a list of firms that have previously worked for the Department on this project? Is there a conflict-of-interest waiver process?	12/22/2010 14:28	<p>A generic letter (FRA-71-670 DB Generic Letter - Conflict of Interest.doc) sent to known firms can be found at the following link: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Fra71-670/SOQ</p> <p>This outlines the waiver process.</p>

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	16	<p>1. Section 11.4.5 of the Project Scope dictates the DBT's are to show in plan the Maintenance of Traffic provisions necessary to complete the microtunneling operations. It then refers to Section 16.8 for ramp closures when developing these plans. Section 16.8 provides no information south of Broad Street for use in completing this plan. Please clarify.</p> <p>2. Section 11.4.5 of the scope, last paragraph states the DBT's are to verify the tunnel alignment does not conflict with the proposed structures in future East Trench project and East Interchange project. Due to the limited time frames pre-bid and expected review times do the verification, we assume this will be done post-bid, with necessary changes addressed at that point. Please verify.</p>	12/22/2010 15:38	<p>1) This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.</p> <p>2) The step 7 plans for the East Trench project and The East Interchange project will be posted. DBTs are responsible for verifying that their designs do not conflict with Projects 2 and 3.</p>
113000	17	Will SS 898 be utilized on this project?	12/23/2010 11:47	No. See Appendix ST-01.
113000	18	<p>Bridge FRA-71-18.31(R) & I-71NB Limit of Work</p> <p>Section 12.2 of the Project Scope indicates that "all bridges in this project shall be completely new construction, except for bridge number FRA-71-1835L." This question relates to the adjacent bridge and the limits of work on I-71 NB. The record plans shows that bridge FRA-71-18.31 (R) carries I-71 NB across Jack Gibbs, and extends approximately from station 163+25 to 164+60. Table 10-4 in the Project Scope indicates the approximate project limits on I-71 NB extend to Station 174+49 which includes this bridge. However, the Step 7 plan drawings show no work on this bridge, and the profile drawing for I-71 NB shows work finishing at station 163+19. Please clarify the work limits on I-71 NB and the disposition of bridge FRA-71-18.31 (R).</p>	12/23/2010 11:51	Clarified in Addenda #4.
113000	19	<p>Microtunnel layout south of FRA-71-17.76</p> <p>We request any proposed or conceptual plans for the future reconstruction projects (Columbus Crossroads Projects 3 & 2) FRA-71-17.14 and FRA-70-14.48 as the microtunnel portion for the FRA-71-17.76 work extends into these roadway contracts. We need these plans so that the microtunnel design we are performing under this proposal does not conflict with future projects.</p>	12/23/2010 11:52	The step 7 plans for the East Trench project and The East Interchange project will be posted.
113000	20	<p>Appendices DR-03 and Appendix DR-04 include preliminary storm sewer and microtunnel information and design calculations that are the output from three software programs, ODOT's CDSS, Bentley PondPak and XP-SWMM. Will ODOT please provide the electronic data files used by these programs that were used in preparing the preliminary drainage design?</p> <p>In addition to the XP-SWMM data files, would ODOT also export the XP-SWMM model files to facilitate analysis with EPA swmm5?</p> <p>Will ODOT also provide calculations related to inlet spacing and ditch flow as represented in the preliminary design?</p>	12/23/2010 14:14	Updated files are located at -> ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/ , in the PBQ-Files directory.
113000	21	<p>Pay Item Definition and Scope of Work</p> <p>The last page of the Proposal (p. 88) lists ten Pay Items with an abbreviated description. We do not understand what work should be in pay items with descriptions of "...BR Eligible Bridges", "...100% City of Columbus Items", "...New Bridges", etc. Please provide a complete description of each pay item along with a scope of work that is to be included in the price for that Pay Item.</p>	12/28/2010 9:52	This is addressed in Addendum 4. Updated files including proposal are located at -> ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/ , in the AddendumD directory.
113000	22	<p>10.5.2 Roadway Design</p> <p>C. For all curved alignments, horizontal stopping sight distance shall be provided in accordance with ODOT L&D, Volume 1, Figure 201-2E. Where necessary to attain required sight distance for roadways with unequal shoulder widths, the wider shoulder shall be placed on the inside of the curve. Additionally, if necessary to attain the required horizontal sight distance, the inside shoulder shall be widened to a minimum of 12 feet"</p> <p>Does this mean, for example, for a 2-lane directional ramp the wider 10ft right shoulder (in direction of travel) can be placed in the inside curve (left side in directional of travel), and the narrower shoulder of 4 ft can be placed on the right side (in direction of travel). Would this be considered acceptable or is a design exception for right shoulder of 4 ft required? Please clarify.</p>	12/29/2010 13:53	Answer: it is acceptable to have the wider shoulder on the inside curve. If the inside of the curve happens to be on the left, it would be acceptable to have the wider shoulder on the left side.

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	23	<p>Bid Form</p> <p>Please provide the Bid Form to be supplied by the Department as referenced in Proposal PN 019.</p>	12/28/2010 9:57	This is addressed in Addendum 4. Updated files including proposal are located at -> ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/ , in the AddendumD directory.
113000	24	We cannot locate the existing retaining wall plans for the following locations: Ramp from I-71 SB to Spring Street and Ramp from I-71 NB to Hamilton Avenue. Please provide these plans or tell us what existing plan set they are located in.	1/3/2011 11:41	These can be found at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/
113000	25	<p>Storm Sewer Files - Followup</p> <p>The following question was asked on December 23, 2010 "Appendices DR-03 and Appendix DR-04 include preliminary storm sewer and microtunnel information and design calculations that are the output from three software programs, ODOT's CDSS, Bentley PondPak and XP-SWMM. Will ODOT please provide the electronic data files used by these programs that were used in preparing the preliminary drainage design? In addition to the XP-SWMM data files, would ODOT also export the XP-SWMM model files to facilitate analysis with EPA swmm5? Will ODOT also provide calculations related to inlet spacing and ditch flow as represented in the preliminary design?"</p> <p>The response was "Updated files are located at -> ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/, in the PBQ-Files directory."</p> <p>We reviewed the files on the ftp site on January 4, 2010 and did not find any updated files. Please confirm the location for the updated files.</p>	1/5/2011 15:48	<p>The Preliminary Drainage calculation files the Department has can be found at the following link: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/DrainageCalcs.zip</p> <p>Please note, the inlet/catch basin spacing shown in I-71/I-670 Step 7 plans were set preliminarily, and there were no calculations performed.</p>
113000	26	<p>Colored Concrete</p> <p>Project Scope section 12.2 states that "colored concrete shall be used in all exposed bridge elements...excluding superstructure deck concrete. All surfaces shall be sealed with non-epoxy sealer..." Do you intend that a powdered coloring agent be added to the ready mix concrete at a premium cost of \$30 to \$50 per cubic yard (potential additional cost of \$1,200,000 over normal ready mix concrete for the project) or do you intend that the concrete be colored using a tint in the specified non epoxy sealer.</p>	1/5/2011 16:02	Answer: The intent is that coloring be added to the redimix concrete mass. The sealer shall be clear. This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.
113000	27	<p>Parapet Concrete Coloring</p> <p>The last sentence of Project Scope section 12.2.14 states that "Superstructure parapets shall be tinted and sealed per section 12.2." Does the Department intend that the non-epoxy sealer be tinted with the appropriate color or that a powdered coloring agent be added to the ready mix concrete at a premium cost of \$30 to \$50 per cubic yard?</p>	1/5/2011 16:04	Answer: The intent is that coloring be added to the redimix concrete mass. The sealer shall be clear. This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.
113000	28	<p>Painting of Prestressed Concrete Beams</p> <p>Project Scope section 12.2.4 states that "If prestressed concrete I-beam superstructures are used, they shall be painted..." ODOT BDM figure 302.1.4.3-2 shows the fascia girder side and bottom only receiving a sealer. Does the Department require that all the prestressed beams be painted or only the fascia girder?</p>	1/5/2011 16:06	Answer: The intent is for the concrete beams to be sealed with Epoxy-Urethane sealer with the limits per ODOT BDM figure 302.1.4.3-2 (fascia only). This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	29	<p>Limit of Work I-71 NB</p> <p>The following question was asked on December 23, 2010 "Bridge FRA-71-18.31(R) & I-71NB Limit of Work - Section 12.2 of the Project Scope indicates that "all bridges in this project shall be completely new construction, except for bridge number FRA-71-1835L." This question relates to the adjacent bridge and the limits of work on I-71 NB. The record plans shows that bridge FRA-71-18.31 (R) carries I-71 NB across Jack Gibbs, and extends approximately from station 163+25 to 164+60. Table 10-4 in the Project Scope indicates the approximate project limits on I-71 NB extend to Station 174+49 which includes this bridge. However, the Step 7 plan drawings show no work on this bridge, and the profile drawing for I-71 NB shows work finishing at station 163+19. Please clarify the work limits on I-71 NB and the disposition of bridge FRA-71-18.31 (R)."</p> <p>The response was "Clarified in Addenda #4."</p> <p>Addenda #4 did clarify the work required on Bridge FRA-71-18.31 (R), but did not clarify the limit of work on I-71 NB. There are no horizontal or vertical changes proposed for the roadway north of station 163+19, yet table 10-4 lists the project limit as 174+49. Does the project scope require that this 1,100' of roadway be reconstructed in-place?</p>	1/5/2011 16:16	Yes.
113000	30	<p>Work Limits – Jack Gibbs Boulevard</p> <p>Table 10-4 indicates the limits of work extend from Station 72+00 to 78+00. Section 10.3.3 paragraph L requires that "an 8' wide parking lane with 7' wide sidewalk adjacent to the curb shall be provided along the south side of Jack Gibbs Boulevard east of Cleveland Avenue. See Appendix RD-04 for conceptual layout." The proposed lane extends from station 50+73 to 55+50 on Jack Gibbs Boulevard. Please clarify the limits of work on Jack Gibbs Boulevard.</p>	1/5/2011 16:25	<p>The limits for Jack Gibbs Blvd. shown in Table 10-4 are for the portion that is to be reconstructed. The parking lane was added to the project after Step 7 was complete. It was added as shown in RD-04.</p> <p>Work from Sta 50+73 to 55+50 shown in RD-04 is for the widening of Jack Gibbs for the parking lane. The DBT is to not fully reconstruct Jack Gibbs within these limits, only widen and construct walkway as needed.</p> <p>This will be clarified in an addenda.</p>
113000	31	<p>Existing Structure Plans – North High St Bridge Cap</p> <p>Would ODOT please provide copies of the plans for the North High Street Bridge cap over I-670 in Columbus? This plan would provide a good example of how utility conduits were incorporated on that cap project.</p>	1/5/2011 16:26	<p>The plans for the High St Cap can be found at the following link: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/</p> <p>Please note that these plans do not detail the utility conduits. These were installed by the developer during construction.</p>
113000	32	NOTE FROM THE DEPARTMENT.		ALL INDIVIDUAL COPIES OF AN ATC SUBMITTAL SHOULD BE BOUND (STAPLED AT A MINIMUM).
113000	33	There are several references in the contract documents to the Retaining Wall Type Studies. We have been unable to locate these in the Appendices. Please provide the Retaining Wall Type Studies.	1/10/2011 10:53	Answer: There is one reference to the retaining wall type studies on page 12-10, which is in error. The last sentence from in Section 12.3.3 will be deleted. This will be clarified in an addenda.
113000	34	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The drainage exhibits provided in Appendix DR-03 show existing storm sewer networks. 77369BU003.dgn appears to be missing which contains much of the existing storm and combined systems. Please provide this .dgn file. Please confirm the design criteria and reconstruction of the 670 bikeway on the North Side of Jack Gibbs Blvd from Sta. 74+00 to 76+00. 	1/11/2011 16:52	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The file (77369BU003.dgn) is posted at the following location: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/ The design criteria is ODOT Design Guidance for Independent Bicycle Facilities and AASHTO Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities. The pavement shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the asphalt concrete pavement described in Section V of the ODOT Design Guidance for Independent Bicycle Facilities. This will be clarified in an addenda.
113000	35	On page PS 16-3 under the I-670 Westbound Ramps it says that the Jack Gibbs/Cleveland ramp to I-670 WB shall remain open at all times. On page PS 16-18 in paragraph 16.8.4.2 it says that the Jack Gibbs/Cleveland ramp to I-670 WB may be closed during construction for a maximum of 90 days. Please clarify which note is correct by addendum.	1/12/2011 14:01	Page 16-18, paragraph 16.8.4.2 is correct that the ramp may be closed for 90 days. This will be clarified in an Addenda.
113000	36	Page 10 of the proposal states that the Department will only accept a handwritten "Price Proposal – Bid" on a hard copy form supplied by the Department. Can the Department provide this form electronically so that the DBT can type the bid into the form to eliminate misinterpretations of handwriting in the hard copy?	1/13/2011 14:20	An Electronic copy will be provided at a later date.

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	37	Q: Page 10 of the Proposal requests that bidders include the following information in their bids: 3) Bridge Renderings. There are multiple bridges on this project. Are there specific bridges where renderings are required, are renderings required for each bridge or is the Department looking for a sampling for the various type structures? Please clarify.	1/13/2011 14:47	Renderings of all bridges are not required. This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.
113000	38	MOT and Construction Access Drawing Scale Design Build Selection Criteria, Section 4.2.A, modified by Addendum #3, states that phased drawings showing construction sequencing of buildable units and method of maintaining traffic for each phase have a scale=40 to 1 (preferred) on 11" by 17" plan sheets. We estimate that 45 individual drawings would be required to cover the entire interchange area at 40 to 1 scale, which would make understanding and evaluation of the proposal quite complicated. Would it be acceptable to provide overall drawings at a scale=100 to 1 or a scale= 200 to 1, on 11"x17" plan sheets, with details of major tapers and shifts at a scale =40 to 1 on 11"x17" plan sheets?	1/13/2011 16:25	Answer: The Department requires any drawings necessary to clearly depict MOT phasing be on scale=40 to 1 (preferred) on 11" by 17" plan sheets. Having breaks in tangent section of roadway which have no shifts or changes in traffic patterns would be acceptable. The Department requests the scales be on 40 to 1 (preferred) on 11" X17" so tapers, shifts, and overall MOT patterns can be clearly reviewed. Overall views of MOT patterns could be shown on 200 to 1 scale, but should only be used to assist in describing MOT concepts.
113000	39	On page PS 5-5 of the scope, in the first commitment box, the note reads "The implementation of any detour routes or closures within or adjacent to the Italian Village historic district, Fort Hayes historic district, Shiloh Baptist Church, Jefferson Avenue historic district, Hamilton Park historic district, and the Ohio Farm Bureau offices is not permitted prior approval of the conceptual Maintenance of Traffic plan by the Department's Office of Environmental Services – Cultural Resources Section." Some of the detours provided in Appendix MT-03 detour traffic through these areas/historic districts already. On what basis will the DOES-CRS evaluate the detour routes and closures for Approval? Please provide more information.	1/13/2011 18:13	All detours shown in the current contract documents will be coordinated by District 6 with ODOT's Office of Environmental Services. Other detours are not permitted except by an approved ATC will be addressed through the ATC process and evaluated by District 6 through the office of OES.
113000	40	Section 12.2 of the Scope states that Bridge FRA-71-1835L, at a minimum, shall be widened and receive a new reinforced concrete deck. The structure type studies at this location show a deck widening, not a deck replacement over the existing beams. Please clarify if the existing deck is to be replaced for the full width of the bridge.	1/17/2011 14:21	Bridge Type Studies (Appendices ST-03) are reference documents. As per section 12.2, "Providing a new reinforced concrete deck and widening of this bridge is a minimum requirement."
113000	41	Section 6.8.1.3 of the scope states that there is an existing City of Columbus Division of Telecommunications aerial facility along the south side of Long Street, attached to utility poles owned by AEP. Per the scope this line is to be relocated by the DBT. The utility matrix in Appendix UT-01 lists a line at this location as owned by and relocated by AT&T. No city telecommunications line or AEP facility is listed in the matrix at this location. Please clarify this discrepancy.	1/17/2011 15:41	Answer: The utilities matrix omitted the City of Columbus Division of Telecommunications aerial facility along the south side of Long Street. This will be corrected in an upcoming Addenda.
113000	42	There was a prebid question asked on 12/14/2010 14:55 regarding the PN013 DBE Affidavit that is required to be submitted with the bid. The answer to this question provided a link to a form that does not appear to apply to a prebid situation. Is the affidavit that is required to be submitted with the bid simply a statement generated by the DBT that we will comply with the DBE requirements for the project? If not, what is the required information or how do we apply the form the Department provided a link to?	1/17/2011 15:45	The DBE Commitment affidavit covers the DBE goal for the duration of the project. The level of detail required to be shown on the DBE Commitment Affidavit needs to match the level of detail known at the time of the Price Proposal submission. It is expected that a DBE Subcontracting plan be submitted at the time of contract execution and that also, will match the level of detail known at that time. The DBT is to determine the level of information provided as part of the technical proposal. The information provided will be used in the evaluation process. The DBE Subcontracting plan submitted after contract execution will be expected to include specific details. The DBT is not to include specific contract values with the Price Proposal - Acknowledgements/Miscellaneous. Percentages of work can be provided.
113000	43	1. In the I-670 Eastbound utility matrix (Appendix UT-01), the stations appear to be 300+00 different from the Step 7 plans. Please confirm that they should run from 510+95-554+47 instead of 210+95-254+47. 2. In the I-670 Eastbound utility matrix (Appendix UT-01), the AEP line at station 213+06 (presumably 513+06) under Cleveland Ave is shown to remain. In Appendix UT-02, the matrices for Ramps V3, X2, X3, and X5 all show this line as being relocated by AEP. Please clarify this discrepancy.	1/19/2011 16:53	Answer: 1) Appendix UT-01, the stations should run from 510+95 - 554+47. 2)The AEP line in question is the overhead line on Cleveland Ave. that is to be relocated underground in advance of the project by AEP and then remain in place (not to be disturbed by construction). This will be clarified in an upcoming addenda.
113000	44	Section 12.3.3 Other Retaining Wall Types states "No tie-backs or foundation elements will be permitted outside of the permanent Right of Way." Is the "permanent Right of Way" listed here the "Ex L/A RW" or the "Ex R/W" shown on the Right of Way Drawings in Appendix RW-01?	1/19/2011 17:15	All-permanent-structural-elements shall be in the L/A Right-of-Way. Note: This statement has been corrected in Addenda #7.

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	45	1. The Design-Build scope for the project states that: All other bridges (carrying more than a single lane of traffic) with stringer/girder type superstructure shall have a minimum of five (5) stringer/girder lines when completed. However, the Group XI Part Studies Part 2 Final document included with Appendix 12 Structures, ST-03 Bridge Type Studies, for the EB670 flyover ramp structure carrying two lanes of traffic shows a superstructure with four (4) girder lines. Please confirm that the above deviation from the scope is not intended to allow for a design exception.	1/20/2011 17:23	Answer: All bridges carrying more than a single lane of traffic shall have a minimum of five stringer/girder lines when completed. The Bridge Type Studies are to be considered reference documents, therefore five girder lines would be required in this instance.
113000	46	RE: FUEL PRICE ADJUSTMENT ITEMS. The project proposal contains PN520 Fuel Price Adjustment, intended to minimize risk to the contractor due to fuel price fluctuations that may occur during the contract. The fuel price adjustment calculation is based upon the sum of quantities of completed and accepted work for specified items. PN520 typically includes items 203 and 204 Earthwork. However the proposal note for this project does not include 203 and 204 Earthwork, which will represent significant items of work on this project. Please include items 203 and 204 Earthwork in the list of items that are eligible for fuel price adjustments for this project. RE: FUEL PRICE ADJUSTMENTS. The project proposal contains PN520 Fuel Price Adjustment, intended to minimize risk to the contractor due to fuel price fluctuations that may occur. The fuel price adjustment calculation is based upon the sum of quantities of completed and accepted work for specified items. Since the contract for this project is of the design-build method, the majority of items of work are paid as lump sum rather than a specific unit of measure. Please verify that the basis of calculation and threshold quantities for this project will be based upon the quantities provided by the contractor's design consultant in the general summary of the approved construction plans.	1/25/2011 17:15	Answers: A) ODOT intends to add Items 203 and 204 to the existing PN520 Fuel Price Adjustment in an upcoming addenda. B) The Fuel Price Adjustment will be based upon completed and accepted quantities of work. These quantities should equal quantities in the final accepted project plans.
113000	47	1. Are drilled shafts, if used, subject to the requirements of the mass concrete specification? 2. Scope section 12.2 states that colored concrete shall be used in all exposed bridge elements excluding superstructure deck concrete. Section 12.2.12 states that colored concrete shall be used in superstructure and exposed substructure elements. There is a conflict in these two statements. Is colored concrete to be used in deck concrete? 3. One of the alternates in the bridge type studies for Bridge FRA-071-1784B uses concrete box beams. However section 12.2.4 of the Scope prohibits the use of box beams. Please clarify if box beams are allowed at this structure.	1/26/2011 8:17	Answers: 1) Drilled shafts are subject to the mass concrete specification. 2) The intent is to not require colored concrete to be used in the superstructure. 3) Pre-cast concrete box beams are prohibited on all structures by the Scope of Services.
113000	48	Please clarify that concrete diaphragms poured integrally with the deck do not need to utilize the integrally colored concrete.	1/28/2011 02:44 PM	Answer: Concrete diaphragms in inner beams will not require integral concrete coloring. The diaphragms poured on external beams will need sealed with E-U sealer.
113000	49	ODOT's answer to the pre-bid question asked on 01/13/2011 16:25 concerning the scale of the MOT plan sheets was that the 40 to 1 scale is preferred. Will ODOT allow the DBT to place a full set of MOT drawings at the 40 to 1 scale in the appendix with the 200 to 1 drawings in the Tech Proposal?	1/29/2011 07:53 PM	The DBTs may include a 200:1 scale in the Technical Proposal if the 40:1 sheets are included in an appendix. Please note the 200:1 scale sheets would be counted toward the maximum page count of 75 for the technical proposal.
113000	50	Plan sheet 9/19 lists approved fabricators for the benches and trellis. We would like to be approved for this work. We are an ODOT approved fab shop. Is there anything else we need to submit to get approved.	1/31/2011 10:12 AM	For these unique items in the project design, the pool of vendors on these items have demonstrated experience in creating the product to the quality level necessary. For other items, we listed two preferred vendors and added an "or equal".
113000	51	The language in the scope regarding 'colored tinted concrete' could be construed as ambiguous. Will the contractor be allowed to apply any type of surface treatment that tints the concrete? If the Department expects the contractor to use an integral pigment that is mixed into the concrete by the concrete supplier to meet the required Federal Color Standard #17778, then the language in the scope should be modified to specifically require this.	2/1/2011 10:40 AM	This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	52	Section 12.3.1 of the Scope states that no utilities shall be placed within the reinforced soil mass of any MSE wall. Due to the numerous ramps that sit on retaining walls, some storm drainage will need to be placed within the MSE wall backfill. There is no other way to capture the drainage on parts of this project without using some inlets, catch basins, and storm runs within the MSE wall backfill. Will the Department modify this requirement?	2/2/2011 03:34 PM	See section 11.3F of the Scope. Storm sewer conduits are allowed in the MSE wall backfill.
113000	53	In Section 14.3.2.2 of the Scope, Table 14.1 lists elements of the project that the DBT will present options for. Other parts of the Scope are very specific regarding the color schemes for elements of the project. What does the Department expect the DBT to present per Section 14.3.2.2 in regards to color schemes since the colors for the project appear to be prescribed elsewhere in the Scope?	2/2/2011 03:46 PM	ODOT expects the DBTs to present the overall Aesthetics and Enhancement Management Plan for the entire project, which the color schemes are integral. The prescribed color schemes shall be used in developing this plan so the all the visual aspects are incorporated (for example: color, finished surfaces, designs, pier shapes, textures, materials, landscaping elements, streetscaping elements).
113000	54	Section 12.2.16 of the Scope states that fencing that complies with the Spring Street and Long Street Bridge Enhancement Plans (AE-02) is required on top of a single slope barrier atop the retaining walls south of Spring Street. 1. Is the requirement to use fencing as shown on Sheets 59 and 60 of Appendix AE-02? 2. If so, how is this to be mounted to a single slope barrier? The details in AE-02 show the fence mounted to the front of the wall, which will cause a hazard on the single slope barrier. Mounting it to the face will also not work due to the slope of the barrier.	2/2/2011 03:51 PM	Answers: 1) Sheets 59 and 60 of Appendix AE-02 detail the screenwall to be mounted on the Spring Street and Long Street structures only. (See sheet 31 of 115 for locations of the screenwall.) The fencing south of Spring Street shall match the intent of the details shown on page 44 of 115 (Parapet Wall End Cap and Knee Wall Elevation) in AE-02 for fencing to be mounted on top of the barriers. A plan sheet from I670 will be posted for fencing details. Details from the reference I-670 previous projects ("High St Cap" and "Neil Ave": Existing I670 Aesthetic Details.zip) can be found at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/contracts/Fra71-670/RFP/PBQ-Files/ 2) Final details for mounting of fencing shall be the responsibility of the DBTs.
113000	55	1. A pre-bid question was asked at 15:38 12/22/10 concerning the maintenance of traffic provisions for the microtunneling operations. Addendum #5 attempted to resolve the issue by adding weekend closures of I-71 southbound to I-70 eastbound and the ramp from I-70 westbound to I-71 northbound may be reduced to one lane during weekends. The microtunnel is not constructible using weekend closures. Due to the area needed to perform the work and the duration at each pit, lane closures on I-71 and affected ramps will be required for several months at each location. Please revise the MOT restrictions for the prescribed microtunneling operations. 2. NB to WB Question: 16.10.2 gives the improvements needed when I-71 northbound ramp to I-670 westbound is closed for more than 120 days. There is no mention of what needs to happen after the detour is removed. Is the DBT required to mill-and-fill the detour route according to 16.4.7? 3. Detour Route: 16.4.10 says that once the detour is removed and traffic returned to its normal pattern, the detour route shall be restored to a condition that is equivalent to that which existed prior to its use for this purpose. If traffic is shifted from its normal traffic pattern, is a mill-and-fill required per section 16.4.7 to be considered an equivalent condition?	2/3/2011 06:52 AM	1) MOT revisions will be forthcoming in an upcoming addendum. 2) "Mill and Fill" of this detour route will not be required as long as pavement marking removals are per 614. 3) Shifts into and out of the projects construction limits will require a "mill and fill". Detours shall have traffic control items replaced and damaged areas repaired.
113000	56	The project scope document, section 2.6.1.10, Table 2-3, requires NICET Level III in Highway Construction for PCC Paving and Structural Concrete Inspectors. This level of certification (or higher) is only held by five Ohio residents. Obtaining this certification level requires approximately three test sessions which are offered quarterly. Would an industry recognized certification such as ACI Transportation Construction Inspector or licensed Ohio professional engineer be considered equivalent?	2/3/2011 07:06 AM	An ACI Transportation Construction Inspector or licensed Ohio professional engineer will be considered an acceptable substitute.
113000	57	NFPA 502 Standard for Road Tunnels, Bridges, and Other Limited Access Highways, 2011 Edition requires engineering analysis of emergency ventilation and supporting egress analysis to demonstrate that a tenable environment can be maintained for evacuation phase for structures over 300 feet. Has an analysis been completed and accepted by authority having jurisdiction and does ODOT have this information available for structure FRA-71-1784B?	2/4/2011 11:34	This study has not been performed. ODOT intent is to utilize NPF502 (2008 Edition). This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.
113000	58	In regards to the Biditems for the project, in the "Reference Item Descriptions" section of the Proposal it states "4/5 Item Special – Misc. Approximately 50% of Non-BR Eligible Bridge Costs:", however, under "Pay Items", Line Number 4 is described as "Special – Misc: Approximately 50% of New Bridge Costs". Please clarify.	2/4/2011 13:22	This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	59	<p>Addendum 4 added rehab work on Structure FRA-71-1835R. Is painting of the existing structural steel on this bridge required? If so, the scope should be modified accordingly.</p> <p>Section 12.2.2 Substructures of the project scope states: "Steel box beam pier caps are not permitted."</p> <p>However, Section 12.2.4 Superstructure of the project scope states: "Structure designs that require fracture critical members are not permitted except for straddle bent."</p> <p>A Fracture Critical member implies that the straddle bent beam, which would be separated from the substructure by bearings, could potentially be designed with steel members. If that is the case, can the straddle bent beam be designed to be made out of steel plate sections?</p>	2/7/2011 04:45 PM	<p>1) Addenda #7 (Addenda G) requires "All existing structural steel in bridges that receive a new overlay shall receive a new paint coating system using OZEU. The urethane top coat shall be tinted to meet Federal color #14062 (Dark Green)." This would include FRA-71-1835R.</p> <p>2) Section 12.2.2 must be held. Steel Straddle Bents are not allowed.</p>
113000	60	<p>Pages 88-89 of Appendix AE-01 show a Parking Lot Screening/Retaining Wall along Cleveland Ave. Appendix AE-01 is supposed to be general in nature, and the DBT is to follow the intent of its recommendations since it is a reference document. Since this area is specific in nature, and does not apply to the rest of the corridor, is the DBT required to construct this element? If so, the scope should be modified accordingly.</p>	2/8/2011 01:47 PM	<p>The screenings and the retaining walls as shown on Cleveland Ave in AE-01 is not a requirement, but the implementation of the intent of the AE-01 is an evaluation element during the review of Technical Proposal. The DBT is also required to comply with RW-02 which address construction of a retaining wall and replacement of plantings (trees). CSCC has the right to comment on the design, as per the Scope of Services (section 14.3.2.2).</p>
113000	61	<p>Addendum # 5 deleted Scope 16.2.8.5 which addressed the I-71 Southbound to Broad Street ramp. The note in the Addendum states that it is ODOT's intent that this ramp is to remain open at all times. Scope 10.3.4 requires the DBT to build transition pavement at the South end of the project to transition the proposed profile grade back to existing grade, which is approximately a 6' grade difference. This is shown in Appendix GN-01 (Contract Document). The geometry, width and work limits on the existing I-71 Southbound to Broad Street ramp will not allow part width construction to maintain this ramp at all times, therefore this ramp will need to closed a minimum of 14 days to complete the transition pavement. Please address this issue.</p>	2/8/2011 14:11	<p>This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.</p>
113000	62	<p>Prebid Question #49 permits the DBT to include 200:1 scale maintenance of traffic drawings in the technical proposal and include the 40:1 scale maintenance of drawings in an appendix. Providing 200:1 scale MOT drawings in the technical proposal will still require a substantial number of pages (likely 15 – 20 pages) that will be counted against the 75 page limit. Will ODOT allow 400:1 or 600:1 scale MOT drawings in the technical proposal provided the MOT schemes can be clearly shown?</p>	2/9/2011 7:59	<p>MOT drawings which are being used to describe the intent of an MOT phase may be any scale, but details must be verifiable in a 40:1 scale drawing in an appendix. Having breaks in tangent section of roadway which have no shifts or changes in traffic patterns would be acceptable.</p>
113000	63	<p>If a proposal is submitted that proposes geometric changes that would require a modification to the IMS or is inconsistent with the basic configuration and allowable adjustments, will that proposal be deemed non-responsive?</p>	2/9/2011 8:01	<p>The Department will evaluate non-responsiveness in accordance to the bid documents.</p>
113000	64	<p>The current scope makes no allowances for needed lane closures for Eastbound traffic coming from the northern I670WB/I71 interchange into the merge area with I-670EB. Will a lane closure be allowed to this EB flow for the construction of new pavement on I-670EB from 562+00 to 574+00?</p>	2/9/2011 8:33	<p>This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.</p>
113000	65	<p>The color specified for the tinted structure concrete is a lighter shade than normal ready-mix concrete. According to multiple suppliers, to achieve this color they will need to use white cement as well as use colored pigment in the concrete. This is going to add at least \$150 /cy to the cost of the concrete, or potentially \$4,000,000 to the cost of this project.</p> <p>The issues include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> White cement is twice as expensive as regular cement. There is concern with the availability of enough white cement to supply this and future projects. Even with the use of white cement, a tremendous amount of pigment will be required at a high cost. Consistency of the color will vary over the course of this project due to variability in aggregates, cement, and batch sizes. Using integrally colored concrete will not result in a consistent product. Patching form tie holes will result in inconsistencies in the look of the final product. It will not be possible to exactly match the color of the initial pour with hand mixed patch material. The specified Federal Color Standard #17778 references a gloss sheen (the first digit of the Color Standard is the sheen reference). It is not feasible to make concrete 'glossy'. We request that ODOT also consider the precedent that is being set on this project for the rest of the corridor. Our suppliers believe that this specification could add over \$20,000,000 to the cost of the first three phases of the 70/71 split reconstruction. Will ODOT consider revising the scope to allow another method for achieving the same aesthetic results? 	2/9/2011 10:03	<p>Answer: Addendum #7 (Addendum G) removed the requirement for Coloring/Tinting of the concrete. It is the intent of the project to have all required exposed surfaces sealed with epoxy-urethane sealer.</p>

Franklin 71-670 Prebid Questions Answers

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	66	NFPA 502 - Section 12.2 of the Project Scope, fifth paragraph begins "All structures must meet the requirements of NFPA 502" The NFPA 502 Standard was recently updated in 2011. One of the changes in the new 2011 version of NFPA 502 is Section 6.3 Protection of Structural Elements, 6.3.1 which reads "Regardless of bridge or elevated highway length, all primary structural elements shall be protected in accordance with this standard" Is it ODOT's intent that the DBTs comply with this standard for all bridges, and if so what specific parameters does ODOT or the Agency Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) require be used in determining the level of protection required?	2/9/2011 01:23 PM	ODOT intent is to utilize NFPA502 (2008 Edition). This will be clarified in an upcoming addendum.
113000	67	MSE Retaining Walls South of Spring Street Section 12.3.1 of the Project Scope, third paragraph reads "MSE Retaining walls are not permitted south of Spring Street Bridge." Appendix ST-03 – Bridge Type Studies for FRA-1784B Northbound C-D over Ramp V2 shows stub abutments behind MSE walls along both sides of the tunnel, which begins south of and ends north of Spring Street. Would this requirement apply south of but not within Bridge FRA-1784B?	2/9/2011 01:24 PM	Answer: ST-03 is intended to be a reference documents. The scope requirement of no MSE walls south of Spring St applies. The intent is also to not allow MSE walls under the Spring Street structure.
113000	68	Sight Distances for I-670 EB, Ramp X3 and Ramp V3 at Cleveland Avenue The sight distances on the inside of the curves for I-670 EB, Ramp X3 and Ramp V3 over Cleveland Avenue in the Step 7 Engineering Plans are less than required for the design speeds, even with widening the inside shoulder to 12 feet as allowed. In addition, the Step 7 Plans indicate a 5 degree curve on I-670 EB over Cleveland. The design speed for I-670 at this location is 60 mph, which according to Table 202-2E in the ODOT Location and Design Manual, should be less than 4 degrees 15 minutes. See summary below. 670 EB X3 EB V3 WB Design Speed at Cleveland Ave - 60 mph 55 mph 50 mph Required Sight Distance 570' 495' 425' Step 7 Plans Sight Distance Provided 309' 336' 378' Sight Distance w/ 12' max shoulder 410' 451' 400' No design exceptions were included for these conditions in the Project Scope. Correcting this condition would require increasing the radius of these curves, and would significantly extend the westerly construction limits and require additional R/W. What is ODOT's intent regarding the need for design exceptions for sight distances and the curve radius in these locations?	2/9/2011 03:19 PM	I-670 EB is in a sag vertical curve allowing sight lines over top of the proposed barriers. An addendum will be issued for Section 10.2.3 #4 regarding the design speed for Ramp X3, Curve 2 and Table 10-2 for Ramp X3. The required design speed shall be 50 mph. Ramp V3 meets the sight distance requirements for the proposed design speed (Curve = 5 deg 15 min, Des sp = 50 mph, HSSD Reqd = 425') with an inside shoulder width of less than 12 feet. It should be noted that this area is in a spiral curve to the east. Entrance ramp W5 also meets the 360' HSSD requirement for the 45 mph design speed (terminal design speed per L&D Manual Figure 503-1E) with an inside shoulder of less than 12 feet. I-670 EB over Cleveland Avenue is in an area designated in Table 10-4 as a Directional Roadway, with a 55 mph design speed (Table 10-2). The maximum degree of curve is 5 degrees 30 minutes for a 55 mph design speed according to Table 202-2E, which is greater than the 5 degree curve shown in the Step 7 Engineering Plans. No Design Exceptions will be needed for these locations noted in the question.
113000	69	Wayfinding Signs Section 15.3.5 Wayfinding Signs of the Project Scope refers to TC-19. Can ODOT clarify that the intent of TC-19 is to replace only the wayfinding signs inside the Project limits?	2/9/2011 04:35 PM	The intent is to replace the Wayfinding signs within the project limits.
113000	70	On page 15 of the selection criteria document (Section 4.1), if your intent is for the DBT to provide a full updated organizational chart, can the font restriction be waved? Can we include this updated org chart in the appendix?	2/9/2011 04:59 PM	Yes the org chart can be included in the appendix. Please make sure that it is referenced and readable.
113000	71	At the Utility Pre-bid Meeting on 1-27-11, there was a question about the existing traffic camera at Long Street.	-	The camera belongs to the City of Columbus and is to be removed and stored by the DBT for the City to pick-up. This is covered on page 29 of Appendix TC-09 (Item 632 - Removal Traffic Flow Monitor, As Per Plan).
113000	72	Scope Section 11 - Drainage - 11.3 Notes and Specifications: Item C. states: "The DBT shall use ODOT's supplemental specification SS802 for constructing and inspecting the Department's storm sewer system and drainage structures. The DBT shall use the City of Columbus CMS for constructing and inspecting the City's storm sewer system and drainage structures" Item D. states: "The Department's Proposal Note (PN603) does not apply to drainage conduit and drainage structures that will be owned and maintained by the City of Columbus or any other agency outside of ODOT" Proposal Note PN603 is not in the proposal. Is the DBT's to follow SS802 for construction of ODOT Drainage?	-	PN603 will be added in an upcoming addenda. SS802 is to be followed in the construction of storm sewers in ODOT maintained systems. Note: PN603 was added by addenda#8 and subsequently removed in addenda#10.
113000	73	Will the contractor be responsible for maintenance of the existing asphalt, striping, and bridge structures in their current condition as of the date of contract signing?	2/22/2011 16:11	The contractor will be required to maintain the project per Item 614. If the pre-existing condition of the facilities are in question, the recordings performed per scope section 1.18 will be utilized.
113000	74	In a maintenance of traffic situation where a exit only lane is required, the scope does not currently require overhead guide signing. Will the department require overhead guide signing on temporary supports in this situation?	2/22/2011 16:22	All traffic control requirements must comply with the Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Ground mounted signs for a <u>temporary Exit Only</u> lane may be sufficient, but all temporary sign requirements shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and must clearly and safely convey lane assignments/designations.

Project	Question #	Question	Date	Answer
113000	75	At the pre-technical proposal meeting, it was stated that a bidders checklist would be provided by the Department. The prebid questions also state that the bid form will be provided electronically for the bidders to use in submitting their typed bids. Is the Department still planning on providing these items? We also asked a question regarding the Supplemental Questionnaire information referred to on page 11 of the proposal. Is this referring to simply filling out the information on sheets 11 and 12 of the proposal or is there additional information that ODOT will require?	2/22/2011 16:26	ODOT will send via email the checklist, electronic sheet (Excel and/or EBS), directly to the DBT's noted contact persons. DOT is seeking current information regarding the financial commitments of the DBT in the supplemental questionnaire information referred to on page 11 of the proposal. Please fill in the blanks with dollar amounts that reflect the now-current outstanding ODOT work and now-current outstanding non-ODOT work that the DBT is engaged in at the time of submittal of its Proposal. For both blanks include any work that the DBT is performing as a prime contractor or a subcontractor.
113000	76	seed quantities	3/3/2011 14:49	Seed Quantities shall be determined by the DBT in final Design.
113000	77	There appears to be a discrepancy in the number of ♦Type C♦ planters and in how they need to be fabricated. Detail 3/sheet 64-115 appears to show that the planter is in 4 sections around the Trellis post. There are two additional Type C planters that are not indicated on the material plan (sheet 12-115) but shown on the elevation (Sheet 36-115). Please advise regarding whether the planters at the Trellis post are to be in 4 sections and whether the material plan should have a note indicating a planter Type C is required at the plinths on the South side of Long St.	3/3/2011 17:22	Detail 3/ sheet 64-115 does <u>not</u> require the planters at the trellis posts to be in 4 sections. The number of sections is up to the DBT. Regarding the second question, yes planters are required at the two plinths without the trellis along the south side of Long St. as depicted on sheet 36-115
113000		PN 019 Modified - Preparation of Price Proposal	3/4/2011 03:58 PM	
	78	This proposal note states the the bidders must prepare their "Price Proposal....on hard copy forms supplied by the Department." and "The Department will not be using Bid Express for this project. A disk or printout of any electronic file of the Price Proposal-Bid is not required." We are confused by the email sent to bidders with an EBS file for this project. Are we to make copies of the pages in the Proposal for the Supplemental Questionnaire, the Federally Required EEO Certification, the Certification Against Debarment and Suspension (p.9), and the list of Pay Items (p.93)or use the printout from the EBS file?		Proposal Note 019 contains submission guidelines as well as the Supplemental Questionnaire, Certification Against Debarment and the EEO Certification Clause. You may use the EBS attachment sent to you for the Price Proposal. If you do, a printed out hard copy of the price proposal is required, no electronic copy needed. This project is not available on Bid Express for online submission. Do not submit the price proposal electronically through the EBS system. Hand written price proposals will not be required if a printed out copy of the EBS form is submitted. For this project, you can disregard the miscellaneous section of the EBS file as well as the Bid Bond section and fill out the Supplemental Questionnaire, EEO Certification, and Certificate Against Debarment and Suspension provided in the bid packet sent to DBTs this week.
113000		The following are questions regarding the Bid Form and Check List that were provided on Friday March 4, 2011:	3/7/2011 07:13 AM	
	79	1. The fourth bullet on the Bidder's Checklist under Bid Items references a hard copy and an electronic copy. Is this referencing the electronic copy of the Technical Proposal only? Does the Department want a completed copy of the EBS file on a disk or CD along with a printed copy of the bid price? If so, is this to be included in the envelope with the Price Proposal or submitted electronically thru EBS? 2. The proposal still states that a 'handwritten' Price Proposal is required. Are the DBT's required to submit a handwritten copy or will a printout of the EBS bid form be sufficient? 3. The proposal and bidders checklist state that the DBT's should include PN013 DBE Affidavit with the Price Proposal-Acknowledgements Miscellaneous information. Prebid question # 4 answered a question regarding this form by linking the DBT's to a post-bid reporting form. A follow up Prebid Question # 42 asked if the DBT's could generate their own form showing commitment to the DBE goal. Our interpretation of the answer the Question # 42 is that the DBT can generate their own form showing a general commitment to meeting the goal without using an ODOT supplied form. Please advise if this is not correct. 4. The seventh thru ninth bullets on the Bidder's Checklist under Bid Items references the Supplemental Questionnaire, EEO Certification, and Certificate Against Debarment and Suspension. Are the bidders expected to fill out the information in the Bid Acknowledgement section on the EBS file that was provided and insert a hard copy of this information? If so, do the bidders still need to fill out the information from Pages 11 and 12 of the proposal? Note that the EBS file does not contain a section to answer the EEO Certification question. Please clarify this issue by listing what exact information the Department wants in the Price Proposal-Acknowledgements Miscellaneous package and what form it is to be submitted on.		Proposal Note 019 contains submission guidelines as well as the Supplemental Questionnaire, Certification Against Debarment and the EEO Certification Clause. You may use the EBS attachment sent to you for the Price Proposal. If you do, a printed out hard copy of the price proposal is required, no electronic copy needed. This project is not available on Bid Express for online submission. Do not submit the price proposal electronically through the EBS system. Hand written price proposals will not be required if a printed out copy of the EBS form is submitted. For this project, you can disregard the miscellaneous section of the EBS file as well as the Bid Bond section and fill out the Supplemental Questionnaire, EEO Certification, and Certificate Against Debarment and Suspension provided in the bid packet sent to DBTs this week.