

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 203000

Sale Date - 7/9/2021

HAM-104668 - IR 74-18.01

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2021 9:30:06 AM **Question Number - 207**

Can this project be delayed to a non-regular bidding week? There are too many project on the 5/13/21 and there is just not enough time in the days to get them all done. Many designs to consider. Would appreciate the help.

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 5:00:12 PM **Question Number - 206**

\*\*\*ODOT Provided Status for Project 20-3000; MCE 5B\*\*\* What is the status of the project procurement with regard to the Technical and Price proposal due on May 14, 2021?

**The procurement of the Project has been suspended due to unforeseen design requirements. The Department will establish confidential meetings to discuss the Technical Proposal impacts with each bidder to then determine the fairest time extension once the known impacts are determined. The Technical and Price Proposal due date will be modified. Proposals will not be due or accepted on May 14, 2021. Revisions to the Instruction to Offerors (ITO), Request for Proposals (RFP), and Scope of Service (SOS) will be modified at a later date.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/8/2021 9:07:42 AM **Question Number - 205**

Scope section 9.5.3 requires resurfacing of all transition areas at the time the surface course is applied. Section 10.3 mentions pavement resurfacing due to MOT (10.3.L) and provides a pavement makeup for MOT Clean-up/Resurfacing (10.3.1.C). These sections appear intended for interstate pavement. It is not clear if MOT cleanup/resurfacing is intended to apply to local roads. Please confirm resurfacing of local roads will not be required where work zone pavement markings are applied. If resurfacing is required on local roads, please provide the applicable surface course specification (reference question 196).

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 12:00:39 PM **Question Number - 204**

Per 9.5.5 of the Scope Of Services, it states "Class I work zone markings expected to be in place longer than 14 days shall be wet reflective". What is ODOT's expectations for the performance of the wet reflective pavement markings through the winter season? Is the striping contractor going to be required to restripe all wet reflective pavement markings every time the roadway is plowed, after every snow event, because the snowplows shear off the wet reflective elements?

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 5:21:01 PM **Question Number - 203**

Scope Section 10.5.5 "Bridge Foundations" says that CSL and TIP testing is required on ALL shafts greater than 4' in diameter. It's uncommon for TIP to be done on all shafts. BDM 305.4.5 says min 10% of all drilled shafts including at least one shaft per substructure unit. Please confirm it is the intent for CSL and TIP testing on all substructure foundation drilled shafts or revise to match BDM standards.

**Shafts are to be tested as outlined in Scope Section 10.5.5. Shafts greater than 48" in diameter will require CSL and TIP testing.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 9:57:44 AM **Question Number - 202**

The Level 2 Ecological Survey Report did not include a mussel reconnaissance survey; however, current ODNR guidelines require one. Shall a revised Level 2 ESR be completed for the project and/or a mussel reconnaissance survey be prepared and submitted to the agencies?

**Based on the approved environmental re-evaluation dated 1/13/2020 no Level 2 ESR and/or mussel survey is required.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 9:56:57 AM **Question Number - 201**

The original wetland delineation field work occurred in May 2014 and the Jurisdictional Determination was approved in August 2015. Typically, wetland delineations are valid for five (5) years. Has ODOT completed an update to the Ecological Survey Report since the five year period has elapsed or will a re-evaluation of the ecological resources not be required?

**This is covered under the approved environmental re-evaluation dated 1/13/2020.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 4:08:34 PM Question Number - 200

SOS 10.3.M and PBQ 197 will require a complete shutdown for roadway sections that have two lanes or less. EB I-74 is only two lanes. Therefore, EB I-74 will require a complete shutdown to meet the hot joint requirement. Please provide details on allowable EB I-74 shutdowns or revise the scope to allow cold joints on two lane sections of roadway.

**On EB74 west of HAM-74-1892 a cold longitudinal joint between the two mainline pavement lanes and a hot longitudinal joint between the mainline pavement lane and the adjoining shoulder and all ramps and the adjoining shoulders is acceptable.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 5:41:24 PM Question Number - 199

Per scope section 10.4.1.H "All existing storm sewer conduits and structures located under mainline interstate and ramp pavement (travel lane or paved shoulder) within the Project Limits shall be taken out of service..." Is it the intent to replace existing pipes under existing pavement that will only be resurfaced (mill and overlay)? Please clarify.

**Yes, replacement of existing pipes under existing pavement that will only be resurfaced (mill and overlay) is included in the referenced Work within the Project Limits.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2021 3:47:43 PM Question Number - 198

The new EBS file released with Addendum #11 still shows a bid date of 4/30/21 along with the BidX website. Please revise to match the updated ITO in Addendum #11.

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2021 9:53:06 AM Question Number - 197

Section 10.3.M of the Scope of Services specifies a hot longitudinal joint between mainline pavement lanes and all ramps and adjoining shoulders. The section also allows a single cold joint when there are 3 or more lanes. However, per Item 447.07, Joint Construction specification, if a hot joint is specified between mainline pavement lanes, the Contractor may construct a cold joint between mainline pavement lanes and adjoining shoulders. Section 10.3.M contradicts 447.07 Joint Construction specification. Please advise.

**The language in the scope is correct and is what will be expected.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2021 9:52:40 AM Question Number - 196

Section 10.3.1.D of the Scope of Services, Local/City Street Pavement Makeup, describes the final asphalt surface as 1.5" Item 442 Asphalt Surface, 12.5MM, TY A (447). Will the department please consider revising the 447 longitudinal joint density spec on the Local/City Street Pavement Makeup as this spec applies to interstate paving?

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2021 9:52:09 AM Question Number - 195

Section 10.3.L of the Scope of Services describes a pay item for Item 251 Pavement Repair, depth of 3 inches. Is the depth of 3 inches from the existing or planned surface? What is the replacement material for Item 251 Pavement Repair?

**3" depth is from existing surface (i.e. 3" mill and fill). Intermediate asphalt for material (i.e. one 3" lift)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2021 8:52:56 AM Question Number - 194

Please repopulate the FTP site. Many of the files have been deleted.

**The Department provided a general description of Addendum 11 changes to the Appendices on the FTP within the Addendum 11 cover letter. If additional information appears to be missing from the FTP site please try clearing your cache data in your browser and provide specific information on what may be missing. As previously noted the FTP site is a short term file sharing system and the data should be downloaded at your first convenience.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/14/2021 10:09:32 AM Question Number - 193

The non-RFC drawings provided with BU-14 for PID 104667 show the use of cement stabilization, per typical section legend balloon 10. Was cement stabilization ultimately used on the project, and if so, what was the average percent of cement utilized?

**Yes. The average was 4.5%.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/14/2021 7:45:34 AM Question Number - 192

Did ODOT submit a 408 Permit for the Project?

**ODOT submitted draft 408 Permit documentation to USACE for early coordination. This information is provided with Appendix DD for reference. USACE determined that the permit information was only based on a feasibility study and will require more detailed information along with means and methods. Because this information varies with each Shortlisted Offeror design, Addendum 10 revised Scope Section 6.1 requiring the DBT to prepare and submit the 408 permit request and receive approvals.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/14/2021 7:44:40 AM Question Number - 191

Scope Section 9.5.1 was revised with Addendum 10 requiring the DBT to comply with MT-101-90. Are all requirements of MT-101-90 including Note 13 related to portable barrier offsets included with this Project?

**Unless specifically stated in the Scope, the DBT shall follow all requirements of MT-101-90. This includes requirements of Note 13 that "Portable barrier shall be placed on the same level as the traffic surface and shall not encroach on width(s) designated as the minimum required for traffic use. Offset from the travel way to the barrier toe shall be a minimum of 2'. Offset from the back side of the barrier toe to the work area shall be a minimum of 2' unless otherwise specified in the plans due to anchoring.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2021 10:49:51 PM Question Number - 190

Along I-75 SB, historical borings B-356, B-363, B-399, L-002-0-90, L-003-0-90, and L-004-0-90 near Transystem's Wall 4 (I-75 STA 245+00) show poor soils and unsuitable materials which would require significant improvements for retaining walls. Were ground improvements in this area required during construction of retaining walls for 5A that are not shown in the RFC plans?

**The work performed for the retaining walls in Phase 5A of Project 183000 is outlined in the applicable Buildable units.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2021 10:59:41 PM Question Number - 189

In reference to PBQ 172, will the Department provide the superelevation design (table, superelevation rate, transition, etc.) for the revised section of BU 14?

**The updated BU14 SE table is at the link below for reference  
only.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/104667\\_BU14\\_SE\\_table%2004262021/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/104667_BU14_SE_table%2004262021/)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2021 10:59:14 PM Question Number - 188

In reference to PBQ 172, will the Department provide a typical section for lane and shoulder widths configuration for the revised section of BU 14?

**Typical sections for lane and shoulders width configurations for the revised section of BU14 will be provided with Appendix A1 (for reference) with Addendum 11.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2021 10:58:40 PM Question Number - 187

PID 104667 Phase 5A plans show an existing manhole D-282 in the IR 74 WB lanes at Sta 1036+69 to remain. Per Phase 5B scope section 10.4.1.1 "Existing manholes cannot remain in service if the proposed roadway alignment results in the existing manhole being located in the pavement (traveled way or paved shoulders). Please verify that that manhole (D-282) from Phase 5A is not required to be relocated.

**The revised WB74 full depth plans being provided in addendum 11 will show this being removed / filled and plugged.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/4/2021 10:57:55 PM Question Number - 186

Addendum #10, section 12.5.2 specifies that the radar detector that is being installed with PID 104667 near station 1004+32 shall have a conduit path back to the ramp meter cabinet and radar cable connecting the controller to the radar in order to operate correctly. The PID 104667 ITS design plans show a new ground mounted cabinet for the detector being installed adjacent to the new radar detector pole and 2 detectors mounted to the pole. The ITS termination details show the 1004+35.9 RADAR connected to the fiber backbone in splice enclosure SE-5. Please clarify the new requirement. Is one detector to be connected to the new ground mounted detector cabinet, and the other connected to the ramp meter?

**Only one Radar is required. The radar shall be connected to the ramp meter cabinet. The cable is to run from the ramp meter cabinet to the radar pole. the pole mounted cabinet at the radar pole with a pull box and the radar cable will run back to the ground mounted ramp meter cabinet.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2021 10:32:26 AM Question Number - 185

Per the scope of services section 10.3 Pavement, section A, westbound I-74 from SLM 18.0 to the west approach slab of HAM-74-1892 shall have the shoulders replaced full depth. The outside shoulders were recently replaced in HAM-74-17.80, PID 113476. Does ODOT intend the DBT to replace the new outside shoulders along the Ramp A merge? Please provide a station limit for the outside shoulder replacement. It is assumed this limit should be the start of the ramp gore, approximate station 980+00.

**Scope Section 10.3.A will be revised with Addendum 11 to allow existing shoulders reconstructed with PID 113476 to remain if the minimum pavement composition requirements per Section 10.3.1.A are provided.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/1/2021 12:12:21 PM Question Number - 184

Please clarify the limits of Special, Maintain Existing Lighting. What is the west limit on I-74 and north/south limit on I-75?

**Maintain Existing Lighting shall be followed for this Project within the limits of the lighting work described in this Section, for all additional lighting impacted by other Project work, and within the limits of Work.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/31/2021 2:48:12 PM Question Number - 183

Addendum 10 removed the requirement of the PID 104668 project to widen the outside shoulder of WB74 to 15' from the access road to 500' east of the access road from scope section 10.2. Please clarify what will be built on PID 104667 in this area.

**The PID 104667 project will construct a 15' wide full depth outside shoulder on WB74 starting at approximately station 1036+90 LT. This was the reasoning for the removal of the requirement for the PID 104668 project to widen the shoulder from the access road to 500' east of access road from scope of services section 10.2 in addendum 10. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/31/2021 1:25:31 PM Question Number - 182

The PID 104667 plans show truss structure OS6 being erected at station 246+03 on SB75. This truss has yet to be erected on the project and will need to be removed on the upcoming 5B project due to the fact it is no longer applicable with the relocation of the ramp from SB75 to WB74 on PID 104668. Please confirm PID 104667 is erecting truss OS6 at station 246+03.

**PID 104667 will install truss OS6 over southbound I75 at station 251+25 instead of station 246+03. The truss length (92') and length of the support legs (23.5' and 28') will remain the same. The shop drawings will be provided with the next addendum. The median foundation will be installed to a depth of 14' below the bottom of barrier wall. The outside foundation will be installed to a depth of 12' below ground elevation. The DBT for PID 104668 will be permitted to reuse this structure. In the event the DBT for PID 104668 alters this structure or loading (i.e. truss, support legs, increases sign area, etc) the DBT for PID 104668 shall be required to show the modified structure being reused is structurally sound. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2021 5:05:14 PM Question Number - 181

Can the department clarify whether a geotechnical report is available for the proposed MSE wall identified in the TranSystems drawings as Wall 4?

**The geotechnical reports for PID 83723 will be provided for reference.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2021 4:50:21 PM Question Number - 180

Regarding existing bridge HAM-74-1908L, the scope states "Eliminate the intermediate expansion joint and/or westernmost span." If the intermediate expansion joint in the deck is eliminated but the westernmost span remains, then is it ODOT's intent that the bridge be analyzed as a 5 span continuous structure (i.e. ignore the presence of the existing hinge which would remain)?

**The context of the scope text is physical changes that need to be made to the bridge. There is language with additional work that will need to be done if two specific methods are utilized. Regardless of the method chosen by the contractor, the physical intermediate expansion joint will need to be eliminated. This is anticipated to be accomplished either by the physical elimination of the joint that would require the additional structural steel needed to make the beams/girders continuous or removing the span and creating a new abutment in the vicinity of the old intermediate joint. Additional beam repair work is also stated if the existing beams are utilized in the final work.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 3:13:09 PM Question Number - 179

Appendix A1/MCE 5A Excavation and Soil Information/Picture of Material.... shows various pictures of unsuitable excavated material. Where were the picture locations? Please provide relative stationing along I-75.

**The pictures in Appendix A1/MCE 5A are excavation spoils from construction on west side of I-75 SB beginning at 243+00 extending through 251+00. The material was encountered from edge of pavement to the existing LA R/W at varying elevations and depths. Similar soil conditions are noted in the archive boring logs and are anticipated to be present in the proposed work limits of PID 104668.**

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

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 12:10:33 PM Question Number - 178

Scope Section 12.2 states that signs and supports shall be replaced along WB I-74 with the limits starting at station 984+00 and end at the merge with I-75. However, WB-74 does not merge with I-75. Please clarify the end limits of the sign replacement along WB I-74 and I-75.

**All signs and supports on WB I-74 and ramps shall be replaced, unless stated otherwise in the scope. The limits start at STA 984+00 and end at the diverges from I-75. This will be clarified in Addendum 11.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 12:08:03 PM Question Number - 177

Is it the intent of Section 11.1DD to provide a drainage trough under each strip seal, or does a strip seal joint count as the drainage trough?

**Drainage troughs are not the same as strip seals as troughs catch the water that will leak though the strip seals given time. Drainage troughs are only required to be added to strip seals joints that are in problematic locations like within 10 feet of a pier or any joint that will experience differential longitudinal as well as transverse movements.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 11:16:37 AM Question Number - 176

MSE Wall Section 2 states: ..."provide steel casing of any utility permitted to remain in the MSE wall reinforced zone, extends below the MSE wall or is proposed through the wall facing." This sentence does not appear correct. Is the intent to provide steel casing when in the strap zone as well as when under or through the wall?

**Please refer to BDM Section 310.4.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/25/2021 1:53:48 PM Question Number - 175

Addendum 10 details multiple scope revisions and stated that a revised Scope of Services document was issued. However, there was no new Scope document published to the FTP site. Please publish the new Scope document.

**The addendum 10 revised scope is on the ftp site at the link below:  
[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Addendum%2010/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%2010/)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/25/2021 7:58:45 AM Question Number - 174

Scope of Services Section 10.3.D states the inside shoulder on EB74 from approximately SLM 18.15 to the west approach slab of HAM-74-1892 shall be replaced full depth. The work was originally part of PID 104667 and has been moved to this project. Is PID 104667 still constructing the inside shoulder on EB74 from the east approach slab of HAM-74-1892 to the west approach slab of HAM-74-1908R?

**Full Depth Replacement of the eastbound 74 inside shoulder from HAM-74-1892 to HAM-74-1908R will be non-performed from PID 104667. This Work will be added to PID 104668. PID 104667 will leave this inside shoulder in the condition that existed prior to the PID 104667 project and that matches the existing median barrier wall. PID 104668 will be required to replace this shoulder full depth. Starting at the eastern edge of the HAM-74-1892R structure the inside shoulder shall be widened to 10ft following standard taper rates. The inside shoulder shall be constructed in accordance with L&D figure 301-8, curbed high side of superelevated sections. This will require the inside shoulder to be sloped towards the median, lowering the pavement elevation at the inside edge of the shoulder, requiring median barrier replacement (which is currently required per the Scope of Services) from HAM-74-1892 to HAM-74-1908R. Please note, the eastbound 74 profile has a sag at approximate station 1026+07 and the existing median wall becomes a retaining wall as it approaches the HAM-74-1908R structure. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2021 8:17:20 AM Question Number - 173

The BU3 drawings for PID 104667 show work to be performed on the backwalls of the EB74 bridges underneath the new superstructure being placed on PID 104667 near the median. For example, see page 90/120 and 91/120. Please confirm the PID 104668 contractor is to perform this work.

**It is assumed reference is made to the WB74 backwall underneath the new superstructure being placed on PID 104667 near the median of I74. Yes, the contractor for PID 104668 shall perform the Work as required in Scope of Services sections 11.3.3, 11.3.4, and 11.3.6. Shoring was left in place on PID 104667 and the approximate location of the shoring left in place on PID 104667 will be provided in a future addendum. The DBT is advised to verify the referenced documents provided for PID 104667 to determine if they accurately depict existing field conditions as stated in Scope of Services Section 1.2. See forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/17/2021 11:00:45 AM Question Number - 172

The Revised BU 14 drawings from 5A show portable barrier between 1035+80 and the forward abutment at 1908L. Please confirm that new permanent barrier wall for this section is required within the 5B contract and provide the typical section left behind so we can determine the work required to install the new barrier wall in this section.

**The DBT shall remove all PCB upon completion of the project and install permanent barrier protection, if required, based on the DBT's design. Cross section data was provided in Addendum 9 at the following location:**

**[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_A1\\_PID104667%20MCE%205a%20Project%20Information/MCE%205A%20Scope%20Changes/WB74%20Full%20Depth%20Changes/74%20WB%20Revisions\\_PCB%20to%20Remain%20or%205B.pdf](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A1_PID104667%20MCE%205a%20Project%20Information/MCE%205A%20Scope%20Changes/WB74%20Full%20Depth%20Changes/74%20WB%20Revisions_PCB%20to%20Remain%20or%205B.pdf)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2021 11:07:05 PM Question Number - 171

Section 2 of the Scope states work areas available upon a signed contract are shown in Appendix O1. All other work areas are not available until June 1, 2022. Appendix O1 limits the early work area to Prang and Powers Street. Will the Department consider allowing local street improvements at Borden and King Place to also begin upon signed contract?

**The Department is currently coordinating the timing of local street traffic restrictions with the City of Cincinnati. At this time, the Department will not allow local street improvements at Borden and King Place to begin upon signed contract. This may be revised in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2021 10:36:40 PM Question Number - 170

Scope sections 11.3.1 (1908L), 11.3.3 (1840), 11.3.4 (1852), and 11.3.6 (1892) require connecting all existing crossframe stiffeners to the top and bottom flanges. Fit of the existing structures vary by structure. For example, 1840 and 1852 plans indicate the intermediate stiffeners have contact bearing on one end and a maximum clearance of 1-1/4" on the other. 1892 plans indicate contact bearing with the top flange and clearance of not more than 1/8" on the bottom flange. The as-built condition of the stiffener fit with the flanges will impact how the connections are made. Please provided as-built plans, inspection information, or otherwise confirm the actual fit of the existing stiffeners.

**Scope Section 1.2 states "The Design-Build Team (DBT) is advised to verify the preceding referenced plans to determine if they accurately depict existing field conditions." It should be noted that the contractor for PID 104667 verified an existing field condition on this item for structure HAM-74-1908R that was different to that shown on the reference-only plans provided by The Department. Connecting all existing crossframe stiffener to the top and bottom flanges per the Scope may require the addition of structural steel due to gap size.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/15/2021 4:55:12 PM Question Number - 169

In reference to pre bid question No. 52, can ODOT provide an updated status set of plans for PID 104667 buildable unit 14?

**Question Submitted:** 3/15/2021 4:54:46 PM Question Number - 168

Can ODOT provide Design Files (CAD/CAE) for PID 113476 to supplement Appendix AA information from Addendum 9?

**CAD files have been uploaded to the link below. See forthcoming addendum.**

**[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Addendum%2010/Appendix\\_AA\\_project\\_20-5000\\_DGN/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%2010/Appendix_AA_project_20-5000_DGN/)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/15/2021 4:54:17 PM Question Number - 167

In reference to scope of services, Section 7, can the department provide a gpk file or other documentation showing the existing monuments found as part of the PID 83723 and 82284?

**All GPK files can be found here:**

**[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_A\\_3.85%20final%20plans%20TranSystems/Sheets/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A_3.85%20final%20plans%20TranSystems/Sheets/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/15/2021 4:53:51 PM Question Number - 166

In reference to scope of services, Section 7, can the department provide the Survey and Mapping Certification for PID 83723 and 82284?

**Survey certification can be found in the record plans for the PIDs listed in the question. Survey Control as included in Appendix C is the only survey element that is Contractual. All other survey data provided is for reference only. Section 11.1 (DBT Survey Responsibilities) requires the DBT to obtain survey for this project. As previously conveyed to each Shortlisted Offeror, there are known tie-in issues with the original flown survey from PID 76256 (MCE Corridor project).**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/15/2021 4:53:30 PM Question Number - 165

In reference to scope of services, Section 7, can the department confirm that proposed Iron Pins were set at all proposed right of way corners shown in PID 83723 right of way plans?

**Iron pins were set at right of way corners as shown in PID 83723 in 2013/2014. The Department cannot confirm that all pins are still in place.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2021 9:24:31 AM Question Number - 164

There is significant settlement risk on 74 EB adjacent to the new MSE wall abutment for Ramp R (between WB and EB). The scope is unclear if the DBT will be responsible for settlement monitoring on the EB roadway. Please clarify.

**Geotechnical investigation and recommendations are the responsibility of the Design Build team. Settlement evaluation and subsequent settlement monitoring requirements are to be specified by the geotechnical engineer of record as outlined in the Specifications for Geotechnical Explorations.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2021 9:15:53 AM Question Number - 163

The TranSystems drawings for Noisewalls include a significant amount of earthwork along EB 74. Is the earthwork included in 203000?

**As noted in Scope Section 10.5.7, noise walls NSA 14 and NSA 15 are to be constructed to meet the acoustic profile outlined in Appendix S. Incorporate design elements to meet the scope requirements.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2021 9:14:35 AM Question Number - 162

Addendum 9 added 90 calendar day railroad reviews for Interim, Final, and AFC drawing submittals. Please confirm ODOT wants the DBT to carry 270 calendar days of review for the design development of the two bridges over the railroad.

**The Scope is accurate. The DBT shall include 90 days for each of the review submittals including Interim, Final, and Construction totaling 270 Calendar Days of review for the design development of the work impacting the railroad.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2021 9:13:30 AM Question Number - 161

Similar to other PBQs, site clearing will be required to complete early design work such as geotechnical explorations and site survey. Will the Department grant an exception so clearing and access can begin prior to June 1, 2022? Without this variance, substantive design work cannot begin until October 2022.

**The June 1, 2022 restriction is for physical construction work. Data collection including but not limited to field surveys and geotechnical investigations are permitted upon signed Contract subject to environmental and third party restrictions. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2021 9:11:48 AM Question Number - 160

Site clearing will be required to complete early design work such as geotechnical explorations and site survey. Will the Department grant a variance request to allow clearing during the Indiana Bat Season's restricted clearing calendar (April to October)? Without this variance, substantive design work cannot begin until October 2022.

**The June 1, 2022 restriction is for physical construction work. Data collection including but not limited to field surveys and geotechnical investigations are permitted upon signed Contract subject to environmental and third party restrictions. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2021 9:10:24 AM Question Number - 159

Where Type C Approach Slab Installations are used, Standard Drawing AS-2-15 shows a Type B Pressure Relief joint 50 feet from the end of the sleeper slab. In the pavement sections where the existing rigid pavement is to remain adjacent to a Type C Approach Slab Installation, are we required to provide a Type B Pressure Relief Joint 50 feet beyond the end of the sleeper slab?

**Yes, a Type B Pressure Relief Joint 50 feet beyond the end of the sleeper slab shall be required per the SCD.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/14/2021 9:09:25 AM Question Number - 158

Where Type A Approach Slab Installations are used, Standard Drawing AS-2-15 shows 25 feet a full depth flexible pavement between the end of the approach slab and the roadway section. In the pavement sections where the existing rigid pavement is to remain, are we required to provide full depth pavement replacement for the 25 feet beyond the end of the approach slab?

**Yes, full depth pavement replacement beyond the approach slab shall be required per the SCD.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:40:57 AM Question Number - 157

Addendum #9 added language to scope section 5 regarding Hazardous Materials and the DBT's responsibility for removal and disposal of material "discoverable from site investigations and analysis." This scope language could be interpreted to broadly cover all materials encountered on the site as there is no limitation to site investigation or analysis. It is not reasonable to expect the DBTs to perform additional prebid underground site investigations (test digs or additional borings) that would uncover any and all potentially discoverable items. It is also not reasonable to expect the DBTs to perform unlimited analysis of the site which would encounter buried obstructions, C&DD or other site furnishings. Please revise the scope to limit the DBT's responsibility to observable surface materials.

**The Department is not requiring underground site investigations (test digs or additional borings). This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:39:22 AM Question Number - 156

The scope discusses providing graffiti protection on several bridge substructures as well as pedestrian bridge superstructure. The BDM discusses limiting the concrete surfaces that are treated with permanent graffiti coatings to those reachable by easy climbing and visible to the traveling public. Please clarify if all areas noted in the scope require graffiti protection or areas within a certain distance of the ground.

**Graffiti protection requirements are defined for each structure in the scope. While the BDM provides guidance for graffiti protection, the scope defines the work required which exceeds the guidance included in the BDM.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:38:39 AM Question Number - 155

Please provide a list of signs that are less than five years old as referenced by Scope 12.2-A.1.a. We cannot know at what time all signs have been installed throughout the project corridor.

**All signs not replaced or being replaced with PID 104667 are over 5 years old and shall be replaced. The Design-Build Team (DBT) shall verify existing field conditions.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:38:17 AM Question Number - 154

Please provide the 408 Permit (Appendix DD) that will be submitted to the USACE before April 1st so that DBTs can appropriately account for any design restrictions before the PTI submittals.

**The Department is currently working with the USACE to develop and submit the 408 permit. The Department will provide all 408 permit information in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:37:42 AM Question Number - 153

Please clarify the limits of where guardrail, concrete barrier and fence are being placed by projects PID 76257, 113476, 104667 in relations to scope sections 10.2.E.2, 10.2.F.1, and 10.9. It is necessary for the Department to provide this information in order to ensure that all contractors have the same bidding information in the event that guardrail, barrier or fence was replaced that is not shown on the Released for Construction Drawings provided (i.e. replacement lengths modified during physical construction or by change order).

**The DBT is responsible for field verifying plan work completed to date. For plan work not yet constructed, the DBT shall review the plans provided for determining replacement quantities to include in their bid.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:36:39 AM Question Number - 152

Can the department provide a graphic or station range of where the portable concrete barrier mentioned in scope 9.5.7 will be left on the project?

**The limits of the portable concrete barrier per Section 9.5.7 are depicted on Sheets 95 and 98 of the MCE-5a "WB 74 Full Depth Changes" file provided with Addendum 9**

**here:[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_A1\\_PID104667%20MCE%205a%20Project%20Information/MCE%205A%20Scope%20Changes/WB74%20Full%20Depth%20Changes/74%20WB%20Revisions\\_PCB%20to%20Remain%20for%205B.pdf](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A1_PID104667%20MCE%205a%20Project%20Information/MCE%205A%20Scope%20Changes/WB74%20Full%20Depth%20Changes/74%20WB%20Revisions_PCB%20to%20Remain%20for%205B.pdf)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:36:09 AM Question Number - 151

Addendum #9 removed three bid items (#24, 25, 31) from the proposal. However, the updated EBS file that was provided included more revisions than the three deleted bid items. Can the Department provide a revised (clean) proposal or update the EBS file to match the projects proposal with incorporated addendums?

**The EBS file will be updated in a future addendum.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:35:13 AM Question Number - 150

Scope 10.11.C states that buried concrete and debris was encountered on PID 104667 on the west side of I-75 from north of Ludlow to I-74. The scope does not provide any clarity as to the extent of the buried materials, or the nature of the 'debris'. The contractor which encountered the buried items on PID 104667 would have a clear advantage with the superior knowledge of the exact locations and types of materials encountered. For this reason we request that the Department agree to compensate the 5B contractor via change order for any buried concrete or debris encountered.

**In addition to the provided pictures and description, the archive borings indicate the presence of fill of varying composition, limits and depth along I-75 SB from north of the Ludlow Overpass to the I-74 WB ramp. The fill generally extends from the I-75 SB mainline pavement edge, westward to the R/W limits. Additionally, as outlined in BU #14, Project 183000 has installed embankment and drainage structures in the areas in question. Note that the incorporation of concrete fragments as well as recycled asphalt pavement is permitted per Item 203 of the CMS. Thus, it is not reasonable for the Department to agree to compensate for buried concrete when the material is permitted to be utilized as outlined in the CMS. Additional compensation as requested is not anticipated based on the existing data. Additional CPT data, archive topographic survey and additional boring information will be provided in a forthcoming addenda. Additional geotechnical information meeting the requirements of the Specifications for Geotechnical Exploration will be required by the winning bidder once detailed design has commenced.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:34:04 AM Question Number - 149

Per addendum #9, Appendix O3 was removed. Work in the Prang St area was moved to Appendix O1 to allow for work upon contract award. Can the area along I-75 and Mill Creek originally shown in Appendix O3 be re-added to the scope to allow for work to occur before 6/1/2022?

**Only clearing and grubbing activities would be permitted to be performed from 3/01/2022 to 3/31/2022 subject to approval of the 408 permit for work within 50 feet of the Federally Funded Civil Works project limits. The DBT shall provide written notice 30 calendar days in advance of the Work. The DBT shall coordinate the Work with the current PID 104667 contractor prior to beginning Work. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:33:09 AM Question Number - 148

Scope section 2 prohibits physical work from beginning until 6/1/2022. However, this is outside the clearing window due to the Indiana Bat. Will the DBT be permitted to do clearing and grubbing before 6/1/2022 or will the Department perform the project clearing in a separate contract?

**The Department will not perform clearing and grubbing through a separate contract. Other than the Prang Avenue Area (which will be available upon signed contract per Appendix O1), clearing and grubbing activities are permitted to be performed from 3/01/2022 to 3/31/2022 subject to approval of the 408 permit for work within 50 feet of the Federally Funded Civil Works project limits. The DBT shall provide written notice 30 calendar days in advance of the Work. The DBT shall coordinate the Work with the current PID 104667 contractor prior to beginning Work. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:32:24 AM Question Number - 147

PBQ 141 referenced multiple structures (MSE walls, wall foundations, etc.) but the response only references QC3 use at bridges. Will QC3 be required for other retaining wall elements?

**QC3 is not required for retaining wall elements.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:14:28 AM Question Number - 146

For Bridge 74-1840, Section 11.3.4 note 4 requires abutments to be converted to semi-integral. However, note 5 seems to leave that decision up to the DBT. Please clarify the Department's intent.

**Section reference provided within the question does not correspond to the bridge listed. Per Section 11.3.3 (Structure HAM-74-1840), the DBT may convert the abutments to semi-integral and bearing replacement would only be necessary if required by semi-integral conversion. Per Section 11.3.4 (Structure HAM-74-1852), the DBT is required to convert the abutments to semi-integral and bearing replacement would only be necessary if required by semi-integral conversion.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/11/2021 9:09:57 AM Question Number - 145

Per the response to PBQ#137, the DBT is required to meet ODOT's photometric lighting standards on IR-74 from IR-75 to Montana Avenue. Also, per the response to PBQ#136, the DBT is required to replace the full lighting system in its entirety. There are four light towers east of Montana and west of the full-depth pavement limits which will not be physically impacted by this project. Does the scope require the DBT to remove and replace the towers, circuits, and control center for these 4 towers?

**Photometric standards shall be met starting at the median tower light near the EB I-74 Truss at approximately SLM 17.9 and continue East to I-75. The Scope will be revised in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2021 4:36:07 PM Question Number - 144

Since the issuance of Addendum 9, we have found several additional files (which are not identified in Addendum 9) have been uploaded to various folders throughout the FTP site. Please provide a list of the documents that were posted outside of the Addendum 9 folder.

**The Department provided a general description of Addendum 9 changes to the Appendices on the FTP within the Addendum 9 cover letter.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2021 4:29:44 PM Question Number - 143

Can all the CADD and GPK files for the MCE-5A "WB74 Full Depth Changes" scope change be provided?

**The Department will provide the "WB74 Full Depth Changes" Cadd and GPK file in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/8/2021 12:35:20 PM Question Number - 142

Item 9 within section 11.3.4 refers to replacement of section loss on the fascia girders. We would like more clarification on this repair to better define the area of girder 10 that needs replaced at the rear abutment. Can the Department quantify this work or provide an attachment detailing areas of section loss?

**Additional information will be added. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2020 4:47:06 PM Question Number - 141

Please specifically identify where QC1, QC2, and QC3 Concrete As Per Plan will be required on the project. The contract documents include As Per Plan notes for QC3 concrete. However the contract documents do not specify where QC3 concrete is required to be used. According to the BDM, the designer is to specify QC3 Special Concrete when concrete strengths and/or permeability other than QC1 or QC2 are necessary. Therefore, if the DBT only uses QC1 or QC2 concrete on the project, QC3 As Per Plan is not required by the Contract Documents. Note that a general substitution of QC3 As Per Plan for QC1 and QC2 will result in its use in abutment foundations, wall foundations, MSE wall concrete leveling pads, etc.

**Use CLASS QC3 CONCRETE WITH QC/QA, SUBSTRUCTURE, AS PER PLAN that is listed in Appendix I for all substructure concrete and use CLASS QC3 CONCRETE WITH QC/QA, SUPERSTRUCTURE, AS PER PLAN for all superstructure concrete involved with the permanent construction of the bridges**

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2020 4:45:27 PM Question Number - 140

Appendix W of the project Scope of Services includes a hydraulic model for Mill Creek, including the proposed improvements for this project. The proposed condition model includes the proposed Ramp O/R. The following is taken from the TranSystems Hydraulic Report and confirmed with the HEC-RAS results. "... The elevations were within 0.03 feet with the maximum differences upstream of the Ramp O Bridge (see Table 1). These changes are nominal and could be taken as no increase due to the accuracy of the model. Therefore, the proposed bridges do not have an adverse effect on the water surface elevations." While the increase is very minor, and for practical purposes could be assessed as model error, FEMA defines no-rise as 0.00 feet. Additionally, FEMA states there is no-rise permitted in a Zone AE if there is any proposed fill within the regulatory floodway. . The Scope of Services Appendix A design includes piers within the floodway for the Ramp O/R structures. According to the NFIP, the rise in base flood elevation that occurs as part of this project will require a CLOMR/LOMR. Will ODOT prepare, at their own cost, the CLOMR/LOMR and accept the risk that FEMA may reject the application for a CLOMR/LOMR?

**A permanent change in the flood elevation as a result of the project will trigger a CLOMR/LOMR. All permits are required to be obtained by the DBT, through ODOT, based on their final design.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2020 10:22:46 AM Question Number - 139

Where the proposed alignment of shoulders are on existing pavement (recently constructed full-depth or concrete with asphalt overlay), is it acceptable to resurface proposed shoulders with asphalt in lieu of full-depth asphalt reconstruction? This would be limited to areas where travel lanes are to be resurfaced.

**this is acceptable for areas where travel lanes are only being resurfaced.**

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

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2020 5:34:16 PM Question Number - 138

Scope Section 12.4.D and 12.4.G appear to conflict with each other. Item D requires all new materials, but Item G allows for updates west of HAM-74-1840. Please clarify that west of HAM-74-1840 does not require new materials for the entire lighting system.

**see forth coming addendum. Lighting items constructed with PIDs 104667, 82284, 82282, 82278, and 76257 can be reused is they are not damage and in full working order. all lihgitng not constructed with these PIDs shall be new. Seperate lihgting circuits and power services shall be provided for interstate and surface streets.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2020 5:33:12 PM Question Number - 137

Scope Section 12.4.A states that lighting requirements shall be met within the limits of improvements. In regards to the west end of the project, what are the "limits of improvement"? Is this the full depth replacement, mill/fill, or other?

**See forthcming addendum. Continuous freeway lighting is also required on IR-74 from IR-75 to montana avenue. Lighting within these limits shall provide lightin for the intersate mainline, ramp,s and overpasses.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2020 12:10:58 PM Question Number - 136

PBQ #120 asked: "There are multiple existing highmast lights within the I-74 / Beekman Interchange. Will the Department allow the reuse of the existing lighting system within the interchange if the system is upgraded to provide LED lighting?" The answer stated: "These Lights need to be replaced." Please clarify. Does the scope require the DBT to replace the full lighting system (e.g., all poles, towers, foundations, circuits, control centers, etc.)? Or does the response indicate that only the light fixtures, which are currently High Pressure Sodium, will need to be replaced with LED (with existing poles, towers, circuits, and control centers to be reused for the LED system)?

**The DBT is to replace the full lighting system in its entirety.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2020 7:54:53 AM Question Number - 135

[Attachment - 203000](#)

In reference to Question #134, the files for archive 08c1498 were uploaded to the FTP site but archive 08c1489 is still missing. Can archive 08c1489 also be made available?

**they have been posted to the link below.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/ExistingPlans/08C1489/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/ExistingPlans/08C1489/)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2020 5:09:26 PM Question Number - 134

The existing plans list item number 2 as archive 08c1489 (HAM-25-2.99) to be provided. However, no files on the FTP site are provided for archive 08c1489. Will the department please provide the existing plan set?

**The plans have been re-uploaded to the link below. Please note that this a short term file storage site and files are automatically deleted.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/ExistingPlans/08C1498/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/ExistingPlans/08C1498/)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/25/2020 10:54:56 AM Question Number - 133

Will VPF be required on both sides of the approach spans to the PED bridge (BR 1875), or will VPF only be required for the side that is adjacent to the highway?

**The VPF is required on both sides of the approach spans to the PED bridge.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/25/2020 10:53:18 AM Question Number - 132

Based on recent project site visits, there appears to be trench drain installed along the median of I-74 for MOT drainage purposes. Will the department allow for the trench drain to remain in place for the Phase 5B contract for MOT use as well?

**No, the trench drain will not remain in place.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2020 5:50:09 PM Question Number - 131

Scope sections 10.3.C, 10.3.H, 10.3.I, 10.3.R, and 10.3.S do not provide clear direction for the roadway south of the new Ramp O/R exit along 75 SB. If the existing-newly-constructed pavement (from 5A) is left in place for the new shoulder, the shoulder cross-slope will not meet current L&D requirements. Corrective methods could include mill & fill, but 10.3.R pushes the scope requirements into a complete full-depth reconstruction and 10.4.1.L.3 would add in underdrain requirements at the sawcut due to the 10' shoulder width requirement. Will the Department require new under-drains and full-depth removal/replacement along this newly constructed corridor, or will a new pavement makeup section be included in the scope which allows mill and fill in this section?

**The DBT shall remove existing Ramp O pavement and shoulders and construct a new I-75 southbound outside shoulder which will require underdrain replacement. This will be clarified in a future addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2020 3:43:47 PM Question Number - 130

Can guardrail installed on the 5A project be removed and re-used on the 5B project?

**All guardrail (even if installed on MCE 5A) is to be new.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2020 3:42:56 PM Question Number - 129

Please provide removal limits for existing Ramp O.

**Per Scope Section 10.3.N any excess or unused pavement is to be removed. This includes existing Ramp O.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2020 3:41:51 PM Question Number - 128

Scope section 10.3.H states all pavement at the end of the project will be free from previously removed pavement marking scars and will be resurfaced the entire width of the roadway. Along 75 SB, the existing white edge line conflicts with the new Ramp O/R exit and will need to be removed. Is the DBT required to perform full width resurfacing on the newly constructed 75 SB due to this edge line removal and replacement?

**see forthcoming addendum changes will be made to section 10.3.H all pavement impacted by MOT shall be resurfaced. At the end of the project shall be clean and free of previously removed pavement marking scars. The resurfacing shall include the entire width of the roadway lanes immediately adjacent to the removed pavement markings, including shoulders no matter where the pavement impacts are located on I-75.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2020 4:59:37 PM Question Number - 127

10.5.5 Bridge Foundations, page 68 of 107, states "A dynamic load test is required at each substructure unit using piles, regardless of the pile type and ultimate bearing value." Three paragraphs later, in the same section, the scope states "Dynamic load testing is not required at substructure units in which structural pile sections, such as H-piles, are utilized for foundation support." What are the requirements for dynamic pile load testing?

**Dynamic load testing is required for all pile foundations utilizing side friction in any capacity to resist structural loads.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2020 4:52:01 PM Question Number - 126

In the absence of an executed Railroad Agreement, can the Department clarify who is responsible for the cost of any utility relocations associated with utilities in the railroad right of way? There are several locations where known fiber optic utilities exist along the railroad alignment and drift in and out of State of Ohio right of way.

**All railroad owned utilities shall be relocated by the railroad at the expense of ODOT. If other utilities are in the railroad right-of-way and have an easement to be there they will be relocated at ODOT's expense, if no easement is available it is the utilities responsibility to relocate. The utility will have to provide ODOT with a copy of their easement or lease prior to ODOT agreeing to reimburse the relocation.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2020 4:50:15 PM Question Number - 125

Can ODOT please post all of the CADD files associated with PID 82284?

**The cad files are at the link below. These are for reference only.  
[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/ExistingPlans/74%20existing%20plans/08C3266/DGN/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/ExistingPlans/74%20existing%20plans/08C3266/DGN/)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2020 4:18:41 PM Question Number - 124

Section 10.4.2.A states that DOTE and SMU regulations shall be used outside L/A R/W. SMU calls for using a 10-year frequency for spread calculations. Appendix A (Spread calculations prepared by Transystems) for the sideroads used a 2-year storm frequency. What design frequency is to be used on the local roads?

**DOTE and SMU regulations shall be used for drainage design for all roadways outside of L/A R/W. The calculations provided are For Information Only. The contractor is expected to develop their own calculations following the scope requirements and using their own proposed design.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2020 4:17:31 PM Question Number - 123

Per Appendix A, storm and spread calculations for the local roads did not include flows from adjacent properties. Can we assume drainage areas in Appendix A are appropriate for use?

**Accurate drainage areas are required. Appendix A is for reference only. Any assumption of using reference only information instead of verifying the information before the final design is at the risk of the DBT.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/13/2020 11:28:20 AM **Question Number - 122**

Per PBQ 96, the Department is revising the design speed of 74 WB from 18.99 to 19.47 to 50 mph. There is a vertical curve issue at the east limits of 74 WB, where the 5B limits match 5A full depth limits (this is near the CSO driveway). The 5A full depth work touches a portion of the existing curve, which is only designed for 40MPH, not 50MPH. If we are to meet the 50 MPH design speed for VC as well, we must chase the full depth back to the gore of 75 NB and 74 WB... according to the TS plans which did address this issue. The 5A plans indicate full depth pavement replacement limits into the deficient vertical curve, all of which will need replaced again by the 5B DBT. Is the DBT expected to correct the deficient vertical curve at the east limits of the 74 WB work?

**See forthcoming addendum. A change order has been started with the DBT for MCE 5A to perform this full depth work. MCE 5A will perform the full depth work on I-74 up to the 1908R structure.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2020 8:15:42 AM **Question Number - 121**

Scope Section 10.3.I states that all ramp pavement within the project limits shall be constructed full depth. The "project limits" in regards to I-74 WB on-ramps from Colerain/Beekman are not well defined. Please clarify what station full depth construction starts along the Colerain/Beekman ramp to I-74 WB.

**Full-depth pavement and shoulder replacement is only required along the I-74 westbound on ramp from Colerain Beekman Ramp within the limits of the landslide damage and within limits impacted by retaining wall repair construction. Limits of landslide repair will be clarified in a future addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2020 8:15:03 AM **Question Number - 120**

There are multiple existing highmast lights within the I-74 / Beekman Interchange. Will the Department allow the reuse of the existing lighting system within the interchange if the system is upgraded to provide LED lighting?

**These lights are to be replaced.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2020 8:13:54 AM **Question Number - 119**

Due to the recent bid delay and an expected project award of 07/13/2020, it is assumed that a contract execution will not occur until around the first of August. With multiple plan submittal and review stages, it is not possible to complete the design of the landslide repair buildable unit in time to construct the remediation this coming winter. Please revise the physical construction dates of the RFP for the landslide remediation work.

**The start of physical landslide repair activities is to begin on or before November 1, 2020. The contractor shall continuously perform physical work on the landslide repair from the start date to completion unless impacted by weather, as agreed upon by the Engineer. The landslide repair, including all roadway work, shall be completed by May 1, 2021. See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/10/2020 9:30:06 AM **Question Number - 118**

PBQ 105 asked: Scope section 12.4(D) states that west of HAM-74-1840 lighting shall be updated or reconstructed to eliminate any dark spots to the end of the project, which is assumed the end of the mainline full depth pavement. Please Clarify. The response to this question did not clarify the western limit for the lighting analysis. This question was intended to pertain to the existing dark spot on I-74 which is clearly outside the project limits. There is an existing light tower at approximate Station 986+80 and an existing light tower at approximate Station 979+70. As a result, there is a large dark spot on the freeway between these two towers. Is it the intent of the scope to add lighting to the freeway to light the gap to between STA 986+80 and STA 979+70?

**The dark spot between STA 986+80 and 979+70 shall be illuminated and meet standards.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2020 4:30:22 PM **Question Number - 117**

Per Scope Section 11.3.1.14 for the HAM-74-1908L bridge, the required vertical clearance over Spring Grove is 15'-6". Our survey team field verified an existing vertical clearance of 15'-1 5/8" at the southernmost fascia girder over the right edge line northbound. There are multiple locations throughout the project (1840 and 1852 over Beekman and 1892 over Elmore) where the 15'-6" minimum vertical clearance requirement was removed, and the requirement changed to "no reduction in existing vertical clearance will be permitted". We request that the same change be made for the 1908L bridge over Spring Grove.

**Based on the classification of Spring Grove Avenue the minimum vertical clearance over Spring Grove Ave shall remain 15'-6" as required in the scope.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/7/2020 8:56:32 AM Question Number - 116

The scope regarding roadway drainage at MSE walls is unclear. SOS 10.4.1.E requires RCP for storm drains within MSE walls. SOS 10.5.4 does not allow drainage conduits within 5 feet of the select granular backfill, unless the Department approves on a case by case basis. If approved, the conduit must be encased within steel. Please clarify if the Department will allow roadway drainage conduits at MSE walls and if they need to be steel encased RCP. An MSE wall that supports a roadway must include standard drainage features (i.e. barrier inlets and conduits) for the roadway. The Department's approval on a case by case basis after award places an undue risk on the DBT. The most strict interpretation of the SOS would preclude the use of MSE walls on the project.

**Standard drainage conduits and features utilized for control of roadway drainage developed from a MSE wall supported roadway surface are permitted for use at MSE Wall locations. The drainages features controlling roadway surface drainage of the MSE supported roadway are permitted in the select granular backfill zone. The requirements of scope of service section 10.4.1.E shall be followed for implementation of drainage conduits controlling roadway surface drainage at MSE wall locations. Steel encasement of conduits and utilities is required for items that are proposed to extend below or through any MSE wall as outlined in 10.5.4.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 5:27:09 PM Question Number - 115

The TEM is listed under "Section 41 - Governing Regulations". Section 1103-6.9 of the TEM states: "Adjacent underpasses may be located in such proximity that the roadway beneath the underpass structures must have supplemental lighting during daylight hours. In these cases, guidance will be found in the IES's Recommended Practice 22 (RP-22). This possibility should be considered when the length of the underpass exceeds 80 feet." Does the scope require the DBT to install Daytime Lighting Systems per RP-22, if underpass structures are greater than 80 feet wide?

**The following has been added to the scope. See forthcoming addendum: The DBT shall provide photometric calculations which display illumination values on all roads, including underpasses, within the project limits. Lighting values on ODOT maintained facilities, including underpasses, shall meet design criteria as contained in the TEM. Lighting on City streets, including underpasses at proposed bridges, shall meet the City standard of at least 0.9 foot-candles (average initial) and a uniformity of 4:1, or better. The DBT shall also evaluate each overpass as a tunnel per the T.E.M section 1103.6.9.3 using a perspective drawing and seek the Engineer's approval on underpass lighting both at daytime and nighttime prior to starting highway lighting plans.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 5:07:52 PM Question Number - 114

Per the TEM: "Artificial illumination is normally not needed for underpasses which are less than 75 feet in length. However, both skewed underpasses and parallel underpasses less than 40 feet apart may need underpass lighting regardless of their length. Each underpass should be evaluated on its own merits." What criteria should be used to determine if underpass lighting is warranted, since specific criteria is not provided in the TEM? For this project, we suggest an amendment to the scope which reads: "The DBT shall provide photometric calculation which display illumination values on all roads, including underpasses, within the project limits. Lighting values on ODOT maintained facilities, including underpasses, shall meet design criteria as contained in the TEM. Lighting on City streets, including underpasses at proposed bridges, shall meet the City standard of at least 0.9 foot-candles (average initial) and a uniformity of 4:1, or better."

**The following has been added to the scope. See forthcoming addendum: The DBT shall provide photometric calculations which display illumination values on all roads, including underpasses, within the project limits. Lighting values on ODOT maintained facilities, including underpasses, shall meet design criteria as contained in the TEM. Lighting on City streets, including underpasses at proposed bridges, shall meet the City standard of at least 0.9 foot-candles (average initial) and a uniformity of 4:1, or better. The DBT shall also evaluate each overpass as a tunnel per the T.E.M section 1103.6.9.3 using a perspective drawing and seek the Engineer's approval on underpass lighting both at daytime and nighttime prior to starting highway lighting plans.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 4:58:43 PM Question Number - 113

Can ODOT provide the HAM-74-ARTIMIS existing ITS plans?

**All ITS/ARTIMIS plans are at the link below.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/ExistingPlans/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/ExistingPlans/)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 1:23:15 PM Question Number - 112

Scope Section 12.6.2, please verify that the 2 side-fired radar detectors, poles and cabinets adjacent to the DMS sign on I-74 EB east of Montana Ave. should be removed.

**Yes they should be removed.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 1:22:43 PM Question Number - 111

Scope Section 12.6.1 G requires a new 24-strand SM fiber terminated at the west end of the project at the DMS sign on I-74 EB east of Montana Ave. Please clarify if the new 24-strand fiber is to be connected on the east end to the existing fiber at the camera Colerain Ave/Beekman St, or if the fiber is to be connected to the new fiber installed by Phase 5A at the camera at Elmore St.

**The new 24 SM needs to service all the devices between the DMS on the west end and the node cabinet at 74/75 on the east end. If the new 24 SM coming from the east stops at Elmore, that is where the new 24 SM coming from the west should stop.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 1:22:02 PM Question Number - 110

There is an existing side-fired radar detector on the EB side of I-74 at Elmore St. at STA. 1017+82.6, 67.6' RT as shown on the Phase 5A ITS plans. The Phase 5A ITS plans indicate that this pole, cabinet, and detector are to remain. Please confirm if Phase 5B should remove this detector.

**Yes the radar is to be removed with 5B.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 9:57:41 AM Question Number - 109

Department Update: Please provide a follow up to Question 81 on how changes will be communicated to all teams?

**The following links will take you to all RFIs, Design Submittals, Construction Submittals, As-Built Log, and CPM monthly Schedule Updates.**[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_A1%20MCE%205A%20RFC%20and%20basemap/ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_D%20MCE%205A%20progress%20schedule/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A1%20MCE%205A%20RFC%20and%20basemap/ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_D%20MCE%205A%20progress%20schedule/)

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 9:27:29 AM Question Number - 108

In addendum 5, for the 1875 Pedestrian Bridge, the railing type changed from curb railing and fence to concrete parapet per BR-2-15, 24-inches in height. Is it ODOT's intention that only the concrete portion of the railing is to be provided and not the steel tubular railing? Additionally, is it the intention that this type of railing be provided for the limits of the pedestrian bridge over I-74 only or is this to be provided on the approach ramps as well?

**It is ODOT's intention that the BR-2-15 with its steel tubes will be installed on the pedestrian bridge over IR 74 and its approach ramp structures.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2020 9:19:18 AM Question Number - 107

Reference SOS 10.2.E, "All guardrail within the Project Limits shall be replaced..." Guardrail along 74EB outside shoulder between the Beekman ramp and HAM-74-1892 was not replaced in MCE Phase 5A. Is it ODOT's intent to remove and replace this section of guardrail on the 5B project?

**Yes. all guardrail not replaced with MCE Phase 5A shall be replaced in this project.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2020 9:53:17 AM Question Number - 106

Scope section 12.4.D states that the DBT must provide all new materials for the lighting system including luminaries, supports, foundations, pull boxes, conduits, cabling, etc. Can the DBT remove and relocate, if necessary, new poles and towers installed with Project 5A (PID #104647)?

**The DBT can remove and relocate, if necessary, new poles and towers installed with MCE 5A.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2020 9:51:26 AM Question Number - 105

Scope section 12.4.D states that west of HAM-74-1840 lighting shall be updated or reconstructed to eliminate any dark spots to the end of the project, which is assumed the end of the mainline full depth pavement. Please clarify. Also, does this scope requirement apply to the Beekman ramps as well, both WB and EB.

**Yes this applies to the WB and EB Beekman Ramps.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2020 9:49:10 AM Question Number - 104

Scope section 12.6.1.G requires all new fiber. Please clarify if the intent is to replace all fiber within the project limits or just that fiber which is impacted by the 5B project scope. If the intent is to replace all fiber within the project limits, does the fiber placed by the 5A contractor need replaced.

**Fiber not replaced with MCE 5A is to be replaced. All aspects of the ITS supplemental specs are to be met.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2020 9:47:54 AM Question Number - 103

Scope section 12.6.1.A requires all new conduit. Please clarify if the intent is to replace all conduit within the project limits or just that conduit which is impacted. If the intent is to replace all conduit within the project limits, does the conduit placed by the 5A contractor need replaced.

**All conduit is to be replaced. Conduit that was installed with 5A can remain unless it is impacted.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2020 7:23:26 AM Question Number - 102

Please provide an update on the storm jack and bore under the RR that eliminates the detention in MCE 5A

**The jack and bore plan that was submitted to the RR is at the link below. The file is names "104667\_DP001 – storm JB draft\_2020-03-27.pdf" at the following link: [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/)**

**Question Submitted:** 4/1/2020 12:43:31 PM Question Number - 101

Can ODOT provide the HAM-74-11.16 existing ITS plans?

**the ITS plans can be found at the link below [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/ExistingPlans/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/ExistingPlans/)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/31/2020 11:27:19 AM Question Number - 100

Will the state allow ReCon Gravity Wall to be used for the Gravity wall specified on this project? Spec 870 and Spec 840

**All proprietary retaining wall systems must meet the requirements of SS 870 and SS 840. The ReCon Gravity Wall system referenced is not currently approved in either SS 840 or SS 870 wall applications.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 12:43:41 PM Question Number - 99

Scope Section 10.3.B requires EB I-74 shoulders to be replaced full depth from SLM 18.15 to BR 1892. However, 10.3.I states that shoulders reconstructed by PID 104667 do not need replaced. PID 104667 BU 14 demonstrates portions of I74 EB median shoulders being reconstructed. This does not align with the answer to Question #93 stating that the I74 EB median shoulders were being non-performed. Please provide clarification as to the work required for the I-74 EB median shoulders.

**Full depth shoulders between the approach slabs of HAM 1840 and 1892 were non-performed in MCE 5A. The inside shoulder will only be resurfaced.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 12:43:08 PM Question Number - 98

Scope section 10.3.2 requires the Access Road to be asphalt. However, MCE 5A Buildable Unit 13 shows the asphalt pavement limits being generally for the access road drive apron with the remaining part of the access road being Item 304 8" aggregate base on Item 206 cement stabilization. Can ODOT confirm that the asphalt pavement limits per 10.3.2 for the Access Road are limited to the drive apron?

**The asphalt limits are limited to the drive apron. There shall be 25ft from the outside edge of the shoulder to end of the "apron" asphalt to allow for a truck to have all wheels on the asphalt while waiting to enter I-74.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 12:25:01 PM Question Number - 97

Appendix G1 provides Inclinator readings through 09-30-2019. Is it possible to have more current data provided?

**The inclinometers will be read in the near future. The updated information will be added to the scope by addendum.**



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2020 12:21:47 PM **Question Number - 96**

Per the scope of services Section 1.1, and further clarified in prebid question #89, the design speed for WB 74 is 60 mph. The original construction plans of WB 74 was designed for 60 mph for both horizontal and vertical alignments. However, design standards have significantly changed since the original construction. Current standards require a stopping sight distance that is approx. 100' longer, as well as a height of eye that is 1-ft lower (from 4.5' to 3.5'). With the proposed reconstruction of WB 74 in PID 83723, a 60 mph design speed was used for the vertical alignment, and a 50 mph design speed for the horizontal alignment. This design equated to a SSD of 53 mph for the inside shoulder on WB 74 (on HAM-74-1908L). PID 83723 also provided for a larger radius on the horizontal curve, as well as a widened inside shoulder of 8.25' on HAM-74-1908L. The proposed barrier was designed as 42" tall. Had the SSD been met for this curve (60 mph) in PID 83723, and with a 42" high barrier, the inside shoulder would have had to been widened to 15.4'. With this project (PID 104668), the DBT is required to make adjustments to the existing profile and structure (which is to remain) to achieve the 60 mph design speed for both horizontal and vertical alignments. To account for the 60 mph SSD, the inside shoulder must be increased to approx. 18' to meet current design criteria (570' per L&D Volume 1, Figure 201-1). Is it ODOT's intent to construct an 18' wide inside shoulder on HAM-74-1908L to meet SSD criteria? If not, Section C309.4.3.1 of the BDM states, "on bridges where the 42-in Single Slope (SBR-1-20) barrier system causes a stopping sight distance (SSD) issue, 36-inch New Jersey (BR-1-13) barrier can be used". Will ODOT consider using the BR-1-13 barrier on HAM-74-1908L, in lieu of constructing additional substructure/superstructure to reduce the required width of the inside shoulder?

**The Department will revise the scope in a future addendum to indicate a 50 mph design speed for WB I-74 from approximately SLM 18.99 to SLM 19.47. The DBT's design shall include a shoulder of standard, or increased width to meet sight distance requirements for 50 mph while using a 42" high barrier within these limits. The 60 mph design speed will be retained for the rest of WB I-74.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 4:27:18 PM **Question Number - 95**

Department Update: The Department is providing the following in regard to the procurement schedule for Project 20-3000, Mill Creek Expressway 5B.

**The Department will be issuing an addendum to delay the remaining procurement schedule for Project 20-3000 (Mill Creek Expressway Phase 5B) due to the decline in revenue caused by the COVID19 crisis. This delay will permit the Department to continue to deliver other projects on-time and minimize impacts of these new fiscal constraints. The following procurement dates will be revised. Intermediate Technical Proposal Submission deadline: Thursday, May 21, 2020. PTI Meeting Date (approximately): May 28, 2020. Final Technical and Proposal Due Date: Friday, June 19, 2020. The Anticipated Successful Offeror will be announced on (or approximately) Thursday, July 2, 2020. Anticipated Award will be approximately Monday, July 13, 2020. The deadline for ATC submission process will not be extended.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 1:13:01 PM **Question Number - 94**

Can ODOT provide a Photometric file (.VSL) for the Proposed 5A Lighting along EB I.R. 74 and I.R 75?

**the files are found at the link below: [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_A1%20MCE%205A%20RFC%20and%20basemap/MCE%205A%20lighting%20files/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A1%20MCE%205A%20RFC%20and%20basemap/MCE%205A%20lighting%20files/)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/24/2020 9:53:42 AM **Question Number - 93**

Per section 10.4.1.L.6, 6" underdrains are to be placed on both sides of median barrier. The 5A project is placing new underdrain at the edge of shoulder along I74 EB. Is the 5B DBT required to replace the newly constructed underdrain?

**the underdrains were non-performed with the non-performance of the full depth replacement of the EB74 inside shoulder from station 995+46 to 1018+78.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/23/2020 2:22:05 PM **Question Number - 92**

Appendix O3 depicts areas of work available May 2021. Portions of these areas will need clearing and grubbing before starting construction activities. However, due to the Indiana Bat restriction, clearing would not be able to begin until October 2021. Will the Department allow Appendix O3 clearing and grubbing activities to occur during the October 2020 – March 2021 clearing season so construction activities may begin in May 2021?

**Appendix O3 will be updated to allow the clearing to happen between March 1- March 31. See forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 8:27:46 AM **Question Number - 91**

In response to question #12, are the Duke relocation plans completed and can they be provided along with elevations the wires are being raised to?

**see forthcoming addendum. appendices N2, N3, and N4 have been added.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Addendum%205/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%205/)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/20/2020 8:26:44 AM **Question Number - 90**

Scope section 10.5.2 requires chemical stabilization for all new full-depth roadway areas. Please clarify that the contractor can follow ODOT Geotechnical Bulletin 1 in terms of alternate stabilization methods where full depth roadway sections are too narrow for stabilization equipment.

**The scope is clear that chemical stabilization is a requirement. Alternate subgrade treatments will not be considered. The DBT shall make provisions to chemically stabilize the subgrade in areas of less width than the equipment proposed for use. Include the proposed method to stabilize the narrow areas in the stabilization submittal required per CMS 206.03.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 2:45:53 PM **Question Number - 89**

Please clarify the design speed for westbound I-74. Scope Section 1.1 indicates a design speed of 60 mph for I-75/I-74, but Section 10.2.A includes a reference to 50 mph design speed for a portion of northbound I-75 to westbound I-74.

**The design speed for westbound I-74 is 60 mph per Section 1.1 from SLM 17.80 to SLM 19.47 as identified in Section 2. Section 10.2.A.1.iii references a 50 mph design speed of Ramp S, which begins after the exit terminal from mainline I-74.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 11:14:40 AM **Question Number - 88**

Scope Section 10.2.C.iv was added in Addendum #3 in regards to the ROW near Ramp O/75 SB Exit. Will the Department clarify the limits of ROW being obtained for the slope easement?

**The Department is in the process of obtaining rights to construct in the existing slope easement.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 11:13:41 AM **Question Number - 87**

Scope Section 11.1.U for all bridges states that if weathering steel is used, the fascia girder should be painted. However, each individual bridge scope section specifies that all new and existing structural steel is to be painted. These scope sections appear to be in conflict. Is the use of weathering steel with fascia girder painting allowed for new steel?

**See forthcoming addendum.11.3.2.3 and 11.3.5.3 will say:Paint the new structural steel IZEU per CMS 514, or utilize weathering steel meeting the painting requirements of 11.1.U. The topcoat of the paint shall be Federal Color 595B-34058 (Dark Green).**

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2020 11:12:36 AM **Question Number - 86**

Scope Section 9.5.8 refers to pavement marking repairs on existing pavement. Does this apply to just existing pavement markings or does all temporary striping on existing pavement also require pavement repairs?

**Section 9.5.8 will be deleted in the forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/18/2020 1:48:17 PM **Question Number - 85**

Regarding ITO 5.3.b.iii, superstructure transverse sections. Is it the Department's intent for the DBTs to include the transverse sections for new Ramp O and Ramp R structures as indicated in section ii only, or for all bridges on the project?

**Section 5.3.b.iii of the ITO was revised in Addendum 6 to require superstructure cross sections for all new structures. Cross sections for rehabilitated structures will not be required.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:51:02 AM **Question Number - 84**

Section 6.4 and Appendix W included a hydraulic report and HEC-RAS models prepared by TranSystems. Can ODOT clarify whether the model used in Appendix W was the effective FEMA model?

**The effective FEMA model was the basis for the models that were ultimately used. The effective FEMA model was converted and named Duplicate Effective Model. The effective/Duplicate FEMA model was missing existing I-74 bridges, so a Corrected Effective Model was made. The Proposed Conditions Model was built from the Corrected Effective Model. All of this is detailed in the Hydraulic Report in Appendix W.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:50:32 AM **Question Number - 83**

Referring to RFP Scope Section 10.2.O, can ODOT clarify how the Access Road is intended to extend to WB I-74? Per Appendix A reference document, a 15-foot paved right shoulder width, in the direction of travel on I-74 WB, is shown on I-74 WB (between HAM-75-0440 and the Access Road). This 15-foot shoulder is, however, tapered to 10' on PID 104667 project (BU-14 AFC plans). For PID 104668 project, is a 15-ft paved right shoulder width on this section of WB I-74 required (i.e. east of the Access Road; and connection to PID 104667)?

**A 15ft shoulder is required to get to the Access Road. west of the access road the shoulder is to taper down to 10ft.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2020 8:49:43 AM **Question Number - 82**

Referring to RFP scope Section 10.2.D.4, can ODOT clarify the proposed lane configuration at Prang Street/Elmore Street intersection. Are left turns required to and from Prang Street? Elmore currently has concrete median islands which would prohibit left turn movements, however the scope does not address work along Elmore.

**The final condition is to match what is proposed in the PID 83723 plan by Transsystems.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2020 4:49:33 PM **Question Number - 81**

The response to PBQ #65 addresses scope increases as a result of changes to 104667 documents. How will the Department communicate substantive changes to the 104667 documents which effectively reduce scope for 5B? If the changes are not communicated, one team has a clear and unnecessary advantage over the other two teams.

**All substantive changes will be communicated with all teams.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2020 11:48:59 AM **Question Number - 80**

Scope section 12.2.B.2 states the following "No reused extrusheet signs will be accepted. This includes all signs on the mainline and interchange ramps". However, according to the provided HAM-75-3.84 plans (BU-19) new signs are being installed for the existing Ramp O exit from IR-75 Southbound configuration. Will the department allow the reuse of these signs at the new locations required by the changed ramp O and IR-75 configuration?

**See forthcoming addendum. Extrusheets installed with PID 104667 may be reused.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2020 11:47:16 AM **Question Number - 79**

For the pedestrian bridge, HAM-74-1875, is a handrail required where vandal protection fence is provided?

**hand rails should be constructed based on the requirement in L&D Vol 1 section 300.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/13/2020 11:46:31 AM **Question Number - 78**

Is the 12' curved vandal protection fence required on the approaches for the pedestrian structure HAM-74-1875?

**The vandal protection fence is required on the approaches.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 3:41:03 PM **Question Number - 77**

In response to Question 69, will the Department provide a plan and profile for the new bore location?

**The proposed bore location has been moved to 20ft south of CSO 21. The plan and profile will be provided in the next addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 3:39:54 PM **Question Number - 76**

In response to Question 59, will the Department provide the PID 83723 impacts while the current waterway permit draft is finalized? With the PTI submittal forthcoming and a draft permit not coming for 30 days, we need information to adequately respond to ITO Section 5.3.b.v about crane locations in relation to Mill Creek.

**See forthcoming addendum. The link below will take you the permit determination documents and the re-evaluation. Also included is a list of environmental commitments.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Addendum%205/Appendix\\_Z\\_03232020/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%205/Appendix_Z_03232020/)**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 12:25:23 PM **Question Number - 75**

Can the Department clarify if the railroad reviews listed in section 1.3.1.E are 90 calendar days or 90 work days?

**Railroad reviews are 90 calendar days.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 12:23:22 PM **Question Number - 74**

Please confirm the required face to face of parapet (roadway width) for the pedestrian bridge over I-74 and approach spans/roadway adjacent to the overhead pedestrian bridge. Please note that Transystem plans indicate a 14'-0" face to face of parapet with an overall out to out width of 16'-0".

**14ft face to face of the parapet is acceptable. see changes to section 11.3.5 in the forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 11:40:33 AM **Question Number - 73**

PBQ #46 response is that plans for the landslide repair are to be completed in one buildable unit encompassing all work including MOT and reviewed in 5 working days. Please confirm that this buildable unit will require a Stage 1, Stage 2 and AFC submission each with a 5 day review.

**Yes this BU will require a stage 1, stage 2, and AFC submittal.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2020 11:37:48 AM **Question Number - 72**

In an effort to protect the Indiana and Northern Long Eared bats, clearing of trees is limited to a timeframe of October 1st thru March 31st. The Project Scope requires the Landslide repair work to be completed no later than December 1, 2020. Since the Project will not be awarded until June of 2020 the clearing will not be permitted to begin until October 1, 2020, leaving minimal time to complete the Landslide repair work. Will ODOT to have the trees removed in this area prior to March 31, 2020 so the landslide work can begin when the Project is awarded or allow additional time for completion of the repair work?

**see forthcoming addendum the Colerain Beekman Landslide interim completion date section will read as follows: Colerain Beekman landslide Interim Completion Date: 02/01/2021. All landslide work completed except for full depth pavement replacement and permanent pavement markings. Failure to complete the required work by the time specified shall result in a disincentive in the amount of \$3,200 per day being assessed for each day the work remains incomplete. . Work shall commence by 10/01/2020. Failure to commence the work by 10/01/2020 shall result in a disincentive in the amount of \$3,200 per day being assessed for each day the work does not commence after 10/01/2020. Coordinate the slide repair work with HAM-75-3.84 and all aspects of this current project.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/5/2020 5:40:37 AM **Question Number - 71**

Scope sections 11.3.1, 11.3.2, 11.3.3, 11.3.4 and 11.3.6 refer to bridge barrier constructed per SBR-1-13 (Rev. Jan. 2020). On ODOT's standard bridge drawings page the latest revision to SBR-1-13 is 7/20/18 but SBR-1-20 on the same page is dated 1/17/20. Which concrete bridge railing standard drawing applies to this project?

**see forthcoming addendum. The "SBR-1-13 (Revised January, 2020)" should be updated in the scope to read "SBR-1-20 dated 1/17/20".**

**Question Submitted:** 3/5/2020 5:34:23 AM **Question Number - 70**

BDM section 303.2 states "Where sidewalks, pedestrian, and/or bicycle bridges are intended to be used by maintenance and/or other incidental vehicles, include an H15-44 vehicle, as shown in BDM Figure 303-2, in the design loading". Is H15-44 loading required for the pedestrian structure HAM-74-1875?

**H15-44 loading requirements are not required for the pedestrian bridge.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/4/2020 7:18:32 AM **Question Number - 69**

Will ODOT please provide an update on the underground detention requirement/ construction near CSO 21 on MCE 5a?

**The detention system in the MCE 5a project is being replaced with a bore under the Rail Road for a direct outlet into the Mill Creek. This proposed conduit will be parallel to the existing 78" MSD outfall from CSO 21 and approximately 25ft to the north.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:44:21 AM **Question Number - 68**

Scope Section 10.3.I states all ramp pavement and shoulder shall be constructed full depth. Can the department clarify exactly which ramps are to be reconstructed and the start/end station limits?

**See addendum 3 for clarifications.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:43:55 AM **Question Number - 67**

Scope Section 10.3.I states that full depth pavement reconstruction is not required if already reconstructed full depth on PID 104667. Please clarify the limits of full depth reconstruction of PID 104667.

**Limits of full depth construction on PID 104667 are shown on BU-14.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:42:28 AM **Question Number - 66**

We understand that project 104667 BU #13, 14, and 26 are not RFC'd. These Buildable Units have multiple implications and mesh points with the current 104668 project. Are we to use the plans currently provided to form a basis of bid? If so, when will be the last date to receive updates to these BU's order to finalize our designs for a bid basis?

**The Offerors shall use the 104667 Buildable Units, as shown. The Buildable Units as shared at the date of PTI Documentation (Intermediate Technical Proposal) Submission Deadline shall be the basis of bid.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:41:36 AM **Question Number - 65**

If further revisions are made to RFC Buildable Units for PID 104667 which effect this project (PID 104668), how will these effects be handled, by change order?

**The status of PID104667 design as depicted in the available Buildable Units (regardless of the BU status) as provided at the date of PTI Documentation (Intermediate Technical Proposal) Submission Deadline shall be the basis of bid. Substantive changes made to project PID 104667 after the PTI Documentation (Intermediate Technical Proposal) Submission Deadline shall be consider a Differing Site Condition (as defined in 104.02) except when it can be demonstrated that an Offeror was aware, or reasonably should have been aware, of a potential design revision to PID 104667 made after the PTI Documentation (Intermediate Technical Proposal) Submission Deadline. This will be in an upcoming addenda.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/28/2020 7:40:24 AM **Question Number - 64**

Per pre-bid question #24, escrow documents are to be submitted 2 business days after the deadline for Technical and Price proposal submittals. However, the PN110 of the ITO still requires Escrow Bid Documents to be submitted the business day after the bid opening. Will the Department update PN110 to match the prebid response?

**For the purposes of PN110, the Escrow Documents shall be submitted 2 business days after the deadline for Technical and Price proposal submittals as identified in the Instruction to Offerors. This will be reflected in an upcoming addenda, but no revisions will be made to PN110.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/26/2020 8:56:55 AM **Question Number - 63**

Can ODOT provide further clarification and guidance on the shoulder widths along I-74 WB?

**L&D requirements for shoulder width shall be determined on a directional basis. Left-side shoulder widths (while referencing the direction of travel) for I-74WB shall be ten feet for all sections with 3 or more immediately adjacent lanes. Ten feet shall be fully developed by the end of all merging tapers. Left-side shoulders (when referencing the direction of travel) for I-74WB shall be no less than four feet for all section with 2 or less immediately adjacent lanes**

**Question Submitted:** 2/26/2020 8:08:49 AM **Question Number - 62**

Please post the submittal register listing of all Buildable Units from Phase 5A.

**The submittal registry is for reference only and is at the link below.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Addendum%203/Appendix/Appendix\\_A1/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%203/Appendix/Appendix_A1/)**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 4:01:47 PM **Question Number - 61**

"In response to prebid question 27, the "191022\_183000\_BU-14\_AFC PLANS\_SUBMITTAL.pdf" page 54 of 417 shows an existing "SH" easement along the right side of I-75 SB from approximately sta. 255+60 to sta. 257+50 (north of the existing billboard sign). The easement doesn't appear to be shown in Appendix A right of way plans or any CAD files that have been provided by the Department. Can ODOT provide the right of way plans, legal descriptions, and CAD file(s) for this existing SH easement?"

**The question is referencing parcel 332 SH. The requested information is at the link below.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_A%203.85%20final%20plans%20Transystems/Parcel\\_332\\_SH/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A%203.85%20final%20plans%20Transystems/Parcel_332_SH/)**

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 4:00:36 PM **Question Number - 60**

Referring to the environmental re-evaluation, does seasonal restriction on in-stream work apply to this project?

**Seasonal restrictions for in-stream work do not apply. Only Cutting restrictions for Indiana Bat/Northern Long Eared Bat. All tree removal will occur between October 1 and March 31.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/21/2020 3:59:48 PM **Question Number - 59**

When will the finalized waterway permit and new Wetland Special Provisions be available for the project that state the current impact limits allowed under the permit? What impact limits can we assume in the meantime?

**The finalized waterway permit and special provisions are under development. We anticipate having a draft version of the special provisions within 30 days. The waterway permit is assuming the worst case scenario by mimicking the PID 83723 impacts.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 8:29:52 AM **Question Number - 58**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 8:28:56 AM **Question Number - 57**

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

**see forthcoming addendum. I-74 WB limits are correct SLM 17.80. Additional information on EB I-74 was added to sections 10.2.G and 10.3.B, to clarify that the concrete median barrier and median/inside shoulder is to be replaced started at approximate SLM 18.15 (where the concrete median barrier starts).**

**Question Submitted:** 2/20/2020 8:28:25 AM **Question Number - 56**

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

**I-75 work limits in the Design Build Scope of Services are correct.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 11:54:54 AM **Question Number - 55**

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

**LED fixtures are required.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/19/2020 11:50:24 AM **Question Number - 54**

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

**See forthcoming addendum. Bearings are required to be replaced with the semi-integral conversions.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/18/2020 5:57:28 PM **Question Number - 53**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/17/2020 2:53:14 PM **Question Number - 52**

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

**BU26 AFC (ODOT stamped) BU14 AFC (outstanding comments being addressed) BU13 AFC (outstanding comments being addressed) The three BU's mentioned above can be found at the link below. These are for reference only. [ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_A1%20MCE%205A%20RFC%20and%20base%20map/MCE%205A/RFCs/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A1%20MCE%205A%20RFC%20and%20base%20map/MCE%205A/RFCs/)**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 2/17/2020 2:40:26 PM **Question Number - 51**

Per section 11.3.5 of the scope, a 12' high fence is required. Is the intent to follow the Standard Drawing VPF-1-90 details for a 12' VPF or is the intent to modify this detail to ensure the top of the fence is 12' above the deck?

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/10/2020 5:00:51 PM **Question Number - 50**

Scope section 10.2.A.1 states that access to Beekman interchange shall be on Ramp S and "barrier separated" from mainline I-74 in a braided condition. Section 10.2.C.1 states that "no access" from Ramp O to west bound I-74 shall be permitted. Are Ramp O and Ramp S required to be separated by a barrier wall to meet the "no access" and "barrier separated" requirements?

**See forthcoming addendum. Braiding of the ramps shall be achieved by using concrete barriers and attenuators as required. The intent is to physically prevent the weave using concrete barrier.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/10/2020 4:56:47 PM **Question Number - 49**

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

**No reduction in city streets is permitted. The dual right turn shall remain.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 10:53:44 AM **Question Number - 48**

As noted in L&D Manual - vol. 2 Drainage Design, Section 1010 Maintenance of Traffic Drainage will the District be requiring evaluation of MOT for drainage? If so, is a 2 year design frequency to be used for spread calculation as noted or will the District be providing a different frequency?

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 10:52:58 AM **Question Number - 47**

Scope Section 2 designates 12/2/2020 as the interim completion date for "All landslide work completed." Will the department further define or clarify what all elements of the landslide remediation shall be completed by the interim completion date?

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 10:52:30 AM **Question Number - 46**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 10:51:42 AM **Question Number - 45**

With regards to setting the proposed bridge span over the railroad, are there any future tracks that need to be accommodated? If so, can ODOT please provide the necessary information about the planned location of any future track(s) (i.e. outline the offset distance and side from existing centerline of RR to centerline of planned future track(s))

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

**Question Submitted:** 2/7/2020 10:51:06 AM **Question Number - 44**

Can ODOT provide the design criteria for the Ramp O vertical sag curve geometry near I-75 SB (Sta 1041+00 to Sta 1046+00) as depicted on sheet 462 of 2327 in Appendix A?

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

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 1/29/2020 9:33:08 AM **Question Number - 43**

Scope section 11.3.1.8 lists work to be completed on 1908L "if the westernmost span is to remain." Sub-bullets C and D are specific to the Forward Abutment (east abutment). Should C and D fall under item 8? Will these items be required regardless of the DBT's solution for the westernmost span?

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/29/2020 9:29:03 AM **Question Number - 42**

Scope Section 10.3.H states "All ramps within the project limits will receive the same treatment as the mainline. a. All ramp shall be replaced and constructed full depth." Are ramps to be replaced full depth or are they to receive the same treatment as mainline? Will ODOT provide a schematic showing the intended limits of ramp reconstruction?

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/29/2020 9:27:52 AM **Question Number - 41**

Scope Section 10.3, bullets A, B, and C reference lane and shoulder construction or reconstruction. These items seem to conflict with each other. In particular, Bullet C states that shoulders be constructed or reconstructed full depth within the project limits. This conflicts with bullets A and B. It is also noted that the project limits in Section 2 include I-75 SLM 4.04 to SLM 4.96. Please clarify the intent of pavement and shoulder construction on I-75 and I-74.

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/27/2020 2:22:40 PM **Question Number - 40**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/27/2020 2:22:02 PM **Question Number - 39**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/27/2020 2:21:44 PM **Question Number - 38**

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

**see forthcoming addendum for design criteria clarification.**

**Question Submitted:** 1/27/2020 2:21:14 PM **Question Number - 37**

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

**see forthcoming addendum for design speed clarifications.**



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 11:31:21 AM **Question Number - 36**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/24/2020 11:30:47 AM **Question Number - 35**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**All pavement is considered existing pavement.**

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

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

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

**[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Appendix/Appendix\\_A%203.85%20final%20plans%20Transystems/Sheets/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Appendix/Appendix_A%203.85%20final%20plans%20Transystems/Sheets/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/2018-02-14-CADD%20DGNs/)**

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/22/2020 8:48:13 AM **Question Number - 26**

Appendix A1 contains some PDF drawings of MCE 5A Buildable Units. Can the department provide all MCE 5A BUs noted as complete for ODOT Approved AFC Plans?

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/22/2020 8:47:25 AM **Question Number - 25**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:35:07 AM **Question Number - 24**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:34:29 AM **Question Number - 23**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:34:00 AM **Question Number - 22**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:33:20 AM **Question Number - 21**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:32:52 AM **Question Number - 20**

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

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:32:24 AM **Question Number - 19**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:29:46 AM **Question Number - 18**

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/20/2020 11:29:08 AM **Question Number - 17**

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

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

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

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

**The Department will allow the Offerors to utilize "Prequalified Subcontractor" or "Prequalified Subconsultant" as applicable except when the Offeror identified a Subcontractor or Subconsultant for work Work Type Codes and/or Designer Prequalifications. If applicable, subcontractors or subconsultants named in the SOQ shall be shown under the expected work type.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

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

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

**Final design by Duke Energy will be completed by March 1, 2020. Upon completion of final design, the elevations will be available. The conceptual KMZ file has been provided at the link below as Appendix N1, for REFERENCE ONLY.  
[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Addendum%201/Appendix%20N1/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Addendum%201/Appendix%20N1/)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/17/2020 4:44:37 PM **Question Number - 9**

In addition to the basemap provided in Appendix A1 can the department please provide the CAD/CAE and survey (.dtn or .tin) files from the current HAM-74/75 Phase 5A project?

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

**Question Submitted:** 1/15/2020 3:12:32 PM **Question Number - 8**

Can the Department provide the LiquidFile email address for the PTI Discussion, ATC, and Technical Proposal submittals, please?

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

**Question Submitted:** 11/27/2019 6:59:13 AM **Question Number - 7**

Can the Department provide the landslide exploration report at the Colerain/Beekman location?

**Please see the following ftp site link.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/Colerain-Beekman\\_slide/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/Colerain-Beekman_slide/)**

**Question Submitted:** 11/14/2019 8:30:35 AM **Question Number - 6**

Regarding the response to prebid question #3, will the Department accept projects representing the capabilities of the Design Team, in which the design is substantially complete but construction is on-going or yet to be completed?

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

**Question Submitted:** 11/13/2019 3:30:56 PM **Question Number - 5**

Can the Department post the presentation and transcript as well from the MCE 5B Project; HAM-74-18.01 Mandatory Pre-SOQ meeting on 11/7/2019?

**The presentation is available on the following FTP site link. The transcript will be made available once the Department receives possession.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/PRE\\_SOQ\\_MEETING/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/PRE_SOQ_MEETING/)**

**Question Submitted:** 11/12/2019 2:37:50 PM **Question Number - 4**

Can the Department post the sign-in sheet from the MCE 5B Project; HAM-74-18.01 Mandatory Pre-SOQ meeting on 11/7/2019?

**The sign in sheet from the mandatory Pre-SOQ meeting on 11/7/2019 for the MCE 5B project can be found on the following FTP site link.[ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM\\_74\\_18.01/PRE\\_SOQ\\_MEETING/](ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/HAM_74_18.01/PRE_SOQ_MEETING/)**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 11/7/2019 2:50:43 PM **Question Number - 3**

Section 2.5.9 of the ITO states "Projects should be completed or substantially completed." Can this language be revised to "At least 50% of Contractor's or Designer's work should be complete."?

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

**Question Submitted:** 11/7/2019 1:32:12 PM **Question Number - 2**

Section 2.5.9 of the ITO states "Projects should be completed or substantially completed." Can this language be revised to "At least 50% of Contractor's or Designer's work should be complete."?

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

**Question Submitted:** 11/1/2019 4:16:58 PM **Question Number - 1**

Will the Department allow for Organizational Charts as requested in RFQ Section 2.5.4.1 to be on one 11"x17" sized sheet, folded to 8.5"x11" size, and count as a single sheet for the purposes of page count?

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

**Project No. 210221**

**Sale Date - 5/6/2021**

MUS-93006 - IR 70-10.49

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 4:31:57 PM **Question Number - 76**

Please advise the lineal footage for reference 516, Structure Drainage. It is not clear what the total is, and it bids Lump Sum.

**Lengths of each run of conduit are provided on sheets 1503 & 1504. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 4:21:42 PM **Question Number - 75**

Please confirm that light weight concrete will be required for the decks on bridges 1066L, 1066R, and 1159.

**Yes, light weight concrete is required for those structures.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 1:22:05 PM **Question Number - 74**

Reference 498, Struct Steel Misc, Steel Girder repairs has a plan note on sheet 1458 utilizing a 4" x 4" inspection pattern for the UT thickness gauge. In the past, these inspections has been limited to the last 10 feet from the ends of the bridge and within 10 feet of any joints and hinges. That part of the note is missing. Will the inspection and UT thickness testing be required for the whole bridge?

**That item of work was removed from the plans with a previous Addendum so the referenced testing procedure is not required.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 11:18:22 AM **Question Number - 73**

Please check your quantity for ref no 361. Add no 5 changed it to 95810 ft but the subsummary only shows 70810 ft which appears to be correct. Was the 25000 ft of unanchored barrier estimated for pre-phase 1 included here by mistake?

**The total quantity of 95,810 FT is correct. The additional 25,000 FT of anchored portable barrier is being carried from a plan note on sheet 61. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 6:33:50 AM **Question Number - 72**

ODOT's website says there are 7 addendums but only 6 area available. Please post addendum 7.

**Addendum 7 has been posted.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 6:28:56 AM **Question Number - 71**

The plan note on sheet 1230 for Item 625, Conduit, Multicell, 4", 725.20, HDPE, calls for the conduit to be continuous with no joints/couplings between junction boxes or pull boxes. There are cases where junction boxes are spaced over 1,000 ft apart. This will require pulling the conduit through 1,000 ft of parapets and barrier inlet/end anchor steel. Due to the size and weight of the rolls will splices be permitted between junction boxes or pull boxes? This will assist with constructability and reduce the amount of conduit that will be wasted.

**The HDPE conduit shall be a continuous run and no splices will be permitted outside of the proposed junction box locations as detailed in the plans. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 6:27:57 AM **Question Number - 70**

The plan note on sheet 1230 for Item 625, Conduit, Multicell, 4", 725.20, HDPE, calls for the contractor to use a conduit that is coilable on reels. For runs of barrier with multicell, will the contractor be permitted to lay the multicell on the asphalt? Note that if the coilable multicell is placed on stands, it will not be straight and will sag between the stands.

**The contractor will be permitted to lay the multicell conduit on the top of the asphalt between junction boxes.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 6:27:02 AM **Question Number - 69**

There is a note on sheet 1230 for Item 625, Conduit, Multicell, 4", 725.20, HDPE. The spec 725.20 is for PVC but the item description references HDPE. Please clarify what material is required.

**725.20B of the C&MS provides the details regarding the HDPE conduit. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 9:30:12 AM **Question Number - 68**

Are the bearing stiffener plates for MUS-70-1066 L shown on page 1321 to be mill to bear ?

**No. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 8:10:19 AM **Question Number - 67**

Following up from question 65 and 66, due to the difficulty in access to the formwork over both waterways, please reconsider allowing the use of SIP's forms verse conventional forming for this work. The use of SIP's has never been considered a VECP, as the department would receive full benefit at bid time.

**Any changes would have to go thru CMS 105.19 VECP process. Please bid according to the plan set.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 9:14:57 AM **Question Number - 66**

Can Stay in Place metal decking be used on the Muskingum River bridge spans over the Water?

**Any changes would have to go thru CMS 105.19 VECP process. Please bid according to the plan set.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 9:13:33 AM **Question Number - 65**

Can Stay in Place metal decking be used on the Licking River bridge spans over the Water?

**Any changes would have to go thru CMS 105.19 VECP process. Please bid according to the plan set.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 8:44:51 AM **Question Number - 64**

Can ODOT please clarify how the staining and sealing of the concrete with a non-epoxy on this job is to be done since there is not an ODOT approved system that is in place.

**Could you further clarify your question? From our previous projects this has not been an issue.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 3:15:07 PM **Question Number - 63**

Can ODOT provide bore log information for the proposed 36" Steel Pipe, Bored or Jacked, APP located at station 665+89?

**The information is now available in the reference only folder under Existing Soil Borings at 6003036.zip.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 10:05:44 AM **Question Number - 62**

The DBE Goal for this project is 11%. With this large of a project and percent, it will take multiple DBE's to fulfill this goal. Add to that, the long duration of the project, and DBE participation will be difficult to fulfill at bid time due to bonding capabilities as well as limiting the DBE's overall work capacity and their ability to plan for future work opportunities. Would the department consider implementing something similar to PN-014 Design-Build DBE Performance Plan which would allow the contractor to achieve the DBE goal as the project progresses?

**The Contractor will need to follow the process per PN 13 and if they need to update their DBEs throughout the life of the project, they need to follow the process to add/terminate DBEs. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 8:57:51 AM **Question Number - 61**

Verify the quantity for ref no 771 MSE Wall, APP. The pay limits do not appear to go from top of leveling pad to top of coping.

**The quantity has been revised to include the area stipulated in Supplemental Specification 840.08. See forth coming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 8:38:25 AM **Question Number - 60**

Please clarify the need for ref nos. 734 and 735. If this is for foundation prep then Type C granular is included under that reference and fabric is no longer required.

**These two quantities have been deleted from the Bridge Summary on Sheet 2012 and Item 840 – Foundation Preparation has been revised to Item 840 – Foundation Preparation, As Per Plan. Also, the callouts for the 203 items on the MSE wall sections on Sheet 2053 have been revised to state they are included for payment with Item 840 – Foundation Preparation, As Per Plan, in accordance with Supplemental Specification 840.09. See forth coming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 5:55:36 PM **Question Number - 59**

Please add biditems for the fiber associated with the Traffic Surveillance.

**The conduit for the ITS is being installed for future use. Please see note on sheet 1230 for the multi-cell conduit detailing the requirements.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 5:54:43 PM **Question Number - 58**

Sheet 2127 provides details for Item 606 – Impact Attenuator, Type 2 (Unidirectional), As Per Plan. Please setup a biditem for this work as no item is currently setup.

**A bid item for this will be added in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 5:53:57 PM **Question Number - 57**

The reference docs contain plans for PID 106824 that detail existing traffic cameras on the project. The plans show the electrical hookup for the existing cameras but do not show any communication lines being installed. Are the existing cameras wireless or is there an existing run of fiber running along I-70 that the cameras tie-in to?

**The existing cameras communicate via cellular/wireless and do not have any other communication lines at this time.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 12:45:05 PM **Question Number - 56**

Quantity for MUS-70-1089 class qc2 concrete parapet appears to be overstated. Please confirm this quantity. (pg 1398)

**The quantity is correct. This item includes the 42" Parapet and the 57 median parapet. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 12:10:52 PM **Question Number - 55**

Based on the calculations for MUS-70-1089 provided, the general summary quantities for class qc1 concrete pier and abutment appear to be reversed. Please confirm. (pg 1398)

**These quantities were revised for Addendum 2. Please make sure you are looking at the most up to date plan set.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 12:21:04 PM **Question Number - 54**

The plans for bridges 1186, 1192, 1199, 1306, 1186K and 60D-0005 contain notes prohibiting the use of hoe ram type equipment and track hoe pulverizer/shear/multi-processor attachments for demo of the superstructure concrete. There is no other practical method to remove superstructure concrete on slab bridges without using a hoe ram or track hoe with pulverizer/shear/multi-processor attachment. Please remove this note.

**Plan note will be revised to include the use of this equipment to within 5 feet of the substructures that is to remain. See forth coming Addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 11:08:21 AM **Question Number - 53**

Sheet 61 lists contingency quantities for guardrail repairs. Please consider removing the contingency quantities for repairing guardrail damaged on the project and pay for these repairs under force account. The cost of the repairs will be dictated by the quantity available per shift and contractors have no way of knowing this information prior to the bid in order to accurately price these items.

**We have considered your comment but feel it is in the best interest of the project to keep these items in. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 11:07:28 AM **Question Number - 52**

Biditem 139, 253 Pavement Repair, As Per Plan (100 cy) and biditem 142, 255 Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement, Class QC FS are discussed on sheet 61. They are contingency pavement repairs to be used as directed by the engineer. Please consider deleting these biditems and paying for the repairs under force account. The cost of the repairs will be dictated by the quantity available per shift and contractors have no way of knowing this information prior to the bid in order to accurately price these items.

**We have considered your comment but feel it is in the best interest of the project to keep these items in. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 11:06:23 AM **Question Number - 51**

Please provide a date when Columbia Gas will be finished with the relocation of the existing facilities along Old Newark Road. Will the gas line be relocated below the proposed storm crossing Old Newark Road as shown on sheet 901?

**Columbia Gas relocation of existing facilities along Old Newark Rd. completion date of January 30, 2022, The line will be lowered under the proposed drain line.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 11:05:32 AM **Question Number - 50**

Please provide a date when AEP Communication will be finished with the relocation of the fiber cable crossing at mainline station 588+00.

**AEP Communication relocation of existing fiber crossing at main line station 588+00 completion date of December 31, 2021**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 9:03:48 AM **Question Number - 49**

In Addendum 5, the updated plan quantity for Reference Item 754 now includes the missing plates detailed in Prebid Question #38. However, are all fasteners, welds and deducts (such as holes, clips and copes) also included in this plan quantity as described ODOT 513.29 Structural Steel method of payment? Please clarify.

**The structural steel quantities provided in the plans are estimated quantities that were calculated using the general details provided in the plans. The plan details are not intended to be used as a substitute for the fabricator's shop drawings. The Department will pay for accepted quantities of structural steel using the submitted weight computations that have been based upon the accepted shop drawings, in accordance with the provisions of CMS 513.29."**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 2:00:19 PM **Question Number - 48**

If F-Shape PCB with Easi-Set J-Hook connection is used for the anchored PCB on the project will the anchoring detail as shown on PCB-91 standard drawing be an acceptable anchoring method?

**The MASH J-J Hook PCB has its anchoring details on the approved products page under portable temporary barrier located at <https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/static/Working/Engineering/Roadway/Approved-Products/JJHook-Anchored.pdf>. This is not the same as the anchoring for the NCHRP 350 PCB stated in the PCB-91 SCD. Installation shall be as per the manufacturer's details on the approved products list website.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 1:27:24 PM **Question Number - 47**

Please provide a pavement joint layout sheet for Ramp O.

**The sheet will be provided in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 4:18:54 PM **Question Number - 46**

The existing plans for MUS-70-8.60 (1990) show item 453 – Continuously Reinforced Concrete Pavement on mainline 70 west of the current project (see sheet 9/420). Is any of the concrete pavement/base within the limits of the current project continuously reinforced? Note that concrete pavement with continuous reinforcing is much more expensive to remove than concrete pavement with standard roadway mesh.

**The existing plans and historical pavement joint and full-depth repairs indicate that the concrete within the project limits of the full-depth replacement is Item 451 Reinforced Concrete Pavement (no continuous reinforcing). Please bid according to the available information.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 12:59:27 PM **Question Number - 45**

For structure 1159, on sheet 1543, a new connection plate is called out for the sidewalk diaphragm for existing girders spans, please clarify if its intended to be a field weld.

**The intent is for the new connection plate to be field welded. See forth coming Addendum for details.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 12:57:20 PM **Question Number - 44**

For structure 1159, there is a crossframe modification detailed on sheet 1541 of 2231. How is the back face of the existing angle and new angle supposed to get painted once installed. There is only a 3/8" gap between the two.

**See forth coming Addendum for notes and details.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 9:33:02 AM **Question Number - 43**

Will the contractor be permitted to build the State Street bridge in phase 1? The current plan shows the State Street bridge being built in phase 3. However, during this phase westbound traffic will be running on each side of the median with no access to safely complete the cap extensions for pier 2.

**State Street will be allowed to be constructed during Phase 1 provided that the schools have a one year notification prior to closing State Street, all ramp closure restrictions are met and ramps V & W are tied into State Street at all times other than when the ramps are closed. If the contractor chooses to modify the maintenance of traffic they will be responsible for all modifications as per the Alternate Methods note on sheet 58.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 9:31:55 AM **Question Number - 42**

Please furnish the design for the temporary abutment shoring walls for bridges MUS-70-1186, 1192, 1199 and MUS-60D-0005 due to the excavation depth being greater than eight feet.

**See forth coming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2021 8:23:13 AM **Question Number - 41**

Can the department please post plans for addendum 4 to the ftp site?

**The Office of Contracts has posted them.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2021 8:22:59 AM **Question Number - 41**

on addendum number 3 reference number 535 and 572 class qc2 concrete with qc/qa was deleted, I think it was supposed to be just the falsework note.

**See forth coming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2021 12:46:50 PM **Question Number - 39**

Closure information for Linden Ave, specifically for bridge 1159 was not provided. Please provide closure information based on MT Standard drawings or allow for 60-day closure periods per phase for items like, demo, structural steel, and decking.

**This work will have to done during the night time to minimize any short term closures with the use of a flagging operation to stop traffic intermittently during demo, structural steel or decking operations.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2021 10:46:18 AM **Question Number - 38**

Per ODOT 513.29, the weight of all fasteners, welds, deducts are to be accounted for in method of payment for Structural Steel. It does not seem that this is the case with the Level 5 Steel on Structure 1142. Additionally, the lateral bracing connection plate (Sheet 2035/2231) and splice fill plates (2033/2231) do not appear to be included in the engineers calculations. Please review and revise the quantity.

**See forth coming Addendum for Revised quantities.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2021 9:44:30 AM **Question Number - 37**

Closure information for Underwood Street, specifically for bridge 1212 was not provided. Please provide closure information based on MT Standard drawings or allow for 60-day closure periods per phase for items like, demo, structural steel, and decking.

**This work will have to done during the night time to minimize any short term closures with the use of a flagging operation to stop traffic intermittently during demo, structural steel or decking operations.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2021 9:37:09 AM **Question Number - 36**

For structure 1212, on sheet 1876, the beam section calls out a different beam than the bolted splice detail, along with different splice plates. Please specify what is the correct beam and splice plates to use?

**The beam size shown in the beam section detail on sheet 1876 has been revised to W 27x146. The bottom flange inside splice plates shown in the beam section detail have been revised to 3/4" x 5-3/4" x 3'-0". See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2021 9:24:43 AM **Question Number - 35**

For structure 1212, on sheet 1876, the beam section calls out a different beam than the bolted splice detail, along with different splice plates. Please specify what is the correct beam and splice plates to use?

**The beam size shown in the beam section detail on sheet 1876 has been revised to W 27x146. The bottom flange inside splice plates shown in the beam section detail have been revised to 3/4" x 5-3/4" x 3'-0". See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/11/2021 10:28:48 PM **Question Number - 34**

I have a guillotine breaker that is capable of breaking up to 20" of concrete pavement and have been in business for over 30 years. I offer reliable demolition services at extremely competitive rates. I would like to submit a bid for pavement breaking on this project and would like to know how to get a bidders list. Thank you

**All contractors that do work for the Ohio Department of Transportation must be prequalified by the Office of Contract Sales and Estimating. Guidance on prequalification can be found on the following link. Pages - Prequalification (state.oh.us) . The Planholders List for Project 21-0221 PID: 93006 can be found on the following link.  
<https://www.dot.state.oh.us/divisions/contractadmin/Contracts/Planholders/210221bid.txt>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/8/2021 1:48:20 PM **Question Number - 33**

For Structure 1142E, should the weld for the bearing stiffener be a field weld.

**Yes, the existing beam welding of the bearing stiffener shall be done in the field. Plan sheets will be revised accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/8/2021 1:21:33 PM **Question Number - 32**

For Structure 1142E, please provide the weld information for the proposed intermediate crossframes.

**Please see forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/7/2021 10:08:26 AM **Question Number - 31**

Closure information for Newark Road, specifically for bridge 1089 was not provided. Please provide closure information based on MT Standard drawings or allow for 60-day closure periods per phase for items like, demo, structural steel, and decking.

**The Newark Road will not be allowed to be closed for a long duration. The contractor will have to use a flagging operation to stop traffic intermediately during demo or decking operations.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/7/2021 10:07:14 AM **Question Number - 30**

Closure information for Licking Road, specifically for bridge 1066L&R was not provided. Please provide closure information based on MT Standard drawings or allow for 60-day closure periods per phase for items like, demo, structural steel, and decking.

**The Licking Road will not be allowed to be closed for a long duration. The contractor will have to use a flagging operation to stop traffic intermediately during demo or decking operations.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/7/2021 9:17:29 AM **Question Number - 29**

Based on the departments response to question 25, regarding the phase construction of the State Street Bridge, is the 100-day closure intended for only phase 1? Between the construction time and the large amount of cure time for the phased construction work, the 100 days given in the plans is not enough time to construct both phases. If the 100 days is for both phases please add more days to the closure or consider making it non-phased construction.

**The A+B for this structure will be increased to 125 days. See forthcoming Addendum for revisions.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2021 2:39:17 PM **Question Number - 28**

This project requires anchored barrier in nearly all cases except for the shoulder widening in pre-phase 1. The requirement for anchored barrier appears to be in response to the requirement in note #13 of std dwg MT-101.90 that states, "Offset from the back side of the barrier toe to the work area shall be a minimum of 2 ft unless otherwise specified in the plans due to anchoring." Requiring anchored barrier for the full length of full depth pavement replacement will require contractors to purchase a large quantity of anchored barrier specifically for this project at a significant cost to the department. Will ODOT consider changing the portable barrier through the limits of full depth pavement replacement from anchored to unanchored?

**The restrictions on cross-section width, dictated predominantly by the bridges along IR 70, limit the barrier offset width to the work zone to less than 2' in most locations and phases. As required, anchorage of the barrier in these cases will be called out and quantified in the plans. A forthcoming addendum will detail the minimum requirements for offsets and widths.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2021 11:24:00 AM **Question Number - 27**

Regarding Bridge 1159, will the requirements of 508.03 stating the formwork under the closure be independent of the adjacent structure be waived in spans 3-7 where the cross frames will remain?

**When forming the deck on the existing girder spans (Spans 3 through 7) of Bridge MUS-70-1159 where the existing crossframes remain in-place, it will be acceptable to waive the requirement of CMS 508.03 and allow the forms for each deck section at the closure pour to be supported from the adjacent structure.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2021 11:14:40 AM **Question Number - 26**

Regarding Bridge 1159, can the Department please provide overhang widths on either side of the closure pours in a format similar to those provided on sheet 114/160 to allow us to properly bid their formwork?

**Minimum and maximum overhang widths for each span will be provide with forth coming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2021 1:54:39 PM **Question Number - 25**

Can State Street be performed in 1 phase instead of the planned 2 phases, in order to help facilitate the contractor meeting the maximum day closure of 100 days as stated on Sheet 58 of 2231?

**The planned 2 phases were established to maintain pedestrian access across the bridge during construction. Restricting pedestrian access at this location results in significant pedestrian detours. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2021 8:32:49 AM **Question Number - 24**

Per ODOT 513.29, the weight of all permanent fasteners is included in the method of payment for Structural Steel members. Based off of the engineer calculations, the weight of the bolts was omitted from the overall weight of the steel members for 1066R and 1066L. Please revise the quantity to include this weight.

**We will review the structural steel quantity calculations, revise them as necessary, and provide updated quantities to be issued with a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/1/2021 10:23:43 AM **Question Number - 23**

For Structure 1159, on sheet 87, note 1 states that the splice locations for the sidewalk carrier are to be determined by the contractor. Is the contractor responsible to provide stamped design engineered drawings and if so, please include a bid item for this work.

**Because the sidewalk carrier beam will be supported by the diaphragms attached to the fascia girder, which will require a unique erection procedure and sequence, we provided the plan note that allows the contractor to determine the splice locations in the beam based on his preferred construction means and methods, accounting for the fabrication and shipping costs of the beam. The splice design shown in the plans can be applied anywhere along each segment of the sidewalk carrier beam, as long as it does not conflict with the support diaphragms and connections. The contractor will need to show the splice locations in the shop drawings per CMS 501.04 and CMS 513.06. Stamped, engineered drawings are not required for the splice locations.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/1/2021 7:52:19 AM **Question Number - 22**

The temporary jacking support note for structure 1089 on sheet 1397 of 2231 states that we need to provide temporary supports at pier 4 for various beams (phase dependent). Please provide the load information for these supports.

**See forth coming Addendum for clarification.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/31/2021 8:18:43 AM **Question Number - 21**

Conduit, bored or jacked, type b, 15" on pg 895, ref no 21-SS through 29-SS are missing from plans and cross sections. Please provide this information.

**Details for these pipes can be found on sheets 977 - 985.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/31/2021 7:47:40 AM **Question Number - 20**

Please setup bid items for Class III temporary striping to be used behind placement of the asphalt surface course, prior to placing final permanent striping.

**Revised Sheet 62 from Addendum 1 added a note and quantities to be used for short term and long term pavement marking needs.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/31/2021 7:46:50 AM **Question Number - 19**

Will the temporary striping used to put traffic in its permanent configuration in phase 4, prior to final mill/fill, be paid under items 352 through 355?

**Revised Sheet 62 from Addendum 1 added a note and quantities to be used for short term and long term pavement marking needs.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2021 3:48:53 PM **Question Number - 18**

Please specify that there is a field weld and its size for the bearing to the existing steel on sheet 1517 of 2231 for structure 1159.

**The intent is for a 1/2" field weld. See forth coming Addendum for a revised plan sheet for clarity.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2021 4:23:35 PM **Question Number - 17**

For structure 70-1142E, the bearing pad details on sheet 1992 of 2231 do not match. The dimensions given in the drawings on that sheet do not coincide with the written dimensions. Please clarify what is correct.

**See forth coming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2021 11:25:51 AM **Question Number - 16**

Since reference 461 is bid as a Lump Sum, please clarify on sheet 1428/2231 that the Type B Crossframes are to be 4x4x7/16". GSD-1-19 with 36" beams and a greater than 3' overhang and beam spacing of 7' state angle size of 5x5x1/2". This would increase the total steel weight and the contractor would not be compensated.

**The bridge was designed with the 4x4x7/16" crossframes. The plans will supersede STD GSD-1-19. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/29/2021 10:24:20 AM **Question Number - 15**

Addendum #1 has specified the use of New Jersey Shape Bridgemount PCB per PCB-91. This type of PCB is no longer produced as of 12/31/2019, per ODOT direction and specifications. Please advise how you would like contractors to proceed to meet plan requirements?

**Please see forthcoming addendum. The type of barrier to be used will be omitted from the plan. In areas where anchoring will be required, the anchoring pins of specific types of barrier may impede into the work area. The barrier used will need to be on the approved products list and allow for phased construction.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 2:20:23 PM **Question Number - 14**

Bid item 463 STRUCTURAL STEEL, MISC.: EXTERNAL POST TENSIONING, is temporary post tensioning. Is it necessary to galvanize the components as stated on plan sheet 1397/2231?

**Yes, the components shall be galvanized as per the plan note on sheet 1397/2231.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 2:19:15 PM **Question Number - 13**

Without knowing what amount of work the contractors will encounter for bid item 498 STRUCTURAL STEEL, MISC.: STEEL GIRDER REPAIRS, it is impossible to bid this item. We believe this work should be performed by force account as directed by ODOT which would include all costs for this item as described on plan sheet 1458 / 2231. Please advise.

**This pay item and all related notes will be deleted. Please see forth coming Addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 2:17:55 PM **Question Number - 12**

Bridges 1066 L/R are skewed enough such that the bridge deck finishing machine will be blocking traffic if we are held to pouring with the skew on the bridge. If we pour square with the bridge the deck finishing machine does not interfere with traffic. Will the contractor be allowed to pour the deck square?

**The contractor will have to skew the finishing as much as possible without interfering with the adjacent traffic, in lieu of the provision of CMS 511.16, and place the wet concrete along the skew per CMS 511.07.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 10:37:12 AM **Question Number - 11**

Can you please provide the engineers calculations for the structures?

**Yes, Engineer's Calculations will be added to Reference Material.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2021 7:36:21 PM **Question Number - 10**

The MOT notes on sheet 58 state that 5th Street, 6th Street and 7th Street shall be closed during bridge demolition and while falsework is in place. 5th Street and 7th Street shall not be closed at the same time. This same note is included under the sequence of construction in all 3 phases. Bridge MUS-70-1186 sheet 1609, Bridge MUS-70-1192 sheet 1690, and Bridge MUS-70-1199 sheet 1762 under item 511 Class QC2 Concrete have a note that states falsework from all three phases shall remain in place until the entirety of the deck concrete has fully cured per CMS 511.14. At that point all falsework shall be removed. If falsework is left in place the vertical clearance will be reduced to less than 11 ft. Please remove the requirement about falsework being left in place in order to allow traffic to be maintained on 5th or 7th street between bridge phases.

**The requirements for falsework to stay in place will be removed. See forth coming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2021 7:34:12 PM **Question Number - 9**

Please setup a biditem for 613 Low Strength Mortar Backfill, As Per Plan for the following structures: MUS-70-1089, MUS-70-1186, MUS-70-1192, MUS-70-1199, MUS-70-1212, MUS-70-1186K, MUS-60D-0005, MUS-60G-0033. This is required at all of the structures and currently the associated biditem is only setup for select bridges. In order to be consistent please setup this biditem for the structures noted above.

**Details and pay items will be added to MUS-70-1212 and MUS-70-60G-0005. All other bridges will remain the same with the Low Strength Mortar paid for with Item 503 - Unclassified Excavation, As Per Plan . Please see note in the plans. Forth coming addendum will include the other bridges as mentioned.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2021 7:32:56 PM **Question Number - 8**

Please setup a biditem at all bridges for Type C Installations at the approach slabs.

**The sleeper slab and armor less joint seal and all incidentals to construct are included for payment with ITEM 516 - Structural Joint or joint Sealer, Misc.: Emseal with Sleeper Slab. Please bid accordingly.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/22/2021 1:37:33 PM **Question Number - 7**

Please confirm approach slab length for MUS-70-1212. Drawing 1905 of 2231 calls it to be 30' and drawing 1902 of 2231 show 25'.

**The approach slab lengths for MUS-70-1212 are 25'-0". All references to 30' will be edited/changed to 25'-0", see forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/18/2021 1:13:43 PM **Question Number - 6**

what is the depth for the unclassified underdrain? The plans do not specify the depth.

**The elevations for the unclassified underdrains are listed in the plan view of the Drainage Plan and Profile Sheets located at the labeled/numbered runs. However, a few were missed on Sheet 911 and those will be denoted in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/16/2021 12:05:20 PM **Question Number - 5**

The revised sheet 59 in addenda A, changed the earthwork for maintaining traffic quantities to EXC 5,293 CY and EMB 1,657 CY, however the MOT\_Earthwork.docx file in the reference file was not updated and still show 4,519 CY Excavation and 2,201 CY Embankment. Would ODOT update the MOT Earthwork.docx file?

**The MOT\_Earthwork.docx file will be removed from the reference only folder. The quantities on Sheet 59 are now calculated in a file labeled MOT\_SECTIONS\_REFERENCE\_ONLY and will be placed in the reference only folder for access.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 3/9/2021 2:17:28 PM **Question Number - 4**

How are the scuppers to be paid on bridge MUS-70-1089?

**See forth coming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/26/2021 2:14:16 PM **Question Number - 3**

Sheet 68 details a temporary barrier wall to be right at the construction joint, reference 361 propose to use Portable Barrier, anchored for the whole job, SCD RM-4.2 requires driving 3 pins 1.5 inch in diameter. This will undermine the construction joint, is it ODOT intent to anchor all the barrier at all locations, or only on certain locations?

**Sheet 68 will be revised to provide more detail on the anchored PCB. The PCB that is to be installed right at the construction joint will be required to be the New Jersey Shape PCB with 4 anchor bolts per segment. The New Jersey Shape PCB has anchor bolts that go straight down. The PCB on the outside on the shoulder widening can be either shape anchored barrier as detailed in SCD RM-4.2. Please see forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/26/2021 2:12:58 PM **Question Number - 2**

The typical on sheet 68 details the widening to require sliver embankment, will benching per 203.05 be required? Could ODOT provide cross section for the shoulder widening, and the crossovers sheets 190 and 196?

**Benching as per 203.05 will be required for the sliver embankment. Cross sections for the shoulder widening and for the crossovers will be provided as reference only material. Please see forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 2/26/2021 2:05:58 PM **Question Number - 1**

The MOT plan proposes to widen the shoulder See typical sheet 68 and plan sheet 107. Some locations have a guardrail protection, SCD MOT -101.90 treatment requirement to use DRUMS at the edge line of the travelled lanes, for drop off thickness between 5" and 12" at a location between 4 FT and 12 FT from the travelled lanes. Is it safe to maintain traffic without guardrail while constructing the widening, or should temporary barrier wall be installed? Note also it is unachievable to excavate, pave and install PCB in a single day or night shift.

**A quantity of Item 622 Portable Barrier, Unanchored will be added to the plan. The shoulder shall be closed as per SCD MT-95.45. Plan Sheet 68 shall be revised to show the Pre-Phase 1 work. Please see forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 210258**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

SUM-106002 - IR IR 77/277/US 224 Various

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 1:54:10 PM **Question Number - 74**

In the proposal Ohio Edison will only deenergize the overhead lines in October of 2021 for 14 days. Does The State know if Ohio Edison would be willing to deenergize these lines outside of October of 2021?

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 5:32:44 PM **Question Number - 73**

The As Directed undercut items shown on the General Notes Sheet 69 are exclusive and should not be blended into the roadway Excavation & Embankment items of work. Will the Department consider separating the Wetland Area Undercut and Roadside Ditch Undercut quantities from the Excavation and Embankment Items?

**Quantities are provided and notes are included to provide clarity. Bid as shown.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 2:00:34 PM **Question Number - 72**

The temporary drainage pipe and structures listed in the Maintenance of Traffic section will all be removed or filled & plugged after the proposed drainage is constructed. Are conduit and structure inspection and testing reports required for the temporary drainage items?

**No, inspection and testing reports are not required for the temporary MOT drainage items.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 2:09:05 PM **Question Number - 71**

As a follow up to ODOT's answer for question #54 which allows the contractor 45 days of road closure for each phase of Warner Road, the contractor will have to build the new piers while maintaining traffic on Warner Road. Since there is no concrete barrier wall or impact attenuators shown for this, how does the department intend to protect workers during pier construction?

**As noted on sheet 74, Warner Road can be closed for the construction of both the median bridge work and roadway lowering in Phase 1. At the contractor's option the roadway lowering and piers can be combined into a single closure to avoid conflict with active traffic. However if more time is needed for pier construction, the contractor is to use flaggers while maintaining traffic and constructing the piers.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 1:30:14 PM **Question Number - 70**

As a follow up to the answer to question 54, 45 days is still not enough time to complete this work per phase. Please allow a 90 day closure for this work.

**45 day closure shall remain, bid as shown.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 4:58:18 PM **Question Number - 69**

Bid Item 334: "SNAP" Mill and Fill: Plan sheet 82 gives a description of the item and general median shoulder location but doesn't give a number or phasing of locations. Please provide a breakdown by phase/pre-phase and if on northbound/southbound 77 and/or eastbound/westbound 277/224.

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 2:38:11 PM **Question Number - 68**

Addendum 5 revised the sequence of construction to build Phase 3 before Phase 2. The current MOT plans show building the NB crossovers before the SB crossovers. Please provide revised X-section sheets and corresponding CAD files for the Temporary Crossovers that reflect the new sequence of construction. Also, please update the estimated quantities of Earthwork for Maintaining Traffic on plan sheet 83.

**While the volume to be placed in phase 2 and phase 3 changes for the crossover construction, the overall volume needed does not change. The cross over alignments and profiles are not changing.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 8:01:12 AM **Question Number - 67**

Can the department provide new lane closure times for the surface course installation for the Northbound lanes as they will be configured to 4 instead of 3. Also what lane closure schedule should be used for the ramps surface course installation.

**The permitted lane closure chart sold with the project would still hold for the surface course even though there could be 4 lanes available. Nowhere in the phasing does the project utilize the 4 lanes until the project is complete. Refer to Note 4 on page 74 for ramp information.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 7:56:55 AM **Question Number - 66**

the sub summary for the monuments shows 2 to be adjusted while it only should be 1. please review.

**The monument quantities match across sheets 66, 73, 403 and 1283.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 4:56:04 PM **Question Number - 65**

Addendum 9 mentions see addendum 7 for answers to pre-bid questions that are addressed in addendum 9 not 7. It appears the reference to addendum 7 really is for the plan sheet revision 7 not addendum 7. Can you please clean this up.

**Please note that when an addendum is referenced in the "Answers To Pre-Bid Questions" section, the addendum number is intended to match that of which it is on. Example: Addendum 9 should say "see addendum 9 for answers to pre-bid questions" not "see addendum 7".**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 10:55:45 AM **Question Number - 64**

There currently is not a MOT phase for SUM-77-0927R steel erection and pier cap construction as detailed on plan sheets 1230 thru 1232. Please provide a MOT phase for this work.

**Please see Phase 1 Sequence of Construction note 6 on sheet 74 of the plans.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 9:37:41 AM **Question Number - 63**

Can the department provide the proposed surface files?

**These files are located in the CADD files located at the following link: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/SUM-106002/Reference%20file/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 9:33:51 AM **Question Number - 62**

Plan sheet 66, right column has a note about Airway/Highway Clearance for Airports and Heliports. First paragraph calls out a not-to-exceed height but nothing in the specified blank. Is there a specified no-to-exceed height or should this note be removed?

**The department has verified that this information is provided in the latest plans and is accurate**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 9:05:02 AM **Question Number - 61**

Item 125 – 10' x 5' conduit, Type A, 706.05, as per plan – The note on sheet 911 states that the conduit must be cast-in-place. Will the department accept precast in lieu of cast-in-place considering the headwalls may be precast as noted on the plans?

**Proceed with bidding as shown in the plans.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 9:03:54 AM **Question Number - 60**

Item 472 – Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel does not include the drilled shaft reinforcement however the plans do not state that it is included with the drilled shafts for payment. Is the reinforcing for the drilled shafts incidental to the drilled shaft bid items?

**Per CMS 524.17, the cost to furnish and place the reinforcing steel is included with item 524**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 9:02:35 AM **Question Number - 59**

Sheet 1240 shows mechanical connectors in the proposed Pier Columns however they are not indicated on the Bar list shown on sheet 1260. Are mechanical connectors required in the proposed Pier Columns for Structure 0927?

**Yes, the mechanical connectors are required for the pier column bars. They are #14 bars and are required by the CMS to be mechanically spliced due to their large size. The cost of the mechanical connectors included in item 509.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 8:26:44 PM **Question Number - 58**

As a follow-up to the answer to question 45; are there any other season long ramp closures or other major MOT restrictions resulting from adjacent projects that will affect this project? Until question 45 was answered only the contractors working on the adjacent project were aware that three separate ramps would be closed for an entire season. This kind of privileged information is vital to ALL the bidders of this project.

**There are no other long ramp closures or MOT restrictions resulting from adjacent projects.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 3:58:17 PM **Question Number - 57**

ODOT answered prebid question 31 stating that temporary fence will be incidental to the noisewall item. Per the noisewall standard drawing NBS-1-09, the basis of payment shown on standard drawing sheet 2/13 states "The department will pay for furnishing, erecting, maintaining, and removing temporary fence under item 607 – Fence, MISC.". Please create a biditem for the temporary fence required for the noisewall.

**Item 607-Fence, Misc.: added to the plans. See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 2:37:48 PM **Question Number - 56**

Can Stay in Place metal decking be used on the structure 0810?

**No, that will not be permitted.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 2:21:29 PM **Question Number - 55**

With one week until the bid, there still seems to be some major unanswered MOT problems, along with some other unanswered pre-bid questions. Would the department consider delaying the letting of the project to allow time for the questions to be properly answered along with providing ample time for the contractor to review and price the changes.

**No. The Department will not consider delaying this project.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 12:39:12 PM **Question Number - 54**

As a follow up to questions 13, 15, 19, 23 and 32 regarding the allowable Warner Road lane closure, ODOT provided a note on sheet 74 from Addendum 4 stating "Two separate 30 day closures are permitted for Warner Road. One closure shall be for the bridge work. The second closure shall be to lower the road." Each of the 3 phases for this bridge requires deck formwork to suspend into the minimum required clearances shown in sheet 1155. 30 days for any one of the three phases is insufficient time to form, pour, cure and strip the slab deck in each phase. For constructability purposes, please extend the road closure limits for Warner Road to 90 days per phase in addition to the 30 day closure for lowering Warner Road.

**Plans revised to allow a 45 day closure for each phase of Warner Road bridge build. See forthcoming Addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 8:25:18 AM **Question Number - 53**

The revised sheet 178 in Addendum 8 shows the new pier 1 approximately 2 feet from the PCB. This excavation is approximately 6 feet deep and will require shoring. Can the Department add a cofferdam item for this bridge?

**Per 503.10 of CMS, if an Item for Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing is not included in the Contract for payment, perform work according to 503.03 and the Department will pay for Cofferdams and Excavation Bracing under the contract unit price for excavation.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 4:40:57 PM **Question Number - 52**

The revised sheet 178 in addendum 8 will not work for the construction of the entire C-2 Ramp Bridge. Based upon the erection sequence detailed in sheets 1229 thru 1232, the contractor will need access to both piers (for pier cap shoring and pouring) and all bent locations in the same traffic phase. Is there a traffic phase which accommodates the erection sequence of this bridge?

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 4:28:18 PM **Question Number - 51**

Following up from question and answer 47, if ramp C-2 is required to be built prior to the new Ramp B-2 construction, is it the departments intent for Ramp C-2 to be built in the Phase 1A traffic pattern, ? If this is the departments intent, Pier 1 drilled shaft/footer will still be in conflict with the Phase 1A traffic pattern layout.

**See forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 3:25:49 PM **Question Number - 50**

Regarding the Removal of Existing Coatings on the structure piers and abutments that are not being replaced. Will the Department be adding a pay item for this removal?

**Removal Item added to the plans. See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 2:23:29 PM **Question Number - 49**

Addendum 8 revised plan sheet 178 with revision 6. This new phase will not work. Plan sheet 1230 shows temporary bent 3 to erect the proposed girders on 0927R. This temporary bent will be in the middle of Ramp B-2. A solution to build the substructure at pier 1 is to use a traffic shift prior to implementing phase 1 from approximate STA 482+00 to STA 499+00. Once this pier is built, phase 1 as detailed on sheet 140 can be used.

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 2:13:43 PM **Question Number - 48**

A 30 day closure will be required to build the outside of the bridge deck edges on 0802 L and R during phases 2 and 3. The required false deck to form these deck edges will not allow the minimum clearance for vehicles on Warner Road. Also, the 30 day closure of Warner Road to build phase 1 of these bridges needs to be a minimum of 45 days not 30 days.

**Plans revised to allow a 45 day closure for each phase of Warner Road bridge build. See forthcoming Addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 10:09:59 AM **Question Number - 47**

In phase 1B, can there be weekend ramp B-2 closures for structural steel setting and decking of Ramp C-2, structure 0927R?

**The revised phasing will have ramp C-2 built before the new ramp B-2 is constructed. This should no longer be an issue.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 8:01:20 AM **Question Number - 46**

On sheet 1251 for structure, 0927R, there is a detail for a counterweight at the abutments. Where is this accounted for, as it does not seem to be in the deck concrete quantity?

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 6:12:17 PM **Question Number - 45**

Addendum 4 added the notes and tables per revised sheet 74A which revised the sequence of the project to align with project PID 102329. The notes state that PID 102329 will have priority to this project. The notes also state that certain ramps (C-1, D and B) are to be constructed while the ramp is closed due to project PID 102329. Each of these ramps has a 45 day closure with LD's. How can this project have LD's for closures when we are at the mercy of another project? Do these closure durations align with the other project? What months will these closures take place in?

**PID 102329 will have ramps C-1, D, and B closed for an entire season. As long as this project gets the reconstruction completed during the time that PID 102329 has the ramps closed, the LD's would not apply.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 3:21:50 PM **Question Number - 44**

The earthwork between the existing Forward Abutment and the proposed Forward Abutment for Structure SUM-77-0927R does not appear to be included in the project cross sections. Can the Department provide quantities for this work?

**The earthwork quantities between the existing Forward Abutment and the proposed Forward Abutment for Structure SUM-077-0927R were quantified on Ramp B-2 (Sta. 291+50 to Sta. 293+50), which is the ramp underneath that structure. Please refer to Sheets 692-693 for those earthwork quantities.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 2:23:32 PM **Question Number - 43**

Where is bid item 158 to be used? Each structure has PRJ set up in the structure drawings for Types A and C.

**Bid Item 158 - Pressure Relief Joint has been removed from the plans. See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 1:11:14 PM **Question Number - 42**

REF. 185 calls for an LED underpass luminaire with 39 Watts, 3,140 lumens, Type III distribution, and 3000K color temperature. Please advise if GE Lighting's EWAS LED underpass fixture with 36 Watts, 4,900 lumens, Type III distribution, and 3000K color temp is considered an approved equal to what's being specified in the plans.

**Yes, this is considered an approved equal.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 10:33:22 AM **Question Number - 41**

The Noise Barrier plan and profile sheets show that noise barriers have their own construction limits. The construction limits are 5 feet in front of the wall (b/w roadway and wall) and 3' behind the wall. This work space is not large enough for drilled shaft construction or post and panel setting. Will the contractor be allowed to extend the construction limits in front of the wall to facilitate construction including clearing?

**Yes, so long as the extended construction limits are minimized and there are no additional stream/wetland impacts and construction does not extend beyond the existing or permanent right of way.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 10:32:45 AM **Question Number - 40**

The drilled shafts at piers 1 & 2 for Bridge No. SUM-77-0927R are in direct conflict with the existing bridge pier piling. The contractor will not be able to drill through these steel piles. The Structure Removed, over 20 foot span, APP makes no reference to removing these existing piles. How will the contractor be compensated for this removal? Please consider setting up a Pile Removal Item by the Each.

**As stated on the site plan and general notes, the existing foundation of pier #1 and the forward abutment shall be removed and paid under Item 202 -Structure Removal, over 20', As Per Plan. This includes any piles that interfere with the drilled shafts.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 2:52:34 PM **Question Number - 39**

Drawing 1181 & 1183, Bridge 0810 L/R, shows pay lengths of pier #1 @ 70' and pier #2 @ 40'. The piers are only 60' apart and based on the soil borings, the 70' pay length will be difficult to achieve with the specified hammer size and also damage to the .27 wall pile. Pier #2 seems to be the correct pay length for the piers. Please advise if Pier #1 pay length is correct.

**Pile driving analysis performed during plan preparation using the soil values directed by ODOT resulted in the pile lengths specified. Reduced pile length in the field during driving shall be addressed in accordance with CMS 507.04...". Based on the maximum driving stress of 40,500 psi specified in the plans, Grade 3 steel shall be used to help with the overstressing". We recommend that a dynamic load test shall be performed at pier #1. Based on the results of the dynamics load test, another load test at pier #2 may be needed per the direction of the field engineer.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 2:35:58 PM **Question Number - 38**

The concrete quantity for reference 436 - Bridge Deck for structure 8010 seems understated. Please verify the quantity is correct.

**The quantity was verified and was determined to be understated by 0.36%. See forthcoming Addendum .**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 1:16:49 PM **Question Number - 37**

Paint notes on sheet 1199 and 1201 call out for a 3 coat paint system to be applied at the crossframe replacements, end beam modifications, and the edge of the existing top flange, is the quantity for this captured in the respective paint reference items?

**Yes. 753 SF has been estimated for this work as stated in the PAINTING OF STRUCTURAL STEEL note on Sheet 1183/1288. Note that this only accounts for the areas disturbed by the proposed work and the areas of top flange edges that were previously encased in haunch concrete but will no longer be encased in the proposed deck haunch.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 1:09:42 PM **Question Number - 36**

Does the existing steel require a blast/prime prior to the retrofit installation?

**Existing steel require a blast/prime prior to the retrofit installation and to be paid under Item 514, SURFACE PREPARATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURAL STEEL.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 11:58:04 AM **Question Number - 35**

Please provide the complete soil boring information for B-033-3-17 and B-003-4-17, it appears that page 2 of 2 for both borings has been cutoff.

**The boring sheets have been revised. See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/23/2021 2:16:36 PM **Question Number - 34**

will the department allow the infields to be utilized as waste areas for this project?

**No.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/23/2021 1:56:57 PM **Question Number - 33**

As a follow up to your response to Q30, the Proposed Legend (#39) on Typical Sections Sheet 29 is calling out 18" Riprap, Type C. Per CMS 601.04, the plans are calling for Riprap, Type C - Concrete Riprap Using Cloth or Burlap Bags. Is the intent for this item to be Rock Channel Protection, Type C instead of Riprap, Type C?

**This has been revised to Rock Channel Protection, Type C. See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 10:20:38 AM **Question Number - 32**

Several MOT questions have been answered with see forthcoming addendum. Will this addendum be out before the end of the week? If not, can the questions be answered so we can proceed with how this project is going to be phased by year?

**The Addendum is now available on the ftp site.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 10:10:29 AM **Question Number - 31**

The answer to question 28 states the right of way fence will be removed. Is temporary safety fence incidental to the noisewall item?

**Yes. Temp fence is the contractor's responsibility depending on means & methods of constructing the new noise wall.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 9:25:25 AM **Question Number - 30**

Per CMS 601.04, Riprap Type D requires a 6" Reinforced Concrete Slab. The Proposed Legend (#36) on Typical Sections Sheet 29 is calling out 12" Riprap, Type D. If the Riprap Type D required thickness is 12", please add an As Per Plan designation to this item.

**This is revised to Rock Channel Protection, Type D with Aggregate Filter, As Per Plan. See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 8:26:03 AM **Question Number - 29**

Plan sheet 74 under pre-phase 1 notes gives a table of drainage runs to be installed utilizing permitted lane closure charts. 3 of the 8 are bored (P-18, P-28, P-42) and 1 of 8 (P-63) is a longitudinal median run so they can be performed without issue. However 4 of these 8 runs (P-11, P-12, P-14, P-22) are paid for as open-cut type B 611 pipe items which are to be backfilled and restored per detail on plan sheet 83. These 4 runs cannot be realistically installed and restored within the allowable permitted lane closures. Please either make these runs bored/jacked, or allow exceptions to lane closure durations so the contractor can get these 4 runs installed in a safe and non-disruptive manner.

**These 4 pipes have been revised to be bored/Jacked. See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2021 4:39:11 PM **Question Number - 28**

Is the right of way fence to be removed where the new noise walls are being constructed?

**The fence is to be removed when the noise walls are along the R/W. This is indicated on the Fence Plans and Estimated Quantities.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2021 4:38:41 PM **Question Number - 27**

The seeding and mulching note on plan sheet 72 states the quantity will be for all areas between the right of way lines. The quantities on plan sheets 411 thru 416 do not appear to include the areas where the noise wall near the right of way is being constructed. Is the seeding adjacent to the new noise walls incidental to the wall item?

**Seeding items have been added, See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 4:32:43 PM **Question Number - 26**

the snap mill and fill on sheet 82 refers to utilizing SP-404 is this correct?

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 2:23:25 PM **Question Number - 25**

Sheet 908 shows a Riprap Cutoff Wall per DM-1.1. How is this item to be paid for?

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 12:53:36 PM **Question Number - 24**

Bridge Sum-77-0802 L/R has conflicting construction joint for the outside parapet / bridge deck replacement for the let bridge. Plan sheet 6/26 (1160) shows 2'-6". The other drawings for the structure show 1'-6". Please confirm what the plan intent is.

**The location of the joint is consistently called out as being located 2'-6" from the edge of the deck throughout the plans.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 11:39:50 AM **Question Number - 23**

Please allow an additional 60 day closure of Warner Road to build phase 1 of the structure.

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 11:29:35 AM **Question Number - 22**

The wintertime limitation notes on plan sheet 74 states all ramps shall be open between October 15 and April 1. The table in the time limitation on a detour section on plan sheet 74 states Ramp C-2 can be closed for 270 days. Please clarify if Ramp C-2 can be closed for 270 days or only between April 1 to October 15. The construction of the Ramp C-2 structure will require the full 270 days and will need to be closed during the wintertime.

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 9:54:01 AM **Question Number - 21**

Based on Winter Time Limitations and Ramp Closure Durations, Phase 1 work could not begin until the 2022 construction season. Is this the Department's intent?

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 9:00:40 AM **Question Number - 20**

Structure 0927R Ramp C-2 – MOT Phase 1 requires I-77 NB traffic to be shifted to the outside shoulders and temporary pavement. Sheet 140/1288 shows three lanes of traffic on I-77 NB open during Phase 1 construction of structure 0927R Ramp C-2. It appears that the Pier 1 construction will be impeding into at least the outside NB traffic lane, possibly the center traffic lane as well. Nightly single lane closures on I-77 NB are permissible per plan sheet 74 (Phase 1 note 6) however once the area is excavated for Pier 1 construction it will be several weeks before the lane is accessible and opened back up to traffic. How does the department plan to have the contractor construct Pier 1 while maintaining the MOT lanes shown in sheet 140/1288?

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2021 5:06:01 PM **Question Number - 19**

The MOT note on sheet 74 referring to "Time Limitation On A Detour" says Warner Road may be closed for 30 days with exceptions of noted golf events. Sheet 1155 shows final clearance at 14.55'. This is a slab deck bridge that with falsework needed during construction will reduce this clearance drastically. With the duration of the bridge widening and rehabilitation activities, the closure of 30 days in any of the three phases will not be sufficient to allow re-opening to traffic due to risk of this lessened vertical clearance. Please extend the closure time limits for Warner Road to 90 days per phase for constructability purposes.

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2021 3:22:43 PM **Question Number - 18**

Following the link provided in question 16 it appears only the pavement calcs are uploaded. Please provide the structure calcs.

**The structure calculations have been added to the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/SUM-106002/Reference%20file/SUM-106002-%20Office%20Calculations/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2021 6:24:30 AM **Question Number - 17**

Can the Department clarify the construction sequence for Bridge SUM-77-0927R (Ramp C2 over IR 77 NB)? It appears that the forward half of the bridge is constructed during Phase 1 (see sheet 140) and the rear half is constructed during Phase 2 (see sheet 215). The steel erection sequence on sheet 1232 has the pier caps being completed after the erection of the steel which appears cannot be completed because bent 3 (see sheet 1232) is in the open lanes for Phase 2 traffic.

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/14/2021 12:22:06 PM **Question Number - 16**

Please provide the office calcs for the structures. They were not included in the folder.

**The office calculations are located on the ftp site. <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/SUM-106002/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/14/2021 9:52:54 AM **Question Number - 15**

As a follow-up to question 13. The formwork for the CIP deck on the Warner Rd bridges will reduce the vertical clearance to less than 11'. The road needs to be closed while the formwork is in place.

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2021 2:42:51 PM **Question Number - 14**

Please provide the office calculations for the structures.

**For simplicity, the Office Calculations have been separated into its own folder, they are located in the reference only folder.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2021 2:04:37 PM **Question Number - 13**

The 30 day closure duration for Warner Rd. is not adequate for structure removal, forming, reinforcing, pouring, curing and striping a CIP bridge deck. Please increase the closure to 60 days.

**Per the phase 1 note 8 on sheet 74, the closure of Warner Road is for the lowering of Warner Road, and not for the bridge construction. It is assumed that short duration stoppages and flaggers will be utilized for bridge construction.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2021 4:09:22 PM **Question Number - 12**

Pay item 368 as well as estimated quantity on plan sheet 1147 show Granular Material, Type B. Plan pages 1148, 1149, 1150, 1151, and 1152 show Granular Material, Type C. Please clarify which material type.

**The Type B and Type C material are two different things. The plan sections are consistent with BDM Figure 201-3, which differentiates between the two areas. The quantity for 167 CY of ITEM 203E35110 – GRANULAR MATERIAL, TYPE B is for behind the abutment and wingwall as shown on Sections A and B on sheets 1151 and 1152. Item 203 – Granular Material, Type C is not a separate pay item. It is part of, and included with, ITEM 840E22000 – FOUNDATION PREPARATION.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/8/2021 8:49:28 AM **Question Number - 11**

Per the plan note on sheet 82, Item 614, Maintaining Traffic, Misc.: Bridge Deck and Pavement Patching should have a Fixed Unit Price of \$1.00. Please correct Line Number 0332 of the ebsx file.

**The unit price for 0332 (614E18000) Maintaining Traffic, Misc.: Bridge Deck and Pavement Patching (WT: 39) is Fixed at \$1**

**Question Submitted:** 4/7/2021 3:24:37 PM **Question Number - 10**

Bid Item 385 – Portions of Structure Removed, > 20', APP: Plan note #3 on sheet 1161/1288 states "Salvage all the existing reinforcing steel projecting from the footing." Sheets 1163 thru 1165 show new horizontal and vertical reinforcing steel doweled into the existing foot. Is the existing vertical and horizontal reinforcing steel to be salvaged?

**Note 3 about salvaging the projecting reinforcing has been removed. See Addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 4/7/2021 3:22:11 PM **Question Number - 9**

Can the existing plans be provided for structures SUM-77-0802 L/R, SUM-77-0810 L/R and SUM-77-0927 R?

**The existing plans for these structures have been added to the SUM-106002-Existing Plans folder in the reference files.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/6/2021 9:23:07 AM **Question Number - 8**

The office calculations for the pavement did not appear to be in the ftp location mentioned in the answer to Question #1. Will these be made available prior to the bid?

**The Office Calculation location are within the SUM-106002-CADDfiles folder. Refer to the info files tab in the project index.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2021 4:59:14 PM **Question Number - 7**

According to the Sequence of Construction on sheets 74-75, Bridge 0927R and Ramp C-2 are to be built in phase 1 and open to traffic prior to Season 1 Winter Shutdown. There is insufficient time this season to procure, fabricate and deliver the curved girders for this structure and complete the bridge and ramp C-2 prior to winter. Please consider extending the closure of Ramp C-2 into the second season.

**See forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2021 1:24:46 PM **Question Number - 6**

Unclear MOT from STA 396+00 to 410+00NB. Phase 2I ends at 396+00 (pg 279) and phase 2 resumes at 410+00 (pg 210). No clarification as to why there is a gap.

**A note has been added to Sheet 279 indicating the NB temporary barrier shall be continued to Sta. 422+80 as shown on Sheet 209. See Addendum 2..**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2021 10:14:35 AM **Question Number - 5**

Bid Item 375 – Mechanically Stabilized Earth Wall: Per SS 840.08, the Department will determine the area of the MSE wall with a height from the top of the concrete leveling pad to the top of the concrete coping. It appears the bid item quantity of 3,109 SF does not include the MSE coping area. Please confirm if the quantity includes the 2' coping at the top of the MSE wall.

**The estimated quantity has been revised in Addendum 2 to include the wall area from top of leveling pad to top of coping.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/2/2021 10:13:25 AM **Question Number - 4**

Retaining Wall 2 – MSE Wall Below SUM-77-0927R Forward Abutment: Plan sheets 1151 – 1152/1288 show proposed concrete slope protection behind the MSE coping. There is no pay item for this work listed in the estimated quantities on sheet 1147/1288. Where is the proposed concrete slope protection for retaining wall 2 to be paid?

**A pay item has been added to the Retaining Wall 2 estimated quantities in Addendum 2.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/1/2021 8:33:01 AM **Question Number - 3**

Can the Department consider a weekend closure for the erection of the drop in pieces for Ramp C2? There is no way the drop in piece can be safely set during a 15 minute rolling road block. These are curved girders and will probably require a holding crane until a second piece is in place. This will probably take a few hours to make safe.

**MOT note revised in Addendum 2. The contractor may close I-77 and detour traffic utilizing Ramp C, US 224, Kelly Avenue, Ramp D nightly between 12:00AM and 4:00 AM. Detour will utilize 3 message boards. Payment shall be included in maintaining traffic.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 1:16:28 PM **Question Number - 2**

Can the XSR Cross Section Files be made available?

**The cross section files are available in the CADD folder at the following link:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach>**

**Question Submitted:** 3/26/2021 10:44:04 AM **Question Number - 1**

Will the office calcs be made available?

**The office calculations are available in the CADD zip under the Reference Only folder at the following link:<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach>**

**Project No. 210269**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

JEF-107648 - SR 7-(20.54)(20.82)

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 9:52:17 AM **Question Number - 8**

Item 513 - fatigue retrofit plates. Is the intent to have all coats of paint shop applied or only primed with the finished coats field applied? Should the bolts be supplied uncoated to the field for installation and then painted?

**This is already addressed in the specifications: CMS 513.27 states the plates need to be shop primed. CMS 711.09 states the bolts need to be zinc coated, if the plates are shop primed.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 3:14:26 PM **Question Number - 7**

On pier details dwg 83/98, the listed the demand for the fiber wrap shear is  $V_u = 170$  kips. Is this the total shear demand or the additional shear demand? If it's the total shear demand, what is the existing capacity? Or what is the Concrete ( $f'_c$ ) and transverse steel ( $A_s$ , spacing,  $f_y$ )? This will be needed in order to calculate  $V_c$ ,  $V_s$ . Please clarify.

**The value listed on pier detail dwg 83/98 is the additional shear strength ( $V_u = V_c + V_s = 170$  kips) required for the fiber wrap.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 2:11:42 PM **Question Number - 6**

On page 3 of the plans it appear that the outside shoulder is to be removed as pavement removed and replaced as 302 asphalt. (see detail a). the x-sections quantify the same area as excavation. On sheet 12 the outside shoulder is identified as 615 temporary pavement. How is this to be paid?

**The 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic on the outside shoulder is not required and is being removed from the plans. The shoulders will be rebuilt as shown on the typical sections. The pavement removed includes removal of the existing pavement while the excavation quantity includes any additional material below the existing pavement that needs removed in order to place the new asphalt pavement.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 10:01:30 AM **Question Number - 5**

Regarding the question about removing traffic control during the winter and ODOT's response that construction phasing shall not be in place during the winter. Is ODOT going to issue an addendum clarifying this as a requirement? What are the dates for the lane restrictions? Will the completion date be extended in order to complete the second construction season?

**The previous answer is being changed. The department will not require the traffic control to be removed over the winter months. The traffic control items may stay in place as needed.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 9:02:43 AM **Question Number - 4**

Jewett Road is going to have to be closed longer than the plan stated 15 mins. It is a slab bridge and will need to be removed over a several day closure. Also the clearance for the falsework beams will be well below 13' tall.

**The closure requirements will not be changed. The minimum clearance indicated in the plans shall be met.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 1:06:04 PM **Question Number - 3**

Is the Temporary Pavement outside of the the shoulder reconstruction to the face of guardrail? Can it be part of the shoulder reconstruction? Can it be left in place?

**The Pavement for Maintaing Traffic on the outside shoulder has been removed from the plans by addendum. The outside shoulder is being rebuilt per the typical section and no Pavement for Maintaining Traffic will be required.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 4:08:10 PM **Question Number - 2**

Is it ODOT's intent for this project to stay in construction phasing throughout the winter season or will the contractor be required to remove traffic control devices for winter snow plowing season?

**The construction phasing shall not be in place during the winter.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/5/2021 10:29:19 AM **Question Number - 1**

Page 88/98 Note 5 Retrofits says to clean final surface and then blast clean to near white finish. Where is the blast paid and does the steel need a prime coat? And are the retrofit plates to receive field intermediate/finish coats?

**Surface preparation (including the blast cleaning) of the existing beams at the fatigue retrofit locations is included under ITEM 514 – SURFACE PREPARATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURAL STEEL. Prime coat to the faying surface of the existing beams at the fatigue retrofit locations is not required. The retrofit plates are to be shop primed per 513.27 and shall also receive the field intermediate and finish coats. The cost of applying the shop prime coat is incidental to the bid for structural steel.**

**Project No. 210275**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

MOT-113479 - Mad River Rec Trail Resurfac

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 4:38:10 PM **Question Number - 2**

Can the percentage of work performed by the prime be lowered to 30% to allow for more competitive bids?

**CO looked at the request and has decided to keep the prime percentage at 50%.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2021 2:43:51 PM **Question Number - 1**

The weight restriction of 16 tons is unreasonable. The operating weight of our smallest self propelled mill is 46,000. The paver weighs 33,000. Would the department consider removing or modifying this note?

**The intent was to limit trucks hauling material, not the paving equipment. The note on sheet 5 will be revised in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 210285**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

CUY-107657 - IR 480-21.30 WB Safety

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 2:54:09 PM **Question Number - 31**

Plan Sheet 5 under the Proposed Legend circled item no. 2 - Item 442 - Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, 19MM, Type A, shows the depth at 3.50" to be placed in two lifts. However, the PAVEMENT SUBSUMMARY calculates the bid quantity for the is item at 3" not 3.50" Which one is it?

**The typical section is correct with 3.5" thickness. We have updated the Pavement subsummary and General Summary to reflect a 3.5" thickness for Item 442 - Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, 19MM, Type A**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 2:11:17 PM **Question Number - 30**

Upon the completion of Phase 1 , which adds one new lane WB Under Broadway, taking it from 3 lanes to 4 lanes, the Permitted Lane Closure Time Chart for I-480 WB - Under Broadway, page 29, attached, needs to be changed from 3 lanes to 4 lanes, as well as the times. Presently, with only 3 lanes you can't take a 2 lane closure WB until 11:30pm. On I-480 in the 4 lane section from I-77 to Broadway East & West, you are allowed to take a 2 lane closure from 8pm to 5am

**The interstate lanes are not considered changed until the project is completed. Therefore, no adjustment in the permitted lane closure schedule.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 3:04:48 PM **Question Number - 29**

When adding the linear foot item 509E30020 for the No. 4 GFRP bar under each respective bridge, the pay item 509E10000 for epoxy coated rebar by the LB will need revised to eliminate the GFRP bars which have been listed in the rebar schedule with a weight of a number 4 steel bar.

**The 509 Items have been updated to reflect the use of the GFRP bars. Updated sheets attached. This reply also covers Question 28**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 2:50:52 PM **Question Number - 28**

According to SCD SBR-1-20, payment for GFRP bar reinforcement shall be included under the linear foot pay item 509 - No. \_ GFRP Deformed Bars. Add item 509E30020 for the No. 4 bar linear foot for each respective bridge

**See response to Question 29Q29 - The 509 Items have been updated to reflect the use of the GFRP bars. Updated sheets attached.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 1:23:44 PM **Question Number - 27**

Prebid Q&A 23 stated the completion date will be changed. Addendum 5 did not include this revision. Add revision by addendum.

**This will be done. The new completion date is 9/30/2022**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 1:18:47 PM **Question Number - 26**

Why did addendum 5 add ref. no. 200, 202, 203, 205? These duplicated items already exist under each respective bridge.

**This was an error. Quantities have been deleted in addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 12:39:25 PM **Question Number - 25**

Revisit Q&A 20. Question required clarification as to if ODOT wanted 848 rehabilitation performed on the existing approach slabs. Addendum 5 only addressed how existing asphalt is to be removed. Addendum 5 added the two 848 pay items (Ref. No. 201 and 204) to account for wcr asphalt on the existing approach slab areas. This is correct, assuming you are also going to perform 848 hydrodemolition and sdc overlay on the approach slabs. If the intent is to perform 848 rehabilitation on the approach slabs with the deck, then ODOT will also need to add quantities to the sdc overlay items (848E10200), surface prep using hydro items (848E20000), and sdc overlay, variable items (848E30201) in order to do so. Answer to question 20 and addendum 5 did not provide complete clarification/quantities for the 848 items on each respective bridge.

**The intent is to remove the existing asphalt overlay on the approach slabs down to the existing approach slab concrete. No further removal is intended. The existing approach slabs will then be paved over during the ramp/mainline work, up to the new abutment backwall. Only the superstructures are to receive the SDC overlay**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 10:31:13 AM **Question Number - 24**

The answer to Q18 states it was assumed all phases would be in 2022 construction season. Why is there an interim completion date in the plans? Can phase 1 shoulder reconstruction be performed in 2021 and then do phase one again in 2022 to start the structure work? If so, the barrier wall and striping items need to be increased. This would also require the ramp to be closed twice.

**The note in the plans is a standard seasonal shut down note. No. Phase 1 should be completed as shown.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/27/2021 9:59:46 AM **Question Number - 23**

The answer to question 18 states to complete all 4 phases in 2022 prior to the completion date of August 18, 2022. This is not possible. At best, phase 1 MOT will be install in the middle of April 2022. This leaves 4 months to complete 4 phases of construction. Phases 1 and 3 each have approximately 15 days of water cure on the new concrete items. Please reconsider changing the completion date to October 1, 2022. In addition to these cure days, table 108.06-1 has 19 weather days in this period of time before any time extension will be considered by the Department.

**The completion date has been changed to Friday, September 30, 2022.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 8:40:37 PM **Question Number - 22**

On Pages 90 & 98, the last note on the page says that the GFRP Bars are included in the table but they are not called out. The note refers to the current standard which references all of the horizontal bars to be GFRP bars. Can you please clarify.

**The GFRP bars are to be installed per the standard (horizontal bars) and are now indicated as GFRP bars on the sheets (sheets 90 & 98)See Addendum 3**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 2:53:57 PM **Question Number - 21**

Once the backwalls, deck ends, joints, and deck overlays are completed in each respective phase (1-3), what items/scope of work has ODOT included to account for the transverse profile adjustments on/off the ends of the bridges? All mill and fill is to be completed under phase 4. Will ODOT allow asphalt for MOT to remain in place during the winter shutdown?

**Asphalt for maintaining traffic would be used for the transitions on and off the bridge during transitions. Refer back to answer in pre-bid question 18 that all phases would be completed in 2022**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 2:43:24 PM **Question Number - 20**

Plan sheet 88 and 96 of 98 show details for removing existing and placing proposed overlay on the existing approach slabs. The plan quantities do not include the approach slab areas at either bridge for 848 scope of work items? Revises quantities or correct details.

**We've added the following pay item to cover the removal of the existing asphalt overlay on the approach slabs:848 – Wearing Course Removed, Asphalt: 2.5 inches SFN 1813374 = 292 SYSFN 1813382 = 298 SYSee revised sheets 20, 20a, 21 & 81See Addendum 3**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 2:35:00 PM **Question Number - 19**

The excavation quantity is overstated. The excavation quantity includes the volume of concrete and asphalt in the pavement removal item.

**We have updated excavation quantity to remove the pavement removed quantity from the total excavation. Revised Sheets 19 & 33. See addendum 3**

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 2:33:34 PM **Question Number - 18**

Please consider changing the final completion date of this project to October 15, 2022. The expansion joints required for this project will not be available until the middle of August 2021. There is no way to complete all three phases prior to the interim completion date of October 15, 2021. All three phases of this project must be completed prior to the winter shutdown due to the grade changes at each phase line and structure ends. The work on this project should not begin until the 2022 construction season.

**Due to the lead time of the expansion joint material, it was assumed no phase work would be completed in 2021. Contractor should be prepared to get into full phase construction as early as weather allows in spring of 2022. Completion date will remain as proposed.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/23/2021 10:36:35 AM **Question Number - 17**

Two addendums have been posted after it was stated, in answer to prebid question 8, that the Cleveland & Cuyahoga Railway special clause was received. When will it be available by addendum?

**This document is our standard railroad agreement not a "special clause." It has been placed on the ftp site**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 3:24:50 PM **Question Number - 16**

Can the 32 inch PCB with glare screen be substituted for 50 inch PCB?

**Yes, the 32 inch PCB with glare screen can be substituted for 50 inch PCB**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 3:18:21 PM **Question Number - 15**

Will 32" pcb with 18" glare screen be an acceptable alternate to the 50" pcb?

**Yes, the 32" pcb with 18" glare screen is an acceptable alternate to the 50" pcb**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 1:31:29 PM **Question Number - 14**

Please reconsider your answer to Q5 and allow the existing vertical bars to be cut and new dowel bars installed at the contractors expense. The amount of jack hammering on this median wall is going to create microfractures on the deck edge, increase the duration on the project and require a lane closure in the other direction during the removal operation at night. See the attached drawing as one example where an ODOT parapet is replaced saw cutting the vertical bars and replacing with dowel bars. How is this example any different than what is on this structure?

**The district and the designer revisited the issue. It is preferred to construct as originally designed.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2021 12:21:45 PM **Question Number - 13**

Page 17 of 19 lists two different sizes for the strip seal. Clarify which is correct.

**Should be 3" for SFN 1813382. Just a typo. Sheet 96 revised in Addendum 2**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/21/2021 12:17:52 PM **Question Number - 12**

Quantities included for the QC1 abutment concrete under both structures are doubled. The structure office calcs added sections A-A and B-B together for the end area. This end area in the calcs is incorrect. Adjust quantity by addendum.

**The QC1 quantity for SFN 1813374 should be 13 CY, and SFN 1813382 should be 17 CY. Sheet 81 revised in Addendum 2**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 1:59:52 PM **Question Number - 11**

Provide the existing structure drawings

**Files have been placed on the project ftp site.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 1:57:18 PM **Question Number - 10**

Provide the structure office calculations

**Calculations are placed on the project ftp site**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 9:19:23 AM **Question Number - 9**

Provide the limits of sealing for the epoxy urethane on both structures

**The revised transverse section details show the sealing limits. There are no changes to quantities. Sheet 84 & 93 revised in Addendum 2.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2021 6:45:08 PM **Question Number - 8**

Answer to pre-bid question #2 stated special clause for the Cleveland & Cuyahoga Railway would be provided by addendum. When will this be made available?

**The Agreement was received in this office on 4/19/2021. The addendum will be submitted shortly.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/19/2021 1:09:22 PM **Question Number - 7**

Please clarify bid item 0056. The proposal reads 442 AIC 19mm, Type A (446), while the typical sections calls out AIC, 19mm, Type A, (448).

Also, Please provide a separate pay item for the variable depth 9.55 intermediate called out in the typical sections. Variable depth paving carries different production rates than standard 1" paving.

**The typical sections were correct. We modified the pavement subsummary and the general summary to match the typical sections. There is not a separate item in the item master for "ASPHALT CONCRETE INTERMEDIATE COURSE, 9.5 MM, TYPE A (448), VARIABLE DEPTH", so we are not able to split the quantities in the general summary. The items are separated in the pavement subsummary on sheet 22, but the combined total is the quantity carried to the general summary. Sheet 20 & 22 revised in Addendum 2.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2021 3:32:04 PM **Question Number - 6**

Can ODOT provide the clear distance at the centerline between the westbound and eastbound structures for both bridges?

**There are no openings between EB and WB bridges . Please see picture at the ftp site.  
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/CUY-107657/>**

**Question Submitted:** 4/9/2021 12:06:00 PM **Question Number - 5**

The median parapet on Br. #'s 480-2139 & 480-2154. That is being completely replaced; will ODOT allow for the wall to be horizontally cut at the bottom, level with the deck. This cut will saw through the existing vertical rebar. Then drill and epoxy dowel bars of the same kind back into the deck for the vertical reinforcement steel?

**This item shall be bid as designed.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/8/2021 10:21:21 AM **Question Number - 4**

Plan sheets 64 and 69 have incorrect summations of dirt volumes at bottom of page. Furthermore, a summary of all excavation and embankment quantities by stations on sheets 46-71D are significantly larger than the ODOT quantity shown on plan sheet 19 summary. Please review and revise corrected quantities for bid items 5 and 6.

**Sheet 64: Revised Excavation Volume – 180.3 CY, Sheet 69: Revised Excavation Volume – 68.7 CY, Revised Embankment Volume – 6.6 CY. Revised grand totals on General Summary (sheet 19): Total Excavation Volume – 2228 CY, Total Embankment Volume – 504 CY, Total Seeding and Mulching – 3120 SY. This item has been addressed on Addendum 1.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/8/2021 10:17:08 AM **Question Number - 3**

Typical sections show outside shoulder widening beginning at 1149+46.31. Widening base quantities on sheet 22 and cross sections begin on sheet 46 at station 1158+10.40. Please verify station limits for widening.

**Confirmed limits of widening begin after structure CUY-480-2139 (Sta 1158+10.40). This has been revised in Addendum 1.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2021 10:13:51 PM **Question Number - 2**

Will Cleveland & Cuyahoga Railroad require their own separate insurance policy? If so, provide the proposal special clause for this railway company.

**The special clause for this railway will be provided by addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 3/30/2021 8:57:53 AM **Question Number - 1**

AASHTOWare file requires 8% DBE participation. Proposal cover lists 8% EDGE. Provide correction.

**The DBE tab will be removed from the electronic bidding file by the bid deadline.**

**Project No. 210290**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

ADA-112920 - US 52/SR 247-08.29/00.00

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 10:21:25 AM **Question Number - 1**

Can PN 520 and 534 be added to the proposal?

**This will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum**

**Project No. 210291**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

ALL-111375 - US 30-16.19

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 2:32:18 PM **Question Number - 2**

The only existing pavement buildup included in the plans appears to be for U.S. 30 (Bubble A on sheet 4). Are the existing intersections of Mayberry, Thayer and Cool Road made up of this same build? If they're different, can the existing pavement buildup be provided?

**The requested existing pavement buildups will be included in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 2:13:06 PM **Question Number - 1**

Ref #69 would GE Lighting's ERL2 cobrahead fixture be an approved equal to the fixtures being called out in the plans? (20,100 lumens / 174W / 3000K / Gray / Type III / 120-277V) GE Part #ERL2-0-21-C3-30-1-GRAY-GILR-053

**Yes. Thank you for the question. No plan change or addendum is needed.**

**Project No. 210292**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

ALL-114150 - CR 152 Shawnee Rd Roundabout

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 9:43:47 AM **Question Number - 3**

General Notes plan sheets 3 through 5 for Wet Reflective Pavement Marking - Is this an adopted supplemental specification by Central Office, or a general note written by District 1?

**The note on sheets 3-5 will be removed from the plans in a forthcoming addendum. The item 807 Wet Reflective items shall conform to supplemental specifications 807, 850, and 905. Supplemental specification 905 will also be added to the plans in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 8:48:16 AM **Question Number - 2**

Is reference no. 26, item 646 Word on Pavement, 72", Type A90 intended to be epoxy, or Type A90 preformed tape?

**The A90 designation will be removed from this item in a forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/15/2021 10:03:46 AM **Question Number - 1**

To whom it may concern, We are the representatives for a product BIORESTOR, eligible for bid on ODOT's project number 210292 and had a few questions and concerns. Quantities are expressed in bid as to be: per manufacturer's recommendation. If this is to be implemented the bid call's for a quantity of 561 gallon, yet there are 3 different products with 3 different rates. BIORESTOR® recommended application rate is 0.02 gal/sy of 1:1 diluted concentrate. Change in specs 2019 to an emulsion product. The suggested application rates for each product listed would return these square yard conversions: 512 gal / 0.02 = 25,600 sq. yd treated. 512 gal / 0.035 = 14,743 sq. yd treated. 512 gal / 0.3 = 17,200 sq. yd treated. This becomes confusing when trying to bid the job without total square yards portrayed. Generally the bids for pavement treatment are given in square yards to be treated. Would this be possible to adjust the this bid to better explain the product? Thank you for your time and we look forward to further discussion.

**A forthcoming addendum will change the pay items for asphalt sealing from gallons to square yards for all 3 alternates.**

**Project No. 210293**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

ATB-91887 - SR 11-00.00

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 1:43:49 PM **Question Number - 2**

Can the department add an anti segregation equipment item?

**According to the pavement design manual, Item 424 does not require anti-segregation equipment.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 6:50:16 AM **Question Number - 1**

the project has 1000sy of 255 repairs. the maximum quantity for full depth sawing would be 4,500lf and not 6,000 lf as provided in the plans. please revise.

**The design team is comfortable with the current 6,000 ft of full depth pavement sawing.**

**Project No. 210294**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

BEL-107380 - US 40-11.62/11.81

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 3:45:27 PM **Question Number - 1**

The steel casing (748.06) is intended to be the carrier pipe, correct? The 36" & 48" items are Type B & Type A which under 611.02 do not show 748.06 and I want to be sure a different carrier is not desired. The note on plan sheet 2 does specify the steel casing to be the carrier. Thank you

**Yes. The steel casing (748.06) is intended to be the carrier pipe for both locations as specified in the note on sheet 2.**

**Project No. 210295**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

CUY-112460 - Lake Avenue

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 5:02:36 PM **Question Number - 2**

The plans call out 446 in the intersections. Is this correct?

**Question will be answered in a forthcoming Addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/2/2021 10:33:23 PM **Question Number - 1**

Ref 77 listed as RRFB but the description on page 17 calls out 8inch beacons, These are also drawn as beacons on the plans. Is this item for Rectangular Rapid Flasher or Flashing Beacons

**This question will be answered in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 210296**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

CUY-114329 - SR 175-07.97

**Question Submitted:** 5/8/2021 8:25:30 AM **Question Number - 3**

the full depth notes on sheet 5 state that curb removal and replacement is incidental to the project. the full depth sawcut calculations are however calculated that no curb will be replaced at all. will the curb be replaced for full depth repairs within phase 1 repairs? if so please adjust the sawcut calculations for these areas so they reflect what the department will actually pay for.

**Per the Full Depth Pavement Removal and Rigid Replacement note on sheet 5, the Integral Curb, will be replaced in Phase 1. The quantities of Full Depth Sawing is sufficient for tis task.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 3:54:45 PM **Question Number - 2**

Alot of the repair sizes as shown in plans are not conform bp 2.5 as being a minimum of 6' wide. please change the repair table so it conforms to bp 2.5.

**The 5 ft repair length will remain. This length was used in the previous project on SR-175 last year with no issues.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 3:52:29 PM **Question Number - 1**

based on the overnight excavation note on sheet 6 is it the intent that all pavement removed will be replaced the same day?

**No, the pavement does not need to be replaced the same day. That note is for backfilling if the work if the work is suspended due to weather.**

**Project No. 210299**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

FRA-114210 - IR 270-(08.29)(17.28)

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2021 12:58:55 PM **Question Number - 6**

ON PAGES 19 AND 20 OF THE PLANS IT SHOWS RAMP A GETS HIGH FRICTION TREATMENT HOWEVER RAMP A IS NOT IN THE CALCULATIONS ON SHEET 16 .IT IS HOWEVER IN THE EPOXY PAINT AND GROOVING CALCULATIONS ON PAGE 15

**Ramp A shall receive High Friction Surface Treatment, and this work is quantified under callout FT-7. There is an error in the quantity table on Sheet 16 – the subheading that FT-7 is under should be Ramp A instead of Ramp C**

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2021 11:10:13 AM **Question Number - 5**

Are all areas in this proposal scheduled for HFST double lift application? The quantities page in the drawings lists all sites as double lift. However, the SS888 High Friction Surface Treatment states on page 5, "Use a single lift on pavement surfaces. Use a double lift on concrete bridge decks." Please confirm if all areas are double lift or if only bridge decks are.

**All HFST areas shall be a double lift.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2021 7:00:56 AM **Question Number - 4**

According to the traffic restriction, Ramp E and Ramp H can not be closed simultaneously as they are utilized as detours. Ramp E and H merge before they merge onto I-70. Will lane closures be allowed in this area to complete the HFST on both ramps?

**A single lane closure is acceptable on Ramp E (270SB to 70EB) while Ramp H (270NB to 70EB) is closed.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/16/2021 2:05:22 PM **Question Number - 3**

There is not matching Wet Reflective Epoxy 6" per mile and Grooving for 6" Recessed Pavement Marking per mile quantities. And there is not matching Wet Reflective Epoxy 6" per foot and Grooving for 6" Recessed Pavement Marking per foot quantities. These items must match exactly. Can these errors be corrected?

**This question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/15/2021 4:26:26 PM **Question Number - 2**

On sheet 17 of the project plans, labeled Pavement Marking Quantities, item 644 has two items accounted for, both at .1 ml, for a total of .2 mi. However, the quantity you list to be carried over is 1 mi.

**This question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/15/2021 4:18:47 PM **Question Number - 1**

After reviewing the Ramp Closure Restrictions Table on Sheet 6 of the Project drawings and manufactures specifications for BRS's, would ODOT be willing to extend the weekday (Monday - Friday) working hours on all ramps? With nighttime closure temperatures hindering curing times, these shortened working windows significantly hold back production on a double lift system.

**ODOT will extend the allowable ramp closure hours with a forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 210300

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

FRA-108702 - Etna St / Elbern Ave Pt 1 & Pt 2

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2021 10:11:43 AM **Question Number - 10**

Regarding the Elbern Ave Bridge, the proposed structure type is a Corrugated Aluminum Box Culvert per item 707.25 and installed per item 611. As required by 611.09, B, waterproofing is to be installed by the contractor. For the buried liner waterproofing membrane option it appears the state does not have any approved products on their QPL for item 711.22. Would it be acceptable for the contractor to use a 30 mill HDPE membrane liner as this option is recommended by the culvert manufacturer?

**Yes, the department will accept a waterproofing membrane liner per the manufacturer's recommendation.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 2:45:57 PM **Question Number - 9**

Utility poles conflicting with proposed construction at Elbern to be removed from Feb 2021 to Apr 2021 have not been moved. What is the updated schedule for removal?

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 2:43:33 PM **Question Number - 8**

Utility poles conflicting with pile driving at Etna to be removed from Feb 2021 to Apr 2021 have not been moved. What is the updated schedule for removal?

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 2:52:38 PM **Question Number - 7**

We have not visited the site yet, but please confirm that all bat trees have already been removed since the contract completion date is 10/15/2021 and clearing of bat trees can only occur from 10/1 to 3/31.

**Trees at both sites have been removed.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 2:49:25 PM **Question Number - 6**

Is there a profile for the retaining wall design provided in the plans that can be provided?

**If question is intended to refer to temporary shoring wall profiles, contractor shall determine these based on means and methods as all are anticipated to be less than 8 ft in height per the general notes.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 2:48:17 PM **Question Number - 5**

On plan sheet 17/29 (Part 2), There is a note for the temporary shoring wall 1 referring to a "table" for design information. Where is the table?

**Reference to table has been removed on sheet 17/29, see forthcoming addendum. Sheet 18/29 details temporary shoring alignment/locations proposed at the site.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 2:47:03 PM **Question Number - 4**

Page 25/29 has backfill material for the invert of the corrugated pipe. What material is to be used to make this fill.

**On-site bank fill material, see forthcoming addendum for clarification.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 10:45:06 AM **Question Number - 3**

The typical sections show 448 density for the surface asphalt. The general summary and proposal show 446 density. Which is correct?

**446 is correct. this will be clarified via forthcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 11:19:49 AM **Question Number - 2**

Are the closure durations for the two (2) structures specified in the plan documents?

**The closures for the 2 structures can last throughout the duration of the project.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 10:26:05 AM **Question Number - 1**

Page 6/38, General summary the header for the STRUCTURE OVER 20 FOOT SPAN CALLS OUT THE STRUCTURE AS M1485. Should this be structure M1555

**Yes, it should be M1555. This will be corrected in a forthcoming addendum.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 210301

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

HAM-104844 - /WAR-IR 71-19.83/00.00

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 2:39:02 PM **Question Number - 30**

Can the contractor excavate the excess dirt that was left between the northbound IR-71 exit ramps from the previous project to use for embankment and/or surcharge material. Here are the coordinates 39.291948925277524, -84.3170270195711.

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 9:18:30 AM **Question Number - 29**

The cross section page subtotals for 54/146, 58/146 and 61/146 do not equal the sum of the quantities on those pages. Will the page subtotals be revised?

**See forthcoming addendum. The quantities have been reviewed and revised.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 5:52:01 AM **Question Number - 28**

Item 452 concrete pavement begins at station 1008+44.85 where the forward approach slab ends. Plan sheet 99/146 shows Type A Installation at this location. Should this be Type C Installation?

**Per the \*\* designation on the typical section for station 1008+44.85 there will be 25' of asphalt pavement provided per a Type A installation. District has reviewed and determined the Type A installation is correct.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 5:51:30 AM **Question Number - 27**

The Superelevated Section - Ramp C STA. 1008+44.85 - STA. 1012+26.49 typical section indicates asphalt curb in lieu of combination curb and gutter 1008+44.85 to 1008+69.85. Will a pay item for asphalt curb be added?

**See forthcoming addendum. A curb, Type 4-C will be provided instead of the mentioned asphalt curb.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 5:50:32 AM **Question Number - 26**

Will pavement joint details be provided for Ramp C terminal at Mason Montgomery Road?

**Sheet 66 shows the transverse joint location.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 8:18:48 AM **Question Number - 25**

ODOT is posting a revision to the response to prebid question #21.

**Prebid question #21: Can the curb & gutter that needs to be removed & replaced for the installation pavement for MOT be added to the appropriate bid items instead of being incidental? Revised Response: See forthcoming addendum. The new curb and gutter quantities were already provided as references C7-C9 on sheet 29. The reference bubbles will be added to sheet 45. The removal is incidental to the MOT items.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 7:51:29 AM **Question Number - 24**

Can a bid item be provided for the temporary sidewalk with an estimated quantity? There are no details or location provided.

**The temporary sidewalk as shown on sheet 21 is incidental to the MOT items. The plans and standard drawing MT-110.10 provide the necessary information.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 7:48:16 AM **Question Number - 23**

Does ODOT expect the contractor to test the drilled shaft concrete, approach slab concrete, and type A installation concrete? The item for miscellaneous concrete testing is within section 4 the pavement bid items, which would not include the structure items. Please clarify?

**The concrete testing pay item includes all concrete that is not already covered by a QC/QA pay item.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 7:44:05 AM **Question Number - 22**

Can ODOT please verify the quantity for REF 273 30" drilled shafts into bedrock. Plans call for 4 shafts at 8 FT at the rear abutment, and 6 shafts at 9 FT for the forward abutment, which gives us 86 FT. Bid quantity is 150 FT. Please verify.

**See forthcoming addendum. The bid quantity will be revised to 86 FT.**



## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 7:36:33 AM **Question Number - 21**

Can the curb & gutter that needs to be removed & replaced for the installation pavement for MOT be added to the appropriate bid items instead of being incidental?

**The District has reviewed the request and the curb and gutter work is to stay incidental to the MOT items.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 7:31:49 AM **Question Number - 20**

Maintenance of traffic - Please clarify if there are any modifications needed to the private drive on the northside of Fields-Ertel Rd. for the pavement for maintaining traffic. Shown on pages 20 & 76.

**There are no modifications needed at the private drive. Any existing items impacted by the pavement for maintaining traffic will need replaced in kind which is incidental to the MOT items.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 11:32:55 AM **Question Number - 19**

The description for Ref 260 in the Proposal does not match the description in the General Summary.

**See forthcoming addendum. The additional description wording in the proposal will be revised to match the General Summary.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 8:54:50 AM **Question Number - 18**

Page 33/146 the item for 8" NON-REINFORCED CONCRETE PAVEMENT, CLASS QC1 a quantity of 320.76 sy from station 997+90.00 to 1005+26.21. The typical sections for this area does not show any concrete pavement. Please clarify where this concrete pavement is located.

**See forthcoming addendum. The quantity in question was in error and will be deleted.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 11:49:33 AM **Question Number - 17**

Class QC3 concrete, QC/QA, Superstructure, app. The quantity is 50 cy but the diaphragms take approx. 36 cy. What is the other 14 cy for?

**See forthcoming addendum. After further review the quantity will be reduced to 43 cy. A quantity calculation reference file is provided here: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/104844/>**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 11:00:17 AM **Question Number - 16**

There is a fiber optic line running under the middle of pier 1, looks to almost hit the middle pier column. The utility notes state that all these lines are to remain in place. We feel that this line will be in conflict can any work be done to relocate the fiber optic line running under Pier 1 through the edge the center drilled shaft/column. Due to the depth of the shafts potential over-drilling for permanent or temporary casing, this line will surely be an issue.

**The District has further researched the line in question and determined there will be no conflict with the proposed work.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 10:57:52 AM **Question Number - 15**

It appears the 75 FT of Single Slope D-Wall is referencing the 75 FT of parapet on the approach slabs. Where is this to be paid in the D-Wall item, incidental to the approach slab, or another spot?

**See forthcoming addendum. The quantity for Type D Barrier will be deleted and replaced with quantities for the reinforcing steel and Class QC3 concrete (Bridge Deck Parapet as Per Plan) for the approach slab parapets.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 1:47:13 PM **Question Number - 14**

REF # 33 calls for 75 FT of Type D single slope barrier wall, we cannot find this wall and don't think it exists. Can ODOT please confirm which sheet number and call-out for the Type D single slope wall.

**See forthcoming addendum. The quantity for Type D Barrier will be deleted and replaced with quantities for the reinforcing steel and Class QC3 concrete (Bridge Deck Parapet as Per Plan) for the approach slab parapets.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 12:35:25 PM **Question Number - 13**

We cannot find the call-outs for D33/34 and D36/37 as shown on sheet 31/146. Can you please direct us to where these call-outs are located?

**See forthcoming addendum. Reference numbers D33-D37 will be deleted.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 10:18:03 AM **Question Number - 12**

Please reference, page 3/146, Normal Section - Ramp C. "See Note 3" is referenced in this typical section, but there is no note 3 on this page. Please clarify.

**See forthcoming addendum. The "See Note 3" reference should read "See Note 2".**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 7:44:52 AM **Question Number - 11**

The Underdrain Summary quantities do not match the General Summary or Proposal. Please correct the Underdrain Summary to show the required items, quantities and locations.

**See forthcoming addendum. The general summary will be revised to match the subsummary quantities.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 7:31:18 AM **Question Number - 10**

The Drainage Subsummary does not match the Drainage section of the General Summary or the Proposal. Please correct the Drainage Subsummary to show the required items, quantities and locations.

**See forthcoming addendum. The drainage subsummary will be updated as references D33-D37 will be deleted.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 7:21:32 AM **Question Number - 9**

Plan sheet 45/146 has D-38 on Fields Ertel Rd. at about 17+70 right. There is no D-38 on the drainage summary on 31/146. Will this be added?

**See forthcoming addendum. The D-38 label is incorrect and will be revised to D-31.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 7:20:33 AM **Question Number - 8**

The drainage subsummary includes D33, 46 feet 18" Conduit, Type A with 1 Side Ditch Inlet and D34, 0.27 CY Concrete Masonry at 989+71 left. This is not shown on the plan and profile or on cross sections. Will details for these items be provided?

**See forthcoming addendum. Drainage items D33-37 are not required and will be removed from the drainage subsummary. These items are not included in the general summary.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 10:20:48 AM **Question Number - 7**

Pavement Restoration for Drainage Structure Installations on 10/146 says "The following quantity is provided for pavement restoration following installation of item 604 drainage structures." What are the 604 drainage structures and where are they located?

**See forthcoming addendum. The note and quantity will be removed from the plans. The quantity was originally included for the reconstruction of existing catch basins on Fields Ertel Rd, however the pavement restoration is covered under separate as per plan pay items in the plans.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 10:13:07 AM **Question Number - 6**

Field Office, Type B As Per Plan on 9/146 says "...the contractor shall only be responsible for maintaining the field office and providing applicable items indicated in table 619.02-1." Will the contractor be responsible for maintaining room temperature, electric service, potable hot and cold water, toilet accommodations, or utility services?

**See forthcoming addendum. The contractor will be responsible for maintaining the items listed in the question and the plan note will be revised as such.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 9:57:30 AM **Question Number - 5**

Will the department consider lowering the work type percentage performed by prime to 40%?

**The prime work percentage with remain at 50%**

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 9:52:00 AM **Question Number - 4**

The Construction Noise note on 8/146 says "The project must comply with local noise ordinances." What noise ordinances apply to this project?

**Deerfield and Symmes Townships.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 4/28/2021 9:43:00 AM **Question Number - 3**

A note on 100/146 says "No construction of structures including bridge foundations (drilled shafts at abutments) or pavement supported by embankment retained by the bridge abutments shall begin until settlement waiting period has been terminated by the Engineer." Will the contractor be permitted to construct piers 1, 2 and 3 prior to the settlement waiting period being terminated?

**Piers 1, 2 and 3 are not supported by either the forward or rear bridge abutment and hence are not subject the settlement waiting period criteria.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/23/2021 12:39:48 PM **Question Number - 2**

What part(s) of the superstructure is included with line 0259 Class QC3 Concrete, Misc.: with QC/QA, Superstructure, As Per Plan?

**The quantity for reference number 0259 Class QC3 Concrete, Misc.: with QC/QA, Superstructure, As Per Plan is for the cast in place end diaphragms on the Fields Ertel bridge.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/20/2021 8:15:11 AM **Question Number - 1**

Can you please provide a expected start for this project?

**The contractor is permitted to start work after the contract is signed and after a preconstruction meeting. A contractual start date is not included in these plans. Work shall be completed according to the Interim Completion Requirements included in the plans and the final completion date per the proposal.**

**Project No. 210302**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

HEN-101274 - US 6-00.00 Resurfacing

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2021 10:05:07 AM **Question Number - 2**

Would the Department consider reducing the self-perform work type percentage from 50% to 40% for this project? Obtaining 50% will be difficult for both asphalt paving contractors and heavy highway contractors who do not have asphalt paving work types.

**The percentage will remain at 50%**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 10:59:44 AM **Question Number - 1**

1. After a review of the note on sheet 6 labeled Vegetated Filter Strip, would ODOT please clarify if Topsoil/sodding is to be included as part of Bid Item #23 Slope Erosion Control?

**Topsoil is not included in bid item 23 slope erosion control. Topsoil is provided separately as Item 659 Topsoil. Sodding is not required for this project. Item 670 Slope Erosion Protection is included for the erosion control mat.**

**Project No. 210304**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

LOG-103822 - US 33-15.96/20.80

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 1:35:42 PM **Question Number - 8**

PG 29 and 34-approach concrete called out as QC2 bridge deck, concrete on bridge deck under LMC overlay called out as QC2 superstructure PG 23 approach concrete called out as QC2 bridge deck, concrete on bridge deck under LM overlay called out as QC2 bridge deck. QTY's for all 3 items on each bridge are exact same- 10 CY for superstructure and 7 CY for bridge deck. Just looking for clarification as to which concrete goes with which item.

**Item 511E34444 Class QC2 concrete, Bridge Deck is the quantity for the bridge deck portion of the pour only. Item 511E34410 Class QC2 concrete, Superstructure is the quantity for the backwall portion of the joint replacement and the bridge railing that is going to be replaced on top on both sides of the joint.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 10:26:36 AM **Question Number - 7**

Resubmitting Question #6: Can the department label where the proposed refurbish bearing devices and the reset bearing devices will occur. It makes a difference if they are at the abutment and or piers.

**The corrected answer for Question #6 is: See Sheet 26 & 35 under "Proposed Bearing Work" heading.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 7:31:32 AM **Question Number - 6**

Can the department label where the proposed refurbish bearing devices and the reset bearing devices will occur. It makes a difference if they are at the abutment and or piers.

**Reset and refurbished bearing locations are labeled on the site plan of each structure under the Notes heading. This tells which bearings are getting reset and which ones are getting refurbished as well as if they are abutment or pier bearings. Bearings are numbered left to right looking up station to pick out each particular bearing along an abutment or pier.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 4:02:54 PM **Question Number - 5**

Ref #40, #58, and #77 are for variable thickness latex material only. The qtys provide for over 3" of additional thickness. This is too high. Please lower these quantities.

**The concern over too much plan quantity is not understood. Variable depth quantities were calculated based off of field measured unsound areas. The thickness of the estimated variable depth quantity is calculated from the bottom of the uniform overlay thickness to ¾" below the top rebar. It is hoped that less depth is needed to be removed once hydrodemolition is complete, but the actual depth was included in estimated plan quantity conservatively. The variable depth will be around the existing bars, so the deep portions of these overlays will be reinforced, if that is the concern. Please bid per plan.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 8:33:45 AM **Question Number - 4**

Would the department allow for the new expansion joints to be galvanized as this would potentially allow and help the contractor to meet the schedule for this year's work?

**No. Bid per plan.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 11:58:02 AM **Question Number - 3**

Previous jobs in the district have required false decking under the bridge before any hydro demolition could be completed. Is the false decking required for this project?

**SS848.16 states the following: The Contractor is responsible for protecting traffic under and adjacent to the work on the bridge while removing deck concrete. District 7 does utilize a plan note that requires false decking when performing hydrodemolition over interstate traffic. The use of this note is due to concerns with the risk this operation poses to high volume routes and is regardless of the condition of the deck. As the structures on this project are not over interstate traffic, the criteria in SS846.16 is sufficient. The methods and means for how to accomplish this is left up to the Contractor.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 10:47:31 AM **Question Number - 2**

It appears that REF #7 quantity has been doubled. We believe it should be 8159 Ft. Summary tables pull from Sheet 5, 6, & 7, but sheet 5 is just a second statement of what is already recorded on Sheet 6 & 7.

**Ref #7 Rumble Strips, Shoulder (Asphalt Concrete), As Per Plan quantity will be revised in an upcoming addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 1:49:11 PM **Question Number - 1**

Please consider extending the interim completion date for the 2021 work on this job. We will need the date moved to at least Nov. 15th of 2021 due to longer lead times with fabricated items such as expansion joints. Currently the lead time for expansion joints is close to 4 months, meaning phase 1 joints won't be received until at least mid-September. Please consider extending the interim completion date or moving all work into the 2022 season.

**The interim completion date will be extended in the plans to 10/29/21 in an upcoming addenda.**

**Project No. 210305**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

MIA-108161 - N Hyatt St Repaving Project

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 9:18:27 AM **Question Number - 2**

Are temporary pavement markings not required for this project? There are no bid items for this work.

**Work Zone Center Line markings will be added to the plan in an upcoming addendum**

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 9:15:30 AM **Question Number - 1**

Are Asphalt and Fuel adjustments applicable to this project? They are not listed in the proposal.

**PN 520 Fuel Price Adjustment and PN 534 Asphalt Binder Price Adjustment will be added to the project in an upcoming addendum.**

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 210306

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

RIC-103717 - SR 309-06.36

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 11:09:45 PM **Question Number - 1**

This project has a completion date 5 months after the bid date. Since this project includes fabrication and installation of a TC-15.116 Overhead Truss we expect drawing preparation, fabrication, galvanizing, and delivery to require 6-1/2 to 7 months. Please extend the completion date to December to allow for the time required to fabricate the proposed sign structure.

**This question will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.**

Project No. 210308

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

SEN-110482 - US 224-11.98 Safety Grp A

**Question Submitted:** 4/23/2021 1:05:03 PM **Question Number - 1**

REF. 93 calls for (4) 30' Bracket Arms going on TC 81.22 poles that are installation only. Please advise if these are to be clamp on bracket arms or simplex bracket arms that have the 4 bolt simplex provisions.

**The lighting bracket arms, which are included with the poles, have the 4 bolt attachment design.**

Project No. 210309

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

HEN-109641 - N-SR 67/SR 109-02.68/21.06 RRFBs

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 1:26:14 PM **Question Number - 2**

Pay Item 20 is a for an accessible pushbutton for the RRFB crossing on plan page 9. IS it correct that the pusbutton onplan page 10 does not require an accessible button and should only be provided with a standard button. Also therefore the RRFB on plan page 9 should be provided without the standard button specified with it?

**The pushbutton on page 10 does not require accessible pushbuttons and should only be provided with the pushbuttons that are required for the RRFBs. Page 9 requires an accessible pushbutton for both individual pedestals. The pushbuttons provided with the RRFB's at this location will be acquired by ODOT for our inventory but will not be used at this location.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/29/2021 1:23:54 PM **Question Number - 1**

Pay Item 27 is a 3' pedestal. A 3' height would place the required pushbutton below the minium standard mounting height. Is te 3' height correct

**The pedestals height will be changed in the forthcoming addendum**

Project No. 210311

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

STA-96516 - US 62T-00.00

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 2:36:44 PM **Question Number - 2**

the project has 1000sy of 255 repairs. the maximum quantity for full depth sawing would be 4,500lf and not 6,000 as provided in the plans. please revise.

**Plan quantity will remain.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 2:34:37 PM **Question Number - 1**

what is the intent of placing the 12" concrete in 2 6" layers as per the 255 pavement repair note?

**An addendum will be issued to clarify.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 210312

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

VAN-109285 - CR 418-15.31

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 3:52:09 PM **Question Number - 2**

The plan note for Ref #7 Pavement Repair on sheet 4 states repair areas are transverse at an average depth of 1" and width of 2'. If these repairs are performed prior to the 1.25" pavement planing the depth doesn't seem sufficient. Is it possible that this is a typo and the average depth of the repair is supposed to be 1'? That would be sufficient to expose the concrete per the existing typical section on sheet 2.

**The intent is to have the pavement repair at 1" average depth AFTER planing is complete. Per a forthcoming addendum, clarification will be added to the "ITEM 253 PAVEMENT REPAIR" plan note in the General Notes found on Construction Plan sheet 4.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/4/2021 11:17:15 AM **Question Number - 1**

The proposal and the plans call for a 1.75" course of 441 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate, Type 1, (448). Is this the correct material or should it be Intermediate, Type 2, (448) ?

**In a forthcoming addendum, the 1.75" pavement course of 441 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate, Type 1, (448) will be changed to an Intermediate, Type 2, (448) course.**

Project No. 210313

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

WAY-110876 - US 30-20.15

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 11:12:39 AM **Question Number - 2**

On sheet 6, a note reads that "limits for excavation of unstable subgrade are shown and labeled on the cross sections". Can the department please clarify how that quantity is labeled and how it is separate from excavation and pavement removed quantities?

**Currently, global stabilization is shown on the typical sections to treat for both the unsuitable and unstable soils. This treatment is to excavate and replace 24" of subgrade as depicted with balloons 7, 8, 9A and 9B. Quantities for these items are already included in the pavement calculations and General Summary. The Cross sections are being revised in an upcoming Addendum to show and label the unsuitable and unstable soil. The unsuitable soil is under the proposed left turn lane in the median of US 30. All other areas are unstable soils. Addendum is forthcoming.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/12/2021 3:11:00 PM **Question Number - 1**

Typical sections on plan sheet 3 shows PG 76-22 binder in the 442 asphalt mixes. The general summary and proposal does not reflect that requirement. Which is correct?

**The 442 asphalt mixes should use PG 76-22 binder as shown on the typical sections. Addendum is forthcoming.**

Project No. 210314

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

BRO-109627 - US 52-02.51

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 2:04:17 PM **Question Number - 1**

Project requires clearing and grubbing but can't be cleared between 04/01/21-09/30/21. This project has a completion date of 09/27/21. Please clarify.

**The trees are down. Bid according to plan.**

Project No. 210316

Sale Date - 5/13/2021

CUY-103299 - LG FY2021

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 9:07:59 AM **Question Number - 3**

Can the Department please provide soil borings for the tower foundation locations?

**Any available boring logs for the light tower foundation locations can be found on the ODOT Transportation Information Mapping System (TIMS) website.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 4:08:08 PM **Question Number - 2**

For Bid Ref 031, will Cooper's VERD- C02H6-D-8-T3-7030-AP-20X be considered an approved equal to the specified luminaires.

**Cooper Verdeen style luminaires are on the ODOT approved product list and will be considered an approved equal.**

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

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/7/2021 8:41:10 AM **Question Number - 1**

B/R # 38 - Power Service, APP - Please provide the required amperage for each control center ( 11 ea. ) so that they can be accurately quoted.

**All control centers itemized under reference number 38 shall be equipped with a 100 amp main breaker and 60 amp branch breakers.**

**Project No. 210318**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

D01-113963 - CR FY21

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2021 11:36:29 AM **Question Number - 3**

Addendum No. 1 states to "Replace plan sheet 2, 4, 5, 6, & 7 of 7", however, revised plan sheets were not provided or listed. Could you please advise if these plan sheets were to be replaced with revised plans?

**Please see the following FTP site link <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/D01-113963/Please use Internet Explorer>.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 9:05:16 AM **Question Number - 2**

As noted on page 6 of the plans, the existing files that have been placed on the contract sales and estimating website under "other information" is too large of a file to download. Will the department please provide individual files for each location

**The larger noted existing plans electronic file has been broken up into several smaller electronic files. These smaller electronic files will be available from the Office of Contracts FTP site for the subject project for reference only.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 11:23:22 AM **Question Number - 1**

For the cured in place liner- would the owner be willing to accept CCCP as an alternative technology? This technology is a green technology and is just as strong as CIPP. More often than not- this technology is typically cheaper as well.

**Thank you for asking the question. ODOT District One has reviewed the request, and after some consideration, ODOT District One will not change the construction plans and/or bid documents to accept CCCP as an alternative. No plan change or addendum is needed. Bid according to the construction plans and related bid documents.**

**Project No. 210324**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

LUC-109330 - ODNR Maumee Bay State Park

**Question Submitted:** 5/11/2021 7:14:05 AM **Question Number - 1**

The note for Item 424-Fine Graded Polymer Asphalt Concrete, Type B, As Per Plan on sheet 3 states 100CY has been carried to the general summary to account for surface irregularities. It appears that this additional quantity has not been included, please confirm bid quantity.

**The quantity for Item 424 Fine Graded Asphalt Concrete , Type B, As per plan will be revised to 839 CY in an up coming addendum**

**Project No. 210328**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

ASD-102640 - US 250-11.61

**Question Submitted:** 4/30/2021 2:51:38 PM **Question Number - 1**

Could Valmont Con-Struct galvanized steel tub girders of the same size be bid as an equal to the designed 21" prestressed concrete box beams.

**The District will not permit the substitution of the planned PCBs with galvanized steel tub girders. No addendum required.**

**Project No. 210329**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

ATH-113934 - SR 13-11.33

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 1:53:32 PM **Question Number - 1**

The plan description calls for a B2B RRFB system but the drawings show a dual beacon (top and bottom) system. Wondering which system is correct? Thanks

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Project No. 210336**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

CRA-95577 - SR 100-22.23

**Question Submitted:** 5/3/2021 11:57:46 AM **Question Number - 1**

The proposal lists the completion date as 10/28/22. Is this correct?

**The listed completion date is incorrect and will be revised to 10/30/2021 in an upcoming addenda.**

**Project No. 210339**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

FAY-98139 - SR 41-00.47/02.32

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 3:03:48 PM **Question Number - 1**

Will the department allow the conduits crossing St Rt 41 to be capped on each end and filled with LSM instead of removal.

**No, the ex. conduits shall be removed per the plan.**

**Project No. 210341**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

HAM-106411 - IR 275-28.29 (PART 1 AND PART 2)

**Question Submitted:** 4/26/2021 2:08:53 PM **Question Number - 1**

In the unit pricing sheet and general summary ref #82 and 145-151 call for the old ODOT standard structures, (TC-17.10 & TC-81.10 respectively) whereas the cover sheet and plan note calls for the new standard. Please advise on which ODOT standard should be followed for quotation.

**See forthcoming addendum. The general summary will be updated to reflect the new standards.**

**Project No. 210349**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

SCI-109845 - /LAW-US 52-33.82/00.00

**Question Submitted:** 4/22/2021 3:47:54 PM **Question Number - 1**

There are no matching items 850 Grooving for 4" (Asphalt) per mile, 6" (Asphalt) per mile, 12" (Asphalt) per foot, 6" (Asphalt) per foot, and 6" (Concrete) per mile, for the Wet Reflective Thermoplastic 6" per mile, 4" per mile, 12" per foot, 6" per foot, and Wet Reflective Epoxy 6" per mile quantities. These items must match exactly. Can these errors be corrected?

**This question will be addressed by addendum.**

**Project No. 210354**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

BRO-96804 - SR 221-06.80 Landslide Site

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 2:08:35 PM **Question Number - 2**

Reference is made to BRO-505-5.97 completion date and our start date. We cannot start until BRO-505-5.97 is complete & open to traffic. When does BRO-505-5.97 complete and open to traffic?

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 2:06:38 PM **Question Number - 1**

Have the trees that need to be removed been fallen by others? Since the "federal bat tree" rule is in effect and the completion date is 10-31-21-there is no way to perform any clearing before the project completes. Please clarify clearing restrictions\dates.

**Project No. 210358**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

D08-101025 - TSG FY2021/FY2022

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 6:35:02 PM **Question Number - 1**

On page 3 of the plans under School Speed Limit Sign Assembly, Solar Powered, a plan note states "Provide a AP21 GPS timer that satisfies the requirements of CMS 731.10 and is listed on the ODOT Qualified Products List." The Electrotechnics Corporation (ELTEC) TC-18 time clock is listed on the Traffic Approved Products List under CMS 731.10. Please advise if the Eltec TC-18 clock will be acceptable for this project. Also, please clarify the intent of the "GPS" listing in the referenced plan note.

**Proprietary approval is pending for the AP21 timer for the project. GPS is not required for the project.**

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



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Project No. 210360**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

D09-114145 - PR-FY2022

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 7:20:48 AM **Question Number - 2**

Is this job subject to prevailing wage?

**Please see Proposal Note 049 in the Proposal.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 7:20:07 AM **Question Number - 1**

The bid line item calls for 608 -18" (odot spec 12-24") trees to be removed. If the trees are greater than 24 inches how will the contractor be compensated?

**Bid according to plan.**

**Project No. 218004**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

BEL-108722 - CR 4-04.34/05.15

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 3:13:01 PM **Question Number - 2**

The sequence of construction note on sheet 6/20 states, "The contractor is to close down CR 4 and detour traffic as described in the plans." There is no other information provided in the plans for the detour routes. Please provide the detours and required signing for both phases.

**The Contractor will not be responsible for any detour signing.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/5/2021 5:19:06 PM **Question Number - 1**

On plan sheet 11, there are existing poles and overhead electric lines called out where the proposed wall is to be constructed. There are not any notes in the plans or proposal regarding utility relocation. Will all utilities in conflict of construction be relocated by the utility owner, at the utility owners expense, prior to award of the contract?

**Please refer to the Utility Note? Depending on the utility there are some being relocated prior to construction and some being relocated during construction once notified by the contractor.**

**Project No. 218005**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

BEL-108720 - CR 24-00.71

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 3:10:52 PM **Question Number - 4**

Would the department consider extending the closure to 60 days? If the soil nail testing process consumes a week, each of the 3 rows (lifts) of soil nails consumes a week each and adding time for shotcrete cure; 30 days does not seem to provide enough time for the balance of the work to be performed.

**The closure has been increased to 45 days.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 3:03:30 PM **Question Number - 3**

This project allows for a 30 day closure with local traffic access. If soil nail testing consumes a week, each row (lift) of soil nails consuming a week, and adding time for shotcrete curing the closure period appears to not account for the balance of the the work to be performed, or weather days.60 days of closure would be more practical.

**The closure has been increased to 45 days.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 2:59:17 PM **Question Number - 2**

This project allows for a 30 day closure with local traffic access. If soil nail testing consumes a week, each row (lift) of soil nails consuming a week, and adding time for shotcrete curing the closure period appears to not account for the balance of the the work to be performed, or weather days.60 days of closure would be more practical.

**The closure has been increased to 45 days.**

## Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/1/2021 2:23:26 PM **Question Number - 1**

Would the department consider decreasing the work type percentage performed by prime? If a subcontractor is utilized to meet the contractor soil nailing experience requirements in addition to paving, guardrail, and maintenance of traffic subcontractors - the work type percentage performed by prime may be unattainable.

**The prime percentage will be lowered to 35% in a forthcoming addendum.**

**Project No. 218009**

**Sale Date - 5/13/2021**

WAS-110114 - SR 26-25.10

**Question Submitted:** 5/10/2021 2:44:48 PM **Question Number - 1**

Why is Reference No. 0023 a Type 1 Impact Attenuator. Shouldn't this be a Type 2?

**Project No. 218010**

**Sale Date - 5/27/2021**

HAM-111202 - US 127 9.67

**Question Submitted:** 5/6/2021 7:18:25 AM **Question Number - 1**

Will there be any plans issued for this project?

**The plans are now available online**