



12/18/2020

Project 213000 **Addendum No. 4**
PID No. 102329
SUM - SR 8/IR 76/IR 77 - 0.63/9.74/8.42
Major Reconstruction
Letting: March 4, 2021

Notice to all Bidders and Suppliers to please be advised of the attached Proposal Addendum.

The Department utilizes Bid Express (<http://www.bidx.com>) as the official medium for electronic bid submittal. All bidders must prepare bids and submit them online via Bid Express using AASHTOWare Project Bids software.

Addenda amendments must be acknowledged in the miscellaneous section of the Project Bids file and all amendments loaded in order for your bid to be considered for award of this project. Bid express will not accept bids that do not have amendments incorporated. Failure to incorporate changed quantities or items in your Project Bids submissions will result in the rejection of your bid.

**Proposal Addendum
For
SR 8/IR 76/IR 77-00.63/09.74/08.42; PID 102329
Project 21-3000**

Completion Date Change: No

Please be advised of the following:

1. Replace “*Instructions To Offerors (ITO) For Request For Proposals*” with the revised version (In addition, a marked up version is included that shows the revisions to the document that have changed since the last version)
2. Replace “*Design Build Scope of Services*” with the revised version (In addition, a marked up version is included that shows the revisions to the document that have changed since the last version)
3. Replace “*Attachment A—Design and Construction Requirements: Structures*” with the revised version (In addition, a marked up version is included that shows the revisions to the document that have changed since the last version)
4. Replace “*Attachment B—Preliminary Roadway Plans*” with the revised version (In addition, a marked up version is included that shows the revisions to the document that have changed since the last version)
5. Replace “*Attachment C -- Central Interchange Plans (SUM-76/77/8-10.99/11.54/0.00)*” with the revised version (In addition, a marked up version is included that shows the revisions to the document that have changed since the last version)
6. Replace “*Attachment F—Required Plan Notes*” with the revised version (In addition, a marked up version is included that shows the revisions to the document that have changed since the last version)
7. Replace “*Attachment O—Maintenance of Traffic*” with the revised version (In addition, a marked up version is included that shows the revisions to the document that have changed since the last version)

Files referenced above are located on the ODOT FTP Site at
<ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D04/102329/Addendums/04/>

Add the following Note: No

Answers to Prebid Questions: Yes

(The inclusion of the question(s) in this addendum is provided for reference only and shall not be construed as a contract modification or change.)

Q39: In response to the Departments change to Attachment O, Table 1 – Lane/Ramp Closure, the MOT issue indicated in Pre-Bid Question # 27, asked November 19th

still leaves concerns associated with performing the work on RT 8. Please consider the following as one concern related to the available roadway width on RT 8 NB & SB under the CI. Two major drilled shaft pier units need to be constructed on the centerline of RT 8, along with relocations of large storm sewer lines to accommodate this work. On RT 8 NB & SB roadway, the available widths are 40' each direction. Per scope we can reduce to 2 each 11' lanes, 1' clear distances, 2' PCB, and 2-2.5' for the asphalt stepping detail. This uses no less than 28' of roadway, leaving 12' in each direction, and another 4' to centerline of roadway, totaling 16'. The new pier columns are 8' diameter, taking another 4' away from the 16', leaves 12' of space on each side to work with. Barely enough to fit some equipment past and not enough for others, i.e. drilled shaft rig. Move to the following phase and we would not have constructed enough roadway to carry even 1 each, 11' lane with PCB. The original SOS appears to have planned around using the PLCC for mill/fill work, which is feasible. Has the Department reviewed any other options to maintain this movement of traffic during a full roadway replacement schedule? One constructible option would include a single lane maintained in each direction, with a posted detour directing traffic around the Kenmore Leg/IR 277 route? Please consider the complexity of the concern at hand.

A39: The department has evaluated the proposed work on SR-8 and the PLCC shall be followed as stated in Attachment O. Attachment O will be updated in the next addendum to state maximum ramp closures of Ramp S (NB 8 to Carroll/Fountain St) and Ramp T-1 (Carroll St/Goodkirk St to SB 8).

Q46: Ramp N (77NB to Fredrick Blvd) is allowed a 4-day ramp closure per Attachment O, 2.2.10.c. This is not enough time to reconstruct the ramp and adjacent mainline pavement without multiple phases. Can the Department extend the ramp closure to 5 weeks to allow for complete reconstruction without phasing?

A46: Ramp N closure duration will be updated in the next addendum.

Q47: Attachment O Table 1 details lane closure restrictions for I-76 WB from SR-8 to Inman St. However, this does not account for reconstruction work east of Inman. Please update the table to extend the lane closure to include the project work limits.

A47: Attachment O will be updated in the next addendum to state more clearly that reconstruction of 76WB east of Inman St shall follow the PLCC.

Q52: As a follow up PBQ No. 28 and 40. With preliminary drainage spread calculations requiring additional median inlet drainage, the current SOS does not provide the necessary MOT allowances for this level of work to be performed, and the PLCC allowances are not sufficient. Required improvements will include new median inlets, replacement median barrier and shoulder, and lateral drainage, but most importantly is the access to perform any of this work. Based on the response provided to PBQ 40, the District intends for this level of work to be performed. Will the District clarify, with a revision to the SOS, the additional work, time and MOT allowances necessary to reconstruct the median of SR-8 between Beacon and Carroll?

- A52: The department has evaluated the proposed work on SR-8 and the PLCC shall be followed as stated in Attachment O. Attachment O will be updated in the next addendum to state maximum ramp closures of Ramp S (NB 8 to Carroll/Fountain St) and Ramp T-1 (Carroll St/Goodkirk St to SB 8).
- Q54: Per Attachment O, 2.3, 2., the new pedestrian bridge south of Lafollette St. is to be in service prior to Lafollette St. demo. Heritage trail, North of the ped. bridge, both forward and rear, cannot be opened as the retaining walls supporting the trail cannot be constructed until the Lafollette St. Structure is demolished. Will the District provide clarification that the trail will not be available North of the ped. bridge until after the demolition of Lafollette?
- A54: Clarification will be provided in Attachment O as part of the next addendum.
- Q55: Project Scope Section 14.7.2.2 states that PART 2 Drainage is to be performed in accordance with the plans and provisions as shown in Attachment C. Section 14.7.2.2 goes on to state that the requirements shown for PART 1 for drainage will apply. Section 14.7.2.1.4 for PART 1 states that reuse of existing drainage structures/pips/etc. within the areas of full depth replacement is NOT permitted which is contradictory to what is shown in several locations in the Attachment C Plans. Please advise if existing drainage features may be reused as shown in Attachment C, or if there are to be replaced according to Scope Section 14.7.2.1.4.
- A55: Clarification to the Scope of Services will be made in a future addendum. It is not the intent to replace drainage conduits and structures denoted in Attachment C to remain and be reused in the areas of full depth pavement replacement shown in Attachment C.
- Q59: Per 6.2 in the scope of services for part two the DBT is to provide the scope of attachment C. The state provided engineered calcs for part two that conflict with the typical sections provided (ramp N). Which is the intent for the State, the build up by typical sections or what is shown on the engineered calcs?
- A59: The Pavement Buildup shown in the Typical Sections is to be used. Clarification will be made to the Scope of Services in the next addendum.
- Q60: Please confirm whether the disposition of utilities in Attachment B are for reference only and are not contractual obligations on the DBT? Specifically the disposition of "DO NOT DISTURB" for the aerial powerlines over I-76/77 at Manchester and the aerial transmission lines over I-76/77 from Bowery to Lake Shore. If one or both of these dispositions are required, please update the scope of services clarifying the commitment by ODOT to accommodate these utilities.
- A60: The disposition of utilities in Attachment B is for reference only. It is up to the DBT to coordinate the utilities as per the Scope of Services. The aerial transmission lines at Lakeshore Blvd shall not be disturbed, provisions for this will be added to the Scope of Services on a future addendum.

- Q61: Addendum #3 revised Attachment "O" Table 1 maximum lane/ramp closure duration for I-76 WB (Sta 530+75 – Inman Street). The reduction of 2 lanes to 1 can now only occur for a maximum of 45 days. This work must be phased and 22.5 days for phase 1 and 22.5 days for phase 2 is not enough time to complete pavement reconstruction, including cement stabilization and cure. Please revise the maximum lane reduction duration to 90 days to allow for sufficient time to complete this work.
- A61: A revision to the number of days will be in the next addendum.
- Q66: Scope 14.7.2.1.2.f: When concrete barrier is proposed in the median, underdrains are to be placed on both sides of the concrete barrier. Attachment B - Preliminary Plans typical sections show a single run of underdrain at the median barrier. Please confirm if the Department will accept a single run of median underdrain with the aggregate layer sloped to provide positive drainage.
- A66: The requirement in Scope of Services Section 14.7.2.1.2.f for underdrains on both sides of median barrier will be removed in a future addendum
- Q68: Section 8.1 of the scope says to use the current edition, including updates released on or before the Announcement of the Shortlist, of the following ODOT manuals... 1. Bridge Design Manual. This would be BDM 2020 effective 07-17-20. The scope documents for this job seem to reference the 2007 BDM. Example being sealing in Scope Attachment A references 302.1.4.3 for Epoxy Urethane Sealer. Could the Department check and revise references to ODOT BDM in the project documents?
- A68: The BDM effective 07/17/2020 is the proper BDM to be used for this project. The Department will review the documents and make the appropriate revisions in a future addendum.
- Q69: Attachment O - section 4.1 calls for a 1.5" milling and paving using 442 Surface, 12.5mm, Type B, APP if the existing shoulder pavement meets the requirements of 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic, Class A. The plan note in Attachment F (#7 & #8) includes APP notes for 442 Surface, 12.5mm, Type A mixes. What material is intended to be used for these areas?
- A69: The material specified in Attachment O is to be used. A plan note will be added to Attachment F for the material in a future addendum.