

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

Project No. 240438

Sale Date - 9/26/2024

GRE-105675 - IR 675-14.91

**Question Submitted:** 8/21/2024 11:26:34 AM

There are no permitted lane closure, permitted ramp working times or any other time restrictions listed in the plans. Can the department please clarify any time restrictions pertaining to the project?

Project No. 240441

Sale Date - 9/26/2024

HAN-98521 - SR 568-02.88/03.63

**Question Submitted:** 8/19/2024 4:05:27 PM

Will the Department consider allowing this work to take place outside of the given work window of 6/1/2025 - 8/1/2025?

**The contractor will be permitted to work on the project prior to the start of the road closure period. In a forthcoming addendum a row will be added to the Window Contract Table that allows all work on the project (including the road closure work) from 5/1/2025 to 8/1/2025. Additionally, the addendum will change the completion date to 8/1/2025. The road closure for this project can't start until 6/1 due to a project on the detour route (SR 37) that is scheduled prior. The closure and all remaining work are required to be completed by 8/1 due to the HAN-Greenway Trail Extension 3 project which will construct a multi-use bridge adjacent to the HAN-568-3.63 bridge. Also note there is a Coordination of Contractors note on sheet 8 of the plans that discusses coordination with the Greenway Trail Extension project.**

Project No. 240446

Sale Date - 9/26/2024

MRW-118889 - SR 314-04.02

**Question Submitted:** 8/20/2024 4:00:08 PM

The typicals for the repairs located on sheet 4 show that one of the repair depths is 3.25". This matches the depth stated in the proposal, the plan notes, and the general summary. The pavement subsummary on sheet 12, however, indicates that the repair depth is 3". Could the department please clarify the correct depth for this repair item?

**3.25" is the correct depth, the Pavement Subsummary is incorrect. This will be addressed in a forthcoming addendum.**

Project No. 240456

Sale Date - 9/26/2024

LUC-114413 - /OTT Sign FY2025

**Question Submitted:** 8/20/2024 11:08:53 AM

I see that several of the foundations were changed on addendum 1. Is there soil boring information available for the deep foundations? Also, plans indicate that 2 of the overhead foundations are in the median barrier. How are those items to be paid for along with the transitions and the MOT required to remove and replace the barrier wall sections.

**Geotechnical report is being finalized and will soon be posted. New pay items will be added through a forthcoming addendum.**

Project No. 243005

Sale Date - 8/29/2024

GRE-115388 - - US 68 - 12.65 ITO/RFP

**Question Submitted:** 8/22/2024 10:04:51 AM

Under the Design Build Scope of Services, Item 690E20250 Special - Miscellaneous Pavement DB (1 LS) is not mentioned. Please clarify what is to be included in this item of work.

**Question Submitted:** 8/20/2024 4:43:56 PM

ODOT Initiate Question - Clarification for QC/QA Concrete testing

**Concrete testing for QC/QA items for concrete items exceeding the QC/QA thresholds per the CMS and design requirements shall be incidental to the cost of concrete. All structural concrete will likely be QC/QA concrete. Quantities are not itemized by ODOT, however, concrete quantities that exceed the thresholds may require QC/QA concrete. If total concrete for do not exceed thresholds, ODOT will perform QC testing. A pay item will not be included and shall be incidental to the original pay item.**

\*\*\* 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:** 8/20/2024 10:03:21 AM

How will the Department pay for concrete testing for QC/QA items and non QC/QA items? There is no bid item for non QC/QA testing.

**Concrete testing for QC/QA items shall be incidental to the cost of concrete. All concrete will likely be QC/QA concrete as all concrete is paid for under major singular Lump Sum pay items (example LS-Roadway / LS-Structure). Quantities are not itemized by ODOT, however, the Department anticipates total concrete quantities will exceed the thresholds requiring QC/QA per original pay item. If total concrete for original Pay Items do not exceed thresholds, ODOT will perform QC testing.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/19/2024 7:51:09 AM

All drawings in Appendix M appear to generally show the same details for the graphics except for Elevation Details-Span#1. This drawing generally matches the current Span #1 truss requirements but does not match what is shown in the renderings or other drawing for the graphics. The ribbon has fewer turns and is a larger scale. The lettering is larger and stretched to fit across the truss. The medallions appear to be the same size in both drawings and renderings. Both the Elevation Details-Span#1 and Federal Color Palette Legend have scales to get approximate dimensions but they do not match. This will also cause the light fixture to be in different locations across the bottom chord of the truss. Please clarify which drawing and/or rendering the graphics are to be based on.

**The graphic details provided for in Appendix M - Elevation Details-Span#1, are what the graphics shall be based on.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/15/2024 12:56:51 PM

There is a fenced in construction storage area on the east side of US 68 within the limits of the proposed bridge. When will this area be removed from the site?

**This area is owned and temporarily being used by ODNR. This storage area will already be removed, upon the ODOT DBT taking over the project site.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/15/2024 12:56:14 PM

Appendix M, Architectural Concept Renderings, shows a railing along US 68 at the termination of the west approach SUP. Please clarify if this railing is a contractual requirement as it appears to be within the clear zone of US 68.

**Agreed. The cited section of railing is located within the CZ and poses a hazard to SB US68 traffic and shall not be installed as illustrated.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/15/2024 12:55:36 PM

DBSOS Section 10.2, Joint Utility Bank, states to backfill the trench with LSM and the trench must have a minimum depth of 42". Can the Department please clarify to what depth the LSM shall be backfilled?

**LSM shall be backfilled within the trench to a minimum of 24 inches. Any minor void areas resulting between the proposed top elevation of the 6" concrete walk and the bottom elevation of the 4" of 304 aggregate base can be filled with Item 304.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/15/2024 12:55:07 PM

The SUP in front of the Interpretive Center appears to be asphalt. DBSOS Section 12 requires 6" concrete for the SUP after Sta 99+32. If the SUP is impacted by the utility bank construction, shall it be replaced using asphalt or concrete?

**Any impacts made to the referenced existing section of the SUP shall be replaced by concrete matching the abutting project SUP along the west side of US68.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/15/2024 12:54:40 PM

Due to the addition of the joint utility bank in DBSOS Section 10.2, construction will impact the driveways and SUP in front of the Interpretive Center. Can the Department please clarify to what extent the SUP and driveways shall be replaced?

**If the existing concrete drive apron is impacted, then concrete shall be replaced back to the closet joint. If the existing asphalt SUP is impacted do not replace with asphalt but rather replace the SUP with concrete matching this ODOT project SUP material called for in the SOS.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/15/2024 12:54:14 PM

Due to the addition of the joint utility bank in DBSOS Section 10.2, construction will impact the two driveways to the Interpretive Center. Can the Department please clarify the requirement for maintaining access to the Interpretive Center?

**Input from ODNR is pending. It appears that if space on the adjacent gravel lot can be coordinated to use for special events (i.e., school field trips to the center), then only one drive will need to remain open at a time. ODNR will provide final direction.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 8/12/2024 11:14:56 AM

We have all the info and the addendum is uploaded to ODOT's website fine, but EBS and addendum still list the August 14th as the bid date, can that be updated? The scope etc. and all that had it updated to the August 29th date, but did state Tuesday August 29th, where Tuesday is the 27th and Thursday is the 29th, can all that please be cleared up?

**An addendum will be posted shortly updating the bid date to Thursday, August 29th, 2024.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/9/2024 2:52:53 PM

It does not appear the added files for Appendix H from Addendum 9 have been added to the ITP site. These files are "8-5-24-AES-PrelimRelocationPlan" and "IC\_revSanitary&WaterConnections".

**The ITP site will be updated. They are available under the provided public link:<https://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Districts/D08/115388/AppendiciesPID115388>**

**Question Submitted:** 8/8/2024 11:45:44 AM

DBSOS Section 13, Roadway, states all driveway locations shall have their existing aprons replaced. However, the feasibility study in Appendix C does not include replacing driveways at 96+50 RT and 96+90 RT. Can the Department please clarify the limits of driveway apron replacement?

**The cited driveway locations are the new driveway access points for the new Interpretive Center. The two drives do not need to be replaced unless they suffer damage as a result of the project construction operations.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/8/2024 11:39:54 AM

DBSOS Section 10.1, Existing Utilities, states Greene Co. Water and Sewer and Green Co. Sanitary will incur any costs associated with impacts resulting from the project work. It appears the project will require at a minimum water valve boxes to be adjusted and fire hydrants to be relocated. Please confirm this is not to be included in the bid for this project and will be paid for by the County.

**All costs associated with relocating the water and sewer will be covered by Greene Co. No bid item for this work is needed to be included in the project bid.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/7/2024 8:11:22 AM

There are existing overhead utilities east of US68, over proposed span 3 that are scheduled to be relocated. Please confirm where these utilities will be relocated to.

**AES will terminate the overhead power lines at two poles outside of the construction limits and re-route the service. A terminating pole will be located to the north of span #3 and will re-route service to the power lines north of the work site. Likewise, another terminating pole will be located to the south of the work limits, with service being re-routed to the southern power lines. This provides for a gap in the overhead lines such that no overhead lines will be over span #3 and they will be located outside of the work limits.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/6/2024 3:22:04 PM

Please remove DBSOS Section 16, Landscaping, from the scope and the associated bid item from the EBS file. Per the answered prebid questions, seeding and mulching is the minimum requirement which falls under DBSOS Section 14.3 and bid item for 659 Permanent Erosion Control.

**Landscaping pay item will be removed from scope of work and reflected in the forthcoming Addendum-009.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/6/2024 12:54:59 PM

Will the bridge lighting be powered from a control center, per STD DWG HL-40.20? If so, will a ground mounted cabinet (per HL-40.20, Page 3 of 4) be required?

**STD DWG HL-40.20 applies, including sheet 3 of 4.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/6/2024 8:09:30 AM

Do the large trees in front of the houses between the proposed bridge and Brush Row Rd need to be removed? Please clarify the clearing limits along US 68.

**Yes. They are within the RW and pose a poor intersection sight distance issue.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 8/6/2024 7:56:38 AM

Due to answers to recent pre-bid questions some of the scope has been made more clear and has opened up more options to contractors for constructability. Please consider extending the bid date so contractors have time to vet out these options.

**The Department will be issuing Addenda 9 adding the requirement of the design and installation of a conduit bank by the DBT and the addition of an additional virtual Pre-Proposal One-on-One Discussion (anticipated for Aug 15 2024). The conduit bank will be designed and installed by the DBT, however, the DBT will be required to assist in the coordination with the overhead utilities immediately along US-68; the utility companies will be required to perform the relocation into the DBT constructed conduit bank. The added Pre-Proposal One-on-One discussion will be a forum for the Shortlisted Offeror to discuss Project requirement revisions occurring after the PTI Discussion Meeting which may have impacted the Shortlisted Offeror's initial approach to the Project. The Technical Proposal requirements will not be modified. The Technical Proposal and Price Due date will be adjusted to Aug 29, 2024. The Department anticipates the "Scores Announced" date to be adjust to approximately Sept 6 2024.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/2/2024 2:43:45 PM

What are the limits of the anti-graffiti sealer? Is this to be on just the substructure or the entire structure?

**The coloring will look different between sealed and unsealed surfaces, so in order to maintain consistent coloring, the limits include the entire structural/substructure concrete surfaces.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/2/2024 2:41:49 PM

Is the DBT to design the catch basin spacing on US 68 based on spread calculations for the future 1 FT shoulder lane configuration?

**Yes. Language will be added to the DBSOS to clarify this point in the forthcoming Addendum-009.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/1/2024 2:35:24 PM

Will the DBT be responsible for the work involved with relocating the overhead utilities underground?

**Yes. Details describing the required work, scheduling, notifications, power connection responsibility, etc. will be provided in the forthcoming Addendum-009.**

**Question Submitted:** 8/1/2024 8:41:55 AM

The scope calls out for post mounted wood fencing on spans 2, 3, and 4 of the bridge. Will the metal base plate/foot need to be galvanized and painted, or what is the treatment/aesthetic scheme for this metal base plate for the wood railing/fencing?

**The metal base plate/foot for the post mounted wood fencing on spans 2, 3, and 4 will need to be galvanized and painted to match the same color as the fence in order to provide for a uniform appearance.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/31/2024 11:05:13 PM

Will the Department require any portable changeable message boards. If so how many are required and for what duration?

**The contractor may choose to use portable message boards for notice of closure regarding the short/intermediate term road closures, per TEM 642-8. If used, the contractor shall provide 2 portable message boards during each short/intermediate term road closure to provide detour information.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/31/2024 9:57:22 PM

Please confirm that all the sealer is to be 512 Epoxy-Urethane with an anti-graffiti coating. Is this anti-graffiti coating required on the concrete beams or only on substructure elements?

**The 512 Epoxy-urethane coating includes all concrete surfaces, including the concrete beams.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/31/2024 9:48:57 PM

What is the difference between Section 10 and Section 11 of the bid reference items. The proposal lists two structure file numbers: Section 10 is SFN 2901139 with REF # 20-24, and then Section 11 is SFN 2926107 REF # 25-29. Where does the one pedestrian bridge split structure file numbers and which REF #'s should be used for what section of the bridge, or can one of the sections be deleted?

**The pedestrian bridge was assigned two SFNs to differentiate the final ownership and maintenance responsibilities between ODOT and ODNR. Per the DBSOS, SFN 2901139 is assigned to span #1, reference numbers 20-24, and SFN 2926107 is assigned to spans #2, #3 and #4, reference numbers 25-29. Please bid as per plan.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 7/31/2024 2:09:13 PM

Please confirm that ODOT wants 6 luminaires on each side of the bridge, or do they only want lighting on one side of the bridge for span 1?

**Yes. Per the aesthetic renderings, provide for 6 luminaries on each side of Span #1.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/31/2024 2:04:18 PM

Will ODOT require the underside of the corrugated metal deck in span 1 to be painted or will it be allowed to remain galvanized like typical metal decking under a pedestrian bridge.

**In accordance with the aesthetic renderings and the scope language, all structural steel members shall utilize a two-coat paint system (epoxy/urethane).**

**Question Submitted:** 7/30/2024 4:17:31 PM

The aesthetic renderings appear to show relief and setbacks indicating individual block courses as they step back along the batter. Are these horizontal steps between block courses required? Is a wall battered at the required 8:1 rate with a traditional formliner application acceptable? This would provide the desired block pattern, but would not provide the 'steps' between individual block courses as shown in the renderings. All individual block faces would follow the batter, they would not be vertical.

**Having a formliner which appears to have the individual courses without horizontal setbacks will generally meet the intent of the aesthetic requirements, however, the overall batter of the wall must remain.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/30/2024 11:50:55 AM

DBSOS Section 19.1, Pavement Markings and Delineators, states to remove and replace existing pavement markings in kind. It appears the existing pavement markings on US 68 are paint. Can the Department please confirm the new pavement markings are to be 642 paint?

**"In-kind" is to be interpreted as in the same location as the existing longitudinal pavement markings. Edge line and center line paint last applied entailed Item 644, and would again on a newly paved surface.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/29/2024 3:28:11 PM

Please add a bid item for 878 compaction testing per DBSOS Section 15.6.

**EBS file will be updated via an addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/29/2024 3:09:44 PM

It appears the asbestos abatement, building demolished, and lighting bid items still exist in the EBS file. Please update the EBS file to reflect the removal of these items.

**EBS file will be updated via an addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/25/2024 4:17:44 PM

In accordance with SS 870 and SS 840, please confirm there are no ODOT approved modular block and/or MSE wall systems that can meet the aesthetic requirements of this project.

**The DBT is responsible for choosing a wall system which meets the aesthetic requirements of the Project. The Department will not confirm nor deny this question without knowing the DBT's final design.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/25/2024 4:17:14 PM

In accordance with SS 870 and SS 840, the only modular block wall systems currently approved by the Department provide blocks that are approximately 46" wide, 18" tall, with a 5-degree batter - OR - panels that can be have custom formliner/pattern included to match the desired aesthetic dimensions, with 0-degree batter (vertical face). Please confirm none of these systems are acceptable for use on this project.

**A wall "system" with a final overall constructed 5-degree batter would not meet the aesthetic requirements of the required batter depicted in Appendix M. A wall "system" with a final constructed 0-degree batter (vertical face) would not meet the aesthetic requirements of the required batter depicted in Appendix M.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/25/2024 3:26:35 PM

DBSOS Section 11.3, Traffic Engineering Manual Notes, includes note 642-25 for Designated Local Detour Route. Is a local detour route necessary for this project? If so, what quantities should be assumed to be used "as directed by the engineer"? Please consider setting up bid items for local detour route paving separate from the LS items.

**Quantities will be set up in the forthcoming Addendum-008.**

\*\*\* 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:** 7/25/2024 3:24:42 PM

DBSOS Section 11.3, Traffic Engineering Manual Notes, includes 642-22 and 642-23 for replacement sign and drum. The note does not seem to apply to this project. Per the Designer Note: This note shall be used on all four-lane, high-speed projects which will last longer than six months, and on other projects where there is a high probability that a number of signs will be damaged during construction. Can these notes please be eliminated?

**These notes will be removed in the forthcoming Addendum-008.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/25/2024 3:23:19 PM

DBSOS Section 11.3, Traffic Engineering Manual Notes, includes 642-9 for quantities to be "as directed by the engineer." If temporary drive surfaces are required, what quantity of 410 and 614 should be assumed to be used "as directed by the engineer"? Please consider setting up bid items for these items separate from the LS items.

**Quantities will be set up in the forthcoming Addendum-008.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/23/2024 3:25:22 PM

Are the outermost southern retaining wall, and western most retaining wall in the pedestrian ramp area required to be battered?

**All retaining wall surfaces require an 8:1 batter as illustrated in the aesthetic renderings.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/23/2024 3:22:43 PM

Section 19.3.B has a bid item for reinstalling the luminaire at Brush Row Road. However, in Section 10.1 of the scope, it states that prior to construction Miami Valley Lighting will be reinstalling the luminaire at Brush Row Road as part of AES's relocation project. Please clarify if there is additional lighting work included with this item.

**The referenced lighting item has been removed and the revised DBSOS will be forthcoming in Addendum-007.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/23/2024 8:24:00 AM

Please provide who was consulted during the preliminary design phase to fabricate & install the guilloche ribbon shown in the renderings in Appendix M to meet the aesthetic requirements. Constructing these of individual strips up to 1" thick in aluminum is not achievable as intended. Allow the contractor to meet the intent of the renderings using acceptable industry standards for design, fabrication, installation and safety.

**The Department may be accepting of thicknesses less than 1" (but not less than ½") for lettering and the guilloche ribbon, if there are not readily available standard materials. However, the thickness of the emblem must remain nearly 1" to ensure the required milling to achieve the outlined pattern (approximate 1/4" width with a ¼" depth), so that the interior emblem's shapes can be properly machined without compromising the integrity of the 6'8" emblem.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/22/2024 3:39:47 PM

Matching batter and look of the rear abutment and west approach embankment retaining walls will likely require the use of small modular blocks. It is not clear that these smaller blocks would be considered as an accredited PMRW system as defined in SS 870. Will the use of smaller modular blocks (ex: Allan Block or equivalent) for the retaining wall system be allowed by the Department?

**The bidding documents are depicting a required final aesthetic treatment; the bidding documents are not specifying any final retaining wall system. Any retaining wall systems meeting the aesthetic requirements and which are approved for use by the Department will be allowed.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/22/2024 12:53:44 PM

DBSOS 19.3.A states "The installed bridge lighting system shall be separate and independent from the street lighting along US68 and shall be connected to the lighting system associated with the adjacent interpretive center." Connection to the interpretive center will require coring into the building and disturbing the new pavement and landscaping at the center. Please consider connecting the lighting system to the AES pole located north of the proposed bridge or provide details on how the connection to the interpretive center lighting system is to be made.

**Agreed. DBSOS language shall be revised to stipulate that the lighting system for the bridge will be connected to the closet AES pole located to the north of the bridge, under the forthcoming Addendum-007.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 7/22/2024 9:43:14 AM

DBSOS 19.3.B lists an item for street lighting to be included as lump sum with the only work under this item being the re-installation of the luminaire at the US 68 / Brush Row Rd intersection. DBSOS 10.1 has this luminaire being reinstalled on an AES relocated pole prior to award. Please remove the lump sum lighting item.

**agreed. Language will be revised in forthcoming Addendum-007.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/22/2024 9:42:09 AM

Can the department verify that the lighted night view of the bridge is using light fixtures with a minimum output of 8,000 lumens? In our experience 8,000 lumens would provide a much brighter condition than is suggested in the rendering.

**The minimum output for the light fixtures is 8000 lumens.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/22/2024 9:41:09 AM

Based on the renderings added in Addendum 5 (document - Lighting Placement on Span #1), it appears that the architect had a specific lighting fixture in mind. Can the department provide the fixture and/or manufacturer?

**Only approved lighting components will be used. No manufacturer was specified.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/21/2024 4:57:31 PM

Section 19.3.B has a bid item for reinstalling the luminaire at Brush Row Road. However, in Section 10.1 of the scope, it states that prior to construction Miami Valley Lighting will be reinstalling the luminaire at Brush Row Road as part of AES's relocation project. Please clarify if there is additional lighting work included with this item.

**Given the luminaire at Brush Row Rd. will be relocated as a part of AES's relocation, this lighting item has been removed from the DBSOS. The revisions will be forthcoming in Addendum-007.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:24:44 PM

Scuppers are currently required at the end of each span to minimize drainage flowing over the joints. Considering the limited locations to drop the collected water and the need for a closed system at the rear abutment, can ODOT please reconsider that this requirement is truly desired and intended? Can the number of scuppers be reduced if the DBT can demonstrate through calculations that a minimum 2'-0" dry path is maintained as suggested in Section 14?

**Scuppers are required for the long-term structural integrity of the joints and must be provided. Additional scuppers may be necessary to maintain a minimum 2' dry path. It is understood that a closed system at the rear abutment would be necessary.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:24:00 PM

The contract documents state that aesthetic lettering and Guilloche pattern are to be constructed of 1" thick aluminum. Please confirm this is required. If deviation is allowed, please provide a minimum thickness.

**The Department may be accepting of thicknesses less than 1" (but not less than ½") for lettering and the guilloche ribbon, if there are not readily available standard materials. However, the thickness of the emblem must remain nearly 1" to ensure the required milling to achieve the outlined patterns (approximate 1/4" width with a ¼" depth), so that the interior emblem's shapes can be properly machined without compromising the integrity of the 6'8" emblem.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:23:15 PM

Please provide the desired texture/formliner pattern required on the piers.

**The texture and formliner pattern are required to generally match the pattern illustrated in the aesthetic renderings. Aesthetic pattern on piers shall match the aesthetic pattern used on the retaining walls. For reference, the pattern shown in Appendix M is an ashlar stone running bond pattern.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:22:25 PM

Please confirm the pattern on the piers is to exactly match the appearance of the switchback walls. For example, is the block appearance required to dimensionally match the block appearance on the walls? Is the color pattern to match the retaining walls.

**The dimension and color patterns on the piers is to match the appearance of the switchback walls.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:21:48 PM

Please provide the texture and/or formliner pattern required on the retaining walls in the area of the switchback.

**The texture and formliner pattern are required to generally match the pattern illustrated in the aesthetic renderings. Aesthetic pattern on piers shall match the aesthetic pattern used on the retaining walls. For reference, the pattern shown in Appendix M is an ashlar stone running bond pattern.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:21:04 PM

The aesthetic renderings of the retaining walls at the switchback show what appear to be mortar joints between the blocks/relief pattern. Please confirm the appearance of mortar joints is required, including appropriate coloring to differentiate the mortar joint from adjoining surfaces.

**The appearance of mortar joints is not necessarily required as a part of the texture/pattern surface of the retaining wall, abutments and piers. If mortar joints are used, they may vary from 0" to approximately 3/4" without a differentiating color from the adjoining surface.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:20:20 PM

The file titled 'Federal Color Palette Legend' included in Appendix M indicates that the typical segments in the switchback retaining walls are in 4' horizontal lengths. Additionally, the segments appear to scale to 8" tall - these are not industry standard block sizes included with an engineered wall of this height. What is the allowable variance from the noted dimensions.

**The surface of the retaining walls shall generally match the aesthetics illustrated in the provided renderings. Reasonable variations in height which do not substantially modify the aesthetic intent as depicted in Appendix M may be allowed. Appendix M may generally depict the block height at approximately 8"; however, reasonable variation in that height to meet generally commercially available aesthetic sizes may be acceptable up to approximately 12", however the height to length ratio of an individual block should reasonably conform to the H to L ratio of as US brick (which 2.25in to 7.5in) upto nearly a 1 to 2 H to L ratio.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:19:16 PM

The file titled 'Federal Color Palette Legend' included in Appendix M indicates that the typical segments in the switchback retaining walls are in 4' horizontal lengths. Additionally, the segments appear to scale to 8" tall - these are not industry standard block sizes included with an engineered wall of this height. Please confirm that the intent is to have a Modular Block wall constructed.

**The intent is to have a final appearance which generally meets the aesthetics as depicted in Appendix M. Appendix M is not dictating a specific wall system. Appendix M generally depicts the block height at approximately 8"; however, reasonable variation in that height to meet generally available aesthetic sizes may be acceptable (up to approximately 12"), however the height to length ratio of an individual block reasonable should conforms to the H to L ratio of as US brick (2.25 to 7.5) upto nearly a 1 to 2.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 4:18:22 PM

Section 13 of the Roadway scope references a TWLTL. Is the purpose of that reference just for determination of clear zone, or is a TWLTL to be designed with this project?

**The purpose of that reference for determination of the most conservative dimension of the clear zone.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 9:24:27 AM

DBSOS Section 8.4.1, Asbestos, includes language related to asbestos abatement on the garage structure at 1609 US-68 near the ramp on the west side of US-68. It appears this structure is no longer present and has already been demolished. Can the Department please remove the asbestos abatement and building demolished bid items, and remove this section from the Scope?

**ODNR has confirmed that the referenced structure has been removed. Language in the DBSOS will be revised accordingly and will be reflected in the forthcoming Addendum-007.**



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:42:51 AM

DBSOS Section 15.4, Geotechnical Instrumentation and Construction Vibration - last paragraph, states damage that was not present in the pre-construction survey shall be repaired by the contractor to a condition approved by the Department. Due to the limited width of the parcel and the proximity of existing buildings to property lines, there is a high probability that existing structures will incur some type of damage from construction activities. It is also known that the adjacent property owners are not in favor of the project. This adds extensive risk to the DBT. How will the Department assess the damage, recommend a repair, and determine when the repair is complete?

**Any damage will be assessed based upon the DBTs Post-Construction Condition Survey. Repairs will be made in concurrence with CMS 107.10. Any damage resulting from the contractor's work will be repaired to the documented pre-construction inspection and survey of the existing conditions, at a minimum. Repairs will be completed before the close of the contract.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:42:25 AM

DBSOS Section 14.2, Temporary Access Fill, states two 30" conduits were found to meet the allowable headwater requirements. It further states that if the DBT is unable to meet these requirements then the contractor is required to buy flood insurance for the effected properties. If the DBT follows the requirements of Appendix K (reference) and it is determined that two 30" conduits do not meet the allowable headwater requirements, will the Department pay for the required flood insurance?

**If the DBT determines that two 30" conduits do not meet the allowable headwater requirements, the contractor will pay for the required flood insurance.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:42:02 AM

Can the Department please provide specific information for the requirements of vertical and horizontal joints on the retaining wall as shown in Appendix M?

**The horizontal and vertical joint locations between indicated "blocks", shall be consistent and visually appear as illustrated in the aesthetic renderings.&nbsp;The joint dimension can be approximately 0" to 3/4".**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:41:38 AM

Can the Department please provide specific dimensions for individual retaining block size?

**Appendix M may generally depict the "block" height at approximately 8"; however, reasonable variation in that height to meet generally commercially available aesthetic sizes may be acceptable up to approximately 12", however the height to length ratio of an individual block&nbsp;should reasonably conform to the H to L ratio of as US brick (which 2.25in to 7.5in) upto nearly a 1 to 2 H to L ratio.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:41:11 AM

What approved wall systems were considered during the preliminary design phase to produce the renderings shown in Appendix M and to meet the batter rate and aesthetic requirements?

**The renderings were not developed with any specific wall system as the final solution.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:40:47 AM

Is the DBT allowed to access the construction area via US-68, Brush Row Rd and LMST or via US-42, Brush Row Rd and LMST?

**Yes, with some conditions. 1. Access for emergency vehicles to US-68 be maintained at all times. 2. The DBT would need to coordinate Section 106 for impacts made to the farm located along the east side of the LMST beyond the tree line.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:40:19 AM

DBSOS Section 12, Pavement - US68 Curb, only requires the placement of Type 6 Curb. It is possible to remove and replace the existing curb without damaging existing pavement but only if existing pavement conditions allow. Can the Department please clarify if the pavement in front of the curb shall be replaced and if so, to what pavement build-up and width?

**The existing pavement in front of the existing curb is deteriorated and will need to be replaced as a part of the curb reconstruction. A minimum 2 feet in front of the proposed curb will be removed. Pavement replacement can follow section 410.5 of the Pavement Design Manual for conditions including roadways carrying less than 1500 trucks per day.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:39:50 AM

DBSOS Section 14, Drainage - Underdrain Design, states proposed underdrains shall be 6" in diameter and provided at locations required per the PDM, wherever full depth pavement is proposed. Per DBSOS Section 12, Pavement, there is no proposed full depth pavement on US-68 or any other location except for the SUP. Can the Department please clarify the extent of new underdrain or underdrain replacement?

**As a part of the new curb installation, the existing pavement will require full depth pavement cut, removal and replacement.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:39:10 AM

DBSOS Section 14, Drainage, states in the first paragraph that portions of the existing US68 roadway drainage system shall be replaced as part of the curb and catch basin reconstruction. However, in the fifth paragraph states all existing storm sewer conduits and structures shall be removed with the project. Can the Department please clarify the extent of storm drainage replacement?

**The DBT is directed to review the existing plans provided in Appendix G for locations of existing storm sewers. All storm sewer components located within the project limits shall be replaced except as cited in the DBSOS with installations associated with the new Interpretive Center. As a part of the new curb installation, the existing pavement will require full depth pavement cut, removal and replacement. There are likely not any existing roadway pavement drainage elements to remove but pavement drainage is to be installed for the full depth strip pavement reconstruction associated with the new curb reconstruction.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:38:41 AM

DBSOS Section 12, Pavement - N. Parking Lot for Interpretive Center, states the pavement build-up shall be gravel. Please clarify what type of gravel and the required thickness.

**Revised specific language will be added in Addendum -007. Thickness of gravel = 6" and the type shall conform to Item 304. The use of slag is prohibited.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:38:14 AM

DBSOS Section 12, Pavement - US68 Shared Use Path - Ramp, states the buildup should be 6" concrete walk on 4" 304 base. It further describes that the feasibility study shows the ramp pavement buildup as asphalt. Please clarify if an asphalt buildup is allowable for the SUP ramp and the allowable asphalt pavement section.

**The stipulated concrete paved SUP is preferred due to construction installation issues. However, an asphalt surface is allowable.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:37:47 AM

Please add tack coat to the pavement buildup for US-68 mill and fill under DBSOS Section 12, Pavement.

**This item will be included as cited in the forthcoming Addendum-007.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:37:08 AM

DBSOS Section 11.2, MOT Requirements - Maximum Duration of Detour, states there are 8 allowable short-term/intermediate term closures on US-68. Can the Department please clarify the length of the short-term/intermediate closures?

**Short term closures are not to exceed 3 calendar days. Revised language will be provided in the forthcoming Addendum-007.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/18/2024 8:36:25 AM

DBSOS Section 5, Scope of Work - Project Goals, states to substantially complete the Project by September 1, 2026. However, Section 5 Completion Date and Section 5.1 Interim Completion Date Requirements, state an interim completion date of 10/1/26. Will the Department please clarify the interim completion date?

**The forthcoming Addendum -007 will clarify that this is supposed to read as October 1.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/12/2024 12:12:58 PM

When will any preliminary landscaping plans and plant/tree selections be made?

**No formal landscaping plans will be part of the project information. The expectation is that final grading and seeding will be the minimum requirement.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 7/12/2024 8:12:30 AM

Can we assume that no existing effective FEMA model data is available? The Temporary Access Fill Report in Appendix K that is listed in the scope as "Reference", states that "the FEMA Engineering Library was consulted for electronic files, and it was determined that no files for the effective model were available." This "non-contractual" statement cannot be verified without paying a large fee to FEMA for them to perform the search.

**The DBT does not need to request the Hydraulic Model from FEMA since the original designer already consulted the FEMA Engineering Library and no modeling was available.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/5/2024 7:11:42 AM

The bridge lighting rendering shows six luminaires mounted on arms extending from the low chord of the truss. Should bidders assume that six luminaires on each side of the bridge will be adequate to achieve the desired effect? What type of light source is used? What intensity is required? What beam spread/pattern is required? Is only static white light needed or is a control sequence required? Should the lighting system have dimming capabilities? If bidders are required to design the system please provide design criteria.

**The questions have been addressed in Addendum - 006 which was posted 7/2/24.- 1. Yes. See Appendix M. 2; ....shall be connected to the lighting system associated with the adjacent Interpretive Center.";&nbsp; 3. "...output of a minimum of 8,000 lumens each."; 4. "The lights will need to be a type of spotlight with a medium-wide (70-100 degree) beam angle and..." 5.&nbsp; "...4000k color temperature..."; 6. static - yes. 7. dimming - no.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/5/2024 7:11:15 AM

Can The Department please provide further details regarding the aesthetic elements on the span 1 truss? For example, what material types, coatings, colors, etc. are needed to accurately detail and price these items.

**Details regarding material type, paint coatings, colors, etc. have been provided in Addendum-006, posted 7/2/24.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/2/2024 9:47:30 AM

When will any preliminary landscaping plans and plant/tree selections be made?

**No. Landscaping is expected to entail final grading and seeding (grass).**

**Question Submitted:** 7/2/2024 8:32:07 AM

When will the mussel survey and relocation be complete. In order to do some of the tree clearing per the anticipated schedule the TAF may need to be placed this coming fall/winter late 2024/early 2025 will the mussel survey and relocation be completed by then?

**The mussel survey and reconnaissance were completed 6/26/24.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/2/2024 8:19:08 AM

Does the forward abutment near the existing LMST require any aesthetic treatment?

**No.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/2/2024 8:19:00 AM

With the aesthetic renderings given in addendum 5 sheet A4.2 (Federal Color Palette) and the Lighting Placement on Span #1 it appears that the retaining wall, piers, and rear abutment have a large rock/block form liner on the concrete that is then has a multi-color finish. Is there any direction as to a form liner pattern or coursing height for this block/rock look?

**The pattern shall be random as shown. The pattern is provided on the cited color template on sheet A4.2 which was included in Appendix M as the Federal Color Palette Legend. The intent is that the face of the retaining wall illustrated in the elevation would turn the corner and be repeated. A field sample may entail a portion of the elevation that captures all the colors for visual confirmation.**

**Question Submitted:** 7/1/2024 11:17:27 AM

The RFP states in Section K (page 48 of 68) that "the fence fabric shall be welded wire fabric with an opening of 3 inch horizontal and 1/2 inch vertical. The core wire shall be 10.5 gage". We do not believe these dimensions will provide a look like the architectural Concept Renderings. Rather, with a vertical opening of only 1/2", we believe it will appear more like a solid wall than an open, airy fence. Is this the intent?

**The recommended fence fabric may not be as "open" as the renderings imply but the scoped fence fabric is what shall be adhered to.**



# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 6/23/2024 12:20:43 PM

Is mesh needed on the top (roof) surface of the truss spans?

**No.**

**Question Submitted:** 6/17/2024 1:39:36 PM

The allowable closure for the LMST has conflicting notes within the DBSOS. DBSOS 8.1 states access to the LMST shall only be restricted for the necessary amount of time to complete constructions activities that could compromise public safety. DBSOS 11.2 states to close the LMST for the duration of the project. Please clarify the allowable closure requirements for the LMST.

**The DBT shall only restrict public access to Little Miami Scenic Trail for the necessary amount of time to complete construction activities that could compromise public safety. Access to Little Miami Scenic Trail shall remain open to the public at all other times throughout construction. The language in the scope has been modified to be consistent at both locations. The pending addendum will reflect this change.**

**Question Submitted:** 6/14/2024 1:22:59 PM

Please provide a marked up version of DBSOS from Addenda 4. It appears the clean version of the DBSOS was included twice in Addenda 4.

**The addendum is 134 pages total. 2 pages for the addendum, 66 pages for the clean version and another 66 pages for the clouded version. The changes are shown on pages 114 and 116 of the addendum.**

**Question Submitted:** 6/14/2024 6:12:26 AM

Please clarify where galvanized reinforcing steel is required. Please confirm if it is required throughout the entire bridge structure, to include all foundations, substructure units, superstructure, and prefabricated elements (such as prestressed beams, etc.). Is galvanized reinforcing required in retaining walls?

**Galvanized reinforcing steel is required in the entire superstructure, approach slab, deck and the external stirrups in prestress beam. Galvanized reinforcing steel is included in all substructure concrete from the footing and above. It is permitted for drilled shafts to have black reinforcement, but galvanized reinforcement is also acceptable. As a minimum, the rebar for the retaining walls is to be epoxy coated per the requirements of SS 840 & SS 870.**

**Question Submitted:** 6/13/2024 10:57:49 AM

Page P.21 of the Feasibility Study plans shows a transverse section of the pedestrian truss bridge with a height from deck surface to top truss members of 10' MIN. Section 18.1 L of the DBSOS (also referenced in 18.2) requires the DBT to construct a 14' tall fence. Please clarify the required height of the fence for the prefabricated truss span over US 68. Please confirm that the fence is only required in this span. Also, please confirm that the 10' MIN height of truss shown in the preliminary plans is what is desired.

**The prefabricated truss over US 68 shall be a height that accommodates the 14' high vandal protection fencing. The VPF is only required on Span #1, over US68 and not required on Spans 2, 3, or 4. The 10' minimum height of the truss over Oldtown Creek (span #4), as shown in the FS, is the desired height. An addendum, clarify these points, is forthcoming.**

**Question Submitted:** 6/13/2024 10:56:28 AM

Will the Department consider allowing the use of hollow structural sections (tubing) as the truss structural members? Tubing results in a cleaner finish/look (no gusset plates) and any concerns with moisture build-up in the tubing can be addressed by including a weep hole at the low end of shapes.

**As these structures are fractural critical, D8 is making all pedestrian trusses that will have maintenance and inspection responsibilities by the State, open sections members (I-sections, H-sections, channels, angles, etc. As such the use of hollow tubular sections is not permitted.**

**Question Submitted:** 6/12/2024 9:29:30 AM

TEST

**Question Submitted:** 5/29/2024 2:33:48 PM

The project's EBS file lists a bid date of 8/23/24. However, the ITO/RFP document lists a bid date of 8/14/2024. Please clarify.

**The bid date in the EBS file will be updated to 8/14/2024.**

# Ohio Department of Transportation - Prebid Questions

**Question Submitted:** 5/21/2024 10:06:54 AM

Are the architectural concept renderings updated 5-3-24 the ones to be used for bidding purposes for the contractor? With the three options shown on the updated renderings is it the contractor's choice between Option H, M, N?

**First Question: At this time....Yes. Second Question: No. The final choice is forthcoming. (Expected by next week.) The options only vary by color and the trim detail. Costs variations between the options are very minor and therefore, insignificant.**

**Question Submitted:** 5/21/2024 9:55:04 AM

Can all of the cadd files that have been generated for this project be made available on the ftp site?

**The CADD files developed as a part of the Feasibility Study, have been requested from the designer and should be forthcoming. CADD files have been added to Appendix C on the ftp site. These plan sheets are for information only and not to be used as a part of the final construction plans.**

**Question Submitted:** 4/3/2024 9:30:25 AM **Question Number - 5**

GRE-US68-12.65- PID 115388 - Project (24)3005 - Pre-Bid Question

• Section 2.5.7 Part F of the RFQ, bullet i (page 18/26) – If a C-95 or CES evaluation form is not currently available, is one still required to be provided?

**Provide a CES or C-95, or similar performance evaluation, if an evaluation is performed by the contracting oversight authority. If one was not performed by the contracting authority, the Department is not expecting a submitter to develop, or have one developed, for the SOQ.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/25/2024 7:47:26 AM **Question Number - 4**

\*\*\*Department asked prebid question\*\*\* Addendum 001 clouded document posting clarification.

**The Addendum 001 clouded document has been posted to the ftp site.  
\\ftp.dot.state.oh.us\pub\$\Districts\D08\115388\AddendaPID115388\Addendum-001**

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2024 5:26:18 PM **Question Number - 3**

Can more information be provided on the Technical Proposal submittal requirements?

**The question is ambiguous. Please consider specifying the contents of the question. See Section 2.4 of the RFQ. There are two (possibly three requirements) for SOQ submission files to LiquidFiles. Contact the Department (Chase Wells, Ph 614-466-4789 or Jamie Fink, Ph 614-644-6588) to establish a LiquidFiles account and to submit test submissions for verification. Interested Offerors are highly encouraged to establish an account early to avoid access issues.**

**Question Submitted:** 3/19/2024 5:23:57 PM **Question Number - 2**

The shortlisted contractors will be participating in an ATC process and completing a technical proposal to currently unknown requirements. Will the department consider paying a stipend to the shortlisted contractors?

**On Page 25/26 in the RFQ Section 6.3 Obligated For Costs of Proposing, 'The Department intends to provide a payment currently anticipated to be \$75,000.00 (or the Shortlisted Offeror's actual costs, whichever is less) for preparing a responsive Technical Proposal and Price Proposal to each unsuccessful Shortlisted Offeror.'**

**Question Submitted:** 3/18/2024 2:27:51 PM **Question Number - 1**

Request for Qualifications page 12 of 26 in the 5th paragraph states "SOQs shall be submitted to the following address..." There does not appear to be an address to send the files to. Can the electronic address be provided for the SOQ submittal?

**The Department will only accept an Offeror's SOQ via the Department's LiquidFiles program. The Department will not accept a hard copy. The RFO language referencing an "address" will be clarified by addendum. Contact the Department (Chase Wells, Ph 614-466-4789 or Jamie Fink, Ph 614-644-6588) to establish a LiquidFiles account.**