



1/8/2021

Project 213000 **Addendum No. 6**
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

Bid Item Changes, Additions or Deletions: 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 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/06/>

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.)

Q58: In scope Attachment ‘A’ – Design and Construction Requirements: Structures, for bridge locations 14 (SUM-76-0914 (Manchester)) and 16 (SUM-76-0964 (Lake Shore)) the proposed transverse section dimensions produce a bridge width that matches existing; however, for bridge Location 15 (SUM-76-0954 (Bowery)) the proposed transverse section dimensions result in bridge widths that are approximately 1.5-feet narrower than the existing. Is it ODOT’s intent to narrow the SUM-76-0954 Bridge over Bowery street and the Ohio Canal?

A58: See response to PBQ #71

- Q62: Will the Department consider adding a contingent quantity or station limits, for excavation of subgrade and placement of granular material to pay for unforeseen subsurface conditions where global stabilization cannot be performed for part two as was provided for part one (addendum 2, pre-bid question 24)?
- A62: This will be addressed in a future addendum
- Q65: Scope 14.6.1.2 requires that all curbed sections shall be protected by guardrail. Attachment B Preliminary Plans show some areas with curb but no guardrail protection (e.g. Ramp S10 – Wilbeth on-ramp to SB IR-77). Please confirm that ramps with curbing do not require guardrail protection.
- A65: A revision to the Scope of Services will be made in a future addendum to clarify the intent.
- Q67: The pavement cores are inconclusive in identifying limits of shoulder replacement for purposes of MOT. Can the department provide station limits of shoulders that would requirement replacement per Attachment O section 4.1 if utilized for MOT?
- A67: This will be addressed in a future addendum
- Q70: In ITO Section 5.3.b.iv.2, ODOT is requesting the DBT to provide the following: For “Manchester, Lakeshore and Bowery Structures section(s) showing the following information: “(1) Integral and/or Semi-integral abutment details; (2) Substructure (pier columns and pier caps) analysis for proposed structure (3) Pier retrofit details (if required)”. Can ODOT please verify what level of detail they are expecting to see from an analysis standpoint for (2)?
- A70: This will be addressed in a future addendum
- Q71: As a clarification/follow up to prebid question #58: In scope Attachment ‘A’ – Design and Construction Requirements: Structures, for bridge locations 14 (SUM-76-0914 (Manchester)) and 16 (SUM-76-0964 (Lake Shore)) the proposed transverse section dimensions produce a bridge width that matches existing; however, for bridge Location 15 (SUM-76-0954 (Bowery)) the proposed transverse section dimensions seem to offer up some discrepancy: Transverse Sections: East Bound → 54’-2 ½” t/t barrier (8’-2 ½” Inside Shoulder, 3 x 12’-0” , Lanes, 10’-0” Outside Shoulder) this toe-to-toe requirement produces an out-to-out bridge width of 57’-8” which is approximately 1.33-feet narrower than existing. Is it ODOT’s intent to narrow the eastbound bridge?
West Bound → Varies from 89’-3 3/16” to 96’-8” t/t barrier (8’-2 ½” Inside Shoulder, 3 x 12’-0” Lanes, Variable Gore Area, 3 x 12’-0” Lanes, Varies from 10’-1 ½” to 10’-2 9/16” Outside Shoulder); First, we believe there should be 5 total 12-foot lanes, not 6? Secondly, the toe-to-toe widths of the westbound , 89’-3 3/16” and 96’-8”, result in the bridge being 1.5-feet wider to the north. Is it ODOT’s intention to DECREASE the width of the eastbound bridge by approximately 1.33-feet and INCREASE the westbound bridge by 1.5-feet?
- A71: For all three structures, the design build team is to hold the median edge lines at 10 feet from the centerline of the roadway, which due to the new median barrier

standard only allows for 8'-2 1/2" for each median shoulder. A design exception for the median shoulder width was obtained.

For all three structures the design build team is to hold the existing right (in the direction of travel) edge lines. For SUM-76-0914 (Manchester) per the scope of service, the right (in the direction of travel) outside shoulders are to match the existing 11'-6" wide shoulders. For SUM-76-0964 (Lakeshore) per the scope of service, the right (in the direction of travel) outside shoulders are to match the existing 11'-6" wide shoulders. For SUM-76-0954 (Bowery) per the scope of service the right (in the direction of travel) outside shoulders are to be 10'-0". This does not match the existing right (in the direction of travel) outside shoulders. The existing right (in the direction of travel) outside shoulder for EB I-76 over Bowery is 11'-6" wide while the proposed is only 10'-0" wide. The existing right (in the direction of travel) outside shoulder adjacent to the SR-59 SB ramp to WB I-76 is only 9'-6" wide while the proposed is 10'-0" wide. The roadway width for I-76 WB at Bowery St. shown in the scope was taken beyond the limits of the bridge due to the skew on the structure, this in combination the shoulders off the bridge being greater than the shoulders on the bridge, along with the variable gore widths lead to the variable roadway width shown in the scope.

For SUM-76-0954 (Bowery) in the westbound directions, there are only five lanes as opposed to 6 lanes mentioned in the scope. Three for I-76 WB and two for the SR-59 SB ramp to SR-76 WB. This will be corrected with an addendum.

- Q73: Section 6.3.1.1 allows for the expedited design review of the work items with an interim completion date of 10/31/2021, allowing for the omission of the Preliminary Design review submission. Considering the amount of work required for SR-8 north of Beacon Street, work for this area will need to start in the 2021 construction season in order to meet the 7/31/2022 interim completion date. Will the District consider allowing for the same expedited review for the SR-8 portion?
- A73: This will be revised in a future addendum to allow for expedited re of the work items to be performed on SR-8 north of Beacon Street
- Q74: Section 16.3.1 Bullet D of the scope states that the continuous lighting within the project limits that is being replaced shall be with median mounted low-mast LED lighting. However, Bullet F.1 references TEM plan note 1142-6 for "Luminaire, Low Mast, As Per Plan." This note specifies specific luminaire IES files for High Pressure Sodium fixtures. Can the District please clarify if we are to provide the HPS fixtures listed in the As Per Plan note, or if we are to select an approved LED fixture from ODOT's Approved Products list "SS813—Luminaires, Solid State (LED)".
- A74: LEDs are required. A clarification to the Scope of Services will be made in a future addendum.
- Q75: Can the District please clarify the type of fixtures (LED per SOS or HPS per TEM Note 1142-9) that are to be furnished for Underpass Lighting locations?

- A75: LEDs are required. A clarification to the Scope of Services will be made in a future addendum.
- Q76: Several shoulder cross-slope labels on the typical sections in Attachment B (including sheets 19, 24, and 25 of 138) are in conflict with L&D Volume 1 Figure 301-8. Please confirm that L&D requirements override the shoulder cross-slopes shown in Attachment B.
- A76: The cross slopes of the shoulders are required to follow the Location and Design Manual and will override those in conflict in Attachment B
- Q77: With addendum #4, the Department has allowed the closure of all service ramps, however the following side roads contain potential conflicts with ramp closures. Can the Department please provide clarification that concurrent side road closures will be permitted with adjacent the ramps?
Ramp G - South St. Concurrent Closure
Ramp S - Fountain St. and access drives Concurrent Closure
Ramp S6 - Burkhardt Ave. and access drives Concurrent Closure
Ramp S9 - Allendale Ave. Concurrent Closure
Ramp S12 - Coventry St. and access drives Concurrent Closure
Ramp W10 - Russell Ave. Concurrent Closure
- A77: Any side road that is shared with a ramp being reconstructed will can be closed concurrently for the allowable days the ramp closures have been specified in the scope. Side road closures are not part of the ramp closures that have been specified for controlling volumes on the mainline. Clarification will be in the next addendum.
- Q79: In Scope Attachment O, Section 5 Item 4. requires Conceptual MOT Plans showing detailed detour plans, incorporating detour routes provided in "the Appendix". Specific detour routes do not appear to be specifically listed in the Scope or Appendix. Is the information in Attachment O, Section 5 Item 4. meant to reference Scope Attachment D?
- A79: "the Appendix" referenced in the scope is referring to an appendix the DBT includes with their to the conceptual MOT plans provided, not an appendix in the scope document. Clarification will be in the next addendum.
- Q80: Per scope section 16.2.1 it is unclear if guide signs at the ends of entrance ramps and lead-in signs on arterials are required to be replaced. Please clarify if these signs are included in the scope of work.
- A80: Yes, it is required to repalce the lead in signs, clarification will be made ina future addendum
- Q81: Scope Attachment A requires the Refurbishing of Bearings on several structures. The BDM note for refurbishing bearings is not provided in the Scope. Please confirm that Item 516 - Refurbishing Bearing Devices, As Per Plan is the intended specification for this Work.

- A81: Yes, Bearings to be Refurbished per BDM Note 610.4-1. Clarification to Attachment A will be made in a future addendum.
- Q83: Scope Section 14.7.2.4 states "Reuse of existing drainage structures/pipes/etc. within the areas of full depth pavement replacement is NOT permitted and shall be designed and constructed as per the Location and Design Manual Volume 2." There are two (2) large, open ended culvert crossings on the East-West leg of I-76/I77 as listed below, which are beneath full-depth pavement replacement sections:
1. 6'x4' Concrete Box Culvert near Sta. 205+50
 2. 76"x48" Concrete Elliptical Culvert near Sta. 215+75
- Is the DBT required to replace these two culverts as part of this project?
- A83: We believe the section of the Scope of Services you are referring to is 14.7.2.1.4. This section will be updated in a future addendum to allow these culverts to remain as long as they are not impacted by construction activities.
- Q88: For Bridge Location 7 (SUM-8-0160), the scope says to remove and replace the existing Pressure Relief Joints. Is the intent to replace the entire Pressure Relief Joint including the sleeper slabs or just the 4'-0" section of asphalt?
- A88: The intent is to replace the asphalt material only. Clarification to Attachment A will be made in a future addendum.
- Q91: Addendum 4, 14.7.2.2 Part 2 item 1 calls for replacement of drainage in resurfacing areas referenced in Attachment C. On attachment C plan sheet 138/1022 in the median barrier wall at the south approach to Beacon Street bridge exists an inlet which is not shown on the plan. Existing plan set SR 8-00.630-2002-1 sheets 202 and 203 show this median barrier inlet which drains 12" and 15" lines but sits on top of an existing manhole that is 33' deep with a 15" pipe outlet that runs under the existing abutment and under Beacon Street. Please define the limits of the drainage replacement at this structure.
- A91: This will be addressed in a future addendum
- Q99: Scope 14.6.1.6.c requires 'Paving Under Guardrail [Item 441 - Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 1, (446), T=3"]'. Attachment B Preliminary Plans Typical Section Legend Item 16 requires Item 441 - Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type 1, (448), (Under Guardrail). Can the Department please confirm which item is required?
- A99: ITEM 441 - ASPHALT CONCRETE INTERMEDIATE COURSE, TYPE 1, (448), (UNDER GUARDRAIL) is required to be used. This will be addressed in a future addendum.
- Q102: The requirements of Scope Section 14.7.2.1 apply to the area on SR-8 between Beacon Street and Carroll. One of the requirements of Section 14.7.2.1 is that all existing storm sewer conduit and structures within the areas of full depth pavement replacement shall be taken out of service. Since the median drainage of SR-8 is in resurfacing pavement, are the median inlets and pipes beneath existing

pavement of SR-8 between Beacon Street and Carroll Street permitted to remain in place with a concrete collar on the pipes at the edge of full depth pavement replacement, or is the intent to replace all drainage structures and pipes in the area with trenches and pavement repair?

A102: A revision to the Scope of Service will be in a future addendum to address concerns expressed

Q103: The requirements of Section 14.7.2.1 apply to all areas where full depth pavement replacement is being performed. However, in the range of Sta 228+00 to 244+00 as an example, existing trunk lines are not beneath areas of full depth pavement replacement. They are north of the pavement in grass infields. Are these trunk lines permitted to remain, or is the DBT required to replace these trunk lines?

A103: Clarification will be made in a future addendum