OHIO TURNPIKE AND
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION

ADDENDUM NO. 2
ISSUED FEBRUARY 10, 2021

to

PROJECT NO. 43-21-02
BRIDGE DECK REHABILITATION AND BRIDGE REMOVAL
FANGBONER ROAD OVER OHIO TURNPIKE M.P. 91.1,
OHIO TURNPIKE RAMP OVER OHIO TURNPIKE M.P. 91.6,
OHIO TURNPIKE RAMP OVER S.R. 53 M.P. 92.0
SANDUSKY COUNTY, OHIO

OPENING DATE EXTENDED TO: 2:00 P.M. (EASTERN TIME**), FEBRUARY 19 ~~16~~, 2021**

ATTENTION OF BIDDERS IS DIRECTED TO:
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED THROUGH 12:00 PM ON FEBRUARY 10, 2021

MODIFICATIONS TO THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

Plan Sheets: 42, 43, 44 and 98 of 127
-AND-
Bid Schedule of Items and Estimated Quantities Worksheet
Reference Nos.: 51, 157
-AND-
Special Provisions: SP 622

Issued by the Ohio Turnpike and Infrastructure Commission through Jennifer L. Stueber, Esq., General Counsel.

February 10, 2021
Date

Jennifer L. Stueber, Esq.,
General Counsel

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED THROUGH 12:00 P.M. ON FEBRUARY 10, 2021:

Q#3 615 Pavement for Maintaining Traffic and 615 Temporary Roads are referenced in the MOT sequence notes on sheet 17 and temporary pavement areas are called out in the phasing plan sheets but there are no bid items for these. Please add bid items to address these requirements.

A#3 Reference Note 7 on Plan Sheet 14 of 127, "PAYMENT FOR MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ITEMS, UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED SEPARATELY, ***SHALL BE PAID FOR UNDER THE LUMP SUM BID FOR ITEM SP 614 – MAINTAINING TRAFFIC****, WHICH SHALL INCLUDE ALL LABOR, EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS AND INCIDENTALS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE WORK AS DETAILED IN THE PLAN."*

Q#4 Could the OTIC please provide invert elevations and pavement/rim elevations for the proposed drainage lines on the project?

A#4 Reference Plan Sheets 78 and 79 of 127 for storm sewer and culvert profiles. Rim and invert elevations are provided on those plan sheets.

Q#5 Plan sheets 42-44: The plan sheets call out "PROJECT 43-20-03 DATE: 06/10/19"- is this a misprint that should be corrected?

Note VI.C on plan sheet 16/127 references SP 622 which is not part of the contract documents. Please add this to the bidding documents.

A#5 The Project Number on Plan Sheets 42 thru 44 of 127 has been revised and the revised Plan Sheets are included as part of this Addendum No. 2. Special Provision SP 622 has been added to the bidding documents and is included as part of this Addendum No. 2.

Q#6 **The Typical Section on Sheet 6 for The Ohio Turnpike Ramp over the Ohio Turnpike (MP 91.6) shows Item 254 Pavement Planing, Portland Cement Concrete, 3" for one section but there is no item for this in the General Summary. How will this work be paid for?**

A#6 The concrete planing quantity was incorrectly included in the asphalt planing item. A pay item for Item No. 254, Pavement Planing, Portland Cement Concrete, T=3" has been added to the project as Reference No. 157 and the revised Plan Sheets 42 and 98 of 127 have been included as part of this Addendum No. 2. The quantity for Reference No. 51, Item No. 254, Pavement Planing, Asphalt Concrete, T=3" has been reduced to 608 SY.

Q#7 Is it acceptable for the contractor to use QC2 concrete in lieu of HP4?

A#7 *Class QC2 concrete is acceptable as a replacement for Class HP4 concrete at no additional cost to the Commission. Where appearing throughout the Contract Documents "Class HP 4 Concrete" is supplemented with "or Class QC2 Concrete" through this Addendum No. 2. All applicable provisions of Item 511 of the Specifications shall apply except as modified in SP 511B for both HP4 and QC2.*

Q#8 SP 511B Section D requires a 36" walkway width for inspection access. A standard C-49 overhang jack with a C-54 extender gives 66 ¼" of useable surface on the top of the jack. Taking away 49" for the bridge overhang leaves 17 ¼" between the edge of deck and face of handrail. Will this distance be acceptable, or will the contractor be required to modify the overhang jacks to create a 36" walk? Is the 36" dimension from the edge of deck to the face of handrail, or is it measured from the end of form kicker to give 36" of unobstructed walkway?

A#8 *The minimum acceptable walkway width measured from the back of the deck form to the face of the handrail is 18 inches provided the full 36" width cannot be obtained from standard brackets available in the industry. The walkway width dimension is measured from the back of the deck form to the face of the handrail and is not impacted by the use of a form kicker.*

Q#9 The engineer provided one subsummary sheet which addresses limited amount of drainage items. Please provide subsummary sheets for all roadway, erosion, and pavement items.

A#9 *Due to the relatively small size of this project, additional Subsummary sheets are deemed to be unnecessary and have not been included in the bid documents.*

Q#10 Will the Commission allow the contractors the option to waste concrete debris and/or excess excavation materials within the infield area south of the existing toll plaza? In addition, can this same area be utilized for contractor laydown and staging?

A#10 *The Commission is reviewing potential permissible areas for waste sites and will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.*

Q#11 Has the OTC performed a Jurisdictional Determination to identify any jurisdictional streams and or wetlands on or adjacent to the referenced project? If so, will the Commission identify all jurisdictional streams and or wetlands on or adjacent to this project?

A#11 *The Commission checked for juristictional streams and wetlands but found none present within the construction limits.*

Q#12 Has the Commission obtained any 401/404 Water Quality Certification / Permits associated with this project? If so, can these be provided to the Bidders?

A#12 The Commission checked for juristictional streams and wetlands but found none present within the construction limits thus no permits are required for this project.

Q#13 Will the commission allow the contractor to borrow and waste material within the infield?

A#13 See the response to Q#10.

Q#14 After reviewing the MOT plans and project bid items, it appears a roads for MOT item is required to account for the earthwork below the temp pavement, please review.

A#14 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#15 Please add a bit item for the pavement for maintaining traffic as shown in the MOT phasing, and clarify class A or Class B pavement.

A#15 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#16 Please provide existing pavement thickness for the existing pavement legend shown on sheet 4, 5, and 6.

A#16 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#17 Will the existing stone base under the current ramps being removed be required to be removed prior to placing topsoil?

A#17 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#18 There are no depths provided for existing asphalt and concrete pavements. Please provide plans of previously-constructed sections of work such as OTIC 59-16-03 that would be indicative of this information.

A#18 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#19 Plan sheets 45 through 48 show pavement removed APP by the square yard. Plan sheets 61-70 give cross sections of the new pavements. It appears that existing pavements have been included in the cross-section areas and volumes for excavation and embankment where proposed pavements transition into new pavements and therefore the excavation quantity

appears to be overstated. Please review and revise excavation and embankment quantities as required in an addendum.

A#19 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#20 The typical sections do not provide the thickness of the existing pavement to be removed. In addition, the existing plans, due to age, I believe do not accurately reflect pavement makeup. Will OTC provide the thickness of the existing pavement by material types?

A#20 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#21 Does OTC have a geotechnical report for the project? If so, will you provide to the contractor?

A#21 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#22 Does OTC have a CAD file for the project? If so, will you provide to the contractor?

A#22 There are no CADD files available for the project.

Q#23 Bid item 53- Aggregate Base: takeoff quantity appears to be significantly higher than plan quantity, but there is no subsummary on the plan sheets to check the takeoff against. Please provide subsummary and breakdown of this item.

A#23 The Commission will respond to this question in Addendum No. 3.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2