OHIO TURNPIKE AND
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION

ADDENDUM NO. 2

PROJECT NO. 43-19-03
BRIDGE DECK REPAIR AND REHABILITATION
OHIO TURNPIKE RAMP OVER STATE ROUTE 420 M.P. 71.4,
SOUTH BILLMAN ROAD OVER OHIO TURNPIKE M.P. 75.2
WOOD AND OTTAWA COUNTIES, OHIO

EXTENDED OPENING DATE: 2:00 P.M. (EASTERN TIME), DECEMBER ~~20~~ *21*, 2018

ATTENTION OF BIDDERS IS DIRECTED TO:
QUESTIONS RECEIVED THROUGH 3:00 P.M. ON DECEMBER 14, 2018
-AND-
EXTENSION OF THE BID OPENING DATE TO 2:00 P.M. ON DECEMBER 21, 2018

Issued by the Ohio Turnpike and Infrastructure Commission by Anthony D. Yacobucci, Chief Engineer, and Mark R. Musson, Director of Contracts Administration.

Anthony D. Yacobucci 12/14/18
Anthony D. Yacobucci Date

Mark R. Musson 12/14/18
Mark R. Musson Date

QUESTIONS RECEIVED THROUGH 3:00 P.M. ON DECEMBER 14, 2018:

Q#28 Will Class QC2 concrete for the bridge superstructures be acceptable in lieu of the Class HP4 Concrete?

A#28 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#29 What is the anticipated Earth Disturbed Area for the project? This number (in acres) could not be found in the plans.

A#29 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#30 The SWPPP is identified in the quantities to follow item ODOT C&MS 832, however this specification just updated to require the use of the SWPPPTrack software program on all projects. Does the OTIC intend to proceed in utilizing SWPPPTrack on this project?

A#30 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#31 The Abutment bearing details shown on Sht 39/51 for the SR-420 bridge show two steel load plates, one below the HP10x42 and one above the HP10x42. Are both of these steel load plates to be beveled per the detail and t1/t2 thickness shown on that sheet? If not what is the thickness of the non-beveled plate? Can the total bearing heights, Tt, in the Abutment Bearing Dimension Table be reviewed, they appear to be too short.

A#31 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#32 Plan sheet 12/51 shows the approach slab typical section. There is no #304 stone base or subgrade compaction underneath the approach slab. Is these omissions or will there be no payment for this work under the approach slabs?

A#32 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#33 In the provided Geotechnical Report page 14 section 6.0 "Construction Recommendations" states the following *"Fill should be placed in uniform layers not more than 8 inches thick (loose measure) adequately keyed into stripped and scarified soils."* Will the OTC require contractors to key and or bench into the existing slopes at SR 420 (MP 71.4) structure while building the slope embankment associated with the structure? If so, will the OTC provide additional excavation quantities to accommodate for the key and or benching into the

existing slopes? Also will OTC provide updated drawings of the minimum width and height requirements to key and or bench into the existing slopes?

A#33 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#34 With short distances to pave asphalt at the bridges approaches will a Material Transfer Device (MTD) as call for in SP 400 (page SP-57) be required?

A#34 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#35 Does SP 400S apply to the project as called under SP 400 page SP-60?

A#35 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#36 Plan sheets do not include OTIC standard drawing CB-1 for the #1 CB bid item (reference 91). Please provide the most updated drawing for this item.

A#36 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#37 Bid item 63 "Vegetated Biofilter, As Per Plan": plan sheet 8 note says "Place either item 659 seeding and mulching with a 4" lift of topsoil" but doesn't say "or" to anything else. There are already bid items set up for seeding and mulching and topsoil. Please revise the plan note and provide a plan detail if necessary to define exactly what is considered incidental/inclusive to this bid item.

A#37 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#38 At the Billman Rd bridge there is existing conduit inside both concrete parapet walls which are getting replaced. Are there any active utilities in these conduits? If the conduits have active lines in them are they going to be temporarily relocated while the parapet walls are removed and replaced? Are any conduits to be placed back within the new walls?

A#38 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#39 One of the sole plates needs a thickness dimension added to the total height (Tt) of the bearing assemblies at the abutments. When the various elements of the bearing (pad, centerline of tapered plate, and HP 10x42) are added up, in reaches the Tt dimension presented in the table; however, it does not appear to take into account the thickness of second load plate. Further, it is unclear as to which of the load plates is to be tapered, top or bottom. Please clarify.

A#39 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Q#40 Does the existing structural steel at the MP 71.4 bridge contain lead paint?

A#40 The Commission will response to this question in Addendum No. 3.

Receipt of Addendum No. 2
Project No. 43-19-03 is hereby acknowledged:

(Firm Name) _____

(Signature) _____

(Printed Name) _____

(Date) _____

BIDDERS MUST RETURN THE ABOVE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM NO. 2 WITH THEIR BID.