

The quantities were based on the most current spreadsheet from the consultant. Some differences from my original quantities were found, (probably due to the numerous revisions of the spreadsheet), and have revised them in this addendum.

- Q: #304 Aggregate base quantities for both alternates appear to be incorrect. The up-to-date aggregate base quantity for the asphalt alternate is 74789 cy. The aggregate base quantity for the concrete alternate is 50332 cy. Based on the foot print areas covered by both, the asphalt alternate's #304 base appears to be overstated and the concrete alternate's #304 base appears to be understated. One suggestion to these differences could be the volume of stone base under areas not covered in the alternates being included in one but not the other. Should there be a separate #304 aggregate base item for those areas not covered in the alternates? Please review, revise, and provide updated calculations for both alternates including all 304, asphalt, concrete, and affected quantities in an addendum.
- A: I have posted the concrete pavement calculation <ftp://ftp.dot.state.oh.us/pub/Contracts/Attach/LAK-13486/> and the aggregate base quantity has increased.
- Q: Addendum 11 added reference 1048 Item 448 Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, PG 64-22 and reference 1049 Item 448 Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, PG 64-22. Items already exist in the EBS file for this work. What is the Department's intent for these items?
- A: Reference numbers 1048 and 1049 were added for the paving of SR-91 and SR-306 that was inadvertently omitted from the general summary. Reference numbers 157, 158 and 159 are for driveways or under guardrail.
- Q: How is the pavement widening on side roads SR 306 and SR 91 to be handled if the concrete alternate is accepted?
- A: The side road pavements are unchanged regardless of the alternative chosen. If the concrete alternative is chosen, the ramps would be paved up to the saw cut already shown in the plans.
- Q: In the revised roadway subsummary submitted in Addendum # 11 it appears that at each "CONCRETE BARRIER END ANCHOR REINFORCED" 15 ft of barrier is being subtracted from the quantity of the "CONCRETE BARRIER, SINGLE SLOPE, TYPE B1". However, in the standard drawings RM - 4.3 no mention is made of deducting any footage from the barrier wall at end anchors (see list of what is to be deducted at bottom of page RM 4.3 page 1/2). Also, on RM 4.5 page 1/2 is shows the pay length of "Item 622 - CONCRETE BARRIER, SINGLE SLOPE, TYPE D" overlapping the 15ft of end anchor. Please clarify if the Concrete Barrier, Single Slope, Type B1 and Type D will be paid through the end anchorages, or if 15ft of wall will be deducted at each end anchor, thus requiring the cost of this deducted barrier to be added to the end anchor pay item.
- A: According to the standard drawings, the 15' sections were subtracted from the concrete barrier quantity and included with the end anchor quantity.
- Q: A prebid question was asked back on November 24, 2008 regarding construction noise and lane closure availabilities. The response was that ODOT was awaiting signed noise variances from 2 of 3 cities, and that only one had been signed. Is there an update on the status of this? Will there be any restrictions on night work?
- A: We have signed noise variances from all three Cities. There will be no restrictions on night work concerning noise, except the contractor must adhere with the construction noise note on sheet 41/1679.