



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor

Oregon Department of Transportation
Statewide Project Delivery Branch
Project Controls Office
555 13th St NE
Salem, OR 97301

BID REFERENCE DOCUMENT

DATE: April 21, 2026

Letter of Clarification No. 02

TO: PLAN HOLDERS

PREPARED BY: Veronica Vong 2026.04.21
15:22:49-07'00'
Veronica Vong, WSP USA

FINAL ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

SUBJECT: Willamette River: Stormwater Source Control Improvements Project
Lower Columbia River, Northeast Portland, Stadium Freeway
Multnomah County
Grading, Drainage, Paving, Signing, Illumination, and Roadside Development
(Bids Closing April 30, 2026)

The following Bid Reference Documents have been added to eBIDS:

- C15643 - CCTV Data

The following are the Agency's responses to Bidders' questions/requests for clarification:

Question #1

Special Provisions section 00530.80(a) also includes reinforcing for structures D00429, D00508 and D00509. This reinforcing does not belong in bid items 1620, 1670 and 1680?

Response #1

Reinforcing for the cast-in-place water quality structures D00429, D00508, and D00509 are paid under 00530.90. Subsection 01010.90 will be updated in Addendum 03.

Question #2

Sheet HA401 and J401 both appear to show 9 concrete pedestals. HA401A appears to show 10 pedestals. What is the correct quantity of pedestals at Fremont Bridge east?

Response #2

9 pedestals is correct. HA401A will be updated in Addendum 03.

Question #3

Notes 2 and 3 on sheet J401 call out concrete pedestals. One calls out J401 for the pedestals. Should this be J402? Also, the details on J402 appear to match what is shown on S401. Is there a difference between the detail on J402 and S401?

Response #3

J402 is showing the modification for pedestals on the existing Fremont Bridge East (FBE) foundation. J401 shows the entire system at FBE. S401 is showing the modification for pedestals on the new cast-in-place footing (slab on grade) for FBE.

Question #4

Which bid item(s) include the concrete and rebar for the piles?

Response #4

The quantities for the concrete and rebar for the piles is captured under 1870 PRESETTLING TANK, 26'D X 20'H.

Question #5

There appear to be major oversight in the specifications. Special Provision section 00510 – Structure Excavation has a table of shoring systems allowed. This table lists the allowable shoring for each site. Many of these sites will require the listed shoring's, but some of them can be done with conventional shoring. My question is, if we submit stamped conventional shoring is ODOT really going to take 120 days to review (SP00510.04 (b)) for these situations?

Response #5

The 120 day review window is part of ODOT's standard requirements. Contractor shoring submittals are subject to review and approval by Portland Permitting & Development and Bureau of Environmental Services as part of the building permit approval process. Alternative shoring designs may be submitted during construction according to 00180.31.

Question #6

The new structure, Note 7 on sheet HA201 is falling over an unverified blind flange connection. What additional details can you provide about this connection to ensure we can tie it into the manhole? The Storm Report, 2.1.3 states, data on this to follow.

Response #6

The full CCTV data package will be added to the bid reference documents as "C15643 – CCTV Data."

Question #7

HB203 shows the footings in elevation view with depth and relation to the structures. What we do not have, is the correct elevation view with the bridge foundation closest to the wetwell, Note 3 on sheet HA201A. This is much closer than the other two structures, can you please provide this?

Response #7

The bridge footing top elevation is approximately 35' NAVD88 and will be added to HA201 in Addendum 03.

Question #8

Can you please confirm what type of material the 42 inch and the 48 inch pipes are on sheet HA201?

Response #8

The pipes are concrete and will be added to HA201 in Addendum 03. Material is to be confirmed by the Contractor as indicated in Note 2 and 3.

Question #9

The provided Bore logs for TB22552-05 and -06 on sheet GA201 do not match the geotechnical report 03, PDF pages 34-39. Some of the bore callout id numbers appear to be switched.

Response #9

The boring numbers for TB22552-05 and -06 are switched on the GA201 profile. GA201 will be updated in Addendum 03.

Question #10

On sheet HA201 there is an existing 27 inch pipe intercepting the new flow splitter, Note 1. The 27 inch line goes thru the flow splitter to the east, showing to be removed. The removal line just stops close to the new fence line with no notes. We are to remove this line to the east of the flow splitter, but we are unsure why the removal callout stops. How far does the pipe go and how much do we remove?

Response #10

The 27 inch line extends to the 48 inch line where it connects to the 48 inch line using a blind flange. Contractor will remove as much of this 27 inch line as needed to construct Manhole (Note 1) and new 48 inch line directed to Manhole (Note 7). The remainder of the 27 inch line can be abandoned. As stated in Note 3, existing pipe locations are approximate. Contractor to verify prior to excavation.

Question #11

To appropriately size the bypass systems we will need at many of the connecting existing lines to new structures, please provide the peak flows required for the bypass designs.

Response #11

Temporary bypass sizing is the responsibility of the Contractor and will need to comply with ODOT and local jurisdiction storm drainage standards. Available flow information is in the Stormwater Drainage Report as a bid reference document.

Question #12

Sheet HA201 – The new flow splitter manhole, note 1, clearly conflicts with an existing manhole (which the lid is present in the field) connecting to the 42”or48” lines. Maybe we are missing something here but it seems this design will not work unless the flow splitter is moved.

Please provide the elevations for the existing lines coming into this manhole, we are unsure how these lines will conflict with the shoring and the new pipe run from note 1 to note ?

Response #12

The 42-inch line does not exist and will be removed from the plan sheet HA201 in Addendum 03.

Question #13

Sheet HA201 shows Future footing seismic retrofit. Please let us know how that is applicable to this project and what considerations that should consider.

Response #13

Limits shown for future seismic retrofit on the plans are for information only for ODOT and future projects. The design of the project elements, as shown in the contract plans, does not need to be modified for those limits.

Question #14

Sheet ES01 provides a traffic control plan for I-405/Fremont Bridge Interchange – MP3.03. This traffic control plan shows only a cone lane closure immediately adjacent to a 35ft deep cut. This seems very unsafe, we are unsure why this site isn't barrier. Please review and reconsider the safety aspect of this plan.

Response #14

Barrier will be added to ES01 in Addendum 03.

Question #15

What is the required spacing between contraction joints on BA08?

Response #15

Use minimum spacing of 12' and maximum spacing of 15' for contraction joint spacing. BA08 will be updated to include this spacing as part of Addendum 03.