

Col-7-0.00 PID B4323 D-B Mtg 11/29/10 1000

| Name | Co. | Phone # | Email |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Sharon Bennett | ODOT | 330-308-7856 | Sharon.Bennett@ oh.state.us |
| Tim STILLION | ODOT | 330-308-7860 | tim.stillion@ dot.state.oh.us |
| Chris Varcolla | ODOT | 330-308-3994 | chris.varcolla@ dot.state.oh.us |
| Rodney Wilson | ODOT-D11 | 330-308-3968 | Rodney.Wilson@dot. state.oh.us |
| LEN MORE | CLEVELAND BARRICADING SYSTEMS | 330-220-9965 | LMORE@CLEVELAND BARRICADING SYSTEMS.COM |
| MIKE HOBBS | GPD GROUP | 330-572-2214 | mhobbs@gpdgroup.com |
| Russell Krock | ADIR & Assoc. LTD | 740-345-1921 | rkrock@adrianoventon.com |
| Nick Susich | ODOT | 330-204-2653 | nick.susich@ dot.state.oh.us |
| CHRISTINE MURGIDA | ODOT-D-11 | 330-440-3967 | christine.murgida@ dot.state.oh.us |

OHIO DEPART OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 11

- - -

IN RE: ODOT DESIGN BUILD

SCOPE OF SERVICES PRE-BID

MEETING FOR PID: 84323

COLUMBIANA COUNTY

- - -

BE IT REMEMBERED that upon the meeting of the above-entitled matter held at Ohio Department of Transportation, 2201 Reiser Avenue, SE, New Philadelphia, Ohio, and commencing on Monday the 29th day of November at 10:06 a.m., the following proceedings were had.

COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION BY

BISH & ASSOCIATES

520 S. Main Street, Suite 2501

Akron, ohio 44311

(330) 762-0031

(800) 332-0607

E-MAIL: bishinfo@bish-associates.com

WWW. bish-associates.com

1 MS. MURGIDA: Good morning. My name
2 is Christine Murgida. I'm the district
3 construction engineer for District 11. We're in
4 the process of passing around a sign-in sheet.
5 Why don't we go around and introduce ourselves.

6 MR. SUSICH: I am Nick Susich,
7 engineer for ODOT on this project.

8 MR. MORE: I'm Len More with
9 Cleveland Barricading.

10 MR. HOBBS: Mike Hobbs GDP.

11 MR. KROCK: Russ Krock, ADR.

12 MR. VARCOLLA: Chris Varcolla, ODOT
13 planning.

14 MR. WILSON: Rod Wilson with ODOT
15 District 11.

16 MR. STILLION: Tim Stillion,
17 District 11 production.

18 MS. BENNETT: Sharon Bennett,
19 production administrator District 11.

20 MS. MURGIDA: As we all know, we are
21 here for the pre-bid meeting for project 3020 of
22 2010, PID Number 84323, and it is in the county
23 of Columbiana on State Route 7, signing project.

24 I guess we can proceed to the scope
25 of work, and we will refer to the author. Do we

1 want to give a rundown first? The project
2 limits as we can see are from 0 to 6.56, the
3 project length is 6.56 miles.

4 Do we have any specific questions, I
5 guess, from Columbiana SR 7, Jeff SR 6, through
6 the different sections? Do we want to start
7 that way I guess, Columbiana SR 7.

8 Then Jefferson, the project limits
9 from 19.22 to 34.55, project length of 15.33
10 miles. Do we have any questions on that
11 section?

12 Tuscarawas US 36, project limits
13 being 15.53 to 17.67, the project length is 2.14
14 miles. No questions?

15 Tuscarawas US 250 project limits
16 from 12.79 to 23.49. Project length of 10.70
17 miles.

18 MR. VARCOLLA: I do have a comment
19 on that section of roadway. At the State Route
20 416 interchange there in the city of New Philly,
21 416 is also known as Broadway there.

22 There is a bridge mounted sign on US
23 250 northbound on State Route 416. If you refer
24 to page 34 of 46 of the scope there's a picture
25 of that sign. Above there I said that bridge

1 mounted sign has no work. That sign will need
2 to be replaced. The one southbound, there won't
3 be any work on that one. We had a bridge hit
4 there a couple years ago and the southbound sign
5 got replaced with the bridge hit. That's a new
6 sign, so we don't have to do any work on that
7 one. But the one on the northbound side does
8 need replaced.

9 And then also at that same
10 interchange there, if you're going northbound on
11 416 up to Mill Avenue, we would like the beam
12 mounted sign replaced from that -- for that
13 section, so it would be from Mill Avenue south
14 down to that interchange. There's a couple beam
15 mounted guide signs we would like replaced with
16 this project. That's all I have.

17 MS. MURGIDA: Anything else?

18 MR. HOBBS: I have a couple
19 questions based on his comments. If you refer
20 to page 33 of the scope, the picture in the
21 middle is the overhead truss at the 77/250
22 interchange, the straight line mileage 12.52,
23 which according to page 9 of the scope is
24 outside of the project limit. So my first
25 question is, is the project limit supposed to be

1 the 77 interchange at 12.50, straight line
2 mileage, instead of 12.79?

3

4 MR. VARCOLLA: Just the
5 interchange -- I guess this overhead -- this
6 should be included in the work. But the signs
7 down on, I guess it would be 39 there, those
8 aren't included. This is really the beginning
9 of the project.

10 MR. HOBBS: Okay. There's signs
11 between -- there's other additional signing
12 between this straight line mileage point and
13 12.79. So is everything from the bridges --
14 from the overpass bridges as you're coming
15 southbound off 77 onto 250, does the project
16 start at the south end of those bridges and
17 everything south of there gets replaced?

18 MR. VARCOLLA: Yes.

19 MR. HOBBS: So this reference is
20 wrong on page 9.

21 MS. MURGIDA: Anything else?

22 MR. HOBBS: I know we had this
23 discussion at the last pre-bid for the last
24 project, just to make sure we're all bidding the
25 same project, the way the scope reads it says

1 replace the existing, I'm just reading, this
2 actually applies to all the sections, even
3 though I waited to bring this up, replace the
4 existing guide, route, regulatory and warning
5 signing around the main line and the lead-in
6 signing at interchange areas.

7 Please define interchange area. In
8 the past it was defined as the start of all the
9 trail blazing sign into the interchange. But
10 the problem with this project is there's several
11 interchanges that are not traditional
12 interchanges, they're joined by service roads or
13 something of that nature or they're agra
14 interchanges at Route 7 through the Canton area.
15 We need a better definition what is the project
16 area just to make sure we're all bidding the
17 same job.

18 MS. BENNETT: Is that something you
19 want to clarify as part of the --

20 MR. HOBBS: I have questions I'm
21 planning on submitting as pre-bid questions but
22 that's definitely an issue.

23 MR. VARCOLLA: The area through
24 Stanton there, we don't intend to go off the
25 main line. We are not intending to go into the

1 village there and get to any of those side
2 streets. The intent is to do the main line work
3 on 7 there. As far as the other interchanges,
4 as far as the lead-in signing I think the intent
5 is to do the trail blazing signs leading up to
6 those interchanges, but also, I mean, correct me
7 if I'm wrong, Rod, that, you know, if it's
8 something that we feel needs replaced, we would
9 like to have that replaced to the district's
10 discretion.

11 MR. WILSON: Do you have specific
12 locations that we can talk about?

13 MR. HOBBS: Yeah, we can talk about,
14 for instance, the one you just mentioned a few
15 minutes ago about -- between Mill Street and 250
16 at the 416 interchange. It would be much
17 simpler, from a bidding point, if you said from
18 the very first trail blazing sign that says
19 Junction 250, everything from there to the
20 interchange gets replaced based on the scope,
21 every route marker, guide sign, regulatory or
22 warning sign from that point on gets replaced,
23 as opposed to picking and choosing, because I
24 know we've had some confusion on the last job
25 which ones were supposed to be included and

1 which ones weren't supposed to be included. And
2 by saying that it's per OMUTCD section whatever,
3 that leaves it up to interpretation what should
4 be done. I'm just looking to nail down exactly
5 what the project is so everybody is bidding the
6 same project.

7 MR. WILSON: I think that section of
8 the manual starts with the junction signs. I
9 think ODOT's intent and what you're saying I
10 believe are the same. You're saying maybe we
11 ought to reword it to be in the project where
12 the junction sign is located, and I think that
13 would -- generally speaking that would probably
14 be an okay place to start.

15 MR. HOBBS: Okay. And every sign
16 from there to the freeway gets replaced, if it's
17 a regulatory, route, guide or warning sign?

18 MR. VARCOLLA: Correct.

19 MR. SUSICH: Is that something we
20 might clarify in an addendum, or can we walk out
21 of here and feel comfortable with that
22 definition?

23 MR. WILSON: I don't know that we
24 need to clarify it any, if everybody here
25 understands what we're saying and is comfortable

1 with that description.

2 MR. HOBBS: I would like it
3 clarified. I know there are certain players in
4 the field not at this meeting, to make sure
5 everybody is building the same project. I have
6 15 pre-bid questions so there's an opportunity
7 to respond to it, to the pre-bid response.

8 MS. BENNETT: I believe the reason
9 we're having this meeting is to address those
10 questions. There will be not be time for
11 pre-bid questions after this meeting. We prefer
12 to discuss as many of those here.

13 MR. HOBBS: We can go over those,
14 but will there be an addendum issued to respond
15 to the pre-bid questions?

16 MS. BENNETT: What we'll do as part
17 of this meeting is during the meeting if there
18 are specific questions raised that cannot be
19 answered here with the transcript she is doing,
20 then we will follow up with one addendum that
21 clarifies all of them. We will also be
22 reviewing this transcript to make sure
23 everything is identified and correct. And that
24 will also be posted as part of the pre-bid
25 package.

1 MR. HOBBS: Okay.

2 MR. KROCK: This particular job on
3 sheet 26 does define what locations, the extent
4 of which, I agree, Mike, with Mr. Hobbs, there
5 is a question to the extent how far we go.
6 Those are the defined, and that's good to see.

7 MS. MURGIDA: Well, since we're
8 going to attack those 15 pre-bid questions, just
9 going on a little further here with field
10 office, general provisions of work, so forth, do
11 we have any other questions that would be more
12 in general?

13 MR. HOBBS: Mine are fairly
14 specific.

15 MR. KROCK: I have one general
16 question regarding overhead signs. The
17 structures, they're going to be regalvanized,
18 recoated. How many of them have lighting on
19 them? I assume some do. It doesn't -- some
20 would have lighting on them or no, because
21 there's nothing to be done with the lighting on
22 this project. Working around the lighting may
23 or may not be an issue, I guess, as far as the
24 recoating, removal of existing sign, replacing
25 the new sign maybe with a different size, part

1 of the equation I dont' know how many, if any,
2 have lights.

3 MR. HOBBS: Almost all of them do.

4 MR. KROCK: The existing lighting
5 could be an issue with the other work you're
6 asking to have done and if it is an issue --

7 MR. HOBBS: To go along with that,
8 the other question is about the sheeting because
9 the reason, one of the reasons why we're
10 replacing guide signs across the state, removing
11 lighting and new sheeting is designed to account
12 for that. Are we going to use older sheeting
13 spec or are we going to use the current high
14 reflectivity spec?

15 MR. VARCOLLA: I think we're going
16 to -- well --

17 MR. WILSON: The new sheeting
18 specification is what we would be using.

19 MR. VARCOLLA: Right. I think for
20 the intent of this job I think we were removing
21 the lighting off there.

22 MR. HOBBS: Sheet 35 says that it
23 doesn't.

24 MR. WILSON: I think it calls for --
25 the existing lighting is to stay.

1 MR. KROCK: Easy enough to change,
2 but right now lighting is not an --

3 MR. WILSON: It stays. I think the
4 intent was, and we are still working with the
5 central office, to see if eventually we can
6 replace these lights with some type of LED
7 fixture or something. We haven't given up in
8 our district to the use of light.

9 MR. KROCK: You have more foggy
10 roads than most districts.

11 MR. WILSON: We have conditions
12 along the river, things we feel lighting is
13 still appropriate. At this point we haven't --
14 there hasn't been any lighting, LED
15 lighting-type fixtures that have been approved
16 for us to use.

17 MR. KROCK: We'll wait for --

18 MR. WILSON: We keep our fixtures
19 there so we can use them.

20 MS. MURGIDA: Okay, so, again --

21 MR. WILSON: Did we answer his
22 question regarding coating?

23 MR. KROCK: There wasn't a question
24 about the coating. It was if there's an issue
25 with the coating, the new sign size and existing

1 lighting. I don't have any specific examples,
2 but if the lighting is to remain --

3 MR. WILSON: The coating is on the
4 end frames.

5 MR. SUSICH: The lighting is to
6 remain as far as his question for the reflective
7 sheeting.

8 MR. WILSON: We would use the new
9 sheeting in accordance with our specifications,
10 current specifications.

11 MS. MURGIDA: So going on, as I said
12 earlier, with more general categories with
13 partner and communication permits and so on, do
14 we have any other general questions there or
15 should we proceed on to the specific ones?

16 MR. MORE: I don't have any
17 questions. We had a good working relationship
18 with the last project we just finished, so open
19 communications, very helpful, made life easy to
20 get the job done. So the informal partnering
21 does work.

22 MS. MURGIDA: We have Tim Stillion,
23 who is the project manager, here. All his
24 contact information is in here for that
25 communication.

1 MS. BENNETT: He and Chris will be
2 reviewing design build plans as submitted to
3 confirm that we're doing what is expected.

4 MS. MURGIDA: Okay. Well, going on
5 through if there are no other questions that we
6 can address, let's go to the specific ones since
7 we have a number of them.

8 MS. BENNETT: If you have a page or
9 something discussed that would help also.

10 MR. HOBBS: One of the pages notes
11 railroad coordination is not required. And then
12 on page 16 it says all necessary work for the
13 project will be performed with any existing
14 right-of-way. Just to the north of the very
15 south project coming out of Steubenville, as you
16 are driving north the rail line parallels 7 very
17 closely, and there are two or three beam mounted
18 sign that are either very close to the railroad
19 right-of-way or actually encroaching the
20 railroad right-of-way.

21 One of the things I'm concerned with
22 is one of the notes in the plan, page 6 is the
23 railroad coordination note, one of the other
24 notes in the plan describes the levels of signs
25 that are to be used and I believe it's going to

1 be increase in sign size from what is out there
2 now. So my concern is that we're either going
3 to encroach on the railroad right-of-way or the
4 signs are already encroaching on the railroad
5 right-of-way. I have multiple concerns. If the
6 signs are getting bigger, we're going to have
7 insufficient clearance to the roadway. We won't
8 be able to meet the design clearance for the
9 roadway because we can't move the sign away from
10 the road because of the railroad right-of-way.

11 My first question is, is railroad
12 coordination necessary, whatever railroad, I
13 think it's Norfolk Southern.

14 MR. VARCOLLA: I don't have an
15 answer for you on that one. I have to do some
16 research.

17 MR. HOBBS: That's fine. Because
18 the next question is in the last project, I
19 think in all previous projects, Russ, you can
20 correct me if I misspeak, I'm pretty sure the
21 requirement for surveying, establishing the
22 right-of-ways has been waived because of the
23 statement that all the work is to be done within
24 the existing right-of-way. Is that true in your
25 previous projects.

1 MR. KROCK: In most cases it's
2 pretty obvious you're in the right-of-way four
3 lane intersections there were a couple instances
4 where we did some research to determine if the
5 existing sign was well within the right-of-way.
6 I don't think we went out and staked any
7 right-of-way, but there were a couple instances
8 we thought it was close and we better check, and
9 it turned out the sign was well within the
10 right-of-way and we could move it a little bit.
11 There was some due diligence done there, but we
12 never went and staked out the entire
13 right-of-way or spent a lot of time on it.

14 MR. HOBBS: I guess the expectation
15 is going to be that the DBT is going to have to
16 research the right-of-way in any area where it's
17 a concern, specifically around along the
18 railroad, and make sure we're not encroaching on
19 the railroad right-of-way?

20 MR. VARCOLLA: Correct.

21 MS. MURGIDA: I would think that
22 would be reasonable.

23 MR. VARCOLLA: I think the existing
24 plans that I have listed on there, I think they
25 have included -- they usually have some kind of

1 right-of-way information on there. I guess when
2 I was preparing the scope, I didn't think we had
3 any problems putting back any signs but, you
4 know, if the sign is getting to be really extra
5 large than what the existing is, I think we need
6 to look at what the legend says on that sign and
7 adjust it.

8 MR. WILSON: I want to ask a
9 question just for clarification purposes. The
10 existing right-of-way is to be shown on the
11 plans, is that not correct.

12 MR. STILLION: Yes, that's correct.

13 MR. WILSON: And the design build
14 team will be expected to use the right-of-way
15 information on the existing plans to put on the
16 plans that they're preparing.

17 MS. MURGIDA: But I think don't we
18 want to stipulate that he has to confirm what is
19 on the plan?

20 MR. HOBBS: That's the whole issue
21 with the question.

22 MS. MURGIDA: I think that's what we
23 need to focus on. But you need to confirm them,
24 you can use that as reference, but it needs to
25 be confirmed when you use it to do your design.

1 MR. HOBBS: Which means the center
2 lines has to be established, the right-of-way
3 has to be surveyed. You're shaking your head,
4 Russ.

5 MR. KROCK: To do that right, you're
6 correct.

7 MS. MURGIDA: Again, though, as you
8 point pointed, it would probably be an
9 infrequent situation you would have to do that
10 much work to verify. It should be pretty plain
11 in most cases, I would imagine.

12 MR. HOBBS: I would agree. I want
13 to make sure we're all bidding the same thing,
14 again, because there a big difference between
15 establishing a center line and right-of-way and
16 copying a center line and copying a right-of-way
17 in terms of effort. And on the last job, and I
18 know in some of the previous projects, it wasn't
19 an issue because it was never a conflict, the
20 last project there was never a conflict. There
21 was none of these issues, but this one there's
22 going to be issues, at least along the railroad.

23 MR. WILSON: Just that one location
24 you feel potential is for concern at this time?

25 MR. HOBBS: So far.

1 MR. KROCK: It would be good to know
2 if permitting was done to place those signs in
3 the first place with the railroad.

4 MR. WILSON: I'm not aware we have
5 any permit from the railroad to put the signs on
6 their right-of-way: The intent is to stay
7 within our own right-of-way with the sign, and I
8 believe we would want to even reduce the size of
9 the sign if we have to do to stay within our
10 existing right-of-way, I don't think we intend
11 to go off ODOT's right-of-way for a sign.

12 MS. MURGIDA: So you feel the area
13 in question is going to be the railroad
14 right-of-way based on what you've seen. And we
15 can do the research on that and determine that
16 ahead of time.

17 MS. BENNETT: We can see if there's
18 any agreements in place.

19 MR. SUSICH: Is the contractor to
20 assume that the DBT -- to assume the existing
21 signs are all on ODOT right-of-way?

22 MR. WILSON: Yes.

23 MS. MURGIDA: Anyone else have any
24 comments or follow ups to that question? Do you
25 have the next one?

1 MR. HOBBS: Again, this is a project
2 limit question. At the 250/36 interchange just
3 north of Dennison, 250 makes a hard left-hand
4 turn and goes -- changes from a north/south
5 orientation to east/west orientation to go along
6 and matches with 36 alignment. Where does the
7 project stop at that interchange to the south?
8 Does it go all the way to the eastbound ramp
9 terminal from eastbound 36? Is that the
10 intention where the project limit is?

11 MR. VARCOLLA: It's from McCauley
12 Drive to the interchange.

13 MR. HOBBS: Which one is McCauley
14 Drive?

15 MR. KROCK: 250 is 800, right?

16 MR. HOBBS: Correct.

17 MR. KROCK: According to the SLM
18 sheet, that's 800.

19 MR. VARCOLLA: Can you restate where
20 your question is again?

21 MR. HOBBS: At that interchange
22 where is the southern project limit? Is it this
23 eastbound ramp terminal or something different?

24 MR. VARCOLLA: This is all part
25 of -- this whole interchange is all part of this

1 project because 36 ends right here and 250
2 begins.

3 MR. HOBBS: I guess what I'm saying,
4 because through the interchange you end up on
5 some local street because the state route never
6 goes south of the bridge. I'm asking what is
7 the southern limit, is it the ramp terminals.
8 Do you have that, Russ?

9 MR. KROCK: It goes over. It runs
10 over 800.

11 MR. WILSON: Talking about the
12 connection, the connection to Urichsville up to
13 the interchange area. I think you're doing all
14 the signing down to the corporation in
15 Urichsville.

16 MR. HOBBS: Does it stop right there
17 at ramp J's terminal?

18 MR. VARCOLLA: The incorporation
19 line is down here. That is where you want to
20 stop. The intent was to get from this corner
21 everything.

22 MR. HOBBS: There's an overhead sign
23 you don't have a picture of. I don't know if it
24 was replaced or not. The sign to ramp H.

25 MR. VARCOLLA: I may have missed

1 that when I did my field work.

2 MR. HOBBS: So we're going all the
3 way to Urichsville corporation?

4 MR. WILSON: Yes, Urichsville
5 corporation.

6 MS. BENNETT: For the purpose of
7 this, can you define the location, what we call
8 it, US 250.

9 MR. HOBBS: Yes, US 250/36
10 interchange.

11 MS. MURGIDA: Next question.

12 MR. HOBBS: There are multiple
13 locations on both sections of roadway 250 and 7
14 that have pedestal mounted flashers with signs
15 in between the flashers like intersection
16 approach warning signs. Is the intent of the
17 project simply to replace the sign that is on
18 that pedestal?

19 MR. VARCOLLA: Yes.

20 MS. MURGIDA: Next question.

21 MR. HOBBS: At the 250/800
22 interchange there's an America's By Way signing
23 that looks like it was recently put in. Is that
24 intended to be replaced by the project?

25 MR. VARCOLLA: That would just be

1 erected. I don't think we have a sign.

2 MR. HOBBS: That was going to be my
3 next question, if you wanted it replaced, do I
4 have a block.

5 MR. VARCOLLA: No, just re-erected.

6 MS. MURGIDA: Your next question?

7 MR. HOBBS: Still at the 250/800
8 interchange, I think it might occur on a couple
9 locations, there's mast street-mounted street
10 name signs. Are those included? As you come
11 off the ramps, there's street name signs on the
12 signal pole.

13 MR. WILSON: I'm not familiar with
14 the location you're talking about, you said 800?

15 MR. HOBBS: In New Philadelphia
16 800/250/416 interchange.

17 MR. VARCOLLA: At Broadway, 416.

18 MR. HOBBS: Yeah. I thought I
19 remember noticing a couple other places.

20 MR. WILSON: Talking about street
21 name signs on the mast on the signal pole. I
22 don't think our intent was to replace those.

23 MS. BENNETT: Leave as is or
24 re-erect.

25 MR. WILSON: Don't touch. They're

1 mounted on the mast and they don't need to do
2 anything.

3 MR. HOBBS: To follow up with that.
4 Any signs on signal poles are not replaced, push
5 button signs, unless it a trail Blazer.

6 MR. VARCOLLA: There may even be a
7 no left turn I think at that one interchange,
8 one mast-on or lane usage sign I guess. But I
9 want to point out on sheet 34 the picture for
10 southbound state 46 lane control signs those
11 don't have to be replaced either.

12 MS. MURGIDA: Next question?

13 MR. HOBBS: Still there at
14 250/800/416 interchange, there's an area along
15 Graff Road S.E. between eastbound ramp terminal
16 and 800. Is that included in the project?

17 MR. VARCOLLA: You mean Graff Road.

18 MR. HOBBS: Yes.

19 MR. VARCOLLA: No.

20 MR. HOBBS: So in general the
21 project always stops at the ramp terminals?

22 MR. VARCOLLA: Correct. These are
23 kind of unique interchange areas, I guess.

24 MR. WILSON: I believe this is the
25 only location in this project that would be like

1 that extension, if you will, between the end of
2 the ramp and connecting with a state route that
3 I can think of.

4 MR. HOBBS: 45, but that is short,
5 that's a short stretch.

6 MR. WILSON: You know what I'm
7 talking about.

8 MR. VARCOLLA: Where 45 comes in on
9 Route 7 there.

10 MR. WILSON: Yes. There shouldn't
11 be any guide signs or anything in that area as I
12 recall.

13 MR. HOBBS: There are. There are
14 beam mounted guide signs as well on connecting
15 street between the two interstates.

16 MR. WILSON: Beam mounted.

17 MR. HOBBS: They're destination-type
18 signs with the city name and an arrow connecting
19 between the two interchanges.

20 MR. WILSON: We want to replace
21 them, yes.

22 MS. MURGIDA: Next one.

23 MR. WILSON: If I can re-ask that
24 question regarding Graff Road here at the
25 interchange of South Broadway, are there, do you

1 recall any destination signs on Graff Road beam
2 mounted?

3 MR. VARCOLLA: There weren't any on
4 Graff Road.

5 MR. HOBBS: There may be trail
6 blazers.

7 MR. WILSON: We would want to
8 replace the trail blazers, I think.

9 MR. VARCOLLA: On Graff.

10 MR. WILSON: On Graff between the
11 westbound entrance ramp and down pass Broadway,
12 past Bob Evans, in that area.

13 MR. HOBBS: I don't remember if
14 there is or not.

15 MR. WILSON: There may be trail
16 blazers, route marking signs 2, 4, 6, whatever.
17 I think we want to replace that.

18 MR. HOBBS: Still at that
19 interchange on the outside of 250, there's the
20 first trail blazing sign just north of the
21 Broadway commercial avenue intersection where
22 416 turns to the left. It's where it says
23 junction 800/250. I assume that's where the
24 project starts on that street and it doesn't
25 actually get into the intersection?

1 MR. WILSON: Do you have any
2 pictures of that, Chris? I know what he's
3 talking about.

4 MR. HOBBS: The first junction sign
5 right there.

6 MR. VARCOLLA: We would be starting
7 here at commercial. I wouldn't do anything on
8 commercial, just it would be Broadway 416.

9 MR. HOBBS: In Stanton along 7
10 there's signs for the W.L. Stamos plant that
11 appears to be in the right-of-way, are those
12 owned by ODOT or are they First Energy?

13 MR. WILSON: They don't belong to
14 ODOT, so we would not be replacing them.

15 MR. VARCOLLA: I would just show as
16 no work on the plan.

17 MR. HOBBS: Near 8th Street up in
18 the northern project limit on State Route 7 by
19 East Liverpool, there's an overhead flashing
20 school zone sign that is within the defined
21 project limit. It's just south of the main
22 interchange with 30 and 39. Do you intend to do
23 any work on that flashing school zone sign?

24 MR. VARCOLLA: No.

25 MR. HOBBS: That's all I got.

1 MS. MURGIDA: That's it. Do we have
2 any additional comments?

3 MS. BENNETT: I'm going to try to
4 recap, not in detail, all the questions.
5 Basically several of these question had to do
6 with actual start and end points. When we get
7 the transcript from, I forgot the name of the
8 company, we will review to make sure that the
9 answers seem clear. If they don't or if we need
10 to revise the scope based on those questions and
11 answers as we discussed here, we will do that as
12 part of an addendum. Mainly we did answer --
13 you don't need to know the number of overhead
14 signs with lighting, you know that most of them
15 do, you don't need a follow up.

16 MR. KROCK: No.

17 MS. BENNETT: And we're going to use
18 new sheeting specs and lighting as is. We do
19 have a couple questions on railroad coordination
20 both on whether or not we need to coordinate
21 with the railroad and also if there are
22 agreements on the right-of-way for signs inside
23 or outside of the right-of-way in that area. I
24 think everything else seemed to be answered as
25 we discussed each location.

1 But, again, the way this will work
2 from here, after this meeting has ended, we will
3 get a transcript back to review within a few
4 days. We will discuss very few because the sale
5 of the project is 12-16. We will be correcting
6 the transcript and sending it to central office
7 for posting as part of this project. And any
8 changes in the scope that are required as part
9 of these questions will also be posted as an
10 addendum. I believe that's it.

11 And we intend to hopefully only do
12 that once or at the most twice, to have two
13 changes. That's why I asked, because of the
14 shortened time frame I asked that you to ask all
15 the questions here. That is only two weeks from
16 now. Anybody have any question on that part?

17 MS. MURGIDA: Any other questions
18 regarding the scope. Any comments?

19 MR. WILSON: I want to thank Mike
20 for raising the questions he did to get
21 clarification so everybody understands what we
22 want. I appreciate that.

23

- - -

24

(Meeting concluded at 10:59)

25

