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5 P R O C E E D I N G S

6 MR. BEHRMAN: Good morning, everybody.

7 We're here for the design-build pre-bid for Project

8 3000-14.

9 I'll do some quick introductions up here

10 at the front table. I'm Aaron Behrman. I'll be the

11 design project engineer.

12 MR. CHARVAT: I'm Dennis Charvat,

13 construction administrator.

14 MR. MEYER: I'm Dan Meyer,

15 construction. I'll be the engineer on the project.

16 MR. BEHRMAN: Just a few housekeeping

17 things. We are doing, you know, stenographic

18 reporting, so if you ask a question later, if you could

19 just basically state your name and your affiliation so

20 we can get that into the minutes, we'd appreciate it.

21 And with that, basically I'll just go

22 through the different major highlights of the project,

23 and then we'll go ahead and open it for questions.

24 Again, like I said, we're here for the

25 3000-14 design-build project for Hancock County and Wood
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1 County. Essentially the project description is

2 basically to widen the I-75 corridor from three

3 lanes -- or two lanes to three lanes with widening of

4 four pairs of mainline structures and drainage

5 replacement.

6 So with that, the general concept, my MOT

7 is to widen to the inside and then basically flip traffic

8 it to the outside. We do have a

9 transition zones with the MOT on the north end. We'll

10 be constructing the transition zone with the project

11 that's immediately north of this project that you will see later in

12 the year.

13 As part of this project for the southern

14 lane transition, we'd be building basically the full

15 width down to the end of the project, but when we final

16 up the project, we will be striping out the third lane

17 north of the project back to the two lane at the south

18 terminus at the end of the project.

19 On the pavement side, the project is set

20 up to be an asphalt project. Right now we have some

21 pavement repairs set for the existing. We will be

22 adding some partial depth pavement repair basically for

23 the maintained areas or the areas that the traffic's

24 going to be running on, so I will be adding that.

25 The project does have stabilization
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1 through the whole project. We do have sulfates within

2 the project, so there's areas of undercut along with

3 cement stabilization. A couple changes on that. We

4 are looking at changing the Type D rock to a Type C,

5 and also we'll be adding a curing coat for the --

6 basically the stabilization areas.

7 On the bridges themselves, general scope

8 of that is essentially widen the existing decks,

9 re-deck the bridges. Some of the bridges will require

10 new beams be placed. Other ones the beams can stay.

11 Several of the bridges had recent rehabs -- well,

12 basically about 20 years ago, so that stays. The other

13 ones will need to be replaced because of the cover

14 plates. They don't allow us to use those cover plates

15 any more.

16 On the bridge over the railroad, we are

17 going to be adding crash walls on that structure. The

18 existing clearance requires that. And those crash

19 walls will have to be in line with the new piers that

20 are going to be placed. Essentially there's a gap

21 between the existing walls that were done 20 years

22 ago, that will have to be built in, so that's something

23 that will be added.

24 On the drainage side, essentially what we

25 want to do is to have all the drainage reevaluated
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1 within the project to make sure that all the existing

2 pipes can handle the new drainage from the enclosed

3 median.

4 There is a couple issues that came up on

5 what can stay. There's some issues with the MOT, can

6 we leave the pipes in during the MOT phases. We're

7 still looking at that to see how that would affect the

8 job. And the removal policy too, there was a question

9 on whether they can be removed per the L & D or do we

10 want them all taken out, so we're still looking at that

11 also.

12 I guess with that, that's kind of all, unless

13 you guys have anything.

14 MR. GRAMZA: Mike Gramza from ODOT.

15 Clarification, Aaron, it's lime stabilization.

16 MR. BEHRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. So with

17 that, I guess we'll go ahead and open it up for

18 questions.

19 MR. WILSON: Jim Wilson, E.S. Wagner.

20 In regard to the stabilization, I know you've got a

21 pretty good quantity set for stabilization and you've also

22 got the undercut. Do you have any idea what the limits

23 of those locations that you anticipate being undercut

24 are? Did you define that is I guess what I'm asking?

25 MR. HURST: It's in the geotech.
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1 MR. BEHRMAN: Yeah. There are geotech

2 forms that we've taken, and there's a -- I think a

3 spreadsheet that has the GB1 listing in there. I mean,

4 I believe if you get into that, it does have the areas

5 that -- where the sulfates are higher. That's

6 basically what we -- where we defined our quantities

7 from.

8 MR. ALFAOUR: Faour AlFaour. The

9 pavement repair, does it also apply to the shoulder

10 repair or just the mainline?

11 MR. BEHRMAN: The initial full depth

12 repair to be done at each season is for the mainline

13 lanes and shoulders. The partial pavement depth repair

14 that we're going to be adding would be for basically a

15 surface, like a pothole-type repair, which would

16 include basically your mainline and shoulder again.

17 MR. HURST: Jeremy Hurst with

18 Miller Brothers. Has a completion date been

19 established for the projects to the north of this?

20 MR. BEHRMAN: What we're shooting for

21 is basically June of '16. Is that right?

22 MR. GRAMZA: Mike Gramza with ODOT.

23 Yes.

24 MR. HURST: Those projects have the

25 same completion date and they're conventional design.
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1 How do you expect a design-build to be built in the

2 same time frame? What I'm asking for is consideration

3 to move that completion date.

4 MR. BEHRMAN: Do you have any idea of

5 how long you would anticipate?

6 MR. HURST: I'll submit a pre-bid

7 question.

8 MR. BEHRMAN: I'd appreciate it.

9 MR. CLUM: Chuck Clum for Kokosing.

10 Along those same lines, there's a 401 permit

11 requirement to be obtained. I think it said 120 days.

12 Has that been considered into the overall schedule?

13 That could wipe out quite a bit of this season.

14 MR. BEHRMAN: There's been a couple

15 pre-bid questions. I can't remember who asked about

16 what exactly the 404 and 401 permits apply to. The

17 biggest area of concern would be essentially the

18 Hancock Rocky Ford Creek crossing. Essentially any

19 in-stream work, we're going to have to coordinate that

20 work, and again, if there's any changes on the Rocky

21 Creek in Wood County, we've coordinated with our

22 existing design. If there's going to be additional

23 impacts or in-stream work on that structure, we may

24 have to re-coordinate that.

25 There was a pre-bid question asked about the
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1 roadside ditches. As of right now they are not

2 jurisdictional.

3 MR. CLUM: Culverts as well?

4 MR. BEHRMAN: I believe the culverts

5 as well.

6 MR. CLUM: I thought the scope said

7 culverts weren't included, but maybe you answered that.

8 MR. BEHRMAN: Yeah. We just got a

9 question in yesterday that might offer some

10 clarification for that, so we'll get those answers out

11 there to you.

12 MR. YODER: As a follow-up, Jeff

13 Yoder with Poggemeyer's, in the area where the slide

14 repair area is, the sloping area next to the -- I guess

15 the northwest corner of the existing railroad ditch,

16 does the ecological report show that as being wetlands

17 in that area?

18 MR. BEHRMAN: We'll check into that.

19 MR. WING: Craig Wing, E.S. Wagner.

20 Along those lines, some of the roadside ditches are

21 also labeled as wetlands, so it's hard for us to

22 imagine that none of those are jurisdictional.

23 MR. KERST: Jeff Kerst for Kokosing.

24 There's still several unanswered previous questions

25 that you haven't answered here at this meeting. Do you
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1 have any idea when those will be answered? Mainly

2 pertaining to a lot of these additional drainage lines

3 that are under the bridges.

4 MR. BEHRMAN: There were several

5 questions on the drainage underneath the bridges, and I

6 believe also under Grant Road and Insley Road. The two

7 under Insley do not drain any -- basically do not drain

8 any of the 75 median drainage, so those I did answer.

9 The two on Grant that -- essentially what

10 they do is they connect the old county ditches across

11 75. We're currently inspecting those to see what kind

12 of condition those are in, and we hope to have an

13 answer back on that shortly for you.

14 The other conduits that are essentially

15 between the pier and the -- basically the slope

16 underneath the bridge, we'll have to look at those.

17 Again, our intention was to have all the drainage

18 reevaluated for the sizing, so I guess we'll have to

19 say we're still investigating those as of right now,

20 but we'll get an answer back to you.

21 MR. KERST: Is this going to affect

22 the bid date?

23 MR. BEHRMAN: Our intention is no.

24 MR. WILSON: Jim Wilson, E.S. Wagner

25 Company. Do you by chance have a complete listing of
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1 the drainage features, drainage structures that you

2 have identified within this corridor since you have not

3 provided any plans along here other than some existing

4 drawings as to what's real and what's not real?

5 MR. BEHRMAN: We can see what we have

6 available.

7 MR. WILSON: That would be nice.

8 That way we make sure we've got everything addressed

9 that you want addressed. For bidding purposes right

10 now, your scope, you're under a replacement?

11 MR. BEHRMAN: Right.

12 MR. WILSON: And I assume that's

13 everything within the right-of-way?

14 MR. BEHRMAN: Right.

15 MR. WILSON: Okay.

16 MR. WING: Craig Wing, E.S. Wagner.

17 There is a requirement in the plans that you put in

18 these temporary pavement markings, surface asphalt,

19 surface pavement, that at the end of the job we have to

20 do a mill and fill operation in those areas, and

21 certainly we're going to have substantial transition

22 zones at the north and south end of the project. Will

23 those -- will a mill and fill operation be required in

24 those areas since there is going to be ongoing

25 projects?
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1 MR. BEHRMAN: The north transition

2 will be handled by the project to the north, so our --

3 MR. WING: Regardless --

4 MR. BEHRMAN: So, regardless, on the

5 north end, you guys should not have to do anything.

6 MR. WING: What about the south?

7 MR. BEHRMAN: The south end, I mean,

8 we would allow that the surface course not be placed

9 until even that final year.

10 MR. WING: I get that, but our

11 temporary markings are going to have to extend out onto

12 existing pavement. Are you going to -- are we going to

13 do a small mill and fill operation down there

14 considering there's going to be another job?

15 MR. BEHRMAN: We'll have to get back

16 to you on that. We'll have to talk with District 1.

17 MR. WING: Okay.

18 MR. CLUM: Chuck Clum for Kokosing.

19 Will the transition area north of the job be built full

20 width?

21 MR. BEHRMAN: Yes.

22 MR. CLUM: Okay.

23 MR. HURST: Jeremy Hurst, Miller

24 Brothers. I just want to make sure I'm clear and

25 everybody in the room is clear. The existing culverts
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1 within the right-of-way, are they to be reevaluated to

2 be replaced or are they to be replaced?

3 For instance, there's a particular location, I

4 guess Station 1071, there's an 84-inch culvert

5 underneath I-75 that's 24 feet deep. Obviously there's

6 a lot of dollars that need to go into replacing that

7 with inside out construction, so we want to be clear as

8 to what the intent is.

9 MR. BEHRMAN: Okay.

10 MR. HURST: And another thing to

11 consider, is relining an option too for particular

12 instances?

13 MR. WILSON: Jim Wilson, E.S. Wagner.

14 How do you -- how do we bid reevaluate -- at some

15 point -- since we're not having any pre-bid design

16 meetings so we know what's real and what's not real,

17 how do we price this? Because what we perceive to be

18 acceptable, you may not, and then after the fact you

19 say well, you've got to replace it, you should have had

20 it covered. So how do we cover that?

21 MR. BEHRMAN: We'll make a

22 clarification on that.

23 MR. WING: Craig Wing, E.S. Wagner.

24 Following along the drainage lines, the previous

25 conduit runs have been abandoned on other jobs. Are
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1 they going to be required to be removed or will those

2 be allowed to stay?

3 MR. BEHRMAN: Do you have specific

4 locations that you know of?

5 MR. WING: Going through the

6 existing plans that were provided and the jobs that

7 were provided, there are some that were called out as

8 abandoned in the past, so I assume we'll find those out

9 there. The question is do we need to anticipate

10 removing those or will they be allowed to stay in

11 place?

12 MR. BEHRMAN: Right, removing them.

13 MR. HOPPENJANS: Dick Hoppenjans with

14 Bowser-Morner. Has any of the geotechnical test boring

15 data been completed for any of the structures?

16 MR. BEHRMAN: The -- all the geo data

17 for the Hancock structures -- or excuse me -- for the

18 Wood structures were placed out on the website with

19 Addenda 1, so the structure report and then the soil

20 sheets have been placed out there for the two Wood

21 County structures.

22 The Hancock structures, the existing

23 borings for the -- that were done for the original are

24 out there. I'll have to look -- we'll have to check on

25 if the other additional structure borings are out
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1 there. I'll have to double check on that. If they're

2 not, I'll get them out there for you.

3 MR. HOPPENJANS: That's the existing

4 stuff. Has any new material been -- any new borings

5 been done so that -- it appeared that, when I reviewed

6 the data, that some new borings have already been done

7 so that won't need to be repeated.

8 MR. BEHRMAN: Right.

9 MR. HOPPENJANS: But it wasn't clear. I

10 wasn't able to find all of it.

11 MR. BEHRMAN: I will have to check on

12 that.

13 MR. HOPPENJANS: All right.

14 MR. WILSON: Jim Wilson for E.S.

15 Wagner. Keep in mind that when you -- based upon the

16 timing of when some of this information is provided,

17 we've got another step in this whole process with the

18 design aspect. If they have to review all that and in

19 turn get that back to us so we can price it, it adds

20 another step into this process, so obviously the

21 earlier this material can be made available, the better

22 we are --

23 MR. BEHRMAN: Exactly.

24 MR. WILSON: -- in order to hit your

25 bid date.
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1 MR. HURST: Jeremy Hurst, Miller

2 Brothers. Just a general question in regards to the

3 stabilization. Is there a specific reason why lime was

4 chosen over the cement? Is that due to the sulfates

5 or -- I couldn't really find much.

6 MR. BEHRMAN: I'll have to check into

7 that.

8 Any other questions?

9 MR. YODER: Jeff Yoder, Poggemeyer

10 Design Group. On the farmer's road where it goes over

11 Eagleville Road, it's one of the bridges that's already

12 been designed, it has a full ramp on both the

13 northbound and southbound bridges existing right now,

14 and there is some span under those bridges. Is it the

15 intent that those ramps off the Eagleville interchange

16 will be extended?

17 MR. BEHRMAN: I'll have to take a look

18 at those structures. Offhand I cannot -- I can't

19 answer your question. I'll take a look.

20 MR. WING: Craig Wing, E.S. Wagner.

21 Does ODOT consider the existing shoulders capable of

22 handling the MOT as they are or will work be required

23 on the shoulders?

24 MR. BEHRMAN: Yeah, I believe they --

25 yes, they will handle it.
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1 MR. WING: As a follow-up to that,

2 is it the department's intention to pay for the mill

3 and fill and the rumble strips that will be required

4 under the MOT due to the pavement repair?

5 MR. BEHRMAN: We can answer that.

6 Anyone else? If nobody has anything

7 else --

8 MR. WILSON: Any time frame on that?

9 MR. BEHRMAN: My hope is to have it

10 out by next Thursday.

11 MR. CLUM: Well, that's only two

12 weeks before the bid. Being the fact this is design

13 and build, I really think more time is needed. It

14 seems there's a lot of things we're still reviewing.

15 MR. BEHRMAN: I'll do everything

16 possible to get it out there.

17 Any other questions? No? All right.

18 Thank you for coming today.

19 (Proceedings concluded at 10:54 a.m.)

20 - - -
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