

Pre-Bid Meeting Sign in Sheet

Project CLA-40-10.11; PID 99779

Date 12/14/15 Time 10:00AM

Place: 4170 Allium Ct., Springfield, OH 45505

NAME	COMPANY	TELEPHONE / E-MAIL
Russ Krock	ADR Assoc.	740-345-1921, rkrock@adriinnovation.com
Terry Mills	Resource Intl	614-823-4949 / jerry.m@resourceintl.com
Brian Fultz	Barnett Paring	937-424-9120 bfulz@barnettparing.com
TRICIA BISHOP	ODOT D7	937-497-6721 tricia.bishop@dot.ohio.gov
Randy McCallan	SMT	614-204-7651 rmcclan@jmt.com
RYAN HANKE	ODOT D7	937-497-6948 ryan.hanke@dot.ohio.gov
JIM CHRISTOFF	John R. Jurgensen	513-771-0820 jimchristoff@jjnet.com
Kate Holden	John R. Jurgensen	513-771-0820 Kate.holden@jjnet.com
Josh Carter	John R. Jurgensen	513-771-0820 Josh.Carter@jjnet.com

NAME	COMPANY	TELEPHONE / E-MAIL
Paul Morzik	TRA	513-532-3477 Paul.Morzik@TRAINT.COM
Sherry Wampler Ley	D-7 ODOT	937-497-6892 Sherry-wampler-ley@dot.ohio.gov
Michelle Porr	ODOT D-7	937-538-6291 michelle.porr@dot.ohio.gov
SAL VERZI	ODOT D-7	937-538-6447 Salvatore.Verzi@dot.ohio.gov
Johnston Burr	CCE	737-521-1801 jbur@CLARKCOUNTYOHIO.GOV
Scott Schmid	CSTRC	937-521-2133 sschmid@clarkcountyohio.gov
Joe Mellman	Resource International	513-769-6998 joem@resourceinternational.com
Dave Ley	ODOT-D-7	937-497-6848 david.ley@dot.ohio.gov

BEFORE THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

- - -

In the Matter of: :
 :
CLA-40-10.11 :
PID 99779 :
 :
 - - -

PRE-BID MEETING

at the Ohio Department of Transportation, 4170 Allium
Court, UAS Auditorium, Springfield, Ohio, called at
10 a.m. on Monday, December 14, 2015.

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
Fax - (614) 224-5724

- - -

1 Monday Morning Session,

2 December 14, 2015.

3 - - -

4 MR. LeBLANC: We are going to get
5 started. This is the pre-bid meeting for the Clark
6 County 40-10.11 project. And the intent for today is
7 to just have some interaction between any of the
8 prospective build teams and the Department to make
9 sure that although we have a pre-bid question
10 process, that we have some dialogue, if necessary, to
11 get some clarifications to ensure that the project
12 that you guys put together for us is the project we
13 are expecting to get on our side of the house, that
14 when we get to bid time, we have as little surprises
15 as we can possibly have.

16 A couple of -- I want to talk about a
17 couple of ground rules before we start. First, the
18 cell phones, I just heard one go off. Just got to
19 make sure your cell phones are on vibration. If you
20 have to take calls, feel free. We probably will not
21 stop the meeting for your phone calls. Hopefully --
22 I know. Hopefully when you come back, anything that
23 you have missed you can pick it up in the minutes for
24 the meeting.

25 We do have a stenographer here today, so

1 some of the ground rules we are going to have before
2 you speak you state your name and the company or
3 entity that you represent so that we can get that
4 into the record.

5 We will then as a Department review those
6 records, and we will be issuing any formal official
7 responses via addendum. So this is more casual
8 conversation today. For the actual contract changes
9 that might occur through the scope, it will be done
10 through addendums. So just be aware of that and we
11 will get those out as soon as we get those back from
12 the stenographer and have those reviewed.

13 Okay. I think it's appropriate, at least
14 for us up here, I would like to do introductions
15 through the room so we kind of know who you are.
16 State your name and whatever company or entity that
17 you are representing so we can kind of get an
18 understanding of who our audience is here today.

19 I will start. I am Scott LeBlanc, and I
20 am the area engineer for ODOT, that I will be
21 overseeing this project.

22 MR. HANKE: I am Ryan Hanke from ODOT
23 District 7. I am the project manager on the design
24 side.

25 MS. BISHOP: I'm Tricia Bishop, District

1 7 environmental coordinator.

2 MS. WAMPLER-LEY: Sherry Wampler-Ley,
3 senior design engineer.

4 MR. VERZI: Sal Verzi, transportation
5 manager.

6 MS. PORR: Michelle Porr, ODOT District 7
7 project engineer.

8 MR. KROCK: Russ Krock, ADR & Associates.

9 MR. MILLS: Jerry Mills, Resource
10 International.

11 MR. LAMB: Dave Lamb, District 7
12 construction engineer.

13 MR. McCLELLAN: Randy McClellan, JMT.

14 MR. MELLMAN: Joe Mellman, Resource
15 International.

16 MR. CARTER: Josh Carter, John R.
17 Jurgensen.

18 MS. HOLDEN: Kate Holden, John R.
19 Jurgensen.

20 MR. CRAWFORD: Jim Crawford, John R.
21 Jurgensen.

22 MR. MOTOLIK: Brian Motolik, John R.
23 Jurgensen.

24 MR. BURR: John Burr, Clark County
25 Engineer.

1 MR. SCHMID: Scott Schmid, TCC.

2 MR. FULTZ: Brian Fultz, Barrett Paving.

3 MR. LeBLANC: Okay. Thank you. That's
4 great.

5 All right. I am going to apologize
6 upfront for the IT side of the house is not in the
7 middle of the room, so I will be kind of walking back
8 and forth this morning.

9 So this is the agenda that I put
10 together. It's pretty generic, pretty
11 straightforward. We will obviously expound on the
12 bullets as we go through. If there is a topic -- a
13 larger topic that you think is omitted, feel free to
14 bring it up. We can obviously discuss whatever topic
15 you think is appropriate that will help you put your
16 bids together for this project.

17 So I guess the easiest way to start is to
18 give an overview of the project. This project was
19 part of ODOT's Ramp Clear Initiative, kind of how it
20 got developed. The idea is to eliminate backups from
21 68 at the exit ramp here, ramp H, is the intent.

22 There are going to be improvements to the
23 intersection of Upper Valley Pike and ramp H. We are
24 going to do some modifications to Columbia Road there
25 as it comes out. There is going to be some

1 limitation on movements there and, of course, the
2 intersection Upper Valley Pike and the U.S. 40.

3 Those are kind of the main components of
4 this project. So are there any questions in general
5 about the project scope about what the intent is here
6 on the job? It's fairly straightforward. The
7 details might need some clarification. That's really
8 the intent is to address those three major items
9 which would be the ramp, the intersection at the toe
10 of the ramp, and the intersection there at U.S. 40
11 and Upper Valley Pike.

12 So we will run through. The next thing
13 we will look through real quick is on the
14 environmental side of the house. I will just leave
15 that up. We have a couple of bid items that would be
16 outside of the lump sums for the project that were
17 set up, and they are -- they are all for
18 environmental items.

19 One of them is for petroleum-laden soils
20 potentially that are going to exist. It's the 2700
21 West National Road address marked up on the plans
22 there. There were -- there is going to be 10 tons of
23 material set up for that potential environmental
24 situation. The scope lays out how that material is
25 supposed to be handled which is not uncommon for

1 petroleum-laden soils.

2 The other two had to do with the landfill
3 location which is down here outlined in orange which
4 is the approximate boundaries of that
5 junkyard/landfill operation that's now been capped
6 but at one point in time was active. So we do have
7 some environmental restrictions based on the work
8 primarily on ramp H that will be impacted by that
9 site. So we added a dewatering item for a thousand
10 gallons which will be necessary for the dewatering
11 operations that would occur within those boundaries
12 primarily probably for trenching operations would be
13 the primary use of that.

14 We also have 3,000 yards set up for
15 removal of material that's within 300 feet of that
16 boundary so that's kind of the nexus is that 300-foot
17 zone from the boundary. So as you can see, there is
18 going to be a fair amount of ramp H's work that is
19 going to be inside of that boundary or the 300 feet
20 of it so that was the purpose of setting up those
21 items because we don't know what the volume is going
22 to be. They will be paid outside of the stated lump
23 sum build, so whatever we encounter we can compensate
24 the contractor and design team for that work.

25 Environmental commitments, we have the

1 sole source aquifer commitment which we have on a
2 fair amount of projects in this area so there will be
3 requirements that need to be included for sole source
4 aquifers, spill kits, reporting -- reporting items.
5 And, again, those are covered in the scope also.

6 And then because they get around the
7 landfill area because it was a landfill we have
8 potential methane or explosive gas requirements for
9 monitoring of those explosive gases when you are
10 working within that region. The excavations again
11 are covered partly by bid item that we discussed
12 previously.

13 And then the only other somewhat unique
14 item is any trenches done within that area has to be
15 backfilled LSM, so we will have to make sure we
16 incorporate the costs of low-strength mortar as
17 backfill for all trenching operations within that
18 area in order to try to mitigate migration of the
19 groundwater.

20 Anybody have any questions about the
21 environmental?

22 MR. CARTER: Josh Carter, John R.
23 Jurgensen. The quantity of 3,000 cubic yards in the
24 scope, Addendum No. 1 had 100 tons of that; the DBT
25 file still says 100 ton and not 3,000 cubic yards.

1 MR. LeBLANC: Can you speak to that,
2 Ryan?

3 MR. HANKE: There's three items. There's
4 the 10 ton per petroleum contaminated and then there
5 is the thousand gallons for dewatering and then the
6 3,000 cubic yard is for the excavated soils that
7 isn't included in the petroleum.

8 MR. LeBLANC: You said the DBT file is
9 still carrying old numbers?

10 MR. CARTER: The added bid numbers in
11 item No. 1 added those three items you just
12 mentioned, and they added 100 ton of excavated soils.
13 If you look at Addendum No. 3, which included the
14 updated scope, it's 3,000 cubic yards of excavated
15 soils. Now, Addendum No. 3 did not add any items.

16 MS. BISHOP: No. 3 just posted the
17 scope. That did not post the addendum so we will go
18 verify the DBT files and make sure that they match
19 the current scope.

20 MR. LeBLANC: The intention is to have it
21 match the current scope, so we will make sure the bid
22 items reflect that.

23 MR. CARTER: That 3,000 cubic yards any
24 time we have excavation within 300 foot of that
25 landfill, it would be paid under that item?

1 MR. LeBLANC: Yes.

2 MR. HANKE: I believe so.

3 MR. LeBLANC: Because it has to be
4 treated as irregular waste, right term?

5 MS. WAMPLER-LEY: We don't know yet how
6 it has to be treated, and I assume there is some
7 mechanism if you agree to allow it to be reused
8 on-site, if it comes back meeting all the
9 requirements to allow for reuse, that that would
10 somehow alter how that gets covered.

11 MR. LeBLANC: Correct. We could cover
12 it -- we could cover it by change order, cover it
13 that way. The intention is, yes, the yardage that is
14 excavated within that defined zone we pay under that
15 reference.

16 MR. CARTER: What point is that? If you
17 are milling an inch and a half, that is not
18 considered excavation in that zone?

19 MS. WAMPLER-LEY: The milling of asphalt
20 would not be.

21 MR. CARTER: What point as you are going
22 down through the existing pavement would it go --

23 MS. WAMPLER-LEY: When you get to soil as
24 opposed to pavement or subbase. I don't know if I am
25 using the right language. I don't do construction; I

1 do environmental.

2 MR. LeBLANC: Once you got to subgrade.
3 So not the 304, not the asphalt. Once you get into
4 the actual dirt materials is how it would generate
5 that.

6 MR. CARTER: And then the underdrain,
7 underdrain trench?

8 MR. LeBLANC: Obviously it would not
9 function very well.

10 MR. CARTER: I know.

11 MR. LeBLANC: Correct. Yeah, so the
12 underdrains on the ramp within that region would have
13 to be open in order to function. It would be any
14 other type of trenching that would not be perforated
15 pipe that we would warrant the LSM. Good question
16 though.

17 MR. CRAWFORD: Jim Crawford with John R.
18 Jurgensen. So that includes utility relocations?

19 MR. LeBLANC: Yes.

20 MR. CRAWFORD: Public or private-owned
21 utilities?

22 MR. LeBLANC: Yes.

23 MR. CARTER: One more question, the
24 explosive testing -- monitoring, sorry, the testing
25 is paid for per Section 109 of the scope. Would that

1 monitoring be paid as well under Section 109?

2 MR. LeBLANC: I'm sorry. Repeat the
3 question.

4 MR. CARTER: The explosive --

5 MR. LeBLANC: Monitoring.

6 MR. CARTER -- gas monitoring, would it be
7 paid for under Section 109 the same way the testing
8 for the soil is going to be paid? That's in the
9 Scope Section 9.4.

10 MR. LeBLANC: We'll have to clarify. My
11 initial reaction is no, but I will clarify that in
12 the addendum. It's definitely ambiguous.

13 Okay. Any other environmental questions
14 before we?

15 MR. CRAWFORD: Jim Crawford with
16 Jurgensen. Do you know if there is existing methane
17 monitoring?

18 MS. WAMPLER-LEY: There is not.

19 MR. CRAWFORD: There is not. Thank you.

20 MR. LeBLANC: Okay. Anybody else on
21 environmental before we move on to the maintenance of
22 traffic?

23 Okay, okay. So maintaining traffic on
24 the project, there has been a couple of pre-bid
25 questions more specifically to Columbia Road than

1 anything else as far as allowability to close that
2 down or detour that during construction. That was
3 answered by addendum already.

4 As part of the design build scope, it is
5 going to be a contractor maintenance of traffic.
6 There will be restrictions as we will discuss here in
7 a minute. It's got typical submissions for that so
8 we will have a conceptual to be put in initially to
9 the Department for review. And then once that's
10 acceptable then it will go back to the design build
11 team for the final MOT plan which will then have to
12 be submitted again.

13 The intent there is that we don't have
14 you spend a bunch of calories on a plan we are going
15 to reject, so we want to get your concept of
16 construction down based on your means and methods and
17 then we will approve that conceptually and then once
18 it's refined we will approve the final plan also
19 prior to implementation.

20 In the scope itself that you guys got
21 when you came in here, pages 24 and 25 is where the
22 MOT is covered, and Section 13.4 marks specifically
23 the restrictions. So the A -- we will go through
24 these fairly quickly, but we have a restriction on
25 U.S. 40 to maintain two through lanes during the peak

1 hours. There is exclusions for the off-peak hours of
2 9 to 3 and then 7 p.m. to 6 a.m. Lane closures for
3 all other roads, except U.S. 68 and 40, will be
4 allowed during off-peak periods from 9 to 3 and 7 to
5 6. Similar hours as far as peak hours to U.S. 40.

6 All existing turn lanes shall be
7 maintained. We are really trying to maintain the
8 movements. We want to make sure if we have multiple
9 lanes turning the same direction, we just maintain
10 one -- that single movement, so the capacity can be
11 restricted from two to one as far as turn lanes if
12 those are necessary. So we just need to make sure we
13 don't cut off any turn movements.

14 Access to all driveways should be
15 maintained which is all common. The Masonic Drive,
16 which actually loops around, starts here off A and is
17 also -- there is also an entrance to the Masonic
18 Drive to the very north of that picture. The one of
19 concern is the one at the ramp A down here so this is
20 the one that needs to be maintained at all times.
21 The other one is probably going to be maintained
22 because it's at the fringe of the project limits.
23 But the one we are concerned about is the one coming
24 off the ramp there. I believe that was also
25 addressed already by addendum.

1 All ramps at U.S. 68 and U.S. 40 shall
2 remain open to traffic for the duration of the
3 project. So, again, we are not really going to allow
4 the ramps to be shut down as far as the traffic
5 schemes.

6 11-foot lanes is the lane width we need
7 to maintain.

8 Again, we can't run any detours except
9 for Columbia Road can be detoured back out to the
10 other end of the plat there, if desired.

11 Another thing if we are setting PCBs, we
12 need a foot and a half of clearance. We are not
13 going to let you jam to the edge lines up to the
14 barrier wall. We need that 18 inches of clearance on
15 the portable concrete barrier.

16 And then L is kind of our standard
17 holiday note that was added by addendum. It
18 restricts work during the holiday seasons, based on
19 the note Christmas, Fourth of July, New Years, Labor
20 Day, Memorial Day, and Thanksgiving.

21 And then, as I said, M got modified by
22 addendum that allows the detour of Columbia at Upper
23 Valley Pike.

24 The other thing I have under maintenance
25 of traffic is we did add provisions of shoulder

1 strengthening out on U.S. 40 west of Upper Valley
2 Pike. So if your MOT scheme would require you to put
3 traffic on that shoulder, then we need to have that
4 shoulder strengthened prior to utilizing it in that
5 fashion.

6 Currently rumble strips exist. If we are
7 going to maintain traffic over the rumble strips or
8 cross traffic over, then they will need to be filled
9 in and there's a detail or narrative how that should
10 be done as part of the addendum.

11 Anybody got any MOT questions?

12 MR. CRAWFORD: Jim Crawford with
13 Jurgensen. Ramp H is pretty tight as it exists now,
14 downhill, coming around a curve. Can that be closed
15 at night to pave nighttime 8 to 6 or 7 to 5? It's
16 going to be a challenge.

17 MR. LEY: Dave Ley, ODOT District 7.
18 We'll get back to you on that one. That will be in
19 the addendum.

20 MR. LeBLANC: He wants to look at what
21 the possible detours are.

22 MR. CRAWFORD: What, please?

23 MR. LeBLANC: We will have to look at
24 what the possible detours are. That's part of our
25 consideration for that.

1 Any other questions on MOT?

2 MR. FULTZ: Brian Fultz with Barrett
3 Paving. Can turn lanes be reconfigured to still
4 maintain turns but to not have the exact
5 configuration, existing configuration?

6 MR. LeBLANC: Yeah. I would say as long
7 as you meet the design standards. There's got --
8 yes, the answer is yes, you can as long as the turn
9 lanes' configurations that you create would meet all
10 the required standards, design standards.

11 Any other questions MOT related?

12 Okay. We will move on. The next thing
13 on the agenda is pavement design. As part of this
14 project, most of the pre-bid questions that have come
15 in have been answered via addendum or are still being
16 considered by the Department in relation to the
17 pavement on the job.

18 And as you can see in the scope, the
19 Department has established certain pavement design
20 criteria or pavement design, pavement makeups, and
21 locations in which certain ones are to be utilized
22 and other locations where it is kind of an option or
23 design build team's option to which they would prefer
24 to install.

25 Ryan Hanke is probably going to field any

1 of those questions that come out on the pavement
2 designs as to potentially why maybe we picked certain
3 types or location, if that's a question to you, or
4 anything else that's unclear in the scope.

5 MR. CARTER: Josh Carter, Jurgensen.
6 Ramp H, the asphalt portion of it needs to be
7 widened. Would the shoulder have to be replaced, or
8 can we just go from the edge of the existing and
9 start with the new paving section?

10 MR. HANKE: Typically we like to get a
11 clean joint so you can use the majority of it but as
12 long as you get a clean joint so, you know, usually
13 that's about a foot in or so.

14 MR. CRAWFORD: Jim Crawford with
15 Jurgensen. The flexible pavement section that you
16 show, is there latitude to work with that as long as
17 it meets the same criteria?

18 MR. LeBLANC: No. It was chosen for a
19 purpose. I guess I would say you would have to
20 prepare your bid with that section required. If you
21 for some reason would like to discuss that as the low
22 bidder, we might be in it for discussion, but being
23 the project we would like the pavement sections that
24 were scoped.

25 Anything else?

1 Okay. So the last topic I have
2 officially on the agenda is drainage for the project.
3 Obviously going to be somewhat of a challenge as a
4 lot of the drainage we are going to create in the
5 turn lanes, especially coming down the hill on 40.
6 In this general intersection there is where we have
7 centerline drainage now, open grade drainage in the
8 grass medians, that is obviously going to be paved in
9 as part of this project, or the vast majority of it
10 anyways, at least by scope so that's one area of
11 concern that we'll definitely be looking at.

12 Any real questions? Obviously we put
13 Appendix J out there which is kind of what we want,
14 we as we reviewed the project thought would be done
15 with the existing structures as well as some
16 requirements for the new structures.

17 Any questions? We saw some pre-bid
18 questions that came in on what was considered an
19 impacted structure which would have to be replaced as
20 part of the design build scope versus modified or
21 reconstructed as defined in the Attachment G. If
22 it's still not clear to anybody, we can further that
23 discussion here, I guess. Painless.

24 Again, the intent on the drainage is that
25 it discharges to the same locations. Obviously the

1 drainage system itself will have to be laid out
2 pursuant to the design of the project, but the intent
3 would be to have them discharging in the same
4 locations as the current drainages so you understand
5 that.

6 Okay. I am going to open it to anything
7 else you guys want to discuss that you think would be
8 prudent.

9 MR. MELLMAN: Joe Mellman, Resource
10 International. If we maintain existing alignments
11 and profiles with the design, would such an exception
12 be granted if they are not?

13 MR. HANKE: I think in the scope we
14 stated if you change an alignment, it needs to follow
15 the manual standards.

16 MR. MELLMAN: Only if you change it. If
17 you maintain the existing one --

18 MR. HANKE: Correct, yes.

19 MS. BISHOP: You will still have to write
20 a design section even just for us on the project.

21 MR. LeBLANC: Does that answer your
22 question?

23 MR. MELLMAN: Yeah.

24 MR. LeBLANC: So for clarification if
25 it's existing, it stays on the existing, that design

1 exception would be approved, you still have to write
2 the design exception and submit it into the
3 Department.

4 MR. McCLELLAN: Randy McClellan with JMT.
5 That's contrary to what's in the scope, Section 14.6?

6 MS. BISHOP: Yes, contrary to what's in
7 the scope.

8 MR. LeBLANC: We will review the scope,
9 and if it's in conflict, we will issue by addendum to
10 clarify that --

11 MR. McCLELLAN: Okay.

12 MR. LeBLANC: -- so all the bidders have.

13 MR. LEY: Dave Ley with ODOT. Just as a
14 reminder, pre-bid minutes are not actually
15 contractually binding. An addendum will be issued
16 which will -- anything in the addendum is what will
17 be contractually binding.

18 MR. LeBLANC: Okay. Any other questions?

19 MR. CRAWFORD: Jim Crawford with
20 Jurgensen. Section 12.18, a lot of the language in
21 there about what is the design build team's
22 responsibility is related to utilities. You have
23 written this, you put us in a pretty bad situation.
24 I don't know that anybody in this room can say that
25 they have control over utilities, but you've -- as an

1 example, item E, "No additional compensation will be
2 made to the DBT for delays, inconveniences, or
3 damages," et cetera. I guess my question is I don't
4 know what makes this project any different from a
5 hard bid job.

6 MR. LeBLANC: I think the intent, again,
7 we will clarify, the intent would be since you have
8 some control over the design of the project, your
9 design is of such that it impacts additional
10 utilities than what somebody else's design would
11 impact, then you need to have some culpability to
12 designing a job that impacts nine utilities versus
13 five utilities, and I think the intent was to lay
14 some of the onus on the design build team so that if
15 they chose a design that required moving of a large
16 utility trunk, for example, that then they wouldn't
17 automatically have an excusable delay for the
18 relocation of this large trunk. I think that's the
19 intent. But I do understand that a contractor can't
20 control the utilities.

21 MR. CRAWFORD: Yeah. For anybody to say
22 that they are in control of public utilities is --
23 and I don't know from a design perspective that there
24 is that many different ideas. You are pretty
25 descriptive about what we are doing, so as an

1 example, that widening that you are doing on Upper
2 Valley Pike, everybody is going to have to do that.
3 I don't know if there is any utilities right there in
4 the way or not. Just the way it's worded, I don't
5 like the way it's worded. You put all the onus on
6 the team, and I'm concerned that it could impact. I
7 am hoping that you can take another look at that.

8 MR. LeBLANC: Fair enough.

9 MR. CARTER: I wanted to add a little bit
10 further we don't really say any word about how the
11 widening goes. Now, you have told us where to put
12 the widening and there is a utility there, you told
13 us to move it, and it's our risk, so we don't have
14 any design to try to go around these utilities. Just
15 seems like an expensive risk for the Department to
16 put on the contractor.

17 MR. CRAWFORD: Scott, just as a reference
18 too, if you do concede with your note, that is
19 referenced several other places.

20 MR. LeBLANC: Correct. And, again, it
21 was -- yes, it's consistently referenced the same
22 because of the intent. We'll look at it to try to
23 clarify, and we may decide that -- we may list
24 certain work that would not be because it is pretty
25 much dictated by us, location, but other items of

1 work that would be in the contractor's control, then
2 those might be left with the onus of the contractor,
3 but we'll review that, make a clarification if
4 appropriate.

5 MR. CRAWFORD: Jim Crawford. 13.6 talks
6 about notice for construction activities.
7 Traditionally we notify the project engineer and the
8 chief, that the project engineer would make all the
9 notifications. This makes it sound like it's
10 something different.

11 MR. LeBLANC: Yes, it is different.

12 MR. CRAWFORD: Is that what you want to
13 do I guess is my question?

14 MR. HANKE: I think the intent is the
15 information gets to whoever needs it as fast as
16 possible so. That's why it would go directly to
17 them. Obviously keep the project engineer in the
18 loop.

19 MR. LeBLANC: To answer your question,
20 yes, Jim, send it to Mandi or Phil, whoever is
21 dictated in the contract in the scope.

22 MR. CRAWFORD: Okay.

23 MR. LeBLANC: Any other questions?

24 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes. Ramp H, could you
25 bring the picture back up, please?

1 MR. LeBLANC: Oh, sure.

2 MR. CRAWFORD: Some of the information
3 that you provided us the Geotech report talks about
4 benching. I think the benching is along that ramp
5 but yet page 33 14.4 says the guardrail stays in the
6 same spot. I'm questioning what the Department's
7 expectation is.

8 MR. HANKE: 14.4E, it says that you can
9 remove and replace in the same location.

10 MR. CRAWFORD: Yeah, I agree with that.
11 That's what I am saying, but as part of the Geotech
12 work, it shows benching in that same area.

13 MR. HANKE: If any benching is needed per
14 that widening there.

15 MR. CRAWFORD: So the widening all the
16 way down the ramp?

17 MR. HANKE: Correct.

18 MR. CRAWFORD: Where the guardrail is but
19 it's your intent for the guardrail to stay in the
20 same location.

21 MR. LeBLANC: It says it can, correct,
22 Ryan? Is that right, Ryan? It says it can.

23 MR. HANKE: I think the intent --

24 MR. CRAWFORD: Shall be removed and
25 replaced. Doesn't say can.

1 MR. HANKE: The intent is to maintain the
2 offset.

3 MR. CRAWFORD: You have a specific
4 requirement where you have offset off the base of the
5 rail for grass and then pavement. So if those
6 things -- I guess I am questioning why the Geotech
7 showed all that benching.

8 MS. WAMPLER-LEY: Sherry Wampler-Ley, I
9 guess I should tell you that. I will have to look at
10 the Geotech report closer and see. I think our
11 intent was we did not think we could get the full
12 shoulder width there, therefore, that's why we stated
13 we would get the design shoulder width and maintain
14 guardrail in the existing location. But for you to
15 get any of that new pavement in there you might --
16 you probably have to remove the guardrail, widen it
17 out enough, and then you just put it back in place,
18 and we have a design exception.

19 MR. CRAWFORD: The design exception is
20 the 6 foot.

21 MS. WAMPLER-LEY: The shoulder width that
22 would be required for non-paved.

23 MR. CRAWFORD: I understand.

24 MS. WAMPLER-LEY: We'll go back and look
25 at the report and project again and clarify.

1 MR. LeBLANC: Anything else?

2 Okay. If there are no other questions,
3 after the meeting, you can obviously feel free to
4 submit a pre-bid question through the normal
5 processes. Again, anything discussed in here that
6 seemed viable for a contract change will be put into
7 an addendum.

8 Another question?

9 MR. CRAWFORD: I do have another
10 question. Page 36, the CPM note, schedule note,
11 Ryan, you can probably speak to this, this has to be
12 submitted fairly quickly after the award; is that
13 right? It's a little difficult to find durations
14 early, so you have plans designed, and I don't know
15 if there is another note that applies or not. We've
16 had trouble with this a number of times. You submit
17 a CPM based on your best guess. You don't have plans
18 defined yet to figure out duration.

19 MR. LeBLANC: I would agree, although as
20 you discussed earlier, this is a pretty laid out job.
21 The work is fairly well defined for you. Most likely
22 you should be able to put together a schedule with
23 reasonable durations. Activities might not be as
24 detailed as they are on a design build project. So
25 we will take some latitude in the --

1 MR. CRAWFORD: That's I think the biggest
2 point, when you are going to take latitude.

3 MR. LeBLANC: Right, but it won't really
4 be with the durations as much as it will be with the
5 conciseness of the activities themselves, so we might
6 typically require you to give us five activities to
7 detail a work item. You might be able to lump it
8 into one with a larger duration, and we would have
9 some conversation about that for sure.

10 MR. CRAWFORD: The other issue is the
11 utility impact. There again, it's not like we have
12 notes that you can work off of. We don't have 4A
13 notes here.

14 MR. LeBLANC: Correct.

15 MR. CRAWFORD: So that clearly could
16 impact.

17 MR. LeBLANC: Yes. And depending on the
18 answer to the previous question, those impacts will
19 either be yours or mine or both or share of some
20 sort.

21 MR. CRAWFORD: Okay.

22 MR. LeBLANC: Okay. Anything else?

23 Very good. We will call this meeting
24 adjourned, and if you have any other questions coming
25 up, feel free to follow the pre-bid process and good

1 luck.

2 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at
3 10:43 a.m.)

4 - - -

5 CERTIFICATE

6 I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
7 a true and correct transcript of the proceedings
8 taken by me in this matter on Monday, December 14,
9 2015, and carefully compared with my original
10 stenographic notes.

11
12 *Karen Sue Gibson*

13 Karen Sue Gibson, Registered
14 Merit Reporter.

15 (KSG-6129)

16 - - -



17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25