1. Fee related guidance on time required to develop geotechnical drawings.

   - ACEC feels the 4 hours per sheet is generally not enough and does not provide enough flexibility for different situations. ACEC believes that the recommended hours should reflect sheet types (title page, summary tables, etc.) and should also consider the number of borings and drilling footage. A sheet with 3 6-foot boring sticks does not take the same amount of time as a sheet with 8 40-foot boring sticks.

   - New fees for Geotechnical services had ACEC representatives (SME and HDR) and ODOT- OGE representatives. These are guidelines for hours, unit cost and cost drivers. There was a discussion on it and Chris and Joe Smithson will suggest a range to the drafting hours – Low and High with examples for the different levels to the consultant services.

   - CAD Standards vary by districts and therefore Geotechs will need to detail the assumptions to support the changed hours in the proposed fee. This will help ODOT assess the validity of the request.

2. gINT and Microstation

   - Peter Narsavage presented a way of creating boring sticks semi-automatically using gINT and GEOPAK. It was agreed that took a number of steps, but would reduce the time. Unfortunately Bentley has not chosen to combine gINT and GEOPAK. ODOT will submit a form to Bentley and see if they will accelerate the programming to make the programs compatible.
• A Bentley online forum exists which is ODOT specific, and ODOT users can communicate regarding ODOT gINT. 
  *It is called Ohio DOT & Consultants at communities.bentley.com*

3. ODOT Geotechnical Consultant Workshop

• OGE plans to hold a Consultant Workshop in May 2015.

• OGE will send out a notifications to consultants to save the date for the workshop. They will increase the number of attendees that a company can send to 5 persons as opposed to 3 before.

• Suggested topics were:
  a. Describe the new CES
  b. Retaining wall accreditation and submission process for MSE walls and precast gravity wall systems.
     *ODOT will not be generating a supplemental spec for precast gravity wall systems, rather, ODOT will consider accreditation (approval) of all wall systems through an accreditation submission/approval process currently being developed*
  c. Update on sulfate content and chemical stabilization based on profiling data that is being collected
  d. Updates to the GEOMS data

• All are requested to send suggestions for the workshop Agenda by February 28, 2015

4. Consistency between ODOT reviewers

• It was explained that the “consistency between reviewers” issue pertains to subsequent reviews (by ODOT-OGE) contradicting acceptance of previous submission items in previous reviews (by District). In response, ODOT-OGE explained review procedures followed by the office, in cooperation with the District Geotechnical Engineer (DGE) as follows
  • DGE sends review request into OGE, identifying whether or not they (the DGE) will be reviewing the submission as well.
  • If an OGE engineer reviewed a previous submission for a project, OGE makes every attempt to assign subsequent project review submissions to the same engineer.
  • OGE will not perform a Stage 3 review as a first review, unless the District has specific question(s) regarding the project. In that case, only the specific questions will be addressed.
  • All review comments from OGE are sent to the DGE, and the DGE combines these comments with any District geotechnical comments and sends to the project engineer for inclusion with the overall project comments.
  • If any contradictory comments are received by a consultant, they should bring it to both the DGE and OGE’s attention, preferably in their disposition of comments.

• These procedures will help eliminate the inconsistencies of reviewers. If specific cases do occur consultants are encouraged to bring it to the attention of OGE.
5. The new CES has two rating items for Geotechnical Engineering
   a. Boring and sampling program properly designed
   b. Report preparation meets ODOT requirements

   • ODOT would like to know how geotechnical consultants interpret these rating items to represent their work.
   • Chris Merklin (ODOT) proposes the rating items be changed as follows (feedback welcomed):
     • Boring, sampling, and testing programs were executed in accordance with ODOT requirements (Carry it out)
     • Report presentation meets ODOT requirements (Carry it out)
     • Recommendations resulted in a practical, economical, and adequate design (Figure it out)

   • All agreed that the changes suggested by Chris Merklin would help bring clarity to the CES Score for the geotech subs.

6. OGE regularly see explorations where the driller augered an appreciable depth into bedrock before starting the coring process. Augering the bedrock does not allow for proper characterization of the bedrock, which affects projects in both design (overly conservative) and construction (change order claims). How can ODOT and the geotechnical consultants ensure that the near surface bedrock is properly characterized on ODOT projects?

   • OGE recommends that coring should begin as high as possible. It was agreed that this will be an issue since there are numerous variables that affect the excavation of rock. Corps of Engineers has a document about Rippability of rock, which provides some guidelines that can be adapted. The report is ETL 1110-2-282 Rippability. Unfortunately, this reference does not provide specific steps to determine the surface elevation of rock.

7. Are ODOT’s geotechnical reporting requirements (SGE Section 700) clear? If not, please identify where clarity is needed.

   • No one had issues with the reporting requirements. All consultants are urged to send suggestions to OGE, if and when appropriate.