

## SR21 Scott County Design-Build Pre-Proposal Meeting Minutes

Date: 4/03/06

Location: MDOT Administration Building, First Floor Auditorium

Attendees: Bill Jones  
Spencer Statzman  
Keith Quick  
Caleb Douhlas  
Mark Turner  
Randy Ahlrich  
Rick Ferguson  
Stephanie Welch  
Joe McGee  
Milton Smith  
Paul Leonards  
Mark Price  
B.B. House  
Scot Ehrgott  
Brad Lewis  
Richard Sheffield  
John Pickering

Don Nelson  
Chad Wages  
Eddie Rogers  
Matt Devors  
John Sones  
Mike McKenzie  
Paul McPhail  
David Trevathan  
Bud Smith  
Kenny Collins  
Eddie Templeton  
David Foster  
James Williams  
Nick Altobelli  
John Reese  
Mitch Carr

### **Brad Lewis (Construction Division) - Introduction**

Brad welcomed everyone and performed introductions.

### **David Foster – Additional Introduction**

David notes that July 2004 Legislation gave MDOT authority for design/build projects. However, due to Hurricane Katrina in the fall, this project was delayed. He discussed how the MDOT Design/Build team had worked hard to move this project along. David welcomed everyone and advised them to feel free and ask questions.

### **Brad Lewis opened the discussion as stated below:**

Brad begins the meeting by discussing all Milestone dates on page 15, Section X, of the RFP. Comments Brad added include the following:

- The specifications will follow the “2004 Redbook” with some modifications.
- District will supply coordinates for ROW markers.
- Fuel and material adjustments will not apply to this project.
- This project does have a 7% DBE goal.

Brad turns the floor over to Nick Altobelli of Bridge Division.

**Nick opens the floor for questions concerning Exhibit 2B of the RFP:**

Questions:

Kenny Collins: If a proposed bridge is in a curve, what degree of curve is the breaking point that would allow you to construct it continuous or simple?

Nick Altobelli: If curves are slight enough, and the continuous connection can be made, then yes, they can be made continuous.

Rick Ferguson: Why did the RFQ state that a hydraulic engineer was required since MDOT provided all the hydraulic info in the RFP?

Nick Altobelli: When writing the RFQ, the RFP had not yet been written. The project evolved so that MDOT eventually provided most of the hydraulic information.

Mike McKenzie: Is the scour elevation as stated for bridge #12.3 on page 37-38 correct?

Nick Altobelli: The elevation does appear to be low, so Bridge Division will check the numbers again. If the elevation is not correct, MDOT will give the contractor a new elevation immediately.

**SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING: Further analysis by MDOT revealed that the 100 and 500 year scour elevation of 317.0' for Bridge #12.3 is incorrect. They should be 340.0'.**

John Sones: Will you require a diaphragm in the middle of the 40' span?

Nick Altobelli: No

**SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING: Additional clarification of Section 2.1.3 of Exhibit 2B should read as stated below and will appear in an addendum:**

**“An intermediate, cast in place, concrete diaphragm is required when the unbraced length of the girder exceeds 40'-0". The diaphragm shall be 9" thick and extend from the bottom of the deck to the top of the bottom flange.”**

Nick then turns the floor over to John Reese of Roadway Design Division to discuss Exhibit 2a of the RFP.

**John Reese leads off by making the following comments:**

- The Proposers may use the existing alignment or one developed by the Proposer as long as it stays within the existing Right of Way (ROW).
- Follow the criteria shown in Exhibit 2A
- Micro station & Geopack are required.

- The Pavement width is 28' wide with 12' lanes and 2' paved shoulders
- At the bridge ends, the entire shoulder width will be paved with a minimum of 3" of asphalt under and along the guardrail.

Questions:

Mike McKenzie: Which ROW file is correct - the one in Exhibit 4 or the one in Exhibit 24?

John Reese: The ROW was revised for the addition of spur dikes at the bridges. The ROW file that shows ROW blocked out at the bridge is correct. The correct ROW is found in Exhibit 4 - ROW plans.

### **Additional Questions and Comments covering various topics:**

Bud Smith: What is considered a "Full Maintenance Release"? Must the grass be growing?

Brad Lewis: The "Full Maintenance Release" is obtained through final inspection as documented in the MDOT "Red Book" like a regular MDOT project. In other words, the "Full Maintenance Release" is considered the date signed by the State Construction Engineer after a satisfactory growth of grass.

Bud Smith: There will be great difficulty getting the grass to grow by that time.

Brad Lewis: MDOT will note the concern regarding this issue and make adjustments in an addendum if deemed necessary.

Bud Smith: In order to calculate "Part B" of the Best Value Proposal, why did MDOT choose the value of \$15,000?

Brad Lewis: That number was chosen to weight the time factor as indicated in the RFP. MDOT will take another look and make an adjustment in an addendum if deemed necessary.

Eddie Templeton: Are lab tests and soil profiles available?

James Williams of Material Division: The test results (lab data) are available for the generalized soil zones if the contractors want to see them.

**SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING: Lab test results for the generalized soil zones (strata) are available and will be supplied to all Proposers in an addendum.**

Bud Smith: Why did MDOT short list all responders instead of just two or three?

Brad Lewis: The Department only stated the "intent" to short list. The final decision of the Department was to short list all responsive Responders.

Paul McPhail: Two questions: Are there any "warranty" requirements? Are there any incentives or disincentives?

Brad Lewis: As the best I can recall, there are no warranty expectations. I will continue to research that question and inform everyone if some warranty issues exists.

As far as the incentives / disincentives, there are no incentives. The contract time is A+B. All liquidated damage amounts fall under the guidelines of the “Red Book”.

**SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING: This project does not contain any warranty provisions, incentives or disincentives.**

David Trevathan: The state estimate may not properly reflect the appropriate amount of the actual final cost for design and construction work performed on the project. The contractor may be able to purposely take a hit by going into liquidated damages but still complete the project without losing money. There is concern that the 15,000 used to calculate the “Part B” of the Best Value Proposal is not well thought out. The A+B bidding will be unbalanced.

Brad Lewis: Once again, MDOT will revisit this issue. If necessary, changes to this value will be addressed in the form of an addendum.

Bud Smith: Why is there not a stipend for this project?

Brad Lewis: That issue was discussed thoroughly. Initially, one existed until MDOT learned that the FHWA would only participate in a small amount of the project’s estimated cost.

David Foster: The FHWA will only participate in 0.1% of the estimated project’s cost.

John Sones: However, the engineering consultant firms will be affected.

Brad Lewis: MDOT also learned that other states do not have a stipend for smaller projects either.

Mark Price: Will the Department handle inspection and QA testing?

Brad Lewis & James Williams: The Department will run QA tests. The Department will not operate in a hands-on fashion. The contractor is still responsible for their testing (QC).

Chad Wages: Will there be an MDOT individual available on site to answer any questions “on the spot”?

Brad Lewis: A project engineer will be on site like a normal MDOT project. The district office will be involved like always. MDOT will do the best they can to answer questions as quickly as possible. Please give the Department a call if there are some submittals that need addressing quickly in order for the project to stay on schedule.

Eddie Rogers: Will mix designs be approved in a timely manner without holding up the project?

Brad Lewis: Once again, if necessary, give the Department a call and let them know of its urgency.

Richard Sheffield: If it is a concrete mix design transfer, it shouldn't take long. If it is a new mix design, the contractor may need to plan accordingly. They may take more time.

James Williams: The proposal indicates the standard 30 day review period for concrete mix designs. However, Materials Division is committed to processing new mix designs or transfers as quickly as possible due to the urgency of time on this project.

David Trevathan: What is MDOT's policy regarding the 10% variance of the state estimate's amount?

Brad Lewis: No magical number (10 %) over the state estimate's amount exists for this project. The state estimate is difficult to determine accurately without knowing exactly what the contractors are proposing to do.

Mike McKenzie: Will you award the project if it is over the 10%?

Davis Foster: It is the Department's intent to award the project.

Mike McKenzie: According to page 8 of the RFP, the contractor is to provide a breakdown of project costs and assumptions. When will these be submitted?

Brad Lewis: No prices will be listed in Volume #1. Only Volume #2 will have the prices listed. Therefore, the breakdown with prices and the schedule of values will be submitted within ten days of the contract award.

Mike McKenzie: According to page 9 of the RFP, what size plans are needed?

John Reese: Half scale.

Mike McKenzie: According to page 10 of the RFP, what firms are considered to be major participants?

Brad Lewis: The design firm and the prime contractor. However, I will have to confirm this answer.

**SUBSEQUENT TO THE MEETING: Major participants have been defined as the Project Director, Lead Design Engineer, Construction Manager, QC Manager – Design and QC Manager – Construction by an answer to a RFQ question.**

Mike McKenzie: According to page 9 of the RFP, how far down the organizational chart will an "Organizational Conflict of Interest" carry?

Brad Lewis: This question was already addressed in the RFQ questions and answers posted on the web site.

Mike McKenzie: What is the frequency of the partner meetings? How should those be addressed?

Brad Lewis: There should first be a "kick-off" meeting, and then they may occur once every one or two weeks. The more global meetings may not occur

but once a month. Meetings will be based on the contractor's proposed schedule.

Ed Rogers: When the DOT performs inspections, do the team members need to be present?

Brad Lewis & James Williams: When MDOT's inspection person is present, MDOT recommends that the contractor's QC person be available as well. MDOT is not taking QC from the contractor. Remember, the QC responsibility still belongs with the contractor. The contractor is not relieved of any QC responsibilities.

**Additional comments by Brad Lewis:**

- Permits: as indicated in the RFP, MDOT has provided copies of the permits in Exhibit 23 of the CD.
- Utilities: MDOT has relocated all known utilities. A Sebastopol waterline is located on the project but should not conflict with construction. If the Proposer's design creates a conflict, the contractor will be responsible for all costs associated with the relocation of the waterline. No additional time will be given for the relocation. The contractor will be responsible for all other utilities if they conflict with the proposed design.
- Since MDOT will be awarding and executing this project the day after the letting, the Proposers must make sure they have signed and turned in all their documents with their packages for the letting. These documents will also include the OCR-485s and OCR-481s.

**Brad Lewis: Are there any additional questions before we close?**

Chad Wages: Has the Bellsouth line been relocated?

Brad Lewis: It is to be moved by April 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>. MDOT will check on it. If the line is not moved by that date, the project will be awarded but the "Notice to Proceed" will not be issued until the line is relocated.

Mike McKenzie: If the contract start time is delayed, will you roll back the completion time?

Brad Lewis: Yes, MDOT will roll back the completion time if MDOT delays the project for any reason.

Mark Price: Can "Suretrack" be used?

Brad Lewis: "SureTrak" or a bar chart will be acceptable for the schedule.

**MDOT will post these meeting minutes to their website. Meeting adjourned!**