



MINUTES SUMMARY

PROJECT:	(0) CBIS Program Management Team	
SUBJECT:	CBIS C-2 Pre-bid meeting for the October 27th letting	
MEETING TYPE:	Construction Progress Meeting	
MEETING #:	151007	
MEETING PUBLISHED BY:	James, Becky	
DATE AND TIME:	Start: 10/8/2015 10:00:00 AM	End: 10/8/2015 12:00:00 PM
LOCATION:	Iowa DOT Central Complex	

MINUTES DETAILS

151007.1	TOPIC:	Introductions	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	---------------	---------	------

Discussion:

- Proposal consists of 8 projects - 3 bridges, noise wall, 2 grade & pave, signing and lighting.
- Letting date is October 27th, with turn-in time at 1:00pm.
- Bid documents can be requested up until October 26th at Noon.
- The proposal has a 4% DBE goal.
- There are currently 4 eligible bidders - 2 are joint ventures.
 - One joint venture is Ames Construction and Jenson Construction; the second is Hawkins Construction, United Construction and Cramer Associates.
 - Other qualified bidders will be added to BidEx.

151007.2	TOPIC:	Contract Overview	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	-------------------	---------	------

Discussion:

- Includes all the paren numbers on the proposal.
 - (372) is the main bridge.
 - (373) is Ramp A.
 - (374) is grade & pave on the west side.
 - (377) is Ramp G (the flyover)
 - (362) is the grade and pave north up to Madison Ave.
 - Noise wall, signing and lighting are also included
- Contract milestones are listed on the proposal.
 - In 2016, the bridge piers in railroad yard should be complete.
 - Complete Stage 4B Traffic Shift which is part of the 30-day window to close the ramp at Madison Ave. A approximate start date is listed in the Proposal for this.
 - The main shift for the west bound bridge by Fall of 2017.
 - Complete all the projects by Spring of 2018.

151007.3	TOPIC:	Staging Overview	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	------------------	---------	------

Discussion:

- There are 2 major traffic stages: One is where traffic currently is and the other is the shift for the west bound bridges. This will be done by the Fall of 2016.
- Madison Ave. On-ramp has 30-day closure and needs to be done 30 days prior to the opening of the new west bound I-80.
 - This has to be coordinated with a future letting that would include South Expressway.
- Staging for the Madison Ave. area:
 - Stage 2: Build detour in the interior between EB & WB I-80 and paving on Ramp C. This will allow traffic to be shifted to put grading in place.
 - Stage 4a: Builds a detour for Ramp C, some interior detour which all occurs before the west bound on-ramp is closed.
 - Stage 4b: Ramp C is closed. There is some removal and some additional paving to tie into the new alignment to WB I-80.
 - The next stage has pavement removals and paving on Ramp C.
 - Ramp G has some staging, as well.



151007.4	TOPIC:	Access Routes	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	---------------	---------	------

Discussion:

- There are a few access roads that access to & from the interstate.
- There will be some lane closure restrictions which have been listed in the plans.
- Access Route 1 - this is along side or up onto an embankment currently being placed, which will be maintained from the current project.

151007.5	TOPIC:	Work Restrictions	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	-------------------	---------	------

Discussion:

- There are a couple areas that are have restrictions:
 - Ramp G south abutment area is not available until April 1, 2016.
 - West bound viaduct abutment area is not available until June 1, 2016.
- These are being monitored and may change.
- Area at US 275 and Ramp C - the 2 towers cannot be constructed until settlement is out.

151007.6	TOPIC:	RR Yard Coordination	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	----------------------	---------	------

Discussion:

- The first group of piers to be constructed by June 1, 2016. The intent is the railroad lines will be constructed by IAIS after June 1, 2016.
- The other limitation with the pier construction is that only one group of piers can be constructed at one time. They should be constructed together in the following groups:
 - 16G-8WB-9EB
 - 17G-9WB-10EB
 - 18G-10WB
- Contractor shall coordinate with IAIS RR for location and installation of temporary rail crossings, rail switches and crane mats.
- Up to six (6) temporary rail crossings and (2) rail switches will be paid for by Iowa DOT and installed by IAIS RR.
- Contractor has option to provide and install crane mats on IAIS track "E" at contractor's expense.
- There are a couple areas that are delineated for TBR. The yard will be in use & under traffic during the construction period. There is a temporary container area being created to give more room for pier work construction.

151007.7	TOPIC:	Borrow Site	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	-------------	---------	------

Discussion:

- The borrow site shown on plans has been moved.
- An addendum will be sent out soon to show the new borrow site.

151007.8	TOPIC:	Questions	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	-----------	---------	------

Discussion:

NOTE: Questions are in bold. Answers are not bold.

- **When will the 23rd Ave. be opened up?**
 - That new crossing will be part of the April Letting. The railroad crossing is part of the (366) project that includes the railroad work currently going on, and would tentatively be installed in late 2016. The roadway work will be done with the April letting project, after the RR crossing is installed.
- **Is there any chance the wage decision will change between now and the letting? Has the Feds decided what they want to do?**
 - Submitted to the DOL months ago and have not seen anything yet. They have a 10 day rule so it has to be decided 10 days prior to the letting for it to change.
- **Do you have an arrangement for getting windows to move steel across the tracks? As was discussed at the constructability review.**
 - The windows would have to worked out in coordination with the railroads. We will have railroad representation during construction to work out coordination issues. We have train data information that would provide you with the frequency of



the train traffic on the tracks; the duration of the traffic. Addendum #1 included a new data sheet for BNSF. The one that came with the original proposal showed 46 trains a day but we know from experience that track doesn't have the much traffic. The addendum shows a new data sheet that shows 2 trains per day.

- **Is this an A+B on the flagging?**
 - It will follow the current standard. There is three different railroads with 3 different agreements. In the proposal, one part is the DOT will pay anything over a certain amount and the other is 100% paid by the contractor.
 - **So there is not an A+B reimbursement? Shouldn't there be?**
 - Yes, in my opinion there should be. But that is not what is included in the special provisions.
 - **Seems like there is a little less larceny in their heart when the DOT is involved. We just got done doing a City job in Ogden, modifying some crossings and when they got done with the administrative fee - it was \$1,600 a day. The \$900 or \$1,100 per day that the Contracts Office is using is not realistic. I can provide you with this information. We're not disputing the days but thought it would be at least \$1,100 a day.**
 - At this point we don't have a different railroad agreement or other agreement to do this.
 - **Why not besides you don't want too?**
 - Because we've developed an agreement with the railroads.
 - **It doesn't have anything to do with that because it is an agreement between the contractor and the contracting authority - the A+B.**
 - George said they'd look into it.
 - **These agreements here are not your agreements with the railroads. These are just the specs between the contractor & DOT.**
 - Will refer to Contracts to look into this. The specs you guys have just implement the agreement with the railroad. So whatever the requirements the railroad puts on DOT, should be what the spec is. And A+B would be when DOT pays the railroad and the agreement says the contractor to pay railroad directly.
 - **Ultimately, the DOT is going to pay for it anyway. The A+B is good because it makes the contractor pick a number and then not abuse. With the A+B gives the contractor a defined reimbursement that the bill the DOT. If we go over the days we bill, it comes out of our pocket. Over the days we bid, it comes out of our pocket. It's a good balance that we at least have some reimbursement on the thing and we don't have to pick a number out of the air and say I have to throw in a million bucks for railroad flagging. It's not like the boogie man is not in the closet on the railroad flagging because there is not a bid item. If you polled all the contractors in here, if we have to deal with the railroads, (our first choice is to not deal with them) but A+B takes some of the risk out of it for both sides.**
 - I will pass this up with the folks who negotiate these agreements but it comes down to our agreements which have the contractor pay them so the A+B doesn't really work.
- **On the sheet on the west area by Schillburg pond, when will that be clear for the current contract?**
 - Current contractor that is in there was told to vacate by Nov. 1. They are using this area as a truck yard and transfer stuff.
- **Pier 15 WB, there is a pretty heavy transmission line and a bunch of COMM cables directly above the pier. I might of missed it but didn't see any thing that talks about relocating this and it serves IAIS. It's right on top of it. Looks like a lot there.**
 - There are plans in the works to have this relocated.
- **Any idea when? Is there a plan to get this moved and relocated outside of the project area?**
 - Yes, we are waiting for MAE for their plan.
- **Along with any internal IAIS intermodal facilities, light poles they have in there? Temporary lights?**
 - They have a plan in place to relocate these.
- **Do we have to assume there is no coordination between the railroads, so we may have multiple flaggers on the same day.**
 - Since there are multiple railroads, each railroad will have its own flaggers.
- **The traffic control plan on the signing drawings are vague when it comes to roadway closures for removal and installation of the signing truss for a short duration. What is a short duration? Two hours? They talk about full closures at night to set bridge piers and bridge construction but they don't talk about full closures for I-80 WB for removal of overhead sign trusses and DMS structures.**
 - We'll clarify that. It will be similar to closures for setting beam. There have been detours that have been outlined for these closures. It will be up to someone to include traffic control and the set up in their bids. If it is just for bridge beams it also needs to be approved for closures.
- **You don't want to use road blocks for 15 mins. to drop them. You would rather close a roadway is that your intent?**
 - Can't use a rolling roadblock.
- **Status of geotech report?**



- We are putting those all together since there are several of them. They will be posted on BidEx. We've asked geotech to confirm this is their final report.
- **On the rigid inclusions, in Q30 it anticipate to go 72-73 feet deep however in no condition the rigid inclusion go deeper 75 feet. In another portion of the spec it says it would be up to the geotech how deep it goes. Does the 75 foot limitation hold true across the board?**
 - The rigid inclusion criteria will establish the tip elevation.
- **I asked this because it would have an impact on the size of equipment.**
 - Exactly, it's a different piece of equipment. We ran into this on the current project where we had two different rigid inclusions per depth.
 - **For now I will plan on the 75 foot limitation.**
 - Correct. If it changes we will have a change of conditions.
 - **Would you modify the grid instead of go deeper.**
 - Correct.
- **Scheduling Spec: The schedule as it is, even though it has been modified a little bit, is requiring allot more than a contractor needs to build a project. So it seems like one of the things you are looking for is an as-build schedule that is allot more detail that what we would need. Would you consider letting HDR do the more involved schedule and letting the contractor do some of the other specs that we've had in the past where it is a lot less complicated and time consuming. The way it is written now, you have to have a full time scheduler on staff, that is an expert in the software and understands thousands of segments and activities, all the logic that goes with it. And you have to have a lot of management involvement, because it has become a monstrosity of negotiation and reports that you end up with thousands of dollars in the bid to just stick with the schedule we have. It seems to me that you can get the project built with what you need with a simpler schedule. You think you have whittled it down as much as you are going to?**
 - Yes. I've spent a lot of time looking at the I-35 spec and other DOT specs depending on the size of the project and what they use in the scheduling spec. for. Looking at ours, from my stand point, I'm comfortable with where we are at with these projects.
- **I'll ask Nick, do you know any little things that still can be tweaked such as changing the size of the activity that would allow us to not have a thousand activities and only 500?**
 - Nick answered "Yep".
 - George: We have a lot of inter-related projects that are going on in the area, where I see an advantage to the amount of activities.
- **The contractor likes the field work to drive the field schedule; HDR likes to have the schedule drive the field work. What ends up happening is that you get out there and realize that this piece of steel should be erected first, we have our crane set and we realize the crane reach and what obstacles are in the way. Now you have to switch and that's a big deal for the schedulers. They want a report ahead of time and know why you did this and it throws off 100 activities out of whack.**
 - I'm sure if you put together a schedule and your superintendent decides to build a different pier at a different time because it works better for moving the cranes around. As long as the bridge decks get poured and the bridge gets opened according to your original schedule probably doesn't make that big of difference. But if putting the pier footing in a different sequence has an impact on the opening of traffic, that's when we get interested. That's when we sit down to talk about why it was changed. If the milestone doesn't change, it shouldn't make a difference. Try to keep an eye on the milestones, so we can understand what elements are being done.
- **The first set of bridge piers be started this year or will it be next year? The question is for the contractor. I'm a supplier and we have some good hefty re-bar coming out of those footing that have to be threaded. And some of the 18/14 bar has got to be rolled at the middle, it is not vary accessible. For a pier foot you have a lot of those bars sticking out of there. What are your plans for rolling this?**
 - Contractor: With a schedule spec., No. With an approved base line schedule required before, No.
 - George: Let's get a rough idea with a Nov. letting. You can get a baseline schedule approved within 45 to 60 days, and you could get a limited NTP that involves site work, etc. When the contractor releases the fabrication of the bars would be between you and the contractor. Is that a fair assessment?
 - Yes.
- **Seems like a little contradictory, with all the milestones, the way they effect the schedule if they don't get done. What do all these little bitty things have to do with starting the job. Obviously, they are not going to get done - there's a year's work to do. What difference does it make if it starts a month earlier, they 'll end up in the schedule. It's the most illogical thing I've ever heard. Why would you delay for a piece of paper. It's not like there is one or two piers, there's 20. A contractor can get out in front of the project while you're getting the schedule developed.**
 - When you get the schedule developed, the early development of the schedule is critical in having this pier done by June 1, 2016. If it's critical to that you get started in December, then it is more critical for you to get your schedule done in the first 120 days. It would give you limited NTP. But it still depends on a piece of paper.



- **George, will the district be open to a different material on the soldier piles in lieu of the CLSM material. (CLSM - Controllable Strength Material from the top of the tip of the piles to the existing ground elevation prior to excavation and prior to install.**
 - That's a geotech question and I don't have an answer to that today.
- **The reason I asked is because a majority of those shafts will be under water. You're going to start your concrete pour 20-30 feet down from existing grade elevation and you're not going to be able to push all that water out. If you are going to be using drilling slurry, the slurry will be sitting at the concrete pour. They will be asking for 20 foot elevation for the CLSM to be placed to fill the void while your pile construction is completed. Then they will come back, excavate the material and breakaway this material from the beams. The material is going to go away.**
 - This is a question for geotech. Please submit this question on BidEx.
- **On the piling, it gives design bearing on one sheet, then on the next sheet for the same pier, it gives pier bearing that is substantially higher. Which bearing value is the Dept. going to use in determining refusal? It's a difference of which equipment we use. It's WB and Ramp G. It talks about down drag. There is an note on one sheet that lists the bearing, then the next sheet on the quantity summary for the same pier, it has 3 paragraphs about the piling.**
 - We'll take a look at this.
- **Would you consider changing some of the sub-base on the ramp. I know you have done so in the past.**
 - We'll take a look at this. You're referring to the south end of Ramp G. This is a temporary paving that we may be able to change.

151007.9	TOPIC:	Pre-Bid Documents	STATUS:	Open
----------	--------	-------------------	---------	------

Discussion:

To access documents (sign-in sheet; PowerPoint presentation; audio recording of meeting) from this meeting, please click on the following link:

<https://app.e-builder.net/da2/daLanding.aspx?OS=310480845e21456a84dfc1e091cba936>

MEETING ATTENDANCE

ATTENDED: YES/NO

ATTENDEES:	Charlie	Beeler	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Keith G.	Blum	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Tom R.	Braun	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Willie	Calderwood	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Robert	Cramer	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Neal	Fobian	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Mark	Freier	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Nick	Gaebel	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Jason	Griffin	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Rick	Harlan	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Todd	Horton	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Becky	James	No
ATTENDEES:	Jay	Johnson	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Chuck	Kadlecek	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Jonathan	Kipp	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Ryan	Kipp	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Joe A.	Larson	Yes



ATTENDEES:	Tony	Leung	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Mark	Leusink	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Benjamin	Lovin	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Kevin	Molczyk	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Jordan	Muller	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Rich	O'Brien	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Josh	Opheim	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Ryan	Paradis	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Tim	Paul	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Mark	Pohlmann	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Keith	Quernemoen	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Luke	Ridder	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Brian	Sadler	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Bob	Schutt	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Chris	Stebal	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Andy	Stone	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Dan	Timmons	Yes
ATTENDEES:	Kim	Triggs	Yes