



111 E. Capitol Street, Suite 400
Jackson, MS 39201
601-352-2701
601-352-4421 fax

MEETING MINUTES

DATE HELD: September 21, 2011 10:00 AM

DOCUMENT DATE: September 23, 2011

LOCATION: MDOT 1st Floor Commission Room

SUBJECT: I-20 Bridge Widening in Newton County
Newton County, Mississippi
State Project No. IM-0020-02(078)/105444301

Pre-Proposal Mandatory Meeting

ATTENDEES: See attached Sign-In Sheets

SUMMARY

Purpose

This meeting was to inform the potential Proposers of key items regarding the Request for Proposal (RFP) for this Project.

Discussion

Ken Wallace, MDOT District 5 Construction Engineer, welcomed the group of short-listed proposers to this Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting and stated that the purpose of this meeting was to review some of the particular changes that had been made in this RFP. He stated that this project included the 5 bridge sites listed in the RFP, and that Proposers should determine how many bridge sites could be accomplished for the \$10M bid limit. He stated that there would likely be an addendum to add the replacement of the bearings to the bridge at Chunky River Relief (Bridge 118.9A) that had already been widened in a previous project. He stated that the three shortlisted Proposers were the ones present today, including, Joe Magee Construction, Key Construction, and T. L. Wallace Construction. Mr. Wallace stated that MDOT had obtained the Categorical Exclusion for the project. He stated that as listed on page 52 of the RFP, Proposers should note that MDOT will be responsible for Construction Engineering and Inspection, but that the Contractor will retain quality control responsibilities for concrete and asphalt. He also stated that lane restrictions (page 27 of RFP) would be limited to 1 mile, that Work Zones in the same lane could not be closer than 1 mile, and that normal holiday restrictions would apply. He stated that utilities would be handled similar to other jobs, MDOT has identified the utilities, and the Contractor would be responsible for utility relocation if the Contractor's operation requires such. He also stated that temporary pavement markings (see page 234 of the RFP) required the use of Type 1 tape rather than paint to avoid grinding on the new asphalt (recent resurfacing jobs) and concrete surfaces (bridge widenings). He also stated that MDOT had repaired a glitch on the Project Website, so if there were

any questions that were submitted previously, that they should be submitted again. Also, the deadline for submitting questions is Monday, September 26, 2011.

Brad Lewis, MDOT State Construction Engineer stated that he would cover the highlights of what was different in this RFP from other RFP's that MDOT has issued for design-build projects. As previously stated by Mr. Wallace, he stated the Quality Control for the Contractor is limited to asphalt and concrete – all other QC would be accomplished by MDOT or through a consultant. He stated that job acceptance material and testing results would be handled similar to a MDOT design-bid-build contract. He also reiterated that temporary Type 1 tape should be used for temporary pavement markings rather than paint. He noted that guardrail on the project should be salvaged and brought to the MDOT maintenance facility in Kalem, Scott County (this should be coordinated with the MDOT Project Engineer). He stated that the Contract time should be scheduled by the Contractor (there was no “back end” date included in the RFP).

Mr. Keith Carr, MDOT Bridge Engineer, noted that there were some changes to the structural specifications and that there were some pending items that would be further clarified by addendum. In Section 15.3.2 of the Technical Specifications (page 242 of the RFP), the second sentence was added to allow a “pile and cap” configuration for bents 4 and 5 of the Oakahatta Creek bridge. He stated that Section 15.4.5 of the Technical Specification (page 249 of the RFP) requires that the replacement bearings should be designed to provide the same compressed height as the original height bearings and that same height should be used on the widened section (so that all bearings are the same height in the final condition). He stated that all bearings should be replaced, but that some of the bridges had integral abutments and that those would be excluded by addendum. He stated that Section 16.4 of the Technical Specifications (page 253 of the RFP) was intended to stop traffic only during the “jacking” operation. Traffic could be reopened once the bridge was “jacked and locked” as long as the jacking system was designed to carry live loads. An addendum will be issued to clarify this section and to clarify that one entire end of the bridge would need to be jacked at one time (i.e. the whole end, not just one or two beams). He stated that Section 15.5 of the Technical Specifications (page 251 of the RFP) required the submittal of a “Jacking Plan” and that it would be critical to determine the load points for the jacking system (should be explained in the plan). He stated that Section 15.4.7 of the Technical Specifications (page 249 of the RFP) required a more in-depth joint reconstruction rather than the joint replacement used on other projects. This joint reconstruction would require that 2 feet on either side of the joint be reconstructed. He also stated that the sequencing of the bearing replacement, joint reconstruction, and bridge widening would be a consideration in the overall evaluation. This is included in the evaluation criteria on page 12 of the RFP (see the third bullet item).

Mr. James Williams, MDOT Materials Engineer noted that the job inspection and job acceptance testing was previously discussed by Mr. Brad Lewis. He noted that the QC Manager for the Contractor was eliminated, however, the Contractor should identify how a Non-Conformance Report (NCR) would be addressed (see RFP, page 10, Item 8, Quality Management Plan). He noted that the Contractor would be responsible for addressing NCR's and providing solutions, and this would be a key element in the evaluation of the proposals. He also noted that Contractor would need to provide the certifications for materials delivered to the job site and that the Contractor would be responsible for providing MDOT QC test reports for asphalt and concrete in accordance

with the Specifications. He noted that MDOT would prepare the final Form TMD 725 for final Materials Clearance.

Mr. BB House, MDOT Contract Administrator noted that design-build projects were different from normal MDOT let projects. He noted that Proposers should submit a list of e-mails that should receive the addendums or postings to the website (otherwise, Proposers should just check the project website regularly). He noted that the Form OCR-481 would need to be submitted with Volume 2 submittal and that the DBE requirement was 10% for this project. He noted that the Volume 1 would require a "Schedule Certificate" indicating the Proposers Schedule with the Technical Proposal (no Legal Entity Forms are required as none of the Proposers is a Joint Venture), and that Volume 2 is basically a "stripped proposal", and that a list of the requirements is on page 10 of the RFP.

Mr. Ken Wallace then asked if there were any questions or final comments. Mr. BB House noted that the unsuccessful Proposers could request the Stipend, and that it would need to be made on company letterhead. Payment of the stipend will be made upon successful execution of the Contract with the best-value Proposer. Mr. Keith Carr noted that the placement of the jacking locations is important. Jacks will not be allowed on the slab or diaphragms as these will lead to excessive forces on other components. Mr. Wallace then opened the floor to questions.

Q1. Will Nofke, TL Wallace – Will MDOT do the PDA testing for the piles?

R1. James Williams – Yes, MDOT will do the PDA testing, however the Contractor will be required to determine the pile lengths.

Q2. Will the as-builts for the new bridge on 118.9A be provided?

R2. Yes, this information will be posted on the project website.

Q3. Will the pile data for the existing bridges be provided?

R3. Yes, this information will be posted on the project website.

Q4. Will the standards for the 70 foot spans be provided?

R4. MDOT will research whether or not this information is available. If it is available, it will be posted on the project website.

Q5. Kevin Thompson, Joe Magee Construction – Will the MDOT inspectors keep up with the quantities that will be used for material testing requirements? This project is lump sum.

R5. Kevin Delva, URS – Yes, MDOT will tract the quantities, but it is important that the Contractor submit quantity calculation with each final submittal.

There being no further questions, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.

Minutes of September 21, 2011
September 23, 2011
Page 4 of 4

If written comments or corrections to these minutes are not received by the undersigned within 10 days, the minutes as published will be considered to accurately reflect the meeting.



Kent B. Dussom P.E.
Project Manager

**Project No. IM-0020-02(078)/105444301
I-20 Bridge Widening
In Newton County**

**MDOT Headquarters,
First Floor Commission Room
Jackson, Mississippi**

**Pre-Proposal Meeting
AGENDA
September 21, 2011
10:00 AM**

- 10:00 – 10:15 AM Introductory Comments and Project Overview
- Ken Wallace, P.E. - District 5 Construction Engineer
- 10:15-10:35 PM Project Requirements / Review of Document Modifications
- Brad Lewis, P.E. – MDOT Construction Engineer
 - QC by Contractor*
 - Job Acceptance by MDOT*
 - Temporary Pavement Markings*
 - Guard Rail*
 - Contract Duration*
 - Keith Carr, P.E. – MDOT Bridge Engineer
 - Joints*
 - Bearings*
 - Foundations*
 - Bridge Jacking*
 - James Williams, P.E. – MDOT Materials Engineer
 - Address NCR's*
 - Approach to completing the project*
- 10:35 – 10:45 AM Schedule and Next Steps (Including Stipend Request)
- BB House, P.E. – Contract Administration
 - OCR 481*
 - Submittal Requirements*
- 10:45 – 11:00 AM Questions & Answers

**I-20 Bridge Widening Project In Newton County
 Pre-Proposal Meeting for IM-0020-02(078)/105444301
 September 21, 201**

**MDOT Administration Building
 Jackson, MS**

Name	Representing	Phone	E-mail
Kent Dussom	MDOT/URS	225-303-4664	KENT.DUSSOM@URS.COM
Kevin DeLue	MDOT/URS	303-796-4646	Kevin.DeLue@URS.com
Ken Wallace	MDOT US	601-683-3341	Kwallace@mdot.state.ms.us
Jason McGehee	Joe McGehee Const	601-507-2233	jason.mcgehee@joe.mcgeheeconst.com

**I-20 Bridge Widening Project In Newton County
Pre-Proposal Meeting for IM-0020-02(078)/105444301
September 21, 201**

**MDOT Administration Building
Jackson, MS**

Name	Representing	Phone	E-mail
IAN ENGSTROM	PARSONS	901-248-6200	ian.engstrom@parsons.com
Will KOFFKE	T.L. WALLACE	601-736-4525	Will.KOFFKE@TLWALLACE.COM
KEVIN THOMPSON	JOE MCGEE CONST.	601-735-3754	Kevin.Thompson@jmcgeeconst.com
Jeff Gibson	Gibson & Associates Inc.	972-557-1199	jeffg@jgibsonassoc.net
A. B. House	MDOT	601-359-7730	bbhouse@dot.state.ms.us
James Williams	MDOT-Materials	601-359-1798	jwilliams@dot.state.ms.us
Rick Ferguson	Pickering	601-956-3663	rferguson@pickeringfirm.com
Kyle Eidson	Neel-Schaffer	601-948-3071	Kyle.Eidson@neel-schaffer.com
KEVIN KENNEDY	NEEL-SCHAFFER	601-948-3071	Kevin.Kennedy@neel-schaffer.com
Keith Carr	MDOT-Bidy	601-359-7200	Kcarr@dot.state.ms.us
PAUL McPHAIL	KEY	601 8989892	pmpshail@KEYCONSTRUCTORS.COM
DAVID TREATHAM	KEY	601 8989892	dtreatham@KEYCONSTRUCTORS.COM
Justin Walker	MDOT - BRIDGE	601-359-7200	jmwalker@dot.state.ms.us
NICK J. ALTABELLI	MDOT - BRIDGE	601-359-7200	nick@dot.state.ms.us

