September 9, 2015

Illinois Asphalt Pavement Association
Illinois Association of Aggregate Producers
American Concrete Pavement Association
Illinois Ready Mixed Concrete Association
American Traffic Safety Services Association
Associated General Contractors of Illinois
Illinois Road and Transportation Builders Association
and
Illinois Department of Transportation

Attendance:

Location:
The IDOT/Industry Joint Cooperative Committee met at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, August 26, 2015 in the conference room of the Associated General Contractors of Illinois, 3219 Executive Park Drive in Springfield.

Introductions

The meeting was called to order and self-introductions were made.

Old Business

1. ICT Research Projects – Updates & expectations (IRTBA)
   - An Expert Systems Approach to Highway Construction Scheduling
     This was the Phase 1 research to develop software to more accurately predict the required time to complete a project. See next bullet point for discussion on the research.
• Enhancements to Highway Construction Scheduling Expert System

This was the Phase 2 research to develop software to more accurately predict the required time to complete a project. The software work was completed during this phase, and is now available for use by the Districts. Industry requested the software be made available to Contractors as a tool for schedule development.

• Evaluating Pavement Markings on Portland Cement Concrete (PCC) & Various Asphalt Surfaces **Project ID:** R27-077

This research evaluated the cost effectiveness of pavement markings, developed tools for inspection of markings, and a training class is being considered for inspectors.

• Evaluating All-Weather Pavement Markings & Lab Methods to Simulate Field Exposure **Project ID:** R27-120

This research looked at reflective media and its durability.

• Options & Recommendations for Web Database of Materials & Construction Inspection ICT R27-138 (Alternates to ICORS & MISTIC)

This research evaluated software replacement for ICORS and MISTIC, and the Department has begun the process to find a software replacement. Industry indicated it was willing to provide support to help ensure this is accomplished.

2. **Separate pay item for water blasting used for removal of pavement markings – Update (IRTBA)**

   The agenda item was deferred because a meeting later that day with ATSSA was going to discuss the topic.

3. **Earth excavation/embankment placement requirement - Update (IRTBA)**

   A Construction Memorandum has been drafted to more clearly explain the interpretation of Article 301.04(b) regarding the processing of soil for three days with a disc. The proposed memo will be sent to the participants of the earthwork task force for review.

4. **Update on removal of construction signing (AGCI).**

   The Department would like signing to be relevant, and taking the construction signing down during winter months when work is not being done will be evaluated on a case by case basis. Industry asked if they would be compensated if the signs are taken down and put back up. Industry also indicated some concerns with liability if the signs are down while the plans indicate they must be up. Based on the comments from Industry, this topic will need further review by the Department.

5. **Update Steel Barrier status.(AGCI)**

   The Department has met with three manufacturers regarding the barrier. The barrier has low deflection when pinned, but will deflect more than concrete barrier when not pinned. The Department will continue to evaluate this type of system.
6. Payment for temporary pavement marking used in conjunction with the various traffic control standards. (AGCI).

   Industry indicated that a schedule for temporary pavement marking included in the plans will not always match the pay item quantity. This can cause much confusion. The Department asked if the subcontractor for traffic control will also perform pavement marking. Industry indicated this is normally only done when temporary pavement marking tape is required. The Department will continue to evaluate the issue.

**New Business**

1. Section 703 provides explicit prescriptions for use of short term pavement marking on mill/overlay projects. Current experience indicates that IDOT prefers significant additions to the SSRBC requirements. Has IDOT considered adding short term pavement marking plans/standards to detail their preferences in order to avoid confusion/disputes in the field regarding verbally directed extra work to accommodate “safety concerns”? (ACPA)

   There was extensive discussion on this topic. It was mentioned that the Standard Specifications require short term pavement markings to be replaced with temporary or permanent pavement marking after three calendar days for no passing zones and fourteen calendar days for all other markings. Letters and symbols may also be required. In addition, paint may be used for short term pavement markings instead of tape.

   Since short term pavement markings normally do not include letters and symbols, bidding can be a challenge if letters and symbols are required for short term pavement markings. This is a result of short term pavement markings being measured for payment by the lineal feet for the various line widths. Short term pavement markings do not have a provision for paying letters and symbols by the square feet.

   Another area of concern is providing the method of payment in the plan notes, which is subject to interpretation mistakes. It was agreed that this should not be done.

2. Striping damaged by Surface raveling possibly caused by snowplows. (ATSSA is working on a report). How can these repairs be submitted – Claim Process? (IRTBA)

   The agenda item was deferred because a meeting later that day with ATSSA was going to discuss the topic.

3. Has it been discussed about placing the contractor’s name on name plates? (AGCI)

   The subject has not been discussed internally by IDOT.
4. Ever since the change of the specifications that dictates that the contractor is responsible for the maintenance of erosion control systems there has been an ambiguous determination of “when are we complete?” In years past when we seeded within the allowable seeding dates then the project was complete (as it pertains to erosion control). Now we can called back two years later to fix some erosion issues on projects that were seeded within the allowable dates, and because the Department takes forever to close out projects, are being required to correct erosion areas.(AGCI)

Although the Department is making efforts to close out projects quicker, the repair of erosion issues is not related to the time to close a contract. The Department stated the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) remains in effect until seventy percent uniform growth of vegetation. In addition, seeding performed outside the established planting times is required to have seventy-five percent uniform growth per the Standard Specifications. Industry requested that the Department become responsible after seeding has been completed and sediment has been cleaned up for erosion control devices, or after a specified period of time. The Department will review.

5. Keep track of time, vs. getting a copy of the Prior Approval? (IRTBA)

Industry expressed concerns with working out the details for payment of extra work per an agreed unit price or force account after the work has started. Industry is requesting at the time a prior approval authorization is processed it be indicated the method of payment. The Department endeavors to agree to the method of payment before extra work begins but there are instances when the extra work must proceed before an agreed unit price can be approved. The Department indicated that a determination of the agreed unit price is normally done within one week for simple items and two weeks for complex items. There was also some discussion that the Department may be short staffed, which may be causing delays in acceptance or rejection of the agreed unit price.

6. Lack of Recognition to schedule delays. (IRTBA)

Industry indicated it would like more timely decisions on the acceptance or rejection of an extension of time. Industry desires to avoid paying additional costs to complete a project when it is not necessary because an extension of time will be approved.

7. Article 701.17(f) “Guardrail" - This article requires the placement of delineation devices at 50’ centers when “guardrail is temporarily removed or where the guardrail installation is incomplete”. It does not provide for any instances when this would not be required. Such as, if the adjacent lane is closed to traffic (whether for a short-time duration or long-time duration). For the sake of cost and liabilities, would the Department clarify this specification by adding “unless the adjacent lane(s) is closed to traffic.”? (AGCI)

The Department indicated that it would not change the specification.
8. 4th of July Red Alert Holiday – The way the holiday fell this year we were restricted by IDOT not to work after 3pm on July 2nd. We assumed going in that the 3:00pm would not start until July 3rd, but was very surprised to see it fall on the 2nd. We hope this isn’t a trend for the future. It seems Easter holiday was added just a few years back and now 2 days before 4th of July seems excessive. (IRTBA)

The specification for Public and Safety (Article 107.09) was recently revised. If a holiday lands on a Saturday, all lanes shall be opened by 3:00 PM the preceding Thursday.

It was discussed that the trade unions considered the Friday (July 3) date as a workable day. July 4 is considered the Holiday. The Department indicated the specification is written for the safety of the traveling public. It was also asked if the 3:00 p.m. time on Thursday could be moved to a later time that day, but the Department is still concerned with the increased traffic volume.

For projects under the old specification, the Department is willing to consider a one calendar day extension for completion date contracts, and no charge of a day for working day contracts.


The agenda item was deferred because of a recent meeting with the Illinois Asphalt Pavement Association.

10. Article 107.09 - Public Convenience and Safety (AGCI)

This article requires “no broken pavement, open holes, barricades, cones, or drums will remain on or adjacent to the traveled way and all lanes will be opened to traffic during any legal holiday period, except where major bridge construction and/or other roadway reconstruction (excluding patching and resurfacing) requiring overnight lane closures would make it impractical. This article goes on to state, “On weekends, excluding holidays, roadways with Average Daily Traffic of 25,000 or greater, all lanes shall be open to traffic from 3:00 PM Friday to midnight Sunday except where structure construction or major rehabilitation makes it impractical.

Please define “impractical”. Is this defined as cost and/or time required adhering to this specification?

What defines “roadway reconstruction (excluding patching and resurfacing)”? What defines “major rehabilitation”?

With the Department’s movement toward deeper milling depths and thicker resurfacing lifts, the cost/time associated with complying with this specification has become more costly (dollars/days).

The Department indicated a mill and overlay project generally will not be considered a “major rehabilitation” because the Department desires to have minimal lane closures during the heavily traveled Holiday period. However, a rubbilization project would be considered major rehabilitation. It was suggested that Holiday periods should be discussed at the preconstruction conference.
11. Section IIC of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan includes the statement "the cost of all materials and labor necessary to comply with the above provisions to prepare and implement an in-stream work plan will not be paid for separately, but shall be considered as included in the unit bid prices of the contract and no additional compensation will be allowed". Different contracts have provisions that include perimeter erosion barriers, temp ditch checks, slope walls and other standard line items. How does IDOT determine whether provisions are included in the referenced unit bid prices of the contract or are reimbursed according to the contract line item? Why does this document regarding IDOT’s commitment to the IEPA actually include payment parameters? How does this wording apply to contracts that include cofferdam line items? (ACPA)

Industry expressed concern that the “will not be paid for separately” wording could be interpreted in a manner that is beyond the intent of the contract.

12. Art. 670.07, propose to include online data usage cost, “…. except that the Department will pay that portion of the monthly long distance, monthly local telephone and online data usage that, when combined, exceed $200.” (AGCI)

Industry requested that Article 670.07 be revised to include data usage, and the $150 amount in Article 670.07 be increased to $200. The Department will consider.

13. What is IDOT’s procedure for field marking state owned underground facilities such as storm sewers or water mains? (IRTBA)

The Department indicated there are no established procedures for field marking state owned underground facilities.

14. The last sentence of Art 502.12, Method of Measurement for Excavation for Structures states that “The volume of any unstable and/or unsuitable material removed within the structure excavation will be measured for payment in cubic yards”. In coordination with Art. 502.13, Basis of Payment, it appears that the Structure Excavation line item is paid in addition to the Removal and Disposal of Unsuitable Material for Structures line item. Is this IDOT’s intent because that is contradictory to the general payment relationship between the Earth Excavation and Removal and Disposal of Unsuitable Material line items? (IRTBA)

The Department will review the wording.

15. Project acceleration invoices. (ACPA)

- Certified payroll vs executed daily work reports: a significant administrative effort is required by both IDOT and the contractors to fill out/review/discuss/ review/discuss these sheets. This effort detracts from the main focus of those personnel administering and constructing the project. Suggest consideration of acceleration invoice preparation based on certified payrolls rather than executed extra work daily reports.

The Department stated that daily extra work reports (BC 635) will be required for acceleration.
• Contractor overhead: In lieu of the contractor documenting effort and cost to formulate all invoices, suggest consideration to allowing contractor to add $100 overhead line rather than adding a detailed cost invoice preparation cost line to each invoice.

  Industry requested that a flat $100 administration fee be applied to subcontractor invoices for acceleration. This request will be reviewed.

• Contractor bond: some consultants are deleting the bond line to acceleration (and Art. 109.05) invoices.

  Industry requested that bond costs be allowed for acceleration since the Department pays only for premium time. This request will be reviewed.

16. Partial Depth Hot-Mix Asphalt Patching and Longitudinal Joint and Crack Patching (AGCI)

Both of these specifications address payment for the HMA patch material by referring us to Article 406.13. There seems to be some confusion with this note. Some Department personnel interpret this to mean that if a surface course material is used then the “weight adjustment” portion of Article 406.18 applies. I do not think that was the intent to adjust the payment weight for anything that used a surface course, but rather a weight adjustment would be appropriate for any pay items that are “HMA Surface Course…..”. Please clarify.

Both of these specifications list Bituminous Material Prime Coat as a material to be used for this work. However, the specification does not address payment for the prime coat. For example, Article 406 also lists Bituminous Material Prime Coat as a required material, but addresses payment. In addition, many of the Special Provisions for projects containing partial depth patching also have the new prime coat specification included. This specification specifically addresses payment for prime coat. Please clarify.

  The Department indicated it would clarify this specification.

17. Recently received a copy of the minutes from the March 25 meeting of the IDOT/Industry Committee meeting, and was interested in the 5th item listed under "Miscellaneous," which read: (AGCI)

  *Industry asked if there was any movement on the Electronic Q&A for the web site. The Department indicated that the replacement of ICORS/MISTIC is in the works and a web Q&A can be looked at with that effort.*

  Industry indicated that it supports a question board for letting items. The Department is working to develop a system.
Miscellaneous

1. Prequalification

The Department is amending Title 44 Illinois Administrative Code Section 650 – Rules for Prequalification of Contractors, Authorization to Bid, and Subcontractor Registration. The amendments are as follows.

• Clarifying that the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) for IDOT and the Department work cooperatively in prequalifying firms.
• Clarifying the definitions of Authorization to Bid, Prequalification, Request for Authorization to Bid and adding the definition for Eligible and Special Letting.
• Clarifying the difference between prequalification and Certificate of Eligibility.
• Adding Cleaning to the category Painting so that pressure washing is applicable.
• Adding the work category 27 – Pavement Markings (Modified Urethane)

These amendments will be filed and published with JCAR soon.

2. Agenda Items for Meeting

The Department requested that agenda items be submitted approximately 1 ½ weeks before the meeting. It was recommended that Industry topics be submitted together as an Industry Agenda, alleviating the submittal of individual Contractor items to the Department.

3. Traffic Control

For delays on working day contracts, Industry indicated its concern that some traffic control equipment is only available on a weekly basis, and not a daily basis for cost reimbursement.

4. Agenda item #16

The specification was briefly discussed again, and the specification needs to also address leveling binder for weight adjustment.

5. Notes in Plans

Industry indicated that it is concerned with the various District special provisions and plan notes inserted in the plans. The Department is in the process of reviewing.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 6, 2015, but is two days before the November letting. A new meeting date will be proposed.

Meeting Adjourned