

The minutes reflect the writer's impressions of the discussion and are not intended to imply or announce policy or directives. Refer to the contract to determine MDT requirements.

**December 17, 2014
MCA-MDT Technical Committee Meeting Minutes**

SPECIFICATIONS

1. 101.03 Definitions (Calendar Day)

The portion of the definition regarding impact to the traveling public was discussed.

2. 212. Obliterate Roadway

3. 401.03.17 Tack Coat

The difference between tack for use prior to plant mix surfacing and for aggregate treatment was discussed. Having a separate bid item for tack was discussed. The Department will review the aggregate treatment spec with regard to the use of tack.

4. 401.03.24 Rumble Strips

Contractors commented that late season cutting of the rumble strips does not work well due the surface temperatures. Discussed safety concerns with regard to rumble strips.

5. 409.03.10 Sweeping and Brooming

A Contractor brought up the issue of the timing of the notification.

6. 608 Concrete Sidewalks

7. 714 Pavement Markings

Contractor asked if the bead suppliers were included in the discussion when the change was developed. The Department mentioned that beads will be coming off of the QPL in the future.

MDT NEW BUSINESS

1. Spec Change Process

MDT discussed changes to the spec process, in particular the use of the Web page and viewing the proposed and final specifications and the comments received by the Department. A Contractor asked how long is the process from when a spec is finalized, to when it is implanted in the Supplementals. MDT responded that it is approximately 6-8 weeks minimum.

The Department also mentioned the Supplemental Specification page and that past Supp books will remain posted. There will likely only be new supplemental specs released quarterly.

2. Funding

MDT discussed the funding through the next fiscal year. There was a bill passed for the entire fiscal year. It included provisions limiting what the Fish and Wildlife service can do with regard to sage grouse. Additional provisions include information on the CWA in irrigation facilities and COE fills in waters of the US.

MCA NEW BUSINESS

1. Referee Samples

The Department asked what MCA was looking for with regard to referee samples. MCA members were asking for 3rd party samples to be taken and tested by an independent lab when Department testing doesn't match with the Contractors'. The Department said they would be open to that discussion but it would only work on certain materials.

The Department used concrete sir content as an example, when there have been disputes, additional testing has been done to verify the concern before taking further action.

Contractors have asked MCA to pursue legislation regarding this issue. One bad test is an outlier, when is there really a problem? It may help Contractors to understand the Department's QC process. Third party

The minutes reflect the writer's impressions of the discussion and are not intended to imply or announce policy or directives. Refer to the contract to determine MDT requirements.

testing adds another level of complexity to the testing process; the Department has to oversee the third party. The Department doesn't require the Contractors to do specific QC, the end products are evaluated. When conflicts do arise, the procedure can vary. The Department is always willing to listen to valid concerns when tests vary. A group will be put together to further discuss the issue.

OLD BUSINESS

1. RAP

The Department had previously proposed a bid credit for RAP usage. The Department is now pursuing a monetary incentive for RAP usage based on a proposal from a Contractor. The amount of oil saved will be calculated and the savings split between the Contractor and the Department. The oil price would need to be certified in some way. The final details are still being worked out.

2. DBE Usage

A revised subcontract report for was discussed as well as the accompanying special provision. The discussion focused on the timing of getting the completed form back to the Department

AD-HOC ITEMS

1. Sage Grouse habitat and awareness

Briefly discussed the sage grouse habitat and that Contractors need to be aware of their projects locations and the sensitivity regarding that habitat. Use caution in core areas.

2. DEQ Permit Transfer

The timing of the transfer of the permit from the Contractor to the Department was discussed. Contractors voiced their opinion about the removal of BMPs and the lag time between permit transfer and what happens when a storm event takes place during that time. Examples were mentioned where this occurred and the question was brought up, who was responsible. The Department mentioned the position of the District Environmental Engineering Specialist, and how that individual assesses risk on a project. The difference between BMPs and permanent installations that would remain in place was discussed.

The next MCA-MDT Highway Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 28, 2015, at 10:00 a.m. at the MCA Office in Helena.