Jeremey Vortherms - Iowa DOT Project Manager, provided the general project overview, including general roadway and levee information. Tony Bower – Stanley Consultants, provided and overview of the anticipated bridge design. The following notes augment the PDF of the presentation. Mark Dunn – Director of Contract Bureau presented the anticipated contracting approach.

The project is in the concept stage. Information presented is preliminary and subject to change.

The current roadway embankment creates a pinch point in the river flood flow.

Goal: get the overflow functional by spring 2020.

Success = new levee tie-ins completed, and additional flow conveyance area (existing road embankment and adjacent levee) removed per presentation depiction.

Q: will we use high performance concrete?

A: Probably not.

Comment: H piles might be more under the contractor’s control.

Q: Need for seal coat?

A: adjacent area presently has standing water. Anticipated wet conditions. Anticipated deep shoring requirements.

Discussion on Shoring:

* Roadway staging indicates 3:1 intermediate slope will work between EB and WB staging.

Comment: AGC members noted USACE will probably not allow levee construction in the winter.

\*DOT to discuss with USACE temp and/or date constraints for levee construction.

Discussion on Precast Deck:

AGC Comments:

* Closure pours and grout are warm weather work and generally can’t be done Nov to March.
* Would be better to do conventional pour and keep it warm.

Consensus: Don’t pursue precast deck option unless the panels will be designed such that no closure pours will be required before April/May.

Comment: Consider allowing use of TBR on new bridge over the winter and pour new rail later when temps allow. This will require additional traffic control.

Discussion on Levee Staged Construction: In the presentation it was noted that the levee section will need to be maintained through the roadway embankment and that the top of levee is higher than the existing roadway at the new tie-in location.

* Q and discussion on how this can be staged.
* Jeremey noted the USACE will be evaluating soils data to determine if the existing roadway embankment can be used as a part of the levee without excavation of that part of the roadway, or if the existing embankment will need to be cored-out for staged construction of the new levee through the roadway.
* AGC: May take some creative staging to construct the levee tie-in before winter.

Contracting approach: We should have a pretty solid design. Super structure elements will be determined, but there may be some remaining questions in the foundation design such as length of pile and number of pile. We propose to let the project with bidable quantities, but the quantities will probably require some adjustment after the DOT finalizes the design, which may occur after the letting.

Q from DOT: Would an additional pre-advertisement meeting in early June be beneficial? Possibly For Information Only plans at that point?

 A: Yes

\*DOT to set-up and post notice for early June meeting.

Wes Musgrove noted the DOT did some outreach with the precast industry and the DOT was assured they can do quick turn-around on standard beam designs.

NEPA will be a CE. Looking to get right of entry agreement if not full TE in place for work to begin. All ROW is with USACE.

Q: Can fill be obtained from river side of levee; dredging allowed?

 A: We have not discussed dredging for fill with the USACE.

Comment: Drilled shafts may be desirable instead of deep cofferdams for footings. Can DOT consider alternate bidding drilled shafts? Others concurred it makes sense to eliminate deep cofferdams.

 \*DOT will consider alternate bidding drilled shafts design.

Q from DOT: Would AGC suggest larger but fewer pile, or smaller and more?

 A: HP14s are fine. Fewer PH14s are better than more smaller ones.

Q: Will DOT consider pipe pile?

Steve Megivern noted that the DOT did use pipe pile on the US 34 bridge upstream of this location and that this might be a good option for increased capacity that might not need to be driven as deep.

\*DOT will consider use of pipe pile.

AGC Concern: If levee is not tied-in before November, we might need to wait until April to be allowed to do the levee work; due to AGC experience in working with the USACE on other levee projects.

AGC idea: consideration of a temp bridge for staging, such as Acrow Bridge. Discussion:

* Temp bridge could be placed, to put traffic on and core out the new floodway. The two new bridges would then be constructed in 2020 and 2021.
* This might help with the levee staging through the roadway embankment concern.
* Might need to be a longer temp bridge to not affect levee tie-in construction area.
* Consider bidding alternate option of using temp bridge. The milestone for main goal of core-out of embankment/levee by March 1 would hold. Consideration includes changing the contract end date to the end of 2021 for original option and alternate.
* This option might eliminate the weather risk on the superstructure; might get the bridge off the critical path.

Q: Will USACE allow contractor to breach levee and if there is flooding potential the contractor would need to put it back within 48 hours of notice from the USACE?

 \*DOT will inquire if this is an option.

Comment: Desire for more roadway/levee/bridge staging information, considering levee construction time limitations, and traffic control across new levee tie-in. Consensus is that the levee tie-in construction appears to be the most time critical element.