



TECHNICAL PROPOSAL REPORT

Agreement: E00973	Project Specific	Active
Name: Marshalls Creek Structure & Geo-Technical Review Contract	Selection Process: Modified	Initiating Org: Engineering District 5-0

Part 1 - Structure and Geo-technical Review Assistance

Description

This agreement encompasses the review of all structure and geo-technical submissions related to final design activities on the Marshall's Creek Bypass project located in Smithfield and Middle Smithfield Townships, Monroe County.

Task 1 - Other Structures Activities

Objective:

2.7.99

This includes any other necessary PennDOT structure activities for the project which are not otherwise covered under the standard structure tasks.

Scope:

2.7.99

Provide work as detailed by the Department. See Below.

Detail Task 1 - Other Structures Activities

Department Details:

The work and services which will be required under this Agreement encompass the review of all structure and geo-technical submissions relating to the Marshall's Creek Bypass project located in Smithfield and Middle Smithfield Townships, Monroe County. The consultant will be required to review and issue comments, for the Departments consideration, on various submissions. These submissions include, but are not limited to: Typical sections; Erosion & Sedimentation plans; H & H reports; TS&Ls; Geo-technical & Foundation submissions; Joint permit applications; Preliminary and final structure plans along with the necessary engineering calculations, cost estimates & special provisions; PS&Es. Work may also include all required structure and geo-technical reviews needed during the construction phase of this project.

Main structure types of focus will be, but not necessarily limited too: (1) single span dual structure with (3) long MSE wing walls, (2) sigle span dual structures, (1) single span superstructure replacement, (5) single span structures, (1) three span structure, (1) three span dual structure, (1) bridge elimination, (2) noisewalls, (1) MSE wall, and (6) sign structures. The Structure numbers and lengths are subject to change as design progresses.

Listing of major requirements for structural and geo-technical reviews by structure funding type. Actual requirements will be discussed on a case by case basis.

Local Structures using Federal/State/Local or Federal/Local Funding:

* Structure reviews will be based on following DM 4 & Pub 541 guidelines. The project letting will be through ECMS.

Geotechnical reviews for Federal and/or State funded structures:

- * RSGER's, GER's (per DM 4); Foundation reports (per Pub 293 & DM 4)
 - * Roadway Ger's - only on projects over 1,000'
 - * Problem statements and/or Draft Exploration Plans
 - * Miscellaneous reviews for special investigations on Complex Geo-technical problems.
 - * GER's for Design field views
 - * Review of subsurface boring, sampling and test contracts (if necessary).
- * RSGER's - District geotechnical engineer will discuss submission

The main deliverables associated with each review will include but not be limited to:

Incomplete Submissions:

The submission of reviewed documents should include all comments clearly shown on the plans (in red) and on all other documents. The original and (1) copy of the review package comments will be transmitted to the attention of the District Bridge Engineer for concurrence. The cover sheet should also include the District Portfolio Manager and Project Manager in the "cc" (no attachments necessary). A signed transmittal is to be included with the submission stating that this submission has been reviewed according to current PennDOT criteria and whether or not it requires further review. All reviews with comments are to be completed in the approximate 10 working day turn around timeframe.

Final Submissions:

A signed and stamped transmittal should be included with the final review submission stating this submission has been reviewed according to current PennDOT criteria and all review comments have been addressed and no further reviews are required. This document will be sealed with the reviewing engineers seal. This information will be forwarded to the District Bridge Engineer for final concurrence. The cover sheet should also include the District Portfolio Manager and Project Manager in the "cc" (no attachments necessary). All reviews with comments are to be completed in the approximate 10 working day turn around timeframe.

A monthly status report must be supplied to the Project Manager with a "cc" to the District Portfolio Manager showing a break down of man hours used per review per structure. This report will be used to verify invoices. This status report can be submitted by email.

Approach:

Project Management/Administration:

The DMJM Harris Team will provide the work and services required under this Agreement to review all structure and geotechnical submissions relating to Phase III of the Marshall's Creek Bypass project located in Smithfield and Middle Smithfield Townships, Monroe County.

All work on this project will comply with the Department's Scope of Work and will be performed in accordance with PennDOT's Design Manuals Part 1 through 5, and the latest editions of pertinent publications and standard drawings.

DMJM Harris will be responsible for the management of the design review team; structural and geotechnical reviews; agency coordination; and quality oversight as it relates to the structural and geotechnical aspects of the project.

DMJM Harris will be supported by two subconsultants: HNTB Corporation for structural reviews and Geo-Explorers, Inc. for geotechnical reviews.

DMJM Harris has assembled the following key team members:

- Tom Cushman, PE, Project Manager, DMJM Harris
- David Didier, PE, Structures Task Leader, DMJM Harris
- Robert Bistline, PE, Structures Task Leader, HNTB
- Bruce Shelly, PE, Geotechnical Task Leader, DMJM Harris
- Tarek Haider, PE, Geotechnical Task Leader, Geo-Explorers

As Project Manager, Tom Cushman has the overall responsibility for the technical and administrative aspects of this contract. He is charged with maintaining the lines of communication between all members of the client-consultant-agency partnership. Mr. Cushman will serve as the District's single point-of-contact with the project team. He will interface directly with the District Project Manager and will plan, coordinate and institute procedures for communication among all members of the partnership.

DMJM Harris will prepare a Project Work Plan (PWP) which is similar to and satisfies the requirements of the Department's Project Specific Quality Assurance Plan (PSQAP). This document will be used to convey to all team members the scope, schedule, lines of communication, budget/financial reporting methods and overall QA/QC requirements. We will also include our checking process and standardized checklists/forms to be utilized during the reviews.

At the project kick-off meeting, DMJM Harris will establish clear lines of communication between personnel in each organization, and confirm their roles in the partnership. We will identify critical decision points and milestones in the schedule, and submission deadlines that must be met to continue the timely development of the project.

Emphasis will be placed on clear direction and coordination through regular telephone conferences. DMJM Harris will prepare minutes and submit them to the District within two weeks of the kick-off meeting. No other meetings are anticipated.

A monthly status report will be supplied to the Project Manager with a "cc" to the District Portfolio Manager showing a break down of man-hours used per review per structure. This report will be used to verify invoices. This status report will be submitted by email.

Structure and Geotechnical Reviews

The DMJM Harris Team will review and issue comments, for the District's consideration, on various submissions including, but are not limited to:

- Typical sections;
- Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plans;
- H & H reports;
- TS&Ls;
- Geotechnical and Foundation Submissions;
- Joint Permit Applications;
- Preliminary and Final Structure Plans;
- Engineering calculations, cost estimates & special provisions; and,
- PS&Es

We understand that the work may also include all required structure and geotechnical reviews needed during the construction phase of this project.

Based on the current project scope, and Dewberry's schedule of structures, the main structure types of focus will include, but not necessarily limited to:

- (1) single span dual structure with (3) long MSE wing walls (Str. No. S1),
- (2) single span dual structures (Str. No. S4-S5),
- (1) single span superstructure replacement (Str. No. S11),
- (5) single span structures (Str. No. S2, S12, S13, S14),
- (1) three span structure (Str. No. S3),
- (1) three span dual structure bridge elimination (Str. No. S9),
- (2) noisewalls (Str. No. NW1 and NW2),
- (1) MSE wall (Str. No. RW1), and
- (6) sign structures.

We understand that the number of structures and their lengths are subject to change as the design progresses. It is understood that the projects will be let through ECMS.

All structure reviews will be based on the requirements and guidelines established in the Design Manual (DM) Part 4 and Publication 541.

Geotechnical reviews for Federal and/or State funded structures:

- RSGERs, GERs (per DM 4); Foundation reports (per Pub 293 & DM 4)
- Roadway GERs
- Problem statements and/or Draft Exploration Plans
- Miscellaneous reviews for special investigations on Complex Geotechnical problems.
- GERs for Design field views
- Geotechnical special provisions and specialty geotechnical designs (if any).
- Review of subsurface boring, sampling and test contracts (if necessary).

The main deliverables associated with each review will include but not be limited to:

Incomplete Submissions:

The submission of reviewed documents will include all comments clearly shown on the plans (in red) and on all other documents.

The original and (1) copy of the review package comments will be transmitted to the attention of the District Bridge Engineer for concurrence. The cover sheet will also include the District Portfolio Manager and Project Manager in the "cc" (no attachments necessary).

A signed transmittal will be included with the submission stating that this submission has been reviewed according to current PennDOT criteria and whether or not it requires further review.

All reviews with comments will be completed in the approximate 10 working day turn around timeframe.

Final Submissions:

A signed and stamped transmittal will be included with the final review submission stating this submission has been reviewed according to current PennDOT criteria and all review comments have been addressed and no further reviews are required.

This document will be sealed with the reviewing engineer's seal.

This information will be forwarded to the District Bridge Engineer for final concurrence. The cover sheet will also include the District Portfolio Manager and Project Manager in the "cc" (no attachments necessary).

All reviews with comments will be completed in the approximate 10 working day turn around timeframe.

Consultant Hierarchy

Business Partner

DBE Type

Supervising BP

AECOM USA, Inc.	No	
Geo - Explorers, Inc.	Yes	AECOM USA, Inc.
HNTB Corporation	No	AECOM USA, Inc.

Attachments

No records found.

You are currently logged in as **Kerry M. Stotler**.

Release: 3.0
Session size: 191.4k

[PennDOT](#) | [Home](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Help](#) | [Pennsylvania](#)
Copyright © 2009 Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. All Rights Reserved.
[PennDOT Privacy Policy](#)

Fri May 22 08:02:10 EDT 2009
Official ECMS Date/Time