



ACEC-NH/NHDOT Highway Design Sub-Committee



**Zoom Virtual Meeting
September 8, 2020
8:00 am – 9:30 am**

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Jim Marshall, NHDOT (Chair)	Brian Colburn, MJ (Vice Chair)
Tobey Reynolds, NHDOT (Absent)	Ben Martin, VHB
Leah Savage, NHDOT	Jen Mercer, GM2 (Absent)
Corey Spetelunas, NHDOT (Scribe)	Travis Wolfel, Kleinfelder
Maggie Baldwin, NHDOT	Clinton Mercer, Jacobs
Ron Grandmaison, NHDOT	Linda Greer, Fuss & O'Neill

These meeting minutes are from the September 8, 2020 ACEC-NH/NHDOT Highway Design Sub-Committee Meeting.

1. Introductory Remarks

Corey volunteered to be the scribe for the meeting.

2. Review and approve minutes – July 14, 2020 meeting

The meeting minutes from the July 14, 2020 meeting were formally accepted as final. All final meeting minutes will be posted to the website by Corey.

3. Design Report Group Update

Leah gave a brief update on the Design Report Group, stating that they are having weekly meetings, but there wasn't much information to share. They are about half-way through the Report, finishing up with the existing information. They have developed a parking lot of related information, such as other Reports that are directly connected to the Design Report (Traffic Report) and existing documents (eg: FOPIS) where consistency with the Design Report is needed. This group is hoping to have a draft ready for the November meeting for review and comment.

Jim noted that the Contract Subcommittee is interested in the resulting Design Report from this group, in an effort to make all reports and checklists follow the same format as well as have consistent and complimentary information. It will also aid in determining how to capture information without duplicating it within several documents.

4. Update Design Criteria Form - Reference Check

Jen volunteered to check references for this form at the July meeting, but was not present at this meeting to discuss. Maggie noted that after trying to use the form, there are several changes she would

like to incorporate to improve usability. Although no references should change, she will reach out to Jen to coordinate.

5. Line & Grade Checklist Update

Brian updated the group on recent changes to the Line & Grade Checklist. The 'Narrative' column has begun to be populated. Several rows note CADD deliverables. It was noted that this will need to be better defined to create consistent submissions and expectations (3D digital, 2D digital, prints, etc.)

Maggie had concerns how to check CADD deliverables from a group leader perspective, given their disconnect from using the software in many cases. She wasn't sure what level of involvement should be expected, or if checks would be dependent on those users who are more familiar with the software. Having many users with different levels of experience with CADD software makes this difficult to create a reasonable expectation of consistency. Brian mentioned that McFarland Johnson is creating a training regimen for various levels of users, with 'reviewer' being one of those levels.

There was discussion for how general plans should be presented at this stage of the project. The Line & Grade checklist currently states that cut sheets are required, but there was concern if the cut sheets need to shift around to make various features display better or if project limits change. A roll plan was discussed as a possible better alternative, with outlines of proposed cut sheets shown for reference. Text would not need to be aligned to cut sheets yet, in case of changes. This would allow a reduction in potential rework so cut sheets aren't being cut multiple times. Ron and Maggie will poll DOT reviewers to determine the Department's preference. The ultimate goal is to be consistent in submissions and expectations.

For ROW information aligning with their respective cut sheets, Brian mentioned that when rotating text within a ROW drawing, they often send the revised version to the ROW Bureau to update their drawings. This is in case of future changes; all the text rotation edits won't be lost and need to be redone. This seems like a good practice, but there hasn't been any indication from ROW that they are on board with this.

Traffic Control Plans required discussion for what level of detail is needed at this submission. The Checklist asks for subsequent phases to show previously constructed work. For this submittal, this would be far too much detail. At this point, it should be determined that traffic control is possible, but details do not need to be developed. Linda suggested that a 3D iteration to identify additional traffic control impacts to slope lines or ROW, and an accompanying 2D layout included for this submission seems appropriate. It is also important to define 'critical sections' for consistency.

Other noteworthy items included:

- Adding critical drives and intersection cross sections to this submission. 'Critical Drives' may need to be defined similarly to 'critical sections'.
- Agreement to include detailed guardrail calculations as a part of this submission for both slope impacts as well as potential utility impacts.

- The Estimate Committee is in the process of updating their documents. More information from the Department will be coming in regards to these changes.

6. Post Hearing Design Review Checklist “test drive”

This agenda item was moved to next month’s agenda.

7. Preliminary Checklist Update

This agenda item was moved to next month’s agenda.

8. Openroads Designer Update

The Department is creating training for Openroads Designer with Bill Caswell. Jim will update the group at the next meeting.

9. Other issues or concerns. Round Table Discussion

Ron asked about all the deliverables that this group has been working on and if there is a timetable/deadline for any of it. Jim will compile a list and work on determining dates for these.

Meeting Adjourned - 9:30am

Next Meeting – October 13, 2020. *Anticipated to be held virtually through Zoom.*