Welcome/Roll Call/Introductions/Opening Comments/Meeting minutes

IN Transportation Team Updates
  - District 360 Engagement Meetings
    - Crawfordsville Virtual Meetings – July 20th and August 17th
    - Crawfordsville is using the virtual concept on a monthly basis. Content of the meetings has been somewhat stalled from ACEC’s perspective.
    - 360° Steering Committee and Laporte District – Central steering committee seems to want to see what develops and use observations and best practices to put into policy. LaPorte seems to be moving forward at a quicker, more organized pace.
    - Beth proposes to get the core 360 group of people (ACEC, INDOT, ICI) back together too to, in part, start looking at the next tier of action items from the 360 plan. Also, open the 360 discussion up to broader ACEC membership – seems to be confined to the INDOT committee primarily.
  - ICI had a Steering Committee Conference Call on April 29th.

Forward Together Update
  - Update design services numbers: in-house vs. consultant design; in-state vs out-of-state firms; and more turnkey contracts in the future? Travis not tracking these numbers. Noted $350M is being given to consultants. QBS is being used on all selections. ACEC noted the need to include ROW in turnkey contracts.
  - Update on INDOT’s initiative for ePlans/eConstruction
    INDOT taking small steps. Jeremy Hunter is being involved now. Jeremy has reached out to the INDOT-ACEC committee for inclusion.
  - LPA Program Items: report on self-certified communities; railroad coordination (consultant self-performed) - explanation of initiative and prequalification on the horizon? Self-certified communities not being utilized. INDOT trying to get out of the local business. However, willing to help where possible and necessary. No prequalification yet. Railroad coordination at the consultant level will be difficult.
  - Indiana Design Manual update: thank you for the new webpage with individual chapters; timeline reconciling new and old chapter numbers; and ACEC’s role and participation. Progress anticipated by the end of the summer 2020. Roland to provide status to Beth – nothing yet.
  - Audit reset
    INDOT does not see a problem. Only 17 projects in the cue.
  - What innovations are INDOT seeing right now thru this stay at home order:
    Use of digital delivery tickets on construction projects.
    Virtual Pre-Construction/Progress/Design Field Check Meetings
    More productive meetings. More efficient use of time.
  - Construction Inspection Contracts: use of field overhead rates on project specific CI contracts; contract management of CI contracts and the inconsistent unwillingness of LPA’s and INDOT to
compensate ACEC member firms for oversight and management time; and training of young staff on active projects is typically not a billable item in some or all districts. 

INDOT does not see any issues OH rate for CI contracts as there is a policy in place and being followed.

Roland to review OH policy for compensation of PM on contracts. No further communication on this.

Roland and Toby to coordinate on training program for INDOT CI staff and how Consultant’s could implement similar. Toby sent Roland draft policy and no response has been received to date.

- Drainage Reviews by INDOT staff: Similar concerns as to Environmental Document Reviews. Hydraulics Sub-Committee developed that will work together with the INDOT Hydraulics group to improve hydraulic submissions and scoring of these packages. First meeting is scheduled for June 19th.
  - Bob Page (HNTB) – Chairman
  - Janette Fulkerson (PTG)
  - Greg Kicinski (Structurepoint)
  - Jeromy Richardson (United)
  - Nathan Beach (WSP)

Still seeing inconsistency in reviews even at Central Office. Toby will let Bob Page know to bring up at the June 19th Hydraulics meeting.

- Constructability Reviews: who has the final say on what comments to incorporate into the project?
  Travis stated that it would be a collaboration between the INDOT PM, Consultant, INDOT design team, and INDOT field staff. Roland to publish formal process – nothing available yet.

- Two-step RFP processes: are these reserved for large and complex projects where higher-level expertise and qualifications are perceived?
  INDOT does not have any definite criteria being followed.

- What is ACEC doing regarding federal funding/federal relief due to COVID 19 efforts and/or loss of revenue?
  Watch alerts to all representatives. Focusing on working with the FHWA concerning providing funding to states that do not have their act together.
  ACEC, ICI, INDOT meet regularly to discuss ways to leverage federal funds. This collective group is proactive in commenting on the Invest Act – pushing for a long-term mechanism, removing burdensome provisions. INDOT plans to avoid having to impact the capital program and is making other adjustments internally to adapt to the funding shortages.

- How can INDOT reduce costs on design while maintaining minimum standards? What do consultants believe could be reduced from Final Tracings packages to save revenue for maintenance and preservation efforts in the field?
  This is for our ACEC-INDOT committee to consider. How are adjacent states handling PM projects like mill and fills? Toby asked for member firms to provide written feedback on how we can help reduce design costs on preventative maintenance projects. Can submission requirements for PM type projects be relaxed or streamlined? Suggest getting ICI input on what it is that is needed for construction. A suggestion was made to start a sub-committee to explore this further – to be led by Steve Fleming, co-chair with Doug Oagley, Laurie Johnson. Consultant plan reviewer should also be on the sub-committee. Troy will explore the incoming 2020-2021 committee members to see who else is interested. Beth will check with ICI to see they would have interest in forming their own sub-committee.

- Any preliminary feedback on the RFI pertaining to On-Calls?
  The volume of on call work will decrease over time. Long term goal is to have less on calls and more LS project-specific projects. Central office managing. Believe process will offer consultants struggling to get a chance to improve scores. ACEC concerned with lack of DBE goals.
• Observations since last meeting:
  o Traffic Standards Subcommittee (update by Dave Henkel)
    ▪ Separate meeting minutes provided via email from the last meeting. No comments or discussion items were provided by the INDOT committee members.
  o Environmental Collaboration Subcommittee (update by Troy Woodruff)
    ▪ Joe Dabkowski reached out to the subcommittee to request feedback of any changes, positive or negative, that they have seen in the process. No responses as of 6/8/20 but provided the following opinion. INDOT still has not provided an updated CE manual and still seems to change their policy as it goes. Central office has been reviewing CE’s that the districts would normally do since INDOT lost district staff, which provides somewhat more consistency. However, the districts seem to have hired some new staff in these roles recently, so we will see what changes with the districts. Recent experience is that INDOT CE reviews are still taking longer than the 15 days (we’ve had them go 2 months recently), and the comments appear to be all over the place. The RFI review timelines have seemed to improve. Ecology has not changed at all.

• Old Business / Committees
  o Selection Subcommittee: Proposed changes are under INDOT review (M. Guzik to update)
    ▪ Plan on providing feedback to INDOT about the changes at the June 2020 committee meeting. No comments from membership has been provided. Mike Guzik will reach out to Clanton to see what the data shows. Mike will clarify the score history criterion being used. With regard to ongoing discussion of LPA scores being used for INDOT selections, Mike G. will lead gathering questions to give Beth so ACEC can prepare a survey monkey to all ACEC firms.
  o Revised Prequalification Rule - 105 IAC 11-2 through 3 (C. Canfield to update)
    ▪ ACEC supported the objective and will provide comment, if necessary or asked.
  o Design Build Best Value Policy Change: (T. Randolph to update)
    ▪ No update. Not on INDOT’s agenda currently.
  o Legislative Update (B. Bauer to update)
    ▪ Working with INDOT to support its budget request for the next FY. This summer is relatively quiet with regard to ACEC interests. ACEC will be on the look-out for fund diversion.
  o New Shop Drawing review process for MSE walls. INDOT Construction Memorandum 20-10 updates the LPA & State Shop Drawing and Falsework Review Procedures (attached) - The LPA and/or their designated representative are now responsible for this work. Have to remember to make sure funds are set aside for this for consultants and their subconsultants with the necessary technical knowledge to do the review. Toby has not received a response from INDOT

2019-2020 INDOT Committee
regarding the 8-page MSE Wall Shop Drawing Review checklist Geotech member firms were asked to review and comment on in Nov 2019. Mike Wigger will help in seeking to get a response from INDOT on the status of the checklist. The checklist would establish a standard of care to be used when reviewing and approving MSE wall shop drawings.

- **Length of time to obtain CIF permits.** Adversely affecting schedules. In correspondence with Nick Batta, DNR committee chair, they are working on this topic closely with INDOT and DNR. Nick reported the following after having a conference call with Ryan Mueller (DNR Division of Water manager) on 6/8 to help establish some items my new committee and can work with them. As it relates to DNR improving their internal processes, here is what he was told:
  - Improvements to UNITY are still an on-going process, albeit not as far along as hoped. They continue to use a software contractor to help, and said it is looking positive that their budget for the 2020/2021 fiscal year will keep the contractor.
  - DNR is about 2 months through a formal “audit” of their processes (or 50% complete). They plan to discuss many of their draft recommendations with my committee at our first meeting in early August. My plan is to assign a couple members of my committee to each of the recommendations to help review.
  - That same audit found last year 40% of the permit applications had deficiencies that required the applicant supplying additional information/corrections before being approved (keep in mind this is statewide, so not just transportation-related projects). One of the recommendations of the audit will be to have more formal training and a dedicated staff person(s) to review the simpler permits. I think the formal training is something ACEC can really help with. The objective is to have a couple DNR staff assigned to the fairly benign applications to free up more of their engineers for the more complicated hydraulic reviews.

- **New Business**
  - **LPA Federal Aid Projects:** The Indy MPO is going to be funding LPA federal aid projects at 80/20 as usual; starting with FY 2025 projects, the MPO will only provide 80/20 funding up to the bid amount, although it hasn’t been finalized. All change orders are going to be on the locals, so that means the local agencies will be on the hook for CO payment, which in turn means they could be scrutinizing CO’s for E&O in an effort to pin the $ on the designers. The belief is the statewide CO average is typically in the 5% range which will be a substantial hit to the LPAs. Currently, the Indy MPO funds an additional 10% to allow for change orders. Dave Henkel gave the consulting side of the story to the Indy MPO, indicating the locals will tend to come after the designers without a CO cushion because every project can’t be perfect. He asked them to consider adding 5% to the bid amount going forward, consistent with the statewide change order average. If ACEC can lobby to push the amount back up to 10%, that would be even better. Is this issue present with other MPO’s in the state?
  - **LPA Utility Reimbursable Agreements:** there are not separate forms for utility reimbursements for LPA projects. The form on the UTA site is INDOT specific. INDOT responded to modify the INDOT template forms to your specific LPA and would provide support where needed.
• New Chairperson – Troy Woodruff, RQAW
  o Officially takes over for Toby Randolph after this meeting.

• Next Committee Meetings:
  o August 2020; Location: TBD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Substitute (please print)</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aikins, Paul</td>
<td>USI Consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:paikins@usiconsultants.com">paikins@usiconsultants.com</a></td>
<td>317-637-3563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bauer, Beth</td>
<td>ACEC Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbauser@acecindiana.org">bbauser@acecindiana.org</a></td>
<td>317-997-5099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Books, Jeremy</td>
<td>Butler, Fairman, &amp; Seufert</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbooks@bfsengr.com">jbooks@bfsengr.com</a></td>
<td>317-408-7103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canfield, Cash</td>
<td>American Structurepoint</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ccanfield@structurepoint.com">ccanfield@structurepoint.com</a></td>
<td>317-997-5099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cicero, Tom</td>
<td>S.E.H. Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tjcicero@sehinc.com">tjcicero@sehinc.com</a></td>
<td>317-514-3235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clodfelter, Jon</td>
<td>United Consulting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jclodfelter@uctindiana.com">jclodfelter@uctindiana.com</a></td>
<td>317-408-7103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cook, Josh</td>
<td>HNTB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcook@hntb.com">jcook@hntb.com</a></td>
<td>317-408-7103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dagley, Doug</td>
<td>CHA Companies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddagley@chacompanies.com">ddagley@chacompanies.com</a></td>
<td>317-554-7569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dalal, Imtiyaz</td>
<td>Janssen &amp; Spaans Eng.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ldalal@jsengr.com">ldalal@jsengr.com</a></td>
<td>317-254-9686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fleming, Steve</td>
<td>Lochmueller Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:SFleming@lochgroup.com">SFleming@lochgroup.com</a></td>
<td>317-829-9635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gottschalk, Michelle</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gottschalkmm@cdmsmith.com">gottschalkmm@cdmsmith.com</a></td>
<td>317-829-9635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Guzik, Michael</td>
<td>Lawson-Fisher Associates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mguzik@lawson-fisher.com">mguzik@lawson-fisher.com</a></td>
<td>317-829-9635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Heidenreich, Kurt</td>
<td>Engineering Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kurt@eri.consulting">kurt@eri.consulting</a></td>
<td>317-829-9635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hetrick, Kevin</td>
<td>Clark Dietz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.hetrick@clarkdietz.com">kevin.hetrick@clarkdietz.com</a></td>
<td>317-808-3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hornsby, Scott</td>
<td>GAI Consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:SHornsby@gaiconsultants.com">SHornsby@gaiconsultants.com</a></td>
<td>317-808-3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Huria, Rajiv</td>
<td>SJCA P.C.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhuria@sjca-pc.com">rhuria@sjca-pc.com</a></td>
<td>317-808-3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Johnson, Laurie</td>
<td>DLZ Indiana, LLC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ljohnson@dlz.com">ljohnson@dlz.com</a></td>
<td>574-904-7221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Longest, Jim</td>
<td>Beam, Longest &amp; Neff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlongest@b-l-n.com">jlongest@b-l-n.com</a></td>
<td>317-808-3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>McKinney, Duane</td>
<td>WSP USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Duane.mckinney@wsp.com">Duane.mckinney@wsp.com</a></td>
<td>317-808-3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Newport, Trent</td>
<td>CrossRoad Engineers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tnewport@crossroadengineers.com">tnewport@crossroadengineers.com</a></td>
<td>317-808-3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Randolph, Toby</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tobias.randolph@parsons.com">tobias.randolph@parsons.com</a></td>
<td>317-616-4676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rape, Marc</td>
<td>Strand Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:marc.rape@strand.com">marc.rape@strand.com</a></td>
<td>317-394-6023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sondles, Scott</td>
<td>Burgess &amp; Niple</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.sondles@burgessniple.com">scott.sondles@burgessniple.com</a></td>
<td>317-394-6023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wigger, Mike</td>
<td>Earth Exploration, Inc.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mwigger@earthengr.com">mwigger@earthengr.com</a></td>
<td>317-394-6023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Woodruff, Troy</td>
<td>RQAW</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:twoodruff@rqaw.com">twoodruff@rqaw.com</a></td>
<td>812-881-6521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>30</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>31</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LPA and State Shop Drawing and Falsework Review Procedures

In order to make the review process more efficient, the Department will allow the Contractor to submit electronic copies of design calculations and shop drawings for approval in lieu of printed copies. Every submittal must include the contract number, contractor’s name, and contact person with contact information. All drawings and calculations should be submitted in the units used for the contract.

A. LPA Contracts
For LPA contracts, review of all shop drawings and other items listed in Part C are the responsibility of the LPA or their designated representative. Contractors on LPA projects are to submit shop drawings and falsework plans as directed by the LPA. Once shop drawings for structural members have been approved by the LPA or LPA’s representative, a copy should be forwarded to INDOT as indicated herein. Questions about LPA procedures should be directed to the District Local Projects Administrator.

Structural Members and Items
For LPA contracts, shop plans for structural members and items are to be submitted to the LPA or their designated representative for review and approval. Since INDOT is responsible for fabrication inspection of structural members, upon completion of the shop drawing review, the LPA or their representative should forward an electronic copy of the approved shop drawings to INDOT Office of Bridge Design, at BridgeDesignOffice@indot.IN.gov.

Approval of Pile Driving Equipment
The Contractor shall submit to the LPA or designated representative, a completed pile and driving equipment data form at least 15 calendar days prior to driving piles. A copy shall also be furnished to the Engineer. The EOR shall review for acceptance the pile and driving equipment data form. The pile and driving equipment data form is available on the Department’s website. The Contractor will be notified by the LPA or designated representative, of the acceptance of the proposed pile driving system within 15 calendar days of the receipt of the pile and driving equipment data form. Acceptance of pile and driving equipment does not relieve the Contractor of the responsibility to provide equipment suitable for driving the specified piling to the required bearing without damage. INDOT Geotechnical Services Division at geotech@indot.in.gov and the Engineer will be notified by the LPA or designated representative, of the acceptance of the proposed pile driving system.

B. Design-Build Contracts
For design-build contracts, responsibilities and procedures for shop drawing review and approval is typically described in the design-build contract documents.

C. State Contracts
For state contracts, the following procedures have been implemented for submittal and review of shop plans, falsework drawings and related items as described below. Regardless
of the submittal process described below, it is the intent that contractors communicate
directly with the PE/S to keep them informed of the status of submittals. If the District has
any concerns about the structural integrity of any shop plans submitted with a P.E. stamp,
they should contact their Division of Construction Management and District Support Field
Engineer for further assistance.

1. **Structural Members & Items**
   For State contracts, shop plans for the following items are to be submitted by the
   fabricator or supplier directly to Burgess & Niple, Inc. for review and approval. Shop
   plans must be in accordance with the applicable specifications. These items do not
   require a P.E. stamp for submittal.
   - Structural steel & structural concrete members
   - Modular expansion joints
   - S-S joints
   - Elastomeric bearings.

   Shop plans are to be sent to Burgess & Niple at shopplanreview@burgessniple.com. Their
   office phone number is 317-237-2760. Burgess & Niple will send approved
   shop plans to the INDOT Division of Bridges at BridgeDesignOffice@indot.IN.gov
   for distribution to the District Construction office.

2. **Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) Retaining Walls**
   Shop plans and design calculations for MSE retaining walls are to be submitted by the
   contractor or fabricator directly to the Engineer of record (EOR) for review and
   approval. MSE shop plans and design calculations must be stamped by a P.E. Upon
   receipt, the EOR should forward an electronic copy of the shop drawings and design
   calculations to the INDOT Office of Geotechnical Services at MSEWallShopDrawings@indot.in.gov
   with the contract number as part of the subject line. The INDOT Office of Geotechnical Services will review the design calculations
   and will provide comments back to the EOR for inclusion in the response back to the
   contractor or fabricator. The EOR will continue to provide the final approval of the
   MSE shop drawings and design calculations. The EOR will attach a cover letter and
   send a copy of approved shop plans to the submitter and to the District Construction
   office for further distribution.

3. **Sound Barrier Systems**
   Shop plans and calculations for sound barrier systems are to be submitted by the
   contractor or fabricator directly to the EOR for review and approval. The plans and
   calculations must be stamped by a P.E. The designer will attach a cover letter and send
   a copy of approved plans and calculations to the submitter and to the District
   Construction office for further distribution.

4. **Precast Concrete 3-Sided Structures and Box Culverts (Effective with January 2016
   lettings)**
   Shop drawings and design calculations are to be submitted for all precast concrete 3-
   sided structures and for precast concrete box culverts that have a dimension or design
earth cover not listed in Table 1 of ASTM C 1577. Shop drawings and design calculations must be stamped by a P.E.. Shop drawings for 3-sided structures must include details to provide sufficient horizontal restraint (prior to backfill being placed) unless the design demonstrates such restraint is not required. Load rating calculations must be included for structures whose span measured along the centerline exceeds 20 ft, except where the height of cover is greater than 8 ft and exceeds the perpendicular span length.

Plans and calculations should be submitted by the contractor to the Project Engineer/Supervisor (PE/S). The PE/S should send the shop drawings directly to the EOR for review and approval and copy the Office of Roadway Review Coordinator at coordinator7@indot.in.gov. For structures requiring load rating, the EOR should forward an electronic copy of the shop drawings, design calculations, load rating calculations and load rating summary (RPD 700-B-301d) to the Office of Bridge Inspection Load Rating Engineer at BridgeDesignOffice@indot.IN.gov. Load Rating Engineer will provide comments back to the designer.

5. **Welded Wire Reinforcement**
   Shop plans and design calculations are to be submitted for locations where the contractor proposes to substitute welded wire reinforcement in lieu of the reinforcing bars shown on the plans. Shop plans must be stamped by a P.E.

   Plans and calculations are to be submitted by the contractor to the PE/S. The PE/S should send the plans and calculations directly to the EOR for review and approval and copy the Office of Bridge Design Manager at BridgeDesignOffice@indot.IN.gov. The EOR will send approved shop plans to the PE/S for distribution to the contractor.

6. **Traffic Items**
   Shop drawings for Signing, Signals, and Lighting will be reviewed and approved by the Office of Traffic Design and Review. These items typically include all overhead sign structures, signal strain poles and cantilevers, high mast lighting, luminaries, and light poles. Plans and calculations should be submitted by the contractor to the PE/S and forwarded to the INDOT Office of Traffic Design Manager at: TrafficDesignReview@indot.IN.gov for review and approval.

   The Office will distribute approved shop plans to the PE/S for distribution to the contractor.

7. **Falsework and Temporary Bridge Drawings**
   Falsework drawings for the following items are to be submitted to the PE/S. Each drawing must include the contract number, contractor’s name and must be stamped by a P.E.
   - Cofferdams
   - Deck falsework – temporary
   - Coping falsework
- Falsework for reinforced concrete slab superstructures
- Falsework for hammerhead pier caps
- Designs for temporary bridges for runarounds.

Temporary bridge design submittals must also include design calculations.

The PE/S will review drawings for compliance with the specifications and the specific job conditions only. Questions should be directed thru the Area Engineer and District Construction office.

8. Permanent Metal Deck Forms
Shop plans for permanent metal deck forms are to be submitted by the contractor to the District Construction office for review for compliance with the specifications and the specific job conditions only. Shop plans submitted by the contractor must be stamped by a P.E. The Division of Construction Management maintains a deck form calculation spreadsheet on the INDOT Y: drive under Div.contracts&construction/metal deck form cale that can assist in review of metal deck forms.

9. Foundation Seals and Deck Pour Sequences
Requests for use of foundation seals not shown in the plans are to be submitted to the INDOT Geotechnical Services Division at geotech@indot.in.gov for review and approval. The submittal must include the contract number, contractor’s name and indicate the location and dimensions of the seal. The Office will distribute approved requests.

Requests to revise planned deck pour sequences are to be submitted by the contractor to the PE/S. The PE/S should send the deck pour sequence directly to the EOR for review and approval and copy the Office of Bridge Design at BridgeDesignOffice@indot.IN.gov.

The submittal must include the contract number, contractor’s name, indicate the original and proposed alternate sequence and pour rate. The EOR will distribute approved requests.

10. Approval of Pile Driving Equipment
The Contractor shall submit to the Office of Geotechnical Services, a completed pile and driving equipment data form at least 15 calendar days prior to driving piles. A copy shall also be furnished to the Engineer. The pile and driving equipment data form is available on the Department’s website. The Contractor will be notified of the acceptance of the proposed pile driving system within 15 calendar days of the receipt of the pile and driving equipment data form. Acceptance of pile and driving equipment does not relieve the Contractor of the responsibility to provide equipment suitable for driving the specified piling to the required bearing without damage.

11. Stream Crossings and Work Bridges