

MP Committee Meeting – May 9th, 2018

Agenda

1:00 PM at MCST

1. Brief review of Open Meetings Act.
 - a. Notice - Secretary of States Office
 - b. Agenda -Posted on Specifications webpage
 - c. Open Meeting - Public can attend the meeting
 - d. Minutes -If making a comment, please say your name at start
 - e. Voting - Cast a vote for or against items that are up for approval
2. MP Process for Birth to Approval
 - a. Our Internal Process (Flow Chart to be presented at meeting).
3. That have been approved and are in the process of moving to FHWA

a. MP 603.02.10	i. MP 401.07.20
b. MP 603.10.40	j. MP 401.07.21
c. MP 604.02.40	k. MP 401.07.22
d. MP 700.10.01	l. MP 401.07.23
e. MP 709.04.40	m. MP 401.07.24
f. MP 711.03.23	n. MP 401.07.25
g. MP 714.03.30	o. MP 401.13.50
h. MP 401.02.31	

4. Old Business:

1. Champion: Kim Hoover:
 - MP 688.02.20 – 4th presentation to Committee.
 - MP 688.03.20 – 4th presentation to Committee.
2. ~~Champion: Hoover/Brayack:~~
 - ~~• MP 700.00.00 – 2nd presentation to Committee – This needs more work.~~

3. New Business:

1. Champion: Chapman:
 - xxx.xx.xx - ST-1
 - 109.00.10 – Non Testing Charges
2. Champion: Burns/Brayack:
 - 106.03.51
3. Champion: Travis Walbeck/Vince Allison/John Crane:
 - 700.00.05 Coring
4. Champion: Caudill:
 - 720.10.01 – Profiler

5. Champion: Lipscomb:

- 709.01.50 – Corrosion Resistant R/F
- 709.04.40 – Wire R/F

Comments from Previous Meeting (response to comments due 5/2/18 by respective champions)

Ron Stanevich:

688.02.20

3.2.1 – Last sentence – “As a minimum an acceptable plan should...” Why even say “at a minimum” when you only tell them they “should” contain the following? Delete “should” and replace with “Shall”.

3.2.1 bullets a,b, & c – should you also not require contact information (number & address) of the individuals in bullets a & b?? Please do so.

3.3.1 – why are we putting the appearance of the surface aft the blast cleaning in a standard in the contract and not in the MP or Specifications. This seems like it would be information that is constant from project to project and should not be in a contract but instead either in this MP or the standard specifications.

3.3.2 – seems like there should be some industry standards for these tasks? If so why not just require such methods to be in accordance with such standards?

3.4.3 – where are these documented in the project? Seems like we are overlapping requirements of what should be in the specification and what should be in the contactors quality control plan. Nevertheless should we not tell them what to do with said documentation after they document. Is it required in the spec for them to turn it over to the project or verify with the DOH inspector’s QA?

3.5 – should we not want to say what we want to see in this “detailed plan”. As this is written all the contractor has to say is that he/she will fix needed corrections in accordance with industry standards. Seems like we should specify some minimums here that we want to see and review.

- 6.1 Should we not also mention that such plans should be in accordance with all Laws, regulations, policies, etc etc????

Attachment 1:

Project information – include a field for Contract ID. This number is more important than some of the others.

I would not use "Bridge Name" because bridge names can change every four years. I would separate Bridge Number as a separate field. Then say Project Name.

MP 700.00.00 RESPONSE: (DB)- I HAVE PUT THIS ON THE BACK BURNER FOR NOW. WE NEED TO RE-WORK THIS SIGNIFICANTLY.

Referenced documents: First don't use symbols as bullets. DO NOT. It makes things hard to reference. In this case you only have one document under both bullets 2.1 and 2.2. instead of symbols they should be 2.1.1 and 2.2.1 respectively.

RESPONSE: (DB) –WHEN I FORMAT THESE, I WILL REMOVE THESE AND REPLACE WITH a) etc.

2.1 – change symbol to 2.1.1 and is this the most up to date? Should we say latest edition? AASHTO is no longer publishing these books it's an electronic publication now I think.

2.2 – change symbol 2.2.1 and is this the most up to date? Do we have a copy of this technical advisory? If so where can it be found?

2.3 – what about the supplemental specifications????

4.3 and 4.3.1 – using this convention then should this MP not be in the 100-199 range?????

4.4 – I doubt this will always apply, some guidance should be given how to handle when it doesn't.

4.5 and 4.5.1 – is this really necessary to go into detail in this digital age? I like the intent but how many MP's currently do we have that fit nicely in this scheme? Why would this MP be labeled "00" it is not Field Sampling related????

5.5.2 – get rid of symbols as bullets. Either 5.5.2.1 or use letters in this case. For example what is subbullet 5? You have to count.

7.0 looks like we may have skipped some of these steps when we sent to FHWA.

What's the checklist "Development and Review of Specifications"??

Also I think you should prepare a MP Template to distribute for people when they need to update one.