#### (Revised March 1, 2022)

# **DOTD FORM: 24-102**

#### PROPOSAL TO PROVIDE CONSULTANT SERVICES

Prime consultant shall complete the DOTD Form 24-102 without altering the Form's text; however, the instruction and/or guidance for Sections 12 through 23 can be removed but do not remove Section title and number.

ANY CONSULTANT FAILING TO SUBMIT ANY OF THE INFORMATION REQUIRED ON THE DOTD FORM 24-102, OR PROVIDING INACCURATE INFORMATION ON THE DOTD FORM 24-102, MAY BE CONSIDERED NON-RESPONSIVE.

Prime consultant should enter the firm name in the footer at the bottom of this page. (It will carry over to subsequent pages.)

1.	Contract title as shown in the advertisement	NORTH JOSEPH ST OVER CREEK
2.	Contract number(s) as shown in the advertisement	4400025052
3.	State Project Number(s), if shown in the advertisement	H.015016.5
4.	Prime consultant name (as registered with the Louisiana	TriCoeur Services, L.L.C.
	Secretary of State where such registration is required by law)	
		TriCoeur
		V Services LLC
		(Louisiana charter number 40282112K)
5.	Prime consultant license number (as registered with the	EF#: 4660
	Louisiana Professional Engineering and Land Surveying Board	VF#: 0653
	(LAPELS) if registration is required under Louisiana law)	
6.	Prime consultant mailing address	9270 Siegen Lane, Suite 501, Baton Rouge, LA 70810
7.	Prime consultant physical address (existing or to be established,	9270 Siegen Lane, Suite 501, Baton Rouge, LA 70810
	if location is used as an evaluation criteria)	
8.	Name, title, phone number, and email address of prime	Barry P. Gahagan, PE, PLS; Projects Principal
	consultant's contract point of contact	Phone: 225-266-7507
		E-Mail: BGahagan@TriCoeur.com
9.	Name, title, phone number, and email address of the official with	Aileen Foley, Managing Principal
	signing authority for this proposal	Phone:225-228-2681
		Email: <u>AFoley@TriCoeur.com</u>



10. This is to certify that all information contained herein is accurate		
and true, and that the team presently has sufficient staff to		
perform these services within the designated time frame. By		
submitting this proposal, proposer certifies that it is not engaged		
in a boycott of Israel and it will, for the duration of its contract		
obligations, refrain from a boycott of Israel. Proposer also		
certifies and agrees that the following information is correct: In		
preparing its response, the proposer has considered all proposals		
submitted from qualified, potential subcontractors and suppliers,		
and has not, in the solicitation, selection, or commercial		
treatment of any subcontractor or supplier, refused to transact or		
terminated business activities, or taken other actions intended to		
limit commercial relations, with a person or entity that is		
engaging in commercial transactions in Israel or Israeli-		
controlled territories, with the specific intent to accomplish a		
boycott or divestment of Israel. The proposer also has not		
retaliated against any person or other entity for reporting such		
refusal, termination, or commercially limiting actions. DOTD	Signature (shall be the same person as #9):	
reserves the right to reject the response of the bidder or proposer	1.0 1.0	
if this certification is subsequently determined to be false, and to	theen foley	
terminate any contract awarded based on such a false response.	Date: December 20, 2022	
11. If a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal has been set	Firm(s):	Firm(s)'
for this advertisement, indicate which firm(s) will be used to	<u>%:</u>	
meet the DBE goal and each firm(s)' percentage.	N/A	



# 12. Past Performance Evaluation Discipline Table:

As indicated in the advertisement, insert the completed table here. The percentages for the prime and sub-consultants must total 100% for **each past performance evaluation discipline**, as well as the overall total percent of the contract.

**Sub-consultants are allowed to be used for this proposal.** Fill in the table by identifying only those evaluation disciplines consistent with the approach and methodology proposed in Section 18 of the DOTD Form 24-102\*, the name of each firm that is part of the proposal, and the percentage of work in each past performance evaluation discipline to be performed by that firm. The percentage estimated for each evaluation discipline is for evaluation purposes only and will not control the actual performance or payment of the work. The percentages for prime and sub-consultants must total 100% for each past performance evaluation discipline, as well as the overall total percentage of the contract.

Evaluation Disciplines	% of Overall Contract	Prime TriCoeur Services, LLC	Firm B Landsource, Inc.	Firm C Terracon Consultants, Inc.	Each Discipline must total to 100%
Survey	28.1%	10%	90%	0%	100%
Bridge	63.3%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Environmental	8.6%	4%	0%	96%	100%
Identify the percentage of	f work for the <u>ove</u>	erall contract to be pe	rformed by the prime	e consultant and each sub-con	sultant
Percent of Contract	100%	66.4%	25.3%	8.3%	



## 13. Firm Size:

For all firms that are part of this team, indicate the approximate number of personnel to be committed to this contract, by DOTD Job Classification and the total number of personnel within the firm that could provide support, if needed. If a specialized job classification is required and not included on the DOTD job classification list, specify "Other (xxxx)" and include the classification title inside the parentheses. The DOTD Job Classification(s) to be used can be found at the following link:

http://wwwsp.dotd.la.gov/Inside\_LaDOTD/Divisions/Engineering/CCS/Job\_Qualification/Job%20Classifications%20with%20Descriptions.pdf

Firm name	DOTD Job Classification	Number of personnel committed to this contract	Total number of personnel available in this DOTD Job Classification (if needed)
	Administrative	1	1
TriCoeur	Principal	1	1
Services LLC	Engineer	2	2
	CADD Technician	1	1
	Engineer - Intern	1	1
LandSource Inc	Surveyor	1	2
L'anusource, me.	CADD Technician	1	4
	Clerical	1	2
	Instrument Man	1	4
	Party Chief	1	4
Forracon	Biologist/Wetlands	2	20
	Environmental Manager	1	15



## 14. Organizational Chart:





# **15. Minimum Personnel Requirements:**

Use the table below to identify both prime consultant and sub-consultant staff designated to work on this contract meeting the Minimum Personnel Requirements (MPRs) specified in the advertisement. Ensure the résumé reflects the required experience stated in the MPR.

MPR No. Do not insert wording from ad	Personnel being used to meet the MPR (Individual(s) may not satisfy more than one MPR unless specifically allowed by Attachment B of the advertisement)	Firm employed by	Type of license / certification & number	State of license	License / certification expiration date
1	Barry P Gahagan, PE		PE /Civil 21586	LA	3/31/2024
2	Barry P Gahagan, PE	TriCoeur	PE /Civil 21586	LA	3/31/2024
3	Barry P Gahagan, PE	Services LLC	PE /Civil 21586	LA	3/31/2024
4	David L. Patterson, PLS	LandSource, Inc.	PLS.0004784	LA	3/31/2023
4	Scott L Patterson, PLS		PLS.0005246	LA	9/30/2023
5	Jim Baxter	Fierracon	N/A	N/A	N/A



# 16. Staff Experience:

Résumés shall be provided for all prime and sub-consultant personnel listed in Sections 14 and/or 15 of the proposal. Résumés of personnel not identified in Section 14 or Section 15 of the proposal should not be included and will not be evaluated. Résumés should be limited to 2 pages per person. Any certificates required by the advertisement are to be placed in Section 20.

Firm employ	yed by	TriCoeur Services, I	L.L.C.			
Name	Barry	P Gahagan, P.E., P.L.	S.	-65	Years of relevant experience with this employer	12
Title	Projec	ts Principal		6. 3 al	Years of relevant experience with other employer(s)	31
Degree(s) / Years / Specialization					Bachelor of Science/ 1980 / Civil Engineering LSU	
				- 24	Master of Science / 1990 / Civil (Structural) Engineering LS	U
Active regis	stration	number / state / expiration	on date		PE LA 21586, PLS 4834 / Louisiana / 3/31/2024	
Year registe	ered	1985	Discipli	ne	Civil Engineering	
		1997			Land Surveying	
Contract rol	e(s) / bi	ief description of respon	nsibilities		Project Manager	
Experience	]	Experience and qualific	ations rel	evant to the	e proposed contract; i.e., "designed drainage", "designed gird	lers", "designed
dates intersection", etc. Experience dates should cover the tim			es should c	over the time specified in the applicable MPR(s).		
12/18 - 07/2	20	<mark>SP No. H013122.5 OSB Ouachita Parish (Pine Street over West Prong of Young's Bayou &amp; Harrison – Collier</mark>				
	Streets over Concrete Drainage Canal) TS & PP					
	Project Manager/ directed topographic survey/ designed horizontal and vertical geometrics for approach roadways and					idways and
	1	oridge span configuratio	n/ coordii	nated draina	age design/ reviewed plan preparation of two multiple RCB cro	ossings in place
	(	of existing bridge structu	ares along	g existing sk	tewed alignments in FEMA floodways.	
12/18 - 03/2	20	SP No. H013098.5 OSB	Vernon	Parish (Ji	n Cryer Rd. over Bayou Anacoco) TS & PP	
	]	Project Manager/ direct	ed topogi	raphic surv	ey/ designed horizontal and vertical geometrics for approach	1 roadways and
	l	bridge span configuration	on/ develo	oped structu	ire type size and location recommendation/ reviewed plan pro	eparation of a 5
	5	pan LG25 crossing alon	g offset al	lignment to	enabling Parish's request to through travel during construction.	Recommended
		5) 48ft spans in lieu of	t (6) 40ft	spans to ir	nprove debris passage and gain economics advantage by elii	mination of one
00/10 00/	1	ntermediate bent.		<u></u> D		
09/13 - 03/	1/	SP No. H010597.5 USB	West Fe	eliciana Pai	rish (Sligo Road Bridges) 15, PP & FP	1.11 /
		roject Manager/ directe	a topogra	aphic survey	// designed norizontal and vertical geometrics along extremely	nilly terrain
for approach roadways and bridge span configu				span confi	guration/ developed structure type size and location recommer	idations/
	1	repared graphical grade	S/KUW	aking skett	thes and reviewed plan preparation for the skewed 12 span Qu	au beam
		ondownon hotwoor cite	ind the 3	span crossii	ing of Gayle's Creek. Sile construction sequencing to maintain	access to
	landowners between sites.					



04/13 - 04/16	SP No. H010040.5 OSB Morehouse Parish (Bud Road & Bonne Idee Road Bridges) TS, PP & FP
	Project Manager/ designed horizontal and vertical geometrics for approach roadways and bridge span configuration/
	developed structure type size and location recommendation/ ROW taking sketches and reviewed plan preparation for
	skewed /re-aligned/ curved and super-elevated slab span crossings. Prepared cantilevered sheetpile wall system design to
	minimize wetland encroachment.
05/13 - 01/14	East Baton Rouge City Parish Project No. 12-BR-US-018 (East Brookstown Bridge over Hurricane Bayou, Bridge
	Replacement) TS, PP & FP
	Project Manager/ designed horizontal and vertical geometrics for approach roadways and bridge span configuration/
	developed structure type size and location recommendation/ and reviewed plan preparation for slab span crossings over
	concrete lined channel and along challenging utility corridor including shallow, large diameter sewer force main and
	maintained pedestrian access.
02/19 - 03/20	East Feliciana Parish Project No. PW1178-DR 4277 LA (FEMA) (Carruth Road Bridge) TS, PP & FP
	Project Manager/ directed topographic survey/ designed horizontal and vertical geometrics along narrow flood prone
	corridor for approach roadways and bridge span configuration/ developed structure type size and location recommendation
	and reviewed plan preparation for a multi span LG25 crossing as a cost saving alternative to "in kind" timber bridge
00/10 01/00	crossing of the Lateral and Comite Creek Relief structure north of Clinton, LA.
02/19 - 04/20	East Feliciana Parish Project No. PW1190-DR 4277 LA (FEMA) (John Thomas Lane Bridge) TS, PP & FP
	Project Manager/ directed topographic survey/ designed horizontal and vertical geometrics along narrow flood prone
	corridor for approach roadways and bridge span configuration/ ROW taking sketches /developed structure alternative span
	recommendation and reviewed plan preparation for a multi concrete slab crossing as a cost saving alternative to "in kind"
02/17 02/19	Umber bridge crossing of the waterfall Bayou structure south of Clinton, LA.
02/17 - 02/18	west Feliciana Parish Project No. 16-HWP-PW-02 (FEMA) (Plettenberg Road Bridge) 15, PP & FP
	in systemaly flood means corrider for emmasch readyieve and bridge men configuration/ means and BOW taking sketches
	(developed structure alternative span recommendation of three control gued beam spans and curved and slob spans/
	reviewed plan preparation for the Polly Creek crossing replacement structure in the seasonally flood prope grees from the
	Mississippi River batture porth of St Francisville I A
02/11 = 02/13	Inffarson Parish Project No. DPW 07 0/6R DP(SELA) (WR West Mateirie Ave over Soniat Canal) PP & FP
02/11 - 02/13	Project Manager/ directed tonographic survey/ designed horizontal and vertical geometrics along curved alignment
	requiring split phase construction, channel naving, approach surcharge loading and designed superstructure and
	substructure including segmental spliced precast nile construction below high tower electrical transmission lines. This
	project alternative was conceived following realization of constructability issues at the confluence of numbed drainage
	canals at the upstream terminus of USACE/SELA flood improvement project.
	culture at the approach terminals of OSTICL/SELETT hood improvement project.



Firm employed by	y TriCoeur Services, L.L.C.						
Name Tho	mas M. Willis, P.E.	Years of relevant experience with this employer	7				
Title Proj	ect Engineer (Hydr & Env)	Years of relevant experience with other employer(s)	35				
Degree(s) / Years	/ Specialization	BS/ 1981/ Civil Engineering					
Active registratio	n number / state / expiration date	24205 / LA Expiration: 3/31/2024					
Year registered	1991 Discipline	Civil (Hydraulic) & Environmental Engineering					
Contract role(s) /	brief description of responsibilities	Project Engineer Civil (Hydraulic) & Environmental					
Experience	Experience and qualifications relevant to the	e proposed contract; i.e., "designed drainage", "designed gird	lers", "designed				
dates	intersection", etc. Experience dates should co	over the time specified in the applicable MPR(s).					
12/18 - 07/20	<mark>SP No. H013122.5 OSB Ouachita Parish (F</mark>	'ine Street over West Prong of Young's Bayou & Harrison	<mark>ı – Collier</mark>				
Streets over Concrete Drainage Canal) HYDR							
	Project Engineer/ Prepared hydraulic analyse	s reports/ calibrated results to conform to FEMA data in undo	cumented pump				
	drainage network of Monroe, LA./ confirmed	sufficiency of Parish preferred multiple RCB bridge replacen	nents along				
existing skewed alignments in FEMA floodways.							
12/18 – 03/20 SP No. H013098.5 OSB Vernon Parish (Jim Cryer Rd. over Bayou Anacoco) HYDR							
Project Engineer/ Prepared hydraulic analyses report for bridge span configuration developed structure type size and							
	location recommendation/ reviewed plan prep	paration of a 5 span LG25 crossing along offset alignment in v	voody debris				
	prone regions downstream of the Anacoco La	ke dam.					
09/13 - 03/17	SP No. H010597.5 OSB West Feliciana Par	ish (Sligo Road Bridges) HYDR					
	Project Engineer/ Prepared hydraulic analyse	s reports for two bridge sites along extremely hilly terrain/flas	hy streams for				
	Quad Beam bridge spans for the skewed 12 s	pan crossing of Bayou Sara and the 3 span crossing of Gayle's	s Creek.				
02/19 - 03/20	East Feliciana Parish Project No. PW1178-I	<b>DR 4277 LA (FEMA) (Carruth Road Bridge) HYDR</b>	<i>a a</i>				
	Project Engineer/ Prepared hydraulic analyses rep	ports for narrow flood prone corridor for roadway crossing at the con	nfluence of a				
	drainage lateral and significant primary channel r	ellet along the existing bridge upstream face. Developed hydraulic s	studies inclusive				
	of 2011 timber and 4011 LO25 girder spans. The re	to "in kind" timber bridge crossing of the Lateral and Comite Cree	S crossing				
	north of Clinton LA.	to in kind timber of dge crossing of the Lateral and Connic Cree	K Rener structure				
02/19 - 04/20	2/19 - 04/20 East Feliciana Parish Project No. PW1190-DR 4277 LA (FEMA) (John Thomas Lane Bridge) HVDR						
	Project Engineer/ Prepared hydraulic analyses reports for flood prone roadway crossing in flood prone corridor for a multi						
	concrete slab crossing of Waterfall Bayou structure south of Clinton, LA.						
02/17 - 02/18	West Feliciana Parish Project No. 16-HMP-	PW-02 (FEMA) (Plettenberg Road Bridge) HYDR					
	Project Engineer/ Prepared hydraulic analyses rep	ports for alignment in extremely flood prone corridor for the Polly C	Creek crossing				
	replacement structure in the seasonally flood pror	e areas of the Mississippi River batture north of St Francisville, LA	1.				



Firm employed by	LandSource, Inc.			
Name David L.	Patterson		Years of relevant experience with this employer	26
Title President	C C		Years of relevant experience with other employer(s)	10
Degree(s) / Years	/ Specialization	Loui	siana State University, B.S., 4 yr., Construction Technology	
Active registration	n number / state / expiration date	Lice	nse No.: 4784 / LA / 3/31/2023	
Year registered	1996 Discipline	Prof	essional Land Surveyor	
Contract role(s) /	brief description of responsibilities	Prine	cipal-in-Charge/Project Manager/Land Surveyor - Mr. Patters	on has &
		will	serve as Principal-in-Charge, Project Manager & Professional	Land
		Surv	reyor on the projects listed below and the advertised project. H	le will
		over	see all project activities.	
Experience dates	Experience and qualifications rele	vant 1	to the proposed contract; <i>i.e.</i> , "designed drainage", "designe	d girders",
(mm/yy–mm/yy)	"designed intersection", etc. Expe	rience	e dates should cover the time specified in the applicable MPR(	s).
2021	S.P. No. H.014318 Site 1, Off-Syst	tem H	ighway Bridge Program, East Baton Rouge Parish. Responsi	bilities
	included topographic survey to rep	lace o	one bridge. (2021)	
2021	S.P. No. H.014318 Site 2, Off-Syst	tem H	ighway Bridge Program, Rapides Parish. Responsibilities inc	luded
	topographic survey to replace two	bridge	es. (2021)	
2020	S.P. No. H.014223, Off-System Hi	ghwa	y Bridge Program, Vermillion Parish. Responsibilities includ	ed
2020	topographic survey to replace one	bridge	2.(2020)	
2020	S.P. No. H.014261, Off-System Hi	ghwa	y Bridge Program, Rapides Parish. Responsibilities included	
2010 2010	topographic survey to replace two	bridge	(2020)	1
2018-2019	S.P. No. H.013122.5, Off-System I	Highw	vay Bridge Program, Quachita Parish. Responsibilities includ	ed
2010	topographic surveys to replace two	(Pine	Street and Harrison Collier) bridges in Monroe, LA. (2018)	1
2019	S.P. No. H.013098.5, Off-System I	Highw	vay Bridge Program, Vernon Parish. Responsibilities included	1
2012	topographic survey to replace the e		g Jim Cryer Road bridge over Bayou Anacoco bridge. (2019)	1 1
2013	S.P. No. H.010040.5, Off-System I	Highw (Dec 1	Vay Bridge Program, Morehouse Parish. Responsibilities include the second party of the	laea
2012	s p N <sub>2</sub> H 010061 5 % H 010062		Koad and Bayou Bonne Idee) bridges. (2015)	a
2013	5.r. No. H.010061.5 & H.010062.	5, UII	-System Highway Bridge Program, Tangipanoa Parish. Resp	onsibilities
	included topographic survey to rep	lace f	our bridges. (2013)	



Firm employed by	LandSource, Inc.			
Name Scott L. P	atterson		Years of relevant experience with this employer	10
Title Project M	anager / Land Surveyor		Years of relevant experience with other employer(s)	3
Degree(s) / Years /	Specialization	Loui	siana State University, B.S., 4 yr., Construction Technology	
Active registration	number / state / expiration date	Lice	nse No.: 5246 / LA / 9/30/2023	
Year registered 2022 Discipline Pr			essional Land Surveyor	
Contract role(s) / b	rief description of responsibilities	Proje	ect Manager	
Experience dates	Experience and qualifications relevan	nt to tł	ne proposed contract; i.e., "designed drainage", "designed girders"	, "designed
(mm/yy–mm/yy)	intersection", etc. Experience dates	should	l cover the time specified in the applicable MPR(s).	
2021	S.P. No. H.014318 Site 1, Off-System	m Hig	hway Bridge Program, East Baton Rouge Parish. Responsibilitie	s included
	topographic survey to replace one br	idge. (	(2021)	
2021	S.P. No. H.014318 Site 2, Off-System	m Hig	hway Bridge Program, Rapides Parish. Responsibilities included	
	topographic survey to replace two br	idges.	(2021)	
2020	S.P. No. H.014223, Off-System High	hway ]	Bridge Program, Vermillion Parish. Responsibilities included top	ographic
	survey to replace one bridge. (2020)			
2020	S.P. No. H.014261, Off-System High	hway ]	Bridge Program, Rapides Parish. Responsibilities included topog	raphic
	survey to replace two bridges. (2020)	)		
<mark>2018-2019</mark>	S.P. No. H.013122.5, Off-System Hi	ghwa	y Bridge Program, Ouachita Parish. Responsibilities included top	ographic
	surveys to replace two (Pine Street a	nd Ha	rrison Collier) bridges in Monroe, LA. (2018)	
<mark>2019</mark>	S.P. No. H.013098.5, Off-System Hi	ghwa	y Bridge Program, Vernon Parish. Responsibilities included topo	graphic
	survey to replace the existing Jim Cr	yer Ro	bad bridge over Bayou Anacoco bridge. (2019)	
2013	S.P. No. H.010040.5, Off-System Hi	ghwa	y Bridge Program, Morehouse Parish. Responsibilities included t	opographic
	surveys to replace two (Bud Road an	id Bay	ou Bonne Idee) bridges. (2013)	
2013	S.P. No. H.010061.5 & H.010062.5,	Off-S	ystem Highway Bridge Program, Tangipahoa Parish. Responsibi	lities
	included topographic survey to repla	ce tou	ir bridges. (2013)	



Firm employed by	LandSource, Inc.					
Name Michael (	C. Pitre			Years of relevant experience with this employer	26	
Title Vice Pres	ident			Years of relevant experience with other employer(s)	5	
Degree(s) / Years	/ Specialization		T.H.	Harris Technical College, Associates Degree, 2 yr., Civil Eng.	ineering	
			Tech	nology		
Active registration	number / state / expi	ration date	Lice	nse No.: CST Level III Certified / LA License #1003-1863		
Year registered		Discipline	Surv	rey Coordinator		
Contract role(s) / b	orief description of res	ponsibilities	Surv	vey Coordinator - Mr. Pitre has & will serve as Survey Coordin	ator on the	
			proje	ects listed below and the advertised project. He will coordinate	survey	
			crew	rs and CADD personnel.		
Experience dates	Experience and qua	lifications rele	vant 1	to the proposed contract; <i>i.e.</i> , "designed drainage", "designe	d girders",	
(mm/yy–mm/yy)	"designed intersection	on", etc. Exper	ience	dates should cover the time specified in the applicable MPR(s)	).	
2021	<b>CDN H014210</b>			'I D'I D D D D D I D 'I'	• • • • •	
2021	S.P. No. H.014318	Site I, Off-Syst	em Hi	ighway Bridge Program, East Baton Rouge Parish. Responsibi	lities	
2021	included topographi	c survey to rep		$\frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}$	1 1	
2021	S.P. No. H.014318 S	Site 2, Off-Syst	em Hi	ighway Bridge Program, Rapides Parish. Responsibilities inclu	lded	
2020	S D No 11 014222	o replace two t	oriage	S. (2021) A Dridge Dreamann, Vermeillien Derich - Desmensibilities includes	4	
2020	S.P. No. H.014223,	on-System Hi	gnway	(2020)	1	
2020	S P No H 01/261	Off System Hi	ahway	. (2020) A Pridge Program Denides Perish Desponsibilities included to	nographia	
2020	survey to replace tw	o bridges (202	gnway	y Bridge Frogram, Rapides Farish. Responsionities included w	pographic	
2018-2019	SP No H 013122 4	Off-System H	-0) Tighw	av Bridge Program Quachita Parish Responsibilities include	4	
2010 2017	topographic survey	nanagement to	repla	ce (Pine Street and Harrison Collier) bridges in Monroe LA (	$\frac{1}{2018}$	
2019	S.P. No. H.013098.	Off-System H	Highw	av Bridge Program, Vernon Parish, Responsibilities included	<u>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</u>	
	topographic survey	nanagement to	repla	ce the Jim Cryer Road bridge over Bayou Anacoco bridge. (20	<mark>19)</mark>	
2013	S.P. No. H.010040.5	, Off-System H	Highw	ay Bridge Program, Morehouse Parish. Responsibilities include	ded project	
	management for topographic surveys to replace two (Bud Road and Bayou Bonne Idee) bridges. (2013)					
2013	S.P. No. H.010061.5	& H.010062.5	5, Off-	-System Highway Bridge Program, Tangipahoa Parish. Respo	nsibilities	
	included topographi	e survey to repl	lace fo	our bridges. (2013)		



Firm employed	by Terracon Consultants, Inc.						
Name	Jim Baxter			Years of relevant experience with this employer	15		
Title	Senior Ecologist			Years of relevant experience with other employer(s)	5		
Degree(s) / Yea	rs / Specialization	Master of	of Forest Res	sources, University of Georgia, 2002			
	-	Bachelo	Bachelor of Science, University of the South, Natural Resources, 2000				
Active registration	ion number / state / expiration date	N/A					
Year	N/A Disci	oline C	CERTIFICA	ATION: Wetland Delineation, 2005			
registered							
Contract role / b	orief description of responsibilities	Mr. Bax	xter meets the	e requirements of MPR #5 with 20 years of experience performing	y wetland delineations.		
Mr. Baxter is a	Senior Ecologist. Project duties inclue	e jurisdicti	tional waters	delineations, Section 404 permitting, threatened and endangered s	pecies habitat		
assessments	s and surveys, state waters guidance, s	tream buffe	fer variance a	applications, guidance for mitigation banking, and Phase I Environ	mental Site		
Assessment	s (ESA). Mr. Baxter is a lead reviewe	r for natura	al resource w	vork, including wetland delineations and he oversees various ecolo	gical projects		
throughout	the southeast.						
Mr. Baxter was	initially trained in wetland delineation	field meth	hods in 2005	5. He has since attended additional courses and training programs	in wetlands and		
endangered	species.						
06/21 - 01/22	H.014319.5 Cedar Crest Ave. Off	System Br	ridge Wetlar	nd Delineation, Baton Rouge, LA, DOTD	· · ·		
	Senior Project Reviewer. Terracon j	ertormed a	a WOTUS de	elineation for a project that involved a proposed bridge dismantlin	g project and a new		
0.1./0.0	replacement structure at the Cec	ar Crest br	ridge location	n in Baton Rouge, LA where it crosses Weiner Creek.			
01/20 - 02/20	H.013081 Roundhill Road Wetlan	d Delineat	tion, W. Car	rroll Parish, LA, DOTD	11 . 0		
	Senior Project Reviewer. Terracon o	onducted a	a wetland del	lineation and prepared a preliminary WOIUS delineation report a	ddressing Section 404		
	of the Clean Water Act and Sec	10n 10 of t	the Rivers an	a Harbors Act compliance requirements for the proposed Roundhi	III Road over Little		
12/10 02/20	Colewa Bayou bridge replacem	nt.					
12/19 - 02/20	H.013111 Webster Bridge, Minde	I, LA, DU	)   D 	lineation and anneal a WOTUS delineation report addressing Sa	stion 101 of the Clean		
	Water A at (Section 404) and Se	onducted a	a welland del	ineation and prepared a wOTOS defineation report addressing Se	ction 404 of the Clean		
	over Caney Creek bridge replace	ment proj	i ule Rivers a	and Harbors Act (Section 10) compliance requirements for the proj	Josed Dorcheat Road		
07/10 12/10	H 0131/3 OSB Avoyallas Parish			er ransn, LA.			
0//1) = 12/1)	Senior Project Reviewer, Terracon (	onducted a	o wetland del	lineation for the Carbon Plant Road bridge over Bayou Boeuf in A	vovelles Parish The		
	delineation was conducted acco	dance with	h the 1987 II	S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Wetland Delineation Manu	al and the Regional		
	Supplement to the Corps of Eng	ineers Deli	ineation Mar	uual: Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region (Version 2.0, 2010) f	or a replacement bridge		
	design/construction project with	a similar a	alignment to	the previous bridge.	or a replacement oridge		
07/19 - 12/19	H.013130, OSB Ouachita Parish.	Red Cut R	Road Bridge	(over Watson Branch) and Charles Rawls Road (over Prairio	n Bavou), Ouachita		
	Parish, LA, DOTD						
	Senior Project Reviewer. Terracon of	onducted a	a wetland del	lineation for the Red Cut Road Bridge traversing Watson Branch s	south of West Monroe.		
	LA. The proposed project inclu	led design/	/construction	of a replacement bridge structure with a similar alignment to the	previous bridge.		



07/19-03/20	H.013163 Wadesboro Road over Unnamed Creek, Tangipahoa Parish, LA, DOTD
	Senior Project Reviewer. Terracon conducted a site visit at the Wadesboro Road Bridge for proposed replacement of the 29.7-foot-long timber
	bridge, a project located withing the Pontchartrain River Basin in the Lake Maurepas Watershed. Terracon subsequently prepared a Waters of
	the US (WOTUS) Delineation report based on site conditions. The delineation was conducted in general accordance with the 1987 USACE
	Wetland Delineation Manual and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Delineation Manual: Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain
	Region (Version 2.0, 2010), and the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) guidelines.
05/22 - 06/22	SP H.014270, Lefort Bypass Road OSB, Thibodaux, LA, DOTD
	Senior Ecologist. Terracon prepared a Waters of the US (WOTUS) Delineation report based upon findings obtained during field delineation.
	Terracon recommended consultation with the USACE to determine the appropriate Nationwide Permitting action and for a jurisdictional
	determination of the identified waters, and for potential permit issuance prior to initiating construction activities for this project.
02/22 - 04/22	After the Fact Permitting – McComb Substation, LaPlace, LA, Illinois Central RR
	Senior Project Reviewer. Terracon performed a preliminary WOTUS delineation on the approximately 37.03-acre site to characterize the existing
	site conditions, observe the site for the presence of WOTUS, including wetlands, provide an opinion regarding whether WOTUS (if observed)
	would be considered jurisdictional by the USACE. Additionally, at the time of the WOTUS delineations, Terracon sought to identify (if
	observed) any impact from emergency repair operations from Hurricane Ida.
10/18 - 02/19	City Parish Project No. 16-BR-US-0019, Port Hickey Road Bridge over Drainage Bayou, E. Baton Rouge Parish, LA
	Senior Project Reviewer. Provided environmental wetlands services including Cultural and Historical Sensitivity of the Property (Section 106
	Environmental Review).
07/18 04/20	SR 306 from SR 400 to SR 369, Baldridge Creek Project, Forsythe County, GA, GDOT
	Project Manager. For the approximately one-mile road widening project for State Route (SR) 306 located from SR 400 to SR 369, Terracon
	performed a wetland determination in addition to other ecological surveys. Background research was conducted prior to field surveys to identify
	potential ecological resources within the study area. Jurisdictional wetland determinations were performed using the three-parameter approach
	(hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and hydrology) as described in the 1987 USACE Wetland Delineation Manual and utilized the 2012
	Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Regional Supplement as guidance.
08/15 - 10/22	SR371 (Post Road) from SR 9 (Atlanta Hwy) to SR 20 Widening Project Forsythe County GA GDOT
00/15 10/22	Senior Project Reviewer For the proposed widening and roadway reconstruction project. Terracon provided a geotechnical soil survey and several
	environmental services including Phase I Environmental Site Assessment NEPA Ecology Air Quality Noise Study History and
	Archaeology



Firm employed by Terracon Consultants, Inc.												
Name	Rachel Keane		Years of relevant experience with this employer	4								
Title	Senior Staff Scientist		Years of relevant experience with other employer(s)	20								
Degree(s) / Year	rs / Specialization	Bachelor of S	Science, Limnology, 1997									
Active registrati	on number / state / expiration date	N/A										
Year registered	N/A Discipline	CERTIFICA	ATION: Wetland Delineation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1987	Manual								
Contract role(s) / brief description of responsibilities Ms. Keane meets the requirements of MPR #5 requiring a minimum of 5 years of experience performing wetland delineations.												
Ms. Keane meet	ts the qualifications of an Environmental F	rofessional as o	defined by EPA's AAI. With 24 years of experience, she has perform	med all aspects of								
Phase I ESA's in	ncluding site reconnaissance and report pr	eparation for si	tes throughout the Southeast. She has also been a contributing write	r of documents								
required by the	National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA	A) as well as Ph	ase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) and assisted in natura	al resources surveys								
for various proje	ects. Ms. Keane has completed +200 Phas	e I ESAs and h	as assisted in multiple Phase II ESAs.									
01/20 - 06/20	Carruth Road Bridge over the Little C Clearance.	omite River, I	E. Feliciana Parish, LA Senior Staff Scientist. Provided DOTD NE	PA Environmental								
03/20-05/20	SP H.013122 Ouachita Parish Bridge	Replacement: ]	Harrison Street and Collier Street Bridge/Drainage Canal, Oua	<mark>chita Parish, LA</mark>								
	Senior Staff Scientist. DOTD NEPA Environmental Clearance.											
03/20-05/20	SP H.013122 Ouachita Parish Bridge	SP H.013122 Ouachita Parish Bridge Replacement: Pine Street Bridge Ouachita Parish, LASenior Staff Scientist. DOTD NEPA										
	Environmental Clearance.											
02/18-	New Orleans Redevelopment Authorit	y - Acquisition	n, Construction, and Disposition Projects, New Orleans, LA Proj	ect Manager/Main								
Ongoing	Point of Contact. Provided NEPA and E	nvironmental R	Review Record (ERR) documentation for several HUD programs.									
1/20 - 6/20	John Thomas Bridge Senior Staff Scie	ntist. DOTD N	EPA Environmental Clearance.									
02/18 -	Louisiana Housing Corporation – Ren	ovation and N	ew Construction, Various Grant Programs for 2016 Flooding R	ecovery, Statewide,								
Ongoing	LA Program Manage/Principal Technica	l Writer/Team	Leader. Prepared Environmental Assessments and Tier II ERRS in s	support of various								
	grant programs administered by the Loui	siana Housing	Corporation (LHC) for renovation and recovery funding for the Man	rch and August 2016								
	flood events in Louisiana. These program	ns included Ne	ighborhood Landlord, Multifamily, Baton Rouge Rebuilds, and Bat	on Rouge Rebuilds								
00/20 00/20	Developers grant funding. Ms. Keane al	so trained junic	or staff and guided the preparation of 100+ Environmental Assessme	ents and Tier II ERRs.								
02/20 - 08/20	Habitat for Humanity – Four (4) Resid	lences, Lafaye	tte, Louisiana Project Manager/Principal Technical Writer. Prepare	d the Phase I ESA								
	and Environmental Assessment (EA) in	compliance wit	h HUD and NEPA for the construction of four single-family resider	ices on contiguous								
	parcels in Lafayette, Louisiana. The Pha	se I ESA was c	conducted in compliance with the appropriate ASIM Standard. Res	ources assessed for								
	the EA included, but was not infinited to,	historic resourc	LESA or the EA	Similarity resources.								
7/19 _ 11/19	SP H 013008 Jim Cryar Lana Bridge Senior Staff Scientist Environmental Clearance											
10/18 05/10	Habitat for Humanity St. Tammany W	Vost Four Sa	attered Desidential Late Mondeville and Covington LA									
10/18 - 03/19	Project Manager/Main Technical Writer	est - rour Sca	invironmental Clearance									
01/07 Present	Department of Housing and Urban De	volonment N	Aultiple Project HUD NEDA Environmental Clearance									
01/07 - Present	Department of Housing and Urban De	velopment – N	Iultiple Project – HUD NEPA Environmental Clearance									



Firm employed by	Terracon Consultants, Inc.												
Name	David Brunet	Years of relevant experience with this employer	<1										
Title	Senior Staff Scientist	Years of relevant experience with other employer(s)	22										
Degree(s) / Years /	/ Specialization	Master of Science /Biology/1995; Bachelor of Science, Biology, 1994											
Active registration	number / state / expiration date	N/A											
Year registered	N/A Discipline	N/A											
Contract role(s) / b	rief description of responsibilities	Wetlands Biologist											
Mr. Brunet has 22	years of experience as a wetland consultant. He	has conducted field work associated with wetland delineations and Coas	tal Use Permits. For										
various project	ts, he performed various rare and endangered sp	becies surveys and habitat surveys. For four years, Mr. Brunet served a	s the Environmental										
Program Mana	ager / Coastal Zone Administrator for the St. Tam	many Parish Government. In this role, he was responsible for reviewing	all local Coastal Use										
Permits for con	mpliance with local and state regulation and issuir	ng permits as appropriate. He ensured that all parish projects followed loo	cal, state, and federal										
environmental	permits and assisted various state and federal age	ncies in data collection efforts on the Pearl River System in St. Tammany	7 Parish.										
11/22 - Ongoing	Plettenburg Bridge OSB, W. Feliciana Parish	ı, LA											
	Wetland Scientist. Terracon is conducting a WC	wetland Scientist. Terracon is conducting a wOTUS delineation for the bridge site. David is conducting the wetland delineation and preparing											
	the permit application.												
11/22 - Ongoing	Baton Rouge City-Parish, Replacement of the	e Port Hickey Road Bridge over Drainage Bayou, Zachary, LA											
	Wetland Scientist. Terracon conducted a geote	chnical investigation and is providing wetlands permitting for the project	t. David is assisting										
	with obtaining the wetland permit.												
01/20 12/20	Samana Sita, Canatal Usa and Saania Diwan D	annite Lasamha LA											
01/20-12/20	Sawaya Sile, Coastal Use and Scenic River P	ermits, Lacombe LA	action 101 of										
(performed with	the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the I	Die for the fieldwork, data confection, drafting, and reporting for the address	th Coastal Usa Stata										
amployar)	Lands Scenic Rivers and local requirement	ts for the bulkhead and boat house. Project size was two acres	ui Coastai Ose, State										
employer)	Lands, Seeme Kivers, and local requirement	is for the builthead and boat house. Project size was two acres.											
02/18-03/19	Railroad Avenue Site, Wetland Delineation a	nd Scenic River Permits, Covington LA											
(performed with	Environmental Consultant. David was responsib	ble for the fieldwork, data collection, drafting, and reporting for the addre	essing Section 404 of										
previous	the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the I	Rivers and Harbors Act compliance requirements for permitting along wi	th Coastal Use, State										
employer)	Lands, Scenic Rivers, and local requirement	ts for the bulkhead and boat house Project size was one acre.											
04/19-12/19	Residential Subdivision, Wetland Delineation	and permits, scenic river permit, DEQ Water quality certification C	Covington LA										
(performed with	Environmental Consultant. David was responsib	ble for the fieldwork, data collection, drafting, and reporting for the addre	essing Section 404 of										
previous	the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the I	Rivers and Harbors Act compliance requirements for permitting along wi	th Coastal Use, State										
employer)	Lands, Scenic Rivers, and local requirement	ts to construct a residential subdivision. Project size was 64 acres.											



# 17. Firm Experience:

Firm name	TriCoeur Services, L.	L.C.	Pa	st Perfori	nance Evaluation	Discipline(s)*		Bridge				
Project name	Sligo Road Bridges					Firm responsibili	ty (prim	e or sub?)	Prime			
Project number	S.P. No. H.01	0597.5	Owner's r	name	Louisiana DOT	D						
Project location	West Felicia	na Parish, L	A		Owner's Pro	oject Manager	Barba	ara Ostuno	, PE			
Owner's address, phone, email1201 Capital Access Road, (225) 379-1047, B.Ostuno @LA.GOV												
Services comm	enced by this firm (mm/	yy)	09/13	Total co	onsultant contract of	cost (\$1,000's)			155.948			
Services compl	eted by this firm (mm/	(yy)	01/22	Cost of	consultant service	s provided by this:	firm (\$1	,000's)	155,948			
Prepared Prelin	ninary and Final bridge r	eplacement p	plans for r	ural local	roadways/ design	ed horizontal and v	vertical	geometrics	along			
extremely hilly	terrain for approach roa	dways and br	ridge span	configur	ation/ developed s	tructure type size a	and loca	tion recom	mendations/			
prepared graphi	prepared graphical grades/ ROW taking sketches and reviewed plan preparation for the skewed 12 span Quad Beam crossing of Bayou Sara											
and the 3 span of	and the 3 span crossing of Gayle's Creek. Site construction sequencing to maintain access to landowners between sites. All current members											
of the TriCoeur	staff were involved in t	his project an	id 100% p	erformed	in Louisiana.							
Firm name	TriCoeur Services, L.	L.C.	Pa	st Perfori	mance Evaluation	Discipline(s)*		Bridge				
Project name	<b>Bud Road and Bonne</b>	Idee Road I	Bridges			Firm responsibili	ty (prim	e or sub?)	Prime			
Project number	S.P. No. H.01	0040.5	Owner's r	name	Louisiana DOT	D						
Project location	Morehouse H	Parish, LA			Owner's Pro	oject Manager	Barba	ra Ostuno	, PE			
Owner's addres	s, phone, email	1201 Capit	al Access	Road, (2	225) 379-1047, в.с	Ostuno @LA.GOV						
Services comm	enced by this firm (mm/	yy)	04/13	Total co	onsultant contract of	cost (\$1,000's)			116.113			
Services compl	eted by this firm (mm/	yy)	11/15	Cost of	consultant service	s provided by this:	firm (\$1	,000's)	96.639			
Prepared Prelim	inary and Final bridge rej	placement pla	ns for rura	l local roa	adways / ROW taki	ing sketches for ske	wed /re-	-aligned/ cu	rved and super-			
elevated slab spa	an crossings. Prepared ca	intilevered she	eetpile wal	ll system	design to minimize	wetland encroachn	nent. <mark>Al</mark>	l current me	mbers of the			
TriCoeur staff w	vere involved in this proje	ect and $100\%$	performed	in Louisi	ana.							



Firm name	TriCoeur Services, L.	L.C.	Pa	ast Performanc	e Evaluation 1	Discipline(s)*		Bridge			
Project name	Pine Street over West	Prong of Y	loung's B	ayou & Harri	son –	Firm responsibilit	y (prim	e or sub?)	Prime		
-	Collier Streets over (	Concrete Di	rainage Ca	anal		_					
Project number	S.P. No. H013	122.5	Owner's	name Lou	isiana DOTI	D					
Project location	Ouachita Pa	rish, LA			Owner's Pro	oject Manager	Barba	ra Ostuno,	PE		
Owner's addres	s, phone, email	1201 Capi	ital Access	s Road, (225) 3	379-1047, Ba	rbara.Ostuno@L	A.GOV	7			
Services comm	enced by this firm (mm/	yy)	12/18	Total consult	ant contract c	cost (\$1,000's)			110.664		
Services completed by this firm (mm/yy) 05/21 Cost of consultant services provided by this firm (\$1,000's) 102.9											
Prepared Prelimi	nary bridge replacement p	lans for urba	n local road	ways, determine	ed and impleme	ented practical applic	cation as	desired by C	City Parish		
representatives of multiple RCB crossings in place of existing bridge structures along existing skewed alignments in FEMA floodways. All current											
members of the TriCoeur staff were involved in this project and 100% performed in Louisiana.											
Firm name	<b>TriCoeur Services, L</b> .	L.C.	Pa	ast Performanc	e Evaluation 1	Discipline(s)*		Bridge			
Project name	Project name Jim Cryer Rd. over Bayou Anacoco Firm responsibility (prime or sub?) Prime										
Project number	S.P. No. H013	098.5	Owner's	name Lou	isiana DOTI	D					
Project location Vernon Parish, LA Owner's Project Manager Barbara Ostuno, PE											
Owner's addres	s, phone, email	1201 Capi	ital Access	s Road, (225)	379-1047, Ba	rbara.Ostuno@L	A.GOV	7			
Services comm	enced by this firm (mm/	yy)	11/18	Total consult	ant contract c	cost (\$1,000's)			79.692		
Services comple	eted by this firm (mm/	yy)	10/22	Cost of cons	ultant services	s provided by this f	firm (\$1	,000's)	42.778		
Prepared Prelimi	nary bridge replacement p	lans for rural	local roady	vay, determined	and location re	ecommendation/ revi	iewed pl	an preparatio	on of a 5 span		
LG25 crossing al	ong offset alignment to en	abling Parish	n's request t	o maintain trave	elway during co	onstruction. Recomm	nended (	(5) 48ft span	s in lieu of (6)		
40ft spans to imp	rove debris passage and g	ain economic	s advantage	e by elimination	of one interme	ediate bent. All curre	nt memb	pers of the T <sub>1</sub>	iCoeur staff		
were involved in	this project and 100% per	formed in Lo	ouisiana.			<b>D</b> • • • • • • •		<u> </u>			
Firm name	TriCoeur Services, L.	L.C.	Pa	ast Performanc	e Evaluation	Discipline(s)*		Bridge			
Project name	Poplar Street Bridge	over Bonna	bel Cana	[		Firm responsibilit	y (prim	e or sub?)	Prime		
Project number	<b>S.P. No. H006</b>	138.5	Owner's	name <b>Lou</b>	isiana DOTI	D					
Project location	Jefferson Pa	rish, LA			Owner's Pro	oject Manager	Barba	ra Ostuno,	PE		
Owner's addres	s, phone, email	<b>1201</b> Capi	ital Access	s Road, (225) .	379-1047, Ba	rbara.Ostuno@L	A.GOV	r			
Services comm	enced by this firm (mm/	yy)	03/12	Total consult	ant contract c	cost (\$1,000's)			71.517		
Services comple	vices completed by this firm $(mm/yy)$   08/13   Cost of consultant services provided by this firm (\$1,000's)   71.517										
Preparation of Fi	nal Plans from Preliminary	/ Plans and T	`opographic	Survey previou	sly initiated by	v others. Project requ	ired prej	paration of so	cour analyses,		
revisions of the p	roject geometric layout, in	corporation	ot prior Pla	n in Hand review	v comments, co	oordination of geotec	chnical i	nvestigations	s, coordination		
with utility confl	tots for primary water, nati	aral gas and s	sanitary sew	/er crossings, in	teraction with I	Parish personnel, pre	paration	OI non-stand	iard bridge bent		
approach slab de	tails, and roadway plan pre	eparations. A	ll members	of the TriCoeur	staff were invo	olved in the project a	und 100%	6 performed	in Louisiana.		



Firm name	Landsource, Inc.			I	Past Performance Evaluation Disc	)*	SURVEY				
Project name	Pine Street over	West Prong of	f Young's	s Bayou &	Harrison – Collier Streets over	Firm	responsibility	Sub			
	Concrete Drainag	ge Canal									
Project number	State Proj. No.	H.013122.5	Owner?	vner's name LA Dept. of Transportation & Development							
Project location	Ouachita Paris	sh			igan, P.E.						
Owner's address, phor	ne, email	9270 Siegen	ı Ln., Bat	Ln., Baton Rouge, LA 70810 (225)228-2681, bgahagan@tricoen							
Services commenced b	by this firm (mm/y	y)	12/18	Total consultant contract cost (\$1,000's)					.0		
Services completed by	this firm (mm/yy)	)	01/19	Cost of consultant services provided by this firm (\$1,000's)					.0		

The project's objective was to develop plans for the replacement of two (2) bridges in Ouachita Parish, which was off the State Highway System. LandSource, Inc. was responsible for all the surveying, which included topographic, field and right-of-way surveys. All LandSource personnel listed on the prime's organizational chart were involved in this project & will be utilized in any future projects. 100% of the work was performed in Louisiana.

Firm name	Landsource, Inc.			-	Past Performance Evaluation Disc	SURVEY				
Project name	Jim Cryer Rd. ov	er Bayou Ana	acoco			ponsibility	Sub			
Project number	State Proj. No. H.013098.5 Owner's nan				LA Dept. of Transportation & Development					
Project location	Vernon Parish	1			Owner's Project Manager Barry Gahagan, P.E.					
Owner's address, phon	e, email	9270 Siegen	ı Ln., Bat	on Rouge	e, LA 70810 (225)228-2681, bgaha	ngan@tr	ricoeu	r.com		
Services commenced by this firm (mm/yy) 11/1				Total consultant contract cost (\$1,000's)					.0	
Services completed by	this firm (mm/yy)	)	01/19	Cost of consultant services provided by this firm (\$1,000's)				00's) 6	.0	

The project's objective was to develop plans for the replacement of a bridge in Vernon Parish, which was off the State Highway System. LandSource, Inc. was responsible for all the surveying, which included topographic, field and right-of-way surveys. All LandSource personnel listed on the prime's organizational chart were involved in this project & will be utilized in any future projects. 100% of the work was performed in Louisiana.



ource, Inc.		F	Past Performance Evaluation Disc	SURVEY						
Bonne Idee Rd Bridge (S	Site 1) &	Bud Rd H	Bud Rd Bridge over Bayou Bonne Idee (Site 2)Firm respon							
e Proj. No. H.011532.5	Owner's	name LA Dept. of Transportation & Development								
orehouse Parish	1		Owner's Project Manager Barry Gahagan, P.E.							
il 9270 Siegen	Ln., Bato	on Rouge	, LA 70810 (225)228-2681, bgaha	agan@tric	coeur.com					
firm (mm/yy)	3/2015	Total co	16.0	)0 Est.						
m(mm/yy)		Cost of	(1000's) 160	)0 Est						
	Bonne Idee Rd Bridge (S Proj. No. H.011532.5 rehouse Parish 9270 Siegen rm (mm/yy)	Bonne Idee Rd Bridge (Site 1) & Proj. No. H.011532.5 Owner's rehouse Parish 9270 Siegen Ln., Bate rm (mm/yy) 3/2015 p (mm/yy)	Bonne Idee Rd Bridge (Site 1) & Bud Rd H Proj. No. H.011532.5 Owner's name rehouse Parish 9270 Siegen Ln., Baton Rouge rm (mm/yy) 3/2015 Total co p (mm/yy) Cost of	Bonne Idee Rd Bridge (Site 1) & Bud Rd Bridge over Bayou Bonne Idee (Site 1) No. H.011532.5       Owner's name       LA Dept. of Transportation & E         Proj. No. H.011532.5       Owner's name       LA Dept. of Transportation & E         rehouse Parish       Owner's Project Manager         9270 Siegen Ln., Baton Rouge, LA 70810 (225)228-2681, bgah         rm (mm/yy)       3/2015         Total consultant contract cost (\$1,000's)         p (mm/yy)       Cost of consultant services provided by the service of the ser	Bonne Idee Rd Bridge (Site 1) & Bud Rd Bridge over Bayou Bonne Idee (Site 2)         Proj. No. H.011532.5       Owner's name       LA Dept. of Transportation & Development         rehouse Parish       Owner's Project Manager       Barry Gate         9270 Siegen Ln., Baton Rouge, LA 70810 (225)228-2681, bgahagan@trict         rm (mm/yy)       3/2015       Total consultant contract cost (\$1,000's)	Bonne Idee Rd Bridge (Site 1) & Bud Rd Bridge over Bayou Bonne Idee (Site 2)       Firm responsibility         Proj. No. H.011532.5       Owner's name       LA Dept. of Transportation & Development         rehouse Parish       Owner's Project Manager       Barry Gahagan, P.E.         9270 Siegen Ln., Baton Rouge, LA 70810 (225)228-2681, bgahagan@tricoeur.com       16.0         rm (mm/yy)       3/2015       Total consultant contract cost (\$1,000's)       16.0				

The project's objective was to develop plans for the replacement of two (2) bridge in East Baton Rouge Parish, which was off the State Highway System. LandSource, Inc. was responsible for all the surveying, which included topographic, field and right-of-way surveys. All LandSource personnel listed on the prime's organizational chart were involved in this project & will be utilized in any future projects. 100% of the work was performed in Louisiana.



Firm name	Terracon Consultants, Inc	Past Perf	ormance Evaluation	Discipline(s)*	Environmental				
Project name	Carruth Road Bridge over	r the Little C	omite River	Firm responsi	bility (prime or sub?)	Sub			
Project number	PWEF014C	Owner's	East Feliciana Pari	sh Police Jury					
	name								
Project location	East Feliciana Parish, LA		Owner's Project Manager Sonya Crowe, Parish Manager						
Owner's address	s, phone, email	12064 Mars	12064 Marston Street, Clinton, LA 70722, 225-683-8577						
Services comme	nced by this firm (mm/yy)	02/19	Total consultant con	\$NA					
Services comple	ted by this firm (mm/yy)	02/20	0 Cost of consultant services provided by this firm (\$1,000's)						

Terracon was retained by TriCoeur Services, LLC for the replacement of the Carruth road Bridge over the Little Comite River FEMA Disaster Project in East Feliciana Parish. Terracon provided a wetland assessment and NEPA environmental review for the bridge replacement project.

The Little Comite River is considered a USACE Jurisdictional Water of the US. However, the project qualified for an NWP within the USACE's expedited program for transportation projects due to the lack of wetland habitat in the vicinity of the project area. A report was provided which outlined the site reconnaissance and findings, referenced published maps (including National Wetland Inventory Maps. Topographic Maps, and historical aerial photographs).

Based on the lack of wetland habitat and minimal impacts to the river from the proposed construction, it was recommended that a Nationwide Permit 14- Linear Transportation Projects be obtained for the construction portion of the project.



Key Members: Jim Baxter, Rachel Keane

Firm name	<b>Terracon Consult</b>	tants, Inc.		Pa	st Performance H	Environmen	ntal				
Project name	Jim Cryer Lane H	Bridge Ov	er Bayou Ai	ianco	co	e or sub?)	Sub				
Project numbe	r FAP No. H.013	098.5	Owner's na	ime	Louisiana Department of Transportation & Development						
Project locatio	n Vernon Parish,			Owner's Project Manager Ryan Rodney							
Owner's addre	ss, phone, email	1201 Ca	pital Access	Road,	Baton Rouge, L	A 70802, 225-379-	1309. R	kyan.rodney@	øla.gov		
Services comn	nenced by this firm	(mm/yy)	07/19	Total consultant contract cost (\$1,000's)					\$N/A		
Services comp	leted by this firm (n	nm/yy)	11/19	Cost of consultant services provided by this firm (\$1,000's) \$3.3					\$3.3		

Terracon was retained by TriCoeur Services to perform a wetland delineation of the Off-System Bridge project which included the replacement of an existing 23-foot wide 190-foot long concrete bridge on Jim Cryer Lane over Bayou Anacoco in Vernon Parish, Louisiana. The replacement bridge was proposed to be a 5-foot span, 240-foot long concrete bridge with 28-foot clear roadway. A wetland delineation was conducted to identify wetland and Waters of the US to provide the USACE with a request for a Jurisdictional Determination. Terracon completed a wetland delineation, utilizing the approved United States Army Corps of Engineers Manual, 1987 and the 2008 Supplement for the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain. Prior to the initiation of field work, Terracon completed a desktop review which included gathering published resources for background information. These resources include the USFWS National Wetland Inventory maps, topographic maps, United States Department of Agriculture Soil Surveys, and aerial photographs. During the site reconnaissance, vegetation communities, hydrologic evidence, and the soil profile to an approximate depth of 16 inches below ground surface was observed and documented. A determination was made as to the actual area of impact based on the construction area and expected bridge footprint with gathered information compiled to prepare a wetland delineation report.

In addition, an Environmental Checklist as required by LADOTD to complete a Categorical Exclusion document to satisfy the NEPA and FHWA requirements was prepared. Solicitation of Views (SOV) Letters including project description and location were prepared and submitted to Federal, State, and Local agency for coordination and consultation. In addition, other readily accessible information was reviewed to provide support documentation toward the completion of the Environmental Checklist. The Environmental Checklist with SOV letter responses, support documentation, and other pertinent information was compiled and submitted to the Contractor for submittal to the LADTOD.

Key Members: Jim Baxter, Rachel Keane

Prime Consultant: TriCoeur Services, LLC



Firm	Terraco	on Consultants,	Inc.		Pas	st Performance Evaluation Discipline(s)*	Enviro	onmental		
name										
Project	Ouachi	ta Parish Bridg	e Replace	ement: Har	rison	Street and Collier Street Bridge/Drainag	Firm responsibility	Sub		
name	Canal						(1	prime or sub?)		
Project nu	ımber	SP H.013122		Owner's r	name	Louisiana Department of Transportation	and Dev	velopment		
Project lo	cation 0	Duachita Parish,	LA			Owner's Project Manager Noel A	rdoin			
Owner's address, phone, email 1201 Capital Access						l, Baton Rouge, LA, 70802, 225-242-4201	Noel.Ar	rdoin@la.gov		
Services of	commence	ed by this firm (1	nm/yy)	03/20	Total	consultant contract cost (\$1,000's)	\$NA			
Services completed by this firm (mm/yy) 12/20						Cost of consultant services provided by this firm (\$1,000's) \$2.8				

Terracon was retained by TriCoeur Services to perform a wetland delineation of Off-System Bridge project which included designing and constructing the replacement of an existing 64.3-foot wide, 21.3-foot long clear opening concrete decked, steel girder single span bridge over a concrete paved drainage canal in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana. The recommended replacement bridge consists of a 93.2foot double reinforced concrete box girder bridge. Terracon completed a wetland delineation, utilizing the approved United States Army Corps of Engineers Manual, 1987 and the 2008 Supplement for the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain. Prior to the initiation of field work, Terracon completed a desktop review which included gathering published resources for background information pertaining to wetlands. These resources include the United States Fish & Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory maps, topographic maps, United States Department of Agriculture Soil Surveys, and aerial photographs. During the site reconnaissance, vegetation communities, hydrologic evidence, and the soil profile to an approximate depth of 16 inches below ground surface was observed and documented at specific observation points. This information was compiled and used to determine and delineate area of wetlands adjacent to the bridge. The wetland habitat and Other Waters were identified and determination was made as to actual area of impact based on the construction area and expected bridge footprint. The information gathered during the site visit and desktop review was compiled to prepare a wetland delineation report.

In addition, an Environmental Checklist as required by the LADOTD to complete a Categorical Exclusion document to satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements to be prepared. Solicitation of Views (SOV) Letters including project description and location were prepared and submitted to Federal, State, and Local agency for coordination and consultation. Other readily accessible information was reviewed to provide support documentation toward the completion of the Environmental Checklist. These sources included the NRCS Web Soil Survey, USFWS iPAC Project Review Application, EPA Sole Source Aquifer Map, FEMA FIRM Map, and other sources. The Environmental Checklist will include SOV letter responses, support documentation, and other pertinent information was compiled and submitted to the Contractor for submittal to the LADTOD.

Key Members: Jim Baxter, Rachel Keane

Prime Consultant: TriCoeur Services, LLC



## 18. Approach and Methodology:

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The staff provided by the TriCoeur Services, LLC team offer a combined over 60 years of LADOTD Off-System Bridge Replacement (OSBR) experience with a record of project delivery for the OSBR program. Our staff has surveyed and prepared plans for OSBR projects involving both standard plan and numerous non-standard structures in accordance with appropriate LADOTD procedures and manuals including roadway and bridge design, BDEM, BDTM's, environmental and OSBR guidelines. Our team is led by Barry P. Gahagan, PE, PLS, who has served in various roles on LADOTD bridge replacements. Our Survey team includes David L. Patterson, PLS, who has led TriCoeur's survey effort on 7 LADOTD bridge replacements who has been involved in the OSBR program over 15 years. TriCoeur's team includes Terracon Consultants. Inc. who has a long history of performing environmental services for LADOTD through TriCoeur. Jim Baxter holds Wetland Delineation certification since 2005 and has over 20 years of experience performing wetland delineations.

#### **PROJECT UNDERSTANDING & SITE VISIT**

A site familiarization will be conducted to assess the project conditions, confirm Project site, identify potential design challenges, and understand Jefferson Davis Parish concerns. Helpful dialogue can include site closure concerns, flood history, and utility and R/W constraints in advance of design preparation.

#### **TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY**

Landsource will perform the topographic survey for the project. The TriCoeur engineering staff works closely with survey staff during this phase to ensure that all required data is collected. The dual control and collaboration provides greater QA/QC. Surveys will be completed in accordance with LADOTD Off-System Bridge Guidelines and applicable LADOTD Location & Survey requirements. GPS control will be established using at minimum four (4) control points set in concrete with levels run between these points.

Once control is established and sketches complete, the topographic surveys will continue for the existing roadway, bridge, and channel/river. Surveys will be extended beyond traditional limits to incorporate any curves or additional geometric changes needed for design. Additional data points needed to show DTM break lines and surface anomalies will be collected, and any upstream structures in the channel/river will be surveyed. Bridge sketches will be provided and the channel/river traverses shown on the field roll. Survey data will be reviewed by the project engineering staff for completeness prior to preparation of survey deliverables and field rolls. The survey submittal will include all items required by the LADOTD OSBR Guidelines including photographs, point listing and plotted cross sections. Surveys will undergo QA/QC by both the survey and engineering teams prior to submittal to LADOTD.

#### 50% PRELIMINARY PLANS & HYDRAULICS ANALYSIS

After surveys are reviewed and approved by LADOTD, our team will begin the hydraulics analysis and preparation of 50% Preliminary Plans. <u>Design Criteria</u>

Tricoeur will review the 5-year crash history of the site as provided by the Parish to determine the roadway's performance and if any geometric improvements should be considered. Poor roadway performance may be justification for addressing geometric issues within the project limits per Section 1.2 of A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, AASHTO, 7th Edition (Green Book). Upon review of data, bridge design criteria and LADOTD Design Report Forms will be submitted for review and approval, guiding the remainder of plan development. Hydraulics & Scour Analysis

We will begin the hydraulics and scour analysis by reviewing additional data including topographic maps, FEMA Firm maps, USGS Quadrangle maps and LiDAR to delineate the site's drainage basin. Peak discharges and water surface elevations will be developed. Hydraulic design will be conducted in accordance with the LADOTD Hydraulics Manual and the results prepared in report format along with the Hydraulic Data table. The <u>Bridge, Type, Size and Location (TS&L)</u> will determine the appropriate bridge length, revetment slopes and hydraulic opening will be developed at the start of the hydraulics analysis. The existing bridge(s) may be subject to overtopping and debris loading. Our staff has the recent relevant experience and design tools to perform the design of a non-standard bridge structure in-house per LRFD methodology to accommodate non-standard site conditions.

#### 75% PRELIMINARY PLANS (PRE-PIH) & SOLICITATION OF VIEWS (SOV's)

After review of the 50% Preliminary Plans, Tricoeur will address all comments will prepare the Pre-PIH plans, if necessary, or proceed to Plan in Hand. Upon approval of the replacement structure, Tricoeur and Terracon will prepare the Solicitation of Views (SOVs), receive DOTD approval thereof and mail these to the recipient list provided by LADOTD Environmental Section. Responses will be logged and loops closed to all SOV responses.

#### 95% PRELIMINARY PLANS (PLAN IN HAND)

Comments from the 50% PP or, 75% PP (if necessary) will be addressed in the Plan in Hand submittal. The roadway model, typical sections, plan & profiles, general notes, bridge GPE, summary of estimated quantities, and construction signing will continue to be developed from the previous plan submittal(s). If superelevation is required, the superelevation diagrams will be further developed and completed by the end of preliminary plans along with the foundation layouts. Standard Plan lists, cost estimate and the Constructability & Biddability Review form will be provided. Tricoeur will attend the Plan in Hand meeting onsite with LADOTD and Parish representatives. Meeting notes will be provided within three (3) days.

#### 100% PRELIMINARY PLANS (POST PLAN IN HAND PRINTS)

Plan development will continue to progress as comments are addressed and major design elements are completed. Items discussed at the PIH meeting will be addressed and added to the plans per the PIH Meeting Memorandum.

Prime Consultant: TriCoeur Services, LLC



#### Environmental

The wetland delineation will be conducted onsite and a wetland findings report prepared in accordance with US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) guidelines. A Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) will be requested from the USACE upon report completion. Permit sketches sized 8.5"x11" will be prepared to accompany the wetlands report, SOV packet, and Environmental Determination Checklist. <u>R/W Sketches & Other Documents</u>

TriCoeur will prepare the Right of Way Sketch per OSBR guidelines showing the required taking lines and anticipated parcels affected along with a draft of the R/W agreements. A draft utility conflict matrix will be provided to the Parish to aide in their responsibility to relocate utilities. Our site visit will establish initial evidence of existing utilities. In addition to the 100% Preliminary Plans, environmental package and R/W sketches, the Design Report forms will be finalized and sealed by Tricoeur's Engineer of Record. The Level 1 or Level 2 TMP checklists will also be prepared and submitted. Pile length requests with all supporting documentation will be submitted at this stage for use by the geotechnical engineer.

#### 75% FINAL PLANS (PRE-ADVANCED CHECK PRINTS)

Following the environmental approval and receipt of the Notice to Proceed for Final Plans, Tricoeur will begin the development of additional plan sheets required including embankment widening details, geometric layout (if necessary), erosion control plans, quantity summary sheets, Pile Data & Elevation, and concrete surface finish. All bridge structure and pile cutoff elevations will be finalized. Any special design superstructure or substructure bridge elements or special approach slabs will be fully detailed and placed on bridge sheets. Bridge railing, joint and bearing details will also be completed. If a nonstandard structure is chosen for the site, a draft of the bridge calculations and Load Resistance and Factor Rating (LRFR) will be prepared at this stage to ensure adequacy of reviews.

#### 98% FINAL PLANS (ADVANCED CHECK PRINTS)

Comments from the 60% Final Plans (Pre-ACP) will be reviewed with LADOTD and addressed. Additional details, notes or changes will be added to the plans and quantities will be completed. The ACP Plans will be provided to the Plan Quality Unit (PQU) if necessary. An ACP review meeting will be held to ensure all comments are addressed. Upon resolution, a 98% Final Plan set will be prepared for review by the Chief Engineer and use by General Files to prepare the proposal. Tricoeur will work with LADOTD staff to input pay items and quantities into AASHTOWARE and generate final cost estimates.

#### 100% FINAL PLANS (TRACINGS)

Tricoeur will provide the 100% Final Plans (Tracings) as per OSBR Guidelines with the Title Sheet on Mylar for Chief Engineer signature. This submittal will be prepared once all comments are addressed from task managers, PQU and/ or the Chief Engineer. Parish granted Design Exceptions will be noted on the Title Sheet. A bound calculations book will be prepared and submitted with the original field books and an electronic copy of the Hydraulics Report.

#### QUALITY CONTROL AND QUALITY ASSURANCE (QC/QA)

A project specific QC/QA plan has been included Section 21. Each submittal will be accompanied by LADOTD QC/QA certification forms. Design and plan comments, along with their resolutions will be documented in Design Comment Review forms.

#### LETTING

Tricoeur will respond to questions and assist LADOTD during letting. Upon receiving the bid results and tabulations, Tricoeur will provide additional information to LADOTD as needed regarding contract award.

#### **STAGE 5: CONSTRUCTION**

Tricoeur staff will be available to provide LADOTD with Construction Support (if needed) by assisting with RFI's, reviewing shop drawings, evaluating contractor submittals, attending meetings, and providing design review assistance in the event of bridge component changes

	TASK / DELIVERABLE	P	RO.	JECT	DU	RA	ΓΙΟΙ	N (N	101	ITH	S)														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
	NTP - KICKOFF																								
	TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY																								
	50% PRELIM PLAN (PP) & HYDRAULICS																								
= +	SOV'S & 75% PP (PRE- PIH)																								
Par	90% PP (PLAN-IN-HAND)																								
8	PIH REVIEW - SITE MEETING																								
art	ENVIRONMENTAL (WETLAND DETERM.)																								
З, Р	RIGHT OF WAY SKETCHES																								
ge	100% PP (POST PIH PRINTS)																								
Sta	ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW & APPROVAL - PJD																								
										< PROJECT HOLD FOR FP SUPPLEMENT															
	FINAL PLAN (PRE-ACP) SUBMITTAL & SCOUR																								
	PRE-ACP REVIEW																								
	ACP PRINTS																								
$\geq$	ACP & PILE DATA REVIEWS (IF INCLUDED)																								
art	98% FINAL PLANS																								
е, Р	100% FINAL (TRACING) SUBMITTAL																								
ge	R/W & UTILITY CLEARANCE																		TBD						
Sta	PROJECT LETTING FOR BID																					Т	3D		
					<u> </u>							_			_	_								للجب	<u>ا</u>



# 19. Workload:

Firm(s)	Past Performance Evaluation Discipline	State project number	Project name	Remaining Unpaid Balance
TriCoeur Services,	Bridge	H.013098.5	Off System Bridge Program, Vernon Parish	\$11,812
L.L.C.	-		Jim Cryer Road Bridge, Stage 3 – Part IV Final Plans	
LandSource, Inc.	Survey	N/A	N/A	N/A
Terracon	Geotechnical	H.003931.5-2	I-10: Calcasieu River Bridge Additional Borings	\$339,579
	Geotechnical	H.002868	I-49 Frontage Road Bridges PDA Testing	\$227,811
	Environmental	H.004273.5	Lafayette Urban Section (I-49 Lafayette Connector) Phase II ESA,	\$9,138
			Lafayette Parish	
	Geotechnical	H.005967	Nelson Road Extension and Bridge	\$52,531
	Geotechnical	H.012569	Little Sugar Creek Bridge	\$5,419
	Geotechnical	H.005121	LA-1 and LA-415 Connector	\$227,167
	Geotechnical	H.000385.5	US190: LA415 & RR Overpass	\$213,763
	Geotechnical	H.011670	Loyola Interchange Design-Build	\$221,316
	Geotechnical	H.012033	Cross Bayou and Caney Bayou	\$20,420
	Geotechnical	H. 002794.5	LA 308 – Canal Bridges Near Larose	\$676
	Geotechnical	H.003931.5-2	I-10: Calcasieu River Bridge Additional Borings	\$339,579
	Geotechnical	H.002868	I-49 Frontage Road Bridges PDA Testing	\$227,811
	Environmental	H.004273.5	Lafayette Urban Section (I-49 Lafayette Connector) Phase II ESA, Lafayette Parish	\$9,138
	Geotechnical	H.005967	Nelson Road Extension and Bridge	\$52,531



# 20. Certifications/Licenses:

	ECRETAR OF STAT	Y E r. kyle ardoin		номе
		Search for Louisiana Business Filings		
Buy Certificates and Certified	Copies Subscribe to Electronic Notification Prin	nt Detailed Record		
Name		Туре	City	Status
TRICOEUR SERVICE	S, L.L.C.	Limited Liability Company	BATON ROUGE	Active
Previous Names Business: Charter Number: Registration Date: Domicile Address 9270 SUIT BATO Mailing Address 9270	TRICOEUR SERVICES, L.L.C. 40282112K 8/19/2010 SIEGEN LANE E 501 DN ROUGE, LA 70810 SIEGEN LANE			
SUIT	E 501			
BATC	ON ROUGE, LA 70810			
Status				
Status: Appuel Deport Status	Active			
File Date	8/19/2010			
Last Report Filed:	7/20/2022			
Туре:	Limited Liability Company			



The Louisiana Profe	sional Engineering and I	Land Surveying Bo	pard has the following information on file:						
Name:	Public Address:								
TriCoour Services L	Mr. Barry P. Gahag	Mr. Barry P. Gahagan, PE, PLS9270 Siegen Lane, Suite 501							
medeur Services, El	Baton Rouge, Louis	Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70810							
License/Certificate I	nformation w/ Supervisi	on							
License Sta EF.0004660 Act	us First Issuance Date ve 09/16/2010	Expiration Date 03/31/2023	Supervisor(s) Mr. Barry Patrick Gahagan # PE.0021586 - Active						

The Louisiana I	Profession	al Engineering and L	and Surveying Bo	oard has the following information on file:						
Name:		Public Address:	Public Address:							
		Mr. Barry P. Gahaga	n, PE, PLS9270 Si	egen Lane, Suite 501						
TriCoeur Servic	es, LLC	Baton Rouge, Louisi	Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70810							
License/Certific	cate Infor	mation w/ Supervisio	n							
License	Status	First Issuance Date	Expiration Date	Supervisor(s)						
VF.0000653	Active	09/16/2010	03/31/2023	Mr. Barry Patrick Gahagan # PLS.0004834 - Active						







	2:		
	1		
Name:	Public Address:		
	Ms. Sandra Wiley6730 Exchequer D	Drive	
Landsource, Inc.	Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809		
License/Certifica	e Information w/ Supervision		
License Statu	First Issuance Expiration Super Date Date	ervisor(s)	
	Ma		
VF.0000377 Activ	e 02/13/1996 09/30/2024 Acti	David Lee Patterson # PLS.000 ive	04784 -
VF.0000377 Activ	e 02/13/1996 09/30/2024 Acti LOUISIANA PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING BOARD (LAPELS) 9643 Brookling Avenue, Sulte 121 Baton Rouge, LA 70809 Phone (225) 923-6291 www.lapels.com	David Lee Patterson # PLS.000	04784 - LOUISIANA PROFESSIONA ENGINEERING & LAND ŞURVİYING BOAR (LAPEL 9643 Brookline Avenue, Suite 12 Baten Rouge, LA 7080 Phone (225) 925-625 www.lepels.co
VF.0000377 Activ	e 02/13/1996 09/30/2024 Acti Louisiana professional ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING BOARD (LAPELS) 9643 Brookling Avenue, Suite 121 Baton Rouge, LA 70809 Phone (225) 925-6291 www.lapels.com	David Lee Patterson # PLS.000	LOUISIANA PROFESSIONA ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING BOAR (LAPEL 9643 Brookline Avenue, Suite 12 Baten Rouge, LA 7080 Phone (225) 925-625 www.lepela.co Scott Lee Patterson
VF.0000377 Activ	e 02/13/1996 09/30/2024 Mir. Acti LOUISIANA PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING BOARD (LAPELS) 9643 Brookling Avenue, Sulto 121 Baton Rouge, LA 70809 Phone (225) 925-6391 www.lapels.com )avid Lee Patterson ne Number Expiration Date 02/21/2022	David Lee Patterson # PLS.000 ive	LOUISIANA PROFESSIONA ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING BOAR (LAPEL 9643 Brookline Avenue, Suite 12 Baten Rouge, LA 7080 Phone (225) 925-628 www.lepela.co Scott Lee Patterson pe-Number Expiration Date 00/20/20023
VF.0000377 Activ	e 02/13/1996 09/30/2024 Acti LOUISIANA PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING BOARD (LAPELS) 9643 Brookling Avenue, Sulte 121 Baton Rouge, LA 70809 Phone (225) 925-6291 www.lapels.com David Lee Patterson Ne Number Expiration Date 03/31/2023	David Lee Patterson # PLS.000 ive Mr. 5 Ucense/Certificate Typ PLS.0005246	LOUISIANA PROFESSIONA ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING BOAR (LAPE) 9643 Brookline Avenue, Suite 12 Baten Rouge, LA 7000 Phone (225) 925-621 www.lepela.co Scott Lee Patterson pe-Number Expiration Date 5 09/30/2023







Prime Consultant: TriCoeur Services, LLC

# Quality Control / Quality Assurance Plan Off System Bridge Program

#### **Project Identification**

1 i oject i uchtineution	
State Project No.:	H.015016.5
Federal Aid Project No.:	H.015016
Project Title:	OFF-SYSTEM HIGHWAY BRIDGE PROGRAM
	JEFFERSON DAVIS PARISH
Project Name:	NORTH JOSEPH ST OVER CREEK

**Declaration:** 

TriCoeur Services, L.L.C. and its design team shall maintain and follow active Quality Control / Quality Assurance procedures in conformance with the no less than the minimum requirements set in the "Guidance on QC/QA in Bridge Design in Response to NTSB Recommendations (H-08-17)" (FHWA/AASHTO Guidance), which was published by FHWA and AASHTO in August 2011, and LADOTD Bridge Design Section QC/QA policies for the duration of this project.

Signature of Official: Barry P. Jahaga Date: 12/20/2022



#### **Project Modules/Components & Assignments**

Module - Component	Project Manager/	Professional of	Checker	Reviewer
Description	Supervisor / Team	Record (P.O.R.)		
	leader			
Stage 3, Part Ia				
- Topographic Survey	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	D Patterson, PLS	S Patterson, PLS	M Pitre
		(Landsource)	(Landsource)	(Landsource)
Stage 3, Part III:				
- Preliminary Plans	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	N Lowe, EI	B Gahagan, PE, PLS
- Hydraulic & Hydrologic	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	TM Willis, PE	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	TM Willis, PE
- Solicitation of Views & Categorical Exclusion	D Brunet (Terracon)	J Baxter (Terracon)	R Keane (Terracon)	J Baxter (Terracon)
- Wetland Studies	D Brunet (Terracon)	J Baxter (Terracon)	R Keane (Terracon)	J Baxter (Terracon)
- Environmental Clearance	D Brunet (Terracon)	J Baxter (Terracon)	R Keane (Terracon)	J Baxter (Terracon)
- Right of Way Agreement /	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	N Lowe, EI	B Gahagan, PE, PLS
Sketch				
Stage 3, Part IV				
- Final Plans	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	B Gahagan, PE, PLS	TM Willis, PE N Lowe, EI	B Gahagan, PE, PLS



#### QC procedures shall assure:

1) A supervisor or team leader is responsible for determining the necessary technical knowledge and experience of the designer/checker for that specific design; Designers & checkers are assigned to bridge projects by matching experience to project complexity.

2) All bridge plan sheets shall include the names or initials and dates of the appropriate designer and checker, and may include their signatures. Including the names or initials of the drafter and reviewer is also good practice. Sealing of the bridge plans by the engineer in responsible charge of the work should follow state requirements.

3) All relevant special provisions shall be identified by the appropriate author in responsible charge and checker. Sealing of special provisions should follow state requirements.

4) Design calculations, check calculations, review comments/resolutions and other pertinent documents as discussed above shall be retained in the permanent bridge design file. Including other important documents like QC checklists, cost estimates, and supporting reports in the design file is good practice.

5) A documented program which details the procedures, standards, and policies to be used in the oversight of bridge design.

#### QA procedures shall include:

- 1) Independent check of design calculations with depth and extent of this review commensurate with bridge size, complexity, and level of risk.
- 2) Participation in field engineering reviews during design, construction, and in-service.

#### Design Criteria:

- 1) Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development Off System Highway Bridge Program Guidelines Latest Edition
- 2) Reference Project Advertisement (Pg 5)

#### Design Checklists:

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development - Off System Highway Bridge Program Guidelines - Latest Edition

- 1) Location (Topographic) Survey Checklist
- 2) Plan-in-Hand checklist
- 3) Constructability / Biddability checklist



#### PLAN / CONSTRUCTABILITY / BIDDABILITY REVIEW (ADOPTED FROM LADOTD WITH MODIFICATIONS)

#### Purpose:

- To provide information to assist in producing quality plans.
- To provide a history of information that is easily accessible.
- To provide questions to stimulate discussion of potentially problematic areas.
- To provide questions to stimulate checking details and items required to complete the project.
- To provide aid during design for QA/QC
- To provide primary discussion for the plan-in-hand meeting

#### **Instructions for completing the form**

- The Design Review portion of the form shall be filled out by the designer during design and prior to PIH submittals.
- The form may be filled out by any district person (ADA, Area Engineer, Lab Engineer, etc.) but the Project Engineer must sign the signature sheet that he concurs with the comments. It is encouraged that the Area Engineer and the Project Engineer both review the plans.
- The Project Engineer and any District personnel designated by the Project Engineer are responsible for reviewing the plans and filling out the review form. The Project Engineer and all reviewers must sign the signature sheet at the back of the form. The Area Engineer is also encouraged to review the plans.
- If answer to the question is in blue box (or lightly shaded if in black and white), a comment is **NOT** required.
- Most questions are designed that a "NO" answer will require comments on what is missing or needed.
- Most questions are designed that a "YES" answer means the plans meet the project needs or a follow up question is required.
- Comments should be shown by reference number on notes page for easy reference. (Example III-2)
- Constructability and Plan-in-Hand questions shall be answered prior to the Plan-in-Hand. The plans should provide enough detail to construct the work required.
- ACP and PS&E / Biddability submittal shall have copies of the completed PIH review attached. If missing contact the Project Manager for a copy. The plans and specifications should provide the details and pay items to bid the project.
- Project Managers are required to respond to all comments and copy all reviewers.
- Each review is considered complete when all comments are addressed
- If question is answered N/A, question is not applicable to project.
- 95% Final Plan reviews (ACP) shall have the completed 95% Preliminary Plan (PIH) review attached. It may be helpful to reference the PIH plan set during the ACP review.
- Comments may be required for certain checklist items. Comments are to be written at the back of the form along with reference numbers for the plan section and checklist item number.

Project managers shall collect all review forms, insert responses to any comments, and copy all reviewers.



#### **APPLICABLE SECTION FOR REVIEW**

State	e Projec	t No.	<u>H.015016.5</u> Route No. <u>N/A</u> <b>P/H – Constructability</b> $\checkmark$	
F.A.	P. No.		H.015016 Parish Jefferson Davis Advance Check Print	
Proj	ect Nan	ne:	NORTH JOSEPH ST OVER CREEK	
Yes	<u>N/A</u>	<u>#</u>	Description	
$\boxtimes$		I.	TYPICAL SECTION SHEETS	
$\boxtimes$		II.	SUMMARY SHEETS	
$\boxtimes$		III.	PLAN-AND-PROFILE SHEETS	
$\boxtimes$		IV.	DRAINAGE INFORMATION	
	$\square$	V.	SIGNAL PLANS	
$\boxtimes$		VI.	GEOMETRIC DETAILS	
$\boxtimes$		VII.	SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION & CONSTRUCTION SIGNING	
$\boxtimes$		VIII.	GENERAL	
$\boxtimes$		IX.	UTILITIES	
$\boxtimes$		Х.	STRUCTURES - BRIDGE	



#### PLAN-IN-HAND INSPECTION REPORT AND CONSTRUCTABILITY / BIDDABILITY REVIEW

		Desig	n		Construction							
		Review	N/	Pla	n-in-Ha	nd			PS	&E		
Description	C	omme	nts	Cons	tructat	oility			Bidda	bility		
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
I. TYPICAL SECTION SHEETS												
1. Has District been consulted on the pavement type?		<b>~</b>										
2. Is District in agreement with the typical section?												
3. Are project limits covered by typical sections?		$\checkmark$										
4. Are superelevation diagrams and tables provided?	<b>~</b>											
4a. If yes, Is the design speed noted on the diagram?												
5. Does the typical section fit within existing and/or proposed right-of-way? (Check cross sections)		$\checkmark$										
6. Will the typical section drain water from the base course?		<b>\$</b>										
6a.If yes, is there a method/detail to drain and required items?									-			
7. Is a subgrade layer required?												
7a. If yes, what types are applicable? (List Types)												
7b. If no, Is lime treatment provided in the plans?												
8. Are all measurements, thicknesses, and slope rates labeled and accurately indicate what is to be	e											
constructed?		$\checkmark$							_			
9. Is the minimum ditch elevation dimension shown on the typical section?												
		<b>~</b>							_			
II. SUMMARY SHEETS												
1. Will existing ditch cleaning be required?												
1a. If yes, are there limits and pay items?												
2. Are there sufficient removal items for the types of pavement/structures being removed?	<b>~</b>											
3. Is method of payment for earthwork design addressed (e.g. "temporary" borrow, "additional												



	Design				-					
	F	Review/			1-in-Ha	nd			PS8	έE
Description	Co	omme	nts	Constructability			ACP		Bidda	bility
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
4. Have sufficient temporary erosion control items been included?		<b>~</b>								
5. Are construction entrances required?										
5a. If yes, are the number and section shown?										
6. Is method of payment for removal of pavement satisfactory?										
7. Is traffic maintenance aggregate required?										
7a. If yes, how much?										
8. Is there a summary of drainage structure sheet provided?										
8a. If yes, are items adequately covered?										
8b. If no, is one required? Why?										
9. Are work elements identified clearly with all corresponding pay items included with adequate										
quantities to construct project? (i.e. summary tables)	$\checkmark$									
10. Is there any work under this project designated as "no direct pay"?			<ul> <li>Image: A start of the start of</li></ul>							
10a. If yes, is this work clearly linked to a specific pay item that can be quantified in the										
contractor's bid item list?										
11. Are permanent erosion and pollution control items included?										
		<b>~</b>								
III. PLAN-AND-PROFILE SHEETS		. /								
1. Is adequate right-or-way provided for relocation of utilities?		×								
2. Is there space between the R/W line and drainage structure to allow for utility relocation?		<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>								
<ol><li>Are right-of-way and property line dimensions shown on plans?</li></ol>		$\checkmark$								
4. Will any right-of-entry agreements be required?			$\checkmark$							
4a. If yes, is this satisfactory?										
4b. If yes, who will secure it?										
5. Does existing horizontal or vertical clearance allow for construction?										
6. Are all the utility owners with contact numbers listed?	<u> </u>	$\checkmark$								
<ol><li>Are the existing utility locations marked in the plans?</li></ol>		$\checkmark$								
8. Are the utility conflict boxes and their location noted on the plans?		$\checkmark$								
9. Will overlay affect the intersection, gutters, or curbs drainage?	$\checkmark$									



	Design			Construction						
	F	Review	v/	Plar	n-in-Ha	nd			PS	&E
Description	Co	omme	nts	Cons	tructab	oility	AC	CP	Bidda	bility
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
9a. If yes, are adjustments required?										
10. Are retaining walls required?			$\checkmark$							
10a. If yes, are details provided for the walls?										
11. Are all oil or gas wells on the project shown on the plans?	$\checkmark$									
12. Are encroachments on the right-of-way being addressed?										
13. Are existing improvements within 50' of required right-of-way shown on the plans?		<b>~</b>								
14. Is there any potential hazardous waste site / UST?			<b>~</b>							
15. Have construction or drainage servitudes been shown?		<b>~</b>								
16. Are the limits of clearing, grubbing, and landscaping shown?		<ul> <li>Image: A start of the start of</li></ul>								
17. Can any significant tree be allowed to remain?										
17a. If yes are those to remain been identified?										
18. Are there apparent conflicts between plans and specifications?			<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>						1000 V 1000	
19. Are the benchmark data, required elevations, and curve data on the plans?		<b>~</b>								
<ol> <li>Does location of the grade shown on the typical section (sub grade or finished) match grade shown in profile? (Check for label)</li> </ol>		<b>~</b>								
21. Are vertical and horizontal limits of removal clear?										
21a. If yes, are the depths of embedment required excavation shown.										
21b. If yes, are details of removable item required?										
22. Have arrangements been made for relocation of hydrants by utility agreement?										
23. Do general site conditions conform to those represented in plans?										
24. Is existing topography accurate and up-to-date?										
25. Does profile fit the terrain?		$\checkmark$								
IV. DRAINAGE INFORMATION		·								
1. If subsurface drainage is being used, is there any evidence of effluent sewerage entering										
existing roadside ditches?										
1a. If yes, what is the plan of action										
2. Is adequate outfall information shown?		$\checkmark$								



	Design									
	F	Review	/iew/ Plan-in-Hand		PS	≩Ε				
Description	Co	omme	nts	Cons	tructab	ility	ACP		Bidda	bility
	N/A Yes No		N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
3. Has sufficient drainage excavation and/or cleaning of outfall lateral required for adequate										
drainage been shown?										
3a. If yes, who is cleaning laterals (City, Parish)?										
4. Will cleaning be required for existing drainage structures?									<u> </u>	
4a. If yes, are pay items included?										
5. Will special ditch protection items be required?									<b> </b>	
5a. If yes, identify type										
6. Have existing drainage patterns, their continuity, and high water indications been identified?		<b>~</b>								
7. Are ditches compatible with existing and proposed drainage structures?		$\checkmark$								
8. Is design drainage elevations shown in the plan compatible with the existing conditions?		$\checkmark$								
9. Is there a provision for temporary drainage?										
10. Is water being trapped on the lanes on travel lanes which are to be maintained during										
construction?										
11. Is there a method to connect new and existing drainage facilities?		$\checkmark$								
12. Is a second profile sheet required for right and left of centerline?			$\checkmark$							
V. SIGNAL PLANS – Not Anticipated for this Project										
(Review with Traffic Engineer)										
<ol> <li>Are pole locations in conflict with utilities or drainage structures?</li> </ol>										
2. Are a controller, signal head, pull box, and pedestrian poles required?			<b>~</b>							
3. Is the existing controller compatible to added items?	$\checkmark$									
4. Are overhead power lines in conflict with span wire?										
5. Will fiberglass insulators be required or relocated?										
6. Are there any signs attached to the overhead span wire for the existing traffic signal?										
7. Is the disposition of existing signal poles and signal equipment to be removed identified?	$\checkmark$									
8. Is the sidewalk being obstructed by signal equipment access?	$\checkmark$									
9. Does the foundation match requirements for span lengths/mast arms?	$\checkmark$									
9a. If ves, are details provided?	$\checkmark$									
10. Are street name signs included on mast arms?										
10a lf ves, are details provided?	$\overline{\checkmark}$									
<ul> <li>6. Have existing drainage patterns, their continuity, and high water indications been identified?</li> <li>7. Are ditches compatible with existing and proposed drainage structures?</li> <li>8. Is design drainage elevations shown in the plan compatible with the existing conditions?</li> <li>9. Is there a provision for temporary drainage?</li> <li>10. Is water being trapped on the lanes on travel lanes which are to be maintained during construction?</li> <li>11. Is there a method to connect new and existing drainage facilities?</li> <li>12. Is a second profile sheet required for right and left of centerline?</li> <li>V. SIGNAL PLANS – <u>Not Anticipated for this Project (Review with Traffic Engineer)</u></li> <li>1. Are pole locations in conflict with utilities or drainage structures?</li> <li>2. Are a controller, signal head, pull box, and pedestrian poles required?</li> <li>3. Is the existing controller compatible to added items?</li> <li>4. Are overhead power lines in conflict with span wire?</li> <li>5. Will fiberglass insulators be required or relocated?</li> <li>6. Are there any signs attached to the overhead span wire for the existing traffic signal?</li> <li>7. Is the disposition of existing signal poles and signal equipment access?</li> <li>9. Does the foundation match requirements for span lengths/mast arms?</li> <li>9. Joes the foundation match requirements for span lengths/mast arms?</li> <li>10. Are street name signs included on mast arms?</li> <li>10a. If yes, are details provided?</li> </ul>										



			Desig	n	Construction						
			Review	v/	Pla	n-in-Ha	nd	P P		PS8	ξE
	Description	Co	omme	nts	Cons	tructab	oility	A	CP	Bidda	bility
		N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
11.	*Are communication cables overhead?										
	11a. If yes, will they fit with overhead electric?										
12.	Do loop detectors exist?										
	12a. If yes will existing loop detectors be destroyed by construction?										
	12b. If loop detectors are being replaced, are all pay items included (i.e. conduit, junction boxes,										
conduit,											
	EIC.) / 12a Will compare he added?										
4.0	12c. Will cameras be added?										
13.	Is jacking and boring required?										
14.	Is open trenching required?	$\checkmark$									
15.	Is right-of-way adequate for signal equipment? (e.g. for signal and lighting foundations, utility										
10	relocations, construction easements, adequate work space, desirable clear zone, etc.)	$\mathbf{\vee}$									
16.	Are temporary traffic signals required?										
1											
1.	Have all areas where improvements can be made to alignment been addressed?										
2.	Are sight distances adequate at intersections? (r/w flares, obstructions, etc.)		<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>								
3.	Is the required information shown on the geometric sheets (e.g. curve data, sight distance,		. /								
	ventical datum, centenine, etc.)		<b>V</b>								
4.	Is existing access being denied due to inadequate sight distance?			$\checkmark$							
	VII. SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION & CONSTRUCTION SIGNING										
1.	Is through traffic to be maintained?			<b>~</b>							
	1a. If no. is a detour provided?		<b>~</b>								
2.	If local traffic only, are sufficient details and items provided for school buses, mail carriers,		· ·								
	emergency vehicles, or other local traffic to be maintained.										
3.	Is temporary sheeting required to maintain existing/required travel lanes?			$\checkmark$							
	3a. If yes, are specifications and details provided?										
	3b. If ves. is method of payment satisfactory?										
4	Are there conflicts between new and existing roadway used to maintain traffic?			$\checkmark$							
3.	Is temporary sheeting required to maintain existing/required travel lanes? 3a. If yes, are specifications and details provided? 3b. If yes, is method of payment satisfactory? Are there conflicts between new and existing roadway used to maintain traffic?			<ul> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>							



	Design Co				Con	nstruction					
	Review/ Plan-in-Hand			nd			P		PS8	έE	
Description	Comments Constructability		ACP		ACP		Bidda	bility			
·	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
5. Are traffic control plans for the bridge coordinated with roadwork phasing?											
6. Can utility crossings be resolved via scheduling restrictions (i.e. weekends, after hours) or temporary structures?											
7. Do utilities conflict with required special construction sequencing?			<b>V</b>								
<ol> <li>Are traffic operations requirements properly addressed? (i.e., signing, pavement markings signal, etc.)</li> </ol>		<b>~</b>									
<ol><li>Are lanes on which traffic is to be maintained compatible to local conditions?</li></ol>											
10. Is there sufficient clearance within the work zone for the operations (such as crane swing room)?											
11. Are there adequate accommodations for intersecting and crossing traffic?											
12. Have pedestrian and bicycle accommodations been addressed?		<b>V</b>									
13. Has a method of containing bridge slopes during phased construction (at end bent) and approach grade separation been identified?	~										
14. Have restrictions (e.g. lane closure, general construction or peak-hour restrictions in urban areas) been identified?	<b>~</b>										
15. Are there notes covering pay for traffic control items?		<b>\$</b>									
16. Is the Traffic Control Plan clear, complete, and approved?											
17. Are items for temporary safety devices, requirements and provision (i.e. guardrail, attenuators, barrier rails, etc.)?		<b>~</b>									
18. Have the traffic control signs, warning devices and barricades been located?		$\checkmark$									
Scheduling & Phasing											
<ol> <li>Is scheduling and phasing coordinated with activity needs? (Schools, festivals, harvesting, parallel routes, etc.)</li> </ol>											
20. Will staging areas be provided to contractors that will accommodate the sequence of work and work areas?											
21. Is the type and limits of fence for temporary construction servitude identified?	<b>~</b>										
22. Have requirements for local/state/federal special permits been addressed?		$\checkmark$									
23. Is existing access being denied by obstacles (walls, guard rails, etc.) or grade differentials to adjacent property?											
24. Is safe pedestrian access and access to business and residences provided?		<b>~</b>							i		



		Desig	n			Con	struction			
	F	Review	N/	Plar	n-in-Ha	nd	P;		PS8	έЕ
Description	Co	omme	nts	Cons	tructab	oility	AC	ACP Biddab		bility
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Detours										
25. Is detour facility clearly depicted?			<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>							
26. Do the detour limits conflict with roadway improvements?			$\checkmark$							
27. Is method of payment for detour satisfactory?										
28. Can detours be built due to grade difference between new and existing roadways?		$\checkmark$							_	
29. Is traffic addressed on side streets?		$\checkmark$								
30. Is night work required?			<b>~</b>							
31a. If yes, are hours and/or restrictions shown?	$\checkmark$									
VIII. GENERAL										
1. Are appropriate general notes and special provisions required for construction provided?										
2. Is there adequate construction access for demolition?										
3. Are there adequate provisions if signs or road markers are to be removed?		$\checkmark$							_	
4. Are contamination sites delineated?	$\checkmark$									
5. If there is a contamination site, have utility relocations been addressed?										
6. Does the Corp permit require work not shown on plans?			$\checkmark$							
<ol><li>Have environmental safeguards or dust control, erosion, and disposal of wastes been addressed?</li></ol>		<b>&gt;</b>								
8. Are there provisions for noise abatement (e.g. permanent noise walls)?			<b>~</b>							
<ol><li>Do conflicts exist between landscaping and planting requirements with utilities (e.g. irrigation lines) and billboards?</li></ol>										
10. Is there sufficient space (25'-30') for power mowers between additional trees that are planted?	<									
11. Is there an erosion control plan provided? (to be provided in Final Plans)			<b>V</b>							
12. Where pile driving is to be encountered near existing structures, should pre-existing conditional survey (video/pictures) be performed on the existing structures?										
12a. If yes, are items provided?										
13. Did you create any S-item wording?			<b>~</b>							
IX. UTILITIES										



		Desig	n	Construction						
	I	Reviev	v/	Plar	1-in-Ha	nd			PS8	έE
Description	Co	omme	nts	Cons	tructat	oility	AC	ACP Biddał		oility
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
<ol> <li>Will there be disruptions of utilities and provisions for restoration?</li> </ol>										
2. If utilities are outside of limits of construction but within the r/w, have all parties (including utility			•							
owners) agreed to allow them to remain in-place?			$\checkmark$							
3. Has responsible party for utility relocation been identified with provisions?										
4. Are there overhead utilities, guy wires, etc. in potential conflict with operations and access of large equipment?										
5 Are there gas lines above other utilities?										
6. Are there conflicts between gravity and force sewer mains and construction?		$\checkmark$								
6a. If ves for force main, is there a utility agreement for relocation?	<b>V</b>									
6b. If ves for gravity sewer, are plans included for relocation of sewer?			$\checkmark$							
7. Are there utility conflicts with drainage?			-							
8. If project is preceded by clearing and grubbing contract, have utilities been relocated?										
9. If there are pipelines, are they shown in the profile?		$\checkmark$								
10. If there is a need for a specified utility corridor?			$\checkmark$							
10a. If yes, is it shown?										
11. Should an integrated utility relocation plan (scheduling and final location of utilities) be included in the construction plans?			<							
11a. If yes, is the integrated utility relocation plan included in the construction plans?									ľ	
	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>									
X. STRUCTURES										
GENERAL NOTES, INDEX, AND BRIDGE SUMMARY OF QUANTITIES										
GENERAL NOTES & INDEX										
1. Is information complete, accurate, clear and free from multiple interpretations?		<b>~</b>								
2. Have all environmental commitments been identified?			$\checkmark$							
3. Has the disposition of salvageable materials been addressed?										
4. Are utility permit requests addressed?			$\checkmark$							
BRIDGE SUMMARY OF QUANTITIES										
1. Are all necessary items shown and properly footnoted?	<b>~</b>									
2. Are all quantities and units adequately shown?	$\checkmark$									



		Desig	n	Constr				truction		
		Review	N/	Plar	n-in-Ha	and		PS8		ЗЕ
Description	Co	omme	nts	Cons	tructal	bility	A	CP	Bidda	bility
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
3. Have all items been brought forward properly to the Master Summary of Quantities?	$\checkmark$									
4. If the project is composed of multiple project numbers or funding sources have the quantities been subdivided?	✓									
5. Have all non FHWA participating items been identified?	$\checkmark$									
GENERAL BRIDGE PLANS										
1. Are all geometric controls shown and consistent with other sheets?	$\checkmark$									
<ol> <li>Does each plan sheet provide a clear layout and configuration of the intended structure (matchlines, span/bent numbering, joint types, etc.)?</li> </ol>	✓									
3. Does the roadway and bridge interface agree?	$\checkmark$									
4. Has all guard rail installation information been shown?	$\checkmark$									
5. Are vertical clearances shown (navigable waterways, roads under bridge, etc.)?	<									
6. Is deck drainage type specified (drain holes ,barrier slots, etc)?	<									
HYDRAULIC DATA										
1. Is the hydraulic table shown?		<b>~</b>								
2. If river gauges are present, has the removal and disposition of these gauges been addressed?	✓									
3. Has predicted scour, scour protection and abutment protection been adequately addressed?		<b>~</b>								
4. Have design water surface elevations been shown?		<b>~</b>								
5. Do all water surface elevations reference the project survey datum?		<b>~</b>								
6. Have any channel changes been addressed in the plans?		<b>~</b>								
GEOTECHNICAL INFORMATION (If not addressed on foundation plan)										
1. Have all borings, CPT, test piles, and settlement plates been shown on the plans?			<b>~</b>							
2. Has all temporary shoring for phased construction been covered adequately?	$\checkmark$									
3. Is Pile Batter indicated (if not shown on bent details)?	<									
CONSTRUCTION CONFLICTS										
1. Is the existing structure shown?		<b>V</b>								
2. Are all utilities to remain shown?		$\checkmark$								



		Desig	n			Con	struct					
		Revie	N/	Plar	n-in-Ha	nd					PS&	
Description	C	omme	nts	Cons	tructab	oility	AC	ACP		bility		
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
SUPERELEVATION DIAGRAMS												
(Superelevation implementation plans should always be included when superelevation												
transition occurs on the bridge. The bridge superelevation will control the design.)												
1. Is the superelevation implementation plan clear and concise?	<b>~</b>											
<ol><li>Is the transition from roadway to bridge clearly conveyed?</li></ol>												
	✓											
FOUNDATION PLAN												
(A foundation plan may be used when geometry is complex, additional information is												
required for layout of foundation or conflicts with foundation construction need to be												
identified)												
1. Has all temporary shoring for any phased construction been covered adequately?	✓											
2. Are all conflicts identified in the plans?	✓											
3. Are all utilities to remain shown?		<b>~</b>										
4. Is the pile batter shown (if not shown elsewhere)?	<b>~</b>											
5. Have all overhead or underground obstructions or conflicts that may impede pile driving operations been addressed?												
6. Will pile driving interfere with maintenance of traffic?												
7. Will a pre / post construction site survey for such structures be needed?												
8. Are there any residences, businesses, or facilities (including instrumentation) in the area that may be affected by the noise and vibration from the pile driving operations or construction activities?												
9. Will vibration monitoring be needed?												
SUBSTRUCTURE												
1. Does reinforcement location allow for proper placement of concrete? (Special attention should												
be given to splice locations)												
2. Are any special details required for superstructure anchorage?			$\checkmark$									
SUPERSTRUCTURE / APPROACH SPANS AND MAIN SPAN DETAILS												
1. Are details adequate for layout of deck reinforcement?	<b>~</b>											



		Desigi	า	Construction						
		Review	1	Plai	1-in-Ha	nd			PS8	ξЕ
Description	C	ommei	nts	Cons	tructat	oility	A	СР	Bidda	bility
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
2. Are any special details required for special areas of the deck?	✓									
3. Are deck joint details shown?	✓									
4. Are drains removed over railroads, roadways, and revetments?	✓									
5. Are girder connection details shown?	✓									
6. Is adequate information provided for the fabrication of girders, cross frames, and diaphragms?	✓									
7. Has the pouring sequence been specified?	✓									
APPROACH SLABS										
1. Are the drainage details for the approach slab adequately shown?	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>									
NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS (Not anticipated for this Project)										
1. Are details for clearance gauges shown?	✓									
2. Are details for navigation lighting provided?	<b>~</b>									
3. Has pier protection been addressed?	<b>~</b>									
MOVABLE BRIDGES (Not for this Project)										
1. Are all required Special Details included (End Drains, fencing, etc.) ?	✓									
2. Has operator's house been located?	✓									
3. Has adequate parking and access been provided for operators house?	$\checkmark$									
As-Builts										
1. Are As-built drawings required for this project?			$\checkmark$							
2. Would As-built drawings be helpful for bidding and/or construction?			$\checkmark$							
3. Are As-built drawings included with these plans?			$\checkmark$							
Permitting Issues										
1. Are utility permit requests adequately addressed?	$\checkmark$									
2. Are there any special requirements that need to be addressed in the plans for the construction										
of a bridge over a navigable water way or roadway? (These requirements may be related to										
agreements with the USCG. COE or for purposes of maintenance of traffic)			$\checkmark$							



			Desig	n	Со			struction			
			Review	N/	Pla	n-in-Ha	nd			PS8	kΕ
	Description	C	omme	nts	Cons	tructab	oility	A	CP	Biddal	bility
	·	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
3.	Are there any access issues that may affect the contractors' construction of the bridge or										
	demolition of the existing bridge that have not been addressed in the plans?										
4.	Is the water depth at the site of sufficient depth to float barges?										
5.	Will barges obstruct navigation?										
6.	Are all environmental commitments being met by the proposed construction methods? (These										
	commitments should be noted in the General Notes section of the plans)	$\checkmark$									
7.	Has the removal of the existing bridge been adequately coordinated with the permitting										
	agencies and any special requirements covered in the plans?	$\checkmark$									
	Construction Site Access										
1.	Are there any access issues the contractor may have for the delivery of materials to the project										
	site? (Posted bridges)										
2.	Are there any driveways or property entrances that will have to be maintained during										
2	construction, relocated and / or reconstructed?										
3.	Will any work bridges or haul roads be required for the construction of the bridge?										
4.	Is there sufficient right of way to construct the bridge structures?										
5.	Are there any other construction related issues that will affect the constructability of the project										
6	that needs to be accounted for in the construction estimate?										
0.	Are there any utilities supported on the structure that need to be addressed in the plans?										
1.	For navigational traffic, have channel alignment and clearance issues been addressed?	✓									
2.	If the project is to be constructed utilizing phased construction, will the construction scheme										
	Tacilitate maintenance of traffic?	<b>V</b>									
	General Constructability and Biddability										
1.	Are there adequate staging areas for the contractor?										
2.	Are all required work items covered under proper pay items?										
3.	Have quantities for phase construction been broken out on the individual sheets to facilitate										
	payment during construction?	✓									
4.	Has uniformity of formwork been adequately considered in all of the bridge elements?	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>									
	K. SPECIAL PROVISIONS (95% Final Plan Review)										



	Design C					Cor	struct	tion				
	F	Review	v/	Plar	n-in-Ha	nd			PS8	λΕ		
Description	Co	omme	nts	Cons	Constructability		Constructability ACP B		ACP		Bidda	bility
	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
1. Is asbestos or creosote timber being removed?	<b>~</b>											
(a). Are special instructions and disposal defined?	<b>~</b>											
(b). Has entity to handle been identified?	<b>~</b>											
<ol><li>Is the contract type and time period sufficient?</li></ol>												
3. Is there a treatment for the removed steel if it has red lead?	<											

Project Engineer

ACP review by

Project Engineer

Constructability / Biddability review by

Project Engineer

Date

Date

Date

Date

Date

Date



Page 51 of 53

Prime Consultant: TriCoeur Services, LLC

# **NOTES PAGE**

Item	Comment	Response
No		
VII.1	Is through traffic to be maintained?	Parish to provide detour signage
VII.25	Is detour facility clearly depicted?	Parish to provide detour signage
VIII.8	Are there provisions for noise abatement (e.g. permanent noise walls)?	Noise abatement not anticipated
VIII.11	Is there an erosion control plan provided?	Erosion control plan to be prepared in Final Plan Phase
IX.2	If utilities are outside of limits of construction but within the r/w, have all parties (including utility owners) agreed to allow them to remain in- place?	Utility conflicts will be resolved by Parish prior to Bid advertisement
IX.6	Are there conflicts between gravity and force sewer mains and construction? If yes for gravity sewer, are plans included for relocation of sewer?	Gravity Sewer Main conflict to be resolved. Alternatives to resolve will be reviewed at Plan-in-Hand (PIH).
IX.11	Should an integrated utility relocation plan (scheduling and final location of utilities) be included in the construction plans?	Utility conflicts will be resolved by Parish prior to Bid advertisement.
X.2	Have all environmental commitments been identified?	To be reviewed. No pile driving noise/vibrations at issue since no driving is planned.
X.4	Are utility permit requests addressed?	Any utility permit requests will be resolved by Parish prior to Bid advertisement.
X.Geo.1	Have all borings, CPT, test piles, and settlement plates been shown on the plans?	None taken. Geotechnical scope to be discussed at PIH.
X.AsBlt.3	Are As-built drawings included with these plans?	No As built drawings anticipated for inclusion in plans.



#### 22. Sub-consultant information:

If one or more sub-consultants will be used, provide the name, address, point of contact and phone number for each. Otherwise, leave this section blank.

Firm Name (as registered with Louisiana's Secretary of State)	Address	Point of Contact and email address	Phone Number
LANDSOURCE, INC.	6730 Exchequer Dr.	David L. Patterson	(225)752-0995
(Charter Number 34514462D)	Baton Rouge, LA 70809	patterson@landsource.com	
TERRACON CONSULTANTS, INC.	2822 O'Neal Lane, Building B	D'Juana Beason	225-344-6053
(Charter Number 35701137F)	Baton Rouge, LA 70816	Djuana.beason@terracon.com	225-614-0404 (mobile)

#### 23. Location:

If location is an evaluation criterion for this advertisement and the prime consultant intends to establish a local presence, describe the plan for doing so. Otherwise, leave this section blank.

N/A