# Meeting Sign In Sheet for PCI Update

Wednesday January 18, 2017 @ 11 AM at the Public Works Conference room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Weiss</td>
<td>AP Tech</td>
<td>115 W. Main Urbana, IL 61801</td>
<td>217-398-3777</td>
<td>bweiss@appiled pavements.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu Truitt</td>
<td>IE I</td>
<td>456 Fulton St Peoria</td>
<td>309-272 8506</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ttruitt@infrastructure-engine.com">ttruitt@infrastructure-engine.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Keyster</td>
<td>Dewberry</td>
<td>401 SW Water</td>
<td>309-282-8115</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akeyster@dewberry.com">akeyster@dewberry.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Rockaw</td>
<td>Dewberry</td>
<td>401 SW Water</td>
<td>309-282-8115</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gblack@dewberry.com">gblack@dewberry.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Zick</td>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>203 Haresotof</td>
<td>307-980-1304</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mzick@cmuengr.com">mzick@cmuengr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Tereklo</td>
<td>Terra</td>
<td>401 Main St Peoria, IL 61501</td>
<td>309-999-0123</td>
<td><a href="mailto:etereklo@terraengineering.com">etereklo@terraengineering.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Adams</td>
<td>Farnsworth</td>
<td>100 W. Walnut St Peoria, IL</td>
<td>309-689-9856</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jadams@f-w.com">jadams@f-w.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibreel Rana</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>301 Regency Dr. East</td>
<td>217-356-5445</td>
<td><a href="mailto:e@erikub.com">e@erikub.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbas Butt</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Hodej</td>
<td>Cloudpoint</td>
<td>107 W. Ann St Roanoke, IL</td>
<td>877-377-8124</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodej@cloudpointgeo.com">jhodej@cloudpointgeo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://peoriagov.sharepoint.com/sites/publicworks/engineering/References/City Forms/Meeting sign in.docx
PCI update RFP Questions & Answers

1. Who was the selected team in 2014
   a. Applied Pavement Technology, CMT & Mandli

2. How many centerline miles are part of the update
   a. The 2014 report had 930 lane miles. We have added some new streets, but not a significant number.

3. Will additional imagery within the ROW be needed
   a. We are not planning on updating the street assets (lights, traffic signals, signs, etc) at this time.

4. Item 8 lists the submission requirements and, of those, Sub-Item 7 requests billing rates but not proposed fee. The Item 9 “Criteria for Evaluation” lists Project Cost as one of the Criteria for Evaluation. I believe this is the only place that submission of cost information is mentioned. Item 1 (Introduction) notes that a selection will be made, after which a detailed scope and fee will be negotiated, implying that project costs would not be required in the proposal submission. Could you please provide clarification as to the requirement to provide a proposed cost for the effort with the Statement of Interest and Qualifications?
   a. Please give a total price and list the hourly rates that will be used for creating invoices

5. Sampling rate used previously

6. Were all lanes driven? Including turn lanes?
   a. One lane in each direction was driven. Turn lanes were not collected.

7. How did the City use the video images?
   a. The City didn’t use the images very much

8. Size of GIS database?
   a. Roads info is 166 mb, pavement preservation 10 gb, and street assets is 18 gb. Total size will depend on the information you need

9. Size of Paver data?
   a. 22,000 KB

10. GIS Version
    a. 10.3.1
11. How does the City use the PAVER data?
   a. The City uses the data to run scenarios and select roads to be evaluated for pavement preservation. We have to balance the budget spent over the five council districts. We are not currently using PAVER to select arterial roads, but we do use the PCI information on the arterials.

12. Is the City using PAVER’s GIS capabilities?
   a. Not currently.

13. Has the City been trained by PAVER?
   a. No, just by the last consultant. We are open to getting PAVER training in the future by both the consultant and by PAVER.

14. Would the City consider upgrading to a newer version of PAVER?
   a. Yes. When we purchased the software, the newer version had just come out and had bugs, so it was recommended to us that we get the version we have currently: 6.5.7.

15. Why aren’t you using each Council District as a network?
   a. It was recommended to us that we keep it simple because too many networks can corrupt the data. We would need 10 networks, an arterial and non-arterial for each of the five council districts.

16. Were alleys inventoried last time? Do you anticipate having funding to inventory alleys now?
   a. Last time we did not have enough funding to inventory alleys. We expect that to be the case this time as well.

17. Percentage of streets that are HMA?
   a. Approximately 85% are HMA or some kind of surface treatment.

**General information:**

1. The project is to update the PCI’s. We have existing street network GIS and PAVER databases. New streets would need to be added as well as updating the PCI information and surface type (if it changed).

2. We will be looking for a report that will give information on the condition of the roads and the effects of using the past budgets compared to what was predicted with the original PCI results.