

MINUTES
PORT OF SIUSLAW COMMISSION,
SPECIAL MEETING
Tuesday, 14 December 2010, 12:00pm,
Port Office, 1499 Bay St, Florence OR

ATTENDANCE: Commission: Commissioner Joshua Greene (Greene), Commissioner Bud Saulsgiver (Saulsgiver); Commissioner John Scott (Scott); Commissioner John Buchanan (Buchanan); Commissioner Sally Owens (Owens); Staff: Port Manager Mark Freeman (Freeman), Recording Secretary Susy Lacer;

Commission President Saulsgiver called the meeting to order at 11:58am. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the financial summary of the Maple Street Landing & Transient Dock (MSLTD) project.

Freeman reviewed his prepared narrative of the project, attached.

Greene asked about the sources of project funding. Freeman and Lacer explained the Oregon State Marine Board and Oregon Dept of Transportation division of the project. Greene asked about preliminary engineering costs. Freeman explained the Port was initially unaware of the cost of the ~\$160k preliminary engineering and that it would immediately use up \$100k of the ODOT funding.

Scott asked about the source of the \$711k payment made in August. Freeman stated that was from the several OSMB grants which had been reimbursed to the Port. Scott stated he recalled an original project cost of only about \$1.3M. Freeman agreed that early details on project cost were sketchy, and because of various delays, project costs escalated.

Scott noted the Port would need to draw the line somewhere on acquiring more debt for projects that do not produce revenue. Freeman agreed, but noted the new dock project will last 50+ years. Freeman stated this was the last big, federal project that will be done at the Port in the foreseeable future. Scott noted the Port will have about \$1M in total debt following this project and scheduled wharf repairs, with little income to offset those costs. Freeman agreed that revenue sources would be critical moving forward, especially for wharf tenants. Saulsgiver asked the timeframe to pay off the debt. Freeman stated they were 20 year loans and noted the Port needed to focus on selling land in the Industrial Park and could then put those funds toward debt repayment. Buchanan agreed it was vital to market the IP. Greene stated the costs for the debt could be \$1k-\$2k per month, with interest and maintenance. Scott suggested the Port needed to look at selling the boardwalk property and Nopal parking lot, which do not generate much revenue, or perhaps consider a bond levy to pay for these recent projects. Greene asked about the cost to do a bond levy. Freeman stated he would have to research that. Scott noted the Port needs to raise awareness of the costs to maintain these public facilities and the need to make changes in order to meet these costs. Greene suggested having a community meeting at FEC to lay out the situation with some options and ask for community input. Buchanan agreed and noted that process was used when the Port first marketed the boardwalk for development. Freeman stated he would like to get an Economic Development grant to fill in the open section of the wharf in order to increase usable space, and that he has continued to request those funds on a yearly basis.

Greene asked about change order costs on MSLTD. Freeman referred to page 5 in the ODOT narrative, attached. Greene asked who approved the change orders. Freeman
Port of Siuslaw Special Meeting 14 December 2010

stated they were approved by the Port, OBEC Engineering, and ODOT. Freeman stated the electrical changes were made because the Port was looking to the future for what electrical needs would be on the dock over its service life of 50 years, when boats will be demanding larger capacity electrical connections. Freeman noted many larger vessels are using 50-100amp services now. Saulsgiver asked how many ports on the west coast currently have this power available. Freeman stated he could find out. Saulsgiver noted the dock pedestals did not have connections for lower power users. Freeman stated he learned after the fact that including the 30amp connections was not communicated to the contractor when the work was done; those connections were installed later. Buchanan asked who designed the docks and electrical service originally. Freeman stated the Marine Board did. Greene stated the pedestals are in the way of boat use now and asked how the problem could be fixed. Freeman offered to ask OSMB for assistance. Greene asked if the problem pedestal and transformer could be moved. Discussion on possible solutions. Scott asked if every boat using the hoist had a problem with this pedestal and transformer. Saulsgiver stated individual boats can tie up okay, but if several boats are there it could be a safety concern. Saulsgiver added that the pedestal or transformer could be hit by a boat swinging around or when the tides make maneuvering difficult. Greene stated he would like to remedy the problem. Buchanan suggested Freeman request estimates to fix the issue.

Scott asked about the status of the ice machine. Saulsgiver stated they were waiting on the catwalk now. Greene asked if there would be any additional costs the Port would have to bear for the ice machine. Saulsgiver stated he was not aware of any. Saulsgiver noted SFA is making a \$225k gift to the Port. Scott stated it might not be a gift if it doesn't pay for its upkeep. Discussion of income sources for the Port.

Saulsgiver adjourned the meeting at 1:10pm

President

PORT OF SIUSLAW TRANSIENT DOCK COMPLETION

The Port of Siuslaw's 800 foot long transient dock was completed in 2009. The former transient dock had been closed and unusable since 2005.

In 2007, the process for the new transient dock had already begun but was delayed partly due to a change in management at the Port. The process again began to move forward by mid to late summer.

There were \$1.495 million from several sources (Federal Highway funds through ODOT, Clean Vessel Act, Boating Improvement Grant, US Fish and Wildlife funds through Oregon State Marine Board, Business Oregon) designated for the project. Background information on the \$1.495 million worth of available funds was incomplete or minimal.

The Port entered into an intergovernmental agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to manage the project. Any changes to the project would be made with concurrence with that organization, the engineering firm and the selected contractor.

It is generally not possible to increase Federal funds after an award has been made. Federally funded projects require specific procedures and contracting guidelines that can add 10-30% more cost than might otherwise be expected for a project.

Additionally, the Port was informed that unless construction was completed by a certain date, the Port would lose funding from one Federal source. Therefore, time was of the essence to move this project forward.

The initial estimates of building this project were made, to the best of our knowledge, sometime in 2005 or early 2006. These estimates did not include the ice machine currently on the wharf or the larger capacity hoist now on the dock. Marine construction inflation in that intervening time period had been estimated at 10% by Bellingham Marine (an internationally recognized manufacturer of floating docks). From the time of the original estimates, it was certain that there were to be increases in the final construction costs.

Since 2005, the Port has spent \$779,339 on the Maple Street Landing and Transient Dock project. This figure includes grant funding of \$711,844.

Based on construction estimates from ODOT, staff made our best estimate as to the amount of "gap funding" needed to complete the project. The figure of \$462,000 was used as it was over ODOT's construction estimates. This amount has been presented in the Port's approved budget for the past three years.

This \$462,000 was in the form of a drawdown loan from the State of Oregon. That is, the Port could tap up to that amount. We have to date not tapped those available funds and no expenses have been paid on that loan. It is a 20 year loan from the Oregon Ports Revolving Fund at 4.67%.

Discussions of existing loan amounts and an overall view of Port finances were communicated through the annual audits, budget meetings, a 29 April 2010 special meeting and through updates to the Commission.

The transient dock faced cost increases from labor, materials, engineering and permitting delays. For example, after notice to proceed had been given in December 2008, one biologist raised an objection as to the content of existing permits. This resulted in increased standby and permitting costs estimated at \$60,000 or more. It was attempted to use "Stimulus" funds to cover any additional costs, but this was not possible at the time of construction.

ODOT has stated this was a "normal" project from the financial perspective. They have also stated it was somewhat complex but that final costs were close to their project estimates. Because Federal funding for this project was to be passed through ODOT and the Oregon State Marine Board, project cost allocation had to be "separated" into two parts by OBEC Engineering. This was not an easy task to accomplish.

After completion of the transient dock, the Port Manager visited ODOT in November 2009 to better understand what would become the final accounting for this project. After several hours and explanations, it was stated that final accounting figures would likely not be available for six or more months as project bills might still arrive over this time.

In August of 2010, the Port Manager met with five ODOT officials to better understand what appeared to be the "final" bill. During this conversation, it appeared that only one of the five persons clearly understood the entire billing/accounting process as well as the total amount due for the Port. During the conversation, it became clear that the pre-engineering and ODOT costs had consumed \$100,000 of our allocated Federal Highway funds. This had not been clearly explained prior to the use of a requested \$462,000 loan figure. If it had been more clearly presented, the original loan request would have increased by at least \$100,000 and we might not have requested additional bridge funding.

In late August 2010, the Federal funds made available through the Oregon State Marine Board were paid back to ODOT for final reimbursement to contractors. This left a balance owing on the project.

Port staff calculated the amount of budgeted cash on hand and the balance owing and concluded that the Port had to apply for more funding from the State of Oregon to pay off the transient dock. We applied for this increased loan funding in the amount of \$138,871 and was notified by telephone of this increased loan amount on 22 November 2010. Formal written notification arrived on 24 November 2010 stating that additional documents would be arriving in the near future. Prior to this notification, the Port had incomplete information for the Board as to the final resolution of the monies owing on the project. No additional terms or restrictions were applied in making this additional loan request. These documents are under review by the Port's attorney.

Available budgeted Port cash and the drawdown loan will be used to pay off the remaining balance of the transient dock project.



Oregon Department of Transportation Project Managers Narrative Form

REVISED

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Project Managers Narrative is to provide constructive feedback to both internal (ODOT) and external (Consultant) Designers and Project Delivery Teams so that needed improvements can be considered and incorporated on future projects.

INSTRUCTIONS

The Project Narrative should not be submitted until after expiration of the time for submission of a claim, which is 15 days after Second Notification is issued (*Final Second Notification for Design-Build projects*). In addition, the Narrative should not address, argue, or admit any points for active or unresolved claims. It is appropriate to indicate a claim has been filed on a particular work item, with no further discussion.

Upon expiration of the time for submission of a claim, after completion of the Post-Construction Review meeting, and after receipt of the Contractors Construction Process Feedback (Form 734-2469A), but prior to issuance of Third Notification, the Project Managers Narrative Form shall be completed and distributed according to the distribution list on the last page of this Form.

Submitted By:

Project Manager	Guy Hakanson	Signature	<i>Guy Hakanson</i>	Date	4-6-10
Narrative Prepared By	Patrick Moore	Title	Assistant Project Mgr	Date	12/29/2009
Narrative Prepared By		Title		Date	
Narrative Prepared By		Title		Date	

KEY PROJECT DATA

Project Name	<i>Port of Siuslaw Infrastructure Improvements</i>		
Contract Number	13960		
Key Number	15338	FAP Number <i>(Only if project is federally funded)</i>	X-HPP-S000(415)
Highway <i>(If multiple highways, list all)</i>	Maple Street	County <i>(If multiple counties, list all)</i>	Lane
Project Type <i>(Bridge, Paving, IM, etc.)</i>	Dock	Funding Source <i>(STIP, OTIA, IM, etc.)</i>	
Prime Contractor or Design-Builder	Laskey-Clifton Corporation		
ODOT CPM <i>(If consultant administered project)</i>	JJ Johnson	Asst. Project Manager	Partick Moore
Lead Inspector	Patrick Moore	Asst. Inspector	
Project Leader		QCCS	Garrick Doll
Engineer of Record / Discipline	Nicholas Robertson	Design Firm	OBEC
Engineer of Record / Discipline	Dave Running /Geotech	Design Firm	Foundation Engineering, Inc.
Engineer of Record / Discipline	Gregg Scholz /Electrical	Design Firm	RQ Engineering, Inc.
Engineer of Record / Discipline		Design Firm	
Engineer of Record / Discipline		Design Firm	



Oregon Department of Transportation Project Managers Narrative Form

KEY PROJECT DATES	
Project Advertisement Date	10/23/2008
Bid Letting Date	11/20/2008
Contract Award	12/11/2008
Notice to Proceed	12/23/2008
Partnering Session Held? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If Yes, date held	
Pre-Construction Conference	1/6/2009
First Notification	1/6/2009
Specified Completion Date <small>(Per Sec 00180.50. For DB, Article 4 of DB Agreement. For CM/GC, Article 5 of CM/GC Contract. If date is modified, provide final date and CCO No.)</small>	6/30/2009 (Original) 9/11/2009 (CCO#8)
Second Notification <small>(Final Second Notification for Design-Build projects)</small>	9/11/2009

CONSTRUCTION COSTS					
Engineers Estimate		Original Authorization		Semi-Final Estimate <small>(Using Corrected Estimate Values)</small>	
Bid Item Amount	\$1,467,000.00	Bid Item Amount	\$1,498,196.00	Bid Item Amount	\$1,489,428.60
Contract Change Orders		Contract Change Orders		Contract Change Orders	\$165,177.02
Adjustments		Adjustments		Adjustments	
Extra Work Orders		Extra Work Orders		Extra Work Orders	
State Force Orders		State Force Orders		State Force Orders	\$13,407.24
Anticipated Items		Anticipated Items	\$52,436.00	Anticipated Items	
Contingencies	\$57,505.00	Contingencies	\$52,436.86	Contingencies	
Engineering	\$176,000.00	Engineering	\$163,755.00	Engineering	\$230,210.40
TOTAL:	\$1,700,505.00	TOTAL:	\$1,714,387.86	TOTAL:	\$1,898,223.26

Was a Request for Overrun or Increase in Construction Authorization required? Yes No If yes, how much? \$184,177.00

Percent of Total Construction Authorization Used <small>As shown on semi-final estimate</small>	110.72
--	--------

Anticipated Items Breakdown			
If no Anticipated Items, check here: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Item Description	Original Authorization	Amount Spent	Method (CCO, SFO, etc.)
TOTALS:			

Identify each anticipated item as shown on the zero pay estimate. Identify the original authorization amount, the final amount spent, and the method used for payment (CCO, SFO, etc.).



Oregon Department of Transportation Project Managers Narrative Form

Complete Sections A through I for each project. If any of the sections are not relevant to the project, identify as "N/A"

SECTION A: PROJECT SCOPE

Provide a brief narrative describing the main scope of work for the project.

The project consisted of the installation of 28 structural steel pipe piling to support 545 foot of precast concrete floating dock segments and gangway access to the dock. Electrical, water and sewer installations supply utility services to the commercial and transient portions of the dock. The existing hoist was replaced with a new hoist to allow offloading of commercial fishing vessels.

SECTION B: PROJECT PROGRESS

Provide a general discussion regarding the progress of work on the project as it pertains to Items No. 1 thru 13. Also include any design and/or construction issues, solutions used, and suggested improvements for future projects. Identify design and construction components that worked well, and include suggestions for items that could be considered on future projects.

Project Progress Overview

During the bidding for this project it was discovered that the permits were improperly written under the SLOPS 3 provisions. The Contractor was put on standby prevented from starting the pile driving until a Biological Assessment was completed and the permit application was completed. This project consisted of the installation of 545 feet of new precast concrete floating docks, the supporting pile foundations and concrete abutments, and the supporting utilities. The piling were installed with a vibratory hammer to meet specific permit requirements. The dock segments were floated into place and secured to the piling. The water supply, pressurized sanitary sewer lines, and electrical components were installed and the operation of the components were checked. The changes in the electrical system delayed the project but were completed within the time extension allowed by the change order.

1. Part 200 – Temporary Features & Appurtenances

Unsupported Sediment Fence was installed at the abutment location to protect the river from run off during the construction of the abutment. The sediment fence was monitored and maintained until the construction at the abutment was completed.

2. Part 300 - Roadwork

N/A

3. Part 400 – Drainage and Sewers

A new 2-1/2 inch pressurized sanitary sewer system was installed connecting the peristaltic boat waste pumpout facility to the street sanitary sewer. A pump out system was added to the project to allow removal of waste materials and water during freezing conditions.

4. Part 500 - Bridges

The project called for the installation of 545 foot of new precast concrete floating segmented docks supported in place by 28 driven steel piling.

5. Part 600: Bases



Oregon Department of Transportation Project Managers Narrative Form

Bases were utilized in the project only as backfill in the electrical and sanitary sewer trenches. The project had no road work.

6. Part 700 – Wearing Surfaces

Asphalt concrete wearing surfaces were utilized as patches to the existing road surfaces above the electrical and sanitary trenches.

7. Part 800 – Permanent Traffic Safety & Guidance Devices

N/A

8. Part 900 – Permanent Traffic Control & Illumination Systems

N/A

9. Part 1000 – Right-of-Way Development & Control

N/A

10. Right-of-Way, Railroad, Utilities

The project contained provisions to add electrification to the dock-mounted pedestals, water supply to each of the pedestals, and a sewer pump out facility. Electrification was added for the owner-supplied ice machine.

11. Survey Work

The project consisted of utilizing reflectorless laser to accurately locate the piling during pile driving. This allowed the pile placement to be accurately monitored during the driving operation. The existing pier was monitored for vibration and settlement during the pile driving operations.

12. Quality of Materials

Material quality was maintained throughout the project.

13. Additional project-specific work items

SECTION C – SIGNIFICANT CONTRACT CHANGE ORDERS

Discuss each Contract Change Orders identified as significant by the Project Manager. Identify those Change Orders required to correct errors in the Plans and Specifications, and those required to add or modify work. In the discussion section, identify what changes made during project development could have prevented the need for the Change Order and how the Change Order impacted the project. Large Change Orders may have effects on other Narrative sections such as Section D – Overruns/Underruns, and Section F – Contract Time. This information may be included in the discussion section with a cross-reference made in other applicable sections. You are not required to duplicate the information in multiple sections. For Design-Build projects, identify who requested the Change Order, the Agency or the Design-Builder.

If no "Significant" Change Orders were issued, check here:



Oregon Department of Transportation Project Managers Narrative Form

REVISED

CCO #	Reason Code	Original CCO Value	Final CCO Value
CC 1	1i	\$26,414.74	\$26,414.71
Description	CCO includes standby costs for permit delay, additional biological conservation measures, and Chnged the completion date to July 12, 2009		
CCO2	2	\$1,922.61	\$1,922.61
Description	CCO included all the work required to substitute HDPE waterline materials for the specified PVC waterline materials for the above ground water distribution system. It also includes all work required to furnish and install additional valves, boxes, and connections related to the sewer pumpout connections		
CCO3	10	\$13,500.00	\$13,500.00
Description	CCO includes CLPUD Power Service Extra Work and changes the completion date to July 14, 2009		
CCO4	4c	\$7,453.00	\$7,453.00
Description	CCO includes all work required to furnish owner-approved upgrade options for the Dockside Hoist.		
CCO5	4c	(\$3,917.50)	(\$3,917.50)
Description	This CCO instituted a credit for the deletion of the reinstallation of the existing hoist as called for on Plan Sheet 3 and added options to new hoist as requested by the Port of Siuslaw.		
CCO6	4c	\$95,772.85	\$95,772.85
Description	This CCO provided the contractor compensation for the revision of the electrical system. The revised electrical improved the shore power system for the dock facilities, provided electrical power to the commercial ice machine, revised the CLPUD transformer, and included the modifications to the pre-cast concrete floats to carry the heavier loading.		
CCO7	4c	\$2,733.42	\$2,733.42
Description	This CCO compensated the contractor for the installation of potable water service to share power pedestals P1 through P6 on the commercial dock.		
CCO8	1e/1m	\$12,347.93	\$12,347.93
Description	CCO provided for the installation of a Reduced Pressure Backflow Preventer, construction of a Transition Ramp for Dock "A", Fabrication and installation of the Modified Hoist Support Attachment, and changed the completion date to Sept. 11, 2009.		

SECTION D – BID ITEM OVERRUNS / UNDERRUNS

Discuss each **significant** bid item overrun and underrun. For purpose of this section, "significant" shall mean ± 25% of the original bid item quantity. Include the reason for the overrun/underrun and the total value for each affected bid item. Identify any bid items which were noted as having potentially unbalanced bids in the bid evaluation report. Discuss any perceived impact to the project and the efforts made to manage these items.

BI Number and Description	BI Quantity Overrun/Underrun	Percent Over/Under Original Quantity	Dollar Value of Overrun/Underrun
BI 180 - Relocate Existing Hoist	Under	100%	(\$9,000.00)
Discussion	Relocate Existing Hoist deleted by CCO#5		
BI 340 - PP 16 x 0.5 Steel Pile Splices	Under	100%	(\$1,000.00)
Discussion	The Steel piling were provided in adequate length and did not require splicing outside of the order lengths.		

SECTION E-1: ESCALATION / DE-ESCALATION

Identify the final costs for project fuel, asphalt and steel escalation/de-escalations. If there are no applicable steel items identified in the Special Provisions, or if the fuel or asphalt provisions are not included, provide this information in the comments field. If the final cost for fuel, asphalt or steel escalation/de-escalation is \$0 due to all monthly fuel prices being within the base range, provide that information.

Final Cost (+/-)	Comments



Oregon Department of Transportation Project Managers Narrative Form

Fuel Escalation/De-escalation		
Asphalt Escalation/De-escalation		
Steel Escalation/De-escalation		

SECTION E-2 – ADJUSTMENTS

Identify and discuss all adjustments, including standard and nonstandard adjustments, not previously addressed in change orders. Include adjustments whether or not they were anticipated. Include the reason and the total value for each adjustment.

Adjustment #	Anticipated Value of Adjustment	Final Adjustment Value
Description		
Description		
Description		

Total Number of Adjustments		Total Value of all Adjustments	
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--

SECTION F: CONTRACT TIME

Discuss any modifications or amendments made to the original contract time (including interim and final contract completion dates) identified in the Special Provisions. Include reasons for all amendments. Identify any liquidated damages applied to the interim and final contract completion dates. Also provide suggestions for specific contract language changes that could be used to prevent modifications to contract time on future projects. Did the Project Manager provide input into the original contract completion date?

The contract time was extended four times extending the contract completion date from 6/30/2009 to 9/11/2009. CCO1 extended the completion date to 7/12/2009 to include additional work and standby time due to delays for project permit changes. CCO3 extended the completion dated to 7/14/2009 to allow the contractor additional time for CLPUD extra work. CCO6 extended the completion date to 8/8/2009 to allow the contractor additional time to incorporate owner-initiated changes to the electrical system. The changes required changing out the transformer. The increased size of the transformer required a relocation as well as a larger size to meet electrical code requirements. CCO8 further extended the completion date to 9/11/2009 to allow the contractor additional time to install and modify the support for the hoist.

SECTION G – INNOVATION

Address any new or innovative construction means, methods, or materials that were used, including the specific results achieved (i.e., saved time, reduced cost, increased life of product, etc.). Also discuss the results of the means, methods, or materials that were not successful and the reason why. Include specific information regarding failures, and suggestions on how to prevent the same experiment from being used on other projects. For Design-Build projects, if innovation was allowed as part of the proposal and included as a basis for selection, discuss the innovation concepts that were proposed by the Design-Builder, and the results of the innovation on the overall project; was the innovation successful or not?



Oregon Department of Transportation Project Managers Narrative Form

SECTION H – POST PROJECT CRITIQUE RESULTS

Discuss the post-project critique received as part of the Post-Construction Review (00150.91 or DB150.91), and the Prime Contractors Performance Evaluation Form 734-2469 (Part A). Ask the Contractor for input on the project Plans and Specifications, as well as any suggestions to improve the clarity of the Plans and Specifications.

The contractor feels that the largest impact to the project was the late change to the electrical supply component to the commercial dock. The change came late in the project which made it difficult to get the materials and get them installed in an orderly fashion.

SECTION I – SPECIFIC FEEDBACK FOR PROJECT DESIGNER(S) and/or PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM

Provide constructive feedback to the project Designer(s) and/or Project Delivery Team identifying project components and aspects that worked well, and which could/should be used on other projects. Identify project components or aspects which were problematic along with suggested solutions to avoid repeating on future projects. For Design-Build projects, include feedback to the DB Project Manager or Project Leader regarding contract language which was problematic, along with suggested solutions. Also identify contract language which worked well.

The owner-initiated changes to the electrical utility caused delays and hesitancy in the contractor's project management. The changes encompassed the whole of the electrical system which impacted the orderly acquisition of materials and scheduling of material placement. The float system supported by driven piling worked well. Typically the floats would have been assembled, moored into place, and then the piling driven through the pile "pockets" to secure the floats into place. Due to the limited allowable exposure to the river within the permit applications, the contractor had to drive the piling first and then manufacture the floats to fit the existing pile placement. The construction of the dock proceeded well and provided the owner with a good product.

Upon completion, the PM must print the Narrative form, sign and date. The original, signed Narrative shall be submitted to the ODOT Construction Section, Attn: Contract Services Unit.

The PM must then scan the signed Narrative, and electronically (e-mail) distribute according to the following:

PROJECT MANAGERS NARRATIVE DISTRIBUTION LIST		
No. of Copies	Required Distribution	Distributed to:
HARD COPY DISTRIBUTION		



Oregon Department of Transportation Project Managers Narrative Form

Original	Construction Section <i>Attn: Contract Services Unit</i>	
ELECTRONIC COPY DISTRIBUTION		
1 E-copy	ODOT Contract Administration Engineer	Bob Pappe c/o Lori Butler: Lorraine.E.Butler@odot.state.or.us
1 E-copy	ODOT Region Tech Center Manager <i>(for Region in which project is located)</i>	Region 1: Tamira.J.Clark@odot.state.or.us Region 2: Steven.B.Cooley@odot.state.or.us Region 3: Mark.Thompson@odot.state.or.us Region 4: Jon.W.Heacock@odot.state.or.us Region 5: Steven.A.Davis@odot.state.or.us BDU: Raymond.Mabey@odot.state.or.us
1 E-copy	ODOT Area Manager <i>(for Area in which project is located)</i>	David Kim: David.Kim@odot.state.or.us Rich Watanabe: Richard.F.Watanabe@odot.state.or.us Tim Potter: James.T.Potter@odot.state.or.us Sonny Chickering: Sonny.P.Chickering@odot.state.or.us Vivian Payne: Vivian.B.Payne@odot.state.or.us Larry McKinley: Larry.McKinley@odot.state.or.us Mark Usselman: Mark.Usselman@odot.state.or.us Art Anderson: Arthur.H.Anderson@odot.state.or.us Gary Farnsworth: Gary.C.Farnsworth@odot.state.or.us Butch Hansen: Norman.C.Hansen@odot.state.or.us Frank Reading: Frank.H.Reading@odot.state.or.us Rena Cusma: Rena.M.Cusma@odot.state.or.us Ray Mabey: Raymond.Mabey@odot.state.or.us
1 E-copy	Each Applicable ODOT Technical Services Branch Section	
	ODOT Bridge Engineering Section	bridge@odot.state.or.us
	ODOT Traffic / Roadway Section	RoadwayEngineeringSection@odot.state.or.us
	ODOT Geo-Environmental Section	GeoAdminWorkOrders@odot.state.or.us