July 27, 2017

TO: Standards Committee

FROM: Scott Trammell, Secretary

RE: Minutes from the May 18, 2017 Standards Committee Meeting

The Standards Committee meeting was called to order by Mr. Leckie at 09:00 a.m. on May 18, 2017 in the N955 Bay Window Conference Room. The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 a.m.

The following committee members were in attendance:

John Leckie, Chairman, Construction Management Director
Michael Beuchel, Contract Administration Division
Joseph Bruno*, Traffic Engineering Division
Mark Orton**, Bridges Division
Greg Pankow, State Construction Engineer
Kumar Dave, Pavement Engineering, Highway Design
Mike Prather***, Materials Engineer, Materials Management
Michael Koch, Fort Wayne District Area Engineer
Rob Goldner, Manager, Construction Technical Support

*Proxy for Dave Boruff
**Proxy for Elizabeth Phillips
***Proxy for Matthew Beeson

Also in attendance were the following:

Andrew Meeks, 3M
Andrew Pangallo, INDOT
Chris DeColli, 3M
Joel Salinas, INDOT
Joshua Kiilu, INDOT
Katherine Smutzer, INDOT
Kirk Frederick, INDOT
Libby Crawford, INDOT
Steve Fisher, INDOT
Ting Nahrwold, INDOT
Tom Duncan, FHWA

Steve Smart, County Materials
David Alyea, INDOT
Ellis Holder, INDOT
Scott Trammell, INDOT
Dan Osborn, ICI
Elizabeth Phillips, INDOT
Brent Swonger, C-Tech Corp. Inc.
Tom Harris, INDOT
Derrick Hauser, INDOT
Kurt Pelz, INDOT
The following items were listed for consideration:

A. GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS

OLD BUSINESS

(No items were listed)

NEW BUSINESS

1. Approval of the Minutes from the April 20, 2017 meeting

DISCUSSION: Mr. Leckie requested a motion to approve the minutes from the April 20, 2017 meeting, with minor revisions as shown in the final draft minutes.

Motion: Mr. Pankow
Second: Mr. Goldner
Ayes: 8
Nays: 0

ACTION: PASSED AS SUBMITTED

B. CONCEPTUAL PROPOSAL ITEMS

OLD BUSINESS

(No items were listed)

NEW BUSINESS

(No items were listed)

C. STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS, SPECIAL PROVISIONS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS PROPOSED ITEMS

OLD BUSINESS

(No items were listed)

NEW BUSINESS

Item No. 1 (2016 SS) Ms. Phillips pg 4

601-TBGC-01 THRIE-BEAM GUARDRAIL COMPONENTS
601-TBGC-02 THRIE-BEAM GUARDRAIL COMPONENTS TRANSITION SECTION
601-MGSA-01 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY
601-MGSA-02 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY
601-MGSA-03 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY
601-MGSA-04 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY
601-MGSA-05 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY
601-MGSA-06 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, OMITTED POST
601-MGSA-07 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, OMITTED POST
601-MGSA-08 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, LONG-SPAN
601-MGSA-09 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, LONG-SPAN
601-MGSA-10 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, STRUCTURE TOP-MOUNTED POST
601-MGSA-11 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL TRANSITION WITH CURB
601-MGSA-12 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL TRANSITION WITHOUT CURB
601-MGSA-13 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL TRANSITION
601-MGSA-14 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL TRANSITION
601-MGSA-15 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL TRANSITION
601-MGSA-16 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL HEIGHT TRANSITION
601-MGSA-17 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, CABLE TERMINAL ANCHOR SYSTEM
601-MGSA-18 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, CABLE TERMINAL ANCHOR SYSTEM
601-MGSA-19 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, CABLE TERMINAL ANCHOR SYSTEM
601-MGSA-20 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, CABLE TERMINAL ANCHOR SYSTEM
601-MGSA-21 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, CABLE TERMINAL ANCHOR SYSTEM
601-MGSA-22 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, CABLE TERMINAL ANCHOR SYSTEM
601-MGSA-23 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, WORKING WIDTH

ACTION: PASSED AS REVISED

Item No. 2 (2016 SS) Mr. Boruff pg 36
Recurring Special Provision: 805-T-078 ELECTRICAL INSULATION SEALANT

ACTION: PASSED AS SUBMITTED

Item No. 3 (2016 SS) Mr. Pankow pg 40
103.06 Wage and Labor Requirements

ACTION: PASSED AS SUBMITTED

cc: Committee Members
FHWA
ICI
PROBLEM(S) ENCOUNTERED: The 2016 Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (2016 MASH) is the current standard for crash testing safety hardware (guardrail, end treatments, bridge railing, transitions, etc.). MASH replaces the previous standard NCHRP Report 350. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) entered into a Joint Implementation Agreement for the new installation and full replacement of safety hardware. The agreement sets dates after which only MASH-compliant hardware can be installed. The deadline for guardrail on the NHS is letting dates on or after December 31, 2017.

The current w-beam guardrail standard (known as strong-post w-beam) set at 27 ¾” railing height met the MASH crash-testing requirements for the steel post configuration. However, w-beam guardrail has been has historically been performing at or very near 100 percent of structural design capacity.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Replace the current strong post w-beam guardrail with non-proprietary Midwest Guardrail System (MGS) w-beam guardrail.

Although visually similar, notable differences between the two systems are:
- The MGS w-beam has a top rail height of 31” vs. 27 ¾“ for the strong-post w-beam.
- The MGS w-beam has a mid-span splice vs. a splice at the post for the strong post w-beam.
- The MGS w-beam uses a 6-ft post with an embedment depth of 3’-4”. INDOT currently uses a 7-ft post with 4’-7 ¾” embedment), but a 6-ft post is acceptable.

The two systems use the same w-beam rail section and assembly bolts, may use either a steel or wood post, and may use either a wood or composite blockout. The MGS w-beam system will maintain the same 1’-5” typical section (front face of rail to back face of post) as current strong-post w-beam guardrail system.

Standard Specifications sections 601, 926.03, 910.11 and 911.02 are under review. Proposed changes (including pay items) will be brought for review and approval at a later date. IDM sections 49-4.0 thru 49-9.0 are under review and will be provided at a later date.

APPLICABLE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS:  601, 926.03, 910.11, and 911.02(f)

APPLICABLE STANDARD DRAWINGS:  601-TBGC-01 and -02 (add 6’-3” thrie beam element and asymmetric element), New 601-MGSA series

APPLICABLE DESIGN MANUAL SECTION:  49-4.0, 49-5.0, 49-8.0, 49-9.0
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS, SPECIAL PROVISIONS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS

REVISION TO STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS

APPLICABLE SECTION OF GIFE: Section 21.1. Currently general and may not need updates, but providing a distinction between strong post w-beam and MGS may be beneficial.

APPLICABLE RECURRING SPECIAL PROVISIONS: No

PAY ITEMS AFFECTED: Yes

APPLICABLE SUB-COMMITTEE ENDORSEMENT: Todd Shields and Elizabeth Phillips

Comments have been solicited from industry and ICI.

IMPACT ANALYSIS (attach report): Yes

Submitted By: Katherine Smutzer for Elizabeth Phillips

Title: Standards Engineer

Organization: INDOT/Standards

Phone Number: 317-233-2074

Date: April 24, 2017

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT CHECKLIST

Explain the business case as to why this item should be presented to the Standards Committee for approval. Answer the following questions with Yes, No or N/A.

Does this item appear in any other specification sections? No

Will approval of this item affect the Approved Materials List? No (materials are all the same)

Will this proposal improve:

- Construction costs? No
- Construction time? No
- Customer satisfaction? Yes
- Congestion/travel time? No
- Ride quality? No
Will this proposal reduce operational costs or maintenance effort? No

Will this item improve safety:

- For motorists? Yes
- For construction workers? No

Will this proposal improve quality for:

- Construction procedures/processes? No
- Asset preservation? No
- Design process? No

Will this change provide the contractor more flexibility? No

Will this proposal provide clarification for the Contractor and field personnel? No

Can this item improve/reduce the number of potential change orders? No

Is this proposal needed for compliance with:

- Federal or State regulations? Yes
- AASHTO or other design code? Yes

Is this item editorial? No

Provide any further information as to why this proposal should be placed on the Standards Committee meeting Agenda: MASH-compliant w-beam guardrail must be used for installations on the NHS for projects letting after December 31, 2017.
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS
601-TBGC-01 THREE-BEAM GUARDRAIL COMPONENTS (WITH MARKUPS)

Note:
1. All three-beam components shall be 12 gauge, except as shown.
2. G-3 Three Beam Rail Section for Guard Rail Transition

moved detail to sheet 02
Note:
1. (Same notes as on -01)
MGS

Add extra holes for guardrail transition

THRIE BEAM RAIL SECTION

Moved detail to sheet -01

Added Symmetric W-Beam to Thrie Beam Transition Section from sheet -01

Add New Asymmetric W-Beam to Thrie Beam Transition Section
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS
601-MGSA-02 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY (FINAL DRAFT)
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS
601-MGSA-03 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY (FINAL DRAFT)
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS
601-MGSA-04 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY (FINAL DRAFT)
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS
601-MGSA-08 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, LONG-SPAN (FINAL DRAFT)
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS
601-MGSA-11 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL TRANSITION WITH CURB (FINAL DRAFT)
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS

601-MGSA-12 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL TRANSITION WITHOUT CURB (FINAL DRAFT)
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS

601-MGSA-15 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, GUARDRAIL TRANSITION (FINAL DRAFT)
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS
601-MGSA-17 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, CABLE TERMINAL ANCHOR SYSTEM (FINAL DRAFT)
REVISION TO STANDARD DRAWINGS
601-MGSA-23 MIDWEST GUARDRAIL SYSTEM ASSEMBLY, WORKING WIDTH (FINAL DRAFT)
COMMENTS AND ACTION

601-TBGC-01 and -02
601-MGSA 01 thru 23

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Orton, sitting in as proxy for Ms. Phillips, introduced and presented this item proposing to replace the current strong post w-beam guardrail with non-proprietary Midwest Guardrail System, MGS, w-beam guardrail, for the reasons stated in the proposal sheet. Although visually similar, as shown on the revised drawings above, Ms. Phillips, who attended this meeting for this item, pointed out that there are notable differences between the two systems.

Ms. Phillips stated that the two systems use the same w-beam rail section and assembly bolts, may use either a steel or wood post, and may use either a wood or composite blockout. The MGS w-beam system will maintain the same 1 ft 5 in. typical section, front face of rail to back face of post, as the current strong-post w-beam guardrail system. Ms. Phillips further noted that Standard Specifications sections 601, 926.03, 910.11 and 911.02 are currently under review. Proposed changes, including pay items, will be brought for review and approval at a later date. IDM sections 49-4.0 thru 49-9.0 are also under review and those revisions will be presented at a later date as well.

Mr. Koch addressed some design issues, regarding spacing with the guardrail posts and guardrails as they connect at the headwalls. Ms. Phillips and Ms. Smutzer provided clarification. Ms. Phillips clarified with Mr. Pankow that there are no snag points. Ms. Phillips stated that she has a PowerPoint presentation that explains the design and installation differences and plans to present it to ICI. Mr. Pankow asked if it could be posted to the website and Ms. Phillips agreed.

Ms. Smutzer explained the reasoning behind some of the design decisions and what it may take to replace or repair after a hit. Mr. Koch asked if there should be guidance in place for post installations. Mr. Pankow and Ms. Phillips agreed that we may have to address specific situations as they occur, on a case by case basis. Ms. Smutzer added that we won’t know how the new system will work with existing structures, regarding safety issues and MASH requirements, until those specific situations are addressed.

Ms. Phillips also addressed the post size issues, stating that what is shown will be in compliance.

Ms. Smutzer agreed with Mr. Koch that an additional note on the general info page will be added regarding post sizes. Mr. Swonger, of C-Tech Corp, asked about design height, post lengths and spacing of posts in various locations. Clarification was provided by Ms. Phillips and Ms. Smutzer. Design guidance currently dictates that those considerations are to be accounted for and will be site specific. There was no further discussion.

Based on the discussion and comments received the final draft of these drawings' set is shown in these minutes.

Mr. Orton revised his motion, to approve as revised. Mr. Pankow seconded.
**COMMENTS AND ACTION**

601-TBGC-01 and -02  
601-MGSA 01 thru 23  

(CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion: Mr. Orton</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second: Mr. Pankow</td>
<td>Passed as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayes: 8</td>
<td>Passed as Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: 0</td>
<td>Withdraw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FHWA Approval: YES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Specifications Sections referenced and/or affected:</th>
<th>2020 Standard Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>601 pg 393; 910.11 pg 936; 911.02(f) pg 962; 926.03 pg 1084.</td>
<td>Revise Pay Items List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurring Special Provision affected:</th>
<th>Create RSP (No.____)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Effective _____ Letting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSP Sunset Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Drawing affected:</th>
<th>Revise RSP (No.____)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>601-TBGC-01 and -02; 601-MGSA series (proposed new)</td>
<td>Effective _____ Letting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Manual Sections affected:</td>
<td>Standard Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-4.0, 49-5.0, 49-8.0, 49-9.0</td>
<td>Effective Sept. 01, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GIFE Sections:                        | Create RPD (No. 601-R-658d) |
|---------------------------------------| Effective Jan. 01, 2018 Letting |
| 21.1                                  | TBD GIFE Update            |
|                                       | SiteManager Update        |
PROPOSAL TO STANDARDS COMMITTEE

PROBLEM(S) ENCOUNTERED: RSP 805-T-078 for electrical insulation sealant has not been updated in many years and the product information is no longer current.

PROPOSED SOLUTION: Update RSP 805-T-078 with products that INDOT is using for signal cable and wire splices.

APPLICABLE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS: 805.05

APPLICABLE STANDARD DRAWINGS: No

APPLICABLE DESIGN MANUAL SECTION: No

APPLICABLE SECTION OF GIFE: No

APPLICABLE RECURRENT SPECIAL PROVISIONS: 805-T-078

PAY ITEMS AFFECTED: No

APPLICABLE SUB-COMMITTEE ENDORSEMENT: Ad hoc review by district signal tech supervisors and traffic operations managers

IMPACT ANALYSIS (attach report): Yes, attached.

Submitted By: Joe Bruno on behalf of Dave Boruff

Title: Traffic Administration Engineer

Organization: INDOT

Phone Number: (317) 234-7949

Date: 4/24/2017
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS, SPECIAL PROVISIONS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS
REVISION TO SPECIAL PROVISIONS

IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT CHECKLIST

Explain the business case as to why this item should be presented to the Standards Committee for approval. Answer the following questions with Yes, No or N/A.

Does this item appear in any other specification sections? No

Will approval of this item affect the Approved Materials List? No

Will this proposal improve:

- Construction costs? No
- Construction time? No
- Customer satisfaction? No
- Congestion/travel time? No
- Ride quality? No

Will this proposal reduce operational costs or maintenance effort? Yes

Will this item improve safety:

- For motorists? No
- For construction workers? No

Will this proposal improve quality for:

- Construction procedures/processes? Yes
- Asset preservation? Yes
- Design process? No

Will this change provide the contractor more flexibility? No

Will this proposal provide clarification for the Contractor and field personnel? Yes

Can this item improve/reduce the number of potential change orders? No

Is this proposal needed for compliance with:

- Federal or State regulations? No
- AASHTO or other design code? No

Is this item editorial? No

Provide any further information as to why this proposal should be placed on the Standards Committee meeting Agenda: N/A
REVISION TO SPECIAL PROVISIONS
805-T-078 ELECTRICAL INSULATION SEALANT

(Basis for Use: Required for contracts with traffic signal or lighting installations.)

805-T-078 ELECTRICAL INSULATION SEALANT

(Adopted 09-01-05)

The electrical insulation sealant for this contract cable or wire splices as described in Section 805.05 shall be chosen from the following list:

(a) Aquaseal Star brite liquid electrical tape, manufactured by Star brite, Inc.

(b) Electrical 430

(c) 3M Electrical Insulation Putty Scotchkote Electrical Coating, manufactured by 3M Company

(d) Plyseal Insulating Mastic, manufactured by Plymouth Rubber Europa S.A.

(e) or approved equal.
COMMENTS AND ACTION
805-T-078 ELECTRICAL INSULATION SEALANT

DISCUSSION:
This item was introduced and presented by Mr. Bruno, sitting in for Mr. Boruff, who stated that RSP 805-T-078 for electrical insulation sealant has not been updated in many years and the product information is no longer current. Mr. Bruno therefore requests approval of the updated RSP 805-T-078, shown above, with products that the Department is using for signal cable and wire splices.

There was no discussion and this item passed as submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion: Mr. Bruno</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second: Mr. Pankow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayes: 8</td>
<td>X Passed as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: 0</td>
<td>X Passed as Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Approval: YES</td>
<td>X Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Specifications Sections referenced and/or affected:

- NONE

Recurring Special Provision affected:

- 805-T-078 ELECTRICAL INSULATION SEALANT

Standard Drawing affected:

- NONE

Design Manual Sections affected:

- NONE

GIFE Sections cross-references:

- NONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Specifications Sections referenced and/or affected:</th>
<th>2020 Standard Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise Pay Items List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurring Special Provision affected:</th>
<th>Create RSP (No. 805-T-078)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Sept. 01, 2017 Letting</td>
<td>RSP Sunset Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Drawing affected:</th>
<th>Revise RSP (No.805-T-078)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Sept. 01, 2017 Letting</td>
<td>RSP Sunset Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Design Manual Sections affected:                         | Standard Drawing            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------| Effective                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIFE Sections cross-references:</th>
<th>Create RPD (No. 805-T-078)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Letting</td>
<td>RSP Sunset Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteManager Update</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
PROPOSAL TO STANDARDS COMMITTEE

PROBLEM(S) ENCOUNTERED:

The Department is going to start requiring the submittal of payrolls to the PE/S in electronic format in order to take care of issue with State Board of Accounts.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

Therefore the Department needs to change the Specifications to require the submission in electronic format and also let Contractors know that the Department may hold estimates until they are submitted.

APPLICABLE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS: 103.06

APPLICABLE STANDARD DRAWINGS: N/A

APPLICABLE DESIGN MANUAL SECTION: N/A

APPLICABLE SECTION OF GIFE: TBD

APPLICABLE RECURRING SPECIAL PROVISIONS: N/A

PAY ITEMS AFFECTED: None

IMPACT ANALYSIS (attach report):

Submitted By: Greg Pankow

Title: State Construction Engineer
IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT CHECKLIST

Explain the business case as to why this item should be presented to the Standards Committee for approval. Answer the following questions with Yes, No or N/A.

Does this item appear in any other specification sections? No
Will approval of this item affect the Approved Materials List? No

Will this proposal improve:

- Construction costs? No
- Construction time? Yes
- Customer satisfaction? Yes
- Congestion/travel time? No
- Ride quality? No

Will this proposal reduce operational costs or maintenance effort? No/Yes;

Will this item improve safety:

- For motorists? No
- For construction workers? Yes

Will this proposal improve quality for:

- Construction procedures/processes? Yes
- Asset preservation? No
- Design process? No

Will this change provide the contractor more flexibility? No
Will this proposal provide clarification for the Contractor and field personnel? Yes

Can this item improve/reduce the number of potential change orders? No

Is this proposal needed for compliance with:

- Federal or State regulations? Yes
- AASHTO or other design code? No

Is this item editorial? No

Provide any further information as to why this proposal should be placed on the Standards Committee meeting Agenda:
The Standard Specifications are revised as follows:

SECTION 103, BEGIN LINE 631, DELETE AND INSERT AS FOLLOWS:

103.06 Wage and Labor Requirements
These requirements will apply only to a 100% State funded contract to all contracts let by the Department. These requirements will apply to all work performed by the Contractor with its own organization and with the assistance of workers under its immediate superintendence, and to all work performed by piecework, station work, or subcontract, or lease.

(a) Non-discrimination of Employees
The Contractor and its subcontractors shall not discriminate against an employee or applicant for employment, to be employed in the performance of the contract work, with respect to hire, tenure, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment or matters directly or indirectly related to employment, because of race, religion, color, sex, sexual orientation, sexual identity, disability, national origin, or ancestry. Breach of this covenant may be regarded as a material breach of the contract.

(b) Affidavits and Payrolls
All labor shall be paid weekly. The payroll and related records of the Contractor and all subcontractors shall be preserved for a period of three years after completion of the project work, and be open to the inspection of the Department.

The wages of labor shall be paid in legal tender of the United States. However, this condition will be considered satisfied if payment is made by means of a negotiable check, on a solvent bank, which may be cashed readily by the employees in the local community for the full amount, without discount or collection charges. If checks are used for payment, the Contractor shall make all necessary arrangements for them to be cashed and shall give information regarding such arrangements.

The Contractor on each contract let by the Department shall be responsible for electronically filing certified payroll for its employees and any subcontractors on a weekly basis with the appropriate Department personnel and in a format acceptable to the Department. Failure of the Contractor to timely file certified payroll for its employees or any subcontractors, may result in the withholding of progress estimate payments until the certified payroll is properly submitted.

No fee shall be asked or accepted by the Contractor or its agents from a person as a condition of the contract.

No laborers shall be charged for tools used in performing their respective duties except for reasonable avoidable loss or damage thereto.
Each employee on the work covered by the contract shall be allowed to lodge, board, or trade where or with whom he or she elects. Neither the Contractor nor its agents, nor its employees shall directly or indirectly require as a condition of employment that an employee shall lodge, board, or trade at a particular place or with a particular person.

No charge shall be made for transportation furnished by the Contractor or its agents to a person employed on the work.

No individual shall be employed as a laborer on the contract except on a wage basis. This shall not be construed to prohibit the rental of trucks or other equipment from individuals. No such rental agreement, or charges for fuel, supplies, or repairs on account of such agreement shall cause deduction from the wages accruing to an employee except as authorized by the regulation cited herein.

(c) Wage Stipulations

No person employed on a federally funded contract shall be paid less than required by the rate of wages set forth for labor classifications listed in the General Decision as required by the Davis Bacon Act and related Acts. No person employed on a state funded contract shall be paid at a rate of less than $11.25/h, as required by IC 8-23-9-22 or the rate of wages set forth for labor classifications listed in the General Decision, whichever is greater.

1. General Decision Included in Contract Information Book

The Contractor shall pay the workers who are employed in performance of the contract work, rates of wages which are not less than the rates set forth for labor classifications listed in the General Decision.

The computations used in arriving at the contract unit prices shall be based on the hourly rates shown in the General Decision and as shown above. The wages herein stipulated shall become and be a part of the contract as provided by law.

The following statement, shown in the General Decision, will not apply to state funded contracts.

“Unlisted classifications needed for work not included within the scope of the classifications listed may be added after award only as provided in the labor standards contract clauses (29 CFR 5.5(a)(1)(ii)).”

2. General Decision Not Included in Contract Information Book

If the General Decision is not included in the Contract Information book, the requirements of 103.06(c)1 will not apply.
COMMENTS AND ACTION

103.06 WAGE AND LABOR REQUIREMENTS

DISCUSSION:
Mr. Pankow introduced and presented this item stating that the Department is going to start requiring the submittal of payrolls to the PE/S in electronic format in order to take care of issues with State Board of Accounts. Therefore, the Department needs to revise the language in 103.06 to require the submission in electronic format and also let Contractors and subcontractors know that the Department may hold estimates until they are submitted. Also included are revisions from legal to bring the language up to date with other previous spec revisions, as shown.

Mr. Pankow and Mr. Beuchel discussed including this RSP in current lettings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion: Mr. Pankow</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second: Mr. Dave</td>
<td>X Passed as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayes: 8</td>
<td>X Passed as Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: 0</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Approval: YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Specifications Sections referenced and/or affected:

| 103.06 pg 26. | 2020 Standard Specifications |
|               | Revise Pay Items List         |

Recurring Special Provision affected:

| X Create RSP (No.103-C-254) | Effective July 01, 2017 Letting |
|                             | RSP Sunset Date: 2020 Book     |

Standard Drawing affected:

| NONE | Revise RSP (No.____) | Effective ____ Letting |
|      | Standard Drawing     | Effective               |
|      | RSP Sunset Date:     |                        |

Design Manual Sections affected:

| NONE | Create RPD (No.____) | Effective ____ Letting |
|      | GIFE Update          | Effective               |

GIFE Sections cross-references:

| NONE | SiteManager Update   |
|      | X                   |

44