# STATE ARBITRATION BOARD

10780 Anderson Lane Lake Worth, FL. 33467-5464

Phone (561) 433-4535

FAX (561) 433-8136

March 26, 2001

Mr. Robert G. Graham, President Cone & Graham, Inc. 5201 Cone Road Tampa, FL. 33610

Re: Arbitration Board Order 2 & 3-2001

State Project Number 10020-3524

Hillsborough County

Dear Mr. Graham:

Find enclosed the State Arbitration Order and Transcript as captioned above.

Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely;

**State Arbitration Board** 

John W. Nutbrown, Chairman & Clerk

cc: Board Members

# STATE ARBITRATION BOARD

10780 Anderson Lane Lake Worth, FL. 33467-5464

Phone (561) 433-4535

FAX (561) 433-8136

May 14, 2001



Mr. Bill Albaugh, P.E.
Highway Operations
Florida Department of Transportation
605 Suwannee Street MS-57
Tallahassee, FL. 32399-0450

Re: Arbitration Board Order 2 & 3-2001 State Project Number 10020-3524 Hillsborough County

Dear Mr. Albaugh

Find enclosed the State Arbitration Order as captioned above.

Mr. Freddie Simmons has a copy of the Claimants package as well as the Departments rebuttal for your use if you will contact him when this arrives.

Sincerely;

**State Arbitration Board** 

John W. Nutbrown, Chairman & Clerk

cc: Board Members



# STATE ARBITRATION BOARD STATE OF FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	COPY
- and -	PROJECT NO. 10020-3524  LOCATION: Hillsborough County, Florida
CONE & GRAHAM, INC.	

RE:

Arbitration In The Above Matter

DATE:

Tuesday, February 27, 2001

PLACE:

Florida Transportation Center

1007 Desoto Park Drive Tallahassee, Florida

TIME:

Commenced at 10:40 a.m. Concluded at 1:00 p.m.

REPORTED BY:

CATHERINE WILKINSON

CSR, CP

Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at

Large

WILKINSON & ASSOCIATES
Certified Court Reporters
Post Office Box 13461
Tallahassee, Florida
(904) 224-0127



#### **APPEARANCES:**

#### MEMBERS OF THE STATE ARBITRATION BOARD:

Mr. John W. Nutbrown, Chairman Mr. Jack Roebuck Mr. Freddie Simmons

## APPEARING ON BEHALF OF CONE & GRAHAM, INC.:

Mr. Nathanael Winthrop Mr. Anthony Caruso Mr. Bob Graham

#### APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION:

Mr. Marty Sanchez Mr. Brian McKishnie Mr. Gerald Golepiewski Mr. James Hubbard

## ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. H. E. "Gene" Cowger

\* \* \*

### INDEX

<b>4</b> 5
4
13

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: This is a hearing of the
3	State Arbitration Board, established in accordance with
4	Section 337.185 of the Florida Statutes.
5	Mr. Freddie Simmons was appointed as a member of
6	the Board by the Secretary of the Department of
7	Transportation.
8	Mr. John Roebuck was elected by the construction
9	companies under contract to the Department of
10	Transportation.
11	These two members chose me, John Nutbrown, to
12	serve as the third member and as the Chairman.
13	Our term will expire on June 30 of this year.
14	Now before I get into that, we have a court
15	reporter. I would like to see a lack of conversation
16	across the table or between individuals. The poor
17	lady's fingers, they go crazy, but please, one person
18	at a time do the speaking.
19	And if you've got a question, raise your hand and
20	I will recognize you so we don't have a lot of
21	conversation between us.
22	Okay. Will each person who will make oral
23	presentations during the hearing please raise your
24	right hand and be sworn in.
25	(Whereupon, all witnesses were duly sworn.)

1	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: The request for arbitration
2	of a claim submitted by a claimant including all
3	attachments thereto and the administrative documents
4	preceding this hearing are hereby introduced as
5	Exhibit 1.
6	Does either party at this time have any other
7	information you wish to put into the record as an
8	exhibit other than what you have previously submitted?
9	MR. WINTHROP: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Can we all have a copy of it.
11	MR. WINTHROP: (Handing documents to the Board)
12	MR. SANCHEZ: One copy, John, or would you like
13	three copies?
14	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: I'm going to label this
15	information from Cone and Graham as Exhibit 2. The
16	Department's Exhibit I will enter as Exhibit 3. The
17	single sheet of figures here I will enter as Exhibit 4.
18	(Whereupon, Exhibit Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 were received in
19	evidence.)
20	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Anything else that needs to
21	be presented?
22	MR. WINTHROP: We had two stapled hand-outs. We
23	have a single sheet as 4, this as 3
24	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: No, the one with Cone
25	Corporation on the front is Exhibit 2. The small

1	packet with the received June 4, '99 with Cone and
2	Graham on the front page is Exhibit 3 and the single
3	sheet is Exhibit 4.
4	MR. WINTHROP: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Marty, do you have anything
6	that you wanted to enter?
7	MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, John, the spread sheet of
8	figures.
9	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: The information from the
10	department will be marked as Exhibit 5.
11	MR. CARUSO: Is there an extra copy of that?
12	(Whereupon, Exhibit No. 5 was received in evidence.)
13	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Take a minute and everybody
14	can examine the information you received.
15	During this hearing the parties may offer such
16	evidence and testimony as is pertinent and material to
17	the dispute being considered by the Board, and shall
18	produce such additional evidence as the Board may deem
19	necessary to an understanding of the matter before it.
20	The Board shall be the sole judge of the
21	relevance and the materiality of the evidence offered.
22	The parties are instructed to assure that they
23	receive properly identified copies of each exhibit used
24	in this proceeding. You should retain these exhibits.
25	The Board will send the parties a copy of the court

1	reporter's transcript, along with our order, but will
2	not furnish copies of any exhibits or other
3	information.
4	As is typical in arbitration proceedings, this
5	hearing will be conducted in an informal manner. The
6	Board is not required to apply a legalistic approach or
7	strictly apply the rules of evidence used in civil
8	court proceedings.
9	We are primarily looking for the information
10	regarding the facts and the contract provisions that
11	apply to this case.
12	The order of proceeding will be for the claimant
13	to present their claim and then for the respondent to
14	offer rebuttal. Either party may interrupt to bring
15	out a pertinent point by coming through the Chairman.
16	And as I said before, for the sake of the court
17	reporter and for all of us, please just raise your hand
18	and I will recognize you and get you through there.
19	We have no attorneys here today. We will go from
20	there.
21	Bob, are you or I'm going to start off.
22	MR. GRAHAM: If we could start with the asphalt
23	thickness issue. It's a separate, smaller discussion,
24	I would assume.
25	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: For everybody's information,

1	that's listed in our package as item number 3-2001.
2	MR. GRAHAM: Just as a brief overview of the
3	issues, when we bid this project, we were working on
4	the adjacent projects both to the north and the south
5	of this particular project. We are the prime
6	contractor on both of those projects.
7	This project called for a complete four laning
8	and rebuilding of existing two-lane roads, which would
9	entail the milling out of the existing asphalt and
10	base.
11	We had similar conditions on both the north and
12	the south projects.
13	This particular work activity would be paid for
14	under clearing and grubbing.
15	We are to assume at bid time how much work effort
16	that would require to include that in a lump sum.
17	There wasn't a separate milling pay item that we
18	sometimes see on milling and resurfacing jobs.
19	On the adjacent projects, we were in the
20	construction and found the existing roadway thickness
21	to vary between three and three and a half inches.
22	When we started milling this project and using
23	the data that the CEI inspectors generated, the average
24	thickness varied from 4.75 to 5.33.
25	The problems that that causes is when we

1	subcontract to the milling subcontractor, he charges a
2	flat rate to mill a certain thickness. If it exceeds
3	that rate or he has to make a second pass with his
4	milling machine, which is the case when it's over four
5	inches thick, he charges us additional monies.
6	So, the basis of the claim is strictly a
7	difference in site conditions than what we had
8	anticipated. We are only trying to recover costs
9	associated with the extra milling.
10	The total milling bills on the project were in
11	excess of \$32,000. The milling costs that we are
12	seeking compensation for is only \$3500.
13	So, the rest of the claim consists of our MOT
14	activities and supervisions associated with the extra
15	time involved with that particular operation and the
16	loading and disposal of the milled material.
17	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Do you have anything else,
18	Bob?
19	MR. GRAHAM: That's all.
20	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Who is going to reply for the
21	Department?
22	MR. SANCHEZ: I will go ahead and start. The
23	Department's contention is this corridor is pretty well
24	aged. Without a doubt it's experienced resurfacing
25	over the years

You heard Bob say that his bid assumption was based on what he experienced on the jobs prior to this particular project. We contend that that bid assumption, that's his risk. Whenever they make bid assumptions, the contractor can sometimes benefit from the assumptions.

It's our contention that the two earlier 41 projects, they were in a position to make a reasonable bid assumption, and we believe that three inches would have been a reasonable bid assumption. So, therefore, they most likely would have benefited on the other two projects.

In turn, coming to this project and the -- you will see the average thicknesses range from roughly four and three-quarters to around 5.3. There's a fine line there as to what can be determined as reasonable.

That range thickness for a corridor, as old as this particular corridor, we didn't think the -- it would be extremely unreasonable.

### CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Anything else?

MR. McKISHNIE: To add on that just for a second, considering the plans did not indicate a specified thickness, and like Marty said, it was likely to have been resurfaced at some point in its history.

We didn't feel that, you know, rather than

arguing reasonableness of the bid or not, we didn't
feel the conditions that we encountered were a change
in site condition. We felt that what we experienced
could have reasonably been assumed, if in this case it
wasn't -- that wasn't the assumption used at bid.
Rather than discuss or argue whether it was reasonable
or not, there were some risks associated with that
fairly low number.

The Department's position is that it's not reasonable for us to be anticipated to take the burden of every bit of removal over and above that three and a half inches, especially when the overall average — there doesn't seem to be a dispute in what the actual thickness was. It's in the range of five inches or less when averaging the whole thing.

CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: How about the jobs on either side of them that was open and available for them to inspect and see what was there? How does the average in those compare?

MR. McKISHNIE: I don't know that we have data to show the average. Cone and Graham has made the statement that it's in the range of three or three and a half. I don't know that we have any data to show it was in that range or not.

CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Was there any information in

1	the plans that would indicate how much was there?
2	MR. McKISHNIE: On this job?
3	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Yes, on this job.
4	MR. McKISHNIE: No.
5	MR. GRAHAM: We do know that there is a precedent
6	of the Department paying for extra thickness asphalt to
7	be milled because we received a supplemental agreement
8	on the job adjacent to this one on the north side.
9	So, I guess it becomes an argument at what point
10	is it too thick and the contractor should not assume
11	all the costs associated with that.
12	While this thickness is not extraordinarily above
13	the average that we had anticipated, when you talk
14	about the full length of the project and the magnitude
15	of the milling required to take this additional paving
16	out, it becomes a pretty big cost for us.
17	In regards to anticipating resurfacing an
18	existing road, I wouldn't dispute that, but normally we
19	would see in a typical urban-type area that has curb
20	and gutter on each side of it, you are not going to go
21	out there and resurface the top of it without lowering
22	the grade of the existing road because then you are
23	going to have a drainage problem between the curb
24	lines. You are not going to plaster on two inches on
25	top of what is there and continue to raise the

1	thickness of the asphalt.
2	We've not found that to be the case in jobs of
3	this nature.
4	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: You are saying this road did
5	not have curb and gutter at the time you started?
6	MR. GRAHAM: There were portions that had curb
7	and gutter, which would lead me to believe that
8	suddenly you would not put another two inches on top of
9	that because it would mess up the drainage.
10	MR. ROEBUCK: Did you notify the Department about
11	any claim pending over this extra thickness? Did you
12	put them on notice?
13	MR. WINTHROP: Yes, we put them on notice.
14	MR. McKISHNIE: If I might speak to that. There
15	were some sections with curb and gutter, I think
16	primarily around the various intersections, but the
17	bulk of the job, if my recollection is correct was
18	rural typically and no curb and gutter.
19	In the essay that was included earlier on was
20	different than this scenario because it's my
21	understanding that what is included on that essay
22	document is the plans included a thickness of four
23	inches of asphalt and they encountered 25 inches.
24	That's an area where we specified a thickness of

25

four and it actually came out to be 25 inches. We

1	agreed that is a change in site conditions but it's
2	different than this case.
3	MR. SIMMONS: The typical section, did it include
4	X depth milling or did it basically say get all the
5	asphalt up.
6	MR. SANCHEZ: Reconstruction.
7	MR. SIMMONS: You are milling all the asphalt up,
8	putting new structural and friction course down?
9	MR. McKISHNIE: Did not specify milling.
10	MR. SANCHEZ: Just total reconstruction.
11	MR. CARUSO: I would like to address the
12	referenced claim to the project to the north, what we
13	were speaking about.
14	The supplemental agreement, the intent of that
15	supplemental agreement, although the quantity was large
16	in that particular area, the intent of that
17	supplemental agreement was to compensate the contractor
18	for what we had considered to be above an average of
19	what to be expected for asphalt on the roadway.
20	In that supplemental agreement, if you read it,
21	the Department determined that anything in excess of,
22	say, four inches would be unreasonable for a contractor
23	to consider that in bidding the job, especially for
24	milling, because it would require second pass milling
25	operations and other associated costs.

1	That was the large part of getting that
2	supplemental agreement approved in the Department,
3	establishing a baseline.
4	MR. SIMMONS: Was that supplemental going on
5	while this was going on?
6	MR. CARUSO: Two separate projects.
7	MR. SIMMONS: I understand that, but time
8	frame-wise had you already processed that before this
9	job was bid? What is the time frame related to the
10	two?
11	MR. McKISHNIE: It was executed in August of
12	1998.
13	MR. SIMMONS: The supplemental on the job?
14	MR. McKISHNIE: Yes.
15	MR. CARUSO: As part of an overrun essay on that
16	job. The 1998 frame is when it actually went to
17	compensate the contractor to settle a variety of
18	issues.
19	MR. SIMMONS: So, actually, that supplemental was
20	done after this one was initiated?
21	MR. WINTHROP: It was processed after, but
22	I think the impact was during 1997, concurrently with
23	the other projects.
24	MR. SIMMONS: Okay. Help me to understand.
25	I know the milling itself is only, as Bob was saying,

CATHERINE WILKINSON & ASSOCIATES (904) 224-0127

Ţ	3500 of so of this total.
2	The milling by the invoices that were part of the
3	package here, what was had he just been milling up
4	to the three and a half expected? What was his bid?
5	MR. GRAHAM: Sixty cents.
6	MR. SIMMONS: Then the next one shows when he
7	went to four inches it went to 69. Is that the way
8	I read that?
9	MR. GRAHAM: Correct. So we just charged the
10	nine cents. There wasn't any charge on this first one
11	for the 60 cents.
12	MR. SIMMONS: The next one is that when he went
13	below four inches, is that when he went to the 90
14	cents?
15	MR. GRAHAM: It was more than four inches thick.
16	MR. SIMMONS: Most of the rest of the costs was
17	in the maintenance of traffic you said, Bob?
18	MR. GRAHAM: That's correct, Freddie. There's
19	also some dump truck costs associated with it.
20	MR. WINTHROP: This job was phased where when we
21	switched traffic we would have to bring the millers in
22	to remove the old asphalt and then we could begin our
23	remaining storm drainage utilities, to begin roadway
24	reconstruction after this was done.
25	If it required a second pass, there was

1	additional time in trucking and handling materials out
2	there. Sometimes there is a market value for the
3	milled material. In this case there wasn't a market.
4	Our paver did not want the material, and we had to
5	stockpile it behind pond three.
6	In part of our punch list at the end of the job
7	was the removal of this sizable stockpile of milled
8	material. We had to haul it up to adjacent projects.
9	We tried to sell as much as we could during the life of
10	the project but were unable to do so.
11	We had some double and triple handling in this
12	additional material.
13	MR. SANCHEZ: From the Department's perspective,
14	we are again reiterating our view that a three-inch
15	thickness assumption for this corridor in the rural
16	section it wasn't an urban section isn't
17	reasonable.
18	You heard Tony talk about pavement thickness
19	represented in jobs adjacent. Well, that pavement
20	thickness was four inches, which is an inch more than
21	what Cone and Graham alleges their argument is based
22	on.
23	If I might add, too, as far as the impacts go,

24

25

and the costs submitted to the Board for consideration,

there's direct costs that Bob discussed, MOT issues,

hauling, and millers, et cetera.

In addition -- and this issue might extend to the other issue that we discussed -- Cone and Graham is requesting four days for extended home and field office overhead.

Again, that's a cost issue that we don't see -you've probably read in our rebuttal, this contract
finished on time, so because the contract finished on
time, we have difficulty in understanding how there is
an extended presence on the project as submitted.

We have two views we are attacking. We don't think a three-inch pavement thickness judgment on this project is reasonable.

And second, in their quantum presentation they include costs for an extended field presence when the contract finished within approved contract time. And Cone and Graham was provided payment for all time extensions related -- unrelated to this issue that the Department executed.

MR. WINTHROP: We feel we would have finished the contract earlier than our completion date without the additional milling. These were bottleneck areas where the traffic essentially came to a halt while we switched traffic and removed this material so we could begin the crunch of our work. We felt we would have

finished at least four days earlier.

Also, with the additional payment beyond the original contract time, those issues were separate. I don't believe there is any language in global settlement in any of those agreements or issues besides the ones specifically discussed in those supplemental agreements. We are not aware of any on the table. That's not our understanding.

We reserved our right, even at the time we signed and settled those agreements to pursue those other issues. That was understood.

MR. McKISHNIE: What was not understood is that if the job finished within allowable contract time, there may have been a contention that the job could have finished earlier. That didn't happen. You would think the appropriate claim mechanism would be a cost for some sort of acceleration.

What efforts did they undertake that were over and above what they reasonably anticipated that allowed them to get back on target?

In this case, you know, we don't know whether it had the four-day impact, but we did not see any evidence of acceleration and don't know that the overhead costs really apply to this when they finished on time, allowable time.

MR. CARUSO: To add to that, please, going back to the actual thickness, I would like to do that and pose a question.

What would be considered unusual or -- unusual thickness without any notes in the plans, without any typical sections or reference to, or historical data of resurfacing projects? What would that cut-off be? If not three, if not four, would it be five? How would you determine that? That was the intent of the other essay.

MR. WINTHROP: We felt with what was being reconstructed, I believe, was three and a half inches of structural with half inch of friction. I might be wrong, but that's my recollection of this project.

With this lump-sum item, I don't think the

Department has written in the specs or wants

contractors to bid worst case scenarios. We felt three

to four inches was a reasonable assumption. That's

what we were replacing.

It took quite a few cores to determine the actual average thicknesses over the project. That is not reasonable for us to do prior to bid under traffic conditions to perform those kind of cores to get a ballpark.

So, I guess it comes down to why do we have the

1	differing site conditions clause in the specifications?
2	We feel this is a type two scenario where the
3	information was not provided and the change or the
4	additional depth constitutes is differing material
5	in kind and affecting our costs. That's what we've
6	tried to show as direct costs and delays to the job
7	because of the additional thicknesses.
8	MR. SANCHEZ: The site is an old corridor being
9	resurfaced. The three-inch assumption we don't
10	consider falls into the category of a different site.
11	MR. McKISHNIE: It could be considered
12	reasonable, but there's a risky assumption you pretty
13	much know there's not going to be less than that. You
14	are basically assuming a very bare bones thickness from
15	the get-go.
16	To tack on to what Tony said as far as a
17	definition, I would agree that the other essay that we
18	have, and I don't know that it's an exhibit. It's a
19	case of differing site conditions.
20	We identified four inches. We encountered 25
21	inches. The essay is written in that way.
22	We agree that essay constitutes a differing site,
23	but we do not see that an average thickness of less
24	than five inches on a rural typical is a change in site
25	conditions.

1	MR. SIMMONS: was the other essay related to
2	having to get 25 inches out?
3	MR. WINTHROP: Yes.
4	MR. CARUSO: And costs associated with multiple
5	passes.
6	MR. WINTHROP: Even though the thicknesses are
7	quite different, the cost ball parks for both essays
8	are quite similar. I believe that was in the \$25,000
9	range, this one was in the \$35,000 range. It's
10	probably a similar amount of asphalt if you can
11	imagine, but one spread out over a large area, one is
12	in an isolated area.
13	From our perspective a smaller thickness increase
14	over a larger area is a greater impact than an isolated
15	area.
16	MR. SIMMONS: In the plans themselves we didn't
17	show a thickness?
18	MR. SANCHEZ: No.
19	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: I'd like to address the issue
20	of stockpiling material for maintenance, maintenance of
21	traffic on pond two.
22	That material was used for driveway maintenance,
23	material which they were paid for as a separate pay
24	item, a lot of that material they were paid for.
25	I think that was their decision. I understood at

1	the time that was Cone and Graham's decision to
2	stockpile that material for that purpose, not as to
3	help out their miller and having too much material.
4	MR. GRAHAM: Jerry, would you agree that there
5	was excess material at the end of the job that had to
6	be hauled off?
7	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: That's a judgment, how much did
8	you stockpile versus how much were you going to use.
9	At the end of the job there was a small pile there,
10	yes.
11	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Do you have any other
12	questions?
13	MR. SIMMONS: No.
14	MR. ROEBUCK: No.
15	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Marty, do you have anything
16	else you want to add?
17	MR. SANCHEZ: No.
18	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Okay. Bob?
19	MR. GRAHAM: No.
20	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Okay, Okay, Mr. Contractor,
21	you have completed your presentation. Mr. Sanchez for
22	the Department has completed his rebuttal. Mr. Simmons
23	doesn't have any further questions, Mr. Roebuck doesn't
24	have any further questions.
25	The hearing is hereby closed. This Board will

	mood and deliberate on this over the next 30 days, and
2	usually we it says six weeks in here, but we try to
3	get them done as quickly as possible.
4	Sometimes we try to deliberate a little bit the
5	day of the hearing. I don't know whether that will
6	take place today because we have a full schedule. We
7	will have another hearing in approximately six weeks,
8	and at that time we will deliberate if we haven't done
9	it already.
10	So with that we will close this hearing and we
11	will open the hearing.
12	Ms. Wilkinson, will you please note in the next
13	hearing that everybody has been sworn in. We will
14	continue. There's no sense in me reading this whole
15	paraphernalia again.
16	All right, the next one is relating to utility
17	delays on Florida Avenue, and Mr. Contractor first
18	is there any information on that project that needs to
19	be submitted?
20	MR. WINTHROP: I have several aerial photographs.
21	I do not have them as copies. They are individual
22	photographs. I'm wondering if I can pass these around
23	to make a couple of simple points.
24	They are not that detailed unless anybody has an
25	objection to it. They were part of the monthly aerials

1	that were performed on the project.
2	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Okay. Supposing we do that,
3	and then I would ask you to have color copies made and
4	forwarded to the Board and I will distribute them as a
5	package.
6	MR. WINTHROP: Very well.
7	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Those photographs will be
8	Exhibit 2.
9	(Whereupon, Exhibit 2 was received in evidence.)
10	MR. ROEBUCK: We can look at them and then decide
11	if they are that relevant.
12	MR. SIMMONS: You can just do some kind of Xerox
13	color thing. You don't have to go get films.
14	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: They don't have to be prints
15	of them.
16	MR. WINTHROP: You may not find them necessary.
17	What I would like to do today is kind of talk
18	about how we began this project and worked up to the
19	point where
20	MR. ROEBUCK: Before you start, just one point of
21	policy here. These submittals, Marty, Cone had a lot
22	more than you did. You looked at theirs and do you
23	think this is going to cause you a misunderstanding of
24	something you are going to have to study more?
25	MR. SANCHEZ: There's a couple of things I hadn't

T	seen yet. You can go ahead and start talking. I will
2	be looking through it.
3	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: If you do, just let us know
4	and we will talk about it.
5	MR. WINTHROP: These submittals are not an
6	original analysis that was performed. They are either
7	party of our submittals to the Department some are
8	part of the partnering agreement that everybody
9	attended. Some are the DOT's internal scheduling
10	documents.
11	And then we have engineering dailies and minutes
12	from the utility meetings, documents that are already
13	in their possession and part of the record. I just
14	wanted to highlight some points from these documents.
15	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Just a minute, Chuck. This
16	stuff that you gave us okay, Ms. Wilkinson, these
17	need to be readdressed as not being part of the first
18	hearing.
19	The exhibit marked Exhibit 2, tentative work
20	schedule relates to job number 10020-3524.
21	MR. ROEBUCK: They both do. This is claim two of
22	a two-part claim issue two, of a two-part claim.
23	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: But these additional things,
24	am I correct, they go with the scheduling?
25	MR. WINTHROP: Yes. They don't have to do with

1	the milling claim. One is a contractor's score that
2	has to do with the TECO delay and the other one is a
3	MR. SIMMONS: The correct number is 2-2001. The
4	last one was 3-2001.
5	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Go ahead. Apologize for the
6	interruption.
7	MR. WINTHROP: I'd like to talk about how we
8	began this project and began the work up to the point
9	where we feel we were impacted, will talk a little bit
10	about the nature of the impacts and then talk about
11	some of the residual effects of these impacts beyond
12	the date when they were resolved and we began working
13	the areas of impacts.
14	I will begin with these photographs. This first
15	photograph is an aerial dated from April of '96. This
16	was the the contract started July 6, so this was a
17	few months prior to us beginning work.
18	It shows TECO working at the north end of the
19	project installing a series of 85-foot concrete steel
20	reinforced poles, installing their line of new poles at
21	the north end of the project.
22	MR. ROEBUCK: Transmission poles.
23	MR. WINTHROP: These photographs are dated June,
24	July and September. They show much of the same areas.
25	They all indicate the same point is TECO was installing

new strain poles from the north end of the project working to the south.

We were working on an adjacent project, and some of their relocation work on the north end of the job had to do with the north adjacent project, but they did continue well into the new project areas.

We were concerned about this because the traffic control plans specifically show work beginning from the south end of the project out of pond one and pond two to activate the drainage systems for the new roadway. That's where we planned on essentially beginning most of our work, along with utility work under the JPA contract.

So in an effort -- we noticed this was a potential problem. In an effort to mitigate this problem beyond any requirement by the contract -- and this is an unusual nature -- we met with some of the representatives from TECO, Ms. McGehee and Sam Bregacy with Transmission, and Matt Gulch with distribution with TECO on June 6 in an effort to tell them if they can shift their forces to the south so that it would complement our efforts when this project began.

They at the meeting didn't indicate that this would be a problem, and did make some efforts to shift their forces to Fletcher Avenue at the very south end

1 of the project and work up to 138th Street. looked like we were going to be okay with their 2 3 relocation schedule. We also noticed in the contract plans that GTE 4 was phased in phase one they were supposed to begin --5 their first phase was indicated on the north end of the 6 7 project. Phase four and five was the south end of the project. 8 We discussed this problem with Jack Ellis with 9 GTE, and told him we would begin installing their new 10 conduit system on the south end of the project, which 11 12 would be phase four, would that be a problem. And he didn't have a problem with us beginning 13 phase four instead of phase one as stipulated under the 14 relocation schedule. 15 16 So these two efforts were in order to mitigate 17 this conflict that was inherent to the contract 18 documents. 19 As such, we attended the preconstruction conference. We submitted a tentative work schedule. 20 21 That's page one of submittal number two. 22 We specifically discussed clearing and grubbing of the pond sites and excavation of the ponds, and then 23

proceeded with installation of the necessary drainage

24

25

structures.

If you go to page two, these are copies of the traffic control plans. And under phase one they specifically call for installation, clearing and grubbing of the ponds and installation, grading of the ponds, installation of associated control structures.

In phase 1-D, they specifically call for group three, a series of structures to be installed in phase one, in order, prior to beginning phase two.

Now on the south end of the project, the road was going to be lowered and curb and gutter was going to be installed. These systems had to be active in order to accept flow from the construction area and the new pavement areas.

Now we've been in a drought condition for a couple of years, but at the time of this project, if this had not been done -- and by the summer of '97 we got into some significant El Nino impacts. These ponds in my recollection were at their hundred year levels.

They were flowing into the out-falls during much of this rain activity, and the areas that we had bulkheaded up and not activated became seriously flooded.

We spent a lot of nights and weekends out there busting out bulkheads in order to activate as much of the drainage system that was installed on a piecemeal

1	basis in order to alleviate flooding on the project.
2	There was also some private property that was
3	flooded. It was an ongoing problem.
4	It was necessary that we start with these
5	structures and maintain flow into these ponds. It was
6	critical for this project.
7	Now looking at a page from the Tampa Electric
8	Company, they have immediately after clearing and
9	grubbing, they have 110 days listed. In item three
10	during drainage they have five days listed.
11	We made an assumption in our schedule and in our
12	planned operation that we could work and install these
13	initial drainage structures and associated runs, trunk
14	lines, to these separate systems concurrently with the
15	planned utility work.
16	There's nothing in the TECO relocation schedule
17	that we can discern or figure out when they are going
18	to be moving specific poles or specific line of poles
19	or that there is a transmission or distribution,
20	separate schedule.
21	We didn't have much to go on, so we made the
22	assumption that we could begin this work and work
23	concurrently with this non-JPA agency.
24	If you look at the estimate of contract time that
25	the Department came up with, it looks like they made

the same assumption we did. They have 110 days in TECO utilities planned concurrently with phase one work and phase two work, and they have flow in their schedule for TECO.

I know that's not part of the contract document, but what I'm trying to say is that we made the only assumption we could, that we would be able to begin work and that our schedule would dictate how everybody else worked on the project.

Our schedule would mandate and trump any other vague relocation schedule, and they would coordinate and work with us as we were following the traffic control plans.

We weren't making up or creating a different type of approach to this job. We promised to follow the traffic control plans, and we did to the best of our ability.

Now a big contention of Marty's rebuttal is the fact that we didn't turn in a CPM as dictated in the contract documents, and that impacted how everybody worked out there.

There was some lack of knowledge that people didn't know or the other utility agencies didn't know, and the Department didn't know where we would be working.

I'd like to refer you to the -- this job was a partnering job. We did attend -- I don't think Marty attended and I don't think TECO attended. Brian was there. It was a pretty good partnering meeting.

Part of that meeting was to talk, discuss the schedule and the submittal date. Part of this action plan at the partnering agreement -- it's not binding, but we all talked about submitting it by August 16.

Our initial submittal -- Paul Landrum was our scheduler at that time. We essentially met that date. The Department did not approve that particular schedule. They wanted some cost loading to be performed and some other minor adjustments to the schedule that would meet the specification, but the information in the schedule was certainly submitted.

It was no surprise to the Department that it was on August 16. That was agreed upon and understood by all parties at the partnering meeting. So, we didn't really have a CPM to talk about up to the 16th.

We began work. We submitted controlling item work sheets every two weeks at -- or every week at the utility progress meetings. We submitted them to the Department. They signed and approved them.

I've got the sheet dated the 26th of August where we turned in a two-week look-ahead where we are going

to be installing -- planned to install 50 four-inch 1 We specifically delineate the structures we are 2 3 planning on working to. This is August 26. This is signed and approved by the project engineer. 4 Again, it's no mystery to anybody where we are 5 going to be working and what we are going to be doing. 6 7 We came out of pond one, installed the drainage line to pond one, established our trunk lines, then 8 went to pond two and began working out of there. 9 10 That's where we ran into our problems. There are a number of mechanisms we used to keep 11 12 everybody in the loop, provide them with information 13 and a planned sequence of activities that we were planning on doing. 14 15 There's no record from the Department in response that we were making a gross error in judgment or we 16 17 made an incorrect assumption or warning us not to 18 proceed in this manner because it would have been 19 fruitless. 20 We worked up to literally a point where we could not install the structure because of a TECO pole being 21 22 in conflict with it. 23

We had decided on this job, because of the condensed nature of the 540-day contract time and the number of utilities present on the job, to go with

24

25

precast structures to ease and speed installation.

I have a small drawing on here. It's kind of light because of the copy machine, but it shows a typical area where you have -- and this is to scale -- where you have a TECO pole, a fairly large drainage structure, and then you have some other utilities that must go in after you put in the drainage.

Drainage is the deepest on here. It controls the entire project. It's critical to get the trunk lines in so you can put in additional GTE conduit, water or force main because it's a joint trench.

You have to put in the deepest first or you are going to be fighting this stuff falling in on you and you have to use additional sheeting. It really slows production if you don't work from the bottom up.

Now, initially in the project we felt that TECO was doing a fairly good job of installing the new poles. Transmission seemed to be doing an excellent job. They had managed to get most of the poles in prior to the start of the project, and I believe they finished all of the pole installation sometime in early or mid August.

In our experience that is the majority of work and effort they have to do is installing the new poles. They had then transferred and energized all their

transmission lines. We felt they were in the home stretch.

It was up to distribution. They didn't have to install new poles, they merely had to transfer their lines over. And specifically from about 138th Street up to Bearss Avenue on the east side of the road, that was our planned phase two construction of the roadway. We felt it would not take an enormous amount of time for them to just transfer their lines over.

On other projects Florida Power, in order to mitigate some of the impact, I know on our State Road 54 project they have elected to install new lines on the poles instead of relocating the lines. It saves time. Then they salvage the lines on there.

There are a number of things utility agencies can do to speed things along.

What we did not anticipate was the late start of the distribution agency on bringing crews in to relocate this work. I think I have this in my correspondence, but I'd like to highlight some of the -- some of the notes from the utility conferences.

Again, if you read the utility conference information, we talk in utility conferences about the storm drainage we are planning on doing and where we are going to be working. Everybody was there. There

was no objections, there was no mystery to anybody.

Then we look at some of the -- from the second meeting we look at the transmission department -- I'm sorry, the distribution Department. They report on August 6 that work is expected to begin next week starting at the south end of the project working north, and no problems are anticipated at this time. We expect them to be out there the following week.

MR. ROEBUCK: What page?

MR. WINTHROP: I don't have the pages numbered, but if you look at the back of the document, we are at the second utility conference dated August 6, 1996.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay.

MR. WINTHROP: Sorry about that. Again, on the first page we talk about continuing storm sewage construction, exiting pond one, which we had stated under our work plans and we stated at the preconstruction conference.

Our response back from the distribution department is they are going to get out there and start work next week. Although I felt they could have begun work earlier, they didn't. They didn't anticipate any problems at this time.

Now, if we go to the third utility conference where Cone and Graham is discussing storm sewer

1 installation out of pond two, which is where this set 2 of drainage structures is where we encountered our 3 problems, and this is August 20. Distribution did not attend the meeting. 4 has not begun. Work crew did not begin work this past 5 6 week as expected. 7 So, the Department is a little perplexed on why 8 they are not starting. We are certainly concerned. We 9 continue to proceed with our work. 10 Now I jump to the sixth utility conference 11 meeting. This is October 1. 12 We have already been impacted and we've shifted 13 up to pond three because we can't finish our drainage 14 in pond two. 15 There we see Tampa Electric has finally got two 16 work crews on the project to perform their work. 17 unfortunate that they did not really mobilize two work 18 crews until these problems arose. I felt that if they 19 had begun two work crews back in August as was planned, 20 we might have avoided a lot of these impacts. 21 At this point in the project everybody spent a

At this point in the project everybody spent a lot of time doing walk-throughs. We worked up to a particular structure. There was a conflict with a pole. We could not work on our trunk line that headed north along Florida Avenue on the east side.

22

23

24

And for a while we did, as part of our original claims package, we jumped around and put in some side drainage, although we had an oversize crew.

We didn't have structures on site because the precasting schedule then got all disoriented and

precasting schedule then got all disoriented and buggered up. We had to work with what structures were on site.

A lot of these were piecemeal. We didn't have

A lot of these were piecemeal. We didn't have complete systems on site as planned. We did a lot of jumping around, had a lot of inefficiencies with our pipe crew working until this problem was resolved.

I'd like to go to the ninth utility conference.

This is November 12. Again, we look at the distribution department. They reported that one crew is working on the project. The second crew is working on the north end of the project working south.

They -- this is one of the few times they do give us feedback on the progress. They say, well, we expect completion of the work in approximately two months. They didn't make two months. It was mid or late February before they finished their work. That's erroneous information that we're working on.

Then I go jump to the twelfth utility conference on December 31 and go to distribution. They didn't attend. And Duluth Caprin notes, there's been no

1 activity in the past three weeks.

This was a problem with the distribution department. They had other problems. I think there might have been a storm in another part of the country that demanded their crews, but they were in and out of the project, didn't have a continuous effort on the project to perform their work.

This impacted our work, which was continuous and dependent upon coordination with this agency.

Now, how did it impact the job? Marty stated in part of his letter that the phase one traffic switch happened ahead of our schedule.

Now, I'd like to talk about what the phase one traffic shift entailed. That was a lot of temporary asphalt wedges that we placed and then shifted people onto these widening areas to free up some areas where we could perform permanent roadway construction.

I agreed that the phase one shift happened on or around our original baseline that was submitted, or if not a week earlier.

Where we really got impacted was we didn't have the trunk line, enough progress on the trunk line. It impacted the phase two shift, meaning we got a two-month window where we were fairly well impacted with our pipe crews. We were counting on them to be

far enough ahead.

The storm drainage installation was almost the slowest start of our roadway construction efforts. We now had areas that we were behind with storm drainage and we couldn't apply grade crews and roadway crews to begin roadway construction or -- and we had to piecemeal a lot of utility work. We were behind the eight ball with our new roadway construction.

If you look at our baseline schedule, our phase two to phase three shift where we are putting people on newly constructed road was supposed to happen somewhere in late March. We didn't begin to perform this traffic shift until the mid or late May. We didn't complete that traffic shift until the summer.

What we had to do is piecemeal the traffic shifts. That was one of the mechanisms we used to mitigate the delay.

Now if everybody can -- again, I apologize for the haphazard nature, but if everybody can find the engineer weekly summary dated 12-29-96, TECO is essentially managing to get the poles out of our way in the areas that were critical, but we are feeling the full impact of not being able to perform our planned work.

I will call attention to the cash flow job

1	progress which shows 24.2 percent completion. The
2	elapsed time is 31.2.
3	MR. ROEBUCK: I'm lost.
4	MR. WINTHROP: Engineer's weekly summary.
5	MR. SIMMONS: It's about halfway in the middle
6	there. Look down close to the bottom left-hand corner
7	where it says week ending 12-29-96.
8	(Brief pause)
9	MR. ROEBUCK: Okay. Make your point.
10	MR. WINTHROP: Essentially it's showing us behind
11	schedule. The money is at 24 percent; the elapsed time
12	is at 31 percent and the CPM had planned a cash flow
13	showing 39 percent.
14	I believe it was then in January that we were
15	issued a letter by the CEI that we are approaching our
16	delinquent status and we are being threatened with
17	delinquency. They don't recognize the delay issue.
18	They don't wish to resolve it.
19	And so at this point with the delinquency hanging
20	over our shoulder, we have to catch back up.
21	The next page is dated May 18, '97. The cash
22	flow is at 55. The elapsed time is at 56. The
23	progress schedule shows 63 percent.
24	We have essentially caught up with time versus
25	money. I believe it was July of this year where the

Department then accepted -- once we had caught back up and mitigated the impacts to the schedule, they then accepted that schedule as a revised baseline schedule.

This delay is pretty much bracketed by the beginning of the project in July or August of 1997.

We then get into some El Nino impacts which delay the project again. That's what I would like to show on the following page, 6-22-97 and the following page, 8-10-97 you can find that we slip again behind schedule.

But there are some notes in those two summaries about the amount of rainfall we are beginning to experience on the project, which are reaching record events. Those are not concurrent delays. They are really separate issues. They are bracketed by separate time frames.

The proof is in the pudding. We were behind schedule. We were threatened with delinquency. We did a lot of things to catch up with the cost curve, which is difficult to do on a project of this nature.

What kinds of things did we do? Again, we split up where they have global traffic switches for the entire length of the project that were planned under the original traffic control plans. We had to break these up into areas that became available.

On the south end of the job, on the west side of the road there was a line of GTE poles that impacted our work. We couldn't shift traffic there because the conduit got behind, because the storm drainage was not in.

Between 138th and Bearss, we were able to build a small part of the road and to shift folks onto that part of the road when it was complete.

We had to do many, many traffic shifts, and we were not compensated under the lump sum MOT item for this additional work which involves more people and more effort to do smaller switches versus larger ones. We had restricted areas of working.

We noted that in our original claim. We talked about if we don't resolve this issue we are going to have to accelerate the contract, accelerate our work forces to catch up.

The reply from the Department is they don't see any evidence of it and don't agree and this is our fault. We also noted it on just about every CPM submittal during this time frame of some of the efforts we were having to do to mitigate these delays, but it fell on deaf ears.

Some of the other costs were additional crossings for some of the storm drainage stub-outs, which we

should have been able to leave stubbed out but we 1 2 crossed in order to find areas for pipe crews to work. We also gave up a lot of joint trenching areas 3 because the utilities, the stuff had to go in as soon 4 as possible. The storm drainage had to wait. 5 6 We either had to fight utilities that were above the drainage line or had to come back and put in 7 utilities after we had gotten piecemeal drainage in 8 because we were trying to find areas for our crews to 9 10 work. We didn't shut the job down. We tried to keep 11 everybody active. That makes for a much more confusing 12 delay claim because we are out there working, doing 13 14 some work. 15 In our opinion it wasn't on the areas we had 16 planned to and it wasn't on trunk line work, which 17 affected subsequent efforts. That pretty much wraps up my presentation. 18 19 I might have missed one or two things, but I've spoken 20 long enough. I will give the floor to my buddy, Marty. (Brief pause) 21 22 MR. SANCHEZ: I think one of the underlying 23 issues that we have to discuss and talk about, and probably the problem here is, as Tug mentioned, their 24

operations, they assumed that they could trump, using

1	their words, any other contractor utility or whomever
2	else is within the project limits.
3	That's the root cause from the Department's view.
4	That's where we disagree. The Department had
5	contemplated and TECO had contemplated the fact that
6	they are going to be on the job a certain number of
7	days while Cone and Graham is working.
8	I look at the DOT estimate, and I might have
9	missed that, but I don't see drainage happening
10	concurrently with the Department's estimate of how long
11	TECO was going to be on board.
12	If so, if it is shown concurrently, there is no
13	inherent assumption from the DOT standpoint that the
14	contractor is not going to be impacted.
15	The power pole relocation, especially in this
16	instance, as Tug was saying, was substantial,
17	transmission and distribution.
18	I would like to add, too, to that relocation
19	scenario that there were, I think, two joint users,
20	Time Warner
21	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: Time Warner and GTE.
22	MR. SANCHEZ: Were joint users of the TECO poles.
23	It's not merely an act of one agency getting out of the
24	way. There were several agencies and some coordination
25	on our part to make sure they are moved out of the way

as quickly as possible.

But, again, that's something for the contractor to consider when they are bidding a job.

Let me make one other point, too. Tug mentioned some El Nino issues. I apologize. I didn't expect to have to address that, but there is an essay for El Nino issues on this project that occurred. Bryan tells me it's around \$140,000.

And the Department felt, okay, El Nino is an extensive circumstance. Any efforts related to what they had to do as far as recovery or mitigating on the bulkheads, et cetera, they've been compensated.

MR. WINTHROP: For point of clarity, none of our package has any effort to remove the bulkheads. We agree El Nino was fully compensated by the Department.

I was merely trying to make the point that we had no choice but to complete the drainage structures out of the ponds because they were required to take water off of the project. None of that is part of this package.

MR. SANCHEZ: One other thing as we go forth, the dollar amounts submitted by Cone and Graham, there are a lot of issues that Tug presented as far as what their crews had to do.

We would classify those as direct costs. In this

Claims package we have from Cone and Graham, the things
Tug is mentioning are quantified by their methods as
\$30,000 worth of work. This issue presented to the
Board is comprised of the \$30,000 worth of work that we
talked about.

Some of the things you might have interpreted from Tug. And second, we are back to the scenario where we discussed -- where Cone and Graham alleges, or their submission is presented under the context of extended home office, field office overhead of roughly -- what is the total amount? 110,115? It's in the six figures. I don't have the exact dollar amount.

In addition to interest on those funds --

MR. WINTHROP: It's 144,000.

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. 144,000.

So, the dollar value that we are debating and arguing here, number one, is approximately \$30,000 for direct costs, which is things that Tug probably just described to you, \$140,000 under the context of extended home and field office overhead and 50,000 for interest on those funds. Keep that in the back of our minds as we go on.

We feel the root cause here is something Tug
mentioned, the contractor has the right to trump, so to
speak, any other agency, utility agency, contractor, et

cetera, within their project limits. We disagree.

The existing power poles are laid out in the plan profiles in the sheets. Everyone knows they are going to be working at the same time that we are working out in the project.

This assumption they could trump someone we don't believe is reasonable by any means. Granted Tug may have mentioned GTE shows more detail than TECO shows.

Okay, we are still back to the point that TECO is going to be on the project.

In addition Tug mentioned some of the conversations he had with TECO, the transmission and distribution early on on the project. I need to add that we weren't privy to any of those discussions.

Jerry wasn't included in those discussions that may have occurred.

So as we go forth in some of the documentation, you will see -- we kind of set a backdrop to what the Department is thinking and what we are going to experience with TECO.

We go past the instruction area. We will go
to -- I didn't number my pages either, but it's Cone
and Graham's interpretation of the documents. It's
probably your first tab.

We've talked about TECO, the fact that we know

1	TECO is going to be working concurrently with Cone and
2	Graham. We get Cone and Graham's schedule submittal,
3	August 16.
4	In their narrative it's clear, without a doubt.
5	We've made the assumption that TECO will not be in our
6	way and, therefore, have not included their work in our
7	schedule.
8	But in the same paragraph, if that assumption is
9	wrong, we will adjust our schedule accordingly. Not we
10	are putting you on notice, we expect that they are to
11	be cleared and out of the way. We will not mitigate,
12	we will not adjust, we are going to send you a bill if
13	TECO is in the way. Nothing of that context.
14	It's our understanding that, indeed, they've
15	contemplated the documents they've read, or they
16	understand that TECO is going to be present.
17	Yes, it would be nice if TECO was wholeheartedly
18	a hundred percent out of the way. That's not the case.
19	They've made it clear that they will adjust if it
20	becomes an issue.
21	For this reason and other reasons I think we
22	agree to let them cost load in the second submittal.
23	I don't know if there were other logic issues that had
24	to be addressed, but we felt and the Department

responded back to them, and asked for a resubmittal.

1	Part of the basis for that resubmittal, if you
2	will turn back in that package there is an exempt from
3	the special provisions. Sorry to skip ahead a little
4	bit. It's just in front of right in front of your
5	third tab, probably two or three sheets in front of
6	your third tab. I think it's in front of that, Jack.
7	Part of the contractual basis for us asking that
8	they include a TECO presence on the job, it's clear in
9	the submittal of working schedule specifications.
10	I will read the paragraph starting with sufficient
11	liaison. It's probably at the bottom third of the
12	sheet.
13	"The schedule shall confirm to the utility
14	adjustment schedules included in the contract documents
15	unless changed by mutual agreement of the utility
16	company and the contractor and the Department."
17	There wasn't a TECO consideration in Cone and
18	Graham's baseline submittal.
19	That paragraph or that sentence also goes on to
20	read, "Unless there is some change in agreed to by
21	the contractor and the utility."

Cone and Graham's presentation includes extended field office, home office costs. And based on the previous issue we discussed, the discussion was had it

not been for a TECO issue they may have been out

1 earlier.

Well, that's hypothetical. That wasn't discussed. There wasn't an early completion scenario presented to the Department nor to TECO to consider, which is key considering the extent of the work that TECO is going to have to do. That's a significant work effort for them to relocate distribution lines, and considering the coordination needed for the joint users that are on board with TECO.

So, I emphasize the point that our frame of mind, Jerry's frame of mind, they are going to adjust if TECO becomes an issue. So, that's in the backdrop of some of the utility meeting conferences that Tug alluded to in his presentation.

Now, 30 days after their submittal, keep in mind again what we could be thinking based on their narrative. They submit their first claim. And this is a letter by Chuck Schwab, I think who was their general superintendent or project foreman on the job.

Thirty days later he's submitting a claim for TECO being in the way. Now, the fact that they submit a claim surprises us. We have this backdrop of them being willing to adjust their schedule. It's 30 days after they submit their claim -- excuse me, that they transfer their narrative, they provide a claim notice.

1	That's the reasonableness of that approach is
2	further doubtful when considering that, again, this
3	relocation effort is extensive, 30 days or I think
4	I might have said roughly 40 days into TECO's time
5	there's a claim against their performance or lack
6	thereof.
7	We don't think that's reasonable. Again, back to
8	who trumps whom.
9	As an attachment in that section I've highlighted
10	their schedule, narrative transmittal showing the
11	statements in Chuck's letter.
12	The coordination efforts that went into the
13	project. Tug talked about some of the earlier
14	discussions he had with TECO. Again, we can't testify
15	or attest to what was discussed. We weren't there.
16	We can add that the schedule submittal, again, we
17	are looking for that big picture of where we are going
18	to be working, where TECO needs to coordinate their
19	efforts. That's missing somewhat.
20	The second issue alludes to meetings that Cone
21	and Graham had with TECO in the utility conference
22	meetings.
23	In one of Tug's letters on September 3 excuse
24	me, in a February 14, 1997 letter, Cone and Graham is
25	going back through the project records.

He notes in a September 3 utility conference that
Cone and Graham notes a particular work area which in
their words this is the first official documented
notice detailing our intentions to install storm sewer
in an area with a known TECO electrical conflict. Two
weeks later we have a claim.
Again I'm going to harn on the same point. The

Again, I'm going to harp on the same point. The poles don't just jump out of the way. You don't install one pole adjacent to an existing pole and pull the old one. It doesn't work that way.

So, we think in their transmittal to the Board they felt that their efforts were exhaustive. We disagree. We don't think that a two-week notice based on their own interpretation of what transpired on the job is reasonable in any way.

And there's some other utility conference meeting minutes, one that Byron Tyler conducted asking for the contractor's schedule and a couple of Jerry's letters to Cone and Graham asking for their schedule. You had to ask twice for it.

MR. WINTHROP: Revised schedule. Our baseline schedule was submitted. You guys were asking for a revision at that point.

MR. SANCHEZ: No, we were asking for -- there was an original submittal. The Department had comments.

1	Before the comments back to Cone and Graham this is
2	the baseline submittal, nothing has been accepted we
3	asked for corrections, one of them being a TECO
4	consideration.
5	There are a couple of letters, Jerry's response
6	to Cone and Graham, response to their TECO alleged
7	delay, emphasizing that we wanted that schedule in hand
8	so that the parties could coordinate and get ahold of
9	what the big picture is going to be.
10	There's an excerpt from Cone and Graham's claim
11	where he reiterates on September 3 they give their
12	first notice of a known conflict with the TECO utility
13	pole. Two weeks later there is a claim package in
14	hand.
15	We started thinking about it. We started
16	thinking I'm sorry, we are on the third tab.
17	MR. GRAHAM: What is the heading of it?
18	MR. SANCHEZ: Effective TECO presence.
19	MR. ROEBUCK: Page before the third tab.
20	MR. SANCHEZ: Correct. Sorry about that. Okay.
21	What was the impact? Cone and Graham quantified
22	\$30,000 worth of work, direct work. That's labor and
23	equipment having to mitigate, having to adjust, having
24	to do things on the project.

That's the dollar amount submitted to the Board

for consideration for some of the things I assume that
Tug talked about, his crews having to do certain
things, oversight crews working on smaller pipe than
they would have liked. \$144,000 worth of extended
costs.

Now the point the Department is making is that this project finished within approved contract time. So there were adjustments.

The number I gathered was there were 86 days of weather. It did rain a lot during this project. There were El Nino -- there was El Nino compensation provided Cone and Graham.

Then there were 68 days of other issues unrelated to having anything to do with TECO. These issues by and large I think occurred -- there were a handful of them. They occurred probably after, for the most part, the TECO issues.

Cone and Graham reserved their right to pursue compensation for extended home office, field office, overhead costs for these 68 days. At the close of the job or after the close of the job, the Department sat down and negotiated extended costs for these 68 days with Cone and Graham for various issues, again unrelated to this TECO issue.

I think the dollar amount was around \$175,000.

I attached the backup documentation.

CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Let me ask you a question, please. Earlier you mentioned that there was a supplemental agreement in the amount of approximately 140,000 approximately for El Nino effect. That has nothing to do with what you are talking about now?

MR. SANCHEZ: That's correct. I think most of what we categorized, most of the work effort we categorized on El Nino were things that Tug described, having to fool with bulkheads and recovery efforts for washouts, not being able to work material when Cone and Graham would have liked, et cetera. And the Department determined that as reasonable and that's why we paid them.

MR. McKISHNIE: To back up a second, the original qualified acceptance letter had in the range of \$900,000 worth of outstanding issues after final acceptance that still needed to be resolved.

We have negotiated since that time until now all of those issues but two. The two remaining ones are the ones we are talking about today. El Nino and the 68 days that Marty is talking about of compensable time was part of that original letter.

MR. SANCHEZ: So, again, the job finished on time. How can we entertain a request for costs for

1	extended home office and field office overhead costs?
2	Their presence on the job either should have been bid
3	and considered when they were looking at the scope of
4	the work they had to do.
5	The extra stuff the Department placed on Cone and
6	Graham, that extended presence was paid. Time was
7	given for those issues.
8	We heard Tug mention had it not been for TECO or
9	this issue, they would have been out of the project.
10	I think the claim period is 56 days.
11	Number one
12	MR. WINTHROP: Is that by four?
13	MR. SANCHEZ: That's by four. I won't tell you
14	what a buck is really for. We disagree with that
15	contention. It's totally hypothetical.
16	Number one, for the Department to entertain that
17	scenario, we have to have the discussion in advance, at
18	precons, in early project meetings, and you have to
19	have an agreement with utilities that are involved on
20	the project.
21	Cone and Graham wants to pursue early completion.
22	We are going to do what we can. They want to knock off
23	30 days, try to knock off 45 days. We agree we are
24	going to adjust, we've got to work with them.
25	That's a discussion that needs to happen very

early on. It didn't happen in this project. There
never was an early completion schedule. That's -- as
far as with the Department accepting schedules, that's
a very important point that we want to stress in
consideration of the fact that they were pursuing some
type of early completion.

Let's say the drainage went fine and they were able to finish all their drainage activities on time. Well, we still had a significant utility that was still going to be present that would have ultimately conflicted with curb work, other flat work, some road base operations, et cetera.

So, with these exceptional efforts to accelerate, there was still going to be a utility on board contractually. They were still going to be on board and within the project doing their work.

Now we are fine. I think there was some agreement, you might have had some discussions with GTE to say this is what we want to do, can you help us out. I think there was agreement. There was not that discussion with TECO.

We want to get out of the way, finish our work really, really fast, can you cut down your 180 days, be out in 120 days. That didn't happen. That's key when we discuss the early completion scenario.

1	Now we will talk about what we could deduce or
2	figure out from the pay records and some of the work
3	that Jerry did with his bunch out in the field.
4	What happened during the dates that Cone and
5	Graham is alleging their TECO delay period
6	MR. GRAHAM: Can I ask you what dates you are
7	using for that?
8	MR. SANCHEZ: I think it's you gave us notice
9	September 16 or September 17 to I think the pole was
10	moved November 4th or November 6th. I'm grabbing their
11	time frame. There is a letter in there where Tug
12	explains that this pole, this one particular pole was
13	out of the way November 6, my claim is over.
14	MR. GRAHAM: Is that the 56 days then?
15	MR. SANCHEZ: I think so.
16	MR. GRAHAM: That should be beyond November 6
17	then, shouldn't it?
18	MR. WINTHROP: It's September 17, November 12.
19	MR. SANCHEZ: It's 56 days. I grabbed their
20	period. During that period, based on pay records,
21	there was about \$140,000 worth of drainage work.
22	Again, this is a claim for impacts on drainage
23	activity.
24	I tried to compare that to another time frame to
25	see if there was some grinding halt to work, and if

1	they wanted to could have expected to do more work.
2	Well, I grabbed probably the next 60-day period.
3	I gave them a little more time because there were a few
4	holidays during the TECO alleged delay period. I think
5	I used maybe 60 days.
6	MR. GRAHAM: And tell me that time frame.
7	MR. SANCHEZ: I grabbed it was shortly after
8	the holidays.
9	MR. GRAHAM: I don't see any dates on there is my
10	problem.
11	MR. SANCHEZ: It would be during the time frame
12	of the \$214,000
13	MR. ROEBUCK: This is Exhibit 5 we are discussing
14	right now?
15	MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Marty, there is a breakdown
17	here that shows the drainage.
18	MR. GRAHAM: That's my breakdown. That's the
19	reason I'm asking the question. I'm differing from
20	Marty's numbers. I'm not sure we are comparing apples
21	to apples. I wanted to see what his time frame was
22	compared to mine. Mine was based on the pay estimates.
23	That's the information I had to cut it off. Granted
24	the 19th may run a little beyond the 56-day period, but
25	there should be consideration for the Christmas

1	holiday
2	MR. SANCHEZ: I did. I agree. I did give him
3	consideration.
4	Let me back up. I think I said something wrong,
5	Bob. My time frame started before the Christmas
6	vacation, which is the reason I went I probably wen
7	67 days to make it fair because you had Christmas
8	holidays. You only shut down probably a couple of day
9	for the Christmas holidays.
10	MR. GRAHAM: We worked through that week. I was
11	just trying to find out where you ended for your
12	170,000 or whatever your number is.
13	MR. SANCHEZ: When your delay period ends plus 6
14	days.
15	MR. GRAHAM: That should be close to the
16	January 19 cut-off.
17	MR. SANCHEZ: Pretty close. Okay. So, the point
18	being, as we look at the numbers, there was a good
19	amount of work that took place during this alleged TECO
20	delay period. Things didn't stop. These were
21	activities that were, as best we could tell from the
22	baseline submittal that we did have in hand, there was
23	float in these activities. Many of the activities were

24

25

completed before the float was exhausted, which means,

lo and behold, the end of the job isn't really pushing

1	out.
2	It goes back again, who can trump whom. We know
3	TECO is going to be on the job while Cone and Graham is
4	doing some of their underground work.
5	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Let me ask you a question,
6	please. In the utility agency owner with Florida
7	Power, there are 110 days. When did that start and
8	when does it end?
9	MR. SANCHEZ: It's supposed to start after
10	clearing and grubbing is complete for them to do the
11	work.
12	MR. WINTHROP: Does that include removal of
13	asphalt off the roadway, which is included in the
14	clearing and grubbing pay item?
15	MR. SANCHEZ: I just said for them to be able to
16	do their work.
17	MR. GRAHAM: They were out there prior to
18	starting construction, the day we started construction.
19	There wasn't any impact to them for getting started.
20	MR. SANCHEZ: There was a period before
21	construction, 60 days. That's them on the job doing
22	the work.
23	MR. SIMMONS: That aerial photo you said was
24	April?
25	MR. WINTHROP: Yes.

1	MR. SIMMONS: The job didn't start until July.
2	So they had started work at least three months before
3	construction began?
4	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Transmission work.
5	MR. SANCHEZ: There was a time period in that
6	same relocation agreement that they would be working
7	before Cone and Graham started.
8	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: It was a very short period of
9	time. When did TECO actually finish with their work so
10	they were not in the way of the contractor?
11	MR. SANCHEZ: I want to say late February.
12	MR. GRAHAM: Which is contract day 235?
13	MR. SANCHEZ: I don't know what contract day.
14	MR. SIMMONS: I looked at the dailies or weeklies
15	or whatever it was, and they show TECO working into two
16	hundred thirty something days into the contract, but
17	all of that was not interfering with drainage, was it?
18	You all didn't even say that?
19	MR. WINTHROP: Not through February, but the bulk
20	of it was between the September and November dates.
21	MR. ROEBUCK: But they did extend their contract
22	about TECO was there two months later late,
23	whenever that was.
24	MR. SANCHEZ: Again, there is a clearing and
25	grubbing consideration for them to start. There needs

1	to be some consideration given to the fact that they
2	need to start after clearing and grubbing and their
3	relocation agreement. That's how it's stipulated.
4	I wasn't there as much as Jerry or Tug.
5	MR. WINTHROP: That's how it's stipulated, but
6	the fact is they weren't waiting on any clearing and
7	grubbing to do their work.
8	MR. McKISHNIE: Our agreement with them bound us
9	as far as when the clock started ticking, the point at
10	which the clearing and grubbing work went into effect.
11	They were impacted to some degree by clearing and
12	grubbing.
13	MR. WINTHROP: It doesn't really stipulate in
14	their agreement what clearing and grubbing activities
15	they would be waiting on. As I said, asphalt milling
16	or the removal of asphalt from the roadways is part of
17	the clearing and grubbing pay item.
18	I think one reasonable interpretation was they
19	had time beyond the end of the contract to perform the
20	work. Who knows specifically when the clock started.
21	That's one of the problems we had in considering their
22	schedule is when does the clock start for them.
23	MR. GRAHAM: When did the DOT think the clock
24	should start?
25	MR. SANCHEZ: Jerry responded to that during

1	the
2	MR. GRAHAM: They were out there the first day we
3	started.
4	MR. McKISHNIE: As part of their contract, they
5	had 30 days prior to.
6	MR. SIMMONS: It's 60 days.
7	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: 60 days.
8	MR. GRAHAM: There wasn't any clearing and
9	grubbing impacts on that start.
10	MR. McKISHNIE: On that portion of the work,
11	that's correct.
12	MR. WINTHROP: Which is installing the new poles
13	and transferring the transmission lines. If they can
14	put their new poles in, transfer the transmission lines
15	without clearing and grubbing, what is the distribution
16	folks waiting on?
17	MR. McKISHNIE: We can talk about this until we
18	are blue in the face. The agreement between the
19	Department and TECO outlined the time period. There
20	was some subjectivity when that time starts. Marty is
21	looking for it, the date which we felt that occurred.
22	No matter how you look at it, they had a
23	contractual right to be there throughout this 56-day
24	delay period, September 17 to November. We are talking

about January, February.

1	MR. SANCHEZ: That's an important point. The
2	period we are being charged for is a subset of the 180
3	days that TECO had a right to be present on the job.
4	MR. SIMMONS: How does help me relate the 125
5	days they had during construction, which is on the
6	original thing from the utility company, the relocation
7	schedule, to all the time extensions that ended up
8	being granted, I guess, during that 125-day time frame.
9	Was all that time extensions that we gave the
10	contractor basically added to the amount of time the
11	utility had to be out there because of the way the
12	impact to the utility company was?
13	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: Let me try to answer that.
14	First, let me go back to the clearing and grubbing.
15	There were trees along the right-of-way the entire
16	length of the job that had to be removed. Now, was it
17	entirely delaying TECO? No.
18	There were there was a clearing and grubbing
19	operation that started at the south end of the job and
20	continued all the way up to the north end of the job.
21	To answer your question about the extensions of
22	time, all of those extensions of time occurred after
23	this period of time that we are talking about here, the
24	September, October, November time.
25	MR. SIMMONS: So, the time extension didn't

1	really impact the utilities' relocation schedule?
2	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: That's correct.
3	MR. SIMMONS: So, I'm having trouble seeing why
4	if we told them 125 days after construction they were
5	still working 230 days into the contract. If the time
6	extension didn't do you see what I'm saying?
7	MR. SANCHEZ: Those are workdays, number one.
8	They are adjusted up to represent calendar days. Tug
9	went through the presentation in one of his memos where
10	he expands up to it. Cone and Graham's contract time
11	is calendar days. That presentation in that relocation
12	agreement is workdays.
13	Number two, again, you heard Jerry say there was
14	some dependency on clearing and grubbing between for
15	clearing and grubbing for TECO. And you will find the
16	letter where Jerry put the date.
17	MR. WINTHROP: I'm thinking the 6th or 7th of
18	August.
19	MR. SANCHEZ: I agree.
20	MR. WINTHROP: I don't remember TECO ever saying
21	there was a certain section of clearing and grubbing
22	that had to be done prior to them bringing in crews.
23	Their applying crew resources had nothing to do with
24	clearing and grubbing. They could have applied it
25	sooner. If it was done on August 6th, they weren't out

Ţ	there working with distribution crews on August /th.
2	It was another month.
3	MR. GRAHAM: Had TECO's distribution crews
4	started when the work was available, they could have
5	kept ahead of every drainage crew that they had. They
6	did not start when they were supposed to start. They
7	did not continue operations during their relocation
8	schedule of 125 days. That's why they were out there
9	at day 235.
10	If they had finished within their original 125
11	working days of work available, we wouldn't be sitting
12	here.
13	The fact the delays occurred within their
14	relocation schedule is not our fault. They could stay
15	out ahead of us, still accomplish their work and not
16	interfere with our work. That was anticipated in our
17	original schedule and in DOT's original schedule of
18	time.
19	MR. SANCHEZ: Let me make one other point with
20	TECO being on the job possibly into late February.
21	Joint use with TECO poles or joint use on TECO poles
22	was a signal interconnect system or a cable. That was
23	within Cone and Graham's contract to relocate it.
24	I don't know if it went underground or overhead.

That cable was one factor that contributed to the

1	fact that TECO's existing poles had not been pulled by
2	a certain time frame. I can't tell you if Cone and
3	Graham scheduled seven days for it or ten days for it
4	and finished it within three days. That's a
5	consideration.
6	I should have included that in my presentation.
7	I'm trying to find it now.
8	MR. WINTHROP: TECO distribution was the
9	controlling factor. They are on the top of the poles.
10	Nobody could move their lines over until the energized
11	poles were out without shocking themselves.
12	Interconnect, it's a minor thing to move once the
13	poles are topped. We are talking about three or four
14	days of work to do the whole line of poles.
15	TECO and the Department should have contemplated
16	our work occurring after TECO is out of the way. We
17	have to have some time.
18	If TECO gets behind, everybody gets behind.
19	That's beyond our control.
20	MR. CARUSO: In light of the confusion between
21	this TECO schedule is inherent to the approval of the
22	schedule itself. What I'm hearing, the disagreement
23	going back and forth here, is when should they have
24	gone, TECO's right to be on the project.
25	Really, I would like to look at the schedule

1	itself. This utility relocation schedule is vague.
2	It's wide open to interpretation. It's open to
3	interpretation from what the Department believes it
4	should say to what TECO believes it should say and what
5	the contractor believes it should say.
6	At the very least it's not a very clear schedule.

At the very least it's not a very clear schedule. It does not relate to the phasing in the plans and should have been, prior to letting these plans, been addressed by the Department. There is some responsibility by the Department to control not only plans and documents but also utility relocation schedules.

I do not think that the Department could look at this and say this is a very clear contract document, and hence the confusion.

MR. SIMMONS: Marty, did you get through?

MR. SANCHEZ: TECO is going to be on the job -in response to some of the points Tony was making, TECO
is going to be on the job. We know where their poles
are. The poles are laid out in the topo for the plan
profiles.

Back to this particular section we were talking about. There was a pretty good amount of work that took place while this alleged delay, TECO delay period was happening. We think that really undermines the

Т	allegation that there is a delay period.
2	The time extension specification in one of
3	Tug's letters he kind of went through some of the
4	highlights of Section 8-7.3.2, which expands to read -
5	that's probably your last second to the last tab.
6	MR. McKISHNIE: Titled time extension,
7	specifications.
8	MR. SANCHEZ: Real quick, "The effect of utility
9	relocation will be considered as a basis for granting
10	time extension only if the following criteria are met.
11	And you read their number one, delays are the
12	result of utility work not detailed in the plans, not
13	detailed in the plans, detailed, not accomplished, in
14	close accordance.
15	Number one, we say TECO indeed, it was known
16	to the parties that TECO was going to be on the job
17	moving these particular poles. We know where the poles
18	are.
19	Number two, did they extend as there is a late
20	February date. Is that late? Is that beyond their 187
21	days? When does the time start?
22	The reason we are here is we think the progress
23	was reasonable. Had it not been, you will see in our
24	summary, we are not defending someone that was
25	haphazard about what they were going to do and didn't

1 give a rip.

We thought there was diligent pursuit of the work. Was it ideal, was it perfect, was it what Cone and Graham wanted? No. Was it what they could have expected? What they needed to expect was the fact that a significant utility was going to be within their corridor.

Tug is right. It was a very narrow corridor. There was some effort to coordinate theirs and the balance of the underground, including the JPA work.

Utility work affected progress toward completion of the controlling work items, number two. Cone and Graham is alleging these drainage items were impacted by TECO's relocation.

We disagree for the reasons we talked about a second ago. There was a lot of drainage work that took place during this TECO alleged delay period.

Looking at the baseline submittal we ultimately got, a lot of these items were finished before late dates, which were -- in theory don't impact the end of a project.

And number three, the contractor took all reasonable measures to minimize the effect: number one, a late schedule; number two, in some of Tug's writing, September 3 is the notification the drainage

1	work is scheduled for an area where TECO is in the way.
2	Two weeks later we are in receipt of a claim
3	notice. That's not reasonable, not exhaustive. We
4	disagree with that contention.
5	Lastly, in a summary, just to go over some of the
6	points we tried to make. The summary sheet should be a
7	sheet right before the clearing and grubbing issue.
8	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Next to the last tab.
9	MR. SANCHEZ: It should be the fifth sheet, the
10	last tab, Jack.
11	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Has eight items on it.
12	MR. SANCHEZ: All right. Number one, we know
13	TECO is going to be on the job. We know they have a
14	lot of work to do. We know where their poles are.
15	Number two, there was some difficulty in getting
16	a schedule on time. There was an August 16th date or
17	August 6th date agreed to at the partnering session,
18	yet still we didn't get it until probably 30 to 45 days
19	after that.
20	MR. WINTHROP: You got the initial submittal on
21	August 16, did you not?
22	MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
23	MR. WINTHROP: Did you distribute it to the
24	utility agencies at that date?
25	MR. SANCHEZ: Not personally.

MR. WINTHROP: The Department did.

MR. SANCHEZ: Their claim is roughly \$240,000, \$30,000 of which is the direct cost that Tug alluded to in his presentation, the significant balance of it, \$140,000 is extended field and home office overhead.

The job finished on time. There wasn't an early completion schedule. There wasn't discussion, let's jump in this together, we really want to finish together. I need you, TECO, to do something, and I need you to work faster than what the schedule or relocation agreement, whatever you want to call it, indicates.

Number five, we've paid Cone and Graham for their presence out on the job via previous essays for time issues that weren't associated with TECO. We believe they've been made whole for their presence out in the field.

Number six, there was a good amount of work done during this alleged delay. There's not a 56-day complete halt of construction. This is work on activities that are -- they are in a path to finish the job. Their activities -- there was work happening on the activities, probably not what Cone and Graham would have liked, but there was work occurring that counts toward the completion of the project.

1 Number seven, we alluded to the phase one traffic 2 switch happening pretty much on time when Cone and 3 Graham wanted. 4 Number eight, probably the reason we are here is 5 we thought there was reasonable diligence for the utilities to do their work. They didn't wait months 6 7 and months and months because they could. 8 They had around 187 days or so, and they needed 9 some time. 10 Did they extend? What clearing and grubbing date 11 do you pick? When does their time period end? 12 they exceed it? And if they exceeded it, did that 13 impact the job? That's not the scenario we submitted. The costs 14 15 we submitted in rebuttal to what they submitted, which 16 you've heard us say, the work finished within contract 17 time, we didn't have an acceleration scenario to 18 review. We reviewed what was presented to us and to 19 the Board. 20 I'm really thirsty. Do you guys have anything? 21 MR. McKISHNIE: I have one thing to add. We were 22 asked a simple question a few minutes ago, didn't give 23 a very simple answer. 24 The question was in relation to the allowed time 25 period for TECO to be on the project.

1	interpretation of the starting point of that time
2	period is documented in the package that Cone and
3	Graham submitted to the board by referencing Jerry's
4	letter stating that August 7, 1996 was the starting
5	date in which clearing and grubbing was done, not the
6	point in which it allowed TECO to begin their work.
7	And 187 calendar days from that would put us at
8	roughly February 10, 1997. If consideration is given
9	to the weather during that time period, that bumps it
10	out to roughly February 28, 1997.
11	So, that's a the time period that we should be
12	looking at as far as TECO's presence when analyzing the
13	contract document.
14	MR. GRAHAM: You are saying TECO didn't start
15	until August?
16	MR. McKISHNIE: I'm saying the relocation
17	scheduled says that during construction, work during
18	construction, the 187 calendar days and I don't know
19	how many workdays
20	MR. GRAHAM: 125.
21	MR. McKISHNIE: Began August 7.
22	MR. GRAHAM: Why didn't it begin the day they
23	were out there?
24	MR. McKISHNIE: Because the contract time begins
25	after clearing and grubbing.

1	MR. GRAHAM: The complete clearing and grubbing
2	on the project?
3	MR. McKISHNIE: I don't have the specific
4	verbiage in front of me.
5	MR. GRAHAM: They can start in areas that don't
6	require clearing and grubbing. Wouldn't that not start
7	the time?
8	MR. McKISHNIE: Our agreement with them
9	anticipated that, a portion of that work was to be done
10	ahead of the clearing and grubbing.
11	MR. GRAHAM: They also started day one of
12	contract time and they were still out on the job.
13	I don't see any impact on clearing and grubbing that
14	impacted TECO starting anything. I never heard that
15	from TECO.
16	MR. McKISHNIE: I think Jerry addressed it, all
17	along the whole project the impact may have been
18	difficult to ascertain the total extent, but there were
19	areas where trees in the right-of-way impacted TECO's
20	ability to progress the work.
21	MR. GRAHAM: You are saying there was impact to
22	TECO's transmission poles, Jerry?
23	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: They could go into a specific
24	location for a pole, and when you are pulling lines
25	along the corridors, there's trees in between. Yes, it

impacted them or it would have. The trees were still 1 2 there. 3 MR. WINTHROP: The transmission was done with their lines. You can look at the pictures. They got 4 them all up and energized by early and mid August. 5 The reason the distribution didn't have a crew 6 out there is because they just didn't bring a crew out 7 there. There was no feedback or notice from TECO that 8 there were specific trees in the way. They just didn't 9 bring a crew out there. 10 If you want to use August 6 as a start date, they 11 didn't start on August 6. They started a month later. 12 MR. McKISHNIE: I said it was the date in which 13 the contract started assessing those 125 workdays. You 14 mentioned the apparent ambiguity with the relocation. 15 That precedent for TECO or for Florida Power's work is 16 not unusual. It's very common in overhead power 17 relocation schedules to have the work in construction 18 be preceded by clearing and grubbing. This is not a 19 unique situation. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Everything we talked about, points 21 we are trying to make, again, it's under the backdrop 22 in their transmittal for their baseline. We will 23 24 adjust if we have to. MR. WINTHROP: You are reading too much in that 25

That statement means we can't discern 1 statement. anything from this TECO schedule. There is a long 2 3 laundry list of poles, as to when these specific poles are going to be moved and in what phase is absolutely 4 indeterminant from that schedule. 5 We don't put any activities into our CPM for TECO 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

because we have to change the contract by doing so.

What we are saying there is if there is a problem, we will address the problem, not that we will bend over and take damages for any delays caused by a conflict. We don't know what they are because we can't tell from their schedule. You are reading way too much into that statement.

MR. GRAHAM: I wrote the letter. In that statement are you telling me I should have put you all on notice for a delay that didn't occur yet? You all chastise me enough for writing about delays that do occur. Are you telling me I should write a letter about a delay before it occurs?

MR. SANCHEZ: John, we expect some TECO presence in the schedule. We didn't get it. We are looking at them saying we will adjust if we have to. asking anybody to bend over. That's how it was read.

Again, we are not privy to discussions that happened between TECO and Cone and Graham during the job. That's how we read it. Thirty days later there is an issue.

MR. GRAHAM: I want to make a general comment on CPMs. The Department has recently revised some of the schedule specifications. I've been part of some of those discussions.

This whole CPM submittal in my opinion is a red herring. The new specifications regarding CPMs now gives the contractor the ability to submit it 90 days after the start of the construction. I don't think there's a wide pattern in any district in a job of this magnitude of submitting the full-blown CPM at the construction conference.

You can look at our grade on this project, we got a hundred percent for all submittals at the preconstruction conference.

To say that TECO is suddenly going to get this and give it to their distribution guy to determine what poles he's going to relocate, that's absurd. Nobody itemized TECO poles on any schedule ever submitted that we've ever submitted.

It's not a use of utility agencies to guide their crews out there. The weekly utility meetings is what dictate utilities, where they should be. They don't even live up to their verbal agreement to be out on the

1	job to get started.
2	There's no impacts on clearing and grubbing for
3	them to start. If they had started on day one on
4	transmission, they would have been well ahead of our
5	drainage work and we wouldn't be sitting here today.
6	MR. SIMMONS: Let me ask you something, Bob. On
7	this back on the Department's, the first Tab E
8	I don't know if yours is done that way, but it says
9	Cone and Graham's interpretation of the documents. I'm
10	sure it's in your package, too. This is just a
11	summary.
12	MR. GRAHAM: I've got it.
13	MR. SIMMONS: I am assuming this is accurate out
14	of the letter. I didn't try to go back and try to
15	compare it.
16	Again, you just reference this, August 16, '96,
17	Cone and Graham states we made assumptions they will be
18	out of the way. If not, we will adjust accordingly.
19	Then the next paragraph, two paragraphs down, is
20	a letter already asking for time extensions or
21	whatever, schedule impacts because they're not out of
22	the way.
23	Did it happen see, that's on like a 30-day
24	period or something.

Help me understand how all -- you know, that

1	quick we know they are impacting your schedule. This
2	was sort of like, basically one location, S-50, where
3	this incident is related in the September 17th letter,
4	wasn't it?
5	MR. WINTHROP: There was a couple of structures,
6	but the trunk line was basically in the line where the
7	poles were. So, it was once we cross a road out of
8	pond two, there is a physical conflict with the
9	structure and pole. That trunk line we had to pull off
10	for a period of two months before we could get back on
11	it, get a productive effort.
12	MR. GRAHAM: The number of poles to get out of
13	our way at that time was a very small percentage of the
14	total poles on the project. We would assume for them
15	to complete within their 125-day working days that they
16	are going to have to be out there pulling some poles in
17	order to meet their own schedule.
18	If they had done that, they would have stayed out
19	of our way just by having a straight line, production
20	rate of pulling poles.
21	MR. SIMMONS: This area here in question, it was
22	right close to the south end of the job, is that right?
23	I don't have all the plans.
24	MR. WINTHROP: It was S-43. I think it was
25	station 236, 238, something like that, right across

1	from pond two.
2	MR. SIMMONS: Is that at the south end of the
3	job?
4	MR. WINTHROP: Not the very south end, but around
5	Bearss Avenue, probably 25 percent of the quadrant of
6	the job in the south end.
7	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: Quarter of a mile.
8	MR. SIMMONS: You are putting in structures
9	starting at the pond going north. Did the job flow
10	south all of it?
11	MR. GRAHAM: Flows into the ponds.
12	MR. SIMMONS: So you are starting at the ponds,
13	working backwards. You are actually opening up and
14	using the system as you go? Is that more or less?
15	MR. WINTHROP: Yes.
16	MR. McKISHNIE: It's somewhat impractical to
17	assume that with two weeks' notice or some minimal
18	notice that TECO is going to be able to move certain
19	poles. We are not talking about I said I was
20	talking about a distribution line.
21	They can't move poles that are in conflict. In
22	some cases that's a conflict. In the ones we are
23	talking about, which is the basis of this 56-day delay
24	It's a little more difficult.
25	MR. WINTHROP: We gave plenty of notice in our

1 controlling item work sheets, our preconstruction, and 2 we follow the traffic control plans. This shouldn't be 3 a mystery to anybody where we are going to be working. 4 This information was known before bid time. MR. McKISHNIE: My point is even with the notice 5 6 to assume that TECO can move this pole at station 7 so-and-so without having a large majority of the other 8 work done is not practical. That's not the way this work progresses. It shouldn't come as a surprise they 9 10 cannot move this one pole in conflict. 11 MR. SIMMONS: On the diagram that you all had, Tug, where you showed -- and it's in here somewhere. 12 13 It's in this Cone Exhibit 2. Was this basically the 14 way most of the structures were? It looks like the 15 pole is like four feet or so back of the manhole. 16 MR. WINTHROP: Those are the new poles that were 17 installed, the large concrete poles in the 18 right-of-way. There was about a five-foot window from 19 the front face of the curb. Then you had sidewalk over 20 the top and to the poles. It was really a tight 21 drainage installation. 22 MR. SIMMONS: These are like inlets that were 23 basically running right under the -- these were inlets most of them? 24

MR. WINTHROP: Yes.

1	MR. SIMMONS: Then the sidewalk is behind them?
2	MR. WINTHROP: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: In the area adjacent to the
4	new transmission poles was it necessary to sheath the
5	poles to get the box in?
6	MR. WINTHROP: Yes, depending on the cut.
7	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: Shield.
8	MR. WINTHROP: Trench shield. Sometimes they had
9	to hold the pole depending on the cut.
10	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Were they there when that was
11	needed, or did that drag on?
12	MR. WINTHROP: They were fairly responsive to
13	bring a crew out to hold a pole when we needed to, but
14	it was the we weren't trying to find an area to
15	create a claim.
16	We saw that the poles had been done in an
17	excellent schedule from the transmission, and we had no
18	idea it would take 60 days to transfer lines. That was
19	not our experience.
20	It was no mystery where we were coming out from.
21	We didn't provide official claim notice until the day
22	we got held up that we had no feedback and no
23	indication from the Department there was going to be an
24	additional 60 days or 56 days for that one specific
25	pole to be moved along with that line of poles

1	MR. CARUSO: I would like to add, a third-person
2	summary, kind of tying in everything, a brief summary
3	of the overall two issues at hand. I wasn't going to
4	start with this, but since we are talking about this
5	last item we were referring to, I will be using
6	specifically for this the rebuttal. I'm looking at the
7	rebuttal which you are open to right now.
8	Where we were just referring to the 30 days,
9	specifically quoting, just 30 days after stating they
10	were just as scheduled, Cone and Graham is filing a

claim.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As with much of this rebuttal, we are pulling portions out of overall statements and documents. kind of reminds me of the last election here where everybody was unfortunately being quoted and that wasn't what they meant.

If I were to continue reading, basically it's the This reversal serves no purpose than but to catch all those involved off guard. That's the second part of this statement.

Fairly assuming an aggressive -- and as we in detail assure you there was no intent to set the stage for a delay. That's kind of halfway through that.

If I really go back to this whole reviewing of this rebuttal quickly, there just seems to be an

1	overall misrepresentation of what the contractor was
2	saying.
3	If I may say, it's a somewhat naive presentation
4	on the part of the Department.
5	Specifically I'm looking at right from the get-go
6	we are stating that the Tampa Electric relocation
7	agreement included the Florida Avenue contract and
8	cannot be ignored, and that the contractor by his own
9	words called it purposeless.
10	Well, it was purposeless, but not in the sense
11	that we didn't need it. A relocation schedule serves
12	no purpose. TECO isn't a major utility. It was
13	purposeless in the sense that it was an indeterminant
14	schedule. It was a bad document.
15	I assure you if you are to look at future
16	relocation schedules, even on adjacent projects let
17	after this fairly recently, you would not see something
18	that's left open to interpretation, hence the
19	disagreement of when they should be at work and when
20	they should finish. That's all I'm going to say about
21	that.
22	Continuing, as such, because it was vague, no,
23	the contractor did not include that in the original CPM

As any experienced contractor would know, you are

schedules in his activities.

24

not going to -- you are going to build the job in accordance with the phases. You are going to have to provide for positive drainage, put the infrastructures in first.

That's not only what the Department should know but the utilities, in going through the utility process of the overall plan design.

To make an assumption that because Cone and Graham did not submit their CPM and as such -- and I'm quoting here -- without a schedule in hand it will be difficult for all parties involved to coordinate upcoming work.

The naiveness, what I'm assuming, you are basically saying TECO is waiting the schedule of their entire distribution crews until they got their entire CPM schedule. That doesn't happen that way. We built the job according to the plans, the controlling item of work.

If that were the case, if everyone were waiting with baited breath for that CPM, then by contract the CPM spec contract should never have been the second part of that. No money should ever have been disbursed to the contractor. No payment should ever have been made.

They should have stopped the job right then if

1	they, in fact, thought we were setting up the job for a
2	claims situation. That's a pretty serious statement.
3	Again, it wasn't stopped because in reality no
4	one was trying to pin this on anybody.
5	A lot of the other stuff we've gone back and
6	forth. For brevity I'm hitting the highlights of what
7	I see. What I really see the crux of this is, one, the
8	interpretation of CPMs.
9	Scheduling, when it's submitted, is an inherent
10	flaw to the specs at that time.
11	In reference to, well, what if you have a
12	situation where the contractor submits a CPM schedule.
13	Forget day 30, how about day one?
14	Day two, I have an unforeseen situation and
15	there's a claim, the job is stopping.
16	There is no way the contractor and the Department
17	are going to agree on updates, revisions, new
18	schedules. It's just not going to happen.
19	Now, the CPMs. Are contract documents important?
20	The contractor respects them, try their best to provide
21	it, but it's not to be used as schedule utility
22	relocation work.
23	MR. GRAHAM: I'd like to talk a little bit about
24	why we have designated that number.
25	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Exhibit 4?

1	MR. GRAHAM: Yes. I worked this up. It was in
2	response to some of Marty's numbers that he generated
3	to show the amount of revenue that was generated during
4	the delay period and the amount of revenue after the
5	delay period.
6	I haven't been able to come up with his numbers.
7	That was one of the reasons I was quizzing him about
8	his time line for generating his numbers. I think my
9	numbers are right. They are off of the pay estimate.
10	I did my best to isolate the drainage pay items within
<b>L1</b>	those particular estimates.
12	I think what it does show in Marty's analysis, he
13	did not review the amount of drainage work that was
L <b>4</b>	done prior to this delay period. I highlighted
L <b>5</b>	September 16 through November 10 as being the delay
.6	period.
.7	The prior pay period we did \$130,000 worth of
.8	drainage work. We were geared up ready to go, ready to
.9	put the pipe in.
10	Now in the delay period we ran it back down to
1	80,000 one month, 61,000 the other month. That adds up
2	to about what Marty had on the 140,000.
:3	Once the delay was over we kick it back into
:4	89,000. Then December 15 is cut-off. Then we are
:5	really going full bore into January 19. It shows

1 214,000 of drainage revenue.

This is also reflected in the total job revenue that was going on in those same time frames.

We were geared up as the September 15 cut-off, did \$814,000 worth of work during the delay, then we are down to 465, then two months after that we were back up to 867.

I think it clearly shows we were impacted monetarily from the revenue end of it which would naturally lead one to believe there were costs associated with home and field office overhead, inefficiencies to the pipe crew.

And then in order to get back on schedule,

I think these numbers show we did accelerate. And
there's some inherent costs associated with
accelerating a project for inefficiencies of too many
crews being out there.

There's no argument that during this 56 days -naturally there wasn't zero amount of dollars being
done and maybe the full hundred percent amount of the
home office and field office overhead is not justified
during that time frame, but I think a portion of that
is justified. It's offset by paying the full amount in
regards to the acceleration it took us to get back up
on schedule, which we did.

1	MR. SANCHEZ: There was
2	during the period. The secon
3	acceleration claim before us
4	office, home office costs $arepsilon$
5	at some detailed cost anal
6	to accelerate.
7	MR. GRAHAM: The re-
8	accelerated costs is the claim was submice
9	after the claim occurred, timely submittal of a claim,
10	probably sooner than we've ever submitted a claim. The
11	accelerated costs had not been incurred, or we were
12	denied those costs associated with the delay.
13	We were offered by Marty and Jerry at a meeting
14	to give us the 56 days of time extension without the $\bigvee$
15	money. I did not accept that. We continued on with
16	the project in our own attempt, got back on schedule
17	despite Jerry's letters of threatening disincentives to
18	being behind schedule. I guess would be kicked off the
19	bidders' list, some ramifications of that sort.
20	MR. GOLEPIEWSKI: I didn't send any threatening
21	letters, just reminders to you of what the
22	specifications say.
23	MR. GRAHAM: Delinquency is what I was looking
24	for.
25	MR. SIMMONS: It shows in this Exhibit 2, Cone

1	Exhibit 2, the one we started with, that you all were
2	having, I guess was it weekly, a set of weekly utility
3	conferences?
4	MR. WINTHROP: Yes.
5	MR. SIMMONS: You all were discussing these
6	issues as this went along. The first one that we've
7	got a copy of right here was August 6. Is that the
8	first one?
9	MR. WINTHROP: I believe that was the second one.
10	MR. SIMMONS: Okay. That one Tampa Electric
11	distribution, which seems to be the hold-up in this day
12	we are talking about says there was no problem
13	anticipated. Then there is a summary well, this one
14	doesn't have a summary.
15	I'm looking at a few of those to see what was
16	said about the distribution.
17	The next one, which was the 20th, they didn't
18	attend. Work hadn't begun.
19	Then the next one, October 1 says that they
20	reported two crews were working on the job October 1.
21	Did they when the distribution group started,
22	did they go to the area where there was a problem and
23	start working at that time?
24	MR. WINTHROP: They went to the south end and
25	jumped on that line of poles from on the east side

T	of the foad. They had done some refocation on the very
2	south end of the project up to 138th Avenue.
3	I think that's how they were transferring stuff
4	in a south to north manner, although they had to string
5	a lot of their hardware on a linear basis along the
6	entire side. That's where they directed their crew
7	efforts to, yes.
8	MR. SIMMONS: Then if you go to the engineer's
9	weekly summary in the back of your package under
10	attachment H, the thick one that you sent ahead of
11	time, you start reading those weekly summaries. All
12	those have some reference to what was going on with
13	TECO, also.
14	On the week of September which is H-10, on the
15	week beginning September 15, it says no distribution
16	pole work going on.
17	Then week 9-22 doesn't mention really
18	distribution crews being out there. Then the one 9-29
19	it doesn't. Then the one 10-6, which would have been
20	after this utility conference.
21	I don't know, it doesn't seem like they were
22	clear about exactly how they were writing this stuff in
23	as to who was there, who wasn't.
24	The point I'm trying to get to is you had these
25	weekly meetings with them starting early in the job.

1	You've said that and I would have had the same
2	questions that I'm hearing you come up with, what does
3	the 110 days immediately following clearing and
4	grubbing mean?
5	Okay. Why wasn't that cleared up early on to
6	know that and be clear with TECO as to when you are
7	going to be when are you going to be out of our way
8	so we can start these drainage structures?
9	You said we've got a schedule. You give them our
10	schedule. The Department has our schedule. Here is
11	this one here from the relocation schedule which
12	doesn't make a whole lot of sense.
13	Was there an effort to try to resolve why it
14	didn't make sense early on and for them to explain to
15	you when are you going to be out of our way? I don't
16	see that in these notes.
17	MR. CARUSO: As we heard, they didn't believe
18	they were in their way because they had 110 days.
19	Their interpretation was we are within our contract
20	right. We heard that today, too, the Department and
21	the utility felt they were not in the way, that they
22	had 110 days after their interpretation of clearing and
23	grubbing.
24	MR. WINTHROP: A lot of stuff there isn't any

25

discussion in the utility progress meetings, but to say

1	that we were lying in wait to a
2	with this claim on TECO is i
3	up.
4	Those meetings it was
5	working, where we were going to
6	that TECO put crews on the proj
7	to begin their relocation. We
8	put crews out there and have this problem. We wanted
9	them to begin as soon as possible and requested that
10	that happen, which is why you see some statements.
11	They did not show up this week, work did not begin as
12	expected.
13	We are telling them we are working up to a
14	potential problem. When is this going to happen? Why
15	aren't there crews out there?
16	And we are not given any direction by the
17	Department, look, you are going to have to wait until
18	February until all the poles are out of the way. We
19	are not sure where they are, what gets moved, but their
20	schedule is controlling the progress of the job.
21	I never heard the Department make any kind of
22	statement as to the problem.
23	MR. GRAHAM: Looking at the schedule for TECO
24	there is a specific line item there for drainage, five

days. Does that mean they can be out there for five

24

1	days and they are going to be (
2	drainage?
3	I think someone could re
4	what we anticipated when we s
5	That didn't turn out to be re
6	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: In
7	fair to everybody and yet ti,
8	do you have any other questions?
9	MR. ROEBUCK: Not really. One of my
10	disappointments was these utility meetings occurred.
11	I've attended some lately on other jobs. Damn if they
12	don't do a good job, but the people have to be
13	responsive to them.
14	It's not like TECO. The distribution was the
15	biggest bottleneck on the job. They don't show up for
16	the meeting. That's a heck of an endorsement.
17	The next time they show up, say we will be out in
18	a couple of days, don't show up.
19	It's a matter of where is the authority to
20	enforce their reaction to these serious problems on
21	time. That's what seems to be missing.
22	MR. McKISHNIE: I would answer that saying that
23	it's based in that utility relocation schedule. That
24	is our ability to have the authorization to impress.
25	Yes, when looking through the utility conference

minutes, you can see times when they better job. I look at it different represented. I didn't see any re' saying they said I've got 125 wc going to be out there. They were trying to give Cone and Graham best estimate of what could be done. Could they have done things better? Probably. The ability for the Department to enforce the time line is the same as our ability to recoup these costs that incurred. That mechanism for us to have enforcement over any utility is based on that. 

MR. CARUSO: Which is why if you look at future relocation schedules, there is a lot more language in both the Department's words and the utility in reference to the actual construction phase. It's a little different than this.

MR. WINTHROP: I included one for a comparison on one of our current projects that has specific policy and specific phases with specific durations and what activities are dependant upon it. I can use that schedule and incorporate it into my CPM and we can work around it. Completely different from this. This is about the skinniest relocation schedule you will ever see, just a vague number of days. You don't know when

1	they are going to start, not really sure when they will
2	finish.
3	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Do you have any more
4	questions?
5	MR. SIMMONS: Last thing. Can somebody tell me
6	where the \$30,000 direct cost is summarized? I'm
7	missing that somewhere. Is that in one of these
8	things?
9	MR. WINTHROP: It should be in the original
10	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: In the original package.
11	MR. SIMMONS: That's what I'm looking for.
12	MR. WINTHROP: On attachment F I have a lot of
13	our foreman's dailies that show the impact, the impact
14	of two months, then a few days after that. In my
15	original letter dated February '97 I summarize those
16	direct costs on a day-to-day basis. There is a spread
17	sheet that's representative in attachment D and C-12,
18	C-11 you will start seeing C-7 dated 9-18-96.
19	You have a spread sheet that talks about the
20	inefficiencies for that specific crew. Then you can
21	refer to an attachment F, specific foreman's report to
22	compare that to as backup for that spread sheet.
23	To make a point of clarification, the \$30,000 is
24	strictly associated with costs associated with the
25	pipe crew jumping around between September 17 and

November 12, whenever the pole was removed and we were able to get back on that particular sequence of structures that we had planned on doing.

Again, I would like to reiterate Bob's point that at this time, at this juncture in February when he turned in this claim, we were behind schedule by any way you want to look at it, whether it was the CPM, whether time versus money, whether the flow from the CPM.

We were threatened with delinquency by the Department. We asked for a time extension so we could apply resources as we had planned in the project over a longer period of time. We didn't get that. So at that point after I turned in this claim for delay and extended office overhead, we then began to apply additional measures to get back on schedule.

Now it's my fault that I didn't specifically quantify them, but we feel they are a wash between what is being labeled as extended overhead and the amount of effort we went through to catch back up and get on the time versus money schedule.

Marty's point is not backed up in basis of law where, you know, the contractor finishes early, there is a cost savings to the contractor, and the courts I think do recognize that.

Whether we had to submit a schedule or discuss acceleration, well, certainly whenever we talked about accelerating our schedule in February we had compiled this claim.

They didn't want to recognize the delay. They didn't want to discuss that aspect at all. We had a decision to make. We made the decision once the department made the decision. They weren't open to discussion of those topics at the time.

MR. McKISHNIE: I will say two things. The specifications themselves dictate that if we have an early completion schedule that affects the utilities' performance, we are obligated to reach an agreement to see how that early completion schedule -- and revise the relocation schedule accordingly.

The other part is the schedule we are talking about using as the basis for determining how far we were behind is based on logic that assumed that there would be no impact of the concurrent work that was required with TECO. That's the standard of which this 56 days is being measured by.

From the Department's established point it's hand in hand whether or not there was a delay and whether or not Cone and Graham had a contractual right to consider concurrent work with utilities during that period.

1	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Okay. Marty, do you have
2	anything else?
3	MR. SANCHEZ: No.
4	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Doug, do you have anything
5	else?
6	MR. WINTHROP: No, not without beating a dead
7	horse.
8	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Jack, do you have any other
9	questions?
10	MR. ROEBUCK: No. Sometimes we've had a
11	number of these utility confusions. Sometimes it might
12	be for information to bring the guy here, take the
13	company operations man to the meeting and let him see
14	how he impacts this whole situation of construction.
15	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Mr. Simmons, do you have any
16	other questions?
17	MR. SIMMONS: No.
18	CHAIRMAN NUTBROWN: Okay, with that we will
19	consider this hearing closed. The Board will
20	deliberate and try to come up with an order in the
21	shortest period of time.
22	(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at 1:00 p.m.)
23	
24	
25	

Ţ	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER		
2	STATE OF FLORIDA )		
3	COUNTY OF LEON )		
4	I, CATHERINE WILKINSON, Court Reporter, do hereby		
5	certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically		
6	report the foregoing proceedings; and that the transcript is		
7	a true record of the testimony given.		
8	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,		
9	attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a		
10	relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or		
11	counsel in connection with the action, nor am I financially		
12	interested in the action.		
13	Dated this day of March, 2001.		
14			
15	tachenné Ilhenna		
16	CATHERINE WILKINSON CSR, CP		
17	Post Office Box 13461 Tallahassee, Florida 32317		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

CONE & GRAHAM/ POJ

'96 [2]	26:15;	81:16
<b>'97</b> [3]	29:16;	41:21;
99:15		
'99 [1]	5:1	

- 0 -

00 [2] 1:18; 102:22

-1-

1 [8] 1:18; 2:20; 4:5, 18; 37:11; 93:19, 20; 102:22 1-d [1] 29:6 10 [3] 1:17; 76:8; 90:15 10-6 [1] 94:19 10020-3524 [2] 1:6: 25:20 1007 [1] 1:15 103 [1] 2:25 110 [6] 30:9; 31:1; 62:7; 95:3, 18, 22 110,115 [1] 47:11 **12** [3] 38:13; 59:18; 100:1 **12-29-96** [2] **40:20**; 41:7 120 [1] 58:24 **125** [7] 66:4; 67:4; 68:8, 10; 76:20; 78:14; 98:4 **125-day** [2] 66:8; 82:15 **130,000** [1] 90:17 **13461** [2] 1:24; 103:16 138th [4] 28:1; 35:5; 43:6; 94:2 **14** [1] 52:24 **140,000** [6] 46:8; 47:19; 56:5; 59:21; 74:5; 90:22 **144,000** [3] 47:14, 15; **15** [3] 90:24; 91:4; 94:15 **16** [7] 32:8, 17; 49:3; 59:9; 73:21; 81:16; 90:15 **16th** [2] 32:19; 73:16 **17** [4] 59:9, 18; 65:24; 99:25 **170,000** [1] 61:12 **175,000** [1] 55:25 17th [1] 82:3 18 [1] 41:21 180 [2] 58:23; 66:2 187 [4] 71:20; 75:8; 76:7, 18 **19** [2] 61:16; 90:25 **1996** [2] 36:12; 76:4

52:24; 76:8, 10 1998 [2] 14:12, 16 19th [1] 60:24

- 2 -

2 [11] 2:20, 23; 4:15, 18, 25; 24:8, 9; 25:19; 84:13; 92:25; 93:1 **2-2001** [1] 26:3 20 [1] 37:3 2001 [2] 1:13; 103:13 20th [1] 93:17 **214,000** [2] 60:12; 91:1 **224-0127** [1] 1:25 **230** [1] 67:5 **235** [2] 63:12; 68:9 **236** [1] 82:25 **238** [1] 82:25 **24** [2] 2:23; 41:11 24.2 [1] 41:1 **240,000** [1] 74:2 **25** [5] 12:23, 25; 20:20; 21:2; 83:5 **25,000** [1] 21:8 **26** [1] 33:3 **26th** [1] 32:24 **27** [1] 1:13

- 3 -

28 [1] 76:10

3 [9] 2:20; 4:16, 18, 23; 5:2; 52:23; 53:1; 54:11; 72:25 3-2001 [2] 7:1; 26:4 30 [11] 3:13; 23:1; 51:15, 23; 52:3; 57:23; 65:5; 73:18; 86:8, 9; 89:13 30,000 [7] 47:3, 4, 17; 54:22; 74:3; 99:6, 23 **30-day** [1] 81:23 **31** [2] 38:24; 41:12 **31.2** [1] 41:2 **32,000** [1] 8:11 **32317** [1] 103:17 **337.185** [1] 3:4 **35,000** [1] 21:9 **3500** [2] 8:12; 15:1 **39** [1] 41:13

- 4 -

4 [8] 2:20; 4:17, 18, 23; 5:1, 3; 89:25 4.75 [1] 7:24 40 [2] 1:17; 52:4 41 [1] 9:7 **45** [2] 57:23; 73:18 **465** [1] 91:6 **4th** [1] 59:10

- 5 -

5 [5] 2:21; 5:10, 12; 60:13 5.3 [1] 9:15 5.33 [1] 7:24 50 [1] 33:1 50,000 [1] 47:20 54 [1] 35:12 540-day [1] 33:24 55 [1] 41:22 56 [8] 41:22; 57:10; 59:14, 19; 85:24; 91:18; 92:14; 101:21 56-day [4] 60:24; 65:23; 74:19; 83:23

- 6 -

6 [9] 26:16; 27:20; 36:5, 12; 59:13, 16; 78:11, 12; 93:7 6-22-97 [1] 42:8 60 [7] 15:11; 60:5; 62:21; 65:6, 7; 85:18, 24 60-day [1] 60:2 61,000 [1] 90:21 63 [1] 41:23 67 [2] 61:7, 13 68 [4] 55:13, 20, 22; 56:22 69 [1] 15:7 6th [4] 59:10; 67:17, 25; 73:17

- 7 -

7 [2] 76:4, 21 7th [2] 67:17; 68:1

-8-

8-10-97 [1] 42:9 8-7.3.2 [1] 71:4 80,000 [1] 90:21 814,000 [1] 91:5 85-foot [1] 26:19 86 [1] 55:9 867 [1] 91:7 89,000 [1] 90:24

- 9 -

9-18-96 [1] 99:18 9-22 [1] 94:17 9-29 [1] 94:18 90 [2] 15:13; 80:9 900,000 [1] 56:17 904 [1] 1:25

- A -

ability [6] 31:17; 77:20; 80:9; 97:24; 98:9, 10 able [10] 31:7; 40:23; 43:6; 44:1; 56:11; 58:8; 62:15; 83:18; 90:6; 100:2 **above** [6] 1:12; 10:11; 11:12; 13:18; 18:19; 44:6 absolutely [1] 79:4 absurd [1] 80:19 **accelerate** [5] 43:16; 58:13; 91:14; 92:6 accelerated [2] 92:8, accelerating [2] 91:16; 101:3 acceleration [6] 18:17, 23; 75:17; 91:24; 92:3; accept [2] 29:12; 92:15 **acceptance** [2] 56:16, accepted [3] 42:1, 3; accepting [1] 58:3 accomplish [1] 68:15 accomplished [1] 71:13 accordance [3] 3:3; 71:14; 88:2 according [1] 88:17 accordingly [3] 49:9; 81:18; 101:15 accurate [1] 81:13 across [2] 3:16; 82:25 act [1] 45:23 action [3] 32:6; 103:11, activate [2] 27:10; 29:24 **activated** [1] 29:21 active [2] 29:11; 44:12 **activities** [13] 8:14; 33:13; 58:8; 61:21, 23; 64:14; 74:21, 22, 23; 79:6; 87:24: 98:21 activity [4] 7:13; 29:20; 39:1; 59:23 add [9] 9:21; 16:23; 19:1; 22:16; 45:18; 48:13; 52:16; 75:21; 86:1 added [1] 66:10

**addition** [3] 17:2;

**1997** [5] 14:22; 42:5;

47:13: 48:11 additional [16] 5:18; 8:5; 11:15; 16:1, 12; 17:22; 18:2; 20:4, 7; 25:23; 34:10, 14; 43:11, 24; 85:24; 100:16 address [4] 13:11; 21:19; 46:6; 79:9 addressed [3] 49:24; 70:9; 77:16 adds [1] 90:21 adjacent [10] 7:4, 19; 11:8; 16:8, 19; 27:3, 5; 53:9; 85:3; 87:16 adjust [10] 49:9, 12, 19; 51:11, 23; 54:23; 57:24; 78:24; 79:22; 81:18 **adjusted** [1] 67:8 adjustment [1] 50:14 adjustments [2] 32:13; administrative [1] 4:3 advance [1] 57:17 aerial [3] 23:20; 26:15; 62:23 aerials [1] 23:25 **affected** [2] 44:17; 72:11 affecting [1] 20:5 affects [1] 101:12 aged [1] 8:24 **agencies** [5] 31:23; 35:15; 45:24; 73:24; 80:22 agency [7] 30:23; 35:18; 39:9; 45:23; 47:25; 62:6 aggressive [1] 86:21 agree [10] 20:17, 22; 22:4; 43:19; 46:15; 49:22; 57:23; 61:2; 67:19; 89:17 agreed [5] 13:1; 32:17; 39:18; 50:20; 73:17 **agreement** [24] 11:7; 13:14, 15, 17, 20; 14:2; 25:8; 32:7; 50:15; 56:4; 57:19; 58:18, 20; 63:6; 64:3, 8, 14; 65:18; 67:12; 74:11; 77:8; 80:25; 87:7; 101:13 agreements [3] 18:5, 7, 10 ahead [11] 8:22; 25:1; 26:5; 39:12; 40:1; 50:3; 68:5, 15; 77:10; 81:4; 94:10 allegation [1] 71:1 alleged [6] 54:6; 60:4; 61:19; 70:24; 72:17; 74:19 alleges [2] 16:21; 47:8 alleging [2] 59:5; 72:13 alleviate [1] 30:1

allowable [2] 18:13, 25 allowed [3] 18:19; 75:24; 76:6 **alluded** [3] 51:13; 74:3; 75:1 alludes [1] 52:20 although [4] 13:15; 36:21; 38:3; 94:4 ambiguity [1] 78:15 ambush [1] 96:1 amount [20] 21:10; 35:8; 42:12; 47:11, 12; 54:25; 55:25; 56:4; 61:19; 66:10; 70:23; 74:18; 90:3, 4, 13; 91:19, 20, 23; 92:1; 100:19 amounts [1] 46:22 analysis [3] 25:6; 90:12; 92:5 analyzing [1] 76:12 answer [4] 66:13, 21; 75:23: 97:22 **anthony** [1] 2:8 **anticipate** [2] 35:17; 36:22 anticipated [9] 8:8; 10:10; 11:13; 18:19; 36:7; 68:16; 77:9; 93:13; 97:4 anticipating [1] 11:17 apologize [3] 26:5; 40:18; 46:5 apparent [1] 78:15 appearances [1] 2:1 appearing [2] 2:6, 10 apples [2] 60:20, 21 applied [1] 67:24 apply [7] 6:6, 7, 11; 18:24; 40:5; 100:12, 15 applying [1] 67:23 appointed [1] 3:5 approach [3] 6:6; 31:15; 52:1 approaching [1] 41:15 appropriate [1] 18:16 approval [1] 69:21 approve [1] 32:11 approved [5] 14:2; 17:16; 32:23; 33:4; 55:7 approximately [5] 23:7; 38:19; 47:17; 56:4, april [2] 26:15; 62:24 **arbitration** [6] 1:2, 12; 2:3; 3:3; 4:1; 6:4 area [17] 11:19; 12:24; 13:16; 21:11, 12, 14, 15; 29:12; 34:4; 48:21; 53:2, 5; 73:1; 82:21; 85:3, 14; 93:22 areas [18] 17:22; 26:13, 24; 27:6; 29:13, 20; 39:16; 40:4, 22; 42:25;

77:5, 19 aren't [1] 96:15 argue [1] 10:6 arguing [2] 10:1; 47:17 **argument** [3] 11:9; 16:21; 91:18 arose [1] 37:18 **ascertain** [1] 77:18 aspect [1] 101:6 **asphalt** [14] 6:22; 7:9; 11:6; 12:1, 23; 13:5, 7, 19; 15:22; 21:10; 39:15; 62:13; 64:15, 16 assay [2] 14:15; 19:10 assessing [1] 78:14 **associated** [15] 8:9, 14; 10:7; 11:11; 13:25; 15:19; 21:4; 29:5; 30:13; 74:15; 91:11, 15; 92:12; 99:24 associates [1] 1:23 **assume** [7] 6:24; 7:15; 11:10; 55:1; 82:14; 83:17; **assumed** [3] 10:4; 44:25; 101:18 **assuming** [4] 20:14; 81:13; 86:21; 88:13 **assumption** [19] 9:1, 9, 10; 10:5; 16:15; 19:18; 20:9, 12; 30:11, 22; 31:1, 7; 33:17; 45:13; 48:6; 49:5, 8: 88:8 **assumptions** [3] 9:5, 6; 81:17 **assure** [3] 5:22; 86:22; 87:15 **attached** [1] 56:1 attachment [5] 52:9; 94:10; 99:12, 17, 21 attachments [1] 4:3 attacking [1] 17:11 attempt [1] 92:16 attend [4] 32:2; 37:4; 38:25; 93:18 **attended** [5] 25:9; 28:19; 32:3; 97:11 **attention** [1] 40:25 **attest** [1] 52:15 attorney [2] 103:9, 10 attorneys [1] 6:19 august [26] 14:11; 32:8, 17, 24; 33:3; 34:22; 36:5, 12; 37:3, 19; 42:5; 49:3; 67:18, 25; 68:1; 73:16, 17, 21; 76:4, 15, 21; 78:5, 11, 12; 81:16; 93:7 **authority** [1] 97:19 authorization [1] 97:24 authorized [1] 103:5

**available** [4] 10:17;

43:13; 44:2, 3, 9, 15;

42:25; 68:4, 11 avenue [7] 23:17; 27:25; 35:6; 37:25; 83:5; 87:7; 94:2 average [9] 7:23; 9:14; 10:12, 18, 21; 11:13; 13:18; 19:21; 20:23 averaging [1] 10:15 avoided [1] 37:20 aware [1] 18:7

## - B -

backdrop [4] 48:18; 51:12, 22; 78:22 **backed** [1] 100:22 backup [2] 56:1; 99:22 **backwards** [1] 83:13 **bad** [1] 87:14 **baited** [1] 88:20 **balance** [2] 72:10; 74:4 ball [2] 21:7; 40:8 **ballpark** [1] 19:24 bare [1] 20:14 **base** [2] 7:10; 58:12 **based** [10] 9:2; 16:21; 50:23; 51:16; 53:13; 59:20; 60:22; 97:23; 98:12; 101:18 **baseline** [10] 14:3; 39:19; 40:9; 42:3; 50:18; 53:21; 54:2; 61:22; 72:18; 78:23 **basically** [9] 13:4; 20:14; 66:10; 82:2, 6; 84:13, 23; 86:17; 88:14 **basis** [10] 8:6; 30:1; 50:1, 7; 71:9; 83:23; 94:5; 99:16; 100:22; 101:17 **bearss** [3] 35:6; 43:6; 83:5 **beating** [1] 102:6 became [2] 29:21: 42:25 becomes [4] 11:9, 16; 49:20; 51:12 **began** [10] 24:18; 26:8, 12; 27:22; 32:20; 33:9; 63:3; 76:21; 100:15 begin [17] 15:22, 23; 17:25; 26:14; 28:5, 10; 30:22; 31:7; 36:5; 37:5; 40:6, 12; 76:6, 22; 96:7, 9, 11 **beginning** [8] 26:17; 27:8, 11; 28:13; 29:8; 42:5, 12; 94:15 begins [1] 76:24 begun [4] 36:21; 37:5, 19; 93:18

behalf [2] 2:6, 10 **behind** [13] 16:5; 40:4, 7; 41:10; 42:9, 17; 43:4; 69:18; 85:1; 92:18; 100:6; 101:18 behold [1] 61:25 believes [3] 70:3, 4, 5 below [1] 15:13 bend [2] 79:10, 23 benefit [1] 9:5 benefited [1] 9:11 besides [1] 18:5 best [5] 31:16; 61:21; 89:20; 90:10; 98:7 between [13] 3:16, 21; 7:21; 11:23; 43:6; 63:20; 65:18; 67:14; 69:20; 77:25; 79:25; 99:25; 100:18 beyond [8] 18:2; 26:11; 27:16; 59:16; 60:24; 64:19; 69:19; 71:20 bid [15] 7:3, 15; 9:1, 3, 4, 9, 10; 10:1, 5; 14:9; 15:4; 19:17, 22; 57:2; 84:4 bidders' [1] 92:19 bidding [2] 13:23; 46:3 big [4] 11:16; 31:18; 52:17; 54:9 biggest [1] 97:15 bill [1] 49:12 bills [1] 8:10 binding [1] 32:7 bit [5] 10:11; 23:4; 26:9; 50:4; 89:23 **blue** [1] 65:18 board [23] 1:2; 2:3; 3:3; 4:11; 5:17, 18, 20, 25; 6:6; 16:24; 22:25; 24:4; 45:11; 47:4; 51:9; 53:11; 54:25; 58:14, 15; 75:19; 76:3; 102:19 bob [10] 2:8; 6:21; 8:18; 9:1; 14:25; 15:17; 16:25; 22:18; 61:5; 81:6 bob's [1] 100:4 bones [1] 20:14 bore [1] 90:25 both [6] 7:4, 6, 11; 21:7; 43:17; 86:19; 100:20 25:21: 98:15 bottleneck [2] 17:22; 97:15 **bottom** [3] 34:15; 41:6; bound [1] 64:8 **box** [3] 1:24; 85:5; 103:16 bracketed [2] 42:4, 15 break [1] 42:24 breakdown [2] 60:16,

breath [1] 88:20 bregacy [1] 27:18 brevity [1] 89:6 brian [2] 2:11; 32:3 brief [4] 7:2; 41:8; 44:21; 86:2 bring [6] 6:14; 15:21; **78:7, 10; 85:13; 102:12** bringing [2] 35:18; 67:22 bryan [1] 46:7 buck [1] 57:14 buddy [1] 44:20 **buggered** [1] 38:6 build [2] 43:6; 88:1 built [1] 88:16 bulk [2] 12:17; 63:19 bulkheaded [1] 29:21 bulkheads [4] 29:24; 46:12, 14; 56:10 bumps [1] 76:9 bunch [1] 59:3 burden [1] 10:10 busting [1] 29:24 byron [1] 53:17

- C -

c [1] 3:1 **c-11** [1] 99:18 **c-12** [1] 99:17 **c-7** [1] 99:18 cable [2] 68:22, 25 calendar [4] 67:8, 11; 76:7, 18 caprin [1] 38:25 caruso [11] 2:8; 5:11; 13:11; 14:6, 15; 19:1; 21:4; 69:20; 86:1; 95:17; 98:13 case [12] 6:11; 8:4; 10:4; 12:2; 13:2; 16:3; 18:21; 19:17; 20:19; 49:18; 88:19; 97:6 cases [1] 83:22 cash [3] 40:25; 41:12, catch [5] 41:20; 42:19; categorized [2] 56:8, 9 category [1] 20:10 **catherine** [3] 1:19; 103:4, 15 caught [2] 41:24; 42:1 cause [3] 24:23; 45:3; 47:23 caused [1] 79:10 causes [1] 7:25 cei [2] 7:23; 41:15 center [1] 1:15 cents [4] 15:5, 10, 11, 14

**certain** [6] 8:2; 45:6; 55:2; 67:21; 69:2; 83:18 **certainly** [3] 32:15; 37:8; 101:2 certificate [2] 2:25; 103:1 **certify** [2] 103:5, 8 cetera [5] 17:1; 46:12; 48:1: 56:12: 58:12 **change** [6] 10:2; 13:1; 20:3, 24; 50:20; 79:7 **changed** [1] 50:15 charge [1] 15:10 charged [2] 15:9; 66:2 **charges** [2] 8:1, 5 **chastise** [1] 79:17 **choice** [1] 46:17 **chose** [1] 3:11 **christmas** [4] 60:25; 61:5, 7, 9 **chuck** [2] 25:15; 51:18 chuck's [1] 52:11 circumstance [1] 46:10 civil [1] 6:7 **claim** [40] 4:2; 6:13; 8:6, 13; 12:11; 13:12; 18:16; 25:21, 22; 26:1; 43:14; 44:13; 51:17, 20, 22, 24, 25; 52:5; 53:6; **54:10, 13; 57:10; 59:13,** 22; 73:2; 74:2; 85:15, 21; 86:11; 89:15; 92:3, 8, 9, 10; 96:2; 100:6, 14; 101:4 claimant [2] 4:2; 6:12 **claims** [3] 38:2; 47:1; 89:2 clarification [1] 99:23 **clarity** [1] 46:13 **classify** [1] 46:25 **clause** [1] 20:1 **clear** [7] 49:4, 19; 50:8; 70:6, 14; 94:22; 95:6 cleared [2] 49:11; 95:5 **clearing** [33] 7:14; 28:22; 29:3; 30:8; 62:10, 14; 63:24; 64:2, 6, 10, 11, 14, 17; 65:8, 15; 66:14, 18; 67:14, 15, 21, 24; 73:7; 75:10; 76:5, 25; 77:1, 6, 10, 13; 78:19; 81:2; 95:3, 22 **clearly** [1] 91:8 clock [4] 64:9, 20, 22, 23 close [8] 23:10; 41:6; 55:20, 21; 61:15, 17; 71:14; 82:22 closed [2] 22:25; 102:19 color [2] 24:3, 13 commenced [1] 1:17 **comment** [1] 80:3 **comments** [2] 53:25;

54:1 common [1] 78:17 companies [1] 3:9 company [5] 30:8; 50:16; 66:6, 12; 102:13 compare [4] 10:19; 59:24; 81:15; 99:22 compared [1] 60:22 comparing [1] 60:20 comparison [1] 98:18 compensable [1] 56:22 compensate [2] 13:17; 14:17 compensated [3] 43:10; 46:12, 15 compensation [3] 8:12; 55:11, 19 compiled [1] 101:3 complement [1] 27:22 **complete** [9] 7:7; 38:9; 40:13; 43:8; 46:17; 62:10; 74:20; 77:1; 82:15 **completed** [3] 22:21, 22; 61:24 completely [1] 98:23 **completion** [13] 17:21; 38:19; 41:1; 51:3; 57:21; 58:2, 6, 25; 72:11; 74:7, 25; 101:12, 14 **comprised** [1] 47:4 concerned [2] 27:7; 37:8 **concluded** [2] 1:18; 102:22 **concrete** [2] 26:19; 84:17 **concurrent** [3] 42:14; 101:19, 25 concurrently [7] 14:22; 30:14, 23; 31:2; 45:10, 12; 49:1 **condensed** [1] 33:24 **condition** [2] 10:3; 29:14 conditions [8] 7:11; 8:7; 10:2; 13:1; 19:23; 20:1, 19, 25 conducted [2] 6:5; 53:17 conduit [3] 28:11; 34:10; 43:4 cone [56] 1:4; 2:6; 4:15, 24; 5:1; 10:21; 16:21; 17:3, 17; 22:1; 24:21; 36:25; 45:7; 46:22; 47:1, 8; 48:22; 49:1, 2; 50:17, 22; 52:20, 24; 53:2, 19; 54:1, 6, 10, 21; 55:12, 18, 23; 56:11; 57:5, 21; 59:4; 62:3; 63:7; 67:10; 68:23; 69:2; 72:3, 12; 74:13, 23; 75:2; 76:2; 79:25; 81:9,

17; 84:13; 86:10; 88:8; 92:25; 98:6; 101:24 **conference** [15] 28:20; 35:22; 36:12, 18, 24; 37:10; 38:12, 23; 52:21; 53:1, 16; 80:13, 16; 94:20; 97:25 conferences [4] 35:21, 23; 51:13; 93:3 **confirm** [1] 50:13 **conflict** [10] 28:17; 33:22; 37:23; 53:5; 54:12; 79:11; 82:8; 83:21, 22; 84:10 conflicted [1] 58:11 confusing [1] 44:12 **confusion** [2] 69:20; 70:15 confusions [1] 102:11 connection [1] 103:11 **consider** [6] 13:23; 20:10: 46:3: 51:4: 101:24; 102:19 consideration [11] 16:24: 50:17: 54:4; 55:1; 58:5; 60:25; 61:3; 63:25; 64:1; 69:5; 76:8 considered [6] 5:17; 13:18; 19:4; 20:11; 57:3; 71:9 considering [5] 9:22; 51:5, 8; 52:2; 64:21 **consists** [1] 8:13 constitutes [2] 20:4, 22 constructed [1] 40:11 construction [23] 3:8; 7:20; 29:12; 35:7; 36:16; 39:17; 40:3, 6, 8; 62:18, 21; 63:3; 66:5; 67:4; 74:20; 76:17, 18; 78:18; 80:10, 13; 98:16; 102:14 contemplated [4] 45:5; 49:15; 69:15 contend [1] 9:3 contention [6] 8:23; 9:7; 18:14; 31:18; 57:15; 73:4 **context** [3] 47:9, 19; 49:13 **continue** [6] 11:25; 23:14; 27:6; 37:9; 68:7; 86:17 **continued** [2] 66:20; **continuing** [2] 36:15; 87:22 continuous [2] 39:6, 8 contract [42] 3:9; 6:10; 17:7, 8, 16, 21; 18:3, 13; 26:16; 27:13, 16; 28:4, 17; 30:24; 31:5, 20; 33:24; 43:16; 50:14; 55:7; 63:12, cpm [16] 31:19; 32:19;

13, 16, 21; 64:19; 65:4; 67:5, 10; 68:23; 70:14; 75:16; 76:13, 24; 77:12; 78:14; 79:7; 87:7; 88:20, 21; 89:19; 95:19 contractor's [2] 26:1; 53:18 contractors [1] 19:17 contractual [3] 50:7; 65:23; 101:24 contractually [1] 58:15 contributed [1] 68:25 control [9] 27:8; 29:2, 5; 31:13, 16; **42:24**; 69:19; 70:10; 84:2 controlling [6] 32:20; 69:9; 72:12; 84:1; 88:17; 96:20 controls [1] 34:8 conversation [2] 3:15, conversations [1] 48:12 coordinate [5] 31:11; 52:18; 54:8; 72:9; 88:11 coordination [4] 39:9: 45:24; 51:8; 52:12 copies [6] 4:13; 5:23; 6:2; 23:21; 24:3; 29:1 cores [2] 19:20, 23 corner [1] 41:6 corporation [1] 4:25 corrections [1] 54:3 correspondence [1] 35:20 corridor [7] 8:23; 9:17, 18; 16:15; 20:8; 72:7, 8 **corridors** [1] 77:25 cost [12] 11:16; 17:6; 18:16; 21:7; 32:12; 42:19; 49:22; 74:3; 92:5; 99:6; 100:24 costs [32] 8:8, 11; 11:11; 13:25; 15:16, 19; 16:24, 25; 17:15; 18:24; 20:5; 21:4; 43:24; 46:25; 47:18; 50:23; 55:5, 20, 22; 56:25; 57:1; 75:14; 91:10, 15; 92:4, 8, 11, 12; 98:11; 99:16, 24 counsel [2] 103:9, 11 counting [1] 39:25 country [1] 39:4 counts [1] 74:24 county [2] 1:8; 103:3 couple [8] 23:23; 24:25; 29:15; 53:18; 54:5; 61:8; 82:5; 97:18 course [1] 13:8 courts [1] 100:24 cowger [1] 2:15

41:12; 43:20; 79:6; 80:7, 12; 87:23; 88:9, 16, 20, 21; 89:12; 98:22; 100:7, coms [4] 80:4, 8; 89:8, 19 crazy [1] 3:17 **create** [1] 85:15 **creating** [1] 31:14 crew [15] 37:5; 38:3, 11, 14, 15; 67:23; 68:5; 78:6, 7, 10; 85:13; 91:12; 94:6; 99:20, 25 crews [24] 35:18; 37:16, 18, 19; 39:5, 25; 40:5; 44:2, 9; 46:24; 55:2, 3; 67:22; 68:1, 3; 80:23; 88:15; 91:17; 93:20; 94:18; 96:6, 8, 15 criteria [1] 71:10 **critical** [3] 30:6; 34:9; 40:22 cross [1] 82:7 crossed [1] 44:2 **crossings** [1] 43:24 **crunch** [1] 17:25 crux [1] 89:7 curb [9] 11:19, 23; 12:5, **6**, **15**, **18**; **29**:10; **58**:11; 84:19 **current** [1] 98:19 curve [1] 42:19 cut [4] 58:23; 60:23; 85:6, 9 cut-off [4] 19:7; 61:16; 90:24; 91:4

- D -

d [3] 2:17; 3:1; 99:17 dailies [3] 25:11; 63:14; 99:13 damages [1] 79:10 damn [1] 97:11 dander [1] 96:2 data [4] 7:23; 10:20, 23; 19:6 date [15] 1:13; 17:21; 26:12; 32:6, 10; 65:21; 67:16; 71:20; 73:16, 17, 24; 75:10; 76:5; 78:11, **dated** [9] 26:15, 23; 32:24; 36:12; 40:20; 41:21: 99:15, 18: 103:13 dates [5] 59:4, 6; 60:9; 63:20; 72:20 day [15] 23:5; 62:18; 63:12, 13; 65:2; 68:9; 76:22; 77:11; 81:3; 85:21; 89:13, 14; 93:11; 103:13

day-to-day [1] 99:16 days [71] 17:4; 18:1; 23:1; 30:9, 10; 31:1; 45:7; 51:15, 20, 23; 52:3, 4; 55:9, 13, 20, 22; 56:22; 57:10, 23; 58:23, 24; 59:14, 19; 60:5; 61:7, 8, 14; 62:7, 21; 63:16; 65:5, 6, 7; 66:3, 5; 67:4, 5, 8, 11; 68:8, 11; 69:3, 4, 14; 71:21; 73:18; 75:8; 76:7, 18; 80:1, 9; 82:15; 85:18, 24; 86:8, 9; 91:18; 92:14; 95:3, 18, 22; 96:25; 97:1, 18; 98:4, 25; 99:14; 101:21 dead [1] 102:6 deaf [1] 43:23 debating [1] 47:16 december [2] 38:24; 90:24 decide [1] 24:10 decided [1] 33:23 decision [5] 21:25; 22:1; 101:7, 8 **deduce** [1] 59:1 deem [1] 5:18 deepest [2] 34:8, 12 defending [1] 71:24 definition [1] 20:17 degree [1] 64:11 delay [32] 26:2; 40:17; 41:17; 42:4, 6; 44:13; 54:7; 59:5; 60:4; 61:13, 20; 65:24; 70:24; 71:1; 72:17; 74:19; 79:16, 19; 83:23; 86:23; 90:4, 5, 14, 15, 20, 23; 91:5; 92:12; 100:14; 101:5, 23 delaying [1] 66:17 delays [8] 20:6; 23:17; 42:14; 43:22; 68:13; 71:11; 79:10, 17 **deliberate** [4] 23:1, 4, 8; 102:20 delineate [1] 33:2 delinguency [5] 41:17, 19; 42:18; 92:23; 100:10 **delinguent** [1] 41:16 demanded [1] 39:5 denied [1] 92:12 department's [9] 4:16; 8:23; 10:9; 16:13; 45:3, 10; 81:7; 98:15; 101:22 **dependant** [1] 98:21 dependency [1] 67:14 dependent [1] 39:9 depending [2] 85:6, 9 depth [2] 13:4; 20:4 **described** [2] 47:19; 56:9 design [1] 88:7

designated [1] 89:24 desoto [1] 1:15 despite [1] 92:17 detail [2] 48:8; 86:22 **detailed** [5] 23:24; 71:12, 13; 92:5 detailing [1] 53:4 **determine** [3] 19:9, 20; 80:18 determined [3] 9:16; 13:21; 56:13 determining [1] 101:17 diagram [1] 84:11 dictate [3] 31:8; 80:24; 101:11 dictated [1] 31:19 difference [1] 8:7 different [7] 12:20; 13:2; 20:10; 21:7; 31:14; 98:17, 23 differently [1] 98:2 differing [5] 20:1, 4, 19, 22; 60:19 difficult [4] 42:20; 77:18; 83:24; 88:11 **difficulty** [2] 17:9; 73:15 diligence [1] 75:5 diligent [1] 72:2 direct [8] 16:25; 20:6; 46:25; 47:18; 54:22; 74:3; 99:6, 16 directed [1] 94:6 direction [1] 96:16 disagree [6] 45:4; 48:1; 53:13; 57:14; 72:15; 73:4 disagreement [2] 69:22; 87:19 disappointments [1] 97:10 disbursed [1] 88:22 discern [2] 30:17; 79:1 discuss [6] 10:6; 32:5; 44:23; 58:25; 101:1, 6 discussed [9] 16:25; 17:3; 18:6; 28:9, 22; 47:8; 50:24; 51:3; 52:15 **discussing** [3] 36:25; 60:13; 93:5 discussion [8] 6:23; 50:24; 57:17, 25; 58:21; 74:7; 95:25; 101:9 discussions [6] 48:14, 15; 52:14; 58:18; 79:24; 80:6 disincentives [1] 92:17 disoriented [1] 38:5 **disposal** [1] 8:16 **dispute** [3] 5:17; 10:13; 11:18 distribute [2] 24:4;

73:23 distribution [27] 27:19; 30:19; 35:3, 18; 36:4, 19; 37:4; 38:14, 24; 39:2; 45:17; 48:13; 51:7; 65:15; 68:1, 3; 69:8; 78:6; 80:18; 83:20; 88:15; 93:11, 16, 21; 94:15, 18; 97:14 district [1] 80:11 document [6] 12:22; 31:5; 36:11; 70:14; 76:13; 87:14 documentation [3] 48:17; 56:1; 98:3 documented [2] 53:3; 76:2 documents [14] 4:3, 11; 25:10, 12, 14; 28:18; 31:20; 48:23; 49:15; 50:14; 70:11; 81:9; 86:13; 89:19 dollar [5] 46:22; 47:12, 16; 54:25; 55:25 dollars [1] 91:19 dot [3] 45:8, 13; 64:23 dot's [2] 25:9; 68:17 double [1] 16:11 doubt [2] 8:24; 49:4 doubtful [1] 52:2 doug [1] 102:4 down [10] 13:8; 19:25; 41:6; 44:11; 55:22; 58:23; 61:8; 81:19; 90:20; 91:6 drag [1] 85:11 drainage [45] 11:23; 12:9; 15:23; 27:10; 28:24; 29:25; 30:10, 13; 33:7; 34:5, 7, 8; 35:24; 37:2, 13; 38:3; 40:2, 4; 43:4, 25; 44:5, 7, 8; 45:9; 46:17; 58:7, 8; 59:21, 22; 60:17; 63:17; 68:5; 72:13, 16, 25; 81:5; 84:21; 88:3; 90:10, 13, 18; 91:1; 95:8; 96:24; 97:2 drawing [1] 34:2 drive [1] 1:15 driveway [1] 21:22 drought [1] 29:14 duluth [1] 38:25 duly [1] 3:25 dump [1] 15:19 durations [1] 98:20

- E -

e [5] 2:15, 17; 3:1; 81:7 each [3] 3:22; 5:23; 11:20 earlier [10] 9:7; 12:19;

17:21; 18:1, 15; 36:22; 39:20; 51:1; 52:13; 56:3 early [18] 34:21; 48:13; 51:3; 57:18, 21; 58:1, 2, 6, 25; 74:6; 78:5; 94:25; 95:5, 14; 96:6; 100:23; 101:12, 14 ears [1] 43:23 ease [1] 34:1 **east** [3] 35:6; 37:25; 93:25 **effect** [4] 56:5; 64:10; 71:8; 72:23 **effective** [1] 54:18 effects [1] 26:11 **effort** [15] 7:15; 27:14, 15, 20; 34:24; 39:6; 43:12; 46:14; 51:7; 52:3; 56:8; 72:9; 82:11; 95:13; 100:20 **efforts** [14] 18:18; 27:22, 24; 28:16; 40:3; 43:21; 44:17; 46:10; 52:12, 19; 53:12; 56:10: 58:13; 94:7 eight [3] 40:8; 73:11; 75:4 **either** [7] 4:6; 6:14; 10:16; 25:6; 44:6; 48:22; 57:2 el [11] 29:17; 42:6; 46:5, 6, 9, 15; 55:11; 56:5, 9, elapsed [3] 41:2, 11, 22 **elected** [2] 3:8; 35:12 **election** [1] 86:14 **electric** [4] 30:7; 37:15; 87:6; 93:10 electrical [1] 53:5 ellis [1] 28:9 **emphasize** [1] 51:10 emphasizing [1] 54:7 **employee** [2] 103:8, 10 encountered [4] 10:2; 12:23; 20:20; 37:2 end [30] 16:6; 22:5, 9; 26:18, 21; 27:1, 4, 9, 25; 28:6, 7, 11; 29:9; 36:6; 38:16; 43:1; 61:25; 62:8; 64:19; 66:19, 20; 72:20; 75:11; 82:22; 83:2, 4, 6; 91:9; 93:24; 94:2 ended [2] 61:11; 66:7 ending [1] 41:7 endorsement [1] 97:16 **ends** [1] 61:13 **energized** [3] 34:25; 69:10; 78:5 **enforce** [2] 97:20; 98:9 enforcement [1] 98:12 **engineer** [2] 33:4; 40:20

engineer's [2] 41:4; 94:8 engineering [1] 25:11 **enormous** [1] 35:8 **enough** [4] 39:22; 40:1; 44:20; 79:17 entail [1] 7:9 **entailed** [1] 39:14 **enter** [3] 4:16, 17; 5:6 **entertain** [2] 56:25; entire [6] 34:9; 42:23; 66:15; 88:15; 94:6 **entirely** [1] 66:17 **equipment** [1] 54:23 **erroneous** [1] 38:22 error [1] 33:16 **especially** [3] 10:12; 13:23; 45:15 essay [7] 12:19, 21; 20:17, 21, 22; 21:1; 46:6 essays [2] 21:7; 74:14 essentially [6] 17:23; 27:11; 32:10; 40:21; 41:10, 24 established [3] 3:3; 33:8: 101:22 establishing [1] 14:3 **estimate** [5] 30:24; 45:8; 90:9; 98:7 **estimates** [2] 60:22; 90:11 et [5] 17:1; 46:12; 47:25; 56:12; 58:12 even [6] 18:9; 21:6; 63:18; 80:25; 84:5; 87:16 events [1] 42:14 everybody's [1] 6:25 evidence [12] 2:20, 21, 23; 4:19; 5:12, 16, 18, 21; 6:7; 18:23; 24:9; 43:19 **exact** [1] 47:12 **exactly** [1] 94:22 **examine** [1] 5:14 excavation [1] 28:23 exceed [1] 75:12 **exceeded** [1] 75:12 **exceeds** [1] 8:2 **excellent** [2] 34:18; 85:17 exceptional [1] 58:13 **excerpt** [1] 54:10 **excess** [3] 8:11; 13:21; 22:5 excuse [2] 51:24; 52:23 **executed** [2] 14:11; 17:19 exempt [1] 50:2 **exhausted** [1] 61:24 **exhaustive** [2] 53:12; 73:3 exhibit [26] 2:20, 21,

23; 4:5, 8, 15, 16, 17, 18, 25; 5:2, 3, 10, 12, 23; 20:18; 24:8, 9; 25:19; 60:13; 84:13; 89:25; 92:25; 93:1 **exhibits** [3] 2:18; 5:24; **existing** [8] 7:8, 9, 20; 11:18, 22; 48:2; 53:9; 69:1 **exiting** [1] 36:16 expands [2] 67:10; 71:4 **expect** [6] 36:8; 38:18; 46:5; 49:10; 72:5; 79:20 **expected** [7] 13:19; 15:4; 36:5; 37:6; 60:1; 72:5; 96:12 **experience** [4] 34:23; 42:13; 48:20; 85:19 experienced [4] 8:24; 9:2; 10:3; 87:25 **expire** [1] 3:13 **explain** [1] 95:14 **explains** [1] 59:12 **extend** [4] 17:2; 63:21; 71:19; 75:10 **extended** [15] 17:4, 10, 15; 47:10, 20; 50:22; 55:4, 19, 22; 57:1, 6; 74:5; 92:3; 100:15, 19 **extension** [7] 66:25; 67:6; 71:2, 6, 10; 92:14; 100:11 **extensions** [6] 17:18; 66:7, 9, 21, 22; 81:20 **extensive** [2] 46:10; 52:3 **extent** [2] 51:5; 77:18 **extra** [6] 5:11; 8:9, 14; 11:6; 12:11; 57:5 extraordinarily [1] 11:12 **extremely** [1] 9:19

- F -

f [2] 99:12, 21
face [2] 65:18; 84:19
fact [11] 31:19; 45:5;
48:25; 51:21; 58:5; 64:1,
6; 68:13; 69:1; 72:5;
89:1
factor [2] 68:25; 69:9
facts [1] 6:10
fair [2] 61:7; 97:7
fairly [7] 10:8; 34:5, 17;
39:24; 85:12; 86:21;
87:17
falling [1] 34:13
falls [1] 20:10
far [9] 16:23; 20:16;

40:1; 46:11, 23; 58:3; 64:9; 76:12; 101:17 fast [1] 58:23 faster [1] 74:10 fault [3] 43:20; 68:14; 100:17 february [14] 1:13; 38:21; 52:24; 63:11, 19; 65:25; 68:20; 71:20; 76:8, 10; 96:18; 99:15; 100:5; 101:3 feedback [3] 38:18; 78:8; 85:22 feel [7] 9:25; 10:2; 17:20; 20:2; 26:9; 47:23; 100:18 feeling [1] 40:22 **feet** [1] 84:15 fell [1] 43:23 felt [14] 10:3; 17:25; 19:11, 17; 34:16; 35:1, 8; 36:21; 37:18; 46:9; 49:24; 53:12; 65:21; 95:21 few [7] 19:20; 26:17; 38:17; 60:3; 75:22; 93:15; 99:14 field [13] 17:4, 15; 47:10, 20; 50:23; 55:19; 57:1; 59:3; 74:5, 17; 91:11, 21; 92:3 fifth [1] 73:9 fight [1] 44:6 fighting [1] 34:13 figure [2] 30:17; 59:2 figures [3] 4:17; 5:8; 47:12 filing [1] 86:10 films [1] 24:13 final [1] 56:17 finally [1] 37:15 financially [1] 103:11 fine [3] 9:15; 58:7, 17 fingers [1] 3:17 finish [8] 37:13; 58:8, 22; 63:9; 74:8, 21; 87:20; 99:2 finished [17] 17:8, 16, 20; 18:1, 13, 15, 24; 34:21; 38:21; 55:7; 56:24; 68:10; 69:4; 72:19; 74:6; 75:16 finishes [1] 100:23 five [8] 10:14; 19:8; 20:24; 28:7; 30:10; 74:13; 96:24, 25 five-foot [1] 84:18 flat [2] 8:2; 58:11 flaw [1] 89:10 fletcher [1] 27:25 float [2] 61:23, 24 flooded [2] 29:22; 30:3

flooding [1] 30:1

floor [1] 44:20 florida [15] 1:3, 8, 15, 16, 21, 24; 3:4; 23:17; 35:10; 37:25; 62:6; 78:16; 87:7; 103:2, 17 flow [8] 29:12; 30:5; 31:3; 40:25; 41:12, 22; 83:9; 100:8 flowing [1] 29:19 flows [1] 83:11 folks [2] 43:7; 65:16 follow [2] 31:15; 84:2 **following** [6] 31:12; 36:8; 42:8; 71:10; 95:3 fool [1] 56:10 force [1] 34:11 forces [3] 27:21, 25; 43:17 **foregoing** [1] 103:6 foreman [1] 51:19 foreman's [2] 99:13, 21 forget [1] 89:13 forwarded [1] 24:4 found [2] 7:20; 12:2 four [22] 7:7; 8:4; 9:15; 12:22, 25; 13:22; 15:7, 13, 15; 16:20; 17:4; 18:1; 19:8, 18; 20:20; 28:7, 12, 14; 57:12, 13; 69:13; 84:15 four-day [1] 18:22 four-inch [1] 33:1 frame [14] 14:9, 16; 43:21; 51:10, 11; 59:11, 24; 60:6, 11, 21; 61:5; 66:8; 69:2; 91:22 **frame-wise** [1] 14:8 frames [2] 42:16; 91:3 freddie [3] 2:5; 3:5; 15:18 free [1] 39:16 friction [2] 13:8; 19:13 front [8] 4:25; 5:2; 50:4, 5, 6; 77:4; 84:19 fruitless [1] 33:19 full [6] 11:14; 23:6; 40:23; 90:25; 91:20, 23 full-blown [1] 80:12 fully [1] 46:15 funds [2] 47:13, 21 **furnish** [1] 6:2 further [4] 22:23, 24; 52:2; 103:8 **future** [2] 87:15; 98:13

- G -

g [1] 3:1 gathered [1] 55:9 geared [2] 90:18; 91:4 gene [1] 2:15

general [2] 51:18; 80:3 **generated** [3] 7:23; 90:2, 3 generating [1] 90:8 gerald [1] 2:12 get-go [2] 20:15; 87:5 given [5] 57:7; 64:1; 76:8; 96:16; 103:7 gives [1] 80:9 global [2] 18:4; 42:22 golepiewski [11] 2:12; 21:19; 22:7; 45:21; 65:7; 66:13; 67:2; 77:23; 83:7; 85:7; 92:20 grabbed [3] 59:19; 60:2, 7 **grabbing** [1] 59:10 grade [3] 11:22; 40:5; 80:14 grading [1] 29:4 graham [87] 1:4; 2:6, 8; 4:15; 5:2; 6:22; 7:2; 8:19; 10:21; 11:5; 12:6; 15:5, 9, 15, 18; 16:21; 17:3, 17; 22:4, 19; 36:25; 45:7; 46:22; 47:1, 8; 49:2; 52:21, 24; 53:2, 19; 54:1, 6, 17, 21; 55:12, 18, 23; 56:12; 57:6, 21; 59:5, 6, 14, 16; 60:6, 9, 18; 61:10, 15; 62:3, 17; 63:7, 12; 64:23; 65:2, 8; 68:3; 69:3; 72:4, 13; 74:13, 23; 75:3; 76:3, 14, 20, 22; 77:1, 5, 11, 21; 79:14, 25; 80:3; 81:12, 17; 82:12; 83:11; 86:10; 88:9; 89:23; 90:1; 92:7, 23; 96:23; 98:6; 101:24 graham's [9] 22:1; 48:23; 49:2; 50:18, 22; 54:10; 67:10; 68:23; 81:9 **granted** [3] 48:7; 60:23; 66:8 granting [1] 71:9 greater [1] 21:14 grinding [1] 59:25 gross [1] 33:16 group [2] 29:6; 93:21 grubbing [33] 7:14; 28:22; 29:4; 30:9; 62:10, 14; 63:25; 64:2, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17; 65:9, 15; 66:14, 18; 67:14, 15, 21, 24; 73:7; 75:10; 76:5, 25; 77:1, 6, 10, 13; 78:19; 81:2; 95:4, 23 gte [7] 28:4, 10; 34:10; 43:2; 45:21; 48:8; 58:18 guard [1] 86:19 guide [1] 80:22 gulch [1] 27:19

gutter [6] 11:20; 12:5, 7, 15, 18; 29:10 guy [2] 80:18; 102:12 guys [2] 53:22; 75:20

## - H -

h [2] 2:15; 94:10 **h-10** [1] 94:14 **half** [6] 7:21; 10:12, 23; 15:4; 19:12, 13 halfway [2] 41:5; 86:23 **halt** [3] 17:23; 59:25; 74:20 hand [10] 3:19, 24; 6:17; 54:7, 14; 61:22; 86:3; 88:10; 101:22, 23 hand-outs [1] 4:22 handful [1] 55:15 handing [1] 4:11 handling [2] 16:1, 11 hanging [1] 41:19 haphazard [2] 40:19; 71:25 happen [10] 18:15; 40:11; 57:25; 58:1, 24; 81:23; 88:16; 89:18; 96:10, 14 happened [4] 39:12, 18; 59:4; 79:25 happening [4] 45:9; 70:25; 74:22; 75:2 **hardware** [1] 94:5 harp [1] 53:7 haul [1] 16:8 hauled [1] 22:6 hauling [1] 17:1 headed [1] 37:24 heading [1] 54:17 heard [9] 9:1; 16:18; 57:8; 67:13; 75:16; 77:14; 95:17, 20; 96:21 hearing [18] 2:19, 22; 3:2, 23; 4:4; 5:15; 6:5; 22:25; 23:5, 7, 10, 11, 13; 25:18; 69:22; 95:2; 102:19, 22 heck [1] 97:16 held [1] 85:22 help [5] 14:24; 22:3; 58:19; 66:4; 81:25 hence [2] 70:15; 87:18 hereby [3] 4:4; 22:25; 103:4 herring [1] 80:8 **highlight** [2] 25:14; 35:20 highlighted [2] 52:9; 90:14 highlights [2] 71:4;

hillsborough [1] 1:7 historical [1] 19:6 history [1] 9:24 hitting [1] 89:6 hold [2] 85:9, 13 hold-up [1] 93:11 holiday [1] 61:1 holidays [4] 60:4, 8; 61:8, 9 home [11] 17:4; 35:1; 47:10, 20; 50:23; 55:19; **57:1**; **74:5**; **91:11**, **21**; horse [1] 102:7 hubbard [1] 2:12 hundred [5] 29:18; 49:18; 63:16; 80:15; 91:20 hypothetical [2] 51:2; 57:15

## - I -

idea [1] 85:18 ideal [1] 72:3 identified [2] 5:23; 20:20 ignored [1] 87:8 imagine [1] 21:11 immediately [2] 30:8; 95:3 impact [18] 14:22; 18:22: 21:14: 35:11: 39:10; 40:23; 54:21; 62:19; 66:12; 67:1; 72:20; 75:13; 77:13, 17, 21; 99:13; 101:19 impacted [15] 26:9; 31:20; 37:12; 39:8, 21, 23, 24; 43:2; 45:14; 64:11; 72:13; 77:14, 19; 78:1; 91:8 impacting [1] 82:1 impacts [13] 16:23; 26:10, 11, 13; 29:17; 37:20; 42:2, 6; 59:22; 65:9; 81:2, 21; 102:14 **important** [3] 58:4; 66:1; 89:19 impractical [1] 83:16 impress [1] 97:24 inc [2] 1:4; 2:6 inch [2] 16:20; 19:13 inches [21] 7:21; 8:5; 9:9; 10:12, 14; 11:24; 12:8, 23, 25; 13:22; 15:7, 13, 15; 16:20; 19:12, 18; 20:20, 21, 24; 21:2 incident [1] 82:3 include [6] 7:16; 13:3; 17:15; 50:8; 62:12; 87:23

included [10] 12:19, 21, 22; 48:15; 49:6; 50:14; 62:13; 69:6; 87:7; 98:18 includes [1] 50:22 including [2] 4:2; 72:10 incorporate [1] 98:22 incorrect [1] 33:17 increase [1] 21:13 incurred [2] 92:11; 98:11 indeed [2] 49:14; 71:15 indeterminant [2] 79:5; 87:13 indicate [4] 9:22; 11:1; 26:25; 27:23 **indicated** [1] 28:6 indicates [1] 74:12 **indication** [1] 85:23 individual [1] 23:21 individuals [1] 3:16 inefficiencies [4] 38:10; 91:12, 16; 99:20 informal [1] 6:5 information [17] 4:7, 15; 5:9, 14; 6:3, 9, 25; 10:25; 20:3; 23:18; 32:15; 33:12; 35:23; 38:22; 60:23; 84:4; 102:12 infrastructures [1] inherent [5] 28:17; **45**:13; **69**:21; **89**:9; **9**1:15 initial [3] 30:13; 32:9; 73:20 initially [1] 34:16 **initiated** [1] 14:20 inlets [2] 84:22, 23 inspect [1] 10:18 inspectors [1] 7:23 install [7] 30:12; 33:1, 21; 35:4, 12; 53:4, 9 installation [9] 28:24; 29:3, 4, 5; 34:1, 21; 37:1; 40:2: 84:21 installed [5] 29:7, 11, 25; 33:7; 84:17 installing [8] 26:19, 20, 25; 28:10; 33:1; 34:17, 24; 65:12 instance [1] 45:16 instead [2] 28:14; 35:13 | jack [6] 2:4; 28:9; 50:6; instructed [1] 5:22 instruction [1] 48:21 intent [4] 13:14, 16; 19:9; 86:22 intentions [1] 53:4 interconnect [2] 68:22; 69:12 interest [2] 47:13, 21 **interested** [1] 103:12

**interfere** [1] 68:16

interfering [1] 63:17 internal [1] 25:9 interpretation [11] 48:23; 53:14; 64:18; 70:2, 3; 76:1; 81:9; 87:18; 89:8; 95:19, 22 interpreted [1] 47:6 interrupt [1] 6:14 interruption [1] 26:6 intersections [1] 12:16 into [25] 3:14; 4:7; 20:10; 27:6; 29:17, 19; 30:5; 33:10; 42:6, 25; 52:4, 12; 63:15, 16; 64:10; 67:5; 68:20; 77:23; 79:6, 13; 83:11; 90:23, 25; 97:3; 98:22 introduced [1] 4:4 invoices [1] 15:2 involved [4] 8:15; 57:19; 86:19; 88:11 involves [1] 43:11 isn't [4] 16:16; 61:25; 87:12; 95:24 isolate [1] 90:10 **isolated** [2] 21:12, 14 issue [19] 6:23; 17:2, 3, 6, 18; 21:19; 25:22; 41:17; 43:15; 47:3; 49:20; 50:24, 25; 51:12; 52:20; 55:24; 57:9; 73:7; 80:2 **issued** [1] 41:15 issues [22] 7:3; 14:18; 16:25; 18:3, 5, 11; 42:15; 44:23; 46:5, 23; 49:23; 55:13, 14, 17, 23; 56:17, 20; 57:7; 74:15; 86:3; 93:6 item [13] 7:1, 17; 19:15; 21:24; 30:9; 32:20; 43:10; 62:14; 64:17; 84:1; 86:5; 88:17; 96:24 itemized [1] 80:20 items [5] 72:12, 13, 19; 73:11: 90:10 itself [3] 14:25; 69:22; 70:1

#### - J -

73:10; 97:7; 102:8 james [1] 2:12 january [4] 41:14; 61:16; 65:25; 90:25 jerry [10] 22:4; 48:15; **59:3**; **64:4**; **67:13**, **16**; 77:16, 22; 92:13 jerry's [5] 51:11; 53:18; 54:5; 76:3; 92:17 job [74] 11:2, 3, 8;

12:17; 13:23; 14:9, 13, 16; | laid [2] 48:2; 70:20 15:20; 16:6; 18:13, 14; 20:6; 22:5, 9; 25:20; 27:4; 31:15; 32:1, 2; 33:23, 25; 34:17, 19; 39:10; 40:25; 43:1; 44:11; | large [8] 1:21; 13:15; 45:6; 46:3; 50:8; 51:19; 53:15; 55:21; 56:24; 57:2; 61:25; 62:3, 21; 63:1; 66:3, 16, 19, 20; 68:20; 70:17, 19; 71:16; 73:13; 74:6, 14, 22; 75:13; 77:12; 80:1, 11; 81:1; 82:22; 83:3, 6, 9; 88:1, 17, 25; 89:1, 15; 91:2; 93:20; 94:25; 96:20; 97:12, 15; jobs [6] 7:18; 9:2; 10:16; 12:2; 16:19; 97:11 john [6] 2:4; 3:8, 11; 4:12; 5:7; 79:20 joint [7] 34:11; 44:3; 45:19, 22; 51:8; 68:21 jpa [2] 27:12; 72:10 judge [1] 5:20 judgment [3] 17:12; 22:7; 33:16 july [5] 26:16, 24; 41:25; 42:5; 63:1 jump [4] 37:10; 38:23; 53:8; 74:8 jumped [2] 38:2; 93:25 jumping [2] 38:10; 99:25 juncture [1] 100:5 june [4] 3:13; 5:1; 26:23; 27:20 justified [2] 91:21, 23

### - K -

keep [4] 33:11; 44:11; 47:21; 51:15 kept [1] 68:5 key [2] 51:5; 58:24 kick [1] 90:23 kicked [1] 92:18 knock [2] 57:22, 23 knowledge [1] 31:22 **known** [4] 53:5; 54:12; 71:15; 84:4

### - L -

label [1] 4:14 labeled [1] 100:19 labor [1] 54:22 lack [3] 3:15; 31:22; 52:5 lady's [1] 3:17

98:14 laning [1] 7:7 14:1; 21:11; 34:5; 55:15; 84:7, 17 larger [2] 21:14; 43:12 last [8] 26:4; 71:5; 73:8, 10; 86:5, 14; 99:5 | **lastly** [1] 73:5 late [11] 35:17; 38:20; 40:12, 13; 63:11, 22; 68:20; 71:19, 20; 72:19, 24 lately [1] 97:11 later [7] 51:20; 53:6; 54:13; 63:22; 73:2; 78:12; 80:1 laundry [1] 79:3 law [1] 100:22 lead [2] 12:7; 91:10 least [3] 18:1; 63:2; 70:6 leave [1] 44:1 left [1] 87:18 left-hand [1] 41:6 legalistic [1] 6:6 length [3] 11:14; 42:23; 66:16 leon [1] 103:3 less [4] 10:15; 20:13, 23; 83:14 letter [16] 39:11; 41:15; 51:18; 52:11, 24; 56:16, 23; 59:11; 67:16; 76:4; 79:14, 18; 81:14, 20; 82:3; 99:15 letters [6] 52:23; 53:18; 54:5; 71:3; 92:17, 21 letting [1] 70:8 levels [1] 29:18 liaison [1] 50:11 life [1] 16:9 light [2] 34:3; 69:20 likely [2] 9:11, 23 limits [2] 45:2; 48:1 line [21] 9:16; 26:20; 30:18; 33:8; 37:24; 39:22; 43:2; 44:7, 16; 69:14; 82:6, 9, 19; 83:20; 85:25; 90:8; 93:25; 96:24; 98:10 linear [1] 94:5 lines [17] 11:24; 30:14; 33:8; 34:9; 35:1, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14; 51:7; 65:13, 14; 69:10; 77:24; 78:4; 85:18 list [3] 16:6; 79:3; 92:19 listed [3] 7:1; 30:9, 10 literally [1] 33:20 little [9] 23:4; 26:9;

landrum [1] 32:9

language [2] 18:4;

37:7; 50:3; 60:3, 24; 83:24; 89:23; 98:17 lo [1] 61:25 load [1] 49:22 loading [2] 8:16; 32:12 location [3] 1:7; 77:24; 82:2 logic [2] 49:23; 101:18 long [3] 44:20; 45:10; 79:2 longer [1] 100:13 look-ahead [1] 32:25 loop [1] 33:12 lost [1] 41:3 lot [24] 3:20; 21:24; 24:21; 29:23; 37:20, 22; 38:8, 10; 39:14; 40:7; 42:19; 44:3; 46:23; 55:10; 72:16, 19; 73:14; 89:5; 94:5; 95:12, 24; 98:14; 99:12 low [1] 10:8 lowered [1] 29:10 lowering [1] 11:21 lump [2] 7:16; 43:10 lump-sum [1] 19:15 lying [1] 96:1

# - M -

**m** [3] 1:17, 18; 102:22 machine [2] 8:4; 34:3 made [14] 10:21; 24:3; 30:11, 21, 25; 31:6; 33:17; 49:5, 19; 74:16; 81:17; 88:24; 101:7, 8 magnitude [2] 11:14; 80:12 main [1] 34:11 **maintain** [1] 30:5 maintenance [4] 15:17; 21:20, 22 major [1] 87:12 **majority** [2] 34:23; 84:7 make [22] 3:22; 8:3; 9:4, 8; 23:23; 27:24; 38:20; 41:9; 45:25; 46:4, 16; 61:7; 68:19; 73:6; 78:22; 80:3; 88:8; 95:12, 14; 96:21; 99:23; 101:7 makes [1] 44:12 making [4] 31:14; 33:16; 55:6; 70:18 man [1] 102:13 managed [1] 34:19 managing [1] 40:21 mandate [1] 31:10 **manhole** [1] 84:15 **manner** [3] 6:5; 33:18; 94:4

marked [2] 5:10; 25:19 market [2] 16:2, 3 marty [15] 2:11; 5:5; 9:23; 22:15; 24:21; 32:2; 39:10; 44:20; 56:22; 60:16; 65:20; 70:16; 90:22; 92:13; 102:1 **marty's** [5] 31:18; 60:20; 90:2, 12; 100:22 material [16] 5:16; 8:16; 16:3, 4, 8, 12; 17:24; 20:4; 21:20, 22, 23, 24; 22:2, 3, 5; 56:11 materiality [1] 5:21 **materials** [1] 16:1 matt [1] 27:19 matter [4] 1:12; 5:19; 65:22; 97:19 mcgehee [1] 27:18 mckishnie [29] 2:11; 9:21; 10:20; 11:2, 4; 12:14; 13:9; 14:11, 14; 18:12; 20:11; 56:15; 64:8; 65:4, 10, 17; 71:6; 75:21; 76:16, 21, 24; 77:3, 8, 16; 78:13; 83:16; 84:5; 97:22; 101:10 meaning [1] 39:23 means [3] 48:7; 61:24; meant [1] 86:16 measured [1] 101:21 measures [2] 72:23; 100:16 mechanism [2] 18:16; 98:11 mechanisms [2] 33:11; 40:16 meet [3] 23:1; 32:14; 82:17 meeting [12] 27:23; 32:4, 5, 18; 36:3; 37:4, 11; 51:13; 53:16; 92:13; 97:16; 102:13 meetings [10] 25:12; 32:22; 52:20, 22; 57:18; 80:23; 94:25; 95:25; 96:4; 97:10 member [2] 3:5, 12 members [2] 2:3; 3:11 memos [1] 67:9 mention [2] 57:8; 94:17 mentioned [7] 44:24; 46:4; 47:24; 48:8, 11; 56:3; 78:15 mentioning [1] 47:2 merely [3] 35:4; 45:23; 46:16 mess [1] 12:9 met [3] 27:17; 32:10;

march [2] 40:12; 103:13

71:10 methods [1] 47:2 mid [4] 34:22; 38:20; 40:13; 78:5 middle [1] 41:5 might [12] 12:14; 16:23; 17:2; 19:13; 37:20; 39:4; 44:19; 45:8; 47:6; n [2] 2:17; 3:1 52:4; 58:18; 102:11 naive [1] 87:3 mile [1] 83:7 naiveness [1] 88:13 mill [1] 8:2 **narrative** [4] 49:4; milled [4] 8:16; 11:7; 16:3, 7 miller [1] 22:3 millers [2] 15:21; 17:1 milling [21] 7:9, 17, 18, 22; 8:1, 4, 9, 10, 11; 11:15; 13:4, 7, 9, 24; 14:25; 15:2, 3; 17:22; 26:1; 64:15 mind [3] 51:10, 11, 15 minds [1] 47:22 minimal [1] 83:17 minimize [1] 72:23 minor [2] 32:13; 69:12 minute [2] 5:13; 25:15 minutes [4] 25:11; 53:17; 75:22; 98:1 misrepresentation [1] missed [2] 44:19; 45:9 missing [3] 52:19; 97:21; 99:7 misunderstanding [1] 24:23 mitigate [7] 27:15; 28:16; 35:11; 40:17; 43:22: 49:11: 54:23 mitigated [1] 42:2 mitigating [1] 46:11 mobilize [1] 37:17 monetarily [1] 91:9 money [6] 41:11, 25; 88:22; 92:15; 100:8, 21 monies [1] 8:5 month [4] 68:2; 78:12; 90:21 monthly [1] 23:25 months [11] 26:17; 38:19, 20; 63:2, 22; 75:6, 7; 82:10; 91:6; 99:14 most [9] 9:11; 15:16; 27:11; 34:19; 55:16; 56:7, 8; 84:14, 24 mot [3] 8:13; 16:25; 43:10 **move** [6] 69:10, 12; 83:18, 21; 84:6, 10 moved [5] 45:25; 59:10; 79:4: 85:25; 96:19 moving [2] 30:18; 71:17 multiple [1] 21:4

must [1] 34:7 mutual [1] 50:15 mystery [4] 33:5; 36:1; 84:3: 85:20

### - N -

51:17, 25; 52:10 narrow [1] 72:8 nathanael [1] 2:7 naturally [2] 91:10, 19 nature [6] 12:3; 26:10; 27:17; 33:24; 40:19; 42:20 necessary [5] 5:19; 24:16; 28:24; 30:4; 85:4 negotiated [2] 55:22; 56:19 new [18] 13:8; 26:20; 27:1, 6, 10; 28:10; 29:12; 34:17, 24; 35:4, 12; 40:8; 65:12, 14; 80:8; 84:16; 85:4; 89:17 newly [1] 40:11 next [14] 15:6, 12; 23:1, 12, 16; 36:5, 21; 41:21; 60:2; 73:8; 81:19; 93:17, 19; 97:17 nice [1] 49:17 nights [1] 29:23 nine [1] 15:10 nino [11] 29:17; 42:6; 46:5, 6, 9, 15; 55:11; 56:5, 9, 21 ninth [1] 38:12 nobody [2] 69:10; 80:19 non-jpa [1] 30:23 none [2] 46:13, 19 nor [3] 51:4; 103:9, 11 normally [1] 11:18 north [16] 7:4, 11; 11:8; 13:12; 26:18, 21; 27:1, 4, 5; 28:6; 36:6; 37:25; 38:16; 66:20; 83:9; 94:4 nos [2] 2:20; 4:18 notary [1] 1:20 note [1] 23:12 noted [2] 43:14, 20 notes [7] 19:5; 35:21; **38:25**; **42:11**; **53:1**, **2**; 95:16 **nothing** [5] 30:16; 49:13; 54:2; 56:6; 67:23 notice [16] 12:12, 13; 49:10; 51:25; 53:4, 13; 54:12; 59:8; 73:3; 78:8; 79:16; 83:17, 18, 25; 84:5;

85:21 noticed [2] 27:14; 28:4 notification [1] 72:25 notify [1] 12:10 november [11] 38:13; 59:10, 13, 16, 18; 63:20; 65:24; 66:24; 90:15; 100:1 **number** [34] 7:1; 10:8; 25:20; 26:3; 28:21; 33:11, 25; 35:15; 45:6; 47:17; 48:22; 55:9; 57:11, 16; 61:12; 67:7, 13; 71:11, 15, 19; 72:12, 22, 23, 24; 73:12, 15; 74:13, 18; 75:1, 4: 82:12; 89:24; 98:25; 102:11 **numbered** [1] 36:10 **numbers** [7] 60:20; 61:18; 90:2, 6, 8, 9; 91:14 **nutbrown** [48] 2:4; 3:2, 11; 4:1, 10, 14, 20, 24; 5:5, 9, 13; 6:25; 8:17, 20; 9:20; 10:16, 25; 11:3; 12:4; 22:11, 15, 18, 20; 24:2, 7, 14; 25:3, 15, 23; 26:5; 56:2; 60:16; 62:5; 63:4, 8; 73:8, 11; 85:3, 10; 89:25; 97:6; 99:3, 10; 102:1, 4, 8, 15, 18

## - 0 -

o [1] 3:1 objection [1] 23:25 objections [1] 36:1 **obligated** [1] 101:13 occur [2] 79:16, 18 occurred [9] 46:7; 48:16; 55:15, 16; 65:21; 66:22; 68:13; 92:9; 97:10 occurring [2] 69:16; 74:24 occurs [1] 79:19 october [4] 37:11; 66:24; 93:19, 20 offer [2] 5:15; 6:14 offered [2] 5:21; 92:13 office [19] 1:24; 17:4; 47:10, 20; 50:23; 55:19; 57:1; 74:5; 91:11, 21; 92:4; 100:15; 103:16 official [2] 53:3; 85:21 offset [1] 91:23 old [4] 9:17; 15:22; 20:8: 53:10 once [5] 42:1; 69:12; 82:7; 90:23; 101:7 ones [5] 18:6; 43:12; 56:20, 21; 83:22 ongoing [1] 30:3

onto [2] 39:16; 43:7 open [7] 10:17; 23:11; 70:2; 86:7; 87:18; 101:8 opening [1] 83:13 operation [3] 8:15; 30:12; 66:19 operations [5] 13:25; 44:25; 58:12; 68:7; 102:13 opinion [2] 44:15; 80:7 opportunity [1] 92:4 oral [1] 3:22 order [12] 6:1, 12; 28:16; 29:8, 11, 24; 30:1; 35:10; 44:2; 82:17; 91:13; 102:20 original [17] 18:3; 25:6; 38:1; 39:19; 42:24; 43:14; 53:25; 56:15, 23; 66:6; 68:10, 17; 87:23; 99:9, 10, 15 our [96] 3:13; 6:1; 7:1; 8:13; 9:7; 15:22; 16:4, 6, 14; 17:7, 21, 25; 18:8, 9; 20:5; 21:13; 25:7; 27:12, 22; 30:11; 31:8, 10, 16; 32:9; 33:8, 10; 34:23; 35:7, 11; 36:17, 19; 37:2, 9, 13, 24; 38:1, 10; 39:8, 12, 19, 25; 40:3, 8, 9, 21, 23; 41:15, 20; 43:3, 14, 16, 19; 44:9, 15; 45:25; 46:13; 47:21; 49:5, 6, 9, 14; 51:10; 53:4, 21; 58:22; 64:8; 68:14, 16; 69:16, 19; 71:23; 75:25; 77:8; 79:6; 80:14; 81:4; 82:13, 19; 83:25; 84:1; 85:19; 92:16; 95:7, 9, 10, 15, 19; 97:24; 98:10, 19; 99:13; 101:3 out-falls [1] 29:19 outlined [1] 65:19 outstanding [1] 56:17 overall [5] 10:12; 86:3, 13; 87:1; 88:7 overhead [13] 17:5; 18:24; 47:10, 20; 55:20; 57:1; 68:24; 74:5; 78:17; 91:11, 21; 100:15, 19 overrun [1] 14:15 oversight [1] 55:3

- P -

87:8; 92:16

oversize [1] 38:3

overview [1] 7:2

owner [1] 62:6

own [4] 53:14; 82:17;

p [3] 1:18; 3:1; 102:22

package [13] 7:1; 15:3; 24:5; 38:2; 46:14, 20; 47:1; 50:2; 54:13; 76:2; 81:10; 94:9; 99:10 packet [1] 5:1 page [11] 2:18; 5:2; 28:21; 29:1; 30:7; 36:9, 15; 41:21; 42:8; 54:19 pages [2] 36:10; 48:22 paid [6] 7:13; 21:23, 24; 56:13; 57:6; 74:13 paragraph [4] 49:8; 50:10, 19; 81:19 paragraphs [1] 81:19 paraphernalia [1] 23:15 park [1] 1:15 parks [1] 21:7 part [29] 14:1, 15; 15:2; 16:6; 23:25; 25:8, 13, 17; 31:5; 32:5, 6; 38:1; 39:4, 11; 43:7, 8; 45:25; 46:19; 50:1, 7; 55:16; 56:23; 64:16; 65:4; 80:5; 86:20; 87:4; 88:22; 101:16 particular [14] 7:5, 13; 8:15; 9:3, 18; 13:16; 32:11; 37:23; 53:2; 59:12; 70:22; 71:17; 90:11; 100:2 parties [8] 5:15, 22, 25; 32:18; 54:8; 71:16; 88:11; 103:9 parties' [1] 103:10 partnering [6] 25:8; 32:2, 4, 7, 18; 73:17 party [3] 4:6; 6:14; 25:7 pass [4] 8:3; 13:24; 15:25; 23:22 passes [1] 21:5 past [3] 37:5; 39:1; 48:21 path [1] 74:21 pattern [1] 80:11 paul [1] 32:9 pause [2] 41:8; 44:21 pavement [4] 16:18, 19; 17:12; 29:13 paver [1] 16:4 paving [1] 11:15 pay [10] 7:17; 21:23; 59:2, 20; 60:22; 62:14; 64:17; 90:9, 10, 17 paying [2] 11:6; 91:23 payment [3] 17:17; 18:2; 88:23 pending [1] 12:11 people [5] 31:22; 39:15; 40:10; 43:11; 97:12 percent [9] 41:1, 11, 12, 13, 23; 49:18; 80:15;

83:5; 91:20 percentage [1] 82:13 perfect [1] 72:3 perform [7] 19:23; 37:16; 39:7, 17; 40:12, 23; 64:19 performance [2] 52:5; 101:13 performed [3] 24:1; 25:6; 32:13 period [36] 57:10; 59:5, 20; 60:2, 4, 24; 61:13, 20; 62:20; 63:5, 8; 65:19, 24; 66:2, 23; 70:24; 71:1; 72:17; 75:11, 25; 76:2, 9, 11; 81:24; 82:10; 90:4, 5, 14, 16, 17, 20; 92:2; 100:13; 101:25; 102:21 permanent [1] 39:17 perplexed [1] 37:7 person [2] 3:17, 22 personally [1] 73:25 perspective [2] 16:13; 21:13 pertinent [2] 5:16; 6:15 phase [22] 28:5, 6, 7, 12, 14; 29:2, 6, 7, 8; 31:2, 3; 35:7; 39:11, 13, 18, 23; 40:9, 10; 75:1; 79:4; 98:16 phased [2] 15:20; 28:5 phases [2] 88:2; 98:20 phasing [1] 70:7 photo [1] 62:23 photograph [1] 26:15 photographs [5] 23:20, 22; 24:7; 26:14, 23 physical [1] 82:8 pick [1] 75:11 picture [2] 52:17; 54:9 **pictures** [1] 78:4 piecemeal [5] 29:25; 38:8; 40:7, 15; 44:8 pile [1] 22:9 pin [1] 89:4 pipe [7] 38:11; 39:25; 44:2; 55:3; 90:19; 91:12; 99:25 place [5] 1:15; 23:6; 61:19; 70:24; 72:17 placed [2] 39:15; 57:5 plan [4] 32:7; 48:2; 70:20; 88:7 planned [15] 27:11; 30:12, 15; 31:2; 33:1, 13; 35:7; 37:19; 38:9; 40:23; 41:12; 42:23; 44:16; 100:3, 12 planning [3] 33:3, 14; 35:24 plans [20] 9:22; 11:1;

12:22; 19:5; 21:16; 27:8; 28:4; 29:2; 31:13, 16; 36:17; 42:24; 70:7, 8, 11; 71:12, 13; 82:23; 84:2; 88:17 plaster [1] 11:24 **please** [7] 3:17, 23; 6:17; 19:1; 23:12; 56:3; 62:6 plenty [1] 83:25 plus [1] 61:13 point [34] 6:15; 9:24; 11:9; 24:19, 20; 26:8, 25; 33:20; 37:21; 41:9, 19; 46:4, 13, 16; 48:9; 51:10; 53:7, 23; 55:6; 58:4; 61:17; 64:9; 66:1; 68:19; 76:1, 6; 84:5; 92:2; 94:24; 99:23; 100:4, 14, 22; 101:22 points [5] 23:23; 25:14; 70:18; 73:6; 78:21 pole [21] 33:21; 34:5, 21; 37:24; 45:15; 53:9; 54:13; 59:9, 12; 77:24; 82:9; 84:6, 10, 15; 85:9, 13, 25; 94:16; 100:1 poles [51] 26:20, 22; 27:1; 30:18; 34:18, 19, 24; 35:4, 13; 40:21; 43:2; 45:22; 48:2; 53:8; 65:12, 14; 68:21; 69:1, 9, 11, 13, 14: 70:19, 20; 71:17; 73:14; 77:22; 79:3; 80:19, 20; 82:7, 12, 14, 16, 20; 83:19, 21; 84:16, 17, 20; 85:4, 5, 16, 25; 93:25; 96:18 policy [2] 24:21; 98:19 pond [15] 16:5; 21:21; 27:9; 28:23; 33:7, 8, 9; 36:16; 37:1, 13, 14; 82:8; 83:1, 9 ponds [8] 28:23; 29:4, 5, 17; 30:5; 46:18; 83:11, poor [1] 3:16 portion [3] 65:10; 77:9; 91:22 portions [2] 12:6; 86:13 **pose** [1] 19:3 position [2] 9:8; 10:9 positive [1] 88:3 possession [1] 25:13 possible [5] 23:3; 44:5; 46:1; 96:6, 9 **possibly** [1] 68:20 post [2] 1:24; 103:16 potential [2] 27:15; 96:14 **power** [5] 35:10; 45:15;

48:2; 62:7; 78:17 power's [1] 78:16 practical [1] 84:8 precast [1] 34:1 precasting [1] 38:5 preceded [1] 78:19 precedent [2] 11:5; 78:16 preceding [1] 4:4 precons [1] 57:18 preconstruction [4] 28:19; 36:18; 80:16; 84:1 presence [10] 17:10, 15; 50:8; 54:18; 57:2, 6; 74:14, 16; 76:12; 79:20 present [6] 2:14; 6:13; 33:25; 49:16; 58:10; 66:3 presentation [10] 17:14; 22:21; 44:18; 50:22; 51:14; 67:9, 11; 69:6; 74:4; 87:3 presentations [1] 3:23 presented [6] 4:21; 46:23; 47:3, 9; 51:4; 75:18 **pretty** [10] 8:23; 11:16; 20:12; 32:4; 42:4; 44:18; 61:17; 70:23; 75:2; 89:2 previous [2] 50:24; 74:14 previously [1] 4:8 primarily [2] 6:9; 12:16 **prime** [1] 7:5 prints [1] 24:14 prior [11] 9:2; 19:22; 26:17; 29:8; 34:20; 62:17; 65:5; 67:22; 70:8; 90:14, 17 **private** [1] 30:2 privy [2] 48:14; 79:24 probably [18] 17:7; 21:10; 44:24; 47:18; 48:24; 50:5, 11; 55:16; 60:2; 61:6, 8; 71:5; 73:18; 74:23; 75:4; 83:5; 92:10; 98:8 problem [19] 11:23; 27:15, 16, 24; 28:9, 12, 13; 30:3; 38:11; 39:2; 44:24; 60:10; 79:9; 93:12, 22; 96:8, 14, 22 **problems** [9] 7:25; 33:10; 36:7, 23; 37:3, 18; 39:3; 64:21; 97:20 proceed [2] 33:18; 37:9 proceeded [1] 28:24 proceeding [2] 5:24; proceedings [3] 6:4, 8; 103:6 process [1] 88:6

processed [2] 14:8, 21 **produce** [1] 5:18 **production** [2] 34:15; 82:19 productive [1] 82:11 profiles [2] 48:3; 70:21 progress [10] 32:22; 38:18; 39:22; 41:1, 23; 71:22; 72:11; 77:20; 95:25; 96:20 progresses [1] 84:9 projects [13] 7:4, 6, 12, 19; 9:8, 12; 14:6, 23; 16:8; 19:7; 35:10; 87:16; **promised** [1] 31:15 proof [1] 42:17 properly [1] 5:23 property [1] 30:2 provide [5] 33:12; 51:25; 85:21; 88:3; 89:20 provided [3] 17:17; 20:3; 55:11 provisions [2] 6:10; 50:3 public [1] 1:20 pudding [1] 42:17 pull [2] 53:9; 82:9 pulled [1] 69:1 pulling [4] 77:24; 82:16, 20; 86:12 punch [1] 16:6 purpose [3] 22:2; 86:18; 87:12 purposeless [3] 87:9, 10, 13 **pursue** [3] 18:10; 55:18; 57:21 pursuing [1] 58:5 pursuit [1] 72:2 pushing [1] 61:25

# - Q -

**quadrant** [1] 83:5 **qualified** [1] 56:16 quantified [2] 47:2; 54:21 quantify [1] 100:18 **quantity** [1] 13:15 **guantum** [1] 17:14 **quarter** [1] 83:7 question [9] 3:19; 19:3; 56:2; 60:19; 62:5; 66:21; 75:22, 24; 82:21 questions [8] 22:12, 23, 24; 95:2; 97:8; 99:4; 102:9, 16 quick [2] 71:8; 82:1 quickly [3] 23:3; 46:1; 86:25

quite [3] 19:20; 21:7, 8 quizzing [1] 90:7 quoted [1] 86:15 quoting [2] 86:9; 88:10

rain [2] 29:20; 55:10

raise [4] 3:19, 23; 6:17;

rainfall [1] 42:12

### - R -

r[1] 3:1

11:25 ramifications [1] 92:19 ran [2] 33:10; 90:20 range [8] 9:14, 17; 10:14, 22, 24; 21:9; 56:16 rate [3] 8:2, 3; 82:20 rather [2] 9:25; 10:6 rcp [1] 33:2 re [1] 1:12 reach [1] 101:13 reaching [1] 42:13 reaction [1] 97:20 read [12] 13:20; 15:8; 17:7; 35:22; 49:15; 50:10, 20; 71:4, 11; 79:23; 80:1; 97:3 readdressed [1] 25:17 reading [5] 23:14; 78:25; 79:12; 86:17; 94:11 ready [2] 90:18 real [1] 71:8 reality [2] 89:3; 97:5 reason [7] 49:21; 60:19; 61:6; 71:22; 75:4; 78:6; 92:7 reasonable [19] 9:8, 10, 16; 10:6, 10; 16:17; 17:13; 19:18, 22; 20:12; 48:7; 52:7; 53:15; 56:13; 64:18; 71:23; 72:23; 73:3; 75:5 reasonableness [2] 10:1; 52:1 reasonably [2] 10:4; reasons [3] 49:21; 72:15; 90:7 rebuilding [1] 7:8 rebuttal [9] 6:14; 17:7; 22:22; 31:18; 75:15; 86:6, 7, 12, 25 receipt [1] 73:2 receive [1] 5:23 received [6] 4:18; 5:1, 12, 14; 11:7; 24:9 recently [2] 80:4; 87:17 recognize [5] 3:20; 6:18; 41:17; 100:25; 101:5

recollection [3] 12:17; 19:14; 29:18 reconstructed [1] 19:12 reconstruction [3] 13:6, 10; 15:24 record [5] 4:7; 25:13; 33:15; 42:13; 103:7 records [3] 52:25; 59:2, recoup [1] 98:10 **recover** [1] 8:8 recovery [2] 46:11; 56:10 red [1] 80:7 refer [2] 32:1; 99:21 **reference** [5] 19:6; 81:16; 89:11; 94:12; 98:16 **referenced** [2] 13:12; referencing [1] 76:3 referring [2] 86:5, 8 reflected [1] 91:2 **regarding** [2] 6:10; 80:8 regards [2] 11:17; 91:24 reinforced [1] 26:20 reiterate [1] 100:4 reiterates [1] 54:11 reiterating [1] 16:14 relate [2] 66:4; 70:7 related [5] 14:9; 17:18; 21:1; 46:10; 82:3 relates [1] 25:20 relating [1] 23:16 relation [1] 75:24 relative [2] 103:8, 10 **relevance** [1] 5:21 relevant [1] 24:11 relocate [4] 35:19; 51:7; 68:23; 80:19 relocating [1] 35:13 **relocation** [34] 27:4; 28:3, 15; 30:16; 31:11; 45:15, 18; 52:3; 63:6; 64:3; 66:6; 67:1, 11; 68:7, 14; 70:1, 11; 71:9; 72:14; 74:11; 76:16; 78:15, 18; 87:6, 11, 16; 89:22; 94:1; 95:11; 96:7; 97:23; 98:14, 24; 101:15 **remaining** [2] 15:23; 56:20 **reminders** [1] 92:21 reminds [1] 86:14 removal [4] 10:11; 16:7; 62:12; 64:16 remove [2] 15:22; 46:14 removed [3] 17:24;

66:16; 100:1 replacing [1] 19:19 reply [2] 8:20; 43:18 report [3] 36:4; 99:21; 103:6 **reported** [3] 1:19; 38:14; 93:20 reporter's [1] 6:1 reporters [1] 1:23 represent [1] 67:8 representative [1] 99:17 representatives [1] 27:18 represented [2] 16:19; 98:3 request [2] 4:1; 56:25 requested [1] 96:9 requesting [1] 17:4 require [3] 7:16; 13:24; 77:6 required [5] 6:6; 11:15; 15:25; 46:18; 101:20 requirement [1] 27:16 reserved [2] 18:9; 55:18 residual [1] 26:11 resolve [3] 41:18; 43:15; 95:13 resolved [3] 26:12; 38:11; 56:18 resources [2] 67:23; respects [1] 89:20 responded [2] 49:25; 64:25 respondent [1] 6:13 response [6] 33:15; 36:19; 54:5, 6; 70:18; 90:2 responsibility [1] 70:10 **responsive** [2] 85:12; 97:13 rest [2] 8:13; 15:16 restricted [1] 43:13 **resubmittal** [2] 49:25; 50:1 result [1] 71:12 resurface [1] 11:21 resurfaced [2] 9:24; 20:9 resurfacing [4] 7:18; 8:24; 11:17; 19:7 retain [1] 5:24 revenue [5] 90:3, 4; 91:1, 2, 9 reversal [1] 86:18 review [2] 75:18; 90:13 reviewed [1] 75:18 reviewing [1] 86:24 revise [1] 101:14

revised [3] 42:3; 53:21; revision [1] 53:23 revisions [1] 89:17 right-of-way [3] 66:15; 77:19; 84:18 rip [1] 72:1 risk [1] 9:4 risks [1] 10:7 risky [1] 20:12 road [13] 11:18, 22; 12:4; 29:9; 35:6, 11; 40:11; 43:2, 7, 8; 58:11; 82:7; 94:1 roads [1] 7:8 roadway [11] 7:20; 13:19; 15:23; 27:10; 35:7; 39:17; 40:3, 5, 6, 8; 62:13 roadways [1] 64:16 roebuck [17] 2:4; 3:8; 12:10; 22:14, 23; 24:10, 20; 25:21; 26:22; 36:9; 41:3, 9; 54:19; 60:13; 63:21; 97:9; 102:10 root [2] 45:3; 47:23 roughly [6] 9:14; 47:11; 52:4; 74:2; 76:8, 10 rules [1] 6:7 run [1] 60:24 running [1] 84:23 runs [1] 30:13 rural [3] 12:18; 16:15; 20:24

#### - S -

**s** [1] 3:1 **s-43** [1] 82:24 s-50 [1] 82:2 sake [1] 6:16 **salvage** [1] 35:14 sam [1] 27:18 sanchez [54] 2:11; 4:12; 5:7; 8:22; 13:6, 10; 16:13; 20:8; 21:18; 22:17, 21; 24:25; 44:22; 45:22; 46:21; 47:15; 53:24; 54:18, 20; 56:7, 24; 57:13; 59:8, 15, 19; 60:7, 11, 15; 61:2, 13, 17; 62:9, 15, 20; 63:5, 11, 13, 24; 64:25; 66:1; 67:7, 19; 68:19; 70:17; 71:8; 73:9, 12, 22. 25; 74:2; 78:21; 79:20; 92:1: 102:3 **sat** [1] 55:21 saves [1] 35:13 savings [1] 100:24 saw [1] 85:16 scale [1] 34:4 scenario [9] 12:20;

scenarios [1] 19:17 schedule [96] 23:6; 25:20; 28:3, 15, 20; 30:11, 16, 20; 31:3, 8, 10, 11; 32:6, 12, 14, 15; 38:5; 39:12; 40:9; 41:11, 23; 42:2, 3, 10, 18; 49:2, 7, 9; 50:9, 13; 51:23; 52:10, 16; 53:18, 19, 21, 22; 54:7; 58:2; 64:22; 66:7; 67:1; 68:8, 14, 17; 69:21, 22, 25; 70:1, 6; 72:24; 73:16; 74:7, 10; 79:2, 5, 12, 21; 80:5, 20; 81:21; 82:1, 17; 85:17; 87:11, 14; 88:10, 14, 16; 89:12, 21; 91:13, 25; 92:16, 18; 95:9, 10, 11; 96:20, 23; 97:4, 23; 98:22, 24; 100:6, 16, 21; 101:1, 3, 12, 14, 15, 16 scheduled [4] 69:3; 73:1; 76:17; 86:10 scheduler [1] 32:10 schedules [8] 50:14; 58:3; 70:12; 78:18; 87:16, 24; 89:18; 98:14 scheduling [3] 25:9, 24; schwab [1] 51:18 scope [1] 57:3 score [1] 26:1 second [18] 8:3; 9:21; 13:24; 15:25; 17:14; 36:2, 12; 38:15; 47:7; 49:22; 52:20; 56:15; 71:5; 72:16; 86:19; 88:21; 92:2; 93:9 secretary [1] 3:6 section [8] 3:4; 13:3; 16:16; 52:9; 67:21; 70:22; 71:4 sections [2] 12:15; 19:6 seeking [1] 8:12 seem [2] 10:13; 94:21 seemed [1] 34:18 seems [3] 86:25; 93:11; 97:21 sell [1] 16:9 send [3] 5:25; 49:12; 92:20 sense [5] 23:14; 87:10, 13; 95:12, 14 sent [1] 94:10 sentence [1] 50:19 separate [9] 6:23; 7:17; 14:6; 18:3; 21:23; 30:14, 20; 42:15 september [17] 26:24; 52:23; 53:1; 54:11; 59:9, 18; 63:20; 65:24; 66:24; 72:25; 82:3; 90:15; 91:4;

20:2; 45:19; 47:7; 51:3;

57:17; 58:25; 75:14, 17

94:14, 15; 99:25 **sequence** [2] 33:13; 100:2 series [2] 26:19; 29:7 serious [2] 89:2; 97:20 seriously [1] 29:21 serve [1] 3:12 serves [2] 86:18; 87:11 session [1] 73:17 **set** [4] 37:1; 48:18; 86:22; 93:2 **setting** [1] 89:1 settle [1] 14:17 settled [1] 18:10 settlement [1] 18:5 seven [2] 69:3; 75:1 several [2] 23:20; 45:24 sewage [1] 36:15 sewer [2] 36:25; 53:4 **shall** [3] 5:17, 20; 50:13 **sheath** [1] 85:4 **sheet** [12] 4:17, 23; 5:3, 7; 32:24; 50:12; 73:6, 7, 9; 99:17, 19, 22 sheeting [1] 34:14 **sheets** [4] 32:21; 48:3; 50:5; 84:1 shield [2] 85:7, 8 **shift** [10] 27:21, 24; 39:14, 18, 23; 40:10, 13, 14: 43:3. 7 shifted [2] 37:12; 39:15 **shifts** [2] 40:16; 43:9 **shocking** [1] 69:11 short [1] 63:8 shortest [1] 102:21 **shortly** [1] 60:7 **shoulder** [1] 41:20 **shouldn't** [3] 59:17; 84:2, 9 **show** [16] 10:21, 23; 20:6; 21:17; 26:24; 27:8; 42:7; 63:15; 90:3, 12; 91:14; 96:11; 97:15, 17, 18; 99:13 showed [1] 84:12 **showing** [3] 41:10, 13; 52:10 shown [1] 45:12 **shows** [11] 15:6; 26:18; 34:3; 41:1, 23; 48:8; 60:17; 90:25; 91:8; 92:25 **shut** [2] 44:11; 61:8 side [9] 10:17; 11:8, 20; 35:6; 37:25; 38:2; 43:1; 93:25; 94:6 sidewalk [2] 84:19; 85:1 signal [1] 68:22 signed [3] 18:9; 32:23; 33:4 **significant** [5] 29:17;

51:6; 58:9; 72:6; 74:4 similar [3] 7:11; 21:8, **simmons** [45] 2:5; 3:5; 13:3, 7; 14:4, 7, 13, 19, 24; 15:6, 12, 16; 21:1, 16; 22:13, 22; 24:12; 26:3; 36:13; 41:5; 62:23; 63:1, 14; 65:6; 66:4, 25; 67:3; 70:16; 81:6, 13; 82:21; 83:2, 8, 12; 84:11, 22; 85:1; 92:25; 93:5, 10; 94:8; 99:5, 11; 102:15, 17 simple [3] 23:23; 75:22, single [3] 4:17, 23; 5:2 **site** [12] 8:7; 10:3; 13:1; 20:1, 8, 10, 19, 22, 24; 38:4, 7, 9 sites [1] 28:23 sitting [2] 68:11; 81:5 **situation** [5] 78:20; 89:2, 12, 14; 102:14 **six** [4] 23:2, 7; 47:12; 74:18 **sixth** [1] 37:10 **sixty** [1] 15:5 **sizable** [1] 16:7 **skinniest** [1] 98:24 **skip** [1] 50:3 slip [1] 42:9 **slowest** [1] 40:3 slows [1] 34:14 **small** [5] 4:25; 22:9; 34:2; 43:7; 82:13 smaller [4] 6:23; 21:13; 43:12; 55:3 so-and-so [1] 84:7 sole [1] 5:20 **somewhat** [3] 52:19; 83:16; 87:3 soon [2] 44:4; 96:9 sooner [2] 67:25; 92:10 **sorry** [5] 36:4, 14; 50:3; **54:16, 20 sort** [3] 18:17; 82:2; 92:19 south [21] 7:4, 12; 27:2, 21, 25; 28:7, 11; 29:9; 36:6; 38:16; 43:1; 66:19; 82:22; 83:2, 4, 6, 10; 93:24; 94:2, 4 **speak** [2] 12:14; 47:25 speaking [2] 3:18; 13:13 spec [1] 88:21 **special** [1] 50:3 **specific** [13] 30:18; 77:3, 23; 78:9; 79:3; 85:24; 96:24; 98:19, 20; 99:20, 21 specifically [12] 18:6;

27:8; 28:22; 29:3, 6; 33:2; 35:5; 64:20; 86:6, 9; 87:5; 100:17 specification [2] 32:14; 71:2 specifications [7] 20:1; 50:9; 71:7; 80:5, 8; 92:22; 101:11 **specified** [2] 9:22; 12:24 **specify** [1] 13:9 specs [2] 19:16; 89:10 speed [3] 34:1; 35:16; 97:7 spent [2] 29:23; 37:21 split [1] 42:21 **spoken** [1] 44:19 **spread** [5] 5:7; 21:11; 99:16, 19, 22 stage [1] 86:22 standard [1] 101:20 standpoint [1] 45:13 stapled [1] 4:22 **start** [34] 6:21, 22; 8:22; 24:20; 25:1; 30:4; 34:20; 35:17; 36:20; 40:3; 62:7, 9; 63:1, 25; 64:2, 22, 24; 65:9; 68:6; 71:21; 76:14; 77:5, 6; 78:11, 12; 80:10; 81:3; 86:4; 93:23; 94:11; 95:8; 99:1, 18 started [22] 7:22; 12:5; 26:16; 54:15; 61:5; 62:18, 19; 63:2, 7; 64:9, 20; 65:3; 66:19; 68:4; 77:11; 78:12, 14; 81:1, 3; 93:1, **starting** [10] 36:6; 37:8; 50:10; 62:18; 76:1, 4; 77:14; 83:9, 12; 94:25 starts [1] 65:20 **state** [7] 1:2, 3, 21; 2:3; 3:3; 35:11; 103:2 stated [3] 36:16, 17; 39:10 **statement** [8] 10:22; 79:1, 13, 15; 86:20; 89:2; 96:22 **statements** [3] 52:11; 86:13: 96:10 **states** [1] 81:17 **stating** [3] 76:4; 86:9; **station** [2] 82:25; 84:6 status [1] 41:16 statutes [1] 3:4 stay [1] 68:14 **stayed** [1] 82:18 steel [1] 26:19 **stipulate** [1] 64:13 **stipulated** [3] 28:14; 64:3, 5

stockpile [4] 16:5, 7; 22:2, 8 stockpiling [1] 21:20 stop [1] 61:20 stopped [2] 88:25; 89:3 **stopping** [1] 89:15 storm [11] 15:23; 35:24; 36:15, 25; 39:4; 40:2, 4; 43:4, 25; 44:5; 53:4 straight [1] 82:19 strain [1] 27:1 street [2] 28:1; 35:5 stress [1] 58:4 stretch [1] 35:2 strictly [3] 6:7; 8:6; 99:24 string [1] 94:4 structural [2] 13:8; 19:13 structure [4] 33:21; 34:6; 37:23; 82:9 structures [16] 28:25; 29:5, 7; 30:5, 13; 33:2; 34:1; 37:2; 38:4, 6; 46:17; 82:5; 83:8; 84:14; 95:8; 100:3 stub-outs [1] 43:25 stubbed [1] 44:1 study [1] 24:24 stuff [8] 25:16; 34:13; 44:4; 57:5; 89:5; 94:3, 22: 95:24 subcontract [1] 8:1 subcontractor [1] 8:1 subjectivity [1] 65:20 submission [1] 47:9 **submit** [6] 51:17, 21, 24; 80:9; 88:9; 101:1 submits [1] 89:12 **submittal** [17] 28:21; 32:6, 9; 43:21; 49:2, 22; 50:9, 18; 51:15; 52:16; **53:25**; **54:2**; **61:22**; **72:18**; 73:20; 80:7; 92:9 submittals [4] 24:21; 25:5, 7; 80:15 submitted [23] 4:2, 8; 16:24; 17:10; 23:19; 28:20; 32:15, 20, 22; 39:19; 46:22; 53:22; 54:25; 75:14, 15; 76:3; 80:20, 21; 89:9; 92:8, 10; 97:4 submitting [3] 32:8; 51:20; 80:12 subsequent [1] 44:17 subset [1] 66:2 substantial [1] 45:16 **such** [5] 5:15, 18; 28:19; 87:22; 88:9 **suddenly** [2] 12:8; 80:17

**sufficient** [1] 50:10 **sum** [2] 7:16; 43:10 **summaries** [2] 42:11; 94:11 **summarize** [1] 99:15 summarized [1] 99:6 **summary** [11] 40:20; 41:4; 71:24; 73:5, 6; 81:11; 86:2; 93:13, 14; 94:9 summer [2] 29:16; 40:14 superintendent [1] 51:19 supervisions [1] 8:14 supplemental [11] 11:7; 13:14, 15, 17, 20; 14:2, 4, 13, 19; 18:6; 56:4 **supposed** [4] 28:5; 40:11; 62:9; 68:6 supposing [1] 24:2 surprise [2] 32:16; 84:9 **surprises** [1] 51:22 switch [2] 39:11; 75:2 **switched** [2] 15:21; 17:24 switches [2] 42:22; 43:12 sworn [3] 3:24, 25; 23:13 system [4] 28:11; 29:25; 68:22; 83:14 systems [4] 27:10; 29:11; 30:14; 38:9

- T -

tab [9] 48:24; 50:5, 6; 54:16, 19; 71:5; 73:8, 10; table [2] 3:16; 18:7 tack [1] 20:16 **tallahassee** [3] 1:16, 24; 103:17 tampa [4] 30:7; 37:15; 87:6; 93:10 target [1] 18:20 teco [102] 26:2, 18, 25; 27:18, 20; 30:16; 31:1, 4; 32:3; 33:21; 34:5, 16; 40:20; 45:5, 11, 22; 48:8, 9, 12, 20, 25; 49:1, 5, 13, 16, 17; 50:8, 17, 25; 51:4, 6, 9, 11, 21; 52:14, 18, 21; 53:5; 54:3, 6, 12, 18; 55:14, 17, 24; 57:8; 58:21; 59:5; 60:4; 61:19; 62:3; 63:9, 15, 22; 65:19; 66:3, 17; 67:15, 20; 68:20, 21; 69:8, 15, 16, 18, 21; 70:4, 17, 18, 24; 71:15, 16;

72:17; 73:1, 13; 74:9, 15; 75:25; 76:6, 14; 77:14, 15; 78:8, 16; 79:2, 6, 20, 25; 80:17, 20; 83:18; 84:6; 87:12; 88:14; 94:13; 95:6; 96:2, 6, 23; 97:14; 101:20 teco's [8] 52:4; 68:3; 69:1, 24; 72:14; 76:12; 77:19, 22 temporary [1] 39:14 ten [1] 69:3 tentative [2] 25:19; 28:20 term [1] 3:13 **testify** [1] 52:14 **testimony** [2] 5:16; 103:7 | **thank** [2] 5:4; 47:15 theirs [2] 24:22; 72:9 **themselves** [3] 21:16; 69:11; 101:11 theory [1] 72:20 **therefore** [2] 9:10; 49:6 thereof [1] 52:6 thereto [1] 4:3 they've [5] 46:12; 49:14, 15, 19; 74:16 thick [4] 8:5; 11:10; 15:15; 94:10 thickness [23] 6:23; 7:20, 24; 8:2; 9:17, 23; 10:14; 11:6, 12; 12:1, 11, 22, 24; 16:15, 18, 20; 17:12; 19:2, 5; 20:14, 23; 21:13, 17 thicknesses [4] 9:14; 19:21; 20:7; 21:6 thinking [5] 48:19; 51:16; 54:15, 16; 67:17 third [7] 3:12; 36:24; 50:5, 6, 11; 54:16, 19 third-person [1] 86:1 thirsty [1] 75:20 thirty [3] 51:20; 63:16; 80:1 though [1] 21:6 **threatened** [3] 41:16; 42:18: 100:10 threatening [2] 92:17, three [22] 4:13; 7:21; 9:9; 10:11, 22; 15:4; 16:5; 19:8, 12, 17; 29:7; 30:9; 37:13; 39:1; 40:10; 50:5; 63:2; 69:4, 13; 72:22 **three-inch** [3] 16:14; 17:12; 20:9 three-quarters [1] 9:15 throughout [1] 65:23

ticking [1] 64:9 tight [1] 84:20 timely [1] 92:9 titled [1] 71:6 today [6] 6:19; 23:6; 24:17; 56:21; 81:5; 95:20 together [2] 74:8, 9 tony [4] 16:18; 20:16; 70:18; 98:2 top [5] 11:21, 25; 12:8; 69:9; 84:20 topics [1] 101:9 topo [1] 70:20 topped [1] 69:13 **total** [7] 8:10; 13:10; 15:1; 47:11; 77:18; 82:14; totally [1] 57:15 toward [2] 72:11; 74:25 **traffic** [21] 15:17, 21; 17:23, 24; 19:22; 21:21; 27:7; 29:2; 31:12, 16; 39:11, 14; 40:12, 14, 15; 42:22, 24; 43:3, 9; 75:1; 84:2 transcript [2] 6:1; 103:6 **transfer** [5] 35:4, 9; 51:25; 65:14; 85:18 transferred [1] 34:25 transferring [2] 65:13; transmission [16] 26:22; 27:19; 30:19; 34:18; 35:1; 36:3; 45:17; 48:12; 63:4; 65:13, 14; 77:22; 78:3; 81:4; 85:4, **transmittal** [3] 52:10; 53:11; 78:23 **transpired** [1] 53:14 transportation [5] 1:9, 15; 2:10; 3:7, 10 **trees** [5] 66:15; 77:19, 25; 78:1, 9 trench [2] 34:11; 85:8 trenching [1] 44:3 triple [1] 16:11 trouble [1] 67:3 truck [1] 15:19 **trucking** [1] 16:1 true [1] 103:7 **trump** [5] 31:10; 44:25; 47:24; 48:6; 62:2 trumps [1] 52:8 trunk [9] 30:13; 33:8; 34:9; 37:24; 39:22; 44:16; 82:6, 9 tuesday [1] 1:13 tug [21] 44:24; 45:16; 46:4, 23; 47:2, 7, 18, 23; 48:7, 11; 51:13; 52:13;

55:2; 56:9; 57:8; 59:11; 64:4; 67:8; 72:8; 74:3; 84:12 tug's [3] 52:23; 71:3; 72:24 turn [4] 9:13; 31:19; 50:2; 97:5 turned [3] 32:25; 100:6, twelfth [1] 38:23 twice [1] 53:20 two-lane [1] 7:8 two-month [1] 39:24 two-part [2] 25:22 two-week [2] 32:25; 53:13 tying [1] 86:2 tyler [1] 53:17 type [3] 20:2; 31:14; 58:6 typical [6] 6:4; 11:19; 13:3; 19:6; 20:24; 34:4 typically [1] 12:18

## - U -

ultimately [2] 58:10; 72:18 unable [1] 16:10 under [14] 3:9; 7:14; 19:22; 27:12; 28:14; 29:2; 36:17: 42:23: 43:10: 47:9. 19; 78:22; 84:23; 94:9 underground [3] 62:4; 68:24; 72:10 underlying [1] 44:22 undermines [1] 70:25 understand [4] 14:7, 24; 49:16; 81:25 understanding [5] 5:19; 12:21; 17:9; 18:8; 49:14 understood [4] 18:11, 12; 21:25; 32:17 undertake [1] 18:18 unforeseen [1] 89:14 unfortunate [1] 37:17 unfortunately [1] 86:15 unique [1] 78:20 unless [3] 23:24; 50:15, unreasonable [2] 9:19: 13:22 unrelated [3] 17:18; 55:13, 24 unusual [4] 19:4; 27:17; 78:17 upcoming [1] 88:12 updates [1] 89:17 **upon** [3] 32:17; 39:9;

98:21 urban [1] 16:16 **urban-type** [1] 11:19 **us** [27] 3:21; 6:17; 8:5; 10:10; 11:16; 19:22; 25:3, 16; 26:17; 28:13; 31:12; 33:17; 38:18; 41:10; 50:7; 51:22; 58:19; 59:8; 64:8; 68:15; 75:16, 18; 76:7; 91:24; 92:3, 14; 98:11 users [3] 45:19, 22; 51:8 usually [1] 23:2 utilities [12] 15:23; 31:2; 33:25; 34:6; 44:4, 6, 8; 57:19; 75:6; 80:24; 88:6: 101:25 utilities' [2] 67:1; 101:12 utility [54] 23:16; 25:12; 27:12; 30:15; 31:23; 32:22; 35:15, 21, 22, 23; 36:12, 24; 37:10; 38:12, 23; 40:7; 45:1; 47:25; 50:13, 15, 21; 51:13; 52:21; 53:1, 16; 54:12; 58:9, 14; 62:6; 66:6, 11, 12; 70:1, 11; 71:8, 12; 72:6, 11; 73:24; 80:22, 23; 87:12; 88:6; 89:21; 93:2; 94:20; 95:21, 25; 97:10, 23, 25; 98:12, 15; 102:11

37:22

want [15] 16:4; 22:16;

## - V -

vacation [1] 61:6 vague [4] 31:11; 70:1; 87:22; 98:25 value [2] 16:2; 47:16 varied [1] 7:24 variety [1] 14:17 various [2] 12:16; 55:23 vary [1] 7:21 verbal [1] 80:25 verbiage [1] 77:4 versus [5] 22:8; 41:24; 43:12; 100:8, 21 via [1] 74:14 view [2] 16:14; 45:3 views [1] 17:11

## - W -

w [1] 2:4 wait [4] 44:5; 75:6; 96:1, 17 waiting [5] 64:6, 15; 65:16; 88:14, 19 walk-throughs [1] 57:22; 58:4, 19, 22; 63:11; 74:8, 11; 78:11; 80:3; 96:7; 100:7; 101:5, 6 **wanted** [9] 5:6; 25:14; 32:12; 54:7; 60:1, 21; 72:4; 75:3; 96:8 wants [2] 19:16; 57:21 warner [2] 45:20, 21 warning [1] 33:17 wash [1] 100:18 washouts [1] 56:11 water [2] 34:10; 46:18 way [38] 15:7; 20:21; 40:21; 45:24, 25; 49:6, 11, 13, 18; 51:21; 53:8, 10, 15; 58:22; 59:13; 63:10; 66:11, 20; 69:16; 73:1; 78:9; 79:12; 81:8, 18, 22; 82:13, 19; 84:8, 14; 88:16; 89:16; 95:7, 15, 18, 21; 96:18: 97:1: 100:7 we've [14] 12:2; 20:5; 29:14; 37:12; 48:25; 49:5; 57:24; 74:13; 80:21; 89:5; 92:10; 93:6; 95:9; 102:10 **weather** [2] 55:10; 76:9 wedges [1] 39:15 weekends [1] 29:23 weeklies [1] 63:14 **weekly** [8] 40:20; 41:4; 80:23; 93:2; 94:9, 11, 25 weeks [7] 23:2, 7; 32:21; 39:1; 53:6; 54:13; 73:2 weeks' [1] 83:17 well-known [1] 96:4 west [1] 43:1 **whereupon** [5] 3:25; 4:18; 5:12; 24:9; 102:22 **whole** [9] 10:15; 23:14; 69:14; 74:16; 77:17; 80:7; 86:24; 95:12; 102:14 wholeheartedly [1] 49:17 **whomever** [1] 45:1 wide [2] 70:2; 80:11 widening [1] 39:16 willing [1] 51:23 window [2] 39:24; 84:18 winthrop [61] 2:7; 4:9, 11, 22; 5:4; 12:13; 14:21; 15:20; 17:20; 19:11; 21:3, 6; 23:20; 24:6, 16; 25:5, 25; 26:7, 23; 36:10, 14; 41:4, 10; 46:13; 47:14; 53:21; 57:12; 59:18; 62:12, 25; 63:19; 64:5, 13; 65:12; 67:17, 20; 69:8;

73:20, 23; 74:1; 78:3, 25; 82:5, 24; 83:4, 15, 25; 84:16, 25; 85:2, 6, 8, 12; 93:4, 9, 24; 95:24; 98:18; 99:9, 12; 102:6 wish [2] 4:7; 41:18 witnesses [1] 3:25 wondering [1] 23:22 words [4] 45:1; 53:3; 87:9; 98:15 work [132] 7:13, 15; 17:25; 25:19; 26:8, 17; 27:4, 8, 12; 28:1, 20; 30:12, 15, 22; 31:2, 3, 8, 12; 32:20, 21; 34:15, 23; 35:19; 36:5, 17, 21, 22; 37:4, 5, 9, 16, 17, 19, 24; 38:6, 19, 21; 39:7, 8; 40:7, 24; 43:3, 11, 16; 44:2, 10, 14, 16; 47:3; 49:6; 51:5, 6; 53:2, 10; 54:22; 56:8, 11; 57:4, 24; 58:11, 16, 22; 59:2, 21, 25; 60:1; 61:19; 62:4, 11, 16, 22; 63:2, 4, 9; 64:7, 10, 20; 65:10; 68:4, 11, 15, 16; 69:14, 16; 70:23; 71:12; 72:3, 10, 11, 12, 16; 73:1, 14; 74:10, 18, 20, 22, 24; 75:6, 16; 76:6, 17; 77:9, 20; 78:16, 18; 81:5; 84:1, 8, 9; 87:19; 88:12, 18; 89:22; 90:13, 18; 91:5; 92:1; 93:18; 94:16; 96:5, 11; 98:22; 101:19, workdays [4] 67:7, 12; 76:19; 78:14 worked [7] 24:18; 31:9, 21; 33:20; 37:22; 61:10; 90:1 working [38] 7:3; 26:12, 18; 27:2, 3; 31:25; 33:3, 6, 9; 35:25; 36:6; 38:11, 15, 16, 22; 43:13; 44:13; 45:7; 48:4; 49:1; 50:9; 52:18; 55:3; 63:6, 15; 67:5; 68:1, 11; 82:15; 83:13; 84:3; 93:20, 23; 96:5, 13; 98:4 worst [1] 19:17 worth [8] 47:3, 4; 54:22; 55:4; 56:17; 59:21; 90:17; 91:5 wraps [1] 44:18 write [1] 79:18 writing [3] 72:25; 79:17; 94:22 written [2] 19:16; 20:21 wrong [3] 19:14; 49:9; 61:4

wrote [1] 79:14

- X 
x [2] 2:17; 13:4

xerox [1] 24:12

- Y 
year [3] 3:13; 29:18;
41:25

years [2] 8:25; 29:15

yours [1] 81:8
zero [1] 91:19