

Roche de Boeuf Committee Meeting

Friday, May 26, 2026, 1:30pm; ODOT District 2 Office

Attendees: Pat McColley, David Geckle, Joanie Cherry, Kacey Young, Mayor Tim Pedro, City Administrator Jon Gochenour, Councilman Todd Borowski, John Pautz, Bill Vermes (via Teams), Rex Childers

Meeting Minutes

- Pat McColley thanked everyone for coming together. Kokosing's partial demolition cost estimate of \$4,287,754.15. Pat McColley discussed the following:
 - o The revised demolition cost estimate is within 10% of ODOT's original allocation for the demolition project.
 - o ODOT is willing to move forward with the partial demolition assuming City of Waterville takes ownership of the bridge.
 - o Presented Right-of-Way plans and a draft Contract of Purchase. These documents are attachments to the meeting minutes.
 - o ODOT is willing to present information to the City of Waterville as an advisory.
- Tim Pedro asked for clarification of two items in Kokosing's estimate. The mention of a delay beyond July 6th could result in extra costs and the assumption material to be removed in more than two lifts could increase cost estimate.
- David Geckle explained July 6th is Kokosing's start date for the project and if they are delayed by ODOT, they can ask for extra costs for a compensable delay. He also explained Kokosing's assumption that the fill on top of the bridge can be removed in no more than two lifts to ensure loading on the concrete arches remain as consistent as possible. Kokosing has not yet hired a demolition engineer to stamp/sign a plan, so it is possible their assumption may need to change. If fill removal is required in more than two lifts, additional movement of the causeway will be needed.
- Bill Vermes addressed thrust forces and agreed with Kokosing's assumption. He said it may even be possible to remove all the fill in one lift.
- Pat McColley said ODOT does not dictate a contractor's means and methods.
- Kacey Young explained that the contractor is responsible for hiring the demolition engineer.
- Tim Pedro asked if the demolition engineer had been identified.

- Kacey Young explained Kokosing has not hired a demolition engineer yet because they want to make sure the partial demolition option is moving forward before accruing the costs for the demolition engineer which is approximated to be \$40,000.
- Rex Childers offered Bill Vermes and John Pautz to Kokosing to assist in demolition ideas.
- Pat McColley stated Kokosing was confident in their assumptions and not interested in test demolition on the southernmost span.
- Bill Vermes agreed the test demolition would not be necessary.
- Rex Childers clarified Kokosing is not responsible for damage to the arches during partial demolition per their assumptions. He also stated that no patching will be performed and the existing hole in the one arch span will remain per their email.
- Bill Vermes agreed with Kokosing's statements in their email.
- Todd Borowski asked what happens if one arch collapses during the project.
- Kacey Young handed out the draft MOU and her and Pat McColley started to go over it with the group. The MOU is an attachment to these meeting minutes.
- David Geckle passed out copies of letter from Dr. Douglas Nims, PhD, P.E. and a physical condition assessment from Jared Backs, P.E. and Ed Hayes, P.E. about the existing bridge. The documents are attached to the meeting minutes.
- Dave Geckle explained that the spandrel walls were scored with the concrete arches in the physical condition assessment due to the bridge type being a filled concrete arch. This is explained in the assessment and follows ODOT Bridge Inspection Standards.
- Todd Borowski asked about details of the demolition project.
- Dave Geckle explained the demolition sequence shared by Kokosing in a phone call with ODOT. The causeway would start from the Lucas County side and the first lift of fill over the arches would be removed. The causeway would then be moved to the Wood County side, and the remaining first lift of fill would be removed. The second lift of fill and spandrel walls then would be removed, the causeway flipped again to the Lucas County side and the same repeated. The causeway would then be removed.
- Todd Borowski asked if the portion of existing structure on the opposite side of River Road would be removed.
- Pat McColley explained this would be left in place to accommodate City of Waterville's awarded TMACOG grant to build a bridge over River Road to a lookout area.
- Rex Childers asked why the fill is assumed to be removed in two lifts and what would cause it to be potentially required to be removed in additional lifts.
- Dave Geckle and Bill Vermes discussed unbalanced loads on the arches.

- Dave Geckle stated if Kokosing's demolition engineer will not approve and stamp/sign spandrel wall removal and arches remaining in place, this would be an issue.
- Rex Childers asked what level of City of Waterville decision needs to be made for Kokosing to hire the demolition engineer.
- Pat McColley stated a final decision regarding ownership and execution of documents.
- Pat McColley explained the conditions which would lead to a full demolition outlined in the MOU is intended to help ODOT/Kokosing/City of Waterville make a timely decision and agree in case anything happens during the project.
- Jon Gochenour asked when City of Waterville would be required to start contributing costs to the project.
- Pat McColley explained City of Waterville would be responsible for costs outside the original scope of work of partial demolition such as has concrete patching, material testing, etc. ODOT will cover 100% of costs of partial demolition project if the scope of work is not changed. If a full demolition is triggered during partial demolition, ODOT will also be covering the full demolition cost
- Tim Pedro asked how potential additional material testing be handled.
- Pat McColley explained two options. Potentially Kokosing could hire a testing company to perform the testing and City of Waterville pay for it. Or City of Waterville could hire their own company and upon approval of Kokosing, the hired testing company could access the site to perform testing procedures.
- Dave Geckle clarified any additional costs Kokosing would need to spend to accommodate a testing company would be responsibility of the City of Waterville.
- Rex Childers asked Bill Vermes what type of additional testing would be needed. Bill Vermes said concrete cores would not be necessary and an assumption of concrete strength could be used.
- Todd Borowski asked what potential concrete patching looks like. Dave Geckle explained different methods and materials which have been used on past projects.
- Bill Vermes stated in the last span on the Lucas County side, the spandrel walls are one foot thicker than the rest of the spans making the arch width twelve feet instead of 14 feet.
- Dave Geckle clarified the concrete arches would not look like the AI image Kacey Young presented in previous meetings.
- Tim Pedro discussed the next City Council meeting on June 8th, but in the meantime, there will be discussions with council. A field visit will be scheduled as well. Future grant opportunities and ODOT working as an advisory to the City was discussed.

- Jon Gochenour asked for clarification if signing the MOU means intent to take ownership.
- Pat McColley discussed the role of the City of Waterville being a responsible party as part of the project. The City of Waterville needs to be serious about taking ownership of the bridge. ODOT currently holds all the liability regarding the project, including cost overruns within scope. He summarized how ODOT has incurred costs accommodating the City of Waterville so far. One example was paying the design consultant to revise demolition plans to save portions of the existing bridge to accommodate the City's TMACOG grant.
- Jon Gochenour stated he understood but was concerned about project cost overruns being the City's responsibility.
- Pat McColley gave many examples of instances where ODOT covers 100% of costs for local owner projects. He again stated ODOT is responsible for 100% of the project costs as long as the scope stays the same. ODOT is just asking City of Waterville to take ownership of the bridge which they have been asking to be saved for the past year and a half.
- Pat McColley suggested the draft MOU could be revised to address Jon Gochenour's concern about project cost overruns not being the City's responsibility.
- Pat McColley reminded the group ODOT has given the revised decision date of June 15th which is one month longer than the original 30 day extension.
- Tim Pedro suggested a meeting next week for ODOT to answer any questions City of Waterville Council may have about the project. He asked to hold the date of Monday June 1st for a special meeting. Tim Pedro stated the City of Waterville will need ODOT's assistance in the future if the bridge is saved.
- Pat McColley stated a current risk is ODOT will still be the owner in two years. He stated at this point, ODOT and the City of Waterville are the project partners, not other groups.
- Todd Borowski stated ODOT has gone above and beyond so far and thanked them.
- Meeting Adjourned.