

From: John Bennett
To:
Subject: RE: 64078 - Cushman Street - 63784 Gillam Way Reconstruction
Date: Tuesday, June 04, 2019 10:53:00 AM

yes I remember this driving me nuts also a long time ago. I have a real vague recollection that on some set of as-builts I really did see a scrawl noting the 7.75' offset but I can't seem to find it on any of the copies I have now. But since I did remember it when I got started on the Airport Way/Cushman Intersection basemap, I have the two attached files "Readme.txt" and "Record OS Mon Airport Way Alignment.docx". This resulted in me accepting that the intended 7.75' offset was valid. Also, the two ADA ROS by Scott Sexton notes the same offset which he arrived at independently. Note that back when the Gillam/Gaffney/Big Bend portion of Airport Road Was constructed (1971-73), the Department of Highways had their staff do all of the construction staking. All the contractor had to do was set the cases and monuments based on the DOH surveyor's cross ties. So the contractor never really had a need to know that the monuments were offset 7.75 feet, they just set them where the surveyors told them to. This may be one reason why there are no notes on the as-builts as to the fact that the monuments are offset. At least if there is, I can't see it. So maybe there is something back in the design archives that you can refer to as the basis for the 7.75 feet but I think with the consistent references by control surveys over the years that the 7.75' is valid. That's all I've got! Oh, and yes I scanned some of the original control sheets and have attached the L line. And yes all that I had scanned came out of the ROW Engineering Archives and was returned. I scanned a couple of sheets just as an example such as the old IBM Cogo sheets that used to be hand coded and then sent to Juneau for processing. JohnB

John F. Bennett, PLS, SR/WA Senior Land Surveyor – Right of Way Services

R&M CONSULTANTS, INC. | 212 Front Street, Ste. 150 | Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
907.458.4304 direct | 907.687.3412 mobile

[Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [rmconsult.com](#)

Innovating Today for Alaska's Tomorrow

From:
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2019 5:05 PM
To: John Bennett
Subject: RE: 64078 - Cushman Street - 63784 Gillam Way Reconstruction

John;

Thanks... yes I was viewing the Feb '19 "Draft".

O.k., it is clear from it that you used the '68 ROW F-062-4(21) ROW Set with reference to the F-062-4(10) & F-062-4(27), F-037-1(27)

As-Builts to retrace ROW Centerline with your project.....*I'm leading into a question I'm hoping you'll know the answer to ...*

With that and the fact you'd certified ROW On the TEA-NR-ADA Improvements of 2004, I was hoping you'd be able to shed some light on

where the original 7.75' offset from project centerline to S.I. recovered mons on both our respective projects originates ? In scouring over the old '66 original construction project that widened Airport F-062-4(10), I wasn't able to locate it? Looking at the the F-062-4(27), F-037-1(27), it's visibly apparent that the S.I. monuments were either set or reset during that project's early 70's construction @ 7.75' offsets. Also, when I brought in the TEA-NR-ADA VII DOT Control Record that Bob Whaley had done to my project, and adjusted to our control, it fits with both my project calc's and recovered mons perfectly as well as to your project's Airport Way centerline & ROW delineation to within a negligible tolerance throughout both our project limits.

Still, not finding the origin of the 7.75' on the original build project in '66, the "needing to know surveyor" of me was hoping you'd identified it ? Also, I wanted to ask if you had scanned the '68 coordinate geometry sheets for your project or had returned the hard copies to Neg. Archive –or- ROWE Archive folder? Hope all is well with you these days, and thanks again!

From: John Bennett <JBennett@rmconsult.com>

Sent: Monday, June 3, 2019 11:30 AM

To:

Cc:

Subject: RE: 64078 - Cushman Street

the "DRAFT" ROS for ROW is also labeled as "FEB 2019". Just wanted to make sure you were looking at the same set I am. Although the initial scope had us develop a ROW basemap from Barnette/Gillam to Noble St. I believe the refined scope will be such that the acquisition plans will not show the Barnette/Gillam or the Noble intersection and will just focus on the Cushman/Gaffney intersections and the lanes leading up to them. Note 11 deals with the ambiguous A/C definition at the intersections. The design drawings and the ROW acquisition drawings will require that the A/C be geometrically correct and at this time I don't know whether the design will generate a revised A/C definition at the Cushman/Airport intersection. We won't be doing anything further with the ambiguities in the A/C definition at Barnette/Gillam or Noble. So if you come up with a better definition of the A/C at those two intersections, don't let my preliminary definition get in your way. JohnB

John F. Bennett, PLS, SR/WA Senior Land Surveyor – Right of Way Services

R&M CONSULTANTS, INC. | 212 Front Street, Ste. 150 | Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
907.458.4304 direct | 907.687.3412 mobile

From:

Sent: Monday, June 03, 2019 9:46 AM

To: John Bennett

Subject: 64078 - Cushman Street

John;

Good morning.

I'm reviewing and referencing a bit (where there is some overlap) R&M's 64078 Airport Way/Cushman Street Intersection project and the 63784 Gillam Way Reconstruction project. Briefly, I noticed that you'd included a note referencing the A/C lines under "Boundary Conflicts & Resolutions" section of your notes as well as No. 10) "Existing ROW – General note 10.1..

My question with reference to the notes on the "Draft" 64078 set is: *Are the A/C Lines in the Draft submittal to DOT complete, or will there be changes with R&M final submittal.* I'm just looking to match apple- to-apple for our projects going to public record. Thanks!

Respectfully;