WITNESS INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

Florida Department of Transportation

Miami, FL

HWY18MH009

(27 pages)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Investigation of: *
*
PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE COLLAPSE *
MIAMI, FLORIDA * Accident No.: HWY18MH009
MARCH 15, 2018 *
*
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Interview of: ROBERT ROBERTSON and
THOMAS ANDRES
Florida DOT

Via Telephone

Thursday,
March 22, 2018

APPEARANCES:

KENNETH BRAGG, Senior Highway Accident Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board

DAN WALSH, Highway Factors Investigator
National Transportation Safety Board

REGGIE HOLT, Senior Bridge Engineer - Concrete Specialist
Federal Highway Administration

DENISE JOHNSON, Deputy General Counsel
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)

Also Present:

EDDIE THERYO
FDOT

I N D E X

I N T E R V I E W

(11:00 a.m.)

MR. BRAGG: Today is Thursday, March 22nd, 2018. It's about 11:00 a.m., Eastern daylight time. My name is Kenneth Bragg. I'm highway accident investigator for the National Transportation Safety Board. This interview is connection with the FIU bridge collapse in Miami, Florida.

Also, on the interview with me we have?

MR. WALSH: Dan Walsh, highway bridge factors investigator with the National Transportation Safety Board.

MR. HOLT: Reggie Holt, Federal Highway.

MR. BRAGG: Okay. If you don't mind going around the table at your office and identifying yourselves and your agency.

MR. ROBERTSON: Robert Robertson, state bridge engineer, FDOT.

MR. ANDRES: Tom Andres, assistant state bridge engineer, FDOT.

MR. THERYO: Teddy Theryo, major brick design engineer. MR. BRAGG: I'm sorry. Could you --

MS. JOHNSON: Denise --

MR. BRAGG: Excuse me. The last person we could barely hear you. Could you restate that and maybe -- and possibly spell your name please?

MR. THERYO: Teddy Theryo, major bridge design engineer. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Spell your last name.

MR. THERYO: Theryo, T-h-e-r-y-o.

MS. JOHNSON: And, good morning. This is Denise Johnson, Deputy General Counsel for the Department of Transportation.

MR. BRAGG: Okay. Is that everyone?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

MR. BRAGG: Okay. And I think the principal parties we'd like to interview is Robert Robertson and Tom Andres.

INTERVIEW OF ROBERT ROBERTSON AND THOMAS ANDRES

MR. BRAGG: I want to start with Mr. Robertson. Could you go ahead and identify your position with the FDOT?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah. I'm the state structures design engineer.

MR. BRAGG: Okay. And how long have you served in that position?

MR. ROBERTSON: Roughly 11 years.

MR. BRAGG: Eleven years. And have you performed any other position with the Florida DOT?

MR. ROBERTSON: Have I ever done what?

MR. BRAGG: Have you performed any other position while at the --

MR. ROBERTSON: In my time with DOT I've been in the construction office as the structures design engineer and then I served in the structures design office for about 25 years.

MR. BRAGG: If you could explain a little bit about your

involvement with this FIU bridge project.

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, Tom Andres is in charge of the plans review group, and so they did all the plans review and if they had any issue, resolution that needed to be made, policy interpretation, et cetera, they would come into my office and we'd have a discussion. Mine would be kind of a -- call it a hands-off. I'm not part of the actual review, just in issue resolution.

MR. WALSH: Dan Walsh, with NTSB. What requirement was Florida DOT -- what was the requirement that initiated Florida DOT to have plan review on this particular project?

MR. ROBERTSON: Let me ask if we heard the question right because it's kind of hard to hear. You're basically asking what's DOT's role on this LAP design-build project for plans review?

MR. WALSH: That's correct.

MR. ROBERTSON: Okay. Standard design-build project, the department's review is generally for general compliance with department policy. We do not intend to do in-depth reviews such as -- we don't do a lot of calculations. We don't do a bunch of modeling. We leave that up to the peer review engineers and the original QC control of the original engineer of record.

And on a LAP job, the department does it basically to make sure that the LAP administration of the project is going correctly, but we are not really party to the contract administration as a whole. We are specifically assigned to review the plans on major bridge.

MR. WALSH: What makes this project different than any other state project in terms of your requirement for inspection, and that type of thing?

MR. ROBERTSON: Are you talking about field inspection?

MR. WALSH: Correct.

MR. ROBERTSON: I have no idea.

MR. WALSH: Okay.

MR. ROBERTSON: That's beyond the role of this office.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Robert, I'm just -- I'm trying to understand, because this bridge project spanned a state highway, why Florida DOT is involved in the project only from a plan review process. And if you could just give us an explanation of that that would be good.

MR. ROBERTSON: I don't have the answer to that. I think that would be the LAP coordinators would know the role of the department other than just plans review.

MR. WALSH: Okay. So, Florida DOT was only involved in this project from a plan review process, was not involved in an inspection process, or any other process just only plan review?

MR. ROBERTSON: I can only speak for what our office was asked to do and that was the plans review. What the agreement is on CEI or payment issues or whatever I don't know.

MR. WALSH: Okay. And what was the requirement for you to do plan review on this particular project? Was it because there was a requirement in the LAP funding process or what was the

requirement for you to conduct plan review on this particular project?

MR. ROBERTSON: I'm not sure what the LAP agreement says in regards to what the federal requirements, how they mimic each other. All I know is that for LAP projects with major bridges on them across state highways the department reviews the bridge plans.

MR. WALSH: Okay. That's great. Thank you for your explanation of that. I just have a few general questions for you Robert and Tom, to help us just understand the Florida DOT process on state projects or on a state bridge project.

There were cracks that developed on this bridge and I think you're aware of those cracks, or I'm not sure if you have seen photographs of the cracks, but my question is: What would have Florida DOT required if they saw these specific cracks on this structure during the construction of the bridge project? What would Florida DOT have done if they had saw these specific cracks during inspection of a standard state DOT project?

MR. ROBERTSON: Generally speaking, on a state project the CEI would notify the district folks of cracks in a bridge, on whether it's beams or whatever, deck or whatever the issue was. And we would expect them to guide the department in what they thought the criticality of those cracks were. At that point, if it's a major bridge, typically the state construction office would be contacted and said, hey we've identified some cracks. We are

doing crack maps, whatever action that the CEI thought was appropriate. You know, it's not unusual for us to get calls that says, hey, we've got bridge components with some cracking. It's not a big deal. So, we're going to produce crack maps; we'll produce a repair plan and submit it for approval.

So at that point, based on what the recommendation from the CEI is depends on the department's reaction. If they tell us that they think they have extremely critical cracks, then you'll have one type of response. If they tell you that they're more routine cracks, then we usually take their word for that and just wait for a repair procedure to come in.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Are there specific dimensions of a crack that would require, for instance, closure of a bridge or shoring in order to address those cracks?

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, our specifications lay out crack widths and environmental factors and locations and kind of guides the CEI into what type of repair would be required. Now, if the cracks are in certain locations or of certain magnitudes, we would expect the CEI to recognize that and draw everybody's attention that something was outside of the norm and required extra effort, such as shoring and closing down a roadway or whatever. But the CEI is the, you know, the front person.

MR. WALSH: That is -- that's terrific information, Robert. Can we get a copy of the specifications that you just mentioned that would address that issue?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah. We'll get you a copy and it's going to

be section 400.

MR. WALSH: That would be fantastic. That would be fantastic.

MR. ROBERTSON: Okay.

MR. WALSH: Take me through the process for changes that occur when manipulating loads on a member that are not called out in the plans.

MR. ANDRES: Repeat the question. I'm not sure of it.

MR. WALSH: Okay. I'd like for you -- for on a standard Florida DOT project, can you take me through the process for changes that would occur when manipulating loads on a member that are not called out for in the design plans.

MR. ANDRES: Okay. So, if I understand -- let me repeat it because I -- so you're saying what would be the procedure if there was a change in loading?

MR. WALSH: Correct.

MR. ANDRES: And I'm assuming you're talking about a change in loading during construction?

MR. WALSH: That's correct. Not called out in the design plans.

MR. ANDRES: Wow, okay. Well, you know, the design plans, and for this job and for many other jobs, show an erection sequence with certain assumptions, and that erection sequence -- well, and in this case, I believe there's a technical special provision that requires an erection plan. So for these -- and of

course there's a SPMT, self-propelled modular transporter, move as well. So the way that would normally work is there would be a specialty engineer -- sorry. Do you have a question?

MR. WALSH: No. No.

MR. ANDRES: There would be -- yes, I'm sorry.

MR. WALSH: Continue, Tom.

MR. ANDRES: Okay. It would be a specialty engineer that would develop an erection plan and would sign and seal it. It may cover some changes within the realm of, you know, let's say the means and methods, if you will, of how the bridge gets placed or, you know, like I say, SPMT move and all the various things. He would sign and seal that and it would be reviewed, in this case where you'd be reviewed by the engineer of record, and so that could involve changes in the loading.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Tom, I'm specifically referring to the restressing that occurred on the day of the collapse to the structure. That was not called out for in the design plans and I'm asking if Florida DOT would consider that -- if they would consider that to be something that would need to be required to be stamped by an engineer, reviewed by an engineer and approved by -- if this was a standard DOT project, would it be required to be approved by the Florida Department of Transportation?

MR. ANDRES: Yes. If it was not addressed in the erection plans or in the plan set, the answer is, yes, that is a true statement.

MR. WALSH: Okay.

MR. ANDRES: In other words, let me rephrase it just to make sure because we've got a bad connection here. But basically, if they -- like you said, if they were to restress the post-tensioning bars, okay, in addition to what the plans called for, the erection plans called for, that is a change in loading and that would have had to have been submitted for approval.

MR. WALSH: Okay. And that's critical. It would have been needed to be submitted for approval and the Florida Department of Transportation would have needed to approve that on a standard Florida DOT project?

MR. ANDRES: Yes. And the state -- on a normal state DOT project that would be true.

MR. WALSH: Okay. All right. My understanding is that the engineer of record had reached out to the Florida Department of Transportation regarding his plan for restressing on the day of the collapse and I believe that communication was through an email.

MR. ANDRES: It was by an email, you said? So you said that the EOR, you understand that the EOR reached out to the DOT on the day of collapse regarding the restressing?

MR. WALSH: Or -- yes. Yes.

MR. ANDRES: And it was done by email?

MR. WALSH: Yes. Is that correct or not?

MR. ANDRES: No one in this office received an email.

MR. WALSH: Okay. I will check -- go ahead.

MR. ANDRES: I mean -- I'm just -- I mean, in my -- you know, the folks that are on this interview line are the only folks that really were involved in the project in this office. And I just want to make it clear there could have been someone in the construction office or some other office. But from the standpoint of this specific office, Robert, myself or Teddy, I can tell you that no one received an email on the day of the collapse regarding any restressing of the member.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Thank you for that.

There was a meeting on the day of the collapse in which there was the engineer of record, the contractor, the CEI was in attendance, and there was a Florida Department of Transportation representative. I don't recall his name. But I think he was probably from the district office. So if you could check to see if the engineer of record reached out to the district office regarding the proposal for the restressing of certain members? But it's my understanding that the Florida Department of Transportation did not give -- you know, there was no approval process. There was no approval of that restress proposal and that the engineer of record moved forward with what he thought was a proposal without any approval whatsoever.

So all I'm trying to do is acknowledge if there was a communication between the engineer of record and the Florida Department of Transportation regarding the restressing that was

conducted on the day, first, of the collapse and what that form of communication was.

MR. ANDRES: Okay. Like I said, from the structure's design office up here, we certainly didn't receive anything. So are you requesting that we look to see if anybody in the district received such an email?

MR. WALSH: Yes, please.

MR. ANDRES: Okay.

MR. WALSH: Yes, please. Can I ask your opinion that -- your professional judgment that restressing of a member constitutes manipulation of loads on that member?

MR. ANDRES: Yes, it does.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Thank you. Since this is an accelerated bridge project, is there any additional Florida Department of Transportation design guidance regarding the review of proposed changes to the design plans? I'm asking the question: Is there any additional guidance that's provided on accelerated bridge projects versus a normal bridge project?

MR. ROBERTSON: This is Robert. No. They would have the same special engineer responsibilities and submittals regardless of the construction in accelerated or not.

MR. WALSH: Okay.

MR. ANDRES: One other addition to that. Since this is a design-built project with a category 2 structure, our policy would require an independent peer review, which was performed.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Can you tell me a little bit about the independent review that was done by Lewis Berger? Are they on the pre-qualified list for the Florida Department of Transportation?

MR. ROBERTSON: The day that they turned in or the day that they signed the pre-qualification -- or the certification, they were not pre-qualified with the department as of that date. Now, when they actually performed their peer review we do not know. We just know the date of the certification was.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Can you say that again, Robert, please?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah. For some reason they did not -- they were pre-qualified earlier on during the project development and for some reason that I don't know they did not retain their pre-qualification due to some type of reorganization or something on their side. So by the time they submitted the certification letter, and I believe that was February the 10th or something like that, they were no longer listed as a pre-qualified firm with DOT.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Can I get some -- can I get documentation regarding that?

MR. ROBERTSON: Sure.

MR. WALSH: Okay. That concludes my questions. I may have some questions later on.

MR. ANDRES: Okay.

MR. ROBERTSON: Okey-doke.

MR. WALSH: Reggie Holt has additional questions.

MR. HOLT: Reggie Holt, Federal Highway.

Good morning, Robert, Tom, Teddy.

MR. ROBERTSON: Good morning.

MR. HOLT: So, I'm going to have a few questions under a few themes, but you just said something that is new to me. Could you elaborate on these pre-qualifications and what's in, say, category 1, 2, and maybe even category 3?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah. We can send you the definition of category 1, 2 and -- then under pre-quals we have minor bridge, major bridge and then complex bridge. Minor bridge -- go ahead.

MR. HOLT: So, what -- go ahead. Go ahead you were answering my question. Sorry.

MR. ROBERTSON: I'm not understanding what's going on.

MR. HOLT: No, go ahead. I didn't mean to interrupt. Sorry.

MR. ROBERTSON: Okay. Well, minor bridge is basically, most in Florida anyway, is going to be simple span concrete. We don't do much simple span steel regardless. But it's basically simple span concrete consisting of slabs and beam bridges.

Major bridge gets into segmental, continuous steel box, post-tension beams things like that. Complex -- cable-stayeds, extradosed bridges and truss bridges. And so, depending on how the project gets advertised, depends on what the pre-qualifications for that project. So if it's advertised as a major bridge, then they only have to be major bridge qualified. If it's advertised as complex, then they would be complex bridge qualified.

Now, on this job, Lewis Berger at one point was pre-qualified in major concrete. But, again, for some reason at the end of 2016, I guess it was, they fell off our pre-qualification list and at the time they signed the pre-qualification they were no longer pre-qualified.

MR. HOLT: Okay. So, category 2 is major bridge?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yeah. They were still pre-qualified category 1 and I think they were pre-qualified major bridge steel, but not major bridge concrete.

MR. WALSH: This is Dan Walsh. If we could get documentation of that again --

MR. ROBERTSON: Sure.

MR. WALSH: -- that would be useful to us.

MR. ROBERTSON: Okay. Yeah, I'll give you a timeline and we'll give you copies of the pre-quals and definitions.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Thank you. Reggie is going to continue.

MR. HOLT: So, we learned that Bolton Perez, the independent CE&I, was I guess the conduit as far as to transfer information to Florida DOT; is that correct?

MR. ANDRES: Are you saying the contact person at Lewis Berger, who you're asking for?

MR. HOLT: Bolton Perez indicated that they would have gotten the submittal for this additional work from the design-build team and then they were -- it was their responsibility to forward that on to Florida DOT to a specific contact, and that that was the

communication channel.

MR. ANDRES: We worked through the LAP coordinator of District 6. So a conduit for this project really came through that person, which is Mr. Reyna, Alfredo Reyna.

MR. HOLT: Okay. I guess this was kind of asked before but I'll just rephrase it. So do you have procedures, I guess written procedures that identify what was commonly referred to as a field design change, that is, a change that happens in the field that affects the final design, and I guess components that might define what a field design change is and is not?

MR. ANDRES: For some reasons the phones are breaking up.

MR. HOLT: I'm in the back seat. So I'm not as close as -- let me.

MR. ANDRES: So ask me the question again.

MR. HOLT: Okay. So, I'm asking if for design-build projects or even design/bid/build projects, whether there are procedures or rules in place of when you need to engage an engineer of record and when you do not, what they can do in the field without engineer of record concurrence and what they cannot do in the field without engineer of record concurrence?

MR. ANDRES: I don't know that there's a blanket line in the sand of when a field change can be made versus a design change. Anything major -- anything that's going to affect the structure would have to go through the engineer of record, but there is some latitude for the CEI to make some of those calls. They typically

do that more so in like a roadway application or maybe a drainage application than they do on a structural application. I know they move like inlets all the time. For some reason inlets is not at the bottom of the hill, the CEI makes that call and they move it to the bottom of the hill and they note it on the as-builds. But in the bridge group, most of the time they're going back to the EORs before they change anything that has effect on the structure.

MR. HOLT: So there's -- okay. I agree. So there's a gray area, so --

MR. ANDRES: Yeah, and that would be a question that if you would get district's instruction or somebody to -- if you interview them, that would be a good place for them to lay out that question.

MR. HOLT: Okay. But based on your experience and designers that routinely work with Florida DOT, it would be commonly understood that changing or adding post-tensioning to the bridge that was not called out in the final design plans that was going to be in place for the in-service condition, would be a change that would require notification to the engineer or to the owner for occurrence?

MR. ANDRES: Yes.

MR. HOLT: So it's not really a gray area.

There's a theme that this temporary post-tensioning was put in place and was in it's final support condition and worked fine; so therefore, putting it back in that condition would waive that

understanding that it would require engaging the owner or the engineer of record?

MR. ANDRES: I didn't understand a bit of that unfortunately.

MR. HOLT: Okay. All right. So --

MR. ROBERTSON: The phone is modulating; that's the problem.

MR. HOLT: So the question is -- is it any better?

MR. ROBERTSON: A little bit.

MR. HOLT: I'm trying to find out where the mic is in the car.

MR. ROBERTSON: Okay. That sounds better there.

MR. HOLT: Okay. The question is: There has been a position stated that since the bridge had this post-tensioning in place during the erection process, that even though the final plans did not have this post-tensioning force in place for service, that putting it back in place for the long-term performance of this bridge did not really need this engagement from the owner or engineer of record. Would that, under your understanding of what your processes are, be a reasonable assumption?

MR. ANDRES: I could see where they would argue the department did not need to know they were going to leave that bar in place. But I would expect them to validate with the engineer of record that that bar could or could not stay in place.

MR. HOLT: When I say bar, that bar -- it's in place regardless, but it's whether it's stressed or destressed, that's the critical part, whether it's applying a prestress force or not.

MR. ANDRES: Yeah, if the plans call for the bar to be removed and then for some reason somebody decides to leave it in place, the engineer of record would have to be consulted and make that call whether that was acceptable or not.

MR. HOLT: Okay. Thank you.

Again, I'm shifting away from the prestress and this is the distress that was observed. And we are trying to identify I guess some sort -- something procedurally that identifies a level of distress that would cause enough concern to notify the owner or engineer of record. And it sounds like from your previous answer that it really -- you're relying on the CEI to trigger that based on their experience?

MR. ANDRES: Yes. Those are the only eyes that the department would have out there representing us. So we would rely on the CEI to say we've got something really unusual and that they need assistance or that they're taking unilateral action on their own due to the severity as they see it.

MR. HOLT: Now, on a typical Florida project is a CE&I, do they have the authority to stop work due to safety concerns?

MR. ANDRES: Yes.

MR. HOLT: They do?

MR. ANDRES: Oh, yes. They could stop work or they could stop traffic.

MR. HOLT: And I've only got one last question. This is clarification, the voice mail that voice mail that was left by

Denney to Florida DOT, was that to your office or was that to a different office?

MR. ANDRES: It was to me. This is Tom Andres.

MR. HOLT: Okay.

MR. ANDRES: I was on assignment. I was in the Pan Handle. Denney Pate left a phone message to me and I basically -- and I'm going to paraphrase what he said. He basically said, you know, there are some cracks on the bridge; there is no safety concerns; give me a call when you get a minute. And that's pretty much what he said.

He did not characterize, you know, anything beyond that. So I got that on -- I got that voice mail on Tuesday. I was back in the office later Wednesday. Of course, you know, the day of the collapse was Thursday. And we were quite busy, so I did not pick up the voice mail until early Friday morning.

MR. HOLT: Okay. I wasn't -- I was more interested in who Figg determined or which office Figg had in their mind as far as who to contact. Earlier answer to a question was they could have contacted another division other than the bridge division. But it was apparent to them that what they were seeing on this bridge at that time they knew that your office was the appropriate office to contact.

That's the last question for me.

MR. WALSH: This I the -- go ahead, Tom.

MR. ANDRES: Yes, so the question -- repeat it one more time.

Just so I make sure I understand.

MR. HOLT: I didn't pose that question for the response. I was trying to pose the question to determine which office Figg had in mind to contact with regard to this issue. And that's the only reason I asked it.

MR. ANDRES: I don't know that.

MR. HOLT: Yeah, thank you.

MR. WALSH: So, this is Dan Walsh, NTSB, just following up.

Just to follow up on Mr. Holt's comments, Tom, you received a phone call, a voice mail from Denney Pate, the engineer of record, on Tuesday indicating that there were cracks on the bridge. And that was basically the content of the message?

MR. ANDRES: Yes, and that there were no safety issues and beyond that he didn't say anything. Yes, that's pretty much it.

MR. WALSH: Okay. That may be what I'm referring to in my earlier questioning about the communication between the engineer of record and Florida DOT regarding the cracks. But I'd like you to check with Alfredo Reyna to see if there was any additional communication by email or by phone regarding the cracking and any proposal to repair the cracking.

MR. ANDRES: Okay.

MR. WALSH: Okay.

MR. ANDRES: On that point, Dan, let me just -- I also, regarding Mr. Reyna, on the Friday morning, you know, when I finally got to my voice messages, I got a voice message from

Mr. Reyna the morning of the collapse. And what the voice message was, that have you heard -- no, he said, I understand that Figg has talked to you about these cracks. He just wanted me to confirm that I had talked to Figg about the cracks. Of course, I did not. But I did receive a message from Mr. Reyna, and this voice massage I received a couple hours before the collapse itself.

MR. WALSH: Okay. All right.

MR. ANDRES: Which would have been on Thursday.

MR. WALSH: Okay. Thank you for sharing that. It's obviously in a typical situation the engineer of record should wait for a response, you know, before proceeding with any proposal to -- we're in no way trying to indicate that Florida DOT did anything wrong in this instance. We're just documenting the issue of when the phone call was made and that type of thing. So I want you to understand that we're not trying to blame the Florida DOT in any way regarding this. We're just trying to get the timeline regarding when phone calls were made and those dates and those times.

MR. ANDRES: Yes.

MR. WALSH: Thank you. Just one more follow-up question from Mr. Holt's line of questioning, and I'll try to make this as brief and concise as I can and get your opinion on it.

If the engineer of record was submitting a proposal to bring -- to conduct restressing and had indicated that the restressing,

which was not called for in the design plans, was to bring the structure back to its preexisting condition, then that's something typically that would require approval by the Florida DOT on a standard DOT bridge project; am I correct?

MR. ANDRES: Yes.

MR. ROBERTSON: Anytime they deviate from the plans, they have to go back and get the department's concurrence on what their actions are.

MR. WALSH: Okay. That -- I have no further questions.

MR. BRAGG: Okay. The time is 11:42. We are going to go ahead and conclude the interview. And thank you for participating.

(Whereupon, at 11:42 a.m., the interview was concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceeding before the

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:	PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE COLLAPSE MIAMI, FLORIDA MARCH 15, 2018 Interview of Robert Robertson and Thomas Andres
ACCIDENT NO.:	HWY18MH009
PLACE:	Via Telephone
DATE:	March 22, 2018

was held according to the record, and that this is the original, complete, true and accurate transcript which has been transcribed to the best of my skill and ability.

[redacted]

Letha J. Wheeler
Transcriber