

Minutes - Bridge Technical Committee Meeting

March 15th, 2012

1:00 PM– 3:30 PM

SW District office (Dane - Rock)

Mark Your Calendar - Next Meeting

Thursday, July 26th, 2012 1:00 PM - 3:30 PM

SW Region Office (Dane – Columbia Rooms)

Previous Meeting Carryover Topics:

1. **RR submittal time frames.** Concern over the excessive approval times for getting railroad submittals returned (demolition plans and other). There was discussion for the need to standardize the process for plan submission and review between the various rails. Additional thoughts were that Demo Plans may be addressed during the design phase. Comments were made that the time element of demolition is usually more of an issue than the means and methods aspects. One option presented by industry would be to provide one demo plan at the time of bidding that is accepted without a review process. If contractors want to pursue an alternative, they would need RR approval
2. **Railroad flagging** - (New Related Item) - Several contracts within the last few months do not account for railroad flagging. When presented with the question, the contact person states to follow the standard specification which states the contractor is to pay for the entire bill. This can be done, but no rates or figures are available to base the bid upon. Is this the path the DOT is taking on future jobs? (Darrin Stanke) Discussion ensued from the industry about contracts not including flagging rates at all. The industry does not have an issue following 107.17.1.3, but does not know what it is going to cost without rates provided in the contract. There was a motion industry that rates should be included in contract documents to allow contractors to bid. If rates change from the special provision rates, then WisDOT would assume additional costs. Greg Baer will follow up with the railroads and DOT Regions.

Subcommittee Reports:

None at this time.

Standing Topics:

1. **North South Update** (Laura Shadewald)
2. **USH 41 Update** (Bill Dreher)
3. **Zoo Interchange** (Laura Shadewald)
4. **IH-39 (Illinois – Dane County)** (Laura Shadewald)
5. **Verona Road (Madison)** (Laura Shadewald)
6. **Every Day Counts – General & GRS Project & Potential Showcase** (Bill Dreher, Bill Oliva, and Bob Arndorfer)
7. **Wisconsin Highway Research Program (WHRP) Bridge Items –** (Bill Oliva)

New topics:

1. Prestress girder deliveries (**Matt Grove Chris Kirchner**) Industry struggling with girder deliveries. It is becoming extremely difficult with very small time windows allowed to deliver girders. OSOW committee is discussing, but industry needs designers to understand these challenges when developing contract time.
2. Draft Change to Spec 501.3.5.2 for Concrete Delivery (**Mike Hall, Kevin McMullen, Jim Perry**) Mike Hall presented the final version of the revised specification 501.3.5.2.
3. Final **Draft** of the revised Pile Specification (**Bob Arndorfer, Mike Hall**) **Bob** presented the updated specification. Some concerns and resolution may still need to be addressed for the paint system.

Buy America – Industry notes that it is not possible to obtain certs on much of the piling that is currently used. The paper trail does not exist. The use of cut off pile and second hand pile is not unusual and is manufactured in US but the paper trail is nearly impossible to maintain. This will result in cost increases if required.

4. Temporary Barrier Block 12.5 ft - Has anything been done with the corner design. This was discussed at length in other BT meetings with someone (DOT?) going to look into it and get back to the committee. The block as detailed is very brittle at the corners with the current design. (**Darrin Stanke**) Dave Kiekbusch will follow up on additional reinforcement at the corner of the block. A chamfer was previously approved during manufacture of the block. Dave has contacted Eric Emerson and requested update on this concern.
5. We had 1 engineer wait until the project was completed for weeks before finally paying for ANY heavy riprap, the first which was placed at the early stages of the project---reason?-he wanted to wait until he could have his survey crew come with a GPS so he could calculate the placement quantity using those readings. Even when first asked about payment for the riprap that was completed up to that point, he sounded like he would send at least a partial payment, but never did. Yet when the contractor goes over the contract time by one day he is docked how much? (**Curt Pheifer**) This issue will be discussed at CCAW. Full payment should be made every two weeks per Standard Specs - issues should be elevated to supervisors.
6. Seismograph needs to be bid out by the day. Now that strip recorders are required, it costs a lot more than one without, and leaving the time when it is required to be used up to the engineer, every engineer is different and it makes it hard to guess how many days the engineer will require it being used on the project. (Curt Pheifer) Contractors see inconsistent expectations for the use of seismograph due to not having a per day pay item. Contractors would prefer providing a per day pay item to help control costs.
7. Stone veneer walls---Any way these can be bid out by the SF like brick rather than by the LS? A couple of projects the size had to be adjusted due to utilities being in the way. One project the details weren't too clear. It was bid out by the LS, but an estimated quantity was given, and those quantities were so grossly under estimated, it was like they only figured 1 side of the 4 sided wall. Masons don't really know how to read a WDOT plan with stations and such. We were able to negotiate a new price, but after starting work, found there were utilities in the way that required the wall to be shortened, so a new price had to be negotiated once again. If it was bid out by the SF, a lot of this could have been avoided. (**Curt Pheifer**)

Curt suggests that veneer wall be changed to SF though addendum if there looks like there may be a problem on a project by project basis.

8. Stockpile payments—some engineer's either don't know how to do this, or don't want to bother with this. Some engineers whip this out as soon as requested. More training may be needed on how to do this? All what I know is suppliers demand payment as soon as their product is delivered. **(Curt Pheifer)** Issue has been previously discussed at CCAW – Should be elevated to supervisors.

Additional Items:

1. Stone to be used under Box Culverts - discussion (Matt Grove)

From Previous Bridge Tech Meeting Minutes:

Industry has seen inconsistent requirements regarding stone to be used for providing a working platform (under structures). There have been cases where material that is difficult to work with, unavailable or more expensive has been specified, with no apparent value over other more feasible materials. One suggestion was to only have a P200 spec and allowing the contractor to use the material of his choice passing the P200. There was some discussion regarding the need for breaker run or stabilization stone under the structure. The concept of creating a "Box Culvert Stabilization" item was discussed and supported by industry. This would help project staff and contractors deal with potentially changing quantity needs without having to create change orders. Either way, contractors need to have flexibility in the last 6" of base in order to set forms and grade base.

Bob A. asked about the use of Geotextile fabric and whether industry felt it was useful. Industry said yes, but should be a pay item for it if it is desired.

In response to this concern and the discussion, Dave Kiekbusch has updated the Bridge Manual and Standard to reflect new guidance and flexibility. Please see attached.



BoxStone.pdf

2. **Elastomeric Bearings.** Bill Dreher indicated that some of the suppliers of Laminated Elastomeric bearings may no longer be on the "approved supplier" list.

Attachments:

1. Draft Pile Specification (Bob Arndorfer)



PileSpec_RPA
Draft_Mar5,2012.d..

2. Draft Concrete Delivery Spec. (Mike Hall)



No Pile Structures
Review (3-1...