

Bridge Technical Committee Minutes

July 26th, 2012

1:00 PM– 3:30 PM

SW District office (Dane - Columbia)

Previous Meeting Carryover Topics:

1. **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.

Update – (Greg Baer) The use of the correct provision is important (107.026 for overlays and similar – no rates & 107.034 re-decks and similar - rates). The Regional Rail Coordinators should provide guidance to project staff on the correct provision to be used. One area of consideration should be related equipment working on site. If a crane could foul track, then a flagger should be included. Project staff is encouraged to call Greg Baer to resolve specification problems with specific projects.

Also noted was that the Union Pacific review time has improved.

2. **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 Kieckbusch 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. There is a construction note that allows the use of a chamfer. This has not yet been reflected on the SDD (Eric Emerson). **No additions (7-26-12)**

Subcommittee Reports:

None at this time.

Standing Topics:

1. **North South Update** (Laura Shadewald)
2. **USH 41 Update** (Bill Dreher) – **See Attached**
3. **Zoo Interchange** (Laura Shadewald)
4. **IH-39 (Illinois – Dane County)** (Laura Shadewald) –
5. **Verona Road (Madison)** (Laura Shadewald) – **May 2013 Let of Verona Road Bridges. Additional 2014 Letting for other work.**
6. **Every Day Counts – General & GRS Project & Potential Showcase** (Bill Dreher, Bill Oliva)
7. **Wisconsin Highway Research Program (WHRP) Bridge Items** – (Bill Oliva)

New topics:

1. **Top of footing needing to be 6'6" below the top of the railroad rail (Curt Pheifer)**
Standard detail drawing 38.01 is being updated---no need to blast through solid rock to get footing to minimum depth.
Concerns were also noted for deck cracking for projects around active rail lines similar to staged construction cracking concerns. In addition, some discussion related to potential for settlement of deck false work as a result of train induced vibrations.

2. **In- Stream Work time restrictions and Schedule impacts. (Curt Pheifer)**
WDNR suggested requesting approval to adjust the restricted periods as actual weather conditions or other factors may justify modification of window. This request may be made after PSE or LET.

Use of water from streams for project needs – There is a new process to obtain a variance. Dave Simon of BPD sent out updated information in July 2012. WisDOT posted the Drought Guidance memo on the HCCI website
<http://roadwaystandards.dot.wi.gov/hcci/>

3. **The industry is looking for statewide consistency in the placement of bridge deck concrete. (Tom Braun) Attachment** In particular, the use of evaporation retarders or water in emergency situations. Please refer to Section 5.25.1.4.1 of the CMM – attached. I understand that the department no longer allows the use of evaporation retarder, but instead has allowed the use of water to close up deck surfaces in emergency situations. The Industry has been getting resistance from some Department Regions and or its Consultants to allow the use of water to close up the deck's surface. Can we revisit the issue and then get the message implemented statewide?
There was a follow up discussion after the July 26th meeting with BTS staff (sub-committee) and Industry. We will ask for a report out at the November 15th meeting. It was noted that Jim Parry may have some historic documents on this issue.
4. **Conflict between the standard and the specials for splices. (Ryan Pheifer) Attachment**
If the intent is to change to 6x 1f for all piles we should discuss it openly, not bury the change in 100's of pages of special provisions. **The 2013 Specification (550.5.2 Piling) has been updated and this issued resolved. Payment is 9' for HP and 6' for other types.**
5. **Request for designers stop including all the piles specifications into each project (Ryan Pheifer)** (including much which is NA to the project being bid) as it is confusing for engineers when a change order comes up that may add a type of pile that was not included as a bid item, but has discussions inserted into the project in the special provisions. (ie: HP notes when no HP is on the job or CIP when vice versa, or notes regarding pre-boring when none is included) it is obvious this is a cut and paste for every job, but seem needless and confusing.
The new standard spec should address these issues. The new dot.s items are only used for wave equation analysis. There STSP references the standard spec measurement section and thus cannot be in conflict on measurement of splices. The only possible conflict with splice measurement would be if there were a project special (SPV item) in the contract that used the old allowable stress spec.
6. **The use of continuous high chairs (Steven Lunde)** When we use wide flange prestressed girders, with the flanges being as wide as 4', the use of continuous high chairs, which rest on the deck plywood, to support the top mat of reinforcing should be avoided. What happens is

that there is no support for the top mat over the girder flanges. In most cases, the contractors are using continuous slab bolsters supported by the bottom mat of rebar. This is the ideal way to go; we should therefore consider changing the spec. to eliminate the continuous high chairs in these situations.

Standard Spec 550.3.4 Placing and Fastening has been updated - (4) On decks with prestressed wide flange girders, support top longitudinal bars on the bottom longitudinal bars in the flange area with continuous bar chairs that have continuous bottom runners spaced 4 foot on centers or closer.

Additional Items:

7. Payment for Ice (Matt Grove)

Industry is concerned that payment for ice is being written out of contracts or that Regions will not pay since it may not be a controlling item. There may be inconsistencies in how the Regions apply this provision. It was agreed that this item should go to the BPD State-Wide Construction Conference call for discussion. This item was included on the August 2nd, 2012 BPD Construction conference call. There was considerable discussion on this item related to contingency plans, temperature control plans to schedule pours early in morning or at night. However, this may be an area where additional Department/Industry discussions need to take place.

8. Errata (Mike Hall)

Mike hall commented that change ASTM A570 to ASTM A1011 where ever it occurs. Formal change will come with the next ASP 6 issuance and/or the 2014 standard spec.

9. Anchorage for Temporary Barrier (Tom Braun)

Follow up with the roadway standard people is required on this item. We will work with FDM and Roadway people to examine the SDD related to this item.

Attachments:



USH 41 3.docx