



ADSC/WSDOT Joint Meeting
 1 December, 2011, 8:30 A.M. – 11:30 P.M.
ADSC/WSDOT Meeting Minutes

Team Members

Attended	Member	Company	Phone	E-mail
	Allen, Tony	WSDOT	360-709-5450	allent@wsdot.wa.gov
x	Armour, Tom	DBM	253-838-1402	tarmour@dbmcm.com
x	Bauer, Mike	WSDOT	360-705-7190	bauerm@wsdot.wa.gov
	Bennion, Stuart	WSDOT	360-705-7468	bennios@wsdot.wa.gov
x	Clarke, Patrick	WSDOT	360-705-7220	clarkp@wsdot.wa.gov
	Cuthbertson, Jim	WSDOT	360-709-5452	cuthbej@wsdot.wa.gov
X	Deffenbacher, Jon	WSDOT	253-589-6100	deffenj@wsdot.wa.gov
	DiFabio, Vinnie	Paco	206-762-3550	vdifabio@pacoequip.com
x	Dinneen, Molly	DeWitt	360-576-8755	molly@dewittconst.com
x	Etheridge, Mark	DMI	206-793-3951	mark@dmidrilling.com
x	Foster, Marco	WSDOT	360-705-7824	fosterm@wsdot.wa.gov
x	Frye, Mark	WSDOT	360-709-5469	fryem@wsdot.wa.gov
x	Gaines, Mark ¹	WSDOT	360-705-7827	gainesm@wsdot.wa.gov
	Groneck, Paul	DBM	206-730-4578	Paulg@dbmcm.com
	Hagy, Mike	PACO	805-746-6965	Mike@PacoEquip.com
	Kvinsland, John	Malcolm	253-395-3300	jkvinsland@malcolmdrilling.com
x	Heinz, Mike	PACO	206-949-9369	mikeheinz@pacoequip.com
	Lehman, Debbie	FHWA	360-753-9482	Debbie.Lehman@dot.gov
x	Macnab, Alan ¹	CJA	206-575-8248	amacnab@condon-johnson.com
x	Olney, Chuck	Rainier Steel	206-949-7092	chuck@rainiersteel.com
x	Parmantier, Dominic	CJA	206-575-8248	dparmantier@condon-johnson.com
	Radom, Greg	DBM	206-730-1317	Gregr@dbmcm.com
x	Rasband, Al	Malcolm	253-395-3300	arasband@malcolmdrilling.com
	Stegeman, Dave	Kiewit	253-943-4121	David.stegeman@kiewit.com
	Sarhan, Anthony	FHWA	360-753-9412	Anthony.sarhan@dot.gov
x	Sexton, Jim	DBM	253-838-1402	jims@dbmcm.com
x	Starcevich, John	Malcolm	253-395-3300	jstarcevich@malcolmdrilling.com
	Tuttle, John	Sinclair	661-212-1223	tutmud@aol.com

¹ Team co-chair

Guests

Attendee	Company	Phone	E-mail
Darrel Johnson	PACO	206-786-7584	djohnson@PacoEquip.com

Meeting minutes were prepared by Marco Foster, WSDOT Assistant State Construction Engineer, Bridge.

Topics -- Soldier pile soil/cement mixing specifications; Pumpable lean mix def. in Specification; Update on synthetic slurry disposal; Update on annual shaft reporting ; Payment for shaft reinforcing cages as materials on hand; Summary of

last AGC Structures Team meeting; Review of drilled shaft centralizers ; Discussion of Force Account Obstruction Clause

1. Welcome/Introduction of new members

Mark Gaines introduced Jon Deffenbacher and Marco Foster as new members to the team. Mark also discussed consultant (Bob Schulach) inquiries about CSL testing and the forgery/falsification of records that recently took place in California with drilled shaft construction. Mark let the ADSC know that he informed Schulach that WSDOT is satisfied with the quality of drilled shaft construction in Washington State and the we do not see a need to utilize gamma-gamma testing in addition to the CSL testing we currently perform on all of our shafts. Al R. commented that there has been discussion within ADSC about the falsification of records experienced in California but there has been no discussion with Bob Schulach. The investigation of falsification is a result of a whistleblower within Caltrans.

2. Review/Approval of October 2011 Minutes

One comment was provided on the October minutes. Alan M. asked that the minutes include the list of Force Account issues that Mark Gaines had captured at the October meeting. The October meeting minutes will be updated with Mark's notes and posted to the web site.

Action Items: Marco to make correction and post to the web.

3. Soldier pile soil/cement mixing specifications

This issue was a carryover from the October 11 mtg. Mark E. asked the team what is the best way to move forward developing the Specification. The ADSC members believe soil/cement mixing is a useful tool that should be used more often. There were recent examples cited where SCM was proposed and rejected by WSDOT Project Engineers. Mark E. specifically mentioned a recent request to utilize cement mixing for a temporary shoring application and it was rejected without much/any consideration. Mark F. pointed out that for temporary applications, there shouldn't be any concern with soil/cement mixing; the concerns are related to the long-term durability of these systems in permanent applications. Mark E agreed to make another attempt to write a draft specification for a permanent use application.

Action Items: Mark E. will present draft specification language to the team at the next meeting.

4. Pumpable lean mix def. in Specification

Mark Gaines handed out a draft of the proposed language. The Contractor's asked why we use a different definition of a "wet shaft" than is currently used by FHWA. There was consensus that the "wet shaft" definition in our specification be revised to be consistent with FHWA. The rest of the specification was endorsed by the group.

Action Items: Mark G. will adjust the specification and report back to the team at the next meeting.

5. Update on synthetic slurry testing

As discussed at the previous meeting, all sampling and testing of synthetic slurry has been completed for both main slurry providers on the I-5 Northbound HOV project in

Tacoma. There will be some additional consultant work done to validate the data collected and assist us in reporting the findings to DOE. The consultant work would also work on draft guidance for the disposal of shaft spoils. Funding was recently approved for this effort, and work by the consultant should be commencing shortly.

Mark Gaines put Scott Carey of WSDOT Environmental on speaker phone for an update on the synthetic slurry testing. Scott provided a re-cap of the tests that were conducted on the slurry samples. Tests results from the various samples were provided to WSDOT in August. The DOE has already reviewed the data and has begun developing guidance on acceptable ways to dispose of liquid slurry. Alan M. expressed concern that DOE is developing this guidance without Contractor input. Scott explained that DOE is drafting guidance for our review and we should be receiving this draft in late December. We will have about a month to review and comment. The goal is to have revised specifications for slurry disposal in late January. Disposal of the liquid slurry into local storm sewer treatment plants is the immediate goal – and then guidance will be expanded to look at acceptable upland disposal practices. Scott was encouraged that DOE is being very proactive on pursuing the guidance. Alan M. agreed this appears to be a positive direction. Alan also offered Contractor representation to assist in reviewing/commenting and discussing revisions with DOE in January.

Mark G. discussed that GeoEngineers discovered the presence of chloroforms in some of the samples taken during the sampling/testing. Mark asked the ADSC if they could discuss with this with Slurry suppliers to help comment and address. Solid disposal (drilling spoils) will be addressed after liquid disposal resolved. It was suggested that Mike Hagy be involved in this discussion.

Action Items: Mark G. will distribute draft disposal language to the group in late December. ADSC will have an opportunity to comment prior to final specification language being developed.

6. Update on annual shaft reporting

Mark Gaines provided an update on drilled shaft reporting. Mark G. agreed we are behind on updating the report and has asked Mark F. to assist in compiling the information. Mark G. discussed possible ways of dissecting CSL data - perhaps by shaft diameter. It was also suggested by some of the members that we track force account costs and that we drop tracking claims. It was also decided there is no need to distinguish between rotator and oscillator. Al R. stated the Rotator is commonly used where rock excavation is necessary.

Action Items: Mark G. will continue to work on the overdue shaft reporting and will keep the Team apprised of the progress.

7. Payment for shaft reinforcing cages as materials on hand.

Chuck raised concern over lack of timely payment for shaft reinforcing cage construction. Due to the size and quantity of shafts being constructed – there is a lot of money spent/advanced before payment is received to pay the subcontractor for their work to construct shaft reinforcing cage. The Contractor can request to be paid for material on hand – and this typically results in payment for the weight of steel used. However – this is only a portion of the money expended and does not pay for

the labor/equipment necessary to fabricate the steel reinforcing cage. Interpretation of when/what the PE pay's for material on hand is inconsistent. Chuck would like to see more prompt payment. Alan M. suggested he would be reluctant to pay his subcontractor 100% for all the shaft steel until it is vertical and installed but was sympathetic to the cash flow problem. There was some discussion between team members that the payment clause of the contract language could be revised and this may assist in addressing this prompt payment issue.

Action Items: Mike B. will bring forward draft payment language changes for the next meeting.

8. Summary of last AGC Structures Team meeting

Al R. summarized discussion of the last at last AGC/Structures Team meeting. Per Al - there was good discussion about FA and Prime/sub relationship. Also discussed Accelerated Bridge Construction (ABC) – precast will be an option on future projects and not necessarily required. Found constructability review with General Contractor's interesting/informative. Mark G. thanked Al for ADSC participation at the AGC/Structures team meeting.

9. Review of drilled shaft centralizers

Mark G. handed out photos of steel reinforcing cage centralizer installation from three recent projects. He asked the team why we are not seeing reinforcing steel centralizers being installed as we detail them in our Contracts. The team was asked the following questions.

- Are the standard WSDOT centralizer details working?
- Should WSDOT allow alternative centralizers? If so, what types?
- How do centralizers and current shaft construction practices insure we achieve the required concrete cover?

Mark Suggested we develop a detail that everyone agrees to and eliminate the option to submit something different. Pat Clarke provided some history behind our current detail for centralizers. The current detail was generated due to failure of centralizers and the resulting misalignment of shaft cages. The problem appeared to be caused by centralizers collapsing if the cage twisted during installation. Chuck believes some of the challenge is due to the centralizers being fabricated early but not accounting properly for use of casing and any revisions in shaft cage diameter; field modifications are often required to make the centralizers work. For example - the legs of the centralizer are installed under the hoops (in lieu of on top as currently detailed) so the shaft can be installed (physically fit) within the temporary casing diameter. There was then some discussion on how the detail could be modified. There was general consensus from team members that detail shown on the last photo (legs of centralizer on top of hoops) is preferred.

Action Items: Chuck will get detail for centralizers from fabricator and send to Pat Clarke. Pat Clarke will modify the Option 1 detail and Option 2 will be deleted.

Mark G. discussed how to best change our details to insure we get the proper cover of concrete on the outside of the shaft cage. Do we need to change our specification? The ADSC suggested we revise our spec to distinguish between cased and uncased holes. A suggestion was made to re-define the "t" dimension that defines the depth of the centralizer. The "t" dimension could be adjusted to address cased or uncased holes.

Action Items – Pat Clarke will look at revising the “t” dimension so centralizers can be detailed to accommodate the various combinations of casing and cage diameter.

10. Discussion of Force Account Obstruction Clause Force Account discussion

Mark Gaines led a brain storming discussion on concerns with the current force account method of payment. Mark took notes on the major issues with force account. There was no discussion of dollars, only general discussion about force account administration issues. Today’s discussion began with a recap of last month’s discussion. There was much discussion on lack of prompt payment. It is a big problem. Mark G asked drillers to send specific examples/cases so WSDOT can follow up with Project Engineers to better understand administrative/accounting challenges.

Alan M. brought up issues with standby. There was some discussion that what WSDOT considers standby that really is not standby. There was a request that the Specification be revised/modified to better define standby.

Action Items : Mark G. will review the specification.

Force Account in general. Alan M led the discussion on the obstruction clause and the history behind it. The intent was to remove risk from the Contractor’s bid. In the past 5 years the ADSC members feel the FA obstruction item has served WSDOT well in overall reducing cost. There was general agreement that not all projects should have a FA item. It may be more appropriate to describe the condition and eliminate payment by FA. The industry has advanced technically and it was felt that we revisit the obstruction clause.

Mark G suggested we will look closer at the estimates for FA and adjust based on risk (not just use a straight 15%). Mark F./Mike B. will look at how we estimate FA.

Action Items: Mark G. will send a list to the ADSC group, asking the members to provide rate sheets for drilling tools. We will revisit this issue at our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45.

Future Meeting Dates: January 19th, March 22nd, May 3rd, and June 21st.