

November 14, 2008 Meeting –

**WSDOT Bridge Office
7345 Linderson Way SW
Tumwater, WA 98501
Conf Room 1034**

Members:

<u>WSDOT</u>	<u>ACEC</u>	<u>Guests</u>
Dick Stoddard (705.7217)	Mark Johnson (CH2M HILL)	Bijan Khaleghi
Ron Lewis	Paul Bott (HDR)	
Geoff Swett	Steve Aisaka (Parametrix)	
Mike Grigware	David Goodyear (TY Lin)	
Eric Schultz	Jim Schettler (Jacobs)	
Jesse Beaver	Rich Johnson (HNTB)	
John Lefotu	Yuhe Yang (PB)	

Minutes from 11/14/08 Meeting:

9:00 am		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Minutes of Previous Meeting • Review Action Items and Today's Agenda
<p>Reviewed new items and action items from previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Lefotu has left WSDOT. The team will need to look into new candidates to replace John. Jesse has some ideas and will discuss with Dick. • Dick prepared the cover letter to sponsors for the process change recommendation on clarifying the term "Engineer" in the Standard Specifications. The approach to involvement of sponsors in actions of the committee was subsequently discussed – see meeting notes below. • Mark brought list of issues from previous EORs on DB projects – see discussion below. 		
9:30 am to Noon		Open Discussion
<p>Discussed the following topics:</p> <p>BDM Hard Points vs. Soft Points</p> <p>Input from previous EORs:</p> <p>I-405 Renton Stage I project – There was no specific feedback related to the BDM, but a general comment cautioning the use of the BDM as a mandatory standard, since the document is not written in contract-enforceable language.</p>		

I-5 Everett project – Eric had a few thoughts on the following issues:

- The anchor bolt type for high mast luminaires was not specifically defined, and the Contractor selected A449 bolts, whereas WSDOT wanted F1554 bolts due to their better fatigue resistance. BDM does not specify bolt type, it just refers to AASHTO standard guideline for designing luminaires that permits A449 and F1554 bolts. This should be addressed in the BDM.
- Confinement reinforcement in noncontact lap splice zones (where column longitudinal rebar is spliced with shaft rebar) – BDM (page 7.8-4) specifies to use the TRAC report that provides guidelines for confinement reinforcement. The amount of confinement reinforcement is very high, resulting in the need for using the steel casing as confinement for the Everett project. Recently, a Design Memorandum was issued (July 18, 2008) that relaxes the confinement requirements; however, the memo leaves the judgment to the Engineer and does not provide clear guidance on when the confinement requirements can be relaxed. This needs to be better addressed for DB projects.

SR 519 project – Mark brought up the issue of the contractor wanting to use a pinned column base above the top of the drilled shafts for one of the structures, to reduce the seismic demands in the drilled shafts. WSDOT allows this detail with permission of the State Bridge Engineer, but only for spread footings.

This brought up a broader issue with the BDM related to assigning more responsibility to the design-build contractor than intended. In DB contracts, the RFP is written to read:

“All references to the ...Bridge Design Engineer... shall mean the Design-Builder.”

This could be problematic, especially for Chapter 4 of the BDM that addresses allowable earthquake resistance systems. There are several ERS's that are permitted only with the approval of the State Bridge Design Engineer; however, it appears that this authority has been delegated to the design-builder. From an owner's standpoint, WSDOT may not want to relinquish the authority to make these types of overarching decisions.

Updates to BDM

Discussed having the BDM updated more regularly. The Bridge Office has a technical committee that meets once/month to discuss updates to the BDM. The committee is made up of design unit supervisors, specialists, and senior bridge engineers. However, there is not a person assigned to champion this effort. As a result, updates to the BDM are not made regularly and there is not consistency in the updating process.

Several ideas were discussed:

- May need to designate a full time position for someone to lead this effort. The Design Office has full time staff devoted to updating its manuals. Once the process of updating the BDM has been established, the position could likely become part-time.

- Mike suggested using a technical writer. The Design Office uses Rebecca Nichols to update its manuals.
- The WSDOT-ACEC committee could be used to provide input from the industry by soliciting ideas for changes to BDM and to vetting proposed changes prior to implementation.
- An update cycle of 6 months was felt to be a reasonable recurrence interval. This could eliminate the need to issue Design Memos.
- It would be a good idea to place vertical bars on the margins to designate the areas of the BDM that have changed since the last update (in addition to updating the date at the bottom of the page). This would be helpful for users of the document.

Geoff and Eric will prepare a draft process change recommendation prior to next month's meeting.

Structural Foundation Specialist

The WSDOT Bridge Office has specialists for most aspects of bridge design. Specialists are responsible for technical oversight, updating the BDM in their subject area, and setting office policy. The Bridge Office does not have a structural foundation specialist.

Jesse noted that a structural foundation specialist would be a resource to the Construction Office during construction. Jesse often has to contact several engineers in the Bridge Office when an issue comes up during construction, which is time-consuming. In addition, the specialist would provide feedback on lessons learned after completion of a project.

Jesse will prepare a draft process change recommendation prior to next month's meeting.

Implementation of Committee Process Change Recommendations

The group was wondering if there was a way to track past process change recommendations to see if they were being implemented. Dick has done tracking for some of the environmental recommendations.

Jesse questioned what is being asked of the sponsors when the committee sends them a cover letter with the process change recommendation. Are we asking them to approve the recommendation and/or help implement the change? One approach might be to get their endorsement early as ideas are developed for process changes, and then have them sign the completed process recommendation to show their support.

This issue will be further discussed at next month's meeting.

12:00 pm.	30 min	Working Lunch
12:30 pm.	30 min	Wrap Up

Next Meeting:

Friday, December 12 at HNTB Office, 600 108th Ave. NE, Suite 900, Bellevue

Action Items:

- Identify replacement for John Lefotu (**D. Stoddard**)
- Look for examples of hard points vs. soft points in BDM (**All**)
- Prepare draft process change recommendation for updating the BDM on a regular basis prior to next month's meeting (**E. Schultz and G. Swett**)
- Prepare a draft process change recommendation for establishing a structural foundation specialist prior to next month's meeting (**J. Beaver**)

1:00 pm.

Adjourn