ACEC/WSDOT Structures Team
Minutes
ACEC/WSDOT Bridge and Structures Committee
10:00AM to 2:00PM
3/18/2016

WSDOT Bridge and Structures Office

Attendance:

WSDOT	Jeri Bernstein, P.E., S.E.	Washington State Ferries (Co-Chair)	Yes
	Geoff Swett, P.E., S.E.	WSDOT - Bridge Design	Yes
	Mark Gaines, P.E	WSDOT - HQ Bridge Construction	No
	Jed Bingle, P.E., S.E.	WSDOT - Bridge Design	Yes
	Glen Scroggins, P.E, S.E.	WSDOT - Bridge Preservation	No
	Lou Tran, P.E.	WSDOT - Bridge Design	Yes
	Michael Rosa, P.E.	WSDOT - Bridge Design	Yes
ACEC	Paul Brallier, P.E., S.E.	HNTB Corp. (Co-Chair)	Yes
	Jim Schettler, P.E., S.E.	Jacobs Engineering	No
	Bill Elkey, P.E., S.E.	Parsons	No
	Richard Patterson, P.E., S.E.	COWI Bridge	Yes
	Chester Werts, P.E., S.E.	HDR	No
	Paul Guenther, P.E., S.E.	COWI Marine	Yes
	Matthew Lengyel, P.E., S.E.	FIGG Bridge Engineers	Yes

Meeting Began at 10:15 AM

- **Jed Bingle was assigned to take minutes.**

- **For the benefit of the new member, existing ACEC and new WSDOT members introduced themselves.**

- **Contact information for members was reviewed and edited. The contact information is to be updated on the website.**

- **Meeting minutes were reviewed:**
  - **Matt discussed difference between current strip seal gland vs inverted 'V' gland and discussed the benefits of the inverted 'V' gland.**
  - **Geoff discussed his experience with the failure of a similar inverted 'V' gland.**
  - **Approved 1-2-2016 Meeting Minutes**

- **Team Charter was approved with the addition of new WSDOT team members.**

- **Reflect on goals for the year**

  - Provide Comment to the WSDOT Project Delivery Method Selection Guide (PDMSG)
    - Jeri discussed her review of the selection process using the PDMSG, performed by a project manager.
    - Jeri described her experience with the PDMSG selection checklist form for the SR 160 Southworth Ferries project. The justifications for choosing Design-Bid-Build delivery method were length of permits and plenty of time to design.
    - Richard discussed his insight into the difference between Design-Bid-Build and Design-Build contracting methods and described the benefits of each. The primary decision being how to shift risk between owner, designer and contractor.
    - Richard provided examples of his experience with risks shared between designer and contractor in Design-Build projects, including identifying the risks with existing utilities.
    - The group discussed the benefits of GCCM for projects with challenging construction phasing, such as the Seattle Seawall and WSF Coleman Dock projects. When selecting GCCM as a project delivery method, it should be recognized that additional costs will be incurred relative to Design-Bid-Build costs.
    - Paul B. explained challenges as an engineer in a cable-stay bridge Design-Build project, where the 30% design omitted temperature effects in the design, requiring additional deck thickness. The realization of the change occurred after a significant portion of the towers had been constructed.
    - Matt proposed providing panel discussion for the selection of the project delivery method for projects over a certain project cost. This is defined in the PDMSG as the Final Project Delivery Method Selection Matrix Workshop, which is required for projects over $100 million. The workshop attendees include project engineer, project design lead, project staff, Asst. State Const. Engineer, Asst. State Design Engineer and a facilitator.
    - Richard estimated that any project less than $25 million may not be worth consideration for the Design-Build project delivery method, unless multiple projects can be combined for a program similar to the Navy's process. This process preselects Design-Build teams and utilizes them similar to an on-call list.
    - Paul G. identified the risks of unknown underground conditions and conflicts with existing utilities, which create claims as change of conditions for Design-Build projects.
  - Develop Guidelines for the Role of Design Engineers, both Consultant/EOR and WSDOT/Owner under DB and GCCM contracts.
    - The group discussed the importance of a strong owner for the success of any project delivery method, especially for the Design-Build project delivery

method. The primary means to maintain strong ownership is to utilize review staff that has extensive design experience and maintains that experience.

- The group discussed the WSDOT Bridge Office's involvement in the selection of project delivery method and the inclusion of the level of effort that is required to support Design-Build projects, including the creation of the RFP and review of the project throughout design and construction.
- The group discussed concerns over contractor's consideration of designer as a commodity, contractor self-performing engineering and multiple contractors owned by parent companies bidding on the same project.

- **ACEC/WSDOT Structures Website**
  - The group discussed the continuing involvement of Mark, considering his recent change in responsibilities.
  - The group discussed replacing Glen with other WSDOT Bridge Preservation staff.
  - Website up to date.
  - Jed mentioned the "Request a Project Review" and "Ask a question" services at his presentation during the WSDOT Local Programs Bridge Condition Inspection Update class in February.
  - Matt provided an overview of the schedule for the APWA newsletter article.
  - The group discussed the "Request a Project Review" and "Ask a question" services for the benefit of new members.

ACTION ITEMS: Geoff will verify the "Request a Project Review" service was mentioned in the WSDOT Local Programs newsletter.

Matt will provide a draft version of the article for the APWA newsletter.

- **Role or Engineer Consultant/EOR and WSDOT/Owner in DBB, DB and GCCM contracts**
  - WSDOT/ACEC/AGC Design-Build committee is looking at how to document the right-size for different size of DB projects.

ACTION ITEMS: Paul G. to provide a description of the Navy's Design-Build procedure and an example task order.

Paul B. to provide results for I-405 Design-Build projects.

Geoff to find post-project report for SR 167 Puyallup River Bridge project.

Geoff to provide example of RFP for SR 167 Puyallup River Bridge to review.

- **Post-Earthquake Inspection of Bridges Manual for Local Agencies**
  - Paul B. presented an outline for the APWA conference – April 4-7, 2017.
  - Jeri shared the WSF use of ShakeCast.

ACTION ITEM: Paul B. to continue to create presentation and identify area that other team members can work on.

Jeri to email ShakeCast information to Paul B.

Paul B. to email Jeri an example of the City of Seattle Post-EQ building inspection placard.

- Next meeting May 20, 2016 at COWI's Office in Seattle

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm.