



ADSC/WSDOT Joint Meeting

26 October, 2011, 9:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.

ADSC/WSDOT Meeting Minutes

Team Members

Attended	Member	Company	Phone	E-mail
	Allen, Tony	WSDOT	360-709-5450	allent@wsdot.wa.gov
	Armour, Tom	DBM	253-838-1402	tarmour@dbmcm.com
X	Bauer, Mike	WSDOT	360-705-7190	bauerm@wsdot.wa.gov
X	Bennion, Stuart	WSDOT	360-705-7468	bennios@wsdot.wa.gov
	Clarke, Patrick	WSDOT	360-705-7220	clarkp@wsdot.wa.gov
X	Cuthbertson, Jim	WSDOT	360-709-5452	cuthbej@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
	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
X	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
	Starceвич, John	Malcolm	253-395-3300	jstarceвич@malcolmdrilling.com
	Tuttle, John	Sinclair	661-212-1223	tutmud@aol.com

¹ Team co-chair

Guests

Attendee	Company	Phone	E-mail
Bill Binnig	Kiewit EWC	253-943-4073	Bill.binnig@kiewit.com
David Crisman	WSDOT	360-428-1593	crismad@wsdot.wa.gov
Don Chadbourne	WSDOT	509-324-6173	chadbod@wsdot.wa.gov
Darrel Johnson	PACO	206-786-7584	djohnson@PacoEquip.com
Jay Drye	WSDOT	360-757-5993	dryej@wsdot.wa.gov

Meeting minutes were prepared by Stuart Bennion, WSDOT Assistant State Construction Engineer, Bridge.

Topics -- Constructability Reviews: SR9 Pilchuck Creek and SR101 McDonald Creek; Update on upcoming WSDOT Projects and workload; Force Account discussion; Update on polymer slurry testing; Update on CRC Test Shaft project; Soldier pile soil/cement mixing specifications; Wet setting soil nail provisions; Pumpable lean mix def. in Specification; Identifying potential project for “O” cell testing; Vent Seal Elevations; Discussion of Force Account Obstruction Clause

1. Welcome/Introduction of new members

Mark Gaines welcomed the group. Mark suggested that we consider adding one or two WSDOT construction Project Engineers to the ADSC team. The team felt this was a good idea.

Action Items: Mark G. will look into some candidates from WSDOT construction PE's and submit names for consideration.

2. Constructability Review – SR9 Pilchuck Creek

This is a bridge replacement project that will construct a new three-span structure with a total length of about 560 feet. The current plan is to use single eight-foot diameter shafts at the intermediate piers. Don Chadbourne discussed the geotechnical conditions from the borings, specifically the boulders, cobbles, and bedrock. It was also discussed that artesian pressures were identified at Pier 4.

It is expected that these shafts will be about 150 feet in overall length, and will require 75 feet of embedment into the sandstone bedrock. The amount of embedment is necessary to achieve axial capacity, and takes into account the potential scour that may occur at these piers. The tentative plan is to require casing to be installed to the sandstone bedrock.

The ADSC shared concerns that there is no shaft-to-column transition; the eight-foot diameter shafts are carried directly up into the crossbeam. This may pose a constructability issue because the crossbeam will need to be able to accommodate the shaft construction tolerances. WSDOT should consider putting a small column or a step in reinforcing cage in order to make adjustments due to the horizontal and vertical alignment.

ADSC was asked if it would be better to construct two smaller, shorter shafts. The general consensus was that a single shaft would be more economical. A step in the shaft, at the rock layer, will aid in constructability. They questioned the need for casing down to the bedrock; based on the sieve analysis of the existing soils, it appears that these holes could be held open with synthetic slurry. In general, they don't see drilling through the sandstone as a problem. ADSC suggested taking a look at the rock hardness and making sure this information is conveyed in the contract.

The artesian well is likely in the glacial till, but it does not appear to be in the sandstone. ADSC suggested drilling a pressure relief well to draw down the artesian head.

Action Items: WSDOT Geotech should consider discussing specifications for rock hardness with the team as the contract documents are developed. Alan M. will provide written comments within ten days.

3. Constructability Review - SR101 McDonald Creek

This project constructs two new three-span structures that will be supported on drilled shafts at all four piers. Don Chadbourne discussed the new bridge and that two shafts will be used at each of the four piers. As with Pilchuck Creek, the potential scour effects and limited axial capacity in this soils warrant fairly deep rock sockets; shafts will be socketed about 50 feet into the siltstone/sandstone bedrock. Don described the sandstone/siltstone as being very weak with some highly fractured zones.

ADSC members have constructed past projects in this area and found that drilling into this rock has not been difficult. It was noted that access could be an issue with the existing slopes, and the existing timber piles could limit the amount of grading that can be accomplished.

The ADSC didn't see that it would be necessary to case this to bedrock. Considering the weak rock, they also didn't see any need to use a smaller-diameter rock socket. Larger or smaller diameter shafts could be used without any issues.

Action Items: Alan M. will provide written comments within ten days.

4. Review/Approval of June 2011 Minutes

No comments were provided on the September 2011 minutes. The minutes will be updated and posted to the web site.

Action Items: Stuart will post to the web.

5. Update on upcoming WSDOT Projects and workload

Mark Gaines mentioned that workload is dropping off over the next few years and much of the remaining work is wrapping up nickel and TPA projects. Unless something changes, funding from the Federal Highway Administration will likely be decreasing also. There is no word at this time of additional funding packages for infrastructure.

Design Build is a major shift in the State. There was a discussion of the use of DB in WSDOT and the limitations placed on contractors in the RFP. We are likely to see much greater use of design-build contracting in the future.

Mark provided a presentation showing the current program for highway construction, the WSDOT Method of Delivery outline (i.e., state organization, design build vs. design bid build), a breakdown of the gas tax, effects of inflation, and the future outlook.

Action Items: No action required.

6. 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.

Issues with Force Account

1. Concern with how force account gets paid. ADSC Members almost always work as sub-contractors. The whole process is lengthy. Even with a signed force account rate sheet, it takes a couple of billing cycles for WSDOT to process the rate sheet. WSDOT often makes payment with no CAPS (back-up that shows where the payment is going). This gets money to the Prime, but doesn't show the Prime how the payment should be made to the sub-contractors. Typically 60 days for WSDOT to make payment, 30 days for CAPS, another 30 days for prime contractor to make payment to sub-contractor. It can be 3-4 months from the time the work was completed until the sub-contractor receives payment for the work.
2. Sometimes differences in submitted payment and actual payment. Differences often aren't explained. If contractors don't sign off on payment and accept what is being offered, they are back into re-negotiating and further delay.
3. Sub-contractors have to resubmit for payment several times before they get paid. Some submittals for payment seem to get "lost" in the system.
4. Payment for equipment on standby. Change requires focused equipment to address the changed issue (i.e. an obstruction). What about payment for the rest of the equipment. For example, WSDOT wouldn't pay standby for a crane on a project. The Contractor demobed and re-mobed the crane, and WSDOT paid for that. It ended up costing more than paying standby.
5. Standby should be paid for at the full standby rate (rather than 50% as described in the AGC agreement).
6. Only getting paid for equipment that is captured in the Inspectors IDR's.
7. Emphasize early and often communication between the drilled shaft supervisor and the WSDOT project inspector. They should be discussing this daily.
8. Reimbursement rates for tools.
9. Overhead rates. In the drilling industry, the overhead rate is higher than for a general contractor (15% vs. 8%). A contractor can apparently audit this to get a higher overhead rate approved. However, the audit process may be difficult and time-consuming.
10. Contractors bringing the correct tools to the job site.
11. What if a drill rig breaks down during force account work?

Action Items: Mark G. will send this list out to the ADSC group, and will probably be asking the ADSC members to provide rate sheets for drilling tools.

7. Action Items:

a) Update on polymer slurry testing

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

Additional work will include data validation, reporting, presenting the results to WSDOT and DOE, and writing draft guidance for the disposal of shaft spoils.

Funding was just approved for this effort, and work should be commencing shortly.

Action Items: Mark G. will ask to see if GeoEngineers can provide a draft, or perhaps give a presentation so ADSC can review the results and recommendations prior to publishing the findings.

b) Update on CRC Test Shaft project

Mark Gaines received a letter from Alan to remove the reinforcing cage. This has been forwarded to the project team. The project will do both the CSL and thermal integrity test. To accommodate the CSL tubes, a reinforcing cage is necessary; the amount of reinforcing in the cage has been reduced significantly to address ADSC's comment.

Action Items: No action required.

c) Soldier pile soil/cement mixing specifications

This will be put on the agenda for the next meeting.

Action Items: Mark E/Mark F. will present to the team at the next meeting.

d) Wet setting soil nail provisions

Mark Frye informed the team we have modified the specifications to allow wet-setting of soil nails. This will be included in the January 2012 Standard Specifications.

Action Items: No action required.

e) Pumpable lean mix def. in Specification

Mark Gaines discussed the City of Seattle specification for this item. The comment was, "why WSDOT can't have a spec like this?" Mark showed the portions of our specifications and how this is close to what Seattle has. The WSDOT specification requires a minimum cementitious amount then goes on to specify a band.

The group agreed that the CDF specification will be left alone. Mark will look at modifying the lean concrete specification to take out the maximum compressive strength requirements limit and make other modifications so this specification is similar to the one for CDF.

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

f) Identifying potential project for “O” cell testing

No discussion, this item will take off future agendas.

Action Items: No action required.

g) Vent Seal Elevations

Mark Gaines talked about cofferdams and why we specify vent seal elevations. There was discussion about why the contractor cannot be allowed to flood at a specific elevation, but it was pointed out that a person would have to be on site 24 hours/7 days a week to ensure that flood levels are not reached during off hours. It was then agreed that the vent seal elevation makes sense. The team agreed that the definition used on the Standard Specifications is sufficient.

Action Items: No action required.

8. Discussion of Force Account Obstruction Clause

Not discussed. This will be put on the agenda for the next meeting.

Action Items: Mark G. to move to next agenda.

Future Meeting Dates: December 1st, January 19th, March 22nd, and June 21st.