



ADSC/WSDOT Joint Meeting
 January 31st, 2013, 8:30 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.
ADSC/WSDOT Meeting Minutes

Team Members

Attended	Member	Company	Phone	E-mail
X	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
	Bennion, Stuart	WSDOT	360-705-7468	bennios@wsdot.wa.gov
	Bill Binnig	Kiewit	253-943-4000	Bill.Binnig@kiewit.com
X	Clarke, Patrick	WSDOT	360-705-7220	clarkp@wsdot.wa.gov
X	Cuthbertson, Jim	WSDOT	360-709-5452	cuthbej@wsdot.wa.gov
	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 ¹	WSDOT	360-705-7824	fosterm@wsdot.wa.gov
X	Frye, Mark	WSDOT	360-709-5469	fryem@wsdot.wa.gov
	Gaines, Mark	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
	Heinz, Mike	PACO	206-949-9369	mikeheinz@pacoequip.com
X	Johnson, Darrel	PACO	206-786-7584	djohnson@pacoequip.com
X	Khaleghi, Bijan	WSDOT	360-705-7181	khalegb@wsdot.wa.gov
	Lehman, Debbie	FHWA	360-753-9482	Debbie.Lehman@dot.gov
	McCutchan, Tait	Malcolm	253-395-3300	tmccutchan@malcolmdrilling.com
X	Olney, Chuck	Rainier Steel	206-949-7092	chuck@rainiersteel.com
X	Parmantier, Dominic ¹	CJA	206-575-8248	dparmantier@condon-johnson.com
X	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
	Sexton, Jim	DBM	253-838-1402	jims@dbmcm.com
X	Simmons, Greg	Kiewit	253-943-4000	GregSimmons@kiewit.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
Mike Fleming	WSDOT	360-705-7830	FleminM@wsdot.wa.gov
John Starceвич	Malcolm	253-395-3300	jstarceвич@malcolmdrilling.com

Chris Heathman	WSDOT	360-709-5592	chris_heathman@hotmail.com
Todd Mooney	WSDOT	360-709-5463	Mooneyt@wsdot.wa.gov
Heather Zimchek	WSDOT	360-709-5562	ZimcheH@wsdot.wa.gov
Sa'ud Tayeh	WSDOT	360-709-5416	TayehS@wsdot.wa.gov

Meeting minutes were prepared by Mike Fleming, WSDOT Assistant State Construction Engineer.

1. Welcome/Review of Agenda

Marco F. opened the meeting and talked about email distribution that did not work this time. Members please verify email addresses to make sure we have current information. Marco summarized the agenda for today's meeting and had introductions due to several guests..

2. Review/Approval of November Meeting Minutes

There are no edits brought forth on the December meeting minutes.

Action: Post to web

3. Constructability Reviews – MTB Couplet Bridge; Davis Slough; Willapa River

Sa'ud Tayeh provided some background information regarding the MTB Couplet Bridge. He explained that there are 4 units of soil, approx. 60' down to rock (fill, alluvium, outwash, siltstone) with water present. There are fairly similar soil profiles across in the area. The shafts will socket into rock (weak rock, in order of 2000psi). Temp casing most likely be needed thru the fill but no permanent casing is anticipated. Silt content approx. 15 to 20%. Will temp casing be needed to get thru outwash? Why have temp casing installed all the way through unit 2? Drillers had some diverging opinions regarding the need for casing all the way down. There are no known utilities close to shafts. The shafts are located approx. 30' from I-5 with minimal existing embankment and 5% fines in the gravel layer. Advertisement is expected in the April/May timeframe.

Action: Sa'ud to provide more information with regards to gradations to determine if slurry will work. Dominic will provide formal response from ADSC.

Davis Slough – Geotechnical Office is seeking feedback on the temporary casing depth. The structure is single span. 4 each 8' diameter shafts approx. 100' in length will be constructed at each at each Pier. Good/fair access and work conditions are expected. A levee crosses the area. The upper 10' of ground is silt/organics, then alluvial/beach deposit then 15-20% silt/sand for 50-60', then well graded sand/gravel dense to very dense beyond that. The design assumes temp casing to 70 to 80' below ground to the gravels. The main question - is it needed? Can it be done with slurry in lieu of casing with only permanent casing at top? The plan tip elevation is approx. 97' into dense gravels. There are temporary geo-synthetic walls up to the bridges and abutments are approx. 10' above existing ground. Shafts do go within the flood plain but it is mostly dry except during wet periods where groundwater resides at the surface most of the time. Access on the east is easy and the west side is more difficult

with debris and environmental constraints. One question that came up was why not drive piles for ground improvements for foundations? Environmental restrictions and permitting restrict what's allowed here. Advertisement is expected in April/May timeframe.

Action: ADSC will review boring information and provide formal response back to WSDOT.

Willapa River – Same questions as the other two projects regarding need for temporary casing. The project is on SR6 near Raymond. There is approximately 15-20' of alluvium with low blow count, then heavy clays/siltstone, then rock. It's a 3 span precast girder bridge with 2 shafts per pier. The design currently anticipates 4 shafts with permanent casing (50' worth), and 4 shafts without permanent casing. Shaft sizes are 6' diameter at abutments and 8' diameter at intermediate piers. There's a need to go into the rock (approximately 20' with the casing) and the shafts need to socket another 15' to tip elevation. Permanent casing needs to tie into overburden soil and rock at bottom in the design, under-ream once to rock. Drillers expressed concern about feasibility getting into rock socket without creating clearance outside the casing with at least ¼" gapping. Intimate contact with rock/soil is not going to happen. Drillers asked about the potential to case to bottom then pull up and reset, then place cage to within 15' (+/-) of the bottom. WSDOT to re-analyze this for feasibility. The end piers use temporary casing within the top layer.

Action: Geotech will analyze the suggestion from drillers. ADSC will also provide formal response.

4. **ADSC/WSDOT Joint Training Workshop**

After discussing internally - Dominic and Marco determined there is enough interest to hold an ADSC/WSDOT joint training workshop in 2013. Currently, it is scheduled for May 7th (in Bothell) at the operating engineers building. Marco asked the group for suggestions/topics for the conference? Ideas that were thrown out by the group included; permanent steel casing capacity, ground improvements technology general presentation (soil mixing, jet grouting), shaft inspection in general, lessons learned/case studies (CRC test program, port of Tacoma), shotcrete in lieu of CIP, thermal integrity testing (state representative), shaft 101 construction presentation by drillers. Invitations will be extended to local agencies. It is anticipated to have about 6 or so presentations (split between contractor/WSDOT) with case studies in the afternoon. WSDOT offered to bring CSL equip and thermal testing equip as possible demonstration discussion (provide comparison). It was agreed that there would **not** be a panel discussion at end of meeting.

Action Items: Marco and Dominic to have agenda paired down by next meeting in March.

5. **Shaft Cage Design Changes**

Bijan Khaleghi – WSDOT has evaluating a modified cage design. The design considers accounting for permanent steel casing in capacity of the shaft design and we now have means and methods in accounting for it. Have two versions developed,

piles and shafts. Developed GSP's regarding some of these modifications. UW doing study regarding shear capacity etc. Another study NCHRP looking at confinement with casing and accounting for it in capacity. If there's interest in the details it can be found on the TRB web site. The GSP changes include welding specification changes. Willapa River project will be using this new specification.

Action: Bijan/Mike Bauer to share study information and draft GSP electronically with group.

6. Engineered pick of Drilled Shaft Cage

At the December ADSC meeting Stuart Bennion discussed the requirements of Section 6-19 requiring an engineered stamped plan for drilled shaft cages over 6' in diameter and 60' or greater in length. We have since then rescinded the requirement for a stamped plan but we are still requiring the remainder of the required drilled shaft submittal be submitted before the drill plan will be approved. There was general consensus amongst the group that this was acceptable/appropriate.

7. Review of the Drilled Shaft Submittal

Marco introduced the issue and asked what can be changed (or not) with regards to what we require in our drilled shaft submittal specifications? Discussions internally within WSDOT it been suggested that we may be requiring too much information. Jim Cuthbertson offered that we are approving portions of the submittal and we really don't know if the Contractor's equipment is appropriate or not and it is really not our responsibility to approve or disapprove. This should be the contractor's determination. The group had a general discussion about approvals, means & methods and implications with the approval. Mike B. mentioned that WSDOT had historically operated under Engineer approval of submittals as everyone involved in conventional design-bid-build projects understood what was meant by "approval". However, recent use of the design-build method of project delivery introduced new terminology and submittal processes that are bringing some confusion and causing WSDOT to evaluate what the process should be and how it should be different for different types of submittals. Mike suggested that HQ Construction Office needed to approach this as a global specification book issue as this was applicable to all types of submittals throughout the specification book. To focus on Section 6-19 exclusively was inappropriate. The group agreed that there's value in the content but how WSDOT handles it administratively is separate issue. The drillers agreed that the narrative is critical and the most important component of the submittal. One question raised was why do we have an experience requirement when you essentially never reject? What about prequalification of drillers or certification in lieu of what we currently have? ADSC could manage and certify drillers. A previous determination by the Attorney General Office was that it could be considered collusion. Drillers are interested in certification but it may not be achievable. The original intent was to demonstrate that the driller had correct equipment, process etc., to accomplish the work. The policy discussion with regards to approving or accepting a submittal will take place at the WSDOT/AGC administration Team. There was some agreement amongst the team to further

investigate the feasibility of ADSC certification and potentially drop much of our current standard specification requirements. This Spec modification issue will be deferred until more is understood about the potential to certify drilling contractors.

Action: Al R. will to report back on what industry is doing (nationally) in regards to certification. Marco to discuss approval with Craig McDaniel (WSDOT Const Policy)

8. Other Items:

a) Pumpable lean mix def. in Specification

One issue is strength problems but can be rejected because exceeding certain strength when it only requires in-situ strength (like CDF). Strength requirements for pump able mix.....Keep this on agenda.

b) Review of drilled shaft centralizers

Details for centralizers – problem is variation in what comes out to job versus what was detailed and planned. One issue is bar layout/design versus what is constructible (fabrication), possible to standardize the centralizer details although varies if using slip casing or not. Utilize a table to allow for selection of “z” dimension based on casing, dimensions, etc...

Action: Al to run through chart with industry and forward to WSDOT for finalizing

c) Update on Slurry disposal

Environmental office pursuing alternative infiltration methods with DOE (such as on-site disposal of processed water in general), suggested holding off on changes at this point.

9. Synthetic Slurry Approval - QPL

Several synthetic slurry products have been added to the QPL this last month. What process do we want to follow for adding future new products? Steve Hughes (QPL manager) is the contact for new submittals.

Action: no action

ADSC researching tip grouting effectiveness and results with FHWA research funding/support. Al to keep group informed of this work being done.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30

Future Meeting Date: Future meeting date set for March 14th and May 2nd.



ADSC/WSDOT Joint Meeting
 May 2nd, 2013, 8:30 A.M. – 11:30 A.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
X	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	Foster, Marco ¹	WSDOT	360-705-7824	fosterm@wsdot.wa.gov
X	Frye, Mark	WSDOT	360-709-5469	fryem@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	Johnson, Darrel	PACO	206-786-7584	djohnson@pacoequip.com
	Khaleghi, Bijan	WSDOT	360-705-7181	khalegb@wsdot.wa.gov
	Lehman, Debbie	FHWA	360-753-9482	Debbie.Lehman@dot.gov
	McCutchan, Tait	Malcolm	253-395-3300	tmccutchan@malcolmdrilling.com
X	McDaniel, Craig	WSDOT	360-705-7823	mcdanic@wsdot.wa.gov
X	Morin, Dave	DMI	206-793-4470	dave@dmidrilling.com
	Olney, Chuck	Rainier Steel	206-949-7092	chuck@rainiersteel.com
X	Owen, Geoff	Kiewit	360-690-6548	Geoff.owen@kiewit.com
X	Parmantier, Dominic ¹	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
	Sarhan, Anthony	FHWA	360-753-9412	Anthony.sarhan@dot.gov
	Sexton, Jim	DBM	253-838-1402	jims@dbmcm.com
	Simmons, Greg	Kiewit	253-943-4000	GregSimmons@kiewit.com
	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
Patrick Fuller	WSDOT	360-757-5991	fullep@wsdot.wa.gov
Heather Zimchek	WSDOT	N/A	zimcheh@wsdot.wa.gov
Todd Mooney	WSDOT	360-709-5463	mooneyt@wsdot.wa.gov

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

1. Welcome/Review of Agenda

Marco F. opened the meeting and talked about email distribution. Members please verify email addresses. The agenda was discussed and introductions were made.

2. Review/Approval of November Meeting Minutes

Mike B. identified that part of the Item 7 discussion was not captured correctly.

Action Items: Mike B. will provide adjustments and Stuart B. will correct and post to web.

3. Constructability Reviews – Hedrick Creek bridge Foundations

Heather Z. provided some background information regarding the Hedrick Creek Bridge Foundations. This project is on SR 542 near Mt Baker. The area is filled with rocks, cobbles, and boulders; some to the size of a house and with 10000 to 24000 psi compressive strength properties. Photos were provided of location, core locations, core samples, and a house size rock next to the creek.

- Do we design for smaller shaft sizes (3' to 4' diameter) or larger shafts (6' to 8' diameter)?

ADSC commented that obstructions are easier to get out of larger shafts. Have micro-piles been considered to accommodate cores where obstructions are not a problem? Getting capacity for micro-piles and resistance to scour are in question with micro piles.

Placing neat concrete in the micro piles with the rocks, boulder, and gravels is a concern. There is also a soil nail wall for temporary traffic alignment into one of these large house size rocks. The water and soil layers with gravels and fines are a concern for micro pile neat concrete placement and grout for soil nail wall in this area. The soil nail wall is only about 75' wide and there is a lot of rock in this section. A different wall type may be better.

Todd M. identified the soil material as medium dense silty gravel with some boulders and cobbles. Length is not yet determined, but likely placed below a silt layer about 70' down. Liquefaction, down drag, and settlement are still being investigated for some soil layers. If you do include design forces to account for settlement and down drag, then shaft lengths may be decreased and perched above the silty layers.

Spread footings are not considered due to scour effects in the area. Can the bridge be lengthened and place footings up on the bank further? This is complicated with traffic flows in the area.

Al R. stated large obstructions come out of 8' - 10' diameter shafts easier than 6' diameter shafts.

- There are three wing walls off the bridge. The plan is to place these utilizing soldier piles to get capacity and deal with scour. Typically, are these 3' diameter shafts?

Using a smaller shaft size would be better for this situation, even down to 24" if possible, since you cannot construct 8' – 10' shafts for this wall type.

- Temporary casing will be required through the boulders; does it need to extend to the bottom? Can you get them into boulders?

Recommend temp casing full depth due to fines, boulders, and scour. Some drillers may be able to do it otherwise, but need to see borings first.

Construction will be next June.

Action Items: Dominic P. will provide formal response from ADSC.

4. Specification Change – Slurry Level

Stuart B. identified an issue where permanent casing is tipped in soft soils and during concrete pours there is potential to have blow-outs if the water head and concrete head are both high. A graphic for tidal construction was used to discuss the need to lower water head as concrete pours near the top of the shaft. The WSDOT Specification does not allow this option for the drillers to mitigate this risk. Proposed is new language that both allows this consideration and re-organizes the requirements in a better format.

Action Items: Stuart B. will send the modified language out for review and comments.

5. Oscillator Casing Sizes

Stuart discussed a current design that is using 11'-0" diameter shafts. A request was made to Malcolm to know what size casing is available for this shaft size. An updated table has been generated by Al/Tate for Malcolm and is presented here.

Al R. identified that this table is for all companies that use this type of equipment. He provided some history on the current sizes available due to industry (Leffer, etc.). Patrick C. offered insight to the history of the BDM requirements.

The contracts are based on the inside diameter of the casing as the shaft size. Oscillator and rotator methods use the outside diameter. Stuart is working with the Bridge Office to update design policies, plan details, and specifications to better reflect options for construction both conventional and with an Oscillator/Rotator.

Action Items: Stuart will work with the Bridge Office to see what language needs to be changed.

6. Review of the Drilled Shaft Submittal

This discussion is ongoing from previous meetings. Issues discussed have been types of certifications available, the amount of requirements, what should be submitted, how the State processes this submittal, and if stamping/signatures are required. Stuart B. presented new language that clarifies the organization of the submittals, modification to the engineering requirement, and WSDOT's responses to the submittal. Correspondence to the Contractor will be in terms of conformance to the contract or rejection with justification.

Al R. reported back that industry is excited / interested in a certification process. Nevada is currently undergoing what Washington experienced some 15 years ago. Prequalification is a hot button that has legal implications to require, but certification is something that can be placed in contracts and enforced. It is a process of saying you have been properly trained and if work is not performed correctly the certification can be pulled. Industry is working to adopt this, though it is at least two years out. Both ADSC and AGP are talking about this in their task force meetings.

Dave M. identified that other industries are effecting this discussion and education is the process right now to get everyone on-board. Will WSDOT consider placing a practice requirement (say 3 jobs)? WSDOT decided to leave the language as is, but this question is why we are looking at industry to get a certification process in place, as a substitute for current requirements.

Action Items: Stuart will send the modified language out for review and comments.

7. Modifications to Obstruction Clause

Craig M. discussed his role in the State as HQ Construction Engineer, Policy. He will be attending all the task force teams to make sure we are updating our policy to stay up with industry. He is looking out for the public, what is the best value, and what is the risk allocation? The obstruction specification is based on historical practices and agreements, but it appears there has been an unbalancing of risk allocation. WSDOT does not want to get into the business of how to perform the Work. There is also the consideration for how the specifications read and how we have acted as an owner in the past.

The current obstruction specification process was outlined. The ADSC is choosing the work method and some methods may be impacted by obstructions and others are not. Dave M. pointed out that the Big 3 could deal with covering obstructions, but the little guys need this clause. It costs more up front to bring in the Oscillator, but less is paid in obstructions. Little companies come in with cheaper bids, when possible, but rely on the obstruction clause for part of their work.

The CRC dispute was used as an example. Both Craig and Al discussed how the project went, how the obstruction collapsed the casing, if a cutting shoe made a difference or not, how it was repaired and the DRB findings.

There are two issues to discuss:

1. Should the contractor be responsible for this work and obstruction costs for that work vs. the current contract language?
2. Is there an off-balanced bidding process for those who get paid for obstructions more often than others?

This morning case study is an example where obstructions are known. This should not use the obstruction clause as is. Dominic P. identified that the specification never made sense for locations where we know there are impacts/obstructions. This places too much responsibility on the State.

Site investigation will help. More information provides more assurance, but you can never know all until the shaft is constructed. Patrick C. identified some examples where more investigation helped and where it did not.

The State is looking for contractors to bid based on the information provided, and not depend on the obstruction clause. Craig likes the Op-in Op-out options based on historical obstruction pool of monies. Dominic P. pointed out that there will be more claims for differing site conditions. Dave M. asked if it could be based on a lineal foot or quantity measurement. Tom A. said the drillers could bid the risk, based on an assumed hourly rate. This will also lead to differing site arguments. A “Major Medical” event is being paid for every day emergencies, rather than the unique real emergencies. Al R. recommended looking at projects on a case-by-case basis and marries the specification to the known work.

Mike B. reminded the group that Bridge Shafts as defined in 6-19 are not the same as soldier piles, noise walls, and sign structure shafts. These might have to have an individual policy for each.

Patrick C. reminded the group of the design requirements vs. methods, specifically glory holes and telescoping and how this works with the seismic specification. This is the purpose of the owner review of submittals.

Action Items: Marco F. will send up a version of new language for the ADSC to review and provide comment on by the end of May. Any ADSC input, language from other States, etc. is appreciated.

8. Action Items:

a) ADSC Certification & Drilled Shaft Submittal

This is discussed in Item 7 (above).

b) Pumpable lean mix def. in Specification

Not discussed.

c) Review of drilled shaft centralizers

Not discussed.

9. ADSC/WSDOT Joint Training Workshop

Dominic and Marco discussed the ADSC/WSDOT joint training workshop scheduled for May 7th (in Bothell) at the operating engineers building.

Action Items: None

Meeting adjourned at 11:20

Future Meeting Date: Future meeting date set for June 13th.



ADSC/WSDOT Joint Meeting
 October 3rd, 2013, 8:30 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.
ADSC/WSDOT Meeting Minutes

Team Members

Attended	Member	Company	Phone	E-mail
X	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	Carnevale, Robert	Hayward Baker	206-223-1732	RACarnevale@HaywardBaker.com
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	England, Paul	Rainier Steel	206-719-0481	Paul@rainiersteel.com
X	Foster, Marco	WSDOT	360-705-7824	fosterm@wsdot.wa.gov
X	Frye, Mark	WSDOT	360-709-5469	frjem@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
	Johnson, Darrel	PACO	206-786-7584	djohnson@pacoequip.com
	Khaleghi, Bijan	WSDOT	360-705-7181	khalegb@wsdot.wa.gov
	Kvinsland, John	Malcolm	253-395-3300	jkvinsland@malcolmdrilling.com
	Lehman, Debbie	FHWA	360-753-9482	Debbie.Lehman@dot.gov
	McCutchan, Tait	Malcolm	253-395-3300	tmccutchan@malcolmdrilling.com
	McDaniel, Craig	WSDOT	360-705-7823	mcdanic@wsdot.wa.gov
	Morin, Dave	DMI	206-793-4470	dave@dmidrilling.com
	Olney, Chuck	Rainier Steel	206-949-7092	chuck@rainiersteel.com
X	Owen, Geoff	Kiewit	360-690-6548	Geoff.owen@kiewit.com
X	Parmantier, Dominic ¹	CJA	206-575-8248	dparmantier@condon-johnson.com
X	Radom, Greg	DBM	206-730-1317	Greg@dbmcm.com
X	Rasband, Al	Malcolm	253-395-3300	arasband@malcolmdrilling.com
	Sarhan, Anthony	FHWA	360-753-9412	Anthony.sarhan@dot.gov
	Sexton, Jim	DBM	253-838-1402	jims@dbmcm.com
	Simmons, Greg	Kiewit	253-943-4000	GregSimmons@kiewit.com
	Starcevich, John	Malcolm	253-395-3300	jstarcevich@malcolmdrilling.com
	Tuttle, John	Sinclair	661-212-1223	tutmud@aol.com

¹ Team co-chair

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

1. Welcome/Review of Agenda

Mark G. opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. Mark announced that he will be resuming as co-chair of the team and is glad to be back. He thanked Marco for co-chairing the team over the past year.

2. Review/Approval of May Meeting Minutes

No comments or corrections were provided.

Action Items: Marco will post the minutes to the web as written.

3. Changes at HQ Construction and WSDOT

Mark discussed recent changes in the Construction Office and went over the newly updated table of organization. Dave Erickson will go back to providing support for roadway construction, Mark Gaines will provide support for bridge construction, and Craig McDaniel's will manage contract administration issues. Mark reiterated that it is his intent to insure consistency across the state with regard to how we manage our contracts. Mark also announced that Tom Baker has assumed the role of State Bridge Engineer and Linea Laird is our new Chief Engineer.

Action Items: N/A.

4. Review of ADSC/WSDOT Joint Training

Mark asked the group for feedback on this year's joint training held May 7th in Bothell. Evaluations of the training sessions revealed that most presentations were well received. The team discussed whether the training should be held annually or semi-annually. The consensus amongst the groups is that the meeting be held annually in the spring since it is always well attended. There was also some discussion that new topics (state of the art) be included as they are informative and create interest for long time industry members/participants. Molly commented that we should also continue to include more basic topic for folks new to the industry.

Action Items: Mark suggested we discuss potential topics in our upcoming meetings.

5. Action Items**a) Modifications to the Obstruction Clause**

This topic was raised last spring. At that time - Craig McDaniel discussed his role as HQ Construction Engineer (Policy), and he was questioning the risk allocation provided by our current practice of including an obstruction clause. The obstruction specification is based on historical practices and past agreements, but there is some belief the clause creates an unbalancing of bids and risk allocation. More directly – the obstruction clause is more likely to be utilized by conventional drilling methods as opposed to oscillator/rotator method of drilling.

Mark Gaines provided data that has quantified how much money we are spending on the F.A. item relative to the dollar value of the drilled shaft work. The annual reports reveal that (with the exception of a couple of unusual projects) the dollar value spent on obstructions is less than 5% of the value of the work. He then asked the group to

update him on their perspective/thoughts regarding the topic. Al M. provided his perspective on the issue and described why he believes that the F.A. can make for an unfair bidding climate between oscillator/rotator drilling and conventional drilling techniques.

Mark presented a concept that would take a portion of the force account dollars as a “deductible”. The contractor would have two options with the deductible:

- For initial obstruction removal efforts, the contractor would pay out-of-pocket (or at risk) for the deductible amount. After the deductible is expended, the State would provide compensation for additional obstruction removal efforts.
- Contractor could collect the deductible amount from WSDOT as a lump sum payment. With this payment, the contractor would assume risk for obstruction removal efforts.

There was discussion on how this could be implemented and that the logic behind this is similar to A plus B bidding. A question was raised as how the Prime would work with his sub on using this type of bidding methodology. It was also noted that neither of these options would preclude the contractor from claiming a differing site condition. The contractors think having the differing site condition protection in place is important from a risk standpoint.

There was discussion that on specific contracts, when conditions are quantifiable but tough (known cobbles and boulders), perhaps the obstruction clause could be eliminated and WSDOT would rely strictly on the boring logs. This could result in more differing site condition claims and would place more responsibility on WSDOT to insure accurate boring logs are included in the contract.

The Contractors pointed out that F.A. is not a money maker for them; it only offsets the added costs associated with the obstruction. The Contractors also were in agreement that the current specification is working well and that WSDOT will not make it better by artificially placing more risk back on the Contractor. Should the clause be eliminated – most likely protested work would be tracked by F.A. tracking and if a differing site condition was confirmed, payment would most likely be calculated by the F.A. records. ADSC members believe that tracking and paying for it up front/as it is occurring makes more sense than engaging in a drawn-out protest process.

Everyone agreed it was beneficial to have this discussion and it should be discussed further at future meetings.

Action Items: This item will be kept on the agenda for future discussion.

b) ADSC Certification & Drilled shaft submittal

This topic was discussed at the last team meeting. Modifications to the current specification were reviewed. Mike commented that the proposed changes have been implemented. Some of the team members questioned why we are requiring the submittal and questioned the value of the submittal. Mark G feels the submittal does have value. Marco reminded the team of previous discussions – the current submittal

requirements are more directed towards drilling contractors we may not consistently work with, not necessarily the team members present.

Patrick provided some history on why the specification was first developed.

Mark F. commented that we should include better language than that the plan needs to be accepted prior to work beginning (not necessarily approving). This way, WSDOT can make sure the Contractor is compliant with the Contract requirements prior to work commencing.

Action Items: This item will be kept on the agenda for future discussion. Mark will make another attempt at rewriting the specification and will bring it back to the group.

c) Pumpable lean mix Specification

This topic has been on the agenda for some time. Mark asked where the team left off on this issue. Amongst the group, there was different recollection on what the issue was with the specification. There was some discussion that reference to the minimum compressive strength was the issue and should be removed. Mark reviewed the recent amendment to the specification. No one at the meeting took exception to the language and it was agreed that we remove this topic from the agenda.

Action Items: This item will be removed from the agenda.

d) Specification change – slurry level

Mark provided a copy of the recent change to the slurry level specification that has been discussed and agreed to by the team. There was one comment provided that would help clarify – Mike B will re-evaluate the specification to address the comment.

Action Items: Edited version will be shared with the Team next meeting.

e) Oscillator Casing Sizes

Patrick reminded the group of this discussion. Basically – metric oscillator casing may differ slightly from the shaft diameter listed in the plans. There is some flexibility on how much the casing diameter can deviate from the actual required design diameter. Al stated he had provided updated charts to Stuart last spring and he thought the issue was resolved. Patrick acknowledged he had received the updated charts and is working on updating the BDM to be consistent with industry tooling. This item has been resolved and will be taken off the agenda.

Action Items: Patrick will update the BDM – no further action required by the team.

f) Review of drilled shaft centralizers

Mark displayed the detail for our current standard design for centralizers and expressed some concern as the current detail was developed and agreed to by the team – but WSDOT consistently receives requests to deviate from it. The discussion then focused on past problems and solutions, and the evolution of the current

centralizer design. Patrick also provided some history on the work he and Chuck Olney have engaged in this past year.

There was lengthy discussion on the problems with the current design and possible solutions. Paul E. brought in an epoxy coated runner that he believes could be modified that may work better than the current centralizer design detail. Paul mentioned that the bending, welding and coating of the current centralizer design make them expensive and that the epoxy coated runner he is proposing would be much more simple and inexpensive to make. The Team saw merit in the epoxy coated runner. Mark suggested and the Team agreed that there should still be a reinforcing steel option on the plans.

Action Items: Paul will work on developing the epoxy coated runner further and will bring a sample in to the next meeting. He will also look at reinforcing steel option being used in the current contract plans. He will revise this detail to make it more constructible and will bring it forward for review at the next meeting.

6. Update on Slurry Disposal

Mark provided language from the current construction storm water discharge permit and asked the group if any of them had experienced any issues with infiltrating water slurry. No one on the team has had a problem.

Mark informed the team that a new Department of Ecology employee is reviewing the current permit and is questioning the infiltration of water slurry from shaft construction.

Action Items: Mark will provide an update at our next meeting.

7. Force Account Rate Updates

Mark G. asked the group if there are still ongoing issues with force account rates for tooling. Greg thought it was going better but that the repair of tools is still a problem. Most agreed it would be a big effort to get all the drillers to agree on standard tool rates.

Action Items: This topic will be discussed at future meetings in coordination with review of the obstruction specification.

8. Future meeting dates

December 12th

Meeting adjourned at 11:10