

## WSDOT/ACEC Structures Team

### Agenda

10:00 AM -2:00 PM

03/16/2018

At

**(NOTICE NEW LOCATION)**

WSP office in Seattle

999 3rd Ave Suite 3200

Seattle, WA 98104

WSDOT	Jeri Bernstein, P.E., S.E.	Washington State Ferries (Co-Chair)	YES
	Brian Aldrich, P.E., S.E.	WSDOT - HQ Bridge Construction	NO
	Jed Bingle, P.E., S.E.	WSDOT - Bridge Design	YES
	Michael Rosa, P.E., S.E.	WSDOT - Bridge Design	YES
	Lou Tran, P.E.	WSDOT - Bridge Design	YES
	Tony Allen, P.E.	WSDOT - Geotech	YES
	Evan Grimm, PE, SE	WSDOT – Bridge Design	YES
ACEC	Paul Brallier, P.E., S.E.	HNTB Corp. (Co-Chair)	YES
	Bill Elkey, P.E., S.E.	Parsons	NO
	Richard Patterson, P.E., S.E.	Stantec (Transitioning Off)	YES
	Chester Werts, P.E., S.E.	HDR (Transitioning Off)	NO
	Paul Guenther, P.E., S.E.	COWI Marine	YES
	Matthew Lengyel, P.E., S.E.	FIGG Bridge Engineers	YES
	Daniel Campbell, P.E.	ACEC – Geotech	YES
	Joan Zhong-Brisbois, Phd, PE, SE	WSP	YES
	Eric Herzstein, P.E., S.E.	Parsons	YES
	Mark Gaines	WSDOT Bridge Office	YES
	Bijan Khaleghi	WSDOT Bridge Design	NO

Meeting started at 10:07am

#### 1. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes from Jan 19, 2018

- Minutes reviewed and approved 3/16/18 (10:19am)

#### 2. Succession Planning

- Need to begin the application process again for new members as the following is happening:
  - o Paul Brallier is going to retire in June – plans to stay on committee till September meeting
  - o Paul Guenther is transitioning off the committee
  - o Chester Werts is transitioning off the committee
- Matt Lengyel was voted in as the new co-chair of the committee.
- ACEC is currently taking a survey on members’ interest in serving ACEC Liaison Committees (including WSDOT).
- Paul Guenther was asked to fill in for Paul Brallier’s remaining 2019-year term (Post meeting notes: Chester Werts declined the extra year and Paul Guenther accepted.)

#### 3. Review of Previous Meeting's Action Items:

- a. Review Updated Website
  - Jerri has started discussions on website update and walked team thru changes to website.

- The WSDOT / ACEC Structures Team link has been updated on the website – Note it still states ACEC Structures Sub-Committee on the actual webpage.
  - Status Report uploaded (from June 13, 2017) and the team charter has been updated
  - Evan discussion – WSDOT is in the process of updating their main website to make it more user friendly. HQ communication is telling WSDOT that the ACEC / WSDOT subcommittee website should not be on the WSDOT website.
  - Question asked about including it with the Engineering section of updated WSDOT website.
  - **Action Item – discuss with the other ACEC committees on how they are handling the shift.**
  - **Action Item – Evan to continue working with WSDOT communications department to determine where ACEC Subcommittee information will be placed. Update will be provided at the next meeting.**
  - Idea to have someone from the committee (consultant) host the Sharepoint site – would be difficult to do this with people rotating off and on of the committee. It was noted that the ACEC website is difficult to use.
- b. Geotechnical review of post-earthquake inspection guidelines (on <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/bridge/acec/> )
- Tony attempted to review these guidelines but was having issues opening the file. Team to review during meeting or a check of the link / document on the site will be looked at.
  - **Action Item - Modify the file (save as a .pdf) file to reduce the size – Paul B. to convert and send to Tony.**

#### 4. New and Continuing Action Items from Oct D/B Issues Meeting

**Review DB documents from the Chambers Way project awarded by WSDOT on 5/4/2017.**

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/biz/contaa/Contracts/Chamber.htm>

**Make suggestions to improve ITP, RFQ, RFP**

**Review Technical Provision for Harbor Bridge Project in Texas (See Attached)**

**With these documents above:**

A lot of discussion took place on this before and after lunch.

- How to influence the builders so they select best engineers (quality) and not just the lowest cost?
- Though it is relatively hard to influence RFQ in setting goals, there is room in RFP for the structural and Geotech to influence.

Secondary Discussion

- Dan C. brought up issue within BDM on wall height limitations for spread footings on top of MSE walls.
- Tony made aware of a 50ft tall abutment on the south Bellevue project with MSE wall supported above.
- Change to the 520 Montlake RFP with respect to geotechnical special inspection. Change allows the contractor to perform quality inspections, by using a QA Inspection Technician employed directly by the contractor, instead of a Geotechnical Special Inspector reporting to the Geotechnical Engineering Lead.

The Geotech is essentially being asked to accept what the contractor submits as an inspection report and to simply document it. – The issue here is that the contractor’s motivations are different from the engineer; they are cutting out the engineer for the sake of cost and replacing that function with unqualified staff.

- **Action Item - Tony to follow up on this as he was unaware of any changes to the RFP language regarding this issue.**
  - In the future, how to ensure the RFP is reviewed by HQ Geotech before issued?
  - A related issue is that even for current projects that don't explicitly state the Contractor can use their QA Inspector Technician for the special inspections, the contractors are doing so because the RFPs only say the Geotechnical Special Inspector is required to "document" the activities, but the RFPs often don't include the words "observe/inspect". The absence of explicit expectations is being interpreted by the contractors that they can use their QA Inspector Technicians to observe and inspect.
- a. Discuss potential draft revisions to the RFP for Bridge & Structures and Geotechnical sections (need to have draft revisions ready basically for the May 2018 meeting). Why not extend until September?

## Discussion

- How are the goals set when WSDOT develops the RFQ & ITP?
    - There is a DB manual (within WSDOT) which describes how to set goals based on risk  
Normally Geotech and Structural challenges are not considered as risk in general.
    - The plan is for WSDOT to publish this manual (assume internally) very soon.
  - PE office is using the standard templates for the developing the DB documents.
  - Can we define when the region would need to contact the bridge and geotechnical offices based on the % of construction cost that is structures / geotechnical
  - If a project has already identified structures and / or geotechnical as a significant risk, then the region or whomever is developing the RFQ should / can contact Bridge and Geotechnical HQ.
  - We determined the following items may trigger consultation with HQ's when developing the DB documents.
    - COST - % of Construction Cost that is structures and/or geotechnical
    - If project includes SPECIAL STRUCTURES (i.e. a cable-stayed, arch, movable bridge or a bored tunnel)
    - If project includes a LONG-SPAN structure (defined not by total length, but by clear span ~ Portage Bay or Columbia River could be example)
    - If the project includes special geotechnical provisions such as a LANDSLIDE or significant zones of liquefiable material.
  - **Action Item – circulate ideas over the next two weeks**
- b. Look at other agencies and design-build projects outside Washington to identify any changes or gaps in AASHTO and/or design-build contracts and provide suggestions for additional design memorandums. Samples attached.
- No further discussion was had on Item (b)
- c. Discuss draft a definition for good practice for durability that maintains flexibility and innovation (Jeri- I am pulling some from 100-year life bridges in NYC to send out).
- Is using "life 365" enough now? Within industry it is considered that it can be manipulated to show just about anything.
  - What are the items you might want to include: stainless steel, galvanized, increased cover, concrete mix properties to achieve a 100-year design life?
  - We could consider placing this within the BDM or could be project specific items listed in the RFP.
  - May encourage to look at the durability thru the lenses of life-cycle cost
  - **Action Item – everyone come to the next meeting with some ideas.**

d. Setting Goals for Technical Credits for Structural Intensive Projects

- See discussion above

e. Team to review the ITP and provide suggestions on how to ensure the DB team that is selected is the DB team that carries forward to construction.

- See discussion above

f. Team to provide items that need to be addressed by AASHTO T-15 to Tony.

- T-15 is the “Foundation (Substructures and Walls)” committee that Tony chairs.

- It is too late for comments to be provided this year – Tony will take comments from team for next year to include in AASHTO.

- There was again discussion, going back to our January meeting about design criteria to be incorporated into AASHTO for soil nail walls that support abutments since there is little guidance in AASHTO for this type element at this time.

- **Action Item – For the T-15, Tony to look into providing upcoming T15 agenda items for the ACEC/WSDOT committee to review / evaluate / provide comments. As T15 agenda items are considered internal working documents, draft agenda items should not be distributed without permission from Tony Allen.**

g. Team to review calculation requirement draft language.

- No additional discussion on this topic

**5. IBC 2019**

a. Cost Estimates for ACEC Support and ideas for how ACEC could support

- Discussed the potential of ACEC & Individual Firm Support.

**Action Item – Jed to provide the sales pitch (formal description and cost proposal) to team and / or Dan Campbell. Dan will discuss this item with ACEC board and invite the member firms to participate. The annual WSDOT/ACEC meeting in June appears a good timing to market this.**

**6. Structural Repair Procedures - Status of updates.**

- No additional information has been provided

**7. Other**

**8. Next Meeting**

**9. May 18, 2018 Tumwater**