

3.	10:25	<p><u>Updates on Previous Topics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falsework Removal Specification (John Babcock) – This is moving forward. • Clear Cure Specification (Dennis Wilder) – Update – NSSP developed, distributed at the March meeting. Looking for pilot projects that it can be used on. This will require a Contract Change. There has been discussion about using it on the Gerald Desmond Bridge Design Build project. They should have a pilot in place and be able to report on it for the next meeting. • Early Wall Stripping (Dennis Wilder) – Update – Being evaluated and would require a Contract Change to modify the time to remove forms. Concerns are wall strength, bonding of re-steel, damage to architectural treatment. • Traffic Windows for falsework, Demolition, and Girder Erection (Dennis Wilder) – Update – Met last Wednesday with Traffic Ops Managers in D11. Longer windows would shorten time contractor is there, innovative. Caltrans understood the upside of the longer window and Caltrans was receptive. Several projects where longer windows were used required intensive Public Information Campaigns that seemingly modify the drivers behavior (alternate routes, change activity, etc.). Building a portfolio of success stories. Traffic Operations generally uses a static monitoring, based upon counts but a dynamic scoring could anticipate changing driver’s behavior. Larger windows could lead to contractor innovation. Longer work windows would not be something used every time but would have to be a tool in the tool box that is used when needed. Longer work windows could prevent driver fatigue of seeing lane closures constantly for a long period of time. • Accelerated Bridge Construction (ABC)-New Developments (Roberto Lacalle) – Moving ahead with projects, two in District 04 (SF Bay Area), one in District 06 (Fresno), looking for about 10. Seeking projects that have 2 – 3 spans with precast elements (girders, bent caps, abutments etc.). Connections tested in the lab utilized UHPC (Ultra High Performance Concrete), lessons learned from earlier project is to allow a longer delayed start period to handle the increased shop drawing reviews and also coordinating drawings/parts. Variations of UHPC and testing of alternatives is under investigation at a research facility – results are a couple years out. Looking at specification for precasting elements on site. • Specifications – bridge decks, friction testing with new equipment by contractor NSSP should be out in February 2016. – Polymer overlay with high friction surface for bridge decks. – New deck specification to control cracking by utilizing: fibers, shrinkage reducing admixtures (SRA), and modified curing. – Coated (Purple and Green) bars will require longer lap splice lengths. – May see the use of stainless steel rebar, MMFX, or Z bar. – Fusion welding of rebar cages for barrier rail. – Revising mass concrete specification to address other structures. Shotcrete addressing cracking and loss of adhesion – UHPC for ABC connections - 2015 Standard Specifications out in October, then about 4-5 months before they accept RSS’s, NSSP’s can be used in the interim. Comment was made that all of these specification changes will cost more. Decks have costs nominally more but should increase the life thus reducing the life cycle costs. ABC costs may be 10 – 15% more but reduction in wetland mitigation or traffic impacts could more than offset that increase. – The cost savings may only be realized in the future. Contractors are in a constant battle of the margins which is affecting some contractors gravely. ABC projects will have the ABC logo. <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>ACCELERATED BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include a spec update on the web page that is updated REGULARLY... ○ 2015 webinar??? ASK OE to see if they are going to do outreaches. Not many changes from the 2010’s to the 2015’s.
		<p>Role of the Demolition Engineer (Ajay Sehgal)</p> <p>- Superstructure definition, “bridge parts except the substructure.”</p>

		<p>Substructure definition, Bridge parts below the bridge seats, pier tops, and haunches for rigid-framed bridges or spring lines for arched bridges; includes abutment backwalls, abutment parapets, and wing walls.</p> <p>Question - Does the RE have to be there after the superstructure is removed? Requirement is for the superstructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The specifications (15-4.01A(2)) require that a bridge removal work plan for each structure be submitted. ○ If protective covers are required or superstructure removal work is performed, bridge removal work plans must be (1) ...substantiating calculations and (2) signed by an engineer ... ○ The specifications (15-4.01(3)(a)) require that for bridge removal signed by a registered engineer, the engineer signing the work plan must be present at all times during bridge removal activities. <p>As an independent you cannot direct the work, a contractor's engineer can do that. Can work with the superintendent to point out if things that are not correct. Specialty contractor work generally performed by a subcontractor under the umbrella of the general. WHO is that person when the plan is not being followed? It is the GC. As it is now it has evolved, have to take it from the Engineer of Record (EOR) to develop a work plan, discusses with EOR to ensure it is agreeable, EOR approves person in charge of the work. Delegation to a contractor person is not there (in the specification). – EOR is important but GC needs to delegate someone to be in charge, this would better align with the law (Title 8). – Bridge removal specification covers entire bridges to minor work, do you want the EOR for the minor work? Allow a delegation to someone with the proper credentials that could handle the “minor” removals, may be a case by case basis.</p> <p>(Cliff Barber, ACC, will send some thoughts.)</p> <p>At the next meeting with the Bridge Contractor's Falsework Engineers the discussion will continue on if delegation can occur or if all demolition requires the presence of the EOR. An update will be provided at the Bridge Contractors / Caltrans Liaison Committee meeting.</p>
5.	11:20	<p>Falsework Certification (Ajay Sehgal)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing specification lists qualifications for the delegate. - Concerning when certificates are issued prior to the falsework being complete, in some cases there are punch lists of 20 – 30 items. This is a bad practice. - Sometimes the EOR is requested to be there a week early, provide a punch list to the superintendent, superintendent provides to the EOR photographic evidence that the corrections have been made, then the EOR writes the letter (certification). Allows them (the field) an opportunity to fix things. Easier for a contractor's engineer for a two-step review. Sometimes reviews are pre-grading thus wedges may not all be in place. - Inspection before grading and then before pour. Yes or properly certified delegate. It would be more expensive but it would be safer. - What about an engineer / superintendent from another job? - Traffic openings or ...? All. - Separation between field and office, not inspecting their own work. Proposal from contractors before grading and before concrete pour. After rebar. - Reviewing criteria for delegation. - Can a better delegation or a delegation for demolition be included? – Next meeting, identify items that require an EOR during removal. - At the next meeting with the Bridge Contractor's Falsework Engineers the discussion will continue on delegation and ensuring the certification and inspection are occurring at the proper time. An update will be provided at the next Bridge Contractors / Caltrans Liaison Committee meeting.
7.	12:15	<p>Gamma-Gamma Logging Presentation (Jason Wahleithner METS/GS/FTB)</p> <p>This presentation will be posted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Main causes of blocked pipe is the lack of effort put into tying them. Securely tie the tubes. Kinked tubes are a main culprit. - If it is a blockage it may be water jetted out, but that creates other issues. - Tube should be 3” min from verticals, but some have interpreted as being from all steel including hoops. - For 2015 16% of piles tested have an anomaly.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time line from test to acceptance? 15 days to test once it is made available, less than a week to get the report out. Then it depends upon how it gets handled. - Can tubes be extended and footings placed prior to testing? Defers to SC. - Can sonic logging be completed immediately after the gamma-gamma testing if needed? Doable but engineer needs to review data and the process would have to be changed. - Design Build, doing own gamma-gamma testing, Caltrans is performing 20% in their IQA role. Some private firms doing this testing do not have a clean vision of what Caltrans wanted from his reports. – Archive the data. Requirements are in the California Test. – Now it is part of the certification process.
8.	1:00	<p>Recap (Steve Altman)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes will be posted and emailed to attendees. • Next meeting in Northern California, March 18, 2016, Location TBD • Action items and questions that arose during the meeting. • Always looking for new items. • We want to ensure this is a relevant effort and that everyone finds value in the Liaison committee meetings. • Nominate New Co-chairs to replace Steve Harvey and David Kennedy • Ken Bocchicchio and John Weldon have agreed to be the 2016 co-chairs for this committee.
9.	1:20	<p>Future Agenda Concepts</p> <p>For 2016 new Co-Chairs - Ken Bocchicchio, Caltrans; John Weldon, Atkinson.</p> <p>Invite pile subcontractors to the meeting to discuss construction joints 20-30' down, pile subs over pour, then it is found that the subs contract excludes preparing the joint.</p> <p>Thermal control, are we getting the bang for the buck? Equipment is expensive, lots of wires, a big deal. Smaller members. [METS] Additional cost is \$27 – \$33 / cy. Alternatives that could be considered? Cold joints?</p> <p>Falsework subcommittee – Is Caltrans abandoning provisions of section 48 and going to NDS?</p> <p>Creating a subcommittee on shoring to discuss the T&S manual. Geotech from Flatiron.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear cure pilot project report from Gerald Desmond (Butch Parker) - Early wall stripping – update - Traffic windows - Bridge specification update - Bridge demolition discussion continuation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Exploration of delegation provisions o Identification of when an EOR is required o Can CT align the specification with Title 8 o Contractor feedback - Falsework certification discussion continuation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Separating the certification from the people building the falsework. o Review the requirements for delegation. o Consider two certifications – proposal is one prior to grading and the second is prior to concrete placement. <p>Contractor feedback</p>
10.	1:30	<p>Shira Rajendra, Caltrans Division of Engineering Services, Project Program and Resource Management mentioned that legislation may result in an influx of money for transportation spending. He questioned the group with if the Department was to put out Design Build contracts with this influx of “fix it first” type of work; what would be an appropriate size of the project packages to assemble? Could we package several (10) structures together, what could be packaged together? What makes sense to the contracting industry?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Almost any type, barriers. CMGC and D/B. With D/B the only flaw is the time frame is too short. 6 months for design and 6 months for construction, needs to have a gap to get constructability reviews

		completed. - Best if it is standard things. There may not be a pool of designers that are familiar with maintenance designs. – Bridge, pavement, culverts. – Traffic control is an issue. – Will the D/Ber have flexibility on the fix? – Guidance is lacking as to how or what to fix which is akin to throwing darts and hoping it sticks. -
	1:45	<u>Adjourn</u>