

## MINUTES OF AGC-DOT JOINT BRIDGE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

(Approved: August 8, 2018)

The AGC-DOT Joint Bridge Subcommittee met on June 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018. Those in attendance were:

Brian Hanks	State Structures Engineer (Co-Chairman)
Berry Jenkins	Carolinas AGC – Highway Division Director (Co-Chairman)
Ron Davenport	State Contract Officer
Lee Bradley	Blythe Construction, Inc.
Patrick Buckley	Crowder Construction Company
Adam Holcomb	Dane Construction, Inc.
David Yates	Fred Smith Company
Tom Meador	Lane Construction Corporation
Erick Frazier	S. T. Wooten Corporation
Randall Gattis	Sanford Contractors, Inc.
Ben Bishop	Sloan Construction
Jorge Gambini	Thalle Construction Company
Larry Cagle	Thompson-Arthur Div., APAC-Atlantic, Inc.
Cameron Cochran*	Construction Unit – Regional Bridge Construction Engineer
Aaron Earwood	Construction Unit – Regional Bridge Construction Engineer
Ken Kennedy	Contract Standards and Development – Contract Time Engineer
Scott Hidden	Geotechnical Unit – Support Services Supervisor
Tom Santee	Geotechnical Unit – Regional Operations Engineer
Bobby Watkins	Materials & Tests Unit – Section Materials Specialist
James Bolden	Structures Management Unit – Project Engineer
Dan Muller	Structures Management Unit – Project Engineer
David Stutts	Structures Management Unit – Project Engineer
Nicholas Pierce	Structures Management Unit – Team Leader
Trey Carroll	Structures Management Unit – Team Leader

\* Joined Via Phone

During the review of the April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018 meeting minutes, the following items were discussed:

1. Express Design-Build Project Packages

Mr. Muller stated the Bidding and Letting website is updated and lists the anticipated Express Design-Build project packages.

2. Stirrups in Cored Slabs & Box Beams with Concrete Overlay

Mr. Hanks shared and discussed two details for projecting reinforcing steel out of the tops of cored slab and box beam units with concrete overlays. The detail with a "L" shaped bar was preferred in lieu of the detail with a "U" shaped bar.

Mr. Gattis inquired if there has been issues with overlays debonding from units. Mr. Earwood discussed a project in which the concrete overlay debonded at the end of the units, and he suggested that a trial project to include the proposed detail be considered.

The minutes of the April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018 meeting were approved.  
The following items of new business were discussed:

1. Contract Times

Mr. Kennedy was invited to discuss contract times with the subcommittee as a follow-up to the February, 2018 meeting. Mr. Kennedy introduced himself and discussed his role and responsibilities as a Contract Time Engineer within the Contract Standards and Development Unit (CSDU). He noted that CSDU provided guidance and held meetings with Division Contract and Proposal Engineers in 2017, but due to turnover within the Divisions a prerecorded webinar for new employees may be necessary. Mr. Jenkins stated a webinar focusing on how CSDU sets contract time would be helpful.

Mr. Kennedy requested feedback on contract inconsistencies with Division let projects. Mr. Cagle noted concerns with inadequate time at the beginning of projects that require detour bridges. Mr. Holcomb suggested floating dates and/or delaying the start date to allow Contractors time to hire subcontractors and begin initial submittals. He noted that subcontractors are not typically hired until notice-to-proceed is issued. Mr. Bradley added that project completion dates during the winter months are challenging due to the limited work that can be performed during this season. Mr. Gattis noted instances when contract times were unreasonable and encouraged Department personnel to discuss project schedules with Contractors if there are any questions. Mr. Davenport stated that Contractors should notify his office of any concerns with contract times during a project's advertisement.

Mr. Kennedy inquired if availability of prestressed members is an issue. Contractors responded that availability is an issue and also noted that it takes reinforcing steel suppliers several weeks to deliver. Mr. Kennedy inquired if increasing the floating date of availability would be helpful, Contractors responded affirmatively.

**Action Item:**

**Contract Standards and Development will discuss internally about providing a webinar focused on contract times.**

2. PDA Testing

Mr. Gattis discussed perceived inconsistencies with requiring PDA testing. Mr. Gattis stated that for some projects he submits hammer information, and no PDA testing is required, while for other projects, PDA testing is required. Mr. Gattis also noted PDA testing being required on multiple structures that are in close proximity to one another and inquired if that is necessary. Mr. Santee responded by explaining the number of PDA tests dictates the resistance factor the Geotechnical Engineer is able to use in design. The use of a lower resistance factor allows for few to no PDA tests while a higher resistance factor, which yields more capacity, requires verification with more PDA tests. Mr. Santee noted additional PDA tests are typically required when structures are more than a couple hundred feet away from one another due to variation in subsurface conditions.

**Action Item:**

**None**

3. Working Drawing Submittal

Mr. Gattis stated that in the past Contractors were able to submit working drawings directly to Structures Management and copy the Resident Engineer on the submittal. Once Structures had reviewed the submittal the response would be sent to the Resident Engineer and the Contractor would be copied. Mr. Gattis noted that recently there have been issues with Contractors not receiving status updates of submittals because Structures Management is sending the response to the Resident Engineer and not copying the Contractor. Mr. Bolden stated certain submittals are sent only to the Resident Engineer for their review and comments prior to the Contractor receiving notification. Mr. Cochran and Mr. Hanks stated the Department will discuss potential solutions internally. Mr. Bolden stated that Contractors should contact Structures Management with any questions concerning status updates for working drawing submittals. Mr. Hanks displayed the Structures Management Website and noted where Contractors could locate the status of submittals.

**Action Item:**

**Construction and Structures Management will discuss internally how to address certain working drawing submittals.**

4. Reinforced Approach Fills at MSE Walls

Mr. Bishop discussed a design-build project that required reinforced approach fills at MSE walls. He noted that this resulted in a drain pipe extending through the MSE wall and was located 15 feet above the ground. Mr. Bishop inquired if this was necessary. Mr. Hidden responded by noting the 2018 Type III Approach Fill Detail does not include a drain pipe. Mr. Earwood noted the project Mr. Bishop discussed was an isolated issue.

Discussion continued on the use of integral end bents at MSE walls and how to properly construct the end bents with reinforcement tiebacks. Mr. Hanks noted current policy does not address integral end bents at MSE walls. Mr. Cagle stated Contractors need to know the Department's preference for design-build project proposals.

**Action Item:**

**Construction, Geotechnical, and Structures Management will investigate integral end bents at MSE walls.**

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2018 in the Structures Management Conference Room C.