

MINUTES OF AGC-DOT JOINT BRIDGE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
(Pending Approval)

The AGC-DOT Joint Bridge Subcommittee met on April 21, 2023. Those in attendance were:

Brian Hanks	State Structures Engineer (Co-Chairman)
Victor Barbour	Carolinas AGC – Highway Division Director (Co-Chairman)
John Pilipchuk*	State Geotechnical Engineer
Todd Whittington	State Materials Engineer
Wiley Jones*	State Construction Engineer
Brian Hunter*	State Laboratory Operations Manager
Gichuru Muchane	Assistant State Structures Engineer
Trey Carroll	Assistant State Structures Engineer
Brian Skeens	Assistant State Construction Engineer – Western Region
Adam Holcomb	Dane Construction, Inc
Brian Weathersby	Reeves Construction Company
Larry Cagle	Thompson Arthur-APAC, Inc.
Mark Newman*	NHM Constructors, LLC
Erick Frazier*	S. T. Wooten Corporation
Patrick Buckley	Crowder Construction Company
David Yates	Fred Smith Company
Tanya Ball	Wright Brothers Construction
Pete Distefano	Balfour Beatty Infrastructure, Inc.
Lee Bradley	Blythe Construction, Inc.
Nathan Thomas	Smith-Rowe, LLC
Chris Britton*	Buckeye Bridge, LLC
Damien Hollifield*	Young & McQueen Grading Company
Thomas Meador*	Lane Construction Corporation
Thomas Santee	Geotechnical Unit – Eastern Regional Operations Engineer
Scott Hidden	Geotechnical Unit – Support Services Engineer
Aaron Earwood	Construction Unit – Regional Bridge Construction Engineer
Aaron Griffith	Construction Unit – Regional Bridge Construction Engineer
James Bolden	Structures Management Unit – Project Engineer
Rebecca Gallas	Structures Management Unit – Team Leader
Nicholas Pierce	Structures Management Unit – Team Leader

* Joined Via Microsoft Teams

During the review of the December 14, 2022 meeting minutes, the following items were discussed:

1. Pipe Pile Order Lengths

Mr. Earwood noted no changes have been made; the project discussed during the previous meeting was an isolated occurrence.

2. Bridge Program/Timber Bridges

Mr. Barbour noted no comments were received from Contractors.

3. 2024 Standard Specifications Updates

Mr. Earwood noted comments for Division 4 have been reviewed and addressed accordingly.

The minutes of the December 14, 2022, meeting were approved.

The following items of new business were discussed:

1. Roadway tie-in on Bridge Deck Rehab with Deck Overlays

A Contractor questioned why some preservation projects with bridge deck overlay work require asphalt approach roadway work while others do not. Mr. Earwood asked if there was a correlation between projects where deck material was removed and an overlay added to achieve the original deck elevation or the overlay was added on top of the existing deck increasing the deck elevation. The Contractor was uncertain, but would investigate and discuss with Mr. Earwood.

Mr. Britton discussed a project that did not include approach roadway work but the deck rebar was higher than anticipated and to meet cover requirements caused problems with the approach pavement being lower than the bridge deck. Mr. Newman noted that milling of the bridge deck can damage approach roadway. Mr. Griffith noted that approach milling and paving costs can quickly escalate depending on the roadway and how far back is needed to smoothly tie-in. It was suggested that a standard 100ft of approach milling and paving pay item could be included in contracts.

Action Item:

Structures Management and Construction Units will investigate adding a token amount or requiring approach milling and paving on all overlay projects.

2. NS RR Protective Services PSP

Mr. Skeens stated that Norfolk Southern (NS) is now requiring Contractors provide the flagging for all projects in their right-of-way, where previously NS provided flaggers. He noted that only two companies are qualified to provide flagging and discussed notable differences between them. Mr. Skeens noted the Construction Unit is working with the two companies to develop uniform PSP language.

Contractors discussed challenges with flagging noting the flagger's time starts when driving to the jobsite, which causes issues for actual working time. Another issue mentioned is that NCDOT dictates if the flagger is kept on-site or not. If the Contractor elects not to work in the right-of-way they still get billed for the service and NCDOT won't pay if the flagger is not used, but if the flagger is released from the job it takes at least 15 days to get them back to the site.

Mr. Skeens noted that the Construction Unit will discuss the forthcoming PSP and how to manage flaggers on projects with the Division Construction Engineer's. A Contractor asked that language be included in the PSP so that the Contractor can schedule meetings with the Resident Engineer to discuss when to release flaggers and schedule work to reduce fees to the Department and the Contractor. Mr. Earwood noted that some Contractors do schedule the work with the flagger and the Construction Unit is considering providing a number of working days per contract. Contractors noted that there are some days when the flagger tells

them there is no rail traffic but they are still paid for the day. Another Contractor noted that they are required to notify the flaggers 5 days before they are needed and similarly if they are not going to be needed. Mr. Barbour noted that AGC and NCDOT both want to make sure flaggers are being utilized on projects instead of sitting idle. Contractors asked if NCDOT could provide quotes and include them in the contract advertisement instead of every Contractor bidding on the project calling to provide quotes for the same project. A Contractor noted that this PSP will require the two flagging companies be a subcontractor and sign the subcontractor agreement as per the terms of NCDOT's contract requirements, which might cost the Department more time and money to review contracts between the Contractor and flagging companies.

Mr. Skeens noted if Contractors have an existing project with an agreement, the agreement must be amended.

Action Item:

Construction Unit will continue developing PSP for Railroad Protective Services.

3. Expansion Joint Detail

Mr. Earwood shared the Roadway Standard Drawing for an expansion joint for rigid pavement at bridge approach slabs. He asked the group if anyone was aware of integral bridges shoving the concrete pavement. He discussed the current details and proposed increasing the expansion joint from 1" to at least 1.5". Mr. Thomas noted that there are multiple structures near Greensboro that are integral with rigid pavement, and they will monitor.

Action Item:

Mr. Earwood will have the 2024 Roadway Standard Drawings increase the detail from 1" to 1.5".

4. Disc Bearings

Mr. Earwood shared an image of a curved girder bridge layout; he noted that bridge expansion is not parallel with the girders but in the direction of the chord between the nearest fixed and expansion bearings. Therefore, expansion bearings should be oriented parallel to the chords for movement. He shared a recent project where a Contractor set the bearing and had to turn the top of the bearing to weld to the bottom flange which caused misalignment with the bearing expansion and the bridge direction of movement. Mr. Earwood inquired if details could be modified to assist Contractors with setting bearings for curved girder bridges. He suggested that if guide bars can be fabricated on a skew, the bearing will be easier to install correctly in the field.

Action Item:

Structures Management, Construction and Materials & Tests Units to discuss modifying disc bearing standards.

5. Pile Alignment Issues

Mr. Earwood noted more frequent occurrences of piles driven out of alignment. He noted that templates, etc. should be used to ensure piles are driven correctly from the start. He has seen

several piles pulled into place while driving to get back to close alignment. A Contractor asked if these issues are happening when something is encountered in the soil, or if the Contractors are setting up incorrectly from the start and not stopping once it's noticed. Mr. Earwood stated he thinks it's the latter. Mr. Santee and Mr. Earwood both asked Contractors take their time, use driving templates, and stop driving and correct if getting off course.

Action Item:

None

6. Girder Buildup Shots

Mr. Earwood shared that during the Construction Unit's training it was noted that the number of buildup shots being taken can require two survey crews for some bridges and the amount of time needed can affect the readings due to daily temperature fluctuations. Mr. Earwood asked if there were any concerns. Mr. Distefano noted that there can be communication issues between the Contractor's survey and reference points versus NCDOT's survey and reference points that can cause issues. Contractors noted that they have seen the use of more shots help with the SIP form installations. Mr. Earwood noted the Construction Unit is working with Materials & Tests Unit to require girder manufacturers to make a smooth area down the center of the top flange to help with surveying the top of girders, instead of the raked top that creates an uneven top to survey. Mr. Earwood noted that Contractors should not be using GPS to shoot top-of-girder elevations due to accuracy concerns.

Action Item:

None

7. Asbestos Program Update

Mr. Carroll noted that the Department is still working towards completing asbestos assessments internally. A Contractor asked what percent of bridges contain asbestos. Mr. Hanks noted that it's less than 1%.

Action Item:

None

8. Other

- i. Mr. Barbour discussed a proposed legislative bill to allow for electronic speed enforcement in work zones.

Mr. Barbour shared another proposed legislative bill that would allow relocation of telecommunication utilities to occur as part of NCDOT construction contracts. The bill would place time requirements on Utility Companies to work with NCDOT to design and relocate their utilities. He noted that projects ready for construction are being delayed because utilities are not being relocated in time to make the letting.

- ii. Mr. Barbour discussed the ACG/NCDOT conferences next year and requested Contractors interested in joining the planning committee let him know.

- iii. It was noted by some Contractors that the bid results page on NCDOT's website cannot be printed anymore, and asked if that could be changed.

Post Meeting Note

Due to scheduling conflicts and limited agenda, the June 14th, 2023 meeting was cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled for August 9th, 2023.

**** Upcoming 2023 Meeting Dates:**

August 9th

October 11th

December 13th