



SC Bridge Subcommittee Meeting February 16, 2011 Minutes

Attendees:

Ted Geddis, HRI Bridge Co.
Charles Eleazer, SCDOT
Steve Nanney, SCDOT
Brian Heape, SCDOT Dist 7
David Rister, SCDOT, Bridge Construction
David Glenn, SCDOT Dist 6
Ken Johnson, FHWA
Bill Mattison, SCDOT Bridge Construction

The meeting was called to order by Bill Mattison with introductions.

Old Business

The Bridge Construction Engineer Position

Bill Mattison explained the current Bridge Engineer Position. He stated that he was Interim Bridge Engineer for January and February and David Rister would be Interim Bridge Engineer for March and April. If a Bridge Construction Engineer has not been picked at that time, the SCDOT would continue the rotation.

Bridge Deck Rideability

It was discussed and decided that the SCDOT would stop recording the bridge deck results. They expect the contractor to perform as per the specs. It was discussed again, that grinding be made a bid item. The biggest problem with grinding is it takes away the hard float finish that brings longevity to the bridge deck. David Rister asked what length of bridge deck needed to be tested. No length was ever discussed, but the traffic speed was discussed as being a possible determining factor. A 45 mph on a 200 ft. bridge allows for more imperfections without them being noticed by the public, than the same length bridge on an interstate highway. Ted Geddis suggested that avoiding longitudinal joints in the wheel path would aid in achieving rideability. Steve Nanney said that Design tries to avoid this but sometimes it is unavoidable due to space restrictions. Bill Mattison said the Bridge Construction Office would try to catch this during their preconstruction plan reviews.

New Business

General Permit

Bill Mattison informed the group that the SCDOT was in the process of developing a new General Permit. One of the wording issues being addressed was the access issue with bridges. The contractors were asked to provide input as to items such as mats, gabions, and barges. We need to define a manufactured mat. Are manufactured mats made of timber planks bolted together, plastic mats, or whatever we define manufactured mats to be. SCDOT is asking for suggested wording the AGC would like to see in the General Permit. The wording can be critical for the contractor in the new Permit. Obviously it will benefit both the AGC and SCDOT to have most standard ways of accessing work in environmentally sensitive areas covered under the General Permit so special permits will be needed less often. Contractors need to provide input as soon as possible. Send all suggestions/suggested wording to Ted Geddis to compile for the SCDOT by March 1, 2011.

Manufactured Mats for Access

See previous item

Other Business

1. Ted Geddis brought up an old item. Can we get items such as welding procedures and cold weather concrete protection in the specifications. The contractor if he/she followed the specifications would not have to submit a welding procedure unless his/her procedure was differing from the specs. This would save paper and time for both the contractor and the RCE. The same application would work for other items that we submit. Bill Mattison expressed concern that not all contractors (or concrete suppliers) do things the same way. SCDOT expressed a willingness to work with the AGC on this issue. Mr. Mattison asked the contractors to provide a list of submittals to be considered for elimination and/or revision.
2. Ken Johnson with the FHWA asked about the bridge deck repair. Mr. Johnson suggested that the bid items used and/or the associated wording could be improved, especially as related to some maintenance projects. It was stated by the contractors that the specifications and the bid items were vague. For example, lane closures did not indicate Interstate or rural road type closures. There is a big difference in cost between the two and the contractor had no way

to cover his cost except to price the interstate closure. It was also stated by the contractors that we had no way of knowing if repairs were over water when considering full depth patches. It is much costlier to work over water and again we had to price our work for the worst condition. The SCDOT would look into the matter for Mr. Johnson.

Adjourn