

Meeting Notes:
Bridge Sub-committee Meeting
February 3, 2016
10 AM
GDOT Bridge Office

Attendees: Bill Duvall (GDOT), Steve Gaston(GDOT),Masood Shabazaz, Tom Tran(GSP), James Aitken(HNTB), Greg Grant (RS&H); Not Present: Al Bowman (Baker), Lyn Clements(GDOT)

1. CRC Discussion

A. Railroad Coordination Discussion

1. Met with Jill Franks (Railroad Liaison Engineer & Marcella Coll (State Rail Crossing Engineer)

2. Railroad Approval, Improving the Process

a. PFPR

i. No major changes to design until RR comments are received and responded to

b. FFPR

i. Ensure a final check is done prior to submittal so no changes occur after the submittal

c. Utilities Website Checklist

i. PM should follow checklist to ensure all items are covered

d. Coordination

i. GDOT PM should be the point of contact for all coord

e. Review Time

i. Allow 2 months for reviews

1. 1 month to complete agreement, 1 month for GDOT

2. GDOT typically gives approval to begin review before agreements are signed

ii. Reviewers are consultants

1. CSX – ARCADIS

2. NS- STV, Hatch Mott MacDonald, HDR, HNTB

f. Concept Report

i. Concept Reports: Future Track- RR decides future track requirements @ concept.

- ii. PE and CST Estimates @ Concept. Send letter to GDOT PM and Front Office.
 - g. ROW/ Survey
 - i. CSX requires span over ROW, NS does not have a requirement to span ROW at this time
 - ii. Every 2-3 yrs RR re-evaluates future track requirements.
 - iii. Survey required- 500' upstation, 500' downstation
 - h. Crash Walls
 - i. 18' w/ Crash wall
 - ii. 25' W/o Crash wall
 - i. For DB Projects Utilities does agreement with RR
 - j. Correspondence and Coordination
 - i. To reduce delays speak with RR Coord. Early and often.
 - ii. Copy RR Coordinator on all Correspondence w/ RR
 - iii. Remember that roadway and rail designers do not "speak the same language" so ensure there is not confusion in the interpretation of the requirements.
 - k. Miscellaneous
 - i. RR wants money up front for local government projects
 - ii. RR moving away from Val Maps and wants the Microstation files
 - iii. GDOT tries to approach RR coordination as a partnership
- B. Environmental/ 404 Permitting
 - a. Meeting took place on 1/12/16
 - b. Section 20 plans
 - 1. Should match Permit or SP
 - 2. Revision to Plans Prep Guide required to address current Section 20 Plans to include:
 - i. Detour Bridges
 - ii. Onsite Haul roads
 - iii. Construction Access
 - c. Formulate a Draft of the Policy as a separate guidance document for bridge office

- i. Second meeting to review
 - ii. Discuss timetables
 - iii. Coordination with other agencies / timing
 - iv. Forms for Issues related to construction access
 - v. Crane diagrams/ table and pad layouts
- d. Second Meeting with OES required to receive feedback .
- 1. Develop Document
 - 2. BSC review
 - 3. OES review meeting

C. LRFD

- a. GDOT Bridge Design Programs
 - 1. GDOT uses MathCad to Develop New Designs
 - 2. Have Leap Conspan but don't use typically
 - 3. No current plan to share in house programs w/ consultants
- b. Consultants
 - 1. Use predominately LEAP software products (Conspan/ RCPier)
 - 2. Report format does not necessarily compatible with GDOT expectation.
 - 3. Generates a lot of output and can be difficult to find specific information.
- c. Needs
 - 1. Development of standard input format and output report format to better correlate with GDOT design Program output expectations and readability.
 - 2. Check and verify using both sets of programs/ worksheets// software
 - 3. Develop documentation for consultants/ GDOT outlining software input/ output protocols

2. Action Items
Next Meeting April 13, 2016 10:00AM -Noon