

GPTQ CRC Materials Subcommittee Meeting  
Meeting Notes  
September 26, 2013

Meeting was held at 10:30 am in the OMT conference room.

Those attending were: Chuck Hasty (GDOT State Materials Engineer), Glen Foster (OMT Geotechnical Environmental and Pavement Bureau (GEP)), Reginald Murph (OMT GEP), Naomi Sims (OMT GEP), A.J. Jubran (GDOT State Pavement Engineer), Randy Bagwell (Nova), Rich Mockridge (S&ME), Tim Brown (Terracon), Tom Scruggs (Willmer), and Mike Thomas (AMEC E&I)

Naomi handed out for discussion: Meeting minutes from GEP Management Meetings of August 27, 2013, September 18/23, 2013 and related documents.

The remainder of the meeting was used to check on status of comments from the August 18 meeting (September 26 updated comments in **bold**):

**Section I Introduction**

- (May 20) Chuck Hasty: Existing Pavement evaluation is not presently shown in PDP
  - (referenced page 4) Full Depth Pavement section should be assumed at Concept phase (Proposed pavement section can potentially be reduced based on existing pavement condition/section)
  - August 19 Update: Chuck noted that if  $\geq 30\%$  of existing pavement is not retained, full depth pavement section should be used (without overlay)
  - August 19 Update: Don Hill inquired about “rule of thumb” concerning if  $\geq 1000$  Ft of existing pavement could not be retained, remove entire section
- **(September 26) Motion made to remove “Responsibility Chart” from Section 1.4. Motion passed**

**Section II Geotechnical Practices: General**

- (May 20) Don Hill: (referenced page 2.1) Liability Limitations for GDOT Consultants
  - Suggested adding a statement addressing changes from ASD Bridge Design to LRFD (increases fieldwork) – Don to draft appropriate text for subcommittee review
  - August 19 Update ACTION ITEM- Rich Mockridge to send Glen Foster proposed language consultants are using

**2.3.1 Right of Entry Letter-** Comments pertain to revising letter to clarify consultant’s responsibility as far as direct discussion with Property Owner prior to entry and feasibility of “least amount of impact”

- (May 20) Mike Thomas presented comments he received from Amec’s Pieter DePree pertaining to Section II (actual comments will be sent to committee members for further consideration)
- **(September 26) Proposed language will be discussed with Glenn Williams since he is author of Right of Entry Letters**

**2.4 Erosion Control and Site Restoration-** Comments pertain to allowing soil survey drilling operations being addressed under the ½ acre rule and subsequent GDOT Environmental documents for the proposed project.

- **(September 26) Two notes added 1) *For most projects, the disturbed area is not expected to exceed the one (1) acre limit that would trigger NPDES requirements.* 2) *An erosion control plan for the subsurface exploration disturbance shall be submitted to the Geotechnical Environmental Pavement Branch for approval before the subsurface exploration begins.***

**2.5 Limitations of Liability- GDOT Consultants**

- **(September 26) Decision made not to include**

**2.6 Unsuitable Materials Investigations-** Comments pertain to statement about limiting the start of geotechnical exploration and adding quantities to address unforeseen materials

- Tom Scruggs pointed out that reference to preliminary BFI's and soil surveys needs to be deleted.
- (August 19) ACTION ITEM- Mike Thomas to send original language from Pieter DePree's suggestions to Glen Foster and Naomi Sims (Completed via email August 19)
- **(September 26) title of section revised to *Unanticipated Subsurface Conditions. Statement providing guidance for 10% of total drilling footage to calculate unanticipated subsurface conditions***

### **Section III Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Guidelines**

#### **3.1.1 BFI Recon form**

- (May 20) Don Hill: GDOT now has their own spreadsheet to estimate costs that shifts other direct costs to 2<sup>nd</sup> sheet.
- August 19 Update ACTION ITEM- Randall Bagwell will send recently used spreadsheet for review
- (August 19) Tom Scruggs discussed Bridge Design's preference that if 36ksi steel is used on any bent of structure, 36ksi is to be specified exclusively
- It was felt that the industry is going to use 50ksi steel regardless and we should consider this extra capacity when calculating allowable loads
- ACTION ITEM- Tom Scruggs will craft a question to be posed to GDOT Bridge Design regarding this **(September 26) Comments forwarded to Bill Duval in GDOT Bridge office (Table for now)**
- **(September 26) ACTION ITEM (Glen) Will review and develop list prior to contacting Genetha Rice-Singleton**

#### **3.2 Typical Software for BFI's**

- Comments added and accepted

## **Section IV Soil Survey (SS) Guidelines**

### **Section 4.4.1 Soil Survey Summary Template**

- (August 19) Also affects Item Eleven (II) of Template (Waste)
- (May 20) Glen Foster recommendation: when large areas of material not meeting subgrade requirements are discovered, consider setting up “test section” of additional 4” GAB and/or subgrade stabilization. This will allow observation of subgrade behavior under field conditions and possibly reduce costs by eliminating large amounts of undercut and replacement, or re-working of area. Tom to work with Glenn on revised language.
- (May 20) Section 15 Geotechnical and Drilling/sampling requirements needs to be revised
- (May 20) Section 24: Remove reference to 20% shrinkage factor (leave blank)
- (May 20) Section 29: Remove reference to 8” minimum GAB (leave blank)
- August 19 Update Add test section reference for pavement design
- **(September 26) ACTION ITEM: (Glen) Develop language to specify what samples are required to be taken during drilling operations.**

### **Section 4.4.4 (County Map: Soils Memo) and 4.4.5 (County Map)**

- (May 20) Don Hill: Preliminary BFI have not been performed for some time now, yet Preliminary BFI's are still shown in manual (Suggested the any reference to Preliminary BFI be deleted)
- Manual now specifies 35 counties in which full soil surveys are required prior to PFPR, reference to Preliminary Soil Surveys should also be deleted
- August 19 Update: It was suggested that a link be provided to reflect the affected counties, rather than a hard copy showing the 35 counties mentioned
- **(September 26) Discussed revising map to display “border counties” in a different color and adding a revision date to the map**
  - **ACTION ITEM (Reginald)- Develop language to be included on map indicating OMT should be contacted in the event that special circumstances are encountered**

### **Section 4.5.13 Soil Support Correlation Chart**

- (May 20 ) Rich Mockridge noted that CBR values in QA/QC Manual (4.5.13) differ from those in the Pavement Design manual
  - It was suggested that the Pavement Design Manual be referenced in the QA/QC manual, rather than quoted/included. (this will prevent possibility of one document being revised, rather than both)
- **(September 26) Reference to Pavement Design Manual added instead of including in QA/QC Manual**
- **(September 26) Decision to keep actual chart in Section 4.5.13, with link provided in Pavement Design Manual**

#### **Section 4.5.14 Regional Factor/ Typical Soil Support Values**

- **(September 26) Decision to place actual chart in the Pavement Design Manual, with link provided in Section 4.5.14**

#### **Section 4.5.29 Soil Support Correlation Chart**

- **(September 26 ) ACTION ITEM (A.J.) Look at this section for possible revisions**

#### **Section 4.5.34 & 35 Filter Fabric Detail and Filter Fabric & Embankment Detail**

- **(September 26) ACTION ITEM: (Tom and Glen) Develop list of contingency items (Filter Fabric, Rock, Undercut, etc.) to be used if test section is required.**

#### **Section 4.7 Typical Software for Soil Surveys**

- **(September 26) Same as Section 3.2 Comments added and accepted**

#### **Section V Retaining Wall Guidelines**

- (May 20) Add LRFD comment in opening paragraph?
  - Glenn Foster advised that this is a work in progress and will be revised in the future, but no date has been set.

#### **Section VI Other Structures Guidelines**

NO COMMENTS

#### **Section VII Pavement Conditions and Thickness Design Guidelines**

#### **Section VIII Special Provisions**

- (May 20) Glen Foster suggested that a section be added addressing environmental (UST's, Hazardous Material Sites, etc.)
- August 19 Update: Randy had a document that addresses this. Reginald pointed out that their office compiled that document
  - GDOT R/W section needs to be involved
- **(September 26) This will be addressed in Section 10.2 GDOT Policy 5525-1 UST and Hazardous Waste Site Investigation Procedure (Under Construction)**

**Section IX LRFD (Chapter Under Construction)**

- **Section 9.2 BFI LRFD Blank Template**
  - **(September 26) ACTION ITEM (All) Review BFI (LRFD) template and send questions/comments to Naomi and Glenn by October 10**

**SectionX Environmental (Chapter Under Construction)**

- **(September 26) Section 10.2 GDOT Policy 5525-1 UST and Hazardous Waste Site Investigation Procedure (Under Construction)**