



MINUTES

ICI/INDOT STATEWIDE BRIDGE SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

12:00 P.M. THURSDAY
MARCH 12, 2020



ATTENDEES

INDOT

Jeremy Hunter, Greg Pankow, Stephanie Wagner and Pete White

ICI Members

Eric Jordan, Derek Merida, Brian Pickering, Andrew Rayner, Carl Tungate, Joe Skibinski and Randy Wilkinson

ICI Staff

Dan Osborn and Sara Perkins

WORK ZONE SAFETY

Mr. Pankow asked for comments concerning Interstate Highway Congestion Policy (IHCP) waivers for bridge painting. He asked whether contractors preferred closing a lane or using a truck-mounted attenuator (TMA). Several commented that it depends on the situation, including bridge characteristics, location, roadway, and traffic volume.

Mr. Pickering expressed concern about work near and over the road centerline. While working on an overpass, deck repair or removal near the centerline is especially risky if there is live traffic on an adjacent lane on the intersecting roadway beneath the work. He stated that rolling slow-downs are difficult to manage due to variables involved with repair and removal work as well as the logistics aspects of preparing for and executing a rolling slow down. Stoppages of 15 to 20 minutes are preferable if a lane or full closure is not attainable. Indiana State Police have taken it upon themselves to shut down traffic completely.

Mr. Osborn mentioned feedback that stoppages may require less manpower in urban areas because of on/off ramp management.

Mr. Pickering suggested utilizing automatic signals or closures for bridge overlay projects instead of flaggers. This is due to the variability associated with curing overlay material and other variables. Mr. Osborn added that, due to the increasing volume of overlay projects, reducing risks such as human flagging is critical to reduce work flow and schedule disruptions. There was discussion of reviewing current contracts for flagging direction.

Potential Action Items: Guidance to designers suggesting consideration for auto signals or closure instead of flagging, and a Construction Memo if there is a significant quantity of current contracts including flagging.

There was also discussion of under deck “blow-through” protection during demolition. It was noted that Kentucky requires this protection. No action on this item.

COMMITTEE UPDATES

Specification Revisions – Recent Approvals

Mr. Osborn suggested reviewing the following recurring special provisions (RSPs)

Bridge Removal – [202-R-705](#) & [619-B-312](#)

Standards Committee actions

- i. 702-R-691, ([3/1/20](#)) ([6/1/20](#)), Structural Concrete
- ii. 709-R-693 ([3/1/20](#)), ([6/1/20](#)) , Alternate to Concrete Sealers
- iii. [714-R-695](#), Reinforced Concrete Box Structures
- iv. [723-R-696](#) (3/1/20), Reinforced Concrete Three-Sided Structures
- v. [724-B-309](#) (12/1/19), Pre-Compressed Foam Joint
- vi. [E 706-BRSF-02](#) (9/1/19), Concrete Railing
- vii. [E 801-TCCB-02](#) (9/1/19) & [801-T-207](#) (9/1/19), Temporary Concrete Barrier

2020 Bridge Design Conference

Ms. Wagner stated that there was emphasis on 100% completion of stage three design plans, and that INDOT and industry are discussing cursory constructability review of plans at design stage two as part of the 360 Indiana Transportation Team initiative.

CONTINUED IMPROVEMENT TOPICS

Bridge Bundles – Discussion included agreement that the make-up and size of current and future bundled bridge contracts is moving in a favorable direction.

Accelerated Bridge Construction (ABC) – Mr. Hunter provided a synopsis of what INDOT is considering about ABC including modular construction and Ultra High-Performance Concrete (UHPC). UHPC is currently offered by one vendor, but INDOT is exploring other options with similar performance.

Integral Reinforced Concrete Approach - This process was used in one contract as a unique provision in the LaPorte district and used as a district level decision in the Ft. Wayne district last year. INDOT is still considering this process prior to a specification revision.

Very Early Strength Latex Modified Concrete (LMC-VE) - Mr. Hunter requested feedback on this material. Industry stated that the material was manageable but required multiple phases as application areas exceeded 20 to 30 feet in width. The current specification is included on the North-South Split 65-70 contract. INDOT will consider this information in future projects.

Bidding Latex Modified Concrete vs. Micro-Silica Concrete - Mr. Merida suggested inclusion of one pay item on bundled contracts to allow a contractor to utilize both materials.

NEW TOPICS

Bridge Deck Drainage System – “incidental to other items”

Mr. Jordan explained that there is concern that this direction is a design policy change. INDOT responded that this is not a policy change and will keep an eye out for this direction in the future.

Automated Pile Driving

Mr. Pankow stated that INDOT is considering new technology in this area to improve real-time monitoring during pile driving.

OPEN FORUM

Mr. Pankow suggested adding training for inspection and contractor staff to increase familiarization with common bridge preparation, construction, and quality control/assurance requirement, activities and procedures. Example topics mentioned were checking “screed grades” and “dry runs”. Mr. Pankow asked if industry had any suggestions.

INDOT asked industry what information designers should include on plans that they are not or are including inconsistently. Also, are there suggestions about additional information with respect to bridge rehabilitation or reconstruction to improve quality during phased construction. Topics mentioned for consideration were beam reaction during phased pours including deflection and rotation, diaphragm removal and closure pours. No suggestions were offered.

Mr. Hunter asked about grooving. Mr. Merida stated that both transverse and longitudinal grooving are still required in current and recent plans. Slurry removal was mentioned as a current challenge. It was stated that there are limited resources to perform grooving. There are additional costs associated with grooving, but the quality versus timing is worth it.

Mr. Hunter stated that INDOT is considering revising the prestressed beam design standard to reduce future removal challenges.

Mr. Merida asked about the status of deck pan use. Mr. Hunter mentioned a trial in LaPorte recently where clear pans were installed.

Mr. Osborn asked about overlays versus bridge rehab or replacement in INDOT’s planning program? Mr. Hunter stated that INDOT Asset Management group is responsible for assessing future programming including life cycle costs. Mr. Osborn mentioned analysis of MOT and motorist disruption cost inputs in the life cycle analysis. Mr. Osborn will follow up with INDOT Asset Management.