



## Meeting Agenda – March 3, 2022 (Wednesday)

#### **Location: WebEx Meeting**

Time	Торіс	Speaker
10:00 -	Welcome and WebEx Overview (Check you are muted)	Jim Nicholls
10:05		
<u>10:05</u> <u>10:05</u> <u>10:20</u>	<ul> <li>Follow up from previous meeting (9/2/021) action items</li> <li>Temporary barriers adjacent to existing sidewalks/Ped facility</li> <li>Addressed in Temporary Barrier Systems Guideline (Attachment 1)</li> <li>Required per 12-4.03C(2) - K-rail both sides of vehicle openings through falsework.</li> <li>16-2.02C Construction – place temporary barrier to separate temporary pedestrian facilities from traffic and equipment</li> <li>If each of the second state of the second state</li></ul>	Jim Nicholls







Follow u (continu	up from previous meeting (9/2/2021) action items ued)	
Minutes	S:	
• 16	Requirements for temporary barriers and pedestrian covers was presented	
0	Reviewed Caltrans guidelines for placing temporary barriers adjacent to existing curbs (Attachment 1)	
• Tı	acking Steel Grades	
0	Marking beams is one option, but would be costly for contractors with large inventories	
0	Assume A36 when beams are not labeled	
0	It is difficult to identify steel grade since it is not visually graded	
0	Providing a certificate from contractor for the beams is a preferred option by some	
0	Some use color coding in conjunction with a legend in the shop drawings	
0	Comment was made that labeling the beam size and grade is preferable to color coding	
0	Comment made the color on the beams fades and is difficult to determine what color is used	
0	There was no consensus of what best option to identify beams with 50 ksi steel	
0	Temporary Structure Technical Team (TSTT) will discuss this issue further and bring options to next meeting	
0	Goal is to find a convenient method to identify beams in the field	
• 15	<ul> <li>0% post load at traffic openings</li> <li>This requirement remains in the Spec and the TSTT will discuss further</li> </ul>	



Caltrans



10:20-	UPRR/BNSF Guidelines for Temporary Shoring	Jim Nicholls
10:35	• New guidelines dated December 7, 2021	
	Significant changes in new guideline	
	Link to new RR guideline presentation	
	Minutes:	
	• The changes to the railroad shoring guidelines was presented in	
	a PowerPoint presentation	
	• Some team members requested a copy of the PowerPoint	
10:35 -	Specification Changes	Jim Nicholls
10:45	RSS 12-3.20 Temporary Barrier Systems	
	• K-rail not allowed after January 1, 2027	
	• Temporary barrier Spec revised until new requirements	
	take effect	
	• RSS 12-3.20 includes minimum clear area width table	
	as discussed at last I wAT inceting	
	• RSS 60-2.02A(4)(b) Bridge Removal – Quality Control	
	$\circ$ Similar requirements as section 48-2 for Temporary	
	Structure Engineer	
	<ul> <li>Engineer may assign a representative</li> </ul>	
	• See Section $60-2.02A(40(b) below:$	
	60-2.02A(4)(b) Quality Control	
	For bridge removal work plans signed by a registered engineer, the engineer signing the work plan must confirm the conditions at least one day before the start of bridge removal activities by visual inspection. Discuss the condition of the structure with the contractor's project superintendent and Engineer at the	
	site. For bridge removal activities, the engineer signing the work plan must:	
	<ol> <li>Be registered as a civil engineer in the State</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Have experience in bridge removal plan design or bridge removal construction inspection</li> <li>Be present at all times during bridge removal activities.</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Ensure compliance with the authorized work plan.</li> <li>Store the operation if it is unsafe. Prior to requiring operations, submit a proposed revision to the</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Stop the operation in it is disarc. Phot to resulting operations, submit a proposed revision to the authorized work plan to remedy the unplanned occurrence.</li> </ol>	
	b. Prepare a daily engineering report for removal activities. The report must describe work activities for each day and the condition of the remaining structure. The report must be sealed and signed by an	
	engineer who is registered as a civil engineer in the State.	
	The Engineer signing the work plan may assign a representative to perform the bridge removal activities specified in section 60-2.02A(4)(b). The Engineer signing the work plan must submit a letter that is sealed and signed certifying that the representative:	
	<ol> <li>Is registered as a civil engineer in the State</li> <li>Has experience in bridge removal plan design or bridge removal construction inspection</li> </ol>	
	Is familiar with the authorized work plan     Will attend at least 1 ich site visit with the contractor's project or project or project and the Engineer to	
	discuss the authorized work plan at least 1 day prior to beginning the bridge removal activities	







Specification Changes (continued)	
<ul> <li>Minutes: RSS 12-3.20</li> <li>RSS 12-3.20 was discussed in last FWAT meeting and the draft table of clear distances will not change in the final RSS</li> <li>Comment made the contract plans need to provide better details on the location of temporary barriers when space is limited</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>RSS 60-2.02A(4)(b)</li> <li>Discussed the RSS and its similarities to what is found in 48-2</li> <li>Comment was made that a better option to having a PE onsite would require a more robust work plan</li> <li>Item #5 requiring the engineer to stop the operation when unsafe was a concern with many of the team</li> <li>Comment made the engineer does not have the authority to stop the work</li> <li>Many times, the engineer is employed by a subcontractor</li> <li>Requiring an PE onsite provides an additional level of safety</li> <li>Some consider requiring a PE onsite for overhangs and minor structures is excessive</li> <li>The PE onsite could be overly conservative creating a situation for disagreements</li> <li>The field personnel (superintendent) many times have more experience in how to complete the operation that the PE</li> <li>The requirement of having a PE onsite for Demo and falsework operations is creating a shortage of engineers</li> <li>The TSTT will discuss item #5 further and respond in next FWAT</li> </ul>	





10:45 -	Load duration factors per NDS	Jim Nicholls
11:00	-	
	• NDS Table 2.3.2	
	Table 2.3.2 Frequently Used Load Duration	
	Factors, C₀¹	
	Load Duration Co. Typical Design Loads	
	Permanent 0.9 Dead Load	
	Ten years 1.0 Occupancy Live Load	
	Two months 1.15 Snow Load Seven days 1.25 Construction Load	
	Ten minutes 1.6 Wind/Earthquake Load	
	Impact <sup>2</sup> 2.0 Impact Load	
	<ol> <li>Load duration factors shall not apply to reference modulus of elastici- ty, E, reference modulus of elasticity for beam and column stability,</li> </ol>	
	Emin, nor to reference compression perpendicular to grain design val-	
	<ol> <li>Load duration factors greater than 1.6 shall not be used in the design of</li> </ol>	
	structural members pressure-treated with water-borne preservatives (see Reference 30), or fire retardant chemicals. Load duration factors	
	greater than 1.6 shall not be used in the design of connections or wood	
	Duration used for duration of maximum load	
	<ul> <li>Falsework is seldom subjected to maximum loading for</li> </ul>	or more
	than 7 days	
	• Structures that require stressing may load temporary	
	structures for longer than 7 days	
	Minutes:	
	• Team agreed that the 1.25 duration factor would apply in	n most
	temporary structure situations	
	• Engineering judgement will need to be applied in cases	where
	maximum loading occurs for longer than 7 days	
11:00 -	Falsework Adjacent to Traffic with Skewed Bents	Jim Nicholls
11:15	• 48-2.02B(4) <i>Special Locations</i> considers adjacent to roa	ds as
	supporting members over roadway or post nearest roadw	vay
	• See Attachment 2 for skewed bent example	5
	• Edge of pavement used to define adjacent to traffic	
	Minutes:	
	• Many think the requirement for traffic restraints is not a	n issue,
	but the 150% post load is	
	• Comment made that only the closest bent should be con-	sidered
	adjacent to traffic and bents behind or partially behind sl	hould
	not	
	• The TSTT discussed limiting the distance (x/h), but four	nd it
	difficult to settle on a distance	
	• Suggested using 25' and some found that too far	
	• Most from Industry would like to eliminate the 150% pc	ost load
	requirement	
	• The ISTT will revisit the 150% load requirement	







11:15 –	HDPE Plates for Redundant System for Temporary Support	Jim Nicholls /
11:20	• Update	Brian Mapel
	Minutes:	
	• No update on the used of HDPE plates	
	<ul> <li>Jim will contact Brian Mapel about status of testing</li> </ul>	
11.00		<b>x</b> , <b>x</b> , <b>1</b> , <b>1</b> , <b>1</b>
11:20 -	Temporary Decking	Jim Nicholls /
11:45	• Caltrans temporary decking plan included in contract drawings	Hogni Setberg
	• Design calculations required when decking is not shown in	
	contract documents	
	• See Attachment 3	
	• Should there be an option to use a temporary decking design	
	other that what is snown?	
	The Team agreed options would be helpful	
	<ul> <li>Many contractors have material on hand that could be used</li> </ul>	
	more efficiently and economically	
	• The experience of most of the team members is that enoxy	
	anchors work better that mechanical anchors. They are less	
	likely to come loose	
	<ul> <li>Comment made the 9" spacing in the Caltrans standard plan is</li> </ul>	
	too close and reduces the capacity of the anchors	
	• The use of neoprene under the plates would better distribute the	
	load and some already apply this detail	
	• The comment was made that the requirements of section 48-4	
	are not applied uniformly across the state.	
	• Requiring an installation and maintenance document would be	
	helpful	
	• Team agreed the option to use both standard plans and	
	contractor designed plans is preferential	
	• Specifying minimum loads and factors of safety would aid in	
	the contractor designed plates	
	<ul> <li>TSTT will discuss this issue and provide options in next FWAT</li> </ul>	
	meeting	











### **Action Items:**

#### Items from Meeting on 9/2/21

- 1. CT will research Spec requiring temporary barriers at pedestrian covers when placed over an existing sidewalk. Topic will be on next FWAT agenda.
- 2. TSTT will revisit the 150% post load adjacent to traffic and add to next FWAT agenda
- 3. TSTT will discuss the tracking of steel grades and add to next FWAT agenda

#### **Today's Action Items**

- 1. Tracking steel grades will be discussed with TSTT and options will be presented at next FWAT meeting
- 2. 150% post load requirement will be revisited by the TSTT
- 3. Requirement for PE onsite stopping operation if unsafe will be discussed with TSTT and topic will be discussed at next FWAT meeting
- 4. Jim will call Brian Mapel about status of HDPE testing
- 5. TSTT will discuss options to deck plates and present to FWAT at next meeting







### Attachment 1

TEMPORARY BARRIER SYSTEMS GUIDELINES

OCTOBER 2021

#### Design Considerations

- Temporary barrier will deflect when impacted. The Standard Specifications require that the clear area behind the barrier must be kept clear. No work resources may be stored in the clear area during non-work hours.
- · Work may be performed during work hours within the clear area.
- · Falsework or temporary supports are not allowed within the clear area.
- For falsework or temporary supports, assume minimum footing width of 64 inches (4 6"x16" pads) and the length of work zone area to be protected must extend a minimum 5 feet past the new edge of deck.
- When temporary barrier is required for pavement widening, the clear area should be a minimum of 24 inches to allow space for a concrete paving machine track or for hot mix asphalt rollers to obtain compaction and joint smoothness.
- Placement of temporary barrier systems near curbs should be evaluated on a caseby-case basis using engineering judgment. Curbs may cause the temporary barrier system to tip over when struck, so adequate deflection distance should be provided between the temporary barrier system and the curb based on the clear area width requirements. If clear area width requirement cannot be achieved for freestanding systems, then consider staking or anchoring the temporary barrier system and allow for 1-foot clear area width for deflection. Do not place temporary barrier directly in front of curb face, if necessary place temporary barrier system on top of the curb, flush with the face of it and the clear area width must meet the requirements in Table 1. Temporary Barrier Systems Clear Area Width Requirements.
- When temporary barrier must be staked or anchored, the locations must be shown on the contract plans.
- Temporary concrete barrier installation requires large equipment and extensive labor. Significant resources are necessary for hauling precast segments to and from the project site. Because of their weight, temporary concrete barriers require more truckloads and thus a higher cost.
- Adequate space must be available within the project work zone for heavy equipment to install and remove the barriers. Lane closures may be required to complete this work.
- When long runs of temporary barrier are used, provide locations for entrances and exits from work areas.
- Barrier ends exposed to traffic must be protected and designed to reduce the effect
  of vehicle impacts. Include temporary crash cushions in the contract. If the





## Attachment 2







## Attachment 3

#### 48-4.01C Submittals

Temporary decking shop drawings and calculations must include:

- Storage location of equipment and materials that allows for 1 shift of work and placement of temporary decking within the time allowed
- Construction sequence and schedule details
- 3. Cure time for concrete to be placed under temporary decking
- 4. Details for removing temporary decking and restoring the existing structure

If temporary decking is not shown, shop drawings and calculations must also include:

- 1. Design calculations, including the description, location, and value, of all loads
- 2. Details of the connection between the temporary decking and the existing or new structure