Meeting Minutes
Meeting Title: AGC/WSDOT Structures
Date: January 16, 2025
Time: 8:53 AM - 10:06 AM (1 hour 13 minutes)
Location: Virtual (Teams Meeting)

Attendees

- **Organizers:**
  - Jim Cuthbertson (WSDOT) - jim.cuthbertson@wsdot.wa.gov
- **Other:**
  - Patrick Glassford (WSDOT) - pat.glassford@wsdot.wa.gov
  - Ed Kane (WSDOT) - ed.kane@wsdot.wa.gov
  - Chad Simonson (WSDOT) - chad.simonson@wsdot.wa.gov
  - Geoff Swett (WSDOT) - geoff.swett@wsdot.wa.gov
  - Troy Watts (WSDOT) - troy.watts@wsdot.wa.gov
  - Eric Bowles (Concrete Tech) - ebowles@concretetech.com
  - Clay Prewitt (H2 Precast) - cprewitt@h2precast.com
  - Kevin Cucchiara (Quigg Bros) - kevinc@quiggbros.com
  - Kelly Griffith (Max Kuney) - kelly@maxkuney.com
  - Bryant Helvey (Graham US) - bryant.helvey@grahamus.com
  - Piotr Jaszczak (OneAtlas) - piotr.jaszczak@oneatlas.com
  - Archie Kollmorgen (Atkn) - archie.kollmorgen@atkn.com
  - Ryan Olson (GC Inc) - ryan.olson@gcinc.com
  - Alex Sari (Knife River) - alex.sari@kniferiver.com
  - Loren Wilson (FHWA) - loren.wilson@dot.gov
  - Dan Zimmerman (Hamil) - dzimmerman@hamil.com

Discussion Notes

1. Safety Update

- **Transition to helmet-style hard hats**:
  - Contractors are adopting rock-climbing style helmets with chin straps for better safety.
  - Enhanced protection against slips and falls compared to traditional hard hats.
  - Jim mentioned that some contractors were now adopting these as mandatory PPE starting in 2025.

2. Specification Revisions

Structural Earth Walls and Geosynthetic Walls Payment:

- **Current Issue**:
  - Discrepancy in payment methods: gravel borrow for structural earth walls is paid by cubic yard, whereas geosynthetic walls allow payment by cubic yard or ton.

- **Proposed Solution**:
    - Standardize payment to "cubic yard" across both wall types.
    - Clarify the inclusion of hauling in the payment descriptions.
- **Feedback**:
    - No objections raised; consensus on moving forward with the changes for the 2026 specification book.

Concrete Barriers:

- **Current Challenges**:
    - Standard plans for precast and cast-in-place barriers need updates to reflect new designs in Standard Plans (e.g., moment slab barriers).
    - Inconsistent approach to contractor-designed barriers atop structural earth walls.
- **Proposals**:
    - Simplify specifications to distinguish between standard plan barriers and contractor-designed barriers.
    - Add design requirements for contractor-designed barriers, such as accounting for traffic or pedestrian loads transferred to walls when appropriate.
- **Discussion Points**:
    - **Ryan Olson** raised concerns about the additional cost and coordination burden for contractor-designed barriers.
    - **Kelly Griffith** suggested relying on standard plans while ensuring drainage compatibility.
    - Consensus and recommendation from team. Prioritize standard plans where feasible and reduce unnecessary re-engineering. Discontinue contractor designed barriers.

Concrete Haul Times and Mix Designs:

- **Issues Identified**:
    - Confusing language in current specifications about allowable discharge times based on temperature.
    - Challenges with long haul times for remote projects.
- **Proposals**:
    - Introduce clear tables summarizing discharge times by temperature (e.g., 55°-75°: 1 hour 45 minutes; 76°-80°: 1 hour 30 minutes).
    - Include a Type 3 Working Drawing submittal if contractors want or need to increase discharge time by more than 15 minutes for the proposed table.

    - Allow extensions for longer hauls with pre-approved mix designs incorporating hydration stabilizers or retarding admixtures.
    - Adjust drum rotation limits to accommodate extended haul distances.
- **Discussion Points**:
    - **Archie Kollmorgen** supported keeping the option to extend times by 15 minutes without requiring a formal submittal.
    - Concerns were raised by WSDOT about segregation risks for mixes with extended haul times, mainly times longer than 3 hours.
    - Conclusions keep a 15 minute extension option with a Verbal approval. The Type 3 submittal for extended time will need review once it is developed more.

3. Concrete Overlays and Crack Sealing

- **Problem**:
    - Current specification requires sealing "all visible cracks," leading to subjective interpretations by inspectors.
    - Inconsistent application results in higher costs for unnecessary full-deck sealing.
- **Suggestions**:
    - Define thresholds for crack sealing (e.g., size or length of cracks).
    - Consider revising language to avoid subjective enforcement.
- **Discussion Points**:
    - **Kelly Griffith** shared examples where projects incurred significant costs due to varying interpretations.
    - **Ryan Olson** noted previous specifications included crack width criteria but were inconsistently applied.

4. Shotcrete Architectural Finishes

- **Updates**:
    - Progress on developing standards for architectural finishes.
    - Test panels being created at a maintenance site to showcase finishes such as Ashlar Stone and block textures.
- **Objective**:
    - Provide clear visual references for acceptable finishes to ensure consistency.
- **Discussion Points**:

- **Geoff Swett** emphasized the importance of finishes being repeatable and scalable for large projects.
- Participants expressed support for this initiative to improve design and bidding processes.

5. Funding and Bid Challenges

- **Current Situation**:
  - Limited funding creating uncertainty for project advertisements.
  - Some projects may proceed only if additional funding is secured from the legislature.
- **Concerns**:
  - Acknowledgment of the cost and effort required for bid submissions.
  - Commitment to provide updates on project timelines and bid dates in future meetings.

6. Other Topics

- **Aggregate Size for Bridge Deck Concrete**:
  - Discussion on allowing smaller aggregates (e.g., 3/4") if shrinkage requirements are met.
  - Concerns about constructability and tight rebar spacing.
  - **Troy Watts** thought the larger aggregate size is required for durability of the wearing surface and that the smaller aggregates may lead to increased rutting.
  - **Action**: Geoff Swett to consult with experts and provide updates.
- **Request for Project Updates**:
  - Participants requested periodic updates on projects previously reviewed by the committee.

Action Items

1. **For Jim Cuthbertson**:
   - Finalize meeting minutes and distribute for review.
   - Prepare a summary of bid dates and updates on past projects for the next meeting.
   - Refine proposed specification revisions based on feedback and circulate drafts.
2. **For Geoff Swett**:
   - Investigate the feasibility of smaller aggregate sizes for bridge deck concrete.

    - Collaborate with experts to ensure proposed changes align with performance requirements.

3. **For Industry Representatives**:
    - Review proposed specification changes and provide comments before the next meeting.
4. **For All Participants**:
    - Evaluate preferences for in-person versus virtual meetings and communicate feedback.

Next Meeting

- **Date**: February 27, 2025
- **Format**: Virtual (Teams Meeting)
- **Agenda**: To include updates on reviewed projects and finalized specification changes.

AGC/WSDOT Structures Team Meeting Minutes

Date: February 27, 2025
Time: 8:51 AM – 10:46 AM
Duration: 1 hour 55 minutes
Location: Virtual Meeting
Chairperson: Jim Cuthbertson (Co-Chair)
Co-Chair: Neil Hunt (Joined Later)

1. Attendees (24 Participants)

WSDOT Representatives:

- Jim Cuthbertson (Assistant State Construction Engineer, Co-Chair)
- Troy Watts
- Kami Koyamatsu
- Jim Wu
- Kenneth Ezeokeke
- Yohanes Darmawan
- Kirk Holyoak
- Kyengo Ndile
- Geoff Swett
- Nikki Wheeler
- Patrick Glassford
- Ed Kane
- Brandon Stevens
- Michael Rosa
- John Romero

External Representatives:

- Eric Bowles (Concrete Tech)
- Lance Rasband (Michels Construction)
- Kelli Rider (Manson Construction)
- Clay Prewitt (H2 Precast)
- Monique Anderson (Shannon & Wilson)
- Alex Sari (Knife River)
- Archie Kollmorgen (Atkinson Construction)
- Jack Arizcuren (Structural Technologies)
- Neil Hunt (Flatiron Corp)

---

2. Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions & Roll Call
2. Safety Moment – American Heart Month & CPR Awareness
3. Project Review: Cat Whisker Creek Fish Passage Project
4. Discussion of Upcoming Bids & Opportunities
5. Updates for Projects Reviewed Last Year
6. Long Haul Concrete GSP Review
7. Buried Structure Submittal Reviews
8. General Q&A and Wrap-Up

---

3. Key Discussion Points

3.1 Introductions & Roll Call

- Introductions were made and roll call taken.

3.2 Safety Moment

- Emphasis on cardiovascular health and CPR certification, particularly for children.

3.3 Project Review – Cat Whisker Creek Fish Passage Project

Project Overview:

- **Location:** Kenmore, King County, SR 522
- **Purpose:** Replace existing culvert with a buried bridge to remove fish passage barriers.
- **Challenges Identified:**
    - Heavy traffic and intersection proximity
    - Depth of excavation (30 feet)
    - Multiple utilities in the project zone
    - Groundwater concerns

Proposed Construction Timeline:

- **2025:** Project advertisement (pending funding)
- **2026:** Contractor selection and construction commencement
- **2027:** Estimated project completion

Utility Constraints:

- Utilities along the shoulders of SR 522 need relocation.
- Sewer and gas lines pose a significant challenge.
- Discussion on the feasibility of consolidating utilities or hanging them under the bridge.

Construction Phasing Options:

1. **Two-Phase Construction:**
    - Divides SR 522 into two sections: one side worked on while traffic is shifted to the other.
    - Allows one lane eastbound and two lanes westbound.
    - Estimated durations:
        - Phase 1: 37 working days
        - Phase 2: 23 working days
    - Concerns raised about insufficient time allocation.
2. **Three-Phase Construction:**
    - Splits work into three segments, ensuring continuous two-lane traffic in each direction.
    - Provides a buffer lane between construction and traffic.
    - Reduces available work time per phase, potentially prolonging the project.
    - Contractors generally favored the **two-phase** approach for extended work windows.

Shoring and Excavation Concerns:

- Secant or tangent pile walls suggested for excavation support.
- Concerns about existing **tiebacks in the retaining wall** and their proximity to excavation areas.
- Dewatering may be required due to perched groundwater.
- Limited staging areas and potential conflicts with the Burke-Gilman Trail.

Utility Considerations:

- Discussion on **directional drilling** or deep trenching to relocate critical utilities like gas and fiber optics.

- Concerns about utility relocations causing delays in each phase.

Key Takeaways & Action Items

Project Review Feedback & Recommendations:

- **Utilities:**
    - Consider **early utility relocations** to avoid schedule bottlenecks.
    - Evaluate feasibility of **directional drilling** for gas and fiber lines.
- **Construction Phasing:**
    - Strong preference for the **two-phase option** due to longer work windows.
    - Consider utility work **prior to or in parallel** with construction.
- **Shoring & Excavation:**
    - **Secant or tangent piles** preferred for excavation stability.
    - **Concerns over tiebacks** in existing retaining wall – need further evaluation.
    - **Possible dewatering challenges** to be assessed.
- **Staging & Access:**
    - Existing space may be insufficient – **contractor may need additional staging areas**.
    - Consider Burke-Gilman Trail restrictions when planning equipment movement.
- **General Considerations:**
    - Raising the structure so that the roadway is coincident with the deck would greatly simplify construction and reducing shoring.
    - The **project may require two construction seasons** due to constraints.
    - Further coordination needed with utility companies to avoid conflicts.
    - **Jack-in-the-box site** will be available as staging area after demolition.

Next Steps

- **WSDOT to evaluate tieback constraints** and potential conflicts with excavation.
- **Further assessment of utility relocation options** before finalizing staging plans.
- **Determine feasibility of extending the fish window** beyond September 30 to allow more flexibility.

- **Additional contractor input required** on potential alternative approaches for construction.

3.4 Upcoming Bids & Opportunities

- Review of **WSDOT's bid schedule** and upcoming call for bids. https://wsdot.wa.gov/business-wsdot/contracts/about-public-works-contracts/alerts-bulletins
- Encouraged contractors to monitor the website for project advertisements. https://wsdot.wa.gov/business-wsdot/contracts/about-public-works-contracts/alerts-bulletins/contracts-planned-advertisement

3.5 Updates for Projects Reviewed Last Year

Project Updates & AGC Feedback Integration

1. **I-5 Martha Washington & Maddox Creeks – Fish Passage**
    - Funding remains uncertain; ad date tentatively Dec 2025.
    - Design adapted to site constraints with a cast-in-place "U-shaped structure."
    - Ground improvements (deep soil mixing or aggregate piers) planned.
    - Addressing groundwater concerns in project specs.
2. **I-90 EB East Channel Bridge – Modular Joint Replacement**
    - Awarded to Ceccanti on Feb 10.
    - AGC insights helped adjust curing time, traffic control, and crew logistics.
3. **I-5 Steamboat Slough, SB Ebey Slough, and SR529 RR Bridges**
    - Pre-design completed; mitigation areas being pursued.
    - Construction will require barge, trestle, and crane matting for marshy areas.
4. **SR-166 Ross Creek Fish Barrier Removal**
    - Delayed until 2032 due to funding and priority ranking.
    - Revised grading limits and staging strategy based on AGC feedback.
    - Future consideration for alternative abutment design to address tidal levels.
5. **Donald Rd Sheet Pile Drivability**
    - On hold due to funding and ownership discussions with the Bureau of Reclamation.

- AGC input led to report update noting potential need for predrilling.

6. **Ballast Island Monument Project**
    - Advertised and Opened Feb 26th.
    - Bids varied significantly (11% under to 150% over).
    - Revised design allows on-site assembly, reducing max lift weight from 52 kips to 32 kips.
7. **Peabody Creek Culvert Repair**
    - Project On hold
    - Design-bid-build approach chosen to minimize schedule risks.
    - AGC feedback confirmed preference for stabilization over full replacement.

3.6 Long Haul Concrete GSP Review

- Brief discussion on concrete material handling for long-distance transportation.
- GSP prepared and distributed for comment prior to meeting.
- No comments of significance to address.

3.7 Buried Structure Submittal Reviews

- Patrick Glassford and Jim Cuthbertson led discussions on best practices for reviewing and approving **buried structure submittals**.
- Proposed revision to Standard Specification 6-20 to clarify responsibility
- Proposed edit below – No changes recommended.

> ….The Contractor shall be responsible for carrying out a thorough check of the Plans and calculations in accordance with the WSDOT Bridge Design Manual LRFD Section 1.4.6, and shall include documentation of compliance with Bridge Design Manual LRFD Appendix 1.4-A2 in the buried structure working drawing submittal.

3.8 General Q&A and Wrap-Up

- No closing questions
- Next Meeting April 10th.
- Notes By Cuthbertson and ChatGPT

AGC Structures Team Meeting Minutes – April 10, 2025

Meeting Details

Meeting Title: AGC Structures Team
Date: April 10, 2025
Start Time: 8:55 AM
End Time: 10:38 AM
Duration: 1 hour 43 minutes
Location: Virtual Meeting
Host: Jim Cuthbertson, WSDOT

Attendees

Name	Email
Jim Cuthbertson	jim.cuthbertson@wsdot.wa.gov
Eric Bowles	EBowles@concretetech.com
Troy Watts	troy.watts@wsdot.wa.gov
Jason Mettler	jason.mettler@wsdot.wa.gov
Kelli Struett	KStruett@MansonConstruction.com
Geoff Swett	geoff.swett@wsdot.wa.gov
Kirk Holyoak	kirk.holyoak@wsdot.wa.gov
Neil Hunt	NHunt@flatironcorp.com
Kevin Burch	kevin.burch@wsdot.wa.gov
Loren Wilson	loren.wilson@dot.gov
Kelly Griffith	kelly@maxkuney.com
Clay Prewitt	CPrewitt@h2precast.com
Archie	ARCHIE.KOLLMORGEN@ATKN.COM
Tim Moeckel	tim.moeckel@wsdot.wa.gov
William Miller	william.miller@wsdot.wa.gov
Chad F. Simonson	chad.simonson@wsdot.wa.gov
Ryan Olson	Ryan.Olson@gcinc.com

Discussion Topics

1. Safety Moment

Speaker: Jim Cuthbertson
Topic: “Take Two” movement at WSDOT, emphasizing mindfulness before changing tasks.
Inspect the area around you and pay attention to hazards.
No action items.

2. Guardrail Installation in MSE and Geosynthetic Walls

Jim Cuthbertson opened the discussion with a presentation on proposed general special provisions (GSPs) to support guardrail installation using 24" HDPE or CMP pipes in MSE and geosynthetic walls. The pipe void would be filled with AASHTO #57 stone to support post installation and allow post rotation upon impact while preventing damage to reinforcing layers.

Tim Moeckel noted the proposal follows research and roadside design guidance, particularly from Midwest states. The testing involved two-foot diameter corrugated pipes backfilled with stone to allow safe deflection of steel or wood posts. He confirmed HDPE was preferred over metal due to cost and corrosion issues.

Ryan Olson raised constructability concerns—specifically, the proposed 24" diameter pipe might be too small to ensure proper placement and post alignment. Others, including Neil Hunt and Geoff Swett, echoed concerns about the limited tolerance and challenges with fill placement around the post.

Clay Prewitt suggested allowing a broader range of materials, including concrete cylinders or square forms. Troy Watts expanded on this by proposing the use of stackable concrete pipe sections commonly used in drainage applications.

The conversation shifted to spacing and wall design impact. Tim and Jim acknowledged that wider pipes reduce reinforcing layers, especially in transition zones with tight post spacing. Neil Hunt cautioned this could result in unacceptable wall designs if not considered upfront.

Concerns:

- - Adequate placement tolerance may not be achievable with 24" pipe.
- - Broader material options such as concrete or square forms should be permitted.
- - Structural impact of voids on wall reinforcing needs further evaluation.
- - Wall designers must plan for guardrail installation method during submittals.

Action Items:

- ✓ Evaluate increasing pipe size to 30" or larger for better constructability.
- ✓ Expand allowable materials to include concrete or stackable options.
- ✓ Update 6-13 spec to require working drawings specify guardrail installation method.
- ✓ Confirm wall system compatibility and provide standard detail if feasible.

3. Buried Structure Specification Edits

William Miller presented several changes to the buried structure specs including requirements for plumb end faces when structures will be placed on a sloping grade. Will also discussed edits providing explicit references to post-tensioning standards in 6-02.3(26) Post-Tensioned Concrete, and the use of new Form 305-019 to document standard plan structures for FHWA reporting.

Discussions centered around practicality and aesthetics with regard to plumb ends. Clay Prewitt and Neil Hunt acknowledged the headwall connection challenges created by skewed box orientations and agreed plumb faces provide a better seal and match, despite added complexity and cost.

The team debated whether to require Form 305-019 for all buried structures or just standard plans. Clay argued for universal use to reduce confusion. William and Geoff clarified that contractor-designed structures already require full load rating submittals, whereas the form is used to track pre-rated standard plan elements.

Concerns:

- - Headwall connection difficulties on skewed boxes with angled end faces.
- - Delayed or missing load rating reports delaying project closeouts.
- - Uncertainty on when to use Form 305-019.

Action Items:

- ✓ Retain requirement for plumb end faces where headwalls are needed.
- ✓ Ensure references to post-tensioning standards are included in Section 602.
- ✓ Promote timely submission of load rating with shop drawings.
- ✓ Require Form 305-019 for standard plans and consider expansion to all buried structures.

4. Shotcrete Specification and Use

Jim Cuthbertson introduced efforts to clarify shotcrete specs, focusing on improving Section 6-18 to better define submittal and testing requirements for three types of shotcrete panels: mix design, nozzleman pre-qualification, and finish aesthetics. He confirmed the need to standardize testing procedures, referencing a transition from ASTM to AASHTO standards for compressive strength.

Geoff Swett described a WSDOT-led research project focused on architectural applications of shotcrete. The team tested various finish techniques, hand-carved Ashlar stone pattern, natural stone pattern, and a rock outcrop finish. The constructed examples will remain at Taylor Town of highway 101 for reference and to document methods for repeatable finishes.

Neil Hunt expressed concern that older projects were unfairly used as a basis for restricting shotcrete use in structural applications due to efflorescence or cracking. He noted similar problems efflorescence issues occurred on standard concrete barriers and bridges, unrelated to shotcrete specifically.

The team agreed a separate specification for temporary shotcrete applications (e.g., soil nail walls) was needed to avoid unnecessary testing burdens.

Concerns:

- - Full testing requirements are too stringent for temporary applications.
- - Need for clear specification on when and how to submit test panels.
- - Misconceptions about shotcrete durability may be limiting broader use.

Action Items:

- ✓ Draft separate temporary shotcrete specification.
- ✓ Clarify Section 6-18 with detailed panel and testing descriptions.
- ✓ Share results of aesthetic texture research and propose repeatable finishes.
- ✓ Coordinate proposed BDM updates for structural shotcrete with the Bridge Office.

5. Next Steps / Closing

- Jim acknowledged feedback from both agency and industry, noting additional refinements are needed for the GSPs and standard spec edits before full adoption.
- Emphasized importance of balancing constructability with long-term maintenance and performance standards.
- Encouraged attendees to provide additional comments by email before the finalization of documents for June publication.

Next meeting → May 22, 2025

Notes by ChatGPT and reviewed by Cuthbertson.

AGC/WSDOT Structures Meeting October 30, 2025
Minutes

Meeting Details

Meeting Title	AGC/WSDOT Structures
Date & Time	October 30, 2025 – 8:54 AM to 9:23 AM
Duration	29 minutes
Average Attendance Time	21 minutes
Total Participants	16
Meeting Lead	Jim Cuthbertson, WSDOT
Meeting Type	Regular Monthly Structures Group

Table of Attendees

Name	Organization	Email
Jim Cuthbertson	WSDOT	jim.cuthbertson@wsdot.wa.gov
Chris Brueske	WSDOT	chris.brueske@wsdot.wa.gov
Troy Watts	WSDOT	troy.watts@wsdot.wa.gov
Kelly Griffith	Max Kuney	kelly@maxkuney.com
Kelli Struett	Manson Construction	KStruett@MansonConstruction.com
Dan Zimmerman	Hamil	DZimmerman@Hamil.com
Archie Kollmorgen	Atkins	Archie.Kollmorgen@Atkn.Com
Patrick Glassford	WSDOT	pat.glassford@wsdot.wa.gov
Geoff Swett	WSDOT	geoff.swett@wsdot.wa.gov
Kevin Cucchiara	Quigg Bros.	KevinC@quiggbros.com
Fuji Hayashi	Structural Technologies	fhayashi@structuraltec.com
Loren Wilson	FHWA	loren.wilson@dot.gov
Eric Bowles	Concrete Technology	EBowles@concretetech.com
Piotr Jaszczak	OneAtlas	Piotr.Jaszczak@oneatlas.com
Chad Simonson	WSDOT	chad.simonson@wsdot.wa.gov
Clay Prewitt	H2 Precast	cprewitt@H2Precast.com

1. Safety Minute

Jim Cuthbertson opened with a safety reminder referencing the Great Washington ShakeOut Earthquake Drill. Attendees were encouraged to ensure participation in future drills and share any safety concerns from job sites. No specific safety incidents were raised.

Action Items:
- None reported.

2. Upcoming WSDOT Annual Precaster Meeting (November 14, 2025)

Jim noted that WSDOT's annual Precaster Meeting would cover a range of precast-related topics (girders, fish passage, pipe sections, catch basins). He invited feedback or issues to bring to the session. Fit-up testing for buried structures was discussed, with no concerns raised.

Action Items:
- None at this time; continue with current fit-up testing practices.

3. Buried Structure Standard Plans

Jim asked for feedback on why standard plan buried structures have seen limited use. Geoff Swett explained that usage has been slow to implement but increasing. Timing and funding cycles were cited as reasons for the slow uptake.

Action Items:
- None at this time.

4. Design-Build Technical Requirements (Stuart Moore Request)

Jim referenced a prior request from Stuart Moore to revisit certain design-build technical requirements. Archie Kollmorgen agreed to contact Stuart and follow up.

Action Items:
- Archie Kollmorgen to follow up with Stuart Moore and email details to Jim.

5. 2026 Standard Specifications & Specification Updates

Jim confirmed that 2026 Standard Specifications were released, though few projects are using them yet. Updates included changes to concrete haul times, revolution counters, and ongoing work on temporary shotcrete specifications. Input is pending from ADSC contractors.

Action Items:
- Jim Cuthbertson to collect ADSC feedback.
- Attendees to send spec issues to Jim before next meeting.

6. Pigmented Sealer Cure Time (Barrier Work)

Kevin Cucchiara proposed discussing pigmented sealer cure time in future meetings, noting Oregon DOT's faster practice. He will provide comparative specifications.

Action Items:
- Kevin Cucchiara to send ODOT pigmented sealer spec and WSDOT comparison to Jim.

7. Bidwell Capabilities & Bridge Deck Pours

Geoff Swett proposed a future topic on Bidwell paving equipment and best practices for bridge deck pours, especially on irregular shapes or grade breaks. Jim confirmed that

WSDOT will retain test pours for crew and equipment readiness.

Action Items:
- Geoff Swett to prepare examples for future discussion.

8. Emergency Bridge Repair – White River Bridge Incident

Geoff provided an update on the White River Bridge repair after a truck strike damaged sway frames. Emergency repairs replaced damaged members and reopened the bridge early. A damaged but unrelated portal was excluded from repairs to avoid betterment issues.

Action Items:
- None; repair complete.

9. Next Meeting Planning

Jim proposed delaying the November meeting due to the Thanksgiving holiday. Consensus was to push to December. Jim was in error, there was no Nov meeting planned, just one in Dec; actually December 11

Action Items:
- Jim Cuthbertson to confirm next meeting date. → (DEC 11 at 9:00)
- Include: Pigmented Sealer Cure Time, Bidwell Capabilities, Design-Build Updates, Shotcrete Specs.

Adjournment

Meeting concluded at 9:23 AM. Next meeting scheduled for December 11 2025 (TBD).

Notes by AI/Reviewed by Cuthbertson.

AGC/WSDOT Structures Meeting Minutes
December 11, 2025

1. Meeting Summary

Meeting Title	AGC/WSDOT Structures
Attended Participants	15
Start Time	12/11/25, 8:48:39 AM
End Time	12/11/25, 10:01:19 AM
Meeting Duration	1h 12m 39s
Average Attendance Time	58m 47s

2. Participants

Name	In-Meeting Duration	Email
Cuthbertson, Jim	1h 12m 37s	jim.cuthbertson@wsdot.wa.gov
Mooney, Todd	55m 4s	todd.mooney@wsdot.wa.gov
Brueske, Chris	1h 6m 37s	chris.brueske@wsdot.wa.gov
Watts, Troy	1h 4m 56s	troy.watts@wsdot.wa.gov
Piotr Jaszczak (External)	1h 4m 35s	Piotr.Jaszczak@oneatlas.com
Kevin Cucchiara (External)	1h 3m 17s	KevinC@quiggbros.com
Wilson, Loren (FHWA)	1h 2m 22s	loren.wilson@dot.gov
Archie (Unverified)	1h 1m 59s	Archie.Kollmorgen@Atkn.Com
Kelly Griffith (External)	1h 54s	kelly@maxkuney.com
Glassford, Patrick	1h 42s	pat.glassford@wsdot.wa.gov
Swett, Geoff	59m 48s	geoff.swett@wsdot.wa.gov
Bryant Helvey (External)	59m 31s	Bryant.Helvey@grahamus.com
Goo, Albert B.	40m 40s	albert.goo@wsdot.wa.gov
Bruce, Jeff (Consultant)	40m 20s	Jeff.Bruce@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov
Kelli Struett	48m 23s	KStruett@MansonConstruction.com

3. Agenda Items

- Project Review – SR542 Squalicum Creek (LDCC efflorescence and trench drain/shoring discussion)
- Fiber Reinforced Pipe – applications, use, and specs
- Bidwell Capabilities
- Pigmented Sealer Acceptance (ODOT Version)

4. Detailed Discussion and Action Items

4.1 Project Review – SR542 Squalicum Creek

Participants reviewed conditions at the SR542 Squalicum Creek project, where LDCC backfill within a wire wall has been efflorescing and producing high-pH effluent (measured near pH 13). The project team presented subsurface information, temporary excavation configuration, and current behavior at exposed sheet piles where effluent is emerging at pick points. The discussion focused heavily on constructibility and shoring requirements for proposed trench drains (10–15 ft deep) intended to intercept water before entering the LDCC.

Contractors raised concerns about access on the 2:1 slope, feasibility of trench boxes, and need for worker protection. Alternatives discussed included installing runoff cutoffs near the roadway, offsetting drains further from the wall, temporary sheet piling, vibration considerations, directional drilling (with concerns about lack of free-draining chimney), and sequencing excavations in halves or quadrants to avoid unbalanced loading. Environmental considerations were noted regarding discharge treatment requirements.

Action Items:

- - Project team to evaluate placing a drainage cutoff near the roadway to intercept runoff upstream of the LDCC.
- - Evaluate feasibility of offset drains further from the wall while maintaining adequate hydraulic capture.
- - Engineering review of unbalanced earth pressure for partial or staged excavations (Jeff/Todd).
- - Environmental review of discharge/treatment requirements for intercepted water (Albert).
- - Reach out to WSDOT Roadway Team (John Romero) for additional excavation and constructibility input (Todd).

4.2 Fiber Reinforced Pipe – Applications and Specifications

The group discussed the increasing use of FRP for bridge drainage systems and the existing Hydraulics Manual requirement for a minimum 12-inch pipe diameter. Field observations from several projects indicate successful performance with smaller diameters (8–10 inch) depending on run length and clogging history. Contractor input emphasized the ease of installation, lighter handling, and reduced cost of FRP. Concerns remain regarding vandalism and damage potential; current policy requires switching back to ductile iron a set distance above ground line.

Action Items:

- - Bridge office to coordinate with Hydraulics (Julie) regarding applicability of the 12-inch minimum requirement.

- - Continue development of bridge drainage specifications, including FRP materials, for inclusion in Standard Specs (Geoff/Monique).

4.3 Bidwell Capabilities

The discussion addressed constructibility challenges for deck pours on bridges with internal grade breaks, variable-width gores, or moving super-elevation transition points. Contractors emphasized that Bidwell machines can accommodate varying widths via floating legs, but cannot self-adjust for internal grade breaks without internal rails or pre-poured sections. The Spokane project was referenced as an example where a narrow gore was pre-poured to serve as an internal control point, enabling two Bidwells to complete the remaining pour without overstressing steel girders.

Action Items:

- - Bridge design team to bring upcoming complex deck geometries (NSC projects) to this group for pre-construction review (Geoff).
- - Evaluate need for staged construction or temporary rails when internal grade breaks cannot be avoided.

4.4 Pigmented Sealer – ODOT Acceptance

Kevin restated the request to evaluate acceptance of pigmented sealer consistent with Oregon DOT practice. Additional material specification documentation is still pending and will be provided at the next meeting.

Action Items:

- - Kevin to provide ODOT pigmented sealer documentation for review at next meeting.

Minutes from Teams transcript
Created by ChatGPT
Reviewed by Cuthbertson