GLS Meeting FINAL Minutes 02-20-2020

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **GLS Attendance, February 20, 2020** |  |
| **Name** | **Email** | **"X ' if attending** |
| Arndorfer, Robert | Arndorfer, Robert - DOT <Robert.Arndorfer@dot.wi.gov> | X |
| burkhart, Larry | larry.burkhart@jpsbp.com |  |
| Cannestra, Beth | [beth.cannestra@dot.wi.gov](mailto:beth.cannestra@dot.wi.gov) | X |
| Chase, Wayne | Chase, Wayne - DOT <Wayne.Chase@dot.wi.gov> |  |
| David, Jake | jakeatwema@gmail.com | X |
| Dupont, Brian | [brian.dupont@dot.wi.gov](mailto:brian.dupont@dot.wi.gov) |  |
| Eberhardt, Brad | bEberhardt@hoffcons.com |  |
| Garcia, Pete | Garcia, Pete <Pete.Garcia@dot.gov> |  |
| Gilbertson, Allen | Gilbertson, Allen - DOT <Allen.Gilbertson@dot.wi.gov> | X |
| Goss, Chris | cgoss@hoffcons.com | X |
| Grove, Matt | [mgrove@wtba.org](mailto:mgrove@wtba.org) |  |
| Hagenbucher, Stacy | Hagenbucher, Stacy A - DOT <Stacy.Hagenbucher@dot.wi.gov> | X |
| Hall, Michael | Hall, Michael - DOT <Michael1.Hall@dot.wi.gov> | X |
|  |  |  |
| Hoffman, Jim | jhoffman@hoffcons.com |  |
| Hoffman, Shawn | shoffman@hoffcons.com | X |
| Hollister, Brad | Hollister, Brad - DOT <Brad.Hollister@dot.wi.gov> |  |
| Kobus, Thomas | Kobus, Thomas - DOT <Thomas.Kobus@dot.wi.gov> |  |
| Lilla, Edward | [Edward.Lilla@dot.wi.gov](mailto:Edward.Lilla@dot.wi.gov) | X |
| Maxwell, Steven | Maxwell, Steven - DOT <Steven.Maxwell@dot.wi.gov> | X |
| Owens, Tadd | Owens, Tadd <tadd.owens@daarcorp.com> | X |
| Peters, Kurt | Peters, Kurt - DOT <Kurt.Peters@dot.wi.gov> | X |
| Peterson, Tim | [tim.peterson@jpsbp.com](mailto:tim.peterson@jpsbp.com) |  |
| Peterson, Ryan | [ryan.peterson@jpsbp.com](mailto:ryan.peterson@jpsbp.com) | X |
| Pilon, David | [david.pilon@dot.wi.gov](mailto:david.pilon@dot.wi.gov) | X |
| Schaefer, Christa | Schaefer, Christa G - DOT <Christa.Schaefer@dot.wi.gov> |  |
| Schave, Daniel L | Schave, Daniel L - DOT <Daniel.Schave@dot.wi.gov> |  |
| Schultz, Brad | [Brad.SCHULTZ@DOT.WI.GOV](mailto:Brad.SCHULTZ@DOT.WI.GOV) | X |
| Shadewald, Laura | Shadewald, Laura - DOT <Laura.Shadewald@dot.wi.gov> |  |
| Stertz, David | David.Stertz@dot.wi.gov |  |
| Taylor, Rodney | [rodney.taylor@dot.wi.gov](mailto:rodney.taylor@dot.wi.gov) |  |
| Teske, Tom | [tomt@relycoinc.com](mailto:tomt@relycoinc.com) | X |
| Wade, Josh | [joshwade@frontier.com](mailto:joshwade@frontier.com) |  |
| Wade, Matt | mattwade@arborgreenwi.com |  |
| Wade, Owen | owenwade@arborgreenwi.com |  |
| Murphy, Ryan | rm@edgerton.us |  |
| Burmeister, chris | [chris.burmeister@integrityge.com](mailto:chris.burmeister@integrityge.com) |  |
| Wizner, Frank | [frank.wizner@integrityge.com](mailto:frank.wizner@integrityge.com) | X |
| Kennedy, Bob | [rjkennedy@rockroads.com](mailto:rjkennedy@rockroads.com) |  |
| Nachreiner, Steve | [sn@edgerton.us](mailto:sn@edgerton.us) |  |
| Ruffing, Andy | [aruffing@mussonbrothers.com](mailto:aruffing@mussonbrothers.com) |  |
| Maples, Jeff | [jmmaples@vintonwis.com](mailto:jmmaples@vintonwis.com) | X |
| Engerson, Jon | [Jonathan.engerson@dot.wi.gov](mailto:Jonathan.engerson@dot.wi.gov) | X |
| Polega,mark | Polega, Mark A - DOT <mark.polega@dot.wi.gov> |  |
| Burg, Aleigha J | Burg, Aleigha J - DOT <Aleigha.Burg@dot.wi.gov> | X |
| Hallanger, Hans | [hans.hallanger@dot.wi.gov](mailto:hans.hallanger@dot.wi.gov) | X |
| Herrmann, Scott | [scott.herrmann@mashuda.com](mailto:scott.herrmann@mashuda.com) | X |
| Doocy, Steve | [steve.doocy@dot.wi.gov](mailto:steve.doocy@dot.wi.gov) | X |
| Oliva, Bill | [william.oliva@dot.wi.gov](mailto:william.oliva@dot.wi.gov) | X |
| Horsefal,Jeff | [jeffery.horsefal@dot.wi.gov](mailto:jeffery.horsefal@dot.wi.gov) | X |

1. EBS. Bob Arndorfer is planning on presenting existing design Guidance that is available through WISdot.

Discussion: A few of the points Bob made;

* The design of a uniform subgrade for the project is key.
* EBS is estimated jointly by the soils engineer and the designer.
* EBS is generally estimated uniformly statewide by the regional soils engineers.
* The use of “undistributed EBS” is not uniform throughout the state.
* A “rule of thumb” is topsoil 12” or greater is considered EBS.
* There is no printed design guidance on when topsoil is EBS
* The state is no longer doing probes for topsoil depth during design.

Tadd Owens pointed out that scratch grading and projects with numerous cut/fill transitions can generally be expected to have greater quantities of EBS.



1. Expansion Factors. Bob Arndorfer is going to present the compiled expansion information and Geotechnical manual section on expansion values. Does WEMA having any information/factors on this topic to present?

Discussion: Some points brought forth by Bob regarding Expansion Factors;

* Assume uniform compaction.
* Staging/phasing will affect the expansion factor
* Borrow is assumed to be similar to useable on-site soils.
* Bob included a district expansion factor summary (attached to EBS.pdf, above).
* There is no lab test for shrinkage.
* In Wisconsin we use engineering judgement to estimate expansion factors, Illinois, Iowa are similar.
* Larger projects in Wisconsin have gone to the embankment specification.
* Once again, Bob asked for contractor project specific examples of what the contractor is using for an expansion factor vs. what the state is using during design.

1. Modification of the no excuse weather spec. How does a contractor bid a project when he does not control the weather? Does this spec. inflate the cost of the work? (WEMA)

Discussion: Beth Cannestra made the point that we have a narrow subset of project that use the specification. (interstate, high profile projects where not completing on time is very detrimental to the state’s transportation system).

* Contractors brought up that they would like to share the risk with the state vs. taking most of the risk on a no excuse clause project.
* STH 20 is an example of where the no excuse clause was miss used. Contractors submitted questions prior to letting asking why the no excuse clause was in the project. The use of the clause was then reviewed by BPD and the region, and then removed prior to letting.
* How about a “weather budget” instead of “no extension for weather delay”. (WEMA)
* Contractors would like to see the STSP regarding other options to the no excuse clause in the STSP’s. The no excuse clause is an option to use in the prosecution and progress STSP’s. The possible different types of clauses are included in the pdf files for calendar day and completion day contracts.



1. With all the recycling of pavements that is being done can we agree to accept statewide that 2 ton/CY in place is the standard? Not all regions accept it now. (WEMA)

Discussion:

* Contractors would like to see 2 tons/CY used statewide, so it would be easier to bid on projects where recycling is likely and to successfully bid with recycling on site, a standardized conversion of 2 tons/CY should be used statewide.
* On some projects, they are using a proctor test to come up with a conversion factor of tons to CY, of compacted recycled base, in place.
* Tadd Owens stated that plans are usually designed using a “fudge factor’ of 2.1 to 2.2 tons per CY to figure increased base needs such as driveways, temporary access, tapers, etc.
* Shaun Hoffman stated that if the state used 1.7 Tons/CY as a statewide conversion, contractors wouldn’t bother with recycling concrete and asphalt into base.
* SE region puts the conversion factors used in the plans.
* FDM 19-5, Table 3.1 is used as guidance for putting the Estimate of Quantities for granular materials.



1. Eliminated Work spec. DOT has read a lot into that spec. How is it a subcontractor can lose all his work on a project but not get the 7% + costs because another contractors work is increased by a like dollar amount? (WEMA)

Discussion:

* Contractors feel that bid items should be stand alone when considering the eliminated work spec.
* Beth Cannestra stated that this issue should be brought to the CCAW committee.

1. What can we, as contractors, do to help get continuity in the interpretation and use of specifications? (WEMA)

* Beth Cannestra stated that WEMA should bring the 3 top specification problems to Wayne Chase. Wayne will then bring this to the PDS chiefs statewide meeting for discussion.

1. Deflection testing of thermoplastic pipe. (Ed Lilla)

Discussion: Ed Lilla stated that Thermoplastic pipe will be allowed under more circumstances, on higher ADT routes. 24” dia. to 36” dia. will required 100 % deflection testing. There is no ADT cap on storm sewers using thermoplastic pipe. Thermoplastic pipe will still not be allowed on higher volume (interstate) facilities. This will be starting with the August 2020, letting.



1. Wind loaded sign structures. (Bill Olivia, Steve Doocy)

Discussion: Steve Doocey explained the changes to overhead sign structures. In the past, designing sign structures was a labor-intensive process. There has been a process improvement project to standardize the designs and use fewer contractor designed structures. The foundations will be covered in section 531 of the Standard Specifications. The superstructure will be in section 532 of the Standard Specifications. All superstructures will be made of commonly rolled pipe, A500 Grade C. There are 9 different standard foundation types used. Foundation drilling will be by the diameter/L.F. There will also be standardized fabrication and construction details.

Next Meeting will be held on Thursday, September 17, 2020, in the Antigo – Silt-loam room of the Truax lab. 1 pm to 4 pm.