### **MINUTES:**

When: Wednesday, August 1, 2018 12:00 – 1:00 PM (Mountain Time)

Where: Web-conference

I. There were 25 attendees to the WBPP regional web meeting. Attendees included:

Andrew Blower – Oregon, ODOT

Andy Pott – Colorado, CDOT

Becky Nix - Utah, UDOT

Brandon Henning – Nevada, NDOT

Brent Toller - DS Brown

Chris Hardan – Montana, MDOT

Chris Keegan – Washington, WSDOT

Cody Parker – Utah, UDOT

David Hoyne – Greenman-Pedersen Inc

Ed Welch - NCPP

Eric Buell – Utah, UDOT

Gregg Freeman – Kwik Bond Polymers

Herbert McDowell - Idaho, ITD

John Hooks - NCPP

Kevin Howland – Colorado, CDOT

Lee Seaman –?

Mike Bezner – Clackamas County, Oregon

Mitzi McIntyre – CTS Cement

Paul Jensen – Jensen Engineering

Ryan Hasselbach - NCPP

Rhett Arnell – Utah, UDOT

Thad Pinkerton – Utah, UDOT

Travis Jones – Utah, UDOT

Travis Kinney – Oregon, ODOT

Zach Haber - FHWA

## II. Welcome/Introductions

Chair - Becky Nix ran the meeting. She welcomed everyone to the meeting and conducted a roll call.

# III. Working Group Updates

<u>Local Agency Outreach</u> – Gregg Freeman reported that the last meeting occurred July 19<sup>th</sup>. The WBPP working group is working on bridge preservation learning modules

(bridge preservation program, bridge asset management and bridge preservation activities). Gregg is working on creating a list of the bridge preservation activities for the associated module. If anyone wants to put together a few slides on individual preservation activities let Gregg know.

Travis Kinney stated that he is working on the introduction to bridge preservation program. This module will include: bridge preservation importance, history on the national bridge inventory, generic cost information for preservation, available resources (FHWA's Bridge Preservation Guide).

An initial deadline was set for early February for the modules to be developed with the goal that a lunch and learn to present these modules might occur before the next WBPP annual meeting. The intent is to have each of the three modules limited to about 20 minutes for a total of about one hour. The intent is to try and offer professional development hour credits for this training.

Implementing this has not been worked through yet. Ultimately they may go through the LTAP, Local FHWA, and the States find folks wanting the training. Also there will need to be folks available to deliver the training as well.

Mike Bezner stated that a good place to reach out to locals is via a State's local/county engineer associations.

The FHWA Bridge Preservation Expert Task Group has generated some pocket guides that will be available soon. One was published on the TSP2 website but has since been retracted. There will be a total of four that will be available via TSP2 website and phone application down the road. The four pockets guides will include: thin polymer overlay, joint systems, bridge washing & bridge coatings. Those guides are expected by late fall to early spring.

Ed Welch stated that folks are still discussing on how locals can participate in AASHTO via TSP2. Becky also stated that she sent the WBPP directors an email to vote for expanding this WBPP working group into a National Working Group for Local Agency Outreach. Directors – if you have not gotten back to Becky, please do that soon.

<u>Deck Patch Matrix</u> – Nothing was reported.

<u>Bridge Deck Chloride Testing</u> – Nothing was reported.

IV. Technical Topic

# Expansion Device Issues – Kevin Howland, CDOT

Kevin brought up issues that Colorado has had for delamination behind expansion armoring with portions of the armoring anchors at the surface. This works well at deflecting snow plows but there is speculation that this is leading delamination of the PPC headers. These issues are happening at high elevations and very harsh environments that get a lot of abuse from plows and snow chains. The delamination is bad enough that they have to replace the joints, headers and anchoring every 2-3 years. Colorado wanted to know what other states are using and if they are having these issues.

Becky stated that Utah has used angle armoring embedded into the headers with shear stud anchors but had poor success with that as the studs were shearing off. They have had better luck using a welded rebar loop in lieu of studs.

Someone proposed the use of 6" spacing on the anchors may be too often. There was discussion that they keep the anchors at 6" but having the "shark fin (portion of anchor at the surface)" at about a 2' spacing.

Travis stated that Oregon does not use armoring that has sharp corners. They have had luck using elastomeric headers with chamfered corners in addition to asphalt plug joints. Another option that Oregon uses is to recess the armoring below the finish surface to reduce impacts to the armoring. Andrew Blower provided links to Oregon's details: <a href="http://ftp.odot.state.or.us/techserv/roadway/web\_drawings/bridge/2018\_01/br145.pdf">http://ftp.odot.state.or.us/techserv/roadway/web\_drawings/bridge/2018\_01/br145.pdf</a>, <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Business/Documents/2018\_STANDARD\_SPECIFICAT">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Business/Documents/2018\_STANDARD\_SPECIFICAT IONS.pdf</a>

Another option brought forth was remove the joints altogether and create a link slab across the joint. Several states have utilized this strategy both with and without UHPC concrete. There is concern as to where the movement goes. The states using this strategy haven't noticed ill effects to doing this.

The plug joints may not be a solution for Colorado as they were requiring larger movements. Another option was the use of a Mageba joint that is similar to a plug joint. Colorado will be using this joint soon and it was requested that they report back on the use of that system.

## V. New Items

<u>FHWA Bridge Preservation Monthly Newsletters</u> – Raj from FHWA reached out to Becky stating that the FHWA is planning on putting together a national newsletter. As part of the newsletter they are considering having a summary of the monthly technical topic included as an article. Becky suggested that whoever submits the technical topic

for the month to provide a summary of the discussion back to her so she can submit it as a possible entry to the newsletter. The newsletter should also be available on the TSP2 website.

<u>Innovative Methods in Bridge Preservation</u> – Zach from FHWA wanted to share information about a new research initiative put on by FHWA Highway Research Center that will look at Innovative Methods in Bridge Preservation. The idea is to look at innovative ways to enhance current bridge structures, increase resilience and increase durability. This research program is just getting started and FHWA is seeking stakeholder input. If there are any owners have any insight or specific challenges in bridge preservation let Zach know and FHWA would look at research that might find some deployable solutions for bridge owners.

Zach Haber can be reached at: 202-493-3469, zachary.haber@dot.gov

### VI. Administrative Items

<u>2019 Annual WBPP Meeting</u> – A meeting location at the Peppermill in Washoe County, NV has been reserved. The dates are May 14 – 16, noon to noon on those days.

A planning committee met prior to the WBPP monthly meeting to begin planning the annual meeting in Reno.

<u>2022 National Meeting</u> – The next national meeting location is already being considered. If any states are potentially interested in hosting, please let Ed Welch or John Hooks know.

<u>Technical Topics</u> – If anyone has technical topics for the monthly meeting please get those to Becky at a minimum of a week ahead of the monthly meetings. Technical topics have generally been an opportunity for members to ask for help regarding preservation. It was discussed that it could also be opportunity members to present/teach in lieu of asking for help. Keep that in mind and let Becky know if you have anything.