

KYTC Division of Structural Design/ACEC-KY Bridge Sub-Committee Partnering Meeting

Thursday, July 1, 2014, 9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

Minutes

These minutes provide an outline of discussions at the Division of Structural Design (DOSD) and ACEC Bridge Subcommittee partnering meeting held at the Transportation Cabinet Office Building. Those in attendance were:

Mark Hite	Director, Division of Structural Design
Bill McKinney	Division of Structural Design
Kevin Sandefur	Division of Structural Design
Ajay Shah	Division of Structural Design
Daryl Greer	Geotechnical Branch
Scott Ribble	Burgess & Niple
David Depp	Johnson, Depp & Quisenberry
Doug Burton	Lochner
Daryl Carter	Stantec
David Deitz	Palmer Engineering

Discussion topics included:

1. The Geotech Branch has changed many of their policies in the continued implementation of LRFD. The attached document provided by Mr. Greer summarizes many of these changes regarding piles. The following additional geotechnical topics were discussed in the meeting:
 - a. Though design capacities of friction piles can be increased by using more stringent field testing techniques, it often proves to be uneconomical for typical projects. The Modified Gates Formula should be assumed for field testing to determine design capacities unless a cost estimate shows a significant savings can be realized by requiring Dynamic Field Testing. If the cost estimate results show a significant savings, then the use of the Dynamic Field testing should be discussed with the Geotech Branch prior to specifying its use in the plans.
 - b. Geotech Branch is in the process of updating the standard Pile Record Notes available for download on the Cabinet's website. They will be posted when the process is completed. Until that time, the Geotech Branch will provide necessary plan notes for specific projects.
2. Different methods to accommodate steep longitudinal grades in the design of elastomeric bearings were discussed. AASHTO requires that bearings either be designed for the longitudinal slope, or the slope must be eliminated from the bearings

by some means. It was agreed that the simplest solution was to slope the concrete cap/pedestal surface below the bearing pad.

3. Transmittal Memorandum 08-01 prohibits design using debonded strands. The DOSD prefers to avoid using debonded strands, but will allow it in cases where there is no other working solution.
4. For plan presentations of deck construction elevations, provide elevations at the gutterline. This elevation matches the fascia elevation based on Guidance Manual Exhibit 601.
5. The requirements of TM 08-01, Section 3.6.5.2, regarding vehicle collision with piers was considered. Piers protected by the Concrete Median Barrier shown in Standard Drawing RBE-065-06 are considered adequate protection of the pier to avoid designing for the impact force stipulated in AASHTO.
6. Shear keys vs. roughened construction joints at cold joints for columns, abutments stems, etc. were discussed. The DOSD is open to either of these details based on design preference.
7. The DOSD asked that consultants use the Structural Design Production Hour Worksheet posted on the Professional Services website. The committee offered to work with Professional Services to update the spreadsheet slightly, making it easier to use. The DOSD is open to the committee contacting Professional Services directly.
8. Extremely complex curved and skewed steel girder bridges can require a more refined geometrical analysis and prediction of cross-frame forces and potential uplift at girder reactions than provided by conventional steel girder design software. Typically finite element analysis is required for the refined study. The DOSD is open to providing additional production hours to perform this work, if justified. The need for the additional effort should be clarified in the negotiation process.
9. Prior to the meeting, DOSD preference regarding CVN testing requirements for steel girder bridges was discussed. Fabricators should meet the attached CVN design requirements for redundant steel bridges. This is in excess of AASHTO requirements.

End Bearing H-Piles

- Maximum Nominal Geotechnical Resistance – Use a resistance factor (ϕ_c) = 0.5 unless otherwise stated in the report.
- In karst areas we will likely recommend using a resistance factor (ϕ_c) = 0.3 in order to increase the number of piles to assist in bridging any potential voids or features. If this does not result in additional piles under the bents (i.e., the pile design loads are still less than the Maximum Nominal at normal spacing), then you may need to consider reducing the spacing as a precaution.

Friction piles

- Typically we are now using pipe piles as friction piles. Usually we recommend closed end pipes although open end pipes and H-piles may be considered if penetration depths or hard driving are issues. All pile points should be inside mount. Common size is 16" diameter unless we determine higher capacities are needed. If the designer has some idea of pile loads or bent design early, it helps the Geotech Branch evaluate pile sizes, penetration depth, etc., and provide appropriate recommendations.
- Scour can control capacities and penetration depths. If possible please provide scour numbers for our use in developing recommendations. This may require some back and forth between the Branch and designer as we can provide grain size information to the designer based on the field exploration so they can complete the scour analysis.
- If certain pile embedment or penetration is needed for lateral stability of the substructure, please let us know so we can evaluate.
- The Branch evaluates drivability of the pile to determine if penetrations can be achieved, pile installation stresses can be handled, hammer sizes can be constrained, etc.
- Capacity tables will provide information for either equation verification or dynamic analysis. Using dynamic analysis does allow for use of higher capacities per pile (higher resistance factors); however, it does require a higher level of capacity verification in the field and special testing. For equation verification, the use of the FHWA Modified Gates formula instead of the formulas in the KYTC Specifications is required.
- The capacity spreadsheets will now show the verification capacities in a clearer format. See attachment. These values need to be included on the plan sets.

LRFD Pile Capacities (For Friction Piles)
Purchase Parkway/KY 348 Interchange

County: Marshall
 Location: Ramp 3 Bridge End Bents
 Item #: 1-8101.00

Date: 5/7/2014

Pile Size: 16" Closed End Steel Pipe

Base of Pile Cap Assumed

to be at approximately elev*: **399 ft**
 finish grade elevation: **396 ft**
 original groundline elevation: **366 ft**

Depth Below Pile Cap (ft)	Approximate Elevation (ft)	Soil Type	Nominal Side Resistance		Nominal End Bearing		R _n		Static Analysis Method			Dynamic Testing Method			Uplift	
			Kips	Tons	Kips	Tons	Kips	Tons	Field Verification Values:	φR _n for design:	Field Verification Values:	φR _n for design:	Field Verification Values:	φR _n for design:	Kips	Tons
							Total Nominal Geotechnical Axial Resistance**	Total Factored Geotechnical Axial Resistance	Field Verification Values:	φR _n for design:	Field Verification Values:	φR _n for design:	Field Verification Values:	φR _n for design:	Total Factored Geotechnical Uplift Resistance	Total Factored Geotechnical Uplift Resistance
0	389	cohesive	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	20	10.0	20	10.0	20	10.0	0	0.0
35	354	cohesive	60	30.0	18	9.0	78	39.0	178	89.0	178	89.0	178	89.0	15	7.5
40	349	cohesive	86	43.0	18	9.0	104	52.0	200	100.0	200	100.0	200	100.0	22	11.0
45	344	cohesive	113	56.5	18	9.0	131	65.5	225	112.5	225	112.5	225	112.5	29	14.5
50	339	cohesionless	165	82.5	150	75.0	315	157.5	465	232.5	465	232.5	465	232.5	47	23.5
55	334	cohesive	231	115.5	27	13.5	258	129.0	385	192.5	385	192.5	385	192.5	64	32.0
60	329	cohesive	264	132.0	27	13.5	291	145.5	365	182.5	365	182.5	365	182.5	72	36.0
65	324	cohesive	297	148.5	27	13.5	324	162.0	393	196.5	393	196.5	393	196.5	80	40.0
70	319	cohesive	329	164.5	27	13.5	356	178.0	423	211.5	423	211.5	423	211.5	88	44.0
75	314	cohesive	362	181.0	27	13.5	389	194.5	450	225.0	450	225.0	450	225.0	96	48.0
80	309	cohesive	395	197.5	27	13.5	422	211.0	480	240.0	480	240.0	480	240.0	104	52.0
85	304	cohesive	427	213.5	31	15.5	458	229.0	510	255.0	510	255.0	510	255.0	112	56.0
90	299	cohesive	459	229.5	31	15.5	490	245.0	540	270.0	540	270.0	540	270.0	120	60.0
95	294	cohesionless	524	262.0	375	187.5	899	449.5	1123	561.5	1123	561.5	1123	561.5	143	71.5
100	289	cohesionless	723	361.5	375	187.5	1098	549.0	1345	672.5	1345	672.5	1345	672.5	213	106.5
105	284	cohesionless	927	463.5	375	187.5	1302	651.0	1575	787.5	1575	787.5	1575	787.5	284	142.0
110	279	cohesionless	1137	568.5	375	187.5	1512	756.0	1810	905.0	1810	905.0	1810	905.0	358	179.0
115	274	cohesionless	1354	677.0	375	187.5	1729	864.5	2055	1027.5	2055	1027.5	2055	1027.5	434	217.0
120	269	cohesionless	1575	787.5	375	187.5	1950	975.0	2305	1152.5	2305	1152.5	2305	1152.5	511	255.5

Factors

Axial Capacity

Skin Friction and End Bearing in Clays, a-Method (Tomlinson/Skempton)
 Skin Friction and End Bearing in Sands, Nordlund/Thurman Method

All Capacities are for a single pile.

Static Analysis Method	Dynamic Analysis Method
Method	Method
0.35	0.65
0.45	0.65

Uplift Resistance

Clays, a-Method (Tomlinson/Skempton)
 Sands, Nordlund Method

0.50
0.25

Driving Resistance Reductions

Cohesive soils = 0.50
 Cohesionless Soils = 0.25

* If base of pile cap varies from plan elevation by more than five feet contact this office for re-evaluation of capacities.
 ** Value calculated using static method.

How to use this table:

Choose the total factored geotechnical axial resistance that equals or exceeds the total factored loads at the strength limit state (φR_n → Σ U_i + Q_s) and use the corresponding depth below pile cap plus the required pile embedment into pile cap to estimate pile tip elevations and the lengths of pile required. The geotechnical report may recommend highest allowable pile tip elevations. Deeper pile tip elevations may be needed to address scour, lateral loads, seismic, and other loading conditions. If the total factored geotechnical axial resistance is chosen from the Static Analysis Method column, then field verification shall be conducted using the FHWA Modified Gates Formula. If the total factored geotechnical axial resistance is chosen from the Dynamic Testing Method column, then field verification by dynamic testing methods is required.

Side Friction Through Embankment Layers (kips):

110

Note: Reported nominal capacities have been adjusted. They are based on the effects of scour and side friction accumulated through embankment layers has been neglected.