

Eric Urmeneta, PE

Structure Representative / Bridge Construction Engineer, Caltrans

Michael MacLeod, PE Project Manager, Golden State Bridge, Inc.

COL

D)I

STATEBRIDGE

ENGINEERS & CONTRACTORS LIC. 851187



AGENDA

- Project Introduction
- Design Features and Visuals
- Unique Project Issue
- Lessons Learned and Takeaways





AGENDA

Project Introduction

- Design Features and Visuals
- Unique Project Issue
- Lessons Learned and Takeaways





PRIMARY PROJECT PARTNERS

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
 - Project Administration
- Golden State Bridge, Inc. (GSB)
 - Prime Contractor
- Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC)
 - Primary Funding Agency
- Parsons Corporation
 - Consultant Designer







PROJECT LOCATION



Berkeley, CA





PROJECT PURPOSE AND SCOPE

 First of two projects funded by ACTC to improve vehicular & pedestrian safety and traffic congestion at the I-80/Gilman Street interchange









PROJECT PURPOSE AND SCOPE

- This particular project involves construction of a new pedestrian overcrossing (POC) bridge over I-80 (a separate sister project involves construction of roundabouts to facilitate traffic flow)
- POC will provide a safe, alternate pedestrian path through the interchange



Conceptual Layout of POC (yellow)





PROJECT PURPOSE AND SCOPE

- This particular project involves construction of a new pedestrian overcrossing (POC) bridge over I-80 (a separate sister project involves construction of roundabouts to facilitate traffic flow)
- POC will provide a safe, alternate pedestrian path through the interchange



POC Falsework (mid-2022)





AGENDA

- Project Introduction
- **Design Features and Visuals**
- Unique Project Issue
- Lessons Learned and Takeaways





DESIGN FEATURES

- 230 ft long steel arch bridge with CIP post tensioned concrete deck
- 8 approach spans that vary in length from 90 ft to 115 ft with concrete box deck









DESIGN FEATURES

- Bridge supported by oblong shaped columns
- Cast-in-drill holed hole (CIDH) concrete pile column foundations
- Permanent steel casings for top 15 to 16 feet of CIDH
- Both sides of the bridge approaches bounded by Type 5 retaining walls on CIDH pile/footing foundations







DESIGN FEATURES

Main Span

- Tied-arch bridge (basket handle) – Two parallel arches inclined towards each other and connected with rib braces
- Deck supported by vertical ties connected to the arch ribs
- Ends of each arch are "tied" together via posttensioned deck to resist the thrust of the arch









I-80 Eastbound looking north





VISUAL SIMULATIONS

I-80 Eastbound Looking South







Eastshore Highway southeast of Gilman St





VISUAL SIMULATIONS



Bay Trail southwest of Gilman Street





AGENDA

- Project Introduction
- Design Features and Visuals
- Unique Project Issue
- Lessons Learned and Takeaways





UNIQUE PROJECT ISSUE – MAIN SPAN CAMBER

Main Span Falsework

 The main span falsework
 system spanned
 over the WB
 On-Ramp, WB 80, and EB-80.





CAMBER STRIP VALUES PROVIDED TO GSB





trans



SET MAIN SPAN STRINGERS, CAMBER, AND SOFFIT PANELS

Set soffit panels with the values provided and started setting forms







MAIN SPAN HANGER PLATES AND GEOMETRIC CONTROL

- Hanger plates, which connect the main span to the cables, were set to theoretical elevation, independent from the soffit panels
- Once the soffit panels and hanger plates were set, GSB started verifying the locations and elevations of the tie hanger plates to confirm the cable lengths will work







HANGER CABLES



. NOTES:

North				
Panel Point	Length (FT)	Length (FT-IN)	Quantity	
2N	5.93	5'-11 3/16"	1	
3N	10.37	10'-4 7/16"	1	
4N	15.14	15'-1 11/16"	1	
5N	19.27	19'-3 1/4 "	1	
6N	22.6	22'-7 3/16"	1	
7N	24.94	24'-11 1/4 "	1	
8N	26.37	26'-4 7/16"	1	
9N	26.85	26'-10 3/16"	1	
10N	26.36	26'-4 5/16"	1	
11N	24.92	24'-11 1/16"	1	
12N	22.53	22'-6 3/8 "	1	
13N	19.23	19'-2 3/4 "	1	
14N	15.09	15'-1 1/16"	1	
15N	10.31	10'-3 3/4 "	1	
16N	5.87	5'-10 7/16"	1	

	So	outh		
Panel Point	Length (FT)	Length (FT-IN)	Quantity	
2S	5.61	5'-7 5/16"	1	
35	10.1	10'-1 3/16"	1	
4S	14.900	14'-10 13/16"	1	
55	19.05	19'-5/8 "	1	
6S	22.36	22'-4 5/16"	1	
7 S	24.74	24'-87/8"	1	
85	26.17	26'-2 1/16"	1	
95	26.65	26'-7 13/16"	1	
105	26.16	26'-1 15/16"	1	
11S	24.72	24'-8 5/8 "	1	
12S	22.33	22'-3 15/16"	1	
13S	19.01	19'-1/8 "	1	
14S	14.850	14'-10 3/16"	1	
15S	10.03	10'-3/8 "	1	
16S	5.55	5'-65/8"	1	



Calbans

GILMAN ST. PEDESTRIAN OVERCROSSING | Bridge Contractor Liaison Meeting | September 22, 2023



INIVIENOTUC

ISSUE PRESENTS ITSELF

- When verifying the soffit and elevation of the hanger plates, the theoretical "fill" values were not correct.
- There was a pattern where the values were generally OK above and near the falsework bents but far out of tolerance at the long falsework spans.







CAMBER VALUES DID NOT ACCOUNT FOR VERTICAL ALIGNMENT



The Contract Plans do not state additional anticipated structure deflection.

It was determined that the provided values only accounted for falsework deflection.

Compensation for the vertical alignment was missed.





ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

- GSB submitted a RFI to Caltrans. The immediate direction was to continue with form, rebar, and PT duct installation.
- Caltrans held internal discussions to finalize how to proceed.
- By the time the final direction was provided, GSB was nearly ready to cast the main span girders.
- Also, the hanger cables were in fabrication to the theoretical lengths. It was too late to change hanger lengths without impacting the project schedule.





OWNER INTERNAL DISCUSSION

Multiple stakeholders are involved in project; due to urgency and technical nature of issue, all needed to be included in collaboration on how to approach issue

- Caltrans
 - Structure Construction
 - District 4 Construction
 - Bridge Design (Oversight)
 - District 4 Management
- ACTC
- Parsons Corporation (Consultant Design) Designer of Record





MULTIPLE APPROACHES DISCUSSED

Option #1	Pros	Cons
 Leave bottom of girders at as-constructed soffit form elevations Construct deck to planned contours Bridge depth would vary (increased at mid- falsework spans) 	 Leave forms and falsework as is, eliminating need to rework installed soffit forms and falsework Tie hanger plates installed at planned elevation and minimum embedment 	 Varying depth would require adjustment of rebar and exterior forms, and additional material Increased bridge depth would increase falsework load New configuration would require design analysis (post tension design, etc.) by consultant and oversight design Unknown delay due to review time Risk of new configuration not being acceptable Aesthetics may be negatively impacted (bottom of bridge not smooth)





MULTIPLE APPROACHES DISCUSSED

Option #2

Cons

- Leave bottom of girders at as-constructed soffit form elevations
- Revise deck contours to provide a "best fit" profile
- Minimize variance in bridge depth

Leave forms and falsework as is, eliminating need to rework installed soffit forms and falsework

Pros

 Compared to previous option, reduces amount of rebar and exterior form adjustment, as well as additional material

- New configuration would require design analysis (post tension design, etc.) by consultant and oversight design
 - Unknown delay due to review time
 - Risk of new configuration not being acceptable
- Because hanger plates need to be installed at planned elevation due to fixed cable lengths, hanger plates may not be installed at planned minimum embedment
- Aesthetics may be negatively impacted (bottom of bridge not smooth)
- ADA compliance of deck is not guaranteed







MULTIPLE APPROACHES DISCUSSED

Option #3	Pros	Cons
• Build per plan	 Eliminates negative risks of previous options (cons) 	 Require rework of forms and/or falsework

• It was decided to approach the issue with Option #3 to GSB, as the negative risks of the other two options were not acceptable





"BUILD PER PLAN" OPTIONS PROPOSED BY GSB

Replace Camber Strips

- Remove previously placed camber strips, install with correctly calculated strips that include vertical alignment.
- To provide access to installed camber strips, crane would be required to lift soffit forms. Full closure of freeway would be needed.
- Potential safety risk to crews working beneath the suspended soffit.

False Soffit

- Added formwork placed on top of existing soffit forms.
- Additional camber strips would be installed underneath new forms to compensate for vertical alignment that wasn't included previously.
- Closures not required.
- Agreed option.







Sketch of proposed False Soffit fix provided by GSB



altrans





CCO 12 - Fix Camber Strips					
Date	Description		Cost	Subco	ntractor Markup
GSB Labor and Equipment					
Varies	GSB estimates (5) weeks of 50 hour weeks to disassemble forms, raise the rebar as needed, slide in a false soffit, reset hanger embeds, reset and rekick forms. Below is a crew of 13 personnel	\$	573,069.23	\$	-
Varies	GSB estimates 2 weeks of work for CMC Rebar to assist GSB as needed and retie any rebar as needed.	\$	80,554.38	\$	8,055.44
Varies	GSB estimates 1 weeks of work for Schwager Davis to reset their tubes.	\$	22,902.65	\$	2,290.27

Total = \$ 676,526.26 \$ 10,345.70

Grand Total \$ 686,871.

686,871.96

Rough Estimate of Direct Cost and Time

- Direct Cost: approximately \$700,000
- Time: 8 total weeks





- Stem panels were removed, but rebar was not removed. Contrary to what was anticipated, PT Ducts also did not have to be removed.
- The rebar cages were raised with come alongs and a temporary "U-Horse" made of 6x12s used as support.
- Caltrans provided additional "fill" values, accounting for vertical curve, for the added camber strips.
- The added camber strips and soffit were slid underneath the cage creating two soffits. Dobies and forms were reset.







• False soffit was installed in 2 weeks. Hangers were set to the correct elevation.









• GSB performed work expeditiously, improving on estimated direct costs and time and reducing the anticipated project impact.

	Estimated	Actual
Direct Costs	\$ 690,000	\$ 318,945.41
Time	8 Weeks	5 Weeks (25 Days)





AGENDA

- Project Introduction
- Design Features and Visuals
- Unique Project Issue
- Lessons Learned and Takeaways





LESSONS LEARNED – ISSUE SPECIFIC

- The camber strips provided by the Engineer should account for vertical alignment.
- Suggest showing the camber calculation to the Contractor. While the Contractor may not check the values nor is it their responsibility, the more eyes on it the better.
- Continue to be proactive and verify critical dimensions (cable lengths) throughout construction. While this issue was unfortunate, it could have been much worse if caught after the main span was cast.







ADDITIONAL TAKEAWAYS

- Taking ownership and accountability of issues leads to quicker resolution.
- Involving all stakeholders can uncover insights that may not have been apparent when only a select number of stakeholders are involved. This will also lead to buy-in of chosen solutions.
- Collaborative problem solving can result in more innovative and effective solutions that may not have been considered otherwise.











AERIAL







AERIAL PICS















AERIAL PICS





Questions?





