PTI M-10 Barrier Cable TG Web Meeting Agenda
Update on Publication Action Items

June 2, 2020 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM Central

Task Group Members Present (x of 15):
- Todd Stevens – TG Lead
- Tim Christle – PTI Staff
- Rashid Ahmed
- Carlos Banchik
- Langston Bates
- Asit Baxi
- Muhammad Cheema
- Baruch Gedalia
- Dawn Kori
- Thomas Matthews
- Andrew Micklus
- Doug Schlegel
- Pete Scoppa
- Eric Tegner
- Dan Williams
- Michael Williams

Short Span Barrier Cable Sub-Task Group Members Present (x of 8):
- Fabrice Brugere – Sub-TG Lead
- Tim Christle – PTI Staff
- Todd Stevens
- Rashid Ahmed
- Don Kline
- Carol Hayek
- Carlos Banchik
- Muhammad Cheema
- Eric Tegner

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the status of each action item listed below as they pertain to PTI publications associated with this Task Group. The goal will be to establish a clear plan, member assignments and due dates which will facilitate completion of these action items.
STATUS OF DOCUMENTS ASSIGNED TO THIS TASK GROUP

1. **PTI M10.7-XX Guide for Barrier Cable Maintenance and Repair**
   a. 180831-Ballot M-10-1803-M10.7-xx Guide for Barrier Cable M&R.pdf is attached
   b. This ballot closed on October 7, 2018
   c. Was there ever a M-10 web meeting held to resolve negatives on this ballot? I don’t believe so based upon the information I’ve reviewed.
   d. **ACTION ITEM 1.1:** M-10 web meeting needs to be scheduled as soon as possible to resolve this ballot
   e. **ACTION ITEM 1.2:** After ballot resolution, final edited document needs to be sent to TAB

2. **Barrier Cable Specification**
   a. 8/31/17 Web Meeting states: Assemble small TG to finalize – Todd and Fabrice to draft prior to Cancun
   b. 10/4/17 Cancun M-10 Meeting minutes state: Barrier cable specifications will be completed and sent to PTI staff by 11/1/17
   c. 5/8/18 Minneapolis M-10 Meeting minutes state: Some specs required re-tightening option. Maybe, screw anchors should be used on one side. ASTM is close to finalizing new spec for galvanized strand; if available, it should be referenced.
   d. 9/26/18 Colorado Springs M-10 Meeting minutes state: Some specs required re-tightening option. Maybe, screw anchors should be used on one side. ASTM is close to finalizing new spec for galvanized strand; if available, it should be referenced.
   e. **ACTION ITEM 2.1:** Complete all revisions needed and send to PTI staff as soon as possible

3. **Technical Note 14 Revision**
   a. Or as I’ve been considering it, a brand new technical note with updated information that will replace existing TN 14.
   b. 8/31/17 Web Meeting states: Todd to review progress with Asit and coordinate with drafting of PT Manual update
   c. 10/4/17 Cancun M-10 Meeting minutes state: Technical note #14 is still under review. Asit Baxi needs to give some input.
   d. 5/8/18 Minneapolis M-10 Meeting minutes state: Technical Note #14 revision; Based on the above items, revisions to the TN can be finalized. (“above items” referenced here were the other barrier cable action items covered during that meeting)
   e. 9/26/18 Colorado Springs M-10 Meeting minutes state: Technical Note #14 revision; Based on the above items, revisions to the TN can be finalized. (“above items” referenced here were the other barrier cable action items covered during that meeting)
   f. 161116-TN 14 Revision Proposal.docx is attached. This is the most recent revised version of TN 14 I could find.
   g. My understanding is that the issues with the short span barrier cable calculation method were the only remaining thing holding up final revisions to this TN 14. Is that the only thing standing in the way of making revisions to this technical note final?
h. ACTION ITEM 3.1: Make final edits to this TN 14 incorporating the decisions that were made regarding design approach for short span barrier cable
i. ACTION ITEM 3.2: Forward this updated TN to PTI staff so it can be balloted by M-10 as soon as possible

4. Short Span Barrier Cable Calculations
   a. The Sub-TG noted above was tasked with determining the recommended design method for the short span condition, due to the large discrepancy between results found using the energy method versus the static method. The appropriate factor of safety needed to be agreed upon as well.
   b. Several meeting notes refer to this item as another technical note. It was my understanding rather that the final recommendations for short span calculation method would instead be incorporated into the revised TN 14. Do we really want to have a second barrier cable design tech note just for short span cables?
   c. 8/31/17 Web Meeting states: Send Todd contact information for Eric Tegner – Todd will contact and inquire on status and offer to help. Carlos and Amy will help with calculations.
   d. 10/4/17 Cancun M-10 Meeting minutes state: Short span technical note will be completed and sent to PTI staff by 11/1/17
   e. 5/8/18 Minneapolis M-10 Meeting minutes state: For short barrier cable runs, there is a big difference in results, depending on what method is used. This will go to TAB to get direction; staff will forward to TAB to get the specific question answered.
   f. 5/31/18 Web Meeting minutes state: TAB committee doesn’t have the needed barrier cable design expertise at this time. Expand this Sub-TG to include specific DC-20 members with barrier cable design expertise. Survey PTI professional members to determine how they approach short span design.
   g. 8/9/18 Web Meeting minutes state: Survey results all over the place. Consider load testing and research to validate results? Further discussion at TG meeting in Colorado.
   h. 9/26/18 Colorado Springs M-10 Meeting minutes state: For short barrier cable runs, there is a big difference in results, depending on what method is used. A Sub TG (Lead Fabrice Brugere) is working on this issue. This will be also discussed at the TAB meeting on 9/27/18. Fabrice will forward report notes to Chair.
   i. 9/26/18 Colorado Springs TG Meeting minutes state: Consensus was to not pursue testing and research, but rather to go with more conservative energy method, clean up the information, show minimum length span, define L and l values, use factor of safety of 1.6, cutoff length for what is considered short is 23 feet.
   j. Short Span Barrier Cable PTI M10 Task Group- FAB REVISED for 1.6 safety coefficient – 9-26-18.docx and IBC 2015-Vehicle Barrier code requirements.pdf are attached. These files were sent out to the TG for review and comment on 9/28/18, but to date no comments have been received.
   k. ACTION ITEM 4.1: Sub-TG members review and comment on the documents produced by Fabrice as soon as possible, then reach a final consensus on the calculation example and recommendations that will be included in the TN 14 update. Hold a web meeting along with primary M-10 TG-Barrier Cable members to finalize action if needed.

5. PT Manual 7th Edition Update – Chapter 16, Design of Prestressed Barrier Cable Systems
   a. The existing PT Manual 6th Edition Chapter 16 is being updated along with all other chapters to be part of the new 7th Edition
b. Asit Baxi is the primary author of this chapter update

c. The work of this Task Group related to TN 14 and the Short Span design issue needs to be completed in order for that information to be updated in Chapter 16 and be compatible

d. ACTION ITEM 5.1: Task Group needs to finalize the items noted above as soon as possible so Asit can finish his update of the chapter

e. ACTION ITEM 5.2: Asit to complete his update to Chapter 16 as soon as possible and forward to PTI staff so it can be made ready for TAB balloting


   a. 5/8/18 Minneapolis M-10 Meeting minutes state: The TG should draft a Design Guide after all the other documents are completed.
   b. 9/26/18 Colorado Springs M-10 Meeting minutes state: The TG should draft a Design Guide after all the other documents are completed.
   c. Would this design guide ultimately be issued as a DC-20 committee document?
   d. Wasn’t there some discussion about merging design guide information with PTI M10.4-07 information to create a singular publication that covers all aspects of barrier cable?
   e. ACTION ITEM 6.1: Need to create a smaller Sub-TG (5 person max.) to work on the creation of this document, but as stated, only after all the other primary TG documents are completed. A mix of M-10 and DC-20 experts would seem appropriate.