

PMPC Concrete Task Group Meeting Minutes

Date: September 9, 2020

Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Location: DOT Translab – OSM Room 514

Facilitator: Keith Hoffman

Attendees: Keith Hoffman, Kuo-Wei Lee, Ken Solak, Kirk McDonald, Mark Hill, Dulce Feldman, Divyesh Vora, Patrick Lo, Bruce Carter, Arshad Vali, Nathan Forrest, Chu Wei, George Butorovich, Cortney VanHook, Doug Mason, Kelly Lorah

Not in Attendance:

1. Introductions/Review Agenda
2. Review Past Action Items
3. Review of Work Products
 - a. Pavement Smoothness
 - i. Still collecting data. Worked with Industry to get data from senior projects that used old specs
 - ii. Working on submitting interim report by end of next month.
 - b. Pavement Acceptance Based on Compressive Strength
 - i. Have specifications from 10 states.
 - ii. Had discussions with FHWA to discuss experience with other states
 - c. Maturity to Estimate to Open to Traffic
 - i. Still in the evaluating phase. Looking into specifications from other states.
 - ii. Not looking at using maturity for acceptance, looking at using maturity for open to traffic as an option
 - d. Precast Pavement – Phase II
 - e. Unique Naming Concrete Mix Design
 - i. Impasse between Caltrans and Industry
 - a. Industry does not believe changing an aggregate source should not require a new mix design ID
 - b. Caltrans position is if aggregate source is changed then will need a new mix ID
 - ii. There are other options to track unique mixes but those are outside the scoping document. If trying to tackle issue within the scoping document then at an impasse.

- iii. Kirk - An EPD doesn't necessarily change with the change in aggregate source
- iv. Chu-Wei – When changing aggregate source, could potentially affect the concrete performance. How is that handled currently?
 - a. Typically a mix is approved for a year. As long as aggregate is on AML and equations check out.
- v. Industry position would be willing to do any additional testing with change in source but don't want to change mix ID
- vi. Keith - Per Brett Soldano, original database would not be ideal to use for unique mix design. Do have DIME that can be used. Would expand DIME database to include additional fields for when tests are performed
- vii. Bruce – have you considered a barcode for each mix?
 - a. Keith – yeah, we started there. Problem is that constituents are changed throughout the project
- viii. Will suggest to EC that a new approach is needed. Modify current database (DIME) to capture data
- f. Recycled Crushed Concrete Aggregate
 - i. Working on final report of efforts
 - ii. Bruce - CIP group very opposed to group proposal
 - iii. The way the spec is written is not usable. Thought the specification would go to the CIP group to evaluate
 - iv. Keith – would think that a phase II would help answer a lot of the pending questions
 - v. Suggest CIP group puts it in their bin list to evaluate as a phase II
- g. CT 523 – Flexural Beam
 - i. Finalized – Final report sent to the CTG on 8/10/20
- h. Portland Limestone Cement
 - i. Kickoff meeting held July
 - ii. On track to complete first milestone by end of September
 - iii. Still no report from OSU. Will be checking to make sure there is no delay.
- 4. Review of bin list/Scoping Documents
 - a. Precast STG
 - i. Without consultant available to write field installation manual will not be productive to have a phase III
 - ii. Currently no STG work available
 - iii. One proposal to moving precast under cast in place STG and then start another STG for foundation work

- a. Industry would want Arshad Vali to have a spot under the CIP STG if combined
 - iv. Arshad – what happens if additional precast issues come up? Will it be separated or handled under the CIP STG?
 - a. Currently no place to handle those issues.
 - b. Need for a separate committee to focus on precast issues (non-pavement)
 - c. Looking into options to deal with those issues. They will not be abandoned.
 - d. Potential to be handled under (Dory's) committee. Would suggest that there be industry representation on that committee
 - b. Potential – Foundation STG
 - i. Proposed to start a foundation STG. Would have both Asphalt and Concrete members.
 - ii. Used to have a foundation STG under RPC. Group was disbanded when moved to PMPC.
 - iii. Some possible foundation STG issues
 - a. Use of alternate compaction method
 - b. Alternate testing for R value
 - c. Non-nuclear gauge or low nuclear gauge
 - iv. Proposal - Suggest trying for a year and seeing how it works. If need to propose an additional STG at that point then reconsider
 - c. Other option to just stay with two STG's (CIP and M&QA)
5. Status of Pilot Projects/Long Term Tracking/Standard Specifications
 - a. Crackless Bridge Deck
 - b. Low Flexural Beam Spec Language
 - c. Corrosion specification
 - d. Report on SCM supply and ASTM/ACI
 - e. Add 4x8 Cylinders
6. Roundtable/Review Action Items/Next Meeting
 - a. CIP with plastic
 - i. Test section created, some issues that caused for them to remove
 - ii. Reevaluating to do another test section October 12th
 - b. Keith – suggest a presentation be put together to explain the process of how specifications get put into place. Progression of spec process (NSSP, Standard Specs, RSPs)
 - i. Setup a separate meeting to discuss with both ATG and CTG
 - ii. 30 minute presentation with follow up questions

Action Items:

1. Send new dates for Concrete Mix Design to Cortney – Nathan/Brett – 6/12/20
2. STGs to develop revised bin lists and submit to CTG – STGs – 8/21/20
3. Send revised PCP Phase III scoping document to CTG – Dulce – 6/10/20
4. Look at CT 523 data exchange availability – Ken – 6/19/20