PMPC Concrete Task Group (TG+STG Chairs/Leads) Meeting Minutes
Date: September 8, 2021
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: Webex/Conference Call

Facilitator: Keith Hoffman
Attendees: Bruce Carter, Dulce Rufino Feldman, Nathan Forrest, Mark Hill, Keith Hoffman, Kuo-Wei Lee, Deepak Maskey, Doug Mason, Joshua Moore, Ken Solak, Don Vivant, Chu Wei, Kelly Lorah
Not in Attendance: George Butorovich

---

1. Introductions/Review Agenda/Past Action Items – See bottom of minutes for updates
2. Introductory Urgent Issues
   - SOP Update
     a. Ken – We're having difficulties with the agreement aspect of decision documents, so we're trying to figure out a way to deal with conflict resolution.
     b. Nathan – We proposed a decision document in M&QA and we understand if one side does not approve, it moves to a scoping document process.
     c. There was a discussion on the decision document process.
3. Concrete Pavement Updates
   - Pavement Smoothness
     - Collecting and analyzing data
     - Working on the draft report
       a. Dulce – We're actively contacting the REs to collect the data. Spreadsheet training may not be needed, but there are inconsistencies in the data. Active projects will be filtered out of the final report. We would like to continue to evaluate the data on an annual basis to improve the specs over time. The report will be done by the end of next month.
4. Foundation Updates
   - Replace R-Value Testing for Unbound Materials
     - Progress status
       a. Deepak – We're on track. The first deliverable is at the end of October, but we're almost done. We've developed draft language for the specification.
       b. Keith – Is R-Value mentioned in multiple documents?

    c. Deepak – No, it's more design related.
- Replace Compaction Method to Determine the Application Rate of Lime for Soil Stabilization
    - Progress status
        a. Deepak – The group is moving on with the development of draft language for the specification.
- Lime, Cement, or Cement-Kiln Dust Modification of Pavement Foundation
    - Working at the STG level and decision document will be developed.
        a. Deepak – We're looking to get a decision document created for this.
        b. Don – There doesn't appear to be any disagreement at this point. I think we can move forward.
        c. The group agrees that this would be an excellent candidate for a decision document.
        d. Ken – Please make sure to discuss with Construction on this as well.
        e. Keith – We will move forward with the development of a decision document.
        f. Deepak Maskey and Marco Estrada were nominated as the decision document champions.

5. M&QA Updates
    - Tracking Concrete Mix Designs
        a. Josh – The DIME team is rescheduling their workloads due to resourcing constraints. Work on this is delayed by 6-12 months. The WG is developing a plan for when the DIME team is ready. The scoping document will be revised.
    - Allowing Blended SCM
        a. Josh – The revised scoping document is out for approval.
    - Performance-Based ASR Testing
        a. Josh – The summary report on the research that was performed is being developed.
    - Impact of PLC on Concrete Performance (Type 1L Cement)
        a. Josh – The AML guidelines have been posted and samples are being submitted.
        b. Keith – This is now closed.
        c. Josh – There is a final report due at the end of the month. The spec change and supporting documents are done. The WG report is in development.
        d. Keith – Maybe we can add this to the pilot project tracker?
        e. Nathan – We'd like to see the data over the next couple of quarterly meetings.

- Corrosion Specification
    a. Keith – This effort was determined by the EC to be a PMPC item. The full scoping document is under development.
    b. Josh – It's nearly complete. We're finding CT members at the moment.
- Neoprene Pads
    a. Josh – We're working on the short scoping document on the neoprene pads.
    b. Bruce – Neoprene pads may be a good candidate for a decision document.
    c. Keith – Let's bring it to a vote. The decision document would need to include the districts as a stakeholder.
    d. There isn't any opposition in going through the decision document process.
    e. Joe Harline and Nathan Forrest were nominated as the decision document champions.
    f. Chu Wei provided a document of states that use neoprene pads for compressive strength testing.
    See Attachment 1 - Neoprene Pad Survey
- 4x8 Cylinders (Informational Only)
    a. To be removed.

6. Caltrans Concrete Related Research and Spec Development
    - UCPRC
        a. Keith – We recently had an update from UCPRC.
    - CP-2
        a. RSC using steel, glass, polypropylene, and other fibers – Under task order; deliverable due in 01/22 to report on result of test specimens.
    - DES (Design and Technology)
        a. CIP Concrete Patch Material AML
        b. Impact of Time Dependent Properties on Performance
        c. UHPC
        d. Grade 80 Reinforcement
            - Potential problem identification underway
        e. Approach Slab Shrinkage
    - DES Bridge Preservation
        a. Keith – Only decks that have issues are being tracked.
    - METS In-House Efforts
        a. Research Proposal for Alternative Aggregate in Pavements
            - Keith – I would suggest a steering committee
            - Chu – Here's a helpful resource:

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/pavement/t504037.cfm

7. Review of Bin List/Scoping Documents
8. Roundtable / Review Action Items / Next Meeting

Action Items from 09/08/21:

Caltrans Concrete Related Research and Spec Development

1. Populate more under the CP-2 heading – Kuo-Wei
2. Get Bridge Deck and Roadway Patching document (reach out to Reimond Garcia) – Joshua/Joe
3. Populate more under the UHPC heading (reach out to Christopher Long) – Joshua/Joe

Action Items from 08/10/21:

1. Have Joe send the Carbon Cure report to everyone - Jackie

Action Items from 06/09/21:

1. Talk with Charles regarding differences between spec interpretations - Keith
2. Discuss the subject of the differences between spec interpretations in the EC meeting next week – Keith – 06/17/21
3. Look into the spreadsheet usage and consistency of usage for Pavement Smoothness; training may be needed – Ken
4. Get most recent STG bin lists from chairs – Kelly – 06/14/21

Previous 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

No.	State	Yes / No	Comments
1	Minnesota	Yes	None
2	**Kansas**	**No**	**Right now everyone statewide is using only surfer caps. There is no way to keep track of how many 'uses' each neoprene pad sees; therefore we don't go that route.**
3	South Carolina	Yes	None
4	Ohio	Yes	We do allow the use of neoprene pads for testing 3x6, 4x8, and 6x12 cylinders
5	Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes, that is typically the only way that we perform compressive strength testing. Sulfur capping has not been required for a long time in PA
6	Texas	Yes	Yes we do allow neoprene pads for compression testing.
7	Indiana	Yes	Yes we do. We don't allow the use of sulfur anymore
8	Vermont	Yes	We used to use them exclusively for years. I think 3 or so years ago we bought a cylinder end grinder and now grind them so it is the concrete on the steel surfaces of the compression machine. This was done to avoid having to qualify pads for higher strength cylinders. We also do sulfur when needed. Independent labs and precast/prestress facilities typically use pads and sometimes sulfur.
9	North Dakota	Yes	Our concrete lab uses them.
10	Arizona	Yes	None
11	Georgia	Yes	None
12	Iowa	Yes	for a very long time
13	Hawaii	Yes	we don't have a restriction on 3rd party accredited labs for using neoprene pads in accordance with C1231 for unbonded caps.
14	Nevada	Yes	None
15	Montana	Yes	We specify AASHTO T 22/ASTM C39 which allows us to use bonded or unbonded caps for compressive strength testing. Our standard practice is to use unbonded caps in accordance with ASTM C1231. There are cases when we have to using capping compound, but pretty rare.
16	Tennessee	Yes	TDOT does allow the use of neoprene pads while performing compressive strength testing.
17	North Carolina	Yes	That is pretty much all we use.
18	South Dakota		None
19	Arkansas	Yes	ARDOT has traditionally used sulfur capping but has moved more towards using pad caps in most of their labs
20	Maryland	Yes	None
21	Delaware	Yes	We only use neoprene pads for our breaks.
22	New York	Yes	None
23	Michigan	Yes	None
24	Wisconsin	Yes	either the pads or sulfur capping can be used.
25	Illinois	Yes	We allow neoprene pads for compressive strength testin
26	Oklahoma	Yes	None
27	Louisiana	Yes	None
28	New York	Yes	NYSDOT does allow neoprene pads in their compressive strength testing
29	Colorado	Yes	That's our normal practice. End grinding or sulfur caps for 7,500+ psi concrete or when cores are tested.
	Missouri		Yet to respond
	Virginia		Yet to respond
	Idaho		Yet to respond
	Maine		Yet to respond
	New Mexico		Yet to respond
	Florida		Yet to respond