

PMPC Materials and QA STG Meeting Minutes

Date: September 1, 2021

Time: 10:00 to Noon

Location: WebEx

Facilitator:

Attendees: Joshua Moore, Nathan Forrest, Samir Ead, Reimond Garcia, David Lim, Gary Kirk,
Katha Redmon, Joe Harline, Eric Fornera, Hamed Sadati

Not in Attendance:

1. Introductions

A. Introductions were given for new team members.

2. Project Updates/Briefing by WG Chairs

A. Concrete Mix Design ID (Joe)

- i. Joe: DIME low on resources, will not be able to program features into DIME. Working to modify deliverables and prepare plan so that when DIME team has resources, they will be able to quickly program. Also, looking into previous efforts and where it will line up with E-ticketing. Gave the DIME team a list of features but with no parameters. Milestone 3 to start in October.
- ii. Josh: DIME team lost some programmers, are you going to have to redo scoping document completely?
- iii. Joe: Milestone 2 would just need to be modified.
- iv. Nathan: Timeline may have to move depending on resource availability.
- v. Joe: Not sure when DIME team will be available, but we will have all the work done within this working group, then may have another working group to implement.
- vi. Josh: DIME team said it would help if the list of things to track in the mix included functionality, units, etc. all figured out in advance, rather than doing a back and forth during programming. This way the team can go full speed during programming.
- vii. Katha: Is there a risk that they won't be able to accomplish our wish list?
- viii. Joe: They did something similar for asphalt, so I don't think there is much risk. They will review as we go so they are not completely out of the loop.
- ix. Josh: We are hoping to get information about the E-ticketing. We are looking for a contact in construction that is working on it. We want to know in advance what functionality is needed to tie into E-ticketing system. Samir are you familiar with anyone?
- x. Samir: Aaron Chamberlin and Barry Mayer are assigned to this task. Not sure what conclusion they have so far but we can communicate with them. **ACTION ITEM:** Samir will communicate with Aaron to get update.
- xi. FHWA or AASHTO money for pilot projects, we are submitting for E-ticketing. Some matching funds will need to come from the state also.

B. Impact of Portland Limestone Cement (PLC) on Concrete Performance (Hamed)

- i. Hamed: PLC WG working on milestone 4. We have started accepting samples for AML. Testing and data review is ongoing. We are reviewing documents to see if there is a need for changes in language. Review is over and summary report is underway. Question about no cost change for current projects for OPC to PLC.
 - ii. Samir: When are the specs going to be out?
 - a. Hamed: October 15th
 - iii. Samir: Will bring it to construction office for CPD
 - iv. Nathan: I support this, it is important to get the word out that this change is coming. It would be good if the report were hosted someplace public facing. Would be positive is language in the CPD for no cost change order.
- C. Blended SCMs (Reimond)
- i. Reimond: finished milestone 1. Once we started on milestone 2 the group realized that switching milestones 2 and 3 would benefit the workflow. Getting OCCS involved and Eric so that spec change can be smooth.
 - ii. **ACTION ITEM:** Josh to confirm whether separate scoping document or supplemental scoping document will be required.
- D. Performance-Based ASR (David)
- i. David: Working on milestone 2 – summary report on literature review. Three categories include other state DOTs, research reports, sustainability related documents. Plan to have a WG meeting to go over the draft by next Friday. Next we will begin developing specifications.
 - ii. Nathan: Any indication on which direction you are leaning toward for the specs?
 - a. David: Our position is to not touch the minimum amount for innocuous aggregate. Sustainability and durability related benefits. We will address how to effectively mitigate ASR risk while using a certain amount of SCMs.
- E. Corrosion Specification
- i. Josh: Short scoping document went to CTG to be approved, we can go ahead and start trying to get working group members.
 - ii. Nathan: We have forwarded names on the industry side of people who are interested.
 - iii. Hamed: The names from industry have been update on the work that was done.
 - iv. Josh: This would maybe be good for someone from Eric's staff since a lot of the work now is getting the spec change made.
- F. Neoprene Pads
- i. Josh: We got direction from Keith to start scoping document on this one. I started writing but would like review since not very familiar with the background.
 - ii. Nathan: We had a short discussion on industry side, we want to ask Caltrans to consider running this through decision document process. We don't feel like there is too much to talk about and ask you to have this conversation on whether going through all the research is necessary.
 - iii. Samir: What is the reason they did not consider this before?
 - iv. Joe: A little background, there is extra work going into maintaining neoprene pads, need to keep track of use. Pads break about 100 psi lower which is probably not too much of a problem.

- v. Nathan: You can get in trouble is casting is not done correctly, some places have a wet-saw if that happens.
- vi. Samir: How much of a health concern is the sulfur.
- vii. Nathan: There are safety concerns that need to be considered to not spill etc.
- viii. Gary: We have moved to neoprene based on safety, chance to get burns, ventilation, ppe, is a lot to manage.
- ix. Katha: With sulfur capping you need to do it the day before where neoprene you can use the day of.
- x. Josh: Is industry bringing this to the CTG meeting at this next meeting?
- xi. Nathan: If there isn't agreement here then we'll just go with the scoping document.
- xii. Josh: I lean toward a decision document but want to get the concern from others in Caltrans who expressed concerns.

3. Bin List

- A. Josh reviews new bin list order from CTG meeting.
- B. Josh: Does anyone have something that they would like to bring up to the CTG to be placed higher on the list?
- C. Nathan: Class C makes sense from the recent SCM look-ahead. There is a senate bill 778 that would have required state agencies to develop performance-based specifications for concrete. Sounds like section 90 would require major overhauls. We are lucky the bill was pulled because it called for Jan 1, 2022. We have in good authority that something similar to this bill will come back around next year. This is going to need a lot of people to work on, we need to have a game plan in place.
- D. Samir: Would industry support a bill like that?
- E. Nathan: In the context of performance-based specs, industry would support that. There are other provisions in that bill that we don't necessarily support.

4. Other Project Updates

- A. Concrete Technology Committee FY21/22 Projects (Joe/Josh)
- B. 5-year SCM Look Ahead (Josh)

5. Open discussion:

6. Action Items:

Action Items from [meeting name] on [date]:

1.

For PMPC meeting minutes please visit:

- EC Meetings: [Pavement & Materials Partnering Committee \(PMPC\) Meeting Minutes | Caltrans](#)
- ATG Meetings: [Asphalt Task Group | Caltrans](#)
- CTG Meetings: [Concrete Task Group | Caltrans](#)