

PMPC Executive Committee (EC) Meeting Minutes

Date: December 15, 2022

Time: 10:00 am-12:00 am

Location: Webex Meeting

Facilitator: Tom Pyle

Attendees: Tom Pyle, Christa Siegenthaler for Gudmund Setberg, Brandon Milar, Raymond Tritt, Charley Rea, Ian Sun Chee Fore, Tim Greutert, Dulce Feldman, Kuo-Wei Lee, Keith Hoffman, Joe Harline, David Lim, Raghubar Shrestha for Deepak Maskey, George Butorovich, Mark Hill

1. Call to Order
2. Scoping Document Discussion
 - a. Tim - Overall – implementation- how the districts are impact; training?, if the IA is affected, Is the product street ready, statewide implementation – CPD – impacting of stakeholders; meets the intended purpose
 - b. Tim – new membership – continuity – and keep the perspective moving.
 - i. Performance Based ASR Mitigation (Joe – copy from presentation)
 1. Estimated Impact - No anticipated impact to policy
 - a. Construction costs:
 - i. May slightly increase where SCMs are readily available
 - ii. May increase significantly where SCMs are not readily available
 - b. Small operations may not have ability to store the required SCMs or may not be familiar with ternary mixes
 - i. Possible increased monitoring/inspection
 2. Tom – 1567 – keep a minimum of 15% - come back in with SCM to fill the 5%?
 - a. Mark – not to backfill the SCM – material that met 15-25; and not backfill up to 25
 - b. Sustainability – reduce CO₂; how would you reduce CO₂?
 - i. Mark – keeping the minimum; not allowing anyone to go below the quantities.
 - ii. Keith – this is ASR focus – not changing any equations.
 - iii. Tom – 25% is sometimes not enough? Could this potentially
 1. Keith – 25% is conservative. Run on the bigger jobs. Allowed it on precast. Run when justified, not all projects.
 - c. Sustainability goals is important.
 3. Tim – safe to say that is will or won't increase the greenhouse gas, EPD will be a major tool.
 - a. Keith – will use more ASR; EPDs should be a part of that. EPD will be how we measure GHGs
 4. George – when contracts go out to bid, aggregates won't be known initially. Won't go below that 15%.
 5. Tom – accredited to do 1567

- a. David - already coded in the specs for Section 90; already in use
 - 6. **Action Item:** Ian will reroute to EC for signatures **DONE**
 - ii. Replacing Compaction Method (EC signed)
 - iii. Spec Improvement of JPCP RSC (EC signed)
 - iv. Concrete in Corrosive Environments
 - 1. Statement of Effort/Improvement - Revision to Section 90-1.02H of the Standard Specifications. Alignment with Section 5, Concrete Structures, of the CA Amendments to AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications – 8th Edition (CA LRFD 8th)
 - a. Seeks to develop performance-based specification
 - 2. Purpose – Not all mixtures in Section 90-1.02H meet the requirements of a corrosive exposure. This effort will extend the expected design life with respect to corrosion to meet LRFD standards
 - a. allow contractors to optimize the SCM content for specific aggregate
 - 3. Approach – meet the objectives – reach sustainability and durability.
 - 4. Milestones – on MS4 – on schedule to meet these deadlines
 - 5. Objectives/Deliverables - Modeling with Life-365™ is essentially complete. Proposed cementitious mix options need to be finalized. Incorporate the mix options and tables into STP 5.1. Section 90-1.02H revision.
 - 6. Benefits – Similar to using high-performance concrete in corrosive environments. Reduction in Portland cement, reducing CO₂ emissions. Clear and concise design guidelines. Specific prescriptive mix proportions as well as a performance-based option.
 - a. Structural concrete will be:
 - i. Highly impermeable
 - ii. Corrosion resistant
 - iii. Require less maintenance
3. Finalize Binder Content Single Test Acceptance Decision
 - a. We are looking for guidance on the next steps, whether we can continue to pursue a short-term solution on consistent binder content deductions or if the direction is to wrap everything into the long-term solution with an emerging scoping document.
 - i. Tim - DRAFT - New Scoping Doc Goals:
 - 1. Statewide consistency
 - 2. Caltrans specifications and practices do not rely on a single test.
 - 3. Identify resource expectations for industry and Caltrans.
 - 4. Develop a means to track progress via DIME for (TAT) for QC and acceptance results.
 - ii. Tim/Ray/Tom – important to fix the 1test/2test
 - b. EC
 - i. CT perspective - will be a scoping document (should not take years to years) – direction to ATG – to address acceptance testing do this across all; gradation, compaction testing – more of a standard
 - 1. **Action Item:** Tom will send an email midafternoon today of the direction from EC. **DONE**

- a. Not to be incentive based. Roll out a change will be extremely difficult – policy directives on existing contracts.
 - i. Brandon – feels that we should have some incentives. Have the calculations in the acceptance decision. Decide that value during the implementation plan.
 - b. Tom - Put some boundaries
 - ii. Industry perspective – Charley – it’s a policy issues; specs verifications; Brandon – scoping document is appropriate – good process - document everything that is going on; short term effort is important and would be beneficial. Whatever we can do to expedite it.
 - 1. Brandon – acceptance testing and reviewing – clear direction – moving to a PWL spec. “Steps towards to PWL” Need to get away from the single test rejection.
 - a. Ray – do we need to give that guidance upfront? Knowing that other states do it.
 - b. Tim – moving us towards Balance Mixed Design – Brandon – this a bit different
 - c. Brandon – this is an efficiency goal; and more confidence in the material used – quantifying the risk for contractors
 - 2. Current acceptance ideology we need to move away from.
 - 3. Tom – what are other states doing?
 - a. Brandon – document state of the practice; FHWA
 - i. Looking at the risks and not wanting to say PWL, acceptable process that does incorporate variability.
 - 4. Ray - There will be big specification changes in constructions. Give them an option to accept the new testing.
 - a. Tim - Split the existing and future contracts
 - i. Identify a subprocess. Covered in the Construction manual.
 - ii. Implement this statewide and Talk with the construction managers; get Chu Wei (FHWA) on board with this.
 - iii. Field practices
 - 1. Tim, Ray, and Brandon - Field inspections will be done to prevent contractors’ installations issues.
4. EC+CTG Meeting Recap
5. Next meeting date, topics, action list and meeting evaluation
6. Open Discussion
 - a. Ray – understand this and how we can solve this with a scoping document
 - b. Christa – good
 - c. Charley - good
 - d. Brandon – next big meeting sponsor meeting; need to meet the first week of Jan
 - e. Tom – Sustainability Presentation for the sponsor meeting
 - i. Donna Berry
 - f. January 5th – to go over sponsor steering meeting on January 19th
 - i. **Action Item** - In person meeting for end of the year for 2023 will all members. **DONE**
 - ii. **Action Item** – Ian to send Christa the January meeting invites. **DONE**

7. Upcoming meetings:

- a. Next 1-hr EC Meeting: January 5, 2022, 9:00 am – 10:00 am
- b. Quarterly EC + Sponsor Steering Committee Meeting: January 19, 2022, 8:30- 10:00am
- c. EC (Post EC + Sponsor Steering Committee) Meeting: January 19, 2022, 10:00-Noon

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](#)