

**Materials/QA Subtask Group
CT-Industry
Planning Meeting
December 12, 2013
1:00 – 4:00
MINUTES**

Materials/QA Subtask Group Members:

Keith Hoffman – Materials QA Subtask Group Co Chair	Not Present
Mark Hill – Materials QA Subtask Group Co Chair	Present
Kirk McDonald	Present
Fritz Hoffman	Not Present
John Lammers	Not Present
Jim Cotey	Present (by proxy)
Deepak Maskey	Present
Al Ochoa	Not Present
Mike Cook	Present
Ruth Fernandes	Present (by proxy)
Tracy Vacura	Not Present
Rick Navarro	Present
Bobby Petska	Present
Marc Robert	Present
Jim Sagar	Present
Guests:	
Paul Fayer (for Ruth)	
Ken Darby (for Jim)	

1. Welcome

2. Purpose of meeting – Briefing of STG activities by representative of the functional unit, garner a general status of milestones, create a forum for discussion and feedback, create a list of action items, and review schedule for near term and longer term.

3. Discussion –

Mr. Sagar (filling in for Mr. Hoffman) gave a quick introduction and discussed the agenda for today’s meeting. Mr. Sagar mentioned the goal of this meeting was to ensure that all members of the Materials/QA STG were on the same page in terms of activity milestones and action items.

There were no significant comments related to the meeting minutes from the previous meeting.

Action items from last meeting were discussed at this portion. There was a discussion regarding the “Shotcrete specification” Scoping Document. Mr. Hill mentioned that there were questions related to Section 53 regarding Supplementary Cementitious Material Content, aggregate gradation, and water demand. Comments would be input into the Scoping Document in the future.

QCQA specification discussion

No significant issues were reported during the QCQA discussion. The STG discussed the QCQA/DIME Lessons Learned reports, and it was noted that a draft document will be developed in the coming days. Mr. Sagar emphasized that lessons learned thus far will help the specification development for future projects.

Mr. Petska mentioned that currently the District 6, 8 and 11 projects are ongoing. District 3 and District 4 projects are next, with the District 4 Prebid outreach meeting having taken place on 11 December.

Coordination for scheduling ACI training is ongoing with the CT Workforce Development Branch, and the next class for northern California staff has been scheduled in Sacramento in October.

Recycle Concrete

The Project team met on November 15 to further discuss the specifications for Returned Plastic Concrete. The meeting was attended by the Division of Weights and Measures, Caltrans construction, METS and Industry representatives.

The STG mentioned that the project team is having a high level of success due in large part to the participation of Division of Weights and Measures, as well as various Industry team members. This is helping the activity stay on the proper course.

Bin List Item discussion

For the Bin list items, the “Shotcrete Specification” was next discussed. It was noted that a Meeting/teleconference with proposed team members would take place in the near future to discuss key specification concerns.

The two biggest issues for the Shotcrete activity were the differences in gradation requirements for Section 53 and Section 90, as well as providing clarity on the cementitious material requirements. Water demand is also a topic that would need to be discussed in this case.

For the “CT 523 Flexural Beam Testing” activity, Mr. Maskey mentioned that indirect tensile test could also be considered. More discussion on this activity would take place in the near future. An action item was noted to develop the full scope of work for this activity.

Mr. Hill mentioned that there are several issues with California Test Method 523, and that moving to ASTM/AASHTO test methods would help in some cases. Differences between CTMs and ASTMs were discussed and the following concerns were expressed by industry:

- Curing of flexural strength beams
- Vibration versus rodding (vibration is allowed by ASTM)
- For compressive strength testing, there is a “reimbursement clause” listed in section 90, but there is nothing defined for flexural beams.

The curing of the concrete specimens (i.e. use of sand) and the transport of the concrete specimens are two relevant topics that may also be discussed.

The differences of between ASTM C31 and CTM 523 are also key items for this activity.

Split tensile testing was also discussed here. Mr. Navarro indicated his lab has little involvement with split tensile testing. He also indicated that there have been some recent projects outside of CT that utilized compressive strength testing exclusively, as opposed to flexural strength testing.

A brief discussion next ensued regarding the “deck cracking” report. Industry members requested to be included in any additional discussions that would be taking place regarding shrinkage or the use of shrinkage-reducing admixtures. It was noted that there would be a great difficulty with meeting 0.030 for shrinkage on bridge decks in the future.

3. Next meeting: February 20, 2014: Materials/QA Sub-Task Group Meeting, in-person in Sacramento. This meeting will only be for Caltrans members of the STG.

Action Items from December 12, 2013	Due Date	Responsible Staff	Status
Distribute the “Flex Strength Beam” Scoping Document to the STG for Review	19 Dec 2013	Bobby Petska	Complete; Document Review ongoing
Distribute the “Shotcrete” Scoping Document to the STG for Review	19 Dec 2013	Bobby Petska	Complete; Document Review ongoing
Distribute QCQA Lessons Learned Report for current projects	31 Dec 2013	Bobby Petska	Pending
Discuss ongoing Crack Control/Shrinkage-	13 Mar 2014	Mark	Pending

related topics at upcoming Concrete TG Meetings		Hill/Industry	
Provide any documents or reports related to recent Smog Eating Concrete use to STG for future reference	13 Mar 2014	Kirk McDonald	Pending
Provide comparison document which compares CTM 523 and ASTM C31	13 Mar 2014	Mark Robert	Pending

Decisions Made at the Meeting