Day/Time: Wednesday, March 1, 2023, on Microsoft Teams, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM.

#### In Attendance:

Henderson, Donny Britton, Michele Liniger, Michael (American Rock Products) Webster, Garrett

Spencer Kull Methvin, Dave (Central Pre-Mix)

Landers, Steven L Vincent, Ryan

Hill, Kentin Cherne, John M (Redmond) USA

Mizumori, Anthony Michael Gardner

Balick, Pete J (Seattle) USA

Bruce Chattin

Forsyth, Heidi E (Redmond) USA

Emerick, John C.

Frye, Sterling R (Redmond) USA

Davis, Steve Papich, Chris M.

Legaspi, Erica Bowman, Anthony T (Sumner) USA

Randy Romeo McKernan, Dan Carlie, Karen James Cannon Diego Coca Carl Labbe

<u>Next WACA Meeting Date:</u> Wednesday, June 7, 2023, on Microsoft Teams, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

<u>Future WACA Meeting Dates:</u> Wednesday, September 6, 2023, on Microsoft Teams, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

### **Meeting Minutes:**

The link below will take you to past meeting minutes and show upcoming WACA meeting dates.

https://partners.wsdot-sites.com/washington-aggregates-concrete-association/

### **New Business topics:**

### • Cement / CAPS Program Update: Steve Davis

- O Discussion on the status of the CAPs program. Discuss any issues and/or challenges.
- o It's been about a year, so 4 meetings, with what we're trying to do with getting quarterly samples and monthly certs in. It was very problematic for us a year ago, but things are going well.
- o Feb 22 from Katie:
  - o Lehigh Ninh Binh Type IL no 4th quarter sample, production in October
  - Boundary Dam Fly Ash no 4<sup>th</sup> quarter sample submitted and no evidence of nonproduction
  - Lafarge Vinh Tan Fly Ash no sample, but was recently put on the QPL in November

- O As far as we're concerned, things are getting better, but we won't be satisfied until we're at 100%. This should be possible.
- Question: Is there any interest from industry regarding joint QPL evaluations of Barged cementitious material? This topic was discussed briefly in the last WACA meeting. (no comments)

### Proposed Standard Specifications Update: 5-05.3(1) Concrete Mix Design for Paving

- o 2. Submittals Second Paragraph:
  - Mix designs submitted by the Contractor shall provide a unique identification for each proposal. A unique identification for the mix design is comprised of the combination of the Mix Design Number and the Concrete Plant Number. The mix design shall include test data confirming that concrete made in accordance with the proposed design will meet the requirements of these Specifications and the 28-day compressive strength result. Test data shall be from an independent testing lab or from a commercial concrete producer's lab. If the test data is developed at a producer's lab, the Engineer or a representative may witness all testing.
  - o If there are no comments or suggestions, we will move to publish.
- Proposed Standard Specifications Update: 6-02.3(A) Contractor Mix Design
   Second Paragraph:
  - The Contractor's submittal of a mix design shall be on WSDOT Form 350-040 and shall provide a unique identification for each mix design. A unique identification for the mix design is comprised of the combination of the Mix Design Number and the Concrete Plant Number. The mix design shall include the mix proportions per cubic yard, the proposed sources, the average 28-day compressive strength for which the mix is designed, the fineness modulus, and the water cement ratio. The mix design submittal shall also include test results no older than one year showing that the Aggregates do not contain Deleterious Substances in accordance with Section 9-03. Concrete placeability, workability, and strength shall be the responsibility of the Contractor. The Contractor shall notify the Engineer in writing of all mix design modifications.
  - o If there are no comments or suggestions, we will move to publish.
  - We took what we implemented in the Construction Manual update and used that wording in these specs regarding "unique identifier" verbiage. When we receive Mix Designs and multiple plants are listed, our determining factor for unique ID is the mix ID number and the plant the mix is coming from. Each individual plant needs to have a separate mix design to be reviewed and approved. We've seen submittals with multiple plants listed we want this separated. We updated the Construction Manual, but were lacking on the Standard Specifications side, so just trying to get things in line on that.
  - Michael Liniger: that's not going to work for Rock Products, we use the same class of concrete for multiple plants. Our tickets distinguish the different plant numbers. To revamp for accounting purposes and mix design processes, it would be a royal pain to have a different number for the batch plants for each mix of concrete.

- You don't have to create 20 different mix numbers for the same class of concrete.
   As long as there are no constituent changes between plants, we would accept the same mix number.
  - Garrett: Not saying you need to create new mix ID numbers. When it comes to us, we'll use the plant number and mix ID to create a unique identifier. We know every big company will have the same mix number, we're not asking them to change this.

# • Proposed Standard Specifications Update: 8-07.3(1) Aggregates and Proportioning / Precast Concrete Curb: Donny Henderson

- The cement concrete mix design for precast concrete curb shall meet the requirements in Section 6-02.3 for concrete class 4000 with a 4,000-psi compressive strength at 28 days and an air content 4.5% to 7.5%. Aggregates used in the manufacture of precast concrete traffic curb shall conform to the requirements of Section 9-03 and shall have a coarse aggregate nominal maximum size of 3/4 inch. The precast concrete mix shall contain sufficient fine fractions to achieve the type of surface finish specified herein.
- o If there are no comments or suggestions, we will move to publish.
- What changed? Just wording updates, Donny not involved in this update, just informed to bring it to the agenda. Can send the specific changes.

### • Proposed: Pea Gravel Approval: Donny Henderson

- O Discuss thoughts with the group on adding Pea Gravel Approval to the ASA evaluation request when submitting a sample for Concrete Aggregate Approval. This change would then list "Pea Gravel" on the ASA report under "Currently Approved for:" along with Coarse and Fine Concrete Aggregates.
- If there are no comments or suggestions, we will move forward with implementation of this process.
- Were you not getting good numbers?
  - O Garrett: the question started popping up from offices about using "pea gravel," but not being defined. We know it's part of concrete aggregates, so it's on our side to clear it up for approval.
- Bruce: it doesn't make approval more cumbersome?
- o Garrett: no, we're just establishing it as another type of aggregate.

# • E-Ticketing, E-Construction or Environmental Permit Concerns with using RCA in Construction: Kevin Waligorski / Dan McKernan

- o Update from Kevin regarding the latest developments with E-ticketing and RCA.
- o Kevin unable to attend today, any questions to run through Kevin?
- o Dan McKernan: transitioning into what Kevin was doing
  - Still working on e-Ticketing, talking about a portal system, and using Starlink for internet access, etc.
- O Bruce: it was a very good meeting that was designed to work with WSDOT to how they would implement their e-Ticketing process, learning from other states' processes and implementation. HaulHub, FHWA, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Delaware, etc. all attended, in addition to collaboration with industry. The portal is designed to make communications more streamlined. The portal is being designed and defined for how they'd work here. It's all part of a trend progression into e-Construction. When we left, I asked Kevin we should start talking about this and get people's impressions. HaulHub was there and helpful.

- On: I remember that it was emphasized that FHWA will not accept a photo as a source document. It needs to be a PDF.
- Erica: took 21 pages of notes from this joint meeting. It was emphasized that we will have a lot of support from various states and FHWA to begin a portal system and e-Ticketing. Our relationships with industry are a high point in being able to implement this.
- Type 1L Cements in Bridge Deck Overlays & Synthetic Fiber Reinforced Bridge Deck Concrete Update: Anthony Mizumori
  - Discuss developing a specification change to allow Type 1L cement for modified concrete overlays.
  - Based on research we've done and feedback from this group, doing a 1:1 equivalency for Type IL in the 3 modified concrete overlays. This should open up for use of modified concrete overlay mixes.
  - o Michele Britton put together the GSP. It will be kept this way for at least a year.
  - O Based on the contractor's schedule for the second bridge selected for the synthetic fiber reinforced bridge deck, it won't be for another 2 years. We have a 3<sup>rd</sup> that will hopefully go to ad in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of this year
    - Another "pilot project" on SR 9 over the Snohomish River. The project should go to AD sometime this year (TBD). Waiting for construction to happen on the two original pilot projects. At least 20,000 SF of deck area in this project. The specs will be the same as the 2 previous pilot projects
  - None of the decks have been poured yet

#### **Old Business:**

- Type I/II Cements no longer being produced: General Discussion with Industry on what the plan is moving forward regarding Type I/II cements.
- Bruce: call individual companies to get the information you need.

### **Additional Topics:**

No new developments on the topics below.

- Standard Specifications 9-23.12 Natural Pozzolan:
- Recycled Concrete Aggregates with MSE Walls:
- Naturally Occurring Asbestos in Aggregates:
- Discussion on Global Warming Potentials (GWPs) for Portland Cement:

<u>Bruce:</u> in talking with Kevin on the e-ticketing thing, Kevin and I talked about reconnecting on stormwater management with ecology and wanting to be part of the conversation. I'd have to reach out with Kevin directly to come back, get things done, get a status report, input, and

information on the industry

Same for the global warming potential. Of all things on the list, this is the number 1 issue we're dealing with right now. We're in battle with 3 different kinds of proposals. These will be the types of things you'll see proposed by other, that we're opposing, wherever we can, not because we want to oppose, but because they don't work, or understand cement as constructability for a product. What you're hearing may not be the best advice for you, or us, or for any of your suppliers. We're fighting tooth and nail against every one of them right now.

Have you heard from Kevin about RCA/environmental stuff Bruce is speaking about?

Dan: No, I haven't. I'll make a note to talk about that with Kevin.

Bruce: Put an asterisk next to global warming potential and like to get stormwater harmonized how we manage that.

Recycled concrete aggregate with MSE Walls – Marco was confident it would move forward. Is there a way to move Marco's work forward?

<u>Dan:</u> RCA, looking at specs of where/what locations we can use it in. For instance, base course can be substituted 100% for recycled concrete, but you don't want to dress your slopes with recycled concrete because of the runoff. I'll inquire with Kevin and see what issues Marco left simmering.

<u>Bruce:</u> With applications for RCA, be aware of ground water and surface water. For RCA, we're taking in more than we can get out.

<u>Dan:</u> I was a PEO in Port Angeles and Spokane, every time we had RCA utilization, they always estimated the paperwork, the truck coming in outweighs the cost of virgin material and haven't used it.

<u>Bruce:</u> If people don't want to use it, they work around it. That's why we worked with Garrett and that's why we set up the map link on the QPL. How much does it take to bring recycled material to Wenatchee? That's why they say "it's too expensive." We need to have a strong effort in getting it to be used.

<u>Sterling Frye</u>, recycling manager for Heidelberg materials: I'm excited to move forward with recycled aggregates. I'm getting a lot of requests on MSE walls, so I'm excited to work on that. With incorporating RCA into concrete, I'm just catching up on conversations you've been having, but would love to connect with you guys and see how I can utilize myself in how to move things forward.

<u>Bruce:</u> another thing, Dan, that Sterling's reminding me of, when working with Marco and WSDOT not meeting the 25% allocation. Marco – put it into Design Build (DB) contracts in their scoring. If they used RCA in the application of their projects, they'd get additional points and elevate their application as a DB project.

<u>Dan:</u> I'll check into that. On MSE walls, is the recycled concrete for backfill or masonry units? Did they make blocks out of it? What's the recycled aggregate for?

Bruce: backfill

<u>Dan:</u> we don't allow MSE walls for wet applications. Personally, I don't see the problem with that, but I'll look into it.

<u>Donny:</u> Dan, I'll put this in as a placeholder for the next meeting in June.

<u>Garrett:</u> did you send Donny and I your concerns with the Global Warming Potentials? I haven't heard anything, could you get us on the loop on that?

Bruce: I can give you a synopsis. WAPA hired the woman from FHWA. Jon Deffenbacher would be good to have in the conversation too.