

Materials Procedures (MP) Committee Meeting

June 16, 2022

Present: Dan Brayack, Adam Nester, Daniel Hoskins, John Crane, Paul Farley, Chris Preston, Colton Jobes, Justin Moffitt, Andrew Thaxton, Calvin Ratchford, Phil Brown, Kelly Chapman, Charles Ramsey, Dale Hill, Dave Matics, Eliot Watson, George Hanna, Josh Beakley, John Susong, Jonathan Bailey, Matt Crum, Mike Mance, Paul Williams, Randy Coyle, Shawn Jack, Vince Allison, Matthew Daly, Clay McCabe

Voting

MCST: Andrew Thaxton

CA: Matt Crum

Operations:

TED: Ted Whitmore

Tech:

109.20.00 Basis for Charges for Non-Submittal of Sampling & Testing Documentation in a Timely Manner

- John Crane provided comments and worked with Dan prior to meeting to resolve changes (comments attached at the end of these notes). Dan presented and discussed changes at the meeting. All agreed on changes.
- Section 2.2.1 does not cover or give material acceptance of the material where test(s) are not available

Vote

Andrew Thaxton: Yes

Matt Crum: Yes

Ted Whitmore: Yes

709.01.51 Acceptance Criteria for Epoxy Coated Reinforcing Steel

- Various comments had not been resolved. Chris still had some questions about them.
- John Crane provided additional comments (comments attached at the end of these notes).

- Chris Preston discussed changes throughout the document. He and Matt began to discuss them but realized it would be better resolved outside the meeting.
- Matthew Daly was concerned that the MP's wording assures that inspections meet all governing specifications, such as ASTM, AASHTO, etc.
- Suggestion by Daly to make sure the steel must be on the Approved Product List (APL).

Vote to Table

Andrew Thaxton: Yes

Matt Crum: Yes

Ted Whitmore: Yes

701.01.10 Portland Cement and Blended Hydraulic Cement Mill Certification

- Changes were made using blended cements, specifically T1L.
- Discussion between Mike Mance and Industry members about time of production at mill (including a 26-day production instead of two years).
- Discussion to approve before 26 production days on a lot-by-lot basis discussion
- Discussion of Matthew Daly's note concerning inspection and certification with CCRL/AASHTO RE:source

Vote

Andrew Thaxton: Yes

Matt Crum: Yes

Ted Whitmore: Yes

110.00.00 Lab Inspections

- John Crane provided comments (comments attached at the end of these notes).
- Will provide letter from FHWA and more changes needed to the MP
- Still lots of comments to be resolved, including significant editorial changes.

Vote to table

Andrew Thaxton: Yes

Matt Crum: Yes

Ted Whitmore: Yes

661.03.40 Criteria to Approve Finished Aluminum Roadway Signs

- Editorial comments made.
- Discussion about two MPs that may conflict.
- Champion was not at meeting and George was unable to resolve the conflict.

Vote to table

Andrew Thaxton: Yes

Matt Crum: Yes

Ted Whitmore: Yes

100.00.00 Preparing Materials Procedures

- First appearance at committee; opening discussions about the need to update the old MP.
- Dan hopes to vote for approval at the next meeting.

Next Meeting July 20, 2022

New Submissions due, June 29th.

Written Comments Submitted by Industry (Jon Crane) on June 15, 2022

- 109.20.00
 - Section 2.2.1
 - Believe there should be a reference to the \$700 rate within the statement regarding “unless otherwise determined by the Director” or the statement needs to be better defined. The way I interpret it, the director can set whatever rate they would like... I know that is not the intent however I do not believe the verbiage supports that well enough. What about “This procedure is not limited to tests listed in Attachment 1, but applicable to any material test required by the Standard Specifications and/or Materials Procedures. For this case, the Director will establish the timeframe for the test or may utilize the standard timeframe as described in section 2.1. The rate shall follow section 2.2.”
 - I don’t think we need to add anything about the Cost/Ea because the MP/spec would define how many tests per lot if applicable.
 - Attachment 1 – Asphalt density field testing should be the same as in place soils testing with the .2*rate since there is 5 tests per subplot
- 709.01.51
 - Section 4.4 how do you get an epoxy powder on the APL? What requirements does it need to meet? Is this define somewhere?

- Section 5.2
 - Question not answered on where the information is to be submitted
- Section 5.4
 - Statement is incomplete... The metallic component of epoxy coated steel bars shall be...
Would this work: The metallic component of epoxy coated steel bars shall meet the requirements of section 709.1 of the standard specification.
- 661.03.40
 - You have 2 sections (4) and (5) that are both titled Acceptance procedure and another (5) for conclusions
- 110.00.00
 - Should probably end in .40s or .60s
 - Title revision – Preparing a Materials Inspection Report for District Laboratory Inspections
 - Current title does not effectively define what the MP is for. MIRs are written about many other items
 - Additional space in 1.1
 - Throughout the Document there is references to “Materials Inspection Report” but again MCST writes MIRs for other topics so you probably should add in something about Laboratory
 - “District Laboratory Inspection Reports”
 - Section 6 – There may be conflicting information.
 - If memory serves, MCS&T does inspection ever other year, but the Feds wanted it done yearly... the document reference may call out yearly so there would be conflicting information.
 - There should be an agreement letter from the Feds and a previous director that supports the every other year.
 - Memo
 - From: (MCS&T Director)
 - Subject: replace Aggregate with (GROUP)
 - In the 3 paragraph it says (explain deficiencies and what was done to fix them)... It should be the Districts who responds to the deficiencies to explain how they fixed them not MCSTs.
 - Last sentence – Remove Dave’s name and up (GROUP SUPERVISOR) and replace phone number with office number.