AASHTO NTPEP (RSCP)
Rapid Set Concrete Patching Materials
Quarterly Conference Call
Wednesday, March 28, 2018

- Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Wild</td>
<td>Vermont Agency of Transportation</td>
<td>Brad Young</td>
<td>Ohio DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Mulcahy</td>
<td>Massachusetts DOT</td>
<td>Patricia Miller</td>
<td>Pennsylvania DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribel Wong</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>Brenda Waters</td>
<td>Pennsylvania DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Winkelman</td>
<td>Illinois DOT</td>
<td>John Rublein</td>
<td>Wisconsin DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengsheng Ouyang</td>
<td>Iowa DOT</td>
<td>Grant Kao</td>
<td>CTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Jones</td>
<td>Iowa DOT</td>
<td>Mark Nelson</td>
<td>Nelson Testing Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Antoniadis</td>
<td>Massachusetts DOT</td>
<td>Wendy Henry</td>
<td>Quikrete Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnn Blakely</td>
<td>Mississippi DOT</td>
<td>Rich Braun</td>
<td>Quikrete Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Heyen</td>
<td>Nebraska DOT</td>
<td>John Kosar</td>
<td>Quikrete Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Carmody</td>
<td>New York State DOT</td>
<td>Ashish Dubey</td>
<td>USG Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Update on field trials (Brad Young)
  - 2017 7 products installed last fall near Bowling Green, OH
    - 6 products on oct 29th
    - 1 product on dec 1st
  - 2015- 5 products 2 yr review data collected and uploaded to DM
  - 2016- 8 products 1 yr review data collected and uploaded to DM

- Update on lab testing (Mark Nelson)
  - 2017
  - 9 cementitious
  - 5 modified
  - 1 polymer
  - 4 extended and neat
  - April 6th reports will become available for state review
  - Mark mentioned 28 day cure time. Jim Wild asked about the cure time because c666 is specified as 14 day. Mark said it is in the work plan and the manufacturers asked for it as that is more applicable to field conditions

- ASTM updates (Rich Braun)
  - No substantial changes to methods of interest to this group. There is work underway by ASTM committee C9.25 which will produce in perhaps 3 years a new test standard for pull-off tensile strength. The application would be for surface repair materials applied at 1 inch or less. I will update when this is closer to completion.

- Industry concerns
  - None

- Changing specimen size of neat material to 2x2” cubes
  - Jim Wild would like to add cube testing to neat material, as ASTM C928 specifies
Currently only 4x8 are done. By adding cubes, it may help get more states to participate if they need this information to approve a product. The 4x8” testing would still be done for neat and extended materials.

- Mark Nelson through a rough estimate that it could add a few hundred or so to the cost.
- NY was in strong favor and Wisconsin and Illinois were also in favor. No one had opposition at this time.
- Wendy from Quikrete had concern on how a product would be classified. Some of their product marking may not say extended but has coarse agg in it.
- Some discussion on possibly adding a question on the submittal form for a manufacturer to disclose if their product is a neat or extended as classified by ASTM c928.
- Will need to look at data mine to see if there is any distinguishing between them when reported.

- Open discussion
  - Wisconsin remembered previous discussion about using ASTM c403 about wet sieving the material. Problem is rapid set materials are beginning to set during wet sieving. They feel dry sieving would be ok.
  - NY had notes from 3/15/17 of discussion of including chloride and sulfate testing on the materials. They would like this added. There was some discussion and decided that if state could send in email on if they would like this or not to gauge interest. Possible good topic for annual meeting.