

MINUTES:

DRAFT

When: Wednesday, May 6th, 2020 11:00 – 12:00 PM (PDT)

Where: Web-conference

- I. There were 33 attendees to the WBPP regional web meeting. Attendees included:

Raj Ailaney – FHWA
Kyle Bartfay – Phoscrete Concretes
Andrew Blower - Oregon DOT
Natasha Butler – Colorado DOT
David Chase - Nevada DOT
Mark Chauvin – Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates
Richard Dunne - GPI
Jason Fogg – HDR
Earl Franks – New Mexico DOT
Gregg Freeman – Quickbond Polymers
Nathan Haddick – Montana DOT
Brandon Henning – Nevada DOT
Michael Hill
David Hoyne - GPI
Paul Jensen
Chris Keegan – Washington DOT/Michigan State University
Darlene Lane – Michigan State University
Mark Libby - HDR
Chris Long – FHWA, California
Max McCarthy
Herb McDowell - Idaho DOT
Mitzi McIntyre - CTS Cements
Becky Nix – Utah DOT
Andrew Pack – Idaho DOT
Cody Parker – Utah DOT
Paul Pilarski – Minnesota DOT
Thad Pinkerton – Utah DOT
Brent Schiller - Forsgren Associates
Thomas Schumacher – Portland State University
Dan Uldall – Quickbond Polymers
Dale Wegner – FHWA, Nevada
Ed Welch – Michigan State University
Tim Woolery – Advanced Chemical Technologies

II. Welcome/Introductions

Herb welcomes everyone, takes roll call, and moves to accept minutes from the previous month's phone meeting. There are no objections and minutes are accepted.

III. Working Group Updates

Local Agency Outreach

Gregg Mott with DelDot has been helping quite a bit. We are looking to take presentations from TSP2 webpage and share with LTAP folks through multiple outlets and put together a recording.

Purdue put together a bunch of video content with the BEPTG and is determining whether it will fit into one video presentation. It has really good information on how State DOTs can fund preservation activities at the local agency level. It covers everything from gas tax revenue down to asset management plans – robust means for funding local agencies for preservation activities. Raj suggested to put more info in for how federal funds can trickle down to local agencies. One suggestion was to look at a peer exchange that took place in Arizona a couple years back. Those funds typically used for worst first scenarios currently.

The group sent a white paper to LTAP folks for distribution. Travis is working with Patti/NCPP for distribution of presentations. We are continuing to work on a poster for the national LTAP event that will probably be pushed.

A couple things came out of conversation with FHWA drawing on their GPI contract – we are possibly looking at federal funds to move forward with this project. We will look at condition states of locally owned bridges versus state owned and what are the shortfalls of locals using federal funds versus the states and possibly put together some case studies. The primary function of this group was to show locals how to access federal funds and we've lost some wind in the sails – if anyone on call can help communicate with local agencies and how these case studies may fall into place we could use support.

Raj – I echo Gregg. We had discussion with Travis and he was supposed to get on regional meetings and pose this same question asking for support. Pat from Indiana LTAP gave a brief overview of their model. They have to have an asset management plan to tap into federal preservation funds. We will get more details from him. We have to identify 2 or 3 more states to add with the study of how funds are being transferred.

We have a video on bridge preservation strategies and I recommend viewing:
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/federal-aidessentials/catmod.cfm?category=other>

Chloride Testing

Herb – The group is currently not meeting. The guide can be found on TSP2 website. Group probably won't be meeting until the guide gets moved toward publishing.

<https://tsp2bridge.pavementpreservation.org/files/2020/04/TSP2-Bridge-Deck-Chloride-Testing-Guide.pdf>

IV. Technical Topic

Evaluation of ECE, FRP and Sealers for Corrosion Mitigation in Reinforced Concrete Bridges

Technical Liaison - Paul Pilarski (Minnesota DOT) 651/366-4562 paul.pilarski@state.mn.us
Principal Investigator - Mark Chauvin (WJE) 763-544-1170 mchauvin@wje.com

<https://researchprojects.dot.state.mn.us/projectpages/pages/projectDetails.jsf?id=20818&type=CONTRACT&jftfdi=&jffi=projectDetails%3Fid%3D20818%26type%3DCONTRACT>

Chat response to presenter asking which States use this technology:

Idaho and WSDOT has not used ECE, CADOT used it on Bixby Bridge, Oregon used realkalization which is a similar process on Dry Canyon and Mosier Bridge on the historic Columbia River Highway. NJDOT has used ECE per Dick Dunne.

Chat Q and A:

Q: what was the coverage rate used for the sealers?

Presenters couldn't recall – can check and follow up. Would follow manufacturer instructions.

Q: Regarding #8, do we know if there is long term change of concrete as a result of ECE and this is influencing the chloride contamination or is it the waterproofing of the section that allowed the chloride contamination? Combination? Anyway to isolate these two variables?

We could go back and look at influencing factors historically. We did not have sealer without ECE, but had ECE without sealer. We do not know why concentration is so high. In 1998 all tests were performed per AASHTO T-260 using powder. Now they are cores using ASTM C1152 so there could be data reasons. We are moving 4-6-8” away and there could be some variability. This is a hybrid installation so we are terminating treatments and you have interfaces and instruments are drilled through FRP – long story short it is not perfect seal. ECE works both ways – chlorides could have been repelled further into concrete and migrated back toward the steel. 20 years since 1998 so deicer use has gone way up –pre-treatments, multiple treatments, concentration of treatments. There are more chlorides in the environment so some increase could be reflection of that.

Q is there a way to isolate on the piers as a control?

That would be tough – if the future exposure could be zero I think the benefits would be seen, but to absolutely keep water and chlorides out may not be realistic in service conditions. We’ve tried different waterproofing, but investing in the deck joints themselves seems to be the best way to keep water out.

V. Administrative Items

2020 WBPP Annual Meeting – Still preparing for November until we know more. Some groups are concerned about pushing/cancelling meetings in Oct/Sept. Lots of OST is being cancelled for the rest of the year. We are all in limbo waiting to see what is going to happen. John or Travis will have updates for our next meeting as they are discussing this in meetings today and tomorrow.

NAIs?

June 3rd will be the next web meeting.

Herb adjourns the meeting after confirming there are no other NAIs.