

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON MATERIALS**

2017 Mid-Year Web Meeting

Thursday, January 19, 2017

2:00 PM – 4:00 PM EST

**TECHNICAL SECTION 4f**

**Metals**

**I. Call to Order and Opening Remarks**

- A. Chair: Merrill Zwanka (South Carolina)
- B. Vice Chair: Steven Ingram (Alabama)

**II. Roll Call**

- A. Voting Members – listed below
- B. Non-voting Members/Friends/Visitors (send email for attendance)

Voting Members:

Name	Agency Name	Designation	Member Type	Present
Zwanka, Merrill E	South Carolina Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Ingram, Steven	Alabama Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
San Angelo, P.E., Michael	Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities	Member	Voting	
Lauson, Robert Boardman, Jonathan	Connecticut Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Duke, Steve M Lasa, Ivan	Florida Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Wu, Peter	Georgia Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	
Pfeifer, Brian	Illinois Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Barezinsky, Richard A	Kansas Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	
Bradbury, Richard L	Maine Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	
Hood, Woody	Maryland Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	
Trautman, Brett Steven	Missouri Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Tedford, Darin P	Nevada Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Horner, Ron	North Dakota Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Seward, Kenny R.	Oklahoma Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Lane, Becca	Ontario Ministry of Transportation	Member	Voting	
Ramirez, Timothy	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Lane, Danny L.	Tennessee Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Gagulich, Mladen	Vermont Agency of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Bailey, William R	Virginia Department of Transportation	Member	Voting	X
Stelzer, Michael	New York Department of Transportation	Visitor	Non-Voting	X
Sirianni, Jonathan	AASHTO		Non-Voting	X
Fragapane, Ryan	AASHTO	Liaison	Non-Voting	X
Streeter, Don	New York Department of Transportation	Visitor	Non-Voting	X
Short, Temple	South Carolina Department of Transportation	Visitor	NonVoting	X

### III. Approval of Technical Section Minutes

Minutes of the August 1, 2016 TS 4f meeting in Greenville, SC need approval.

- Virginia moved to accept minutes, Alabama seconds. All approved. Minutes approved as written.

### IV. Old Business

A. Weld pull test for **T244** came from TS 4a. ACPA helped PA put this draft test together for inclusion as an appendix in **T244**. NV made revisions to the body of **T244** for additional consideration. AASHTO is assisting with preparing this standard for Technical Section ballot.

- No comments

B. TS Ballots – None since the August 2016 meeting.

C. Task Force Reports

1. Task Force 2015-01: Revisions to **MP18**, Standard Specification for Uncoated, Corrosion-Resistant, Deformed and Plain Chromium Alloyed, Billet-Steel Bars for Concrete Reinforcement and Dowels. Work from this TF resulted in several 2016 ballot items that are mentioned in that portion of the agenda. Bill Bailey of VA is the lead for this task force.

- Bill Bailey's report is part of the notes for the MP18 ballot items later in these minutes.

2. Task Force 2016-01: Discussing a possible specification for the proper way to document the "Buy America" requirements for steel and iron products. AASHTO (Sarcinella) would help develop the document and would like to have the TS backing to then approach the FHWA with the proposal. This would really help the states, the FHWA and the manufacturers. OK thinks this would be a complicated task. Every FHWA office in each state requires something differently. FL would like for FHWA to weigh in to tell the states what kind of detail needs to be included to meet the Buy America requirements. A joint task force with NTPEP was put together. Volunteers are as follows FL, OK, PA, AL and SC. NTPEP will reach out to the Reinforcing Steel and Guardrail/Guiderrail technical committees to get more volunteers. Update – no action on this item. In November 2016 AASHTO asked for comments on the FHWA's proposed Buy America waiver. Need to see where that stands.

- Merrill would like to let this sit for a while to see what happens before drawing any conclusions.

### V. New Business

A. Standards Requiring Reconfirmation

1. Had four items on the 2016 SOM reconfirmation ballot (**M54**, **M227**, **T65**, and **T243**). All items passed with the only comments being from Pennsylvania for **T65**. Comments were editorial and have been addressed.

-

B. SOM Ballot Items

Summary: There were nine 2016 SOM ballot items. Items 14-19 dealt with some aspect of **MP18** while the remaining three ballot items dealt with the new **MP XYZ** (welded wire standard for equivalency with **ASTM A1064**), the sun-setting of **M270**, and revisions to **M31**. Listed below are the three non-**MP18** items and then the six **MP18** items. Item 19 was a concurrent ballot item. Details are below:

<b>Item Number:</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Description:</b>	SOM ballot item to adopt <b>MP XYZ</b> , Steel Wire and Welded Wire, Plain and Deformed, for Concrete Reinforcement. See pages 3-4 and 79-95 of the minutes.	
<b>Decisions:</b>	Affirmative: 40 of 51 Negative: 1 of 51 No Vote: 10 of 51	
<b>Agency (Individual Name)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Virginia Department of Transportation (William R Bailey) (bill.bailey@vdot.virginia.gov)	I support adoption of this standard as a provisional standard.	
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (Robert D Horwhat) (rhorwhat@pa.gov)	Recommendation: Affirmative with comments: 1) In Section 6.2.2, revise "Table 5--Deformed Wire Bend Test Requirements" to "Table 7--Deformed Wire Bend Test Requirements". 2) In Section 15.1, revise from existing "Table 6" to "Table 11" and revise from existing "Table 7" to "Table 12".	Affirmative
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (Allen H Myers) (allen.myers@ky.gov)	If this is to be a full standard specification, the designation should not be "MP," but rather it will be an "M" standard. This is the reason for the negative vote.	Negative

- **KY has agreed to withdraw negative vote for item 20 (per email w/ Merrill)**
- **ASTM equivalent is A1064**
- **PA comments editorial and Merrill agrees with them.**
- **No negatives, ballot can move forward**
- **Tech section needs a ballot to sunset the 4 standards that are components of this one.**

Next step – Technical Section ballot will be prepared to sunset M32, M55, M221, and M225.

<b>Item Number:</b>	<b>21</b>	
<b>Description:</b>	SOM ballot item to delete <b>M 270M /M 270</b> , Structural Steel for Bridges. See pages 4 and 121-135 of the minutes.	
<b>Decisions:</b>	Affirmative: 40 of 51 Negative: 1 of 51 No Vote: 10 of 51	

Agency (Individual Name)	Comments	Decision
Virginia Department of Transportation (William R Bailey) ( <a href="mailto:bill.bailey@vdot.virginia.gov">bill.bailey@vdot.virginia.gov</a> )	I support deletion of this standard.	
Florida Department of Transportation (Timothy J. Ruelke) ( <a href="mailto:timothy.ruelke@dot.state.fl.us">timothy.ruelke@dot.state.fl.us</a> )	We concur with the elimination of the standard since industry as well as our agency is already using the ASTM Standard. However, need to send early notification of the elimination of the standard to all agencies in the event that any agency is still referencing to <b>M 270</b> in their standards or specifications.	Affirmative
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (Robert D Horwhat) ( <a href="mailto:rhorwhat@pa.gov">rhorwhat@pa.gov</a> )	Recommendation (Ramirez): Negative with comments: 1) As voting member of TS, I voted Negative to this when balloted as a TS ballot item. According to page 4 of the minutes, PA withdrew its negative. I don't recall withdrawing the negative. 2) If discontinued, PennDOT will need to revise Pub. 408 and perhaps other publications that reference AASHTO <b>M 270M/M 270</b> . 3) My TS ballot negative comments are shown on page 121 of minutes.	Negative

- Trying to figure out why previous minutes before claim to remove negative
  - PA wants to keep the negative because ASTM is balloting revisions to A709 for high chromium base metal, and this affects the AWS welding code which refers to the AASHTO version currently.
  - Tim's original negative was because this was a joint standard with ASTM, and didn't know if AASHTO wanted to give up joint ownership. He may have withdrew his negative before knowing how this could affect other standards.
- Should hold off on removing the standard until more discussion can happen in regards to those other non-AASHTO standards.
  - More people agree to hold off on sun-setting this.
- **Negative stands (found persuasive), M270 stays on the books.**
  - Need to get it up to date over the next couple of months.

<b>Item Number:</b>	<b>22</b>
Description:	SOM ballot to revise <b>M 31M/M31-15</b> , Deformed and Plain Carbon-Steel Bars for Concrete Reinforcement, to be equivalent with <b>ASTM A 615/A 615M</b> with noted additions and exceptions. See pages 4-5 and 136-152 of the minutes
Decisions:	Affirmative: 41 of 51 Negative: 0 of 51 No Vote: 10 of 51

No comments were received for Item 22. The revised **M31** will be published in 2017.

- **No Comments**

MP18 Related Ballot items: Bill Bailey (VA) to report on Items 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

<b>Item Number:</b>	<b>14</b>
Description:	SOM ballot to adopt <b>MP 18M/MP 18-15</b> Provisional Standard Specification for Uncoated, Corrosion-Resistant, Deformed and Plain Chromium Alloyed, Billet-Steel Bars for Concrete Reinforcement and Dowels as a full AASHTO Specification standard. See pages 2-3, 9-25 and 26-40 of the minutes.
Decisions:	Affirmative: 40 of 51 Negative: 1 of 51 No Vote: 10 of 51

Agency (Individual Name)	Comments	Decision
Virginia Department of Transportation (William R Bailey) (bill.bailey@vdot.virginia.gov)	I support adoption of this standard as a full standard.	
Florida Department of Transportation (Timothy J. Ruelke) (timothy.ruelke@dot.state.fl.us)	Section 4.2.1: (editorial) It states that the certified mill report is required. However, the paragraph initiating the list states that the items on the list "should" be included. These seem to conflict. Recommend Indicating in 4.1 that the mill cert is required and in addition, the order should also include the following:  Section 9.2: (editorial) Recommend to move the added language to the end of the sentence for clarity.  Section 24.1: (editorial) There is a comma missing between "dowels" and "X-Ray"	Affirmative
Missouri Department of Transportation (David D Ahlvers) (david.ahlvers@modot.mo.gov)	Affirmative vote with some editorial comments:  1) Section number '11.1.1' has been deleted but the section is still shown in the specification. The following section was changed from '11.1.2' to '11.1.1'. If both sections staying in the specification need to renumbered	Affirmative

	<p>them 11.1.1 and 11.1.2, respectively.</p> <p>2) Section number '11.2' has been deleted but the section is still shown in the specification. Section 11.2 was added but nothing was added.</p> <p>3) Old Section 11.2, the fifth line, shows the incorrect designation for the Chloride Threshold Test. Instead of '<b>T MPa.4</b>' it should be '<b>T MP18a.4</b>'.</p>	
<p>Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (Robert D Horwhat) (rhorwhat@pa.gov)</p>	<p>Affirmative with comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In Section 4.2.1, revise from "Certified mill test reports are required" to "Certified mill test reports (required for all orders)".</li> <li>2) In Section 6.2.1, add a period to the end of this section.</li> <li>3) In Table 1, footnote d, revise from "steel demonstrated" to 'steel has been demonstrated'.</li> <li>4) In Section 9.2, 1st sentence, add a comma after the word "test".</li> <li>5) In Section 9.3, Note 5, revise from "Per <b>T 244</b> Annex A1.2.1 "Selection and" to "In accordance with <b>T 244</b> Annex A1.2.1, selection and".</li> <li>6) In Table 6, footnote c, revise from "bar designation sizes Nos." to "bar designation Nos."</li> <li>7) In Table 7, footnote c, revise from "Bend tests od bar sizes Nos." to "Bend test requirements for bar designation Nos."</li> <li>8) In Section 11.1, 2nd sentence, add a period after the word "prequalification". Also, suggest revising from "or prequalification" to "or product prequalification".</li> <li>9) In Section 11.1.1., revise from "by purchaser. on randomly" to "by the purchaser on randomly".</li> <li>10) In Section 13.2, 2nd sentence, revise from "alloyed steels" to "alloyed steel" since "bars" is pluralized.</li> <li>11) In Section 14.1, revise from "per" to "in accordance with".</li> <li>12) In Section 15.1, revise from "bar sizes No. 10 to 36" to "bar designation No. 10 to 36"</li> <li>13) In Section 15.2, revise from "For bar sizes No. 43 and No. 57 [No. 14 and No. 18] bars," to "For bar designation No. 43 and No. 57 [No. 14 and No. 18],"</li> <li>14) In Section 17.3, 1st sentence, revise from "X-Ray Fluorescence instrument" to "X-Ray Fluorescence Spectrometer".</li> <li>15) In Section 21.3.5, revise from "a metric size bar of Grade 520 for the corresponding inch-pound size bar of Grade 75" to "a metric size bar of Grade 550 for the corresponding inch-pound size bar of Grade 80".</li> <li>16) In Section 23.1, 1st sentence, delete the hyphen after</li> </ol>	<p>Affirmative</p>

	the word "work." 17) In Section 13.1, add a semi-colon after the word "dowels".	
New York State Department of Transportation (Donald Streeter) (donald.streeter@dot.ny.gov)	Yes w/ Comments: - lumps stainless and "other chromium alloyed steels" together - why is pickling required for stainless by <b>MP18</b> but references ASTM for "other chromium alloy steels. <b>ASTM 1035</b> does not require pickling - if pickling not required will presence of mill scale affect the XRF test? See section 5.1 of <b>TMP-18b1</b> - section 21.3.3 refers to Annex B which has been removed	Affirmative
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (Allen H Myers) (allen.myers@ky.gov)	Remove the "MP" designation; this could become confusing. As a full standard, it needs to be given an assigned number with an "M" designation. This is the reason for the negative vote.  Subsections 4.2 and 4.2.1 – Subsection 4.2 states that "the purchaser shall have the option" and follows with Subsection 4.2.1 stating "Certified mill test reports are required." Suggest the requirement in Subsection 4.2.1 become Subsection 4.2 and follow with a Subsection 4.3 containing the additional optional items found in Subsections 4.2, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.2.4.  Please review the alignment of the numbers in Table 5.	Negative

<b>Item Number:</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>Description:</b>	SOM ballot to adopt Annex A1 of <b>MP 18M/MP 18-15</b> described as <b>T MP18a.1</b> Standard Method of Test for Sensitivity of Stainless Steel to Intergranular Attack as a full AASHTO Test standard. See pages 2-3, 9-25 and 41-44 of the minutes.	
<b>Decisions:</b>	Affirmative: 39 of 51 Negative: 2 of 51 No Vote: 10 of 51	
<b>Agency (Individual Name)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Virginia Department of Transportation (William R Bailey) (bill.bailey@vdot.virginia.gov)	I support adoption of this standard as a full standard.	
Florida Department of Transportation (Timothy J. Ruelke) (timothy.ruelke@dot.state.fl.us)	Section 1.1:: (editorial) Seems that language is missing in this section. If, not missing, then needs re-numbering.	Affirmative

Missouri Department of Transportation (David D Ahlvers) (david.ahlvers@modot.mo.gov)	Affirmative vote with two editorial comments:  1) After Section 1. Scope, the next section needs to be labeled as '1.1'  2) After Section 1.3, the next section addresses hazardous materials needs to be labeled as '1.4'	Affirmative
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (Allen H Myers) (allen.myers@ky.gov)	If this is to become a standard method of test, the designation number needs to change. " <b>TMP18a.1</b> " does not follow the established convention. This should be designated as a "T" standard followed by an assigned number. This is the reason for the negative vote.  Section 1 (and throughout the standard) - The " <b>MP 18</b> " reference would need to change to the newly assigned standard specification number if Ballot Item 14 is successful.	Negative
New York State Department of Transportation (Donald Streeter) (donald.streeter@dot.ny.gov)	Negative: - By removing this Annex and creating a separate test procedure, the test procedure is specific to stainless only. We feel the new test should compare all corrosion resistant, coated, uncoated, and other rebars to have a fair comparison of performance. If this test method can be used on coated it should not exclude coated.	Negative

<b>Item Number:</b>	<b>16</b>
Description:	SOM ballot to adopt Annex A2 of <b>MP 18M/MP 18-15</b> described as <b>T MP18a.2</b> Standard Method of Test for Comparative Qualitative Corrosion Characterization of Steel Bars Used for Concrete Reinforcement (Linear Polarization Resistance and Potentiodynamic Polarization Tests) as a full AASHTO Test standard. See pages 2-3, 9-25 and 45-52 of the minutes.
Decisions:	Affirmative: 39 of 51 Negative: 2 of 51 No Vote: 10 of 51

Agency (Individual Name)	Comments	Decision
Virginia Department of Transportation (William R Bailey) (bill.bailey@vdot.virginia.gov)	I support adoption of this standard as a full standard.	



<p>Florida Department of Transportation (Timothy J. Ruelke) (timothy.ruelke@dot.state.fl.us)</p>	<p>Section 1.21:: (editorial) Recommend adding at the end of the sentence for clarity of intent, "".....corrosion-resistant when both of the conditions below are met."</p> <p>Section 5.3.1: (technical) Recommend modifying the sentence as follows, "The specimen shall be covered with an <u>impermeable</u> two part epoxy coating in such a way...."" Same at the end of the sentence.</p>	<p>Affirmative</p>
<p>Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (Allen H Myers) (allen.myers@ky.gov)</p>	<p>If this is to become a standard method of test, the designation number needs to change. "<b>TMP18a.2</b>" does not follow the established convention. This should be designated as a "T" standard followed by an assigned number. This is the reason for the negative vote.</p> <p>Section 1 (and throughout the standard) - The "<b>MP 18</b>" reference would need to change to the newly assigned standard specification number if Ballot Item 14 is successful.</p>	<p>Negative</p>
<p>New York State Department of Transportation (Donald Streeter) (donald.streeter@dot.ny.gov)</p>	<p>Negative: - We need a test that compares all corrosion resistant options, coated, uncoated, and other. If this test method can be used on coated it should not exclude coated.</p>	<p>Negative</p>

<p><b>Item Number:</b></p>	<p><b>17</b></p>
<p>Description:</p>	<p>SOM ballot to adopt Annex A3 of <b>MP 18M/MP 18-15</b> described as <b>T MP18a.3</b> Standard Method of Test for Comparative Qualitative Corrosion Characterization of Uncoated Chromium-Alloyed Steel Bars Used for Concrete Reinforcement (Florida Tombstone Test) as a full AASHTO Test standard. See pages 2-3, 9-25 and 53-66 of the minutes.</p>
<p>Decisions:</p>	<p>Affirmative: 39 of 51 Negative: 2 of 51 No Vote: 10 of 51</p>

<p>Agency (Individual Name)</p>	<p>Comments</p>	<p>Decision</p>
<p>Virginia Department of Transportation (William R Bailey) (bill.bailey@vdot.virginia.gov)</p>	<p>I support adoption of this standard as a full standard.</p>	

Missouri Department of Transportation (David D Ahlvers) (david.ahlvers@modot.mo.gov)	Affirmative vote with an editorial comment:  1) Section 1.3, addressing hazardous materials needs to be in <i>italics</i> .	Affirmative
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (Allen H Myers) (allen.myers@ky.gov)	<p>If this is to become a standard method of test, the designation number needs to change. "<b>TMP18a.3</b>" does not follow the established convention. This should be designated as a "T" standard followed by an assigned number. This is the reason for the negative vote.</p> <p>Section 2 (and throughout the standard) - The "<b>MP 18</b>" reference would need to change to the newly assigned standard specification number if Ballot Item 14 is successful.</p> <p>No offense to Florida, but suggest removing the reference to the Florida Tombstone Test in the title and text. Suggest referencing the test in a footnote instead. The specimens can still be referred to as "tombstones."</p> <p>Section 7.1.1 " To be more specific, the required sand for the reference mix is Ottawa "graded" sand. This is going to be an expensive requirement for 1200 lb per mix. Would <b>ASTM C33</b> natural sand, free of deleterious substances, be adequate for the reference mix?</p> <p>Section 7.4 " Suggest a standard age be specified for curing and prior to the start of the test.</p> <p>Section 8 " Since the mix is selected by the user, report the mix used for testing.</p>	Negative
New York State Department of Transportation (Donald Streeter) (donald.streeter@dot.ny.gov)	Negative: - We need a test that compares all corrosion resistant options, coated, uncoated, and other. If this test method can be used on coated it should not exclude coated.	Negative

<b>Item Number:</b>	<b>18</b>
Description:	SOM ballot to adopt Annex B1 of <b>MP 18M/MP 18-15</b> described as <b>T MP18b.1</b> Standard Method of Test for Identification of Iron-Based Alloy Steel Bars for Concrete Reinforcement



Item 19 is a concurrent ballot item: TS ballot results were: Affirmative 15 of 19, Negative 0 of 19, and No Vote 4 of 19. Below is the listing of all comments:

<b>Item Number:</b>	<b>19</b>	
Description:	Concurrent ballot to adopt the proposed Macrocell Slab - Chloride Threshold Test designated <b>AASHTO T MP18a4</b> by task force 2015-01 as a full AASHTO Test Standard. See pages 2-3, 9-25 and 73-78 of the minutes.	
Decisions:	Affirmative: 39 of 51 Negative: 2 of 51 No Vote: 10 of 51	
<b>Agency (Individual Name)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (Timothy Ramirez) (tramirez@pa.gov)	Affirmative with comment: 1) Figure 1 is missing.	
Virginia Department of Transportation (William R Bailey) (bill.bailey@vdot.virginia.gov)	I support adoption of this standard as a full standard.	
Florida Department of Transportation (Timothy J. Ruelke) (timothy.ruelke@dot.state.fl.us)	Section 3.6:: (technical) Recommend modifying description of sealer as, ::A <u>low permeability</u> two part epoxy sealer shall be used....."  Figure 1:: (editorial) The caption is there but the figure is missing.	Affirmative
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (Robert D Horwhat) (rhorwhat@pa.gov)	Recommendation: Affirmative with comments: 1) Figure 1 missing.	Affirmative
South Carolina Department of Transportation (Merrill E Zwanka) (zwankame@scdot.org)	Section 2 - fix formatting to match AASHTO standards.  3.3 - Note 1 - "Owner" refers to who?  3.11 - Note 3 - delete "i.e."  4.7 - need to add ")" after minimizes edge.  4.10 - calls for attaching a 1-24 stainless steel bolt to one end of each bar. This involved tapping each rebar, but the picture does not show this detail very clearly. Also, section 3.11 should state that each bar shall be tapped to receive a 10-24 bolt.  Section 4.9.3 says that three 4 inch cylinder specimens	Affirmative

	<p>should be made for the various 28 day concrete quality tests. Shouldn't it be specified that the specimens should be 8 inches long?</p> <p>The heading "Note 7" contained in Section 5.1.4 needs to be bolder to match the format of the other notes contained in this test method.</p> <p>What about the results of the 28 day concrete quality tests?</p>	
<p>Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (Allen H Myers) (allen.myers@ky.gov)</p>	<p>If this is to become a standard method of test, the designation number needs to change. "<b>TMP18a.4</b>" does not follow the established convention. This should be designated as a "T" standard followed by an assigned number. This is the reason for the negative vote.</p> <p>Section 2 (and throughout the standard) - The "<b>MP 18</b>" reference would need to change to the newly assigned standard specification number if Ballot Item 14 is successful. There is no Figure 1 in the balloted item.</p> <p>Section 4.9.1 - To be more specific, the required sand for the reference mix is Ottawa "graded" sand. This is going to be an expensive requirement for 1200 lb per mix. Would <b>ASTM C33</b> natural sand, free of deleterious substances, be adequate for the reference mix?</p>	Negative
<p>New York State Department of Transportation (Donald Streeter) (donald.streeter@dot.ny.gov)</p>	<p>Negative: - We need a test that compares all corrosion resistant options, coated, uncoated, and other. If this test method can be used on coated it should not exclude coated.</p>	Negative

- **Bill Bailey Report:**
  - **#14 MP18** – Divided into a specification and 3 or 4 annexes (test methods for MP18) uncoated corrosion resistant steel. Separating all of these into separate standards.
  - Negatives from Kentucky were based on the designations assigned to them. Didn't follow normal numbering of standards until ballot passes. KY withdrew their negatives.
  - Other editorial comment change will be made. With withdraw of KY, it has passed ballot and can move forward.
  - New York had some questions in their comments. Bill answered them as follows:
    - - lumps stainless and "other chromium alloyed steels" together **Yes they were all lumped together**
    - why is pickling required for stainless by **MP18** but references ASTM for "other chromium alloy steels. **ASTM 1035** does not require pickling **ASTM referenced 1 steel different than the others,**
    - if pickling not required will presence of mill scale affect the XRF test? See section 5.1 of **TMP-18b1** **Yes it does**
  - **#15** – Specification placed for Stainless Steels. Wanted to have a way to determine a stainless vs a black vs a corrosion resistant steel.

- New York negative is that this should be able to run on all steels. It can be. Concerned with how the MFXX bar would react. New York ultimately withdrew the negative.
  - KY negative based on the numbering of the standard, withdrew. No objections to the method.
- **#16** – Test method designed as a QC test method for any type of steel which is corrosion resistant (had chromium in it...A1035 steel and stainless).
  - New York had negative based on the fact this should be able to run on all steels, and that it couldn't be run on epoxy coated rebar. New York ultimately withdrew the negative.
- **#17 Florida Tombstone Test** – Going to just call it the “Tombstone Test” to remove state name. New York debated whether (believe it can be run on coated steel and corrosion resistant steel) should exclude epoxy coated. This test is being put in to rank the steel. Some research has been done with epoxy coated bars, but it has not been formalized for that. Task Force recognizes it would be good to incorporate epoxy coated specimens, but there are issues to resolve before that can happen. This is a big part of MP18, and the states would be relying on this test to use in conjunction with that. . KY withdrew negative.
  - **New York (Mike)**: This test originally included coated bars. NY still uses a lot of coated bars, and it is very valuable for them to look at both. Maintaining it for coated and uncoated makes it much more valuable and flexible. New York is keeping their negative.
  - **Bill Bailey**: This test was standardized for uncoated, everything was spelled out with that in mind. Could make an adjustment to the standard through an appendix that allows for epoxy coating. Virginia does not want to delay this because it doesn't have epoxy coated. It would take a year or two to actually resolve this with a test method that everyone is happy with. It would do a disservice to states that aren't as reliant on epoxy steel. Correctly coated epoxy steel will pass this test easily. How long do you run it compared to Stainless? These are long term tests, 3 – 4 years and still haven't gotten to the corrosion part yet.
  - **Florida**: Have run these tests on epoxy coated rebar. If the test was to be used for epoxy rebar the test would have to be expanded. Holidays are one problem, mix design affects test. Uncoated bars are able to do a direct comparison. With epoxy bars, cannot tell how the corrosion starts as easily which makes it difficult to compare between different bars.
  - Merrill - can a compromise be found? Allow it now, but get a Task Force together to address the needs of New York and coated bars and get something into the standard in the future. New York feels this is reasonable. Other states in agreement
    - Create task force for this issue specifically – create a section on epoxy. (Also Item #19 comments below). Task Force 17-01
      - VA, NY definitely on it
      - Florida on it as well. Include epoxy industry and MMFX.
  - New York is going to withdraw the negative with condition of the Task Force.
- **#18** – No comments made
- **#19** – KY withdrew negative. This test can be run on all types of bars. New York negative based on the fact it should be for all bars, but the implication seemed to be uncoated. Can this be rolled into the Task Force from the previous Item? David Miller suggested that this should be part of the task force (he is familiar with the testing). The

two items are fairly similar in nature. New York amicable about it being placed into the Task Force and will withdraw their negative.

C. Research Proposals

- Don't currently have any.

1. 20-7 RPS

2. Full NCHRP RPS

D. Re:source/CCRL - Observations from Assessments

- Nothing

E. NCHRP Issues

- No comment

F. Correspondence, calls, meetings

- Looking at a revision to M31 (Illinois) per a proposal by MMFX. Brian and Chris Hahn from ILDOT are looking into things with this and will provide a report back to the group.
- Dave noted that A615 and A1035 have provisions for Grade 100, the utilization of higher strength steels will be looked at more and more over the next few years.

G. Proposed New Standards

- Just the ones previously discussed.

H. Proposed New Task Forces

- Task Force 17-01...will complete the scope after the meeting.

I. Update on status of standards (spreadsheet). Note: transferred **MP22**, Fiber-Reinforced Polymer Composite Materials for Highway and Bridge Structures, to the new TS 5b – Bridge and Pavement Preservation

- About 5 new ones coming in.
- Everyone should take a look at the list of standards, and see how those standards compare to ASTM. We want to get them all caught up this year.
- Some are blank... No steward...if you want to take it on, volunteers are welcome.

J. TS 4f name change underway: Changing from *Structural Components, Concrete Reinforcement, Castings, and Nonferrous Metals* to simply *Metals* pending SOM Executive Committee approval.

- Going to become just "Metals".
- Trying to drop the TS numbering, and just move to simple names.
- Send Merrill emails if you have any input on the name.

VI. Open Discussion

- Annual meeting is in August in Phoenix

VII. Adjourn

- Meeting Adjourned