

Professional Agreement Invoice and Progress Report

Idaho Transportation Department



This page must be filled out monthly by the Consultant and forwarded to the Agreement Administrator with the monthly invoice. If necessary, attach additional sheets for continuation.

Key Number	Project Number ITD RP 262	Project Name ITD - Concrete Performance	Date 2/6/2017
Agreement Administrator Jeff Marker		Progress Report Number KLK580-1	Agreement Number UI-17-02
Consultant			Report/Billing Period (From and To) 12/10/2016 -1/31/2017
Certification of Payment Submitted <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Certification Date	PSA Number	Invoice Number Invoice #1
Description of Work Accomplished During the Month The research team had the kickoff meeting through a conference call with ITD TAC members and the project manager on Tuesday, January 24 th , 2017. The minutes of the kickoff meeting are attached to this progress report. The research team with the TAC members agreed to take some action items toward the progress of the project.			
Summary of Work Completed to Date (Milestones Completed and Dates) Please see the attached Gantt Chart			
Information Required from ITD to Avoid Delays			
List Changes in Scope or Complexity Requiring a Supplemental Agreement or Time Adjustments			
Consultant's Signature		Printed Name and Title Ahmed Ibrahim, Principal Investigator	

Professional Agreement Invoice and Progress Report

Idaho Transportation Department

This page must be filled out by the Agreement Administrator.

Key Number	Program (Work Authority)	Progress Report Number 1	Agreement Number UI-17-02
Report Reviewed By			Review Date
The Following was Initiated			

Status Report

A completed status report must accompany all Agreement invoices recommended for payment. The requested percentage measurements of progress to this report are required.

Agreement Time 25 months	Time Passed 2 months	Percent of Agreement Time Elapsed 08.00%	Percent of Work Completed 1%
Original Agreement Amount \$150,000.00	Supplemental(s) \$0.00	Current Agreement Amount \$150,000.00	Payments (Including this Payment) \$6,205.20
Percent of Agreement Dollars Paid 04.14%			
Certification of Payment Submitted <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Certification Date	Fixed Fee	This Invoice \$
			To Date \$
			Negotiated \$
If There is a Significant Variance Between the Percentages, Please Explain			
Consultant Invoice Number Invoice #1		This Payment Amount \$6,205.20	

Progress Payment: I certify that the Agreement provisions have been reviewed, the invoice amount checked, progress is substantiated, significant material expenses have support documentation (receipts), and the costs billed are project related and represent the work accomplished. I hereby approve the progress estimate for payment.

Final Payment: I certify that all work under the terms of the Agreement has been satisfactorily completed, any capital assets acquired have been delivered or value received, an affidavit of indebtedness received, and the project reviewed or audited and costs verified for work performed. I hereby approve final payment under the Agreement.

Agreement Administrator's Signature	Date	Second (Independent) Reviewer's Signature
-------------------------------------	------	---

Concrete Performance in Aggressive Salt and Deicing Environments (RP 262)

Kick-off meeting minutes

Day: 1/24/2017

Time: 1:30 pm Mountain Time zone

Attendees:

Clint Hoops, Clint.Hoops@itd.idaho.gov
Jeff Drager, Jeff.Drager@itd.idaho.gov
Ron Wright, Ron.Wright@itd.idaho.gov
Kyle Holman, kyle.holman@dot.gov
Herbert McDowell, Herbert.McDowell@itd.idaho.gov
Greydon Wright, Greydon.Wright@itd.idaho.gov
Ned Parrish, Ned.Parrish@itd.idaho.gov
Anthony Beauchamp, Anthony.Beauchamp@itd.idaho.gov
Ahmed Ibrahim, aibrahim@uidaho.edu
Fouad Bayomy, bayomy@uidaho.edu
Somayah Nassiri, snassiri@wsu.edu
Ahmed Muftah (Postdoctoral Fellow), muft3556@vandals.uidaho.edu
Olaniyi arowojolu (Graduate student), olaniyarowojolu@gmail.com

Meeting was called to order at 1:30 pm.

All: attendees introduced themselves. Ahmed Ibrahim started the call talking about the following main points the will help to achieve the first two tasks of the project:

1. Types and locations of structures shown deterioration: bridge decks, barriers, concrete rails and pavements, and Year of construction and intended life-span

Ahmed Ibrahim: Project's goal is to improve and enhance concrete material performance under deicing salts. He went over the project tasks where the first two tasks were the main focus of the call. The first task that we are going to develop is an intensive literature review with the request of various parameters to be used in the survey of practice.

Ned Parrish: He provided some information about the "project wise" folder that will be accessed by the project manager and the TAC members to be used for the project task order, meeting minutes, project progress report..etc.

Jeff Drager: reported that the major deterioration was found in concrete rails.

Herbert McDowell: mentioned that concrete cracks and deterioration are also observed in bridge decks, especially in districts 1 and 2.

Ned Parrish: asked the TAC members if they could provide a list of the locations and names of all defected bridges, and bridge rails.

Clint Hoops: suggested that contacting district material engineers for more information about the potential bridge list. He also reported that most of the concrete mixes provided were from concrete mixes for bridges but they will look for more.

2. Sign of distress on the structures before and after different weather conditions- (winter, spring, summer, Fall).

Ibrahim: asked about the various signs of distress and if ITD engineers have pictures

Jeff Drager: will provide some test results and pictures.

3. Methods used for inspection (visual, core samples....etc) that ITD engineers follow to determine sign of distress

Clint Hoops: mentioned that they use only visual inspection and in some cases they use core samples for lab testing.

Fouad Bayomy: inquired about the type of data stored in the bridge management system database. Herbert reported that it is mostly visual, and it includes rating such as good, fair or poor. However, the rating does not explain the type of defects that led to that rating. It was suggested that Ahmed and Fouad look at the type of data stored in the bridge management system database to determine whether the database can be used in evaluating defects that relate to concrete deterioration. Further, research team would visit sites where the concrete defects exist. Possibly start with sites in D1.

Ibrahim: mentioned that we will need samples of deicers currently used in the state of Idaho and that will be needed to expose the proposed concrete sample to it.

Ron Wright: provided some information about the salt being used such as the rock salts..etc. and he mentioned that we need to contact district maintenance engineers to find out the type of salts that are frequently used.

Ned Parrish: mentioned that ITD did not track what type of salts that districts used. Only in the past two years, they started to track what is applied on Idaho roads.

Ron Wright: suggested to check with the salt institute the latest types that are being used. He provided a technical report to the research team that have been done in South Dakota State. He suggested to check whether the applied salts meet specs, and made a reference to check the CTC associate research salt synthesis report.

Jeff Drager: sent two reports to the research team that have informative data to be used as guide in the current project.

Action Items:

Ned Parrish will check on the accessibility of research team to the Projectwise link

Ahmed Ibrahim to provide the meeting minutes within a week

Herbert will provide a bridge list that have concrete problems

Clint will provide information about the concrete mixtures being used in the defected areas of bridges and railing barriers.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:25 pm.

Concrete Performance in Aggressive Salt Environments

Task No.	Task	Year	2016 /2017												2018												
		Month	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		Elapsed Month	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Task 1	Literature Survey and Survey of Practice		0%	0%	0%	0%																					
Task 2	Task 2- Field program					0%	0%	0%																			
Task 3	Laboratory Experimental Design and Testing																										
a	Experimental plan design and material procurement						0%	0%																			
b	Mixing and preparing Samples							0%	0%	0%																	
c	Testing of specimens								0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%													
Task 4	Testing of alternative mixes and Development of Recommendation																										
a	Recommendations with new concrete mixtures design												0%	0%													
b	Testing of specimens and preparation of final results														0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%							
Task 5	Final Report																				0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		
Task 6	Final Report																										
a	Submit report outline to ITD for review																				0%						
b	Meet with ITD to discuss outline																					0%					
c	Send draft to peer reviewer and make necessary changes																						0%				
d	Send draft to editor and make necessary changes																							0%			
e	Submit draft of required output to ITD/FHWA for review																							0%			
f	ITD/FHWA review of the draft completed (due 30 days after completion)																								0%		
g	Final output due to ITD (due 30 days after submission of review draft)																								0%	0%	
Deliverables				1			2, 3			4				5	6						7			8	9		