

**Hot Mix Asphalt Specifications (Section 39) Sub Task Group Meeting Notes**  
**March 2, 2011 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.**  
**Sacramento, CA**

1. Tony Limas from Granite Construction welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked Teichert Aggregates for hosting the meeting and providing lunch. Self-introductions followed. Those in attendance included:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Subcommittee</b>
Kee Foo	Caltrans	Technical (Co-chair)
Nahid Hosseinzadeh	Caltrans	Technical
Steve Healow	FHWA	Time/Admin
Ebi Fini	Caltrans	Time / Admin
Lerose Lane	CSU Chico	Technical
Rita Leahy	APACA	Technical
Pat Terrell	Skanska	Time/Admin (Co-Chair)
Mike Cook	Graniterock	Technical
Tracy Zubek	DeSilva Gates	Technical (Co-chair)
Paul Curren	Pavement Engineering	Technical (Co-chair)
Skip Brown	Delta Construction / Asphalt Consulting Services	Time/Admin (Co-Chair)
Pete Spector	Caltrans	Time/Admin (Co-Chair)
John Schmidt	Teichert	Technical
Russell Snyder	CalAPA	Time / Admin
Tim Denlay	Knife River	Time / Admin
Tony Limas	Granite Construction	Technical
<b>ON THE PHONE</b>		
Don Vivant	Sully-Miller	Technical
Bob Humer	Asphalt Institute	Technical
Tim Saenz	Vulcan Materials	Technical
Pat Imhoff	CalPortland	Technical

2. Kee Foo gave an overview of the purpose of the meeting, which was to identify potential issues with the current version of Caltrans Section 39 HMA specifications, and see if the group can come to consensus on potential changes. He reported that no changes will be incorporated into the most current version of the specification, which is being re-written into “plan language” and is due to be published this spring. A link to the latest version of the draft document is here (Version 6):

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/2010/2010%20draft%20specs/39%20HOT%20MIX%20ASPHALT/>

Tony Limas distributed a list of issues that had been raised during a survey of industry and Caltrans about areas where Section 39 could be improved.

There was a discussion about how the group would proceed to resolve issues. It was noted that the group is operating under the Rock Products Committee Charter and issue-resolution process. Those documents can be found on the Caltrans website at the following link:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/Translab/rock\\_products/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/Translab/rock_products/index.htm)

It was determined that the best use of the group's time was to prioritize the list of comments, and to break up into two sub-committees that would examine each high-priority comment in detail, attempt to reach consensus on a solution, and report back to the group. Ultimately, the final recommendations of the group would be elevated to the HMATG of the Rock Products Committee.

The three-tiered priority system settled upon was:

**Priority 1:** An issue that need immediate attention because it results in claims, project delay and extra work for Caltrans and/or the contractor.

**Priority 2:** An important issue that needs clarification. The language creates confusion and may delay a project.

**Priority 3:** Should be eventually addressed for a better specification.

The group also agreed to identify items that may be already fixed, and also which items should actually be worked on by another Task Group. Those comments are noted on the table below.

The group then asked if there were other issues that should be added to the list. They are added to the bottom of the list below as Items 23-27.

The group then brainstormed the priority of each item. It is represented on the second column of the list below. The subcommittee that was assigned to each item is listed on the far right column.

Finally, the group formed two subcommittees to tackle different items. The "Time/Administration" Committee took on some items, while the Technical Committee took on other items. They are noted in the far right column of the attendance list.

#	Priority	Issue Description	Subcommittee
1	1	Change in oil supplier without a requirement for a new JMF. Recommend Caltrans allow the contractor to change oil suppliers	Technical

		without the need for a new JMF. Since the HMA produced and placed must meet the acceptance criteria, the contractor should be allowed to assume this risk.	
2	1	Recommend PG binder that exceeds the range specified by the contract is allowed without a change order or formal approval. As an example, if a PG 64 – 10 is specified, a PG 70 – 10 meets the 64-10 specifications.	Technical
3	1	Discuss the necessity of BOTH JMF verification and production start-up evaluation. Brainstorm more efficient method mix design approval.	Time / Admin
4	DONE	Language needs to be inserted in the specification to clarify the need for IA certification of certain AASHTO and ASTM tests.	To be taken up by IA (Nahid)
5	1	When limited Caltrans resources do not allow for the timely verification of mix designs as specified in the contract allow the Contractor to proceed with production and placement, assuming full risk for the quality of the HMA. Consider reducing mix verification turn-around time to 10 days and/or contracting out work to a private lab as a contract bid item.	Time / Admin
6	1	If Caltrans cannot provide QA tests results (cores etc.) within 48 hours contract out work to a private lab as a contract bid item.	Time / Admin
7	OTHER	Discuss progress of Caltrans Hamburg Wheel Rut Testing.	(Send to Moisture Sensitivity Group)
8	OTHER	Superpave Gyrotory Compactor – recommend Caltrans transition to the use of the Gyrotory compactor ASAP. Issues: Lack of replacement equipment and national research for RAP, RAS, WMA, new performance test, etc. The use of 4-inch molds would still allow the use of the Stabilometer until such time as gyrotory compactor has a new performance test standard (if that is the desire of Caltrans).	(Send to HMATG)
9	1	Discuss Contractor option for post-plant sampling for gradation as a means to meet the mix volumetrics specifications and eliminating the need for RAP testing at the plant.	Technical
10	OTHER	ARRA money – Caltrans contract time is 30 days. Is this reasonable since JMF review and verification can take 25 days?	(Was a CPB issued?)
11	1	Discuss mix design re-verification if production is stopped for 30 or more days. This seems overly restrictive and inefficient. Consider changing criteria to start up evaluation on ongoing basis.	Time / Admin
12	1	If binder content is selected at 5% air void content, adjust volumetric criteria accordingly.	Technical

13	2	Publish definitive guidelines (e.g., minimum tonnage) for method and standard specification use.	
14	2	The directive to stop production/placement and demonstrate compliance upon failure of 2 consecutive acceptance tests of any quality characteristic is better than the previous standard, but it still leaves a lot of questions. How a contractor "demonstrates compliance" leaves a lot of room for interpretation.	
15	2	IA certification for certain AASHTO (T304) and ASTM (D4791, C128) procedures	
16	2	Caltrans forms: CEM 3501, 3502, 3803, 3804, 3511. 3512, 3513 – pdf format problematic	
17	2	Statistical verification issues with revised QC/QA specifications	
18	OTHER	MPQP (CT 109) a) Completion within 8 hours reasonable? Adversely affects production. Industry willing to pay Caltrans staff overtime to remedy this problem? b) Certification should NOT be project specific c) Certify drum plants annually, NOT bi-annually d) HMA storage MORE than 18 hours e) Certification for NON-Caltrans projects? Is industry willing to pay?	(Send to Rock Products Committee co-chairs for guidance.)
19	2	Standard spec process – QC plan requirements are vague	
20	1	Discuss test method variability: a) CT 206 - Specific Gravity and Absorption of Coarse Aggregate b) CT 207 – Specific Gravity and Absorption of Fine Aggregate c) CT 308 - Bulk Specific Gravity and Weight Per Cubic Foot of Bituminous Mixture d) CTM 205 – Percentage of Crushed Particles	Technical
21	OTHER	Base binder requirement used to determine OG OBC (districts using specified binder in lieu of AR-4000/PG equivalent)	
22	1	Clarification of traffic on pavement language (Section 39-1.11).	Technical
23	1	Clarification in Section 39.1.11 and related charts about lift thickness and when to get density measurements (0.15 lifts)	Time / Admin
24		Fix footnote “B” in section 39.1.02e regarding aggregate quality table, it should read “10 percent or less” rather than “less than 10 percent” Chart in 39.202.b needs a similar footnote.	Time / Admin
25	1	Accept aggregate tests annually for HMA similar to how it is done for concrete, rather than requiring a different test for each job (3512)	Technical

26	1	Frequency of sampling in the standard process. Clarify if a lot is slightly over 750 tons it doesn't require an additional test.	Time / Admin
27	1	Method specification, Section 39.304, the table regarding surface and atmospheric temperature should be changed. It currently contains no minimum.	Time / Admin

The group broke into two subcommittees, the Time/Admin subcommittee and the Technical subcommittee. After brainstorming and discussing the Priority 1 items they came up with the following strategy:

The Technical Committee will distribute comments by March 16 to the smaller group, and by March 23 distribute to stakeholders. Responses will be received by April 7 and the group will meet April 13 to review them. By April 20 an initial specification will go out for review, and by May 3 the review and final recommendations will be ready. May 17 will be the date for final comments, with everything completed by May 31. The date for deployment was April 7 for item 1 and 2. See the attached PDF for a snapshot of the group's white board notes.

The Time Admin Committee co-chairs (Pat and Peter) agreed to review their items and propose recommendations, which would be shared within the subcommittee. They will then send out an invitation to industry and Caltrans to be part of the review by March 16. The next meeting of the subcommittee was scheduled for April 5 at 9 a.m. at Teichert QC Lab on Jackson Road in Sacramento.

### ACTION LIST

WHAT	WHO	BY WHEN
Let the IA group know we are handing off Item 4 to them	Nahid	March 18
Item 7 to be sent to Moisture Sensitivity Group	Tony Limas	March 18
Item 8 to be sent to HMATG, WMATG	Tony Limas	March 18
Caltrans Construction Policy Bulletin (CPB) on ARRA funds/ JMF approval to be distributed to this group (See Item 10)	Tim Saenz	March 18
Send comment No. 18 (regarding MPQP/CT109) to RPC Co-chairs for forwarding to another TG	Tony Limas	March 18
Get status of UC Davis research on OG OBC vs. AR4000-PG equivalent) & share with group	Kee Foo	March 18
Get meeting notes out to group	Russell Snyder	March 4
Rewrite Time/Admin comments and distribute to subcommittee	Pat Terrell & Peter Spector	March 11
Time/Admin subcommittee comments on rewritten comments	Time/Admin committee	By March 16

The meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.