

Joint Training and Certification Program
Advisory Council Meeting Minutes
4/23/2021

SUMMARY OF OPEN ACTION ITEMS:

New Action Items 4/23/2021 Meeting	Action Owner	Status
Send out next meeting invitation to AC	Richard	ASAP
Send out pre-read items in advance of meeting to improve effectiveness of the meeting (to include: Agenda, Session Comments and Feedback, Session Statistics, any additional info)	Richard	2-3 weeks prior to meeting
Attend/ Observe ACI Concrete Strength Testing Technician Certification for potential PCC module expansion	Richard	July 2021
Schedule meeting with Jeremy to discuss stats of CT 216, pre and post JTCP/ Combination of 125, 231, 216, 375	Richard	Technical Committee agenda item
Develop a CT 125 only module after the PMPC updates to CT 125 are complete	Richard	Technical Committee agenda item
Explore development of a one-day review course to be paired with recertification exam days (Recert Option 3: "Truncated Review Course")	Richard	Open – Development to begin later in 2021
Outreach to Kate Mergen and AGC involvement in JTCP AC	Charley	Closed – Richard to contact Chris Smith, AGC
Cost analysis and breakdown for JTCP program and Recertification	Richard/ Jeremy	Open
Make JTCP Advisory Council Charter ADA Compliant for web	Esther	Closed
Make JTCP Advisory Council Meeting Minutes ADA Compliant for web	Esther	Open
Engage the Technical Committee to discuss various changes/additions/ subtractions for program improvements.	Richard	Technical Committee agenda item
Richard to email out the list of Action Items for this meeting	Richard	Open
Send out DRAFT and then FINAL meeting minutes	Richard	Open

Previous Action Items Still Open	Action Owner	Status
Discuss the potential for a TC to review expansion to the ACI module (e.g. beam testing)	Tim/Charles S.	Closed – See items below
Look into statistics of CT 216, pre and post JTCP	Richard	Technical Committee agenda item
Schedule meeting with Jeremy to discuss stats of CT 216, pre and post JTCP/ Combination of 125, 231, 216, 375	Richard	Technical Committee agenda item
Attend/ Observe ACI Concrete Strength Testing Technician Certification for potential PCC module expansion	Richard	July 2021, may become a Technical Committee agenda item
Look into what the actual cost savings attending a Recertification Option 2 (opting out of training at 3-year mark)	Jinesh	Open
Schedule a tour of JTCP at the SJSU campus with Former Senator Jim Beall	Russell	Open
AC members to use their communication avenues to amplify the message of benefits of JTCP	All	Ongoing

AGENDA ITEM 1: Introductions – Review Agenda – Richard Hibbard

- **Discussion: Review Agenda**

- Richard provides a reminder as to why we are here and goes over the agenda topics. Here to provide continuous improvement and guidance to the JTCP. Each JTCP Advisory Council member goes through introductions. Richard Hibbard reads “JTCP Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Guidelines” to the committee, each member acknowledges individually by saying “aye”. Tim Greutert, Kate Mergen, Jim Auser and Jinesh Mehta were not present at the time of role call, however Jinesh and Jim arrived later in the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Review Previous Action Items – Richard Hibbard

Action Item List (Previous AC Meetings)	Action Owner	Status
Discuss the potential for a Technical Committee to review expansion to the ACI module (e.g. beam testing)	Tim/Charles S.	Closed – See items below
Provide outreach to Construction on status of 500 series CT’s	Richard	Closed
Schedule meeting with Jeremy to discuss stats of CT 216, pre and post JTCP/ Combination of 125, 231, 216, 375	Richard	Technical Committee agenda item
Attend/ Observe ACI Concrete Strength Testing Technician Certification for potential PCC module expansion	Richard	July 2021, possible Technical Committee agenda item
Look into what the actual cost savings attending a Recertification Option 2 (opting out of training at 3-year mark)	Jinesh	Open
Look into statistics of CT 216, pre and post JTCP	Richard	Technical Committee agenda item
Revise AC charter to reflect current membership	Richard	Closed
Develop options for CT 306 & CT 125 HMA certification of those currently HMA 1 certified	Richard	Closed
Schedule a tour of JTCP at the SJSU campus with Former Senator Jim Beall	Russell	Open
AC members to use their communication avenues to amplify the message of benefits of JTCP	All	Ongoing
Outreach to Kate Mergen and AGC involvement in JTCP AC	Charles	Closed
Develop Action plan for Recertification Option 2	Richard/ Shadi	Closed
Richard to email out the list of Action Items for this meeting	Richard	Closed
Send out DRAFT and then FINAL meeting minutes	Richard	Closed

Bin List	Action Owner	Status
Develop a formal recognition for AC participants	Richard	Bin List
Track additional comments related to the inclusion of CT 216 in the Soils and Aggregate module	Richard	Bin List

- **Discussion:** Richard reviews the action items from previous meetings as documented in the table above.
 - Richard discusses the potential for a Technical committee to review expansion to the ACI module (beam testing). Michelle has scheduled an opportunity to visit an ACI Concrete Strength Tester Certification session in Livermore for July and possibly in Southern California sometime in the summer. Charles would like to attend the visit as well; Michelle will check room capacity. Richard is removing this action item.
 - Richard closes providing outreach to Construction on status of 500 series CT’s action item. Jeremy asks

for clarification on what was done to close out this action item. Richard states that SIAD communication, DME meeting communication and an information sheet on detailing what the changes are. This was done earlier this year and sent to lab managers and boots on the ground testers.

- Look into statistics of CT 216, pre and post JTCP: Richard notes would like to take a closer look into different statistics and bring this up to the Technical committee to make recommendations.
- Richard asks Russell if the outreach to Kate Mergen and AGC involvement in JTCP AC action item has been completed. Russell states he was unable to reach Kate after few attempts. Charley will pick up this action item.
- Richard addresses Russell regarding action item: Schedule a tour of JTCP at the SJSU with Former Senator Jim Beall. He asks if this should be postponed until schools open. Russell agrees and notes that the senator has been termed out however would like to keep this action item open.
- Richard states the action item: Develop options for CT 306 & CT 125 HMA certification of those currently HMA 1 certified has been closed. He continues that currently they are allowing CT 306 and CT 125 outside of the program. The certs are set to expire at the same time as their regular HMA1 certification.
- For action item: Look into what the actual cost savings attending a Recertification Option 2 (opting out of training at 3-year mark), Jinesh was not available at the time to comment.
- Richard states the action item: Develop Action plan for Recertification Option 2 has been completed. The option is to opt out of classroom training to hold us through until the next contract.
- Richard states he will be moving "CT 125 only module after PMC updates" to action items list.
- Richard notes the Bin list item: Explore development of a one-day review course to be paired with recertification exam days (Recert Option 3: "Truncated Review Course") will be moved to the action item list.

Open Items(Bin List):

- Develop a formal recognition for Advisory Council participants (leaving on Bin list)
- Develop a CT only module after the PMPC updates to CT 125 are complete (moving to ACTION ITEM list)
- Track additional comments related to the inclusion of CT 216 in the Soils and Aggregate module (leaving on Bin list)
- Explore development of a one-day review course to be paired with recertification exam days (Recert Option 3: "Truncated Review Course") (moving to ACTION ITEM list)

Action Items:

- Outreach to Kate Mergen and AGC involvement in JTCP AC - Charley to provide contact
- Develop a CT only module after the PMPC updates to CT 125 are complete, discuss with Technical Committee - Richard
- Explore development of a one-day review course to be paired with recertification exam days (Recert Option 3: "Truncated Review Course") - Richard
- JTCP Advisory Council Charter to be ADA Compliant - Esther
- JTCP Advisory Council Meeting Minutes to be ADA Compliant - Esther

AGENDA ITEM 3: Charter and Membership Update/ Class Statistics and JTCP Dashboard – Richard Hibbard

- **Discussion: Richard discusses Charter and Membership Update**
 - Richard states there has been changes in the AC membership list, more specifically in the Caltrans leadership and was due for a refresh. The new sponsor leaders, Tom Ostrom and Ramon Hopkins should be afforded the opportunity to review the Charter and sign off on it. Additionally, the METS office structure has changed and updated to OMMIA, OQASI and OCL. Richard adds no other changes were made other than the membership and sponsor approval. The Charter and meeting minutes will need to be ADA compliant for the web. Richard assigns Esther action item to make the Charter and meeting minutes ADA compliant.

- **Discussion: Richard reviews the Class Statistics and JTCP Dashboard FY 20/21**

- Richard notes the session volume has been substantial possibly due to having classes at half capacity. The challenges doing double duty on lab side for instructors has been tough however the Instructor evaluations have been very good. There have been complaints from students attending San Jose State regarding the classroom and lab temperatures. The school has been vacant this last year. Communication has been sent to the school to address the temperature complaints, but the issue remains. Shadi adds that this issue will be resolved soon, possibly in the fall. Richard states that there will be an update and improve the HMA II book and presentation. The Technical committee will work on this. Richard wants to take a closer look at the statistics regarding recertifying testers who decided to retake a regular session and classroom training vs opting for the recertification session.

- Richard introduces the JTCP Dashboard which will give a better understanding on the statistics and areas that may need improvement. He plans to release this Dashboard monthly to the Advisory council and METS leaders. The Dashboard shows how many sessions in each individual module, the total number of sessions and students. Richard states he will add to this chart the number of students in regular sessions and number of students for recertifying sessions. There is a line chart showing the written test passing percentage, average written passing rate, average instructor evaluation score, monthly student volume, course evaluation score and facility evaluation. Richard discusses the Average Written Test Passing Rate Chart and shows that HMAII has 0 failures however for HMA I the recertification pass rate is down to 93%. The expectation is 98-99% bare minimum. Richard adds that this shows the training program forces the tester to study the course material thoroughly which will result in better test scores. The Dashboard also compares the average instructor evaluation scores. Russell asks what the pass rate percentage is. Richard responds that 96 is cutoff failure rate. Shadi adds this shows us how many people are passing and failing. Typically, the failures in general are the students that are either fairly new or overly confident and experienced.

Russell summarizes the takeaway that the extra time and expense devoted to additional classroom and review time seems to pay off with better comprehension and test scores. Richard adds that this Dashboard will also be helpful with scheduling and forecasting. Chu asks if the monthly student volume will increase after the vaccine and COVID cases decrease. Richard responds that it should be higher, they are getting a lot of new students. Shadi adds it is also dependent on job demand.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Program Updates– Richard Hibbard

1. COVID-19

2. Recertification

1. COVID-19 Updates

- Since reopening in July 2020

- Total Regular Classes:34
- Total Recert Sessions: 4
- Student Throughput: 433

- Since Recerts started in Feb 2021

- Regular Classes Delivered:13
- Recert Sessions delivered: 4
- Classes Open for Enrollment: 16
- Recerts Open for Enrollment: 7
- Avg Regular Classes per month: 5
- Avg Recerts Sessions per month: 3

- Richard discusses the program is barely getting by, having to do quite a few extensions and possible Provisionals. Russell asks when we will be able to increase class sizes. Shadi responds that things are slowly

opening on campus. There is news that the campus will open in the fall but everyone will need to be vaccinated in order to attend in person classes. In the fall, it will be more of a hybrid program with a mix of online and face to face classes, spring will fully be in person. Shadi adds he is unaware of the process on how the university will implement restrictions and requirements.

2. Recertification

- Richard states so far there has been 2 HMA I and 2 HMA II recert sessions that were delivered. It takes a lot of guess work to determine how many students will opt out of classwork, gauging the demand to open classes. Richard adds that one of the challenges he had was to clarify that CT 306 is included in the HMA I recert. There were also handbook delivery issues, if the enrolled student wants the handbook they will need to send an email request. This also leads to another issue, the handbooks were not arriving in time due to mailing through USPS. To resolve these issues, the handbooks will get sent out 12 days before class which is the last day to drop and will be guaranteed to arrive on time for students still enrolled in the class. Shadi states new terms were negotiated with the provider for 3-day shipping and a tracking number will be sent to each student. He adds that whatever issues that may arise from this, it will be resolved. Charley asks what the handbook is used for. Richard responds that the handbook contains practical exams, test methods, study questions, practical exercises, sample problems, and gives a review on the testing material to remind themselves what the expectations are. The handbook is not required. Charley addresses that there has been concern the recert class costs just as much as the regular class. In general costs are an issue and sending out this handbook sounds like a major cost. Richard responds not having an instructor and not having training days are small costs with regard to maintaining the program overall. There are facility costs, equipment maintenance, the administration and running the classes at half capacity. Shadi comments that to maintain this program is a lot of work, there is a lot of things that contribute to the cost. Most people are not aware that maintaining the website with database is a huge cost. Most participants for recert classes opt for the full class over the one-day recert option. The difference and savings in cost is giving flexibility to choose 1-day recert or full session including training recert days. Charley understands there are a lot of changing dynamics however from the producer's side that are paying for these classes, cost is an issue. On the surface it is hard to tell why recert classes are the same, if we can reduce or eliminate the handbook costs that would help. Richard states difference would be very minimal. Charley asks for a break down in recertification costs. Shadi explains that the resources used for this program is combined with the recertification and regular session it is a figurative number. It would be hard to determine due to being an overall program. Additionally, the enrollment projections for each class is unknown. If the class is not at full capacity cancelling the class will waste resources, these are just a few things that would make it very difficult to determine what the exact numbers are for the recertification classes. Charley states that it makes sense however would like to have a cost analysis broken down so everyone will be able to see and understand. Shadi responds that they took some risks in terms of whether the enrollment and projections follow through, however there are constant changes that are being dealt with so to break down the costs for recert vs no recert would be extremely difficult. Charley asks if there is a report given to Caltrans regarding the break down. Shadi responds that there is a lump sum given that will show facility access costs etc and the charge per student. Jeremy comments that the contract is broken down based on SIAD database, the expected number of people going through the program and number of classes expected, also shows the percentage breakdown between industry and Caltrans, and the fee structure for Caltrans is the same amount as the private industry. As Shadi mentioned, it is based on an overall program costs with an expected number of classes. The cost is divided by the number of students in each class. Charley understands, although would still like to see a financial statement so the people that are paying can understand where the money is going and where its being used. He requests a breakdown of the recertification costs and the overall program. Russell notes to remember there is the cost of the employee's salary and travel fees, with the recert option there is an opportunity for some cost savings.

Jinesh just joined meeting

Jeremy updates Jinesh regarding cost savings discussion. Jinesh states that they did a quick analysis and the costs are cut in half because they are saving from the cost of lost revenue, employee leaving work and travel fees. There is significant savings from our perspective. Jinesh will summarize and send out break down of the

separate fee structure. Due to the Covid situation, it is hard to determine costs can be cut, however when there are full capacity classes (24 students) again the issue can be revisited.

Richard discusses that the IA checks every roster of every class to see who has opted out of the test methods in regard to recertification and who is recertifying after 3 yrs but in a regular class. The data is showing that the majority of the recertifying students are opting for the full session class.

Action Items:

- Cost analysis and breakdown for JTCP program and Recertification- Richard/ Jeremy
- Cost saving breakdown for the recertification program- Jinesh

AGENDA ITEM 5: Technical Committee – Richard Hibbard

1. HMA I handbook revisions complete (CT 125 & CT 306)
2. HMA II handbook updates/ improvements
3. Review of potential module modifications or new modules

- **Discussion:**

1. **HMA I handbook revisions complete (CT 125 & CT 306): Richard Hibbard**

Richard states that Technical Committee took a look at the HMA I handbook. Their feedback was great and was able to integrate their comments into the handbook that is currently in circulation now.

2. **HMA II handbook updates/ improvements: Richard Hibbard**

Richard states the next order of business for the Technical Committee will be to review any updates and improvements for the HMA II handbook and whatever else that transpires from this meeting.

3. **Review of potential module modification or new modules: Richard Hibbard**

Richard asks the Council if they have comments on any modules structure changes, adding or removing Test Methods, review potential new modules. We have already discussed possibly adding ACI concrete strength tester from the PCC side. Maybe a module on pay factor test methods, sampling module, 216 should be looked at by the Technical Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Break

AGENDA ITEM 7: New CSULB contract (July 2022) – Richard Hibbard

1. **Recertification (2-day course – Day 1: Review Day 2: Exams)**

Day 1: Test method review, open lab, networking

Day 2: Written & practical exams

2. **Modifications/ Improvements to existing modules?**

-Add/ remove test methods?

-Changes to delivery?

-Other?

3. **New modules? – ACI Strength Tester, T 30/ T 308 post-burn gradation, Pay-Factor module, Field Tester (CT 216/231), other?**

-Expansion of PCC (ACI Strength Tester)

-Pay Factor module

-Other?

- **Discussion: Richard reviews the New Contract completion timeline- July 2022**

- Begin Revisions in by May/June 2021
- Begin development of recertification modules by mid-summer 2021 (1-day review course leading into the recert testing)
- Monitor Technical Committee review of various potential changes that we suggest here today
- Advisory Council Meeting Sept/ Oct to decide on final program structure depending on what comes out of the Technical Committee's decisions.
- Integrate Advisory Council's decisions into contract document towards the end of this year
- Finalize contract by April 2022

Charles addresses that the people in the industry are looking at things in the context of what's the optimal structure of everything and what's the most efficient way of doing things. This contract is offering an opportunity to look at that. This program is great, achieving goals however it's the first iteration of it. There is definite interest from a lot of industry members and the Technical Committee to have the Technical Committee form some recommendations. Some of the things they are looking at are whether they need both Soils & Agg and HMA I class, structuring the HMA I and HMA II classes differently, possibly removing some tests that may not be necessary but also some important ones that are missing and try to incorporate them. That's the context of what people are thinking and just wanted to make sure they knew that through the Technical Committee they will have the opportunity to make those recommendations.

Richard agrees and adds that a lot of those items have been acknowledged for a while, trying to get into national standards the challenge lies with competition between AASHTO and ASTM which is another discussion that is needed internally here. There are lots of challenges involved there but this won't be going into this new contract, it will take a while. Richard adds that he would like the Technical Committee to look at and determine whether having CT 105 is bringing value to anything. If CT 105 is removed, it affords the opportunity to focus on other day to day test methods, CT 202 and CT 216. Another thought: Does CT 216 belong in this lab environment? The bigger labs tend to have CT 216 in lab, and relay information to the CT 231 tech in the field, conversely the smaller labs have one tech doing CT 231 and CT 216 at the same time. Also, CT 231 is part of CT 216 Test method.

Jinesh comments that it's not just about big or small labs, there are specific expectations with specific districts. Some districts don't want two separate technicians. It's very directive as far as districts expectations based on their experience.

Richard adds that the complication goes beyond that, the sampling of the material is a 216 thing, if a tech is not certified but is sampling material for CT 216 how will that work? Richard continues that we can develop a CT 231/ CT 216 certification process outside of JTCP that assures the technician would understand CT 231 and CT 216 and how they work together. This is just another option and would not be a training session but a more robust written and practical exam administered by Caltrans IA. These are a few things to address with the Technical Committee since they are the boots on the ground, involved with the projects and familiar with what the problems are. They will be able to give some feedback on how this should be structured.

Charley likes that the Technical Committee will also look at the recertification and adds that there is a lot of sentiment in the industry out there that a review class is not needed. There is balance between JTCP and efficiency and determining where that lands.

Richard responds that he is willing to speak with them about it explaining the point of JTCP, where it came from, why there were job site disputes and why there was misunderstanding between industry and Caltrans folks and what it means to have them in the same group having discussions. There is a lot of value in this program.

Charley states that they understand the value of JTCP, this was something we all pushed for. It is more the cost issue and the time of their employees.

Jim agrees that coming up with a field and lab program for CT 216 / 231 would be beneficial. There's going to be some overlap of course, however if we can come up with a robust enough program, it would be advantageous.

Jeremy reminds everyone of their last discussion on how to handle all the recertifications during COVID, it was decided by the Advisory Council to have the 1-day review course. If it is decided to go a different direction or

the consideration that comes out from the Technical Committee is that the 1-day review course is something they don't want, the Advisory Council will ultimately make that decision. The Technical Committee will make recommendations and help us dial in what those modules will look like. There may be another interim Advisory Council meeting based off the Technical Committee's recommendations are because there is a tight turnaround time to finalize everything.

Shadi and Michelle agree with Jeremy, the timeline is tight.

Michelle adds reminder that when the vote was made by the council to decide the optional test only day for recertification, there was pressure to make something happen that didn't modify the existing contract. This was put that into place temporarily until the contract was finished and then address the 2-day proposal for recertification. Vote is still with the 2-day recertification.

Richard would like Michelle to be a guest speaker for the Technical Committee explain how ACI's test scores were negatively affected by not attending the review portion.

Michelle agrees and will pull some recent data. With the field tech program, ACI does not offer test only day. It's the full program, whether they show is their choice. ACI has found it does impact the passing rate. With the strength tester program, they are given an option of 2-day course or just the testing day with a slight cost reduction for the test only day. The passing rates aren't as high as the 2-day program.

Richard notes that the work that Caltrans does to maintain this program, manage the training materials and update the program as needed that are not reflected in the overall costs. The other thing is retesting these testers that fail exams. The amount of administrative work is significant and adds to the overhead costs for the failed testers to retake the exam.

Michelle agrees that it adds to the overhead costs to accommodate them, they are taking up seats from other people that would normally be paying full costs for the recert program.

Richard states he will speak to the Technical Committee that the recertification program will have a mandatory review class and at some point, will have more more data to support that. When the contract is redone, the recert session should end up costing less than the regular program. The intention is always working as efficiently as possible and going into this new contract, we will be taking a closer look to reduce costs.

Chu asks how often the contract is updated.

Richard responds it is a 3-year contract.

Shadi adds that we must have an overlap with the 2 contracts, so the program doesn't stop.

Richard opens up the floor to bring up any issues for the Technical Committee to look at? They can comment now or email at a later time.

Charley states he would like the cost breakdown for recert program but also would like cost break for the classes in general. The cost and efficiency are issues with the industry and if the Technical Committee is going to be reviewing these things it would be a good to have that as background to understand fully where the costs are and why they are there.

Jeremy notes that when the contract was developed, they put together scope of work and got an estimate on what it takes to deliver it. Agrees with Charley but may take a while to get there. Need to dial in what the actual scope of work is going to be and what the program delivery looks like. Richard has a good start bringing up discussion points that need to happen. With 125, 216 general modification to existing modules and any expansion to ACI, the cost will be looked at very closely because this will be a new cost that wasn't in our previous contract and will have to be accounted for.

Charley asks how the costs are allocated in the current contract.

Shadi responds that the recertification program/costs are not in the current contract.

Charley understands that it may not be in the current contract, however the recertification is being done so would still like an explanation of the costs.

Shadi responds that we had a lot of turbulence due to pandemic and unexpected circumstances. The class sizes moved from full capacity to 50%. There is a break down in the contract.

Charley would like that information be available, it would be helpful.

Russell asks if it is the Advisory Councils job to micromanage the JTCP budget or look at whether we are meeting the overall goals of the program and what policies should be in place? Russell feels that it should be the duty of

the Advisory Council to communicate those things but not necessarily get caught up where every dollar in the program is spent.

Michelle agrees with Russell and adds comments about the Technical Committee. They should be looking at the technical side such as documents, modules and study guide not the financial concerns and recommends keeping that out of the Technical Committee.

Charley adds that the cost concern is coming from companies that participate in the program and pay for it and it is a substantial number of participants.

Jackie asks if the Technical Committee recommends changes who makes the final decision.

Michelle answers the Advisory Council would make that decision; the Technical Committee would only make recommendations.

Charles asks about budget and the role of the Advisory Council when it comes to budget, wants to know if it is our role in monitoring that or if there is some sort of reporting we should be reviewing.

Shadi responds only budget we can discuss is his contact with Caltrans. The industry side there is no budget so to speak. We are paying by student, so the only budget he has is the one with Caltrans.

Charles asks if it is our position as the Advisory Council to look for ways to optimize spending.

Shadi responds that he is unsure if it is stated in the charter.

Richard comments that it is fair to say when we look at the recert options, the option we are on right now was decided on with the financial consideration of saving the industry travel fees, working days and less time.

Richard adds on to what Russell and Michelle stated, that the focus shouldn't be digging into how Shadi runs the program or the costs involved. It is looking for the efficiencies and making sure this program has value.

Jinesh adds that after presenting to the constituents the cost savings break down showing that the costs were cut in half for recertifications, that put everyone at ease in his perspective. They have an option to send full time or just for the test. Jinesh suggests using a platform to communicate with the company management the breakdown of cost savings and to understand where we are headed with this would be helpful.

Charley notes that there could be a communication gap. But the companies have a lot of questions and want more background on what the costs are and why.

Jeremy comments that he did comparison analysis with other DOTs, CA is more expensive compared to other states. It is our job to get the best value for what we are putting into this contract. We are committed on the Caltrans side to try to mitigate as many costs as possible and that's taking initiation of this project.

Russ comments that he has previously ran a training center for the construction industry and it is expensive to do it right and to have high quality. Looking at all our metrics, the program is achieving all the goals. People are learning, it is high quality, the feedback is excellent, and they are hitting the targets. The costs and benefits are being shared as our people are getting more professional and knowledgeable. This will translate to better projects and less disruption in the field. The goal is to deliver reasonable costs but not sacrificing quality.

Richard has some ideas to take to the Technical committee. One of the ideas is to have them look at the individual modules for HMA I and II, Soils and Agg and get some opinions on what belongs or doesn't belong. Feedback on the sampling module, CT 216, 231 field tester module, there's some thoughts to look at. Also, everyone's opinion on moving the ACI strength tester as a possible module within the PCC side. Richard would like to get some ideas from anyone and will discuss them with the Technical Committee. If there is a lot of information that comes back, we will schedule an interim meeting for the Advisory Council.

Richard opens up the floor before the Round Table.

Michelle states for her and Shadi's piece of mind, the sooner the Technical Committee makes their recommendations to the Advisory Council the better because it will need to be addressed in the contracts and the negotiations for her. Michelle has 2 other chapters to get on board.

Chu comments on the recertification regarding the 5-year interval instead of 3 years, that this can be potential savings. Most states recert every 5 years, asks if Richard has any thoughts on that.

Richard responds that we are trying to produce the best testers that we can but the biggest factor in having shorter cycle is METS is in quite the transition with our own Test Methods and CT's, making alterations to the CT's themselves and integrating the national standards, there is a lot of flux right now. A 3-year cycle was put

into place to address the constant change that is currently happening. An example is the AASHTO T30, where we are going to see a change. If this were a 5-year recert cycle, how would the testers be certified in these changes. Currently, there are too many changes to consider a long cycle. Everything is about improving this program and would like to get the Technical Committee up to speed.

Keith asks if Richard has the pay factor module. Richard responds that we do not have a pay factor module now, it was something that could be considered where you have a technician that is pay factor certified through JTCP specifically the test methods involved with pay factor.

Jeremy states that the concern is the people that are doing the Pay Factor tests have to go through both HMA I and II. The Technical Committee has a lot to discuss and review.

AGENDA ITEM 8: Roundtable / Review Action Items / Next Meeting – Richard Hibbard

- **Discussion:** Richard opens the conversation for roundtable and gives everyone the opportunity to add any comments.
 - Richard reviews the action items for the meeting.
 - Charley closes his action item. He was able to contact AGC and they would like to participate on the Advisory Council.
 - Russell comments that it would be nice if everyone input where they feel the program is going. On a scale from 1-10, 10 being the best and 1 being the lowest.
 - Keith thinks the program is coming along well, it has come a long way. It is a very well thought out, developed program. There is always room for improvement. Score: 8
 - Jim states there is room for improvement better but is better than expected. Score: 7-8
 - Jinesh comments that our primary focus should be good training and getting get good value out of those individuals. Score: 8
 - Jackie comments that she would love to see more alignment with national standards and see some efficiencies from it. Score: 8
 - Ken was not available for comment.
 - Michelle states coming from the industry, one of the problems she sees are the requirements for multiple certifications to do the same work, depending on what jurisdiction is overseeing the construction. This program has come a long way atleast for roadways and Caltrans work to unite that in a single place, seeing some cost savings in that. Also, the fact that the program is off the ground is great. Score: 8
 - Jeremy comments he is looking for improved module layout with contract revision. Score: 8
 - Charles states he is very impressed, gives 10's to the people running the program. The program has suffered due to unforeseen circumstances that was out of anyone's control. Overall impressed and looking forward seeing how this continues to roll out. Score: 8-9
 - Charley shares the same sentiment that it is amazing getting this program off the ground and achieving its objective. There are little crossroads and now that we have the program, we can see what needs to be improved or changed. Score: ----
 - Russ aligns his comment with Charles Stuart. As the program is maturing, we will continue to make tweaks. Impressed with the professionalism with Caltrans and Cal State Long beach to deliver the program especially during the pandemic. Well done. Score: 9
 - Chu states that there has been great achievements and continuous improvement in this program, always evolving and working together to make it better. Score: 8
 - Shadi adds that there is always room for improvement. There were some interruptions, but we showed a lot of resilience and overcame lots of obstacles. The idea of having a program like JTCP is priceless.
 - Jeremy comments that we are on the right path with the accountability and transparency aspect, sharing Test scores and reviews. We are always committed to continuous improvement within the program and we all benefit from the efficiencies. Jeremy applauds Shadi's efforts to keep this program running this past year. This group that comes together giving honest feedback is what we want, there are tough questions being asked that will be worked through. The Technical Committee is also a great addition to the whole system. I am happy

about the direction we are working in.

- Richard thanks everyone for their ideas and input in this committee. He states the importance of having the Advisory Council's guidance for this program in order to have the success that it has. Hoping in the future this program will continue to improve.
- Charley asks whether the handbook is necessary. Richard responds that it is up to the tester whether they would like a handbook. There may be testers where they lost the book or there has been improved updates on the handbook. Richard supports distributing the new handbook, stating there is not much of a cost saving if the handbook was not sent out.
- Jackie asks if there is a way we can make it available electronically.
- Richard states due to the AASHTO Test methods, there is a copyright issue to have it online.
- Jinesh suggests having an option while checking out where it separates the cost for the handbook and the class. The tester can decide whether they want to spend the extra money for the handbook or not.
- Shadi responds currently recertification is not on the contract and the full capacity classes were cut in half (24 to 12). There were a lot of costs associated with that. When we came up with recertification, the option to enroll in full class or recert class. Shadi states we can get down to the penny, however he will have to increase the cost for the regular classes because his capacity has been reduced by half. Shadi adds that this can be an option if its favorable for everyone.
- Charley states he would like to have it in writing that explains this. Shadi adds for the recertification, we were trying to make it work without making massive changes to his contract with Caltrans as we go. The pandemic changed the rules of operation.
- Michelle comments ACI went through the same thing, the costs shifted dramatically. We should give some leeway to Shadi to figure it out. Our charter for this council, it is our job to evaluate the efficiency and applicability of the program, but the final decision on anything that happens with this program remains with Caltrans. If Caltrans is satisfied with the costs of the contract that's all that matters.
- Charley responds that the industry is saying there is substantial costs for the handbook in the recertification program and is it necessary. Charley adds if it is not necessary, is there a way we can reduce costs. Charley doesn't mind who explains the break down but would still like to have an explanation in writing for the people in the industry because they are paying for the program.
- Jeremy states he will take a look and get something written up for him. The whole purpose of this council is to ensure good decisions are being made for this program. Jeremy will put together some justifications and documentation and get back with the group.
- Russell adds that's one of the beauties of everyone on the Advisory Council, it is our responsibility to report information back to their various constituency groups.
- Richard asks for any last comments, thanks everyone and will get the meeting minutes out as soon as possible.

Action Items:

- Send out next meeting invitation to AC- Richard
- Send out pre-read items in advance of meeting to improve effectiveness of the meeting (to include: Agenda, Session Comments and Feedback, Session Statistics, any additional info)- Richard
- Send out DRAFT and then FINAL meeting minutes- Richard
- Engage the Technical Committee to discuss various changes/additions/subtractions for program improvements. - Richard

Parking lot