

**PMPC Asphalt Task Group (TG+STG Chairs/Leads) Meeting Minutes**

**Date: May 5, 2021**

**Time: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM**

**Location: Webex/Conference Call**

---

Facilitator: Tom Pyle

Attendees: Todd Vargason (for Scott Dmytrow), Marco Estrada, Kee Foo, Pat Imhoff, Allen King, Steve Lee, Tony Limas, Douglas Mason, Dennis McElroy, Jacquelyn Wong (for Jeremy Peterson-Self), Tom Pyle, Phil Reader, Ken Solak, Chu Wei, Kelly Lorah

Not in Attendance:

---

1. Introductions/Review Agenda
2. Review Past Action Items (see action items at the bottom of the minutes)
3. Introductory Urgent Issues
  - Section 39 Quality Characteristics (Scoping Document vs. Decision Document) – Phil
    - a. Phil – We're going to develop a SPF for Section 39. Industry is supporting the idea to use a decision document.
    - b. Tom – I would like to see more about it. We want to evaluate lessons learned of using SPF.
    - c. Tony – Pay equations for binder content are not new to us. It shouldn't be too different. Kee and I will discuss offline.
    - d. Kee – We are going to do a decision document for this issue?
    - e. Tony – We will look at it and see what we can do to see if it fits as a decision document. We will propose our ideas to Tom after we discuss.
    - f. Jackie – As long as it's not too involved, a decision document can be used.
    - g. Tony – Yes, if it's easy and doesn't require too much discussion, we will consider a decision document.
    - h. Ken – I like how Tony summed up the requirements for a decision document.
    - i. Tony – We do reach out to our stakeholders to confirm that we are not missing anything that would cause complications.
    - j. Allen – Will the STGs be involved in drafting the decision document guidelines?
    - k. Phil – Yes, the leads of the STGs should get together to write it and send it to the ATG for review.
      - o Decision Document (uses, efficiencies, effectiveness, definition) Phil

- a. Phil – Industry supports the decision document due to the efficiency they bring. We need to define what they can or cannot be used for. We will probably need a SOP revision to outline the process of decision documents.
- b. All – Support
- c. Phil – At the next 3+4, we could have this as an agenda item to discuss.
- d. Ken – Do we need this in the SOP or just somewhere?
- e. Doug – They're not mentioned in the SOP, so I'm not sure where it would go.
- f. Ken – Let's add this to the next 3+4 agenda.
- 3-Year JMF Discussion – Phil
  - a. Phil – Industry is supporting 3-Year JMF extension that Caltrans is internally discussing.
  - b. Tom – Yesterday, we had a meeting. There is still trepidation in some groups. Let's move the 2-year plan forward and set up a process to start considering the 3-year plan. We need more data to support the 2-year, let alone 3-year. A WG needs to be created to compile and analyze the data.
  - c. Phil – Should Kee add this to the bin list?
  - d. Tom – Yes.
  - e. Tony – Could we please get information on concerns so that we can help address them?
  - f. Jackie – The RAP Pile content may be an issue.
  - g. Phil – If Tom can get a list of concerns and get them to us, we can look into it further.
- 2-Year JMF Discussion
  - a. Ken – There may be an issue with 2-Year JMF application on contracts.
  - b. Tom – We need to get the CPD published.
  - c. Ken – We have about 4 months while this may be an issue. We'll discuss this at the 3+4. The CPD and change order is out. We need a memo to go out to the District Directors to get this applied to contracts.
  - d. Chu – Do we need FHWA concurrence?
  - e. Ken – We'll send it to you guys for your concurrence. Brandon called me concerned about the how the cost would be determined. We need to discuss the cost.
  - f. Tony – We did a survey to determine what the cost would be. It would be 1-2 hot drops.

- g. Ken – If job A needs to do a new JMF and they get a year approval, would that JMF get rolled into a 2-year JMF if the contract gets extended. We're going to discuss with the coordinator.
  - h. Tony – Some people are renewing the mix designs without changing the mix.
  - i. Ken – The contractor could not get a new JMF, they can extend the JMF with a renewal.
  - j. Phil – We may need to assess the renewal cost for a contractor.
4. Section 39 High RAP
- a. Tom – We have not had the opportunity to talk about the funding that is currently available. Caltrans has \$8 million to help fund pilot projects. Section 39 High RAP is struggling to get pilot projects. Contractors is not participating as much as we would like. This is on hold until we get pilot projects. We have one hopefully coming through in D7, but it's not nailed down.
  - b. Kee – Funding may help us find pilot projects. We are still looking for someone to try a pilot project for high RAP. Any help you can provide would be much appreciated.
  - c. Tony – I'm sharing the information with industry members and the feedback is that there's concern going into an existing contract. It's difficult to nail down the cost on a high RAP projects. Also, a supplier would not be enthusiastic to pitch pilot projects to the RE and the customers. High RAP and high RAS projects are just not being taken on.
  - d. Tom – If you could find projects where this could be done, we'd like to support you. If the pavement fails, the replacement would be funded by Maintenance.
  - e. Jackie – For the pilot projects, was there a QAQC element?
  - f. Allen – They only need to hit those values during the test phase.
  - g. Chu – Are the \$8 million dollars for maintenance or can you do preservation projects?
  - h. Tom – Yes. It looks like we won't be able to spend the full amount this year.
5. Evaluate new HMA Pavement Smoothness
- a. Ken – The CPD and change order have been drafted. They're in Legal for review. We should be able to proceed with the CPD soon. Pete is fielding questions from contractors.
  - b. Allen – The WG is meeting up frequently. We'll be going through the comments and writing the interim report by the end of May. We're on target with our milestones and will have more information by tomorrow after the meeting.
6. RAS up to 3% - See Section 39 High RAP

- a. Phil – The project just went out to bid, but George Reed got it.
  - b. Tom – If we could get another project, we would be happy, but we're excited for what we have!
7. Section 37 Update
- a. Steve – Received redlines from OE 04/29. Trying to finalize changes for the October 2021 RSS.
8. Post Plant Gradation
- a. Kee – We have the nSSP done and approved by the spec owner and we're soliciting pilot projects.
  - b. Ken – Raghu was in charge of soliciting projects and we are trying to get D3 on board.
  - c. Pat – How many pilot projects are we looking for?
  - d. Kee – We're looking for as many as possible.
  - e. Jackie – How are you reaching out?
  - f. Kee – We're going to the construction manager. On the Pavement side, they are looking through the projects and finding candidates among that list.
9. CCPR Update
- a. Marco – We just got approval and we're forming the WG.
  - b. Allen – The group hasn't met up yet, but they will be getting together soon to get started.
  - c. Dennis – We're going to get started and start moving quick to meet the June milestone deadlines.
  - d. Doug – I warned the EC about the potential for extension request due to the early start of the milestone dates.
10. RAP in RHMA-G
- a. Kee – We got our second plant produced materials and they are testing it now. We are still looking for a 3<sup>rd</sup> set of plant produced mix. The second mix may have issues. We still want to do pilot projects and we're still looking for potential projects. If anyone is interested, please let us know.
  - b. Tony – I have contacted industry to inform them of pilot projects.
11. Review bin lists
- a. Tom – Due to lack of pilot projects, our items are not moving fast. Does anyone have comments about whether to review the bin lists?
  - b. Phil – As long as there's no major changes, we don't need to review.
  - c. Ken – We can review them when they're attached to the agenda.
  - d. Jackie – Does the EC have issues with the formatting?
  - e. Doug – No. They said it makes sense.
  - f. Tom – We may take a revised look at the bin lists as needed, but a more in-depth look on an annual basis in December.

- g. Allen presented the Recycling STG's recently updated and reprioritized bin list to the ATG and received concurrence.

## 12. Roundtable / Review Action Items / Next Meeting

- a. Jackie – Jeremy wanted everyone to know that there are some improvements on the METS side. Patrick is looking on how to leverage the aggregate prequal program to help with HMA. Also, binder and RAP testing in regular intervals.
- b. Doug – Anything you would like to add to the EC meeting? Any scoping documents/final reports/milestone extensions?
  - a. Kee – 10% RAP has a milestone extension going through approval.

## 13. Feedback

---

### Action Items from 05/05/21:

1. Get a list of concerns with 3-Year JMF and give to Phil/Tony – Tom
2. Kee and Tom to discuss a memo to go out for the CPD on 2-Year JMF – Tom/Kee
3. Evaluate the risks of having projects go out to advertising without the 2-Year JMF nSSP – Ken
4. Send the CPD to Tony and industry will draft language to cover renewals and the cost of renewals and return to the ATG – Phil/Pat
5. Follow up meeting on adhoc ATG + Tony for 2-year JMF discussion on 05/21 at 1pm (1hr) – Kelly
6. Add Asphalt Rubber Blending MPQP Discussion to next agenda – Kelly – 06/02/21

### Action Items from 04/07/21:

1. Recover conflict escalation request form from Cortney and have industry review and submit for approval – Phil/Scott/Dennis/Pat/Kelly – 06/02/21 (Next ATG 3+4 Meeting)
2. Obtain approval on the Tack Coat and 2-Year JMF decision documents from the ATG and send to the EC for approval; also add signature blocks to decision documents/dates updated/formatting/proofing; get from Kee Foo; get copy of signatures from Cortney – Kelly – **Complete**
3. Research if a CPD can be executed before an RSS is posted – Ken – **Complete**
4. Review vacuum seal and core dry document – Jeremy – 06/02/21 (Next ATG 3+4 Meeting)
5. Internally evaluate the impacts of pulling the IC nSSP and report the findings to the ATG; also pull a report of data from the IC database to give to industry – Ken

- a. Information to be routed through Kelly
6. Confirm that the Smoothness STG has completed milestone 3 - Ken – **Complete**
7. Move PDR item down to complete in the monthly sheet - Kelly – **Complete**
8. Follow up on milestone 3 on Post Plant Gradation – Jeremy – **Complete**
9. Send Maged a request for a milestone extension – Kelly – **Complete**
10. Determine who was collecting data from the QCQA projects – Pat – 06/02/21 (Next ATG 3+4 Meeting)
11. Update the monthly update sheet and send to Doug – Kelly – **Complete**
12. Get milestone 2 update for RAP in RHMA-G – Jeremy – **Complete**
13. Add the Write nSSPs and Pilot CCPR on Caltrans Projects to the monthly update list – Kelly – **Complete**
14. Recycling STG to add phase 2 CCPR to bin list for EC – Doug/Allen – **Complete**

Action Items from 03/03/21:

1. Finalize the decision document including an implementation plan for 2-year JMF, create a CPD, pending October RSS – Phil/Ken/Kee/Tony/Pat – **Complete**

Action Items from 02/03/21:

1. Clarify/evaluate Section 39 and create short scoping documents for Section 39 Quality Characteristics and UCPRC Report on OGFC Mix Design – Kee/Tony – **In progress**

Action Items from 10/02/19:

1. Review and provide feedback on conflict escalation form – All ATG – **HOLD**