

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

Date: August 4, 2021

Time: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Location: Webex

Facilitator: Tom Pyle

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

Not in Attendance: Marco Estrada, Doug Mason, Tom Pyle

1. Introductions/Review Agenda
2. Review Past Action Items (see action items at the bottom of the minutes)
3. Introductory Urgent/Emerging Issues
 - Update on pilot projects from IPR ATG rep, Dennis McElroy (Tom)
 - a. Dennis – Graniterock just completed a project in D3 (Route 162), 18 lane miles in length, using Partial Depth Recycling- foamed asphalt at 0.25' depth. All indirect tensile strength tests passed.
 - i. Smoothness: The existing MRI was in the mid 130's, the PDR mat improved the low 90's, and after corrective grinding approx. 50 locations (targeting all ALR locations greater than 240) corrected the PDR surface to the mid-80's.
 - ii. This project has a thick rubberized chip seal layer (roughly 1" thick) over the entire surface area and had new crackfiller installed earlier in 2021. These two features make this project unique and have shown that its possible to incorporate a rubberized layer into a PDR mixture, successfully. We will need to evaluate the results.
 - iii. The pilot (CCO) focused on increasing the fines content of the PDR mixture through importing supplemental fines and integrating that material into the PDR mixture. Preliminary results are showing an increase in PSI level upwards of 20PSI compared to the standard mix results. Industry and CT need to be aware of cost impacts of the fines import and need to weigh the cost to benefit ratio on a job by job basis. Further evaluation needed, but all in all a successful PDR project.
 - b. Dennis – A PDR project in D8 is expected to start August 23rd, 2021, JITT is scheduled for Friday, August 13th. This project will focus on

- comparing gradations between multi-unit and single-unit recycling trains. Gradation upper limits of ¾", 1" and 1.25" will be monitored.
- c. Dennis – A D5 PDR project is expected to start August 23rd, 2021. JITT is scheduled for Thursday, August 12th This project will focus on comparing a multi-unit and single-unit recycler on the same project with switching binders between foamed asphalt and emulsions.
 - d. Allen – We have another potential pilot in D11 for next year.
 - e. Jackie – Will this be on the pilot project tracker sheet?
 - f. Allen – We need to clarify what should be on the pilot project tracker.
 - g. Ken – The pilot project tracker is meant for projects from the PMPC work products.
 - h. Jeremy – We should discuss at the CT Only on how we're going to use that information in the future.
- Goodbye to Jeremy (Tom)
 - 24-Month JMF CPD (Ken)
 - a. Ken – We got comments from the districts that some of the contractors are not using the CPD as intended. Was this not anticipated? Is this an issue?
 - b. Phil – How is industry not using the CPD as intended?
 - c. Jackie – We've gotten 1 renewal in the past 2 years. We've gotten 3 in the past 2 weeks.
 - d. Phil – The renewal fee should still be intact. If the JMF has been verified, then the fee should stand.
 - e. Jackie – If we're getting renewals in odd windows, we will inquire that if it's a part of the project, to go through that process. If not, we will continue the renewal process.
 - f. Ken – We're going to wait and see how this develops.
 - g. Phil – I agree.
 - h. Jackie – Renewals are in a weird spot until October.
 - i. Tony – If it's a renewal, industry should be paying the credit.
 - j. Phil – I thought the DD covered the JMF renewal. The CPD doesn't cover the renewal.
 - k. Ken – We're worried about contractors trying to renew before the contract to avoid the credit.
 - l. Kee – The memo went out to the districts. It includes the allowance of the language to be added to the projects.
 - m. Phil/Ken – We are going to see how this goes.
 - n. Tony – To create a new one, you have to create a new mix design. I think this was a non-issue and it's going to go away quickly.
 - o. Jeremy – We're following to see what project its tied to, right?

- p. Jackie – Yes.
- Update from Division of Transportation Planning on incorporating pavement recycling strategies into the Project Initiation Report (PIR) (Marco)
 - a. Dennis – The IPR group made recommended changes to the guidance document and the Division of Transportation Planning didn't incorporate those changes and the links are broken. We need help to get the changes we suggested made as soon as possible.
 - b. Allen – We were contacted by DOTP and asked us for input on how to put recycling options in their guidance. We gave feedback and they incorporated very little and it needs improvement. We want to see if we can push it further.
 - c. Dennis – Can we have a meeting with DOTP?
 - d. Allen – Since it's an unfamiliar/different division, we should elevate this. We've been reaching out for a long time and need to elevate.
 - e. Dennis- In-Place Recycled materials need to be incorporated into the PIR Guidance document and we need help from the executive level to get traction with this as soon as possible.
- District resources to conduct pavement investigations prior to submitting nSSP requests to Office of Asphalt Pavement (Marco)
 - a. Dennis – This is an ongoing issue.
 - b. Allen – We did our training and updated the IPR guidance, we increased our recycling. There are districts that are not accustomed to recycling and they don't have the equipment to do an onsite investigation. They're reaching out for help. We need to set up meetings to utilize the Field & Forensic Services team in METS so that we can investigate prior to construction. We are going to coordinate and find out how to get this going.
 - c. Dennis – This is an opportunity to discuss setting aside funding so that when its relevant, the design teams can perform a more detailed site investigation to determine the best pavement maintenance or rehabilitation option for a particular roadway section.
- CT 306 Ad Hoc Group (Jeremy)
 - a. Jeremy – We did identify the CT participants on the adhoc group. Did we get our industry participants?
 - b. Pat – Yes.
 - c. Jeremy – When you send us the names, we can get them together.
 - d. Tony – Some of the issues may or may not be CT 306 issues. The process may need improvement, based on 1 comment. Other comments may not be along those lines.

- e. Jeremy – That's what the CT 306 adhoc group will discuss and resolve.
- 4. Section 39 High RAP
 - a. Kee – There is not much progress. We're still trying to get pilot projects. We're searching through the SHOPP projects to try to get them through the SHOPP. We're uncertain about funding, but we need to find pilot projects first.
 - b. Jeremy – There may be a central region contractor that is interested in pilot projects. The pilot project tracker may help with items like this.
- 5. Evaluate new HMA Pavement Smoothness
 - a. Allen – This working group is closed out.
 - b. Ken – We had concern about losing track of it. Did the person who wanted to keep it still want to keep it?
 - c. Jeremy – Any final asks on this?
 - d. Allen – The final report was submitted.
 - e. Jeremy – I think that's when the EC asked if industry saw it.
 - f. Tony – There were no comments back from industry though it went out to a lot of people.
- 6. RAS up to 3%
 - a. Phil – Mix designs are in progress.
 - b. Lessons learned on pilots is to increase the amount of material for pilot to allow contractor opportunity to tweak mixes.
- 7. Section 37 Update
 - a. Steve – We're still addressing comments from OCCS and resubmit.
 - b. Scott – When are we going to be done with those?
 - c. Steve – There are 20 pages of comments.
 - d. Scott – Can the TG or WG help?
 - e. Steve – I will consider.
- 8. Post Plant Gradation
 - a. Tony – 2 projects have CCOs finalized. There is a little bit of concern with one of the CCOs.
- 9. CCPR Update
 - a. Dennis – The working group is making good progress on this and is on track to meet the milestones set for the end of September. First round of documents to be sent out end of September.
- 10. RAP in RHMA-G
 - a. Kee – We had a meeting yesterday. The group is going to move ahead with the mixes that meet the specs. We're continuing to work with contractors that do not meet the specs.
 - b. Phil – We may want to seek out different producers that have their own plants that could meet the specs.

11. Full Depth Recycling – Cement

- New scoping document
 - a. Allen – We received a couple of comments and hopefully will resubmit next week.

12. EC Updates for ATG

- EC's determination on whether acknowledgement or approval would be necessary for Decision Documents
 - a. Doug didn't attend; no updates.

13. Review bin lists

- a. Phil – I didn't see PGAR on the agenda. Industry is interested on this.
 - Kee – Tom mentioned that all work group members are present or at least invited to the bin list reprioritization meetings.
- b. ACTION ITEM: Kee and Tony to prioritize Asphalt bin list

14. Roundtable / Review Action Items / Next Meeting

- a. Chu Wei – This is a beneficial resource for the all:
 - <https://infopave.fhwa.dot.gov/infotechnology/pavement/>

15. Feedback

- Scott – We need to either shorten the urgent issues or have additional meetings.
-

Action Items from TG+STG Chairs & Leads on 08/04/21:

1. Add agenda item to the CT Only meeting to discuss the pilot project tracker and what it includes – Kelly – 08/05/21 for 08/11/21 meeting
2. Add agenda item to the EC meeting for an update from Tom on the Division of Transportation Planning pavement recycling strategies incorporation into the Project Initiation Report – Doug/Kelly/Tom – 08/05/21
3. Kick off the CT 306 adhoc group – Jackie
4. Remove Smoothness from future ATG agendas - Kelly

Action Items from TG 3+4 on 07/06/21:

1. Assemble a group to go over the comments regarding CT 125 & 306; CT to propose 3-4 members, industry to propose 3-4 members – Pat/Jeremy – 08/04/21
2. Send the draft pilot project tracker sheet to ATG and CTG – Kelly – 07/09/21
 - a. Create the comment resolution sheet and send it out to the group – Kelly – before internal meeting

- b. Internal meeting to resolve comments – Kelly – before EC meeting (early next week)
3. STGs are to comment and populate the pilot project tracker draft – STG Chairs & Leads
 - a. Send out the tracker sheet after internal meeting mentioned in #2b – Kelly
4. Confirm that the Pavement Smoothness Final Report includes industry perspective – Pat/Allen - **Complete**
 - a. Tony – Brandon and Don approved and I didn't get any comments back when I sent it out to large industry group.
5. Have the EC decide whether their scope is to approve or acknowledge documents – Doug
 - a. To be discussed later in the meeting
6. Add sub-bullet to EC Updates for ATG on next agenda to confirm the decision met by EC regarding approval vs acknowledgement of documents – Kelly – 07/21/21 – **Complete**
7. Follow up what “completion” of a work product means to the EC – Jeremy/Doug
 - a. Jeremy – There's going to be a new DES member on the EC. Kevin Keady is leaving.
 - b. Jeremy – The expectation is that there is some sort of final report-out on the scoping documents for posterity. Future scoping documents should have a final report/deliverable.
 - c. Jackie – The EC doesn't want to approve work products, but they do want to acknowledge the final report for a final closeout. They don't want to be an approving body for the work products.

Action Items from TG+STG Chairs/Leads on 05/05/21:

1. Discuss a memo to go out for the CPD on 2-Year JMF – Tom/Kee – **Complete**
 - Memo sent out 07/15. CPD 21-14 posted 07/16.
 - 07/06/21: Should be signed this week; awaiting signature
 - 06/02/21: Instructions instead of memo to be sent to District/HQ OEs for projects

Action Items from TG 3+4 on 04/07/21:

1. ~~Recover~~ conflict escalation request form ~~from Courtney~~ and have industry review and submit for approval – Phil/Scott/Dennis/Pat/Kelly – 07/06/21
 - 07/06/21: Industry still looking at this. Will be pushed to next meeting. Send out the conflict resolution form to all ATG – Kelly – 07/09/21

- 06/02/21: More review from industry needed; Postponed to adhoc meeting with decision document vs scoping document guidance
- 2. 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; Information to be routed through Kelly – Ken – **In progress**
 - 07/29/21: IC data is report only and continuing to collect the data will provide valuable information regarding future evaluation of the IC spec.
 - The data files are too large to email, but the following fields are being collected:
 - Pass count
 - Temperature
 - ICMV – an indicator of the stiffness of the pavement
 - 07/06/21: Ken will provide the summary of why Caltrans wants to keep the nSSP and provide data from the IC database.
 - 06/02/21: More information needed from Ragu