

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

Date: November 4, 2020

Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Location: Webex/Conference Call

Facilitator: Tom Pyle

Attendees: Scott Dmytrow, Marco Estrada, Kee Foo, Pat Imhoff, Allen King, Steve Lee, Tony Limas, Kelly Lorah, Doug Mason, Dennis McElroy, Jeremy Peterson-Self, Tom Pyle, Phil Reader, Ken Solak, Chu Wei

Not in Attendance: Cortney VanHook

1. Introductions/Review Agenda
 - a. The agenda was moved around to allow more time for urgent issues.
2. Review past action items
 - a. Send Ken information regarding the Hamburg CPD for discussion – Phil – 10/12/20 – **Complete**
Note: Having an effective date for CPDs will be included in the future CPDs
 - b. Follow up on Vialit upload with Lisa – Jeremy – 10/12/20 – **Complete**
Note: It is in the section 37 working group.
 - c. Forward letters regarding the spec change opposition received from industry to the ATG – Tom – 10/12/20 – **Complete**
 - d. Inform the STG that no more comments (aside from the previous set of comments) are to be made on the CCPR scoping documents – Kelly – 10/07/20 – **Complete**
 - e. Take the hold off of the Specification Presentation calendar invite and provide more detail – Kelly – 10/07/20 – **Complete**
3. Section 39 High RAP
 - a. Tony – Looking for update on High RAP projects
 - b. Tom – District 8 potential project will not occur. Direct solicitation to district project managers will be employed.
4. Evaluate new HMA Pavement Smoothness
 - a. Ken – CPD 20-11 in May included resources for training, processing, and contacts. There is confusion from Construction staff on how to administer this.
 - b. Phil – They are trying to learn the spec.
 - c. Ken – Do we need more training or reminders of resources? The final report is due July of next year and data is sparse. The January due date for data may not be sufficient.
 - d. Phil – Could we have QCQA and/or MPQP coordinators who can help?
 - e. Ken – We do have SMEs in the districts. We're not getting calls for questions as much as anticipated.
 - f. Phil – Is that list available?
 - g. Ken – It's on the website and will be sent out again.
5. RAS up to 3%
 - a. Kee – Project available in District 3 and is moving forward.

6. Section 37 Update
 - a. Steve – Comment review under way.
 - b. Scott – Review is almost complete. FHWA had valid comments, but do not fall within the scoping document. There's a term, "Authorized Laboratory", that needs to be redefined/renamed.
 - c. Steve – Vialit may not be utilized in the future.
7. Post Plant Gradation
 - a. Tony – We're on schedule to meet our first milestone.
8. RAP in RHMA-G
 - a. Kee – We're working on our first deliverables and completed our first document. We're working to obtain samples. There will be a 3-month extension request for that milestone.
 - b. Phil – Southern California producers will be participating.
 - c. Kee – Ghazi Romani (District 8) would like to join the group.
 - d. Tom – He can be nominated.
 - e. Jeremy – We were looking for a fourth member to potentially replace Clinton in the near future.
9. PDR (CIR) FA & PDR (CIR) EA
 - a. Allen – We're meeting up weekly. We're able to address most of the issues. The WG is working to address early concerns. The letter was sent up to the STG and a meeting will occur next week. The emulsion industry claims to not be informed of the scoping document.
 - b. Phil – Can we confirm that the information was disseminated to the industry stakeholders properly?
 - c. Allen – As far as I know, it was distributed properly.
 - d. Marco – We are working through the issues as much as possible through the WG. We have to be prepared to keep the specification separate if there is a technical fatal flaw.
 - e. Phil – Has industry used the words fatal flaw?
 - f. Allen – Not at this time. We're working through the comments. Combining the specs is the main point of contention.
 - g. Phil – What were the major concerns?
 - h. Allen – They're concerned that emulsion won't win any more contracts.
 - i. Scott – They're not the same, performance-wise, but one is cheaper than the other.
 - j. Ken – It appears that industry believes it's the contractor's choice to use one or the other. Once the spec was combined, emulsion has concerns. Caltrans will specify the recycling agent for the PDR, either foamed asphalt or emulsion on a project-specific basis and it will not be the contractor's choice.
 - k. Ken – We need to provide a fact sheet that includes the implications of what the spec entails.
 - l. Phil – An internal discussion to determine the best course of action and bring the results of the discussion to Caltrans.

m. Training will occur soon.

- Increase In-Place Recycling Projects in 2021 & 2022
 - a. Marco – We request an initiative to deliver more in-place recycling projects in the upcoming years. Perhaps a quota.
 - b. Dennis – We’re working on getting the training out. We need the work to get these projects out.
 - c. Tom – This was discussed a lot in the pavement program. The upcoming training should help draw attention to these projects.
 - d. Marco – We have been asking for training to help in the long term, but we’re looking for a more immediate response. Can we establish a quota?
 - e. Tom – We’re going to research to find potential project locations and encourage districts. The training is going to be key to get the designers behind these projects. The quota is a great idea, but not sure how to implement.
 - f. Phil – We can sit down with Tom and Ken to develop a strategy.
 - g. Marco – We’ve been working a lot in the long term, but there were 0 FDR projects in the past year. We need something more immediate.
 - h. Scott – The Maintenance industry is not benefitting from SB-1 dollars.

10. Urgent Issues

- Adding additional members to the ATG
 - a. Jeremy – We may be able to table this discussion as there are other discussions still occurring.
 - b. Phil – We can table it. Industry needs further discussions.
 - c. Marco – We’ve been asked to provide a Recycling STG member nomination.
 - d. Will be discussed further in the future.
- Future ATG meeting times
 - a. Ken – Daily 10am meetings.
 - b. Phil – Afternoon meetings may not work when projects pick up in the spring.
 - c. Jeremy – We will propose afternoons and we will work out individual meetings as necessary starting with the next year.
- Formalized process to identify and fund pilot projects (Allen)
 - a. Allen – It’s hard to find and identify pilot projects. The EC is able to haggle a pilot project, but WGs struggle. Establishing a process may be helpful.
 - b. A process being put in place would be good.
 - c. Ken – Mike Keever may help move the process along.
 - d. Jeremy – Should this be a formalized discussion?
 - e. Tom – I think it should be added to the next EC agenda for both ATG and CTG.
- Discussion of Open Grade (Tom)
 - a. Tom – Once the WGs have projects completed items on their lists, Open Grade should be considered. There are two issues: the mix design of open grade and open grade run-off purification masking. This is just for your radar.
- OGFC Performance Life Improvements (Tony)

- a. Tony – Tom just stated it above. Tom addressed my questions.
 - SPF Pilot Project Status (Tony)
 - a. Tony – What is the status?
 - b. Pat – Our job got held up for environmental reasons until next June.
 - c. Tony – Last I heard, there were going to be 60 projects.
 - d. Tom – There were estimated 60 projects. 10-12 projects have been identified.
11. Review bin lists
- a. These will be reviewed outside this meeting. They're attached to the meeting invite.
 - Foundations TG similarities – lime and cement treated subgrade (Marco)
 - a. Marco – There are similarities in the new CTG Foundation TG and the Recycling bin lists
 - b. Phil – We're going to let the CTG take care of the work. We can review at the end.
12. Roundtable / Review Action Items / Next Meeting
- a. Jeremy – Veera Nanugonda will be replaced in the WG and the STG. Information is forthcoming.
 - i. Veera will be missed by many on the ATG.
13. Feedback
-

Action Items from 11/04/20:

1. Industry discussion on technical standpoint for the combination of specs for PDR FA & EA – Pat/Phil – 11/18/20
2. Send training information to everyone – Tom/Allen – 11/06/20
3. Industry meeting to further the quota discussion for In-Place Recycling – Phil – 11/18/20
4. Add topic on formalizing the pilot project process on the EC agenda – Kelly/Doug – 11/18/20

Action Items from 10/7/20:

1. Send the resolution of Cortney's action item – Kelly – 10/07/20 – **Complete**
2. Send Ken information regarding the Hamburg CPD for discussion – Phil – 10/12/20 – **Complete**
3. Follow up on Vialit upload with Lisa – Jeremy – 10/12/20 – **Complete**
4. Forward letters regarding the spec change opposition received from industry to the ATG – Tom – 10/12/20 – **Complete**
5. Reach out to Marco and Scott to discuss personnel representation on the ATG – Pat and Phil – 10/14/20
6. Inform the STG that no more comments (aside from the previous set of comments) are to be made on the CCPR scoping documents – Kelly – 10/07/20 – **Complete**
7. Take the hold off of the Specification Presentation calendar invite and provide more detail – Kelly – 10/07/20 – **Complete**
8. Reschedule ATG (TG only) and ATG (TG+STG Chairs/Leads) meetings to Wednesdays at 1pm. Confirm with Tom. – Kelly – 10/23/20

Action Items from 07/28/20:

1. Allen and group to evaluate CIR scoping document and determine what is needed so that ATG can discuss with EC during next quarterly meeting – Allen – 08/14/20 – **Complete**

Action Items from 10/02/19:

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