

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

**Date: May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

**Time: 1:00 PM – 2:30 PM**

**Location: DOT Translab – OSM Room 514/Webex/Conference Call**

---

Facilitator: Tim Greutert

Attendees: Tom Pyle, Tim Greutert, Blair Anderson, Tracy Zubek, Pat Imhoff, Kee Foo, Tony Limas, Raghubar Shrestha, Marco Estrada, Cortney VanHook

Not in Attendance: Doug Mason, Scott Dmytrow

---

1. Introductions/Review Agenda
2. Introductory Urgent Issues
  - a. PMPC Communication Process
    - i. Tony – Frustration coming from Industry as far as communication between ATG level and WG level.
    - ii. Tony - There is a PMPC process in place where ATG communicates to STG and then down to WG. This process is not being followed
    - iii. Tracy - Examples of lack of communication: RAS scoping document, additional member on EC
      1. Tim – Priority came down from Steve as to push RAS scoping document through
      2. Blair – Information came from EC meeting and was processed through. There was equal representation from both Caltrans and Industry during that meeting
      3. Tony – All ATG members should be aware of what is going on. Not all members of the ATG were aware of what was going on with the RAS scoping document
    - iv. Tony – at WG level there was an issue that was wanted to move up through the PMPC issue resolution process. All STG members (minus Maged) are a part of the WG. WG decided it was inefficient to take to the STG level with all the same members so decided to move up to the TG level and bypass STG
      1. Tony – WG should have sent a formal email to the ATG noting issue and requesting resolution
      2. Blair – aware of the issue through Pete; however had to do lots of research to really understand what the issue was.

- v. SPF - Testing Turn Around Time
  - 1. Blair – Why was testing turnaround time not on the bin list?
    - a. Tony – It was part of a separate group. It was requested of industry to provide data
  - 2. Tony - Is there a requirement to verify a contractors test results?
  - 3. Blair – Not stating whether test results are good or bad. Testing whether there is going to be deduction or not.
  - 4. Tony – Caltrans should follow recommendation that was given to Caltrans from FHWA
  - 5. Tony - There was an agreement that Caltrans would eventually get to 3-5 turnaround time.
  - 6. Caltrans came to consensus on 2 weeks. Industry recommends it should be 5-7 days
  - 7. Kee - FHWA recommended not releasing results until all results have been obtained for the lot
  - 8. DIME would be a good avenue to collect that information and evaluate actual testing turn around over time
  - 9. Blair - Potentially 3 sublots during a paving day. The real issue comes up when it becomes the last lot that is being tested
  - 10. Tracy – It was mentioned that it was not known which lab would be doing the testing. Shipping to 2 or 3 different labs is very inefficient.
  - 11. Decision – Direction from Tim for WG (Industry/Caltrans) to go back and develop a position paper for each side. Coordinate with METS representative on the STG.
  - 12. Decision – CT will provide verification of the contractors QC test results within 7 business days of the completion of the lot
- vi. Tony – Just want to make sure that all members of the TG level know what is going on before it is passed down to STG, same for STG levels and EC levels.
- vii. Tom – Agree that there was a breakdown in communication and that it could have been improved by making sure everyone was aware of what was going on

### 3. Review of Work Products

- a. Statistical Pay Factors

- i. Issue on turn-around time discussed in “urgent issues”
  - ii. First training scheduled for May 14th
  - iii. Action – Kee to forward training schedule to the ATG
  - iv. Tim – Are expectations of QC/QA coordinators laid out in the manual?
    - 1. Kee – No expectations laid out in the manual. The only expectations is that they follow the specifications
    - 2. Tim – Anything more than just knowing the specifications? Need to come up with a systematic way to track progress and identify resource gaps
    - 3. Kee – QC/QA will help verify when lots come in, whether or not they are verified and when they go out
    - 4. Tom – Seems reasonable to put these bullets of expectations in the presentation
- b. Section 39 RAP SD
- i. Raghu - Working on review and are on schedule. Need to select at least six pilot projects and communicate with the districts in advance, so they are well aware of pilot projects ahead of RTL, if possible.
  - ii. Tom – If Caltrans is going to put 40% Rap into specification as fast as we would like to it will probably have to go in as a CCO. Will need to put out notice to the districts requesting participation and identify appropriate projects
  - iii. Tim – Want to focus on constructability portion of the spec
  - iv. Tony – Will be collecting a lot of test data on these projects
- c. Added – RAS Scoping Document
- i. Marco - Discussed on formation of Working Group for RAS and reviewed revised priority list proposed by ATG.
  - ii. Discussed to start preparation of Scoping Document with previously RAS scoping document during the last STG meeting
  - iii. Marco - Waiting on comments from district on FDR draft specification to come back by the 19th for review
- d. Update Section 94 SD
- i. Kee – WG sent out to mandatory stakeholders for concurrence. Now there is an issue with getting spec approved through FHWA. Suggestion that maybe FHWA should be involved in all of our discussions so this issue is not ran into in the future. Possibly at the TG level.
  - ii. Pat/Tracy – A good idea to invite FHWA rep (Chu Wei?) to meetings.

- e. CT 125 SD
  - i. Kee – Draft test procedures have been sent out for review. Received a couple of comments from Jeremy Peterson-Self.
  - ii. Need to keep Jeremy involved in order to determine how to keep the test method updated in JTCP
  - iii. Tony – Any chance that when performing the SPF projects that there be a joint effort and use the new sampling procedures to perform that sampling. Would be a good opportunity to train all technicians
  - iv. Tim – Need to reassess and recertify testers that have been trained before on test methods that now reflect a change and also touch on those that are new to the test method
  - v. Kee – Still working on milestone 4. Discussing with Jeremy on the requested changes.
  - vi. Tracy – Would be ideal to have someone (IA) witness technicians perform new test
- f. HWT for RHMA-G Mixes SD
  - i. Kee – WG ran into issue with water bath temperature times and number of passes and the issue was brought up to the STG. Recommendation came from STG to get test temperature in accordance with AASHTO test method (via water heater or etc) and stick with 5000 pass reduction
- g. Evaluate new HMA Pavement Smoothness SD
  - i. Tom - Specifications has been going into many projects.
  - ii. Tom - Trying to determine how much money should be put into a contract as far as supplemental funds
  - iii. Tom – Will let industry know everything that will be looked at and evaluated as far as efficacy.
  - iv. Tony – Need to get to a point where we know, from an Industry standpoint, that the paving crew is doing every possible practice that they can to get the best product
- 4. Review Bin List
  - a. Marco - Educational Outreach was removed from bin list. Want to request that it be reconsidered and be added back onto the bin list.
  - b. Raghu – Currently working with David Johns to determine how to encourage districts to use CIR/FDR
  - c. Raghu – RAP for RHMA-G should be above RAS as far as bin list goes
  - d. Tony - Why are we not following up with same SPF in the standard specs

- i. Tom - If a working group can work on it and be resourced to work on it, there is no reason that the working group can't work on it
  - ii. Tony – Then if we can spend an extra hour or so to work on reviewing SPF in standard specs then can we
  - iii. Tom – would come down to Tim/Blair and others to determine if there are resources to allow the extra work
  - iv. Tim – Would expect a scoping document to perform that work
  - v. Blair – From Caltrans side, we have to look at all the requests that are coming in. While this may be your main focus, another industry member may have different priorities/requests. Caltrans needs to consider everything that is coming in.
  - vi. Tony – Can we at least present those changes to you at a TG meeting?
    1. Tim – Would be open to that
5. Roundtable/Review Action Items/Next Meeting
- a. Marco – there was a request from Industry to increase the frequency of meetings for RAP and Raghu is very accommodating of that. Want to acknowledge that
6. Feedback
- 

Action Items:

1. Develop position papers for testing turn around issue to pass to ATG for review – SPF WPG – 5/10/19
2. Forward SPF training schedule to ATG – Kee – 5/8/19
3. Bring copies with “wet” signatures to obtain remaining signatures (RAP & Smoothness) – Tom – 5/16/19