

PMPC Executive Committee/Asphalt Task Group Meeting Minutes

Date: November 19, 2020

Time: 8:30 am-10:00am

Location: Webex Meeting

Facilitator: Sergio Aceves

Attendees: Sergio Aceves, Ray Hopkins, Brandon Milar, Ken Solak, Tim Greutert, Kevin Keady, Pat Imhoff, Charley Rea, Doug Mason, Tom Pyle, Jeremy Peterson-Self, Kelly Lorah, Tony Limas, Chu Wei

1. Introductions/Review Agenda

I. Roll Call/Check-in

II. Sergio welcomed the group to the quarterly EC+ATG meeting and thanked the group for attending virtually while California Coronavirus numbers are spiking.

2. Action Items from 08/20/2020 EC+ATG meeting (All):

I. Check with UCPRC on testing capabilities during COVID for RAP and RAS testing for pilots. (Sergio) Completed

II. Send email to RAP/RAS Working Group to request a milestone extension up to a year. (Doug) Completed.

III. Follow up with PP STG on the Vialit test to see if they will remove or suggest replacement test method. (Pat I) Wait for update

IV. Contact Kevin Keady to get his approval on RAP in RHMA scoping document since he wasn't in meeting. (Doug) Completed.

Action Items from 05/21/2020 EC meeting:

I. Tim and Ken to meet to discuss path to use new CT125 test method for all projects. On hold while METS investigating issues with labs on heating rubberized hot mix asphalts whether it is an isolated problem or a statewide issue. Completed with handouts.

3. Introductory Urgent Issues (All):

I. None brought forth.

4. ATG Work Products

I. RAP Up to 40% in HMA:

a. Still having trouble finding pilot projects for specification evaluation.

b. Construction and others working with Mike Keever to see if Project Delivery can help get districts to work with PMPC on pilot projects.

II. Evaluate the New HMA Pavement Smoothness Specification Work:

a) Group is still gathering and evaluating data. Had a little trouble gathering data and understanding the data.

b) Construction has developed a spreadsheet/database to track dates from CCO to submittal of smoothness data to see where the issue is.

c) Brandon: We have several projects worth of data, seems optimistic on data evaluation and reporting, how come?

i. Ken: Group started to identify areas in the specifications for change, but we encountered a fatal flaw with areas of localized roughness (ALRs) in the specification and it will probably be escalated in a couple of months as we ascertain the ramifications.

III. Recycled Asphalt Shingles (RAS) up to 3%:

a) We have a pilot project moving forward in D3 on route 49 in El Dorado County this fiscal year.

b) Tim: Is there a lesson we can learn on how we get a pilot project selected easier in the future?

i. This topic is on the agenda later in the meeting.

- IV. Section 37 Update:
 - a) Pat: The group is working through comments and the last issue is with Vialit test, there are other tests that they can use instead of Vialit and industry has left it in Caltrans hands to decide.
 - b) Tim: Anything else in Section 37 beside the Vialit test holding that is outstanding.
 - i. Pat: The Vialit test is the only thing outstanding at this point.
 - c) Tim: How extensive do you think the training and guidance is going to be?
 - i. Tom: Might be addressed in a Memo to Maintenance Engineers. Depends on the outcome of final specification changes.
 - d) Sergio: So, Milestones 3 and 4 are not really completed even though they are shown on the monthly update as completed since the working group has not resolved the issue with Vialit test. It looks that way.
 - V. Combine CIR FA & CIR EA now called PDR:
 - a) Tom: Received a protest letter from an emulsion company over the specification and how it was being developed and it spread to other emulsion companies. Pat and Phil are working with industry to see if we can resolve the issue with industry without an impasse. Issue with emulsion companies is they feel emulsified asphalt is far superior than foamed asphalt and don't agree with combining of the specifications. Working group has not come up with a delay letter since they don't know yet if they have a set back and how much it might set them back until they find out if this can be resolved.
 - b) Pat: We are waiting to have our industry meeting due to holidays; it is scheduled in 1st or 2nd week of December to understand the issues and see if we can come to a resolution.
 - c) Sergio: Appreciate all the work it takes for Phil and you to communicate with industry on issues. My concern is this has happened to us before in the CTG, it seems like a fatal flaw or error when a particular organization or group objects to a process being developed when we thought we were working with all of industry. All industry partners need to know what it is coming down the pipeline in work products, so we aren't spending our time and resources on something that will be stalled later in the process.
 - d) Tom: We hope to have this resolved by December.
 - e) Chu: Virginia and Texas DOTs have combined the specification, FHWA recommends combining the two specifications.
 - VI. Post Plant Gradation
 - a) Working group meeting on a continuous basis and is on track with its milestones.
 - b) Tony: At the last meeting, working group started working on nSSPs.
 - c) Tim: I am feeling this will have a significant impact on district labs and am concerned on how we communicate these changes and logistics to the labs and training programs.
 - d) Tony: Working group has talked about the challenges, we just haven't attempted to solve them yet.
 - VII. RAP in RHMA:
 - a) Industry and Caltrans working quickly in this. Happy with the progress
 - VIII. Review Closed/Tracking List
 - a) Sergio: On SPF, how many projects have been identified so far?
 - i. There are 10-12 projects scheduled to advertise this year. Memo went out to the districts. This is a huge specification that needs to be properly evaluated.
 - ii. Tim: Thank you for your efforts. Are supplemental funds going to be a sustainable option? There has been some resistance due to limited funds available in supplemental funds for SPF.
 - iii. Do you anticipate a list you can share for the SPF specification?
 - 1. Tom: Prefer to share the list after the projects go out to bid.
5. Review of Bin Lists (Jeremy):
- I. Asphalt STG bin list:
 - a. Nothing is being proposed to be elevated at this time
 - b. Sergio: We want to keep the momentum going. Nothing urgent that needs to be elevated.
 - c. Tom: Extending the life of OGFC has come up but we are still looking into it.
 - d. **Action Item for ATG: ATG to review and prioritize STG's bin lists for all STGs under them.**
 - II. Recycling STG Bin List:
 - a. STG working on scoping document for first item on list.
 - III. Pavement Preservation STG Bin List:
 - a. Item #1-Fog Seals on the bin list needs a working group to develop a skid tester and skid testing numbers to use for fog seals.

b. Item #4-Vialit test can be removed, the group is currently looking into this with the section 37 update.

6. Formalizing the Pilot Project Process:

- I. Tom: All of the STGs would like to have a better pilot project process due to the difficulties they have encountered finding districts willing to do a pilot project. ATG feels they need help from the EC with outreach and funding source for these pilot projects. The group is frustrated with trying to find pilot projects and how to fund some of the proposed specification changes. There is a need to make a more seamless process to entice districts to select pilot projects and the ATG is asking for the EC for help to find pilot projects.
- II. Sergio: Asset management has changed the landscape in the districts due to the performance targets and is how we got to where we are today with districts not willing to take a chance on a project.
- III. Tim: We need to emphasize to districts a return on their investment in choosing to participate in a pilot project.
- IV. Brandon: Some things done in the past that were successful was having district participation in the Rock Products Committees or in this case, the PMPC, so they would have a buy in with the work products being developed.
- V. Sergio-I agree with you Brandon. It would help having the districts participate in the PMPC, so they had some skin in the game too.
- VI. Tim: I like to thank Tom's group for taking the opportunity in the In-Place Recycling training to ask for district participation in the PMPC.
- VII. **Action Item: EC needs to have more discussion on the pilot project process to support TG's in getting more pilot projects from districts.**

7. Open Discussion (All):

- I. Tim: Some recent changes in METS, Veera Nanugonda has moved on to Local Assistance and Steve Seifert has replaced him in the Pavement Preservation sub task group.
- II. Would like to thank the Joint Training team for their adaptability with all the COVID restrictions.
- III. Tim and Sergio thanked the ATG and STGs for all the work products they have completed and working on.

8. Action Items

- I. ATG to review and prioritize STG's bin lists for all STGs under them. (ATG)
- II. EC needs to have more discussion on the pilot project process to support TG's in getting more pilot projects from districts. (EC)