PMPC Executive Committee (EC) Meeting Minutes

Date: February 18, 2021
Time: 10:00 am-12:00 pm
Location: Webex Meeting

Facilitator: Tom Pyle
Attendees: Tom Pyle, Douglas Mason, Raymond Tritt, Charley Rea, Brandon Milar, Tim Greutert, Kevin Keady

1. Call to Order
   I. Tom welcomed everyone back after a brief break.

2. Action Items from 1/21/2021 EC meeting (All) Attachment 1:
   I. Raymond to provide update on pilot project process with construction at next meeting. (Raymond)
      Ongoing, waiting to hear feedback on Mr. Hopkins’ presentation at PDAC and at the Construction
      Management Board meetings on encouraging districts to take on pilot projects.
   II. Doug to check with Kee Foo on comment about securing RHMA-G mixes with 10% RAP to complete
       testing plan and Brandon to check with industry to see what his is about. (Doug and Brandon)
       Completed, working group needs RHMA samples with RAP for testing. Off season for rubber projects
       right now, but Brandon will look to see what will be available.
   III. Schedule a Bridge Program Update in April or June for the Sponsor meeting with topics such as things
        coming out of the PMPC that affected bridge, past specification changes with history, high performance
        concrete and higher strength rebar. (Kevin) Presentation is set for April’s meeting.

Action Items from 1/21/2021 Sponsor/Steering Committee with EC meeting:
   I. Add agenda item to April quarterly meeting to have a briefing or presentation on all sustainability items
      in the PMPC. Look at good work products that meet the Strategic Management Plan. (Doug) Agenda
      item added.
   II. Develop a briefing on the development of eLCAP to the Executive Committee and Sponsors. (Doug)
      Completed

3. Urgent Issues
   I. Tim: Asking Industry about their thoughts on prequalification of aggregates and what we need to do to
      improve it. How can Caltrans get more participants to use the prequalification process?
      a. Charley: So far, about a half dozen companies are participating. So, not sure why more aren’t
         participating.

4. Work Products and Bin List – Attachments 2, 3,4 & 5:
   CTG Work Products
   I. Evaluate the Revised Concrete Pavement Smoothness Specifications
      a. Group is still gathering data and starting to analyze specification and data.
      b. Tim: Do we have an awareness of how much grinding effort was needed to meet the targeted IRI?
      c. Brandon: Don’t have the hours/days of grinding but do have the subsequent smoothness profiles to
         analyze how much correction took place to achieve incentive.
      d. Discussion on the matrices being analyzed for concrete smoothness, such as percent of contractors
         getting incentive/disincentive for smoothness, % of pavement ground to achieve incentive, %
         improvement in IRI for a treatment, evaluation pay factors, etc.
   II. Concrete Mix Design Naming Protocol
      a. This work product has had the original scoping document pulled due to an impasse between
         Caltrans and Industry. It was serving as a place holder in the monthly status as the working group
         developed a new scoping document using the same approach for unique concrete mix identifiers
         with aggregate source but place it in the DIME database with material testing.
b. EC recommended moving this work product to the closed/completed section and wait till new scoping document is submitted, before placing it back on the monthly work product status.

III. Concrete Pavement Acceptance Based on Compressive Strength
   a. Working Group started to put together draft report on summary and analysis of DOT specifications. On-track.
   b. Action Item: Tim to find METS Working Group replacements for Larry McCrum and Dominika Pekala who have moved to different positions.

IV. Evaluating Maturity to Estimate Open to Traffic Strength of Concrete Pavement
   a. Working Group started to put together draft report on summary and analysis of DOT specifications. On-track.

V. Impact of Portland Limestone Cement (PLC) on Concrete Performance
   a. Some confusion on past due milestone dates for this work product, Doug to contact working group to verify milestone dates.
   b. Action Item: Kevin to find replacement for Jeff Goronea/Eric Fornera for specification evaluation.

VI. Bin lists for Concrete Sub Task Group.
   a. No comments. Waiting for full scoping documents to come for approval after seeing some short concept scoping documents.

5. JMF, Tack Coat, 1-Hopper premixed CRM (ATG Work Products):
   I. Discussion on a recent decision document being circulated among ATG on proposed job mix formula changes.
      a. Tim: I would like to see the decision document. I want to see their implementation plan.
      b. Doug: ATG was trying to submit this to EC and were still modifying it the night before the EC + ATG meeting and I told them the EC needs more time to review the decision document before they can discuss and make an informed decision in a meeting, so they held back on submitting the document.
      c. Once the ATG has resolved their issues with document, will present to the EC with implementation plan.
      d. Tom: The ATG checks that all the analysis and considerations have been done right and the EC concurs with the analysis, checking to see that all agreements, dissensions and costs were considered in the analysis.

II. Discussion on CRM and 1-Hopper preblended mix versus 2-Hopper systems, affecting both asphalt pavement industry as well as pavement preservation industry.
   a. Brandon: Proposed specification change looks like it is to solve a problem but don’t know what the issue is here. The solution hasn’t been properly vetted. Industry does not support this moving forward as they have invested funds to move to the 2-Hopper system as directed by Caltrans.
   b. Tom: At the last meeting, Caltrans asked industry to look for information on discussions 8-9 years ago with Caltrans to move to a 2-hopper since we can not find any decision documents on our end.
      i. Brandon: Decision was made when Caltrans implemented MPQP back in 2012 and is when industry started moving forward with a 2-hopper system
   c. Tom: We need to document our decisions for the future managers and the reasons why certain decisions were made. Caltrans has put this proposal on the shelf for now. Construction is the lead on this and is looking for any information on what direction or decision was made on the 1-hopper versus 2-hopper system.
   d. Action Item: Doug to check the old Rock Products website to see if any decision or documents on 1-hopper versus 2-hopper.

III. Discussion on Tack Coat
   a. Tom: We are on a holding pattern with this and want to move forward with the requirement of a tack coat on all layers of the pavement surface. It is a Departmental decision, specification is already in the current specifications, we are just removing the option to remove the tack coat from the specification by construction, as Caltrans feels is a very important to the bonding of HMA layers. Would like industry to review our change and provide feedback.
   b. Brandon: Prefer a decision document to industry by the Asphalt Task Group, similar to the JMF document presented. Is the ATG driving this bus or the STG?
c. Tom: Asphalt STG would be driving the bus.
d. Tim: Does industry have any reservations to the changes?
e. Brandon: These changes will affect production times while waiting for tack coat to break. Will need longer traffic windows, issues with night work, etc. that you need to be aware of all the implications being affected by this change.
f. **Action Item: Tom to circle back with Asphalt STG on the tack coat issue.**

6. **Lime or Cement Modification Short Scoping Document (All):**
   I. Most on EC approve the concept but this is a bigger fish to tackle than what they realize. EC wants to review it a little more before giving their concept approval.
   II. **Action Item: EC to review short scoping document some more and provide comments in two weeks.**

7. **Sponsor Meeting Agenda (All):**
   a. Discussion of the agenda items for the next Sponsor/Steering Committee meeting in April.
   b. Kevin Keady will give a presentation on Bridge Program Update to the group.
   c. Group decided industry members would present sustainability work products out of the PMPC.
   d. eLCAP presentation has been developed for meeting as an agenda item.
   e. Last agenda item proposed was the “Value of PMPC” to be discussed by all.
   f. **Action Item: Doug to send out old sustainability presentation to EC members.**

8. **Open Discussion:**
   I. Charley: Did we approve the adding of additional industry members to the ATG?
      a. The EC recommended to the ATG the addition of the Recycling Association into their Task Group as a better fit than becoming a member of the EC, since they felt they weren’t being represented in the ATG.
      b. WRAPP also was being represented and the ATG decided to add them as well.
   II. Charley: We keep hearing about asset management and how it has changed the way projects are chosen, can you explain asset management to industry so we can better understand what it means and the implications it has for pilot projects, and other PMPC activities.
      a. **Action Item: Doug to see if we can get a presentation on asset management.**
   III. Brandon: Considering the additional members to the ATG, I think it was good to add these people to the group. Do we want to allow others to have access to other Task Groups? Do we need to discuss this at all levels?

9. **Decisions made/Approvals given by EC:**
   I. EC recommended moving the Concrete Mix Design Name work product to the closed/completed section and wait till new scoping document is submitted, before placing it back on the monthly work product status.

10. **Action Items**
    I. Tim to find METS Working Group replacements for Larry McCrum and Dominika Pekala who have moved to different positions. (Tim)
    II. Doug to contact Portland Limestone Concrete working group to verify milestone dates. (Doug)
    III. Kevin to find replacement for Jeff Goronea/Eric Fornera for specification evaluation. (Kevin)
    IV. Doug to check the old Rock Products website to see if any decision or documents on 1-hopper versus 2-hopper. (Doug)
    V. Tom to circle back with Asphalt STG on the tack coat issue. (Tom)
    VI. EC to review short scoping document for lime and cement modification some more and provide comments back in two weeks.
    VII. Doug to send out old sustainability presentation to EC members. (Doug)
    VIII. Doug to see if we can get a presentation on asset management. (Doug)

**Next Meeting scheduled for March 20, 2021**