

PMPC Executive Committee/Asphalt Task Group Meeting Minutes

Date: August 19, 2021

Time: 8:30 am-10:00am

Location: Webex Meeting

Facilitator: Shaila Chowdhury

Attendees: Tom Pyle, Raymond Tritt, Brandon Milar, Dennis McElroy, Ken Solak, Tim Greutert, Gudmund Setberg, Pat Imhoff, Charley Rea, Doug Mason, Phil Reader, Jacquelyn Wong, Kelly Lorah, Scott Dmytrow, Shaila Chowdhury, Sarah Hartz

1. Introductions/Review Agenda

- I. Group introductions were held to acquaint everyone with Gudmund Setberg as the new EC member representing Structure & Engineering Services. Sarah Hartz was introduced and will be acting for Jacquelyn while on she is on leave.
- II. Group reviewed the agenda.

2. Action Items from 05/20/2021 EC meeting:

- I. ATG to provide update on the 1-hopper vs. 2-hopper issue at next quarterly PMPC + ATG meeting. (ATG) *Construction has sent letter to contractor asking how their equipment is meeting specification, have received no response. Construction sent a second letter three weeks ago. If we don't receive a response, ATG will discuss the 1 to 2 hopper system.*
 - a. Brandon: Isn't this a specification enforcement issue?
 - b. Ken: Yes, trying to figure out how contractor thinks he meets the specification and determining how we enforce the current specification.
- II. Jeremy to follow up with IA on CT306 with D5 and D6 to see what is going on. (Jackie/Sarah) *Jackie recommends this action item come back to the ATG. Ad hoc work group/committee was formed to address the issues in CT306.*
 - a. *Phil: Industry is concerned they are not being uniformly applied across the state.*
 - b. *Jackie will investigate more with the ad hoc group.*
- III. Jeremy, Ken, Phil, and Pat to investigate the issue with 3rd party testing lab issues in the Central Region. (ATG) *May have been resolved, haven't heard anything recently. Moved to ATG level to address with action item #2.*
- IV. EC to discuss working group for pilots in EC meeting. (All) *Completed. EC discussed at last meeting and we think the tracking sheet will be sufficient, and do not think a working group is needed for tracking the pilot's projects.*
 - a. Charley: Want to track these work products, these high-profile specifications to see where placed. We need more emphasis on the pilot specifications the PMPC is working on.
 - b. Shaila: Need to understand what the working group is doing?
 - c. Ten years ago, the Department was told to go High RAP and it still has not been implemented.
 - d. Shaila: Pavement is having discussions with district directors with pilot projects in the PMPC and reviewed all SHOPP projects for next year. We have identified candidate projects and working with districts to implement the pilot projects.
 - e. Charlie: Is there a plan then? Is it written down and can we see it?
 - f. Shaila: District directors support it. We can talk more about it off-line.
 - g. Tom: We have even set aside money to help get some pilots and sent out the message to industry and construction for those willing to take on the new specifications. Contractors were silent for stepping up and said they rarely go above 25% RAP in their mixes. We want to get to a higher percentage of RAP into more projects and work with contractors.
 - h. Charley: CCO's are not the way to go, needs to part of the bid package to get contractors to take on.

- i. Phil: Costs for industry through construction change orders (CCOs) is a difficult sale with profit margins being so tight. Industry prefers to bid the specification item over adding to project via CCOs on new specifications.

Action Items from 02/18/2021 EC meeting:

- I. ATG to work out how best to resolve the issue of the 1-hopper versus 2-hopper system. (ATG)
Completed. ATG provided update at today's EC-ATG meeting.
- 3. Introductory Urgent Issues (All):
 - I. Phil: Industry just had a meeting and don't have any urgent issues right now. Industry has some concern on pilots and would like to see some pilots on RAP, RAS, and Post Plant Gradation.
 - a. Tom: Hopefully, we can influence the districts with our list of upcoming projects and fact sheets to work on pilot specifications in the Highway Maintenance and SHOPP programs. Sending the project list to the district for consideration.
- 4. ATG Work Products
 - I. RAP Up to 40% in HMA:
 - a. Still seeking pilot district. Tom's group is developing a list of upcoming paving projects with fact sheet for high RAP candidates to share with districts to push for interest in piloting a specification after talking with district directors about PMPC efforts with pilots for sustainability and innovation.
 - b. Tim: Was the CCO option discussed in the industry meeting if I can ask?
 - i. Phil: Industry has talked about this and feels bidding is better, so they can factor those unknown testing costs in with the bid and cost of treatment for the project. Cost of testing for the CCO is the biggest hurdle. The money from the special fund would be drained rapidly if we factored in the extra testing, possible delays in schedules.
 - ii. Brandon: Testing cost and verification testing for pilot specifications is a big deal. We need for both the contractor and the State to gather data for appropriate limits for RAP and RAS crack testing. We are getting some pushback from RE's on the extra testing for CCOs, it is also affecting the contractors bottom line. The logistics for a contractor with multiple projects could snowball and put schedules out of whack.
 - II. Recycled Asphalt Shingles (RAS) up to 3%:
 - a. There is the one pilot project in District 3, contractor has been working on the mix design since June. Hope to have it paved by October. We need additional projects for pilots.
 - b. Tom: Would like to simplify the project specifications for the next project as we learn from previous projects to help get the ball started.
 - c. Lot of fat in the testing plans, we may want to cut some out in the future.
 - d. Tim: Our collaboration with METS, Construction, Pavement, and industry give Tim a high level of confidence to use lessons learned to clean up specifications for future pilots.
 - III. Section 37 Update:
 - a. Work product specification submitted to Office of Construction Contract Standards (OCCS) and group is working through the formatting with OCCS.
 - IV. Post Plant Gradation
 - a. Looking good for moving forward with specification with CCOs on two projects this construction season. Three projects are scheduled to advertise next construction season with the nSSP.
 - V. RAP in RHMA:
 - a. Working group still trying to find pilots, evaluating 4 potential projects right now but have some complications with a project.
 - i. Describe the problems. Contractor was having mix design issues with their RAP in RHMA mixes and was not sure what the full extent of not meeting the specification would be without a work around and how those work arounds would perform in the field.
 - VI. Write nSSPs for CCPR:
 - a. Working group requested a 3-month extension due to delay in getting scoping document signed. Milestone #1, Literature review and develop specifications is completed. Working group is on to milestones #2 and 3.
 - b. Tim: Is the task, Develop provisional CTM, is it jiggling a current provisional CTM?
 - i. Yes, minor tweaks to the current provisional CTM from a mobile lab to a central lab, just changing of equipment.
 - c. Tim: Don't want to lose sight of the provisional CTM with the transitioning of staff.

- i. Dennis: Group will be looking at training and lessons learned from materials engineers, resident engineers, and designers to adjust the CTM after review.

VII. Review Closed/Tracking List

- a. In the interest in time, the group skipped over the closed tracking list.

5. Review of Bin Lists (Tom):

- I. In the interest of time, the bin list review was skipped. The Pavement Preservation STG is working on a fog seal scoping document, they will be looking at what is being done on a national level to develop a standard. They are also looking at sand to be placed on top of the fog seal as a sand seal to deal with the initial friction issues.
 - a. Tim: The memo from the State Pavement Engineer, has it been executed yet?
 - i. A memo to the districts will be sent to say the strategy is available.

6. ATG Pilot Project Tracking:

- I. Group is still going through the comments on the tracking sheet. STGs will be responsible for updating the tracking sheet once completed.
- II. Ken: Is this going to be just PMPC pilot projects we are tracking, or will it be including all pilot projects?
- III. Tim: Main purpose is for the PMPC, to see if our specifications are being used and where. Looking into a secondary option for all pilot projects in Pavem. Tracking sheet will be for PMPC.
- IV. Dennis: Would like to see the location of data storage, had issues in the past and we lost data. Maybe have a closed tab, some items may go to closed section after completion.
- V. Shaila: It is a very compressive and detailed tracking sheet you have developed. Good job working group!
- VI. Charlie: This is good but when meeting with management, shorten the list to project, # of XX, and where.
- VII. Jackie: Does this become a recurring agenda item? Indication was yes, maybe quarterly.
- VIII. Dennis: Is there any plan to push lessons learned out to districts from the tracking sheet?
- IX. Tom: It is important to tell the districts that we are tracking these items and the team will be looking at the performance of the sections. We are putting together fact sheets about what we learned about the products to share with the districts.

7. Open Discussion (All):

- I. Tim: Looking at a fall PMPC get together with a recognition of accomplishments, introduction of new members and responsibilities. Looking at the end of October, give the ATG some time to think about some topics to discuss.
- II. Shaila: **We need to reserve a date and get it moving.**

8. Roundtable / Review Action Items / Next Meeting

Action Items

- V. EC to reserve a date for the fall PMPC get together and start setting agenda items. (EC)

Next Meeting: November 18, 2021

8:30 am – 10:00 pm