

Group Memory
Superpave Sub Task Group
Feb 12, 2013

Next Meeting dates

March 12, in Southern Regional Lab

Desired outcome for next meeting:

Cover the rest of the top ten

Report from co chairs on progress and co-chair meeting discussion.

Bin List & Great Ideas

Group Decisions

All decisions made will be double underlined in the body of the notes below.

(Date)

Document Register

Upshot

These are the assignments made at the meeting. As new ones are added they will be appended to the list. As assignments are completed they will be lined out with a ~~strike through~~, but left on the list. This will provide a running record of assignments made at these meetings.

Ref. #	Who	What	When
1	Joe	Provide data for RAP specific gravity and binder content to Tony and Tim on the two projects where we have data.	2/22/2013
2	Joe	will get data for industry on the mixes Caltrans has, and will look at 12.5 and 13.5.	2/22/2013
3	Tony	Establish a focus group New mix design when RAP Specific Gravity changes by $> \pm 0.06$	6/1/2013
4	Tim	Establish a focus group VMA for $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ inch mixes (13.5/14.5) –work with Tony and look for volunteers.	6/1/2013
5	Joe	Work with Construction and report back to the group at the next meeting. "Item 19: To resolve dispute both QC and QA data should be reviewed. Initially by Engineer and Contractor and then ITP, if needed."	3/12/2013
6	Joe	Joe needs to share data with industry on item 21: Minimum binder content of 7.5 may be a problem. Does Caltrans have data to support this change?	3/12/2013
7	Tony and Tim	Item 21: Industry needs to show data with gyratory compactor, if they have it.	6/1/2013

Ref. #	Who	What	When
8	Joe	Joe agrees with this item, and will provide language. "Item 30. Section 39-1.01C(1): "Submit quality control test results within 2 days of request"	3/1/2013
9	All-	REMIND YOUR COLLEAGUES OF THIS STG, share the information.	

Critique from this meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Rita did the analysis Not a lot of side conversations Facilitator and notes	Set up a lunch do a working lunch. Go from 10 to 3

#	Time	Topic and Presenter	<i>Purpose</i> and Process
1	0845	Arrival and Networking	
2	0900	Opening and Introductions, sign-in sheet– Joe Peterson	

1. Opening comments
 1. 1. Caltrans appreciates all the comments and the time you spent reviewing the specification.
 1. 2. Today we will take the comments today and prioritize them, working through them as a group.
 1. 3. June 27th is moratorium on spec language changes, per Office Engineer (Caltrans.)
 1. 4.

3	0910	Meeting set up & housekeeping details: Agenda Review, Facilitator role, recorder role, ground rules , upshot and bin list Halverson	Establish roles, process and meeting schedule for Sub-task group.
4	0915	Superpave pilot project update – Joe Peterson	Status of Superpave work under way. Status of Superpave Working Group

2. This group can consider the Superpave working group as a resource. The focus on Superpave is with this group.

5	0920	Purpose of the Superpave sub-task group – Joe Peterson and Tony Limas, Kee Foo and Tim Saenz	Background information: Scoping document from RPC, final product and sunset date of Sub-task group.
---	------	--	---

3. Purpose of this sub task group
 3. 1. Identify and revise issues. Improve the speed

- 3. 2. In early 2014 we will see Superpave spec added to projects. This roll out will allow us to gather data and make changes.
- 3. 3. Caltrans has three projects with data available. Caltrans is sanitizing the data to protect the relationships with ongoing contracts and contractors. Once the contracts are closed out this issue goes away.
- 3. 4. If Industry is willing to share data, this will aid the group's effort. Caltrans needs industry partners to decide how they will work this out.
- 3. 5. Timeline is very tight. Caltrans says that this spec is a living document. Changes will be made as we come to agreement. This is a 2010 spec – Once we get to the moratorium date, we might have to revise the spec and put it through some sort of policy document to implement the changes.
- 3. 6. A focus group could look at data to determine technical issues, adjustments. This will take an effort from industry.

6	0935	Agreement on data sharing – Tony and Joe Agreement on participation –Tim and Tony	Agree on process for the sub task group
---	------	--	---

- 4. Agreement on data sharing
 - 4. 1. Industry will determine this in their breakout.
 - 4. 2. Joe will share comments from DME's with the group. This was done already in the last comment matrix on Superpave review. Comments were from Caltrans and industry.
- 5. Agreement on participation
 - 5. 1. If you are going to participate you have to be involved in all meetings. Get information out to your industry colleagues. We are looking for your commitment.
 - 5. 2. This will start with the next meeting. Brining people in throughout the process would cause us to have to bring up things that have already been decided.
 - 5. 3. Co-chairs will be meeting to aid communication.
 - 5. 4. We need to look at the issue of Southern California participation.
There are only two Caltrans staff involved. Caltrans DME's are working with Joe P.

7	0940	Industry Only: Caltrans staff will be out of the room for this discussion. Presentation of issues Industry discussion Identify the top ten. Tony and Tim	Introduce the issue list. Clarify and validate the industry concerns to be prioritized.
---	------	--	--

- 6. Top-Ten selection
 - 6. 1. The co-chairs will work to clean up the issues that are "housekeeping."
 - 6. 2. The four co-chairs should be able to resolve a lot of the issues.
 - 6. 3. There is a lot of duplication in this list of 103 items.
- 7. Discussion and selection
 - 7. 1. The group went through the 103 items and rated every item as 1, 2, or 3, meaning high, medium and low priority. Picking off the top scores of 15 or more on priority one yielded 8 items. Then, priority class 2 contributed 2 more items with a score of 14 or more.
 - 7. 2. The "top ten items were:

Industry feedback (areas of concern) on Superpave

Top nine or ten

Sorted on 2/12/2013

A	Issue can be resolved by Co-chairs – non-technical changes, typos, etc.
B	Additional data required – data sharing, data gathering.
C	Items to be assigned to focus groups.
D	Items that will not be resolved before June 27 th .

8. Discussion on the top nine or ten

8. 1. The group decided to take the items in order, and discuss each.

			39-1.01C(2)(b) Mix Design	Category
20			1. New mix design when RAP Specific Gravity changes by $> \pm 0.06$	C

9. New Mix/Item 1 on the issue list

- 9. 1. Focus group to analyze impact of specific grav on volumetrics and design. on this –
- 9. 2. Look at the fact that it is only 15-25%.
- 9. 3. Look at impact of SG of the RAP. Calculate this.
- 9. 4. Spec requests a new mix design: A 1 point verification, not a whole new mix design. Need language that spells out what a one point verification is, if it is needed.
- 9. 5. Industry needs data from Caltrans.
- 9. 6. Outcome
- 9. 6. 1. Focus group, Joe to provide data. (see upshot # 1)

17	2		3. VMA for $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ inch mixes (13.5/14.5)	Cat. C
----	---	--	---	--------

10. Item 3. VMA for $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ inch mixes (13.5/14.5)

- 10. 1. Research dealing with VMA has a lot of things that fall right into IA. No differentiation between production and design. If we go to 13 in design and 13 in production would be OK with Caltrans.
- 10. 2. Caltrans will look at the data as they come in and will make adjustments accordingly. This is not set in stone.
- 10. 3. This requires us to stop looking at Vheem.
- 10. 4. Caltrans has not seen a problem with 13.5 in design.
- 10. 5. Better mixes sit at 12.6, 12.7 in production. In design they sit closer to 13.5. This means contractor may need to change the process to make the crush count.
- 10. 6. Industry says, Don't hold us to anything more than the AI asks for in the mix design, realizing it will go down.
- 10. 7. Industry says the variability among Caltrans labs is enormous, and mix rejected on the basis of VMA is enormous. Reproducibility of results among Caltrans labs of contractor results is an issue.
- 10. 8. Caltrans asks district labs to reproduce field conditions and methods. What ever contractor does in production will be mimicked in the lab.
- 10. 9. Outcome
- 10. 9. 1. Joe will get data for industry on the mixes Caltrans has, and will look at 12.5 and 13.5. (see upshot # 2)

15	2	1	4 Dust Proportion for 3/8" mix (0.9 -2.0)	Category C
----	---	---	---	------------

11. Item 4 Dust Proportion for 3/8" mix (0.9 -2.0)
 11. 1. Industry will establish a focus group for this

			39-1.01D(10) Production start-Up Evaluation	
20			18. QA Test Turn-around time should be same as QC test turnaround time	Category D

12. Item 18. QA Test Turn-around time should be same as QC test turnaround time
 12. 1. This is a concern but will not be handled by this group.

			39-1.01D(16) Production	
16	3		19. To resolve dispute both QC and QA data should be reviewed. Initially by Engineer and Contractor and then ITP, if needed.	

13. Item 19: To resolve dispute both QC and QA data should be reviewed. Initially by Engineer and Contractor and then ITP, if needed.
 13. 1. This is a spec language issue.
 13. 2. When there is a dispute Caltrans and the contractor should get together and share their data.
 13. 3. Outcome:
 13. 3. 1. Joe needs to take this to Construction and report back at the next meeting. (see upshot # 5)

20	1		23. It is very difficult to screen RAP on a 1/4" screen. Why is this required? Nearly all state fractionate on the 1/2" or 5/8" screen.	Cat. A and b.
----	---	--	---	---------------

14. Item 23. It is very difficult to screen RAP on a 1/4" screen. Why is this required? Nearly all state fractionate on the 1/2" or 5/8" screen.
 14. 1. This will probably change when Caltrans goes to binder replacement. This issue is before the RAP RAS group.
 14. 2. Outcome:
 14. 2. 1. Caltrans and Industry needs to provide information –needs to work with the RAP/ RAS STG.

14	2	2	21. Minimum binder content of 7.5 may be a problem. Does Caltrans have data to support this change?	Cat. B
----	---	---	---	--------

15. Item 21. Minimum binder content of 7.5 may be a problem. Does Caltrans have data to support this change?
 15. 1. Caltrans has not seen any problems with the higher binder content.
 15. 2. In the two pilots the binder has actually come in over 7.5.
 15. 3. There is limited data on this at this time.
 15. 4. Industry needs to show data with gyratory compactor, if they have it.
 15. 5. Outcome
 15. 5. 1. Joe will share data with industry on min. binder content. (see upshot # 6)
 15. 5. 2. Industry needs to show data with gyratory compactor, if they have it.
 15. 5. 3. -+

			39-1.02J Hot Mix asphalt Production	
--	--	--	--	--

6	15	1	30. Section 39-1.01C(1): "Submit quality control test results within 2 days of request" This is a very tight time frame since AASHTO T283 takes longer than this to perform...If the test result is requested on the day of production this is impossible to meet. Also is this business days or regular days?	Cat. A
---	----	---	--	--------

16. Item 30. Section 39-1.01C(1): "Submit quality control test results within 2 days of request" This is a very tight time frame since AASHTO T283 takes longer than this to perform...If the test result is requested on the day of production this is impossible to meet. Also is this business days or regular days?

16. 1. Outcome

16. 1. 1. Joe agrees with this and will follow up on it.

15	1	1	50. Where is the data? Several projects have been put out on a 'pilot' basis. There are rumors that not all the criteria have been met and 'concessions' have been made. Information gathered on these projects need to be shared with industry and other Caltrans Districts.	Cat. A
----	---	---	---	--------

Item 50. Where is the data? Several projects have been put out on a 'pilot' basis.

1	14	3	103	
---	----	---	-----	--

--	--	--	--	--

16. 2.