Superpave Meeting Notes - Sacramento, Ca.

Group Memory

Superpave Sub Task Group

April 11, 2013

Next Meeting dates
Apr 11 North 9:00 – 3:00
May 15 South
~~June 27~~ North June 18th (Note the change)
Jul 25 South
Aug 22 North
Sep 26 South
Oct 17 / North
November 14 South----

Desired outcome for next meeting:

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

Turn everything blue.

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 first two meetings. **ADDITIONAL ISSUE-SPECIFIC ACTION ITEMS BEGINNING WITH APRIL MEETING ARE SHOWN IN THE WORKING LIST, AND INDICATED BY BEING BOLD, UNDERLINED.**

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 4/11/2013
2	Joe	will get data for industry on the mixes Caltrans has, and will look at 12.5 and 13.5.	~~2/22/2013~~ 3/12/2013
3	Tony	Establish a focus group New mix design when RAP Specific Gravity changes by > ± 0.06	6/1/2013
4	Pascal ~~Tim~~	Establish a focus group VMA for ¾ and ½ 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	~~3/12/2013~~

Superpave Meeting Notes - Sacramento, Ca.

Ref. #	Who	What	When
		meeting. "Item 19: To resolve dispute both QC and QA data should be reviewed. Initially by Engineer and Contractor and then ITP, if needed."	4/11/2013
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~~ 4/11/2013
7	Tony and Tim	Item 21: Industry needs to show data with gyratory compactor, if they have it.	6/1/2013
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~~ 4/11/2013
9	All-	REMIND YOUR COLLEAGUES OF THIS STG, share the information.	

From 3/12/2013 Meeting

Ref. #	Who	What	When
10	Jim StMartin	Send Joe comments for the Superpave project list.	3/15/2013
11	Tony	Create a focus group to come up with a project data collection template. Aa 3)	4/11/2013
12	Joe	Provide language for spec related to issue 1 asking for contractors to take action, modify their JMF. CT is trying to make sure contractors manage their stockpiles (log # 1) CT will define one-point verification.	4/11/2013
13	Joe	Modify the time frame for submittal of QC tests, specifidcally T283.(issue 8)	4/11/2013
~~14~~	~~Tony L~~	~~Truncate issue 10, bring forward atnext meeting. (issue 10)~~	
15	Tony	Set up meeting with Joe to discus issue 17, 18 and 19	

From 4/11/2013 Meeting

Ref. #	Who	What	When
16	Industry	Develop a plan for generic issue Superpave issues and problems. Include Audrie. (CT) (see discussion notes # 1.7)	??
17	Joe	Take section 39 issue process to the next ATG Co-Chair meeting. (see discussion notes # 1)	4/30/2013

No critique done this meeting.

What went well	What Needs Improvement

Critique from last meeting:

Superpave Meeting Notes - Sacramento, Ca.

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Covered a lot of ground Good turnout Good facility Good duration	Donuts and coffee. Too many side conversations

1. APRIL 11 initial discussion with group – CT and industry representatives.
    1. 1. Industry needs to do its homework.
    1. 2. Contract administration concern is to have a fair process.
    1. 3. RE is responsible for contract administration. You havfe to deal with the RE.
    1. 4. If you cannot meet the spec, you need to demonstrate this to Caltrans.
    1. 5. If there are problems they need to be resolved at the lowest possible level.
    1. 6. If you have problems, compile and share them with Caltrans – can be generic unless the contractor is willing to share the data.
    1. 7. Proposal: Industry could develop a form that can be posted on their web site
        1. 7. 1. Contractor could say "on this contract, we are trying to meet this spec and here is the problem we are having." Tells what the contractor has done. Could be a summarized discussion…
        1. 7. 2. A form that would fit all the different scenarios would be hard to come up with…
        1. 7. 3. Caltrans can post data they have.
    1. 8. Section 39 issues cannot be discussed here. This should be discussed at the next ATG Co-Chair Meeting. (see upshot # 17)
    1. 9. Caltrans needs to understand the effect of spec changes on performance. All want to see enhanced performance as a result of spec changes. We need to be able to quantify the improvements resulting from the changes. If the changes do not show enhanced performance what do we do?
    1. 10. Industry concern: There are so many changes it is hard to know which change is yielding what result, what benefit.
    1. 11. Industry would like to know the basis of spec changes. We want to understand the rationale for changes.
    1. 12. Caltrans: Part of this evaluation is to see what impacts performance. Bring your proposals to CT.
    1. 13. Industry: This is not just Caltrans. The Superpave spec issue involves cities and counties also. Caltrans response: We are cognizant of this.
    1. 14. Outcomes:
        1. 14. 1. Industry could develop a form that can be posted on their web site (see upshot # 16)
        1. 14. 2. Section 39 issues cannot be discussed here. This should be discussed at the next ATG Co-Chair Meeting. (see upshot # 17)
    1. 15. The project list is static – we are not adding pilot projects to it, but if contractors want to change over to Superpave by CCO, we will entertain that. If projects have not reached ready to list stage (RTL), then Joe can make spec changes based on resolutions in this sub task group to the issues on the working list. 4 projects are RTL this month.