Superpave Meeting Notes - Sacramento, Ca.

Group Memory

Superpave Sub Task Group

August 21, 2013

Next Meeting dates
Sep 26 South 9:30 – 3:00 District 11 Lab in Kearny Mesa (San Diego) (Note the time change to accommodate flights…)
Oct 17 North
November 14 South----

Desired outcome for next meeting:

Turn everything blue.

Collect data

Bin List & Great Ideas

(8-21-2013): CT will look at QCQA specs when the specification goes live – July 1, 2014

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~~ ~~6/18/2013~~ On-going
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~~ ~~6/18/2013~~ On-going
3	Tony	Establish a focus group New mix design when RAP Specific Gravity changes by > ± 0.06	~~6/1/2013~~ ~~7/25/2013~~

Superpave Meeting Notes - Sacramento, Ca.

Ref. #	Who	What	When
			~~8/21/2013~~ 9/26/2013
~~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~~ ~~7/25/2013~~
~~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~~ ~~4/11/2013~~ ~~6/18/2013~~ ~~7/25/2013~~ ~~8/21/2013~~
6	Joe	Joe needs to share data with industry on item 6: Minimum binder content of 7.5 may be a problem. Does Caltrans have data to support this change?	~~3/12/2013~~ ~~4/11/2013~~ ~~6/18/2013~~ On-going
~~7~~	~~Tony and Tim~~	~~Item 21: Industry needs to show data with gyratory compactor, if they have it.~~	~~6/1/2013~~ ~~On-going~~
~~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.	On-going

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.~~	~~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~~	~~Tony~~	~~Develop a plan for generic issue Superpave issues and problems. (CT) (see discussion notes # - 1.7)~~	~~6/18/2013~~
~~17~~	~~Joe~~	~~Take section 39 issue process to the next ATG Co-Chair meeting. (see discussion notes # - 1)~~	~~4/30/2013~~

Superpave Meeting Notes - Sacramento, Ca.

From 5/15/2013 Meeting

Ref. #	Who	What	When
~~18~~	~~Tony~~	~~Advise Caltrans as to how industry wants to disseminate the data. (see discussion notes # - 2)~~	~~6/18/2013~~

From 6/18/2013 Meeting

Ref. #	Who	What	When
~~19~~	~~Joe~~	~~Dispute resolution - third party testing: Check hidden text section 39 and Superpave for base stock. (see discussion notes # - 2) This relates to sharing data between industry and Caltrans. There is nothing in the spec that requires this to happen.~~	~~7/25~~

From (7/25/2013) Meeting

Ref. #	Who	What	When
~~20~~	~~Joe~~	~~Add a column to indicate which version of the spec is in place for each project, from this day forward.~~	~~8/21~~

From 8-21-2013 meeting:

Ref. #	Who	What	When
21	Tony	Edit the comments on the working document.	Sept.

Evaluation last meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Narrowing down the issues.	Need more data.

Critique from last meeting:

Evaluation for this meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Facilitator. Speegee Good conversation.	

Superpave Meeting Notes - Sacramento, Ca.

#	Time	Topic and Presenter	Purpose and Process
1	0845	Arrival and Networking	

2	0900	Opening and Introductions, sign-in sheet– Joe Peterson	

3	0905	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.

1. Upshot review:

1. 1. Upshot # 6: "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?"

    1. 1. 1. Not every producer will want to make the adjustments to their mix to meet the CT specification. CT has not seen any anomalies pop up with submitted mix designs yet. At this time, CT will stay with 7.5. This is based on 4% air void. If data comes in indicating the need for a change, then there will be a change. Data will drive the changes.
    1. 1. 2. If industry producers make adjustments to get the volumetrics in place, and there is data available, please send it to Caltrans.
    1. 1. 3. Industry needs to report mix designs that have actually passed.
    1. 1. 4. CT may have to look at this differently but there needs to be data to support the changes.
    1. 1. 5. On Superpave mixes RAP is 0-25%. The HWT is in there for any hot mix asphalt under the Superpave spec.
    1. 1. 6. CT will look at QCQA specs when the specification goes live – July 1, 2014 (added to bin list.)
    1. 1. 7. CT is satisfied that they will be able to get the spec out by July 1, 2014. CT comments that there are a few items that are still in question, but the data will drive this.
    1. 1. 8. Industry concern is that there might be a spec that would have requirements they cannot meet. Industry would like to see that contractors will be able to produce a mix that will meet the spec.
    1. 1. 9. CT comment: We have not adjusted core values to anything that would be so far off base that there will be a problem. Contractors need to make sure their sources, plants and materials will meet the specs.
    1. 1. 10. Industry comment: Looking over the horizon and forecasting issues, we try to prepare, to take steps to prepare. Not everyone is paying attention 100%, or is participating in this discussion 100%. This is a challenge for some contractors especially given the economic environment we have been passing through. Reality is that there may be some who cannot for one reason or another, get on board in time to meet the July 1 2014 timetable.
    1. 1. 11. CT: We have tried to keep industry abreast of progress in Superpave spec. Pushing the date out a year or two will not ensure that all are on board. CT wants to get agreement on the values and the spec itself. CT will hold to the July 1, 2014 date.

Superpave Meeting Notes - Sacramento, Ca.

4	0910	Review upshot list	Status the assignments
5	0920	CT 304	

2. CT 304

2. 1. CT does not have any comments indicating that this cannot be done. CT will respond (item 86)

7	1115	Lunch on your own	
8	1230	Go through the comment list work on the issues. Halverson/all	
9	1450	Review action items Next meeting date and desired outcome Halverson/all	
10	1457	Meeting Evaluation: What went well (WWW) and What Needs Improvement (WNI)	
11	1500	Adjourn	