Group Memory

ATG Co-Chair Meeting

July 26, 2016

NOTE: all comments prior to July 7, 2015 have been deleted and can still be found on GROUP MEMORY FOR SEPTEMBER 8. 2015 and earlier.

Attendees: July 26, 2016 – Tim Greutert, Chuck Suszko, Sri Balasubramanian, Pat Imhoff

Next Meeting dates

August 17, 2016, 1:30 p.m – 2:30 pm

August 30, 2016, 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 pm

Desired outcome for every meeting

Update tasks and action items

From April 26, 2016

178	Jack	Check with Sallie Houston and provide an update on the PGAR progress (see agenda item # 9)	~~6/1/2016~~ ~~6/16/2016~~ ~~7/26/2016~~ 8/17/2016
180	Sri	Develop CT position regarding non-amine based products and the New Products process. (see agenda item # 20.16)	~~5/26/2016~~ ~~6/16/2016~~ ~~7/26/2016~~ 8/17/2016

From June 16, 2016

183	Jack	During the QC/QA meeting on June 15, 2016, industry could not reach consensus on the number of inspectors. Industry discuss and provide more information at the next Section 39 meeting (~~7/13/16~~ 8/19/16). (See agenda item #13)	Sept ATG Mtg

From July 12, 2016

~~187~~	~~Jack/Pat~~	~~Jack and Pat to discuss with Toni Carroll today then report back to ATG as there is some confusion related to other alternatives that can/should be considered per the email from Toni. (See agenda item #20.25)~~	~~7/15/2016~~
188	Tim	Revise the scoping document for vacuum seal to reflect the inclusion of drying option and route the revised scoping document to ATG (See agenda item # 16.13)	~~7/29/2016~~ 8/17/2016
189	Tim/Sri/Chuck	discuss and report at next ATG on Caltrans' position on this subject.(See agenda item #20.26)	~~7/26/2016~~ 8/17/2016

From July 26, 2016

190	Sri	Call an urgent meeting of the Asphalt Binder Crumb Rubber Verification STG in response to Doug Carlson's email. (See agenda item #12.13)	8/17/2016
191	Chuck	Call a meeting for Increasing Crumb Rubber Usage STG. (See agenda item #14.15)	8/17/2016
192	Chuck	Send draft CPB to Pat/Jack/Tim/Sri. (See agenda item #18.13)	8/17/2016

Critique from this meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement

Critique from last meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement

1	0900	Opening and Introductions, Purpose of meeting	Introduce new Industry/Caltrans rep?

Agenda Item 1.

1. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) No comments
1. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) No comments
1. 3. (Comment from 8/27/2015) New item to add: New Products issue.
1. 4. (Comment from 09/08/2015) No comments
1. 5. (Comment from 09/29/2015) No comments
1. 6. (Comment from 10/27/2015) No comments
1. 7. (Comment from 12/08/2015) No comments
1. 8. (Comment added 1/12/2016) No comments
1. 9. (Comment from 2/09/2016) No comments
1. 10. (Comment from 2/22/2016) This is Mike's last ATG meeting.
1. 11. (Comments from 4/25/16) No comments

2.	0904	Agenda Review	
3	0905	Review and status the upshot list	OK as written? Corrections needed? Assignments done?
4	0915	HMA-LV (Formerly was TYPE B Aggregates)	

Agenda Item 4. HMA-LV

4. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) No information on the scoping document at this time.

4. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) The RPC Co Chairs have not made a decision on how to deal with HMA-LV. Industry concern is that the RPC Co Chairs may not have been kept informed as to what this issue is about. It was discussed by the RPC co-chairs, and they are discussing this and will decide what avenue to take. Caltrans concern is that it appears that industry is trying to re-write Section 39. Industry does not agree. There have been a lot of meetings on this with Caltrans and industry. Industry concern is that there seems not to be any decision makers at the STG meetings. Caltrans does not agree with this. The industry and Caltrans co-chairs will not have any more meetings of the STG until RPC resolves the issue.

4. 3. (Comment from 08/04/2015) Outcome

4. 3. 1. Sri will notify the Caltrans STG co-chairs to not meet until the RPC has resolved their issue as to how to proceed.

4. 4. (Comment from 8/27/2015) RPC Co Chairs are going to get back to the STG and the ATG Co Chairs on the status of the scoping document and how they want to see this proceed. Industry ATG Co Chairs will check with industry RPC Co Chairs.

4. 5. (Comment from 09/08/2015) No change in status. Industry comment: We continue to wait for RPC decision. Caltrans says they want to talk to the industry co chairs to see what is going on.

4. 6. Outcome:

4. 6. 1. (Comment from 09/08/2015) (See upshot # 151) Pat and Jack will check on the status of the scoping document with Caltrans and provide information to Caltrans on why there needs to be a revised scoping document.

4. 7. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Mike C and Toni C were going to contact Tim to figure out how we need to proceed on this. We are waiting for the RPC to respond back to us.

4. 8. (Comment from 12/08/2015) According to CT: RPC industry co chairs are going to have an industry-only meeting to discuss this item. Industry says there is nothing to discuss at this point because industry does not have any information from CT on their concerns. Industry (Mike and Toni) has asked for Caltrans to put their concerns in writing. Caltrans does not want to have a parallel section 39. CT says this does not relate to CT highways, so it should not be moving forward. Industry says CT has oversight on local streets and roads. Industry says this was never intended to be on Caltrans roads. We are still trying to identify the Caltrans position on the scoping document and why this has not moved forward. Industry is still waiting for a response on this.

4. 9. (Comment from 12/08/2015) Outcome:

4. 9. 1. Sri will look at RPC minutes and any other correspondence related to the HMA-LV issue and provide that information to industry on CT concerns. (See upshot # 161)

4. 10. (Comment added 1/12/2016) This discussion is still happening at the RPC level. Industry reports they are very frustrated with this. Industry got new information from Caltrans and will bring industry response back to Caltrans at the next ATG co-chair meeting.

4. 11. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry report: Mike Cook will take this back to the RPC and they will revisit it. Then we will get a report back. Caltrans reports they are checking into a special meeting of the 4+2 to work on HMA-LV before the third Monday in February. Caltrans reports that Chuck is preparing something for RPC. Industry is waiting for the outcome of the 4+2 meeting discussion. Industry comment: We may have dropped the ball on this.

4. 12. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Caltrans reports that we need a new date for the 4+2, as the usual date falls on a holiday. Caltrans reports they will set up a special 4+2 meeting to discuss this item.

4. 13. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Outcome:

4. 13. 1. Chuck will make sure a 4+2 meeting is set up to discuss this. (See upshot # 170)

4. 14. (Comment from 2/22/2016) There was a 4+2 meeting on 2/19. Caltrans will be putting their position into writing on the Local Agency Low Volume, as requested at the meeting. This should happen within two weeks.

4. 15. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Tim Denlay to provide the industry position on the Local Agency low volume issue/specification development by next ATG meeting. (See upshot # 176)

4. 16. (Comment from 6/1/2016) On 5/28/2016 Kee requested ATG to make a decision that the subtask group can reconvene if they eliminate specifications for roadways with a TI>8. Industry position is that they are willing to proceed with a specification that eliminates roadways with a TI>8. Caltrans/Industry ATG co-chairs unanimously concur. Sri to contact Kee about this decision. Pat will contact Tim Denlay to convey this decision.

4. 17. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Jack – a meeting date has been set 6/21/2016. Industry is very happy about that.

4. 18. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Pat – a meeting occurred 6/21/16, which included local agency representation. Tim D. is taking the lead for industry for revising the draft specifications. Next subtask group meeting is scheduled for 7/26/2016.

4. 19. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Pat – HMA-LV STG meeting occurred today that appeared to make good progress with local agency participation.

5		Review progress of Section 39 STG	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 5. Section 39

5. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) Still making progress – we are working on the aggregate temp. – We are putting a white paper together for this.

5. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) "White Paper" document for aggregate max temp is now in the hands of the STG industry co-chairs. It has been sent on to the Caltrans STG co-chairs to be forwarded to the ATG co-chairs. This will follow the RPC process. Caltrans has developed their own white paper which will be sent on to the STG industry co-chairs.

5. 3. (Comment from 08/04/2015) **Caltrans and industry agree that the Section 39 STG can continue to meet.** Industry's opinion is that the Section 39 STG should be a standing committee to address issues on the specification, if this STG is sunset. They want to continue to meet and work on the Section 39 issues that are in their document. Additionally, new issues come up on projects due to changes that have been made in the spec. At this time there are too many issues to roll into QCQA. Next meeting is in Southern California on August 25. Caltrans does not want to modify the scoping document.

5. 4. (Comment from 08/04/2015) Outcome

5. 4. 1. The ATG Co-Chairs will let the STG co-chairs for Section 39 know that they can continue to meet until all issues are resolved. (See upshot # 148)

5. 5. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Section 39 co-chairs are working to focus the discussion to resolve issues and remove them from the active issues list before adding new issues.

5. 6. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Task group continues to work on outstanding issues. Still working on temperature issue. CT understanding is that the white paper has been sent to industry via the STG co-chairs. CT reports that the white paper was sent to industry, and the STG needs to see if this needs to be elevated to the ATG if issue needs resolution. Industry reports that it was agreed to elevate this issue to the ATG.

5. 7. Outcome

5. 7. 1. Jack will check with the STG co-chairs to see where we are on the aggregate temperature issue. (See upshot # 153)

5. 8. (Comment from 09/29/2015) Jack sent this issue forward – It needs to be taken to the next level to resolve.

5. 9. (Comment from 10/27/2015) The issue has been raised to ATG – Industry: We got two position papers from Caltrans last week. We do not have a consensus on this since industry is not in agreement among ourselves. We will not be able to make any agreement at this time, and we want to move this up to the RPC for a decision.

5. 10. Outcome:

5. 10. 1. Pat and Jack will sign the decision document and send it back to Sri. (See upshot # 155)

5. 11. (Comment from 12/08/2015) CT Pavement Chief Jesse B has the two options for the decision document. He will take the two aggregate temperature options to the RPC Co-Chairs in writing and a decision will be made. Industry says we are not making any progress on this. We are waiting for a response from Caltrans on this. This is holding up work at the STG. Industry hopes to hear back at our next meeting of the ATG Co-Chairs.

5. 12. (Comment from 12/08/2015) Caltrans will wait for industry to report back from their industry-only meeting re: location of future meetings – north only vs north and south.

5. 13. Outcome

5. 13. 1. Jack and Pat will bring the issue of Section 39 meeting locations up to the industry meeting participants and report back to CT (See upshot # 164)

5. 14. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Industry position is that it is unfair to expect the participants in Southern California to always come to Sacramento. Caltrans wants to ensure there is enough participation in the south to justify moving the meeting back and forth. Industry will convey the Caltrans position back to industry at the next industry only meeting.

5. 15. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Meeting location for Section 39 will be going south and north, per industry request. Industry reports that the aggregate temperature issue is holding up the Section 39 progress. ATG co-chairs are waiting for the 4+2 RPC co-chairs to work on this and send it back down to the ATG co-chairs.

5. 16. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Industry reports that they are continuing to move ahead – Caltrans reports that the north/south rotation of meetings is OK.

5. 17. (Comment from 2/22/2016) There will be a meeting tomorrow at the SRL. The RPC Co Chairs are requesting a scoping document for post-plant gradation. This needs to be done at the sub task group level. This will be discussed at the Section 39 meeting.

5. 18. (Comment from 4/25/2016) At the Section 39 meeting last week, industry agreed to provide a draft scoping document for post-plant gradation by mid-May (see upshot #177).

5. 19. (Comment from 6/1/2016) At last meeting Kee requested team go back to initial scoping document. ATG Co-chairs will attend the next Section 39 meeting (6/14) 9:00-2:30 at Granite Summit Room (Bradshaw) to better understand the team's challenges.

5. 20. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Jack – Team met this week. Team is continuing to work through the initial items and any additional items as time allows. Of the 81 items on their task list, 37 have been resolved and 44 are still being worked on.

5. 21. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Jack – nothing to report. July meeting was cancelled. Next meeting is scheduled for August 18, 2016.

5. 22. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Nothing new to report.

6		Review progress of RAP/RAS Subtask Group	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 6. RAP/RAS

6. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) Form is in draft form and is being reviewed. The Forms unit will be uploading them on the web site – two other forms are being reviewed by Construction. A new spec has been circulated for comments – there will be a combined meeting on July 28th at Translab to discuss the changes.

6. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) A meeting took place. Joe Peterson's revised spec for RAP/RAS was discussed and is being worked on.

6. 3. (Comment from 8/27/2015) The STG will meet next week. Caltrans reports that this scoping document is closed. Industry response is to close this off after discussing the changes that were made, and it should not take much time. The spec is finished.

6. 4. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Outcome

6. 4. 1. Jack and Pat will talk to Tony to find out where we are on this issue and complete the changes or produce an expedited scoping document. (see upshot # 149)

6. 5. (Comment from 09/08/2015) There was a RAP/RAS meeting last week. This item still needs discussion in the STG. Refiners will come back with a recommendation on dealing with the variability of their product. Caltrans has requested an expedited scoping document. Caltrans wants to confirm what the STG is working on.

6. 6. (Comment from 10/27/2015) No new information available.

6. 7. (Comment from 12/08/2015) A scoping document was sent to industry to carry forward. Industry comments are due today on the scoping document. CT has extended the comment period to Friday, December 11. Caltrans will be working on an NSSP until this group can get going. When a draft of the NSSP is ready it will be sent to industry.

6. 8. Outcome

6. 8. 1. CT will send the draft NSSP for RAP/RAS to industry. (See upshot # 163)

6. 9. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Caltrans wants to set up a meeting to discuss this long-term. Caltrans is requesting Industry to send in any fatal flaws in the NSSP by next Friday, January 15t.

6. 10. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Outcome:

6. 10. 1. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Industry will report back to Caltrans by COB on 1/15/2016 any fatal flaws in the NSSP for RAP/RAS.

6. 10. 2. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Caltrans will share the draft the Construction Procedure Directive with industry.

6. 10. 3. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Pat and Jack will comment back to Caltrans on the draft CPD by 1/22/2016.

6. 10. 4. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry reports this went out for comments. Industry comments on the NSSP have been sent back to Caltrans. Caltrans needs to look at the comments sent by industry.

6. 11. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Industry reports that the NSSP was sent back to Caltrans with comments. Industry refiners met and drafted a letter to send to Caltrans. Caltrans has not seen a letter on this issue form the refiners. Caltrans reports that there is an approved scoping document for a STG to look at this issue. Kee Foo is the Caltrans lead. Industry leads are Tony and Pascal.

6. 12. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Industry reports there are major problems with the NSSP.

6. 13. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Caltrans reports that they decided to do three things when industry brought this to their attention, because industry said they needed action immediately. Therefore the three action are , 1) Caltrans would in the long term, put a STG together to look at this in detail, and 2) in the short term draft up an NSSP for an interim solution. This was sent out for comment on it. Also 3) write change orders on on-going projects to deal with this.

6. 14. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Industry reports they have sent in comments with several fatal flaws documented. Industry reports they have not seen any response form Caltrans. Industry says there needs further discussion before this NSSP is sent out. They are requesting that a meeting should be set up to discuss this, immediately. Caltrans replied that, based on the comments they have, there is no indication that binder refiners will be unable to provide the test. Caltrans and industry will set up a meeting ASAP.

6. 15. Outcome

6. 15. 1. Caltrans will respond back to the people who have sent in comments on the NSSP. Industry requests the comments be sent back to Tony and Pascal, with a cc to all those who commented. (See upshot # 171)

6. 15. 2. If necessary, as a follow up to responding to the people who have sent in comments, coordinate setting up a meeting with Tony and Pascal to address industry refiner concerns on the NSSP. (See upshot # 172)

6. 16. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Caltrans is still working on comments from the Asphalt Institute. The letter was sent from the AI by US Mail, and Caltrans reports they have not received the letter as of today. Caltrans has not received the letter by e mail either.

6. 17. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Caltrans received the Asphalt Institute letter. CT met with industry including Jack, Tony L., Russ S. A comment matrix was developed. Industry is waiting for revised NSSP that incorporated issues on the matrix. Sri will look into the revised NSSP and get back to ATG by 4/29. (See upshot # 174)

6. 18. (Comment from 6/1/2016) Sri has completed the NSSP. Sri to send out 6/3/2016.

6. 19. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Sri sent out the NSSP on 6/13/2016. Jack – CT is waiting for industry review. Attempt to complete in the next 3-4 weeks.

6. 20. (Comment from 7/12/16) CPD went out regarding blending charts. Jack – industry is generally not happy with outcome. Sri – This is a stop gap measure to address an immediate concern raised. Scoping document has been drafted and posted to come up with a long-term solution. The RAP/RAS STG will need to get together (Kee Foo, Pete Spector, Tony Limas and Pascal M.). Meeting date has not been established to date.

6. 21. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Sri – STG scheduled meeting date 8/12/2016.

~~7~~		~~Review progress of binder set point scoping document (Possibly expedite)~~	~~Current status, progress since last report, next steps~~

Agenda Item 7. Binder set point

7. 1. (Comment from 02/24/2015) Closed today

8		Intelligent Compaction	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 8. Intelligent compaction

8. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) Still monitoring the pilot projects. Caltrans reports: We will have another STG meeting soon – no date yet. The STG met and will be making modifications to the spec. We received input from industry on modifications on future improvements to the VETA program. Industry still has issues with the temperature probe, the intelligent compaction measurement value. These issues will need to be worked out in the STG. We have a ways to go before we have a spec we can all live with.
8. 2. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Nothing new to report.
8. 3. (Comment from 10/27/2015) We have a STG meeting scheduled for Nov 6.
8. 4. (Comment from 12/08/2015) The meeting was held, next meeting is set for December 15.
8. 5. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Caltrans: There was a follow-up meeting on January 7th with the technology providers. The revised draft spec was sent out last week for comments.
8. 6. (Comment added 1/26/2016) No report
8. 7. (Comment from 2/09/2016) No report
8. 8. (Comment from 2/22/2016) No report
8. 9. (Comment from 4/25/2016) CT is doing pilot projects with IC. No action.
8. 10. Comment from 6/1/2016) Chuck – next meeting is scheduled for 6/9 10:00-2:00 from Ebi.(See upshot #182)
8. 11. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Meeting occurred 6/9. Team is gathering data. Jack indicated that industry has some disagreements.
8. 12. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Jack – Described a project-specific issue. The pilot project concept will be discussed at the RPC Operating Principles meeting.
8. 13. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Nothing to report.

9		Review progress of PGAR Subtask Group	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 9. PGAR

9. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) Nothing new to report.
9. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) There is a meeting set today with the co-chairs to discuss the data. They will just be looking at the data.
9. 3. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Nothing new to report. Expect a report at our next meeting.
9. 4. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Sallie Houston has results from the labs and has done a preliminary evaluation of the data. She will continue to evaluate the data and make a presentation in October 20/21 at the PCCAS meeting at UNR in Reno.
9. 5. (Comment from 10/27/2015) No new information available.
9. 6. Outcome
    9. 6. 1. Jack will check on the PGAR with Sallie Houston and report back at the next meeting. (See upshot # 156)

9. 7. Meeting of co-chairs was held on PGAR. CT reports they have not had the small group meeting on this item. It is set for tomorrow afternoon (12/9/2015). Sallie will share her information with us at this time.

9. 8. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Caltrans reports Co Chair meeting took place. Next step is to do additional analysis. Once this is done, there will be a larger group meeting and the information will be shared.

9. 9. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry reports that the data from the second round-robin testing are still being analyzed. Once the analysis is completed on the second round robin the STG will decided what to do next. ,

9. 10. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Nothing new to report

9. 11. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Industry says this will be discussed at the PCCAS meeting this week.

9. 12. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Industry says this will be discussed at the PCCAS meeting in early May. Team is working on the statistics of the data. Jack will talk to Sallie and provide and update at the next meeting.

9. 13. (Comment from 6/1/2016) See upshot #178.

9. 14. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Nothing new to report.

9. 15. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Jack – Team is still working on this. Nothing new to report.

9. 16. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Pat – Jack to update next meeting.

10		Review progress of asphalt rubber binder quality control Subtask Group	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 10. asphalt rubber binder quality control

10. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) No new report. Industry will report more next meeting.

10. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) No new report.

10. 3. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Samples have been located and we will move this forward now.

10. 4. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Samples are being taken next weekend. Results are expected by our next meeting.

10. 5. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Industry: We have samples and they should be sent to the labs this week. Expect results from tests within the next two weeks.

10. 6. (Comment from 12/08/2015) The samples are being sent out this week. We hope to get testing done next week.

10. 7. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Industry reports that the results from testing will be available in the next month. The samples were sent out to the three labs. Testing was conducted last week.

10. 8. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry reports they are still waiting for the testing that Al was going to do. We will report back on the next meeting on this.

10. 9. (Comment from 2/09/2016) There was a problem with an industry lab, so retesting is necessary. This will be done next week. Industry did receive what they needed from the Caltrans binder lab. Industry will report back at the next meeting.

10. 10. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Industry reports that all the work has been done. Jack will be talking to Al about a report on the study. This report will show the results of the study and recommendations. This will be a short report conveying what was done, what was concluded and what is recommended. Caltrans would like to have this in a MS Word format so it can be posted on the web site.

10. 11. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Jack – the preliminary data indicates there is no issue on the reheat. The report will be generated and shared with Section 39 STG along with a recommendation for action within the Section 39 STG. Jack working with Al Vasquez to develop data/report information. The report should be out by next meeting and will be presented at the next Section 39 meeting. After that this sub task group can end.

10. 12. (Comment from 6/1/2016) Jack to get with Al for resolution. Once this is done this project will be CLOSED OUT!!!!

10. 13. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Jack – will report back next meeting (7/12/2016).

10. 14. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Jack – I met with Al. Al agreed to draft a summary document and Jack is drafting changes to the test method (a previous LP). Jack collaborating with Al to get final reporting completed. Jack will have more info at next ATG meeting.

10. 15. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Nothing to report.

~~11~~		~~Review progress of CT 304~~	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 11. Review progress of CT 304

11. 1. (Comment from 8/19/2014) This was posted. Industry will check it out. We are now done with this item and we can drop it off the agenda. **Drop from agenda**

12		Asphalt Binder Crumb Rubber Verification STG	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 12. Asphalt Binder Crumb Rubber Verification

12. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) Caltrans has nothing new to report. We are in the implementation phase.

12. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) Nothing new to report. There will probably not be anything to report until the end of the calendar year.

12. 3. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Nothing new to report.

12. 4. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Noting new to report

12. 5. (Comment from 10/27/2015) We are continuing to work on this. Compliance is required by July 2016. The forms are being finalized.

12. 6. (Comment from 12/08/2015) Industry is working on this. Nothing new to report.

12. 7. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry reports that Caltrans has indicated they have put the requirement for CRM verification into the RSS and they will be requiring this to be included for all projects starting on July 1, 2016.

12. 8. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Nothing new to report.

12. 9. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Nothing new to report.

12. 10. (Comment from 4/25/2016) RSS has been published. Chuck – needs to develop CPB. Draft to be available by next ATG meeting. Plan to have CPB out by June. After the CPB is issued, this sub task group can end (See upshot # 173)

12. 11. (Comment from 6/1/2016) 5/23/2016 Chuck emailed out draft CPB for CR verification with comments due 6/1. No comments from Pat/Jack or Tim. Specifications will start coming out in projects starting today. Once this is signed, this project will be CLOSED!!!!

12. 12. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Chuck – still waiting to get CPB signed.

12. 13. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Sri – We have a new issue. No CRM vendors have submitted their products for inclusion to the Authorized Materials List (AML). Doug Carlson with Liberty Tire sent an email Kee Foo and others on 7/26/2016 indicating that the current chemical formulation of scrap tires will not meet the current Caltrans specification. The AML has a population of zero, therefore no vendors can meet the specification.

13		Section 39 QCQA STG	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 13. QC/QA for Superpave

13. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) Industry reports we are making progress.

13. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) We have had another meeting and are continuing to make progress. The big issue is max. aggregate temperature. This issue has been taken outside the group.

13. 3. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Industry reports they are solid on their position. Caltrans is waiting to confer on September 29th with FHWA before any further action is taken.

13. 4. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Continuing to make progress.

13. 5. (Comment from 10/27/2015) We are continuing to make progress. We had a meeting last Friday.

13. 6. Outcome

13. 6. 1. Caltrans will discuss the issue of minimum number of technicians for QC and discuss at our next meeting. (See upshot # 159)

13. 7. (Comment from 12/08/2015) Industry reports they will be discussing this issue tomorrow at their meeting. Industry will discuss this at the next QCQA meeting. Industry will decide what they will do at that meeting and report back to CT.

13. 8. Outcome

13. 8. 1. Jack and Pat will take the issue of technician requirements to industry tomorrow and report back. (See upshot # 164)

13. 9. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Caltrans has proposed a certain number of QC technicians to Caltrans. Industry has also made a counterproposal. If Caltrans cannot live with the industry recommendation, they need to come back with the Caltrans position. Industry will look at the Caltrans position and decide if they can agree with it. This is still at the STG level.

13. 10. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry has provided their proposal, and they are waiting for a decision. Caltrans reports they are working on this in a small group and will report back to the STG.

13. 11. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Outcome

13. 11. 1. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Sri will check on the small working group who are discussing the industry proposal re: number of inspectors required and clarify what has happened, and will report back at the next meeting. (see upshot # 168)

13. 11. 2. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Jack will check on the status of the proposal on the number of inspectors required from industry with Tony Limas. (see upshot # 169)

13. 12. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Caltrans reports they have prepared a position paper and they are waiting for industry to report back. Industry reports that this will be cleared up at the next meeting.

13. 13. (Comment from 2/22/2016) The group met last week and is continuing to move forward. The post-plant gradation decision will be holding up the progress. This will be discussed at the next QCQA STG meeting on March 23.

13. 14. (Comment from 2/22/2016) As to the number of inspectors, industry does not have consensus among themselves, and want to have Caltrans make the decision. Industry reports there is not any dispute, since they do not have a position on the issue, due to a lack of consensus.

13. 15. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Caltrans requests that the STG put their request in writing for Caltrans to unilaterally make a decision

13. 16. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Once the STG request is received, Caltrans to develop a decision document (Sri) with Caltrans position. Jack/Pat to prepare the STG document. Sri to prepare ATG position document. Industry cannot come to consensus. (See upshot # 168)

13. 17. (Comment from 6/1/2016) Industry is asking for the final decision on the number of technicians required. (See upshot #168)

13. 18. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Jack – During the QC/QA meeting yesterday, industry could not reach consensus on the number of inspectors. Industry will discuss and provide more information at the next Section 39 meeting (7/13/16). We continue to move forward on the issues.

13. 19. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Jack – This will be discussed at the August 19, 2016, Section 39 QC/QA meeting as the 7/13 meeting was re-scheduled.

13. 20. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Nothing to report.

14		Crumb Rubber Usage	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 14. Increasing Crumb Rubber Usage (added October 28, 2014)

14. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) Caltrans has received the information from UCPRC and we are working to finalize the research proposal. After that, we can move forward with the scoping document which will include the cost of the research proposal.

14. 2. (Comment from 08/04/2015) No new report.

(Comment from 8/27/2015) Caltrans is working to secure funding for the research project. Caltrans is making a ballpark estimate of the money needed. After this, the STG will have the opportunity to offer input on the research work plan. Scoping document is expected soon.

14. 3. (Comment from 09/08/2015) We are waiting for a scoping document.

14. 4. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Caltrans sent out draft scoping document to the ATG industry co-chairs.

Outcome

14. 4. 1. Comments need to be sent to Chuck on the draft scoping document by 9/15/2015 (See upshot # 153)

14. 5. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Scoping document has been approved, and we have the research funding, jointly with Cal-Recycle. Right now we do not have any co-chairs.

14. 5. 1. Outcome: Pat and Chuck will identify STG co-chairs for (rubber usage. (See upshot # 157)

14. 6. (Comment from 12/08/2015) Industry will have a response at the next meeting of the ATG Co Chairs.

14. 7. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Co chairs have been selected, meetings will be scheduled soon.

14. 8. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry reports the meeting date was set. March 10, from 9-4.

14. 9. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Industry co-chairs are Mark Belshe and Edgar Hitti. Caltrans co chair Haiping Zhou

14. 10. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Nothing to report.

14. 11. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Jack – 3 Working groups had a meeting. Still working on those items. Haiping has moved over to concrete. Sri will find a replacement. Sri may have an interim staff working.

14. 12. (Comment from 6/1/2016) Chuck – Understanding that Haiping has finalized the work plans. Sri's group is looking for a replacement for Haiping sometime around July. Until then Haiping is still the co-chair.

14. 13. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Chuck - I think Mark B. sent out the final work plan today.

14. 14. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Chuck will confirm that the Cal-Recycle monies have been transferred to Caltrans. Once this is confirmed a meeting of this subtask group will be scheduled.

14. 15. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Chuck – Research funds have been transferred. Meeting still needs to be set.

16		Vacuum Sealing Cores	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 16. vacuum sealing cores

16. 1. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Scoping document for vacuum sealing cores has been approved. This needs to be added to the agenda for future meetings.

16. 2. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Co Chairs for Industry will be picked by the next meeting. Caltrans has not selected a co-chair yet.

16. 3. (Comment from 09/29/2015) Tony will be the co-chair for industry.

16. 4. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Scoping document has been signed. We are looking at how vacuum sealing would be implemented. Next meeting is November 5 at Translab. STG co-chairs are Tony Limas and Al Vasquez.

16. 5. (Comment from 12/08/2015) CT reports the team has been meeting. The next meeting today at 1 pm and this is moving forward in a positive manner.

16. 6. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Making progress, meeting today.

16. 7. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Caltrans reports the team met, they have draft specs. Tony Limas is going to route this through the Section 39 STG at their next meeting.

16. 8. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Industry met on this issue and had no comments for Caltrans. Industry reports this will be discussed at the Section 39 STG on Feb. 23.

16. 9. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Nothing new to report.

16. 10. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Draft specification language provided to 39 STG co-chairs. Next 39 STG meeting is 5/26. This item was not discussed at the 4/12 STG meeting.

16. 11. (Comment from 6/1/2016) This issue became linked with the effort to drop the drying temperature of cores specified in AASHTO T275 from 125 to 100 degrees. A draft CPD has been developed and will be distributed to ATG co-chairs by 6/6. Expectation is that the spec will be updated in the July posting.

16. 12. The specification language was sent through the Section 39 group. The draft language does not include the option to include the drying options in T331. Team to evaluate after receiving the CPD language from Chuck. (Upshot #186)

16. 13. (Comment from 7/12/2016) The ATG decided to incorporate the drying options. The scoping document for vacuum seal will be revised to reflect this inclusion by Tim. Tim to route revised scoping document to ATG by 7/29.

16. 14. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Tim – A meeting has been scheduled in early August with Jack, Al V., Tony Limas and Tim to assess recent changes that impact this project. A likely outcome of this meeting will be a closing of this project and develop a new scoping document that outlines the objectives and stakeholders impacted.

17		RHMA with small amount of RAP	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 17. RHMA with small amount of RAP (Comment from 09/08/2015)

17. 1. (Comment from 07/07/2015) 1) RHMA with low percentage of RAP scoping document, this is going to be signed by the last of the RPC Co Chairs and 2) Vacuum Sealing Cores scoping document. Two of the three co-chairs have signed this, should be signed at next RPC meeting and 3) temporary transverse tapers scoping document. This still needs two Caltrans Task Group co-chair signatures before it can go to RPC before it can be approved by the RPC, and 4) The fourth one, a scoping document for the low amount of crumb rubber in HMA will be written up soon. RHMA scoping document should be signed soon. We will be incorporating the information from UCPRC.

17. 2. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Scoping document for RHMA with small amount of RAP has been approved.

17. 3. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Co Chairs for Industry will be picked by the next meeting. Caltrans has not selected a co-chair yet.

17. 4. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Caltrans and industry have not selected any co-chairs.

17. 5. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Outcome

17. 5. 1. Jack and Chuck will select co-chairs for the RHMA small amount of RAP STG. (See upshot # 160)

17. 6. (Comment from 12/08/2015) We will have the names for industry co-chairs after the meeting tomorrow.

17. 7. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Co chairs have been selected, meeting date will be set.

17. 8. (Comment added 1/26/2016) No date set yet. CO-chairs are Tony Limas and Hongbin Xie, Kee Foo and Haiping Zhou.

17. 9. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Industry will provide a co-chair to replace Hongbin Xie.

17. 10. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Industry will get a replacement co chair and report at the next meeting.

17. 11. (Comment from 4/25/2106) This first meeting will take place on 4/26.

17. 12. (Comment from 6/1/2016) First meeting occurred. Team is waiting for a UCPRC report due out in August. Rita looking for some preliminary data. This is moving forward.

17. 13. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Moving forward – making progress.

17. 14. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Nothing new to report. The next subtask group meeting is scheduled for August 4, 2016.

17. 15. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Nothing new to report.

18	0955	Temporary Transverse Tapers	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 18. Temporary transverse tapers

18. 1. Temporary transverse tapers scoping document has been approved. All three have been posted on the web site. The scoping document for the low amount of crumb rubber in HMA scoping document should be signed soon and is already included in these notes as agenda item 14. Completing the scoping document is dependent on resolving the funding issue for the research.

18. 2. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Co Chairs for Industry will be picked by the next meeting. Caltrans has selected Ken Darby.

18. 3. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Industry has not selected any co-chairs yet.

18. 4. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Outcome:

18. 4. 1. Pat will select a co-chair from industry for Temp Transverse Tapers. (See upshot # 158)

18. 5. (Comment from 12/08/2015) Industry will have names after the industry meeting tomorrow.

18. 6. (Comment added 1/12/2016) Co chairs have been selected, meeting date will be set. (Feb 6??)

18. 7. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry co chair is Frank Rancadore and for Caltrans it is Ken Darby. First meeting is set for February 26.

18. 8. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Nothing to report

18. 9. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Meeting has been set up for this Friday.

18. 10. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Meeting took place. Chuck - There were minor changes made and sent out. Few comments received back. Chuck will see that Ken sends out resolution table within a week or so. (See upshot # 179)

18. 11. (Comment from 6/1/2016) Only one comment received that dealt with approach slabs. Chuck estimates the posting will be by end of July. That will CLOSE THIS PROJECT!!!

18. 12. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Chuck – we should know by 7/15 if spec is posted. Then a CPB will be issued describing changes.

18. 13. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Chuck – Draft CPB has been generated.

19		Pavement Smoothness	Current status, progress since last report, next steps

Agenda Item 19. Pavement Smoothness (added 2/09/2016)

19. 1. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Pavement Smoothness will be a new project. Caltrans co-chairs are Pete Specter and Ken Darby.

19. 2. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Scoping document has been signed. Still waiting for industry to appoint co-chairs.

19. 3. (Comment from 4/26/2016) 4 working groups created. Jack – industry has a lot of concerns. Co-chairs have been identified. (STG - Charles Stewart and Don Matthews). Work groups have already set up meetings and are meeting.

19. 4. (Comment from 6/1/2016) Lively meeting occurred last Friday. This is moving forward.

19. 5. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Lively meeting – still continuing to work.

19. 6. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Sri - work groups are meeting and working through the details.

19. 7. (Comment from 7/26/2016) Sri – Nothing new to report.

20		***Any new items or issues?*** Proposed 14/15 STG Projects and scoping documents –	

Agenda Item 20. Any new items,other business?

20. 1. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Industry concern on new products evaluation. There is frustration with the approval process. Industry partners have not been able to get anything finalized, even though everything Caltrans has requested has been done. How do we move this forward? The process

20. 1. 1. (Comment from 09/08/2015) follow-up – This is something that needs to have a small working group in Section 39 to deal with this. The issue relates to a specific product and the evaluation of it is taking too much time from the industry perspective. Industry agrees with Caltrans that new products are evaluated, they have a history and they do work. When there are products that have a history of success and have been used in other states, there needs to be a faster way to get them incorporated into Caltrans specs faster. Caltrans suggests there may need to be a scoping document for non-amine based LAS products.

20. 2. (Comment from 8/27/2015) Pavement smoothness forum has been set up for September 28th. Right now there are 51 people signed up. We expect a good turnout. It will be held at the CHP Building – 601 North 7th Street - in Sacramento. - CLOSED

20. 2. 1. (Comment from 09/08/2015) All slots in the training have been taken. - CLOSED

20. 3. (Comment from 08/04/2015) No new report. - CLOSED

20. 4. (Comment from 8/27/2015) FHWA is offering to do tack-coat training – best practices. We are looking for November – there will be one north and one south. - CLOSED

20. 5. Outcome

20. 5. 1. Chuck will send an e mail to Jack and Pat when this is set up. (see upshot # 151) November 10 at Red Lion in Sacto and Nov 12, in SRL in Fontana. Registration portal and flyer will be developed. - CLOSED

20. 6. (Comment from 09/08/2015) Caltrans and industry have an issue about AR binder being allowed for hot drop from an alternate site– CT responded back to industry. There will be a meeting set up to discuss the issue. There will be a report at the next ATG co-chair meeting. Next meeting dates - CLOSED

20. 7. (Comment from 09/29/2015) Industry has major issues with smoothness. We need to discuss this at the next meeting. This issue may be residing with the PPTG task group.

20. 8. (Comment from 10/27/2015) Tony is working on a scoping document for smoothness. We will report back in November.

20. 9. (Comment from 10/27/2015) We need more people for the Southern California session of Tack Coat. We are looking to fill 80 seats in each of the sessions. - CLOSED

20. 10. (Comment from 12/08/2015) Good participation both north and south on the Tack Coat workshop. - CLOSED

20. 11. (Comment added 1/26/2016) Industry comment: Caltrans has announced in the new spec they are only going to split a sample into two – Industry would like to have the samples split into 4. Caltrans reports this issue of split samples is being worked on by the same group that is working on the QCQA issue about the number of QC personnel. We can discuss this at the next section 39 meeting.

20. 12. (Comment from 2/09/2016) Pavement Smoothness will be a new project. Caltrans co-chairs are Pete Specter and Ken Darby.

20. 13. (Comment from 2/22/2016) We need to see how we can proceed with Mike Halverson's contract. - CLOSED

20. 14. (Comment from 2/22/2016) Caltrans reports the possibility of a DME meeting in the immediate future is unlikely.

20. 15. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Jack – CT125 scoping doc needs to be provided to industry. Tim to provide by 4/29. (See upshot # 175). Tim provided. Tim set up a meeting with industry for 6/6 to better understand industry concerns.

20. 16. Comment from 4/25/2016) Jack – Non-amine based products are funneled through New Products process. Sri – internally CT needs to evaluate how to address this issue. Caltrans cannot be developing specifications for individual product and industry has indicated in the past that a specification cannot be developed that would cover different types of non-amine based products. Sri will put a position together to

provide at the 5/26 Section 39 STG meeting. (See upshot # 180)
(Comment from 6/1/2016) Chuck to suggest to the RPC that the improved New Products Process be presented at the next quarterly RPC meeting.
(Comment from 7/12/2016) Nothing new to report.
(Comment from 7/26/2016) Nothing new to report.

20. 17. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Jack –On using AR Binder blended at blending plant off-site, CT allows the hot drop using the binder from the other plant as long as the same materials and same blending plant are relocated to new HMA plant and passes MPQP. This will not be addressed in the specification. As issues arise, direct questions to Chuck Suszko. – CLOSED.

20. 18. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Jack – What is the hold-up for the DME meeting.. DME meetings were not conducted due to travel restrictions per Tim. (See upshot # 181) Industry wanted to know the status of their request to allow industry personnel to inspect Caltrans labs during testing. Caltrans is looking at this internally and will get back to the industry.
(Comment from 6/1/2016) Issue elevated to Roberto L. No word back. Jack requested a response to the request. Tim to further pursue (upshot #181).
(Comment from 7/12/2016) Nothing new to report.

20. 19. (Comment from 4/25/2016) Jack – Specific questions/issues were generated (33-38) during the Section 39 meeting with regarding to the interpretation of FHWA guidance. Tony L. and Kee were going to go to FHWA jointly. Kee was not comfortable going to FHWA. Why can't we get input from FHWA for interpretation on QC/QA specification? Healthy discussion took place.

20. 20. (Comment from 6/1/2016) – See upshot 177. Pat and Jack had discussions with Toni and Mike related with post-plant gradation and maximum aggregate temperature. Toni and Mike will elevate this issue at the next RPC 4+2.

20. 21. (Comment from 6/1/2016) Industry ATG Co-chairs sent a letter last Friday to the RPC 4+2 and are awaiting a response.

20. 22. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Pat and Jack have been asked by RPC 4+2 to send a written document indicating industry's position on aggregate temperature and post-plant gradation. Pat and Jack will send an email today to Toni C. indicating that industry could not reach consensus on this issue and Caltrans should make the decision. The intent is to have Toni send a letter to the RPC (4) Caltrans Co-chairs indicating industry's position. The Caltrans Co-chairs have requested 2 weeks to respond to Toni's upcoming letter. (See upshot #185)

20. 23. (Comment from 6/16/2016) Jack – 4+2 has responded to industry concerns letter. At the next ATG meeting we will have more information.

20. 24. (Comment from 6/16/2016) There will be a new scoping document drafted related with AR binder that includes ¾" vs. ½", Ndesign requirements for RHMA, pressure, and gyrations. Shawn Rizzutto will work with Kee to develop the scoping document.

20. 25. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Jack – Jack and Pat are awaiting a response from RPC (4+2). Jack and Pat to discuss with Toni C. today then report back to ATG at the next meeting as there is some confusion related to other alternatives that can/should be considered per the email from Toni.
(Comment from 7/26/2016) Nothing new to report. This is related with post plant gradation/maximum aggregate temperature. 4+2 has moved this topic to their next meeting. ATG awaiting 4+2 meeting outcome for next actions.

20. 26. (Comment from 7/12/2016) Sri – An issue was brought up at the testing turnaround time meeting regarding quality control of Caltrans test results. What is Caltrans doing to make sure that all Caltrans test results are reviewed and approved by a Caltrans quality control manager? This is not a requirement in the specifications. Jack – this is not a widespread problem, in certain places test results are being reported directly by a tester to the RE with no quality review by a quality manager associated with an accredited laboratory. For contractor's labs, results are reviewed by a quality manager. Chuck, Tim and Sri to discuss this internally and report at next ATG. (See upshot #189)
(Comment from 7/26/2016) ATG – The CLAM defines the responsibilities of lab managers. Team agreed to continue this discussion when Jack is in the meeting.

20. 27. (Comment from 7/26/2016) ATG – This agenda item is becoming difficult to manage. Tim will look at elements and indicated – CLOSED and possibly change the color (blue) of the closed items.

19	0955	Review upshot and bin list Halverson/all	

20	0959	Next meeting date, location and expected outcome Halverson/all	

Next Meeting dates

August 17, 2016, 1:30 p.m – 2:30 pm

August 30, 2016, 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 pm

21	1000	Adjourn	