

WAQTC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

LEADER : Tom Biel
FACILITATOR :
RECORDER : Garth Newman

DATE : March 27,2006
TIME : 9:00 am to 4:00 pm mst
LOCATION: Boise

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Biel,	UDOT	Michael San Angelo,	AkDOT&PF
Garth Newman*	ITD	Joanne Nakamura,	HDOT
Jeff Miles,	ITD	Cole Mullis ,	ODOT
Jeffery Rayman*	MDT	John Tenison,	NMSHTD
Tom E. Baker,	WSDOT	Howe Crockett,	WLFHD

MEMBERS ABSENT

David Belser	TxDOT	Richard Duval.	CFLHD
Mark Elicegui	NDOT	Tim Aschenbrener	CoDOT

QUALIFICATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE PRESENT

Bob Briggs WSDOT

* Memebers that serve on the QAC also

GUESTS

Tom Points	ITD	Matt Strizich	MDT
Kevin Dayton	WSDOT	George Raymond	OkDOT
Chris Newman	FHWA HQ		

MEETING OBJECTIVES :

1. Pooled Funds status
2. Bylaws discussion
3. QAC AQASHTO test method revisions
4. Computer Based training
5. TCCC up date
6. Super Pave
7. Review of WAQTC RFQ, recommended revisions.

PLEASE RESPOND TO YOUR ACTION ITEMS.

PAGE 2			
ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED BY
1) Pooled fund	<p>Michael San Angelo (Mike) has determined who has contributed to the pooled fund. There is an issue with the monies given by agencies that went into a “lock box”. FHWA cannot find the money but has told Mike that they would honor the dollar amount determined by Bernie. There is still no written document confirming our funds from FHWA. There are two handout associated with this topic.</p> <p>Each person that is recognized as the agency contact should have been contacted by e-mail from the pooled fund on how to confirm their involvement with the pooled fund.</p> <p>Mike can not find any paper trail for Oregon’s commitment.</p>	<p>Continue to work to get written agreement from FHWA on funding</p> <p>The pooled fund project number is:TPF 5 (064)</p> <p>States that have not been contacted by Alaska should contact Michael San Angelo.</p> <p>Oregon to look for and supply commitment forms and dollars committed.</p>	<p>Mike San Angelo</p> <p>ALL MEMBERS</p> <p>Cole Mullis</p>
2) Bylaws	<p>Tim Biel handed out a copy of the bylaws. He went through the revised and approved areas. The areas of revision included the definitions of executive committee members and voting privileges. There is some contention about voting privileges and that agencies that pay into the pooled fund, receive training materials, but do not use them for qualification should have a vote on the look of these materials.</p> <p>John Tenison is concerned to the point that New Mexico is not willing to continue to place monies into the pooled fund but still wants to be involved in the WAQTC organization.</p> <p>Discussion centered on that everyone gets to voice their opinion, especially by being present for the QAC meetings. However in the case a vote is required for tie-breaking purposes, only agencies using the materials for qualification will get a vote. The question was asked;” Has there been a point where a vote was required with the QAC?” The answer was no.</p>	<p>The majority of the group was unwilling to drip the voting rules at this point.</p>	
3) AASHTO REVISIONS	<p>During the discussion on AASHTO test method revisions it became apparent that there needs to be a standard method on how to Champion a test method though a Tech Section.</p>	<p>Develop a guide for “Championing” a test method and send to all executive committee members through the Chair.</p>	<p>Tom Baker & Tim Biel</p>

PAGE 3			
ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED BY
<p>3) AASHTO REVISIONS Continued</p>	<p>NOMINAL MAXIMUM SIZE: Bob Briggs handed out a paper produced by WsDOT on the issues with nominal maximum size. There are at least 3 different definitions. This creates major confusion with test methods and test results. NMS defined: Nominal maximum size – One sieve larger than the first sieve to retain more than 10 percent of the material using an agency specified set of sieves based on cumulative percent retained. <i>Note:</i> - The first sieve to normally retain more than 10% of the material usually is the second sieve in the stack but may be the third sieve. Where gaps greater than a 2:1 ratio exist in specification sieves, intermediate sieve(s) may be inserted to determine nominal maximum size.</p>	<p>I was agreed that the WAQTC members would support a slightly revised WAQTC / Super Pave definition.</p> <p>The definition was revised and adopted. Assignments as follows: Develop a list of AASHTO “Asphalt” test methods that need revised and submit this list to Tom Baker WSDOT by April 30. Champion revisions at AASHTO in 2a & 2b at AASHTO</p> <p>Contact other tech section Chairman to discuss the confusion with definitions and illicit their support in “one” definition</p>	<p>Jeff Miles & Garth Newman</p> <p>Tom Baker</p> <p>Tim Biel</p>
	<p>The following test methods were submitted to the executive committee by the QAC for approval and to submit to the appropriate AASHTO Tech section for approval.</p>		
	<p>T 176 : Explanation: “This method was reworked to more closely follow the AASHTO development guidelines. Create areas: Reference Documents, Significance and Use, & Sampling.”</p>	<p>Deliver electronic copy to champion</p> <p>Tech section 1a Robert Barnett chair</p> <p>Champion</p>	<p>Garth Newman</p> <p>Jeff Miles</p>
	<p>T 308 : Explanation: This method was completely reworked to create a better flow to the method and now more closely follows the AASHTO development guidelines. If an aggregate was found to have breakdown concerns it should be evaluated the same way as the Asphalt binder correction factor is developed. Asphalt binder is affected by the furnace temperature and the length of time taken to burn the sample. This would be the same for aggregate.</p>	<p>Deliver electronic copy to champion</p> <p>Champion</p>	<p>Bob Briggs</p> <p>Tom Baker</p>

PAGE 4			
ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED
3) AASHTO REVISIONS Continued	T 30: Explanation: This method was modified to represent aggregate taken from T 308 Language imported From T 11 & T 27	Deliver electronic copy to champion Champion	Bob Briggs Tom Baker
	T 209: Explanation: The table in T 209 / 7.2 says “Largest Particle Size” which has no definition. Change to Nominal Maximum Size “WAQTC definition.” This will match other HMA procedures if NMS change is approved. If not just changes to NMS Superpave definition.	Deliver electronic copy to champion Champion	Bob Briggs Tom Baker
	T 329: Explanation: Revise sample size from 500 g to 1000 g. When calculating and reporting moisture content to 0.01 % you must have at least a 1000 g sample. This moisture content is subtracted from the Asphalt binder content (0.01%) in T 308. Temperature for determining constant mass ($325 \pm 25^\circ$) was lowered because Asphalt binder can be lost when using (AC 2.5 or AC 5) which Alaska uses. Lower limit (221° F) and upper limit doesn't exceed JMF mixing Temp	Deliver electronic copy to champion Champion	Greg Christensen Michael San Angelo
	Bob Briggs handed out a study on the different types of reducing and their repeatability. T 328: Explanation: We moved all the mechanical splitters together. Added a quartering method (quartering once) Added incremental method (WaDOT Loaf method) This is actually a practice and should be a “R” not a “T”	Send electronic version of WsDOT data to Tim Biel Deliver electronic copy to champion Champion	Garth Newman Desna Bergold Tim Biel
	T 166: Explanation: The sample drying time once the puck is removed from the bath was defined as: “as quickly as possible.” The QAC defined: “as quick as possible.”	Deliver electronic copy to champion Champion	Jeffery Rayman Matt Strizich
	T 309 Explanation: Calibration of thermometer doesn't match R18. Change to match R 18 and remove only glass liquid type.	Deliver electronic copy to champion Tech Section 3b Champion	Joanne Nakamura Gerry Carnate

PAGE 4			
ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED
WAQTC Test Methods	Garth introduced a new WAQTC test method that the QAC developed and wants the WAQTC Executive committee to accept and use by all WAQTC member agencies. This method is for coring HMA	Executive committee members to review and respond if acceptable by May 15, 2006	ALL MEMBERS
	Garth discussed that there is at this time no AASHTO method for building aggregate blends for mix designs or T 308 correction factor pans. The QAC is requesting each agency submit their method to Garth for their review.	New Mexico stated they have a very prescriptive method. Send to Garth.	John Tenison
	John Tenison stated that New Mexico has developed a new method for fine aggregate specific gravity.	Send to all members for review	Garth Newman
4) Computer based training	Alaska DOT and the University of Alaska are continuing to develop computer based training modules for sampler / tester qualifications. The plan is for U of A to offer this as on line training for a nominal fee. This could also be offered to other WAQTC agencies. They have developed a math and safety module that applies to all the other modules	Continue to keep the executive committee up-dated. Aim for Demo at next Executive Committee meeting.	Michael San Angelo
5) TCCC update	Chris Newman (FHWA) gave an update on where the TCCC is at and what has been developed and far as training materials.		
6) Super Pave	Jeff Rayman started the discussion with the comment that Montana would like to add T 312 added to the existing WAQTC asphalt module. This started a discussion on if a test method could be added to a module. If not only T 312 but volumetric calculations associated with the test data from the asphalt module should be added. Jeff Miles was concerned that if T 312 was added and individuals were just qualified in Asphalt that there would be a lag of over 4 years before they were required to be qualified in T 312. A separate module was discussed possibly a "super Pave Mix Design Module" and a "Super Pave field testing Module"	Gather information on how each agency is implementing qualifying on T 312 and Volumetrics. New Mexico has a Super Pave Field Testing Module. Send to Jeff. General consensus was for individual modules for field testing, both Superpave and Marshall. Report to Executive Committee before October meeting so this can be possible add-on can be discussed further.	Jeff Rayman John Tenison Jeff Rayman

PAGE 5

ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED
7) RFQ	Reviewed latest revision of the RFQ for organization management. Additions and modifications were performed. Discussion on how to advertise the RFQ. Chris Newman questioned if because of federal funding it had to be 5 A compliant.	Complete RFQ and send out for final review and advertisement. Agencies to look for potential bidders in their locals. Jim Sorenson said that because it was a pool fund the requirements are not there. Chris to confirm	Tim Biel All members Garth Newman
Other information	Bob Briggs reported that they have had several Thermolone Furnaces that caught fire. In one case it caused extensive damage to the laboratory. He thinks there is a link to a poor power supply. He recommends checking the power cord and power supply.	CHECK YOUR OVENS!!!!	

NEXT MEETING: Tim would like to try to schedule in conjunction with RMAUPG October meeting in Salt Lake City.

RMAUPG meeting is October 17 & 18.

Please pencil in Monday the 16th and Thursday the 19th. We'll figure out which works best.