

ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED BY
<p>1) Pooled fund Status</p>	<p>Rich Duval and Howe Crockett had a conference call with Laura Lawndy with the office of asset management. Laura is trying to get all the pool funds together from TPF 5(64). Laura has confirmed 90,000 in FHWA’s FMIS system. The lock box funds from New Mexico (\$20,000) & Colorado (\$8000) can be turned over with evidence of a check. On the lock box funds Laura needs a check number, check amount, & date issued.</p> <p><u>The most critical issue is that the funds attached to the Pooled fund expire on June 30th.</u> If we are not under contract by then the fund will never be able to be used.</p> <p>Laura is working with the FHWA accounting department to get written instructions on how to capture at least the \$90,000 of SP&R funds that have been found.</p> <p>The two options that were raise are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Have each state de-obligate their portion of the existing pooled fund and re-obligate them to a new pooled fund OR 2) Have Alaska capture the \$90,000 and the \$28,000 we know we have in this pooled fund. <i>Alaska can not handle the pooled fund It must transfer it authority</i> 	<p>No one felt very comfortable about de-obligation. The concern is that those funds would not be allowed to be re-obligated to a new pooled fund.</p>	<p>Mike San Angelo</p> <p>All Members</p> <p>Rich Duval</p> <p>All Members</p>
	<p>If CFL-HD houses the pooled fund we must follow FHWA protocol for hiring a consultant. This would require to re advertising the RFQ we have in the process.</p>	<p>Utah agreed to have Alaska transfer authority as lead state over to the pooled fund. This should allow us to capture the \$118,000 we have confirmed we have. It will also let us continue with the RFQ process we have started.</p> <p>ACTIONS: Send copies of checks and send to Laura, get authority transferred to Tim</p> <p>A letter will be drafted to King Gee at FHWA explaining our plight.</p> <p>Continue working with Laura on Funding</p>	<p>Michael San Angelo</p> <p>Tim Biel</p> <p>Howe Crockett Rich Duval</p>

PAGE 3			
ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED BY
2) AASHTO TEST METHOD REVISIONS	<p>Review each of the changes to the test methods as listed on the Revisions document.</p> <p>The methods are laid out by AASHTO Tech section.</p> <p>Assignments were made on how would champion the test method in the tech sections.</p> <p>Tom Baker also explained that not only should there be a champion at the tech section but any WAQTC state that is involved with that tech section must speak up in support of the revision during the tech section review.</p> <p>Test methods in TS 1a Test methods in TS 1b Test methods in TS 1c Test methods in TS 2c Test methods in TS 3b <i>Test methods in TS 3c</i></p>	<p>EVERY ONE MUST GET INVOLVED TO GET THE MODIFICATIONS THROUGH!</p> <p>Tim will send out the revised AASHTO Revisions paper with who is the Tech section Chair, Steward, and champion, Also directions to the Web site.</p> <p>Each Champion must contact that tech section chairman to get on the agenda!</p> <p>Champion Oregon Champion Utah Champion Alaska Champion Washington Champion Idaho <i>Champion Colorado***Garth will Contact Alan to see if Tim A. will champion</i></p> <p>Send out reminder on what your assignment s are when and where to meet at AASHTO meeting to finalize strategy</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>Tim Biel</p> <p>Cole Mullis Tim Biel Mike San Angelo Tom Baker Jeff Miles Tim Aschenbrener</p> <p>Jeff Miles</p>
3) QAC TASKS	<p>T 99 and 180: It was pointed out that most test method use formulas to perform calculations not in written format. 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.</p>	<p>Executive committee want T 99 & T180 re-written to formula format.</p>	<p>Bryan Lee</p>
	<p>The discussion continued on what was the difference in definition for Nominal Maximum Size NMS (Superpave, Concrete Agg, WAQTC</p>	<p>QAC to write a report on the differences in the 3 NMS</p>	<p>Garth Newman QAC</p>

	Tim requested a report on the definitions	definitions and why	
--	---	---------------------	--

PAGE 4

ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED
<p>4) WAQTC TEST METHODS</p>	<p>Garth reviewed the 2 new test methods with the Executive members. TM 11 SAMPLING BITUMINOUS MATERIAL AFTER COMPACTION (OBTAINING CORES) TM 12 Field Sampling and Fabrication of 50–mm (2-in) Cube Specimens using Grout (Non-Shrink) and or Mortar Tom Baker asked why we wouldn't submit this to AASHTO since it is already in AASHTO format.</p>	<p>Motion from AKDOT to accept as is Second by ODOT Discussion to add to report section (station / Offset) Unanimously accepted. Motion from AKDOT to accept as is Second by ITD Unanimously accepted. This “practice” will be championed to AASHTO</p>	<p>Jeff Miles</p>
<p>5) COMPUTER BASED TRAINING</p>	<p>Mike stated that he hopes to have the web based training up and operational by the October Executive committee meeting</p>		
<p>6) INSPECTOR MODULES</p>	<p>Tim Biel stated that UDOT is developing inspector training modules and wondered what other states are under mandate to have qualified inspectors. Utah and Oregon the inspector training and materials training are assigned to materials. Idaho, Washington and New Mexico are separate. Alaska and Montana don't have mandated qualifications. All members felt that involving the construction sections on development of training would be a good thing.</p>	<p>Have a meeting with Construction representatives a WASHTO meeting and determine interest in developing similar training & qualification materials</p>	<p>Tim Biel</p>
<p>7) FUTURE DIRECTION</p>	<p>The group discussed the direction for the future, including the need to focus on inspector qualifications, and to have a goal of incorporating all states that belong to WASHTO, that are not part of one of the other regional groups.</p>		

ISSUE	DISCUSSION	DECISION	ACTION REQUIRED
<p>8) REVIEW RFQ SUBMITTALS</p>	<p>Reviewed and rated consultants RFQ's. Ranking showed KBA as rated highest.</p>	<p>Motion to go into negotiations with KBA by AKDOT second by ODOT Unanimously accepted. Time will be 2 years with 3 one year renewals Tim will set a meeting in Vancouver with KBA Tom, Tim, Cole, & Howe will attend</p> <p>The contract for the Administrator will be handled out of Utah in conjunction with the Pooled Fund Management.</p>	<p>Tim Biel Tom Baker Cole Mullis Howe Crockett</p>
<p>9) FUTURE MEETING OPTIONS</p>	<p>FALL MEETING IN OCTOBER: TBA Fall meetings were discussed and the group decided that the Fall meeting would be an optional meeting, decided each spring. Due to RFQ negotiations, there will be a meeting this year, with the new Administrator responsible for planning.</p>		