

WAQTC QAC COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

LEADER: Garth Newman, ITD
FACILITATOR: Desna Bergold

DATE: JULY 22 - 26, 2013
TIME: 1:00 TO 5:00 PM MON, 8:00 AM TO 5:00 PM TUES. THRU THUR., 8:00 AM TO 12:00 NOON FRI
LOCATION: VANCOUVER, WA

ATTENDEES:
 Garth Newman, ITD
 Sean Parker, ODOT
 Wendy Tripp, UDOT
 Linda Hughes, WSDOT
 Greg Christensen, AKDOT
 & PF
 Misty Miner, MDOT
 CK Su, CDOT
 Desna Bergold, DB
 Consulting

ABSENT:
 Ryan Hixson, FHWA
 Brian Legan, NMDOT

MEETING ITEMS:

REVIEWS OF STUDENT, SHORT FORM, REVIEW QUESTIONS, AND PRACTICAL CHECKLIST FOR EACH PROCEDURE

1. Revision to Concrete Field Operating Procedures
 - a. Revisions in AASHTO Test Methods
 - b. TM 2, Sampling Concrete
 - c. T 309, Temperature
 - i. Development of AASHTO test method from TM 10
 - d. T 119, Slump
 - i. AASHTO revision:
 1. Changed T 141 to R 60
 2. Added ASTM references
 3. 7.2: ' . . . penetrate approximately 25 mm [1 in.] into the underlying layer' – WAQTC proposal
 - e. T 152, Air Content
 - i. Standardization frequency to be changed to agree with R 18
 - ii. AASHTO requires a 2 ft square sieving area for the sieve used to wet sieve, should we include this in the WAQTC Manual? – Wendy
 - iii. AASHTO revision:
 1. Changed T 141 to R 60
 2. Changed 'calibration' to 'standardization'
 3. Added Note 1
 4. In note 3: Changed to US customary (SI) – this is not consistent with the Style Manual
 5. Added Section 5 – reference to R 18 and a bad reference to R 61
 - f. T 121, Density
 - i. Rodding large measures is not addressed but vibrating them is – Wendy
 - g. T 23, Test Specimens
 - i. AASHTO revision:
 1. Changed T 141 to R 60
 2. 5.4: three sizes tamping rod, not two
 3. 5.5: Changed the Hz not vpn to make them agree
 - h. Exams

- i. PowerPoint
 - j. T 196 Air Content of Freshly Mixed Concrete by the Volumetric Method – perhaps including in CTT – Wendy Tripp
2. Revision to Aggregate Field Operating Procedures
- a. Revisions in AASHTO Test Methods
 - b. T 2, Sampling Aggregate
 - c. T 248, Reduction
 - d. T 255, Moisture Content of Aggregate
 - e. T 11/T 27, Sieve Analysis
 - i. FOP for T 27 / T 11 Method A example ‘Gradation on all Sieves’ #30 sieve change 16.5 to avoid rounding issue – Wendy
 - ii. Instructor notes concerning the acronyms – Wendy
 - iii. Method B – decimal places for the ‘adjustment factor’ – Garth
 - iv. Method C – change in alternate CPP calculation and additions for clarity - Desna
 - f. T 176, Sand Equivalent
 - g. T 335, Fractured Particles
 - h. Exams
 - i. PowerPoint
3. Revision to Asphalt I Field Operating Procedures
- a. Revisions in AASHTO Test Methods
 - b. T 168, Sampling HMA
 - c. R 47, Reducing
 - d. T 329, Moisture Content
 - i. AASHTO revision – consistent with WAQTC proposals, minor differences
 - e. T 308, Asphalt Content
 - i. Historical data used if agency approved – Wendy
 - ii. Consistent Binder content calculation – Wendy
 - iii. Statement under first example of aggregate correction factor - Wendy
 - f. T 209, G_{mm}
 - i. PowerPoint – do not need two examples for averaging – Wendy
 - ii. Remove Note 2, the actual correction is erroneous and does anyone allow outside this range? - Garth
 - g. T 166, G_{mb}
 - i. AASHTO revision – 6.2: ‘as quickly as possible (*the entire operation is not to exceed 15 s*).'
 - h. T 40, Sampling Bituminous Material
 - i. T 30, Sieve Analysis
 - i. AASHTO Revision – changes throughout
 - 1. Additions in apparatus
 - 2. Added Section 5 – reference to R 18 and a bad reference to R 61
 - 3. Added drying language if the sample has sat too long
 - 4. Added No. 16 as an alternative to No. 10
 - j. Exams
 - k. PowerPoint
4. Revision to Asphalt II Field Operating Procedures
- a. Revisions in AASHTO Test Methods – TBD
 - b. T 312, Gyration
 - c. TM 13 Volumetrics
 - i. Reporting does not address the Ps – Wendy
 - ii. P_{be} formula in book and PowerPoint do not match – Wendy
 - d. Exams

- e. PowerPoint
- 5. Revision to Embankment/Base and In-Place Density Field Operating Procedures
 - a. Revisions in AASHTO Test Methods
 - b. T 255/T 265, Moisture Content of Aggregate and Soil
 - c. T 99/T 180, Moisture/Density Relations
 - d. T 272, Family of Curves
 - e. T 85, G_{sb}
 - i. Revisions to AASHTO - compatible with WAQTC proposal, minor differences
 - f. T 224, Coarse Particle Correction
 - g. T 310, In-place Density and Moisture Content of Soil-Aggregate
 - i. AASHTO revisions
 - 1. Mostly compatible with WAQTC proposal
 - 2. Added Note A1 – calibrating blocks
 - h. TM 8, In-place Density of HMA
 - i. Changes to TM 8 - January meeting
 - i. TM 11, Obtaining Cores
 - i. Changes to TM 11 – January Meeting
 - j. Exams
 - i. Question 22, the answers should be rounded to the tenth of a percent – Sean Parker
 - k. PowerPoint
- 6. Other AASHTO revisions:
 - a. T 84 – compatible with WAQTC proposals – minor differences
 - b. T 231 – change to 6.2.1: ‘Table 1 gives a differentiation on the thickness of capping materials based on the compressive strength of cylinders.’
- 7. All metric removed from all PowerPoint’s – Wendy
- 8. AMRL / CCRL – April teleconference
- 9. Qualification number and the Administration manual – January meeting
- 10. FOP library
 - a. FOP Library work plan – May teleconference - draft work plan developed, will be presented to the Executive Committee for approval – Desna will put on the agenda for August meeting
 - b. FOP for T 196 – Wendy and Misty – Misty gives Wendy all the credit.
 - i. Wendy sent for review – no one had a chance to review – Desna will resend the FOP to the members and request they have comments to Wendy by August 29th.
 - c. Updating T 89, T 90, and T 217 – these are linked on the website and probably should be updated for formatting and any changes to the AASHTO test method – Desna
- 11. Standalone procedure for mixing HMA – Garth’s follow up – January meeting – see notes
- 12. Style Guide Templates – Desna
 - a. Position of slide number on PowerPoints – Sean
- 13. Reciprocity Audits – May Teleconference
- 14. Newsletter articles – guidelines for contributors
- 15. Desk manual for new QAC/EC members -
- 16. Master List of ‘C’ Methods – this was presented
- 17. January 2014 meeting
- 18. July 2014 meeting

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
-------	------------------------------	------------------------

Concrete		
TM 2	<p>Wendy Tripp, UDOT, pointed out that AASHTO T 152 addresses the size of the sieve used to wet-sieve large aggregate. The WAQTC FOP's do not address this. The group decided that the appropriate place to address it is in TM 2 because it is the FOP that deals with wet-sieving.</p> <p><i>Add 'minimum of 2 ft² (0.19 m²) of sieving area' in apparatus.</i></p> <p>It was also noted that nowhere in AASHTO or the FOP's does it state the concrete sampling receptacle should be dampened.</p> <p><i>Add 'Dampen the surface of the receptacle just before sampling, empty any excess water' as step 2.</i></p>	
T 309	<p><i>AASHTO T 309, Temperature of Freshly Mixed Portland Cement Concrete</i> has been discontinued. There has been some discussion that WAQTC should develop a method to address this and propose it to AASHTO. A new procedure would have to be distinct from the ASTM test method so there is no problem with copyrights. Desna Bergold will compare the WAQTC TM 10 with the ASTM to determine if it is distinct and how much work it would take to make it an AASHTO proposal.</p> <p><i>Desna will report on TM 10.</i></p> <p>The group discussed what should be done in the interim. It was decided to continue to refer to the most recent AASHTO iteration in the FOP.</p> <p><i>Continue referencing T 309-11 in the FOP. No changes to the training materials.</i></p>	Desna Bergold
T 119	<p>AASHTO T 119 was revised in the 33rd edition.</p> <p>Changed the sampling reference from T 141 to R 60. This does not affect the training materials because the FOP references TM 2 for sampling.</p> <p>AASHTO also added the language proposed by WAQTC: ' . . . penetrate approximately 25 mm [1 in.] into the underlying layer'.</p> <p><i>Include this language in the FOP for AASHTO T 119.</i></p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
T 152	<p>AASHTO T 152 was revised in the 33rd edition.</p> <p>Changed the sampling reference from T 141 to R 60. Changed all usage of the term ‘calibration’ to ‘standardization’.</p> <p>These changes do not affect the training materials as it already uses the term ‘standardization.’</p> <p>Note 4 required a standardization period that did not agree with the frequency outlined in R 18. The group agreed this should match R 18.</p> <p><i>Revise note 4 to state: ‘Standardization shall be performed at <u>a minimum every three months.</u>’</i></p> <p><i>Revise AASHTO procedure date.</i></p>	
T 121	<p>Wendy pointed out that the FOP for AASHTO T 121 addresses large measure when consolidating by vibration but not rodding. The group decided that addressing consolidation of measures larger than 0.0142 m³ (1/2 ft³) was unnecessary in the FOP.</p> <p><i>Add ‘When using measures greater than 0.0142 m³ (1/2 ft³) see AASHTO T 121’ in Procedure Selection. Removed language in Procedure Internal Vibration, Step 3 concerning large measures.</i></p> <p>AASHTO T 121 does not address dampening the measure.</p> <p><i>This will be included on the agenda for the ‘January’ meeting.</i></p> <p>There was discussion of the yield formula. The formula currently in the FOP only works for calculating cubic meters. The result when using US customary is in cubic feet when the answer needs to be in cubic yards, so it needs to be converted. This conversion wasn’t covered.</p> <p><i>Update FOP to include formulas for yield in cubic ft. and the conversion to cubic yd.</i></p> <p><i>Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i></p>	Desna Bergold

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
T 23	<p>AASHTO T 23 was revised in the 33rd edition. These changes do not affect the training materials.</p> <p><i>Revise AASHTO procedure date.</i></p>	
Aggregate		
T 2	<i>No changes to the training materials.</i>	
T 248	<i>No changes to the training materials.</i>	
T 255	<p>Garth Newman, ITD, is concerned that the procedure does not flow very well. The example does a better job of moving through the actual steps performed. This FOP is problematic in that there are variables depending upon the heat source used to dry the sample.</p> <p><i>Revise steps to follow the process, wrapping in the variables.</i></p> <p>There was also discussion about determining constant mass. The training materials do not discuss the purpose very well.</p> <p><i>Add an 'Overview' section with discussion and definition of constant mass.</i></p> <p><i>Revise PowerPoint to reflect above.</i></p>	Desna Bergold
T 11/T 27	<p>Discussed the rounding issues in calculations. In the examples those results ending in 0.5 are rounded to the even number which may be rounding down. With the extensive use of spreadsheets it has become more common to round a 5 to the next higher number.</p> <p><i>Changed examples to round up to the next higher whole number.</i></p> <p>An editorial error was found in the example for Method B.</p> <p><i>The error will be corrected.</i></p> <p>Method C had errors in the formulas and some confusion in the example.</p> <p><i>Revise examples and fix errors.</i></p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>Wendy feels that the wide use of acronyms in this FOP can be confusing during training. The group agreed that it would be helpful to put the definition for the acronyms in the notes section of the slides with acronyms.</p> <p><i>PowerPoint will be updated to include definitions for acronyms in the notes section and match changes to Method C.</i></p> <p>Garth discussed the fact that when calculating the ‘adjustment factor’ in Method B the results can vary depending upon how many decimal places the factor is carried to. If the ‘adjustment factor’ is carried to five decimal places then the results are more consistent.</p> <p>After discussion it was determined that to show the ‘adjustment factor’ to five decimal places would be mathematically incorrect.</p> <p><i>Do not change the decimal places of the ‘adjustment factor.’</i></p>	Desna Bergold
T 176	<p>It was pointed out that in Note 1 of the short form it states ‘3.8 L (1 qt.)’ This is incorrect.</p> <p><i>Change to ‘3.8 L (1 gal.)’.</i></p>	
T 335	<i>No changes to the training materials.</i>	
Embankment		
T 255/T 265	<p>Same issues as discussed for T 255.</p> <p><i>Revise steps to follow the process, wrapping in the variables. Add ‘Overview’ with discussion and definition of constant mass. Revise PowerPoint to reflect above.</i></p>	
T 99/T 180	<p>Discussed Garth’s involvement with AASHTO’s Task Force to address the issues in these two procedures. There hasn’t been any progress on this.</p> <p><i>Garth will connect with Task Force members at the AASHTO SOM meeting in August.</i></p> <p><i>No changes to the training materials.</i></p>	

PAGE 8		
ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>Linda Hughes, WSDOT, asked how the other agencies deal with materials that do not ‘behave’ on the wet side, i.e. do not create a downward slope. Greg Christensen, AKDOT, described their techniques but which are not covered in the existing methods.</p> <p>Greg suggested that the maximum dry density procedures could be broken into cohesive and non-cohesive methods. Although defining which is which could be problematic.</p> <p>Greg also discussed how AKDOT deals with materials between 30 percent and 40 percent coarse aggregate retained on the ¾ inch sieve. Material containing over 30 percent coarse cannot be corrected using T 224. He will share this method upon request.</p> <p>Should WAQTC develop a Test Method to deal with this situation? Linda will start compiling information and write a problem statement. She would like everyone to give her any information they have and any state methods or techniques that deal with it.</p> <p><i>QAC members will get information concerning this issue to Linda</i></p> <p>The group would like to pursue developing a proposal to the Executive Committee (EC).</p> <p><i>Linda will compile information and draft a problem statement to be presented to the Executive Committee.</i></p>	<p>QAC Members</p> <p>Linda Hughes</p>
T 272	<p><i>No changes to the training materials.</i></p> <p>This FOP does not cover how to develop a family of curves. The AASHTO method has some information but is not very clear. Garth would like the FOP to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> building the curve matching the one-point to the curve then using the one-point on an existing family of curves <p>Sean Parker, ODOT, has some of this covered in an ODOT procedure. Garth will review Sean’s procedure.</p> <p><i>Garth will propose action after he reviews available information.</i></p>	<p>Garth Newman</p>

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
T 85	<p>AASHTO T 85 was revised in the 33rd edition. The revisions were consistent with the changes proposed by WAQTC. A process to adjust the moisture content of the sample if it gets too dry was added.</p> <p><i>Add 'If the test sample dries past the SSD condition, immerse in water for 30 min, and then resume the process of surface-drying' in step 4 of the FOP for AASHTO T 85.</i></p>	
T 224	<p>This falls under the discussion for T 99/T 180.</p> <p><i>No changes to the training materials.</i></p>	
T 310	<p>AASHTO T 310 was revised in the 33rd edition. The revisions were consistent with the changes proposed by WAQTC. Note A1 concerning calibration of the blocks was added.</p> <p><i>Revise AASHTO procedure date.</i></p>	
TM 8	<p>TM 8 will be proposed as a test method (T XX) at the AASHTO SOM meeting in August.</p> <p>There were changes made to the TM in the January meeting. The rotation of the gauge was changed so that it is 'centered over the original footprint.' New graphics will be added to reflect this. The core correlation procedure is now an appendix.</p> <p><i>Update the FOP to agree with the changes in the T XX. Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i></p>	
TM 11	<p>TM 11 will be proposed as a standard method (R XX) at the AASHTO SOM meeting in August.</p> <p>There were changes made to the TM in the January meeting.</p> <p><i>Update the TM to agree with the changes in the R XX.</i></p>	
Asphalt		
T 168	<p><i>No changes to the training materials.</i></p>	
R 47	<p>References to the 'Loaf' method are outdated. AASHTO refers to it as the 'Incremental Method'.</p> <p><i>Remove the term 'loaf'.</i></p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
-------	------------------------------	------------------------

	<i>Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i>	
T 329	<p>Greg mentioned that some technicians have been having trouble with getting accurate moisture contents. It may be that when cardboard or other absorbent material is used as the 'release media' it is not dry.</p> <p><i>Add 'Note 2: Ensure the release media is dry . . .' to Step 2.</i></p> <p>Original note 2 defined constant mass for this procedure. This statement was included in Step 7.</p> <p><i>Remove original Note 2 and add language to step 7.</i></p> <p>As this is a 'dry to constant mass' method the Overview developed for T 255 would be an appropriate inclusion.</p> <p><i>Add Overview section developed for T 255.</i></p> <p><i>Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i></p>	
T 308	<p>The language in the FOP regarding the use of historical data in lieu of developing correction factors was discussed. There were no proposed changes.</p> <p><i>No action required.</i></p> <p>Wendy pointed out that the binder calculation formula is in two locations and although both give the same answer they are not consistent with each other, the variables are listed in a different order.</p> <p><i>The formula in Method B was revised to match Method A.</i></p> <p>The Asphalt Binder and Aggregate correction factor procedure is at the end of the FOP but is mandatory information. This should be an Annex.</p> <p><i>Make correction factor procedure an Annex.</i></p> <p>The language accompanying the aggregate correction factors examples is confusing. One example shows when just the No. 200 sieve is outside the tolerance and the other when a different sieve is outside the tolerance.</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
-------	------------------------------	------------------------

	<p><i>Change the language to more clearly represent how the situations represented by these examples are dealt with. Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i></p>	
T 209	<p>Note 2 in the FOP covers a correction factor when the flask and the sample are not in the temperature range. Garth felt that this language is outdated and should be removed. It is inconsistent with AASHTO and current member states practices.</p> <p><i>Remove Note 2 and references to a water bath and Table 2, Temperature Correction Factors.</i></p> <p>Wendy felt that the two examples of averaging were unnecessary. One is the standard mathematical averaging and the other is more how one would think it through. It was decided to leave the mathematical example in and remove the other.</p> <p><i>Remove the first example of averaging. Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i></p> <p>There have been many discussions concerning the need for a standardization procedure for flasks. It would be good if the group could come up with a procedure that everyone can agree on.</p> <p>Misty Miner, MDT, has volunteered to develop an Annex to the FOP for Standardization of flasks used in the ‘mass-determination-in-air’.</p> <p>Desna has a spreadsheet of the variations in the member states methods but it does not include whether the flask is subjected to vacuum pressure during the standardization process. Desna will update spreadsheet to include this information and send Misty the spreadsheet.</p> <p><i>Desna will update T 209 flask standardization spreadsheet and send to Misty.</i></p> <p><i>Misty will draft a procedure for Standardization of flasks used in the ‘mass-determination-in-air’ method.</i></p>	<p>Desna Bergold</p> <p>Misty Miner</p>
T 166	<p>AASHTO T 166 was revised in the 33rd edition.</p> <p><i>(the entire operation is not to exceed 15 s).’</i> was added in in section</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>6.2.</p> <p><i>Include this language in the FOP for AASHTO T 166. Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i></p>	
T 40	<p><i>No changes to the training materials.</i></p>	
T 30	<p>AASHTO T 30 was revised in the 33rd edition.</p> <p>Language addressing the following was included: additions in apparatus, drying language if the sample is not tested right away, and added No. 16 as an alternative to the No. 10 sieve in the nest of sieves while washing.</p> <p>These revisions were discussed.</p> <p><i>Add No. 16 sieve as an alternative to the No. 10 sieve when washing. Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i></p>	
T 312	<p><i>No changes to the training materials.</i></p>	
TM 13	<p>There were some editorial corrections to be made.</p> <p><i>Corrected errors and added reporting accuracy where needed. Update PowerPoint to match changes in FOP.</i></p>	
Exams	<p>Members can find updates to exams in the training package errata.</p>	
Other	<p>Discussed other revisions in AASHTO that are pertinent to member states.</p> <p>AASHTO T 84 was revised in the 33rd edition. These changes are compatible with the WAQTC proposals.</p> <p>AASHTO T 231 was revised in the 33rd edition. Change to 6.2.1: <i>'Table 1 gives a differentiation on the thickness of capping materials based on the compressive strength of cylinders.'</i></p> <p><i>No action necessary.</i></p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
-------	------------------------------	------------------------

<p>Other related to training materials: Revision dates</p>	<p>During the training materials update there was a discussion of what is considered a significant change to the materials. There should be guidelines on what is considered significant enough to have a revision date change.</p> <p>It was determined that: Significant updates: Any modification to procedure Change in AASHTO reference date Not significant enough to change the revision date: Typos Errors in ‘examples’ Editing errors</p> <p><i>The guidelines on revision date change will be included in the Style Guide.</i></p>	<p>Desna Bergold</p>
<p>Metric in PowerPoints</p>	<p>Wendy was concerned that having the metric equivalents on many of the PowerPoints was too redundant although in some cases was appropriate.</p> <p>The group discussed it and determined that it would be better to have the PowerPoint closely reflect the manuals in this case.</p> <p><i>No action required.</i></p>	
<p>AMRL / CCRL – April teleconference</p>	<p>The Executive Committee decided to talk to the CCRL / AMRL director before formalizing a request for information. The teleconference has not been scheduled yet. As the AASHTO SOM meeting is coming up this will be discussed there.</p> <p>Cole Mullis, ODOT; Tom Baker, WSDOT; and Garth will talk to the AMRL/CCRL director at AASHTO SOM.</p> <p><i>Garth will report on that discussion.</i></p>	<p>Garth Newman</p>
<p>Qualification number and the Administration manual</p>	<p>There was some concern that MDT and CDOT’s system could not accept qualification numbers outside the ranges they were assigned. Misty recently had a technician that was already qualified in another state register with MDT. She found that her system will accept qualification numbers from other states. As Colorado’s system was based on Montana’s it should be safe to assume that they won’t have issues either.</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>Recently a technician sought qualification in Utah after he had already been qualified in Idaho. Utah was unaware that the technician had previously been qualified and issued him a new qualification number. Wendy and Garth are working on how to deal with this.</p> <p>How to notify member states of suspended / revoked qualifications?</p> <p>Each state has a database that is available on-line that will not show a qualification as valid if it has been suspended or revoked. If a member agency needs to verify a qualification held in another state they may refer to the database or contact the QAC member in the state that a qualification is held. This will suffice.</p> <p><i>No action required.</i></p>	
FOP library	<p>The EC has approved inclusion of this effort in the 2013 Strategic Plan and would like the QAC to draft a work to determine how an FOP would be developed and maintained.</p> <p>A draft work plan was developed.</p> <p><i>The draft work plan will be presented to the EC for approval. Desna will put it on the August EC meeting agenda.</i></p>	Desna Bergold
FOP for T 196	<p>Wendy has been working on an FOP package for <i>T 196, Air Content of Freshly Mixed Concrete by the Volumetric Method</i> with help from Misty. Wendy sent out these materials before the meeting. Wendy and Misty would like the group to consider this as one of the first FOP's for the library. Unfortunately members of the committee had not reviewed the materials.</p> <p>Desna will resend the FOP to the members and request review and comments to Wendy by 8/29/13.</p> <p><i>Desna will send the FOP for review to the group.</i></p> <p><i>If the FOP library work plan is approved by the Executive Committee the FOP for T 196 will follow this process.</i></p>	Desna Bergold
Updating T 89, T 90, and T	The FOP's for <i>T 89; Determining the Liquid Limit of Soils, T 90; Determining the Plastic Limit and Plasticity Index of</i>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
217	<p><i>Soils, and T 217; Testing Lime for Chemical Constituents and Particle Sizes</i> are still on the WAQTC webpage. These FOP's have not been updated for many years.</p> <p>If the FOP work plan is approved by the EC the group will be polled for volunteers for Champions. These FOP's would then follow the work plan process.</p> <p><i>Ask for champions if the work plan is approved.</i></p>	
Standalone procedure for mixing HMA	<p>There have been discussions about developing a WAQTC TM (SOP) for mixing HMA in the laboratory.</p> <p>Garth would like any member that has mixing process or procedure to provide copies to him by August 30th.</p> <p>The group may then decide to put together a workgroup</p> <p><i>Members will forward their process to Garth by August 30, 2013.</i></p> <p><i>This will be included on the agenda for the next teleconference.</i></p>	<p>QAC members</p> <p>Desna Bergold</p>
Style Guide Templates	<p>Desna presented the templates for the FOP's and PowerPoints that were developed at the request of the EC. These are now posted on the webpage with the approved Style Guide.</p> <p>There was discussion about the formatting of the slide number on the PowerPoints. Sean felt that it would be better in the center at the bottom of the slide. The group looked at the options and decided the slide number worked there.</p> <p><i>The slide numbers will be centered and 16 pt font in the updated materials. This will be reflected in the Style Guide.</i></p>	
Newsletter articles	<p>Desna has been working with Cathy Higgins, UDOT, to move forward with the WAQTC bi-annual newsletter. Desna asked the group who would be contributing articles for publication. At this point it became apparent that the QAC felt this was not a priority due to work load of all the members.</p> <p>The QAC feels that the newsletter does not have sufficient cost / benefit to be worth pursuing.</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
-------	------------------------------	------------------------

	<p>The QAC members have witnessed many organizations pursue this path with little impact. There is a potential for negative associations with the organization's name due to unsolicited emails.</p> <p>Assignment: each QAC member will discuss this with their respective EC members. Garth will contact Misty and CK Su, CDOT, and discuss this assignment.</p> <p><i>Desna will put discussion of the cost / benefit of a newsletter on the Executive Committee agenda.</i></p> <p>The QAC feels that a 'Benefits of Membership' document / flyer would be a better route. Perhaps take an excerpt from the admin manual (below) and add pertinent information to it and print postcards and pamphlets.</p> <p>From the ADMIN manual:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">BENEFITS OF MEMBERSHIP</p> <p>Cost savings (original cost \$143,000) Partnering Savings to contractors and consultants working in more than one state Sharing resources human, tech, financial Reducing wasteful duplication</p> <p>Misty had a discussion with Matt Strizich, WAQTC EC Chair, on Friday and would like to include the following in the minutes:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Misty called Matt Strizich to determine what the benefits a newsletter would create and the frequency of the publication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semiannual publications • Advertisement • Accomplishments • Statistics of individuals trained by each state <p>Advertising could be better served by creating a marketing ad for the WAQTC website. This could be updated yearly. As much of the information that would</p>	<p>QAC members</p> <p>Desna Bergold</p>
--	---	---

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>be required is already compiled there is little cost.</p> <p>Information concerning individuals trained by each state yearly is not valuable to an Alliance member. The information would only useful for promotion. This information could be made available on the WAQTC website with yearly updates at very little cost.</p> <p>If the Executive Committee would still like a newsletter there are the following would need to be answered: whose task is it to write articles, obtain photos and solicit information from alliance members, design a template, and sent it out? What would be the time and cost of this?</p> <p>Matt will not be at the meeting in two weeks. Oak Metcalf, MDT, will be in his place.</p>	
Desk manual for new QAC/EC members	<p>Garth proposed considering putting together a set of guidelines for new QAC and EC members.</p> <p>This effort would feed into the ‘Reciprocity Auditing’ effort.</p> <p>Linda thinks this is a good idea. WSDOT in considering using the program more fully and she has many questions. Garth asked her to create a list of things that would be helpful to cover. This will be a starting point.</p> <p><i>This will be proposed to the Executive Committee for possible inclusion on the strategic plan.</i></p> <p><i>This will be added to the next EC agenda.</i></p>	Desna Bergold
Reciprocity Audits	<p>This is tabled. The effort under Desk Manual is also a part of the assignment here. Agenda item for January.</p> <p><i>Tabled.</i></p> <p><i>This will be included on the January agenda.</i></p>	Desna Bergold
Master List of ‘C’ Methods	<p>The QAC members have developed a list of the high impact ‘C’ methods so that the EC members can determine what AASHTO intends to do with those identified. The group went over the compiled list.</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>Most agencies agreed on which methods were priorities. Desna will compile a list of methods that are predominately 'high impact' for the Executive Committee meeting.</p> <p><i>This will be presented to the EC.</i></p>	<p>Desna Bergold</p> <p>Garth Newman</p>
<p>January 2014 meeting</p>	<p>The January 2014 meeting will actually be held February 3 through the 7.</p> <p>Seattle has been proposed. Some options include: Residence Inn – Downtown on Lake SeaTac DoubleTree Holiday Express Hampton Suites and others nearby –</p> <p>Linda and Desna will work together</p> <p><i>2014 winter meeting will be held in Seattle pending EC approval.</i></p>	
<p>July 2014 meeting</p>	<p>The QAC summer meeting will be held July 14 through the 18 – Boise ID – Garth will work with Desna perhaps the Grove or the Hampton.</p> <p><i>The 2014 July meeting will be held in Boise pending EC approval.</i></p>	
<p>2013 revision schedule</p>	<p>Revised training materials will be sent for review by Sept 9th.</p> <p>Editorial corrections should be returned to Desna by Sept 18th.</p> <p>The goal is to have final training materials in the mail by Sept. 25th for delivery by Oct. 1st.</p>	<p>Desna Bergold</p> <p>QAC members</p> <p>Desna Bergold</p>



WAQTC Field Operating Procedure Library Work Plan Draft

The majority of this effort will be outside the established committee 'in person' semi-annual meetings.

1. An agency or agencies (champion(s)) wants to propose a method
 - a. The draft must be created around an AAASHTO procedure
 - b. The procedure must be consistent with mission of this group
2. Initial submittal: draft short form is sent to the QAC one month prior to an established meeting – 'balloted'
 - a. QAC members will provide feedback and comments to the champion(s) prior to the meeting
 - b. Vote yes or no: A no vote requires explanation
 - i. All no votes are discussed and found to be 'persuasive' or 'non-persuasive.'
3. The QAC determines whether to proceed with the test method for the library
4. The QAC reviews the draft for content corrections
5. The champion(s) develop and submit further optional materials:
 - a. Student manual
 - b. Performance checklist
 - c. PowerPoint
 - d. Written exam questions (not posted)
 - e. Any optional materials are developed after the short form is accepted by a new developer (s) all the developers become co-champions
6. Maintenance of the FOP – Champion(s) are responsible:
 - a. Tracking AASHTO changes (annually)
 - b. Update FOP to remain consistent with AASHTO
 - c. Committee review of updates
7. When a FOP champion departs from the QAC
 - a. The champion's replacement decides whether to assume these duties
 - b. If this individual will not assume the duties for the FOP
 - i. Open the position to volunteers
 1. Co-champions
 2. Other stakeholders
 - c. If no champion is assigned the FOP is 'discontinued'
 - i. Date of last revision appended to link title
 - d. Removed from library after three years

Proposed disclaimer on the web page: These Field Operating Procedures are to be used for training purposes only unless specifically identified in a contract document.