

## PCCAS Asphalt Paving Committee Minutes – September 25, 2007

Co-Chair Brad Neitzke began the meeting by requesting that each attendee make their own introductions. Brad reminded the group of our antitrust statement which will have a copy attached to the sign up sheet and signing the sheet will indicate a person's acceptance of the statement. Brad gave a quick overview of the Committee and the agenda before starting and requested any addition to the agenda.

Brad Neitzke gave an update on the work that is ongoing in the Round Robin Task Group. He reviewed the objectives of the task group. He continued with an explanation of the "design of the experiment" which was designed to evaluate the repeatability and reproducibility of the Superpave tests currently in use. Laboratories that did not perform the testing according to random basis were excluded from the analysis. Based on the data, the testing precision of the tests being performed were evaluated. In addition the proficiency sample from AMRL was also evaluated. The ranking of the material was not consistent between laboratories indicating an issue that needs to be addressed. Regional meetings were held to discuss the results of the data that was generated. Numerous suggestions from those meetings were included in the work. This process has been in progress which has resulted in clearing up the wording in the procedures of interest. Some of the discrepancies between the procedures of different agencies appear to be causing a significant difference in the precision of the results. A discussion of means to address the differences between test results included clearing up procedure wording, technician training and the variability of use of different equipment. The equipment is being addressed utilizing the data available with the possibility of more work in this area. Phase angle was reviewed as a method for evaluating modified versus unmodified. The results indicated that there was an overlap in the phase angle which would need to be addressed. The conclusions and recommendations to date were presented. There were a few questions and some discussion on the test results. A final report has been posted to the website.

[Click here to view the Round Robin presentation.](#)

Pat Turpen gave a report on the PAV Round Robin work being performed. The task group is looking at the tray location and film thickness as variables. The effect of tray location has been completed. The work was performed by four laboratories with three tray locations being top, middle and bottom. The tray location proved to be not a significant factor. Other factors were evaluated and are including in the report. A final report on the tray location has been posted to the website. The effect of film thickness is currently being evaluated by the same labs. The parameters being evaluated are similar to the items considered on the tray locations. The data will all be complete and provided to Ray Pavlovich this fall.

[Click here to view the PAV presentation.](#)

George Way gave an update on the Asphalt Rubber Task Group activities. A report by Dean Weitzel [provided an update on an asphalt rubber project in Henderson, Nevada](#). The result of interest for the project was a significant lowering of pavement noise. Next summer there will be a project that will utilize terminal blended asphalt rubber section and a polymer modified asphalt section. This project is more for performance than for noise.

Work continues in California on developing a specification for the asphalt rubber terminal blend materials based on the Superpave criteria. George [presented material](#) given by Dale Rand at a San Antonio, Texas meeting on asphalt rubber. The two pavements with use of asphalt rubber were a permeable friction course and a stone matrix mix. More detail mixture composition and performance was presented. Improved safety by the use of these two mixture types was also presented. Other information was presented on the ride and noise issues of these pavement types. George [presented an overview](#) on the use of asphalt rubber in China. Other projects of interest, such as one in Brazil, were also presented. Round robin testing for asphalt rubber is on going.

Rick Holmgren updated the committee on the status of standardization of the elastic recovery test. Essentially all efforts are complete and a majority of the states have adopted the AASHTO T301 as the standard. The issue of wording on the use of the forced ductility clamps is still underway and will be followed up on.

Rick Holmgren gave a brief update on the activities of the Binder ETG. The first item was a few comments on the evaluation of the compression rheometer and the need to continue to work on and identify issues that need to be resolved. Another item was the status of NCHRP 9-36. The German rolling flask appears to be the procedure to use that will best approximate the RTFO. The final report is under consideration by the panel. The fatigue task group has not discovered an acceptable parameter and will consider pursuing the MSCR test at the intermediate temperatures. The need for degassing PAV samples was questioned at the ETG and discussed at the committee meeting. Finally, there was a discussion of the proposed high temperature specification presented by John D'Angelo. Presented was the proposal of using standard traffic, high traffic and very high traffic. As an example using PG64, the proposed grades would be PG64S-xx, PG64H-xx and PG64V. These grades would be distinguished by the amount of non-recoverable strain at environmental temperature. John D'Angelo hopes to have an alternative specification to AASHTO in about a year. Discussion on the above followed. Any comment from the group for the ETG should be directed to Dean Weitzel.

Mike Beavin presented information on the Asphalt Technician Certification program to be provided by the Asphalt Institute. Mike's presentation showed information on the importance of qualified technicians performing tests based on the results obtained. Informational brochures will be sent to interested groups as early as next week. The manual to be used is already available from the Asphalt Institute and was shown to the committee. A discussion on the need for certification and associated issues followed. Brad Neitzke suggested that committee members discuss with their management the idea of technician certification to be discussed at the next meeting.

[Click here to view the Technician Certification program presentation.](#)

Brad Neitzke polled the committee DOT's on current issues at the different agencies. California is continuing to work on the PGR specifications. They have recently received a gyratory compactor, but have yet to start to work with it. Caltrans is also working with others to evaluate the use of asphalt shingles in pavement mixture. The new section 39 for Caltrans is now complete will be implemented by 2008. Nevada is continuing to

experience a budget short fall. There will be fewer projects over the next couple of years. A new \$240 million asphalt project is scheduled in Las Vegas to be completed in three years. There are a number research projects at UNR on asphalt materials. Project reporting is located at [www.wrsc.unr.edu](http://www.wrsc.unr.edu) . Then navigate through the reports. Oregon DOT is still trying to fill the Roadway Materials Engineer, but may need to be redefined to be adequately filled. Oregon has added elastic recovery to some projects. The elastic recovery test is currently not the standard AASHTO test procedure, but they are considering AASHTO T301. Washington completed work on the Tacoma narrows bridge and it is now open. Started performing the MSCR test to see it will work for them. They would prefer to use the test as their only PG plus test. Washington is trying to phase out the California kneeding compactor, but still using for moisture susceptibility. Starting next spring they will use the internal angle for calibration of the gyratory. FHWA Federal Lands have one issue with match contractor mix designs. They believe that the problem may be around the internal angle. Discussion of the issue followed.

Brad Neitzke presented information on warm mix asphalt in Yellowstone National Park. The project was about 7 miles long with two warm mix technologies, Sasobit and Advera, with one control section. The presentation will be made a part of these minutes. In addition, California is taking a look at warm mix in a few locations; primarily at test sections and construction cross over sections.

[Click here to view the Warm Mix Asphalt presentation.](#)

Training updates by UC-Berkeley were given by Larry Santucci. The Asphalt Pavement Fundamentals course is scheduled twice for early 2008. Various “road shows” on different topics are currently underway. A list of the various topics available from UC-Berkeley can be found at [www.techtransfer.berkeley.edu](http://www.techtransfer.berkeley.edu) . The Asphalt Institute will have two workshop courses on construction of quality hot mix asphalt pavements and one course on airport pavements. More information can be found at the Asphalt Institute web site.

The next meeting will be in Reno, NV. on March 4, 2008.