

Paving Asphalt and Mixture Committee Minutes of the
Pacific Coast Conference on Asphalt Specifications
September 17, 2008
Reno, NV

Brad Neitzke called the meeting to order and indicated that this meeting would be abbreviated. He had a few comments on the Binder ETG and the work they are doing. He asked for input on if the group thought on having the ETG meeting in a place where we can attend. The response was favorable. There was a comment that we should not short change our meeting in the future. Introductions followed the brief discussion. Bob Staugaard made a few announcements on the meeting as well as a brief update on the activities of the Recycling Committee. Bob said that we do not have all the minutes from previous Conferences and there is now an effort to obtain a copy of each set of minutes. Brad has indicated that he would be able to put the historical minutes on disc.

George Way gave an update on the Asphalt Rubber Task Group activities. [Click here for presentation.](#) He stated that Nevada had put down a project utilizing the PG-TR specification on IH-80 and there will also be a test section constructed on IH-40 in California. George stated that the Round Robin samples have been sent out for testing under the proposed asphalt rubber performance specification. He also mentioned work at Arizona State University that has an emphasis on moisture damage. George also indicated that there is some work in ASTM on a generic definition of rubber asphalt and perhaps that would then have subgroups that would be more specific to individual products. He mentioned an HVS Report on RAC & MB from CalTrans that are being made ready for release. George presented a few slides on the work behind the results of that report. The slides shown are a part of these minutes. George also recommended that the next meeting of the committee be held in California in order for someone to provide greater detail of the research work. There was more limited discussion on the fact there are several products that deserve further investigation.

Simon Prout was asked to give an over view of the MSCR test calculations. He started with a brief overview of what is to be expected from the MSCR test which is basically the Jnr and percent recovery. He emphasized that the testing is being performed at actual environmental temperatures. There was some confusion on the grading system moving from “grade bumping” to environmental and traffic controlled. To actually calculate the Jnr, the data has to be imported into a spread sheet that is set up to calculate the value. The spread sheet must be obtained from the manufacturer of the DSR. The ASTM test procedure for MSCR is the most up to date. The attached spread sheet can be used with any stress and strain input at stress at 100Pa and 3200Pa. The Jnr value can be determined by this spread sheet. [Click here for spread sheet.](#)

Shauna Teclemariam provided a progress report on the Round Robin Task Group. The task group will conduct a round robin of the MSCR test which will include the determination of Jnr and percent recovery. The task group is considering the use of six separate samples, three modified and three unmodified, from each of the environmental

regions of the conference. Intent of the group is to have one laboratory perform the RTFO conditioning for all samples to limit the variables as much as possible. First round will consist of three samples performed at two temperatures, one at grade and one below. The three samples will be PG58-28, PG64-28 and PG70-22. Samples are expected to be sent to the laboratories by November 1, 2008.

Jeanne Kendrick gave a presentation on research on base course modifications. The presentation is not in final form for public distribution and is therefore not part of these minutes. Please contact Jeanne Kendrick if you wish to receive a copy of the final report. Generally, by modifying the base course certain properties could be introduced that would address the strains being applied. The work is currently being performed in Europe. Initial results suggest that there is reason to consider reduction of the base course depth with the addition of SBS. However, the results are to be considered preliminary. Additional testing is being planned in the United States.

Brad Neitzke gave an update on the activities of AASHTO at the summer meeting. The discussions at AASHTO were around how to propose the specification using the MSCR. Final decision was to add it to M 320 as Table 3 however Table 1 will be the default specification. AASHTO TP 70 is being currently revised.

Brad Neitzke opened the floor for discussions on topics discussed at the ETG. The discussions were then widened to include any topic of interest to the group.

The next meeting will be March 3 & 4, 2008, in Sacramento, CA.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.