

Paving Asphalt and Mixture Committee Minutes of the
Pacific Coast Conference on Asphalt Specifications
March 23, 2010
Sacramento, CA

Brad Neitzke called the meeting to order and indicated that we would be moving items in the agenda to meet people's schedules. He asked if there were any additions to the agenda and one item was added, PPA research update. Brad reminded everyone of their responsibilities to the antitrust requirements. He then asked for the group to introduce themselves around the table.

Brad Neitzke presented the committee charges from the Conference two years ago. The two charges were to continue the evaluation of modifications to the PG specification and asphalt mixture tests and for all task groups continue work as directed by the committee. The dates for the conference being considered are May 19-20, 2010.

The committee then discussed the MSCR test and polled the users on the potential changes in specification by using this test. Western Federal Lands is reviewing data but at this time does not plan to include the MSCR in any asphalt specification. Washington is considering the use MSCR in the upcoming year. They have met with producers to iron out any issues. California has restructured with a different group now responsible for binder specifications. They have not made any significant changes to their specifications. They are using 20-30% PMA. Rick Holmgreen gave an update on the implementation discussions being held in other parts of country. John D'Angelo gave a follow up on the implementation of the Multiple Stress Creep Recovery (MSCR) test and corresponding specification. MP19 is the specification in AASHTO with MSCR and is currently Table 3, MP 320. TP70 is the AASHTO test procedure designation. John was asked to give a background of the work leading up to the current test and specification. Copies of both discussions, background ([click here](#)) and implementation ([click here](#)), are a part of these minutes. There is an issue around the software for calculation of MSCR data reduction.

George Way gave an update on the Rubber Task Group work. He mentioned AR 2009 Asphalt Rubber meeting in China. George also said that he had access to several of the papers if anyone is interest. There may be a posting on the RPA website on the paper titles in the near future. There was a question of the use of the PCCAS specification for terminal blend rubber. California has two specifications one for a surface application and one paving grade. The solubility requirement has been reduced to 90%. There are two processes in use, one terminal blend and one not terminal blend. The California specification does have an elastic recovery requirement. They are considering allowing the TR and the PMA to be interchanged on pavement preservation projects. Nevada is using it on a trial basis. One project last year and one this year make up their current efforts. The specification is similar to the California specification. PG TR requires a minimum of 10% by weight ground tire rubber. Washington is not currently using

ground tire rubber. There was discussion about how to specify tire rubber products and PMA products to be equivalent materials.

Brad Neitzke gave a report on the efforts of the Round Robin Task Group. The degassing of samples is under question. The MSCR is still under review and there are still outstanding data that is needed for completion.

John D'Angelo was asked to update the committee on the activities of the Binder and Mix ETG's that met in Irvine, California in February, 2010. One issue is insuring that the test temperature is at the proper level. A procedure for the equilibration time has been developed. He also mentioned that the ETG would be working on a problem statement for evaluating the use of re-refined motor oil bottoms. Hussain Bahia has a new fatigue test for the binders. The new test is appropriate in time required to perform the test. This test would replace the PAV DSR. There is still some interest in the role the asphalt binder plays in RAP. An experiment was designed to evaluate this issue. There is some work going on in the evaluation of RAP in warm mix.

JV Martin gave a brief update on a project at the Asphalt Institute on the use of PPA with several binders from California. This work includes two aggregates from California with other variables in the binder such as polymer. There was a request that some time be made available for a presentation by the Asphalt Institute at the May Conference.

Peter Sabaaly gave a presentation on "Evaluating the Impact of Lime on Pavement Performance". A copy of the presentation is a part of these minutes ([click here](#)). The report can be found at <http://www.nationallime.org/publications/Asphalt-Report.pdf>.

The next item on the agenda is hot mix asphalt recycling. The northwest has brought some issues to the Paving Asphalt Committee which should actually be taken to the Recycling Committee. The main concerns are over the high level of RAP and RAS (Recycled Asphalt Shingles) The University of Nevada is part of a Research Consortium that is working on recycling as well as other asphalt related items. This information can be found at www.arc.unr.edu. The Recycling Committee will undertake this item in their meeting. Brad asked the states and agencies on the amount of RAP that is allowed. Washington allows 20% in any mix. Nevada does not allow the use of RAP currently, but there are a couple trials underway. California allows up to 15% RAP in the dense graded mixtures only. Arizona allows up to 20-25% RAP. Federal Lands allows 20% RAP.

States were asked for updates. Washington is working with King County on the use of tear off shingles. They will also be looking at the use of the Hamburg rut tester in their mixtures. Any and all projects can use warm mix which has been recognized as an acceptable technology. They allow 20% RAP in the warm mix option. California is looking at warm mix and had several projects last year. They are trying to get a feel for the various technologies. They will continue to use ground tire rubber. California is actively pursuing pavement preservation.

Training opportunities and updates were provided by Larry Santucci.

The last agenda item was the preparation for the Conference meeting in May, 2010. The main work was on the proposed charges to the Committee by the Conference. The charges being forwarded to the Conference for consideration are:

- 1) Continue the evaluation of modifications to the PG specification and asphalt mixture tests.
 - Make recommendations to appropriate agency, ASTM, AASHTO, on improvements to test procedures.
 - Investigate the Multiple Stress Creep Recovery test and possible effects to the PG specification.
- 2) All Task Groups continue work as directed by the Committee.
 - Continue activities to develop performance specifications for asphalt products modified with tire rubber.
- 3) Evaluate warm mix asphalt technologies in relation to binder and mixture performance specifications.

The next meeting will be November 9, 2010 in Reno, Nevada.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58PM.