February 13, 2024
Meeting – HMA Tech Team – Spec Subcommittee

Location: Teams Meeting
Date: February 13, 2024
Time: 2:00PM – 3:30PM

Attendance

- Jeff Anderson
- Bryce Cibulka
- David Hose
- Debbie Schwerman
- Derick Frederixon
- Jake Amundson
- Brian Jandrin
- Jeremy Barron
- Albert Kilger
- Neil Atanasoff
- Chris Peplinski
- James Pforr
- Sean Snyder
- Keena Spencer-Dobson
- Scott Syron
- Travis Kurey
- Zach Lemke

Agenda Items

1. AWP Specification Reorganization.
    a. Review Industry feedback to-date.
        - No new feedback provided in industry review copy at this time.
        - Reviewed reorganized content structure.
            - HMA and SMA nuclear gauge correlation strips have been combined into one program since they accomplished the same objective.
    b. Allow Dept. to use ACT for PWL (705.1.2.2.2)
        - Scott S.: No issues with using an ACT for QV.
        - Derek F.: This could improve turnaround times from the department. Not opposed.
        - **Action Item:** We will move forward with allowing ACT for department testing. Will verify with Erik L.
    c. Mix Design Testing Across Multiple Projects / Records Documentation

Requirements for PWL Lite and Dept. Acceptance Programs (705.1.2.4.2)

- Presented example of sampling per project or sampling per mix design.
    - Ultimately, the main difference is the chance for multiple projects to have similar random numbers and therefore are taking multiple tests around the same time. However, there is not a reduction in overall testing volume.
    - It would be very difficult to determine which projects would use a mix design test result, especially if the jobs are not receiving equal tonnages at uniform intervals.
- Debbie S.: Are we sampling off contract tonnage with pre-established testing frequencies, or is this something that would be done by quantity shipped or what's projected to be shipped that day?
    - Are we isolating a plant for a specific project?
    - Can we ship from another plant that is producing the same type of mix (i.e.: 5MT)?
        - Dan K.: Dept. Acceptance will allow multiple plants to ship to one project. PWL Lite will be like full PWL where the mix comes from one plant.
        - Material coming from multiple plants/sources. May need to test each source at least once. Could do max number of days between samples. Minimum number of tests per plant. Require a test when plants switch. Stipulations for additional testing.
            - Scott S.: Concerned about small tonnage projects that is going to pave multiple times over multiple days without being tested due to the small quantities.
                - Debbie S.: There might be days where testing is not happening and then we may switch to another plant or design. Does that mix now have to be represented regardless of the tonnage?
                    - Dan K.: Could add a stipulation that each source needs at least one QV.
                    - James P.: Could add language about a maximum number of days between samples.
            - Erik L.: Staging and suspension of projects causes issues for HMA.

    - We could come up with guidance on how to deal with the various situations. That guidance could include exceeding the minimum testing requirements.
    - Maybe pick one of these urban projects with heavy staging and pilot these specs on them to see if we are comfortable with the level of QA.
- Sean S.: Southeast region has been testing on a project level now for about 10 years. There isn't too much of an issue with double testing either.
    - Dan K.: Do you share tests between projects then? I.e., If a QV happens in one project, then the next day, they pave the same mix on another project.
        - Sean S.: We get the sample again the next day. The only exception is if the samples are on the same day between the two projects, then we will assign the one test to both projects.
    - Scott S.: We do the same thing in Southwest Region.
    - Bryce C.: We do the same thing Northeast Region.
- There would be issues with dispute resolution as well for determining the quantities of failing material for each project and the pay adjustments.
- Derek F., Zach L., and Jake A. are ok with switching to project level testing.

d. Waive SMA Volumetric Test Strips for PWL Lite. (705.1.2.5.4.1)
    i. Department would like to collect the first production QV split of the QC sample and test in lieu of a volumetric test strip for SMA. (705.1.2.5.4.4)
- **Action Item:** Will send this topic separately to industry to review and provide a response.

e. AC% JMF Adjustments as part of PWL Lite. We would like to only allow this prior to project start up. Other JMF changes would still be allowed during production. (705.1.2.5.4.6.1)
- **Action Item:** Will send this topic separately to industry to review and provide a response.

f. Referee testing low QC %AC tests. Disincentive applied if BTS verifies low AC. This is interim until we can do F&t and PWL with %AC. (705.1.2.5.3.6 and 705.1.2.5.4.6)
- Still targeting implementation for 2025 construction season.

g. Dept. Acceptance QV Testing Frequency = 1 / 1,875 Tons (2 tests/lot) (705.1.2.5.5.3).
   - No changes to PWL (9,750 tons)
   - PWL Lite (3,000 – 9,750 tons)
     - Use on travel lanes and integrally paved shoulders.
     - Important small tonnage areas such as roundabouts and major intersections.
     - Normal life expectancy.
     - 3 QV tests required.
     - No volumetric test strips.
     - JMF changes allowed.
   - Dept. Acceptance
     - Use on standalone shoulders, such as along concrete on interstates.
     - Use on small tonnage projects that are too small for PWL Lite.
     - Use on projects with shorter life expectancy.
     - No limits on tonnage if it meets the requirements.
     - Uses some existing QMP concepts.
       - Use existing QV spec limits.
       - Use QC retains to determine forward and backward limits.
         - James P.: QC tests aren't being used for acceptance, so the retains probably shouldn't be used…
           - **Action Item:** Dept. will review this language for compliance.
     - No 4-point running average pay.
   - Scott S.: Instead of 1,875 tons, could go to 1,500 tons, so that after 3,000 tons, there would be 3 samples and a natural transition to PWL Lite.
     - Don't necessarily have to transition to PWL Lite at 3,000 tons.
     - Reviewed analysis of increases to Dept. testing based on the sampling frequency.
       - Several people were in favor of testing at 1 / 1,500 T for department testing.
         - **Action Item:** Will take this sampling frequency to TSS Supervisors to check if this rate is acceptable.
   - We will take to the TSS supervisors and have a bigger discussion on this.

h. Operating below the specified minimum density needs to be clarified. (705.1.2.6.3.3.5, 705.1.2.6.3.4.4, 705.1.2.6.4.2.5, 705.1.2.6.4.3.4,…)
    i. Something along the lines of… "If you have two consecutive lots with PWL value less than 75 at the completion of the lot, submit a corrective action plan. Production may be stopped under the discretion of the project engineer."
- **Action Item:** Will send this topic separately to industry to review and provide a response.

i. Unify actions when a core is damaged during extraction. There are several versions… (705.1.2.6.3.3.6, 705.1.2.6.3.4.1.1, 705.1.2.6.4.2.6,…)
    i. STSP 460-055 Appendix A (Production Dispute Cores): "If a core is damaged at the time of coring, immediately take a replacement core 1 ft. ahead of the existing testing location in the direction of traffic at the same offset as the damaged core."
    ii. STSP 460-055 Appendix A (Test Strip Cores): "If a core is damage at the time of extracting from the pavement, a replacement core should be taken immediately adjacent to the damage core, i.e., from the same footprint."
    iii. For Correlation Strip: Do we reshoot the new area with the nuc before coring, or use the original value?
    iv. During production: Do not need to shoot with nucs because cores are being used for the acceptance.
- David H.: 1 foot seems small for these kinds of issues. 2-3 feet might be better.
    - Dan K.: We should be reshooting after moving and before coring.
- **Action Item:** Will send this topic separately to industry to review and provide a response.

j. SMA lots with more than 98.0% (up from 97.0% currently) Gmm will not be eligible for incentive. Want to apply to both HMA and SMA. (705.1.2.6.4.5)
- Albert K.: Could use cores to restore incentive if gauge is suspect.
- **Action Item:** Will send this topic separately to industry to review and provide a response.

k. Nuclear Gauge Correlation Strips
    i. Combined SMA and HMA Density Test Strips into one correlation strip.
    ii. Will still use PWL and results from cores for acceptance of the correlation strip.
    iii. 2 Sublots.
        - Two correlation zones will be split, one in each sublot (3,000 ft).

iv. Can continue production beyond correlation strip (unless restricted by volumetric test strip for PWL).