

QIC Meeting Notes February 2, 2005

Next Meeting March 10th at the APAO offices.

Attendees included: Jim Lundy, Ron Depue, Mike Remily, Andy Clayton, Bob Knott, Luci Moore, Larry Ilg, Jeff Gower, Jayne Clarke, Dave Vogt, Chris Doan, Mike Crennin, Jim Huddleston, and Liz Hunt.

We started the meeting with introductions and moved into group updates.

Mat Issues: Dave Vogt presented their Task Group's worksheet highlighting their priorities. Number one on the priority list is mat segregation. Their outlined approach to reducing segregation is to provide contractors and agency personnel training which will be included at the APAO conference in March. They are also working on specification changes including requiring an intermediate machine on projects over a certain size. See handout for additional details.

We discussed joint construction issues. The Mat Issues Group decided that because of variable conditions and the variety of techniques available for good joint construction, the addition of a method spec to our specifications is not warranted. They do propose additional training in this area.

Admin. Barriers to Quality: Jeff Gower presented the issues being discussed by the Admin. Barriers Group. Jeff will be meeting with Scott McCanna (ODOT's Traffic Control Plans Engineer) to discuss issues of limited paving shifts, noise ordinances and the affects on quality. The Agency is emphasizing maintaining freight mobility during construction which could also impact paving operations.

We discussed looking to get projects out for bid earlier like February or March to allow paving in optimum weather. Jeff will be looking to the Accelerated Construction Technology Transfer workshop to be held in April for options to accelerate construction.

Mix Design: Larry Ilg presented the mix design issues. The first issue he presented was related to aggregate production and aggregate gravity management. They plan to meet with crushing contractors to discuss issues. He also discussed the implementation of the Bailey Method where the aggregate gradation will be used to adjust air voids. The task group is evaluating issues like segregation, impact on crushing and impact on mix design procedures associated with using the Bailey method.

The group is looking at ways to provide feedback to CMDTs on mix adjustments made during production. Performance tests are also being discussed. The APA and Hveem tests have few failures. Should adjustments be made to the APA test procedures (like the test temperature or load applied) to better distinguish poor

performers? The last item they are tackling is to review the criteria established for the specifications and mix design processes for AC.

Compaction and Mix Production: Luci Moore presented the issues identified in her task group. Their number one priority is to establish a system to allow for timely field mix design adjustments. They are discussing allowing a CAT II to make changes within certain parameters. Ron D. and Mike R. are developing the language. They propose trying a couple trials this year—assuming ODOT has a high comfort level with the CAT II on the project. They have discussed establishing a CAT II+ category that would require experience plus certification. It might include bringing the CAT II in for additional training.

The group is also looking at the construction implications to meet the needs of the Structures Group which is proposing a change in the target air voids by layer. Luci noted that if we target 95% compaction using oil, we can expect our AC content to increase by 0.3-0.5% which has cost implications. They are also discussing input from the Mix Design Group to evaluate tenderness of “C” mixes. Can it be managed with the Bailey Method?

Structural Design and Materials Selection: Jim Huddleston presented the issues for the group. Top on their list is the design of base courses. Below 4” (considered the rutting zone) there is little to no potential for rutting. Therefore for base courses, we should be focusing on durability rather than rutting potential. Additional durability comes from the addition of more oil and a corresponding reduction in void content. The group is looking at issues associated with reducing the lab air void target to 3% including what is the appropriate field air void target and how to establish minimum compactive effort. Mike Remily noted that in his experience 8 to 12 passes with spec rollers was typical compactive effort. We also discussed the possibility of changing the binder grade with depth per the LTPP criteria if it makes sense from a constructability and tankage standpoint. Generally the number of grades on a project should not exceed 2 due to tankage limitations.

Specifying a base material with a higher asphalt content can be implemented with minimal effort on new work sections for Level 4 pavements. We could specify level 3 mixes, designed at 3% air voids , below 4”. Need to be aware of terminology in plans as the wearing surface is always just the first lift which will never be 4”. The group is also looking at establishing void adjustments to wearing courses by geographical areas like snow zones.

The question came up about stripping under “F” mixes. There is currently a research project looking at ways to identify what caused this to occur in a couple of recent projects and also what are the best design procedures to avoid it in the future.

General: We discussed how to coordinate between groups. Each group is to provide meeting minutes to Liz or Dawn at APAO. The minutes will be posted on the Pavement Services website for review. Most coordination will be done informally and at the QIC meetings. Also, for issues not resolved within a group, the technical expert will be tasked with preparing a white paper documenting the information necessary to make a decision. The decision to implement change ultimately rests with ODOT, however, we will work to keep the process collaborative.

Note that all draft specifications will be sent to all QIC members for review and comment.

The last discussion focused on warranties. How do we move forward? What types of warranties might be necessary for design/build projects? The task groups and QIC need to talk about these issues and a new task group may be necessary to further evaluate the needs. Mike Remily has a stack of information (at least 18" thick) if anyone is interested.

Next Meeting March 10th at the APAO offices.