

GHCA GQI Asphalt Committee March 2002 Meeting Minutes

March 14, 2002

Equipment Task Force: Meeting began with a presentation of the 1st report from the Equipment Task Force (ETF). The group was provided an overview of the report on the remix paver evaluation. The evaluation addressed three areas: gradation segregation, temperature segregation and density variations. Based on the overall results obtained from the evaluation, indications of remixing were evidenced in the study, but not consistently to the amount to satisfy GDOT requirements for gradation and temperature segregation. A copy of the report has been provided to the Task Force members and the Executive Summary is included with these minutes.

Additional recommendations that were made were to measuring temperature differentials with the infrared camera for conventional pavers and MTVs as comparisons, and, to look at taking plant and roadway samples on a project that is supplied material from a restricted plant. The Bituminous Branch will be looking for these additional opportunities and provide information from them in the future.

The ETF will next look at screed extensions and electric screeds. Roger Dill is working on having a demonstration of the "Omni Screed" in Georgia and will notify the Task Force when the dates are identified for the demonstration. GDOT offered to survey other states on their use and experience with screed extensions/electric screeds.

Materials Certificate: Georgene next informed the group of changes in the Materials Certificate process and what that means to HMA Contractors. The changes were effective with the January 2002 letting. Project Engineers will be required to keep track of 159 asphalt reports by lot for their projects. This makes it critical to submit 159s in a timely manner.

Other items covered at the meeting:

A concern was raised that a clear policy was not in place for plant waste materials and use of scrap mix from plants. The bituminous technical services area will look into this issue and with the input of industry develop some recommendations for standardized procedures.

Peter mentioned that GDOT was looking into increasing the % of RAP allowed in base mixes and considering the use of RAP in SMA mixes. Research is going on in both these areas.

Joe Street mentioned that the DOT is looking at the MTV requirements and there may be changes to address logistics and make it easier for the contractor to know if the MTV is required or not on a project.

Items were addressed from a member that was unable to attend the meeting but sent in comments by email:

Request to formally publish QCT disciplinary actions. See sheet attached – GDOT hopes to incorporate this information into a (soon to be developed) Quarterly newsletter for Certified Technicians.

Request to revisit testing and inspection frequency on the lime pod calibration, especially regarding timed (i.e. weekly) vs. lot basis. This requirement is in the specifications. The new specifications (imperative mode) are currently scheduled for use starting with the October 2002 letting. The Bituminous Construction Branch will review the current requirements and address any changes in the new specifications.

Question came up regarding a change related to mix design levels being shown in the Contract. Levels were never shown in the Contract. A change that was made recently was to place mix design levels on the typical sections only. Previously they were either in the General notes, somewhere on the plans or in the typical sections and this caused confusion.

Discussion of the mix design review process and the field verification process. Some contractors requested that the mix design process be simplified, and the frequency of design verifications be reduced due to the Contractor's use of certified Mix Design Technicians. The Bituminous Construction Branch stated that they would review the number of verifications that are currently required in an effort to speed up the process. This may involve reduced testing of some types, but the performance related tests, such as the APA, are still considered important and may not be able to be reduced to the same level as other tests.

Also, trouble with air voids in Level B mixes. What happens is that AC and fines are needed to get the proper air voids, which essentially turns it into a Level A mix, but it does not meet the APA rutting requirements for Level B. Peter mentioned that Georgia may look at adjusting tolerance requirements on the APA, which would address this issue.

Announcements:

In the latest issue of HMAT there is an article on EPA removing asphalt plants from their list of major sources of air quality pollutants (copy attached).

NAPA 2003 World of Asphalt will be located in Nashville, TN March 18-March 20, 2003.

ATTACHMENTS: ETF Executive Summary #1, HMA QCT Report, NAPA article

DISTRIBUTION:

Attendees :Georgene Geary (GDOT), Peter Wu(GDOT), Walter Boyd(FHWA), Mike Cown(GDOT), Phil Slaughter(GDOT), Travis Padgett(C.W. Matthews), Bobby G. Bragg(Everett Dykes Grassing), Wayne Marshall(Reeves Construction), Roger Dill(Reeves Construction), Therol Brown(GHCA), Gene Googe(Ross of GA), Robert Wolford(Southern Asphalt – Robinson Paving), Joe B. Street(GDOT)

Other members: Wayne Boatright(Shepard Construction Co.), Jimmy Camp (E.R. Snell), Bruce Melton (Oxford Construction), Terry Yeager (APAC-Georgia, Inc.), Chris Arnold (QORE)

**HMATQP
QCT Actions Report
July 2001 through March 2002**

HMATQP document adopted July 17, 2001 and amended October 19, 2001

July 2001

Action: Warning letter written

Issue: QCT II requested mix adjustment but changed wrong sieve such that mix was out of specification tolerance, in separate incident plant ran mix using an unapproved stockpile

October 2001 - January 2002 Actions

None

February 2002 Actions

Action: QCT Level I and II certification permanently revoked

Issue: QCT entered test results into the plant diary for a test that could not be performed at the plant because the plant uses a different system. QCT admitted to falsifying results when confronted with the evidence. QCT also was not submitting test results as required.

March 2002 Actions

Action: QCT required to recertify (technician was already scheduled for certification test due to expiration) and 120 day probation

Issue: QCT ran Department's comparison sample without permission, QCT did not retain comparison sample for 3 days, previous letter of warning