

**North Central Superpave Center  
Steering Committee Minutes  
Madison, Wisconsin  
February 3, 2009**

Interim Chairperson Judie Ryan opened the meeting at 12:50pm. Members and guests introduced themselves. Those present were:

Judie Ryan, Wisconsin DOT	Gerry Huber, Heritage Research Group
Will Stalcup, Missouri DOT	Lee Gallivan, FHWA
Joe Schroer, Missouri DOT	Becky McDaniel, NCSC
Michael Heitzman, NCAT	Jan Olek, NCSC
Bill Knopf, APA Indiana	Ayesha Shah, NCSC
Jim Trepanier, Illinois DOT	Dennis Dvorak, FHWA
Jody Reigel, NCSC	Wayne Jones, Asphalt Institute

Several members of the Steering Committee sent their regrets. Ron Walker, Indiana DOT, and John Hinrichsen, Iowa DOT, were not allowed by their agencies to travel to this meeting. Erv Dukatz had a knee replaced two weeks ago and is recovering. Laird Weishahn retired.

The meeting agenda is shown in Appendix A.

Membership

Judie Ryan opened discussion regarding the Steering Committee membership and ideas for expanding participation, perhaps beyond the highway agencies. Last year we added Mike Heitzman as a liaison from NCAT to the NCSC Steering Committee membership. The NCSC is working with agencies beyond just state agencies. Should NCSC membership be extended to some of these other agencies? For the state representatives, it is increasingly difficult for them to travel. Some of the NCSC's other clients would be willing and able to travel.

Will Stalcup suggested that the NCSC go over the summer site visit report and that may help guide us toward answers to the membership questions. Ryan seconded the motion. Approved.

Summer 2008 Site Visits Summary Report

Jody Reigel started the report by discussing the purpose and format of the summer site visit meetings. Becky McDaniel continued with the technical portion of the report with discussion of issues and ideas identified. (See the Site Visit Report in Appendix B and the PowerPoint presentation in Appendix C for details.)

The draft report was emailed to all of the Steering Committee members and friends of the Steering Committee. Ryan suggested sending the report to all who attended the site visit meetings as well as posting it on our website once it is finalized.

The top eleven topics that were brought up at the site visits by at least three states are as follows :

1. Cold In-Place Recycling (CIR)
2. Longitudinal Joints
3. Mechanistic Empirical Pavement Design Guide (MEPDG)
4. Overlays
5. Pavement Preservation
6. Polyphosphoric Acid (PPA)
7. Porous Pavements
8. Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP)
9. Surface Characterization
10. Tear-Off Shingles
11. Warm Mix

Mike Heitzman noted that within the report it is difficult to determine what the nature of the comment was. For example, it is difficult to tell if a state is already working on a topic or wants information, etc. McDaniel noted that we have more detailed notes from the meetings with each individual state. We can make those available once finalized, but many of the topics brought up were simply states noting that the topic is of interest to them one way or another. The group then briefly discussed each topic and what the NCSC might be able to do for the region.

Cold In-Place Recycling (CIR) McDaniel noted that there is an NCHRP synthesis study underway on cold and hot in-place recycling and full depth reclamation; she and Joe Schroer are on the panel. We will be sharing information regarding the synthesis once it becomes available. A CIR project McDaniel evaluated when she worked for Indiana many years ago was a big success, but they did not use it again because no one in state had the equipment. That is a barrier to the use of that technology that must be recognized.

Lee Gallivan noted that on Gerry Huber's TRB committee, Flexible Pavement Construction and Rehabilitation, there were several comments on cold in-place recycling. Gallivan said there was a fair amount of interest from the audience on construction techniques. Gallivan asked if we gathered any information at our site visits regarding construction techniques. McDaniel replied that it was not a topic of discussion.

Joe Schroer stated that folks are looking at recycling enhancers, etc.

Longitudinal Joints Heitzman noted that one option would be for the NCSC to summarize what each state is doing with longitudinal joints.

MEPDG McDaniel asked if there would be interest in doing a round robin on dynamic modulus testing in the region. Jim Trepanier noted that they will be

getting Asphalt Mixture Performance Tester (AMPT) equipment and would be interested in what other states have it and their use of it. Heitzman noted that the purpose of the different states getting the equipment was to make sure that everyone understands the test procedures and can compare results. There will also be other types of round robin testing in the future.

McDaniel noted that she and Heitzman and some others wrote a paper for AAPT a while ago comparing test results, which didn't get accepted. Maybe they should look at it again and share it with the region.

Heitzman asked if we have the proceedings from the North Central MEPDG Users Group meeting on our website. We do not, but we will gladly link to them or post them if possible. We have done that in the past when FHWA has had difficulty posting things because of 508 compliance requirements. The NCSC will contact Gary Crawford with the DGIT group to see if we can get or link to the presentations.

Overlays McDaniel noted that this is a broad topic including such things as thin overlays, porous overlays, overlaying over SMA's, etc. The NCSC will need to get more information from the states before determining what to do on this topic.

Pavement Preservation Dennis Dvorak noted that Michigan has a national pavement preservation group and would know of others around the country. Gallivan noted that the NCSC's plate is very full, so areas of research beyond HMA should not be big time consumers unless they are needed by member states and/or are funded by outside projects. McDaniel agreed that this probably should not be a major area of activity for the Center, but they could perhaps help share information about the topic.

PPA McDaniel suggested that we wait until after the PPA conference in Minneapolis in April 2009 before we decide if the NCSC should do more research in this area. She also commented that FHWA intended to help provide travel funding to encourage every state to participate in the meeting, which will be a balanced, objective discussion of PPA.

Porous Pavements McDaniel commented that the NCSC has done quite a bit in this area, and it is of continuing interest. A five year evaluation of a porous friction course in Indiana, which shares a climate and concerns with the other states in the region, will be available soon.

RAP This has been and continues to be a major emphasis of the NCSC. Gallivan asked if the NCSC has the proceedings from the RAP Summit in Nashville in November 2008 on the website. McDaniel responded that they are on the NCAT website. The NCSC will provide a link from the NCSC website.

Surface Characterization This is another broad area. McDaniel summarized what the NCSC has done in this regard in the past and offered assistance to any state that had a surface characterization issue.

Tear Off Shingles Gallivan asked if the NCSC could put a summary out on who is doing what, when and how with tear-off shingles in the NC states. This will be one of many topics about which the NCSC can share information. Bill Knopf said that one of the Indiana program engineers went to a meeting at which it was noted that a TPF pooled fund study is in the solicitation process for tear-off shingles in this (Midwest) area. Information about this study will be of interest to all the states.

Warm Mix This is a growing interest and several states in the region are trying various processes. The NCSC bid on an NCHRP project as a subcontractor and is hopeful that the team will be successful.

Summary McDaniel concluded that there is a range of things the NCSC could do about these topics. One of the simplest is to collect and share information about what the states are doing. Since there are so many topics where this could be done, she proposes sending a list of topics out to the full Steering Committee and getting their feedback on the priorities. Then the NCSC can follow up every couple of months with a survey. (They will first search states specifications, manuals and test methods to attempt to make the survey as painless as possible.) These and other topics may be suitable for newsletter articles as well. The NCSC can bring in information from outside the region too. The other extreme of the range of possible activities is to conduct research on the topic on a state, regional or national level. McDaniel pledged that the NCSC would continue to work with the Steering Committee to develop plans on the highest priority needs.

Ryan agreed that pulling the information together from the meetings is appreciated. There are a lot of different ways that we could go as far as going forward with pursuing these needs. As little as five years ago, it was more difficult to query what other states were doing. Now it's easier to assemble the information. A summary of what the labs can offer as well as what the research staff can offer would be helpful.

#### Update on Center Status and Activities

In the interests of time, this presentation was not given, but copies were handed out. See McDaniel's report in Appendix D.

McDaniel noted that the NCSC welcomes suggestions on adding a grad student, an intern, or someone from an agency as a temporary staff since the NCSC has lost three graduate students within this past year. They currently have a technician from industry who is assisting with extractions and recoveries for a

research project for six weeks. They would be happy to work with others who want to learn how to run certain tests or work on projects of interest.

#### Financial and Staffing Report

Jan Olek noted that the Center is experiencing some problems getting the state's obligated funds transferred from the Indiana commissioner's office to the NCSC account. We have spent a lot of time and effort trying to get this accomplished.

For details regarding the three-year budget please see the financial report, Appendix E. While reviewing this document, Olek noted that the Center continues to generate more than half its income from outside sources, but the states' base funding is critically important.

Ryan asked if we are actively pursuing research that the other NC state DOT's are doing? Olek said yes, we are, but we are in competition with state universities. We do pursue them and we have been successful in getting some projects with states in the NC region. We have also collaborated with other universities and welcome that type of cooperative work. Wisconsin looks for consortiums with other entities for research projects. Ryan encourages the Center to solicit research projects and joint projects from states, industry, outside agencies, etc.

McDaniel noted that we have the advantage of having to charge no or only half overhead (depending on the funding source) because we are located off-campus.. Also, we have a full-time staff with longevity of service and expertise, rather than grad students who turn over. Gallivan suggested pointing this out in the next newsletter and including a success story of how we have done research for another state agency.

Ryan noted that there are some special skills that are needed for some research projects that are put onto state highway agencies and they often find that there are only maybe three people out of 15 or 20 staff who get to write the proposals due to their other workload. Ryan said that she would be happy to outsource some of the writing of the research proposals that she is expected to write.

Ryan asked about the three-year funding request that was sent out last year.

Heitzman asked if we asked the states how secure their annual contribution of base funding is while we are at their states on the summer site visits. Olek noted that we didn't want to ask that question outright because we don't want to imply that we feel that we are "entitled" to the funding. Olek noted that the meeting participants were very receptive of us visiting the sites because it will assist the person in charge of requesting the funding at each site with justifying the contribution of the base funding.

Ryan asked for clarification on the request for commitment letters that the Center will be sending out soon. The letters will be to request base funding for FY 09/10 and FY 10/11.

Ryan noted that during the summer of 2008, the biggest concern at the states was the price of asphalt. Ryan encouraged the Center to ask the states if their financial situations have changed based on the change in price of asphalt since the summer of 2008.

Ryan noted that the summer site visit in Wisconsin changed the outlook of the folks who make the decision on funding the Center for the better.

McDaniel asked if, in light of the fact that there are a number of state representatives not in attendance, the Center should pursue a video conference meeting in three months or so? Ryan responded that she recommends a follow-up meeting to discuss NCSC Steering Committee membership, the base funding request for FY09/10 and FY10/11, the current common research ideas across states based on input collected at the 2008 summer site visits, etc.

#### Combined State Binder Group (CSBG)

Last year it was suggested that the NCSC could work more closely with the CSBG. McDaniel was to talk to Jim McGraw, John Hinrichsen and Tom Brokaw to get their input on what the Center can do to help with the round robins, their website or with travel assistance to get to meetings (which would probably mean an increase in base funding for those states). Despite many e-mails and attempts to set up conference calls, nothing firm has yet been accomplished. McDaniel will continue to follow up on this topic.

Ryan asked to add her to the group with McGraw, Hinrichsen, and Brokaw regarding discussions on what the Center can do to help the CSBG in hopes that she can help move things forward.

#### Chairperson for the next NCSC Steering Committee meeting

Ryan said she is open to nominations, volunteers, etc.

Gallivan agreed with Ryan's suggestion to doing some persuading behind the scenes (after this meeting but before the follow-up teleconference meeting) with her counterparts to ask the other seven states for someone to step up to the plate and chair the committee next year. Ryan said that within three months, either she will pass the baton to another chair or be ready to be involved in planning the next meeting and chairing for another year.

Ryan said that within state budgets, the traditional position of the dynamic is changing. Now states are more vocal about what is happening and what they are willing to fund.

Heitzman noted that the Marketing Plan is a good document to work from; there are good ideas in it. His experience with other user producer groups around the country is that many people are not able to travel and that we should pursue more videoconferencing. We should also have NCSC meetings more often and have consolidated topics and discuss them in depth and specifically during the meetings.

With no more old or new business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:59pm.