



Midwestern Pavement Preservation Partnership

Adam's Mark Hotel
St. Louis, Missouri
September 27-29, 2006

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 27, 2006

1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. “Setting the Stage”

Dave Levi, Moderator

Mr. Levi opened the meeting by welcoming the attendees to their meeting!

Mr. Levi then introduced Mr. Ed Hassinger, Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) and Mr. Edgardo Cordero, FHWA Missouri Division.

Ed Hassinger, MODOT

Mr. Hassinger described MoDOT's two year old “smooth road” initiative. The agency had originally planned to make 2,200 miles of Missouri's most heavily traveled roads smooth in three years at a cost of about \$400M. However, in response to the Governor's desire to accelerate the program, the department achieved its objective in a little over two years. Mr. Hassinger stressed the importance of honoring public commitments to maintain credibility. MoDOT plans a “seat-of-the-pants” tour in the fall to evaluate the program's results.

Edgardo Cordero, FHWA Missouri Division

Mr. Cordero described St. Louis as an historic city and reminded the attendees that the nation was celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Interstate system. As the first Interstate project to be approved was on I-70 approaching the Missouri River bridge, it was very appropriate to be in St. Louis for this meeting. Many of our roads have served us well but now need attention. While this is a huge challenge, it can be done.

Mr. Levi mentioned a modification of the agenda to include a brief presentation of the FHWA's recent efforts to develop a “Preservation Research Roadmap”. Inclusion of this new topic would necessitate limiting the number of breakout groups to two instead of the five groups as in past meetings.

“Preservation Research Roadmap”

Chris Newman, FHWA Office of Asset Management

Mr. Newman said that the need for a “Preservation Research Roadmap” had been identified by both the MPPP and recommendations generated by interviews with state highway agencies (SHAs) conducted in the FHWA’s “Pavement Preservation Technical Assistance Appraisal and Evaluation” project. A small contract had been awarded to write 8 to 10 “white papers” to be used in subsequent broad audience meetings to gather input about what preservation research is needed.

Mr. Newman also reported that a system for certifying contractors (including training and testing of preservation workers, inspectors, and technicians) was also needed. As input is needed to address both issues, the work of the breakout groups will be devoted to the two topics.

1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. “Concurrent Breakout Sessions”

Dennis Watson, Overview and Instructions

Mr. Watson saw the deliberations of the two breakout groups as a great opportunity to influence the direction of FHWA’s planning. We all need to take an active part in the discussions in view of the importance of MPPP’s deliverables this year. Mr. Watson then provided an overview and instructions for the breakout groups.

Session #1 - “Contractor Certification”

Larry Galehouse, National Center for Pavement Preservation (NCP)

Mr. Galehouse made a slide presentation, after which there was a discussion that featured the following points:

- How should certification be accomplished?
- What should be the frequency of recertification (annual, three years, etc.)?
- What punitive action might be taken against a certified contractor or individual for poor performance?

Session #2 - “Pavement Preservation Research Roadmap”

Roger Olson, Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)

Mr. Olson made a slide presentation and stated that the FHWA would be seeking volunteers to provide input and champion this effort.

Thursday, September 28, 2006

Pre-meeting Training Feedback

After the breakout groups had re-convened, but before they reported their findings, members were provided with the following feedback from the pre-meeting training sessions:

- There is a need for a session on treatment selection and timing (Should be presented at the next partnership meeting - Course #2),
- There was a strong consensus to continue the training,
- Training is a good pay-back for belonging to the Partnership,

- It would be desirable for the NCPP to have a listing of all available courses,
- It would be desirable to make a distinction by having one course related to pavement management and one on treatments or materials,
- Course #3 would be a good candidate because of its valuable application information,
- Chris Newman mentioned that FHWA has a contract with the Volpe Center to prepare a repository of available training and he will insure that the subject of pavement preservation will be included,
- Industry also has available training which should be included in any catalog, and
- FHWA is nearing completion of a computer based on-line training course modeled on the CalTrans Maintenance Technical Advisory Guide (MTAG).

10:30 a.m. – 11:40 a.m. “Treatment Techniques”

LaDonna Rowden, Moderator

- Volunteer champions are needed for individual treatments to gather specifications for posting on the MPPP’s website. Interested persons should contact LaDonna Rowden.
- The Partnership wishes to gather information on all the various treatments used by each agency and their experiences. After obtaining a password from the NCPP, each agency should post their information on the website.

“Chip Seals”

Tom Wood, Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)

Mr. Wood made a slide presentation, after which he answered the following questions from the audience:

Q 1: What is a good candidate for a chip seal?

A 1: A relatively new asphaltic concrete (AC) pavement (perhaps 3 to 4 years old). This is because pavements are a system and everything must work together to give us good performance.

Q 2: Have you had any problems on curves?

A 2: We used to have problems, but not since we switched to our current higher quality ingredients and procedures. Problems can be avoided by using a uniform size cubical aggregate and good emulsions.

Q 3: Do you require any anti-strip?

A 3: We do not need to use anti-strip because we use cationic emulsions.

Q 4: Do you have friction problems with fog seals?

A 4: No, we have measured it and it is not an issue.

Q 5: Do you fog seal on a regular cycle?

A 5: We have a study which will consider this question. However, we do feel that it is effective to fog seal the shoulders on a regular cycle with a very dilute emulsion.

“Microsurfacing”

Randy Terry, Terry Industries

Mr. Terry made a slide presentation after which he and the audience were reminded that when industry meetings are held in places such as Las Vegas, public perception inhibits access by agency employees, so if their participation is desired, the meetings need to be held elsewhere.

“Diamond Grinding”

John Roberts, International Grinding & Grooving Association

Mr. Roberts made a slide presentation on the benefits of diamond grinding when proper selection and techniques are used.

“New Treatment (Fiber-Mat)”

Randy Terry, Terry Industries

Mr. Terry made a slide presentation on a new very promising preservation treatment.

“A Quick Check of Your Network Health”

Larry Galehouse, National Center for Pavement Preservation (NCP)

Mr. Galehouse made a slide presentation showing a simple method to evaluate the health of any highway network.

“Joint Meeting – MPPP / Foundation for Pavement Preservation (FP²)”

Bill O’Leary, President, FP² and Gerry Eller, Executive Director, FP²

After welcoming the members, Mr. O’Leary made a slide presentation that explained the mission and vision of the Foundation. Mr. Eller then described the national efforts being made in pavement preservation and outlined four important Foundation objectives.

- Promote unification and cooperation
 - National Center
 - Texas Center
 - California Center
 - Regional partnerships
- Foster research
 - Research Roadmap (this is the Foundation’s top priority)
 - Urge support
- Facilitate industry contributions to the SHA reviews being done for FHWA by the NCP
- Increase outreach to local agencies

“Transportation System Preservation Technical Services Program”

Carlos Braceras, Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)

Mr. Braceras made a slide presentation explaining the AASHTO TSP2 program to the attendees.

“Technical Assistance Review and Evaluation of State Programs”

Chris Newman, FHWA Office of Asset Management, and

Larry Galehouse, National Center for Pavement Preservation (NCP)

The reviews are provided as a service to SHAs and demand has been strong. Twenty agency reviews have been completed and a new contract is in place to visit the remaining states.

The appraisal looks at eleven areas in both the central office, the field, and with the local FHWA Division office. The reports are confidential and there is no risk to agencies because they are free to use (or not use) the reports as they wish. Information collected in the review is placed in a national database that will be accessible to the participants so that they can anonymously compare themselves to national averages. Major observations to date include:

- A huge need for training,
- A widespread need for improved public relations, particularly to publicize the value of preservation,
- A lack of contractors to do preservation work, and
- A need to use existing PMSs for network level analysis and decisions rather than the present focus on projects.

“Current Trends in Pavement Preservation”

Kirk Landers, Frederick County Maryland

Mr. Landers made a slide presentation about emerging trends seen in the country in recent years toward moving to pavement preservation.

“How to Achieve Quality Pavement Preservation Treatments” - Panel Discussion moderated by Mr. Eller with panel members including Messrs. Newman, Terry, Feda and Buckingham.

Chris Newman, FHWA Office of Asset Management

Workforce development and the Transportation Curriculum Coordinating Council (TCCC) can assist in furthering preservation because the better people are trained the better able they are to provide a quality product. The TCCC plans to expand its curriculum in the maintenance arena to include more surface treatments. Although there are still some unresolved issues, such as how to implement a third party “certifying authority”, the next few months should see some progress.

Randy Terry, Terry Industries

Having had a lot of experience working with owner agencies, it is clear that contractor certification, although it may difficult to implement, would be of great value to the profession. The industry can be seriously hurt by failures created by unqualified contractors but we must continue to work within the low bid environment. Barriers and industry entry costs are relatively insignificant so something like certification is needed to assure the delivery of quality work. Many in the industry would welcome the approach. The breakout session on this topic earlier in this meeting is a good start to raising the quality bar.

Jim Feda, South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT)

Everyone in this meeting wants to deliver a quality product and that takes a commitment. However, the public perceives surface treatments as “cheap” fixes. South Carolina had some bad experiences that nearly led to a legislative ban on chip seals. After a moratorium, SCDOT made major specification changes to increase the quality of the materials and procedures and the results have been excellent. In addition, each new treatment must be implemented very carefully to insure success because one failure can doom a treatment.

Mike Buckingham, Strawser, Inc.

After expending considerable effort developing new clients for preventive treatments, contractors find it very disheartening to see their efforts wasted because of poor workmanship by someone else. We certainly understand that public agency decision makers are averse to taking large risks and simply want to be assured of a quality product that performs as advertised. Audience feedback audience on certification would be welcome and valuable.

The following comments were generated during the Contractor Certification Breakout Session

- Management will likely ask “Why do we want to limit certification to preventive treatment contractors?”
- Contractor certification should be implemented separately from an agency’s normal pre-qualification process.
- Certification is already required by some SHAs for specialty work (e.g., impact attenuators).
- Without a penalty for poor work, contractor certification will be ineffective.
- Regardless of who is responsible, the industry is seriously hurt by “bad work”.
- The low bid system rather than certification is the answer.
- The best marketing is done by a satisfied customer.
- Qualified inspectors are extremely important but too often, they are unavailable.
- Warranties are a good concept but have legal issues.
- If we all did our job well, there would be more work than we could handle.
- Agencies are poor customers in that they are reluctant to ask for what they have paid for (no enforcement).
- Perhaps prequalification is the domain of the owner and certification is the domain of the industry.
- The certification process would have to be meaningful to be accepted by buyers. It needs to be more than a paperwork exercise. Penalties enforced by a “police force” would be needed.
- If the International Slurry Seal Association (ISSA) were the third party certifying body, would they be willing to bar or decertify one of their members?
- Our quality measurements are still quite objective and that will be a problem.
- Agencies cannot complain about quality while they continue to use prescriptive specifications.

- How does a new contractor enter the business? The push for certification may be perceived as a way to restrain competition.
- Certification encourages a new contractor to do it right the first time and not suffer a costly failure.
- Certification should actually entice more people to get into the business because it will increase the market.
- Certification should also reduce political influence on the industry.
- How are the levels of training defined?
- The TCCC has established a structure with four levels from novice to manager. Certification would be directed at levels two and three (operator and foreman). The owner inspectors' training would be done on the same scale.
- Owners cannot insist on quality if they have an unqualified inspection force.
- If certification requirements were in place, a bid by an uncertified bidder would be challenged by the certified bidders.
- Incentives can be powerful. Would it work to give a cost advantage to better or certified contractors? Perhaps the cost advantage (bid credit) would be based on decreased inspection costs for "good" contractors.
- Perhaps a bonus above the bid price could be given for a quantity of work that exceeds a certain quality level and severe penalties imposed for deficient work.
- Quality bonuses have been used for hot mix work in one state and the contractors typically pass along part of the bonus to the work force.
- Quantitative quality measures for most preventive treatments are problematic.
- Agencies have tended to regard preventive treatments as low cost fixes not requiring a lot of inspection or attention to quality.
- Performance is also highly dependent on the condition of the underlying pavement.
- We have not done any true performance specification projects to date.
- On hot mix projects, individuals rather than contractors are certified.
- Certification will need to be implemented with legal assistance.
- In implementing certification, DBEs will need to be considered.

Appeal for Volunteers

Mr. Tom Wood of the MnDOT solicited volunteers to be part of a certification working group.

6:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.

FP² Awards Reception and MPPP Banquet

Messrs. Bill Ballou and Larry Galehouse were inducted into the "Pavement Preservation Hall of Fame".

"Frederick County's Pavement Management Program"

Kirk Landers, Frederick County, Maryland

Mr. Landers made a slide presentation.

Friday, September 29, 2006

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. “Business Meeting”

Dave Levi, Moderator

The meeting began at 9:15 a.m.

Secretary Treasurers Report

LaDonna Rowden, Secretary/Treasurer of the Midwestern Pavement Preservation Partnership (MPPP) provided members with a financial report which showed a current amount of \$37,000 available for future initiatives.

Future Meeting Dates and Locations

Mr. Levi inquired when members wished to have the next MPPP meeting. Randy Terry said that he felt that contractors would prefer to avoid meeting between mid May and mid October and that November would be the best time for a meeting.

A motion to have a meeting in late October or early November was then approved by the membership.

The Montana Department of Transportation then volunteered to host the next meeting, citing the nearby availability of airports at Kalispell and Missoula. The members approved Montana as the location of the next meeting.

Election of Directors and Officers

Several Director positions were filled.

At Large

Tom Roberts was nominated by Jon Watson. LaDonna Rowden seconded the motion which passed by voice vote.

Industry

Pete Scodeller was nominated by Dennis Watson. Roger Olson seconded the motion which passed by voice vote.

Public Agency

Todd Shields was nominated by Jon Watson. Roger Olson seconded the motion which passed by voice vote.

One Officer position was filled.

Secretary/Treasurer

Jane Berger was nominated by Katie Zimmerman. LaDonna Rowden seconded the motion which passed by voice vote.

Rotation of Officers

As mandated in the By-Laws, the rotation of officers took place. Dennis Watson became Chair, LaDonna Rowden became Vice-Chair, and Jane Berger became the Secretary/Treasurer.

Industry Fees

Katie Zimmerman made a motion to consider a new pricing structure for Industry membership. In the ensuing discussion, the following points were made:

- Mr. Levi stated that involving the Foundation for Pavement Preservation added confusion to the issue of the industry membership fee.
- The group voiced the opinion that meeting attendance is influenced by location and calendar dates.
- Mr. Terry believed that marketing the meeting may be a larger issue than any calendar schedule.
- The membership felt that the Foundation's involvement had confused many people and may have been a factor in the decline of industry attendance at this year's meeting.

After discussing the industry fees, members decided that the MPPP would be more proactive in marketing the meeting itself and would seek marketing assistance from the Foundation, but not require industry to join through the Foundation. The membership also stated that the SHA's should proactively market the meeting to their local industry contacts.

Members then discussed possible ways to structure an industry fee. Tom Woods made a motion to set the Industry membership fee at \$400.00 per year with additional costs for meeting registration and promotional booths to be determined each year based on meeting location costs. The motion was seconded by Katie Zimmerman and passed by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned.