

**MINUTES**  
**AASHTO Oversight Panel**  
**Of the**  
**Transportation Systems Preservation – Technical Services Program**  
*Detroit, Michigan*  
*27<sup>th</sup> June 2017*

**Present**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Org</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Org</b>
Conner, George (Chair)	AL DOT	Johnson, Bruce	OR DOT
Freeby, Gregg (Co-Chair)	TX DOT	Juntunen, David	MI DOT
Corley-Lay, Judith	NCPP	Milton, Jeff	VA DOT
Darr, Brad	ND DOT	<i>Neeley, Lloyd</i>	UT DOT
Everett, Thomas	FHWA	O'Doherty, John	NCPP
<i>Franco, Colin</i>	RI DOT	Selmer, John	IA DOT
Galehouse, Larry	NCPP	<i>Suing, Troy</i>	AASHTO
Hahn, Patte	NCPP	Welch, Ed	NCPP

*Italics denote remote participation by telephone*

**Absent**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Org</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Org</b>
Cunningham, Tim	KS DOT	Hayes, Jameelah	AASHTO

**Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting began at 8:30 a.m. EDT, when **Mr. George Conner**, the new Chair introduced himself and welcomed all participants (present and remote). **Mr. Conner** paid tribute to the two previous Chairs and said they had left him a strong legacy. He then invited the remote participants to introduce themselves and state their affiliations. After the remote participants had introduced themselves, **Mr. Conner** introduced **Ms. Judith Corley-Lay**, the NCPP's new director and **Mr. Thomas Everett, Associate Administrator, Office of Infrastructure, FHWA**. The remaining participants then introduced themselves and stated their affiliations.

**Mr. Conner** made the following observations:

- The TSP•2 Program and Oversight Panel are becoming increasingly important as pavement and bridge needs are growing faster than the available resources,
- The vast bulk of the Nation's transportation assets consists of pavements and bridges,
- Alabama DOT's Director believes it is immoral and unethical for agencies to use public funds to construct pavements and bridges and then let them fall apart,
- Many benefits are derived from the Preservation Partnerships, and
- Busy agency decision-makers believe the TSP•2 Program is vital.

### Approval of Minutes

**Mr. Gregg Freeby** moved that the minutes **[Attachment A]** from the 13<sup>th</sup> April 2016 Dallas Meeting be accepted as written. **Mr. Jeff Milton** seconded the motion, there was no discussion, and the minutes were approved unanimously by voice vote.

### AASHTO TSP•2 Voluntary Contributions

In the absence of **Ms. Jameelah Hayes**, who was on leave from AASHTO, **Mr. Troy Suing (AASHTO Fellow)** told the Panel that he had no information on the status of voluntary contributions. **Ms. Corley-Lay** reported that of the 52 agencies,<sup>1</sup> 46 had contributed for FY 2017. The six agencies that had yet to contribute were Alaska, D.C., Massachusetts, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Wyoming. **Mr. Conner** remarked that 46 contributors represented the highest participation level for all AASHTO voluntary programs and was the second highest level since the TSP•2 Program was started. **Mr. Larry Galehouse** mentioned that it had been historically difficult to obtain timely participation data. In some cases, contributions had been credited to wrong accounts. **Mr. Conner** asked whether states could contribute electronically and whether bi-monthly reports could be obtained. He also asked **Mr. Suing** to provide monthly reports to **Ms. Corley-Lay** and the NCPP. **Mr. Suing** agreed to provide the reports. **Mr. Conner** also told the Panel that their meeting packets contained a table **[Attachment B]** showing contribution totals by state for the period 2006 through 2017.

### Membership Status and Discussion

**Mr. Conner** told the Panel that he had had several discussions with **Mr. Galehouse** and **Ms. Corley-Lay** to discuss the Panel's membership structure and current vacancies. He mentioned the following areas that needed to be addressed:

1. Vacancies and identifying suitable prospective members, and
2. A suitable Panel structure in light of the recent AASHTO restructuring.

**Mr. Conner** also mentioned the following AASHTO committee structural changes:

- The Joint Technical Pavement Group has been combined with the Subcommittee on Materials to form the new Committee on Materials and Pavements. The new committee will have two missions – one related to materials and one related to pavement design.
- The Subcommittee on Transportation Asset Management has been combined with the Standing Committee on Performance to form the new Committee on Performance-Based Management. This new committee will also be responsible for Risk Management, an area not reflected in the present AASHTO committee structure.

**Mr. John Selmer**, presently representing the Subcommittee on Transportation Asset Management told the Panel that he would remain a member.

Using the current Oversight Panel Directory **[Attachment C]** as a starting point, the Panel undertook a general review and discussion in light of the recent AASHTO restructuring. The following points emerged:

- **(Franco)** It is important to have materials represented in the new structure. The Committee on Materials and Pavements (SOM) has two important Technical Sections

---

<sup>1</sup> 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

related to Preservation – (2a) “Emulsified Asphalts”, and (5b) “Bridge and Pavement Preservation”. Pavements are probably large enough to stand alone, but there may be some overlap with Asset Management.

- **(Juntunen)** With the new National Performance Measures (NPMs) and the focus on Asset Management, preservation has become very important. Unfortunately, the NPMs have categories for Good and Poor, but not Fair, which is where most of the preservation occurs.
- **(Franco)** 5b includes any preservation treatment for bridge decks.
- **(Welch)** With the availability of so many bridge products, there is concern about a lack of approval reciprocity between the states.
- **(Selmer)** There needs to be better coordination between performance and asset management, and also between the various ETGs.
- **(Corley-Lay)** TSP•2 can be very helpful in fostering a closer working relationship between Pavement and Bridge.
- **(Galehouse)** On the pavement side, lack of specifications has been a problem. Now, with TSP•2 assuming responsibility for the Emulsion Task Force (ETF), we are finally getting preservation specifications into the AASHTO system and this problem should diminish.
- **(Conner)** This Panel needs both materials and pavement design representation.
- **(Corley-Lay)** The new Committee on Materials and Pavements will have three representatives per state – Materials, Pavement, and State’s Choice. Each state will have only one vote.
- **(Conner)** The vacancy formerly occupied by **Ms. Corley-Lay** should be filled by a representative of the new Materials and Pavements Committee with some background in pavement design.

**Mr. David Juntunen** moved that the vacancy formerly occupied by **Ms. Corley-Lay** be filled by a representative of the new Materials and Pavements Committee with some background in pavement design. **Mr. Brad Darr** seconded the motion, there was no discussion, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The discussion continued and the following additional points emerged:

- **(Conner)** The Panel has four representatives from the present Subcommittee on Maintenance (SCOM) and two Vice-Chair positions, one of which is vacant.
- **(Corley-Lay)** There has been a traditional problem with representatives from the Northeast Region gaining permission to attend meetings. One possible approach would be to combine the Northeast and Midwest Regions. However, the Northeast is somewhat sensitive and may prefer to retain separate representation.
- **(Milton)** With respect to SCOM, should representation be regional or based on Technical Working Groups (TWGs)?
- **(Conner)** We need to be flexible to attract high quality representatives.
- **(Galehouse)** Recommended **Messrs. Geoff Hall (MD DOT)** and **Derek Nener-Plante (ME DOT)** as being good candidates. Each has experience with pavement design.
- **(Johnson)** On the bridge side, Panel membership is more related to the TWGs.

- **(Conner)** Today, SCOM meetings are not well attended and sometimes it is hard to attain a quorum for votes. SCOM's focus will be on improving representation. He suggested leaving the Panel position vacant until we find an appropriate person.
- **(Corley-Lay)** If we eventually reduce the Panel SCOM representatives to three, we should remove regional designations. She sees a tendency by AASHTO to reduce the number of technical committees.
- **(Selmer)** If this Panel is to gain more influence with policy makers, it must adopt a more strategic view that would be reflected in its membership.
- **(Conner)** Asked the Panel whether two Vice-Chairs were needed.
- **(Neeley)** The Panel needs two Vice-Chairs – one to represent pavements and one to represent bridges.
- **(Conner)** Just as the Chair must represent pavements and bridges, so each Vice-Chair should represent both groups.
- **(Johnson)** If the Vice-Chair's main role is to stand in for the Chair, the Panel needs only one Vice-Chair.

**Mr. Milton** moved that the Panel have a single Vice-Chair. **Mr. Selmer** seconded the motion, there was no discussion, and the motion was approved by voice vote.

#### **Emulsion Task Force (ETF) Update**

**Mr. Colin Franco** gave a Power Point presentation in which he described the ETF's genesis, mission, goals, membership, working agenda, and accomplishments. Accomplishments prior to 2013 included the development of AASHTO standards in 2010 and 2011, a Best Practices document, and a Low Temperature Recovery Method. He listed and discussed more recent accomplishments, viz.:

- In 2015, specifications for Micro Surfacing, Chip Seal, Emulsion Binders,
- In 2016, specifications for Slurry Seals, Fog Seals, Cold In-place Recycling, and
- Work in progress included specifications for Tack Coat, Scrub Seals, Sand Seals, Full Depth Reclamation (FDR), Nova Chip.

**Ms. Corley-Lay** asked that if the Subcommittee on Construction (SOC) will not process these specifications<sup>2</sup> for AASHTO approval, what would be the appropriate subcommittee<sup>3</sup>? **Mr. Franco** responded that nobody seemed to be taking the initiative and he suggested publishing the specifications on the TSP•2 Website. However, such publication would lack AASHTO's official endorsement. **Mr. Conner** has asked Alabama's SOC representative to ascertain whether SOC still sponsors specifications for approval. If not, some other way will need to be found.

<sup>2</sup> The specifications identified are both Design and Material Specifications sent to SOM for review and approval. The SOC has not reviewed and approved any Construction Specifications for many years.

<sup>3</sup> Draft AASHTO Specifications are forwarded to the following Subcommittees for review and approval:  
 Design Specifications – SOM  
 Material Specifications – SOM  
 Construction Specifications – SOC  
 Best Practices – FHWA (but not really clear today)

**Preservation Expert Task Groups (ETGs) – Update**

**Ms. Corley-Lay** reported on the activities of the Pavement Preservation ETG and mentioned the following highlights:

- The NCPP has now been included as a member and **Ms. Corley-Lay** is the representative,
- The Emulsion Task Force (ETF) is also a member,
- **John Donahue (MO DOT)** has been added to include concrete preservation,
- The PPETG has been slow to start,
- Preservation programs need dependable, recurring budgets and management support,
- The NCPP will assist with a National Survey of States asking their self-assessment of the PPETG's top 10 priorities,
- Work products include:
  - Benefits calculator
  - Performance measures for preservation treatments
  - Distress warrants
  - Research Roadmap updates
- The next meeting will be in 2 months, and
- The PPETG is trying to arrange a face-to-face meeting in the face of FHWA budget uncertainties.

**Mr. Tom Everett** inquired what products were awaiting FHWA's approval and he offered to expedite the process. **Ms. Corley-Lay** said that in addition to an article she had written 8 months ago, there was a set of pavement preservation measures awaiting FHWA's approval.

**Mr. Everett** suggested that it may be desirable to transfer oversight responsibility of the Pavement and Bridge ETGs to this Panel and allow the FHWA to contribute resources to AASHTO for their ongoing operations. This would remove many of the budget uncertainties and expedite product approvals. **Ms. Corley-Lay** reminded the Panel that TSP•2 operates on a fixed budget and could not take on additional programs without additional resources. **Mr. Galehouse** mentioned that in the case of the ETF, the FHWA had provided additional resources for only the first two years, after which the ETF and Concrete Pavement Preservation Task Force had to be funded by TSP•2 at a cost of \$33,000 per year. **Mr. Conner** thanked **Mr. Everett** for his offer to transfer the Pavement and Bridge ETFs. **Mr. Everett** agreed to discuss the transfer with his staff, but he said the FHWA could not guarantee long-term funding.

**Mr. Bruce Johnson** told the Panel that the Bridge ETG was working well, had a Work Plan, generated products, and met face-to-face annually, although the resources were quite constrained. Most of the work was done outside meetings and monthly telephone conference calls. He also mentioned that FHWA would still need to be involved because some of the ETG's activities, such as the Bridge Preservation Guide needed federal leadership.

**TSP•2 Research Roadmap Database**

**Mr. John O'Doherty** briefed the Panel on the status of the Research Roadmap Database, structured using the research categories and research statements identified in the 2008 Research Roadmap Workshops. The database currently contained 2,041 research projects – 709 for Bridge and 1,332 for Pavements [**Attachments D, E**]. Each of the research projects has been

scored – the abstracts have been read and evaluated against the 2008 criteria. The scores have been collated and numerical priorities reflecting the remaining gaps have been assigned. He also discussed the wide variety of sources and mentioned that the bridge total included a number of projects that were recently added, but which were currently being classified and still needed to be scored and added to the Gap Matrices.

**Mr. Ed Welch** reminded the Panel that the objective here was to update the research that had been done in the 8-year interval between the 2008 workshops and the start of the Research Roadmap Database contract. **Mr. O’Doherty** also drew the Panel’s attention to the small informal research investigations that are rarely / never included in national databases. Often, the reports produced by these investigations are short (a few pages) and only circulate within the agency. Many of these small reports and conclusions could be relevant to other agencies and should be added to the Research Roadmap Database.

**Mr. Juntunen** wondered whether the research findings could be linked to Google to allow more extensive searches. Every state has its own State Planning & Research (SP&R) Program which may provide an additional source for projects. **Ms. Corley-Lay** suggested the possibility of having a national webinar of state agencies and learning what additional studies may be available. This should be a separate effort from the present updates. **Ms. Corley-Lay** pointed out that our customer here was not the agency research staff, but the pavement and bridge preservation staff. She also asked what level of resources would be necessary to keep the database current. **Mr. Galehouse** responded that new projects are continually being published and the required resources would vary. The original estimate was on the low side and also included the development of the research evaluation techniques.

**Mr. Conner** saw two ways to look at resources – either evaluate every research project or set a funding level and evaluate projects until the resources have been used. Using the information presented in the TSP•2 Statement of Revenues and Expenditures [**Attachment F**], he produced the following financial summary of the Research Roadmap Project:

Period	Budget	Expended	Remaining
April 2016 – March 2017	\$14,573.36	\$14,573.36	\$0.00
April 2017 – March 2018	\$14,537.44	\$3,607.66	\$10,929.78
April 2018 – March 2019	\$14,609.28	\$0.00	\$14,609.28
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$43,720.08</b>	<b>\$18,181.02</b>	<b>\$25,539.06</b>

The project will continue until March 2019 using the remaining \$25,539.06.

**Mr. Welch** briefed the Panel on the recent meetings of the SEBPP and WBPP. Topics discussed included:

- Performance Measures,
- Emergency response,
- Research needs,
- Successes and failures – lessons learned,
- Preservation developments,
- Resilience,

- Environmental factors, and
- Future needs.

**Mr. Welch** reminded the Panel that the 2018 National Bridge Preservation Conference will be held in Orlando, Florida on April 8-13, 2018. The Conference has its own website which may be accessed at: <http://nbppc2018.org/>.

### **Bridge Product & Technology Database – Update**

**Mr. Welch** also discussed the National Bridge Deck Product Database and the completion of Beta testing. The database is currently being populated. He saw the development of the database as an effective means of promoting “virtual networking” within the national bridge community. The database has been designed so that its framework could be extended to include other products such as coatings, joints, pavement treatments, etc.

**Mr. Welch** also told the Panel that the Bridge Partnerships had also produced training modules for local agencies and several states (OH, AL, WV, WI, IN) had expressed interest. The training is modular and can be finely tailored to fit a state’s needs.

In summary, **Mr. Welch** mentioned the four areas where the states have “wants” and “needs”.

1. Continued development of the database.
2. Local agency awareness support.
3. Research Roadmap regular updating.
4. Monthly accounting of contributions.

**Mr. Juntunen** praised the TSP•2 Website, but declared that he was frustrated at the sheer volume of information it contained. He wondered whether it would be possible to condense some of its highlights into some sort of “Digest” or “Headlines” that could be regularly circulated by e-mail.

**Mr. Galehouse** said that the Research Roadmap could be given its own web address. However, the NCPP was severely stretched in this area – one IT person had responsibility for three very busy websites and any expansion of activities here would necessitate hiring an additional IT person, which would not be possible within the present budget.

**Mr. Conner** told the Panel that Google ranked websites in proportion to the number of external links, i.e., the more external links a website has, the greater prominence Google granted the website. **Ms. Corley-Lay** saw increasing the visibility of the websites as an action item.

### **Equipment Management TSP•2 (EMTSP) Program & Triennial Review**

In the absence of **Mr. Tim Cunningham**, **Mr. Conner** reported that the EMTSP’s Triennial Report was presented to SCOH at AASHTO’s Spring Meeting. The report was well received and approved without exception or comment. He also noted that the next TSP•2 Triennial Report will be due in two years (2019).

### **Pavement Preservation Program Update**

**Ms. Corley-Lay** reported on the activities of the four well-established pavement preservation partnerships. She made the following main points:

- All of the partnerships have task groups and common areas include research, databases, specifications, certification, cost-effectiveness, and integration of pavement preservation into PMS systems.
- Partnership meetings are generally well attended. Representatives from agencies in the Northeast have difficulty in obtaining travel approvals.
- The 2016 National Meeting was very successful, attracting over 700 attendees. The field demonstrations were especially popular.
- Partnership strengths include a willingness to be open and frank in agency discussions. Vendors and sponsors are also strongly represented.
- Partnership weaknesses include lack of time by leaders who also have demanding full-time jobs. It is difficult to get research needs statements written and funded. Success or failure is largely determined by the commitments and personalities of the leaders.

**Mr. Galehouse** added that in contrast with the bridge partnerships, pavement partnership representatives tended to be lower-level employees lacking the authority to make commitments on behalf of their agencies. **Mr. Lloyd Neeley** also observed that non-leadership representatives often find it difficult to keep up with the latest developments as these tend to be discussed on the monthly teleconference calls. **Mr. Galehouse** mentioned that all of the presentations made at pavement and bridge annual meetings are recorded and posted on the TSP•2 Website. **Ms. Corley-Lay** said she would explore possible ways to allow non-leadership representatives to be involved in pavement partnership conference calls.

– Lunch –

### Certification Program

**Mr. Galehouse** briefed the Panel on the year-old certification initiative and made the following points:

- In addition to quality materials and sound design, competent workmanship is vital to ensure the placement of durable pavement preservation treatments,
- Results of the first certification exam were unexpected and somewhat disappointing in that many experienced contractors failed to achieve a passing grade of 70%,
- We have been seeing too many pavement preservation treatment failures,
- In many cases, agency personnel do not know what to look for because they have not been trained in preservation treatments, and
- Industry, particularly ISSA<sup>4</sup>, strongly supports certification, because without it, more failures will occur, incompetent / dishonest contractors will continue to provide treatments, and eventually, agencies will reduce their commitment to pavement preservation.

**Mr. Galehouse** mentioned that currently, three certification exams are available for Chip Seal, Crack Treatment, and Slurry Systems. Slurry Systems include Micro Surfacing, Polymer-modified Slurry, and unmodified Slurry Seal. Many agencies, when they order micro surfacing, receive polymer-modified slurry, not micro surfacing. We recommend that agencies train a specialist from headquarters, district senior inspectors, district designers, and outside consultants.

---

<sup>4</sup> ISSA ≡ International Slurry Surfacing Association



It is particularly important to train the consultants because of the influence they have with smaller local agencies, yet many consultants produce asset management plans for pavements and bridges and are ignorant of preservation. Industry is a critical partner in the effort to ensure high quality preservation treatments.

In cooperation with ISSA, the FHWA has funded the development of web-based training available to all, free of charge on the MSU server. Certification exams for agency personnel and contractors differ slightly. Agency exams contain 50 questions, while contractor exams contain 80 questions because we expect contractors to have a more extensive knowledge of the treatments and equipment.

Lacking in many preservation projects are adequate (if any) quality control plans. Such plans are essential for the attainment of quality assurance. Procedures must exist to address and remedy problems that commonly arise in the installation of preservation treatments.

Agency employees have had a 62% pass rate. The names of passing candidates are posted on the TSP•2 Website under “Certification”. Certification is good for 3 years and successful candidates are issued plastic cards (similar to credit cards) containing TSP•2 and NCPP Logos, Name, Treatment, and Expiration Date. Exams will be offered at pavement preservation partnership meetings and ISSA workshops. If there is interest by 20 or more candidates, NCPP will travel to a convenient location to administer the examinations. If there are only a small number of candidates, the NCPP will arrange for proctoring to be provided by the Consortium of College Testing Centers. Agencies may incorporate certification requirements either in their specifications or prequalification requirements. In any case, for the certification program to be successful, both agencies and contractors must support the concept.

Early results from the program have contained surprises. For example, the Indiana DOT (INDOT), which uses agency employees to install chip seals, sent 36 employees to an all-day training session and tutorial before the employees took the 80-question contractor exam. 33 candidates (92%) passed the exam and were certified. We have also found that candidates (even experienced contractors) must take the exam seriously and do the required study if they wish to pass. To date, we have given 382 exams to agency personnel. Contractors are now starting to see certification as a marketing opportunity.

### **TSP•2 Work Plan Review**

**Mr. Conner** drew to the Panel’s attention the TSP•2 Annual Work Plan **[Attachment G]**. **Ms. Corley-Lay** presented a series of slides summarizing the main components of the Work Plan. She started by showing the four strategic goals:

1. Facilitate the exchange of preservation information.
2. Assist with implementation of preservation practices.
3. Maintain and increase the knowledge base of transportation asset preservation.
4. Quantify and promote the effectiveness of preservation practices.

Highlights of **Ms. Corley-Lay’s** presentation included the following:

- Although the “Help Desk” does not receive many requests, it is quite responsive,

- The TSP•2 Website is extensive and valuable for locating specifications and meeting presentations,
- Each Partnership has its own web pages containing common and partnership-specific information,
- Partnership attendance lists allow members to contact each other,
- Keeping the websites current is a continual challenge – obsolete material is continually being purged and updated,
- Links have been provided to NHI<sup>5</sup> and TC3<sup>6</sup>,
- Certification in pavement preservation treatments now has momentum,
- The book “At the Crossroads” is being revised to include bridge-related material and updated statistics,
- The Partnerships are keenly aware of research, and discuss their needs at each meeting,
- The NCPP is developing a simple “Roberts Rules” slide show to guide new partnership leaders,
- NCAT and MnROAD are partnering on experiments spanning “wet freeze” to “wet no-freeze” zones,
- The NCPP will conduct initial life cycle cost analyses of preservation versus rehabilitation / reconstruction approaches,
- The TSP•2 Website is regularly updated to show state-funded research projects,
- The NCPP actively participates in TRB meetings and SCOM activities,
- The NCPP continues to monitor performance-based specifications,
- The NCPP is represented on the Pavement and Bridge ETGs,
- The NCPP will begin working on bridge certification, possibly starting with joint sealing, and
- The 2018 National Bridge Preservation Conference will be held in Orlando, Florida.

**Mr. Juntunen** suggested that some of the older videos should be purged. He also felt that the TSP•2 Website needed to be more widely publicized. **Mr. Conner** mentioned that AASHTO-TV was always seeking more content.

**Mr. Johnson** observed that the NCPP had carry-over funding from year-to-year and he wondered whether such funding would be safe from reversion to other AASHTO accounts. **Mr. Suing** volunteered to find an answer and he indicated that **Mr. Jim McDonnell** would have more information.

**Ms. Corley-Lay** requested an additional \$20,000.00 for the Bridge Products Database for the coming year. **Mr. Galehouse** said that this would require a contract amendment.

**Mr. Milton** moved that an additional \$20,000.00 be authorized for the Bridge Products Database. **Mr. Juntunen** seconded the motion, there was no discussion, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

---

<sup>5</sup> NHI ≡ National Highway Institute

<sup>6</sup> TC3 ≡ Transportation Curriculum Coordination Council

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m. EDT.

**Summary of Action Items**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
Provide <b>Ms. Corley-Lay</b> with monthly reports showing AASHTO TSP•2 voluntary contributions.	<b>T. Suing, AASHTO</b>
Discuss with FHWA senior staff, transferring the oversight of the Pavement and Bridge ETFs with FHWA funding to the TSP•2 Program.	<b>T. Everett, FHWA</b>
Explore the feasibility of increasing the number of external links associated with the NCPP and TSP•2 Websites.	<b>NCPP and J. Corley-Lay</b>
Publish minutes from the monthly pavement partnership conference calls to allow non-leadership representatives to be aware of the leadership initiatives and activities.	<b>NCPP</b>
Explore possible ways to allow non-leadership representatives to be involved in pavement partnership conference calls.	<b>J. Corley-Lay &amp; NCPP</b>
Ascertain whether year-end carryover funding remains in the TSP•2 account or reverts to another AASHTO account.	<b>T. Suing, J. Corley-Lay</b>