

Northeastern Pavement Preservation Partnership

Meeting Minutes

Gideon Putnam Resort and Spa
24 Gideon Putnam Road, Saratoga Springs, New York
September 14, 2004

Introductions and Welcome

The meeting began at 10:12 am when Mr. Ed Denehy of New York DOT, welcomed the participants and thanked them for their attendance. See participant list (Attachment 1). Mr. Denehy also thanked the Liquid Asphalt Distributors Association and the New York Construction Materials Association for their generosity in sponsoring the meeting. He stated the meeting's goal of forging an agreement and committing to go forward in a partnership.

Setting the Stage:

Why a Partnership?

Mr. Jim Sorenson of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), provided an historical overview of the pavement preservation movement. In the early 1990's, several industry groups formed the Foundation for Pavement Preservation (FP2). Since then, by working in partnership, AASHTO, FHWA, and FP2 have made significant accomplishments in research and training. After posing the question "Why a Partnership?", Mr. Sorenson then described some of the many benefits of partnerships:

Reduction of Duplicate Effort - States should have uniform or consistent specifications, performance standards, training, and certification requirements. Both the FHWA and the states are losing experienced staff through retirements and attrition. By partnering with industry and other agencies they can still find the expertise necessary to successfully accomplish their work.

Partnering to Exchange Ideas – Materials and techniques may not be universally applicable, but collaboration in partnership is an effective way to learn what works for others.

Industry Perspective

Mr. Jim Moulthrop of Fugro Consultants LP, representing FP2, made a presentation on Pavement Preservation Partnerships. He felt that partnerships are good for agencies because they promote knowledge sharing, best practices for various techniques, and create considerable synergism by working together. Partnerships are also good because they help industry to better understand agency needs and expectations, improve communication between parties, and reduce the incidence of adversarial issues. Mr. Moulthrop provided illustrations of other partnering initiatives such as the 1997 Letter of Understanding between the FP2, FHWA, AASHTO, National Highway Institute (NHI),

Asphalt Institute (AI), Asphalt Recycling & Reclaiming Association (ARRA), Asphalt Emulsion Manufacturing Association (AEMA), and the International Slurry Surfacing Association (ISSA). Other partnering examples include the International Preservation Scanning Tour, the development of the September-October 2003 edition of Transportation Research News, and the Pocket Guides on preservation treatments.

Mr. Moulthrop expressed his belief that many challenges / opportunities are to be found in the areas of policy and outreach. From an agency's perspective, they need top management commitment, a champion, a paradigm shift from "worst first" to "best first", and a compelling message. From the industry perspective he felt that qualified quality contractors are important to agencies, the market share impact for traditional suppliers, and the use of innovative products.

Mr. Moulthrop believed that creating partnerships to meet Preservation Research, Development and Technology needs is a good idea because no one entity can do it alone. Pavement Preservation is a "state of mind". An agency Pavement Preservation program can only be effective if the management team provides its support, the right elements are in place, and the funds are committed and available as needed.

Pooled Fund Process

Mr. Chris Newman of the FHWA, briefed the group on the Transportation Pooled Fund Study process. The web address for pooled fund solicitations is www.pooledfund.org. As an example, he cited the Midwestern Pavement Preservation Partnership Solicitation (Attachment 2). Mr. Newman felt that the partnerships facilitate the sharing of experiences, enable research needs to be defined, and can be a funding mechanism for web-sites and meetings. The pooled fund study also allows industry to join the effort, either directly through FHWA division offices or by mailing a check to a locked box in Atlanta. All pooled fund projects have quarterly and annual reporting requirements that consist of activities and financial information (accountability). The National Center for Pavement Preservation (NCPPE) will administer the pooled fund study and the FHWA will assist and monitor them.

Midwestern Model

Mr. Larry Galehouse of NCPPE provided a Northeastern Pavement Preservation Partnership (NEPPP) overview. He recommended that an appropriate mission statement for the group might be similar to that developed by the Midwestern Pavement Preservation Partnership, viz.:

"To provide an ongoing regional forum for Pavement Preservation principles, by sharing and exchanging improvements in research, design, specifications, materials and construction practices, and by promoting the benefits of Pavement Preservation through education and application."

The proposed NEPPP would involve pavement preservation professionals from 11 state public agencies, toll-way authorities, contractors, suppliers, academia, local, and federal government officials. The partnership would cover the states of Connecticut, Delaware,

Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the District of Columbia. This group of states shares several commonalities such as geography, pavement concerns, and environmental issues.

Several possible group objectives could include:

Objective #1 - Promote regional guidelines for pavement preservation treatments which provide consistency, reduce costs, and foster better practices.

Objective #2 – Promote the use of improved materials, equipment, and processes among the member agencies by determining what works best and sharing successes.

Objective #3 – Implement a comprehensive information sharing process by discussing successes and failures and developing an interactive question and answer clearinghouse on the NCPP website.

Objective #4 – Establish a coordinated regional research effort by promptly addressing common research needs. Members would determine the regional research priorities by vote and could then use the research results to support policy changes by their respective leaderships.

Objective #5 – Advocate policies that integrate system preservation activities by providing information supporting the use of pavement preservation, implementing Pavement Management System (PMS) strategies to improve network conditions, and changing from a “worst first” policy to prevention.

Objective #6 – Publicize pavement preservation findings at the national level by documenting successes and research studies, presenting benefits of pavement preservation at national meetings, and preparing articles for publication.

Objective #7 – Advocate a common terminology, complete with definitions to ensure consistency in the transfer of information.

Funding would be provided through a pooled fund study. One possibility would be a 3-year commitment of \$5,000 per year for states with 100% use of SP&R funds (approval pending). The funded work would consist of an annual multi-day conference for information / technology exchange; a dedicated website containing regional research reports, guidelines, etc.; formal training sessions and workshops; and support for the NCPP to manage the partnership and organize, facilitate, and document the Partnership activities.

Mr. Galehouse provided an overview of the Midwestern Pavement Preservation Partnerships (MPPP) accomplishments to date. The partnerships have formed several teams to deal with specific issues, including materials, research, training, specifications, and policy. The group plans to have its next meeting in East Lansing, Michigan from November 29 through December 1, 2004. More information may be obtained from the NCPP website at www.pavementpreservation.org or by contacting 517-432-8220.

Framing the Structure

There was a general discussion of the overall features of the NEPPP concept. Mr. Sorenson pointed out that the principal advantage of a pooled fund project lies in its flexibility as it can be customized to fit the needs of the group. Several participants felt the MPPP framework was a good model to emulate and were willing to make a commitment. Mr. Sorenson noted that with this partnership, the NEPPP could promote processes and products more effectively than any group member acting alone.

Mr. Denehy and Mr. Colin Franco of the Rhode Island DOT, probed the group seeking a consensus on the idea of a partnership. There was a positive response and the idea was moved forward. They proposed reviewing the MPPP's mission, objectives, and fee structure, and using these, with appropriate modifications for the NEPPP group. The By-Laws of the MPPP were then projected on a screen, and the group developed the NEPPP objectives, mission, and fee structure (Attachment 3).

State and Local Agency Presentations

Presentations were then made by attendees on their current pavement preservation practices / programs.

Ed Denehy, NY DOT – New York has a dedicated fund for pavements and bridges, but the preventive maintenance fund will be exhausted by the end of 2004. They currently schedule and use single course overlays, micro-surfacing, chip seals, Nova chip, Cold in-Place Recycling, and Crack sealing.

Ed Block, Connecticut DOT – Connecticut requires Pavement Preservation to be applied to a certain mileage of overlays each year. The principal treatments used are crack sealing (with a stone filler) and some Nova Chip.

Mike Hedges, Vermont DOT – Vermont, which has a 3,800 route-mile system, performs crack sealing, rut filling, and thin paving treatments statewide. The issues they must address are centralization, timing, public / media relations, lack of familiarity / experience, product failures, and some FHWA policies.

Matt Turo, Massachusetts DOT – With gubernatorial encouragement, Massachusetts is currently embarking on a pavement preservation program employing new treatments such as Nova Chip, friction courses, and micro-milling on its 2,900 route-mile system. They will also be seeking dedicated funding in the next couple of years.

Mike Loftos, New York Thruway Authority – The Authority has 3,000 lane miles and 641 route-miles, but no pavement preservation program. Water is their biggest problem and most of the pavement is past its service life.

Bob Peta, Pennsylvania DOT – Pennsylvania, with its 40,000 route-mile system, has system preservation support and a Pavement Policy Manual with pavement

preservation guides. They currently use Nova Chip, mill and fill, micro-surfacing, hot-mix overlays, routing of transverse cracks, chip seals, and full depth reclamation. They are currently evaluating Road Armor, Scrub Seal, and Seal patching.

Colin Franco, Rhode Island DOT – Rhode Island currently uses surface seal, crack seal, micro-surfacing, chip seal, Nova chip, and white topping.

Next Steps

There was a general discussion on how to disseminate NEPPP information to the various agencies that could potentially join the partnership. Mr. Peta volunteered to draft a letter that could be mailed to chief engineers of the states and other interested parties. It was decided the letter should include the vision, missions, fee structure, and goals, but not the by-laws.

Mr. Sorenson asked for volunteers to form a committee to spearhead implementation of the partnership. The resulting committee consists of Ed Denehy, Colin Franco, Mike Loftus, Frank Fee and Mark Edsall.

Participants decided that the next meeting will most likely be held in late January or early February of 2005 at a location to be decided at a later date.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.