

# WAQTC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

**MEETING CALLED BY:** MATT STRIZICH, MDT  
**FACILITATOR:** DESNA BERGOLD

**DATE:** NOVEMBER 2, 2012  
**TIME:** 1:00 PM PACIFIC  
**LOCATION:** TELECONFERENCE

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

GARTH NEWMAN, QAC  
MIKE SANTI, ITD  
SCOTT ANDRUS, UDOT  
BRYCE SIMONS, NMDOT  
HOWE CROCKETT, WFLHD  
COLE MULLIS, ODOT  
GREG STELLMACH, ODOT  
BILL SCHIEBEL, CDOT  
ALAN HOTCHKISS, CDOT  
CK SU, CDOT  
MIKE SAN ANGELO, AKDOT & PF

**ABSENT:**

TOM BAKER, WSDOT  
RON ANDRESEN, CFLHD

**AGENDA ITEMS / OBJECTIVES:**

1. AASHTO SOM follow up
2. English / Metric in AASHTO methods
3. TM 2; Sampling of Fresh Concrete and CCRL – see email - Matt
4. Calibration of air content gauges – see email - Matt
5. QAC meeting locations
6. EC Spring meeting
7. Go, nogo device – from SOM minutes
8. CFL replacement – Howe
9. Garth Newman resigned from TCCC – need WAQTC replacement
10. Other business

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>Cole Mullis introduced Greg Stellmach. Greg will be replacing Cole as ODOT's representative to the WAQTC Executive Committee.</p>	
<p>AASHTO SOM follow up</p>	<p>The group reviewed the summary (attached).</p> <p><i>Desna Bergold will check with committee members to verify that items that should be on the ballot are.</i></p> <p><i>Garth Newman will follow up on T 312 task force.</i></p>	<p>Desna Bergold</p> <p>Garth Newman</p>
<p>English / Metric in AASHTO methods</p>	<p>WAQTC had requested AASHTO consider adding dual units to those procedures that do not have them. The AASHTO Executive Committee was not very enthusiastic about this effort but assigned Cole Mullis, ODOT, and Bill Ahearn, Vermont Agency of Transportation. Desna provided a spreadsheet that listed the procedures and how they present the units.</p> <p>The AASHTO Style Manual does not require dual units, excerpt:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">'In AASHTO publications with dual units, metric units appear first and are followed by U.S. Customary units in parentheses.' Page 62</p> <p>Cole would like the QAC to provide a list of procedures that should be changed.</p> <p><i>Garth and Desna will put together a list for the QAC to review before the January QAC meeting with final QAC approval at the meeting.</i></p>	<p>Garth Newman</p> <p>Desna Bergold</p>
<p>TM 2; Sampling of Fresh Concrete and CCRL – see email</p>	<p>CCRL is not accepting WAQTC TM 2 qualifications as they feel the procedure does not meet the requirements for qualification. MDT got a deficiency based on its use of this procedure to qualify its technicians. The question he asks is 'does WAQTC want to change the procedure to meet AMRL / CCRL requirements?'</p> <p>To summarize: AASHTO and AMRL require a composite sample from two locations in the middle third of the load. WAQTC TM 2 allows sampling a single increment after ½ yd<sup>3</sup> has been unloaded.</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>In an earlier email chain Garth pointed out that TM 2 was developed to reflect the reality of how most agencies sample, if the tests are not performed until later in the load quite a lot of concrete is in the forms and it may not be easily removed. Mid-load sampling defeats the purpose of QC.</p> <p>Bryce Simons points out that a concrete load varies from the beginning to the end and sampling the middle third of the load is the industry standard and as the agency is performing quality acceptance and not quality control it is up to the supplier to ensure the concrete is in compliance. He suggests WAQTC may want to propose a change to AASHTO that would require a single representative portion in the middle of the load instead of a composite sample as two portions are not really necessary. Cole Mullis agreed.</p> <p>Scott Andrus brings up that rejecting a load after half the load is placed becomes problematic. Matt Strizich agrees, the reality is what is in place usually remains in place.</p> <p>Bryce feels there are two issues, where the acceptance sample is obtained and the sampling for process control. Everyone agreed that the AASHTO procedure for acceptance should be changed to one portion instead of a composite sample.</p> <p>Most agree this change should be proposed to AASHTO. All agree that this should be listed on the QAC agenda and discussed again at the Spring meeting.</p> <p><i>Desna will put this on the QAC agenda and try to accurately convey the Executive Committee's discussion. The QAC will review the proposal that the AASHTO procedure for acceptance should be changed to one portion instead of a composite sample.</i></p> <p>See further discussion of this topic below.</p>	<p>Desna QAC</p>
<p>TM 2; Sampling of Fresh Concrete and CCRL –</p>	<p>Further discussion ensued.</p> <p>All agreed that the sampling location is directly related to the intended purpose of the test results. If the intent is to ensure out of</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
see email – revisited	<p>specification material does not get into the forms (QC) then the appropriate place to sample is near the beginning of the load. If the intent is to verify the quality of the material (QA) then the material should be sampled near the middle as it's an industry recognized representative sample.</p> <p>Bryce argued that although a load of concrete is inconsistent 'representative' for concrete was defined by the industry as the middle third of the load. So to obtain a nominal representative sample for quality assurance it should be in the middle third.</p> <p>Garth pointed out that the curing of concrete cylinders is a prescribed method that does not relate to the placed concrete and it was never intended to.</p> <p>Mike felt that if one were to take a confidential survey there would be a clearer picture of what is currently being done and for what purpose. Mike also thought it may be a good idea to become an FHWA recognized accrediting agency.</p> <p>Cole would like Garth and Desna to put together questions for a survey to AASHTO members to determine what the best proposals will be. 'Survey Monkey' is quick and the QAC will be able to have results by the January meeting.</p> <p><i>Garth and Desna will put together a list of survey questions for review by the EC.</i></p>	Garth Newman Desna Bergold
Calibration of air content gauges – see email	<p>Matt has also had a problem with CCRL and WAQTC FOP for AASHTO T 152. AASHTO and ASTM require the air meter to be calibrated (standardized) every three months, the FOP states 'as per agency requirements.' MDT has required yearly standardizations but they will change to every three months to be in compliance with R 18. Matt wanted to know if the FOP should be changed to match AASHTO. Scott agreed.</p> <p><i>This will be put on the QAC agenda to discuss and determine if it is an appropriate change.</i></p>	QAC
QAC meeting locations	The QAC has planned to go to Denver for the January meeting	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>and Vancouver for the July meeting.</p> <p>Matt has looked at the options feels this is reasonable. Scott is concerned about the states that have a problem with out of state travel, are these locations good for them. Cole felt that it may still depend on the agencies shifting policies. Bryce suggested that arrangements be made so that those unable to attend in person may be able to attend via teleconference. We can look into this option.</p> <p><i>The QAC will go to Denver in January and Vancouver in July.</i></p>	QAC
EC Spring meeting	<p>Everyone feels that a location meeting is preferable to a teleconference.</p> <p>The meeting last year was scheduled for Portland before it was cancelled so the perhaps the meeting should be held there.</p> <p>Dates were considered and April 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> were decided on.</p> <p><i>Desna will begin making arrangements and prepare the invitations for Matt to send.</i></p>	Desna
Go, nogo device – from SOM minutes	<p>UDOT has developed to a new device to check sieves for size opening. (First presented at the SOM EC meeting). This is a set of tools (rods) machined such that the point is the correct size for the opening and above it is a section that is slightly larger that should not be able to go into the opening. This set of tools (called ‘Go. NoGo.’) allows quick sieve checking (No. 4 and larger). AMRL has at times approved the use of the tool and at times rejected its use as there is no standard for the use of this tool. This is a quick and easy procedure that could prove very useful.</p> <p>Scott wondered if the WAQTC would like to pursue developing a standard for the use of this tool.</p> <p>Garth thought there might be a concern if an opening was at the opposite extremes in each direction, but this could probably be dealt with.</p> <p>Bryce suggested UDOT develop tolerances on the device and</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>specific instructions (procedure) in its use then WAQTC could propose it to AASHTO. Scott agreed to develop a draft and hopes to have it for review by the QAC January meeting.</p> <p>(AASHTO M 92; Wire-Cloth Sieves for Testing Purposes is identical to ASTM E)</p> <p><i>UDOT will develop a draft procedure.</i></p>	<p>Scott Andrus Howard Anderson</p>
CFL replacement – Howe	<p>Ron Andresen is the Richard Duval’s replacement as Central Federal Lands representative to the WAQTC Executive Committee.</p> <p><a href="mailto:Ron.Andresen@dot.gov">Ron.Andresen@dot.gov</a></p> <p>720-963-3517</p>	
TCCC	<p>Howe Crockett updated the committee on recent TCCC developments. There are four new web based training modules under development. Two are finishing up the earthwork series, one is a ‘rock fall mitigation’ course based on information from WFL and the final probably an Asset Management course.</p> <p>The TCCC is in discussions with AASHTO about becoming a Technical Services Program under an AASHTO Center of Excellence. In short they would be AASHTO’s training wing.</p>	
Garth Newman resigned from TCCC – need WAQTC replacement	<p>Garth explained that he has represented WAQTC and ITD to the TCCC and as his responsibilities at ITD have changed significantly he feels he is unable to adequately represent both parties. He has resigned his TCCC position. The EC needs to determine if they still want a representative to this committee and if so who.</p> <p>Howe feels it is important that WAQTC continue its presence.</p> <p>Garth pointed out that TCCC has representation from WsDOT and UDOT. Howe isn’t certain how much longer he will be a member.</p> <p>Matt asked Garth’s opinion on whether to continue participating.</p>	

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>Garth felt that the challenge is that TCCC focus is far broader than WAQTC's focus it may be difficult to find a representative with the broader ability.</p> <p>Cole has a person that could fulfill both construction and materials roles.</p> <p>The representative's travel is reimbursable from a pooled fund so that should make it easier to get approval.</p> <p><i>Cole and Greg Stellmach will discuss it with ODOT and the individual he has in mind. He should have an answer by the end of the month.</i></p>	<p>Cole Mullis</p> <p>Greg Stellmach</p>
<p>Other business: Finances</p>	<p>Scott updated the group on the finances. Howe asked about a fairly recent contribution from Western Federal Lands and Scott believes it has been received.</p> <p>Alan Hotchkiss asked if the contributions from Colorado are being shown. Scott will check on it.</p> <p>The pooled fund is extended to 2016. As it is an active fund, money can be transferred at any time. The initial agreement was \$10,000 per year.</p> <p><i>Scott will check on CDOT's contribution.</i></p>	<p>Scott Andrus</p>
<p>Other business: Website</p>	<p>WAQTC needs to get a contract with the company that is hosting their website.</p> <p>Mike San Angelo would like to see the money AKDOT contributed used for the website as that was what it was originally intended for. The committee agreed that this was a good idea.</p> <p>Mike made the motion to spend this money on the website. Cole seconded. No opposed, the motion passed.</p> <p><i>Scott will get with the accountant and set aside this money for the website.</i></p> <p>A contract needs to be worked out with the vendor. Is this</p>	<p>Scott Andrus</p>

ISSUE	DISCUSSION / <i>DECISION</i>	ACTION REQUIRED BY:
	<p>something Utah could do or should the consultant handle it as a reimbursable expense?</p> <p>Garth said that the easiest thing to do would be to have DB Consulting be the pass through instead of asking Scott to be in charge of another contract. This option should be covered under the existing contract with DB Consulting. Cole asked what would happen if / when there is a change in consultants, would it pose a problem. Both Garth and Mike said no, the contract with the vendor is year by year and any new consultant would then be responsible for it. The details can be worked out under the contract with the vendor.</p> <p>Desna agreed that this should work.</p> <p><i>Mike and Desna will work together to get the contract in place and work out the details. Mike will set up a meeting.</i></p>	<p>Mike San Angelo</p> <p>Desna Bergold</p>
Other business	<p>Scott wanted to know if TxDOT and HDOT have dropped out.</p> <p>Mike said that these states have said they could not provide any more funding. He used this opportunity to discuss the value of marketing WAQTC.</p> <p>Cole brought up that WAQTC successes at AASHTO SOM are a good method of marketing and a newsletter to advertise this and WAQTC programs. Perhaps in the future we may not want to publish the training materials for free.</p> <p>At the Spring meeting the EC will revisit the Strategic Plan and consider growth potential and marketing.</p> <p><i>Revisit thoughts on marketing as part of the Strategic Plan discussion at the spring meeting. Desna will put it on the agenda.</i></p>	<p>Desna</p>



## Summary of 2012 AASHTO SOM WAQTC proposals

Test Method	Champion	2012 revisions status after AASHTO Tech section meetings
T 23 – TS 3c	Bryce Simons	Approved for concurrent ballot. – This is on the ballot
T 84 – TS 1c	Mike Santi	This was considered editorial and will be fixed. – This is on the ballot.
T 85 – TS 1c	Mike Santi	Most of this was considered editorial and will be fixed. The resoak was considered significant and will be sent out on concurrent ballot but there is a project that is looking at these methods that might change that plan. The saturation time will be addressed when the NCHRP report comes out. The editorial is on the ballot.
T 119 - 3b	Scott Andrus	Approved for concurrent ballot. –This is on the ballot.
T 152 – 3b	Scott Andrus	Approved for concurrent ballot. - This is on the ballot.
T 166 – 2c	Cole Mullis	Changes were considered editorial and will be included in the 2013 edition. – T 166 is on the ballot to change the time allowed for drying. Unable to determine if the ‘editorial’ changes are going to be taken care of.
T 231 – 3c	Bryce Simons	Approved for concurrent ballot. – This is on the ballot
T 312 – 2d	Garth Newman, et al	Revisions from 2011’s QAC submittal were discussed as they were approved but there were many comments. A task Force was put together to deal with the concerns specifically length of time for re heating samples to the required temperature. See attached comments from TS 2d members. This Task Force is the ETG. We must find out who the membership is and get a WAQTC engineer involved. 2012 revisions to include mention of AASHTO T 311 and the mold diameter (120.20) were considered editorial and will be revised. WAQTC 2012 revisions to Section 9 will be handed off to the ETG. – ask Garth to follow up on this and provide him a list of EC members of 2d. Editorial changes will be made. There is nothing on the ballot for this.
T 329 – 2c	Cole Mullis	Approved for concurrent ballot. –This is on the ballot.
T 335 – 1c	Matt Strizich	Changes were considered editorial and will be included in the 2013 edition. – does not need to be on the ballot, the Chairman will make the change – Matt will follow up.