

Meeting Minutes
North Central Pavement Research Coordination Partnership (Frozen Four)
Engineering Hall Rm 2227
1415 Engineering Drive, Madison, WI
August 29, 2006

Attendees:

Hussain Bahia	WHRP	Amy Schutzbach	IDOT
Andrew Hanz	WHRP	Mike Eacker	MDOT (conf call)
Laura Fenley	WisDOT	Ben Worel	MNDOT
Pat Casey	CTC & Assoc	Roger Olson	MNDOT
Matt Mullins	CTC & Assoc	Shongtao Dai	MNDOT
Kim Linsenmayer	CTC & Assoc	Maureen Jensen	MNDOT

Review of Goals and Objectives

Hussain led a discussion in reviewing the goals and objectives of the group.

Review of Bylaws

Amy Schutzbach recommended that Roberts' Rules of Order should be incorporated into the bylaws. Robert's Rules of Order require that a person/organization initiating a proposal and a count of who supported or opposed the proposal be documented. The group agreed that this should be considered. Specifically the following statement will be added to the bylaws under Article IV: Meetings

- Records will be kept in the minutes indicating the person/organization initiating a proposal and the results of the subsequent voting.

This change will be made to the bylaws by Andrew and sent to the group via email for approval. It was decided that further discussion about how to handle duplicate entries was needed for next meeting. (Did we ever decide on this issue? Amy does not recall, and now that I think about it I don't recall a consensus ever being reached?)

Discussion of Project Spreadsheets

A general discussion was held amongst the group regarding the format and the use of keywords for the project spreadsheets. General consensus was that the format of the tables was very good. It provided a clear way to list the projects and sort them by a variety of headings. There were some concerns regarding the duplication of entries in both the material categories (Flexible, Rigid, and Soils) and the design category. It was decided that entries should not be duplicated.

Group members expressed some concern in having difficulties assigning the given list of keywords to some of the research projects. Comments were left in the spreadsheets giving suggestions for improvements. These comments will be incorporated into the spreadsheets by Kim and sent to the group members for review and comment.

MN raised concern that we may be duplicating the efforts of national databases that are already available.

Individual states led discussions using the project spreadsheets. These discussions led to the selection of four common areas or themes for each state to research for next meeting. It was decided that all states would formulate questions they would like to be answered for each category. The questions would then be compiled and sent back to the individual states. The following topics and states were chosen to lead the discussion on each of our four major categories:

- Design: Illinois – ME Design Inputs
- Soils: Minnesota – QC/QA policies for unbound materials
- Rigid: Michigan – Whitetopping
- Flexible: Wisconsin – Guidelines for delay of reflective cracking

Each of these presentations will answer questions posed by the other states and the following two general questions:

- What we are doing now?
- Plans for the future?

Discussion of Trial Analysis Process

It was decided by the group that the time investment required for the analysis was too great to realize any benefit to completing the analysis for all projects listed in the project spreadsheets. Therefore, the analysis process has been put on hold for the time being. The analysis forms can still be used to provide project information on a case by case basis.

Discussion of state activities related to M-E Design

Amy's presentation of the design project spreadsheets spurred a long discussion into each state's activities related to M-E Design Activities. The discussion spanned a wide variety of topics from sensitivity analysis and calibration of the software to local material characterization for accurate input into the software. Individual states also voiced their concerns with the current software and its ability to predict certain types of pavement distress. It also was discussed that the states should share their results and inputs of the sensitivity analysis of the design software. Laura, Hussain, and Andrew also gave an update about a research project to provide regional calibration of the ME Design Guide. Wisconsin is the lead state in the project with participation by both Minnesota and Michigan. The information will also be sent to Illinois with the understanding that their participation may be limited. All states voiced difficulties in finding adequate materials data to link to field performance for calibration.

Future Direction of the Group

Pat Casey voiced his support of the efforts of the group and the need for the group to continue to work towards finding some sort of identity or way to quantify results of collaboration to report to upper management.

Andrew presented the budget for the project and noted that more money would be needed to continue to support Kim in the future development of the website. The decision was

made that since the use of the state plane by MN has greatly reduced travel costs, money from the travel budget would be added to the CTC subcontract.

The group still feels that quarterly face to face meetings are necessary to keep everyone moving in the right direction. The group also felt that serious discussion regarding university/industry involvement should be on hold for discussion at next meeting.

Action Items (next steps):

1. ME Design Sensitivity

- Each state will prepare a table of their design inputs and email them to Kim by **September 22**.
- Kim will compile responses and summarize them in a table to send to all the states by **October 6**.
- At the next meeting states will present a short summary of their sensitivity analysis to the group. Send summary to Andrew by noon the day before the meeting for compilation in a packet for next meeting.

2. Common Topic Areas (ME Design Inputs (IL), QC/QA of Unbound Materials (MN), Whitetopping (MI), and Guidelines for Prevention of Reflective Cracking(WI))

- Each state will prepare questions regarding information they would like to know for all topic areas. They will send all of these questions to Kim by **September 22**.
- Kim will remove redundant questions and send the questions to the state responsible for each area by **October 13**.
- Each state is then responsible for answering the questions posed to them as well as the general questions of what they are doing and what they plan to do in regards to their assigned topic. **Answers to Andrew at least 1 day before the meeting for compilation.**

3. Problem Statement Summary

- Kim will modify analysis forms to include a column for the general area the problem statement is intended for (flex, rigid, geotech, design) and to indicate that these forms are only for problem statements. Newly formatted spreadsheets for problem statements will be sent to the states by **September 15**.
- Each state will enter their problem statements into a format similar to the analysis forms. States are encouraged to provide all the information that they can. Spreadsheets should be sent to Kim by **November 5**.
- All problem statements will be compiled into one spreadsheet and sent to the states for review. States should be prepared to discuss commonalities between spreadsheets in the meeting.

The next meeting will be held in Madison on **Dec 5th**. The next meeting will focus on discussion of the action items above as well as updates on Wisconsin's ME Design Calibration project and the budget.