



**it's your move!**

**CP Road Map  
Executive Committee Meeting  
September 11, 2007  
Chicago, Illinois**

attending	Committee Members		Agency
absent	Randy	Iwasaki	California DOT
	David	Lippert	Illinois DOT
	Kirk	Stuedle	Michigan DOT
	Randy	Bathey	Mississippi DOT
	Gary	Frederick	New York DOT
	Rick	Collins	Texas DOT
absent	Malcolm	Kerley	Virginia DOT
	Julie	Garbini	RMC Research Foundation
	Randy	Riley	ACPA-Illinois Chapter
Gordon Smith for	Jerry	Voigt	ACPA
	Jim	Duit	Duit Construction
	Ron	Guntert	Guntert & Zimmerman Const Div, Inc.
	Rick	Sniegowski	K-Five Construction
absent	Steve	Kosmatka	Portland Cement Association
Jan Prusinski for	Martin	Fallon	St. Marys Cement Inc.
	Claude	Bedard	Euclid Admixture Canada
	Gary	Henderson	FHWA
absent	Peter	Stephanos	FHWA

**Road Map Contract Technical Representative**

Peter      Kopac      FHWA

**Additional Participants 9/11/07**

Fred      Hejl      TRB

**CP Road Map Administrative Group**

Tom      Cackler      CP Tech Center  
 Marcia      Brink      CP Tech Center  
 Sharon      Prochnow      CP Tech Center  
 Dale      Harrington      Snyder & Assoc  
 Ted      Ferragut      TDC Partners

**AASHTO CLARIFICATION:**

In 2005, the AASHTO Subcommittee of Materials (SOM) passed a resolution supporting the CP Road Map and recommended the Standing Committee on Highways support the CP Road Map. The recommendation from the SOM is attached.

**Action items:**

- Kirk Stuedle, chair; Jim Duit, vice-chair of the Executive Committee (EC)
- CP Road Map website will be live with first electronic newsletter
- CP Tech Center will draft proposal for a federally led pooled fund for administrative funding
- Packet of information/Brochure on the Road Map (individual to states depending on their prior involvement and interest)
- Letter of support from FHWA

- Five DOT reps on the EC will be the pilot group. This group will try to get the collaboration agreement signed in their DOT and determine the level of buy-in to incorporating the Road Map into the research program.
- Environmental Track was established and is considered one of the priorities.
- Track 7 (High-Speed Concrete Pavement Rehabilitation and Construction) was not elevated to a full track priority, but “Overlays” was considered a subject priority.
- Next meeting March 2008 in Chicago

-----DETAILED MINUTES-----

## 1. Introduction

Peter Kopac outlined the CP Road Map management plan, consisting of the CP Tech Center for administrative organization, the executive committee for overall guidance, track leaders for direction, and sustaining organizations for funding. The first task order is nearing completion and the second task order is beginning. The first executive committee meeting concentrated on why and how of collaboration. This meeting is a call to action; a continuation of the plan for collaboration and a way to move it forward.

Tom Cackler indicated a shift to collaboration is the model of the future – a necessity to promote and succeed with a national research agenda. Collaboration is needed not only for funding, but also for implementation buy-in. Technology Transfer and training needs are a large part of making research successful and needs to play a larger role. The Road map is good, but not perfect – it needs to adjust as needs and opportunities change.

## 2. General Administration

- Approval of March Minutes: Randy Battey moved, Jim Duit seconded. Approved.
- Election of Officers: Steve Kosmatka and Gary Frederick were the nominating committee. They nominated Kirk Steudle as chair, and Jim Duit as vice-chair. Claude Bedard moved to accept both nominations, Julie Garbini seconded. Approved.

## 3. FHWA Task Order Reports

- Dale Harrington reported on the temporary research database in task order 1. This database is focused to looking for gaps in concrete pavement research and what is being done to fill these gaps, it is not designed to capture all the research being done. TRB, TRIS, RIP etc. are databases designed for the all inclusive efforts.
- Tracks 1-Mix Design; 2-Performance-based Design Guide for New and Rehabilitated Concrete; 3-High speed Nondestructive Testing and Intelligent Construction Systems; 4-Surface Characteristics; have been identified as high priority by the Executive Committee
- Track 1 (Mix Design): Midwest Concrete Consortium has become the track leaders for Track 1 and their September 25<sup>th</sup> meeting will be second meeting of Track 1. After this meeting the CP Tech Center will develop a framework for moving with this track and will submit a framework to FHWA.
- Track 7 (High-speed Concrete Pavement Rehab and Construction) has had a great deal of interest by industry in the past 6-8 months. An Overlay “manual” has been produced and well received. A more complete overlay project is underway with demonstration projects and training.
- Track 11 (Concrete Pavement Business Systems and Economics): Executive Committee is the track leader for track 11. CP Tech Center has developed a brochure that shows a plan on how to get a fully functional system by 2015 through a systematic, collaborative plan.

## 4. Overview of Road Map Action Plan

Dale Harrington introduced the newly developed brochure (copy attached).

## **5. Collaboration**

The CP Road Map is not tied to any single pot of money. It's becoming very difficult to get large amounts of money for a specific agenda – pooled fund studies, collaboration have become necessary.

The action plan has three main tasks:

- Database management: what is all needed in a database and how should it be developed
- Connection: We need to develop a proactive way of connecting research between agencies, between countries, between people. Technical expertise needs to be combined with funding.
- Marketing and communication: The priority tracks will get the most marketing and communication effort.

Discussion:

Over the next six months a collaboration plan needs to be developed and implemented. How to get DOTs and agencies informed and in agreement? How can we get states to use the Road Map when setting their research agenda; can local DOTs be influenced by a national agenda? Each state has different barriers, different mechanisms for coordinating research: a difficult task.

Marketing and outreach will be critical. Each track needs to have well defined subject matter and be communicated so that states can see their specific needs within that track, and can see how joining a pooled fund on a specific need will address their state's needs as well as be part of the national agenda. States need help in seeing how their present research plan can and does fit into a national plan; that will encourage research committees to look at how to incorporate the Road Map into their long range research plan.

A Help Desk would be beneficial to encouraging states to become involved – a central place/person to go for finding out what else is being done, or whether research on a particular problem has been started; too much new research on topics already well documented..

Discussion on who are the benefactors of the collaboration center. Who are the customers; how can we get a coordinated sponsorship of research?

When everything is said and done, what will the structure look like? The vehicles available right now are known pooled funded programs that exist: AURORA, Crash Center – is the CP Tech Center going to be a pooled fund center to manage the Road Map? A regional center of excellence could be suggestion as a way to combine existing mechanisms (pooled funds, university research, consortiums, industry) to be developed as a way to continue funding.

## **6. Project Management System**

The database that will be available on the CP Road Map will show what gap is being addressed, what is still a gap, and what should be done to fill it. It will have lots of information, but needs to have functionality for varying interest levels. The administrative group will be the primary users, but it will also be of use to stakeholders and researchers.

## **7. Communications**

Clarification that references to the Road Map revising priorities actually refers to an updating of priorities, and an updating of funding, i.e. if a state indicates funding for a specific project within a track that project will move up the priority scale, not a change in research priorities. Agencies will have confidence the research they are funding as a priority will not be obsolete due to a revising priority list.

The CP Road Map site will be going live with the first electronic newsletter. There will be a way to signup for future newsletters and information updates.

## **8. Executive Committee Call to Action**

Tom Cackler indicated the administration of the Road Map is about \$750,000 per year (see slide 2 and 3 of item 8) and FHWA's current funding level equals about 40%.

Gary Henderson indicated the FHWA plans to continue funding the administrative support group but likely will not continue the present level of support (approximately \$300k per year) indefinitely. Some other mechanism of support needs to be considered. What are appropriate and equitable ways to continue to fund the administration support of this national initiative? A pooled fund seems to be a good mechanism; SP&R funds are then available.

Marketing will be HUGE! Obstacles:

- States are already facing shortage of research funds for their state projects and giving money to an administrative group will be a hard sell.
- What will state's get for their money? Will they each get a "seat at the table"? Perhaps rotation on the executive committee, and technical committee involvement

The Midwest Concrete Consortium (MC2) is an example of a consortium where states have found value in getting states together. MC2 started out 12 years ago as a technical peer exchange on concrete pavements in the upper Midwest region with about 11 states. The MCO project, consisting of 17 states participating in a PFS, began meeting with the MC2 and resulted in more states involvement and tremendous growth for the MC2. The MCO PFS is having its final meeting on September 25<sup>th</sup>. MC2 has now initiated a new PFS to fund technology transfer that will allow states to continue to meet and discuss projects of mutual interest. Twelve states have signed up and more have expressed interest. Agenda item for September's MC2 meeting will be to move from Midwest Concrete Consortium to a national concrete consortium, consisting of the states, FHWA, and industry representatives. One of the tasks this group will take on is the leadership for Track 1 (Mix Design and Analysis).

Comment made that due to the differences in mechanics of appropriating funds for pooled fund studies from different states, PFS solicitations need to stay open for a year to allow for each state's individual approach.

**INDUSTRY:** Gordon Smith spoke on behalf of the ACPA as an industry representative. Industry, through ACPA and ICPA, has been funding the CP Tech Center @ 600K per year. This funding has been flexible, and the Center has been able to determine how to use the funding. Some of it has been used to fund personnel working on the Road Map. Industry is very supportive of collaboration and interested in talking to local DOTs regarding more collaboration. Industry funding generally has less restrictions on its usage so keeping it to plug holes in research projects, was suggested. Frequently it is difficult for a state DOT to fund research in a different state, so keeping it flexible is advantageous.

Industry reps commented it was refreshing to be proactive in organizing collaboration. Presenting a unified front with research dollars should show legislative entities that something is really getting done.

**POOLED FUND DISCUSSION:** Coordination of national research has been in on going problem. Having FHWA be the lead for the pooled fund gives credibility to the project and will make it easier for the DOTs to participate. Industry will not be part of the PFS, but will continue to fund individual projects. Other state chapters should be approached regarding administrative funding for the CP Tech Center using ICPA as an example.

**Action item: Solicit for a federally led pooled fund for administrative funding. CP Tech Center will draft proposal for DOT reps review prior to MC2 September's meeting.**

If solicitation does not generate the needed interest, state's feedback should provide some direction.

#### COLLABORATION AGREEMENT – Draft

Discussion as to appropriate signatory in each DOT for the collaboration document; effective signature may be specific to each state, however, the higher ranking of the officer lends more serious intent and action.

The intention is to supply documentation that would move from cooperation to collaboration, move from awareness of program to involvement. The draft agreement in the packet does not lock any state into any action; states' are able to retain control by checking the areas of agreement.

#### ACTION ITEMS:

- **Packet of information on the Road Map (individual to states depending on their prior involvement and interest)**
- **Brochure**
- **Letter of support from FHWA**
- **Executive committee members will look into level of commitment for their agency**
- **MCO states will need to champion the advantages of the pooled fund concept**
- **EC members can champion the pooled fund proposal at regional every other month teleconferences – and report on questions and concerns being expressed**
- **Five DOT reps on the EC will be the pilot group. This group will try to get the collaboration agreement signed in their DOT and determine the level of buy-in to incorporating the Road Map into the research program.**

#### 9. Draft Operations Manual

A draft Operations Manual was distributed. The committee is asked to read it, and send comments to the CP Tech Center. A final Operations Manual will be sent out and a vote via email will be solicited.

#### 10. TRB Problem Statement (Fred Hejl)

Fred Hejl from TRB reiterated that coordination on a national level is difficult; the key to optimizing the Road Map research will be through standing committee research agendas.

#### 11. Research Track Updates

- Environmental (recommendation to committee)  
Should environmental research needs become a separate track or stay part of each track? Discussion revolved around aggressive action being sought for environmental concerns, well over half of research proposals being submitted to funding agencies seem to have an environmental angle. Environmental research needs the higher visibility of being a separate track. Julie Garbini moved, Claude Bedard seconded, that the Environmental become a separate track. Approved.
- Should Track 7 ( High-Speed Concrete Pavement Rehabilitation and Construction) be elevated to a full track priority, or should “Overlays” just be considered a subject priority within the track. Although no vote was taken the committee felt Track 7 should not be elevated to a priority track but “Overlays” be considered a subject priority in the track

Executive Committee members commented on the ease of air travel to Chicago. The next meeting will be March 2008 in Chicago.