

CP Road Map Executive Committee Conference Call
Friday, April 3, 2009

Attendees:

CP ROAD MAP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE & POOLED FUND STATE REPS

Randy	Batthey	Mississippi DOT
Claude	Bedard	Euclid Admixture Canada
Rick	Collins	Texas DOT
Jim	Duit	Duit Construction
Martin	Fallon	St. Marys Cement Inc.
Julie	Garbini	RMC Research Foundation
Josh	Freeman	Pennsylvania DOT
Randy	Iwasaki	California DOT
Peter	Kopac	FHWA (HRDI-12)
Steve	Kosmatka	Portland Cement Association
David	Lippert	Illinois DOT
Andy	Babish	Virginia DOT
Cheryl	Richter	FHWA
Randy	Riley	ACPA-Illinois Chapter
Rick	Sniegowski	K-Five Construction
John	Staton	Michigan DOT
Suneel	Vanikar	FHWA

Operations Support Group

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

The meeting of the Road Map Executive Committee was convened in order to discuss the changes being suggested for the continuation of Task Order 3 of the Road Map. Due to the scheduling and cost of face-to-face meetings, this meeting was held via webconferencing.

It has proven to be difficult to get states to commit to the pooled fund project despite presentations at meetings and mailings. The Operations Support Group (OSG) is recognizing the message of the CP Road Map is still not clearly understood or at least lacking in general usage despite efforts to get the message out. This year a full day workshop (on sustainability) was held during TRB; future workshops at TRB are being planned.

Of the identified tracks (original 12, plus sustainability suggested by exec committee in 2008) the progress of the priority tracks was noted (see PowerPoint presentation handout).

[Question: Is recycling being looked at in sustainability? California is looking for less reliance on cement, trying to get to 1990 levels by 2020.](#)

In cooperation with FHWA, OSG is in the initial stages of planning an international conference on sustainability in 2010. Other parts of the world have been involved in sustainable practices and we want to learn from them and incorporate them into our practices where possible.

Question: Could a survey be done to evaluate the impact of alternative bids? The current practice, state techniques being used, issues that need further evaluation, etc.

- What is the impact of alternative bidding – is it giving the states what they need? Don't worry about the fairness aspect, just report on the impact.
- FHWA would need to take lead – no state will buy into it without their involvement.
- Mississippi is looking for a fair and equal plan. Especially with the stimulus package coming, states need something that everyone can use.
- Illinois is interested in technically how states are doing alternate bids first, then more in depth information and specifics on asphalt and concrete.
- FHWA's Office of Pavement Technology is working on updating guidance on alternate bidding which should be forthcoming this year. NCHRP has project on alternate bidding that may include a survey of state practices.

OSG will contact the NCHRP project monitor to see what is being done, and will discuss how to supplement that information if needed.

CP Road Map Executive Committee was designated to assume the track leadership for Business Systems (track 11). No one has emerged to take on this track leadership. OSG will endeavor to get more information to the Executive Committee with the goal of finalizing the leadership for the Business Systems track.

Task Order 2 has been completed; the final report was sent out electronically. However, as a part of TO 3 there has been a continuation of work activities begun under TO 2. Primarily work is being done to bring the sustainability track up to the same status as the other priority tracks.

Question: Is there an assessment of how successful these efforts are? Specifically, a dollar value of projects that could be traced back to the Road Map?

An evaluation is part of the TO 3 activity. The evaluation will attempt to show projects/research that are as a result of this activity.

The NCC meeting last week was very successful with a good participation and enthusiasm for concrete research and for the Road Map. However, we have had comments, and in particular we heard during the Two-lift Paving Open House, that there is concern that enthusiasm for the Road Map is waning. After the Open House the OSG evaluated what had been successful so far, and the concerns. We realized that too many of the researchers, DOTs, and research agencies were not using the Road Map in developing their individual programs. We decided to look at a different way to approach the process and felt the changes should take place immediately rather than wait for TO 4.

Cheryl Richter indicated that in a conversation with a State highway individual who had been a strong supporter of the CP Road Map during its development but is not now involved in the pooled fund or any other activities, the following comments were made:

1. Pertinent people in his state were involved in other things
2. He really wasn't aware that support for coordination activities was lacking. He was of the opinion that the Cooperative Agreement funding should be sufficient.

Clarification is needed to ensure understanding that the Road Map is only one of many projects at the National CP Tech Center. All research (cooperative agreement projects, pooled fund projects, other research) being done through the CP Tech Center is making a contribution to the Road Map, geared to advancing the Road Map priorities. But the Road Map identified 25 M a year in needed research, the CP

Tech Center can't advance it alone. The challenge is to get others to see the big picture. And in order to accomplish that, a new approach is being proposed.

Proposed new approach (see PowerPoint handout beginning at pg 21; red print indicates new tasks)

OSG proposes to listen to researchers, DOTs, and industry regarding research needs through face to face or video conference meetings. This direct contact should clear up misconceptions and improve their involvement in the Road Map.

These meetings will also give the OSG team a clearer picture of funding streams and they will be able to help develop collaborations. A clearer picture of DOT research needs, universities and other researchers capabilities, and available funding should result in less duplication and more involvement in the Road Map priorities.

Assisting with the Technology Transfer programs will become an increasing priority. The OSG will assist in development of T2 publications, tech briefs, research summaries etc.

Question: How does this compare to TRIS or RIP?

This summary would highlight what's going on at DOTs, narrowing it to research that is being moved forward to advance concrete pavement. In addition, it would show how it is connected to the Road Map, the track association and gap it addresses. We need to publicize this information and get it out to the general public.

A format to capture this information would be set up and DOTs could populate the form, or we would do it for them as we hear about their research.

For states that use TRIS or RIP, the OSG would review these entries and extract information on the critical research items for national interest.

Each year, 10-12 projects that substantially advance concrete pavement technology would be developed into tech briefs in conjunction with researchers and the APTP program. The OSG would not be doing the research, but finding the research of national significance and getting the information to the practitioners.

Concern with duplication to what is presently being reported in TRIS and RIP was expressed and the OSG agrees that there should not be a new database, existing ones should be used. However, this proposal involves connecting the research to the Road Map, that information is not included in TRIS/RIP.

The Road Map was also developed to help get research into practice. This process will try to get useful material, emerging research, to the agencies. It takes too long to get new ideas into practice and we need to be more proactive in getting information out. Tech briefs will get the information out, and encourage interest in the researcher's report with a link to their website.

Although there are lots of research reports and tech briefs being done, our contacts show the information is not being utilized. From discussions with DOT representatives, we realize that filtering the information for relevance to specific topics and direct working relationships with DOTs, universities, and agencies will help in the struggle to get research into practice.

Peter Kopac commented that the old approach was "let's try to follow the proposed research" and the new approach is "find out what is going on and see how it relates".

The new approach has received the concurrence of the executive committee and a change of scope for TO 3 will be written. The Technology Transfer program, slide 24 from the PowerPoint (attached), may need some further clarification and discussion. The T2 program may be part of TO 4.

Other questions/comments:

With the stimulus program coming out, states can't move forward on the things that are of interest, they are overwhelmed with just getting stuff out the door for construction.

Even though there is stimulus funding, long term most states are limited in their funding and their programs are still shrinking. Green construction lends itself to alternative bidding. If you're just maintaining existing roadways, it's much harder for alternate bidding. Major existing barriers also makes alternate bidding very challenging.

The Executive Committee does not directly include reps from the pooled fund states. OSG proposes to add representatives from these 6 states to the executive committee to fully involve them as funders?
Agreed.



CP ROAD MAP
Research Projects Identification (2009)

National Dissemination of Research

