The meeting was convened to summarize the accomplishments and outcomes from the CP Road Map Administrative Support Contract and pooled fund project TPF-5(185) and to discuss the future of the CP Road Map.

Summarize accomplishments/outcomes (Dale Harrington) (PowerPoint presentation attached)

1. Review of updated CP Road Map
   - The CP Road Map update has been completed and Volume 1 and 2 were sent to FHWA for final editing on March 1, 2012. FHWA will print 500 copies of the updated Road Map. (post- meeting editing by Ahmad: FHWA will not print copies but will upload the final revised CP Road Map onto the website for public access).
   - Track and subtracks have been reorganized and some tracks renamed to reflect current research needs and accomplishments (i.e. QC/QA is now known as Quality Assurance).

Comments/Questions
   - Most of the revisions were in response to the environment in which we work. To what extent was update driven by what has been accomplished?
     - The team did document research that had been completed, and discovered ongoing research that did influence the track topics, i.e. foundations and sustainability both became tracks as those areas were more significant now. About 50% of the changes were based on changes due to these influences.
     - NCC meetings influenced the tracks. The input from the 23 states was, and should be, valuable in determining on the priorities of the Road Map.

2. Workshops/webinars
   - Training events in 25 states with over 3000 participants have been held thru the collaborative funding between NCC, the CP Road Map pool fund and Michigan Tech Transportation Institute.
• The participants have been a mix of industry and DOT employees. More DOT field participants than any other single group; however, significant number of industry participants as well as individuals from large cities.

• The training fills a need that has been come more acute with the growing number of retirees. Basic training is an on-going problem, i.e. IMCP training is needed again.

Comments/Questions

➢ Excellent training – the workshops really gave states what they wanted.
  ○ ACPA contact in each state was critical to determining what training had been done, and what was needed. Extra planning was needed in order to consolidate modules from multiple workshops but resulted in training unique to each location.

3. CP Road Map E-news and MAP briefs

• From a Road Map exec committee request 3½ years ago regarding information on various states’ research, came state highlights in the E-news. Nineteen states have been contacted, and concrete pavement research in those states has been highlighted in the E-news. The personal contact has resulted in an internal only database; a listing of completed and ongoing research. A static database requiring states to enter their data on a website was discussed, and although a good idea on paper if has not proven to be successful. The personal contact resulted in more information being shared between states, more sharing of testing results and less duplicative research.

Comments/Questions

➢ There is a need to interact more with international counterparts. Austria was very interested in Missouri’s two-lift paving project; there is much we can learn from each other.

➢ The database being used now is in a clearinghouse format and a great tool and resource. It should be continued and linked in the research newsletter. The database is particularly helpful because the information has been vetted; it saves lots of time if one person hunts down the info on the Internet, makes calls for clarification, and documents it.

➢ It would be good to see research results updated when subsequent research answers questions of the earlier work. The correlation between the early questions and subsequent answers are not always clearly shown.

➢ It would be good to see some documents where “accurate enough” is defined – research may show there is value to more information, but when does the “more information” become a hindrance and limit overall achievement.

➢ E-news and MAP briefs are recognized throughout the industry as a job well done.

➢ Could a pavement Wikipedia concept be explored? A venue where people could share their successes, with some oversight regarding the validity of the information, should be considered.

Discuss feedback from NCC on priority interests (Tom Cackler) (PowerPoint presentation)

• There is a great deal of synergy between NCC participants and CP Road Map groups.

• NCC is the single biggest venue for collaboration of industry, states, and agencies.

Research needs and tech transfer is their priority and as such their bi-annual conference is a very significant event for developing specific research and training ideas.
Review scope of new TPF and alignment with CP Road Map (Sandra Larson)

- Iowa DOT leads 15-18 pooled fund projects and participates in over 30. Iowa is a balanced state between asphalt and concrete pavements, but does have a lot of concrete as compared to many states.
- Iowa is leading a pooled fund project on Work Zone Safety: this program has 5 states, all contributing $25,000 annually, and the state reps collectively define an annual program.
- Is it possible to design a similar pooled fund project for the Road Map interests?

Comments/Questions:
- The Road Map started with a focus on research needs, how to implement, and produce products. It has evolved from research issues to facilitator of collecting ideas and collaboration of industry, agency and states. The Road Map has been a guiding document.
- The education component through guides and specs has been critical. It is a rallying point for people to come together, to find out where there is commonality between states’ needs and provide guidance for future research, future pooled fund projects. The Road Map is a good forum for discussion on priorities and how to use limited funds.
- Training on research results and guides equals value added to the products. Training the new workers and an understanding of the specs is critical and will never end.
- The Road Map has changed with the times and that has kept it current. With dwindling resources, states have had to change their focus from building roads to maintaining roads – how to squeeze as much life out of the road as possible. The recent emphasis on overlays was a huge help. Now we need to evolve to building an asset management tool.
- Good information doesn’t always get implemented, specs need to be changed. DOTs used to write specs, but now some states are asking for draft specs to be incorporated into research results.
- The data from the CP Tech Center can help overcome institutional inertia.
- The CP Tech Center has helped develop stronger relationships between agencies, industry and states. Everyone has a common goal of making good pavements but sometimes working together is difficult and the CP Tech Center has helped find common ground.
- One of the Road Map’s great strengths was how it was developed and who was all involved. Anyone that had interest was invited to participate, industry, academia, states, agencies, and this resulted in a broad based document being widely used. The update is showing a maturity to needs and continued updates will bring value to the entire industry.
- The Road Map serves to facilitate research and is a rallying point to address the needs of DOTs to help prioritize research.
- Jim Duit indicated he believed millions of dollars had been saved due to the training through the CP Tech Center’s manuals and workshops. There is a need to develop long term support for the Road Map along with corresponding training and guide development.
- Road Map = opportunity. Having a plan is critical when asking for money. State legislatures, federal agencies, research bureaus, all want a plan and a Road Map of national significance is critical. We need to do a better job of recording and publicizing successes.

Cheryl Richter: Cheryl stated she is happy with the work on the Road Map and what has been accomplished under the program. The Road Map serves as a catalyst for research and training. However, there is a need to change the support model for the CP Road Map.
Tom Cackler: The CP Tech Center has appreciated the opportunity to facilitate the Road Map, connecting needs with funding agencies. Work being done to influence Industry practice; to bring value to states doesn’t just happen. Funding for the Road Map contract is ending. What are the barriers that need to be addressed if we’re going to have collaboration between industry and states as we go forward?

Comments:
➢ We need to work on the relationship between federal agencies and the states. It appears industry, states, and academia are working together but the people with the funding are not buying into the discussion mechanism and seem to be not engaged in supporting the ideas being generated.
➢ Since FHWA is not funding what is being discussed, is there a way to focus our efforts on the current initiatives at FHWA and “get on the same page”, connecting the Road Map to their initiatives.
➢ Buy-in from all parties, agencies, states, FHWA and industry has been a big reason for the success of the manuals and tech transfer.
➢ Still so much research being done where the information doesn’t get out; both nationally and internationally. Biggest roadblock is still people not working together!
➢ As a contractor, prior to the scan tour, our local agency was unwilling to buy in to anyone else’s ideas. However, by-in by everyone, agency, FHWA and industry is necessary to move innovation ahead.
➢ It appears funding research is difficult legislatively; deployment is key word.
➢ Barriers need to be overcome to keep the Road Map alive. Collaborative resources are needed to ensure a sense of everyone “owning” it. The CP Tech Center isn’t owned by anyone so can facilitate getting people together better than other groups.
➢ MAP Brief that shows where CP Road Map has been and its successes would be helpful.
➢ Would be good to try and document the monetary investment payback to industry.
➢ The Center’s “Making a Difference” document is attached.
➢ Suggestion that FHWA consider a promotional piece on the Road Map similar to a recent brochure on FHWA’s successes and how it has made a difference. The information should contain overall information on its successes and depict values on specific efforts and cost/benefit ratio from its implementation.
➢ There is definitely value to the Road Map and the potential of the Road Map is yet to be seen. We need to not become complacent but continue to work at implementing it.

Cheryl Richter: Cheryl stated she recognizes there are some broad challenges being discussed. A lot of the discussions on training, tech transfer, implementation of research have been valuable but not under her jurisdiction. She will carry the message back to FHWA and try to convey the importance of FHWA, both nationally and regionally, as an agency need to be more involved.

Tom Cackler: There is no doubt on the importance of tech transfer. However, research is the basis for tech transfer. Funding for research is needed in order to bring about new ideas for tech transfer. The Road Map has to be a collaborative effort between research, manuals, specs, and training.
Future of the CP Road Map Executive Committee (Cheryl Richter)

Cheryl thanked the CP Tech Center for their work – the original Road Map was a tremendous accomplishment, update has been very valuable, training has had significant benefits.

The change in approach to the coordination of the Road Map is not a reflection on the work that has been done, but rather that there has not been a broad buy-in by states. Therefore, it is appropriate to try a different model. FHWA is committed to coordinating research and continuing to support the catalyst of exchanging information and training. NCC is testament to that involvement. FHWA remains committed to collaboration related to the CP Road Map.

Comments/Questions

➢ Critical not to lose momentum and continuity.
➢ Could the executive committee meeting be coordinated with NCC conferences? Have the Executive Committee meeting after the NCC conference to discuss the research being proposed by the state reps.
➢ What is the future? – E-news, MAP briefs, databases, training. These all need to be built on. States need clarity as to the next phase of the Road Map and FHWA’s vision for it. Who is doing what?

Cheryl indicated she heard the suggestions of the executive committee and she will take that message back to FHWA. She thanked all the committee members for their enthusiasm and encouraged them to remain involved. Cheryl indicated she will be involved in finding funding for the executive committee, and that the CP Tech Center’s obligation for support of the Road Map initiatives will end June 30th. Future activities will be FHWA’s responsibilities and she will be the contact.

The meeting was adjourned.