

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MATERIALS

Mid-Year Web Meeting
Tuesday, February 2, 2016
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm EST

TECHNICAL SECTION 1a Soil and Unbound Recycled Materials Test Methods

I. **Call to Order and Opening Remarks** [Bob Burnett](#) is retiring, [Andy Babish](#) (currently the Vice Chair) will be the new Chair of this Tech Section

II. **Roll Call**

Burnett, Robert A.	New York State Department of Transportation
Babish, Charles A.	Virginia Department of Transportation
Schiebel, Bill R	Colorado Department of Transportation
Pinkerton, Jennifer M.	Delaware Department of Transportation
Hussain, Azmat	Federal Highway Administration
Horhota, David J	Florida Department of Transportation
Douds, Richard	Georgia Department of Transportation
Smith, Timothy E.	Maryland Department of Transportation
Fung, Clement W.	Massachusetts Department of Transportation
Williams, III, James A.	Mississippi Department of Transportation
Tedford, Darin P	Nevada Department of Transportation
Sheehy, Eileen	New Jersey Department of Transportation
Cowsert, Jack E.	North Carolina Department of Transportation
Horner, Ron	North Dakota Department of Transportation
Stellmach, Greg Frank	Oregon Department of Transportation
Ramirez, Timothy	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
Felag, Mark E	Rhode Island Department of Transportation
Feller, Joe J.	South Dakota Department of Transportation
Heinen, Caroline	Texas Department of Transportation
Ahearn, William E.	Vermont Agency of Transportation
Lane, Becca	Ontario Ministry Of Transportation

III. **Approval of Technical Section Minutes**
M/S; vote [Motion to approve: ND, second-NJ](#)

IV. **Old Business**

A. SOM Ballot Items

Items #1 (allowing de-ionized water in T90) and **#2** (move T146, Wet Preparation of Disturbed Soil Samples for a Test, from a test method to a practice) received no Negative votes and no comments. They will proceed to publication.

Item #3, to adopt PP59 (Coal Combustion Fly Ash for Embankments) as a full standard.

Comment from Alabama: There will have to be a lot of coordination with regulation agencies to make sure that the practices in this spec are within the beneficial re-use regulations. If a leachate collection system is installed that becomes a life time commitment to sampling and possibly a discharge permit that will have to be maintained forever. The final rule for the disposal of coal combustion residuals from electric utilities was put out August 2015. Does PP 59 conform with the rule?

Comment from Oregon: I approve of this for full standard. However for future consideration we should discuss if additional language is necessary to clarify expectations on how to make measurements for some of the statements regarding addition of water and compaction requirements. Do we want to clarify that T99/T180 is used and if a moisture density curve needs to be developed for the material? Is T265 what they expect to use to determine moisture content? Oregon does not use fly ash as embankment material, so I am not clear on whether or not the moisture density curve is required to use the material.

Negative from Virginia: Virginia doesn't see anything inherently wrong with this provisional standard, but would rather see it deleted than moved forward. We think this type of practice should be left to designers, and not made a standard. Section 5.1.1 says it all: "Fly ash shall meet the requirements set forth in the contract documents..."and 5.4.1 "Where specified, material used to construct a liner beneath the fly ash embankment shall meet the material requirements of the specifying agency."...And so on. This is a very general practice that doesn't seem to be of much help.

Actions to be taken? [Andy Babish spoke on this item.](#) [There is a lot of information about fly ash embankment included that can be found elsewhere \(such as on the Internet\) - not sure what the value of the standard would be.](#) [We can withdraw the negative, find the negative non-persuasive, or find the negative persuasive.](#) [ASTM E2277 \(Design & Construction of Coal Ash Structural Fills\) was withdrawn in 2012.](#) [EPA has regulations about using fly ash in construction.](#) [This is not a material standard – it is just a bunch of guidance.](#) [Motion to find the negative persuasive and it will not go forward as a full standard: NJ, second-FL.](#) [Motion passed by vote.](#) [PP 59 will not be published as a full standard.](#)

B. TS letter ballots

Reconfirm T 296-10 as a full standard: 47 Affirmative, 5 Not Voting. **Comment from Virginia:** Unclear reference to back-pressure saturation. To the extent that the sample is unsaturated, the engineer should be able to discern a curved failure envelope (i.e., not $\phi=0$). If the sample is saturated, then the $\phi=0$ condition will exist. For an undrained test, use of back-pressure saturation may obscure such findings. In practice, I'm not familiar with back-pressure saturation of UU samples. [Andy Babish explained his comment.](#) [Discussion that UU tests aren't typically performed with back-pressure saturation.](#) [Editorial change – does not require a ballot.](#) [Those three words will be taken out of Keywords section.](#)

Reconfirm T 288-12 as a full standard: 47 Affirmative, 5 Not Voting. No comments.

C. Task Force Reports

The only existing Task Force was on PP-59, Coal Combustion Fly Ash for Embankments. As the work has resulted in a ballot to make this a full standard, the task Force may be discontinued and any future work on the standard should be assigned to the stewards (ND, PA).

D. Carryover Queries from Publications: Still on the Chair's To Do List. [These are things like assigning Keywords to standards.](#) [All editorial-type issues.](#) [The Chair will take care of these.](#)

V. **New Business**

A. Research Proposals

1. Performance of Drainage in Pavements with Aggregate Bases: research problem statement was endorsed by the SOM as the #3 SOM priority for a full NCHRP study; NCHRP voting is happening now. Vote early, vote often!

2. Cost Effectiveness of Geotextiles as Layer Separators; research problem statement; this one had the #2 SOM priority for a 20-7 study. It was not selected at the fall meeting, will rewrite and resubmit for spring meeting vote. May also submit for consideration as a synthesis in February. [Bob Burnett will take care of this.](#)
- B. AMRL/CCRL Issues: None noted. [Not aware of any issues.](#)
- C. NCHRP Issues
1. RNS from TS4b: Use of Recycled and By-Product Material in Soil-Structures. Did not get a high enough rating from the SOM to advance. Any interest here? [Delaware is interested. Evan said we may want to send this out to the group for refined language so it has a better opportunity to pass through. Get edits back to Andy Babish and see if there is support from the TS and Subcommittee at the summer meeting.](#)
 2. Pending NCHRP Project 21-11 (selecting contractor): "Improved Test Methods and Practices for Characterizing Steel Corrosion Potential of Earthen Materials." It may affect T288. [Keep an eye on this.](#)
- D. Correspondence, calls, meetings/ Presentation by Industry
 Email from Bob Gladstone 10/9/15 asking everyone to perform T288 only to saturation, reply from Bob Burnett 10/13/15 explaining the actual test procedure ties in with existing specification limits. [Bob Burnett didn't get any real responses on this.](#)
- E. Proposed New Standards:
 Possible new subbase support test, similar to CBR, for geogrid-reinforced aggregates. From Dr. Charlie Sun at the University of Kentucky: [Bob Burnett spoke to Charlie Sun at TRB. Bob will put Charlie in touch with Andy to see if we want to consider this going forward. Bob told Charlie that the right place for this standard would be TS 1a.](#)

Hi Bob, thank you so much for quick and detail information about developing AASHTO test method.

As I mentioned in our conversation, I had developed a test method to evaluate bearing capacity in an aggregate reinforced with geogrids. The objective for this test method is stated in our proposal:

"Evaluate alternative laboratory tests to determine material properties of geogrid that impact in-situ performance of geogrid used for subgrade stabilization, and, will allow the Cabinet to objectively evaluate various geogrid materials that are submitted for approval."

The method is similar to CBR test to measure bearing capacity vs penetration depth, but is different settings with CBR test. I am not sure which is better between material property and bearing capacity. It will be a big help if you point me to right place developing this test as potential standard method. Thank you for your time and help.

Best wishes and have a wonderful day. Charlie

- F. Proposed New Task Forces: None yet
- G. Standards Requiring Reconfirmation:
 Due up in 2016: T216 (OK, SD), T290 (NY, FL), T 297 (AL, CO), T307 (FL, OK). Please review. [Stewards \(in parentheses\) are asked to review the standards.](#)
 For some reason, T288 (NY, FL) was already balloted for reconfirmation and passed.
- H. SOM Ballot Items (including any ASTM changes): None yet
- VI. Open Discussion** [Mark Felag thanked Bob Burnett for his work over the years and read him a lovely retirement poem. :0\) Bob thanked all the members of the Tech Section and said he would miss you all.](#)
- VII. Adjourn** [Meeting adjourned at 2:44 p.m.](#)