I. Call to Order and Opening Remarks

Meeting called to order by Curt at 11:03; Sejal Barot agreed to be Vice Chair; Curt asked if the members from the old 5b were moved into the new and expanded 5c TS. Sonya has queried Evan R. and Katheryn M. to verify this has occurred. They are double checking.

II. Roll Call – please email

Robert Lauzon
Eric Frempong
Timothy Ruelke
David Jones
Michael Benson
Amir Hanna
Bill Schiebel
Matthew Corrigan
John Staton
Don Streeter
Dennis Dvorak
Jeff Withee
Temple Short
Brett Trautman
Timothy Aschenbrener
Curt Turgeon
Sonya Puterbaugh
Greg Uherek
Brian Johnson

III. Approval of Technical Section Minutes

Motion to approve minutes by Colorado
Seconded by Missouri
Zero neighs

IV. Old Business

A. SOM Ballot Items (concurrent ballots)

i. PP80. 43 Affirmative, 1 Negative from Maine. Standard requires the agency to develop Design Files. This is language from MnDOT’s spec, but is not needed in this standard. Maine agreed to withdraw negative with assurance that this will be reworded as
optional. Comments from Florida, Oklahoma, Texas and Virginia will also be addressed in next Tech Section Ballot. Cut-n-paste error caught by Maine

1. No ballot submitted from Alaska, California, Maryland, New Mexico and North Dakota: Found non-persuasive. Change that will have to be taken care of this spring with the tech section ballot; Concern with relying solely on vendor’s software; contact MN if there are any questions about potential shortcomings of vendor’s software. → No discussion

ii. PP 81. 44 Affirmative, 0 Negative. Comments from Florida and Oklahoma will be addressed in next Tech section ballot.

1. No ballot submitted from Alaska, California, Maryland, New Mexico and North Dakota: Found non-persuasive.

B. TS Ballots

i. Updates to PP80 No discussion.

ii. Updates to PP81 No discussion.

1. Anticipate updates to R 25 by steward Dennis Dvorak, FHWA to eliminate outdated references. Dennis has provided updated R 25. It will be for a Tech Section ballot this spring.


iv. Consider Provisional for File Format of Intelligent Construction Technology Data. There needs to be a guide to standardize file data format, should AASHTO publish something to that effect??

v. Consider Provisional for Rolling Density Meter (SHRP RO6C GPR device) No discussion. Texas, TTI, Maine Nebraska, Alaska and Minnesota will work to generate an equipment Standard for Tech Section ballot in spring.

C. Immigration of Old Tech Section 5B Standards NEED STEWARDS


ii. R 16-04 (2016) Regulatory Information for Chemicals Used in AASHTO Tests (see table below) two concerns:

1. (1) are any standards referring to R16? and
2. (2) we’ve got NIOSH and OSHA standards, has anyone looked at these tables to see if NIOSH and OSHA are up to date?

Chair proposes that this should be balloted for deletion and also find out why it wasn’t deleted last time OR we should go through it top-to-bottom and see if it’s up to date; and if we want to keep it let’s find out why the other standards are not referring to this standard;

Discussion: this is a huge undertaking to maintain this standard and make sure it’s up to date; are people even going to look at this document? is it worth spending all this time on this document if people aren’t even going to look at this? NY points out that most people will just look at MSDS sheets; Curt considering ballot to delete this standard; who is using this? Rick, Maine, will include question in a survey with questions on R 34.

1. Ballot to delete did not succeed.
2. Needs to be updated – DAMS project?

### Table 1—Chemicals Used in AASHTO Test Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>CAS No.</th>
<th>Test Method</th>
<th>NIOSH REL</th>
<th>OSHA PEL</th>
<th>Carcin</th>
<th>Skin</th>
<th>DOT Label</th>
<th>RCRA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acetic Acid</td>
<td>64-19-7</td>
<td>105, 192, 260, 281</td>
<td>10 ppm</td>
<td>10 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrosive</td>
<td>Flam. Liq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acetone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acetone</th>
<th>67-64-1</th>
<th>151, 201, 202, 250</th>
<th>250 ppm</th>
<th>151, 201, 202, 250</th>
<th>250 ppm</th>
<th>750 ppm</th>
<th>750 ppm</th>
<th>750 ppm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>590 mg/m³</td>
<td>750 ppm</td>
<td>1800 mg/m³</td>
<td>590 mg/m³</td>
<td>750 ppm</td>
<td>1800 mg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acetylene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acetylene</th>
<th>74-86-2</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>1 ppm</th>
<th>1 ppm</th>
<th>CL: 2500 ppm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 mg/m³</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>14 mg/m³</td>
<td>14 mg/m³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. First published in 1996 based upon a 1990 AASHTO Hazardous Waste Guide for Project Development. Not sure this Standard adds much value today. Standard basically says that if something doesn’t look like the ‘right stuff,’ then stay away – is this worth keeping?

Tim asked if the 1990 AASHTO Hazardous Waste Guide for Project Development has been updated. After the meeting, Curt went to AASHTO pubs website: Guide has not been updated AND, pubs website has “It does not represent current technical information.” in big red bold letters. More discussion on R 21’s future is needed.


v. R 23-99 (2013) Chemical, Biological, and Physical Analysis of Water


2. Should somebody review SHRP H-332?
3. Should the eleven tests become standalone Standards so they are reviewed and reconfirmed on an ongoing basis?

Is anyone looking at this document (24 years old)? Should these 11 TM’s be turned into separate AASHTO TM’s, should H-332 be reviewed/updated or should R 34 be deleted? MN’s chem lab runs tests per SHRP H-332 but aren’t aware of AASHTO R 34

Rick will send out a survey for this (AND R 16) to ask members of 5c if they’re using it and where

viii. R 65-14 Evaluating the Engineering and Environmental Suitability of Recycled Materials

D. New name for the Tech Section.

V. New Business

A. Research Proposals No discussion. Send any research proposals to Curt or Rick.

1. 20-7 RPS
2. Full NCHRP RPS

B. AMRL/CCRL - Observations from Assessments?

C. NCHRP Issues Amir Reported:

i. A total three problem statements submitted to NCHRP (none from 5c); approx. 100 for 2018 though;

ii. List Environmental research projects in updates for next meeting would be helpful;

iii. Project, “Validating Contractor Test Data” is out for RFP with proposals due within next week or so.

D. Correspondence, calls, meetings – N/A

E. Presentation by Industry/Academia N/A

F. Proposed New Standards N/A

G. Proposed New Task Forces N/A

H. Standards Requiring Reconfirmation N/A

I. SOM Ballot Items (including any ASTM changes/equivalencies) N/A

VI. Open Discussion No discussion

VII. Adjourn Adjourned by Chair at 1129