

COMMITTEE ON MATERIALS AND PAVEMENTS

Meeting (Annual or Mid-Year)	Annual
Date	Monday, August 5th, 2019
Scheduled Time	1:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.
Technical Subcommittee & Name	Technical Subcommittee 5b - Bridge and Pavement Preservation
Chair Name and (State)	Derek Nener-Plante, Maine
Vice Chair Name and (State)	Vacant
Research Liaison Name and (State)	Vacant

I. Introduction and Housekeeping

II. Call to Order and Opening Remarks

Brief Summary of Activities

III. Roll Call of Voting Members

Present	Member Name	State	Present	Member Name	State
<input type="checkbox"/>	Becca Lane	ON	<input type="checkbox"/>	John Staton	MI
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bruce Johnson	OR	<input type="checkbox"/>	Kent Miller	NE
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changlin Pan	NV	<input type="checkbox"/>	Kyle Lester	CO
<input type="checkbox"/>	Charles Babish	VA	<input type="checkbox"/>	LaDonna Rowden	IL
<input type="checkbox"/>	Christopher Ohm	WI	<input type="checkbox"/>	Matt Linneman	ND
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clark Morrison	NC	<input type="checkbox"/>	Michael Lee	TX
<input type="checkbox"/>	Curt Turgeon	MN	<input type="checkbox"/>	Monica Flournoy	GA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Danny Lane	TN	<input type="checkbox"/>	Richard Barezinsky	KS
<input type="checkbox"/>	Derek Nener-Plante	ME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scott George, P. E.	AL
<input type="checkbox"/>	Donald Streeter	NY	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sejal Barot	MD
<input type="checkbox"/>	Edward Inman	NJ	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stewart Linz	AR
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greg Milburn	WY	<input type="checkbox"/>	Temple Short	SC
<input type="checkbox"/>	James Welter	OH	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Nowaczyk	KY
<input type="checkbox"/>	John Donahue	MO	<input type="checkbox"/>	Travis Walbeck	WV

Quorum Rules Met?

Annual Meeting: Simple majority of voting members (☐y/ ☐n) | Mid-Year Meeting: Voting members present (☐y/ ☐n)

A. Review of Membership (*New members, exiting members, etc.*)

IV. Approval of Technical Subcommittee Minutes

Mid-Year Meeting conducted on 11/15/18 – minutes in **Attachment A**.

V. Old Business

A. COMP Ballot Items (*Include any ASTM changes/equivalencies, including ASTM standards' revision years.*)

COMP Ballot #	Standard	Results (<i>neg/affirm</i>)	Comments/Negatives	Action
N/A				

B. Technical Subcommittee Ballots

TS Ballot #	Standard	Results (neg/affirm)	Comments/Negatives	Action
2019-1	MPXX - UTBWC	1 neg 19 affirm 8 no vote	Multiple comments, primarily centering on error in uncompacted voids content, lack of reference to M332, and use of special paving machine terminology Full comments in Attachment B	Comments provided to the Emulsion Task Force for revision and resubmittal
2019-1	PPXX - UTBWC	1 neg 19 affirm 8 no vote	Multiple comments, primarily centering on referencing of emulsion standards, lack of reference to M 332, and errors in the Tables Full comments in Attachment B	Comments provided to the Emulsion Task Force for revision and resubmittal
2019-3	MPXX – Scrub Seal	0 neg 18 affirm 10 no vote	<p>KY: There must be a reason why the minus 200 sieve is established at a maximum of 5%. I have some concern about the aggregate retention at the 5% amount. I am sure that it was discussed but just want to point it out to make sure this was agreed upon.</p> <p>KS: Table 1: Since both viscosities are run at 50C, the Fahrenheit equivalents should be the same for both (120F vs. 122F).</p> <p>TN: Under Table 1 add column for method</p> <p>NV: Table 1, Demulsibility 5 -60%. There is no demulsibility spec on CSS-1h and spec on CRS-2P is 40% min. Can this differentiate either?</p> <p>Table 1, Elastic Recovery temperature should add "(50 degree F)" for consistency.</p> <p>5.5.9 the formula should include "x100%".</p> <p>OH: Table 1 should list test methods similar to Table 2.</p> <p>Section 5.4 Are we following AASHTO T 59 for items with no additional AASHTO/ASTM mention?</p> <p>Section 5.4 Other AASHTO methods (example M 316, Note 2 or 3.1.1) refer to "buyer" instead of "owner." No preference on which to use, but should be consistent.</p> <p>Section 6 Should there be a "sand equivalency" requirement, similar to micro surfacing or slurry seals?</p>	Comments provided to the Emulsion Task Force for revision and resubmittal
2019-3	PP87	0 neg 18 affirm 10 no vote	<p>OH: Section 9.1 propose adding "from minimum emulsion content determined"</p> <p>Section 9.1 What is the purpose of the tolerance? PP 87 is for design also. The paving equipment used for slurry seals will set the emulsion percentage either in the computer system or by the height of the gate during the calibration process. Why would you allow a contractor to change the emulsion percent other than if the residue of the emulsion changes enough from the JMF to what was supplied in the field? If this is for acceptance, if you use the counts from the paver they</p>	TBD

B. Technical Subcommittee Ballots

TS Ballot #	Standard	Results (neg/affirm)	Comments/Negatives	Action
			<p>would be based off a correct calibration performed so the emulsion percent assuming the contractor did not change the percent in the computer or the height of the game should be the original set value (hopefully the value in the JMF). Only way to really verify emulsion percent used is to either pull a sample of the slurry and determine the residual percent of the mix or look at bill of ladings and material used on the job.</p> <p>Section 11.2 What are “appropriate tolerances”? Do the min and max of these “appropriate tolerances” also have to meet the requirements of Table 1?the game should be the original set value (hopefully the value in the JMF). Only way to really verify emulsion percent used is to either pull a sample of the slurry and determine the residual percent of the mix or look at bill of ladings and material used on the job.</p> <p>TN: In 4.4 should the author reference NSF/ANSI 60-2013, Drinking Water Treatment Chemicals—Health Effects, If not should we reference a test method such as AASHTO T 26</p> <p>NV: Section 11.2 stated to report all mixture components and appropriate tolerances. Emulsified asphalt has a tolerance of ± 0.5 percent according to Section 9.1. How about other components?</p>	
2019-4	MPXX - UTBWC	TBD	TBD	TBD
2019-4	PPXX - UTBWC	TBD	TBD	TBD
2019-4	MPXX – FDR w/Emulsion	TBD	TBD	TBD
2019-4	PPXX - FDR w/Emulsion	TBD	TBD	TBD

C. Reconfirmation Ballots

Reconf. Ballot #	Standard	Results (neg/affirm)	Comments/Negatives	Action
N/A				

D. Task Force Reports

Task Force #	Title	Members	Status/Update
N/A			

VI. New Business

- A. AASHTO re:source/CCRL/NTPEP (*Observations from assessments, as applicable.*)
- B. Presentation by Industry/Academia
- C. Revisions/Work on Standards for Coming Year

D. Review of Stewardship List

Technical Subcommittee 5B leadership needs the help of stewards for these standards.

E. Proposed New Standards

1. Construction Guide Specification: Microsurfacing
2. Construction Guide Specification: Emulsified Asphalt Fog Seal
3. Construction Guide Specification: Hot Applied Chip Seal
4. Construction Guide Specification: Emulsified Asphalt Chip Seal
5. Construction Guide Specification: Diamond Grinding
6. Construction Guide Specification: Thin Overlay Treatments Using a Binder Resin System and Aggregates for Concrete Surfaces

F. NCHRP Issues

G. Correspondence, Calls, Meetings

1. Email from Deb Kim concerning Microsurfacing - 7/24/19

Included as **Attachment C**. Question regarding the proper spelling of “microsurfacing”. It has been spelled as “micro-surfacing”, “micro surfacing”, and “microsurfacing”. Given the background provided and the preference to maintain proper grammatical formatting, the Chair answered that “microsurfacing” was the preferred spelling.

H. Proposed New Task Forces

I. New TS Ballots

1. New Standards

Construction guide specifications listed in Section E above.

2. Upcoming Reconfirmation Ballots

Reconf. Ballot #	Standard	Action
2019-1	MP 22-13 (2019)	Revise or 1-Yr. Extend
2019-2	MP 27-16 (2018)	Revise or 2-Yr. Reconfirm
2019-3	MP 28-17 (2018)	Revise or 2-Yr. Reconfirm
2019-4	MP 34-18	Revise or 1-Yr. Extend
2019-5	MP 35-18	Revise or 2-Yr. Reconfirm
2019-6	PP 82-16 (2018)	Revise or 2-Yr. Reconfirm
2019-7	PP 83-16 (2018)	Revise or 2-Yr. Reconfirm
2019-8	PP 90-18	Revise or 2-Yr. Reconfirm
2019-9	PP 91-18	Revise or 2-Yr. Reconfirm

VII. Open Discussion

VIII. Adjourn

TS Meeting Summary

Meeting Summary		
Items Approved by the TS for Ballot <i>(Include reconfirmations.)</i>		
Standard Designation	Summary of Changes Proposed	Ballot Type
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT

Meeting Summary		
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
		<input type="checkbox"/> TS <input type="checkbox"/> COMP <input type="checkbox"/> CONCURRENT
New Task Forces Formed		
Task Force Name	Summary of Task	TF Member Names and (States)
Research Proposals <i>(Include number/title/states interested.)</i>		
Other Action Items		



COMMITTEE ON MATERIALS & PAVEMENTS

2018 - 2019 Mid Year Meeting (*Webinar*)

Thursday November 15, 2018

1:00 – 3:00 PM EST

TECHNICAL SECTION 5b Bridge and Pavement Preservation

I. Introduction and Housekeeping (*AASHTO Liaison*)

II. Call to Order and Opening Remarks

A. Brief summary of activities

III. Roll Call

Last Name	First Name	Email Address	State/Org
Babish	Andy	andy.babish@vdot.virginia.gov	VA
Barezinsky	Rick	rick.barezinsky@ks.gov	KS
Bettis	Graham	graham.bettis@txdot.gov	TX
Bush	Anita	abush@dot.nv.gov	NV(COM)
Dietz	Jason	jason.dietz@dot.gov	FHWA
Donahue	John	john.donahue@modot.mo.gov	MO
Egan	Brian		TN
Mellons	Jason		TN
Smith	Tracy		TN
Black	David		TN
Gaw	Derek		TN
Hall	Heather		TN
Kerstetter	Joseph		TN
Flournoy	Monica	mflournoy@dot.ga.gov	GA
Fraisure	Casey	fraisuc@wsdot.wa.gov	WA
Gordon	Rick	rick.gordon@state.sd.us	SD
Hacker	David	David.Hacker@ky.gov	KY
Hall	Geoff	ghall1@sha.state.md.us	MD
Hanna	Amir	ahanna@nas.edu	NAS
Ilg	Larry	larry.d.ilg@odot.state.or.us	OR
Lane	Becca	becca.lane@ontario.ca	ON
Morrison	Clark	cmorrison@ncdot.gov	NC
Nener-Plante	Derek	derek.nener-plante@maine.gov	ME (C)
PAN	CHANGLIN	cpan@dot.nv.gov	NV
Pfeifer	Brian	brian.pfeifer@illinois.gov	IL
Salomon	Delmar	delmar@technopave.com	
Shoger	Jeff	jeff.shoger@fhr.com	
Stacks	Dan	dan.stacks@txdot.gov	TX

Staton	John	statonj@michigan.gov	MI
Stewart	Robert	rstewart@utah.gov	UT
Walbeck	Travis	travis.b.walbeck@wv.gov	WV (VC)
Welter	Jim	jim.welter@dot.ohio.gov	OH
Woods	Mark	mark.woods@tn.gov	TN
angles	gary	gary.angles@dot.ohio.gov	OH (COC)
dougherty	eric	edougherty@sha.state.md.us	MD
franco	colin	colin.franco@dot.ri.gov	RI
Holt	Anne	anne.holt@ontario.ca	ON
Soneira	Casey	csoneira@ashto.org	

IV. Approval of Technical Section Minutes

Mid-year minutes distributed with this agenda as **Appendix A**.

- Motion by WV second by VA motion carried to have minutes approved.

V. Old Business

A. COMP Ballot Items (Including any ASTM Changes/equivalencies)

1. No 5b related COMP ballot items besides reconfirmation

B. TS Ballots – TS 5b 2018 Ballot #2

Ballot Results and all comments are included as **Appendix B & C**.

1. Item 1 - PP XX - Emulsified Asphalt Content of Full-Depth Reclamation Mixture Design

- i. Ballot Results – 21 affirmative/2 negative/3 not returned
 - ii. Negative from Alabama & Kansas and comments from Tennessee, South Carolina, Maine, Nevada, Georgia, Illinois, Alabama, Kansas, and West Virginia.
 - iii. **Request Emulsion Task Force to address negative votes and comments from the TS ballot and incorporate as necessary for another TS ballot in early 2019.**
- There are some concerns about the definition of FDR – is it only limited to emulsions or may it include other materials? The negatives are considered persuasive and will go back to the ETF for revision.

2. Item 2 - MP XX - Materials for Full-Depth Reclamation Mixtures with Emulsified Asphalt

- i. Ballot Results – 17 affirmative/1 negative/3 not returned
 - ii. Negative from Alabama and comments from Tennessee, Georgia, Illinois, Nevada, Maine, Alabama, and West Virginia.
 - iii. **Request Emulsion Task Force to address negative votes and comments from the TS ballot and incorporate as necessary for another TS ballot in early 2019.**
- There are some concerns about the definition of FDR – is it only limited to emulsions or may it include other materials? The negatives are considered persuasive and will go back to the ETF for revision.

C. Reconfirmation Ballots

Ballot Results and standards

1. Item 1 – M 224 - Use of Protective Sealers for Portland Cement Concrete

- i. Ballot Results – 19 affirmative/0 negative/8 not returned
- ii. Comment from Ohio: In Section 5.2 for Surface Preparation, a statement could be added that says, "For coatings to adhere to a concrete surface, a profile or roughness may be specified."

2. Item 2 – MP 22 - Fiber-Reinforced Polymer Composite Materials for Highway and Bridge Structures

- i. Ballot Results – 19 affirmative/0 negative/8 not returned
- ii. No comments received.



- Jim Welter (OH) weighed in to discuss reconfirmation ballot item #1. His concern will be addressed in future ballots and revisions.
- D. Task Force Reports
 1. Task Force 18-1: Construction Guide Layout and Format
 - i. Work completed and two final documents are attached as appendices
 - a. A .pdf copy of 'COMP 5b Construction Guide Spec Layout and Format'.
(Appendix D)
 - b. A .pdf file containing all of the TF meeting agendas and minutes.
(Appendix E)
- Travis gave a summary of the activity in task force 18-01. This TF was for giving guidance for those who wanted to write a construction guide spec and what it would look like coming from the Materials world. The TS received two standards that looked very different and so the TF was initiated. A template was ultimately made so that a construction guide spec made from the materials group would be useful to anyone who needed to use it. The template is broken down into 5 sections. It also includes instructions for how to submit the spec.
 - The template has been uploaded to the materials website
<https://materials.transportation.org/guidance-documents/>
- Amir Hanna (NAS) and Colin Franco (ETF) weighed into congratulate the group on a job well done.

VI. New Business

- A. Research Proposals
 - B. AASHTO Re:source/CCRL
 - C. NCHRP Issues
 - D. Correspondence, calls, meetings
 1. Update from the Emulsion Task Force – Colin Franco, RIDOT
 - Colin updated the group on the ETF. Industry plays a strong role in their group and they've contributed heavily. This is a good thing as they have expertise.
 - There are a few draft standards coming through and will be sent to Derek.
 - The next big thing they will be working on are quality assurance specs. They will probably have to fit into the construction specs and design guides. They are writing a QA requirement for chip seals.
 - They are now looking at rejuvenators and working with the binder and mix ETG.
 - They have submitted problem statements to NCHRP on the following topics
 - Construction guide specs for tack and slurry seals
 - Development of Materials specs, design practices, and construction guide specs for Emulsion Based Rejuvenating sealers
 - Hopefully the states can take the lead on using the new standards. Smaller municipalities look to the States so they should set the example and get the specs in use.
 - E. Presentation by Industry/Academia
 - F. Revisions/Work on Standards for Coming Year **(Appendix F)**
 - Derek asked for volunteers to be stewards of the standards that will need to be revised or reconfirmed. There were no volunteers on the call so the Chair and VC will reach out again to try to get stewards of these standards. Colin encouraged people to use these standards in their labs, get them tested out, submit feedback for them.
 - The following list of standards need to be reviewed to determine whether changes need to be made. If you would like to volunteer to help with this review, please get in touch with the Chair.
- Full Standard for Reconfirmation in 2019**
1. M 224-91 – Use of Protective Sealers for Portland Cement Concrete
- Provisional Standards for Reconfirmation in 2019**
1. MP 22-13 – Fiber-Reinforced Polymer Composite Materials for Highway and Bridge Structures



2. MP 27-16 – Materials for Emulsified Asphalt Chip Seals
3. MP 28-17 – Materials for Micro Surfacing
4. MP 34-18 – Materials for Sand Seals
5. MP 35-18 – Thin Overlay Treatments Using a Binder Resin System and Aggregate for Concrete Surfaces
6. PP 82-16 – Emulsified Asphalt Chip Seal Design
7. PP 83-16 – Micro Surfacing Design
8. PP 90-18 – Sand Seal Design
9. PP 91-18 – Emulsified Asphalt Scrub Seal Design

G. Proposed New Standards

1. Construction guide specification in process:

- i. Diamond Grinding for Pavement Preservation
- ii. Application of Thin Overlay Treatments Using a Binder Resin System and Aggregates for Concrete Surfaces
- iii. **Revisions being made to the documents by their respective writers to bring them into conformance with the recent Task Force 18-1: Construction Guide Layout and Format guidance.**

2. Constructive guide specifications from NCHRP 14-37: *Guide Specifications for the Construction of Chip Seals, Microsurfacing, and Fog Seals*

- i. Emulsified Asphalt Chip Seals
 - ii. Hot Asphalt Chip Seals
 - iii. Microsurfacing
 - iv. Emulsified Asphalt Fog Seals
 - v. **How will the documents be updated to conform to the recent Task Force 18-1: Construction Guide Layout and Format guidance?**
- These specs were initially prepared for the COC and they should already be in conformance. They should not be too far out of this format and may take minimal work. These 4 will be handled by the TS with a TS ballot ahead of the annual meeting.
 - Charlie (NV) asked if the micro and slurry will be separate. Yes, they will be separate.
 - How will we get more standards? Should we seek them out? It would be ideal for the ETG and ETF to continue feeding TS 5b new standards as they reach levels of completion.

H. Proposed New Task Forces – none proposed

I. New TS Ballots – none currently but will likely come up in the new year

J. Technical Subcommittee membership – no major changes. Please email Derek and cc Casey if you would like to change your status.

VII. Open Discussion

A. None

VIII. Adjourn

AASHTO Electronic Balloting System

Ballot Detail Report

Ballot Detail

Ballot Name:	Technical Subcommittee 5B - 2019 Ballot #1
Ballot Manager:	Derek John Nener-Plante
Ballot Start Date:	4/5/2019
Ballot Due Date:	4/26/2019

Technical Subcommittee 5B - 2019 Ballot #1

Item Number:	1
Description:	Standard Specification for Materials for Ultrathin Bonded Wearing Course
Decisions:	Affirmative: 19 of 28 Negative: 1 of 28 No Vote: 8 of 28

Agency (Individual Name)	Comments	Decision
Tennessee Department of Transportation (Mark E Woods) (mark.woods@tn.gov)	3.1.4 - Why would there be a definition for a "special paving machine" that is a) not referenced anywhere else in the specification and b) not pertinent to a materials specification? If it is intended that this material should be placed with a special paving machine (aka spray paver), then shouldn;t that be specified per a construction guide spec and, at best, be referenced here in the referenced standards?	
Kansas Department of Transportation (Richard A Barezinsky) (rick.barezinsky@ks.gov)	Table 4: Disagree with a value less than 40 for uncompacted voids. We require a value greater than 45 in our UTBWC. Why is sand being required for the fine aggregate?	Affirmative
South Carolina Department of Transportation (Temple Short) (shorttk@scdot.org)	Section 3.1.1 - Mentions HMA. Can WMA ever be used for this application? See also Section 7 and 10.1 which have HMA.	

	Section 3.1.3 - Suggest replacing M316 with "Section 6" since Section 6 modifies the M316 requirement.	
	Table 4 - Remove "min" after Sand Equivalent. Add "%" after Uncompacted Void Content and Water Absorption. Remove "%" from the 3.0% max requirement.	
Alabama Department of Transportation (Scott W. George, P. E.) (georges@dot.state.al.us)	3.1.1- Remove the dashes to be consistent with Affirmative the rest of the document. 7.1- Remove space between # and 8. Table 3 Sodium Sulfate Soundness- Add a comma between % and 5 cycles. 9.1 Add M 332 to be consistent with PPXX 4.4	
Illinois Department of Transportation (LaDonna Rowden) (ladonna.rowden@illinois.gov)	Section 1.1, Line 3: remove hyphen after "1/2" and between "1" and "in." to be consistent with the metric units.	Affirmative
	Section 3.1.1, Line 2: add hyphen between "polymer" and "modified".	
	Section 4.1, Line 2: replace "overlay" with "wearing course".	
	Table 1, Title: add hyphen between "Polymer" and "Modified".	
Nevada Department of Transportation (CHANGLIN PAN) (cpan@dot.state.nv.us)	Table 3, Deleterious material, T112, 5% max seems high. Table 4, Uncompacted Void, T304, is less than 40% correct?	Affirmative
Maine Department of Transportation (Derek John Nener-Plante) (derek.nener-plante@maine.gov)	Negative vote due to technical comments, should be affirmative vote after revisions	Negative
	Section 2.1 “ Add M332 for MSCR binders	
	Section 3.1.4 “ Is there a better name for the paver than "special paving machine"?	
	Section 7.1 “ The maximum Los Angeles Abrasion value of 40 seems a bit high, the	

Northeast generally uses a maximum value of 30

Section 9.1 – Add M 332 for MSCR grades

Item Number:	2
Description:	Standard Practice for Ultrathin Bonded Wearing Course Design
Decisions:	Affirmative: 19 of 28 Negative: 1 of 28 No Vote: 8 of 28

Agency (Individual Name)	Comments	Decision
Kansas Department of Transportation (Richard A Barezinsky) (rick.barezinsky@ks.gov)	4.2. Materials for UTBWC permit anionic polymer-modified emulsified asphalt as well cationic. Rewrite 4.2 to state: Evaluate the polymer-modified cationic emulsified asphalt in accordance with the requirements in M 316, and the anionic polymer-modified emulsified asphalt in accordance with the requirements in MP XX.	Affirmative
South Carolina Department of Transportation (Temple Short) (shorttk@scdot.org)	----- ----- Section 4.2 - Suggest adding "and MP XX" after M316 since both requirements must be met. Section 5.1.1 - Suggest deleting the last sentence and changing the first sentence to read "The job mix formula, JMF, shall be determined for the asphalt surface mixture prepared in a mix design laboratory that has been approved by the owner agency." The current wording of 5.1.1 reads more like an agency specification than an AASHTO standard. Section 5.1.2 - Suggest deleting the last sentence since it reads like an agency specification and not a standard. Table 1 - The placement rate seems out of place here but if it is to be included I suggest adding the word "Recommended" in front of "Placement Rate" since this could be a contractor or agency specification. Also, are there tolerances for the	Affirmative

placement rate of the 1/2 inch and 3/8 inch mixtures?

Section 5.3.1 - Is this wording needed in this standard? This is in reference to the placement of the emulsion and seems out of place in a mixture design standard.

Section 5.3.2 - Recommend revising the second sentence to read "The actual application rates will be determined per the owner agency's specifications." Or something along those lines.

Table 2 - The application rate for the 3/8 inch mixture should likely be 0.18 (0.81) and for the #4 mixture it should be 0.14 (0.63).

Alabama Department of
Transportation (Scott W.
George, P. E.)
(georges@dot.state.al.us)

4.2- Should cationic be removed and add MP XX Affirmative
to the end of the sentence to allow both cationic
and anionic emulsions to be evaluated.

Illinois Department of
Transportation (LaDonna
Rowden)
(ladonna.rowden@illinois.gov)

Section 4.2: This states that cationic emulsified asphalt shall be evaluated according to M 316, but what about anionic emulsified asphalt? Should add a reference to the requirements for anionic polymer-modified emulsion shown in Section 5 of MP XX-YY. Affirmative

Section 4.4: add hyphen between "performance" and "graded".

Section 5.1: add hyphen between "Job" and "Mix".

Section 5.1.1, Line 1: add hyphen between "job" and "mix".

Missouri Department of
Transportation (John P
Donahue)
(john.donahue@modot.mo.gov)

Section 7.1: add hyphen between "performance" and "graded".

The second sentence in Sec 5.3.1 - 'Equipment shall not operate on the applied asphalt emulsion before the asphalt mix is placed' - seems unnecessary since the spray paver requirement in Sec 3.1.4 of the 'Materials for Ultrathin Bonded Affirmative

	Wearing Course' standard dictates achieving the emulsion application and mix placement in one pass. There's probably no harm in leaving it as is though.	
Nevada Department of Transportation (CHANGLIN PAN) (cpan@dot.state.nv.us)	Section 4.4, The MPXX only reference M320, not M332. Table 1, 3/4" sieve size is wrong. 5.2.2.4, 10 F should be 5 degree C	Affirmative
Virginia Department of Transportation (Charles A. Babish) (andy.babish@vdot.virginia.gov)	----- ----- Editorial comment on Table 1.: The sieve size for 3/4 in should be 19 mm not 12.5 mm.	Affirmative
Maine Department of Transportation (Derek John Nener-Plante) (derek.nener-plante@maine.gov)	Negative vote due to technical comments, should be affirmative vote after revisions Section 5.1.1 Suggest making this generic as this is agency specific Section 5.2.1 Table 1 “ The placement rate for the #4 mix has a plus/minus but the others do not, can this be corrected. The placement rate for the 12.5 mm seems a bit high based upon Maine’s experience, but it depends heavily on the substrate Section 5.2.2.1 “ I don’t believe that the standard should be referencing a state standard, can this be folded into the standard? Section 5.2.2.4 “ Where did this TSR criteria come from? A particular state or research project? Section 5.3.1 “ This seems more like a construction requirement rather than a design requirement Section 5.3.2 “ I strongly disagree with the determination of the actual application rates being the responsibility of the Contractor. This needs to be cooperative and ultimately up to the agency.	Negative

Date: 4/30/2019

From: [Kim, Deborah D](#)
To: [Nener-Plante, Derek](#)
Cc: [Soneira, Casey](#)
Subject: Query: Micro Surfacing or Microsurfacing
Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2019 11:24:55 AM

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Derek,

I have a quick editorial question for you about how we spell “micro surfacing.” I’m asking you to weigh in because the term occurs in the titles of just two materials standards: MP 28 and PP 83 in 5b. Would it bother you at all if we close up the term to the more grammatically consistent “microsurfacing”?

If you need more information to form an opinion, please see below.

Influence and Urgency—This affects our update of the AASHTO style guide, which is in production now and due for release before the COMP meeting. It will affect all AASHTO publications that cite MP 28 and PP 83 or use the term going forward, not just those two standards.

Background—When MP 28 and PP 83 were first being developed for ballot, I closed up “microsurfacing” in the preballot editorial phase because the prefix “micro” doesn’t usually stand alone as a word but I was asked to open it back up even though there was no consensus on its spelling then.

Current Usage—There is still no consensus. Online just now, I found instances of the three compound-word options among DOTs, industry, and journals as follows:

Closed “microsurfacing”

Government: Caltrans; Pennsylvania DOT; Utah DOT

Journals: Asphalt Magazine; International Scholarly Research Notices

Industry: Asphalt Paving Systems, Inc.; For Construction Pros; Microsurfacing Contractors, LLC; Slurry Pavers

Open “micro surfacing”

Government: Minnesota DOT; Ohio DOT

Industry: BASF Corporation; the Barnhardt Group; California Maintenance Company; Colorado Asphalt Pavement Association; For Pavement Preservation; International Slurry Surfacing Association; North Dakota Asphalt Conference; North Florida Emulsions; Pavement Preservation & Recycling Alliance; Telfer Pavements

Hyphenated “micro-surfacing”

Government : San Francisco Public Works

Industry: Hudson Materials Company; Missouri Petroleum; Sta-Bilt Construction

Thanks,
Deb

Deborah Doebr Kim, PMP

Assistant Director of Publications | Publications Project Manager, Materials Standards and Design Titles

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)

444 North Capitol Street, Northwest, Suite 249 | Washington, DC 20001

Ph. 202-624-5883 | Fax 202-508-3835 | dkim@aaashto.org

www.transportation.org

Store 1-800-231-3475 | <https://Store.transportation.org>