

Idaho Test Method and Procedures Team Minutes

MEETING DATE: Thursday, March 16, 2006
 MEETING TIME: 9:00 am to 3:00 pm
 LOCATION: ITD HQ Annex WEST Conference Room, Boise, Idaho

Meeting Attendance		
Present: Jeff Miles, ITD HQ Mtls Scott Cron, Strata, Inc. Jamie McCurie, ITD D4 Mtls Paul Steele, ITD D6 Mtls Ed Johnson, FHWA	Jeff Drager, ITD D1 Mtls Ron Shippy, Interstate Jan Hargrave, ITD HQ Mtls Rick Rogers, GeoTek Inc. Tom Point, ITD HQ Mtls	Absent: Garth Newman
Meeting Minutes		Action Points
<p><i>The meeting was brought to order by Team Lead, Tom Points who conducted the meeting according to the printed agenda with only minor deviations. The minutes are shown in the order of the agenda, not necessarily in chronological order.</i></p> <p><i>Introductions were made and the sign in sheet was circulated.</i></p> <p><i>Tom presented the ground rules and asked if anyone wanted to add anything else. Nothing further was suggested and the rules were accepted by majority vote.</i></p> <p><i>Tom explained the term limit for the team members would be two years, especially for the ITD members. Jeff Miles explained the non-ITD members would have the choice of remaining on the team since there are few companies willing to allow participation in addition to employees' regular duties. The ITD members would be rotated through the districts.</i></p> <p><i>Jan Hargrave had everyone draw the month of their term expiration in 2008. These are listed on the team charter.</i></p> <p><i>The team reviewed the team charge. Tom proposed adding to the vision for the team to define each existing test method as a test method, procedure or specification. Everyone agreed. It was also suggested the word documents needed to be available for non-ITD members to review. Jeff said he would assign someone to setup a link on the ITD webpage.</i></p> <p><i>Jeff emphasized to the team that he supported replacing any existing Idaho test methods with AASHTO methods if applicable and he supported deleting any existing Idaho test methods if no one was using the method or if the method no longer applied.</i></p> <p><i>Tom presented a proposed review and voting method (see attached). After discussion, it was agreed as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Tom or Jeff will send out the email review requests but the sub team would evaluate the review comments and votes prior to presenting to the entire team.</i> ○ <i>Comments would be determined as clerical or convincing.</i> ○ <i>The sub team would ignore or include the review comments.</i> 		<p>Jeff: Provide link for non-ITD members to access Word documents of existing test methods.</p>

Idaho Test Method and Procedures Team

- Add to the list of reviewers one ITD subject matter expert and one non-ITD subject matter expert (if available), the ACEC (Mike Merhar), and the entire ITM team.

Jan explained the necessity of developing a timeline for submittal of revised test methods in order to meet the January 1st effective date as specified in the ITD Standard Specifications. The test methods are published on the ITD webpage the last working day of December. After review and discussion it was determined the revisions must be submitted to FHWA by the end of September. It was noted minor last minute items can be allowed but should be avoided if possible.

ITD Trainer, Donna Burns, presented Just in Time Training on team consensus and decision making. The team decided consensus is the major decision making tool and 85% is required. There may be times when the decision must be unanimous. It was determined Jeff Miles had veto power based on FHWA or ITD governing rules. It was also discussed that after consensus is made anyone may ask for gradient of agreement in order to determine if the decision is sustainable. The team decided if any gradient is less than 3 then there must be more discussion.

Tom began the discussion and training on the difference between a test method, specification and procedure using the ASTM Blue Book and AASHTO template. It was decided to use "IT" for test method designations and "IR" for procedure designations. Through the discussion it was determined ITD would probably not use the "M" specification designation because the ITD Standard Specifications are used. The team could submit a specification to the Specifications Committee as a Standard Special Provision.

The team developed a list of mandatory elements for the "IT" and "IR" designations, including elements that can be used when applicable. See attached list.

Jan showed the team how Word can automatically generate numbered paragraphs for the documents and how Word is used to track changes in a document for review by the team. She emphasized it is not mandatory to review the existing test methods using these Word techniques, but is encouraged. The sub teams can also make changes by hand (red-line) method and ITD will provide someone to edit the Word documents.

The team began prioritizing the existing test methods by listing those most in need of revisions. Paul Steele then suggested the sub teams select a group of existing test methods by classification to evaluate for necessary revisions. The team agreed this method would allow a more efficient way to review all the existing test methods to develop the priority list.

The sub teams and their assignments are as follows:

- Aggregates: Jan Hargrave, Paul Steele
- Bituminous Materials: Tom Points, Scott Cron
- Concrete: Jamie McCurie, Garth Newman
- Paint, Miscellaneous: Jeff Drager, Ron Shippy
- Soils: Rick Rogers, Paul Ziman

Idaho Test Method and Procedures Team

<p><i>Each sub team is to review all the existing test methods in the selected classification as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Is the existing test method an "IT" test method or an "IR" procedure?</i> 2. <i>Does anyone use the test method? Should it be deleted?</i> 3. <i>Is there a comparable ASTM or AASHTO method?</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>What are the differences?</i> 4. <i>What is the problem or revisions needed?</i> 5. <i>What are the recommended revisions?</i> 6. <i>What is priority, high or low?</i> <p><i>There was considerable discussion about problems with ID T74, ID T8, and ID T125 so the team was asked to review these three test methods for formal discussion at the next meeting.</i></p> <p><i>The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, May 11th, 9am to 3:30pm.</i></p> <p><i>The meeting was adjourned.</i></p>	
<p>Meetings</p> <p><u>Team Meeting Dates.</u> The following meeting dates are scheduled:</p> <p>May 11, 2006 9:00 – 3:30pm ITD HQ Annex West Conference Room</p>	<p>Agenda for May 11</p> <p>Sub Teams Report Assignments Team will accept reports – prioritize – assign</p> <p>Review T74, T8, T125</p>