



# July 15, 2025

## Meeting – HMA Spec Subcommittee

---

**Location:** Teams Meeting / In-Person (Galena Room @ Truax Madison)  
**Date:** 07-15-2025  
**Time:** 10:00AM – 12:00PM

---

### Attendance

- Albert Kilger
- Brian Jandrin
- Dan Kopacz
- Casey Wierzchowski
- David Hose
- Jeremy Barron
- Neal Atanasoff
- Zach Lemke
- Jake Amundson
- Debbie Schwerman
- Jeff Anderson

### Agenda Items

1. Manual of Test Procedures 2026 Updates
  - i. Discussion
    - i. WTM R35 Note 11 – Recalculated Gmm from Gse Method
      - Albert K.: Added RAP drying step.
      - Deb S.: Gravities should be to 0.001 precision. Also “standard specification” should be “standard specifications”.
      - Albert K.: Note 11 requires recalculating Gmm with the average Gse. This practice may be outdated now. Is this something we want to keep doing?
        - Jeff A.: This goes back at least 30 years. This was primarily used with Marshall designs. Hasn't heard of anyone using this method as opposed to just running the Gmm tests. This is not taught in class anymore.
        - Deb S.: Does this mean that you have to run 2 Gmms for each of the trials to get an average Gmm?
          - Jeff A.: Yes.
          - David H.: We run a Gmm for every point, but occasionally you get an outlier so we could just delete that point and use the calculated value



based off of the Gse to replace that point. The intent was to normalize the Gmms.

- Zach L.: I also use the Gse to normalize the Gmm.
- Jake A.: We should keep it in.
- Jeff A.: In class we tell them to run a minimum of one, but it's always a good idea to run two as a check to verify especially as we're doing smaller batches. Two is recommended, and we do the same thing with the minimum number of points. We say a minimum of 3 points are needed, but a fourth is recommended, the same as with TSR. I don't see the individual results, just the final value, so whatever happens behind the scenes, so be it (normalization, etc.).

- Albert K.: Will give the committee 1 week to review and provide feedback on these updates.

ii. WTM R47 Section 8.2.3 – Splitting Samples for HMA vs. SMA

- Added language for whether or not fines should be reincorporated into the mixtures. Do not reincorporate for SMA.
  - Dan K.: We have seen pictures where there is a glob of the spatula that gets thrown into the box and then ends up in the Gmm or Gmb and doesn't really get remixed into the mixture.
  - Jeff A.: The thing with the putty knife was a person would go around and clean up everything at the end and take that last scrape down and put it in the box. It wasn't individual squares of the splitter, but a final one and they were scraping that into one box with the glob of oil and fines.
- Deb S.: In the paragraph ahead, it says to use a heated splitter for SMA.
  - Jeff A.: This came up when we were at Monarch in 2018 or 2019 and having problems. So, they came out with a ring and put it under the splitter and used a gas heater. After that, it was incorporated into the CMM. This has been around for many years.
  - Albert K. This change should have been marked in



- red.
- Deb S. We can keep this as a best practice, but it shouldn't be required. Torching and warping could be an issue.
    - Dan K. We can send pictures of an acceptable setup. It's essentially a large Bunsen burner that goes under the splitter before splitting.
  - David H.: Where it says, "not to exceed the maximum mixing temperature", may not be possible since the splitter is heated over an open flame that's not really controlled. The hotter the splitter gets, the less likely we are to have anything stick, so I recommend removing that part.
    - Dan K.: I think the concern is if the splitter gets too hot, it's going to heat up the mix, but that won't happen since the material is only flowing through it. It's not like its being mixed in a drum or anything.
    - Casey W.: We can look to see what the temperatures are getting up to before we take it out of the MOTP.
      - **Industry Action Item:** David H.: I will report back what temperatures we are seeing.
  - Jeremy B.: Are there any other recommendations for heating outside of the open flame? We are adding another safety hazard to the mix otherwise.
    - Albert K.: The standard doesn't specify how to heat the splitter. So, if you find it to be unsafe for your company, then find a different way. I don't think we want to specify how you heat the splitter.
    - Casey W.: Induction heaters.
    - Jake A.: We use heating lamps. To David's point, the means and methods we use to heat the splitters won't be very controlled, so I would agree on removing the temperature check language.
  - **Action Item:** The department will investigate further if checking the temperature of the splitter is important to

keep or not.

- Deb S.: Are we scraping the sampling device after sampling from the truck as well? Is this different between HMA and SMA?
  - Dan K.: I've always seen the claw scraped after the fact and not incorporated into the sample, but I don't see everything - so maybe some are.
- Deb S.: Section 10.3 talks about using a template. Should we leave this in and delete 10.4?
  - **Industry Action Item:** Deb S. will type up other errata/feedback and submit it to WisDOT for review.
  - Albert K.: Corrected in document during meeting. 10.3 should be 10.4.

iii. WTM R97

1. Section 1.1 – Contractor requirements should be moved to standard spec (next year).
  2. Section 8 – Reporting requirements should be moved to standard specs (next year).
- Albert K.: These will not be moved with ASP-6, will likely appear in a future AWP Spec revision.
  - Presented updated sample label requirements.

ii. Additional edits made after the original draft was sent to committee.

i. WTP H-001

1. Additional content moved from CMM 866.
  2. Corrections and minor editorial changes for clarity.
- Albert K.: For now, a lot of the language moved is redundant to CMM 866. Future updates to the CMM will remove the redundant content. The goal for the future CMM content should only be guidance. Contractual parts of this process will be in WTP H-001.
  - Albert K.: I am trying to get the 249 report made into a DT form, as currently the link can only be found in the CMM.
    - **Action Item:** Department will work to get 249 report made into a DT form to be published online with the rest of the forms.
  - Albert K.: What is meant by "Use of this submittal procedure, while authorized for Express Level, does not negate further use of Express Level submittals."? [In reference to Section 3, Express Submittals, last sentence of last paragraph]
    - Jeff A.: If you are allowed to submit Express Level



submittals, which are only paper reviews, someone may want to have their mix design done as a Comparison Level as a check for whatever reason. This does not mean you get taken off of the Express Level submittals though.

- Albert K.: Moved language from CMM regarding changing binder grades with existing designs into Mix Design Life section.
  - Jeff A.: Move to Amended JMF Reports section.
- Albert K.: Amended JMF Reports are now located in section 5.
- Albert K.: Non-Traditional or Non-Standard Mix Design Reports are now located in section 6.

ii. WTM T355

1. Additional revisions/clarifications to Gauge Comparison and Standardization sections.
  - Albert K.: For section 8.2, Standardization, clarifications were made for when to perform a standard, the type of material to perform the standard on, and what constitutes a “successful” standard.
  - Albert K.: For section 8.3, Nuclear Gauge Comparison:
    - Cleaned up the procedure into discrete steps.
    - Repeated that the technicians should take a standard on the representative section of pavement.
    - Clarified the averaging procedure as it pertains to the 10 values after an originally “failing” comparison. Whether or not they are the same locations or new locations, all 10 values should be averaged.
  - Albert K.: For section 8.4, Reference Site Monitoring, repeated that the technicians should take a standard on the project reference site. Also cleaned up the procedure into discrete steps.
  - Albert K.: These changes were also made to WTM T310 for soils, as applicable, after discussion with Brian J.

iii. WTP H-004, Annual BTS Nuclear Gauge Block Calibration.

- Albert K.: This procedure was previously a part of CMM 815. Moved here because it is a department process.

iii. Feedback (if any)

- Deb S.: Will there be any issues with meeting the thermometer M339 specification requirements present in the latest updates?



- Albert K.: AASHTO accredited labs, such as our central lab, already need to meet this requirement as part of their accreditation. As far as the other labs go, everyone will need to verify they conform. I also discussed it with Erik L. to make sure it wouldn't be a problem – he wanted to keep the requirement at the time.
  - **Action Item:** Discuss thermometer requirements (M339) at Tech Team.
- Deb S.: There were issues last year with footnote 2 [providing documentation that the number of dry cycles is sufficient] in WTM D8159, auto extractors. Industry puts their material in the oven after running the extraction to get constant mass because with the methylene chloride, the solvent is still in the aggregate. Oven drying should be part of the process to eliminate some of the issues we are having [comparing]. Should this be done with every mix design, and if so, does it need to be redone with every change to the design?
  - Dan K.: Once the number of cycles has been determined, we don't require checking for the constant mass after each test. It should be checked if the result is questionable. What is industry's ask?
    - Deb S.: The ask is that we get the most accurate representation for the asphalt content possible. Right now, the number of dry cycles is based on the sample size [NMAAS]. The current process seems to give an exception to proving you have achieved constant mass. Is this being monitored?
      - Dan K.: There should be no issue with asking the region for the documentation showing constant mass is being achieved for troubleshooting purposes.
      - Albert K.: As we clarify this, we need to address when the number of dry cycles should be verified. Is it by gradation (NMAAS), per mix design, or by sample size (weight). Then we also need to address how often this check should be performed (i.e.: per project).
      - Brian J.: We keep track if ignition oven samples by design, so maybe by that.
      - Dan K.: Possibly could base the number of cycles on the most conservative mix (the most wash/dry



cycles), then you would only have to verify once. If you want to create multiple cycles for different mixes, then you may need to check more often.

- Jeff A.: The process is currently generalized to size as to how it dries. Absorption will come into play in some respects if you're not matching up, and you will have to do more evaluation in those cases and bump up the number of drying cycles. For each design, you would have to have material up front like for ignition ovens with providing samples of known asphalt content. Also, if you are constantly using the oven to check for constant mass, you may get spikes in the emissions of the methylene chloride.
- Dan K.: Some issues were caused by newer staff in the labs and can be solved with training and getting used to their equipment.
- Brian J.: The number of dry cycles could be checked during the test strip on the first few samples.
- Deb S.: Is there anything we can add so that the regions can check if their sample is dry before shutting down a project?
  - Brian J.: In the past I would test the material, leave it in the container, calculate what I got, and then if it didn't pass throw the sample back in the oven and dry it.
  - Dan K.: Scott leaves his sample in front of the fan to dry as well.
  - Jeff A.: For methylene chloride they should first check if the max number of cycles is enough. Then if it is, you can further reduce the number of cycles. This may result in running less samples in a day. I wouldn't recommend doing it for each design, as there are only some mixes that should be checked like modified binders. Most mixes don't need to have individual numbers of drying cycles, etc. without spending a lot of extra time establishing those numbers.
    - **Action Item:** Department will revise footnotes



to require testing at the maximum number of dry cycles allowed by the machine first and checking that it is sufficient before reducing the number of cycles.

- Neal A.: With the adoption of T209-23, we are accepting the wider vacuum window by  $30 \pm 5$  mm of mercury instead of our current  $27.5 \pm 2.5$ ?
  - Albert K.: Yes, I assumed if it was good enough for AASHTO, it's good enough for us since we don't have any justification to change it from AASHTO's requirements.
    - **Action Item:** Department will notify HTCP of the change to the vacuum pressures for the procedure.
  - David H.: When will this go into effect?
    - Albert K.: With November 2025 Lets – 2026 construction. This is NOT retroactive for current projects.
      - **Action Item:** Discuss updates to vacuum pressures at Tech Team.
- **Industry Action Item:** Draft MOTP update will get 1 week review for feedback.