

TRANSPORTATION POOLED FUND PROGRAM QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

Lead Agency (FHWA or State DOT): _____

INSTRUCTIONS:

Project Managers and/or research project investigators should complete a quarterly progress report for each calendar quarter during which the projects are active. Please provide a project schedule status of the research activities tied to each task that is defined in the proposal; a percentage completion of each task; a concise discussion (2 or 3 sentences) of the current status, including accomplishments and problems encountered, if any. List all tasks, even if no work was done during this period.

Transportation Pooled Fund Program Project # <i>(i.e., SPR-2(XXX), SPR-3(XXX) or TPF-5(XXX))</i>		Transportation Pooled Fund Program - Report Period: <input type="checkbox"/> Quarter 1 (January 1 – March 31) <input type="checkbox"/> Quarter 2 (April 1 – June 30) <input type="checkbox"/> Quarter 3 (July 1 – September 30) <input type="checkbox"/> Quarter 4 (October 1 – December 31)	
Project Title:			
Name of Project Manager(s):	Phone Number:	E-Mail	
Lead Agency Project ID:	Other Project ID (i.e., contract #):	Project Start Date:	
Original Project End Date:	Current Project End Date:	Number of Extensions:	

Project schedule status:

- On schedule
 On revised schedule
 Ahead of schedule
 Behind schedule

Overall Project Statistics:

Total Project Budget	Total Cost to Date for Project	Percentage of Work Completed to Date

Quarterly Project Statistics:

Total Project Expenses and Percentage This Quarter	Total Amount of Funds Expended This Quarter	Total Percentage of Time Used to Date

Project Description:

Progress this Quarter (includes meetings, work plan status, contract status, significant progress, etc.):

Anticipated work next quarter:

Significant Results:

Circumstance affecting project or budget. (Please describe any challenges encountered or anticipated that might affect the completion of the project within the time, scope and fiscal constraints set forth in the agreement, along with recommended solutions to those problems).

Potential Implementation:

Table 1: Summary of Current PG Plus requirements by Partner State DOTs

Property		Test Method	Colorado	Idaho	Kansas	Ohio	Wisconsin
Original							
Phase angle	@ Grade Temp.	T315	-	-	-	X (76-80 max)	X (73-79 max)
Specific Gravity	15.6°C	D70	-	-	-	-	X (Report)
Ductility, cm	4°C	D113 T51	X (50 min)	-	-	X (28 min)	-
Toughness and Tenacity	25°C	D5801	X	-	-	X	-
Separation of Polymer, °F		D5976	-	-	X ¹ (2 max)	X ² (10 max)	-
Solubility, %		D5546	-	-	-	X (99 min)	-
Homogeneity (Screen Test)			-	-	-	X	-
Acid or Base Modification		CP-L	X (Pass)	-	-	-	-
RTFO Residue							
Elastic Recovery, %	25°C	T301	X (50 min)	X (50 min)	X (45 min)	X (65 min)	X (60 min)
Ductility	4°C	T51	X (20 min)	-	-	-	-
MSCR		TP70	-	-	-	-	-

1. @ 163°C, 48 hours

2. @ 171°C, 48 hours

Table 2: Summary of Responses Received from Questionnaire

Test Types	State	Reasons for Selection	Comments
Elastic Recovery	Ohio	Durability, More Polymer is better	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use it for 20 years • Would like to replace with MSCR • Do not want to stay with current procedure
	Colorado	Presence of Polymer, Distinguished between modified and unmodified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test too long • Prefer a better test • Would like to stay at 50%
	Kansas	Ensure Polymer modification rather than PPA & GTR, Good experience with PMB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider DSR only if it is repeatable/reproducible and give the same polymer loading as ER
Phase Angle	Wisconsin	Polymer Loading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving to MSCR in 2016
	Ohio	Polymer Loading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willing to consider MSCR but would like to see the test run on original rather than RTFO • Use it in combination with ER
Ductility	Ohio	Specifically to allow using SBR which fails the ER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSR or MSCR will be preferred • Minimum 3.5% SBR
	Colorado	Done at 4C to control thermal cracking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would consider a new method if performance related
Toughness and Tenacity	Ohio	Same as ductility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Ductility
	Colorado	Presence of Polymer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willing to change it to a new test method
Separation of Polymer	Kansas	Avoiding using GTR and have the polymer stable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment
	Ohio	Prevent cheap formulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be DSR based but softening point is easy
Acid or Base Modification	Colorado	Avoiding PPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment
Solubility	Ohio	Avoiding clay and Refined Motor Oils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FTIR and XRF are too expensive
Homogeneity	Ohio	Avoiding non blended polymers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FL microscope is pretty simple