

Materials TAG - Meeting Minutes

Date: Monday, October 08, 2007

Time: 8:02 am to 10:58 am Central Standard Time

Location: Jefferson A & B Room in St. Louis, Missouri

1. Attendees	2
2. Topics	3
2.1 Intro	3
2.1.1 Role Call.....	3
2.2 Mission Statement, Short Term Goals, Long Term Goals	4
2.2.1 Mission Statement	4
2.2.2 Short Range Goals	4
2.2.3 Long Range Goals	4
2.3 2006 Materials TAG Meeting Minutes	5
2.4 Materials TAG Assistant Coordinator.....	5
2.5 Primary Discussion of TMR's	5
2.5.1 Sponsor Agency Recommended Deletions	6
2.5.2 NY SM-Construction Enhancements.....	6
2.5.3 Recommend transfer to SM-Construction.....	6
2.5.4 NY SM-C Enhancements	6
2.5.5 Scheduled for SM 3.9.....	6
2.5.6 Covered in SM 3.8.....	7
2.5.7 Stays on Ballot – M TAG Primary Discussion	7
2.6 Presentation from Louisiana DOT on new mix design enhancements for SM 3.8a	12
2.7 Announcements	14
2.8 Discuss plans for LIMS Enhancement contract (time permitting on Monday) see below ...	14
2.9 Secondary discussion of older TMR's from 1997 & 1998 (time permitting).....	14
2.9.1 Stays on Ballot for now – No input from MTAG – Secondary Discussion	15
2.10 Other Topics	15
3. Review Action Items.....	15

1. Attendees

	Name	Agency	Email Address
1	Alton Treadway	ALDOT	treadway@dot.state.al.us
2	Debbie Hornsby	ALDOT	hornsbyd@dot.state.al.us
3	Susan Powe	ALDOT	powesm@dot.state.al.us
4	David Henning	Arkansas SHTD	David.Henning@arkansashighways.com
5	Kevin Thornton	Arkansas SHTD	Kevin.Thornton@arkansashighway.com
6	Janie Valdez	Colorado DOT	Janie.Valdez@dot.state.co.us
7	James M. Hill	Georgia DOT	James.Hill@dot.state.ga.us
8	Sheri Meyerhoff	InDOT	smeyerhoff@indot.in.gov
9	Steve Fisher	InDOT	SFisher@indot.in.gov
10	Brad Parks	Info Tech, Inc.	Brad.Parks@infotechfl.com
11	Diane Menz	Info Tech, Inc.	Diane.Menz@infotechfl.com
12	Gina Merseal	Info Tech, Inc.	Gina.Merseal@infotechfl.com
13	James Peterson	Info Tech, Inc.	JPeterson@infotechfl.com
14	John Oberdiek	Info Tech, Inc.	johno@infotechfl.com
15	Margaret Andraka	Info Tech, Inc.	Margaret.Andraka@infotechfl.com
16	Monelle McKay	Info Tech, Inc.	Monelle.McKay@infotechfl.com
17	Rick Yunker	Info Tech, Inc.	Rick.Yunker@infotechfl.com
18	Russ Barron	Info Tech, Inc.	Russ.Barron@infotechfl.com
19	Ward Zerbe	Info Tech, Inc.	wzerbe@infotechfl.com
20	Bob Lewis	KYTC	Bob.Lewis@ky.gov
21	Mark Higdon	KYTC	Mark.Higdon@ky.gov
22	Sarah Collins	Louisiana DOT	sarahcollins@dotd.la.gov
23	Laura Chapman	Louisiana DOT	LauraChapman@dotd.la.gov
24	Beth Roberts	Louisiana DOT	BethRoberts@dotd.la.gov
25	Celina Sumrall	Mississippi DOT	csumrall@mdot.state.ms.us
26	Don Grayson	Mississippi DOT	dgrayson@mdot.state.ms.us
27	James Williams	Mississippi DOT	jwilliams@mdot.state.ms.us
28	Jennifer Kiihul	Mississippi DOT	jkiihul@mdot.state.ms.us
29	Pam Schmidt	Mississippi DOT	pschmidt@mdot.state.ms.us
30	Marty Foster	Michigan DOT	Fosterm@michigan.gov
31	Gus Wagner	MN/DOT	Gus.Wagner@dot.state.mn.us
32	Brian Bugar	MoDOT	Brian.Bugar@modot.mo.gov
33	Carla Howard	MoDOT	Carla.Howard@modot.mo.gov
34	Denis Glascock	MoDOT	Denis.Glascock@modot.mo.gov
35	Larry Brooks	MoDOT	Larry.Brooks@modot.mo.gov
36	Mike Meyerhoff	MoDOT	Michael.Meyerhoff@modot.mo.gov
37	Patrick Byron	MoDOT	Patrick.Byron@modot.mo.gov
38	George Cornelius	Montana DOT	gcornelius@mt.gov
39	Joni Wissinger	Montana DOT	jwissinger@mt.gov
40	Kathy James	Montana DOT	kjames@mt.gov

	Name	Agency	Email Address
41	Lisa Durbin	Montana DOT	ldurbin@mt.gov
42	Brad Finch	NDOR	bradfinch@dor.state.ne.us
43	Lee Burbach	NDOR	LBurbach@dor.state.ne.us
44	Rhonda DeButts	NDOR	rdebutts@dor.state.ne.us
45	Melanie Douglass	New Brunswick DOT	Melanie.douglass@gnb.ca
46	Chuck B. Slocter	NMDOT	Chuck.slocter@state.nm.us
47	Robert C. McCoy	NMDOT	Robert.Mccoy@state.nm.us
48	Daryl Bushika	NYS DOT	dbushika@dot.state.ny.us
49	Dave Turco	NYS DOT	dturco@dot.state.ny.us
50	David Bernard	NYS DOT	dbernard@dot.state.ny.us
51	Jim Hanley	NYS DOT	JHanley@dot.state.ny.us
52	Pete Melas	NYS DOT	pmelas@dot.state.ny.us
53	Stephen Zargham	NYS DOT	szargham@dot.state.ny.us
54	Tom Behan	NYS DOT	tbehan@dot.state.ny.us
55	David Conaway	OkDOT	dconaway@odot.org
56	Scott Seiter	OkDOT	sseiter@odot.org
57	John Thomas	OkDOT	jthomas@odot.org
58	Cindy VonNyvenheim	SCDOT	vonnyvencc@scdot.org
59	Brandon Crowley	Tennessee DOT	Brandon.Crowley@state.tn.us
60	Duane Thompson	Tennessee DOT	Duane.Thompson@state.tn.us
61	John Nanni	Tennessee DOT	John.nanni@state.tn.us
62	David Debo	TxDOT	ddebo@dot.state.tx.us
63	Stewart DeWitt	TxDOT	ddewitt@dodt.state.tx.us
64	Tom De La Portilla	TxDOT	tdelaport@dot.state.tx.us
65	Brigitte Codling	VAOT	Brigitte.codling@state.vt.us

2. Topics

2.1 Intro

8:02 am

- Dave called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda.
- We're going to have an election. The current Assistant Coordinator is stepping down. Think about nominations for the next fifteen minutes.
- Have a request from Louisiana to do a presentation this morning. They want to go over some of the enhancements in the Mix Design area and the functionality incorporated in SiteManager version 3.8.

2.1.1 Role Call

8:05 am

- Charlie Brown, Alabama (NO)
- Susan Powe (YES)
- John Giannini, Connecticut (NO)
- Allen Hughes, Florida (NO)
- Terry Callahan, Georgia (YES)
- Steve Fisher, Indiana (YES)
- Mark Higdon, Kentucky (YES)

- Beth Roberts, Louisiana (YES)
- Marty Foster, Michigan (YES)
- James A. Williams, III, Mississippi (YES)
- Denis Glascock, Missouri (YES)
- George Cornelius, Montana (YES)
- Rhonda DeButts, Nebraska (YES)
- Melanie Douglass, New Brunswick (YES)
- Michael Schillaci, New Jersey (NO)
- David Bernard, NY (YES)
- David Conaway, OK (YES)
- Cynthia VonNyvenheim, SC (YES)
- Richard Weber, TN (NO)
- Stewart DeWitt, TX (YES)
- Bob Atchinson, Vermont (NO)
- Bridget Codling, PROXY Vermont (YES)
- Joe Bouchey, Virginia (NO)
- Mitchell Archer, Arkansas (NO)
- David Henning, Arkansas PROXY (YES)

2.2 Mission Statement, Short Term Goals, Long Term Goals

8:07

- Briefly review existing Mission Statement, ST/LT goals of the MTAG and approve them as a group
- The Mission Statement, Short Range Goals, and Long Range Goals were displayed for review.

2.2.1 Mission Statement

- Current: Provide guidance, coordination, and oversight for the development, implementation, and maintenance of a modern comprehensive materials information management system within the framework of a total transportation information system
- Discussion: No comments.
- Vote: Missouri made a motion to leave the mission statement as is. Louisiana seconded. All were favor.
- Final Decision: The mission statement will remain the same.

2.2.2 Short Range Goals

- Current
 1. Prioritize known issues for correction and/or enhancement
 2. Continue to identify areas of concern
 3. Define strategies and guidelines to implement an integrated laboratory information management system (LIMS) for SiteManager
- Discussion: No discussion was contributed.
- Vote: Arkansas made a motion to accept. Indiana seconded. All were in favor.
- Final Decision: The short range goals will remain the same.

2.2.3 Long Range Goals

- Current
 1. Provide oversight for the development of additional Materials Management and Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) functionality in SiteManager
 2. Review current and changing regulations and methods to insure that the AASHTO Trns•port products support the function necessary to comply with all regulations and evolving methods

3. Monitor the maintenance of the Materials management functions and pursue the resolution of problems identified by SiteManager users
4. Implement an integrated Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) in SiteManager
5. Facilitate the implementation of the Materials Management and Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) functionality in NGT
 - Discussion: There is a reference to NGT that needs to be changed to web Trns•port.
 - Vote: With the NGT to web Trns•port change made, Louisiana made a motion to accept. Arkansas seconded. All were in favor.
 - Final Decision: The long range goals will remain the same with the exception of the reference to NGT. It will be changed to web Trns•port.
1. Provide oversight for the development of additional Materials Management and Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) functionality in SiteManager
2. Review current and changing regulations and methods to insure that the AASHTO Trns•port products support the function necessary to comply with all regulations and evolving methods
3. Monitor the maintenance of the Materials management functions and pursue the resolution of problems identified by SiteManager users
4. Implement an integrated Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) in SiteManager
5. Facilitate the implementation of the Materials Management and Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) functionality in web Trns•port.

2.3 2006 Materials TAG Meeting Minutes

8:09 am

- Offer the MTAG a chance to provide comments on last year's minutes, then approve them as a group
- The Materials TAG needs to modify or accept last years Materials TAG meeting minutes.
- Discussion: The minutes were sent ahead to the TAG Representatives. Did not display the minutes with the video projector (there were several pages).
 - No modifications
- Vote: Montana made a motion to accept the minutes as they are. New Brunswick seconded. All were in favor.
- Final Decision: The meeting minutes from last year's Materials TAG will remain the same and have been accepted by the Materials TAG.

2.4 Materials TAG Assistant Coordinator

8:11 am

- Scott Seiter is stepping down as the Materials TAG Assistant Coordinator. Dave requested nominations to be made for the Materials TAG Assistant Coordinator position.
- Scott Seiter nominated a gentleman from Kentucky; Mark Higdon.
- Vote: A motion for Mark Higdon to be the new Materials TAG Assistant Coordinator was made by Louisiana. Indiana seconded. All were in favor.
- Final Decision: Mark Higdon will be the new Materials TAG Assistant Coordinator.

2.5 Primary Discussion of TMR's

- Primary discussion of TMR's (see attachment #1 Accounting)
- Wanted the Materials TAG to reconsider TMRs. If a TMR gets no votes for two years, then they are kind of in purgatory. Dave sent the TMRs around to the TAG members to see if any were obsolete prior to this meeting. Dave displayed a table broken down into categories. The Materials TAG reviewed each set of TMRs.

2.5.1 Sponsor Agency Recommended Deletions

8:13 am

- These TMRs are from 1997 or 1998
- Agencies who submitted the following TMRs recommended deleting them from the ballot.
- If an agency withdraws, then they are withdrawn.
- All TMR numbers below are withdrawn.
- **AI** – Info Tech, Inc. will close the following TMRs.

2161	2171	2188	2654
2162	2173	2197	2655
2163	2174	2203	3673
2164	2175	2205	3674
2165	2182	2206	3865
2166	2183	2207	3988
2167	2185	2208	9052
2169	2186	2279	
2170	2187	2321	

2.5.2 NY SM-Construction Enhancements

8:16 am

- Construction folks in NY adopted this TMR. They have an enhancement TMR and this got rolled up in it. This TMR will be released in SiteManager version 3.9.
 - 9066

2.5.3 Recommend transfer to SM-Construction

8:17 am

- From last year's meeting minutes, it was recommended to move this TMR to SiteManager Construction. Does it make since to everybody? There were heads nodding yes.
- Does anyone want it to remain in the Materials ballot?
- No motion was needed. **AI** – Move the following to SiteManager-Construction.
 - 9080 (from 06 M TAG Minutes)

2.5.4 NY SM-C Enhancements

8:19 am

- This TMR was adopted by NY and NJ, and will be released in SiteManager version 3.9.
 - 9787

2.5.5 Scheduled for SM 3.9

8:20 am

- Bundling these TMRs into the LIMS enhancement. The plan is to release all of these TMRs in SiteManager version 3.9.
 - 7197
 - Texas submitted this TMR a few years ago. This TMR is for assigning testers to labs. New York adopted this one and rolled it up in LIMS development.
 - 8995
 - 8996
 - 8997
 - 9001
 - 8941

2.5.6 Covered in SM 3.8

8:21 am

- New York paid for this TMR and it was delivered in SiteManager version 3.8.
 - 9486

2.5.7 Stays on Ballot – M TAG Primary Discussion

8:22 am

- 2172 ITI Proposed
 - Description: Sorting of sieve data makes rows display incorrectly
 - Discussion
 - **OK**: It is in the built in the T27 and is still a problem.
 - Decision: Will keep this one on the ballot.
- 2699 MODOT Proposed
 - Description: Users want app mat tracked by lot & quantity.
 - Discussion
 - **MO**: Attributed to MoDOT. People thought it to be appropriate to have relationship of represented material and you shouldn't be able to report more than what was Let it float where it floats.
 - **TX**: Thought LA paid for this last year.
 - **ITI**: Michigan funded pre tested stock. Stockpile reduces until it is depleted. Some of this is in web Trns•port.
 - Decision: Agree to keep this one around.
- 3420 Many Agencies
 - Description: Add user code tables to allow select of mix material
 - Discussion
 - **LA**: Discussion on fine aggregate.
 - **MO**
 - One per tag rep
 - **MS** Using it. Functionality is limited.
 - **OK**: Stabilization of an area.
 - **NY** May but haven't gotten there yet.
 - **KY**: Is this where you work with the cement?
 - **IN**: How many people would use it if functionality is improved?
 - OK
 - Still valid proposal.
 - Decision: Keep on ballot.
- 6573 GDOT
 - Description: Apply DWR template functions to material test templates
 - Discussion: Mainly have multi-line.
 - **AL** - Susan: Unless you fund enhancements, these things aren't going to get done. Look at it with web Trns•port in a different way with TRT looking at it like that.
 - **IN** - Sheri: More generic for technical functionality, or keep it more specific like header and multi line. DWR Templates have initial default values for fields and have a few other technical things that you cannot do on the materials side. Seems like you want full functionality. Should it be rewritten a bit to encompass all functionality? Purpose of speaking to that is because a number of people are looking at these.
 - **NY** - Dave: Go back to reporting agency to get details? Should this be rewritten to make the materials test templates more like DWR Templates?
 - **MO** - Denis: An agency or this committee can create a new TMR and reference this one with new details. Would agree that when going into web Trns•port, would take it a step further. It will have other templates strung through there in addition to materials and DWRs. One location for

all templates. As far as the preconstruction and decision support processes, don't know what kind of templates they have in those areas. Trying to get to web Trns•port that is very open. In order to keep it on radar, it would be appropriate to create a TMR from this committee, have someone write it.

- **MN** - Gus: After listening to you and you take (date picker for instance) get pass it if it is in materials. Build this, just like Denis said, have them build a standard text object so it will save you money in the long run, if you need text added here it could be construction or materials, and see if they have already done this in preconstruction. If they have an object, instead of looking at old SiteManager, look at preconstruction that looks like this.
 - **NY** - Dave: Right, don't *think* CO or MA; it's function.
 - **MO** - Denis: Keep it in this environment because recognize that there will be MA and CO using client/server for years to come, but also add a comment for web Trns•port .
 - **IN** - Sheri: Don't want to lose this one.
 - **MO** - Denis: yes, don't want to lose this one.
 - **ITI** - Brad: Will this be affected by LIMS implementation?
 - **ITI** - Diane: LIMS is using current functionality. No impact to it. Big question is how impacts LIMS.
 - **ITI** - Rick: If writing TMR write functions you want not just match DWR Template functionality, so that when materials TRT writes requirements up, you know what functions you want. There will be a lot more opportunities to improve with web Trns•port. Identify what you like.
 - **AI** – Indiana (Steve Fisher) will write a TMR that has a web spin and is detailed in the technical of what we like about DWR Templates and would like to see in web Trns•port.
 - [Decision](#): Recommend writing a TMR that has a web spin and is detailed in the technical what we like about DWR Templates and would like to see in web Trns•port.
- 6987 Oklahoma Proposed
 - [Description](#): Inactivated Specs. And Gradations continue to list.
 - [Discussion](#):
 - **OK** – David: It's for those who would be using the built in T27. When you set up a gradation, and inactivate the materials code, it continues to let you select it as an option, and you shouldn't be able to select it.
 - **NY** – Dave: Stay on the ballot for this year. No disagreements.
 - [Decision](#): Keep on ballot.
- 7193 CTDOT Proposed
 - [Description](#): Cannot 'RE'-generate Contract Sampling & Testing Requirements
 - [Discussion](#):
 - **MO** – Denis: During the life of a contract you may change standards for a particular material. When change order is added, it automatically regenerates those rows. There are several permeations of that. Nebraska has made some things useful for them. Missouri works back door to handle these things. Think it is essential for long term functionality of system. Needs to be thought through. Bottom line is that it needs to stay in the list.
 - **NY** - Dave: Last year when we discussed this there was discussion about Nebraska having written some code and to contact Lee to deal with this. There was an offer that if anyone wanted this they would be willing to give it. Offer is still available to this.
 - **NE** - Lee: Separate application full blown PB app to SiteManager.

- **NE** - Rhonda: Staged implementation by material category, so this application generates for the needed area. It's really helpful to. If you forgot a material on a line item, you can have it added.
 - Decision: Keep on ballot.
- 8081 MSDOT
 - Description: Modify the window to allow to display all materials associate with an item.
 - Discussion:
 - **MS** - James: Decided early on that we would associate all possible materials to each pay item. So when you go in to delete materials from a particular item on a contract, you have to delete materials on an item one at a time and it brings you back to the beginning with each deletion.
 - **NE** – Rhonda: Doubly agrees. It is so time consuming. Definite good one.
 - **IN** – Steve: Could you also include it on the regular sampling and testing requirements window?
 - **NY** – Dave: All agree. Would Mississippi agree to draft a similar TMR that would include global to line item level?
 - **MS** - James: To the template level?
 - **IN** – Sheri: *Thinking* the way SM has multiple windows, item, material, and then tests. Yes, that would be good.
 - **NE** – Rhonda: Thinking that if it increases the cost, then write up a second TMR to ensure at least this part gets done, because it would save so much time. Would hate to not see it go through.
 - **NY** - Dave: Will have two separate TMRs.
 - **AI** – Mississippi (James) will write a new TMR to encompass this one (8081) and the global sampling and testing requirements down to the test method level.
 - **NY** - Daryl: Think it would be good.
 - Decision: Keep this one. An additional TMR will also be created.
- 8530 OKDOT Proposed
 - Description: Generic Fields in Sample Information
 - Discussion
 - **NY** – Dave: Think this is being addressed in web Trns•port. Don't want to take off ballot.
 - Decision: Keep on ballot.
- 9572 OKDOT Proposed
 - Description: Change to Sample Information – Completion Date field parameters
 - Discussion:
 - **OK** – Scott: We talked about this quite a bit in last years meeting. Add completion date then authorize. For an unqualified tester who couldn't get into the template, but could go ahead and get it complete to satisfy S&T Requirements.
 - **NY** – Daryl: LIMS takes care of filling this in for you. You would have to have access to the template to fill in and LIMS fills in completion date. Will work on everything but custom templates, and if you don't implement LIMS.
 - **MS** - James: for those agencies that do not fully implement, there would still be an issue.
 - **IN** - Sheri: If the contractor submits a sample, and they didn't get the test done, then there wouldn't be any data, but you would want to count the sample taken toward S&T requirements. Have a concern that there would be something in there because it's an exception.
 - **MO** - Denis: If understanding Oklahoma, want person who has access to be able to fill date in. Were thinking something had to be in the

- templates before adding completion date. There are lots of ways to do it though.
- **NE** - Rhonda: LIMS should work fine for lab samples, but 80% are field samples. Sometimes some of our samples, the inspector or whoever will forget to put data in the template. Besides having authorized personnel and have info on template before date is entered, a default button or something. That's the main problem, sometimes people forget to put data on template.
 - **NY** - Dave: LIMS system that New York is poised to put into 3.9 with funding partners is built and used by central office lab, but also for field folk to. It's built in New York to handle all testing, not just the central office laboratory.
 - **NE** - Rhonda: Was just saying that if you don't use all of LIMS, then you need something.
 - Decision: Keep on ballot.
 - 9599 MTDOT Proposed
 - Description: Cannot delete contracts from contract mixes.
 - Discussion:
 - Everyone agrees.
 - Decision: Keep on ballot.
 - 9653 NYSDOT
 - Description: Add attachments to the HVEEM, Marshall, and Aggregate Mix Design windows
 - Discussion:
 - Getting more attachments. Leave on ballot.
 - Is this specifically being addressed?
 - **NY** - Dave: Thought it was in web Trns•port last night?
 - **ITI** - Rick: It hasn't been addressed yet. There is a backlog item to include it. It will be in web Trns•port.
 - **OK** - Scott: How many people are still using HVEEM and Marshall?
 - A few are using it.
 - Decision: Keep on ballot.
 - 9713 NYSDOT Proposed
 - Description: Modify the Mix Design Materials Tab to Filter Brand Name
 - Discussion:
 - **NY** – Daryl: The material code and P/S have search lenses, and the Brand Name doesn't. You can actually type in the Brand Name. Should validate against
 - **OK** – Scott: You can use an unapproved product in a mix design. Add 3/8 inch chips and don't.
 - **MS** - James: Agrees with Scott. Have only very few items.
 - **OK** - Scott: Want to have both ways.
 - **MS** – Celina: If you have it forced then we wouldn't be able to
 - **ITI** - Rick: You could force the Brand name here and capture other information in generic fields which you didn't have previously. These are enhancements LA did in SM version 3.8.
 - **AI** – NY will modify TMR 9713 based on discussion heard today.
 - Decision: Keep on ballot. NY will modify TMR 9713 based on discussion heard today.
 - 9786 NYSDOT
 - Description: Facilitate creation of sample records by using DWR data from the DWR window.
 - Discussion:
 - **ITI** - Diane: Described the TMR. Have a way to go in to a DWR and as someone would be collecting and populating the DWR information, a sample record would be created and data would be auto populated from

- the DWR record. It will give me a tie back to it so that I have a link back to these records now.
 - **ITI** - Russ: This is one that is going in jointly funded by NY and NJ in SiteManager Version 3.9.
 - **NDOR** - Rhonda: Question - Pulling quantity over from DWR to sample, will you be able to change the quantity?
 - **ITI** - Diane: Yes, get starting information and then modify sample data.
 - **NDOR** - Rhonda: Sample could represent period of time.
 - **ITI** - Diane: Recommend going back and reading through this TMR because there is a lot of information.
 - **Decision:** Take off ballot.
 - 9849 OKDOT
 - **Description:** Remove delete options from Contract Sampling and Testing Requirements tabs.
 - **Discussion:**
 - **OK** – John: Had a customization for this.
 - **OK** - Dave: Tracking who was making changes but when they deleted it, lost track.
 - **ITI** - Brad: Reword because agencies have multiple materials and then delete ones that don't apply.
 - **ITI** - Diane: Agrees with Brad. Delete what you aren't going to use. Maybe something to inactivate it? Group security setting? Column level or something like that.
 - Zeroing it out, comments, and report.
 - **MS** - James: Handle it with security.
 - **MO** - Larry: Captures last modified and last date, if you captured audit all the way through then you would know who touched it.
 - **MO** - Denis: If TMR floats to the top then amend. If you take delete away then....
 - **OK** – Joel: Have PBL customization to do this.
 - **NY** - Daryl: If you run Citrix like New York then you don't need the PBL customization, it's all on the server.
 - **NY** – Dave: Keep like is, but accommodate Oklahoma with a switch or something?
 - **MO** - Denis: Maybe we could ask Oklahoma to modify it so both worlds exist.
 - **AI** – OK (Scott or Dave) will modify this TMR 9849 to capture both functionalities.
 - **NE** – Rhonda: Do not delete requirement, zero it out. Then add number in frequency box. Found it more beneficial so that it remains there. Also if you implement 8081 which shows all S&T R on one screen, it would help you do that. Then it stays consistent.
 - **Decision:** Keep on ballot. OK (Scott or Dave) will modify this TMR to capture both functionalities.
 - 8080 MSDOT Proposed
 - **Description:** Request to add a print button to the Sample Information Test Template window.
 - **Discussion:**
 - **ITI** - Diane: For LIMS you will have this functionality. For generic, you want it.
 - **IN** – Steve: If you are somewhat savvy you can add print button on template itself.
 - **MS** - James: This came about because the built in lab report lacks a lot in format and functionality. Initial thought was that we needed something to print this template for lab report.

- **NDOR** - Rhonda: Want Sample ID, Lab data, and in case you need a report for federal guidelines, but this report is pretty close to what is required for an official report.
- **NY** - Daryl: Why wouldn't you just run a report?
- **NDOR** - Rhonda: We build reports to capture all information. Want all template data captured. Want to pull in contract information. NDOR has RTF reports. If you can select a button to create a button, then it would be great.
- **MS** - James: Wanted the ability for the technicians in the lab to print out a blank template for a worksheet. The biggest part is the lab report and is an issue that needs to be carried forward.
- **NY** - Dave: What does Dave need to do because the formatting of the Lab Report is so poor no one wants to use it?
- **MO** - Denis: If web Transport, most parties have third party tool for reports. There will be some reports, and all have to agree, that universally it is correct. There is certain information that we recognize that there is a report and template information. Header info would vary from agency to agency. Record that generally states what we desire. Wouldn't hurt to create a TMR that generally states universally what we want.
- **AI** – MO (Denis) will create a TMR in reference to TMR 8080 that generally states universally what we (Materials TAG) want.
- OK: Lab report general starting point.
- Decision: Keep on ballot. An additional TMR will also be added. The new one will reference 8080.
- 9218 NYSDOT
 - Description: Geographic Area Name does not display in Sampler picklist on Sample Information sc.
 - Discussion:
 - **NY** – Dave: On sampler field, you get code instead of description displayed in the search window. Kind of a low priority; it's an annoying thing.
 - Decision: Keep on ballot.
 - Added: **AI** – NY (Dave) will draft a new TMR in reference to TMR 9218 that generically across the system should not display just the code ID.

~Break 9:40 am to 9:55 am~

9:58 am

Dave discussed plans for this evening at Dave and Busters.

2.6 Presentation from Louisiana DOT on new mix design enhancements for SM 3.8a

10:02 am

- Beth Roberts presented Materials Implementation Project Manager
- Lora Chapman is on Beth's staff and working almost 75% of time on implementation, Micah Oliviet working on implementation, and Allen Rush from construction who is becoming DWR guru is also working on implementation.
- During the presentation LA went over the following
 - TMR 9513
 - TMR 9512
 - TMR 9690
 - Materials template window changes
 - Materials Template functions
 - DWR Template window
 - Reports

- Rick Yunker presented the presentation.
- Discussion:
 - **MO** - Denis: Enhancements introduced into templates facility are outside of customizations in the SiteManager system. LA customizations that they are willing to share.
 - **NY** - Daryl: Did almost same thing going from template to template. Functions are built in LIMS 1.5 and will be released with SM version 3.9 in June 08.
 - **IN** – Sheri: Represented Quantity, does that make the Represented Quantity field required on the Contract tab?
 - **ITI** - Rick: No they are two separate functionalities. Contract without Basic, or Basic without Contract. Have to turn both on to require in both places.
 - **MS** - James: Are you also able to turn off functionality requiring basic?
 - **ITI** - Rick: Yes
 - **MS** - James: What about the amount? Are you able to turn that off where the required contract quantity and the sample quantity, can you turn off the 'cannot exceed' also?
 - **ITI** - Rick: If you turn off the Basic Sample quantity flag, the quantity on the contract tab cannot exceed that quantity.
 - **ITI** - Rick: You can turn both off and it functions like it is today, and neither fields would be required.
 - **LA** - Beth: Want to control pre-approved materials.
 - Units of measure have to be the same on Basic and contract tab.
 - **MS** - James: On basic, that is the represented for sample, on contract it is the whole tally. Contract would always be larger. Do not want to require basic quantity.
 - **IN** - Sheri: Link go button in lieu of attachments?
 - **ITI** - Rick: Not doing attachments within SM database. Using content manager.
 - Are you storing link in SM?
 - **ITI** - Rick: Being stored in template field.
 - **IN** - Sheri: Can Go button take you to exact location or navigate?
 - **ITI** - Rick: It may be at a higher level.
 - **ITI** - JR: The location information is included in the template.
 - **MN** - Gus: Create code table where you select different areas.
 - **ITI** - Rick: Theoretically you could create several and navigation link for Go button. Introduce code table and put function to represent code table; with selectable values with customization.
 - Represented Quantity and Mix Design stuff was introduced into SM 3.8a. The other stuff is customizations. Had ITI come in and perform (how to enhance SiteManager with) PB training class.
- Allen Rush created DWR Templates for construction and displayed some things they came up with.
 - Help Button is included. Navigates to Help page. What to put in each field, and if it is required or optional.
 - Report Button created.
 - **IN** - Sheri: Does it take into account all information on DWR Template in the report?
 - **LA** - Allen: They select information for report.
 - **IN** - Sheri: Is there contract authority on that?
 - Yes
 - **NY** - Daryl: Reporting software is?
 -
 - **LA** - Allen: Buttons are on the window itself outside if the template. Save data, go out, buttons will be there.

- **LA** - Micah: Stored on template header.
- CDs will be available in the Demo Room or contact Beth Roberts for copy of this presentation, LaDOTD SM Training, DWR Templates with functions, PBL files, instructions on how to create buttons on DWR and Materials windows, instructions on functions, copy of database, etc.

2.7 Announcements

10:35 am

- Tomorrow from 8:00 am to 10:00 am there is a LIMS presentation and Q&A session.

2.8 Discuss plans for LIMS Enhancement contract (time permitting on Monday) see below

10:36 am

- Last year there were several agencies interested in LIMS to be placed in generic product of Client/Server.
- Initially three agencies replied; KY, MO, OK,
- Presently five agencies have donated (OK, MO, NJ, KY, and LA). NY's donation is the code.
- Asked for estimate from ITI to place in generic. Basically 27 service units and contract for 27 service units.
- Back in April/May time frame, this contract package was brought forward. TTF was not convinced that package was wholly generic; there were a couple of fields that NY stepped on. TTF basically said they liked the idea, wanted ITI to see what it would cost to make this thing wholly generic. ITI developed a research package and bottom line is that it would take 4 SU to do some things to make this proposal such that when it comes out in 3.9, if you didn't want LIMS, it would look just like it did before. It was straightened out. The cost of this extra work is being supplied by the TTF with Task Force directed work.
- Now that that was being prepared, there were some questions that ITI had with the extra scope of work. There were 15 to 20 areas of discussion where agencies using the software now in a sense representing the whole group so that mistakes weren't made. Details will go to ITI today so that they can develop the contract. Loose ends tied up yesterday. This whole discussion would be mute, if there wasn't a license agreement going on in the background. NY sent AASHTO a proposal, a license agreement, and initial discussions. NY basically sold writes to AASHTO for \$1. It allowed NY to donate the software to AASHTO. Lawyers got together and got it settled in a week. There were a lot of people working on getting this done. Agreement should go to Chief engineer this week to sign, and then it will go to AASHTO to sign. ITI was hoping to run software in the demo room but without the legal agreement in place, NY had to tell ITI that they couldn't. Have a team together to work through details to have lab management component added to SiteManager. Fee pretty good that that will happen. Daryl had technical information related to NY's LIMS, for TAG members.
- Training Database LIMS 1.5 SM 3.8. It will only work with the training database. The LIMS ERD is also printed out. The training manual instructor version is included. A LIMS shell is in MS Access of what the tables will be like. You can start pre-populating. There are about 20 tables. A few reference tables. Workflow tables. Have enough CDs for one per agency. Want to ensure there are LIMS enhancement funding agencies. Daryl handed this out.

Post Meeting Comment by DWB: To log onto the standalone training database (modified with the LIMS) handed out by Daryl, users should use User ID = dbernard or dbushika or dmenz with the Password = pass.

2.9 Secondary discussion of older TMR's from 1997 & 1998 (time permitting)

10:54 am

Dave will send an email to the agencies below to see if we can take them off. If they don't reply, then they will stay on unless anyone wants to look at some more very old TMRs.

IN - Sheri: When do the ballots need to be submitted by?

NY - Dave: October 21st.

2.9.1 Stays on Ballot for now – No input from MTAG – Secondary Discussion

- 2189 CODOT– withdrawn by CODOT post meeting, DWB, 20071017
- 2191 MDDOT
- 2192 MDDOT
- 2193 MDDOT
- 2194 MDDOT
- 2195 MDDOT
- 2200 CODOT– withdrawn by CODOT post meeting, DWB, 20071017
- 2204 MODOT- withdrawn by MODOT post meeting, DWB, 20071017
- 2225 CODOT– withdrawn by CODOT post meeting, DWB, 20071017
- 2226 CODOT– withdrawn by CODOT post meeting, DWB, 20071017
- 2227 CODOT– withdrawn by CODOT post meeting, DWB, 20071017
- 2229 MODOT- withdrawn by MODOT post meeting, DWB, 20071017
- 2260 GDOT

2.10 Other Topics

- Not Applicable

3. Review Action Items

1. **Info Tech, Inc.** will close the following TMRs.
 - 2161
 - 2162
 - 2163
 - 2164
 - 2165
 - 2166
 - 2167
 - 2169
 - 2170
 - 2171
 - 2173
 - 2174
 - 2175
 - 2182
 - 2183
 - 2185
 - 2186
 - 2187
 - 2188
 - 2197
 - 2203
 - 2205
 - 2206
 - 2207
 - 2208
 - 2279
 - 2321
 - 2654
 - 2655
 - 3673
 - 3674
 - 3865
 - 3988
 - 9052
2. Move the following to SiteManager-Construction.
 - a. 9080 (from 06 M TAG Minutes)
3. **IN** (Steve Fisher) will write a TMR that has a web spin and is detailed in the technical of what we like about DWR Templates and would like to see in web Trns•port (see discussion on TMR 6573 details for additional information).
4. **MS** (James) will write a new TMR to encompass this one (8081) and the global sampling and testing requirements down to the test method level.
5. **NY** will modify TMR 9713 based on discussion heard today.
6. **OK** (Scott or Dave) will modify this TMR 9849 to capture both functionalities
7. **MO** (Denis) will create a TMR in reference to TMR 8080 that generally states universally what we (Materials TAG) want.
8. **NY** (Dave) will draft a new TMR in reference to TMR 9218 that generically across the system should not display just the code ID.