

Breakout Session 4

Question 7



Question 7

- Regarding allocation rules for “waste” materials coming into pavements from other industries:
 - Should all of the impact of producing the material be assigned to the upstream product, or should it be split between the pavement application and the upstream product? (e.g. slag cement in concrete and tire rubber in asphalt)?
 - Is it possible and feasible to “expand” the system and determine what virgin pavement materials are not used because of the use of the recycled material?
 - Who should be the authority when there are conflicts in allocation between PCRs from different industries? Do the conflicts need to be resolved?
- How should conflicting PCRs be dealt with, especially when having conflicts with secondary materials?

Group 4

- Facilitator:
 - J. Harvey
- Members:
 - K. Chatti
 - B. Ciavola
 - J. Gregory
 - D. Lippert
 - D. Lopresti
 - R. Sines
 - J. Holland
 - M. Ziyadi

Q7:

- ISO type “waste” definition based allocation is problematic for pavements because economic conditions that guide definition change frequently
- Goals of allocation rules are:
 - 1. Transparency in execution; 2. Outcome actually reduces environmental impact;
 - Cutoff (no upstream allocation) appears to potentially meet goals
 - 50-50 might be plausible or attractive
- Need to fill gaps
 - Study of a comprehensive set of pavement recycling sceneries with cutoff and 50/50 to check impacts and economic incentives
 - similar study of co-product allocation rules based mass, economic value and substitution alternatives
 - Both studies should be probabilistic, involve economists
- For pavement PCRs and EPDs should review upstream EPD allocation rules, report where used cutoff in pavement EPD
- Recommend that need a PCR review authority to minimize inconsistencies between upstream and downstream. Same problems occurred with California Low Carbon Fuel Standard. Who? (ISO, States, US EPA, CalEPA ?)