

Report to MAG Technical Committee
Meeting January 22, 2015
Asphalt and Materials Working Group meetings
By Chairmen, Jeff Benedict, Brian Galimore

The meeting was held on noon on August 22, 2015 at the ARPA offices.

Present at the meeting: Gordon Tyus (MAG), Brian Gallimore (WSP), Greg Groneberg (S.W. Asphalt), Scott Clark (Peoria), Jeff Hearne (SRMG), Doug Laquey (Fisher Industries), Robert Herz (MCDOT), Sam Huddleston (Western Refining) Dave Beckel, Kevin Moss, (Southwest Rock) and Todd Ingram (Lhoist North America)

Cases for submittal:

Case 14-06 revision to section 718 Sam Huddleston handed out a list of objectives and concerns with section 718. Items were discussed such as current fog products and adding “seal coat” products that are used now. Sam indicated a need to break polymer modified rejuvenating products into a category. In addition some minor modifications to sections 333, and 334 are need after 718 is updated. A draft of the modified section 718 will be ready by the February meeting. Sam’s list of objectives is attached.

Case 14-12 MCDOT submitted this case for “Pavement removal” and to prevent joints along pavement wheel paths. The case was discussed with line by line changes proposed. The working group will read and comment on elimination of references to saw cutting concrete pavements “mid slab”. The section 336 was reviewed to address concerns from Jim Badowich on compaction enforcement by contractors.

Case 14-17 Stamped (decorative) asphalt this case was discussed and it was decided that more agency input was needed on specific language for paint warranty etc. to move forward. Brian will attempt to get to the manufacturer for more input on this case.

After the carry over cases were discussed the gentlemen form Southwest Rock asked to discuss testing of ABC and the variations of “wet prep” with ABC that may have been treated with lime. They feel strongly that there is non-uniformity of testing with ABC and particularly lime treated ABC.

The working group explained that the issue is probably real but it is also difficult when MAG 702 shows current testing standards for ABC. Not lime “treated” ABC. The rub is the lime treating a poor ABC or is it a in spec ABC that happens to have lime in it? The working group recommended that the company attempt to get an agency involved to “push” the issue into a possible case. The working group did not wish to take this on as a case.

Next meeting is February 26th 2015 at the ARPA offices.
This meeting was adjourned at 1:35PM

SECTION 718

1-22-2015

Update SECTION 718

- Suppliers were contacted for current products being produced and specifications.
- 2012 revision created errors to the 718 specification for products.
 - Specification not match product designation
 - Review on 2004 revision to determine correction
- Received specifications from local agencies for materials currently using.
 - Peoria, Mesa, others through suppliers
- Recommend addition of Polymer modified rejuvenating emulsion (PMRE)
 - This will cover several suppliers products currently being used
- Recommend the addition of Seal Coat specifications
 - Non diluted sealcoating material specification
 - Allows agency testing
 - Currently being specified by several local agencies
 - Available from 3 or more manufactures/suppliers
- Review impact on other Sections in MAG
 - Section 333 and 334 will require update (Minimal language)
- Reviewing specifications to update
 - Test method to current practice
 - AASHTO or ASTM as appropriate to current practice

To: Benedict, Jeffrey
Subject: RE: Test procedure modifications of Lime Treated Natural Aggregate Base Courses

From: David Beckel [<mailto:dbeckel@southwestrockproducts.com>]

Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 4:29 PM

To: Brian Gallimore

Subject: Test procedure modifications of Lime Treated Natural Aggregate Base Courses

Dear Brian, As I was trying to elaborate on the phone, my concerns are of test procedure "interpretation" by technicians in the Valley seem to be quite widespread. Issues we have had here at Southwest Rock Products include the following: With T27/T11 , I have split samples for gradation with a testing lab, they getting 14% passing the #200, myself getting 8% passing the #200. When I talked to the lab about the differences, they said that they looked at the material under a microscope and could tell that since it was a lime treated AB and the clays were bonded together by the lime, they made the judgement call to wash the sample for approx. 2 hours, to get the water "clear". Basically what they did was to unbond the clays and what the lime is supposed to do, to get it into what has been and is an accepted practice for treated gravel pits with clays in them.(I.e. destroying what the lime is supposed to accomplish). My 2nd concern is that of Wet prepping a lime treated AB gravel (T146) for the determination of Liquid Limits (T89) and Plastic Limits (T90) for the determination of the Plasticity Index. If you study and read the T146 procedure, there are many "gray" areas that are open and subject to the interpretation of the technician/operator performing the test. One example (of many I have) is in T146, Method A, Procedure 4, section 4.1 that deals with the prep. of the sample when it is received from the field.....In here it states, "dry the sample in a way not to exceed 140 degrees, THEN, thoroughly break up the "aggregations" in the mortar with a rubber-covered pestle. To me this is to break up clays balls,lumps etc.....to get it ready to split down into the the correct sample size for the LL,PL and PI determination. In a lab I have used, they see it as and this is what they do, is to split it here on the #40, and process the entire +40 material thru the mortar and rubber-tipped pestle. What this does is unbond what the lime has bonded together, creating more "fines" for the LL and PL sample and thus creating a greater chance to determine a PI. Again this is being done because the lab says that lime-treated bonds of minerals are not "natural" aggregate, thus it is correct to do this. This is all happening in section 4.1 of the T146 Method A. If you read the procedure, the material should NOT be split on the #40 in step 4.1, should only be split in step 4.2 etc. I think what needs to be done, is to go thru the procedures for T27/T11, T146, T89/T90 ,step by step, and try to determine, with common sense, what the ORIGINAL intent of the procedures were from the original Authors. It is my belief that these procedures were written and specified BEFORE lime-treated aggregates were commonplace and I truly believe a "modification" is needed on the above procedures when they are specified for lime-treated aggregate bases. Sincerely, David J. Beckel, Quality Control Manager, Southwest rock Products, Queen Creek,AZ. Cell#602-695-2893. Look forward to hearing back from you . I know that's a lot to "digest", but to make it simple, it's all in the prep of the sample for PI, if you are going to get a PI. And as far as wet gradations, it's about how long you wash the sample to get "clear water" and if you have lime treated AB you can literally wash it until all your left with is diamonds.....and an extremely high % passing the #200. If you want to meet in person and have a discussion I am available as per your schedule. Thanks again for your attention to these issues, Dave.

Gordon Tyus

From: Benedict, Jeffrey <Jeff.Benedict@valero.com>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 11:03 AM
To: dbeckel@southwestrockproducts.com
Cc: Brian Gallimore; Gordon Tyus
Subject: section 702 Base materials

David,

Brian forwarded your e-mail to me. Thank you. And thank you for the your attendance at the MAG working group meeting last week.

I feel your frustration. This was passionately clear at the meeting.

As I see this issue, you have a couple of choices:

one, find an agency that supports your position on sample prep. and help them write an update to section 702 and thus modifying the AASHTO procedures listed. It will need to come from an agency in order to get enough approval to have the case pass. If the working group were to generate the case it will not pass. Too self serving.

Two, get someone from ADOT to have AASHTO to include a new section on "lime treated" ABC with special handling of the wet prep sample. This is not impossible to accomplish. Difficult but not impossible.

The current sections (702,701) are written to allow AASHTO to update their procedures without having to rewrite MAG every time. We do not have any voice or association with AASHTO. ADOT and the FHWA do. These sections were recently updated in MAG. They are purposely written (as they are) to allow for national updates. The ASHTO test procedures listed are some of the few that remain within the MAG. Most of the test procedures have been changed to ASTM procedures. This was kept with AASHTO practices for consistency.

I have listed your concerns in my report to the overall technical committee. The report will be distributed to each member of MAG. Your opportunity to find an agency supporter is best after the February MAG meeting on the 4th.

Best of luck.

Jeff Benedict

Jeff Benedict
Valero Marketing & Supply
(M)602-989-6121