

NW-ACPA / WSDOT Meeting Minutes for Monday, October 3, 2011 Meeting

Day/Time: Monday, October 3, 2011, 10:00 AM – 12:00 Noon

Location: WSDOT Cle Elum Maintenance Conference Room, I-90 Exit 80

Attendees:

Johnnie Zabel, Salinas	Mark Russell, WSDOT	David Jones, WSDOT
Kurt Williams, WSDOT	Bob Pipnich, Merlino	Dave Erickson, WSDOT
Jim Tobin, NW ACPA	Darrel McCallum, WSDOT	Morteza Davari, WSDOT
Robert Seghetti, ACME		

Next NW-ACPA Meetings Dates:

Date: April 16, 2012 Location: at WSDOT Cle Elum Maintenance Conference Room, I-90 Exit 80, 10:00 AM to 12:00 Noon.

Meeting Minutes available on line at:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/biz/construction/IndTeams.cfm#ACPA>

Old Business:

Test Section for grinding

4/11/2011 - It was suggested that the test section would not be required when the grinding required only a single pass. The typical grinding pass can take off ½ inch max; 3/8 inch is a better number to plan for. The test section allows the contractor and the contracting agency the ability to gain and grant approval of the grinding effort required. Concern was expressed that this was a method specification and we prefer performance specification over method specifications. It was decided to move this specification forward as a General Special Provision.

There was also discussion about grinder heads. It was noted that you could achieve the required smoothness with either a three foot or four foot heads. Local grinders have four foot grinders.

10/3/2011 – The instructions for use of this GSP will require its use whenever the contract includes 10,000 square yards or more of Cement Concrete Pavement Grinding. This equates to about 5 times the length of the test section (1500 feet).

Action Item: convert the test section into a GSP.

Slag percentage in Portland Cement Concrete Pavement is limited to 25%.

10/4/2010 - It was pointed out that it may be easier to mitigate Alkali Silica Reactions with Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag (GGBFS) if the allowance was raised to 40%. Concrete runways have been placed at army bases up to 50%. The level was set to prevent scaling of the surface.

4/11/2011- Research on the use of larger amount of GGBFS indicates a higher potential for scaling above 40%. The industry would like to move to higher percentages in order to be consistent with the Army Core of Engineers (Core) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements. The Core and FAA allow the use of GGBFS up to 30%. It was asked if WSDOT would consider increasing the use from 25% to 30%. Several projects were pointed out that included slag levels at 30%. The Contracting agency noted that there are differences between Core, FAA and WSDOT projects. Rob Shogren, Lafarge will provide information concerning use and performance of slag from other state DOT's.

10/3/2011- The Department would consider a test section on a contract that places pavement at a lower elevation. The lower elevation would reduce the risk that deicers would be used, thus reducing the risk of scaling. It was noted that FAA has allowed uses up to 40% of slag. The Spokane International Airport recently experienced scaling problems. The early indications are that it resulted from heavy use of deicers shortly after the concrete was placed. The concrete was placed in July and the winter season came early.

Joint Training Specification

4/11/2011- The Cal Trans specification was handed out for review and consideration as a method of paying for joint training. The Joint Training, provided by Jim Tobin, has been extremely useful in preparing the paving team for the placing of Portland Cement Concrete Pavement. The lump sum and force account payment methods were discussed. It was decided to go with lump sum. The contractors asked if it would be appropriate to have a minimum bid amount. The Department is not in favor of utilizing minimum bid amounts and would prefer a lump sum payment item.

We need to better define what is to be presented and who needs to attend. It was also noted that it would be preferable to conduct the training just before the pavement was placed and that it is typically conducted at the Project Engineers Office. Training that is conducted three days before the placement of pavement would be optimum.

Darrel McCallum, WSDOT recently conducted a pre-pavement meeting and can provide the agenda used to help develop the specification.

10/3/2011- The proposed GSP was handed out for review and comment. The Specification was recently included in a contract in the Northwest Region. A suggestion was made to require the ACPA for training. It was decided not to require a contract for training in the GSP. It was also suggested that we pre-qualify the presenters like we do contractors. The Department only pre-qualifies prime contracts and is not interested in developing a least of pre-qualified instructors. It was decided to include a list of people by position or office that should be invited to attend as is done in the bridge deck pre-pour meeting requirements. It was recommended that the training materials should be submitted at least five calendar days before the training rather than five working days.

Action Item: Forward GSP for Joint Training on to Specification Engineer for inclusion in GSP's.

Steel escalation clause for dowel bars.

4/11/2011- It was reported that there is only really one supplier for the dowel bars and that there are no US suppliers for stainless steel dowel bars. The concrete pavement contractors are interested in some sort of escalation clause. Dowel bar providers will only hold their prices for 15 to 20 days and it may take up three to four months for delivery.

Jeff Uhlmeier, WSDOT noted that WSDOT has project on I-82 that will use fiber bars.

10/3/2011- The corrosion resistant dowel bars are the issue when it comes to cost. The real problem is on multi-season projects were the concrete pavement is placed toward the end of the contract or when contract awards are delayed. When contract award is the price of the corrosion resistant dowel bars can't be locked in and the cost can significantly grow. The question was asked if these bars follow the typical steel escalation prices for reinforcement bars or steel fabrication. If they are driven by things other than the cost of producing the materials they would not be a good candidate for a steel escalation specification. It was noted that the chemicals are added to the steel to make them MMFX bars and that the cost would track with the normal steel cost growth. Fiber Bars were mention as alternative. Fiber bars have been tried in a test section on a recent contract. The Materials Lab will be evaluating load transfer results. A concern was expressed that the concrete was adhering to the fiber bars and that some sort of bound breaker should be required.

Action Item: The contractors will provide WSDOT some data showing the price over time to be compared to the steel escalation cost experienced.

Dowel bar diameters on thinner pavements.

4/11/2011- The Department was asked to look at specifying smaller diameter bars for slabs that are 9 inches or less. The American Concrete Pavement Association recommends the diameter of bars be 1/8 inch for every inch of concrete pavement.

10/3/2011- There was a brief discussion and encouragement by the ACPA to make this change, noting that the Department does use 9 inch slabs at intersections and on ramps. It was also noted that the Department should consider using purple bars rather than corrosion resistant bars at the intersections, due to the cost.

Action Item: Jeff Uhlmeyer will look into this.

New Business:

Maturity Validation the curve and other issues –

10/3/2011- The group discussed the need to have the maturity curve done with the materials to be used on the contract. The issue of using a reference mix design was discussed. The industry noted that the maturity curve should be done within 60-120 days of concrete placement. It was recommended that we move the GSP into the Standard Specification for Concrete Pavement by referencing a standard test method. It was also recommended that we consider reducing the number of loggers/sensors that are required, maybe provide a minimum size pour that would require four loggers/sensors and allow only two below that threshold.

Other Items discussed at the Meeting:

Raveling at the longitudinal joints related to longitudinal tining.

10/3/2011- Pictures were handed out for review and discussion. The contracting agency was considering having a 3 inch exclusion band along the longitudinal joints to prevent this. Problems raised included what to do when the joints cut across lane lines, and impacts related to uneven wearing of the surface. The industry representatives present did not see this as a problem

Over-cutting of half panels

10/3/2011- When removing half panels it is difficult to saw cut the half panel without cutting into the adjacent panel. The specifications need to be clearer that that is not allowed. We should stop specifying half panel replacements. It was recommended that The New Partial Panel (Across Pavement Joint) shown on Standard Plan A60.10-01 be revised to have longitudinal tie bars between the existing partial panels and the new partial panel and to place dowel bars that line up with the adjacent transverse joint, thus reestablishing the transverse joint.

Action Item: David J. will discuss the change with Jeff Uhlmeier.

Use of bond breakers under concrete pavement when placed over HMA.

10/3/2011- It was recommended that we place a bond breaker of some sort between the concrete and the HMA. Curing compounds or a thin layer of sand was mentioned as bond breakers. It was decided that the most practical solution was to use a thin application of curing compound. It was suggested that we double the coverage area for the curing compound, say 300 square feet per gallon and don't apply two coats. There would be no need for a pigmented curing compound.

Spall repairs within 6 inches of dowel bars.

10/3/2011- The Department was asked to reconsider the specification that does not allow a patch within six inches of dowel bar.

Action Item: Jeff Uhlmeier to review.

Require the Foam Board to be full height for Dowel Bar Retrofits.

10/3/2011 – It was suggested that we require the foam board and the transverse joint come all the way to the top. That would better reestablish the joint.

Action Item: Jeff Uhlmeier to review.

Completed Items:

Replace Random tining with 1/2 inch uniform tining in order to reduce noise.

4/11/2011- Research shows that uniform transverse tining produces less noise than random transverse tining. Our current specification requires longitudinal tining, and allows random transverse tining for smaller areas. We will update the random to uniform transverse tining in a future amendment.

Action Item: Amendments updated August 1, 2011.