

Green Book Task Force Meeting April 15, 2008

Jamie Quick	Lienberger & Associates	sauphtale@yahoo.com
Tom Cazares	City of L.A.	tom.cazares@lacity.org
Jerry Cowden	Rialto Concrete Pipe	Jcowden@ktircp.com
Keith Hanks	City of L.A.	Keith.Hanks@lacity.org
Richard Julio	L.A. City San Dist	rjulio@lacsds.org
Jerry Ellison	Consultant	Jrellison07@yahoo.com
Steve Hennessee	L.A. County DPW	Shenness@dwp@lacounty.gov
Curt Gilley – via teleconference		

Self introductions were made.

JE introduced GB report, GB committee TF looking at sole source, proprietary items; how does the GB deal with these issues. Do we need changes to our bylaws? TF will review what we have and look at what we do. GB is getting pressured to put things in the GB that are proprietary. Contec wants to change some sections or add their product to the GB. GB does not approve any products or endorse any products, the GB writes specifications.

RJ – GB testing parameters are very stringent. Standards specs; if it is special it would be in the Special Provisions.

TC – GB standard specs need to be broad enough to be inclusive of 5 or 6 companies that can abide by the spec. Material specs what it should look like is a Construction Spec.

RJ – Standing order from Erik; “a spec cannot be written to be sole source”.

KH- We want them (companies) to seek sponsors

JE – Change does not just include one company. A Spec for one company should not be done.

RJ – Should companies be penalized for sole sourcing to the GB?

JE- Right now there is a lot of TF/CC trying to sole source

CG- Municipalities using liners – the specs need to be tight

JE – public agencies cannot sole source w/o following specific guidelines

JE/RJ or equal in special provisions

JE minutes – approved JE

TF meeting

Announcement - None

52NU – RJ made changes

JE – go over changes, 52NU could go to editorial the week of 4/16/08

JQ – Read changes in 52NU

RJ - recommends approval and submission to Editorial

TC – second and carried

RJ – will send electronic copy to JE today PM

RJ – questions will it be ample time to get this into the 2009 printing of the GB?

JE – Editorial has a lot in front of this change that has yet to be completed. It will be totally up to Editorial as to whether or not 52NU goes into the 2009 printing of the GB

RJ, JE – GB 09 Editorial

RJ- Some how the Editorial process needs to speed up, however Editorial will review 52NU for 30 days.

Change 161NU

KH – Pickle jar test has series of chemical materials that products are exposed to
SB of Ram Tech wants to know how a test can be done accurately when there is no guideline for testing procedures

KH – I talked to PC about this, Sulfuric Acid 20% concentration, any competent chemist should be able to make up these solutions according to PC. +/- .1% prepare from 98% Sulfuric Acid. Doing this based on calculations and it should be able to be used the entire test. The solution should be clean; if it is not then the material is failing. Sulfuric Acid is a very stable item.

Sodium Hydroxide, 5% solution, stable & clear – turbidity +/- .02% test after 56 days then change

Ammonium Hydroxide, 5% stable 4% test at 28 days

Nitric Acid, 1%, check every 28 days if -1% tolerance

Ferric Chloride, Not sure why it is even used as nothing ever fails in this, check every 28 days, +/- .02%. According to PC nothing ever fails this test.

Sodium Hypo Chloride, Clear, not stable replace every 28 days; liquid bleach from the store – cheap enough to just replace it as needed; 1% solution – PC has seen up to 10% changes over 14 days

RL/JE even with drop in % the results are pass or fail, it is cheap, so just change it every 28 days

Soap, 0.1% replace every 20 days, city uses an Empire Soap – so that pinky liquid hand soap is what they use. PC does not really care what soap you use.

LAS 0.1% replace every 28 days – detergent

BOD – volatile – replace every 28 days, use the Hawk Standard – According to PC no stirring is involved. However ASTM D 545 wants stirring, full bottle random placement

JE – Samples in basket – baskets touch baskets – what is the basket made out of, does it interfere with the testing?

KH- nothing in standard specifies this holding and/or placement

Michael Goodman states – oven dried – nothing unconditioned

KH – thicker specimens,

RJ- wrote thoughts

KH – says we should stick with PC the guru and suggests going w/ PC thoughts/formula, PCs' is a curve

JE- Can we do a best fit to the curve?

RJ- $A=B \times C$ formula

RJ- the deeper we get into this the more convoluted it becomes, so many detailed procedures – can we get it so a chemist in Saskatchewan can perform the test?

JE, KH, - BOD is the hardest to keep strength

KH passed out a sample of drawing.

Discussion

JE - City has found that not all testing labs do it right

KH – GB tells you what % solution, yet it is not very specific

PJT done by CLA approved lab or by the city's lab or watched by a CLA engineer

RJ- Section 211 needs to have enough detail so that any lab can perform the test, we need to supplement that ASTM, ASTM allows buyer to specify the chemicals they want to be used when performing the test. Table for tolerances, sizes and chemical changes

JE- Change to make it better, step by step

KH – putting together, new testing clarifications for testing

We need to get SB involved, SB says it seems you have to have special knowledge to perform the tests and you really shouldn't.

JE- revisions and changes not a problem, we just need to do it.

TC – General subcommittee discusses a lot of things,

RJ – Task Force should be formed for the pickle jar test changes 161NU

JE – The GB is supposed to standardize all these tests

KH will email PJT to SB

177NU – Jerry Cowden

SH sent standard plan to city of Burbank, CLA; their biggest concern was the number of pages. They wanted to know if the data could be summarized to less pages. SH has already taken the number of pages from 90 to 66.

Standard plans go on the website; JE put standard plans on the website to alleviate the paper.

SH – is going Thursday to the GB Standard Plans Meeting

JE – passed out his changes to 177NU; unless specified in the spec we need to state the strength, specify max amount of fly ash, GB – 20% is acceptable Class F is acceptable, Class C is not,

SH – Class C is not readily available here in this area of CA

JC – we put this spec together under RCP guidelines

SH – we used RCP out of the GB page 123, similar wording, where it does not specify psi strength,

201.1.4.1

JE – GB written specifically for Southern California

SH – Class F used because Class C had problems keeping form and removing the forms

JC, JE- do not want the mixing of the two methods

Most pre casters live & die by strength of mix, design by strength and leave gradation to the plant

JE – what’s designed – you want it to work

SH $\frac{3}{4}$ aggregate abrasion, good something larger may create problems for the manufacturing

JE, SH, JC – Strength mix with a minimum of $\frac{3}{4}$ aggregate (SH- helps with abrasion resistance according to County of Riverside)

JQ – will get a copy of the Cal Trans box culvert spec from Glenn De Cou and Paul Davies

JE- Revisions must follow GB standards, underlined = new; crossed out = removed.

JC – stronger box with more steel, based on manufacturer, greater design we’d give a greater D load than specified, larger earth cover

Standard steel – stronger concrete, stronger box would be one for larger earth cover

JE- agencies have to specify cover, specs need to specify the cover, 2FT, 20FT etc

JC- Engineer is going to pick what is needed profile D load, fill height controls, box plans rarely deviate

SH- Exception to Agency specifying cover, heavier load or something that did not conform to the Standard Plans it would be in the special provisions

JC, JE- Should have the Engineer specify the specifics use whatever box has the stronger strengths, boxes are based on cover not traffic load if you have that, then you need to design your own specification

SH – Coverage is addressed in the Standard Plans

JE – 0-2 heavier box than 2-5, low cover deals with live loads, deeper cover has less live loads – check out the ASTM

JE- dry mix, wet mix wants to know how this works pages 4 & 5 review

Bring back to the table next month

Permeable variations, slab, wall thickness etc

RJ – left

185NU progress-

May 14th meeting, 9:30AM – discussed that is may have to be moved to May 7th.

New business

306

General Discussion

Next Meeting May 13th 11AM

Adjournment

