

Response 2 Comments Received From Industry Review

Donald Barnhouse

The smoke point reads in spec 125 degrees C which is 257 F is this correct? Otherwise I concur.

Response: That is correct. No change.

Allen Schrupf

SECTION 916 – BITUMINOUS MATERIALS

I realize that the charts present information that is for the use by uniquely technical staff of bituminous materials operations, but others may need to review it of testing results, and perhaps they may not be as familiar with it.

I suggest that the charts in this section be numbered, and charts that extend over a single page be given some sort of header be given some sort of continuation references. This is so a portion of the chart is not addressed during testing requirements.

Response: This will be considered in future if a standard format is required. No change.

Sonya Reynolds

File: 9160000 - Bituminous Materials
Username: Sonya Reynolds
UserEmail: sreynolds@gulfatlanticoperations.com
UserTel: 251-456-8491 X 210
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2005
Time: 03:19:54 PM

Comments:

Use of DSR-ob max instead of Vis max for #8 section 1.1?

Response: This option was considered but neither the suppliers as a whole or the Department had sufficient data to develop specification requirements based on DSR. No change.

4 days for SC Test reporting is tight for suppliers testing at a central location; additional time needed (7 days).

Response: The time frame is considered adequate based on discussions with a number of laboratories. Consideration was given, and change made to require 5 working days.

4 hours for QC Test reporting; need more time for suppliers testing at a central location.

Response: The time frame is considered adequate based on discussions with a number of laboratories. Consideration was given, and change made to require 5 hours.

Kevin Hardin

October 18, 2005

Re: Proposed Specification Change Section 9160000 Bituminous Materials

I would like to thank you in advance for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to section 916. We are in general agreement with most of the changes except for the following sections:

916-1.3.2

Suggest the second sentence be changed from "... Testing shall be reported within 4 days of sampling" to "Testing shall be reported within 7 business days of sampling." The 4 day period for reporting is very tight for time especially for samples that are being shipped to non facility labs. We also need clarification on who or where the results be reported to. Section

916-1.3.4 already outlines the reporting requirements. Is this an additional reporting requirement?

Response: The time frame is considered adequate based on discussions with a number of laboratories. Consideration was given, and change made to require 5 working days. Sentence reworded to clarify this is not an additional reporting requirement.

916-1.3.2

Second to last sentence states "Quality Control Testing shall be reported within 4 hours of sampling." This time schedule is not always possible due to new lot numbers arriving or being produced on evenings and/or weekends. Suggest the following "Quality Control Testing shall be reported within 8 hours of sampling, or prior to shipping of the lot number from the associated tank".

Response: The time frame is considered adequate based on discussions with a number of laboratories. Consideration was given, and change made to require 5 hours.

916-1.3.3

The use of the term "tank LOT" is unclear and implies that each tank regardless of the lot number will need to be tested for both specification compliance and QC testing. As an example a barge shipment of 30,000 bbls representing one lot may be stored in multiple tanks. This lot then would be transferred from a "cold" storage tank to a "hot" shipping tank, still retaining the same lot number. If each "tank lot" requires both specification compliance and QC testing it would double and sometimes triple the testing demand on the same binder lot. I suggest the "lot number" system be retained and not use the term "tank lot".

It may be beneficial for the department to require a log to be maintained by the facility to identify the lot numbers in each of the tanks, the date of change, and the rationale for the lot number.

Response: The term “tank” is deleted before LOT to address example provided.

916-1.3.3 (2)

The sampling requirement for rack blended binders is not practical. Conventional wisdom would have the sampling be taken out of the transport trailer at the terminal after loading the binder , however at this point the two binders are not homogenous and sampling will a result in a non representative sample.

Rack blended products are “homogenized” during transportation (mixing action from the liquid surging forward and backward) to the hot mix plant and during the pump off process into the binder storage tank. I suggest that samples representing “rack blends” be produced by a method described by each supplier and tested in the “Process Control Testing” as required in section (4) of 916-1.3.3.

It should be noted that sampling should not be performed when antistriper is present in the binder.

Response: The specification as worded using the term “representative” allows the flexibility of how the samples are obtained. No change.

916-1.3.4

Again I suggest the reporting period be extended to 7 business days. Ocean shipments do come in at the end of the month; sampling often occurs on the last day of the month, 5 days is not always enough time to get everything finished. Please note we currently do not have the electronic form (yet).

Response: The time frame is considered adequate based on discussions with a number of laboratories. Consideration was given, and change made to require 5 working days.

916-1.3.4

Section 916-1, (7.) requires the use of an elastomer to produce PG 76-22. To insure the use of elastomers in producing 76-22 we suggest requiring an elastic recovery test such as ASTM D 6084 at 25C be included with the requirements for PG 76-22.

Response: This has been discussed and the Department is working to determine the best of the many versions of this test procedure and corresponding specification limits, but this is not ready for implementation at this time. No change.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Kevin Hardin

V.P. Materials and Research

phone 813-623-3941
