27th Annual Asphalt Conference

September 8-9, 2003

FINAL MINUTES

Sponsored by:
Asphalt Contractors Association of Florida
Florida Department of Transportation

Schedule of Events

- **Monday, September 8, 2003**

  3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. - Trade Show
  5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. - Reception in Trade Show Area

- **Tuesday, September 9, 2003**

  7:00 a.m. to 8:15 a.m. - Buffet Breakfast
  8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. - Asphalt Conference
  12:00 Noon -1:00 p.m. - Buffet Lunch

Thanks to our many Trade Show Exhibitors and Reception Sponsors.

Trade Show Exhibitors:

ARR-MAZ Products
Asphalt Zipper
ASTEC, Inc.
Barnstead International
Blacklidge Emulsions Inc.
Chemtek Inc.
Citgo Asphalt Refining Co.
CMEC
Compaction America
CTQP
Fiberand, Inc.
Florida Chemical
Florida Paving Concepts, Inc.
Gencor Industries, Inc.
Guardwear
HEATEC
Koch Pavement Solutions
Pine Instrument Company
PRI Asphalt
Quality Assurance Testing Laboratories
Rinker Material
ROADTEC
TransTech Systems Inc.
Troxler Electronics Labs, Inc.

Reception Sponsors:

ARR-MAZ Products
Barnstead International
Blacklidge Emulsions Inc.
Citgo Asphalt Refining Co.
Compaction America
E.A. Mariani Asphalt Co.
East Coast Milling
Fiberand, Inc.
Flexphalt, LC
Koch Pavement Solutions
Pine Instrument Company
Quality Assurance Testing Laboratories
Rinker Materials
ROADTEC

27th Annual Asphalt Conference

Recognition of Reception Sponsors and Exhibitors

Welcome and housekeeping instructions – Jim Warren

Group Presentation from Construction Academy - 20 minutes

Asphalt Conference: Panel Introductions

Ananth Prasad – State Construction Engineer
Bruce Dietrich – State Pavement Design Engineer
Gale Page – State Flexible Pavements Engineer
Jim Musselman – State Bituminous Engineer
David Sadler - Construction Engineer
Jim Warren – Asphalt Contractors Association of Florida

Drawing for Door Prizes at end of conference: (You must be present to win)

HMA Smooth Ride Hat
HMA Smooth Ride Jacket
Titleist Golf Balls
Sony PEG-SJ22 Color PDA ($200 dollar value)

AGENDA QUESTIONS

CTQP Update – Dr. John Goodknight, CTQP

Re-qualification requirements for asphalt have changed. Many presently CTQP qualified trainees will begin to need re-qualification in 2004. "On-line" registration, "Remote Testing," "Computer Based Training - Asphalt testing" computer

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES

1.) Conflict of having to core freshly placed hot mix prior to opening to traffic when adjacent lane must be paved same shift due to drop off issues. "Two-way Rural Road" page 301 2000 DOT Book. (ACAF)

If it can't be cooled with ice, core it 24 hours later, even after you've allowed traffic on the pavement. The 24-hour time frame isn't going to affect the density. But this is for exceptional case, normally, the core shall be taken before opening to the traffic.

2.) Recently ran into what I think is a quality issue for paving on FDOT. The plans call for milling 3" and resurfacing with 150 lb/sy SP-C and 160 lb/sy FC-12.5. The problem comes in the M.O.T. section where it states that lane closures will not exceed 1 mile. In the middle of summer, with milling crews, paving crews, and laying temperature sensitive SP, its difficult to maintain the train method of construction within 1 mile. During the milling/paving operation, there was too much start-and-stop for what I would consider being able to produce a quality mat. And slowing down production can only go so far...an asphalt plant has to produce at a certain tonnage per hour. As the milling machine would get to the end of the 1 mile lane closure, they would have to stop because the back roller was still waiting for the mat temperature to drop to around 150 degrees. The paver would then stop behind the milling machine and let them get out ahead with more of the 3" cut. You can only go so slow, and, I thought the Department was trying to get contractors off of the road as quickly as possible. Why intentionally build language into the contracts to slow our progress? In the era of "get in, stay in, get out and stay out" this seems counter productive. (ACAF)

We agree with the concept of "get in, stay in, get out and stay out", but we need to be more aware of our customer desires as well. In some projects, one mile maybe too short, we could extend to 2 miles (no more than 2 miles).

3.) Projects that limit shift work to short durations that require milling, paving, compaction, and MOT operations are more than likely affecting the quality of the resultant project. Some projects are lucky to be actually paving 4-5 hours per night. This makes the projects last longer, impacts the public more, and creates more joints in the project. Everyone knows you get better consistency when you have few restrictions. It seems as the closures are getting shorter rather than longer – what can be done to reverse this trend and get the projects built faster? (ACAF)

In consideration of traffic control, customer satisfaction, production and other factors, we need to establish a balance but Traffic Operation and customer should have full control. Need to review scheduling closer ie: what about noise at night etc. We will continue to review the project situation and make the most efficient arrangement.

4.) On high speed ramps that have had a history of slippage due to the shear forces of the braking and turning trucks, has the DOT considering scuffing up (milling) the surface of a previously laid mat to increase the bond strength? (ACAF)

Although milling/scuffing the surface would help to increase the bond strength, it adds an additional step to the construction process and is not a practical solution. Probably the best approach is to use good construction practices: make certain the underlying layer is properly cleaned; apply a uniform and consistent amount of tack to the surface; and allow the emulsion to break prior to overlaying. The use of an RA-500 (old AC-5) will also enhance the bond.

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION ISSUES

5.) The details in the plans sometimes are not workable. Look at the number of addendums in the August letting in District 2 and the changes they have made. It appears that the plans are being pushed out the door without being reviewed. (ACAF)

This is an exceptional case. We haven't heard the similar situation statewide. We will ask D2 Construction Office to look into it.

6.) Construction - On Design-build projects the oversight CEI for the Department is overstepping their authority by directing the contractor on how to do their work. We seem to have two project engineers trying to do the same thing (CEI and oversight CEI). It is my impression from FDOT that the oversight is supposed to be there to make sure the CEI is doing their job by randomly checking the CEI's paperwork not Micro-managing the project. (ACAF)

Yes. Your concept is right. We are all in the learning curve. We will continue to evaluate the administration and performance of Design/Build Projects.

7.) The response time to questions submitted to the FDOT is long, if at all (District 2). It seems people are on vacation, changed jobs, off at a seminar, etc. The excuses are endless. Ultimately the response is "Bid it as you see it, there is not enough time to put into an agenda." (ACAF)

May be isolated issues, those reasons should not be considered as excuses. We will ask D2 to look at it.

8.) It was my understanding that the lump sum bidding process would be for simple projects that lent themselves to this process (i.e. mill & pave, and other simple type projects). We have seen many projects that had large dollar prices for various items of work, including signalization off the basic project, I-295 in August with a budget of $5 million (including selective clearing & fencing) and others with limited plan information to determine what the state wanted to construct. Lump sum appears to be a way to catch a contractor in a mistake and the state get a bargain. (ACAF)

The Plans shall be detailed enough for the Lump Sum projects. We must ensure that the quantity is right, the scope of work is clear in the Contract. Plans need to communicate what the intent is. Contract amount has nothing to do with the Lump sum project. We will continue to look into the criteria of Lump Sum project selection guide.

9.) What happened to flexible start time for mill and resurface projects? (ACAF)

It's still available.

10.) Weather days...FDOT used to grant time with pro-rated days to account for 5-day workweek versus 7-day calendar week. Now FDOT is only granting "day for day" without consideration for weekends, and other planned non-work days. (ACAF)

This was a Spec change - intent was to get in and do the job. The CPAM Section 7.2 is the guidance. Use the common sense and engineering judgment for some special situation.

11.) Please discuss delays and quality issues due to supersaturated stockpiles and granting of weather days to let them dry out. (ACAF)

There was an e-mail submitted to DCE's – DME's determine whether the stockpile is too wet and if both DCE and DME agree, the weather day can be granted.

12.) Plans / Design - My favorite subject is Lump Sum jobs bid from plans that are worthless. The plans we are getting are no more than a few lines on a sheet of paper. We have no earthwork info. (i.e.; cross sections or quantities) to try and determine what their intent is. We have mill and overlay projects with overbuild with no info. (i.e.; slopes of exist. and proposed areas and expected yield / sq. yd.). When we try to ask questions from the Department, we get no answers. The only answer I get is to survey the job and determine what we think we might need to do to build the project. (ACAF)

Plans Preparation guidance is for Lump Sum projects to have enough plan detail to be able to bid and construct the project. If there are projects where this is not the case, the specifics should be brought to the district's attention. If inadequate response is received, the specific issues should be elevated through the chain of command.

13.) What is the policy for Lump Sum projects and monitoring spread rate during production? Does the tolerance apply to the completed section or each sublot? Does a penalty apply for being outside the spreadrate for the subblot? Do you use a 5% or 10% tolerance for the tolerance? (ACAF)

SCO Memo. No. 22-03 dated September 22, 2003 provided the clarification on how to monitor the spread rate during construction. Basically, the tolerance applies to each sublot. For penalty consideration, the sublot in question will be combined with other layers (including FC-6, but excluding FC-5) to determine if the total specified asphalt pavement thickness is met. Reductions in pay shall be applied on the sublot. The tolerance given in the Lump Sum specification will be the governing tolerance.

14.) Quality Adjustments on Lump Sum projects – does this apply on all Lump Sum projects? (ACAF)

Yes.

15.) What is the policy for Monthly Estimates of Asphalt Placed Prior to Completion of LOT?

Policy is to pay the LOT monthly for production. Make necessary adjustment at the next Monthly Estimates.

16.) Value Added Asphalt Pavement (VAAP) Specification Status? When does it start? How will they be monitored by the Department? (ACAF)

The VAAP Specification has been developed and formally approved by the FHWA. This specification will be implemented statewide for all the asphalt projects on January 2004. Basically, The Contractor is responsible for the performance of the VAAP for a period of three (3) years after final acceptance of the Contract including continued responsibility for performing all remedial work associated with pavement distresses exceeding threshold values specified in the specification. District Warranty Coordinator initiates and coordinates performance monitoring visually and also by Pavement Evaluation Survey tracking system to document and flag the deficiencies. District Bituminous Engineers will provide the technical assistance to evaluate the deficiencies.

17.) Please discuss the status of the new specifications and the old Superpave and Marshall specifications for local agencies. Re: Archived Specs (SCO)

The State Specifications Office website now includes Archived Specifications for Local Agency Use on its website at http://www.dot.state.fl.us/specificationsoffice/LocalArchives.htm Specifications available through this site are archived specification files no longer approved for use by the Florida Department of Transportation. These specifications have either been superseded by other implemented specifications (such as Contractor Quality Control (CQC) Specifications or newer technology), or represent materials and technology no longer in use on the State Highway System. They are made available as a convenience to Local Agencies for reference, modification and/or potential use on their projects. The website includes Archived Asphalt, Archived Base, Archived Earthwork and Archived Concrete sections. The Archived Asphalt section includes Marshall specifications and the last pre-CQC version of Superpave. Jim Musselman, Jim Warren, Duane Brautigam and others have also been working with the Florida Association of County Engineers and Road Superintendents (FACERS) on another non-CQC version of Superpave that they could recommend for use by any county wanting to use Superpave. When complete, it will replace what is currently posted on the Local Archives page for Superpave.

CQR

18.) Sample Numbers For CQR: When running same type mix, same material number, but different traffic levels, i.e.: fine and coarse mixes, sample numbers have to be in sequence for CQR entry. It can get very confusing keeping plant and road together. With two different lot numbers but sample numbers have to be sequentially. Can anything be done to simplify this? (ACAF)

A new sample numbering system is under development for implementation statewide which identifies the mix type and traffic level. This will further help identify the mix being placed on the roadway.

19.) CQR Entry: We want to thank the DOT for extending the hours of operation for CQR data entry "Effective 8/13/2003, production IMS (CQR) hours have been extended to the following: NOTE: IMS production new hours Mon-Fri 6am-9pm, Sat 6am - 7pm. Question: Why couldn't the access be open 24-7? With projects running day and night and between entering data and QC managers' auditing data, it would make sense to open it up. Construction is no longer a one-shift operation. (ACAF)

The IMS system is used for a number of applications beyond CQR, and uses the non-production hours for system maintenance and the processing of batch jobs. Consequently it will not be possible to have access 24/7.

20.) CQR and LIMS update? CQR access issues: passwords per project or per company, passwords – multiple, expiration. What can be done to make this more user friendly? (ACAF)

Beginning in July 2003, all jobs let will go into LIMS, the Department's replacement to CQR. Under CQR, it is an OIS requirement and there can only be one password per person per project.

DESIGN ISSUES

21.) The two bridge jobs (T2051 & T2052) in Duval County were a prime example of poor construction. The temp detour consisted of 4' of the new roadway pavement (OB GP 10 & 2.5" SP TLC & later FC), a new 5' shoulder consisting of OB GP 1 & 1" SP TLC, the FC came later, and 8' of temp pavement of 6" LR & 1.5" asphalt. This is approximately 300 feet on both sides of the bridge. Plot it out and you have three sections of pavement in a 300-foot length on each side of the bridge. The new shoulder may or may not hold up while the bridge is constructed! Nobody looked at this from a constructability point of view. The existing bridges have reduced load capacities that semi's ignore and with signalized one way traffic for several months, I would question if the detour would be usable for a final product when the job is completed. (ACAF)

Bridge replacement projects often present difficult design and construction issues. Constructibility should be reviewed by the district during design. Feedback on project specific problems during construction should be brought to the districts attention to avoid them in the future.

22.) Why is the structural number the same for the new SP 12.5 Base as it was for the old ABC-3? If all the requirements for Superpave apply to this mix, it only makes sense that it is a more consistent and coarser (therefore more structural integrity) than the old ABC-3. The ABC-3 typically was a Marshall designed fine graded mix and only had intermediate controls on the #4, #10 and #40 with a maximum passing the #200 of up to 10%. The SPB-12.5 is a gyratory designed fine graded mix, again with only intermediate controls on 5 sieve sizes, but with 2 important differences. The SPB 12.5 is a coarser mix (max. of 58% passing the #8 as opposed to 60% passing the #10 for ABC-3) and the gradation of the SPB 12.5 cannot pass through the restricted zone, typically making it a coarser graded mix. In addition, the individual sieve sizes have much tighter controls on the SPB 12.5 with greater production penalties for non-uniform mixes. If the contractors are taking on more risk for the use of a higher type mix in base construction, where is the reward? What additional controls are being placed on the aggregate producers to insure their product is as uniform as a Superpave asphalt mix? I doubt if anything has changed for them. (ACAF)

Structural numbers are empirical numbers that are based on the AASHO road test. The structural properties of Superpave mixes are still being evaluated at the NCAT track and in other research. The new AASHTO pavement design guide that is soon to be released will be using Dynamic modulus values to characterize the structural performance of asphalt mixes.

23.) The structural numbers that are currently in use in the Standard Index are unfairly biased to the aggregate suppliers. The total structural values of the entire column of mix type don't equal each other until you reach Base Group 8 and don't even get close until Base Group 5. In Base Group 1 it is a joke at 4" of SPB 12.5 being substituted for 4" of limerock. If they want to keep the thickness specified, the Type "B" Stabilization should be eliminated under the asphalt base until the structural value of the stabilized subgrade is equal to that of the aggregate thickness. The subgrade for the asphalt base could be specified as "firm and unyielding" as is now used in some instances. This would a least "level the playing field" for the use of the asphalt. (ACAF)

By specification, density determinations are not required on the first lift of asphalt base on a soil subgrade, but is required for the first lift of limerock. A minimum of two lifts of

asphalt base are required by the Base Group chart to be sure that density is achieved in the top asphalt base lift. Without density requirements, the full structural value of the first lift may not be there.

24.) On projects where SP B-12.5 is used, consider paying for the base asphalt by the ton, (on a pro-rata basis of the Optional Base Group SY price) the same way as the structural asphalt. This would allow the contractor options of using different combinations of lift thicknesses and types of mix to achieve the end result by matching the lifts with the thickness of the base group and the mainline and shoulder thickness. Also will allow a safer, higher quality base construction practice and less expensive method of controlling the edge drop-off situation in higher value OBG Group applications. It would also eliminate the need for the time-consuming operation of depth coring, leaving the trench open for an extended period of time for this to take place. I know this one would be a tough sell, but if they look at it in total they will see the benefits in time saved, safety for the public and overall quality of construction. (ACAF)

Specification Section 234 Superpave Asphalt Base now calls for the placement and pay of asphalt base to be controlled by average spread rate rather than coring.

25.) A subject for discussion would be in the design phase of doing a better job in matching the total shoulder pavement thickness to the mainline thickness with regard to lift placement. For instance, we now have a project with a pavement widening (new construction) placed at some bridge ends where the mainline structural thickness is 5.0" and the shoulder thickness is 3.0". Shoulders are 4.0' wide. All Superpave course graded mix (Traffic Level E over limerock base, but that was our choice). Specs. (334-1.3.3) call for the shoulders to be placed in the same pass as the mainline, which in this case means to lay only a 2.0" lift on the bottom, and a 3.0" layer on top to match the 3.0" thickness on the shoulder. This is opposite of how it should be, with the thicker lift on the bottom. To comply with the specs. means doing a poor job of construction. They may say just lay 2, 1-1/2" lifts of SP 9.5. This could be done, but all the lifts of the different mixes would be placed at the minimum thickness. If we have learned anything about Superpave over the years is that density (thus permeability) is probably not achievable at the minimum thickness range of each type of mix. (ACAF)

The minimum lift thicknesses for coarse graded Superpave were increased to 4 times the nominal aggregate size when the first permeability problems were observed. This in line with the latest recommendations of NCAT and FHWA. For an SP 9.5 coarse mix, this is 1.5 inches and the ability to get density at this thickness has been demonstrated on many projects in Florida. Pavement designers prepare constructibility sketches to make sure that there is at least one constructible option within the specifications, and plans are reviewed by construction before they go to bid.

26.) Getting density on coarse-graded Superpave mixes, specifically the use of bank-run shell. Most paving contractors that are prime bidders would never consider this option, but on a lot of projects where the paving contractor is a sub, there is no way of knowing what material the prime bidder may thinking of using. The paver is quoting blind and may be taking on a problem that he has no control over. The simple solution would be to eliminate the bank-run shell option. Another option would be to reduce the target density when used in combination with certain bases, similar to the language in the "Static Only" density specification. It is ridiculous to take a material that can be dug out of the ground and placed

directly on the subgrade without any processing and then try to compact a coarse graded Superpave mix on it. Our experience says it is not realistically possible. (ACAF)

The prime contractor needs to work with his subcontractor to select the correct material to build this layer. The Department will not get involvement of your construction decision. However, SCO is looking into this issue.

MATERIALS/MIX DESIGN ISSUES

27.) Research Update – SMO

See Research Update 2003 Asphalt Conference pdf at http://www.acaf.org/27th%20Asphalt%20Conference.htm

28.) Mix Design Verification/Bituminous Lab Relocation status (SMO)

The Bituminous Laboratory moved into its new location (5007 N.E. 39th Avenue, Gainesville, FL 32609) on September 1, 2003. For the new telephone numbers, see the attached link:

http://www.dot.state.fl.us/statematerialsoffice/Administration/Contacts/telephonedirectory.htm

29.) It seems that the majority of new mix designs need a revision to the AC content when production starts. If a revision of 0.4 or greater is needed to make the mix right, why not allow it? (ACAF)

In most cases, as a mix is produced the aggregate breaks down and generates excess P_{-200} (dust), which reduces the VMA, which in turn lowers the air voids. One way to increase the air voids is to reduce the asphalt binder content – which reduces the mix's durability. The specifications limit the reduction in asphalt binder content to 0.3% in order to limit the reduction in pavement durability.

30.) Can the contractor pre coat its own Granite Materials with lime? Does the FDOT have to approve the process? (ACAF)

This issue has been discussed at previous Flexible pavement Committee meetings. A draft specification has been developed that may be used on a project-by-project basis to gain experience with the process. The issue from Industry has been the 45 day limit from pre-treatment to use as being too short. The 45 day limit is the maximum time being used nationally (Nevada DOT). One possible solution being explored to extend the 45 day limit is to cover the stockpile.

31.) EPR-1 status (ACAF)

The State Materials Office is in the process of reviewing density data from projects that used the reformulated EPR-1 Prime material, to determine if there is a correlation between its use and lower pavement densities. (There have been several complaints that the use of EPR-1 Prime made it more difficult to achieve the specified density level on the first lift of HMA placed on the limerock base.) If there is a correlation, it will be deleted from the specifications.

PAVEMENT CONDITION SURVEYS

32.) What are latest facts and figures regarding the FDOT pavement condition survey for the past year? Status Report.

For the FY 2003 Pavement Condition Survey, there were 8,070 deficient lane miles or 20% of the State Highway System. Of this 6,410 (15.8%) lane miles were deficient to cracking, 1064 (2.6%) deficient due to ride and 596 (1.5%) deficient due to rutting.

SMOOTHNESS SPECIFICATION

33.) Smoothness Specification status?

The Specification Section 330-12.6 was approved by the FHWA last year and was formally implemented now. Basically, the Department will perform acceptance testing on the completed pavement surface with regard to smoothness by Laser Profiler on Limited Access or other High-Speed Roadways (Design Speed is equal to or greater than 50 miles per hour). The pavement smoothness will be expressed as a Ride Number (RN). For evaluation purpose, the pavement will be divided into 0.1 mile LOTs. The acceptance criteria for the pavement smoothness are shown in the Table 330-3.

Table 330-3	
Ride Number (RN)	*Method of Acceptance*
Greater than or equal to 4.00	*Acceptance with full payment*
3.99 to 3.70	*See Note 1*
Less than 3.70	*See Note 2*
***Note 1:** For all LOTs with a RN ranging from 3.70 to 3.99, correct all deficiencies in excess of 3/16 inch [5 mm] within the LOT as identified by the 15 foot [4.572m] rolling straightedge. Perform all corrections in accordance with 330-12.4 (a). Upon completion of the corrections, straightedge the pavement with a 15 foot [4.572m] rolling straightedge as observed by the Engineer. Assure that there are no deficiencies greater than 3/16 inch [5 mm] in the LOT.*	
***Note 2**: For all LOTs with a RN less than 3.70, remove and replace the entire LOT in accordance with 330-12.4.*	

34.) What data was used to determine the laser profiler acceptance criteria for friction course? (ACAF)

The Flexible Pavement Smoothness Committee including representatives from FHWA, SMO, State Pavement Design Office, District Construction Office and Contractors evaluated the data of statewide pavement condition survey on Ride and determine the acceptance criteria by statistical analysis and engineering judgment on pavement smoothness. The Committee members also conducted the job site ride tests on some of the selected projects to verify the criteria before the final version of the specification.

35.) (330-12.6.300) What have ride numbers been on previously tested projects? Should this be treated without penalty until a contractor can have enough experience with what a 4.0 is? (ACAF)

You can find 14 projects (D2: 6, D3: 3, D4: 2, D5: 1, Turnpike: 2) listed in the Tables entitled " Laser Profiler Smoothness and Ride Number Frequency Distribution Results" in the SCO web site. Go to SCO web site and click "Specialized Area" first and click "Asphalt", you will find the Tables. You may also contact Pavement Evaluation Section of State Materials Office in Gainesville to provide the Laser Profiler test results of some projects. Office phone number is (352) 955-6322.

CONTRACTOR QUALITY CONTROL (CQC) SPECIFICATION ISSUES

36.) SCO memo – Review intent and discuss

Open discussion.

37). Project reviews

FHWA has conducted a number of project reviews on active CQC projects. Based on the reviews, recommendations for changes to the system were made and the SCO memo to Verification Technicians was initiated to help explain and clarify the intent of the specification and take some short term actions.

38.) Panel Discussion

Open Discussion

39.) Some contractors are making 3 gyratory pills rather than 2 as called for by test method AASHTO TP4-00. Is the verification tech to do the same or stay with the testing method as called for? (FDOT D5)

It's in the best interests of all parties if the test methods are performed the same way – specifically the way they are taught in Plant Level I. Need to compact two gyratory specimens, not three.

40.) Could it be clarified as to the VT using lab computers to let the QC contractors know that this is a spec.? (330-2.3.2) #7. Also, #8 as to telephone#, fax# with a private line to the QC tech. (FDOT D5)

The Contractor shall provide the facilities for the use of both parties. It is clearly specified in the Specifications that we have to work together.

41.) There seems to be many issues involving trust, some in the FDOT are assuming the worst, assuming that the contractors are dishonest because of honest mistakes. What can be done to correct this? (ACAF)

People involved in this industry need to better communicate and treat each other with professional courtesy. Any system that has involved the amount of change that CQC has brought will have a learning curve, and there is bound to be some confusion until people understand their respective roles in the process. Unfortunately, past issues affect peoples' perspectives and the old statement that it only takes one bad apple to spoil the whole basket rings true. Communication, education, respect, and a little flexibility is what it takes.

42.) Is the FDOT considering abandoning the CQC system? It seems that the FHWA has little faith in its success. (ACAF)

No. It is here to stay. FHWA is in full support.

43.) Is there anyone in the industry who sees a positive value to the contractor quality control specifications? (SMO)

ACAF, representing the industry, sees the long term benefit of this type of specification for the good of the industry and the tax payers. Over time, the DOT will be have more flexibility when it comes to inspection with should lower administration costs – which should result in more dollars for paving. The CQC specification enables contractors to make better judgments on process control during construction. The net result should be longer lasting, smoother asphalt pavements. But any new system takes time to implement and though the benefit of better quality of pavements will be immediate, the cost savings will take a bit longer to realize.

44.) If so, what would make them even better? In the long run they should result in less oversight from the FDOT, more profitability for the Contractor and most importantly better riding, longer lasting roads for the public. (SMO)

VAAP specifications will help the situation.

45.) Can FDOT consider giving the paving report, plant report, CQR entry back to project personnel? This would free up QC techs to get back to their jobs of Quality Control. (ACAF)

No. FDOT will provide the necessary guidance and assistance, but QC reports and CQR/LIMS data entry will remain the responsibility of the Contractor.

46.) What are the dates of the latest set of forms and spreadsheet and when do they take effect? Do they apply to jobs let after that point, or are they supposed to be used on current projects? If so, they should apply from a date forward and the contractor should not be required to go back and redo old forms to the new format. (ACAF)

Forms are available on the FDOT Internet site (See link below) and are also available through a link on the ACAF Internet site.

http://formserver.dot.state.fl.us/capture/listings/FormListing.aspx?ListType=FormOffice

The forms take effect on the date they are published on the site on all jobs statewide. However, it is not necessary to go back and redo the old reports in the new format – just start using the new forms when you find out about them. (See also District Construction Engineers Memorandum No. 29-03

47.) When forms or any substantial change is made, there needs to be a global announcement that they have changed and when to start using them. Just posting them on the internet does not automatically mean people see them. Contractors don't have the time to surf the internet looking for changes that may not be obvious. Change is a part of life, but we need to have some sort of system in place that is easy and comprehensive for all to use. (ACAF)

Any changes or updates to the forms are e-mailed to the District TAC Teams as well as ACAF.

48.) CQC Monthly Certifications – who signs? (ACAF)

Contractor has to sign the CQC Monthly Certifications.

49.) The excel spreadsheet (Departments Asphalt Plant- Pay Factor Worksheet) excepts tons placed in non density areas from the total lot. Does this preclude the entire potential pay bonus for these tons or just the 35% attributable to the density? The spec doesn't provide for this, so why is FDOT doing it? Also, seems to be a place where an unnecessary and confusing accounting is going on requiring more paperwork. (ACAF)

Areas where density testing is not required are assigned a Pay Factor of 1.00, which is prorated into the density Pay Factor for the LOT. All of the other acceptance characteristics (air voids, asphalt content, P_{-200}, P_{-8}) would still be allowed to have a Pay Factor up to 1.05. It's handled automatically by the Composite Pay Factor worksheet.

50.) Was any work done to evaluate the effect of storage of cores over time relative to their dry weights? Are the cores drying out over time enough to cause a VT test of the same core to be different from the air dry weight of a QC test weeks earlier? (ACAF)

Although the additional air drying time should have minimal effect on the density of the cores, in order to assure that it is not a problem, Verification cores should be tested by determining the water weight first, the SSD weight second, and then air dry the samples in front of a fan for a minimum of four hours until constant weight is reached, then the air weight determined.

51.) Other Items
N/A.

Next Meeting: 28th Annual Asphalt Conference, September 13-14, 2004, Tampa.

REMEMBER:

Everything I need to know about life, I learned from Noah's Ark...

1. **Don't miss the boat.**
2. **Remember that we are all in the same boat.**
3. **Plan ahead. It wasn't raining when Noah built the Ark.**
4. **Stay fit. When you're 600 years old, someone may ask you to do something really big.**
5. **Don't listen to critics; just get on with the job that needs to be done.**
6. **Build your future on high ground.**
7. **For safety sake, travel in pairs.**
8. **Speed isn't always an advantage. The snails were on board with the cheetahs.**
9. **When you're stressed, float a while.**
10. **Remember, the Ark was built by amateurs; the Titanic by professionals.**
11. **No matter the storm, when you are with God, there's always a rainbow waiting.**