

"Jim Warren" <jwarren@acaf.org>

11/22/2002 09:55 AM
Please respond to jwarren

To: "Duane Brautigam (E-mail)" <duane.brautigam@dot.state.fl.us>
CC:
Subject: FW: Tack Rate - Specification Change D3000084

Duane, this is another comment on this specification. Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: RBlacklidg@aol.com [mailto:RBlacklidg@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2002 3:43 PM
To: jwarren@acaf.org; R2Les@aol.com; brittanyblacklidge@hotmail.com
Subject: Re: Tack Rate - Specification Change

Why would there be allowed a 50% rate reduction in application rate when using RA-500 over using an asphalt emulsion. RA-500 is a standard grade of asphalt cement with no dilution. An Asphalt emulsion contains approx. 70-75% asphalt cement and the rest is water and emulsifiers. When placed on the roadway and after the water has evaporated, 70-75% of the volume applied is left as residue or asphalt cement . If this spec. is allowed when a contractor used RA-500 (at the proposed one half the application rate reduction of asphalt emulsions) instead of an emulsion there would be 20-25% less residue (asphalt cement) left on the pavement. IT SEEMS THAT WHEN RA-500 IS USED A 30% RATE REDUCTION WOULD BE MORE IN ORDER THAN A 50% RATE REDUCTION AS PROPOSED. THIS WOULD HAVE A FINISHED RESULT THAT IS EQUAL TO USING AN ASPHALT EMULSION AS SPECIFIED.

Thanks
Ronnie Blacklidge



Richard J Kessler

11/05/2002 01:33 PM

To: John H Owens/CO/FDOT@FDOT
cc: Susan Blazo/SM/FDOT@FDOT, Rodney Powers/SM/FDOT@FDOT
cc: Susan Blazo/SM/FDOT@FDOT, Rodney Powers/SM/FDOT@FDOT
Subject: Re: Industry review of the following: D3000084 - Application of
Tack Coat - Rate of Application and D9750000 - Elastomeric
Coating System.

Rodney Powers

11/04/2002 01:16 PM

To: Richard J Kessler/SM/FDOT@FDOT
cc:
Subject: Re: Industry review of the following: D3000084 - Application of
Tack Coat - Rate of Application and D9750000 - Elastomeric
Coating System. 

Rick,

Requiring ISO 9000 Standard might make it impossible to get the coating. Perhaps should allow alternate means of quality control acceptable to the Department .

Rod

Rodney G. Powers
Assistant State Corrosion Engineer
Florida Department of Transportation
2006 N.E. Waldo Road
Gainesville, Florida 32609
Tel. 352-337-3134; SunCom 642-3134
FAX 352-334-1649
E-Mail rodney.powers@dot.state.fl.us
Richard J Kessler

File: D3000084 - Application of Tack Coat - Rate of Application.
Username: Tami Toms
UserEmail: Tami.toms@dot.state.fl.us
UserTel: (727)725-7950
UserFAX: (727)725-7962
ContactRequested:
Remote Name: 156.75.110.41
Remote User:

Comments:

Previously there was a note in the 2000 spec book, 300-7.2 page 219 -
" Generally, the engineer will require a tack coat on hot bituminous base
courses before placing the surface course". That would have left the
decision to the engineer, and if a tack coat was not needed, it could be
documented on the reports. It looks like this would change to a required
0.02 gal/yd². Does this serve a benefit to the department? I have
frequently seen reports where no tack was applied on lifts placed on the
same day. Also, I could not find the supplemental spec 300-8.4. It looks
like application would fall under 300-7.2. The only other suggestion would
be to omit the word "between" in the first sentence.

Tami Toms

10/25/2002 07:45 AM

To: Duane F Brautigam/CO/FDOT@FDOT
cc: Patrick B Stanford/D7/FDOT@FDOT
Subject: Comments for tack and prime specification changes

Duane,

Here are my comments for the changes to the tack and prime specification changes. (300)

Although I am glad to see the tack and prime pay items go, it seems that we will still be documenting the spreadrate for them. I would like to see it go to a visual inspection reserving the right to verify if in doubt, but removing the tack column from the asphalt reports. There is a alot of time spent filling in, checking and re-checking the tack that could be better used in a more useful inspection.

Thank you,

Tami Toms

Clearwater Construction, ph. (727)725-7950, SC 513-7950

File: D3000084 - Application of Tack Coat - Rate of Application.
Username: Jim Warren
UserEmail: jwarren@acaf.org
UserTel: 850-222-7300
UserFAX: 850-942-5632
ContactRequested:
Remote Name: 199.44.94.195
Remote User:

Comments:

Controlling tack application within 10% for a spread rate of 0.03 would be +/- 0.003. The equipment is not capable of this level of accuracy. More realistic would be controlling the application rate to plus or minus 0.01 of the target spread rate.