COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

****

Frank M. Kreis

File: 3301200-Surface Requirements-Acceptance Testing for Surface Tolerance
Username: Frank M. Kreis
UserEmail: frank.kreis@dot.state.fl.us
UserTel: 850/638-0250, ext.634
Date: Friday, December 30, 2005
Time: 10:50:23 AM

Comments:

1) 330-12.3 Cross Slope: Recommend adding "as directed by the Engineer" to the last sentence. Electronic transverse screed controls are not always warranted and can lead to an overrun in asphalt quantities.

2) 330-12.4.1 General: Add the requirement to calibrate the rolling straightedge annually or every two years by the manufacturer.

3) 33012.4.2 Test Method: Change the location of the operation of the rolling straightedge from "outside wheel path" to "centerlane" of each lane being tested.

****

Joe Meier

The following comments do not necessarily address just the changes…but there are some things in existing spec we should take opportunity now to review.

330-12.3.1

This calls for calculation to the nearest 0.01%...however, most smart levels do not read to this accuracy, they comfortably read to 0.1%.

This allows for tolerance of 0.2% for travel lanes…which is an extremely tight tolerance. We recognize the importance of slope to the FDOT, but the equipment and construction processes don't necessarily consistently allow for that level of accuracy in placement or in measuring. We recommend 0.4% tolerance for travel lanes…this still puts lane within design standards either way.

330-12.4.5.2

There should be additional exception consideration for Ramps or Roadways of irregular geometry or configuration. Example: Circular ramps are not only in horizontal curvature, but they are

typically also in extreme superelevated curves…these factors are often such that, by the geometrical design, they will not meet straight-edge requirements. There should be Engineer's discretion to exempt such pavements from the rolling straight-edge.

330-12.4.5.3

Straight-edging of intermediate layers, especially when project is pieced together is excessive. A widening project with 3 lifts of asphalt paving typically is paved with the bottom 2 lifts "puzzled" together due to Traffic Control and Phasing requirements. The top lift of structural is usually reserved to smooth everything out. The majority of FDOT construction is combination widening, reconstruction, and resurfacing and expecting each lift of pavement to meet straight-edge criteria is excessive, especially when we do not typically have control over the phasing as designed by the FDOT. This will also create an unnecessary step on milling/resurfacing project that requires placement of multiple lifts in the same night so lane closure can be re-openned. This could add an inordinate amount of time to straight-edge and then get Engineer interpretation as to any correction, before proceeding to next lift….all in same night during restricted lane closure hours. **We recommend this entire paragraph be stricken.** If FDOT has specific project that has such need and makes sense for such specification then we recommend it be added to project on individual basis as part of that contract's Special Provisions. And even then, such spec should have a clause allowing Engineer discretion to waive intermediate straight-edging in areas not practical, based on individual project design and construction requirements.

330-12.4.5.4

At the end of the 1st paragraph it should be added ", unless directed otherwise by the Engineer." Again, the Engineer should have discretion to waive correction as appropriate.

330-12.5.1.1

Option (a) should be modified to read "approximately 50 feet" instead of "minimum".

Option (a) should give Engineer discretion to reduce length of correction based on specific project conditions.

An Option (c) should be added back, similar to previous spec, allowing "Other methods as approved by the Engineer". The project personnel's hands should not be tied so restrictively…there will always be situations that the specifications can't address all possibilities and the Engineer should be given opportunity to make discretionary judgment.

330-12.5.1.2

The 50 feet distance should be flexible, allowing Engineer discretion to reduce as appropriate for project conditions.

General Manager
The Middlesex Corporation
JMeier@mdlsxco.com
(407) 206-0077

****

Kim Smith

File: 3301200-Surface Requirements-Acceptance Testing for Surface Tolerance
Username: Kim Smith
UserEmail: kim.smith@dot.state.fl.us
UserTel: (850) 414-4492
Date: Monday, December 12, 2005
Time: 01:45:33 PM

Comments:

Why not include the wording from the Special Provision that specifies that the acceptance testing for roadways with design speeds of 50 MPH and above? That Special Provision states that the Laser Profiler will be used in such acceptance testing. The criteria for application of this requirement is clear (design speed of 50 MPH and all interstates) such that its inclusion in the Standard Specs should not result in confusion. To the contrary - if we are always going to use the laser profiler for acceptance testing in those instances, stating as much in the Standard Specs should reduce confusion and promote a clearer understanding of what the FDOT expects.

****

Tami Piascik

330-12.3.1 Quality Control Requirements: Measure the cross slope of the pavement surface by placing the measuring device perpendicular to the roadway centerline. Calculate the cross slope to the nearest 0.01% and round to the nearest 0.1%. Record all the measurements on an approved form and submit to the Engineer "daily" for documentation.

Dear Mr. Brautigam,

If you are changing this spec, I plead with you to include the word “daily” after Engineer.

We have a hard time getting the Contractor to submit this form on a daily basis. We are constantly referring the contractor/QC Manager to 105-5.2 where it states

that all QC activity documents are to be available daily. It would help so much to have this word included.
Thank You,
Contract Support Specialist
GBF Engineering, Inc
(772) 286-8797 Office
****

Gale Page

File: 3301200-Surface Requirements-Acceptance Testing for Surface Tolerance
Username: Gale Page
UserEmail: gale.page@dot.state.fl.us
UserTel: 352-955-2903
Date: Wednesday, December 28, 2005
Time: 02:45:29 PM

Comments:

When ultimately 330-12.4.6 Laser Profile Acceptance is added, I believe the intent would be to have Contractor QC for the Friction Course just as it is required for final Structural Layer. As 330-12.4.5.5 is currently written it appears that wording would need to be added to 330-12.4.6 Laser Profile Acceptance to require the Contractor QC since the wording of 330-12.4.5.5 is acceptance.
****