

**3370000 – ASPHALT CONCRETE FRICTION COURSE, ACCEPTANCE
OPTIONS
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW**

David C. O'Hagan, PE
State Roadway Design Engineer
FDOT Central Office
(850) 414-4283

Comment

I believe my staff has already approved this - I must trust them.....

Bob Dion
bob_dion@urscorp.com
(386)740-0665

Comment

Are pay items for FC traffic levels A,B,C,D,E being established for the different Friction Courses or is the Friction Course to be designed to the same traffic level as the Structure Course? If so, suggest mentioning it. One option would be to add 'and traffic level' after 'type of mixture' in the 1st paragraph of 337-1.

337-5 mentions 330-2, please add (option 1 only) after it. 337-1, last paragraph, mentions that it doesn't apply to option 2.

337-6.2.1 7 mentions 'applicable requirements of 334-5.8.' Either change this to 'applicable requirements of 330-12' or delete 'applicable requirements', stating in accordance with 334-5.8.

Jim Warren
"Jim Warren" jwarren@acaf.org
850-222-7300

Comment

The Asphalt Industry would like to commend the FDOT for working closely with our ACAF Specifications Committee on many of the changes made to this specification. Our small group that met with FDOT personnel was very pleased with the excellent working environment that was so conducive to a great discussion on these issues. All in all, we all felt this was a win-win result.

Looking at the actual proposed changes that were sent for industry review, we notice one major departure than what the joint working group agreed to -

Inclusion of the Optional Acceptance programs inside the 334/337 specification. It is our opinion that this will cause confusion and miss-interpretation in the field. The joint DOT/Industry working group that reviewed many of the proposed specs recommended keeping the R-squared specification as a separate document. Since this R-squared specification is not yet proven in actual use, it will most likely need to be modified. As a free standing developmental specification it would be easy to edit/adjust/modify as needed to improve it over time. If it is incorporated into the regular specifications 234, 334, and 337 it would require changes to these specifications putting yet more editions of these on the street. It may make sense from a specifications viewpoint to include it, but from an application standpoint in the field it does not and will most likely be the source of more confusion, errors, and potential claims.

In addition, changes such as these have additional impacts on CTQP training courses which would have to be redone to accommodate this new specification. Again, if the course is changed to account for the new spec then the new spec is changed (after the pilots), all we have done is waste money twice (on course modifications) and further confusion to the people working in the field (trainees attending the courses).

ACAF strongly disagrees with incorporating this optional specification into the 334/337 specification. We believe it should remain a free standing developmental specification until it is proven in the field and it can be demonstrated that it will not cloud or cause confusion in the field.