

3300000.D02

Response to Comments from Industry Review

Gale Page

gale.page@dot.state.fl.us

352.955.2903

Comments:

The last sentence in first paragraph of 330-12.4.5.2 Straightedge Exceptions should be reworded to the following, "However, correct any individual straightedge deficiency in these areas in excess of 3/8 inch that the Engineer deems to be objectionable in accordance with 330-12.5.1." The test method already identifies how the testing is to be done and therefore the existing wording related to manual straightedge is redundant. The intent is to identify deficiencies by straightedge not from plan grade and therefore that wording needs to be deleted.

Agree. Change will be made.

At the FDOT/ACAF Roundtable discussion 06/20/08, good arguments were made to modify spec requiring correction of all deficiencies in excess of 3/16 to be changed to require correction of all deficiencies in excess of 3/16 high and 4/16 low. Arguments include 1. Corrections of lows require removal and replacement resulting in poor ride. 2. Ability to get better ride in FC if removal and replacement of structural layer is not made. 3. Integrity of structural layer is reduced. There would be no change in the 3/16 deficiency requirement for FC,

This issue will be deferred to the Pavement Smoothness Committee. No change will be made.

Bob Dion

bob_dion@urscorp.com

386 740-0665

Comments:

Suggest you add 'of each lane' to the end of the last sentence of 330-12.4.5.6. You are requiring straight edging of both wheel paths.

Test method states this. No change is needed.

330-12.4.6.1 and 2 were not changed, however both refer to rolling straight edge. Should 'rolling' be removed from both? 330-12-4.5 no longer includes 'rolling'.

Agree. Change will be made.

Kevin L. Price

352-447-5488 ext 243

WWW.FLACQC.COM

Comments:

330-11.2 – Add the following “Plan offsets in advance so that the longitudinal joint of the friction course is not in the wheel path *or in line with the pavement reflectors.*”

The issue of RPMs on top of longitudinal joints is only related to concrete pavements and not asphalt pavements. No change is necessary.

330-12.3 Cross slope – Strike first sentence and replace “Where transverse slope is required in the plans, construct a pavement surface meeting the requirements of this section.”

No change needed. Current wording has the same meaning.

330-12.3.1 – Consider changing the frequency of cross slope measurements to once every 250’. This is the frequency of the documentation, the actual amount of measurements is far more frequent than once every 100’. Eliminate the frequency reduction after so many measurements.

This will be considered at a later date.

330-12.4 – eliminate description, leave just “pavement smoothness”

This change is unnecessary. No change is needed.

330-12.4.1- change second sentence: “Measure surface smoothness on each pavement course placed as required by this section.”

This change is unnecessary. No change is needed.

330-12.4.3 – “provide traffic control as needed and in conformance with the plans and section 600 of the design standards. Submit any alternative MOT plan in writing to the engineer for approval.”

This will be considered at a later date.

330-12.4.4 – remove last sentence.

The Department position is that this should be addressed in the QC Plan. No change will be made.

330-12.4.5.1 – Last sentence, delete “in excess of 3/16 inch”

This wording is needed. No change will be made.

330-12.4.5.2 – Add shoulders to the list of exception areas. (yes it has happened).

Agree. Specification was changed.

330-12.4.5.4 – replace last sentence - “deficiencies that are $>3/16$ ” high and deficiencies that are $>4/16$ ” low must be corrected in accordance with 330-12.5.1 prior to covering with friction. ”

Adding a sentence in 330-12.5 about retesting after corrections. This item was discussed at the FDOT Roundtable meeting.

This issue will be deferred to the Pavement Smoothness Committee. No change will be made at this time.

330-12.4.5.5 – Replace last sentence: “Deficiencies found in excess of 3/16 of an inch will be handled in accordance with 330-12.5.”

Agree. Change will be made.

330-12.4.5.6 – Starts to get really muddy here. I suggest we go back to the general section and add language that defines the different methods. Add second paragraph: “For roadways with design speeds of *50 mph or less* pavement smoothness will be determined using straightedges and FM 5-509 and in accordance with 33-12.14.5.5. For roadways with design speeds *greater than 50 mph* pavement smoothness will be determined using the laser profilograph as outlined in 330-12.4.6.2.” I changed the criteria for the laser profilograph in the previous paragraph. I feel that changing the design speed criteria slightly we may eliminate the majority of the issues around where the profiler is used.

Agree. The design speed was increased to 55 mph.

Let’s bring 330-12.4.5.5 into the acceptance section and consider making the acceptance section 330-12.5.

This is a comment related to restructuring the specification, which will be addressed at a later date. Smoothness Committee input is needed.

Eliminate the descriptions of the laser versus straight edge criteria (we moved it to general). The section should begin with the 330-12.5.1 Acceptance by Straightedge and should have the language from 330-12.4.5.5

This is a comment related to restructuring the specification, which will be addressed at a later date. Smoothness Committee input is needed.

330-12.5.2 should be “Acceptance by Profilograph: Smoothness testing for acceptance will be performed by the laser profilograph in accordance with this section. Testing will be performed in the mainline travel lanes only and all other areas will be accepted using the straightedge method outlined in 33-12.5.1. Areas where signalized intersections occur at frequencies greater than once every 2500’, 50’ at the beginning and ending of the project and 50’ at bridge approaches and departures will also be accepted with the straightedge method.”

Second paragraph: “The pavement smoothness will be determined by a Laser profilograph furnished by the department and operated in accordance with FM 5-549. A ride number will be determined for each wheel path for each lane tested. The ride number will be averaged over each lot and will be reported to one decimal place. (attach third paragraph)

Delete note (A)

The first comment is related to restructuring the specification. The second comment is related to Exceptions for the Laser Profiler. Both comments need Smoothness Committee input and will be addressed at a later date.

Table 330-2: Note 1 – Third sentence, requires straight edging in both wheel paths. Why? Profilograph gives data for each wheel path and which one has the problem, we should only have to check the relevant wheel path. In all the work done I have never found a deficiency in the opposing wheel path, so why waste the time? Last sentence: “Deficiencies found will be handled in accordance with 330-12.5(6).” Language that is there does not allow for waiver of items outside the control of the contractor. If the notes are altered you can delete the 2 sentences below the table.

These comments require Smoothness Committee input. This will be addressed at a later date.

330-12.5.1 – Replace the sentence: “Deficiencies found shall be handled in one of the following methods.”

Structural Layers: I suggest we eliminate the 50' rule and allow the contractor to determine the length necessary to make a correction, i.e. "Remove and replace the deficient area full width of the lane to a depth of 1.5 inches or the full depth of the layer constructed whichever is less."

Add final sentence in this section that states: "Deficiencies found that have been caused by factors beyond the control of the contractor or were not included in the scope of work for the project will be accepted at full pay."

These comments require Smoothness Committee input. This will be addressed at a later date.

If only I had some more time to review, I could really dig into this spec a little more. Thanks again and if you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.

Ed Petersen
(352) 326-7729

Comments:

330-10.1.4 2 Rolling Procedures:

This revised specification no longer addresses pinching the joint. Recommend replacing this language as densities are not taken next to joint. By leaving this language in the specification it allows the Department to have a process control if needed.

Pinching the joint is a "method" specification and the Department is moving towards an "end-result" specification. No changes will be made.
