3340203 SUPERPAVE ASPHALT CONCRETE
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

****

Bob Burleson
bburleson@FTBA.com

Comment: (11-19-09) (from Internal Review)
A comment I received:
However, the change in 334-4 to upload the PC samples in LIMS will add to the workload. The Department folks up north will "you just hit the button and it automatically uploads". Not true- there is a time waiting process for each upload. Currently, one sample takes at least a half an hour for wait time, imputing the information back on to the plant database, forwarding the info to DOT, and validating the sample in LIMS. It doesn't sound like much, but when you have more important issues and responsibilities to handle, this becomes another unnecessary admin burden.

As it stands, if we are out of spec on a PC sample nothing is done and we just need to adjust- hence the name "Process Control". Entering those into LIMS will open doors as LIMS will identify these samples as "unresolved" and the PA's will have to be involved. I GUARANTEE THAT THE CONTRACTORS DON'T WANT THIS, and the Department wants it done for that time consuming data comparison they put together for the IV-QC test failures. It will open up a can a worms in an already uptight industry as some RAC's and PA's want to put more validity into PC samples.

Response:
Due to the importance of PC samples (for the determination of defective material limits, IV/PC split samples, etc.) it is necessary to include this information in the Department's LIMS database. Additionally, Contractors are storing this data electronically in Excel and providing it to the Department to include in the Mix Design Summary Sheet. Therefore, this information could instead be input into the Department's "upload" Excel sheet and uploaded to LIMS. The Department's intent is to have all data stored in LIMS and not to have multiple locations for data storage. Furthermore, this will facilitate data retrieval for project based use or Central Office analysis.
No changes made.

****

Kevin L. Price
QC Manager
DAB Constructors, Inc.
(352) 447-5488 ext 243
Kevinp@dabcon.com

Comments: (11-19-09) (from Internal Review)
(1) 334-3.2.4 - Statement is to measure the molds in accordance with FM5-585. How often are we to measure the molds? This requirement is mentioned twice in this revision and it reads as if prior to use (Maybe even each use) to measure the molds. Perhaps the spec should say "Use molds measured and meeting the tolerances of FM5-585". Also, the FM procedure may

be best served to outline a frequency of checking. For example; Checked and recorded prior to initial use and checked no less than once every six months. The time frame may be adjusted based on what the FDOT and the industry feels is appropriate.

Response:
The frequency will be added to Florida Method 5-585. No changes made to the spec.

(2) 334-3.2.6 - No comments

(3) 334-3.2.7 sub 8 - no comments

(4) 334-4 - Process control is the contractors only method of controlling the production of the mix. The contractors need to be able to perform any test he deems fit at any time without someone looking over his shoulder. I believe that contractors will reduce their testing just to reduce the amount of reporting they are forced to do. I believe that the negatives to the overall quality far outweigh the positives. The amount of additional work is another concern. We already spend far too much time dealing with paperwork instead of testing. DAB typically performs 1 to 2 QC tests and an additional 2 to 3 PC tests per day, that's a substantial increase in reporting. I cannot put into words how much I object to this change.

Response:
Due to the importance of PC samples (for the determination of defective material limits, IV/PC split samples, etc.) it is necessary to include this information in the Department's LIMS database. Additionally, Contractors are storing this data electronically in Excel and providing it to the Department to include in the Mix Design Summary Sheet. Therefore, this information could instead be input into the Department's "upload" Excel sheet and uploaded to LIMS. The Department's intent is to have all data stored in LIMS and not to have multiple locations for data storage. Furthermore, this will facilitate data retrieval for project based use or Central Office analysis.
No changes made.

(5) 334-5.1.2 - I appreciate the department allowing the contractor to finally select the asphalt lot size.

(6) 334-5.1.3 - subsection 2 - change the language here from "termination" to "Closed due to time." There has been some confusion due to the term "Termination" - Also, We request that the 30 day time frame be for "inactivity" instead of from the opening of the lot. "Lots will be closed due to inactivity when no production has occurred for 30 calendar days" 21 days would be acceptable as an alternative.

Response:
The "termination" wording will be changed. Additionally, the time requirement will remain at 20 days instead of 30 days based on other comments received. The current specification allows other time periods, as agreed upon by the Engineer and Contractor. The time frame will be from the start of the lot, not due to "inactivity." Using the word "inactivity" could present problems as

a Contractor could pave for a short while and then have 15 days of inactivity and then pave again, etc. causing the time period for the lot to be excessive. The Department does not want the lot open that long and it is of the best interest for the Contractor to get the lot completed in terms of construction variability and its impact on the PWL and pay factor.
Changes made are as follows: “Termination” changed to “Closure” and time requirements will remain at 20 days.

From the Specifications Office: (1-22-10)
(as per Greg Sholar) After a statewide Bituminous Engineers meeting (January 20-21, 2010), it was decided the time requirement will be set at 30 days.

(7) 334-8.2.1 - Optional Language - "For partial LOTs with no random sample due to limited production or closed due to time, A CPF of 1.00 shall be applied."

Response:
This wording “due to insufficient tonnage”, as currently included in the proposed change, encompasses both the limited production and closed due to time scenarios, as well as any other situation that may arise. Since sampling is based on tonnage, it seems best to phrase the requirement this way. Furthermore, there may be situations where lots with “limited production or closed due to time” may have one, two, or three samples that were obtained, but there was not enough tonnage to equal a full lot.
No changes made.

****

Jim Warren (Bob Burleson)
jwarren@acaf.org

Comments: (11-20-09)
"Measure the inside diameter of gyratory molds in accordance with FM 5-585"
There will need to be a frequency attached to this somewhere and I am not sure it actually belongs here. I spoke to Greg Sholar about this today.
Jim

Response:
The frequency will be added to Florida Method 5-585.
No changes made to the spec.

Troy Whitfield
863-519-4249
troy.whitfield@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-14-09)
In the proposed changes, the following appears:

334-5.1.3 Partial LOTs: *A partial LOT is defined as a LOT size that is less than a full LOT. A partial LOT may occur due to the following:*

l. The completion of a given mix type or mix design on a project.

2. Termination of the LOT due to time. LOTs will be closed 30 calendar days after the start of the LOT. (Time periods other than 30 calendar days may be used if agreed to by both the Engineer and the Contractor.)

3. A LOT is terminated per 334-5.1.4.4.

There is no 334-5.1.4.4 shown on this specification (although it does appear in the 2007 Std Specifications).

Response: From the Specification Office (12-14-09)
Subarticle 334-5-1.4 is not being revised, therefore, we did not include it in this proposed change. It is in the 2007, as well the 2010 Spec. Book. Also, there was a revision for the January 2010 Workbook that included Section 334, which included a minor change to this Subarticle. In Table 334-5, for Density, "percent G_{mm}" was enclosed in parentheses.
No changes made.

****

Howie Mosley
386-961-7853
howard.moseley@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-18-09)
1. Section 334-5.1.2: You may want to reconsider eliminating the initial production lot. I have seen too many cases where new mix designs do not work as well during production as they did during design. While it will still be the Contractor's choice on what size lot to start out it, it might help to reduce that risk if the first lot of a new mix design was a 2000 ton lot.

Response:
The need for the initial production lot is much less than before, when it was enacted at the start of Superpave and Contractors were inexperienced at producing and placing Superpave. Furthermore, volumetric criteria have been added since the incorporation of the initial production lot and should prevent large quantities of asphalt being produced before problems are noticed. In lieu of the reviewer's concerns, wording will be proposed for the January 2011 workbook that states that the first lot of any new mix design shall be limited to 2000 tons.
No changes made for the July 2010 workbook.

From the Specifications Office: (1-22-10)
(as per Greg Sholar) After a statewide Bituminous Engineers meeting (January 20-21, 2010), it was decided to require the first LOT for a new mix design to be limited to 2000 tons instead of potentially 4000 tons.

2.) Section 334-5.1.3: General comment: Not another time change. 20 days worked well. The spec allows longer times if agreed upon by the Contractor and the Engineer. If the new language is adopted, you need to use a word other than terminate for the 30 day time limit. I recommend using the following wording, "2. LOT closure due to time." This is critical, because termination should only apply to lots that have a failure. Termination indicates that the no failing pay factors

will be reduced to 1.00 and not receive a bonus and this should not happen if the lot is only being closed for time.

Response:
Agree with all of the reviewers comments. The time requirement will remain at 20 days instead of 30 days. Additionally, the "termination" wording will be changed to the suggested wording. Changes made are as follows: "Termination" changed to "Closure" and time requirements will remain at 20 days.

From the Specifications Office: (1-22-10)
(as per Greg Sholar) After a statewide Bituminous Engineers meeting (January 20-21, 2010), it was decided the time requirement will be set at 30 days.

****

Scott Watson
Blacklidge Emulsions, Inc.
800-866-3878
swatson@be-inc.com

Comments: (1-7-10)
In 334-3.2.7, what is the rationale for differentiating the target temperatures for PG 76-22, ARB 12, and ARB 5?

Response:
The rationale is to set a maximum temperature not to be exceeded. For 76-22, ARB 5 and unmodified binders the contractor selects the target temp. For ARB 12 the Dept sets the temp at 320 because this binder is used in FC-5 mixtures which are designed by the Dept.

This specification change actually does not change the procedure for handling the temperatures for each binder type, but the wording change was made to eliminate some confusion that people were experiencing when reading the previous wording.
No changes made.

****

From the Specifications Office: (1-22-10)
(as per Greg Sholar) After a statewide Bituminous Engineers meeting (January 20-21, 2010), the following changes were made:

1. Subarticle 334-5.1.2:
The original spec change was proposed by the SMO to remove all initial production LOT requirements. The previous wording required all first LOTs for a project to undergo specific testing requirements and be limited to 2000 tons. The SMO felt this was unnecessary and removed these requirements. At the DBE meeting, we agreed to require

that the first LOT for a new mix design be limited to 2000 tons instead of potentially 4000 tons. However, we did not add back all of the initial production LOT testing requirements.

2. Subarticle 334-5.1.3:
The original spec change modified the time period for closure of a lot from 20 days to 30 days. During the responses to industry comments, one district DBE made a persuasive argument to keep it at 20 days. However, after face-to-face discussion at the DBE meeting, all of the DBE's and the SMO staff agreed to go with the original proposed change of 30 days.