

3340302 SUPERPAVE ASPHALT CONCRETE.
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Mark Robinson
D5
386-943-5727

Comment: (11-4-10)

I have one comment/question from this Specification that is not specifically tied to the proposed revision, but I wanted to raise the question:

- On ramps of 1000 feet or less why do we waive the requirement for Density Testing for Acceptance? Many of our more frequent pavement durability issues occur on ramps, especially where the ramp terminates at the sidestreet.

Response:

This is something we will consider for the next batch of spec changes.

From the Specifications Office: No changes made at this time.

Jimmy Pitman

Comments: (11-9-10)

My only comment on the change to superpave asphalt density requirements is that you need to clarify the difference between an offsite bike path or multi-use trail and the bike lane that is on the outside of a curb and gutter section. I assume we will still be getting density on bike lane area of urban sections.

Response:

Rich Hewitt
386-943-5305
richard.hewitt@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-30-10)

I recommend adding language to require density testing in bike lanes. (ex. "Bike lanes are subject to density testing for acceptance.") Bike lanes are part of the roadway and experience vehicle traffic and we would want reasonable assurance the area had acceptable density when constructed. Also existing bike lanes could be left in place during widening so assurance of acceptable pavement is desired there as well. Although the Plans Prep Manual spells out what a Shared Use Path is, to avoid confusion in the field, we may need to denote the difference between a Bike LANE (part of the roadway where I propose we require density testing) and a Bike PATH (separate path with limited or prohibited motorized vehicle use where the Spec proposes we do not require density testing).

(From Rich (12-1-10) Just to let you know where I am coming from on this issue, it isn't a lack of definition in the PPM issue, the PPM is very clear. It is more of a "getting the word out" to the field folks (who aren't as familiar with the PPM definitions) so they don't confuse the two in the field.

The problem I see is without some reference or indication in the Spec that there is a difference between the paths and lanes, the average field person will read "Shared use/bike paths" in the

334 Spec and apply it to bike lanes also. A few words indicating there is a difference could help get the Spec applied correctly more often.

Response:

David Sadler
414-5203
david.sadler@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-2-10, Internal)

Looks good to go with the addition of one statement as shown in blue below for 3340302 (334-5.1.2):

Density testing for acceptance will not be performed in intersections. The limits of the intersection will be from stop bar to stop bar for both the mainline and side streets. A random core location that occurs within the intersection shall be moved forward or backward from the intersection at the direction of the Engineer. Density testing for side streets will not be required if the length of the paving work on the side street from the stop bar is less than 500 feet.

Response:

From the Specifications Office: As per Greg Sholar, Change made.

Anonymous

Comments: (12-13-10, Industry)

Changes applied to 334-5.1.2, density is waived from paving lengths less than 1,000 feet and side streets less than 500 feet; this may cause some confusion and argument, suggest keeping them consistent using either 500' or 1,000' for both.

Response:

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

Comment: (12-28-10)

1). 334-5.1.2, second paragraph:

Language needs to be added addressing bike lanes that are inside of the shoulder or curb and gutter and attached to the mainline.

Response:

2). 334-5.1.2, third paragraph:

I do not agree with excluding side streets from density testing. There are numerous major side streets (such as US 301) that would be excluded from density testing within our district. The side streets will be prone to premature rutting, cracking, and durability failures if adequate levels of density are not achieved. This wording could potentially void the 338 specification for side

streets since testing in these areas would not be required under this proposed specification change. I recommend either removing the side street language entirely or at a minimum, revising the proposed specification language to indicate residential or low volume side streets only for density testing exclusion.

Response:

Ken Zinck
683-740-3471
ken.zinck@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1-4-11)

1. (Kermit Ramdial/Orlando Operations)

334-5.4.4 Individual Test Tolerance for Quality Control Testing: By striking out “P-200 only” from this Supplemental Specification it is not clear whether we are now adding back the P-8 sieve to this spec.. If the P-8 sieve will now be used as a criteria for terminating the lot then it should be put back into the Master Production Range table(Table 334-5).

Response:

2. (Karen Madrid/Leesburg Operations)

I think it needs to clarify driveways also like they did for side streets.

Response:
