

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 sidewalk.

Response: This has not been an issue statewide. However, this request was discussed between the SMO and SCO. The outcome was to not make a specification change but to allow the VAAP to catch any pavement deficiencies for these areas.

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: Thank you for the comments. The Specifications Office has informed me that the definitions of each are include in the Plans Preparation Manual.

Density testing is not required in bike lanes, regardless of whether they are in curb and gutter sections or not. These areas will be treated as non-density areas for purposes of determining the composite pay factor. No changes made.

From the Specifications Office: Volume I, Chapter 8, of the Plans Preparation Manual discusses pedestrian, bicycle and public transit facilities. For clarification, a bicycle lane is a portion of the roadway, which has been designated by striping, special pavement markings and signing for the preferential use by bicyclists. Bike/shared used paths are physically separated from the roadway and are intended for preferential use by pedestrians and bicyclists.

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: Thank you for the comments. Please see response to comment from Jimmy Pitman.

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: This change will not be made because the entire last sentence of this paragraph is going to be removed to assure that the density testing requirement is not removed from side streets that may be of high volume traffic.

From the Specifications Office: 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: Thank you for the comment. Due to concern from District personnel regarding the change and possibly eliminating density testing on high volume side streets, that wording will be excluded from the proposed spec change. Therefore, there will not be a conflict between the 500' and 1000' distances.

From the Specifications Office: Change made.

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: Thank you for the comment. Please see response to comment from Jimmy Pitman.

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: Thank you for the comments. Agreed. It is not the intent to remove density testing from side streets that are of significant importance. The wording will be removed.

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: Thank you for the comment. This change was a “clean up” change. Table 334-5 only includes P-200 for a gradation parameter so there is no grammatical need to specifically state it. However, to avoid any confusion the wording will be changed to “(P-200)” instead of eliminating the current wording of “(P-200 only).”

2. (Karen Madrid/Leesburg Operations)

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

Response: Thank you for the comment. Density testing is not to be performed in driveways, as you mention. We have never heard of this being an issue before, as project personnel have not been obtaining density cores in driveway areas. No change needed at this time.
