

From: Powell, Jr., Rudy
Sent: Thursday, September 02, 2010 2:08 PM
To: Toole, Deborah; Harper, Clifton (Andy)
Subject: FW: Replacement Files for SPXENHANCE - MHDs Proposal
Attachments: MHDs Proposed Bike-SUP SP series.doc

As discussed.

From: Dougherty, Marshall
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2010 1:40 PM
To: Powell, Jr., Rudy
Cc: Previte, John; Jackson, Fern; Cothorn, Kathern
Subject: Replacement Files for SPXENHANCE - MHDs Proposal

Good Afternoon!

I appreciated our morning's discussion on this subject. I think we agree that we've improved the appropriate use of these necessary specifications by our proposed re-working.

I didn't remember to look at the three files you e-mailed until after I was done with my proposed verbiage. Dang man, we were really close to the same!! Scary, huh?!?

I've attached a faux workbook reflecting the files along with the four proposed new files to replace the one old one. The only thing which still really confuses me is the naming conventions for the various location identifiers. My "workbook" reflects the major Subarticle title covering the change while the heading within the file is the actual name of the Subarticle being expanded, etc. I gave up trying to figure out exactly how your office based their different titling. Anyway, I think it makes some sense.

Please let me know what you think and we can discuss this matter further. Call me if you need me!!

Thanks, again, for the conversation this morning.



Marshall H. Dougherty, Jr., P.E.
President
Prescription Engineering Solutions, LLC
2029 Windwood Lane
Lakeland, FL 33813
(863) 370-4079 or (863) 644-1585
www.rxengsol.com



Florida Department of Transportation

CHARLIE CRIST
GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

STEPHANIE KOPELOUSOS
SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 1, 2010

TO: Specification Review Distribution List

FROM: Rudy Powell, Jr., P.E., State Specifications Engineer

SUBJECT: Proposed Specification: **3340501 Superpave Asphalt Concrete.**

In accordance with Specification Development Procedures, we are sending you a copy of a proposed specification change.

This change was proposed by Greg Sholar of the State Materials Office to clarify that density testing for acceptance will not be required or performed for bike/shared use paths.

Please share this proposal with others within your responsibility. Review comments are due within four weeks and should be sent to Mail Station 75 or to my attention via e-mail at SP965RP or rudy.powell@dot.state.fl.us. Comments received after **November 30, 2010** may not be considered. Your input is encouraged.

RP/dt
Attachment

SUPERPAVE ASPHALT CONCRETE.

(REV ~~109-421-10~~)

SUBARTICLE 334-5.1.2 (of the Supplemental Specifications) is deleted and the following substituted:

334-5.1.2 Acceptance Testing Exceptions: When the total combined quantity of hot mix asphalt for the project, as indicated in the plans for Type SP and Type FC mixtures only, is less than 2000 tons, the Engineer will accept the mix on the basis of visual inspection. The Engineer may require the Contractor to run process control tests for informational purposes, as defined in 334-4, or may run independent verification tests to determine the acceptability of the material.

Density testing for acceptance will not be performed on widening strips or shoulders with a width of 5 feet or less, open-graded friction courses, variable thickness overbuild courses, leveling courses, any asphalt layer placed on subgrade (regardless of type), miscellaneous asphalt pavement, *bike/shared use paths*, or any course with a specified thickness less than 1 inch or a specified spread rate that converts to less than 1 inch as described in 334-1.4. Density testing for acceptance will not be performed on asphalt courses placed on bridge decks or approach slabs; compact these courses in static mode only per the requirements of 330-10.1.8. In addition, density testing for acceptance will not be performed on the following areas when they are less than 1,000 feet (continuous) in length: crossovers, intersections, turning lanes, acceleration lanes, deceleration lanes, shoulders, parallel parking lanes or ramps.

Where density testing for acceptance is not required, compact these courses (with the exception of open-graded friction courses) in accordance with the rolling procedure (equipment and pattern) as approved by the Engineer or with Standard Rolling Procedure as specified in 330-10.1.2. In the event that the rolling procedure deviates from the procedure approved by the Engineer, or the Standard Rolling Procedure, placement of the mix shall be stopped.

The density pay factor (as defined in 334-8.2) for LOTs where there are areas not requiring density testing for acceptance will be prorated based on a pay factor of 1.00 for the quantity (tonnage) of material in areas not requiring density testing for acceptance and the actual pay factor for the tonnage of material in areas requiring density testing.