3340104 SUPERPAVE ASPHALT CONCRETE
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Dave Barrie, Regional QC Manager
Better Roads, Inc.
239-825-3506
daveb@betterroads.net

Comments: (12-7-11)
334-5.4.3
I do not believe the core locations should be able to be arbitrarily changed. The only time I believe we should be move a random core location is if there has been only one or two cores cut in a sublot and one or two more need to be moved to obtain the minimum of three.
The core should be cut behind a lane closer, but there are times when you can be 1 foot from live traffic, putting you and your equipment is a unsafe location. If for safety in a case like this, can it not be specified, move core in x amount of feet from edge of lane.
These specs are written as a FDOT specification, but they are followed by other municipalities. I don't think we should be putting open wording of "can adjust". Maybe it could be "can change the off set".

Response: *The inserted text was added to allow the Engineer to adjust random core locations that may present a safety concern by causing the coring operation to extend into oncoming traffic. This was requested by Industry.*

****

D3
850-415-9592

Comments: (12-27-11)
District Three staff has reviewed the subject document and we have the following comment to offer.
The use of Type SP 19.00 mm mix is not recommended as an overbuild layer due to laydown concerns.

Response:

****

Jim Warren
850-222-7300
jwarren@acaf.org

Comments: (1-3-12)
1. 334-1.4.3 (3) Overbuild lift thickness.
There has been confusion in the field regarding lift thickness and whether this means an average or maximum. The other issue regarding this is not mentioned is the issue of feathering the minimum edge to zero instead of leaving a keyed edge. In general, feathering the minimum edge is preferred as it provides a smooth layer to place the next layer upon. What is important is establishing either the maximum or average thickness for each mix type. In general, the contractor will want to use a mix type to minimize the number of total passes to create the total overbuild thickness specified. The industry recommends removing the minimum thickness

requirement and establishing a maximum thickness per mix type or establishing an average thickness.

Response:

2: Table 334-7 note 1.
By changing the text to “Oscillatory” compaction, this effectively specifies a single model of a single roller manufactured (Hamm) and excludes other brands that have systems that provide non-vertical compaction, like Bomag and others. Industry opposed a sole source specification such as this and recommends leaving the language as it is to promote competition and allow other brands of rollers to be used. Industry recommends leaving the specification as is.

Response:

3: 334-5.4.3 Second paragraph
There have been several instances where the department has failed to lay out core locations during construction and cores have had to be cut at a later date to meet the specification requirements. In general this change restricts the contractor’s ability to dispute the amount of core locations provided by the department within the construction window. Considering the contractors ability to collect the samples is at the discretion of the department, if confusion or mistakes are made it is the contractor that pays the price. The industry does not feel the change to be in anyone’s best interest.

Response:

****