

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 subplot 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.
The addition of the word "offset" would likely accommodate most situations, but there may be a situation where it also needs to be adjusted longitudinally. Therefore, the word "offset" will not be added. If this new wording presents problems once implemented, it will be removed in the next workbook.
No change made.

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: This comment was discussed with District 3 staff. It was agreed upon that it would not be an issue to include the SP-19.0 mm mix type as overbuild, but District 3 may choose to not use it.
No change made.

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: The proposed wording specifies the given thicknesses as maximums. Minimum thicknesses will remain for this workbook and the issue of eliminating the minimum thicknesses will be discussed at the next Flexible Pavement Committee meeting. No change made.

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: The Department agrees with the reviewer's comments and this proposed change will not be made. (The specification change was made because of an Industry member's request; however, if Industry states that the original wording is satisfactory, then no specification change will be made.)
The proposed changes to the Note 1 for Table 334-7 have been removed.

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: The Department agrees with the reviewer's comments and this proposed change will not be made.
The proposed changes have been removed.

Bert Woerner
D5
386-943-5351

Comments: (1-3-12)

I have compiled our comments for the subject asphalt review below:

1. 334-3.2.4 Gyratory Compaction:

N_{int} (initial height of pill) is on our Asphalt Plant Worksheet and measured. If this data is important, could we also have this information listed in the table in the Spec Book as well? The number of initial gyrations is different for each traffic level and is not known to everyone. I am attaching the AASHTO requirements.

Table 334-3 Gyratory Compaction Requirements	
Traffic Level	N_{design} Number of Gyrations
A	50
B	65
C	75
D	100
E	100

Response: When requirements are provided in an AASHTO document, the Department typically does not provide the same information in the specification to avoid redundancy. However, for N_{design} , the Department has provided Table 334-3 because it differs from the AASHTO requirements for N_{design} slightly. However, the Department does not differ from AASHTO for $N_{initial}$. Therefore, the $N_{initial}$ information will not be added to the specification.
No change made.

2. 334-5.9.5 Defective Material:

~~.....The minimum limit of removal of defective material is fifty feet either side of the failed sample.....~~

Why are we taking out the limits of removal? If the material is found to be bad, where will the Contractor remove? Does this need to be specified?

Response: The limits of removal will now be determined by delineation testing results. If all delineation testing results are acceptable, then no material will be removed. Previously, some Districts were interpreting that a minimum of 100' of material had to be removed if a plant sample test result was unacceptable (for AC content for example), even if the delineation cores corresponding to that area showed acceptable test results. This revision will correct that occurrence.
No change made.

3. Need to change or eliminate the picture on the website that is listed for guidance for the 338 Warranty spec for Bleeding. It is conflicting with what the comment says (comment r1- in Table 338-1). We should clarify if the ≥ 10 sf means in one spot or all combined in How big of an area? Maybe a 50 ft area?

Response: Thank you for the comments. The pictures will be changed. Additionally, the wording in Section 338 will be changed to indicate "one spot."

4. Should we change verbiage to allow Oscillating Roller on these?
330-10.1.6 Use of Traffic Roller on first overbuild course.

330-10.1.7 Use of Traffic Roller or Vibratory Roller on first structural layer on a milled surface.

330-10.1.8 Use of Traffic Roller or Vibratory Roller on first structural layer on ARMI.

Response: The subarticles mentioned above were revised in a previous update of the specifications. The subarticle containing this information is now 330-7.6. The updated wording is accurate. Please note that oscillatory rollers are also vibratory and can be used in those situations that require vibration.
No change made.

5. Could we define these? 330-12.5.1.1 Unacceptable pavement / Structural Layers.

Add - For Low or High

Add - For High ONLY

Response: This would be a new change to the specification and would need to be able to go through the review process, which has already occurred. This change will be proposed on the next cycle of specification changes.
No change made at this time.

6. What about storage in the Truck for more than an hour? 337-7.1 Hot storage of FC-5 mixtures.

Response: This is a good comment since it is possible that the mix may sit in the haul truck for an hour or more. In some cases, due to haul distance, this is inevitable. However, it will be added as an agenda item at the next Flexible Pavement Committee meeting.
No change made at this time.
