

3380502 VALUE ADDED ASPHALT PAVEMENT
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Frances Thomas
414-4101

Comments: (12-6-11)

Table 338-1, Notes 8 and 9: Change the URL in both notes to
<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/SpecificationsOffice/Implemented/URLinSpecs/Pavement.shtm>

Response: Thanks for catching this. The URL will be changed in both.
Changes made.

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

Comments: (1-3-12)

1. Table 338-1 Type of Distress Bleeding. The threshold value proposal of area ≥ 10 sf should be an individual area as was noted before. If this is a cumulative area, there will be the potential to add up any and all spots no matter how large or small to accumulate the minimum size. The old spec was designed to handle a single occurrence, and any change to this spec should maintain the same thought process. Industry recommends to retain the term "individual" in the threshold criteria. Additionally the old spec was for areas greater than 10sf and this should be the same.

Response: Agree. The intent was a single area but it was not stated clearly in the proposed wording. The addition of "individual" will be added. Change made.
The old specification was ≥ 10 sf, not $>$ than 10 sf, therefore the specification will remain as written (\geq). No change made.

2: Remedial work requirements for Cracking, Raveling, Potholes, and Bleeding. A previous version of this specification spelled out the remedial area being 150% of the distressed area. Industry doesn't recall this last change going to full depth and width plus 50 each side of the distress. This is overkill and punitive. Industry strongly recommends changing language back to the previous language.

Response: The changes were made for the July 2010 workbook. This item can be discussed at the next Flexible Pavement Committee meeting. No changes will be made for the July 2012 workbook.
