

3340102 SUPERPAVE ASPHALT CONCRETE  
INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

\*\*\*\*\*

Joy Christiano  
813-670-7017  
[jchristiano@keystonecivil.com](mailto:jchristiano@keystonecivil.com)

Comments: (12-5-16)

The specification designates which levels may be substituted by typing them out (example, TL C can be substituted for TL B.) The next sentence indicates that the same traffic level and binder type that is used for mainline may be used on shoulder. This creates some ambiguity in the specs in the field. Which notation takes precedent? For example, if the plans have TL E on the mainline and TL B on shoulders, may the shoulders utilize TL-E? As written above no, but as written in the subsequent sentence yes. Recommend clarifying the intent.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*  
Tim Carter  
386 624-3208  
[tcarter@pandspavinginc.com](mailto:tcarter@pandspavinginc.com)

Comments: (12-6-15)

Has the traffic level substitution option now gone away? We will still be able to go up one level as before or no? Please clarify. Thank You

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*  
Foster Bachschmidt  
352-302-3944  
[fosterb@dabcon.com](mailto:fosterb@dabcon.com)

Comments: (12-13-16)

The attached revision to Specification 334 is concerning to me. Why is the Department attempting to disallow the use of a superior product in instances where it is beneficial for the contractor to do so. It appears that this spec change is being based upon a preliminary study that indicates higher traffic levels used in low traffic environments may lead to rutting. Due to the Department's application of these traffic levels, that can hardly be an applicable effect. Furthermore, disallowing the contractor of the ability to "upgrade" the shoulder pavement such that it can be paved simultaneously with the mainline is near sited and will certainly add significant cost to projects where a dissimilar pavement design is used between the shoulder and mainline.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*  
John Fowler

## D3 Design

### Comments: (12-19-16)

I have reviewed the proposed spec changes, and I offer the following comments:

1. What is the purpose of retaining Table 334-1? The specifications are instructions to the contractor, but the level of ESALs is really a design parameter. I am not aware of any situation where the contractor needs to be aware of the number of ESALs.

### Response:

2. Following along in the same vein as the previous comment, I am not sure that the first two sentences of Section 334-1.2 are necessary either. Really, all the contractor needs to know is that the traffic level for the project is specified in the contract documents.

### Response:

3. Section 334-2.3.1, Number 1 refers to PG 76-22 (PMA) and PG 76-22 (ARB). It was my understanding that those two references would be going away, and there would only be PG 76-22.

### Response:

4. Paragraph 1 of Section 334-3.2.1 refers to the State Materials Engineer. I can find nobody by that title.

### Response:

5. Why can TL-E be substituted for TL-C, and TL-C can be substituted for TL-A, but TL-D cannot be substituted for TL-B? For that matter, why couldn't the contractor choose to substitute TL-E for TL-B or TL-A at no additional cost?

### Response:

6. The website shown in Section 334-3.2.1 is the old website. I understand that the old website redirects, but why not just change the address to the actual website?

### Response:

7. Section 334-3.2.7, Number 8 refers to PG 76-22 (PMA) and PG 76-22 (ARB). It was my understanding that those two references would be going away, and there would only be PG 76-22.

### Response:

\*\*\*\*\*