

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: This is a good comment. The wording for the shoulders will be modified to: "The same traffic level and binder type that is used for the mainline traffic lanes may be placed in the shoulder at no additional cost to the Department, even if the conditions stated above are not met."

Change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

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: The traffic level substitution has not gone away. From 334-3.2.1 "In addition, a Type SP mix one traffic level higher than the traffic level specified in the Contract Documents may be substituted, at no cost to the Department." Some additional wording has been added after this sentence to more explicitly clarify what substitutions are allowed.

No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

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 if 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: The reviewer may have incorrectly interpreted the specification changes, as the new revisions allow exactly what the reviewer is seeking. The following sentence is in 334: "The same traffic level and binder type that is used for the mainline traffic lanes may be placed in the shoulder at no additional cost to the Department, even if the conditions stated above are not met."

No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

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: This is a good comment and the Table will be removed for the next revision (January 2018) after consulting with the Pavement Design Office in Tallahassee.

Change made.

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: This is a good comment and the Table will be removed for the next revision (January 2018) after consulting with the Pavement Design Office in Tallahassee.

Change made.

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: This is a good comment and the references to PMA and ARB will be removed.

Change made.

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

Response: The title of the State Materials Engineer has been changed. The specification wording will be changed to "Director of the Office of Materials."

Change made.

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: The reason for the limitations is to prevent mix designs that do not have adequate asphalt binder content. Therefore, for mixtures that were designed with 50 or 65 gyrations (TL-A and TL-B, respectively), it was decided to only allow a substitution of a mix type with 75 gyrations (TL-C). For mixtures with a gyration level of 75 gyrations (TL-C only), the maximum increase is to 100 gyrations (TL-D and E). With increasing gyrations, typically less asphalt binder is needed to meet mix design specifications. According to Superpave theory, it is not desirable to have low asphalt binder contents in lower traffic pavement sections.  
Change made.

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: Links will be updated with the July 2017 WB and eBook.

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: This is a good comment and the references to PMA and ARB will be removed.  
Change made.

\*\*\*\*\*