

SP3300802 HOT MIX ASPHALT - GENERAL CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Allison Black

Work Phone:

[allison.black@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:allison.black@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments: (1-5-18)

1. Define all acronyms; QC, LOT, ASTM, FM, etc.

Response:

2. Definition for Process Control Testing seems to define a role, rather than a testing process.

Response:

3. Some bullet points seem to be definitions, while others seem to define processes, contingencies, etc. Recommendation is to remain consistent, perhaps defining the term, then providing the associated process.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

D5 Construction Operations  
386-943-5347

Comments: (1-18-18)

1. Please list the areas not suitable for testing with laser profiler. You are proposing to remove Section 330-9.4.5.2 Straightedge Exceptions and Section 330-9.4.6.1 Straightedge Acceptance specification gives lot of information of where we don't have to do the laser profiler.

Response:

2. What is a holdout area as mentioned in the Section 330-9.4.2.3?

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Ponch Frank  
561-793-9400

[Pfrank@rangerconstruction.com](mailto:Pfrank@rangerconstruction.com)

Comments: (1-26-18)

Quite a few comments and questions:

1) Why would we not have the ability to go recheck areas over the 95? It looks as though you are simply going to only rerun your own data. The Contractor and the PA need to go out and verify this area. Believe it or not your machine might be wrong sometimes or an external circumstance

can present an issue that does not necessarily mean a smoothness problem exists. You need to address this.

**Response:**

2) Is this only for FC-5 or is this for FC 12.5 and FC 9.5?

330-9.4.2 Laser Acceptance: “Areas not suitable for testing with the laser profiler.....”

Define areas not suitable. We’ve had FC-9.5 and FC-12.5 on previous projects with laser profile requirements and no mention of either mix within this specification, only the FC-5.

**Response:**

3) The 10 days is an issue. We understand why you want/need it, but it is not always practical. Prime Contractors, who are not paying attention to this spec, simply call for their FC work. If it ends up costing time, you are simply delaying the project. We need to work together to find a better way to do this. The 10 days before we start and 10 days to check corrections adds to much time to projects that already don't have enough time. Please reconsider. Additionally, 330-9.4.2.3 Unacceptable Pavement: “Repeat this process as necessary until all LOTS have an IRI less than or equal to 95.” The retesting of unacceptable pavement could potentially turn into an endless exercise of correcting and waiting with a “minimum of 10 day notice”. We can’t afford to demobilize and remobilize every time corrective work has been performed, along with time lost. Would the FDOT consider accepting the corrective work by means of the Contractors’ calibrated laser profiler, verified by the same or similar agency that the Department employs?

**Response:**

4) RR--338 – Value Added Pavement There’s nothing covering value added pavement and how it’ll be evaluated for “Ride”. Will the criteria remain the same (RN) or should we assume it’ll be based on the IRI? If so, under what criteria?

**Response:**

5) So the upside is 5% but the downside is 80%? Come on FDOT, open up the purse a little bit, give more on the incentive. Get the incentive to 10%. Or raise the disincentive to 85%.

**Response:**

6) Lastly, you folks need to pony up for the perfect job. the extra 3% is a nice opening gesture, but seriously, for a PERFECT job, and that is what it would be, you need to do an ADDITIONAL 10%. 15% for a perfectly riding job. THAT is an incentive. Give that to us. Give industry/FDOT a 5 year window to achieve. If it is costing you too much it can be re-evaluated. Unless you know that no one outside of our industry, namely the traveling public, knows the difference between ad 55 and 62.

**Response:**

\*\*\*\*\*

Deborah ihsan

Comments: (1-29-18)

1) How does this “spec change” affect Spec 338 Value Added Warranty? (Dale Walter/Glenn Beck)

Response:

2) 300-9.4.2.3 unacceptable Pavement: 10 calendar days notification to schedule equipment(laser), confirm this is required each time prior to testing? Will this/these notifications be required to addressed with CPM schedule (similar to FC cure time)? (Dale Walker/Glenn Beck)

Response:

3) 300-9.4.5 QC Testing has been deleted. Would there be any restrictions pertaining to the Contractor pulling a “15 foot rolling straightedge” on final structural asphalt and fixing deficiencies prior to FC placement? (Dale Walker/Glenn Beck)

Response:

4) 330-9.4.2.2 Acceptable Pavement: States Initial Ride Acceptance all LOTS to be less than or equal to 95 IRI...Will the laser report show this information, or are we to deduce it from all other data on the report? Will this Incentive /Disincentive payment be calculated by project personnel utilizing an FDOT excel form for this purpose, or does each project need to create their own method of computing the (+/-) payment? (Marla Hewson)

Response:

5) 330-9.5.1 Corrections: states to “Correct all areas of unacceptable pavement ...and RESET all corrected areas.” It does not state method of retest. Are we to reschedule the laser for these areas, if on Interstate (FC-5) or can the retest be manual/rolling straight-edge? (Marla Hewson)

Response:

6) 330-9.4.2.3 Unacceptable Pavement: The document says that as soon as corrections are scheduled, the engineer shall be notified. Then, a minimum of 10 calendar days from notification is needed from the Department to schedule the testing equipment. Could a statement be added to clarify that the testing shall be conducted after the corrections are made? I was thinking it could be misunderstood that the testing was to take place 10 days after notification. However, if the corrections are scheduled to occur in 15 days, you would not want to test before the corrections were made. (Chad Rucks)

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*