

3340000.D02-SUPERPAVE ASPHALT CONCRETE  
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Dion  
bob\_dion@urscorp.com  
(386) 740-0665

Comments:

334-5.2.5 number 3 conflicts with number 2. The pay percent is reduced to 75% in 2. 3 mentions 'left in place with no pay'. Shouldn't these both be the same?

Response:

Reviewer is correct. The change will be made to #3 to match #2.

\*\*\*\*\*

Gale Page  
gale.page@dot.state.fl.us  
352.955.2903

Comments:

Revision of 334-7 Method of Measurement indicates that the pay will be based on the average spread rate for the project limited to 105%.... The wording is may not be specific enough as indicated by input at the FDOT/ACAF Roundtable discussion 06/20/08. It may be assumed that the intent is the pay quantity for the project since the reference is to the spread rate for the project, but the intent should be made very clear since this is wording that affects the contractors pocket book.

Response:

Specification wording has been revised to be clearer.

\*\*\*\*\*

Chris.Papastratis  
Chris.Papastratis@dot.state.fl.us  
954-777-4193

Comments:

Section 334-7, Method of Measurement. You are adding the statement; The pay quantity will be based on the average spread rate for the project, limited to a maximum of 105% of the spread rate set by the Engineer in accordance with 334-1.4.

How can you limit Super-pave to the 105% rule when it includes overbuild? The statement does not exclude overbuild operations, so I take it that it includes it. This will be almost impossible to field due to the nature of overbuild. Overbuild is what it is, after it has been placed to make the

necessary corrections to the roadway. This will cause field personnel to perform cross sections throughout the entire overbuild area to make certain that the Designer has given them something that will work on the roadway.

Is this the intent of the statement?

**Response:**

The specification has been reworded to exclude overbuild.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ken Zinck (Coordinating D5 Comments)  
ken.zinck@dot.state.fl.us  
386-740-3471

**Comments:**

From John Burnette District 5  
352) 326-7739

3340000.D02-Superpave Asphalt Concrete

Under 334-5.1.1.2 first lift of asphalt base course placed on subgrade, asphalt layers placed directly on stabilization layers, Isn't this saying the same thing?

**Response:**

We agree that the wording in the specification is confusing. The wording has been changed to be clearer.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Comments:**

334-5.1.6.3 In addition, in the event that the application of the Resolution test data results in a failure to meet the requirements of Table 334-5 5(for air voids or the average subplot density for coarse graded mixes only), address any material represented by the failing test result in accordance with 334-5.1.9.5.

Industry disagrees with the premise to use this information for anything more than what it was originally designed to be used for (To compare sets of test data run by two different labs.) Opening the door to now using this data for 'acceptance' is inappropriate and unsound. This language needs to be struck from the proposed specification

**Response:**

If the QC data was valid and did not meet the requirements of Table 334-5, then the material would be addressed in accordance with 334-5.1.9.5. In situations where the QC tests are determined to be invalid and the Resolution tests are used for acceptance, then the same course of action should apply for Resolution tests that do not meet Table 334-5. This spec change was requested by the Districts and is agreed with by SMO staff. No change will be made.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Comments:

334 and 337 refer to section 330 for ride acceptance. Recent discussions with SMO and SCO have shown there are a number of significant changes that need to be made to the ride acceptance specification in 330-12. We would request that a task group composed of industry and FDOT people be formed immediately to address and correct these problems so they can be changed in the next workbook. Thanks.

Response:

Changes to 330-12 are being made in conjunction with 334 and 337. The intent is to clear up confusing language in 330-12. It is agreed that 330 needs further work and the SMO intends to work with a group composed of Industry and FDOT staff.

\*\*\*\*\*

Joe Meier  
The Middlesex Corporation  
JMeier@mdlsxco.com  
(407) 206-0077  
(407) 206-3559 (fax)

Comments:

Following are some recommendations to the 334 Specification recently re-distributed for review.

3340000 – Superpave Asphalt

\* 334-5.1.1.2: Paragraph 2 states: “In addition, density testing for acceptance will not be performed on the following areas when they are less than 1,000 feet in length....”

We have run into situation where we have a ramp that is more than 1,000 feet long, but most of the ramp is bridge, with only a couple hundred feet of asphalt pavement on each end of the bridge. Since each piece of asphalt pavement was less than 1,000 feet it should have fallen within this clause above...however, the CEI interpreted the ramp as being more than 1,000 feet and held us to density testing. We recommend the above clause be clarified such as “In addition, density testing for acceptance will not be performed on the following areas when the continuous asphalt pavement is less than 1,000 feet in length...”

**Response:**

Agree. A change has been made to the specification.

\* 334-5.1.6.1, 334-5.1.1.1,334-5.1.5.1: In these sections it requires the sample be heated for a specific amount of time at a specific temperature. The intent is that the sample attain the design temperature (plus/minus), however, the specifications are based on time...with the assumption that the design temperature will be achieved. We recommend these sections be clarified stating the sample is to be heated to the design temperature (plus/minus)...regardless of the amount of time that may take.

**Response:**

In 1999, the Department conducted a research study examining the effect of oven conditioning on the volumetric properties of asphalt mixtures. The Gmm of an asphalt mixture was highly sensitive to the conditioning time. It was determined that a conditioning time of 1 hour would best represent field conditions at the roadway. I.e., time is a very important factor and it is essential that an oven be obtained that can attain the compaction temperature in the required time frame. No change will be made.

\* 334-7: In paragraph 1, 2nd sentence, the FDOT has added “The pay quantity will be based on the average spread rate for the project,…” Again, in our experience with CEI’s, we have seen them interpret this same specification in 337 by calculating the total project yield using actual tons divided by the plan area from the Engineer’s comp book. We recommend this be clarified such as “The pay quantity will be based on the average spread rate for the project calculated on the total measured pavement areas, limited to a maximum....”

**Response:**

Specification wording has been revised to be clearer.

\*\*\*\*\*