

3340102 SUPERPAVE ASPHALT CONCRETE
INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

Walter Brewer
305-986-0995
brewco12@aol.com

Comments: (2-24-16)

This would be a great change in order to facilitate paving shoulders with the mainline.

Response: Thank you for the positive feedback.

Christopher NeSmith
954-214-7981
christopher.nesmith@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (2-25-16)

I do not agree with TL-D and TL-E mixes on shoulders unless the shoulder is 5' wide or less.

Response: The reviewer's concern is understood, however staff at the State Materials Office do not believe there will be a performance problem on the shoulders if a TL-D or E mix is used at the contractor's choice and expense. The loading on the shoulders is so minimal that even if there is a slight reduction in design binder content due to the higher traffic level mix, it is not believed that it will result in a durability problem.

No changes made.

Anonymous

Comments: (2-28-16)

Why would we want to limit the contractor to one level higher than the level specified in the contract documents for the mainline? Why is it okay for the contractor to place one level higher on the mainline at no additional cost, but two levels higher is unacceptable? A scenario that could come up would be an interstate that is being resurfaced at TL-D, and ramps that have TL-B. The way the spec is proposed to be written, only shoulders would be acceptable for paving at TL-D. The ramp would have to be paved at either TL-B or TL-C.

Response: The reviewer is bringing up good points for discussion regarding future specification changes. However, for this issuance of specification changes, all that is being proposed is the allowance of the shoulders to be paved at the same traffic level as the mainline (which was the request from industry). Therefore, the other issues cannot be addressed in this revision because those issues have not gone through the specification committee and out for internal and industry review.

No changes made.

Howie Moseley
386-961-7853
howard.moseley@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (2-29-16)

334-1.2: I recommend clarifying the added language to indicate only when the shoulder is placed during the same pull as the adjacent travel lane.

Response: The reviewer's comment was not the intent of the specification change. The specification change was intended to apply to shoulders paved in a separate pass (or pull).

No changes made.

D5 Construction
386-943-5347

Comments: (3-21-16)

334-5.4.1 – Loss or Missing Verification/Resolution Sample: “If only the roadway cores are lost, damaged, destroyed, or are otherwise unavailable for testing, then the minimum possible pay factor for density will be applied to the entire LOT in question.” Comments: - Is this proposed addition true regardless of the amount of sublots in the LOT?

Response: Yes, this new addition applies regardless of the number of sublots.

No changes made.
