

3270301 Milling of Existing Asphalt Pavement  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Bob Schafer

[Bob.Schafer@rangerconstruction.com](mailto:Bob.Schafer@rangerconstruction.com)

Comment: (9-11-13) I like it. I've been talking to Rich Hewitt for three years about some relief on standard plan language of "repave same day". This will definitely help when milling mainline roadway along with turnouts. You can leave them overnight and catch them the next day. It should help us with better productions in limited work windows. I do have two What-If's though:

1. What happens if it's raining the next day. Will an overly ambitious CEI be handing out DL's for safety infractions? (I'll answer... YES)
2. Will the plans include additional striping quantity/money to accommodate striping the milled surface for overnight traffic? Needs

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Mike Horan

[mhoran@ajaxpaving.com](mailto:mhoran@ajaxpaving.com)

Comment: (9-11-13) The only change from current spec. in the sentence "Repave all milled surfaces no later than the day after the surface was milled (unless otherwise stated in the Plans)" the parenthesis language removed. I think they should change the language in parenthesis to "unless authorized by engineer". That way should it rain we are all not hamstrung to arguments of CPPR grades etc, having to lay some thin asphalt to protect milled surface, etc. Leave some wiggle room.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Jim Warren

[jwarren@acaf.org](mailto:jwarren@acaf.org)

Comment: (9-11-13) The main issue they are trying to address here is the infamous plan note that came out of D7 that has spread across the state. We have been arguing about getting that "same day pave back note" removed for years and some work had been done to get that accomplished. Leaving the "unless otherwise stated in the plans" in there opens the door back up for another plan note to start the cycle again. I agree that there are special circumstances that can't be covered in the plans and there are times it would make sense to leave small areas open for longer periods, but I'm not sure how to account for every condition. Could some language be developed to account for "special circumstances" and allow the contractor to address that in his QC plan?

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Marty Humphries

[marty.humphries@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:marty.humphries@dot.state.fl.us)

Comment: (10-8-13)

This specification should remain as is. There are particular bases and pavements that would require asphalt to be placed the same day as milling is performed (prior to opening to traffic) in order to avoid damage to the remaining asphalt/base. Whether the note remains or not in the specifications, the plans/typical notes will always override the specifications.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Howie Moseley  
386-961-7853  
[howard.moseley@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:howard.moseley@dot.state.fl.us)

Comment: (10-14-13) I do not agree with the proposed change. In the past, a plan note requiring all milled surfaces to be paved back during the same day or before opening the lane closure has worked well. There are several engineering reasons to prohibit traffic from driving on the milled surface: insufficient asphalt thickness, milling into limerock, or milling close to the existing ARMI layer. Allowing traffic on the milled surface under any of these circumstances could lead to added damage to the pavement structure, potential claims or construction delays. I estimate between 50% and 75% of the resurfacing projects in my district meet one of these three categories each year. If this specification change is made, that would be between 10 and 15 modified special provisions per year. That seems like a lot of extra work compared to a plan note.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Pitman, Jimmy

Comment: (10-14-13) I am concerned with this specification change due to that consistent strategy of milling just above the ARMI layer (when possible). We would not want to leave an ARMI layer exposed to traffic and thus may need to do MSPs to combat this condition once the specification is in effect {one of the reasons for a plan note}. We have heard that District 3 would take a similar approach.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*