

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

Bob Schafer

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: The intent of the proposed change is to be consistent with the use of the current Specification (pave back within one day of milling), as well as, be consistent when we deviate from that Specification and require paving back prior to opening to traffic. For a project where the District feels milled areas must be paved back at some other time frame (such as before opening to traffic), they'll request to add a Special Provision to the project to modify the Spec.

- (1) If it is raining the next day and that prohibits paving, the contractor can't be expected to pave it back when something beyond their control, like weather, prevents them from doing so. They should not receive a DL in such cases.
- (2) As far as additional striping quantity, striping and RPMs are required before the lane can be opened to traffic regardless of how long they will be in place, and the striping and RPMs will be paid in accordance with Sections 710 and 102 respectively.

No Change Made.

Mike Horan

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: Please refer to intent of the Specification change discussed in the response to the previous comment above. Similarly, refer to response provided previously in regards to rain and being required to pave back a milled area. No Change Made

Jim Warren
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: You’re correct on the intent of the change. In regards to “special circumstances”, rain or other work stoppages beyond the control of the contractor should not result in a Spec violation (please see response to first comment above). As far as leaving a milled surface open longer, such instances would have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis due to specifics of the project. As such, that should be worked out at the project level as there may be areas where that may be appropriate. No Change Made.

Marty Humphries
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: The point of the Spec change is to get away from the plan note and require a Modified Special Provision (MSP). While a plan note, by definition, would override the Specifications, this Spec change and related direction to designers is that a plan note is not to be used. If paving prior to opening to traffic is going to be required, an MSP is to be processed. This will ensure we have consistent, justified cases when the Specification is not followed. No Change Made.

Howie Moseley
386-961-7853
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: Agreed it is more work to process a Modified Special Provision (MSP), however, the problem was the plan note became policy in many areas and this lead to it being used in cases where it wasn't justified. There are cases where one day's worth of traffic will not damage the pavement and it shouldn't be required to pave the area back prior to opening to traffic. There are also cases where it is justified and we'd expect to see a request to use an MSP in those areas. No Change Made.

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: Agreed, we do not want to leave an ARMI layer exposed to traffic if there is very thin pavement above the ARMI Layer. We'd expect to see an MSP for such cases. However, there are cases where one day's worth of traffic will not lead to pavement damage and we should follow the Spec there. The intent is not to eliminate any cases of paving back the same day, we just want to be sure that in such cases the reasons are justified and we are consistent statewide. No Change Made.
