

334LAP SUPERPAVE ASPHALT FOR LAP (OFF-SYSTEM)
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Richard M. Hewitt
(386) 943-5305
Richard.Hewitt@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-14-14) (Internal Review)

Overall appropriate changes to bring LAP Spec more in line with current Standard Spec.

A few minor, grammatical changes (noted below and in the attached Word file) are recommended:

1. 334-1.3 FDOT should be FDOT's since it has an apostrophe in the full wording it should have an apostrophe in the acronym. (Same as the way FDOT's is used in 334-22.1 where it reads FDOT's to indicated possession.)
2. 334-3.2.5 Change the word "inchi" to "inch".
3. 334-5.2 Change "Assure" to "Ensure" and delete "that".
4. 334.5.4 Delete "that"

Response: Changes made. ft

Ponch Frank
561-793-9400
Pfrank@rangerconstruction.com

Comments: (10-30-14)

I would suggest changing the language in 334-1.3 MIX TYPES from "one" traffic level to "any" traffic level. Only three traffic levels exist in this spec so I don't see the harm in going from an TL A to a TL C to the LAP, if no additional compensation is required. Changes are shown below in "quotations." A Type SP or FC mix "ANY" traffic level higher than the traffic level specified in the Contract may be substituted, at no additional cost (i.e. Traffic Level "C" may be substituted for Traffic Level A, etc.).

Response: *The current specification allows a one higher traffic level mixture to be substituted for the design mix. This current specification already modifies AASHTO. Therefore, allowing another level substitution higher would further modify AASHTO and perhaps result in a mixture with a lower binder content resulting in a more brittle mixture than needed for the design traffic.*

Jim Warren
591-0558
jwarren@acaf.org

Comments: (11-6-14)

Good morning. I am enclosing some comments on this proposed specification change. I'd be glad to meet with SMO to discuss these changes further if needed.

1. 334- 1.2.1: Refers to "Bike paths" but other sections of the specification refer to "shared use" paths in lieu of Bike paths.

Response: Changed to "shared use path".

2. Table 334-1: There are few Traffic Level "A" mixes out there and most contractors will opt to use a "B" mix, but a "B" mix could be a "C" mix. Maybe some discussion could be given to eliminating the "A" mix all together and just use a "B" or "C" mix to simplify this table and make the mixes more economical to produce. Shared use paths are typically low production due to the constructability factor of building these pavements. This would entail a dedicated silo to store this mix, potentially high waste, and production disruptions. You'd most likely get a higher quality, consistent mix by using B or C mix since it could be used for other purposes as well.

Response: No change is needed. The current specification, by allowing a one traffic level higher substitution, already allows the contractor to produce only two mixtures (B and C). The Department does not further wish to reduce that to only traffic level C mixtures, which might have a lower binder content than that needed for the design traffic level.

3. 334- 5.3: Warm mix has an allowance for high temperature variance at start up to pre-heat equipment and should be carried into this specification.

Response: The language will be modified to match the Department's specification; see Section 334.5-3.

4. 334- 5.6.6: Thickness tolerance of 5% is too tight on these types of pavements, leaving it at 10% is more realistic and achievable. 5% of 1 inch is less than 1/16" of an inch. Come on man!, let's get to some realistic construction tolerances.

Response: The 10% tolerance will continue to be used for LAP projects and the changes have been made accordingly.

5. 334- 5.10.1 Texture: There have been a number of issues regarding the absolute language (No, Free of) found in this section. There needs to be some adjustment in the text to account for actual construction conditions and techniques and to account for various interpretations in the field as to what is and isn't the different parameters listed here.

Response: We want quality pavement "free of" the pavement issues listed in the Spec. If there are any interpretation issues they can be addressed on a case-by-case basis. This is the exactly the same language as the Department's 334 specification.

6. 334- 5.10.3.1.2 RSE Tolerance: We recommend changing the 3/16" to no more than 4/16" to account for constructability of these pavements, especially since DOT is currently enforcing a

strict interpretation. These pavements are typically lower speed applications, and vehicles are less affected by pavement smoothness at slower speeds.

Response: This has been discussed at length and the definition of a deficiency will remain as anything that "exceeds 3/16 of an inch".

FHWA
Rafiq Darji, P.E.
Construction & Materials Engineer
SHRP-2 Program Manager
FHWA - Florida Division
545 John Knox Road, Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 553-2242
Rafiq.Darji@dot.gov

The Division office has reviewed the subject specification and offer the following comment for your consideration.

- Section 334-1.5.2 Additional Requirements: Revise the sentence "**The following requirements also apply to HMA mixtures:**" to read as "**The following requirements also apply to asphalt mixtures:**", since the specification section is applicable to both HMA and WMA mixes.

The above comment has been discussed with Tanya Nash who is the originator of this spec change.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Response: Agree. Change made.