

SP3300802 HOT MIX ASPHALT - GENERAL CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Allison Black

Work Phone:

allison.black@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1-5-18)

1. Define all acronyms; QC, LOT, ASTM, FM, etc.

Response: Acronyms are either defined in Section 1 of the Standard Specifications or in the complete text for Section 330. The acronym “FM” (Florida Methods, defined in 6-2.2) is understood by users of the Specifications. The term “LOT” is defined in appropriate Sections and is also understood by users of the Specifications.

No change made.

2. Definition for Process Control Testing seems to define a role, rather than a testing process.

Response: The Specifications remove process control requirements for the contractor, however, for clarification, the Specifications state the contractor is responsible for performing the process control testing they feel is necessary to meet the Specifications. The intent is for smoothness incentives/disincentives to motivate contractors to implement the process control and construction operations they feel are necessary to construct smooth pavements.

No change made.

3. Some bullet points seem to be definitions, while others seem to define processes, contingencies, etc. Recommendation is to remain consistent, perhaps defining the term, then providing the associated process.

Response: If there are particular Specification subarticles or items which raise concern, if the numbers could be provided, responses can be provided.

No change made.

D5 Construction Operations
386-943-5347

Comments: (1-18-18)

1. Please list the areas not suitable for testing with laser profiler. You are proposing to remove Section 330-9.4.5.2 Straightedge Exceptions and Section 330-9.4.6.1 Straightedge Acceptance specification gives lot of information of where we don't have to do the laser profiler.

Response: Areas not suitable for laser profiler testing are determined by the laser profiler technician when on site.

Language regarding straightedge testing requirements and exceptions have been added back in. This does not change the original intent, but rather clarifies straightedge testing requirements and exceptions.

Changes made.

2. What is a holdout area as mentioned in the Section 330-9.4.2.3?

Response: The term “hold out” has been removed in effort to reduce any confusion. Areas not included in the IRI determination are defined within the Specification language without using the term “hold out”.

Changes made.

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

Comments: (1-26-18)

Quite a few comments and questions:

1) Why would we not have the ability to go recheck areas over the 95? It looks as though you are simply going to only rerun your own data. The Contractor and the PA need to go out and verify this area. Believe it or not your machine might be wrong sometimes or an external circumstance can present an issue that does not necessarily mean a smoothness problem exists. You need to address this.

Response: The laser vans are certified and calibrated on a routine basis and operators will not test new projects if debris is in the roadway. As with any testing, if there is a question about validity of the test results, the remedy can range from reviewing test results, rechecking equipment, all the way to retesting the area. There is also freedom for district personnel to ride these areas (same as with current areas that exceed acceptance criteria) to determine if an area can remain in place.

No changes made.

2) Is this only for FC-5 or is this for FC 12.5 and FC 9.5?

330-9.4.2 Laser Acceptance: “Areas not suitable for testing with the laser profiler.....”

Define areas not suitable. We’ve had FC-9.5 and FC-12.5 on previous projects with laser profile requirements and no mention of either mix within this specification, only the FC-5.

Response: This Specification change is only for FC-5 on limited access roadways.

Other roads with design speed greater than or equal to 55 mph will continue under the current Specifications meaning they’ll be tested by laser profiler and evaluated using the Ride Number Specifications. The goal of the Smoothness Committee is to work towards IRI Specs for all roadways subject to laser profiler testing and ultimately this would also include dense-graded friction courses.

No changes made.

3) The 10 days is an issue. We understand why you want/need it, but it is not always practical. Prime Contractors, who are not paying attention to this spec, simply call for their FC work. If it ends up costing time, you are simply delaying the project. We need to work together to find a better way to do this. The 10 days before we start and 10 days to check corrections adds to much time to projects that already don’t have enough time. Please reconsider. Additionally, 330-9.4.2.3 Unacceptable Pavement: “Repeat this process as necessary until all LOTS have an IRI less than or equal to 95.” The retesting of unacceptable pavement could potentially turn into an endless

exercise of correcting and waiting with a “minimum of 10 day notice”. We can’t afford to demobilize and remobilize every time corrective work has been performed, along with time lost. Would the FDOT consider accepting the corrective work by means of the Contractors’ calibrated laser profiler, verified by the same or similar agency that the Department employs?

Response: The minimum 10 day lead time to schedule laser profiler testing. The 10 days is the worst-case scenario and in most cases the SMO is testing projects within a few days.

Testing and retesting should be coordinated with the SMO. The Contractor should notify project personnel and project personnel should notify SMO regarding anticipated completion date for original work, and if required, corrections. This will ensure testing occurs as soon as possible after work is completed.

Based on the 2005-2010 data the Spec was based on, only 0.5% of all Lot’s exceeded 95. On average, that’s one 528 ft LOT per 20 lane miles of pavement (105,600 ft). Also consider that pavements have gotten smoother since 2005-2010 making the frequency of occurrence even less. Furthermore, I’m not aware of any removal and replacement occurring on any of the pilot projects. Bottom line, pavements are getting smoother and LOTs exceeding 95 are occurring less and less.

No changes made.

4) RR--338 – Value Added Pavement There’s nothing covering value added pavement and how it’ll be evaluated for “Ride”. Will the criteria remain the same (RN) or should we assume it’ll be based on the IRI? If so, under what criteria?

Response: For the time being, VAAP criteria will remain to be based on Ride Number, while for limited access roadways, construction acceptance will be based on IRI.

The goal is to one day have IRI requirements for acceptance, as well as, the VAAP for all roadways subject to laser profiler testing. These IRI values will be analyzed and discussed among the Smoothness Committee (Contractors and FDOT personnel), and eventually will be incorporated into the Specifications.

No changes made.

5) So the upside is 5% but the downside is 80%? Come on FDOT, open up the purse a little bit, give more on the incentive. Get the incentive to 10%. Or raise the disincentive to 85%.

Response: The limits were modeled after the current Composite Pay Factor Specifications which have similar upper and lower limits. There is an additional 3% project-wide Smoothness Incentive which would be applied on top of the 105% limit, so the true upper limit is 108%. Also, technically, the CPF limits go even further on the disincentive side (55%, if a sample is lost).

Regardless, the limits were discussed with industry and were originally set to manage the risks to both the Contractor and the FDOT.

The pilot project with the greatest disincentive per mile (had an average IRI of 64) and was paid about 96% of the FC-5 cost. So, the reality is we don’t expect projects to get anywhere near the 80% limit. In order to achieve a disincentive that resulted in 80% payment, using current 6-month average bid price a contractor would have to have an average IRI greater than 90.

No changes made.

6) Lastly, you folks need to pony up for the perfect job. the extra 3% is a nice opening gesture, but seriously, for a PERFECT job, and that is what it would be, you need to do an ADDITIONAL 10%. 15% for a perfectly riding job. THAT is an incentive. Give that to us. Give industry/FDOT a 5 year window to achieve. If it is costing you too much it can be re-evaluated. Unless you know that no one outside of our industry, namely the traveling public, knows the difference between ad 55 and 62.

Response: While some would like to see greater incentives (which require greater disincentives), others would like to see lower disincentives (which would require lower incentives), the Smoothness Committee struck a balance and established appropriate incentives and disincentives.

No changes made.

Deborah Ihsan
954-777-4387
Deborah.Ihsan@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1-29-18)

1) How does this “spec change” affect Spec 338 Value Added Warranty? (Dale Walker/Glenn Beck)

Response: See response above to Question #4 from Ponch Frank.

No changes made.

2) 300-9.4.2.3 unacceptable Pavement: 10 calendar days notification to schedule equipment(laser), confirm this is required each time prior to testing? Will this/these notifications be required to addressed with CPM schedule (similar to FC cure time)? (Dale Walker/Glenn Beck)

Response: Contractor’s choice of whether they show it in their schedule. Contract requirements still stand that notice has to be given to the Department, whether or not it is shown in the schedule.

No change made.

3) 300-9.4.5 QC Testing has been deleted. Would there be any restrictions pertaining to the Contractor pulling a “15 foot rolling straightedge” on final structural asphalt and fixing deficiencies prior to FC placement? (Dale Walker/Glenn Beck)

Response: No. The Contractor can perform any process control testing they would like to and they are free to remove and replace pavement (in accordance with FDOT Specifications) in effort to achieve smoother pavement.

No changes made.

4) 330-9.4.2.2 Acceptable Pavement: States Initial Ride Acceptance all LOTS to be less than or equal to 95 IRI...Will the laser report show this information, or are we to deduce it from all other data on the report? Will this Incentive /Disincentive payment be calculated by project personnel

utilizing an FDOT excel form for this purpose, or does each project need to create their own method of computing the (+/-) payment? (Marla Hewson)

Response: The Ride Report supplied by the SMO will provide the total project incentive or disincentive based on the LOT-by-LOT IRI ratings.

The report will also list all individual LOTs, as well as, their IRI Rating, and whether the Lot receives an incentive, full pay, disincentive, or requires corrective action.

The project-wide smoothness incentive will have to be calculated by the project or District personnel. If all LOTs have an IRI of 55 or lower a 3% project-wide smoothness incentive is paid. This is calculated by multiplying the FC-5 bid price times the tons of FC-5 placed times 0.03 (decimal equivalent of 3%).

No changes made.

5) 330-9.5.1 Corrections: states to “Correct all areas of unacceptable pavement ...and RETSET all corrected areas.” It does not state method of retest. Are we to reschedule the laser for these areas, if on Interstate (FC-5) or can the retest be manual/rolling straight-edge? (Marla Hewson)

Response: “Retest” by definition, implies the same test method. Retest is used in Sections 120 and 200 in the same manner. If the test method changed, then it would be necessary to define that new test method.

No changes made.

6) 330-9.4.2.3 Unacceptable Pavement: The document says that as soon as corrections are scheduled, the engineer shall be notified. Then, a minimum of 10 calendar days from notification is needed from the Department to schedule the testing equipment. Could a statement be added to clarify that the testing shall be conducted after the corrections are made? I was thinking it could be misunderstood that the testing was to take place 10 days after notification. However, if the corrections are scheduled to occur in 15 days, you would not want to test before the corrections were made. (Chad Rucks)

Response: Yes, testing occurs after corrections are made. Subarticle 330-9.4.2.3 references 330-9.5 where such language exists.

No changes made.
