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Specifications
Overview

• Need for changes to specifications discussed with VDOT and industry personnel until spring 2014

• DRAFT specification changes developed & sent to VDOT and industry stakeholders on July 9, 2014

• Final revisions sent to CN division in early September 2014.
Input received

- 19 comments from industry, 27 from VDOT/VCTIR

- **46 total comments:**
  - 20 comments accepted
  - 26 comments did not require action or not accepted

- 9 of 15 comments from VAA accepted & incorporated into the changes made to VDOT specifications
Noteworthy changes
Section 210+

• Move to Multi-Stress Creep Recovery (MSCR) for binders *(edits to Sections 211, 248, 315, and 317)*

• MSCR better predicts binder contribution to mix performance, particularly rutting.
Noteworthy changes
Section 210+
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The naming convention for binder grades is being changed. Classifications of binders and their new/current equivalents are below. For binder designation in specifications and contracts, the same A, D and E nomenclature will be maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Binder Grade</th>
<th>Old Binder Designation</th>
<th>New Binder Grade</th>
<th>New Binder Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG 64-22</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PG 64S-22</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 70-22</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PG 64H-22</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 76-22</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>PG 64E-22</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional binders that are used in Virginia and their new naming convention are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Binder Grade</th>
<th>New Binder Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG 58-28</td>
<td>PG 58S-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 70-28</td>
<td>PG 64V-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More information about MSCR and its testing can be found in AASHTO M 332.
Noteworthy changes
Section 211

• Adds requirements for lab testing and reporting for permeability of production samples.
  • First lot,
  • and every-other-lot thereafter
  • No spec requirement – simply reported to District Materials Engineers.

• At Engineer’s discretion, allows use of conventional surface mix in lieu of “Curb Mix” (C)

• Incorporates language from prior Special Provision for allowance of use of Recycled Asphalt Shingles (tabs or tear-offs).
Noteworthy changes  
Section 315

• New language requires use of MTV on interstate routes.

• New language requires longitudinal joints on overlaid layers to be offset 6”, and the surface joint to be 6-12” from the centerline.

• New language adds a minimum temperature of 200°F when using warm mix.
Noteworthy changes
Section 317

• New language adds a minimum temperature of 200°F when using warm mix.

• Resolve conflict in current Volume 2 – payment for trial sections will be limited to 2.
Noteworthy changes

Public Notice Requirement

• Added to all contracts, beginning in 2015, at the request of the Commissioner’s office.

• General requirements for notification to the public to be made by the contractor.
Noteworthy changes

PG64E-22 Price Adjustment
(old PG 76-22)

• Mirrors current procedure(s) for price adjustment of PG64S-22.
Special Provisions
THMACO

• Select-use special provision by districts going forward, at their discretion & decision-making

• Does not replace current THMACO special provision

• Instead offers options for the Engineer:
  1. Use current Special Provision, requiring spray-bar pavers
  2. Use new Special Provision, giving options for use of spray-bar or conventional paving equipment
Rideability

• General intent is for their use on ALL qualifying interstate and primary routes (subject to district decisions)

• Potential for default requirement on interstate & primary routes in 2016

• Target for each district to specify 2 “incentive only” sections in 2015.
• General intent is for use in a similar fashion as the current surface prep/patching Special Provision that is currently in use.

• This is not in current contracts - the final version, one finalized, will be for select use by districts going forward at their discretion & decision-making.

• Possible to use this as a work-order tool for those districts that think it beneficial to use it.
Questions?