Section 37 Pressing Issues

Comment	Caltrans Response Industry Response
Basing closures on delay time is much more efficient for both the State and the Contractor. Seal coats are not paving and the length of lane closure restrictions has gotten out of control in the districts. They are way to small in most circumstances.	This is a technical change request. Please submit scoping document to RPC for approval to work on this at sub task group level. (Probably will defer to Traffic Management Plan, TMP) Industry will develop position paper. Industry has developed paper and it is being reviewed. Scott to send out to all of industry and to CCSA for comment.
We believe 2 in addition to the initial 1 to be efficient. This allows consistent coverage of the area as the initial coverage brings them forward. Then they travel back once and forward to the operation for the final pass. This keeps the compaction close to the operation and being done in a timely manner.	This is a technical change request. Please submit scoping document to RPC for approval to work on this at sub task group level. Industry would like to review this specification as part of the technical changes to Sect 37. Add to scoping document.
37-2.04C(1)(c) Submittals: Why Vialit if not required for acceptance? If results required should be required for acceptance.	This is a technical change request. Please submit scoping document to RPC for approval to work on this at sub task group level. Industry would like to review this specification as part of the technical changes to Sect 37.
Hidden Text 3 and 4 in Section 37-2.04B(2) Response- This is incorrectly inserted under the Asphalt Emulsion Seal Coat section and should be hidden text under 37-2.05B(2)(e) Screenings of the Asphalt-Rubber Seal Coat section. Hidden text No. 3, currently listed under Section 37-2.04B(2), "Use 3/8" max for interlayers and low volume roadways" should be the only hidden text under 37-2.05B(2)(e) following "Screenings for Asphalt-Rubber seal coat must comply with the _____ grading." Any reference to an interlayer should be removed from the Asphaltic Emulsion Seal Coat sections, since this product is not utilized as an interlayer.	Hidden language is corrected. New language is: 3. Select screenings gradation 4. Select screenings gradation for 1st and 2nd application of double asphaltic emulsion seal coat. Is this language in the Special Provision instead of in the standard specification? This language will is in the Standard Special Provisions Template page on the Caltrans website. Industry concurs with JC-5. Hidden text referring to Interlayers needs to be removed for emulsion chip seals. Industry needs a response to this issue. In addition, Hidden text is for design only. Hidden text should not be used in Standard Specifications. Follow-up to ensure this is not hidden. Provide industry to with current copy of 37-2. What does this mean?

Comment	Caltrans Response Industry Response
Hidden Text Item 1 under Section 37-2.05B(2)(b) Asphalt Binder Response- The PG 64-28 should be removed and PG 58-22 should be inserted. Asphalt-Rubber binders are blended only from unmodified neat asphalts. PG 64-28 is a modified asphalt. The PG 64-28 was incorrectly inserted at some point in time during the multiple rewrites of this specification. Historically, the asphalt grade was identified as AR-4000, and then changed to PG 58-22 when the PG grading system was adopted.	This is classified as a fatal flaw. The new hidden language is:- 1. Insert the grade of asphalt binder. Choose PG 58-22 for High Mountain and High Desert climatic region. Choose PG 64-16 for all other climatic region. See comment concerning hidden language above. See JC-5 Has this language been added to the Special Provisions? No. It will be added to the 2010 Standard Special Provision Index
Hidden Text under Section 37-2.05B(3)(d) Response- Delete "0.50 gal/sq yard." Add "not less than 0.45 gal/sq yd." This lower application rate is needed to prevent flushing in truck wheel path lanes. The application rate of 0.45 gal/sy has been demonstrated to be a successful application rate for wheel paths in truck lanes as evidenced by the projects performed by our firm on Interstate 8 in Imperial County.	This is a technical change request. Please submit scoping document to RPC for approval to work on this at sub task group level. See comment concerning hidden language above. See JC-5 However, Industry would like to add this issue to the technical review of Section 37 for desert work.
Section 37-2.05B(3)(f) Rolling and Sweeping Response- Pursuant to a discussion I had with Chuck Suszko, Chuck had a valid comment concerning sweeping of an Asphalt-Rubber interlayer. Delete, "Perform a final sweeping before contract acceptance." Add, "When an Asphalt-Rubber seal coat is utilized as a final wearing course, perform a final sweeping before contract acceptance. When an Asphalt-Rubber seal coat is utilized as an interlayer, perform a final sweeping immediately prior to application of a tack coat and/or hot mix asphalt surfacing.	This is a technical change request. Please submit scoping document to RPC for approval to work on this at sub task group level. Note: SAMI is not part of SSP 37-2. However, HQ has approved nSSP for SAMI. Industry concurs that the spec as written is acceptable. However, Industry would like to address this as a possible change during the technical specification review of Sect 37. Industry does not concur with the Note above. Sami was included in previous AR chip seal specification. Industry would like to know how this will be accomplished? 1-13-14 This should be a line included in the standard specifications for when AR Chip is used as an interlayer. There has never been and SSP for interlayer. The hidden language needs to be converted and included in the Standard.

Comment	Caltrans Response Industry Response
Section 37-2.02B Grade of fog seal coat should be specified for project, not determined by Engineer.	This is a technical change request. Please submit scoping document to RPC for approval to work on this at sub task group level. Industry would like to review this specification as part of the technical changes to Sect 37.
Section 37-2.04C(1)(d) Vialet Test should not be report only, should be a requirement.	This is a technical change request. Please submit scoping document to RPC for approval to work on this at sub task group level. Industry would like to review this specification as part of the technical changes to Sect 37.
Section 37-2.04B(2) Why are grading different from polymer modified table in Section 37-2.04C(2). They should be the same.	This is a technical change request. Please submit scoping document to RPC for approval to work on this at sub task group level. Industry would like to review this specification as part of the technical changes to Sect 37. Non-polymer modified is not used for chip seal in California under normal circumstances