

1600000 – STABILIZING  
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Dion  
[bob\\_dion@urscorp.com](mailto:bob_dion@urscorp.com), (386)740-0665

Comments:

Does 'shoulder only construction' in 160-5.1.1.1 include paved shoulder also?

Suggest expanding 160-5.1.1.2 to include side streets or should 'mainline' be removed? Should it be '....construction of the roadbed for pavement lanes....'? Is shoulder construction (paved and unpaved) included? Suggest mentioning shoulders

160-9.3 suggest not deleting 'Type B Stabilization' from the 2nd paragraph, or mention 'in Stabilized Subgrade' in the first paragraph. If not, the 1st and second paragraphs conflict. The first pays for commercial material, the second says no separate payment will be made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Derek Fusco  
[derek.fusco@fdot.state.fl.us](mailto:derek.fusco@fdot.state.fl.us), 850/414-4167

Comments:

Should subarticle 160-5.1.1.2 Traffic Construction include rest area parking lots?

\*\*\*\*\*

Sastry Putcha Ph.D.,P.E.  
State Construction Office  
Ph.850-414-4148; Fax: 850-412-8021

Comments:

1. 160-7.2.4: Use Word Track to highlight changes
2. 160-7.2.4: under Non-Traffic Construction, under Rolling Pattern add Witness for Verification instead of N.A.
3. 160-7.4.4 Define production area in: first paragraph, first sentence.....retest the section or production area

\*\*\*\*\*

Jim Warren  
Asphalt Contractors Association of Florida  
[jwarren@acaf.org](mailto:jwarren@acaf.org)  
Website: [www.acaf.org](http://www.acaf.org)  
Work: 850-222-7300

Comments:

I disagree with the philosophy of moving away from Lots and calling them "Sections". It most likely will cause more problems than it fixes. Lots are standard term and need to be understood by those working in this industry. It is the basis of statistically based acceptance specifications and those in the field are more than capable of understanding these concepts. I have been teaching these basic statistical concepts for years in the CTQP courses and never get questions on what a Lot is, but rather what is the size of the Lot? Changing the terms mid-stream will cause confusion in the field, especially between different material areas. A Lot is a Lot is a Lot, whether it is in linear feet, cubic yards or tons depending on the type of material.

Also, there needs to be provision for accepting shorter segments. In changing the Lots to consecutive feet and increasing the distance/total number of tests - how does one handle a project that is built in short segments? Specifically, if the phasing of the project calls for building an area up that is less than the consecutive footage requirement, how do you accept lower layers of embankment, sub base or base? The same situation applies to areas that in the interest of getting the project built faster – the contractor wants to work smaller sections – is the contractor then placed at high risk in covering up lower layers? Why can't the layers be accepted as they are completed regardless of the length – if it will get the project done faster? If we can reduce the risk to both the contractor and the agency, the projects will undoubtedly be built right (quality) and faster and cheaper in the process. Seems the way that is proposed will be a paperwork nightmare.

There appears to be a push toward larger Lots and longer consecutive distances before reduced testing is an option. My question to the Department is how many projects are actually phased this way anymore, or is the trend to have projects built in shorter sections? Any specification that is developed must be flexible enough to work in both long continuous runs of production and short discontinuous runs of production. I'd go further to recommend to the Department that they consider looking at how they are doing business now (compared to 10 years ago) in terms of the type/scope/phasing of projects to see if the current specifications are applicable to the majority of that type of work.

\*\*\*\*\*

Greg Vickery  
District Performance Management & Communications Coordinator  
Office of the District Secretary  
Office (850) 415-9529, Fax (850) 415-9761  
Cellular (850) 260-5324  
<mailto:greg.vickery@dot.state.fl.us>

We have retrieved the referenced document from the State Specifications Office's Industry Review intranet website. Pursuant to request, we have reviewed the document, entitled "Stabilizing," and offer the following comments for your consideration.

Under 160-7.2.4, add Soil Classification test at the same frequency of LBR test.  
160-2, last paragraph - the reference to Section 290 is a bad reference as 290 is currently written. Only the list of optional materials is applicable, the rest of 290 would not pertain to substituting for Type B Stabilization.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me, at (850) 415-9200.

\*\*\*\*\*

Robert D. Bistor  
Senior Quality Control Manager  
Hubbard Construction Company  
email: [bbistor@hubbard.com](mailto:bbistor@hubbard.com)

Orlando Office  
P.O. Box 547186  
Orlando, FL 32854-7186  
(407) 293-4340;(407) 294-3926 FAX

Tampa Office  
105 N. Falkenburg Road, Suite D  
Tampa, FL 33619  
(813) 685-6005; (813) 685-6740 FAX

Comments:

\* The proposed change eliminates the need to perform the work under an approved QC Plan. By eliminating this requirement, the contractor would not be identifying sources of stabilizing material, there would be no specification requirement to utilize a CTQP certified technician to perform the QC testing (CTQP certified techs are identified in the QC Plan), etc. We feel that this requirement SHOULD NOT be deleted.

\* Section 160-2 changes are deleting the wording allowing an unsoaked LBR, yet 160-7.2.1.2 still has an unsoaked LBR requirement. Is an unsoaked LBR allowed or not under the proposed change? If so then the original wording should be left in place as FM 5-515 does not provide for an unsoaked LBR.

\* The proposed changes to section 160-7.2.4 to include non-traffic area requirements base the frequency on days of production rather than length. The type of work in non-traffic areas is usually performed with smaller equipment with much slower production rates than traffic areas. As a result the ratio of testing to area of in-place material may be substantially higher than for traffic areas. I feel this frequency should be based upon completed area rather than days production.

\* The proposed verification testing requirement is 1 per 4 QC samples in traffic areas and 1 per 2 in non-traffic areas. This seems to be excessive testing when compared to the testing of traffic areas. Additionally work in non-traffic areas is usually smaller areas, and the placement of subsequent layers may occur sooner than in traffic areas. The wait involved due to the verification sample not being selected until after 2 QC samples have been obtained, which then needs to be delivered to the Verification lab and tested, could significantly slow the contractors production.

\*\*\*\*\*

Kevin L. Price  
QC Manager, D.A.B. Constructors, Inc  
PO Box 1589  
Inglis, FL 34449  
Office (352)447-5488 x243, Fax (352)447-4133  
Cell (352)302-1515

Comments:

160-7.2.4 – This table clarifies quite well what needs to be done. What I am having trouble understanding is the traffic and non-traffic construction. If no QCP is required on the non-traffic construction than why are we requiring QC testing? Who is performing this testing? If the intent is to have an independent lab run the testing, you may be better served having the department do the testing.

Another question is what if you have a bike path along with a road reconstruction; QC is required on the road but not the bike path?

I cannot stress enough how the traffic and non-traffic sections need to be separated into separate sections. I am having difficulty following the requirements. Please consider revising this spec into separate sub-sections outlining the requirements for each in its respective sub-section.

Thanks again

\*\*\*\*\*

Stefanie D. Maxwell, P.E.  
Specialty Engineer  
FDOT State Construction Office  
605 Suwannee Street, MS 31  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450  
Phone: (850) 414-4314  
Fax: (850) 412-8021  
E-mail: [stefanie.maxwell@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:stefanie.maxwell@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

Following are comments from State Construction Office (David Sadler and Stefanie Maxwell) for specs 120, 125, 160, 161 and 200. Also, we agree with a lot of the comments made by FHWA, so we tried not to duplicate.

**Section 160: Stabilizing**

Why not title it "Type B Stabilization"?

Keep LOT language

Change all references to "Traffic Construction" and "Non-Traffic Construction" to "Traffic Areas" and "Non-traffic Areas".

160-7.4.2 Mixing Depth Thickness - First sentence, change "Department" to "Engineer". In #1 - capitalize Engineer. #2 - Depth - should be lower case. #3 - Density - should be lower case.

160-9.1 Type B Stabilization - First sentence - Stabilization should be lower case.

106-9.3 Commercial Stabilizing Material - Second paragraph - "No separate payment will be made for any commercial stabilizing material which the Contractor may elect to use - contradicts the first paragraph. The way I understand it is, that FDOT will pay for the material if called for in the plans, but if the Contractor chooses to use commercial material on his own, FDOT doesn't pay for it. Is this the correct interpretation?

\*\*\*\*\*

Sam Weede  
District Geotechnical Engineer  
Asst. District Materials Engineer  
850-638-0250 extension 621

Comments:

It was my interpretation of the 2004 Spec that sampling and subsequent LBR & proctor testing was at different locations to assure a broader Random sampling program. This has been an issue with field personnel as they routinely sample at the same location for convenience. Convenience of sampling should not be a determining factor. On related issue, the use of IV sampling and testing of earthwork seems to be nonexistent. D3 has had recent discussions of implemented an earthwork IV program. With an IV program, the need for sampling at different locations for LBR and proctor becomes less critical. Has the earthwork arena ever considered a need for an IV program? As I understand only HMA has a required IV sampling and testing program.

These are just ideas to consider and if you have any questions or wish to discuss further, please advise.

\*\*\*\*\*