

1610000 – PREDESIGNED STABILIZED SUBGRADE
COMMENTS/RESPONSES FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

Bob Dion
(386)740-0665

Comments:

Please change the subarticle number of 160-1.1 to 161-1.1.

Response:Done

Sastry Putcha Ph.D.,P.E.
State Construction Office
Ph.850-414-4148; SC 994-4148
Fax: 850-412-8021

Comments:

1. 161-4 First paragraph, Second sentence reads: If this test result does not meet the specification requirements, then adjust the design in the field.
Suggestion: add with Engineer's approval. The sentence now should read: If this test result does not meet the specification requirements, then adjust the design in the field with Engineer's approval.
2. 161-6.1: Second paragraph: add the remedy... If the depth checks confirm overthickness.....
3. 161-9: Under Non-Traffic Construction, under Rolling Pattern add Witness for Verification instead of N.A.

Response:

1. Change Accepted.
2. 161-6.1 refer to spreading stabilizing material. There is no need to correct if the contractor spreads too much material.
3. The verification is not required to witness the actual rolling pattern. Verification is required to witness the proof roll. Documentation has been developed to account for the rolling pattern.

Jim Warren
Asphalt Contractors Association of Florida
jwarren@acaf.org
Website: 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.

Response:

1. The lot language is reinstated
2. Lot lengths will remain a minimum of 300 feet or the full length of the embankment. Non-traffic construction areas will be allowed to extend up to a Day's Production. The purpose of this specification change is to remove restrictions that do not add value to construction.
3. Larger sections of construction are allowed in Non-Traffic construction to reduce testing requirements. Traffic construction sections are not expanded.

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>

Comments:

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 "Predesigned Stabilized Subgrade," and offer the following comments for your consideration.

161 - 161-4, Modify second sentence as follows, "The Engineer will collect two samples of the mixed subgrade for LBR and Soil Classification testing."

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.

Response:

Change not made because of conflict with 120-10.1.4.3 which states "Unless required by the Engineer, do not test or classify materials for stabilized subgrade or base." This gives the Engineer the option to test for soil classification.

Greg Schiess
FHWA

Comments:

1. 161-1.1 - We do want to allow this!!
2. 161-3 - ~~The Engineer may request samples of the subgrade soil and the stabilizing material for verification tests.~~ I thought the Districts wanted this requirement?
3. 161-4 - *Construct a trial section in accordance with 161-8.* 161-8 is compaction....161-4 is labeled Trail section but it doesn't describe the trail section.

Response:

1. Noted
2. This sentence was added back.
3. 161-8 refers to 120-8.1.2 which describes the trial section. This trail was used to avoid repeating information.

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

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 161: Predesigned Stabilized Subgrade

1. 161-1.1 Work Categories - Change "Traffic Construction" to "Traffic Areas".

161-2 Stabilizing Material –

2. 1st sentence, 914-3 reference should be to 914-2 or why not just reference Section 914 as stated in Section 160?
3. Second sentence, says to use only "one source" and then 161-3, third paragraph says "Make a separate determination of the spread rate for each source...." - which one is it?

161-6.1 Spreading Stabilizing Material –

4. Second paragraph, delete last sentence and change the previous sentence to "Notify the Engineer a minimum of 24 hours to witness checking the depth of stabilized material. #1 - Engineer should be capitalized.
5. 161-7 Plant Mixing - Second paragraph, last sentence - When the Contractor notifies the Engineer 24 hours prior to plant mixing - what is this for, so the Engineer can witness, so the Engineer can test, or what?

Response:

1. Changed
2. Changed
3. The second sentence in 161-2 states "Use only one source of local materials for a design." This does not conflict because the contractor may elect to use material from another source and the intent is to get another design for each source.
4. Changed
5. This allows the engineer to observe the process and sample if an IV test is warranted.
