

9140000 – MATERIALS FOR SUBGRADE STABILIZATION
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

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 lowers 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 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.

Jeanie Kozak
386-740-3489

Comments:

914 - 2.1.3 Crushed Shell: The determination of the percentage passing the No. 200 sieve shall be by washing only. Shouldn't this read "per FM 1-T 011" to eliminate any questions on which method to use.

914 - 2.2 Local Materials: However, no materials that deteriorate over time, cause excessive deformations, contain hazardous substances, contaminates, or do not improve the bearing capacity of the stabilized material may be used. (see 914-3 for qualifying tests for these conditions.) For certification purposes, how will one know when these qualifying tests are required? This should be more specific as to what tests need to be completed.

914-3 Testing of Materials for Use as a Stabilizer: The organic content shall be performed in accordance with FM 1-T 267 on the portion of a sample passing the No. 4 sieve. (This should read the No. 10 sieve)
