

1600000, Stabilization
Response to Comments From Industry Review

Dan L. Hurtado, P.E.
(850) 414-4155
dan.hurtado@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

160-2.3 Existing Base: “*When the materials from an existing base is used...*”, should read, “When material from an existing base is used...” (“material” should be singular.)

Response:

Modified as follows:

When material from an existing base is used as all or a portion of the stabilizing additives, no further testing is required unless directed by the Engineer.

Tim Ruelke
(386) 961-7730
timothy.ruelke@fdot.state.fl.us

Comment:

Text: In 160-2, why are we eliminating the Contractor's option to use 6" of base in stead of 12" of LBR 40 material. I have had several Contractors choose to do this over the years.

Response:

The option was not eliminated. Included in 160-2.4

Duane Brautigam

Comment

160-2.2 - Combine first two sentences - very redundant.

Response

Done

160-3.2.1.1 - In the first sentence, who is rejecting? Active voice would indicate Contractor rejects; is that the intent or is it the Engineer? Same comment for last sentence in this subarticle, who is rejecting? 160-4.2.1.2 - The use of "following" twice in the first sentence is awkward. Suggest rewording. 160-4.2.4 (also 160-3.2.1)

Response

Done

In Table, the abbreviations "LL" and "PI" should be spelled out.

Response
Done

Barbara Beacham
863-519-4208

Comment:

I recommend considering the following:

160-1 Description

Leave in 6.8 and add Section 105

Response

Not Implemented. Section 6-8 was moved to Section 105.

160-3.2.1 Sampling and Testing of Local Materials:

Require a resolution sample be picked up at the same time the verification sample is pulled.

Response

Included a procedure for requiring the engineer to pick up the resolution the same time the verification is picked up.

Holly Bauman
Holly.Bauman@hatchmott.com

Comments:

160-3.1: Should LOT be changed?

Response:

No Change made.

Anjani Girwarr
Assistant General Counsel
(863) 519-2825

Comments:

Page 6 of 10

Suggest using the titles in the table cells like this: "The following under the Tolerance column are allowed for the values listed in Specified Bearing Value column:"

Response: Modified for clarity

160-754.2.1.2 Undertolerances in Bearing Value Requirements: *The following under tolerances are allowed for the following required Bearing Values: Undertolerances was hyphenated*

First instance of the acronym “LBR” should be defined before being used in the rest of the document.

First instance of “LBR” appears on page 3 of 10 in this paragraph.

160-2.4 Granular Subbase: *The Engineer may allow, at no additional cost to the Department, the substitution of 6 inches of Granular Subbase meeting the requirements of 290-2 & 290-3, when 12 inches of Stabilization requiring an LBR value of 40 is specified.*

The definition of “LBR” does not appears until page 7 of 10 in the paragraph listed below.

160-745.3.1.1 Bearing Values: Test the Stabilized Subgrade sample collected in 160-754.3.1.3. Determine the Limerock Bearing Ratio (LBR) in accordance with FM 5-515 and 160-754.2.4.

Response : Added “Limerock Bearing Ratio” to 160-2.4

Page 6 of 10

Typo? Word “Undertolerances” is this two words or one since it is used in both as “undertolerances” in the title and then as “under tolerances” in the sentence that follows.

160-754.2.1.2 Undertolerances in Bearing Value Requirements: *The following under tolerances are allowed for the following required Bearing Values:*

Response: All cases were hyphenated.

Jennifer Williams
Office of the District Secretary
Florida Department of Transportation
Office (850) 415-9592
jennifer.williams@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

In section 160-3.2.1, the first sentence states “before mixing.” Does this mean to test only the stabilizing material?

Yes

In section 160-4.2.1.2 delete undertolerances for the specified bearing value. Too many roads are built on the 5.0 undertolerance. We would like to emphasize the deletion of undertolerance. Too often contractors don’t stabilize and hope to meet the undertolerance requirement of LBR 35.

The undertolerance is an established engineering practice. There is no plan to address this before this specification is published.

In section 160-6, Basis of Payment, in areas where existing subgrade materials meet the design bearing value, is the contractor required to mix the existing material to receive full payment?

Yes

160-3 requires the contractor to mix the subgrade.

We recommend adding requirement for soil classification on mixed soil (particularly when requesting Unsoaked LBR). This is an inexpensive test and valuable information can be gained. For Verification and Resolution testing D3 performs classification testing as a practice.
Soil Classification was included for VT and Reslution Testing in this specification.

Larry Keen
386-961-7741

Comment

Section 160-3.1, paragraph 3, references 160-7.2. This looks like it should be 160-4.2.

Corrected

Section 160-3.6 references 160-5.2.3. This looks like it should be 160-4.2.3.

Corrected

Section 160-4.2.3.1 references 160-5.2.3.2. This looks like it should be 160-4.2.3.2.

Corrected

The “Mixing Depth Thickness” section is shown as 160-5.4.2. It looks like it should be listed as 160-4.4.2.

Correct

Ken Zinck
(Ed Petersen, Bert Woerner)
386-740-3471
ken.zinck@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

It would appear a grammatical error has occurred as the word “be” should be placed between, may be mixed.... And the comma behind the word mixed should be removed and placed behind the word course; The subgrade may be mixed in one course, 160-543.3 Mixing: Perform mixing using rotary tillers, a plant, or other equipment meeting the approval of the Engineer. The subgrade may mixed, in one course if the equipment and method of construction provides the uniformity, particle size limitation, compaction and other desired results of 160-4.

correct

160-2.2 Local Material Second sentence needs a comma between: materials, test.

This was rewritten.

160-3.3 Mixing Second sentence needs a “be” between may and mixed.

correct

160-4.2.1.2 Under-tolerances Consider putting a limit on how many under-tolerances are allowed. Or why not make the under-tolerances the requirement?

The undertolerance is an established engineering practice. There is no plan to address this before this specification is published.
