

1600000 STABILIZING
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Neil A Monkman
239-462-7371
neil.monkman@wcgfl.com

Comments: (12-18-17)

Currently, the contractor has the option to use soaked or unsoaked LBR results provided the material meets the requirements. The primary reason for unsoaked is time. It appears now that if unsoaked is desired, a soaked must also be performed for comparison. I will apologize in advance if my understanding is wrong, but this is pointless. You are either meeting the stricter requirement of unsoaked with no tolerance or waiting 7-10 days for soaked with tolerances. The Department is already holding the contractor to a tighter standard so what is the point of doing both. This change will only result in one thing, Nobody will bother with an unsoaked LBR. The Department should have just eliminated the option.

If anyone has time, I would greatly appreciate a call or email on this.

Response:

Sherry Valdez
414-4249
sherry.valdez@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-18-17)

Under Section 160-4.6 "Disposition of Defective Material" known as DDM. Currently in MAC this is now called "Material Acceptance Resolution" (MAR). Also need to change Specification 120-10.5 to say the same thing.

Response:

Juan Castellanos
954 677 7032
juan.castellanos@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-19-17)

160-4.1.4.4: In the table, I suggest completing the criteria for test AASHTO M145 as follows:
Symbol= S (per Standard Plans Index 120-001)

Response:

D5 Construction Operations
386-943-5347

Comments: (12-29-17)

There needs to be a definition of “Local Stabilizing Materials”

Response:

Anonymous

Comments: (1-11-18)

160-4.4.1 Frequency for Stabilizing Mixing Depth in the table. Change verification frequency from "witness one per LOT" to "witness". This change would match frequency for verification stabilizing mixing depth check in Verification Earthwork Density Record System Form 675-620-28 table Verification Stabilizing Mixing Depth Witness. Also section 200 of the specifications for rock base the verification frequency is "witness". Thanks for your consideration.

Response:

Tracy Padula
863-519-4276
tracy.padula@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1-11-18)

1. 160-2.2.1 - Because of the sub section title, this would lead me to believe that the section 914 is actually 914-2.2. Shouldn't we specify 914-2.2 Or is the intent is to meet the criteria in 914-1 as well as 914-2.2? What are we comparing? There is no comparison criteria for the test methods listed in 914. Are we going to establish comparison criteria? If so, shouldn't it be stated in this specification? We would have new programing for the comparison packages to be created. With this new programing, will the resolution status to be manually set, or will MAC set the status based on the test data?

Response:

2. 160-2.2.2 – Is testing required if material is coming from an approved RAP source?

Response:

3. 160-2.2.3 - How does QC determine which category to log this sample under? Once the QC passes, VT enters theirs with matching category? The resolution criteria is still vague. Are we going to resolution based on 914-1 or 914-2? Is there a +/- limit that is acceptable? Will that be built into the MAC specification?

Response:

4. 160-3.2 – Last paragraph in this section - Based on this language we now have an IV level of sampling and testing that is used for acceptance/rejection of material. How are these findings

going to be addressed in MAC? Currently there is no programming on pass/fail IV samples. If the sample fails and the material is not removed and replaced, is it an exception?

Response:

5. 160-3.4 - This section reads very repetitive. Can we remove, "Break down or remove from the stabilized area materials, including clay lumps or lumps made of clay-size particles (any particle size 2 microns or less), not meeting the gradation requirements. Remove any lumps of clay or clay-sized particles greater than one inch that do not meet the requirements of 160-3.2."?

Response:

6. 160-3.4.1- Is the intent of this testing to be done on the same sample? The QC will perform a soil class and LBR on the same sample, no matter the material placed (local, RAP, RAP Blend, or Commercial)? Wouldn't this information be located under 160-4.1.4.1?

Response:

7. 160-4 – Exactly what is 'Mixed Material'?

Response:

8. 160-4.1.4.1 - Is the intent of this sentence for the Verification to not log or submit their sample for testing until all 8 QC LOTs have been tested?

Response:

9. 160-4.1.4.3 - In 160-3.4.1 references soil utilization and classification. That is not mentioned here at all. 160-4.1.4.3.2 - We will have two ways to handle a failing unsoaked LBR. Resolution or discontinue unsoaked... How is programming going to handle this?

Response:

10. 160-4.1.4.4 - This section is still very misleading. In 160-4.1.4.1 it is clear on what must be tested. Then this section is introduced. Is the intent that the proctor only be performed on commercial material? And the tests listed in 160-4.1.4.4 on all other stabilizing material OTHER than commercial?

Response:

11. 160-4.4.1 – Table. The way this table is presented, it leads you to understand that all this testing is being done on the same sample, no matter what material that is being placed (Commercial, Local, Existing base). The only difference is the AC content for RAP, RAP Blend. 160-4.5 - So no more soil classification on the VT LBR? It is only an LBR, no matter the material placed?

Response:

12. General comments – With the intricacies of the local material, would you consider making a specification for this material? Referencing the 120 specification so many times with in the specification gets very awkward. Would you consider entering the language instead of the reference?

Response:
