

Specification Section 160

Subarticle 160-2, etc.

ORIGINATION

Date: 6-28-24

Name: Dino Jameson

Email: dino.jameson@dot.state.fl.us

COMMENTARY

Clarification to existing earthwork specification language was requested by the districts for green technicians that is coming into the industry that could read it and understand the requirements without lead to various interpretations or cause confusion.

INDUSTRY COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

(Please note all comments and responses are verbatim as received. The Specifications Office does not alter typos or grammar.)

BLACK = Comment **BLUE** = Specifications Response **GREEN** = Change Made to Specification

Name: Charles Miller

Date: 8-12-24

COMMENT:

1. 160-3.1 General: Paragraph 3 reads: Isolated mixing operations and isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTS. Curb pads and shoulders compacted separately shall be considered separate LOTS. Isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTS. Isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTS. For multiple phase construction, a LOT shall not extend beyond the limits of the phase.
The first sentence states “and isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTS” that is repeated in the 3rd sentence. Not sure if the redundancy was on purpose, as an identical struck out portion of the exact same sentence follows it.
2. 160-4.6~~2~~ Mixing Depth Requirements: This section states the tolerances but adding a reference to 160-4.8~~5~~.7 Mixing Depth would help show where to find the procedures if those tolerances are not met. Adding an additional sentence at the bottom such as: “If the measured depth of the mixed subgrade is found to be outside of these tolerances follow the resolution procedures of 160-4.8.7” Or all of the information could be put into a single spec location with no need for referencing back and forth. The last sentence of the last paragraph in 160-4.6 also states, “Record results on Department approved forms” and this should probably be removed so as not to conflict with Sentence 1 of paragraph 1 that requires reporting to the ERS of the Department’s database.
3. 160-4.8.1 Bearing Value: The Engineer will collect a sample at a location other than the location where the sample was collected in 160-4.1.4.1, and test the stabilized subgrade for determination of the LBR in accordance with FM 5-515. The Engineer will select test locations, including stations and offsets, using a Random Number generator, based on the LOTS under consideration. This removes the IV requirement but stating that the sample comes from a split sample would clarify that for staff that are used to doing the IV sampling. Adding the following to the first sentence can help with clarification: and randomly select one of the retained split samples referenced in 160-4.2.1

RESPONSE:

1. The repeated language in 160-3.1 is a transfer error from the original proposed changes to the condensed changes version. We will get this error corrected.
2. 160-4.6 is directly the requirements for the Contractor. All of 160-4.8 is informing the Contractor, the process (verification and resolution procedures) for accepting the work performed in 160-4.1, 160-4.2, 160-4.6, and 160-4.7, and the process that the Contractor has to take in order for the LOTs to be accepted. This is the flow all of the earthwork specs. 160-4.8.7 cannot be combined with 160-4.6. Concur to remove the following sentence: "Record results on Department approved forms"

ACTION TAKEN:

1. **Removed the repeated language in 160-3.1.**
 2. **No changes to reference 160-4.8.7 in 160.4.6 or combine the two sections. Removed the following sentence "Record results on Department approved forms" and added record and report in the first sentence.**
-

Name: Keith Kummer

Date: 8-13-24

COMMENT: The spec. change should be expanded to allow for pit proctor samples to be tracked by 8,000 linear feet max (no matter where it falls on the roadway nor how many lots it encompasses) rather than by lots and classifications like subbase full width, subbase shoulder only etc. Current max lot limit is 8,000 linear feet when calculating 16 lots at 500 LF for mainline full width or shoulder only 4 lots at 2,000 LF. The material doesn't change based on where it's placed on the roadway and the current system is causing oversampling and overspending so this request is definitely a cost savings initiative.

RESPONSE:

Pit Proctor language is not part of the 160 specifications. Suggested changes cannot be made to upcoming specifications cycle since those specifications has not been modified for Pit Proctor. All the Earthwork specification and also some of the other material sections are based on LOT frequency. This is due to tracking purposes. None of our specs are based on linear feet or volume based frequency or wherever the technician thinks they should use the linear feet logic. Material certification and acceptance is looking to see if every LOT is verified and accepted. This approach would be a nightmare for the Department's Certification and Independent Assurance group.

ACTION TAKEN:

No changes made.

Name: Charlotte Price for Matt Hunter

Date: 8-27-24

COMMENT:160-3.1 General: Paragraph 3 reads: Isolated mixing operations and isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTs. Curb pads and shoulders compacted separately shall be considered separate LOTs. Isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTs. Isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTs. For multiple phase construction, a LOT shall not extend beyond the limits of the phase. The first sentence states "and isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTs" that is repeated in the 3rd sentence. Not sure if the redundancy was on purpose, as an identical struck out portion of the exact same sentence follows it.

RESPONSE:

The repeated language in 160-3.1 is a transfer error from the original proposed changes to the condensed changes version. We will get this error corrected.

ACTION TAKEN:

Removed the repeated language in 160-3.1.

Name: Charlotte Price

Date: 8-27-24

COMMENT: 160-4.62 Mixing Depth Requirements: The last sentence of the last paragraph in 160-4.6 also states, "Record results on Department approved forms" and this should probably be removed so as not to conflict with paragraph 1 sentence 1 that requires reporting to the ERS of the Department's database.

RESPONSE:

The repeated language in 160-3.1 is a transfer error from the original proposed changes to the condensed changes version. We will get this error corrected.

ACTION TAKEN:

Removed the repeated language in 160-3.1.