

Pickering, John

From: Purvis, Keith
Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2003 8:04 AM
To: Reeves, Steve; Reese, John; Pittman, Richard; Fletcher, Brad; Whitfield, Robert; Mood, Amy; Seal, David; Hammons, Jimmy H.; Spell, Steve; Pickering, John
Cc: Ruff, Wendel; Portera, Joy; Lewis, Brad
Subject: FW: LFA / Soil Cement
Until notified otherwise:

On future projects, we will not include a soil cement alternate to the lime fly ash treatment if there is no drainage layer in the pavement design.

It will be the responsibility of the Construction Division to advise of changes needed to previously approved pavement designs.

Keith Purvis, P.E.
Mississippi Department of Transportation
Assistant Roadway Design Division Engineer
Phone: (601) 359-7256
Fax: (601) 359-7063
Email: kpurvis@mdot.state.ms.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Portera, Joy
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2003 4:53 PM
To: Lewis, Brad; Sheffield, Richard H.
Cc: Battey, Randy; Ruff, Wendel; Purvis, Keith
Subject: FW: LFA / Soil Cement

FYI..... Looks like we made the correct decision until we hear further from Richard.

Thanks Brad! Joy
-----Original Message-----

From: Lewis, Brad
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2003 3:58 PM
To: Portera, Joy
Subject: FW: LFA / Soil Cement

This is the last conversation on this matter I've had with Richard.
-----Original Message-----

From: Sheffield, Richard H.
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 4:05 PM
To: Lewis, Brad; Boyd, Barry; Brumfield, Jimmy
Subject: RE: LFA / Soil Cement

We are seriously looking at what we need to do to revise our design requirements. I've got the PCA coming in on April 15th for their input; we can all discuss. We will probably go to a 300 psi design at 14 days (for bases), instead of 400/500 psi at 7 days. This will reduce the cement demand and should greatly cut down on any cracking.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lewis, Brad
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 3:33 PM
To: Boyd, Barry; Brumfield, Jimmy; Sheffield, Richard H.
Subject: RE: LFA / Soil Cement

For bridge replacement projects with less than 1000 lf (I think) you don't have to use the treated layers, I would have to look back at the policy to be sure of the length. It is my understanding that when we added soil-cement as an option, the reduced percentage of cement would also reduce the amount of reflective cracking and would not be a concern. We may need to look at this situation again.

Any comments?

-----Original Message-----

From: Boyd, Barry
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 12:10 PM
To: Lewis, Brad
Subject: LFA / Soil Cement

Brad

One thing we might need to be concerned about in the contractors being given the option of soil cement or lime fly ash is in areas that do not have the drainage course. We were just looking at a bridge replacement on a two-lane route. In this case, the drainage course is not being used so we will not have a layer to interrupt the reflective cracking. I don't think we should not allow the use of soil cement. I am including a statement to that effect in this pavement recommendation.

In my opinion, this will apply to all pavement structures that do not have the drainage course.

Barry M. Boyd
District 1 Materials Engineer
P. O. Box 2060
1915 N. Gloster
Tupelo, MS 38803-2060
Phone: 662-842-4541
Fax: 662-840-5588
Cel: 662-231-2633
Email: bboyd@mdot.state.ms.us
Mail Code: 11-30