

3500200 CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW



Joseph Conover
josephp.conover@cemex.com
(for) James W Mack

Comments: (9-13-22 Industry)

On behalf of CEMEX for James W Mack, we provide the following comments for your consideration.

When the FDOT Section 350 specification was previously revised, FDOT Section 346 was purposely referenced so that there were no conflicts between sections. We see the proposed change as a step away from that philosophy. Unless the sampling frequency is being removed from that section 346 we don't feel any other guidelines need to be added to the Section 350 specification. In reviewing the 346 specifications, we do agree that some additional language to better represent paving could be added, but it should be done in the 346 section.

We also feel that the proposed language is too prescriptive and only provides one way to reduce lot size based on compressive strength on cores or cylinders. We would also like to have the Maturity of the concrete included as an alternative to evaluate strength. We also accept the thought process that tests from previous projects can be used. We would like to see alternate strength methods and other ways to show that lot size can be reduced and accepted too.

Response:

The first review comment (from Joseph Conover of Cemex) refers to proposed changes that were submitted by someone else (Jose Armenteros of the State Materials Office), I believe.

John Bosnoian, P.E., C.W.I
(904) 903-0934
jbosnoian@hntb.com

Comments: (9-1-22 Industry)

Would this additional pay quantity be eligible for design build lump sum projects as well?

Response: The proposed changes are for the Standard Specifications. However, we do plan to also make changes to the Design Build Boiler Plate and Lump Sum Special Provisions so the proposed pay quantity changes would also apply to Design Build/Lump Sum projects.
