
File: D2000000 - Rock Base
Username: Bob Dion
UserEmail:
UserTel: SC373-5161
UserFAX:
ContactRequested:
Remote Name: 156.75.64.64
Remote User:

Comments:

This wasn't changed, but please look at the first sentence of 200-6.2.
Its incomplete.

200-11: change the reference to 300-8 to 300-7.

200-11; change the reference from 300-8 to 300-7 to agree with the
latest version of Section 300.

File: D2000000 - Rock Base
Username: DANIEL L. COBB
UserEmail: rt219cd
UserTel: 386-961-7719 SC 881-7719
UserFAX: 386-961-7940
ContactRequested:
Remote Name: 156.75.19.64
Remote User:

Comments:

2007.4.2 Para 3

The use of the term ..."equipment-comparison" has caused some
discussion in D2. Project personnel wanted to perform another Initial
Equipment Comparison as covered by 10.1.1 with the entire civilized
world. (QC,VT and IA gauges).

I believe the intent is for QC and VT to hunker down somewhere and run
another Initial Production Lot comparison. Folks have jumped on the
word "equipment" with out paying attention to the section reference.

200-7.2

What is the accepted interpretation of the term "consecutive LOTS".
Suppose QC labels the Lots with consecutive numbers, but skips sections
of roadway due to bridges or other construction operations and then
comes back and finishes the skipped sections. Was the intent that LOTS
be adjacent to one another or simply follow the sequence of
construction?

200-7.2.1

How about shoulder base? Old spec allowed 95%.

The following issues are suggested for review.

General Note: The 200 specification states "Perform work in accordance with an approved QC plan.... . The Earthwork sections of the QC plans being approved have virtually nothing in them except the yada-yada from the generic plans posted for use. Nothing is included regarding compaction equipment or compaction effort. It is probably not reasonable to require these things to be estimated before the project starts, but I think there should be a requirement that the contractor go on record for a minimum compaction effort (equipment types & passes etc.) for each class of work or as appropriate for the materials in question.

200-5.2 Para 3

Which test will be verified? The full depth or the bottom 6" or both? Does the Verification test need to compare as well as pass?

200-5.2 Para 4

The use of the open ended word "periodically" seems out of place in a system based on random selection of test locations at set frequencies. Consider adding a frequency for the bottom tests. Perhaps every third or fourth test should be on the bottom. At 1 VT:16 Lots, that is still a lot of rock that won't be checked. Can the bottom density be calculated by proportion using a full depth test and a top half test? Two tests in the same hole are easy to do and do not require the top layer be removed. I would advocate this for all VT tests on production lots and not for the test section. Although the test section data should certainly be used to check the validity of the proportionality equation.

200-6.1.2

Does the wording of the 2nd sentence comply with the CQC philosophy?

200-6.3

1st sentence -- should this read entire LENGTH and WIDTH of the baseto specified DEPTH?

285-6

Has the language of Section 285-6 been CQC'd in light of the changes to the 200 spec?

200-7.1

The word "except" seems inappropriate since 120-10.1 does not include 120-10.2.

200-7.2.1

AASHTO FM T-180 -- Method D is not specified as it is in subsequent sections.

200-7.2.2 Note under table

It seems like most of the widening seen in D2 is 5 ft. and has been included in the "4 ft or less" by DME/DCE memo. Is this the case in other Districts? If so can the minimum width be extended to 5?

200-7.3.2.1

Method D is not specified in previous section.

200-7.3.2.2 Last 2 sentences

Why are these sentences included in this section? 7.3.1.3 indicates that the Contractor/QC folks are responsible for this stuff.

200-7.4.2

Consider adding wording to clarify that a 'QC' retest will be run within 5 ft. etc. See the wording of 200-7.4.3 for continuity.
(Sections 120-10.4.2, 125-10.2 & 160-7.4.4 should also be considered for similar editing)

200-9

This section references 200-10.1 for "measurements specified". 200-10.1 appears to indicate only that the Plan Quantity establishes the pay quantity and does not seem to address anything regarding "measurements". Is this correct?