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

Comments:

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

RESPONSE:

200-11 There is no reference to 300-8.

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

RESPONSE:

200-6.2 The sentence sounds odd but is correct. The words "wet" and "dry" are used as verbs not as adjectives of density.

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:

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?

RESPONSE: This will be clarified in the Department's Density Log Book Procedure.

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.

RESPONSE: This will be clarified in the Department's Density Log Book Procedure.

200-6.1.2: Does the wording of the 2nd sentence comply with the CQC philosophy?

RESPONSE: This comment will be addressed in the next round of specification revisions.

200-6.3: 1st sentence -- should this read entire LENGTH and WIDTH of the baseto specified DEPTH?

RESPONSE: This comment will be addressed in the next round of specification revisions.

200-7.1: The word "except" seems inappropriate since 120-10.1 does not include 120-10.2.

RESPONSE: 120-10.1 makes several references to 120-10.2.

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?

RESPONSE: The use of the term "consecutive" refers to any contiguous sections, sections following in compaction sequence. Either interpretation by the contractor is acceptable and therefore the term consecutive is appropriate.

200-7.2.1: AASHTO FM T-180 -- Method D is not specified as it is in subsequent sections.

How about shoulder base? Old spec allowed 95%.

RESPONSE: Comment has been accepted and issued as a 1/14/03 construction memo by Ananth Prasad. Revise the subject section as follows: (note delete typo reference to AASHTO). The specification will be revised to indicate the use of Method D.

RESPONSE: revise 200-7.2.1 Density to read as follows: Within the entire limits of the width and depth of the base for traveled way and auxiliary lanes, obtain a minimum density in any LOT of 98% of maximum density as determined by FM 1-T 180, Method D. Compact the base for any LOT of shoulder pavement to not less than 95% of the maximum density as determined by FM 1-T 180, Method D.

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?

RESPONSE: This comment will be addressed in the next round of specification revisions.

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.

RESPONSE: The requirements of the last two sentences apply to the contractor supporting the Department's verification testing. Sec. 200-7.3.1.3 applies to QC testing.

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)

RESPONSE: The structure and style of the specifications implicitly require the interpretation of all direct instructions as contractor requirements.

200-7.4.2 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).

RESPONSE: In the 3rd paragraph of Sec. 200-7.4.2 Density: delete the reference to 120-10.1.2 and replace with 120-10.1.1.

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.

200-9: 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?

RESPONSE: Sec. 200-10.1 refers to adjustments made in 200-10.2 and cross-references the measurements made in 200-6.3.

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

RESPONSE: This specification was reviewed and revised for the July 2002 workbook