

RESPONSE 2 Comments from Industry Review – 1050502

Kevin Price

Mr. Brautigam,

I have reviewed the proposed revision to the 105 spec and I do not feel that this is needed. The people performing the testing and documenting results are human just like the rest of us. Some of the most experienced and capable technicians in the field have trouble filling in the blanks correctly. Sometimes QC managers have to make corrections for those field people, most of the time the tech catches his own mistake and fixes it himself. I think that we are getting out of control with this ink requirement.

We must have trust! If the department is having an issue with a technician or QC manager changing data to bring it in spec requirements than the department needs to take it up directly with that individual. I do not see the need for a spec revision or even the ink requirement for everyone. If someone is going to cheat or try and cheat the system no amount of ink in the world is going to stop them.

The forms that are provided barely have room for the data much less the room to strike through and add corrected data, initials, and date. In my opinion a simplification of the forms would be best served. Instead of increasing the stress of the people in the field with more and more requirements, how about we streamline and simplify the system to try and decrease the amount of mistakes.

The people in the field need to be focused on the production and inspection of the product. Quality is the goal. The more difficult the paperwork becomes the more time is needed to rewrite or make corrections. An inspector sitting in a vehicle filling out paperwork is ineffective. I expect the standard reply of “it is just a simple correction, why is it that big of a deal?” The issue is clarity of the reports. The most common error that I have seen has been simple calculation errors. Rounded incorrectly or transposed a wrong number. One or two of those on one page of data muddies up the report because by the time the error is found the report is complete with data above and below. So then you are trying to rewrite a number in the .125” of blank space found on the margins. Then the report is faxed once or twice and no one is able to determine what numbers went where.

All through the process of QC testing, verification people are present. All CQC testing is done under the watchful eye of the department or it’s consultants and it is hard for me to see a need for blue or black ink. This requirement is only going to make the people, who make honest mistakes and try to correct them, lives more difficult and does nothing to solve the real issue. If the issue is that the department feels that people are cheating then investigate those people, if they are cheating reject their certifications, remove them from department projects, but do not punish everyone for the dishonesty of a few people.

I hope I have been able to express my opinion without being rude, I do not wish to offend anyone, but I do have issues with this change. In my opinion it is a slap in the face to those of us who are working hard and trying to make someone else's system work.

Please feel free to contact me if you wish to discuss this matter further. Happy Holidays.

Kevin L. Price
Q.C. Manager
D.A.B. Constructors, Inc
Office - 352-447-5488 ext 243
Fax - 352-447-4133
Cell - 352-302-1515

Response: The proposed change is to reconcile the specifications with several of the FDOT forms that require completion with ink and no erasures. It is not intended as a slap in the face to anyone and FDOT recognizes that the vast majority of people performing this work are doing a good job. FDOT recognizes that mistakes happen and still allows for the corrections to those mistakes, only now they will be made by strike through.

Jeff Featherston

File: 1050502 - Contractor Quality Control General Requirements – Personnel
Qualifications – QC Manager
Username: Jeff Featherston
UserEmail: jeff.featherston@gsc.kiewit.com
UserTel: (954) 205-7741
Date: Monday, December 05, 2005
Time: 11:47:14 AM

Comments:

I think this is a long time coming... Some of the Districts have been saying this for years, but nothing has been put in a procedure to require it from the Contractor. This specification change needs to also include documents like Certification of Quantity on Items, MOT Reports, Etc...

I also think the Department needs to address the statement above the revision ("Under the direction of the QC Manager, and using Department's standard forms"). I've had several extensive discussions with Department /CEI personnel over the past years around the state that the only Department standard form is one that has an approved form number on it... This may need to be addressed now or sometime in the future.

Jeff
Jeff Featherston
Gilbert Southern Corp.
954-835-2228 Office

Response: Thanks for the comments and we'll look at the other suggestions.

Fred McGee

John,

The comments listed below are being submitted by the Precast Concrete Structures Association.

Regards,

Fred

Last sentence of the 1st paragraph should read P.C.S.A Level I, and Level II or C.T.Q.P.

Response: QC Manager qualification requires CTQP qualification.

First sentence of the 2nd paragraph should state "approved standard forms provided by the Precaster or the Engineer"

Response: For the present, we'll stay with FDOT forms.

Bob Dion

File: 1050502 - Contractor Quality Control General Requirements – Personnel
Qualifications – QC Manager
Username: Bob Dion
UserEmail: bob_dion@urscorp.com
UserTel: 386-740-0665
Date: Thursday, December 08, 2005
Time: 10:16:38 AM

Comments:

Does the sentence beginning with ‘Since erasures...’ refer to the original testing and material sampling forms submitted or is this applicable to corrections only? If this is for corrections only it should be after the ‘corrections’ sentence and reworded to ‘Make these only in blue or colored ink, not black ink.

Is there a need to mention ‘strictly enforced’? Where is the requirement for forms not to have erasures?

Response: Applies to original testing and materials sampling forms. No need to mention strictly enforced. Erasures prohibited by specification.

Carl Dempsey

I feel that using ink of any color is an unreasonable requirement for roadway reports. Changes in documentation are a constant issue during the course of a typical paving day.

Irregular area calculations

What quantity of material is used for what (base, structural, misc., waste etc)

If we go to a strikethrough, replace with the correct information and then initial procedure then a large number of reports will not be legible. This is because the report fields are not large enough to accept changes neatly.

Roadway reports contain no information, except for temperature, that is used for acceptance of materials. Roadway reports are for summarizing the daily paving placement activities.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed spec. change.

Carl Dempsey
QC Manager
Anderson Columbia Co., Inc.
386-752-4921 Phone

Response: Thanks for the comments. FDOT will monitor the reports to determine if future changes are necessary.
