

2000000 – ROCK BASE
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

Bob Dion
bob_dion@urscorp.com, (386) 740-0665

Comments:

The definitions of ‘Non-Traffic Construction’ and ‘Traffic Construction’ in 200-6.1 are identical to the specifications currently in industry review for 1200000 and 1600000. Should they be the same? Is it your intent that projects consisting of only paved shoulder construction meet the ‘Non Traffic Construction’ requirements or are all paved shoulders considered ‘Traffic Construction’? See 200-7.2.2. Also, suggest adding ‘vehicular’ between ‘non-’ and ‘traffic’ (non-vehicular traffic) in the second line of ‘Non-Traffic Construction’.

Suggest deleting ‘mainline’ in the description of ‘Traffic Construction’ in 200-6.1 or mention ‘side streets’. Also, delete ‘box culvert culverts and retaining walls’. Should ‘, and shoulders’ or ‘and shoulder pavement’ be added after ‘ramps’?

200-7.2.2, ‘Non Traffic Construction’, includes ‘shoulder/widening surface and thicknesses. Suggest deleting ‘shoulder/widening’ from both. The intent is not clear to me. If the widening surface and thickness frequencies refer to widening strips, as in 200-6.5, suggest adding it as a footnote under the Traffic Construction’ box.

Sastry Putcha Ph.D.,P.E.
State Construction Office
Ph.850-414-4148; SC 994-4148
Fax: 850-412-8021

Comments:

200-7.2.2: Under Non-Traffic Construction, under Rolling Pattern add Witness for Verification instead of N.A

Jim Warren
Asphalt Contractors Association of Florida
jwarren@acaf.org
Website: www.acaf.org
Work: 850-222-7300

Comments:

I disagree with the philosophy of moving away from Lots and calling them "Sections". It most likely will cause more problems than it fixes. Lots are standard term and need to be understood by those working in this industry. It is the basis of statistically based acceptance specifications and those in the field are more than capable of understanding these concepts. I have been teaching these basic statistical concepts for years in the CTQP courses and never get questions on what a Lot is, but rather what is the size of the Lot? Changing the terms mid-stream will cause confusion in the field, especially between different material areas. A Lot is a Lot is a Lot, whether it is in linear feet, cubic yards or tons depending on the type of material.

Also, there needs to be provision for accepting shorter segments. In changing the Lots to consecutive feet and increasing the distance/total number of tests - how does one handle a project that is built in short segments? Specifically, if the phasing of the project calls for building an area up that is less than the consecutive footage requirement, how do you accept lower layers of embankment, sub base or base? The same situation applies to areas that in the interest of getting the project built faster – the contractor wants to work smaller sections – is the contractor then placed at high risk in covering up lower layers? Why can't the layers be accepted as they are completed regardless of the length – if it will get the project done faster? If we can reduce the risk to both the contractor and the agency, the projects will undoubtedly be built right (quality) and faster and cheaper in the process. Seems the way that is proposed will be a paperwork nightmare.

There appears to be a push toward larger Lots and longer consecutive distances before reduced testing is an option. My question to the Department is how many projects are actually phased this way anymore, or is the trend to have projects built in shorter sections? Any specification that is developed must be flexible enough to work in both long continuous runs of production and short discontinuous runs of production. I'd go further to recommend to the Department that they consider looking at how they are doing business now (compared to 10 years ago) in terms of the type/scope/phasing of projects to see if the current specifications are applicable to the majority of that type of work.

Jennifer Taylor
386-740-3471

Comments:

200-7.1 General Requirements: Meet the requirements of 120-10, except use 200-7.2 instead of 120-10.2, 200-7.3 instead of 120-7.3 (shouldn't this read 120-10.3?) and 200-7.4, instead of 120-7.4 (shouldn't this read 120-10.4?)

Robert D. Bistor
Senior Quality Control Manager
Hubbard Construction Company
email: bbistor@hubbard.com
Orlando Office

P.O. Box 547186
Orlando, FL 32854-7186
(407) 293-4340; (407) 294-3926 FAX
Tampa Office
105 N. Falkenburg Road, Suite D
Tampa, FL 33619
(813) 685-6005; (813) 685-6740 FAX

Comments:

* The proposed change eliminates the need to perform the work under an approved QC Plan. By eliminating this requirement, the contractor would not be identifying sources of stabilizing material, there would be no specification requirement to utilize a CTQP certified technician to perform the QC testing (CTQP certified techs are identified in the QC Plan), etc. We feel that this requirement SHOULD NOT be deleted.

* The proposed changes to section 200-7.2.2 to include non-traffic area requirements base the frequency on days of production rather than length. The type of work in non-traffic areas is usually performed with smaller equipment with much slower production rates than traffic areas. As a result the ratio of testing to area of in-place material may be substantially higher than for traffic areas. I feel this frequency should be based upon completed area rather than days production.

* The proposed verification testing requirement is 1 per 4 QC samples in traffic areas and 1 per 2 in non-traffic areas. This seems to be excessive testing when compared to the testing of traffic areas. Additionally work in non-traffic areas is usually smaller areas, and the placement of subsequent layers may occur sooner than in traffic areas. The wait involved due to the verification sample not being selected until after 2 QC samples have been obtained, which then needs to be delivered to the Verification lab and tested, could significantly slow the contractors production.

Greg Schiess
FHWA

Comments:

200-6.1 – Non-Traffic Construction - *Do not proof roll base.* why not?

200-7.3.1.1 - *For Non-Traffic Construction the Engineer may approve the use of Proctor results as established by the Department from the Aggregate source.* This will not be approved.

Stefanie D. Maxwell, P.E.
Specialty Engineer
FDOT State Construction Office
605 Suwannee Street, MS 31
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450

Phone: (850) 414-4314
Fax: (850) 412-8021
E-mail: stefanie.maxwell@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

Following are comments from State Construction Office (David Sadler and Stefanie Maxwell) for specs 120, 125, 160, 161 and 200. Also, we agree with a lot of the comments made by FHWA, so we tried not to duplicate.

Section 200: Rock Base

Keep LOT language

Change all references to "Traffic Construction" and "Non-Traffic Construction" to "Traffic Areas" and "Non-traffic Areas".
