

2000000 – ROCK BASE  
COMMENTS/RESPONSES FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Dion  
bob\_dion@urscorp.com, (386) 740-0665

Comments:

1. 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?
2. 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.
3. Also, suggest adding ‘vehicular’ between ‘non-’ and ‘traffic’ (non-vehicular traffic) in the second line of ‘Non-Traffic Construction’.
4. 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’?
5. 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.

Response:

1. They are the same. We have clarified by inserting “substituting base for embankment” in 200-6. Also we have developed a Special Provision for Non-Traffic Areas
2. Paved shoulders constructed in conjunction with other widening activities will not be considered as non-traffic.
3. Non-Traffic Construction has been separated from the regular specifications for clarification.
4. Non-Traffic Construction has been separated from the regular specifications for clarification.
5. Non-Traffic Construction has been separated from the regular specifications for clarification.
- 6.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**Response:**

Verification may but are not required to witness the rolling pattern compaction. Verification will verify the compaction of the rolling pattern by density tests.

\*\*\*\*\*

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 lowers 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 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.

**Response:**

1. The lot language is reinstated
2. Lot lengths will remain a minimum of 300 feet or the full length of the embankment. Non-traffic construction areas will be allowed to extend up to a Day's Production. The purpose of this specification change is to remove restrictions that do not add value to construction.
3. Larger sections of construction are allowed in Non-Traffic construction to reduce testing requirements. Traffic construction sections are not expanded.

\*\*\*\*\*

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?)

Response:

The corrections have been made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Robert D. Bistor  
Senior Quality Control Manager  
Hubbard Construction Company  
email: [bbistor@hubbard.com](mailto: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:

1. \* 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.
2. \* 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.

3. \* 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.

**Response:**

1. The intent is to remove the requirement that we no longer require the contractor to identify the source of stabilizing material in section 160 for Non-Traffic Areas only. According to section 105-5.5.1 and section 105-5.5.2 the contractor is still required to use certified Techs if needed. The QC plan is not required but appropriate personnel must still be used.
2. Day's Production has been defined. It will have a minimum area
3. The proposed specification for Non Traffic areas reduces VT Modified Proctor and Lime Rock Bearing Ratio test frequency to 1 per 4 days. The frequency for Density & Moisture is reduced to 1 per 2 days. We believe this will create considerably less wait time than the original specification.

\*\*\*\*\*

Greg Schiess  
FHWA

**Comments:**

1. 200-6.1 – Non-Traffic Construction - *Do not proof roll base.* why not?
2. 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.

**Response:**

1. We are uncertain that proof rolling is appropriate for all Florida base materials. Prefer Density testing requirement for base.
2. Pit Proctors have been removed pending an implementation plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

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](mailto: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".

Response: These changes were made.

\*\*\*\*\*