0060103 CONTROL OF MATERIALS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Jason Sika
Dow Corning
(303) 880-9614

Comment: (12-11-12)

6-1.3.1.1, 3rd paragraph:

It mentions "The Department will consider any marked variations from original test values for a product, failure to notify the Department of any modifications or alterations". In my opinion it may be better to say "may" rather than "will". Variations in test values should be reviewed on a case by case basis. One needs to look at the tests performed and determine if one test varied or all tests for that product. The reason I am concerned by this is because Dow Corning has had the same batch of material tested by different labs using the same test methods and achieved varying results. Some tests can yield a great deal of variation depending on the lab and even the individual performing the tests.

Response:

****

John Mauthner
414-4334
john.mauthner@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (12-10-12)

1. 6-1.3.1.1, 2nd sentence - change the word "approved" to "eligible" as used in the third paragraph.

Response: I disagree with changing the word "approved" for "eligible" throughout the section. The QPL products have been reviewed, verified and are approved for use on Department projects.

2. 6-1.3.1.1, 2nd paragraph – "test reports"

Response: I disagree with changing the word "values" in 6-1.3.1.1 paragraph 4 to match the word "report" in paragraph 3. The paragraphs are discussing to separate items and activities. Paragraph 3 discusses how the report will be generated. Paragraph 4 discusses the actual data and how it will be used.

3. 6-1.3.1.1, 3rd paragraph – "eligible"

Response:
I disagree with changing the word "approved" for "eligible" throughout the section. The QPL products have been reviewed, verified and are approved for use on Department projects.

4. 6-1.3.1.1, 3rd paragraph – "test values" vs "test reports"

Response: I disagree with changing the word “values” in 6-1.3.1.1 paragraph 4 to match the word “report” in paragraph 3. The paragraphs are discussing to separate items and activities. Paragraph 3 discusses how the report will be generated. Paragraph 4 discusses the actual data and how it will be used.

5. 6-1.3.1.1, 3rd paragraph – “approval” vs “evaluation”

Response:
I agree with the changes to the last sentence in 6-1.3.1.1 paragraph 3.

6. 6-1.3.1.1, 3rd paragraph – “modifications” vs “changes”

Response: I agree with the changes to the last sentence in 6-1.3.1.1 paragraph 3.

7. 6-1.3.1.1, 4th paragraph – “eligible” - see above.

Response: In the first sentence of 6-1.3.1.1 paragraph 4, I do not agree the insertion of the word “eligible”. If a product is approved – it is eligible. Therefore the word is redundant.

8. 6-1.3.1.1, 4th paragraph – “approval”

Response: I agree with the changes to the last sentence in 6-1.3.1.1 paragraph 4.

****

Howie Moseley
386-961-7853
howard.moseley@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (12-21-12)
Qualified Products List should be abbreviated in Section 6-1.3.1 and not spelled out in Section 6-1.3.1.1.

Response:

****

Matthew Schindler
813 649 1336
matthew@cloverleafcorp.com

Comment: (12-28-12)
Regarding the requirement in 6-1.3.1.1 that vendor drawings need to be signed and sealed, in some cases, this is a burdensome and costly endeavor. For instance, if I have a NCHRP Category II device that’s already been crash tested and accepted by FHWA, I am required to submit a drawing of the device. This device may have been designed years ago by someone who was not a Florida registered PE. Now, I would be required to make the drawing and then hire a FL PE to stamp the drawing, even though he had nothing to do with the initial design or crash testing of the product. I can understand more complex devices like overhead sign supports, crash cushions,

devices with lots of intricate and optional connections, etc. requiring PE stamps. But more simplistic devices like those that are category II devices seem to be burdensome.

Response:

****

D4 Construction

Comment: (1-2-13)
Dist 4 Const has the following grammatical comments: 6-1.3.1.1; fourth paragraph; Producers of QPL approved products are required to resubmit the product for QPL approval when any modifications or alterations are made to an approved product. This includes, but is not limited to design, materials, fabrication methods or operational modifications.

Response:

****