9320203 NONMETALLIC ACCESSORY MATERIALS FOR CONCRETE PAVEMENT AND CONCRETE STRUCTURES
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Dan Scheer
414-4130
daniel.scheer@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-7-13, Internal)
1) What is a 'reasonable proximity' – this is pretty vague and not defendable. Suggest we specify a distance or driving time location, i.e. within 30 miles of the project or 45 minutes driving time…

Response: Disagree. I know that it is vague, so I included "as determined by the Engineer". I did not want to put an arbitrary time or distance as suggested because it should be up to the CEI and District to decide what is too far or not. This should not be a bid issue since the cost to the Contractor to store at the site versus off site is left up to the CEI or Engineer to decide which is known to the Contractor before bid plus it is not a big money issue anyway and more of a convenience issue for the Contractor to store off site.
No change made.

2) Delete the words 'with minimal effort' from 932-2.3. Insert the work 'readily' before 'identified' in the same sentence.

Response: Agree, will change.

****

Randy Cropp
561-310-7711
rcropp@conegraham.com

Comments: (10-7-13, Internal)
We need to go back to just having the bearing pad companies provide us certification of test lab results of the bearing pad test. The Department needs to show us that they have had a problem. To have bearing pads manufactured and delivered to the job site and then to have the Department runs tests could present a problem should they fail. If we are not having a problem with bearing pads why create one? Have the Department provide us with a problem. If we are worried about some half cocked manufacturers coming into the market lets have them get approved first???

Response: Disagree. Testing of bearing pads has been required for many years and is a standard method used by the Department for ensuring the quality, of not just bearing pads but most other materials as well. If bearing pads are not tested periodically, there is a much higher risk that these structurally critical elements will have reduced quality as time passes.
No change made.

****

Charles Boyd/Robert Roberston (SDO)
414-4275

Boyd.Charles@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-7-13, Internal)
(BOYD)
Since 932-2.3 does not adequately define everything that should go into how a LOT is determined, this proposed language would allow a contractor to defeat the testing requirements simply by having the pads delivered 10 at a time. Also, since there is no link to the actual manufacturing process in the definition of a LOT; potential problems might not be identified in large stockpiles of pads that were manufactured at different times by the same manufacturer or component materials that were sourced from different providers. It also doesn't address pads of the same design, materials and thickness that were made by different pad fabricators that end up on the same job.
(ROBERTSON)
I agree with your concerns. Even for a project with less than 10 pads, how do we know we are getting properly fabricated pads since only a certification is required for a lot less than 10? We need a definition of a "Lot"? Now that DOT does not buy large quantities of pads and provide them to a Contractor, we should define a lot as changes in height or outer dimensions for a given project. Easier said than done though.

Response: These are valid concerns and they will be addressed as effectively as possible in the revision. (Revised language highlighted below.)

932-2.3 Sampling: A sampling LOT shall consist of a maximum of 100 bearing pads of a single type of bearing *(plain, steel laminates, fabric laminates)*, of the same design, materials, ~~and~~ thickness, *and manufacturer, referred to here as "like pads",* delivered to the project site *or to an offsite storage facility within the State of Florida in reasonable proximity to the project site as determined by the Engineer*. *Organize stockpiled pads into groups of like pads by LOT so that they can be readily identified and sampled by the Engineer.*

932-2.3.1 Ancillary Structure Pads: Sampling is not required and acceptance is by certification.

932-2.3.2 Bridge Structure Pads: *For LOT sizes that exceed 10, a*~~A~~ minimum of two bridge bearing pads per LOT will be selected by the Engineer*:* ~~at the project site~~ one for testing and one for confirmation in the event of a failing test result. *LOTs will be sampled only after all like pads in the LOT are at the project site or in an offsite storage facility. When the total number of like pads consists of a single LOT of 10 or less, sampling is not required and acceptance is by certification. Provide the Engineer a certification conforming to the requirements of Section 6 stating that the structure bearing pads meet the requirements of this Section.* Samples shall consist of complete pads as detailed in the Plans. Furnish additional complete bridge bearing pads to replace those selected for testing. Bridge bearing pads shall be available for sampling a minimum of three weeks prior to their installation. The sample bridge bearing pads shall be tested by an independent laboratory approved by the Department.
Changes made.

****

Keith Waugh
352-787-1616
kwaugh@lewarecc.com

Comments: (10-7-13)
The problem with the spec as I see it is that the Department has gotten away from accepting certifications. With this spec the Department will randomly select the pad to be tested and the Contractor will ship the pad to a lab and pay for the cost of testing. This seems to be an about-face from FDOT's policy of accepting certifications and thereby saving needless cost.

I suggest that FDOT allow bearing pad manufacturers to submit their Quality Control Plans to Gainesville for approval and then the Department can place them on the Qualified Producers and Fabricators list. As long as the manufacturer has an approved QC plan and uses approved testing labs, then no field sampling and testing would be required.

One more thing: FDOT has gotten away from designing jacking details and locations for pad replacement. They obviously see that pad failures have been few and far between.

Response: This specification was modified to address Industry concerns about the cost of testing small LOTs of pads and this has been addressed in the revision without critical Industry comment. In addition, Industry was concerned about having to store pads on the project site only and this revision now allows pads to be stored off site under certain circumstances also without Industry comment.
With regard to the other comments, I disagree. Testing of bearing pads has been required for many years and is a standard method used by the Department for ensuring the quality, not just of bearing pads, but most other materials as well. If bearing pads are not tested periodically, there is a much higher risk that these structurally critical elements will have reduced quality as time passes. Their structural importance makes their quality a much higher concern than are materials accepted by certification. It is true that pad failures are rare but the Department believes that this is, in part, because of continued testing.
No change made

****

Shailesh Patel
D5 Const.
386-943-5347
shailesh.patel@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-7-13)
Section 932-2.3 refers to stockpiling a reasonable distance from the project as determined by the engineer. This should be defined more by setting a maximum distance. This would not be CPR in the field and would be open to many interpretations.

Response: Please see response to Scheer, question #1.

****