

DISTRICT INCONSISTENCY

Asphalt Operations

- US 441 had two Project numbers. It was decided by FDOT after we got into the job, but before it became too much of a problem, to run the lots as if it was just one project using the lead number on the plans as the project number. I believe this is in specs now. Later on SR 429, a Turnpike project, the CEI insisted on changing lots each time we crossed from one project number into the other. This eventually became so confusing that they combined lots from the two Project numbers. This is something that needs to be addressed before starting any project with multiple project numbers.

Response: DCE Memo 19-05 addresses this. The lead project FPN would be used for all of the reporting and it would be treated like one project. The first scenario (US 441) is correct. The second scenario (Turnpike) appears to have been handled incorrectly.

Turnpike Response: DCE Memo No. 19-05 (Documenting Asphalt Quantities on Multiple Financial Identification Number (FIN) Projects Under One Contract) is dated August 23, 2005. The three Western Beltway (SR 429) Turnpike projects began in May, July and November of 2004. The memo became effective in the middle of the project and that is why we changed during the project.

- One thing that may be a concern. When D5 has a failing IV sample, and our tests have looked good, they come back the next day and get another IV test instead of just requiring us to stop production. I don't know how District 1 is handling these situations.

Question : Why is it of concern that they come back and resample versus just shutting you down?

If IV has a failure, but QC (and VT if applicable) results haven't indicated a problem, and we can't see a cause for the failing result, we have been allowed to keep running and IV would get another sample the next shift. Of course, if they have a failure we are going to be looking at potential causes immediately and reporting what we find, if anything. This would include additional PC tests being run. If we find a problem we would stop and address it and the mix represented would be subject to evaluation.

Response: It sounds like the District is following the requirements of Materials Manual 3.1, and is using good judgment. We tell the Districts not to require the Producer to shutdown their operations unless we have a good reason to (the reasons are listed in MM 3.1), and if they have any questions about their data, then they should get a follow-up sample as quickly as possible.

SPEC 334-5.7.1

"Take samples as directed by the Engineer for Independent Verification testing. " "If any of the results (IV TEST) do not meet the requirements of Table 334-4, cease production of the asphalt mixture until the problem is adequately resolved (to the satisfaction of the Engineer), unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Engineer that the problem can immediately be (or already has been) resolved".

- The current method of recording the daily asphalt roadway report is done by an individual Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. This method works well on smaller projects; while Excel is a powerful tool small mistakes can be easily made creating a paper work nightmare. On large projects these daily roadway reports are plagued with common mistakes. The most common error is the carryover numbers being incorrect.

Response: The report can be completed either on the Excel spreadsheet (electronically) or through the use of the PDF report (manually).

- Projects usually contain multiple of asphalt pay items and numerous mix designs. Keeping track of current lots and previous adjusted totals on a large and fast paced job compounded with constantly switching pay items and mixes can easily create mistakes. You can easily have hundreds of individual Excel files by the end of a project.

Response: Under the current system, this is correct. Each Pay Item requires its own roadway report. The new roadway report being piloted in District 5 allows multiple Pay Items on the same report.

- Another issue will be if a revision to an asphalt roadway report needs to be made. A domino effect is created by the need to adjust all previous adjusted totals of the subsequent reports also needing revisions.

Response: It is not necessary to go back and make corrections per DCE Memo The correction should be noted on the corrected version. Based on the example below, the September 21st report would show the corrected values, with a note indicating that an error occurred on August 21st. The Prep and Doc Manual (9-12.2) has been updated to provide this guidance.

Example: Today is Sept 17th and if an error was discovered on August 21st page 2 of 4 reports, ALL reports from that report to Sept 17th must be corrected. This can affect pay quantities as well as the monthly certification of bituminous materials.

- I was hoping that that FDOT is / will pursue a different program like Access or other program in keeping track of these roadway reports. I believe projects large and small could benefit from a single program with a single file. This program must be able to keep track of the multiple pay items, lot numbers/sizes and previous totals. When generating new daily reports automatically fill in previous information. Allow for simpler revision if needed.

Response: FDOT has no plans to go to Access. We are piloting a new roadway report worksheet in District 5, which includes a number of the options you are describing.

- Materials Bulletin 06-07: This bulletin was issued to give the Districts flexibility in staffing VT technicians at the asphalt plants during production. Each District will determine their own staffing plan and submit it for approval. This will result in different Districts performing things differently. Many producers have facilities in more than one District and we often utilize our personnel at other plants. This will require contractor personnel to be familiar with the specific requirements for each District in which they operate. This is contrary to Brian Blanchard's effort to standardize procedures between Districts.

Response: There are a number of problems associated with pulling the VTs out of the plants, and depending on the available resources of the district, it might need to be addressed differently. All of the plans for this must be approved by the Central Office (SMO) so there will be consistency statewide. Please note that this is an internal Department issue, and should have minimal impact on Industry.

- Different Districts have different requirements for documentation on the roadway reports with respect to turnout construction. District 5 does not require drawings, unless the turnout constructed differs from the plan drawings, whereas District 4 requires them.

Response: The asphalt roadway report has been revised to no longer require drawings. This will accommodate the electronic submission of the report.

- District 5 has developed their own asphalt worksheet, which is not used in other Districts. Additionally the District 5 worksheet does not require reporting the spread rate for tack coat, which is required in other Districts.

Response: This worksheet is being piloted in District 5 – if it's successful, we'll implement it statewide. The Statewide Forms Task Team will make the decision. The tack issue will be addressed by them. The Task Team is made up of representatives of the following: State Construction Office, State Materials Office, D-2 Construction, D-5 Construction D-6 Construction, D-5 Materials, Anderson-Columbia, Ajax, Atlantic Coast, and Community Asphalt.

- District 2 requires a new asphalt mix design every time a new RAP stockpile is produced. In District 4 and 5, no new mix design is required provided the properties (gradation, AC content) are comparable to the original RAP material utilized to develop the design.

Response: Unless there is a significant change in the RAP, a revision to the design would be allowed in District 2. If the RAP changes significantly, then a new design would be required.

In some districts, like District 3, revisions aren't allowed due to the diversity in materials. Districts must consider the amount of variation in the rapp material.

- After talking with my people, it appears that we are ok with the daily paperwork and reporting sequence. The only comment that I can make at this point would be to have all the daily information summarized into one sheet rather than 3 separate reports (qc tests, roadway and ticket cover).

Response: We'll forward the comment to the forms Task Team.

- **Earthwork Operations**

- **Interpretation of meaning of “phase” and “isolated compaction (or mixing) operations”**

This is not specifically a difference between Districts, but more often than not a difference from project to project or from one CEI/Department inspection staff to another. Below are the specification sections involved, followed by a discussion of several situations I have seen or have heard about on various projects since CQC began.

This resolution or clarification of this issue requires careful consideration as the definitions should be consistent between all of the following specification sections. If an “isolated compaction operation” is considered a day's production for pipe backfill, then it should also be a day's production for MSE wall backfill. Any clarification will ultimately affect the number of samples/density tests required. This may affect the number of QC and VT technicians required to adequately staff a project and thusly the cost of QC/QA. As cost of QC must be included in the contractor's bid, the clarification may affect future prices.

- **Specification sections:**

In **120-8.1 General** it states “A LOT is defined as a single lift of finished embankment not to exceed 500 feet. Isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTS. For multiple phase construction, a LOT shall not extend beyond the limits of the phase.”

In **125-8.1.1 General** it states “A LOT is defined as one lift of backfill material placement, not to exceed 500 feet in length or a single run of pipe connecting two successive structures, whichever is less. Backfill around structures compacted separately from the pipe will be considered as separate LOTs. Backfill on each side of the pipe for the first lift will be considered a separate LOT. Backfill on opposite sides of the pipe for the remaining lifts will be considered separate LOTs, unless the same compactive effort is applied. For multiple phase backfill, a LOT shall not extend beyond the limits of the phase. When placing backfill within a trench box each lift of backfill is considered a LOT. Placement of backfill within trench box limits will be considered a complete operation before trench box is moved for next backfill operation. When the trench box is moved for next backfill operation this will start new LOTs for each lift.”

In **160-5.1 General** it states “A LOT is defined as a single lift of finished Subgrade, not to exceed 500 feet. Isolated mixing operations will be considered as separate LOTs. Curbs and shoulders compacted separately shall be considered separate LOTs. Isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTs.”

In **200-6.1 General** it states “A LOT is defined as a single lift of finished base not to exceed 500 feet. Shoulders compacted separately shall be considered separate LOTs. Isolated compaction operations will be considered as separate LOTs. For multiple phase construction, a LOT shall not extend beyond the limits of the phase.”

- **Situations:**

Pipe backfill -

1. What constitutes a phase? Is it an MOT phase? For example: A run of pipe goes across a 4 lane roadway between 2 structures, one on each side of the roadway. During one MOT phase the pipe is installed across the right roadway from one structure to the median. During the second phase the pipe is installed from the median across the left roadway to the next structure. Additionally during each phase the work takes 2 nights (crossing 1 lane a night). I am aware of the following interpretations that have been utilized on projects:
 - a. The total run of pipe was less than 500 feet so only 1 test per lift was required (except bottom lift) across the full width of the roadway.
 - b. “Phase” was interpreted as MOT phase. As long as there was 1 test for each lift across the right roadway and the same across the left roadway, the specifications were met.
 - c. Each night’s operation was considered a “phase” or “isolated compaction operation”, therefore testing of each lift was required each night.

Response: C is the correct answer according to the specs.

2. What constitutes a “phase” or “isolated compaction operation”? For example – A 200’ run of pipe is being installed between 2 structures along one side of the road. If this is shallow small diameter pipe with no factors limiting production, the pipe could be installed in 1 day. One test would be required per lift (except the bottom) between the 2 structures. If this was in an urban area where driveways had to be maintained, installation may take several days, as pipe must be installed and backfilled to maintain a driveway before the next driveway can be closed to install the next piece of pipe.

Response: This is the nature of roadway construction so these areas mean different lots for the isolated areas.

- a. I have seen this tested as if it was all installed in 1 day with one test/lift between the structures.
- b. I have seen it tested as each day being considered a "phase" with one test required per lift placed each day
- c. If this was deep pipe and a trench box was used, densities would be run on each lift for every 10-20' of pipe (depending on length of trench box). What makes this any different than crossing a driveway and backfilling it to the top before proceeding with the next section of pipe?

Response: There is no difference based on the reasons listed above..

NOTE: If a trench box is used and the procedure outlined in the specifications is followed for density testing, a single run of pipe can easily have in excess of 100 density tests performed between 2 structures (depending on the length of the trench box and the depth of the pipe). Yet the if the same run of pipe can be installed with sloped trench walls so a box is not required, less than 10 densities may be required. Is this not excessive testing with a trench box, especially if the same compaction procedure is used throughout?

Response: Whether crossing a driveway or not an isolated compaction operation requires density testing. The answer often depends on how the contractor installs it. Consider whether it is a continuous rolling operation or not.

Specification 125-8.1.1 states that trench box operations create separate LOTS for each trench box location. At times a sloped trench wall can not be used because of limitations dictated by the nature of the site. A contractor with the proper understanding of the Specifications will see the difference and bid the job properly.

Embankment-

1. How is "isolated compaction operations" defined? Typically embankment is placed in large areas in a single operation, although construction of an area may occur over several days. In all cases I am aware of only 1 density is required per lift per 500' interval even though it may be constructed over several days. This is especially true in the construction of MSE walls and wire walls. Often construction and backfill of an MSE wall occurs over a period of several weeks with only 1 density required per lift for every 500' section in each area to be tested (1 within 3' of wall, 1 from 3' to end of straps, 1 in embankment beyond straps). If operations on different days are not considered "isolated operations", how does this differ from pipe backfill?

Response: It is the same as pipe backfill. A density is required to approve each separate compaction operation regardless of the time it takes to compact the section. A day's operation should be considered an "isolated compaction operation". If there was a case where the Contractor was unable to complete compaction of a lift of an MSE wall in one day's operation, the completion of the lift on the next day should be considered an isolated compaction and another density test should be required.

If the compaction effort spills into the next day for a 300 to 500ft section, the density is taken when Contractor has completed their compaction efforts for that 300 to 500 ft lot as long as they are compacting the entire 300 to 500 ft section in one shot. Otherwise, the next day becomes another lot unless they continue to compact the same location.

Response from D1,7: This is deviating from the specifications definition of a "LOT". In District One and Seven the contractor defines his lots and once the lot is completed the QC will take their

random nuclear density test and then contact VT. VT will perform their random verification test for acceptance. At times VT will utilize IV testing to ensure compaction is maintained.

Defer to the ECI Committee

Stabilized subgrade-

1. Definition of LOTS for mixing operations and sampling for LBR and proctor: typically during mixing operations the full width of a roadway section (mainline and shoulders) are mixed in a single operation. Additionally the mixing is performed to a deeper depth to produce additional stabilized material to be used to build curb pads, build up shoulder pads, etc. In District 5 a LOT is considered 500' of area mixed. A sample obtained for LBR and proctor value represents the mainline, the shoulder and the extra thickness material rolled over to produce curb or shoulder pads. On some projects in District 1/7 the Department has adopted the opinion that 3 samples of the material are required; 1 LOT is mainline, 1 LOT is the bottom stabilized material on the shoulder/curb pads, and 1 LOT is the material rolled over to bring the shoulders/curb pads to grade in a single 500' section.

D6 responses: We only take one LBR/Proctor test in this situation since the material is under the same mixing operation.

Agree with above comment on how we normally sample Proctors for Stabilization. However, the District Materials Lab considers the mainline, shoulder pad and curb pad as separate lots and requires we track all these lots to determine when the next QC / VT Proctor is required. The LBR / Proctor sample should represent the mainline / shoulder / and extra thickness material. This material was mixed at the same time and vicinity, therefore it is representative of all 3 locations.

Agree. Hopefully the Lab will soon agree with this thought process. For now, they require we consider the mainline, shoulder and curb pad as three separate lots each contributing to the running stabilization lot totals for sampling.

District 1, 7: Unsure how the contractor can guarantee the material which is rolled out of the construction zone of the roadway and curb pad has not been contaminated by the area that has not been stabilized, thus possibly changing LBR.

Ben Watson with the State Materials Office (SMO) contacted Barbara Beacham and offered their assistance to Barbara to rewrite the specification for sampling subgrade material. Barbara is basically changing the specification to the common practice used by the industry.

Defer to ECI committee

2. When the stabilized subgrade is compacted, often the bottom stabilized material under shoulders and curb pads is compacted with the mainline subgrade. On some projects this is considered a single operation (shoulder compacted with mainline) and no densities are performed on this bottom lift under the shoulders/curb pads. On other projects a density is required on the mainline and on the bottom lift under the shoulder/curb pad. As the upper portion of the stabilized subgrade for shoulders and curb pads is usually compacted in a totally separate operation it is usually tested for density as a separate LOT. It is only that bottom lift that seems to be tested inconsistently.

District 6 responses: We take two densities—one to cover the 12 inch stabilization across the entire roadway width including the stabilization beneath the curb pad and one under the curb pad itself (4 inch test typically) for the material kicked up on top of the stabilization placed as detailed above.

Agree with above comments. The density taken to cover the roadway is also used to represent the 12 inch lift on the shoulder. The second stabilization lift on the shoulder (shoulder pad) normally requires its own density since it gets built in a separate operation.

If the subgrade or base for shoulders and curbspads are compacted at the same time as the mainline, I don't see any reason why additional densities are needed on the shoulder and curbspad. If they are compacted in a separate operation, then yes they would need to be tested.

Defer to ECI committee

Base Course- (this does not apply to asphalt base course)

1. As with stabilized subgrade, base course for shoulders is often constructed with mainline pavement. Base course material from an approved source is delivered to the project and placed on both mainline roadway and shoulders. The material delivered is consistent, but the problem exists in that the pay item for the base on shoulders is different from the pay item for the mainline (different base groups).
 - a. When sampling for proctors, on some projects one sample is obtained and entered into LIMS under the mainline base course pay item number with a remark that it represents the shoulder pay item number also. On other projects a separate sample is obtained from the base material placed on the shoulder which is entered into LIMS with the shoulder pay item number. I have seen both methods used on different projects within the same District.

District 6 responses: In order to prevent confusion, a separate sample for the base material placed on the mainline and shoulder should be entered in LIMS and entered with the specific pay item number.

The District Materials Lab allows the Modified Proctor LR LIMS entry for mainline base to represent the shoulder and vice versa as long as the reference is made in LIMS as per Chuck Simpkins.

District 1, 7: When both are constructed simultaneously, (delivered, sampled and coming from the same source), one sample should represent both the mainline and the shoulder. If there is a problem with LIMS and it creates redundancy let's correct the problem. Otherwise, it would be a lot of unnecessary extra work.

Defer to ECI committee

- b. When performing density testing, often the bottom lift of base course is placed and compacted in one operation with density tests performed. The base course for the shoulder (if 8" or less) is usually placed and compacted with the top lift of the mainline base course. This is often done in one operation. On some projects a note is made in the logbook that the shoulder and mainline were compacted in one operation and 1 density test is performed representing both. On other projects a density test is performed on the mainline AND a test is performed on the shoulder.

District 6 responses: Perform a density test on the top lift for both the shoulder and mainline separately. This will ensure that the shoulder has been properly tested.

The District Materials Lab allows that the density taken for the roadway portion represent the shoulder density if both are constructed in one operation as long as a note is shown in the density book

Most districts agreed that if the mainline pavement and shoulders are mixed at the same time, one sample is required. If it's a separate operation, it's a separate lot.

Defer to ECI committee

Verification testing frequency-

1. The method used to number LOTS is up to the contractor. Various methods are utilized. Although typically on subgrade and base the frequency of 1 VT test per 4 QC tests along the length of the roadway is maintained. On Earthwork operations for embankment and pipe backfill the method of what 1 per 4 means has differed. For example: a contractor has pipe being installed in 4 separate areas by 4 different crews. The QC technician is performing tests for all 4 crews. The LOT numbers are running sequentially irrespective of where they were run. Lot 140 may be a test for the 1st crew, 141 for the 3rd crew, 142 for the 4th crew and 143 for the 2nd crew. If the VT technician is performing 1 test per 4 consecutive LOTS, it will be performed on 1 of these crews. On the next four consecutive LOTS the random VT test might be performed on the same or a different crew. I have seen this method used with the end result being that occasionally there will be runs of pipe where there is only 1 VT test for 5 – 8 QC tests. On other projects I have seen the 1 VT per 4QC frequency based upon each run of pipe. I believe the later is the desire of the Department, but it is not the way it is always performed.

Response: In most districts, the VT should be performed once per every 4 QC tests irregardless of which crew is performing the compaction. Defer to the ECI for discussion.

Stockpiled materials-

1. On many urban projects phasing, MOT, and limited room often dictates working in isolated areas. Often materials such as stabilized subgrade and base course are stockpiled in a convenient area and moved to these isolated areas as needed. Set procedures have not been established to deal with sampling of stockpiled materials. If base course from a stockpile is used to construct several crossovers and a some turn lanes, how often does it need to be sampled for a proctor value. Same applies to an LBR value and proctor on stabilized subgrade. I have seen projects where a sample is obtained and the test results used for several isolated areas. On other projects a sample has been obtained in each isolated area after the material is in place.

Response: Some districts test at the roadbed at each isolated area as a separate lot and this requires separate densities and proctor samples, others don't treat it as separate lots.

Others, in order to expedite construction and simplify testing, a single base and stabilized subgrade stockpile material sample may be used for construction of crossovers and turn lanes where phasing and limited room dictate working in isolated areas.

Defer to ECI committee

- RECOMMENDATIONS:

The issues above may become even more convoluted when we consider the possibility of specifications for traffic and non-traffic areas. When considering this issue (with respect to density testing), we recommend consideration of the concept of "process control" and "independent verification". "Process control" tests are part of the contractor's QC in asphalt operations. Additionally the CEI/Department has the option of performing IV testing at any time in asphalt, concrete, and earthwork operations.

I have almost never seen IV testing performed on earthwork. The CEI/Department performs their required VT testing (1 per 4) and that is all. At the start of the project the contractor performs test sections to develop and document the successfulness of a specified compaction operation. If there is no faith put into accepting that this documented compaction method yields satisfactory results, then why is it required? If the same effort/method is used on every lift backfilling pipe within a trench box and satisfactory results are being obtained, then why all the testing each time the trench box is moved? If at ANY time during compaction operations the VT technician feels that the specifications are not being met, they have the authority to perform an Independent Verification test. Is the true purpose of QC and VT testing to have documented test results which meet the specifications or is it to control a process to achieve a quality product? **Both**

If it takes several days for a contractor to install the pipe between structures and QC acceptance tests and Verification tests are randomly performed at 1 test per lift between the structures, "Process control tests" can be performed on a daily basis to insure the continued effectiveness of the compaction method established. This does not mean testing every lift, but throughout the day running a few random tests. If desired by the Department, these tests could be recorded in the density logbook as process control. The use of IV tests would insure the effectiveness of the PC testing. If it is found that there are a number of PC tests which are not meeting the specifications, then the contractor should adjust the compaction process and increase the frequency of PC testing until consistent satisfactory results are being achieved. Additionally the frequency of IV testing should also be increased until the CEI/Department is satisfied that the specifications are being met.

It is also recommended that the Department clarify their intent with respect to QC/VT testing frequency when multiple crews are working in several areas.

The Department should also clarify how to handle the sampling of stockpiled materials for isolated area construction. As there is little variability in consistency in a well maintained stockpile, the test data from a single sample should be applicable for several isolated areas. For example: If in a roadway section consisting of 3 lanes with two 10' shoulders is stabilized full width in a single operation, the area represented by a single proctor/LBR sample is 3111 SY per 500' LOT. Therefore if 3111 SY of turn lanes or other isolated areas are constructed with material from a stockpile, 1 sample should be sufficient for all these areas.

The purpose of QC and VT testing is to have documented test results which meet the specifications. By documenting these tests, it controls the process to achieve a quality product. This process controls and documents the placement of lots and lifts.

- A big item is Partnering. Recently we have had great success with both D-1 and D-7. Last week we had an Executive Partnering meeting for the Mega I-75 project with D-1 and the Anderson folks were amazed at the attitude, cooperation and enthusiasm the D-1 folks had for the process. Possibly the importance of this process has not been reinforced in all Districts as the folks down here.

Response: Partnering is practiced and promoted

- Interpretation of EEO requirements, DBE, and trainees is different in all Districts. There needs to be a simplified system for interpretation so everyone is consistent. This is huge in my humble estimation.

Response: Agree that a separate meeting with the EEO office is needed to address the different interpretations.

- CQC requirements change not by District but by Project Administrators that work side by side in the same office. There needs to be a handbook of absolute necessary paperwork and avoid double the paperwork on many items.
- We have had some issues with the design engineer using the Cad files and aerial views projects that are out dated to design projects. This causes a tremendous amount of RFIs. The design engineer admitted that he did not have enough information to design the project but did anyway to meet the FDOT budget.
- We also have to provide a log book and have a certified testing firm provide documentation for widening projects as to proctors, densities, etc. on the excavated subgrade that is not disturbed prior to us placing the rock or asphalt base.
- The main complaint we have is trying to finish the punch list. DOT Maintenance will add to the punch list, what needs to be added to the DOT's punch list, most of which is not included in the plans. After meeting on-site with Maintenance and DOT it takes up to ten days to get a response on what the contractor is responsible for. During this time we are using contract days. This issue happens on the 90% completion and final acceptance. Most of the time, DOT will disregard maintenance's punch list because their request is not included in the plans. But, they seem to disregard, especially on final acceptance the use of our contract days deciding if we need to complete this work or not.

Response: Requires good partnering. FDOT needs FDOT Maintenance input. Contractor must send the proper representatives. Sometimes Districts give comments asap to help the contractor, which can lead to multiple lists.

District 3 response: This Operations Center fosters periodic ride-thru's with Asset Management Contracts and/or FDOT Maintenance during the life of the construction project. 25%, 50%, 75%, 90% and 100% ride-thru's are customary. All comments are written down and are handled immediately if required. The Contractor has generally requested the Punch List before all items of work has been completed on our projects. The Contractor has been furnished a "Not a Final Punch List" to assist him in the completion of the project. This Operations Center coordinates closely with VMS and Maintenance to avoid the above noted situations.

- E.E.O.: The Department makes reference to two documents relative to E.E.O. guidelines: FDOT EEO Compliance Workbook and FHWA #1273. Within these two documents there are some inconsistencies. Certain Districts use one of these while others utilize the other.

Response: See above. Get with the EEO office (Art Wright)

- There are different requirements when submitting the Certificate of Sublet Work and what is required with the form.

District 1:

- Submit an Attachment A which outlines all of the items, pay item numbers, quantities and the unit price between the Prime and the Department.
- Submit a Schedule A which outlines the same information as above except that the unit price is the amount that the Prime will be paying the sub.
- Must specify on the Certification of Sublet Work whether the sub is a DBE or Non-DBE and separate the dollar amount between “specialty work” and “normal work”.

District 4:

- Submit Schedule A which is sent to the sub as an attachment to their subcontract.
- Does not require distinction between DBE and non-DBE or “specialty work” and “normal work”.

District 5:

- Recently revised procedure to match D-4.

Response: All districts need to refer to the new form. The columns for sublet specialty and sublet normal have been removed. DBE/Non DBE information is still required.

The contractor must provide enough information through the Schedule A spreadsheet to determine which pay items are being sublet, the amounts, and the cost. For sublet calculations, the amount will be calculated based on the actual contract unit prices unless there is a partial sublet. For partial sublets, use the unit prices from the actual sub-contract.

- **Bidding:**

The level of work applied by the Department to answer pre-bid questions varies from District to District.

District 5: Excellent. The use of the web page to display questions and answers is very user friendly. D-5 is always prompt in answering questions and will take time to discuss your concerns.

Turnpike: Hot and cold. If the questions are relatively simple, or just a mere clarification, the questions usually get answered. Once the questions become involved, the likelihood of an answer is diminished.

District 4: This District is the least responsive to all questions. The majority of our questions over the past year have been answered by “bid it as you see it” or with no response at all.

Response: The Department is working towards an enterprise web application for posting bid questions and answers. Currently D1, 5, and 7 have district versions. Other districts are free to move towards this pilot system.

The districts should make every effort to answer questions, and contractors are encouraged to ask questions early.

- **Construction:**

Most inconsistencies are from District to District, but these issues can also occur from project to project within the same District.

- CPPR:** D-1 uses the CPPR grading system as proposed in Ananth's PowerPoint presentation on the FDOT website. D-4 has made comments to the CEI on SR 70 in St. Lucie County that the Ranger's CPPR is too high and that no one should have a 100 score. If we earn 100, we should get 100. The Turnpike appears to be more punitive with the CPPR grading than the other Districts. A CEI has said that by writing DWLs, they can keep the Contractor busy writing letters.
Response: Contractors should get whatever grade they earn. SCO looks at data regularly on grades. Grades statewide average around 95. Some contractors do get grades of 100.
- Project Solve:** The Turnpike is the only District using it. This is a good project tool for answering questions and processing submittals.
Response: Optional proprietary software is used by the Turnpike, web based.
- Straightedge:** D-1, on two separate projects, did not require the presence of the District Asphalt Engineer to attend and approve the straightedging of the final surface course. The Turnpike requires that the Asphalt Engineer attend and approve the straightedging.
Response: Most districts do not require the presence of the Asphalt Engineer, like the Turnpike. It should not matter, if straightedging is performed properly.
Turnpike Response: DCE memo 13-06 required each District to independently respond to issues regarding the quality of the rolling straightedge operations. The Turnpike proposed assigning the acceptance responsibility to Turnpike personnel rather than CEI personnel to ensure consistency. The Turnpike has never caused a delay to an operation due to unavailability of personnel.
- Striping:** The Turnpike does not allow layout paint (the light, white skip lines used by striping subs for layout) to show anywhere not covered by the permanent paint. These layout marks fade in less than 2 weeks and provide for a "cleaner" final striping presentation. None of the other Districts have this requirement.
Response: Most districts felt that white will fade away.
Turnpike Response: Specification 710-5 requires the use of "tack points" at appropriate intervals for use in aligning stripes, and set a stringline from such points to achieve accuracy. It seems that an "industry standard" has evolved into "painting" the stringline. The Turnpike provided to SCO photos taken Sept. 28, 2007. The striping was completed on August 7, 2007. As you can see, this does not fade away in "two or three weeks" as claimed. This needs further follow-up.
- Signs:** Permanent sign contractors utilize the FDOT program for printing the final products. When making the largest signs, pixilation occurs in the program and there is a slight overlap between colors that is usually only visible when standing less than 20 feet away as you would during a visual inspection. All of the Districts understand the issue with the FDOT program and accept the slight line overlap except for the Turnpike. Acceptable signs are being redone at great expense to the subcontractors.
- QPL:** This item is an inter-district inconsistency. Certifications are QPL items are being asked for submittal on some projects but not others in D-4.

Response: Follow the requirements of the spec for certifications.

Perf. Turf: There are two projects on SR 70; side-by-side. One project has the Performance Turf pay item and stipulates all sod. It also has a topsoil pay item. The adjacent project does not have a topsoil item and specifies seeding in certain locations as part of the Performance Turf. Not knowing the suitability of the onsite excavation material puts bidders in a difficult situation as to deciding what to do to make the seed last.

- On another level, I don't see the need for any of the QC plans that have to be submitted. I feel they are just reiterations of the specifications. Based on discussions with other qc managers, I think there is discrepancies between districts as to what information is to be included in the document.

Response: Districts should follow the checklist in the CPAM. If districts have a history of problems in an area, it could be added to the QC plan

- I don't know if problems with the turnpike authority are up for discussion with this group but issues concerning expediting the delineation and EAR process need to be addressed. Density Log Book - Each district has their own ideas of how it should be filled out. Lot indexes, reduced frequency testing, water tables, subgrade lines, ect... everyone has their own ideas how these things are to be documented and none of them are the same.

Response: The Density Task team will address consistency issues, how to fill out, how to number lots, etc. Willie Henderson (SMO) can provide training.

Turnpike Response: We acknowledge that some responses exceed your expectation. Our goal is to achieve a response time of 14 days without sacrificing quality. When an issue is critical to your schedule, we recommend you bring it to our attention at the Weekly Progress Meeting so that we can prioritize and expedite the review.

- Project documentation - Who gets what? Specs state that asphalt reports are submitted to the engineer. There are many engineers and they all think they need it and that we are required to give it to them.
- Preconstruction submittals - Specs require an unrealistic timeline for QCP and quantity submittals. My last contract did not get returned to my office until 19 days after award. I am not allowed to work on a project until the contract is returned and in hand. Some districts enforce the specs to the letter and others realize the there is a conflict, perhaps an adjustment to the spec is needed. After all the contractor cannot work on anything covered by the QCP until it is approved, so for the most part if it is submitted prior to beginning the work (maybe at the precon) I doubt there would be an issue.

Response: SCO will look into the timeframes.

- Quality control as a whole is misunderstood. Most of the department folks that were around when this stuff started are gone and the new people have no idea how we got where we are today. These new people have expectations well above what is required and do not care about the ramifications of their actions. Some of the CEI firms think that all they have to do is watch QC “inspectors” do all the work that they used to do.
- I could write a book documenting all of the issues we have had through the years and I can say that the department has tried to correct issues as they popped up but the one thing we are still missing is clear guidance. Summaries of the specifications that outline what is required and by who.
- Standardized forms with clear instructions.

MORE COMMENTS RECEIVED OCT. 1:

- I could only give you what I know from a QC side of things, Well on the District level, 1 and 7 are the same people (Bartow) and obviously no variance there. I have no problems what so ever with District’s 1 & 7 handling of procedure. We have dealt with District 5 also who basically has there own way of handling procedures but were not far out of range from District 1 and 7. They both do a great job with handling discrepancies between procedures and variance with in there Construction Offices. But the Turnpike and local CEI offices can definitely cause some difficulties with doing business differently then others.
- (1)The CEI Construction Offices can overdue things at times or may not be current with procedures that aren’t exactly written word for word. The CEI’s will also pull procedural information from the Departments website which may be outdated. Sometimes they will email me the guidelines they have and I wonder where they got them. CEI Offices seem to almost always be in their own world. A good example would be: We recently had a CEI tell us to change information on a roadway report (width and station numbers) or we will not be paid on the entire monthly estimate until it’s done. They were specifically going off the plans, and did not (and still don’t) understand that the roadway reports are going to show the project “as built” for future information purposes. It was found through investigation that that the prime over cut in those areas in which obviously needed to be filled. Granted that material was unapproved and not part of the planned construction quantities, but it had to be reported as it was placed with in a FDOT maintained project limit. The quantity of material was shown as waste and commented in the remarks section for the reason of the waste. They remained stiff about it and waived a deficiency letter in our face until we did it their way. Between numerous phone calls and having upper structure Department personnel involved, we were correct and the reports were to remain as is. The downfall to this was that the CEI now had somewhat of resentment and it also took up a half a day of making phone calls to resolve a minor issue because of arrogance and interpretation on their part. This is not an uncommon occurrence, and I find myself in a defensive position when dealing with most of the CEI offices to protect us. Also, I find myself protecting the integrity of the hard work put forth by the Department and Contractors in getting everyone on the same page and maintaining it when dealing with certain CEI offices. I don’t want to say it’s all the time but I generally have a different disposition at the beginning of a project dealing with a CEI rather then an FDOT Office. I find myself spending a lot of time teaching or getting them to the right people or place for current procedures. Personally, I don’t mind it and consider it a part of my job as a knowledgeable contractor to help them help us build a quality project, but it does cause friction when basically I have to go out side of their office to get resolution on an issue that I already knew the answer to. I would say that about 70% of the CEI offices seem to be out of the loop on general contraction practices that the FDOT and Contractors have currently evolved too, in which both parties have learned what it takes to make projects

run smoothly. They also tend to be more administrative than constructive. The CEI offices that are current or are on the same page are the firms that have hired skilled/experienced FDOT employees. Generally dealing with FDOT Construction Offices, we can work out issues among ourselves without going to District or to higher levels. Most of the time when there is something that is questionable or in doubt, we all will make a few phone calls to get definitive answers and move forward. CEI's tend to really make that process difficult, as they seem to be insulted over guidance.

- (2) The Turnpike-I don't know where to begin. They are in a world of their own, in which they will not deny.
 - (a) My first issue I had with them before the project even began was the "Asphalt Plant Worksheet". We were literally bullied into using that form. It was not an FDOT requirement to utilize that form and the VT was told that they were not allowed to verify any Lots until we utilized that form. I was told in the Pre-Construction meeting "that's correct its not a required FDOT form, but its required by the Turnpike". Twelve Lots through the project we were utilizing all the required forms and not the new APW, and when we had an issue they would not even look at the data until all the info was put on the new database worksheet for the entire project.

Response: Most districts replied that they make the Asphalt Plant Worksheet optional for contractor use.

Turnpike Response: This is a conscientious decision that we made based on the system wide benefits. Two contractors have complained but provided no fatal flaws. We would like to continue based on our operating goal of better business practices.

- (b) EAR handling-Basically we all know that District is the final word on approving a scope for an EAR. I will call the District Bituminous Engineer of district's 1 and 7 and go through the details of a particular failure and give him my intended scope and the testing to be performed. This tends to speed up the process so the procedure can be performed in a timely matter for contract time limitations. We can usually have an EAR extracted from the roadway within a week of the failure with District 1 and 7. Unless I call about a question on the "Asphalt Plant Worksheet" I cannot get the Bituminous Engineer for the Turnpike to even return a phone call. I forwarded a scope to the PA, who forwarded a DDM to the Turnpike with the attached scope that took exactly 31 days for them to respond. The response was a denial letter that basically had re-written our entire scope to the way they felt that the EAR should be performed along with its procedure of the analysis review of the Data. Huge difference in the way they handle EAR's and the way District 7 and 1 handles it. We currently have 40 contract days left on a project with them, and have had a problem with the response time of an initiated DDM with an EAR scope. An EAR scope was forwarded on September 19 and has 47 core extractions to be performed. I have sent 2 emails and left numerous messages to the DBE and his assistant and have still have not received a response. The PA has also attempted to expedite a response in our progress meetings. Can we push for a time limitation for District to respond to an initiated DDM for failures?

Turnpike Response: We acknowledge that some responses exceed your expectation. Our goal is to achieve a response time of 14 days without sacrificing quality. When an issue is critical to your schedule, we recommend you bring it to our attention at the Weekly Progress Meeting so that we can prioritize and expedite the review.

(c) Shutdown on failures. This is another way that they control us and treat us like children in controlling our own mix. We do not for any reason want to put mix out there that is substandard for the obvious reasons that we may have to take it up or lose money on pay factors. We had a failure in Lot 9 that was our first failure and prior to it the mixes have been running well. I sent an email to the PA and copied the Turnpike in stating that we had some rain and believed that the stockpiles had unknown moistures and will run a P/C samples until we were satisfied with the results of the mix. District 1,7, & 5 would be more then satisfied because they have given us the responsibility to deal with our own material. If we don't fix the problem then that's more material or cost that were going to eat because the CQC specs have been written to make us responsible for our production. The Turnpike said no, you're going to do it this way prior to producing; "3 PC tests need to be acceptable and demonstrated that the problem has been adequately resolved" "If those P/C test are acceptable then pull another PC sample in the first 100 tons of production".

Turnpike Response: On 2/12/07, the QC test failed air voids. Per DCE memo 04-06 and subsequent S.A., producer sent e-mail notice and continued production. On 2/13/07, the IV failed asphalt content. Per specification 334-5.4.4, the producer must shut down or demonstrate the problem can be resolved. We required 3 PC tests to gain our satisfaction. On 2/14/07, production resumed. We acknowledge that we do ask for 3 Process Control tests before resuming production when the producer doesn't know what went wrong or when successive failures occur.

- As a finishing general statement Districts 1,7, and 5 both the FDOT construction and materials offices are close enough in procedures that I don't see many differences with them. I'm sure that their offices have to deal with different contractors and their construction procedures/abilities differently also. As far as those 3 districts are concerned, I have no complaints about small differences with some procedures as they have really come along way from the old days. CEI offices tend to break chops and look for ways to hurt us and almost take things personal when they are corrected. Its feels like the CEI's are not part of the partnering that has come about with the FDOT Offices and the Contractors. The Turnpike is a beast all on its own, and you pretty much better do it their way and they don't give a darn how anyone else is doing it.

Turnpike Response: We do incorporate other Districts best practices when they do not jeopardize quality or violate specifications.