

**2040000 – Response to Comments From Industry Review**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Bob Schafer**

Ranger Construction

**Comment**

I think it's a great idea and long overdue for the State to consider recycling concrete for base. There is one line in there that is a little troubling for me though, "Use materials produced by Department approved sources." What are the approved sources? On-site bridges, curb and gutter, and sidewalks only?

**Response**

A Department approved "source" meets the requirements of 14-103 Florida Administrative Code for having a Quality Control Program and doing testing etc. The point-of-use origination of the material is not considered the source. The source would be the processing plant location.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Horace D Autry/D1/FDOT**

863.519.2651

**Comment:**

Maybe I am misreading Section 204.2.2.2 but it references a sieve (minus 0.425 [No.40]) which is not in the gradation table in Section 204-2.2.1. This in my only comment.

**Response**

The gradation requirements don't include a #40 sieve. However, the Liquid Limit, and Plasticity tests require a separation of material over the #40 sieve. The labs running the tests are qualified and should know how to separate material and determine if it meets the specification referenced.

\*\*\*\*\*

**JohnPrevite**

John Previte/D1/FDOT

**Comment:**

While the term "free from" (having a water quality standards connotation meaning absolutely none) may be appropriate in 204-2.2.4 pertaining to "hazardous materials", it is not appropriate, true or enforceable as proposed in **204-2.1** where the adverb "substantially" is proposed to be deleted.

If it is not practical to here quantify aggregate cleanliness, then perhaps "substantially free from" is more correct. Or why not "acceptable to the Engineer" as implied elsewhere throughout the article?

**Response**

Will rewrite first sentence of 204-2.1 as follows:

Use material of uniform quality throughout that does not contain vegetable matter, shale, or lumps of clay balls in sufficient quantity as to be detrimental to the proper bonding, finishing, or strength of the base. Material shall have a Limerock Bearing Ratio value of not less than 100.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Calvin Johnson**  
Calvin L Johnson/CO/FDOT  
414-5287

Comment:

Revisions look fine.

**Response**

Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Lloyd F. Glover, President**  
Space Coast Crushers, Inc.  
8800 Holiday Springs Road  
Rockledge, Fl. 32955  
321-636-2323

Comments

Dear Mr. Brautigam,

I'd first like to take a minute to introduce ourselves. For nearly 30 years I have delivered waste concrete to reclamation centers, and bought their products in several major cities. Then, in late 1980's I decided to build the very first facility in the Orlando Florida area. I sold it in 1998 and moved to our present site 6 miles South of Cocoa, Florida.

Over the years, I've seen many different styles of crusher plants, and as many different quality & gradation of products. Therefore, as I read about this proposed change #2040000 coming up, I truly applaud it. Furthermore, I see very little in this change that would make it impossible for an honest producer to make a high quality base material.

I see in this change a 3-fold purpose:

1. To give local municipalities more reason to use reclaimed concrete base materials.
2. That it should help standardize all producers across our state.
3. It will grossly help keep the product environmentally friendly.

At your convenience, I invite you or your people to plan a trip to our business for a visit. Or, maybe a test site, even maybe a model facility.

If we can be of further assistance, please call 321-636-2323 office, or 407-832-3184 cell.

Thank you!

**Response**

No response required for specification purposes. The Department would be happy to arrange a visit to the facility.

\*\*\*\*\*

**DANIEL.COBB@DOT.STATE.FL.US**  
386-961-7719

Comments offered by D2MRO staff

-----  
Section 204-2.2 -- See duplicate reference in 1st sentence of 2nd paragraph --  
"reclaimed concrete aggregates or reclaimed concrete aggregates"

Daniel Cobb, P.E.

-----  
I believe we should have 0% rebars or WWF materials. Why would we want any in the aggregate?

Henry Haggerty, P.E.

-----  
Section 204-9 references Item 285-6 for thickness requirements. Section 285 is not written as a CQC specification, it only requires verification to test for thickness. Should the reference be to section 200-7 for thickness checks?

Larry S. Keen  
District Density Technologist

\*\*\*\*\*

**Response**

I think the intent is that two supplies of RCA might be combined (first case) or an RCA might be combined with another approved material (second case). No duplicate reference. Suggest rewrite “ *combining one origin of reclaimed concrete aggregates with other origins of ~~or~~ reclaimed concrete aggregates ~~and~~ or other approved materials.*”

I agree that we don’t want any, but the separation process is not perfect. I will reduce 1% in the proposed specification to 0.1%.

Agreed. However the specification will be changed to 200-6.3 to be even more direct.

Late Comment from OGC to make language consistent.

**Response**

Agree to delete second paragraph of 204-2 (The Contractor may furnish the material in two sizes..... *etc*)

Correction in 204-2.1 (first sentence) was addressed in response to John Previte/D1/FDOT .

Comment re 204-2.1.1 has already been addressed.