

**1050502, Guidelines For Development of the Quality Control Plan  
Comments from Industry Review**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Sam K. Joseph**  
**Assistant District Materials Research Engineer.**  
(863)519-4211 (O), (863) 661-1592(C)  
[sam.joseph@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:sam.joseph@dot.state.fl.us)

**Comment:**

I don't know if we are making the spec clearer by stating the "Engineer instead of DMRE". As is there is so much confusion about who is the Engineer. In our District the DMRE is responsible to originate this letter. I don't know why we are changing that to a vague reference of "the Engineer".

\*\*\*\*\*

**Greg Liskey**  
352-742-2333  
[gliskey@mackconcrete.com](mailto:gliskey@mackconcrete.com)

**Comment:**

My suggestion would be to place this issue on the next meeting of the Precast Concrete Structures Association Of Florida, (PCSA) to fully understand the problems associated with this proposed change and suggested corrective measures from our industries stand point> I am a firm believer when these issues are discussed with representation from our entire industry at the PCSA Meetings, we obtain excellent questions, comments and solutions.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Ghulam Mujtaba**  
352 -955-6685  
[ghulam.mujtaba@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:ghulam.mujtaba@dot.state.fl.us)

**Comments:**

The following are my review comments related to the proposed changes: A. Subarticle 105-5.2.1: Qualifications: 1- The first sentence: It mentions that Submit TIN for all technicians. Comment: All certification agencies do not issue TIN numbers. The purpose of TIN is to trace the technician's training and certification records. The specification should state this requirement. The word "Submit" has been mentioned. This may indicate that the Contractor submits it by letter, e-mail or other correspondence. It should state that it should be included in the quality control plan. Suggested change: In the quality control plan, for each technician, include the Training Identification Number (TIN) or any other information which will be traceable to the certification agency's training location and dates. 2- Second Sentence: Provide the names of the CTQP certifications held and the expiration dates for each certification for each technician. Comment: The sentence is fragmented. It indicates that only information about CTQP certification should be included in the quality control plan. There are other certifications which technicians are required to have and they do not belong to CTQP. Modify the sentence to read: The information shall include the issue and expiration dates of the CTQP and other certifications that technicians may possess. B. Article 105-6 Lab Qualification Program –The first paragraph-

last page First sentence: The first sentence reads: “Should any qualified laboratory falsify records, the laboratory qualifications will be subject to revocation by the Engineer. “ Comment: This indicates that other laboratories are exempt from falsification of records. Modify the sentence to read: Should any laboratory falsify records, the laboratory qualifications will be  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Greg Weich**  
813-744-6070  
[gregory.weich@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:gregory.weich@dot.state.fl.us)

**Comment:**

The statement for revocation of a lab (producer’s or CEI), has changed to “Engineer” which was the DMRE. The DMO designates the lab approval status and inspects a lot of these labs. Some of the labs perform tests for local District Materials Offices which Construction may not immediately know of, example being VT Aggregate testing from a source. Maybe it should read as both parties able to revoke for those same issues or are we to understand this as the DMRE being the duly authorized representative of the Engineer in this case for definition purposes?  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Christopher Wood**  
(904) 360-5673  
[Christopher.Wood@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Christopher.Wood@dot.state.fl.us)

**Comment:**

This would require a listing to be submitted with each QC Plan since all CTQP qualifications with expiration dates will be required. This is something similar to what Anderson Columbia provides with their QC Plans. If they do this, then it would negate me having to check out each and every one of the technicians provided. Makes my job a little bit easier. Strongly agree with change.

**Jim Warren**  
850-222-7300  
[jwarren@acaf.org](mailto:jwarren@acaf.org)

**Comment:**

105-5.2.1. We are 100% against this proposed change. Not needed - this was what the online database was developed for. This would require continual maintenance as different technicians come up for re-qualification.

**Comment:**

105-6 (e) How big an issue is this? This can be accomplished with an E-mail and shouldn't be subject to suspending a labs qualification.

**Comment:**

105-6 Where is the due process? Why Why hang whole lab for one person is accountable/responsible. This is overkill and ripe for abuse by the FDOT. If a technician is

suspect they can be temporarily removed pending appeal/due process. There needs to be an appeal process while the lab continues to work. What ever happened to presumed innocence?