

**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

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".

Response:

The term "Engineer" will be used for consistency. Districts may choose to operate in slightly different manners and, by using the term "Engineer", this will be encompassing of varying situations.

Greg Liskey
352-742-2333
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.

Response:

The change "*Should any qualified laboratory falsify records, the laboratory qualification will be subject to revocation by the Engineer. Falsification of project-related documentation will be subject to further investigation and penalty under state and federal laws*" will be removed from consideration until there can be further discussion among affected groups.

Ghulam Mujtaba
352 -955-6685
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.

Response:

Note that this subarticle is under the heading of “Guidelines for Development of the Quality Control Plan”, so it is already clear that this information is to be included in the Quality Control Plan. However, the sentence has been modified to include non-TIN training venues, while not changing the intent of the specification change.

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.

Response:

Agreed. The sentence was modified to include other pertinent certifications, while not changing the intent of the specification change.

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

Response:

This specification change will be removed from consideration until there can be further discussion among affected groups.

Greg Weich
813-744-6070
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?

Response:

The term "Engineer" will be used for consistency. Districts may choose to operate in slightly different manners and, by using the term "Engineer", this will be encompassing of varying situations.

Christopher Wood
(904) 360-5673
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.

Response:

Agreed. Many Contractors are already submitting this information, so it should not be a huge burden.

Jim Warren
850-222-7300
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.

Response:

Many Contractors are already providing this information or a majority of it in their QC Plan. It will not add much work for them. From the Department's perspective, it will provide valuable information.

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.

Response:

This is not a substantial issue or specification change and simply requires the Contractor to notify the accrediting agency and the Engineer if the lab is relocated. A simple e-mail will suffice.

Comment:

105-6 Where is the due process? 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?

Response:

This specification change will be removed from consideration until there can be further discussion among affected groups.