2000702 ROCK BASE
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Neil Monkman
neil.monkman@wrightg.com

Comment: (4-9-14) As a contractor, I believe that the proposed revision to the specification is an enormous improvement. This has been a concern of contractors and material suppliers for a long time since the material must be submitted to FDOT for approval prior to being used on any project. Pulling a proctor on material that is sent to the project with a ticket that states "Certified For FDOT" has always seemed redundant. This will not only save time in the field (7-14 days), but I believe will also save money on the front end if the contract bidding a job knows that this testing will not be required. I would like to thank the author for a well thought and well written proposed revision.

Response: Thank you. We will forward your comments to the Director Ruelke for spearheading this change.

****

Juan Castellanos
414-4276
Juan.castellanos@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (4-15-14)
1. In the proposed 200-7.2.3, last sentence, specify 200-7.2.2 (not just 200-7.2)

Response: Included references to 200-7.2.1 and 200-7.2.2 to include both density and frequency. Change Made.

2. In the last sentence of 200-7.2.3 we are giving the contractor unlimited options to change back and forth from published values to testing as per the current specs. If a source requires more than 2 changes of criteria I believe the source is not consistent enough for this method to be trusted. Also, I am not sure how we will be tracking the correct densities to use if a contractor keeps changing back and forth on the Proctor density options. I suggest limiting the possible changes by modifying the last sentence to “Notify the Engineer in writing if returning to the provisions of 200-7.2.2. Do not re-elect to use the Pit Proctor after returning to the provisions of 200-7.2.2”. This way, the contractor will have one opportunity to change to the published values and then a second chance by reverting back to the specs, but that should be the end of it.

Response: The Contractor must have the option to use the Pit Proctor for more than just one quarter. No Change Made.

3. Subarticle 200-7.4.2. similar to previous comment, Contractor should not be allowed to go back later on to Pit Proctor option again after he has already gone from Pit Proctor to standard procedure of 200-7.2.2.

Response: The Contractor must have the option to use the Pit Proctor for more than just one

quarter. No Change Made.

4. A minor comment in subarticle 200-7.2.3: Make sure to use Modified Proctor Maximum Density throughout this paragraph to be consistent with the Table and the first sentence of this subarticle.

Response: Agree, Change Made.

****

Unknown

Comment: (4-30-14)
1. Recommend moving the 200-7.2.3 Pit Proctor to 200-7.3.1.2 so it is near the Modified Proctor requirement.

Response: 200-7.2.3 has to be under the Acceptance Program. 200-7.3.1.2 deals with Verification. No Change Made.

2. Suggest modifying the language of 200-7.2.1 Density: Within the entire limits of the width and depth of the base, obtain a minimum density in any LOT of 98% of the modified Proctor maximum density as determined by FM 1-T 180, Method D or the Pit Proctor when using the Pit Proctor option. For shoulder only areas and bike/shared use paths, obtain a minimum density of 95% of the modified Proctor maximum density as determined by FM 1-T 180, Method D or the Pit Proctor when using the Pit Proctor option.

Response: Agree, Change Made.

****

Shailesh Patel
shailesh.patel@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (4-30-14)
1. Use of a pit proctor prior to QC testing: The downfalls that were experienced were:

1. If the FDOT determines the pit proctor, and the FDOT IA samples the roadway, and samples do not compare, the contractor can argue that he is being delayed as the FDOT internal testing is inconsistent (non-comparison no fault of the contractor).

2. When a CEI roadway sample did not agree/compare with the FDOT pit proctor, the District Materials personnel took exceptions to the field sampling procedures (and abilities) of the CEI, and the issue became more of an internal difference than a quality control issue (the roadway proctor came back much higher that the pit proctor, raising a question about the quality of the road and proper testing at the pit). The final determination was that large mines have differing strata and differing consistency of the materials within the mine, and a frequency of testing at the mine had to take location within the mine into consideration along with the frequency. Additionally the location of the excavation at the mine had to be tracked to assure correct pit proctors were being used.

The positive experiences were: It saves time and money on field roadway laboratory testing.

a. The contractor knows what density he needs prior to placing and finishing the rock.

b. Fewer limerock samples mean less manpower and equipment to field sample, transport and laboratory test.

c. It expedites the base testing procedure, particularly on the ability of the contractor to cover the first course of base and prime the top course of base (frequently a field issue regarding proceeding at the contractor's risk).

Response:

1.1 The Contractor elects to use the Pit Proctor process with the knowledge that an FDOT IA result non-comparison requires the return to roadway sampling and testing. No Change Made.

1.2 No response required.

3. During construction time will be essential, especially if some embankment material has been placed and accepted. IV test staff will need some time to take the sample into the lab., to complete the test. If the results are higher than 4.5 PCF and does not compare, then the contractor would have to return to provision 200-7.2.2. (conventional testing procedure). This might impact the contractor's production. Will there be any provisions that will address this situation?

Response: The same provisions apply when a Resolution result overrides a QC Proctor. If a new analysis shows that project densities are failing, the contractor responds in the same way. No Change Made.