

2000200 ROCK BASE
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Bob Burleson
bburleson@ftba.com

Comments: (9-18-13, Internal)

Everyone is appreciative of the help here but also question why so much testing?

Response: A reduced testing frequency for exceptional quality material has been added.

Marshall Dougherty
863-370-4079
Marshall@rxengsol.com

Comments: (9-30-13)

The additional verbiage proposed for Article 200-11, i.e. “The reuse of existing base may be considered provided it meets the requirements stated above and shall be submitted as a Cost Savings Initiative Proposal in accordance with 4-3.9,” should be relocated to remove non-basis of payment language from that Article. Its primary goal is, as stated, to require a CSIP. A more appropriate location would be as new Paragraph 9 under Subarticle 200-2.2 which could simply state “Submit a Cost Savings Initiative Proposal in accordance with 4-3.9.” This will provide the desired instruction to the contractor, in the appropriate location, and follow the goal of active voice, imperative mood writing. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed revision.

Response: The language “Submit a Cost Savings Initiative Proposal in accordance with 4-3.9.” has been added to the last paragraph of 200-2.1

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

Comments: (10-18-13)

I suggest deleting the last sentence added in 200-11 requesting the submittal of a CSI. The amount of administrative effort to process CSI that could happen to many projects would be overwhelming. No need to create a separate pay item either. Just pay existing base material under the same optional base pay item. If the contractor makes the existing base work or proves that it works and we get the same end product, let him be paid at the same price. Eventually we should see bid prices coming down. If a contractor thinks he can reuse an existing base and bring the price down, he will bid a lower price for the optional base pay item.

Response: A cost savings initiative is not removed because of the risk that existing rock will not meet the requirements.

Shailesh Patel
386-943-5347
shailesh.patel@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-22-13)

Section 200-2.2 Existing Rock: I would change “process control plan” to “quality control plan”, just to keep it CPR...

Response: The wording “process control plan” is retained. The “Quality Control Plan” is not intended to contain the scope of the means and methods of harvesting Existing Rock
