9320203 NONMETALLIC ACCESSORY MATERIALS FOR CONCRETE PAVEMENT AND CONCRETE STRUCTURES
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Dan Scheer
414-4130
daniel.scheer@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-7-13, Internal)
1) What is a 'reasonable proximity' – this is pretty vague and not defendable. Suggest we specify a distance or driving time location, i.e. within 30 miles of the project or 45 minutes driving time…

Response:

2) Delete the words 'with minimal effort' from 932-2.3. Insert the work 'readily' before 'identified' in the same sentence.

Response:

****

Randy Cropp
561-310-7711
rcropp@conegraham.com

Comments: (10-7-13, Internal)
We need to go back to just having the bearing pad companies provide us certification of test lab results of the bearing pad test. The Department needs to show us that they have had a problem. To have bearing pads manufactured and delivered to the job site and then to have the Department runs tests could present a problem should they fail. If we are not having a problem with bearing pads why create one? Have the Department provide us with a problem. If we are worried about some half cocked manufacturers coming into the market lets have them get approved first???

Response:

****

Charles Boyd/Robert Roberston (SDO)
414-4275
Boyd.Charles@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-7-13, Internal)
(BOYD)
Since 932-2.3 does not adequately define everything that should go into how a LOT is determined, this proposed language would allow a contractor to defeat the testing requirements simply by having the pads delivered 10 at a time. Also, since there is no link to the actual manufacturing process in the definition of a LOT; potential problems might not be identified in large stockpiles of pads that were manufactured at different times by the same manufacturer or component materials that were sourced from different providers. It also doesn't address pads of

the same design, materials and thickness that were made by different pad fabricators that end up on the same job.
(ROBERTSON)
I agree with your concerns. Even for a project with less than 10 pads, how do we know we are getting properly fabricated pads since only a certification is required for a lot less than 10? We need a definition of a "Lot"? Now that DOT does not buy large quantities of pads and provide them to a Contractor, we should define a lot as changes in height or outer dimensions for a given project. Easier said than done though.

Response:

****

Keith Waugh
352-787-1616
kwaugh@lewarecc.com

Comments: (10-7-13)
The problem with the spec as I see it is that the Department has gotten away from accepting certifications. With this spec the Department will randomly select the pad to be tested and the Contractor will ship the pad to a lab and pay for the cost of testing. This seems to be an about-face from FDOT's policy of accepting certifications and thereby saving needless cost.

I suggest that FDOT allow bearing pad manufacturers to submit their Quality Control Plans to Gainesville for approval and then the Department can place them on the Qualified Producers and Fabricators list. As long as the manufacturer has an approved QC plan and uses approved testing labs, then no field sampling and testing would be required.

One more thing: FDOT has gotten away from designing jacking details and locations for pad replacement. They obviously see that pad failures have been few and far between.

Response:

****

Shailesh Patel
D5 Const.
386-943-5347
shailesh.patel@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-7-13)
Section 932-2.3 refers to stockpiling a reasonable distance from the project as determined by the engineer. This should be defined more by setting a maximum distance. This would not be CPR in the field and would be open to many interpretations.

Response:

****