

1050302-MM9.2VII CONTRACTOR QUALITY CONTROL GENERAL REQUIREMENTS –
COMPLIANCE WITH THE MATERIALS MANUAL.
INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

Jeremy Wolcott
386-740-3500
jeremy.wolcott@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-21-16)

1. MM 9.2VII. Section 9.2.7 Design Mixes (7) Slump loss test data with an elapsed time of 5 hours or less and 30 cubic yards of concrete or less for drilled shaft mixes. Comment: This could be worded a little clearer. I assume this is in reference to addressing miscellaneous shafts.

Response: (7) has been reworded for clarification.
Change made.

2. MM9.2VII. Appendix B. Why is this being removed? Because Materials Acceptance and Certification (MAC) system is on board?

Response: Yes. Design mixes are submitted through MAC using the MAC format.
No change made.

Ron Holcomb
239-825-3519
ronald.holcomb@cemex.com

Comments: (11-29-16)

1. In section 9.2.7, it is added that the engineer can rescind any mix with "unsatisfactory results". What process/criteria is there to determine "unsatisfactory results", is this data from a single a compressive strength test, a series of strength tests, failing to meet plastic properties, or an assessment of plastic performance/workability an example could be a barrier wall appearance when the mix performs in other applications? Also, this statement begins with the word "when", which would be better worded with "If".

Response: Statement has been clarified as follows:

design mix is to be verified at a location that is out-of-state. submit the design mix design to the DMREO closest to that location. When If the Engineer determines that unsatisfactory results are obtained during production of a design mix which do not meet the contract document requirements, that mix may be rescinded. ¶

Change made.

2. In section 9.2.8, it is added that a fly ash substitution will require a new slump loss test. Assuming the mix design contained the same class of fly ash, there should be no significant impact on the time of set of the mixture to require an additional slump loss test.

Response: Statement added at the request of the concrete materials technical advisory group. Changes in elapsed time for the same design mix were noted, when fly substitutions were made. No change made.

3. In section 9.2.12 (5) “Describe the action that will be taken when there is a concern with any material or product located at the plant which may be in violation of contract documents and notify the DMRO”. What defines a concern, and who is it assumed that raises the concern? The “any material..located at the plant” could be interpreted that a plant could only have inventory of FDOT approved materials, even though the plant could have multiple stockpiles of materials that are not used for FDOT projects, as these materials may be intended for use on a commercial project. Also the requirement to notify the DRMO of what “action will be taken”, is it intended that every time questionable material is disposed of be reported to the DMRO? The QC Plan covers that the producer uses FDOT approved materials to produce concrete for FDOT products, so this would be covered by that requirement.

Response: The responsibility of enforcing the quality plan is the producers. The Department is only concerned with material which is used on their projects. Should material be used from an unapproved source for a Department project this would be cause for concern and should be reported to the DMRO. The word “any” has been changed to “a”, no additional changes were made.
Change made.

4. In Table 1, it states 90 days for gradations, should this changed every 3 months or quarterly? For instance if a plant samples on the 1st day of the month, they could technically be out of spec by a day or two.

Response: Comment is non-persuasive, no change made
