



Montana Contractors' Association
PO Box 4519
Helena, MT 59604
Ph: 406.442.4162
F: 406.449.3199

Comments on December Specifications

101.03 Definitions

After our discussions, MCA understands that MDT intends to remove “agricultural irrigation systems” from the definition. If that is done, MCA is fine with this spec change.

108.01.1 Subcontracting

MCA continues to disagree with MDT’s rigid interpretation of when subcontracts are required. The proposed spec is confusing and unworkable in numerous actual construction situations, particularly under “material application.” Time constraints and the small size of some work orders do not allow for the development of subcontracts. Small operators often refuse to consider performing low-dollar tasks on highway projects if the “hassle factor” of a subcontract is required. We suggest MDT eliminate the Material application reference entirely. We also question what is meant by “heavy haul trucks,” and how that will be interpreted.

One suggestion offered during the meeting was to consider giving contractors a pre-approved list of subcontractors to work from as an alternative to the current proposal. In any event, we request that MDT revisit this spec proposal and allow for more discussion with MCA members before adopting something.

401.03.12 Compaction.....

MCA members believe the current area used to cut test cores from is already quite small, and MDT is proposing to tighten this requirement to a point that the cores would be virtually touching each other. We believe this could lead to distortions, especially in the test results of the second core. We request that MDT reconsider the rationale for this change and reconsider the proposed tightened standard. We are also concerned with the statement: “Additional tests may be made at the Project Manager’s discretion.” We suggest adding language such as “randomly generated,” or further define to “obviously defective areas.”

618.03.2 Traffic Control Plan

Under A. Traffic Control Plan Requirements, we suggest amending your proposed language “as much as possible,” to “as much as is practicable.” This implies some consideration to cost and practical limitations rather than such an open-ended interpretation of what may “possible.”

Under A.8. NCHRP 350 or MASH Certification, we question why MDT would want all that paperwork, and why a contractor should be required to submit the same certifications for the same devices project after project. We suggest revising this proposed change to require annual submissions.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit input on your proposed spec changes for December.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Cary Hegreberg'. The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped 'C' at the beginning.

Cary Hegreberg
Executive Director