

LAP 120 COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

Sid Florey

COMMENT:

I support the need for this type of integrated process with the local agencies. I have recently completed 2 projects with 2 different local agencies and the experience was not good. I think the process should start with the Purchasing Departments of each agency. They operate in a semi-autonomous environment and make the rules very difficult. I think this is based on the local laws for purchasing in each area. The specifications and adopting FDOT standards is the easy issue to bridge. I find the agencies defaulting to FDOT when the situation requires a solution that is not covered in the local specifications. Have them adopt FDOT across the board and if there are special issues to address then they should cover them under "Special Provisions" with the contract.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mike Slade

COMMENT:

120-5.3 Authorization for Use of Borrow: I think you should add the phase "or commercial fill pits" at the end of the last sentence.

\*\*\*\*\*

Henry Haggerty

COMMENTS:

Section 120:

120-5.1 and 5.3: Who authorizes the borrow pits? Who is the Engineer?  
Contractors/County/ or Cities?

120-6.2.2 I am concerned over the apparent endorsement of depositing material in water or low swampy ground. Huge environmental impact!

120-7.2: Who does all these compaction tests? Why not establish a rolling pattern?

120-8 : Who does these tests?