

0080401 PROSECUTION AND PROGRESS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Thomas Bowles
401-757-0080
tom.b@russellengineering.com

Comment: (12-9-13)

This is a thoughtful revision which comports with the nature of varied night work. The old "one size fits all" approach simply was not feasible for all night work activities. Bravo!!

Response: Thank you for your comment. No change made.

Mike Irwin

Comment: (12-23-13)

The spec removes the requirement of submitting a lighting plan for the Engineers acceptance. However, the requirement to gain the acceptance of the Engineer for alternate lighting methods is still required in the second paragraph: As written below: "Lighting may be accomplished by the use of portable floodlights, standard equipment lights, existing street lights, temporary street lights, or other lighting methods approved by the Engineer."

1. How is the Engineer to approve lighting methods without a lighting plan?

Response: An email requesting the use an alternate lighting method not mentioned in this subarticle would be acceptable. No change made.

2. Is it the Department's intent for the Engineer to accept or reject lighting methods?

Response: Only for other lighting methods not mentioned in this subarticle. No change made.

3. Without a plan are we just being required to subjectively go out at night and determine if it "feels" right?

Response: No. This subarticle requires a measureable quantity of 5 ft-cd measured with a light meter provided by the Contractor. No change made.

Similar to the MOT response, taking away the requirement to think about the way the work will occur will result in insufficient lighting and then a dispute with the contractor over whether or not the lighting met the requirements of the contract. I remember when we decided to start requiring lighting plans and why. There is a good reason why this is in the spec and removing it is a mistake. Either way, if the Department proceeds with these changes there needs to be a better assignment and understanding of responsibility.

Response: Thank you for your comments. No changes made.

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

Comment: (12-23-13)

8-4.1: The second paragraph notes the type of lights that may be used and then references other methods as approved by the Engineer. Without a lighting plan which is removed in the next paragraph, how would you know what is proposed to be used and how would you accept it. I think this section should be left in but you could make provisions to change the way it is submitted. It could be handled in the pre-con by a verbal discussion and agreement.

Response: The Contractor can use any of the light sources provided in this subarticle. If the Contractor chooses to use an alternate light source not mentioned, approval from the Engineer is required. Also, this subarticle requires a measureable quantity of 5 ft-cd measured with a light meter provided by the Contractor.

No changes made.
