

1630000 LANDSCAPE SOIL LAYER
INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

Neil Monkman
(239) 462-7371
neil.monkman@wrightg.com

Comments: (12-5-16)

I think the improvements to the specification are excellent and puts responsibility of the quality on the contractor, where it should be. This will save all parties time and money. My commendations to those involved.

Response: Response: Thank you Neil

Larry Jones
414-4305
larry.jones@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-5-16)

In order to avoid conflicts with Index 505 on a 2:1 slope, I suggest incorporating these revisions into Specification 162 for “Finish Soil Layer” which is already excepted by the Index. Otherwise, a conflict with Index 505 will occur every time the average organic content exceeds 5%.

Response: It’s unlikely that the landscape soil will be used on 2:1 slope. Intent is primarily in medians and other locations where trees will be planted. Seldom will trees be planted on 2:1 slope.

No Change Made

Dianne Perkins
Dianne.perkins@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (12-5-16)

Jeff. my comment on the Spec is more towards the active voice instructions left to the specs development section office by Traunner when we converted to active voice.

163-4: Delete “Prior to” and insert “Before” placement....

You may choose to ignore! ☺

Response: Will do as instructed by specs office

Thank you for your comment no changes made.

Brian S. Dick PLA

863-834-2237
brian.dick@lakelandgov.net

Comments: (12-5-16)

1630000 It is important to know if the existing soil will also percolate. The test holes will percolate if the new soil surrounding the test hole is permeable. If there is a clay layer under your new soil the median will fill up with water and drowned your plants. The test holes are needed in the existing soil and the new soil.

Response: Valid point. Substitute 163-4 second paragraph with; Prior to excavation....., dig or drill a hole..... to a depth 12 inches greater than the depth of the installed soil layer.

Changes Made

Richard Ryals
863-519-2911
richard.ryals@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-12-16)

It looks to me like they are adding a new specification 163. I believe specification 162 will remain.

As I was discussing with you regarding specification 162 and more specifically, pay item 162-1-11, the uncertainty of when to use pay item 162-1-11 has already resulted in several construction claims by contractors.

I would recommend one of the following:

- Eliminate pay item 162-1-11, as it totally undermines the performance requirements of pay items 570-1-1 and 570-1-2.

If they will not eliminate pay item 162-1-11, then require it to be included whenever items 570-1-1 or 570-1-2 are used to eliminate the vagueness and uncertainty of when to include it.

Response: This is a 162 issue.

No change made

Darryl Richard
863-519-2266
darryl.richard@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-12-16)

*-*additional thoughts on Prepared Soil Layer*-*

I think I'm betting understanding what the 'issue' is with the Prepared Soil layer spec. [see attached notes from Rick Ryals – one of our 3R Project Managers]

There's been a recent claim by a contractor on a 3R project (roadway refurbishment/resurfacing) where the contractor was doing work on multiple projects under one single bid. There was a

'goes with' that did not have the prepared soil spec called out as a pay item; and then on another part of the contractor's work – the Prepared Soil layer was called out to be installed (and had a pay item).

Apparently this contractor obtained additional monies from the Dept/FDOT in the form of a change order.

This has the specs guys doing a dance to see how to address the issue; so it doesn't happen again.

There's lots of confusion among the specs folks on what should be specified under 'what condition' i.e. should Prepared Soil Layer only be used when 'seeding' is to take place? So that the soil is a better growing medium for the sprouting of grass seed. It is assumed, under this context, that the 'sod' pieces do not need additional soil amendment in that sod has an 1 inch +/- dirt on each piece of sod.

It'd seem to me that they should just simply 'not use the Prepared Soil Layer spec' and save the Dept. and Tax Payer money – as I don't think the material that contractors haul to a roadway project is very high quality in terms of soil for sod plantings (they're just planting Bahia either by seeding or sod). In review of this issue with our Construction management staff – I'm finding that it's very unlikely that thorough testing of imported material occurs – esp. in regard to soil PH levels. So, why import soil under the context of Section 987 (Prepared Soil Layer)?

I don't want the specs/engineers to decide what happens here w/out the LA's input; especially since Section 580 references Section 987 (Prepared Soil Layer).

At this point my only angle would be to try to further enhance what our Section 580 does using the Section 987 Prepared Soil Layer spec – i.e. can we raise the level of specifics in the 987-1? To better our planting soil?

Response: 580 spec will be updated to reference this new 163 Landscape soil layer

No change made.

Jason Russell
414-4010
jason.russell@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-14-16)

Is the intent to have each test site pass the perk test? What is the cure for failed perk tests?

Response: : Yes, each test site where trees will be planted need to pass the perk test. There is no need to plant tree in a wet hole. Sites that fail the test need to be modified by the contractor, or the plant(s) need to be changed to species adapted to wet conditions, or plants need to be relocated to an appropriate location.

No change made.

John Fowler
D3 Design

Comments: (12-23-16)

District 3 Design Section: I have reviewed the proposed spec, and I offer the following comments:

1. Is this a new specification that is being created? If so, what is happening to Section 162?
2. How will the new spec affect Pay Item 162-1-21 Organic Soil Layer? Under what circumstances will these two different pay items be used?

Response: Yes a new specification. No effect on 162
