
Index 715-002 Standard Aluminum Lighting

ORIGINATION

Date: July 21, 2022

Name: Richard Stepp

Phone: (850) 414-4313

Email: Richard.Stepp@dot.state.fl.us

COMMENTARY

A spread footing option was added at the request of the Districts. This footing is intended for use where project space constraints inhibit placement of the shaft foundation. This typically occurs in urban areas. The footing serves as a sidewalk surface and may be placed immediately behind a raised curb. The Structures Design Office checked the spread footing dimensions and anchor bolt design.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

BLACK = Industry Review Comments **BLUE** = Standard Plans Response **GREEN** = Change Made to Index

Name: Chris Tavella

Date: 8/11/2022

COMMENT: Sheet 5 of 9 Spread Footing Foundation Option

1. Suggest labeling the side dimension of the spread footing as “Spread Footing Width”.

RESPONSE: A new term is not required to describe an unchanging dimension.

2. The proposed standard only shows a 6’ spread footing width. Due to RW constraints most sidewalks within D6 are just 5’ wide. Please consider including a design for a 5’ width spread footer, otherwise this Standard Plan will not be very useful.

RESPONSE: Where possible, the Standard Plans must not conflict with FDM requirements. For the contexts with constrained conditions described, FDM 222.2.1.1 requires a minimum 6-foot sidewalk. Next, this FDM section requires an unobstructed width of 48” for light poles. A 5-foot spread footing would violate both requirements. That said, if a future FDM version was to provide leeway for existing sidewalks and allow for recasting to accommodate a new spread footing, then these dimensions could be reconsidered for a future Standard Plans release.

3. Just curious to know if an anchor plate was consider as shown in Standard Plan 521-660 for Light Pole Pedestal on a Bridge? Perhaps an anchor plate would better facilitate plumb anchor bolts and accurate location? Also, the anchor plate would be an inexpensive insurance for the short anchor bolts embedments.

RESPONSE: An anchor plate was considered, and the SDO determined it was not required. Also, specially fabricated anchor plates have a significant cost, so the generic washer addition was introduced.

4. Suggest considering using U-shape bars along all sides of the footer. It may not be necessarily needed for strength or crack control, but these bars may help facilitate the construction of a full steel cage for the top bars and be easier for construction.

RESPONSE: The proposed straight-bar placement is consistent with most Standard Plans designs. As mentioned, the additional steel is not required for the design to function, so only the necessary steel material is shown for cost-effectiveness. With a standardized and repeatable design, we give leeway to the contractors to develop their ideal construction methods.

5. Suggest considering using a note about the bearing resistance that was used for the design. Such as nominal bearing pressure.

RESPONSE: Agreed. This was already added to the 715-002 Standard Plans Instructions pending release with the Standard Plans. It is placed alongside the design assumptions for the other foundation types.

No changes proposed to Index.

Response Date: 8/11/2022