Comments: (10-17-18, Internal)
- If the bats are rooting behind the MSE wall panels, and not in the bridge, then the specification as written is not sufficient. Expand specification to clarify intent, as necessary.
- Does “methodology for securing all openings half an inch or greater in size” infer that the openings are to be blocked – like with a polystyrene foam? Is this blocking element different from the exclusion devices? Should the blocking element(s) be removed at the end of construction? Clarify intent.

Response:

Chris Sweitzer
Comments: (10-26-18, Industry)
Last sentence of paragraph 2 seems to conflict with the first one in paragraph 3 unless you are limiting work on the bridge to that window. If the intent of the last sentence of paragraph 2 is to limit the initial installation of bat exclusion devices to the specified time window then I suggest a bit of clarification, such as "Initial installation of bat exclusion devices can only occur from...".

Response:

Ananth Prasad
Comments: (10-26-2018, Industry)
Comment 1. Will there be a note on the plans or Specs that this is required? You can usually see the bat guano but I couldn’t tell if it is current or from years ago. Why would this not be a change order situation? Why are we adding more incidental work on the contractors? What happens if bridge work is on critical path and we need to work at this location between April and August? 2. The first paragraph identifies that a bridge has bats. The second paragraph starts with: Exclude all bats from the structure prior to commencing work on the structure The verb exclude means to deny access…..but if the bats are present prior to construction, then is the contractor responsible to REMOVE the existing bats? Do we wait until they fly out at night and then exclude them from coming back in? Or will the FDOT give us a bat free bridge and we go ahead and install the exclusion devices? 3. I echo the concern as it relates to schedule. Typically this concern or timeframe is not contemplated when FDOT lets a project or provides a notice to proceed. At a minimum, projects with a NTP within the timeframe in which you cannot exclude the bats should have special consideration Would like disposition of these comments send to
apradas@ftba.com

Response:

******************************************************************************

Dan Hurtado
(850) 414-4130
Dan.Hurtado@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-26-18, Industry)
1st sentence, 2nd paragraph: Replace the words, "Exclude all bats from the structure" with the words, "Install bat exclusion devices on the structure". The direction to "exclude" bats can be misconstrued with a requirement to actively remove them.
Response:

******************************************************************************

Brian Blair
(863) 519-2676
Brian.blair@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-2-2018, Industry)
Please clarify how the Contractor is compensated (pay item) for this work.
Response:

******************************************************************************

Ann Broadwell
(954) 777-4325
Ann.broadwell@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-21-2018, Industry)
Is it possible to require contractor to contact District Environmental Management Office regarding the re-installation of the exclusion devices? It is not something I am comfortable having a roadway contractor do.
Response:

******************************************************************************

Martin Horwitz
(407) 264-3022
Martin.horwitz@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-21-2018, Industry)
The specification does not indicate any requirements or guidelines for the exclusion devices/required Bat Exclusion Plan. Should it reference the current FWC guidelines at a minimum? • Will EMO be responsible for reviewing/approving the Bat Exclusion Plan as well as coordinating with the Contractor for changes to their plan if needed or will Construction be handling this? • Will this specification remove the need to provide bat exclusion details within the Construction Plans as currently done for FTE projects?
Response: