

SSM5220000 CONCRETE SIDEWALK AND DRIVEWAYS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL REVIEW

District 5

Comments:(03/19/21, Internal) Agree testing requirements should not be included.

Response: No change needed

Zachary Taylor
District 6

Comments: (03/23/21, Internal)

I believe it is important to keep the sentence implying that it is incidental for the contractor to excavate to grade & provide fill to grade as needed. Also, I think we should keep the reference to the density requirements for compaction under FM 1-T099 but leave out the testing & recording requirements. (As testing results would require additional verification from our inspectors & unrealistic burden to fulfill/enforce from a Maintenance perspective)

Response: Agree; additional revisions made to address comments.

Skip Bechtold
District 6

Comments: (03/23/21, Internal) I agree that density testing under some foundations may be an impractical requirement especially when applied to maintenance contracts. I'm also not sure how often cross-slopes apply to foundations.

Response: Agree; future revisions attempted to address

Richard Yates
District 3

Comments: (03/29/21, Internal) First, the only guideline for the appropriate compaction of the foundation is 'firm'. Does this give our inspectors enough information to determine if the compaction under a sidewalk or driveway is suitable? Second, I am unclear on where the last sentence is referring to. Is the "remaining fill areas" inside of the concrete forms, or outside of the forms? If it is referring to fill areas outside of the forms, I'm good with not having to compact the fill denser than the in-situ soil.

Response:

- First Question: Revisions currently being proposed did not prompt this question. If changes are needed to clarify the term "firm", additional efforts with statewide participation will be required. Suggest revisiting with a future revision.
- Second Question: Additional research needed to accurately respond to this question.

Deanna Hutchison
Office of Maintenance

(850) 410-5634

Comments: (03/30/21, Internal)

Based on all comments and questions received, drafted alternate version of SSM5220000 to only include minimal changes to the title/description, and the change from AASHTO T99 to FM 1-T099.

Response: Daniel Strickland in agreement to proceed with the latest revisions for the 07/21 MT Workbook, and recommends further research and discussion with SMO and Statewide Maintenance to confirm and/or clarify the language, as necessary.
