

0050104b CONTROL OF THE WORK
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Duane Brautigam
414-4130

Comment: (Internal - 5-7-10)

“Required revisions” isn’t particularly descriptive, i.e., who is “requiring”(?). In addition to relocating this phrase to the paragraph about major modifications, this might be even more clear if you replaced “required” with “such”, i.e., “Provide signed and sealed revised sheets to the Engineer for any ~~required~~ such revisions to the Contract plans prior to submitting shop drawings.”

Response: From the Specifications Office – this change has been made. (5-10-10dt)

David OHagan

Comments: (Internal – 5-10-10)

1. 4-3.9 Value Engineering Incentive Proposal specification currently under Internal Review to be called “Cost Savings Incentive Proposal.”

Response: Good catch. This change has been made.

2. It seems to me that any “Major Modification” now kicks in the FS statute’s Successor Engineer provision. This should be mentioned as, in my experience, many of these revisions come from out-of-state from newly licensed practitioners.

Response: We do not want to go to this level of detail in the Specification as it would set a precedent for referencing other rules, provisions, etc. We also don’t see that the Specifications should have to remind PEs that they are responsible to know the rules when they work in Florida.
