Specification Section 125
Subarticle 125-1

ORIGINATION
Date: 6-20-2025
Name: Jason Russell
Email: Jason.Russell@dot.state.fl.us

COMMENTARY

Clarifications were necessary to eliminate confusion on pay item choice for excavation and embankment of drainage structure and pipe vs bridge structures. Additional language added to clarify timing of backfill around cast in place elements and non structural applications.

INDUSTRY COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
(Please note all comments and responses are verbatim as received. The Specifications Office does not alter typos or grammar.)

BLACK = Comment **BLUE** = Specifications Response **GREEN** = Change Made to Specification

Name: Brad Salisbury
Date: 7-10-25
COMMENT: For the changes to 125-10 Site Restoration, the new language seems to restrict the site restoration coverage only to locations with replaced existing drainage structures or pipes. Whereas the previous language seemed to cover site restoration for any drainage or pipe (new or replaced existing). In the event that a project is adding new pipe or drainage structure to an existing roadway, it would seem that the designer must separately quantify any site restoration quantities (e.g., embankment, base, pavement, curb & gutter, sidewalk, sod) for an estimated area of drainage construction disturbance. I would recommend reverting to the old language that covers both new and replacement drainage conditions as it provides more consistency in quantities to be tabulated, i.e. site restoration is always included in the cost of drainage and pipe regardless of whether it is new or replacement of existing.

For the changes to 125-13 Basis of Payment, would recommend modifying to "Payment for excavation and backfilling of bridge structures, drainage structures and pipes system items will be incidental to those items." The addition of the "up to the bottom of the base" seems to provide less clarity, as it begs the question as to how the excavation from bottom of base to existing ground would be quantified for the replacement of existing structures or installation of new drainage structures on an existing road.
RESPONSE:
Concur with comment on 125-10.

Comment on 125-13: The revisions are to clarify that the incidental work only covers those items up to the bottom of the base. From the base up is covered by Section 110 and is clearly indicated in Section 120-1.

ACTION TAKEN:
Minor change to 125-10 to include the following language: Wherever the existing site is disturbed solely for the purpose of constructing, removing, and/or replacing existing drainage structures and/or pipes, completely replace and restore the site up to the bottom of base to the Engineer's satisfaction, without additional compensation.

No action needed for 125-13.

Name: Kevin Micocci
Date: 7-10-25
COMMENT: In Section 125-10, the revised language ends up stating "...disturbed solely for the purpose of removing and replacing existing drainage structures and/or pipes..." This language is not as clear as the previous language. For instance, if a Contractor is solely removing a structure and not replacing it, a Contractor could argue the restoration is now not included in the drainage modifications. Similarly, new installations where no previous structures existed would not be classified as "removing and replacing" now stated in the specification. I believe "and/or" or more inclusive language needs to be included here. Additionally, there is common bidder confusion on my projects when drainage work is shown under milling and resurfacing areas, and a widening/reconstruction design is not provided. I have recommended that this specification be revised to specifically state "Completely replace and restore the site, including roadway pavement restoration as needed, to the Engineer's satisfaction..."

RESPONSE:
Concur with comment on 125-10 to cover new construction; however, including "roadway pavement" will conflict with the basis of payment where the incidental only includes those items up to the bottom of the base.

ACTION TAKEN:
For 125-10, the language revised as follows to cover new construction and clarified the boundaries of site restoration up to the bottom of base.
Wherever the existing site is disturbed solely for the purpose of constructing, removing, and/or replacing existing drainage structures and/or pipes, completely replace and restore the site up to the bottom of base to the Engineer's satisfaction, without additional compensation.

Name: Timothy Lease
Date: 7-10-25
COMMENT: Specification Section 430-12.3 Site Restoration currently refers to 125-11; it appears that 125-10 should be referenced instead.

RESPONSE:
Concur

ACTION TAKEN:
Section 430-12.3 will be revised to reference the correct subsection in 125.

Name: Chris Riley
Date: 7-10-25
COMMENT: Section 125-8.1.5 - ". Do not place backfill against components used for nonstructural applications such as mortar used for joints and concrete jackets for a minimum of 24 hours, or unless authorized by the Engineer." This is problematic as many use hydraulic cement that is fast setting and backfill should be allowed in those incidents. I think this should be clarified as this is the norm not one off scenario.

RESPONSE:
The language covers multiple nonstructural applications, which is why the option to allow for Engineer approval was included.

ACTION TAKEN:
No action needed.

Name: Ryan Baderschneider
Date: 7-11-25
COMMENT: Section 125-10 (Site Restoration) includes replacing and restoring the site "without additional compensation" for removing and replacing existing pipe. Section 125-13 (Basis of Payment) includes payment up to the bottom of the base but does not mention restoration. Suggest removing "without additional compensation" from section 125-10 and expanding 125-13 to include site restoration for removing and replacing existing drainage structure and/or pipes.

RESPONSE:
The revisions were to clarify that the incidental only covers items up to the bottom of the base. Other sections cover the other items of work and need to be included by the designer.

ACTION TAKEN:
No action needed. Based on other comments, the language in 125-10 has been revised to emphasize the intent.

Name: Joshua Toole
Date: 7-31-25
COMMENT: Concerning 1250100: Changes made in the DQE details regarding the pay item.
Concerning 4580100: Creation of a 0458- 3 pay item for future use.

RESPONSE:
Agreed: Previous correspondence on the changes to the pay item language has been addressed.

Confused on changes proposed for 458? Assume this is a comment on a different spec change.

ACTION TAKEN:
No action needed.