

9670000 RAIL ELEMENTS FOR GUARDRAIL  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

---

Pat McCann  
954 254-8317

pmccann@targetengineering.com

Comments: (4-29-16)

General comment: The words "must" and "shall" are used throughout. For consistency, should this be changed to use of one of these words?

**Response:**

\*\*\*\*\*

Matthew Schindler  
813-649-1336  
matthew@cloverleafcorp.com

Comments: (5-24-16)

We are a re-seller of guardrail panels, posts, etc. One of my major suppliers uses a pre-galvanization method on the panels which meets AASHTO M180 and the criteria for ASTM A123. They have been doing so for many years in Florida and that process has complied with FDOT specifications. The current 967-1 reads, "Steel guardrail materials shall meet the requirements of AASHTO M180, (except as specified below), and for either Class shown. Type 2 zinc coating will be required. As an exception to the requirements of AASHTO M180, the coating properties, sampling, test methods, inspection, and certification related to galvanizing regardless of the method of galvanization of the rail elements shall meet the requirements of ASTM A123." I note that you have now moved that above paragraph into proposed section 967-3.4. However, the key language "related to the galvanization regardless of the method of galvanization" has been removed. The removal of this key distinction will now limit my available suppliers and cause disruption to my contractor customers. I suspect that this was an oversight made while trying to tidy up the specifications. I request that you keep the two paragraphs regarding the panels that are currently in force and use them verbatim in your purposed revision.

**Response:**

\*\*\*\*\*