

**9450205 – Pipe Markings**  
**Response to Comments**

\*\*\*\*\*

**David O'Hagan/CO/FDOT**

**Comment**

Why is this a "may be" specification instead of a "shall" specification? Is there another method for ID? Do we really need the pipe to be IDd?

**Response:** We don't want to make it a requirement for the engineer to reject pipe. With rigid language the engineer would be required to reject any pipe that had illegible marking. If the engineer is satisfied that a particular pipe with faulty markings is one of many other pipes that are properly marked, he is free to accept the pipe. Pipe markings are necessary to verify pipe origin, type and applicable specification.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Ghulam Mujtaba/SM/FDOT**

**Comments**

1- The Origination form indicates that the proposed specification will eliminate unnecessary requirements, which is coined metal stamping. Also, it has mentioned that coined metal stamping has the potential to damage the aluminum cladding.

**Response:** The intent is to eliminate an unnecessary requirement, as opposed to an undesirable practice. Manufacturers are not coining aluminum pipe and as such, technically these pipe do not meet specifications.

A review of the proposed specification indicates that the plant may mark the pipe with the coined marking or ink stamping. The coined marking has not been eliminated as described in the origination form.

**Response:** The requirement for coined marking has been eliminated but has not been prohibited. Should any manufacturer want to coin instead of ink-mark he will be able to do so as long as the process does not damage the cladding.

2- The last sentence of 945-2.5 mentions that "pipe with illegible or incomplete marking may be rejected". This indicates that the project personnel can accept the incomplete marking pipe. I recommend that the phrase "may be rejected" should be changed to "will be rejected or shall be rejected".

**Response:** See response above on the same matter. Again, I don't think we want to place mandatory language upon our project engineer in our specifications. Now if we were to say "...,"the Contractor shall reject....," that's a different situation. In any case, the wording is sufficient as is.

\*\*\*\*\*