

5560200 JACK AND BORE
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

C.A. Harper
414-4127

Comment: (5-3-11)

Suggest changing 556-3.1 to read. 556-3.1 Pedestrian Traffic: When and where installations temporarily disrupt pedestrian use of sidewalk areas, provide a safe alternate route in accordance with Design Standards, Index Nos. 600 and 660.

556-3.1 ~~The Americans with Disabilities Act~~ *Pedestrian Traffic*: When and where installations temporarily disrupt pedestrian use of sidewalk areas ~~for periods exceeding two consecutive work days,~~ provide **an safe** alternate route ~~that meets ADA requirements~~ *in accordance with the Design Standards, Index Nos. 600 and 660.*

Response:

James T. Barfield
415-9200

Comments: (5-4-11)

Per Roadway Design Bulletin 11-04, Volume I, Chapter 8, Section 8.1.1 Pedestrians and Bicyclists of the PPM has been modified to clarify a shoulder (paved or unpaved) or footpath meets the need for a pedestrian way when one mile outside of the urban area. Using the term sidewalk could lead to these less obvious pedestrian ways not being accommodated during the bore. Consider revising the term sidewalk or include pedestrian way.

Response:

Paul Harkins
863-519-2226

Comments: (5-10-11)

First, it is recognized that Section 556 must have been written to address Utility applications, however, this specification is also used when jack and bore of drainage pipe is performed. Do the materials referenced in the table refer to "Casing" or is it to include the types of pipe which might be allowed within the casing. Also, although not shown in this spec change, is payment to be for all materials, to include the pipe which might be installed inside the casing. Section 556 is far better than what we used to have with regard to jack and bore; however, we are seeing more drainage pipe jack and bore installations. Further tweaking and clarification may be justified to address both types of installations.

Response:

Ken Zinck
386-740-3471

Comments: (5-17-11)

In comparing the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) and Jack and Bore (J&B) spec changes, shouldn't these be consistent? MOT 102 mentions compliance with ADA, J&B 556 mentions compliance with our design standards. Since they are both talking about pedestrian facilities. Why would they not both reference the same standard or criteria. Or list both ADA and the standards in both specs.

Response:
