

4700000 – Comments From Industry Review

David A. Sadler, P.E.
State Construction Engineer

Comment

Ok with language as written. Only question I have is CCA treatment still allowed? I know it still exists but I thought that it was not allowed except for agricultural use.

Van Hogan
vhogan@edwatersandsons.com

Comment:

Looks better to me. If adopted, this specification should eliminate some of the uncertainty surrounding the proper fasteners to use with the new preservative treatments. The update on treating bolts holes was nice to see too.

David Reser
dresser@infrastructureengineers.com

Comment:

I do not believe allowing the contractor to bore bolt holes without treating the interior of the bore hole is a good idea. I have inspected timber structures for 20 years, and have found that bolt hole locations are a common place where internal decay begins. I would recommend that the requirement to treat the interior of the bore hole remain in the specification. An excerpt from the USDA Forest Service specification could be utilized to cover this, and other penetrations of the protective preservative treatment:

“For timbers originally treated with pentachlorophenol, creosote, creosote solutions, or waterborne preservatives, field treat all cuts, abrasions, bolt holes, and recesses that occur after treatment with two liberal applications of a compatible preservative in accordance with the requirements specified in AWP standard M4, Standard for the Care of Pressure-Treated Wood Products”.

Rodney G. Powers
352-955-6690

Comment

Consider developing a table for 470-12.2. In narrative form it is very difficult to read and interpret.

Jorge A Rodriguez
District Structural Design Engineer
(305) 499-2485

Comment

On 470-12.2, is the phrase "**treated wood**" acceptable as interchangeable with "**treated timber**"?

Christopher P. Wood
(904) 360-5673

Comment:

In section 5 of the 470 specification. "The contractor may bore holes in the Field." The word bore should be revised to say "drill".
