

4300201 PIPE CULVERTS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

David A. Sadler, P.E.
david.sadler@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (9-19-12) What is the suggestion when the existing pipe type is no longer available (i.e., Hardie pipe, etc.)?

Response: The intent is for maintenance not to have a completely different pipe in middle of run and get caught by surprise, i.e., if metal pipe with 25 yr service life was extended with concrete and the metal started to fail, we wouldn't want maintenance to think all concrete needed to be replaced since the problem is limited to metal segment.
I would hope that hardie pipe would be extended with another concrete pipe (reinforced or non-reinforced). If the run of existing pipe is no longer an option, then the replacing pipe may be designated in the plans Change Made.

Paul Harkins
paul.harkins@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-3-12) Your language restricts use of different materials within a pipe run. Why? If evaluation is performed, that would allow for different materials what, other than the new language, would restrict their use. Here is an example: The contractor elects to use RCP. During installation a conflict is encountered in which if the contractor could reduce the O.D. of the pipe being installed by a few inches, allowing him to substitute another "Optional" pipe material with a smaller O.D., utilizing a Index 280, could prevent requiring use of a conflict structure which in turn affects time and money. Is it feasible to recommend that we encourage use of a single pipe material in a pipe run rather than require?

Response: Language needs to be authoritative, not encouraging. We foresee that surprise utility conflict occasions will be too infrequent to warrant mentioning in the specification. Contractors could still propose waiving the spec in such cases. No Change Made.

D4

Comments: (10-30-12)
430-3.2 Last sentence (new text): Unclear as to intent of this text. Please re-write.
Response: Agree - added clarifying language.
