

5360500 GUARDRAIL  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

---

Charles Boyd  
414-4275

Comment: (12-17-13)

There's actually a mistake in note 17 on Index 400. The reference to "*Standard Specifications*" is incorrect, "*Standard*" should not be there. The spec language that is being deleted was actually correct.

**Response: Note 17 on Index 400 will be modified. No changes made to the Spec language.**

\*\*\*\*\*

Karen Byram  
414-4353  
[karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us)

Comment: (12-30-13)

The intent is to remove language from the Design Indexes and place the language in the specifications. Shouldn't we be modifying the language in S536 and removing the note from the Design Index?

**Response: First things first. Currently, this note conflicts with Note 17 of the Design Standards, Index No. 400 and deleting it removes the conflict. No additional changes made to the Spec language.**

\*\*\*\*\*

David O'Hagan  
850-391-9885  
[dohagan@palmernet.com](mailto:dohagan@palmernet.com)

Comment: (1-2-14)

Please forgive me but I am confused about this proposed revision. It deletes instructions to the Contractor on acceptable means for installing guardrail to meet conditions actually encountered in the field. The Origination Form declares the reason for the revision as, "To delete the sentence that conflicts with the revised Design Standard, Note #17." The Origination Form declares the purpose to be, "Delete conflict language concerning drilling and reaming of holes in existing guardrail, and remove incorrect reference to Section 971. The requirement is to field punch holes in existing guardrail."

My comments are as follows:

1. Why are instructions to the Contractor being removed from a document that is the Contractor's primary source for project installation requirements? The Standard Specifications seems to be a more appropriate location for these instructions than the Design Standards as the requirement involves permissible modifications in the field as opposed to permissible products to be furnish to the field.

Response: The Contractor is responsible for the Specifications, Design Standards, vendor drawings, etc. This note conflicts with the Design Standards and removing it removes the conflict. No change made to the Spec language.

2. An Adobe search in Index 400 does not reveal the “punch” requirement anywhere. There is no mention of this technique in either 536 or 562. Where is this technique specified? Is it in another Standard Specification revision?

Response: Punching is not defined in the specifications and will not be. No change made to the Spec language.

3. Additional Revisions for Consideration: • Removal of reference to Section 971 that is currently shown on Index 400, Sheet 1/26, Note 17. If punching is indeed the field procedure permitted, add a note on what tolerance on punching diameter is acceptable. Performance of the guardrail depends on maintaining linkage between panels when the post is no longer effective.

Response: Reference to Section 971 will be removed from Design Standard, Index No 400. At this time we do not plan to provide a tolerance for punching the post bolt slot. No changes made to the Spec language.

\*\*\*\*\*