I have no problem with removing the 400-7.13.1 reference, but the bigger issue is the interpretation of “appropriate action” by the CEI and local FDOT. Additionally, I’m not sure where the “specified tolerance” for camber is written.

Notify the Engineer immediately when the sweep or camber exceeds the specified tolerances.

If the actual camber is less than 50% of the predicted camber at release provided by the Plans, move the dunnage towards the center of the beam to a maximum of 5% of the total length at each end to induce camber.

If the camber is outside of the design camber shown in the Plans by plus or minus 1 inch, take appropriate actions to accommodate the product in the structure.

Response:

I have concerns regarding the statement “An epoxy mortar meeting the requirements of Section 926 may be used as an alternative to non-shrink grout.” I am suggesting that the epoxy type needs to be identified. S926 calls out each epoxy usage as a type (A, B, etc). Unless the specific type(s) is identified, the contractor can use any S926 APL product and still be in compliance with the spec. Please contact me if you need additional information.

Response:

Remember these beams are not designed by the contractor and they are in the standards. It is up to the designer to give us the camber.

I believe the EOR should take and direct the action, and if the action is extra work it should be compensable. What we are seeing is that the spec says “take appropriate action” which infers that the one to take the action is the Contractor.

Response:
Comments: (6-15-21, Industry)
Section 450-6.4.1: say "Provide a minimum of 18 inches of exposed strands between adjacent headers of all..." Section 450-13.5: The specifications are silent on epoxy mortar mixes. Suggest adding a section to 926. Section 450-13.6: Instead of "An epoxy mortar meeting the requirements of Section 926, Type F" say "Select an epoxy mortar from the Department's Approved Product List (APL)."
Name:
Response: