

6460100 ALUMINUM POLES, PEDESTALS, AND POSTS  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

-----  
Tim Counts  
Tim.Counts@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-16-20, Internal)  
Subsection 646-2.7.2 says 649-2.7.2.

Response: Thank you for your comment. Change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Arthur Berger  
(850) 414-5368  
Arthur.Berger@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-16-21, Internal)  
In the first paragraph, five-year should be hyphenated as it is further into the specification.

Response: Thank you for your comment. Change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

DJ Conner  
[djc@highwaysafetydevices.com](mailto:djc@highwaysafetydevices.com)

Comments: (11-16-20, Internal)  
Ananth, I have quite a few concerns with this one... to the extent I've tracked changes in the attached.

We've talked for several years now in LESS about how tying 715 & 646 into the 5 yr paint spec (& bond) has many more challenges than meets the eye. I've highlighted just a few concerns but I'm sure much more would come out during a more thorough vetting by all stakeholders.

I'm of the humble opinion much more thought needs to go into this before anything is implemented. Perhaps it should be further discussed in Feb now that DOT is finally ready to address it?

Response: Thank you for your comment. Answers to the following questions are below:

646-2.7.1

**Question 1:** Shouldn't this read 'poles, pedestals, and posts'?

**Answer 1:** Yes – this will be revised to poles, pedestals, and posts.

646-7.2.2

**Question 1:** The only responsible form I am aware of is 700-010-20 but that is for painted galvanized structures only. Will that form be revised or will a new form for 646 (& 715?) be created specifically for aluminum products?

**Answer 1:** Form #700-010-20 is also being revised to include the aluminum products.

**Question 2:** I foresee it being very difficult for contractors to find prequalified vendors that can provide a 5 yr warranty & bond on these types of small misc. materials. It appears as if it is assumed the (currently four) approved prequalified painted steel fabricators are going to fill this niche? Has that been confirmed?

**Answer 2:** Some of the galvanized fabricators will also provide aluminum products, but it is assumed that other aluminum only fabricators will become prequalified.

**Question 3:** Is this a new list? The only list I am aware of is the Prequalified Painted Steel Fabricators list. Not all those on that list provide aluminum products. Is it the intent to tie this to the 5 yr warranty bond?

**Answer 3:** The list and the associated documents to become prequalified are also being revised to include aluminum products. Therefore, the name of the list was changed.

**Question 4:** Is this a new list? The only list I am aware of is the Prequalified Painted Steel Fabricators list. Not all those on that list provide aluminum products. Is it the intent to tie this to the 5 yr warranty bond?

**Answer 4:** Same answer as above.

**Question 5:** Is it really necessary to have 5 yrs of warranty & bond on these types of materials? Are the cost, procurement & administrative obstacles worth it? I think this spec change (along with 965-5) should be tabled for a LESS meeting to further discuss because the execution of this is going to be more of a challenge than I think is anticipated.

**Answer 5:** This issue was discussed thoroughly by the LESS committee. Section 646, 715, 965, and 975 are all being revised to include aluminum products.



Section 646 Internal  
Review Questions ar

\*\*\*\*\*

Scott Arnold  
(850) 414-4273  
Scott.Arnold@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-9-20, Internal)

I think you referenced the wrong Section for the coating properties, see comments in attached file.

Response: Thank you for your comment. Change made.

\*\*\*\*\*