

7000243 INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

\*\*\*\*\*

Doug Hubbard (comments from Internal Review)

COMMENT:

Doesn't look like anything terribly worrisome to me but I wonder what happened to make the Department feel the need to add this requirement?

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Dion

COMMENTS:

The reference to section 649-5 is incorrect; this should be either article 649-5 or 649-5.

Should anything be added at the end of this to indicate a range of acceptance, if for instance the torque on a 3 / 8" bolt is 14, not 15? Or should all bolts not meeting the test be tightened to in accordance with Table A? If the 3 bolts don't meet the table what happens.

\*\*\*\*\*

Lou Buenaventura, P.E.  
Highway Safety Devices, Inc.

COMMENTS:

I have reviewed the proposed specification for Overhead Sign Structures and herein offer my comment.

The last sentence of the proposed spec requires the Engineer to witness a check of the torque on some of the fasteners. Also, this has to be performed within 24 hours after final tightening.

As you know, the installation and final tightening of some of these fasteners (those impacting traffic), as well as the subsequent "check" of these fasteners will need to be performed under MOT lane closures, slow rolls, detours, etc.

As such, it makes sense to perform the "check" immediately after the installation/final tightening occurs. This would allow us all to take advantage of the MOT that is already set up and also to least inconvenience the public.

So, can the "check" be performed immediately after the installation/final tightening occurs???

If so, you may want to consider adding a sentence in the spec stating that.

Otherwise, I see a potential for disagreements over how soon the "check" can be performed.

Contractors will be concerned about having to setup MOT again (lane closures, slow rolls, detours, etc.) to perform the checks and also the potential for a one day delay to the completion of the sign structure.

\*\*\*\*\*

Pat McCann

COMMENT:

A proposed spec. (7000243) was previously sent out for review. This spec. referenced 649.5 for installation. Question: does the author of 7000243 realize the changes proposed to 649-5 here?