

**9450205 – Pipe Markings
Comments**

David O'Hagan/CO/FDOT

Comment

Why is this a "may be" specification instead of a "shall" specification? Is there another method for ID? Do we really need the pipe to be IDd?

Ghulam Mujtaba/SM/FDOT

Comments

1- The Origination form indicates that the proposed specification will eliminate unnecessary requirements, which is coined metal stamping. Also, it has mentioned that coined metal stamping has the potential to damage the aluminum cladding.

A review of the proposed specification indicates that the plant may mark the pipe with the coined marking or ink stamping. The coined marking has not been eliminated as described in the origination form.

2- The last sentence of 945-2.5 mentions that "pipe with illegible or incomplete marking may be rejected". This indicates that the project personnel can accept the incomplete marking pipe. I recommend that the phrase "may be rejected " should be changed to "will be rejected or shall be rejected ".
