

4250302 Inlets, Manholes, and Junctions Boxes
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Paul Harkins

paul.harkins@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-28-11) The Standard Specification already allows for the adjustment of manholes. The specification does not differentiate between 1 piece or two piece. The last paragraph of 425-6.7 states: the Contractor may extend manholes needing to be raised using adjustable extension rings of the type which do not require the removal of the existing manhole frame. Use an extension device that provides a positive locking action and permits adjustment in height as well as diameter and meets the approval of the Engineer. **Question 1:** Is the sponsor of this specification intending to introduce a “Three Piece Ring and Cover”? I believe if further investigation is made it will be found that we do not have a 36 inch cover, nor do we have a Three Piece Ring and Cover.According to Design Index 201Should a Three Piece Ring and Cover be introduced revision to the Design Index needs to be made to coincide with the specification change. From the historical standpoint the rationale for introducing a larger cover was to provide larger access in those cases where frequent access would be required, such as French Drains or manholes having sumps, etc. Initially it was thought that a 36 cover would be sufficient but given the weight it was not deemed appropriate, thus the 2 piece ring and cover. If you reference Index 201 you will not find a reference to a 36 inch ring and cover nor does it address weight of such. **Question 2:** Is the intent of the specification change to allow for ring and cover which allows for adjustment in a manner other than that which is called out in the specification? If so specifying means and methods of installation is not recommended. **Question 3:** This relates to the background information furnished by the sponsor of the specification change. In his comments he wants to allow for a ring and cover that has a floating adjustment. The sponsor should assure that if this is his intent he needs to specify what is unique about the new ring and cover while assuring that it does not preclude use of other types of rings and covers. That being said unless the floating ring and cover does NOT “provide a positive locking action and permits adjustment in height as well as diameter” what justifies the need for the change?

Response:

Mike Bergin

michael.bergin@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-28-11) I'm Ok with the revisions. I am concerned that the contractor will need to be aware that there is less tolerance for cages being placed that are not concentric to the inside of the shaft. The 4 1/2 inch clear cover means that the contractor will have to ensure the placement of the cage is correct. the 6" of cover gave the contractor some latitude, but any deviation may be an issue of durability. Will there be some notification to alert the contractor that this spec applies to his contract? The CEI will also need to be aware of this change and provide oversight and ensure the tolerances are maintained.

Response:

Armando Perez

407-323-2599

Comments: (12-16-11) Tammie I agree with your comment as the adjustability during lifts and phases of construction is the main reason for using adjustable casting in construction. The specification should read, "Make interim and final adjustments using the inner frame in accordance with the manufacture's installation recommendations so the inner frame and cover meet the interim or final grade and slope".

Response:

Comments: (date)

Response:
