

9600000 Post-Tensioning Components
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Steven Plotkin, P.E

steven.plotkin@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (5-8-12) I have begun reviewing these specs and I have observed that the word “the” is not used as it normally would be. In fact, it has obviously been deliberately left out of the text wherever possible. As far as I know, this is not the spec writing convention that all other specs conform to and it is not a standard contact language convention. In order to continue to provide specifications that are written with consistent usage conventions, please consult with your supervisors regarding this unilateral change by the authors of the attached specifications. Do we want to start writing all revisions and new specs with this convention or not? My personal opinion is that eliminating “the” is inconsequential considering that it disrupts the flow of the text and with the advent of electronic specifications just around the corner the savings is even less consequential since the amount of electronic storage saved is minuscule.

Response:

Ghulam Mujtaba, M.S.,
(352) 955-6685

Ghulam.Mujtaba@dot.myflorida.com

Comments: (5-15-12) I reviewed the proposed changes in Specifications, Sections 462, 933, and 960. I have only one editorial comment. In 960-1, third line- the acronym SDO should be defined.

Response: Correction Made, Spec’s Office.

Karen Byram

karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (5-24-12) I have several suggestions for clarifications and consistency within the specification and with other specifications. **1.** There are several grout types on the QPL. To prevent confusion and for consistency, in Section 960-1.1 Material Reference: “Grout” should be reworded to “Post-tensioning Grout”. **2.** Additionally, in the same section, “Epoxy Compounds...S926” needs to be added because the material is referenced in the specification. Additionally, throughout the document, changes need to be made in the wording from ‘epoxy’ to ‘epoxy compound’ for consistency. **3.** In the same Section, for consistency with other specifications, the materials S926 and S938 need to be asterisked (*) and the reference added “Use products listed on the Department’s Qualified Products List (QPL).” **4.** The definition of a certified laboratory could be further defined for clarity. In section 960-1, after the phrase, ‘certified independent laboratory (or laboratories), I suggest that you add “as defined in Section 960-3.1.2”. **5.** In 960-3.6 (d) (1) after the phrase “appropriately accredited independent laboratory (or laboratories)”, deleted the word ‘appropriately’ and change ‘accredited’ to ‘certified’ for consistency. I again suggest that you add “as defined in Section 960-3.1.2” for clarification. **6.** In section 960-3.6 (e) change the wording to ‘Provide all material and component certifications required throughout this Section.’ **7.** In section 960-3.1 (c) the word ‘Conform’ should be changed to ‘Confirm’. **8.** In section 960-3.1.1 and 960-3.1.2 the phrase ‘Testing Lab’ should be change to ‘Laboratory’ for consistency with other specification language. **9.** In section

960-3.2 (b) if you want to the largest and smallest assembly, then state that. Do not use i.e.
Rephrase to '960-3.2.1 (b) Perform tests on the largest and smallest assemblies for each family of
PT systems.'

Response:

Womble, Steve

Comments: (5-29-12) Below are my comments on the proposed modifications to the **9600000** PT
component specs.

1. At numerous locations in the proposed modifications, the expression "Approved Post Tensioning Systems" has been lined thru, only to the duplicated without any changes. So, it is not clear why this shows up frequently.
2. Sections 960-2(a) and (b) could be improved with better wording, for clarity.
3. Section 960-2(e) says that strand or strand-tendon couplers are not permitted, but 960-2(g) appears to approve them. There may not be a problem here, but a clarification would be helpful.
4. Section 960-2.2.2 (and other locations) makes frequent use of the expression "Grout Anchorage Caps," but the proposed modification drops the word "grout." I think the word "grout" should be included.
5. Section 960-2.2.2 includes much discussion on grout inlets, outlets, valves, caps and plugs. You may want to consider including the option of these items being easily removable. We're planning on doing some Magnetic Flux testing on the Skyway stays, and some (most?) such extensions off of the surface of the stay pipes may pose a problem, and require removal.
6. Section 960-2.4.1, Nylon, says "Use one of the following cell classes..." There are three such classes and it is not clear why only one of the three should be used.
7. Section 960-3.1(c) says "Conform all testing procedures used...to..." This would be better worded by a change in word order, "All testing procedures used...shall conform..."
8. Section 960-3.2 seems to be referring to a "mock-up" test, but does not use this term. If this is describing such a test(s), why not use that term? We have done a number of such mock-up tests on various Skyway projects that involved lengthy grout installation of PT bars.
9. Section 960-3.3(b) says that "Standard bar sizes consist from..." This could read "Standard bar sizes range (or vary) from..."

Response:
