COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

****
David K. Meslow

From: dkmeslow1@mmm.com [mailto:dkmeslow1@mmm.com]
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2005 11:38 AM
Subject: Re: Traffic Stripes and Markings - Two Reactive Components

Comments regarding the Traffic Stripes and Markings - Two Reactive
Components (spec 709-4.5).

The only product qualified under this spec is our LPM 1200 material. Final
one year test deck results were 695.9 white and 658.8 yellow! However, the
spec only calls for initial reflectivity of 300 white and 250 yellow.

Because of the need for higher visibility pavement marking products, the
department has increased reflectivity levels of thermoplastic and preformed
tape. We also need to do this with this specification.

Recommendation would be to have initial reflectivity of 500 mcd for both
white and yellow.

Regards,

David K. Meslow
3M Government Safety Specialist
****
Bill Richards

File: 7090000-Traffic Stripes and Markings-Two Reactive Components
Username: Bill Richards
UserEmail: william.richards@dot.state.fl.us
UserTel: (386) 943-5161 or SC 373-5161
Date: Tuesday, June 07, 2005
Time: 08:04:12 AM

Comments:

In 709-4, why place the removal of existing pavement markings in 102-5.9. 102-5.9
specifies that the removal of marking for specific reasons is covered in the Lump Sum
MOT items and the BOE is also covers what is to be handled in this Lump Sum pay
item. Since there is a pay item for removal of existing pavement markings (709-7), this
sub article should have the last sentence of the first paragraph, concerning payment for
removal, removed.

In 709-7, you required a 180 day observation period. Since pavement markings are the last item done in a construction contract this will extend the contract for a 6 month period. How will this 180 period affect final acceptance covered in the specs? How will the extra time be covered in the contract, time extension? Have you coordinated this 180 day period with Ananth Prasad's office? It is important that feedback be obtained from the State Construction Office on this extra time.
****

Eric Jaggers

File: 7090000-Traffic Stripes and Markings-Two Reactive Components
Username: Eric Jaggers
UserTel: 352-315-3100
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2005
Time: 09:26:31 AM

Comments:

1 mile to reapply due to deficiency seems excessive.
****

Mike Ruland

File: 7090000-Traffic Stripes and Markings-Two Reactive Components
Username: Mike Ruland, P.E
UserEmail: michael.ruland@dot.state.fl.us
UserTel: (386)258-4445 or SUNCOM 380-4445
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2005
Time: 11:10:49 AM

Comments:

Possibly add verbiage that any asphalt pavement that is damaged as a result of existing striping removal shall be replaced at no additional cost.
****

Charlie.Doyle

File: 7090000-Traffic Stripes and Markings-Two Reactive Components
Username: charlie
UserEmail: charlie.doyle@pottersbeads.com
UserTel: 678-560-5706
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2005
Time: 08:32:43 AM

Comments:

My comments are as follows:

709-4.3   Minimum retro requirements should be same other markings. This is an expensive marking, and should be held to the 450 mcd white and 350 mcd yellow.
****

Mayur Patel

File: 7090000-Traffic Stripes and Markings-Two Reactive Components
Username: Mayur Patel
UserEmail: mayur.patel@dot.state.fl.us
UserTel: 352 955 6626
Date: Friday, June 24, 2005
Time: 05:24:40 PM

Comments:

700 series:
701-4.1, 702-4.1, 709-4.1, 711-4.1 and 713-4.1, Make the change to these sections as it is written in 710-4.1, remove "The Engineer change will conduct field testing in accordance to....." to "conduct field testing in accordance to....."

701-4.6, 702-4.3, 709-4.3, 710-4.3,711-4.3 and 713-4.3, the reference to FM 5-541 should be changed to FM 5-579 for retro-reflectivity measurements. Also, the wording should be "Measure and record test data, certify..... no later than the next working day..." Make the language same as SMO proposal for the draft Spec 713 regarding use of CQC arrangements and frequencies.