

**Comments Received From Industry Review**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Bob Richards**

File: 7100000 – Painted Pavement Markings  
Username: Bill Richards  
UserEmail: william.richards@dot.state.fl.us  
UserTel: (386) 943-5161 or SC 373-5161  
Date: Tuesday, June 07, 2005  
Time: 07:53:56 AM

Comments:

In 710-4.1, 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. If this is left as is, section 102-5.9 and the BOE should be changed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Donald Rauch**

Proposed Specification revision of 7100000 – Painted Pavement Markings

In a quick review that I have done so far, I noticed that the Florida Test Method has not been Changed in this specification

Need to change FM 5-541 to FM 5-579 in the following location: **710-4.3**

Donald E. Rauch, P.E.  
D2 Construction QA Engineer  
2250 Irene Street ....MS 2803  
Jacksonville, FL 32204  
(904) 360-5675 SC 824-5675  
donald.rauch@dot.state.fl.us  
Cell Phone (386) 623-0605

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mike Ruland**

File: 7100000 – Painted Pavement Markings  
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: 11:11:12 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Eric Jagers**

File: 7100000 – Painted Pavement Markings  
Username: Eric Jagers  
UserTel: 352-315-3100  
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2005  
Time: 09:27:28 AM

Comments:

1 mile to reapply due to deficiency seems excessive. Need to include the time frame as to when the initial reflectivity readings need to be submitted (no latter than the next working day after application).

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tonii Brush**

File: 7100000  
Username: Tonii Brush  
UserTel: 386-943-5348  
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2005  
Time: 10:05:15 AM

Comments:

710-4.3 Retroreflectivity - States that the contractor is to measure and certify on the Department's form but does not state a time that the contractor has to submit the certification to the Project Administrator after application and testing. In other areas where certifications are required the spec states a time as to when the certification for the retroreflectivity is to be submitted. The Department has the option to test the marking 3 days from acceptance of the certification and if a long period of time lapses before the Department receives the certification the possibility of failure may be greater when the Department runs a test.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Charles Doyle**

File: 7100000 – Painted Pavement Markings  
Username: Charles Doyle  
UserEmail: charlie.doyle@pottersbeads.com  
UserTel: 678-560-5706  
UserFAX: 678-560-5716  
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2005  
Time: 09:00:39 AM

Comments:

My comments are as follows:

Paint is the least expensive and durable marking there is, yet you are requiring the same minimum retro requirements as inverted profile, two component and raised rib markings. This does not make sense. At the same time, you are requiring that painted lines last at least 6 months, and if they do not, it has to be replaced at no charge by the contractor. This is asking a lot for the least expensive marking there is. There is no mention of paint thickness nor bead type, yet you are asking for the same retro numbers as all the other binders with the exception of double drop thermo. Tests have demonstrated these numbers can be attained by using a type 3 glass bead with 20 mil paint thickness. How is a contractor to achieve this and be held accountable for 6 months for the performance.

We believe paint thickness should be stipulated to ensure a level playing field when quoting the job. This will also assist in ensuring that the DOT is getting what they are requesting.

710-4.5

Stipulate a single drop type 3 glass bead in the spec

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mayer Patel**

File: 7100000 – Painted Pavement Markings  
Username: Mayur Patel  
UserEmail: mayur.patel@dot.state.fl.us  
UserTel: 352 955 6626  
UserFAX: 352 955 6644  
Date: Friday, June 24, 2005  
Time: 05:24:23 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tim Parker**

June 24, 2005

Specifications recommendations per our ATSSA meeting on June 15<sup>th</sup>

The Florida Chapter of ATSSA is fully supportive of the department's initiative to increase the reflectivity and service life of pavement markings. This effort will make Florida's roadways much safer, and will undoubtedly reduce traffic accidents, injuries and deaths. As a group though, we are very concerned with the lack of good data in which the new reflectivity requirements are based. We think some of the requirements are attainable but we really don't know. We therefore recommend that a one year test period is enacted with the new material specifications. This would enable a years worth of data to be accumulated and evaluated prior to setting the final requirements.

### **Proposed specification 7100000**

Paint manufacturers recommend that the department goes to a new paint material referred to as Hi build. This is a more durable paint applied at 30 mls thick with a type 1 bead. Initial retroreflectivity for white and yellow would be 300 and 250. Only one application of paint on the final lift of asphalt would then be required.

2. If the department stays with the current paint spec material then the initial retroreflectivity numbers for white and yellow would be 250 and 175.

3.) Keep the current language in specs for restriping when the intermittent retroreflectivity of white and yellow markings are less than 150 mcd/lx.m2. Contractors would be paid to restripe any time the values are less than the 150. No six month warranty.

4.) Contractors **would not** be required to take 3 reflectivity readings for each arrow, message, crosswalk, stop bar and transverse lines. This is too much a burden on the contractor. We would all have to hire people just to keep up the paperwork and to take readings. Safety issue also with this spec.

5.) Corrections to retroreflectivity deficiencies should not require removing the line. We should be able to just reapply the line.

\*\*\*\*\*