

**5230201 INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS**

\*\*\*\*\*

Mayur Patel

Username: Mayur Patel  
UserEmail: mayur.patel@dot.state.fl.us  
UserTel: 352 955 6626  
UserFAX: 352 955 6644

**Comments:**

The State Materials Office considers the need for "Set To Bear Traffic Time" a critical need. This is due to the fact that the proposed application of the material would obstruct traffic, and such an obstruction needs to be minimized. Also, in a recent test application of various materials for this application in the Gainesville Construction office site, most of the manufacturers proposed 24 hour setting time (set to bear traffic time)before it opens up to traffic. This makes the implementation almost impossible since it would be hard to find roads that can be closed for traffic for 24 hours.

Our recommendation is to remove this exception from the proposed spec, which will implement 2 minute Set to Bear Traffic time requirement.

I request, if needed, this issue be further discussed with the State Materials Office. Our primary contacts for this issue will be Charles Holzschuher, Paul Vinik, Bouzid Choubane, and Mayur Patel.

**RESPONSE:**

Disagree. None of the patterned textured pavement products currently available can meet the 2 minute set to bear traffic time. We have been waiving this requirement for all of the patterned textured pavement products submitted for QPL approval. While minimum set to bear traffic time requirements are valid for standard pavement markings which are applied continuously along all roadways, it is not necessary to require this for the limited areas where patterned textured pavement products are used. Note that there are numerous installations of these products throughout the state that have been accomplished without meeting this requirement.

\*\*\*\*\*

Pat McCann

UserEmail: cn406pm  
UserTel: 954 777-4387  
UserFAX:

Contact\_Requested:

Date: Monday, August 07, 2006

Time: 10:20:04 AM

**COMMENTS:**

1. 523-1; While reviewing this spec. a question was raised as to items 2., 3. & 4. in this section. The question is are these materials suitable in crosswalks as far as ADA compliance is concerned?

**RESPONSE:**

The specification includes a restriction that joint openings not exceed ½” in width. This complies with ADA Guidelines 302.3 which states the following: “Openings. Openings in floor or ground surfaces shall not allow passage of a sphere more than 1/2 inch (13 mm) diameter except as allowed in 407.4.3, 409.4.3, 410.4, 810.5.3 and 810.10. Elongated openings shall be placed so that the long dimension is perpendicular to the dominant direction of travel.”

---

**Glyn Owen**  
General Manager  
PRISM0 USA, INC.

Suite 140  
3650 Kennesaw 75 Parkway.  
Kennesaw, Georgia 30144  
Telephone: 678 804 0800  
Facsimile: 678 904 0801  
Email: info@prismoussl.com  
August 7th, 2006

**Comments:**

As the manufacturer of IMPRINT, one of the pavement surfaces being proposed for qualification we have a concern over one of the test methods outlined for specification section 523. The test that we have concerns over is the INDENTATION RESISTANCE test and what the test parameters of this test relate to. Imprint is a resin based material which by virtue of its hardness is able to withstand very heavy traffic volumes for long periods of time without obvious wear. The test requirement for this INDENTATION RESISTANCE test requires a maximum of 30 but imprint has a mean value of gland 87 for base 60 and base 70 respectively. This suggests that imprint is 3 times harder than that required which if it were less would make the material too soft to retain a print and would wear prematurely. Therefore given that Imprint is not a direct comparison to normal thermoplastic can we respectfully ask the department to consider please increasing this value to 100 or disregard this requirement in the specification?

**RESPONSE:**

Agree. An edit has been made to eliminate the Indentation Resistance requirement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Matthew Schindler**  
**Cloverleaf Corporation**

July 26, 2006  
1916 South Tamiami Trail  
Ruskin, FL 33570  
(813) 649-1336  
FAX (813) 645-5577  
road.work@mindspring.com

**Comments:**

Regarding section 523-2.1 "*Color and reflectivity requirements do not apply.*"? FHWA has determined in a number of MUTCD interpretation letters, including one send to FDOT on 9/1/04 (attached for reference), that the use of retro-reflective color pavements surfaces between crosswalk lines is not MUTC compliant (See the second to last paragraph). Therefore, I suggest this section be revised "*Color requirements do not apply. Surfaces shall not be made retroreflective* "

**RESPONSE:**

Agree. The recommended final version will included this edit.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Michael Sandow**

Gainesville Construction D2  
Michael.Sandow@dot.state.fl.us  
(352) 381-4219,  
Cell (352) 494-5240  
Fax (352) 381-4250

**Comments:**

As per our discussion, I recommend we consider adding the following requirement to the patterned/textured pavement spec.

523-2.2 Performance Requirements: - *add a number four (4)*

4. The patterned/textured pavement material must retain its original geometric shape and position at the time of acceptance in accordance with the following. The pattern shall not twist, shove, stretch, separate, or distort, more than 1/4 inch from its original position in any direction within the horizontal plane of the crosswalk.

**RESPONSE:**

Agree with this proposal, but this should go back through industry review. Recommend proceeding with current proposed changes, and submit this for a future change.