

RESPONSE TO 9700133 INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

Edwin A. Petersen, Jr.

COMMENTS:

I have performed a review for the above referenced subject; based on my review I have the following comments.

1. Since the reflectivity requirements are being increased, will requirements for adhesion of RPM's be increased? It seems a lot of RPM's break loose from the roadways within the original 12 months. This being the case, the reflectivity would seem minimal if a large percentage of RPM's are lost.

RESPONSE:

We are looking into modifying the adhesive specification to allow use of a flexible bitumen adhesive. We have a test project on I-75 where we used this material for a new type of marker. We will also evaluate the flexible versus the regular bitumen comparison to see if there are benefits to going to flexible.

2. Due to this new requirement, what affect will it have on the few types of RPM's that are on the Qualified Products List (QPL).

RESPONSE:

We have several products currently under conditional warranty on the QPL test deck that we will evaluate under the new specification. Also the Ray-O-Lite AA-ARC II-FH that is currently on the QPL was approved under this revised specification.

Karen Byram

COMMENTS:

This change needs to be coordinated with product evaluation. Has there been a study to determine if any manufacturers can meet this new requirement? Will retesting of all manufacturers be required?

RESPONSE:

The Ray-O-Lite marker currently on the QPL was approved under the revised specification.

The two markers that are currently under evaluation (i.e 3M and Apex) on the test deck are between the 6 month a 12 month evaluation period. We should know by the 12 month evaluation whether we think they will meet the new 18 month requirement.