

**7100400 – PAINTED PAVEMENT MARKINGS  
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW**

\*\*\*\*\*

**JC Miseroy**  
[jc.miseroy@gcinc.com](mailto:jc.miseroy@gcinc.com)  
813-623-5877

**Comment**

I have a problem with having responsibility for perhaps having to repaint the project after 6 months. If we apply two applications of paint at the end of the project using FDOT specs and materials, why should we be responsible if the reflectivity is a problem 6 months later. This is one reason we went with taking the striping out of the contracts a few years ago.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Richard Bass (Eddie Ferris)**  
[richard.bass@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:richard.bass@dot.state.fl.us)  
386-740-3527

**Comments:**

The 6 months on the reflectivity should depend on the volume of traffic. The reason I say that is we are not getting 6 months out of the paint on US 441 but we probably would on say SR. 44.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Bob Schafer**  
[BSchafer@rangerconstruction.com](mailto:BSchafer@rangerconstruction.com)>  
(772) 464-6460 o

**Comment**

As for my initial comments as a Prime Contractor, I'm having a hard time getting my arms around the details of the statement, "If the retroreflectivity falls below 150 mcd/lxm2 within six months of initial application, reapply the pavement markings at no additional cost to the Department." Shouldn't this be a QPL issue? The product is either "good" or it isn't. There are too many variable related o the construction of the project to guarantee the reflectivity.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Thomas Bowles**  
[tom.b@russellengineering.com](mailto:tom.b@russellengineering.com)  
941-204-5987

**Comments:**

This spec, like so many of late, presumes that all inadequacies are the fault of the Contractor. If an item is constructed according to FDOT edicts, properly using FDOT approved materials, under the watchful eye of qualified FDOT inspectors, accepted, and paid for, why should the Contractor be punished? I am constantly amazed by the

Department and agents of the Department who only accept responsibility for positive aspects of the work. The implication of infallibility is unbelievable. As a minimum, the cost should in all cases be shared. This is a requisite of partnering. Either practice Partnering in an equitable fashion, or abandon it entirely.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Jim Pitman**  
District 2 Design Engineer  
Department of Transportation  
(386) 961-7583

### Comments

Please advise me on how we are to pay for the removal of existing pavement markings. The spec book, 710-4.1 says to do it in accordance with 102-5.8 which says "...cost for removing conflicting pavement markings to be included in MOT, lump sum."

However, there is a pay item in the BOE (710-17 and 711-17) that is for removal of pavement markings.

What do we use?  
-----

**Eddy L. Scott**  
FDOT District 2  
(386) 961-7831

### Comment

I agree that the Contractor should be paid for the removal of the markings. But the Specs say that the cost is covered by MOT. This makes it appear that there is no need for the use of pay item 710-17. If Section 710-4.1 did not reference section 102-5.8 this would not be an issue.

Additionally section 711 does not reference 102-5.8. Should it? It would seem that we should be consistent on this no matter what type of pavement marking removal is being done. Personally I like the reference to 102-5.8 because it covers all types of pavement marking removal. Still why have a pay item for when the spec for that pay item states that the cost for the work is paid for under another pay item. Either the Pay Item should be changed or the Specifications should be changed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Martin Yount**  
Transmark, Inc.  
954 428 7202

Comment

710-4.1.1 Final Surface: There are many areas where this is going to cause friction. First of all pavement marking companies travel extensively to do their work. Unlike the prime contractor who is usually local or becomes local for a particular job pavement marking contractors travel extensively. This would be a large expense for the taxpayer if all contractors bid it the way its written. It would involve you to mobilize your crew twice. rf you travel 200 miles one way to do a job in Key West (example) and it is only a small job the travel would be more cost than the installation. This should be looked at both from a safety point and saving the public cash point. My opinion is we should look at this further and arrive at a solution that maintains a degree of safety for the traveling public as well as a cost effective point of views as it is all of the taxpayers money. Additionally, there is confusion in the field when a job is a bonus job. When does the time stop for bonus purposes. before or after the final (second) coat is applied?

Comment

710 -4.3 Petroreflectivity: The six month duration as written is not going to work throughout the State of Florida. This may work in many rural areas but it will not work on interstates in the southern part of the state nor will it work on urban roads in the southern part where the traffic is horrendous. A contractor should not have to guarantee something that has not been proven to work. The state test deck will bear this out. What is the traffic count there where they did the test? At no additional cost? Does the state want the contractor to just figure three coats and if they don't have to do the third then its just free money to them or would it be better to pay for the third coat only if the Department deems it is necessary? I feel the FDQT should go the latter, but that's my opinion. Finally, the numbers arrived at for white and yeUow paint are very difficult or very easy depend ing on the type of asphalt you are working on. We have done many test where we were working on closed mix's and compared them to open mix's and the open mix does not test well. We went as far as to do both on the exact same day with the exact same truck, paint arid crew. The results were terrible. Numbers on open mix's should be looked at further in our opinion.

\*\*\*\*\*