****

Duane F. Brautigam, P.E.

Comments

- Instead of cross referencing only to 102-8.5.8, why wouldn't we say cost included under LS MOT per 102-8.5.8. It is more clear.
- There appears to be potential for conflict between 102-8.5.8 and 711-4.1 as far as "how to do it". Couldn't we clean this up?

Response: This item was discussed within the FDOT since many designers were using the removal pay item for thermoplastic to remove conflicting markings. We all agreed to make this revision to the specification plus add some notes to the BOE for use of the 711-17 pay item. After reviewing the other comments, this verbiage will be modified to say what is in Section 710 rather than refer to Section 710. This sentence will now say, "Cost for removing conflicting pavement markings to be included in Maintenance of Traffic, Lump Sum."

****

Marshall H. Dougherty, Jr.
863-370-4079

Comment:

Why refer to payment responsibility areas for maintenance of traffic within the thermoplastic specification? It doesn't make any sense. Virtually all jobs contain a Maintenance of Traffic item. Conflicting Maintenance of Traffic pavement marking removal work is adequately covered in Section 102-5.8 verbiage. Those conflicting pavement markings removed as a part of the MOT are rightfully paid under the lump sum item. Not all marking removals, though, are done in conjunction with MOT. Those other markings which conflict with the proposed thermoplastic should be paid for under the appropriate pay item (711- 17 – Thermoplastic, Remove) already established for this work. The proposed, additional verbiage adds confusion about the appropriate payment, for work performed, as contained in Section 711. It is non-related verbiage to the subject at hand.

 See response to Duane Brautigam's comment.

****

Previte, John

Comments:

I suggest simply substituting wording from last paragraph of 102-5.8 instead of referencing 102-5.8. Removal instructions in 102-5.8 conflict with removal instructions in 7114.1.

Stated another way, say:

"Cost for removing conflicting pavement markings to be included in Maintenance of Traffic, Lump Sum."
Instead of: "Payment for removal of conflicting pavement marking during maintenance of traffic operations will be in accordance with 102-5.8."

Response: The wording has been changed as you suggested.
****
Ray Haverty

Comment:
I have reviewed this Proposed change and I have a question with any Specification that references and different specification. In this 7110400 spec it states in 711-4.1 paragraph five the "dimensions and in alignment specified in 710-5". In this situation if you have a contract with Thermoplastic Traffic Stripes only you would still have to add the 710 spec to the package. This is a problem looking to happen as this 710 spec. could be missed in the package. I would suggest the 710-5 requirements be added to the 711 spec.

Response: Will consider for future modification.
****

J.W. Hornsby
352-336-1010
jhornsby@hntb.com

Comment:

In my opinion 711-4.1.1 should reflect a minimum temperature of 40 degrees Fahrenheit.

Response: Temperature is critical to getting the proper bed embedment. Reducing the minimum temperature to 40 degrees would create problems with achieving good embedment.
****

Christopher Wood
904-360-5673
Christopher.Wood@dot.state.fl.us
Comment:
Why not just include the cost of removal in the same section "to be included in price of new application" instead of referencing another section and pay item?

Response: This item was discussed within the FDOT since many designers were using the removal pay item for thermoplastic to remove conflicting markings. We all agreed to make this revision to the specification plus add some notes to the BOE for use of the 711-17 pay item. After reviewing the other comments, this verbiage will be modified to say what is in Section 710 rather than refer to Section 710. This sentence will now say, "Cost for removing conflicting pavement markings to be included in Maintenance of Traffic, Lump Sum."
****