

7100200 PAINTED PAVEMENT MARKINGS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL AND INDUSTRY REVIEW

Duane Brautigam
414-4130
duane.brautigam@dot.state.fl.us

Comment: (Internal Review comment 12-3-09)

I strongly disagree with the proposed requirement in 710-4.3 for 18 month performance of durable markings. To me that is an applied warranty, which we have never been successful with. I think it will be next to impossible to track, and even more difficult to enforce. It will force the Contractors to include costs in their bids for second application of product, which will increase the price of paint dramatically. Nothing is free.

All roads are not alike, AADT will vary significantly, environmental conditions are different, etc. I do not think it is reasonable to apply performance levels that were established to test the performance of products over time on carefully selected test decks, and apply them to all projects, no matter the traffic, type of pavement, environmental conditions, etc. There is a reason we carefully select test decks for QPL approvals. This 18 month requirement does not seem reasonable, it seems more like wishful thinking. For the record, I am not even in favor of the 6 month requirement for standard markings.

Response:

N. Rose (Bob Burleson)
NRose@aol.com

Comments: (Internal Review comment 12-3-09)

I am in favor of performance specifications but not combination material/performance specifications. If it is a performance specification the Department sets the performance requirements and the contractor and/or manufacturer then determine the type of material and rate of application to meet the specification requirements. If it is a material specification the Department should specify the type and amount of material and not hold the contractor responsible for performance.

Response:

Paul Vinik
352-955-6649
Paul.Vinik@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (Internal Review comment 12-3-09)

My comments pertaining to the subject specification revision are as follows:

Why specify only Type 3 glass spheres for the durable waterborne traffic markings and not specify the bead type for standard paint? The department should not be dictating bead type. As long as the retroreflectivity requirements are met, the bead type is insignificant. If wet weather retroreflectivity is of concern, then wet weather retroreflectivity should be quantified during QPL evaluations. By specifying type 3 spheres, better products may be eliminated from use. Moreover, the type and rate of glass spheres utilized on projects should be identical to what was tested and approved for QPL evaluations; **not** what is recommended by the manufacturer. Manufacturer requirements will undoubtedly change by project and contractor as we have seen numerous times with other QPL products in the past. If the same drop rate and type of retroreflective element utilized during QPL product evaluation (both standard and durables) is not required on a project basis, then retroreflective testing during QPL evaluations is of little value. The leading states (Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Virginia) in traffic striping all require bead application rates be documented at the time of product evaluation so that project installations can be monitored.

Response:

Karen Byram
850-414-4353
karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-28-09)

For the correct "voice", shouldn't this paragraph delete the phrase and start with Ensure...? Delete the following: "For painted standard and durable pavement markings"; and start here: "Ensure that the minimum retroreflectance of white and yellow pavement markings are not less than 150 mcd/lx m2. If the retroreflectivity values fall below the 150 mcd/lx m2 value within six months of initial application for standard pavement markings or within 18 months of initial application for durable pavement markings, the striping will be reapplied at the Contractor's expense."

Response

John Previte

Comments: (1-4-10)

The last two sentences give conflicting direction.

Response:

Stefanie Maxwell
414-4314

Comments: (1-4-10)

For the record, I do not agree with the following proposed paragraph:

For *paint*ed ~~standard and durable~~ pavement markings, ensure that the minimum retroreflectance of white and yellow pavement markings are not less than 150 mcd/lx m². If the retroreflectivity values fall below the 150 mcd/lx m² value within six months of initial application ~~for standard pavement markings or within 18 months of initial application for durable pavement markings~~, the striping will be reapplied at the Contractor's expense.

(My reason for disagreeing is that if we only require the Contractor to maintain 150 mcd/lx m² value for six months, for both 6 month standard paint and 18 month durable paint, we will only get 6 month standard paint.)

However, Chester has promised me that durable paint will not get put into any construction contracts. To help with that, I recommend including the following statement when Chester revises the Notes/Details for the BOE:

Durable Paint is only to be used for Maintenance projects.

Response:

Al Weeks
al.weeks@cardnotbe.com

Comments: (1-11-10)

Does "drop" mean application? The use of the word "drop" might be confusing to inspectors and contractors.

SUBARTICLE 710-4.5 (Page 797) is deleted and the following substituted: 710-4.5 Glass Spheres: Apply glass spheres on all pavement markings immediately and uniformly following the paint application. For standard paint markings, the type of beads and the rate of application shall be based on the manufacturer's recommendation. For durable paint markings, apply a single drop of Type 3 glass spheres. The rate of application of Type 3 glass spheres shall be based on the manufacturer's recommendation.

Response:
