

7060400 RETROREFLECTIVE PAVEMENT MARKERS AND BITUMINOUS ADHESIVE  
INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

\*\*\*\*\*

Elizabeth Birriel

921-7361

[elizabeth.birriel@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:elizabeth.birriel@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments: (8-2-16, Internal)

**706-4 Application.** “Install RPMs in accordance with Design Standards, Index Nos. 17345 and 17352. Place the RPMs with the reflective face perpendicular to a line parallel to the applicable roadway marking.”

I don't think this sentence is necessary if you are to install RPM's in accordance with the Design Standards. (Comment from Matt Dewitt).

Response: Agree, this information should be in the Design Standards. Sentence will be deleted.  
Change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Daniel Strickland

414-4352

[daniel.strickland@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:daniel.strickland@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments: (8-2-16, Internal)

**1. 706-4:** Add “retro” to the following sentence: “Place the RPMs with the retroreflective face perpendicular to a line parallel to the applicable roadway marking.”

Response: Please see response to previous comment.

**2. 706-4:** I couldn't find in the Design Standards or Specs where we provide a requirement for proper placement of the Bidirectional White/Red RPMs (i.e. Place white face toward the direction of travel). I don't think this is a major issue with contractors placing this type of RPM incorrectly, but I recommend we at least address it either in the spec or the Design Standards.

Response: This information will be added to the Design Standards. (However; the MUTCD states that for bidirectional red/white RPMs, the red shows to wrong way road users.)  
No change made to the Specification.

\*\*\*\*\*