

1020912 MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

-----  
Ananth Prasad  
(850) 942-1405  
[aprasad@ftba.com](mailto:aprasad@ftba.com)

Comments: (5-21-20, Internal)  
This change needs to be further discussed.

Concerns re liability being shifted to the Contractors. Should the APL process address the visibility? The contractor should only be responsible for making sure that signs are placed in a location that is obstruction free from a point at the edge of the travel way ahead of the sign.

**Response:**  
\*\*\*\*\*

Jeff Messenger  
(407) 951-6444  
[jmessenger@bcceng.com](mailto:jmessenger@bcceng.com)

Comments: (6-5-20, Industry)  
The requirement of visibility for 1/2 mile is not practical on many roadways. Particularly curved roads and urban conditions.

**Response:**  
\*\*\*\*\*

Patricia Moore  
(954) 717-2248  
[patricia.moore@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:patricia.moore@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments: (6-8-20, Industry)  
102-9.12 1/2 Mile visibility is unobtainable/unmeasurable for many project sites (near curves, bridge abutments, etc), potentially conflicts with 2nd paragraph "unobstructed" view criteria. Is intent the luminescence/brightness of the lettering on the PCMS, is it sightlines, lettering size, or something else? Recommend clarifying intent or removing altogether. 450-11.6 Increase from 14 to 42 days adds significant time for surface corrosion to form on the exposed strand ends. Has a consideration been made for visual inspection and removal of surface corrosion prior to application of epoxy coating? 620-4 There have been disputes between ITS Maintenance Contractors and Construction Contractors at the time of final inspection over whether or not it is valid to perform FOP testing on grounding systems under certain conditions, or whether it is achievable. Included disputes were in regards to soil saturation level with rainwater and soil chemistry which made the 5 Ohm requirement significantly more difficult to meet. Has this been considered during the reevaluation of this specification. Thank you, Kevin Micocci, P.E. Construction Senior Project Manager FDOT Palm Beach Operations Work Phone: (561) 370-1146 Cell Phone: (561) 719-7793

**Response:**  
\*\*\*\*\*

No Name

Comments: (6-8-20, Industry)

The requirement for the sign to be visible from a half mile (2,640') should be changed. The signs cannot be read from this distance. The letter height controls the distance the signs can be read from. The interpretation of visible by the CEI and the contractor will be a problem.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Christian Cummings  
[ccummings@acmebarricades.com](mailto:ccummings@acmebarricades.com)

Comments: (6-9-20, Industry)

I agree with the change allowing the smaller PCMS on roads with speed limits 45mph or less. However, there are currently no smaller PCMS on the APL. Some consideration should be given to allow these smaller PCMS without APL approval for some time period to allow manufacturers and the Department to add them to the APL.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Kevin Price  
(813) 538-9612  
[kevin.price@preferredmaterials.com](mailto:kevin.price@preferredmaterials.com)

Comments: (6-12-20, Industry)

What does one do if the line of sight does not permit this rigid requirement? Many times there are existing obstructions and the Standard plans are clear about location - what is to be done? this is a very specific requirement that may not always be able to be met. these requirements are followed by many municipalities and urban areas are congested. please reconsider this language.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*