

1020000 MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC  
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

Tim Lattner  
Office of Maintenance  
410-5656  
[Tim.Lattner@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Tim.Lattner@dot.state.fl.us)

**Comments:**

I think we should consider removing the additional payment for crash cushions in section 102-13.12. Payment will be to furnish, install, maintain and remove (same as guardrail and all other temporary MOT devices). If the cushion is hit it is the contractors responsibility to repair at no additional cost.

**Response:**

(per Bob Burluson) I have to disagree with Tim. There is no way for the contractor to anticipate the number of times a crash cushion it hit and damaged.

(per David Sadler) I understand your point Tim but without a mechanism in the contract to pay for damages to these temporary devices when impacts occur, a contractor will have to guess how many times they think the crash cushions will get hit and include the cost in their bid. If the crash cushions never get hit, that money FDOT spent for no return. If they get hit more than the contractor estimated, that a financial impact to the contractor. Allowing compensation for the damages to temporary crash cushions seems the most appropriate way to account for this in my opinion.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

No changes made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ben Burton, P.E.  
Final Plans Engineer  
Program Management Office  
(954) 777-4135

**Comments:**

Rudy,

We had sent a request for a blanket approved Specification for this section and was told by your office to submit a Specification Change request instead. I would like to get this included with this change if possible. Below is the change we are requesting. We will make sure we get you the official request soon.

**102-5.8 Conflicting Pavement Markings:** Where the lane use or where normal vehicle or **pedestrian paths** are altered during construction, remove all pavement markings (paint, tape, thermoplastic, raised pavement markers, etc.) that will conflict with the adjusted vehicle paths **or pedestrian paths**. Use of paint

to cover conflicting pavement markings is prohibited. Remove conflicting pavement markings using a method that will not damage the surface texture of the pavement and which will eliminate the previous marking pattern regardless of weather and light conditions.

Remove all pavement markings that will be in conflict with “next phase of operation” vehicle paths or pedestrian path as described above, before opening to **vehicle traffic or use by pedestrians**. Cost for removing conflicting pavement markings (paint, tape, thermoplastic, raised pavement markers, etc.) to be included in Maintenance of Traffic, Lump Sum.

**Response: Agree. Changes will be made.**

\*\*\*\*\*

B.A. Masing, P.E.  
D1 Design Engineer  
(863) 519-2543

**Comments:**

Rudy—Instead of saying “called for in the plans”, wouldn’t it be better to say “identified in the plans”?

**102-7 Traffic Control Officer.**

Provide uniformed law enforcement officers, including marked law enforcement vehicles, to assist in controlling and directing traffic in the work zone when the following types of work is necessary on projects:

1. Traffic control in a signalized intersection when signals are not in use.
2. When Standard Index No. 619 is used on Interstate at nighttime and required *called for by in* the plans.
3. When *traffic* pacing *is called for in the plans*/rolling blockade specification is used *or approved by the Engineer*.
4. *When pulling conductor/cable above an open traffic lane on limited access facilities, when called for in the plans or approved by the Engineer.*

**Response: No changes made.**

\*\*\*\*\*

Matthew Schindler  
Cloverleaf Corp.  
813-649-1336  
[matthew@cloverleafcorp.com](mailto:matthew@cloverleafcorp.com)

**Comments:**

Section 102-10.3.3: “Black portions of contrast tapes and black masking tapes must be non-reflective and have a reflectance of less than 5 mcd/lx” If requirements for these temporary removable masking tapes which are used to temporarily conceal conflicting markings are given, shouldn’t the use of the black masking tape be discussed in 102-5.8 Conflicting Markings?

Section 102-9.14: I note that the requirement to cover the ENTIRE bottom of the cartridge in the “raised” position has been eliminated. However, what is the minimum amount of reflective area that needs to be provided?

Response:

Section 102-10.3.3: No change at this time. The MOT Committee is working on this issue.

Section 102-9.14: Varies by manufacturer and the language has been clarified as follows “In the raised position, place at least the same square footage of striping on the bottom of the cartridge as placed on the rear facing cartridge in the open position.”

\*\*\*\*\*

Richard Creed  
D4 Design  
954-777-4428  
[richard.creed@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:richard.creed@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

- 1) 102-9.6 “Crash cushion” now being substituted for “attenuator”? However, still using the attenuator nomenclature for truck or trailer mounted crash cushions?
- 2) 102-10.2 Differentiate “durable” waterborne versus “standard” waterborne paint. Is there a definition of these two items?
- 3) 102-11.15 Refer to portable changeable message sign, add PCMS at these locations as well?
- 4) Good to see “tape” finally referred to as tape. Pay item descriptions need to be revised as well. 102-911?

Response:

- 1. No change made.
- 2. 971-3 addresses standard waterborne paint. Durable waterborne paint has been removed, pending test deck results will be addressed in 971-4.
- 3. No change made.
- 4. The BOE description will be revised.

\*\*\*\*\*

Rudy Powell  
[rudy.powell@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:rudy.powell@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

Delete the last two sentences in 102-10.2.1, "Use standard waterborne paint ..." and "Durable waterborne paint may ..." because the durable waterborne paint will not be implemented in January 2010 so the terms standard and durable should not be used.

Response: Standard waterborne paint will remain because it will be implemented in 1/10 in 971-3. The last sentence was deleted.

\*\*\*\*\*

Chris Papastratis  
954-777-4193  
[Chris.Papastratis@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:Chris.Papastratis@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

General comment; why are we making so many minor changes to the new 2010 Standard Specification Book, which most of us have just received? These changes should have been accomplished prior to printing of the Book. Examples of the minor changes are as follows: 1. Retroreflective instead of reflective. 2. Called for in the plans instead of requested by the plans. 3. Retroreflective Pavement Markers instead of Raised Pavement Markers. 4. Crash Cushion instead of Vehicle Impact Attenuator. 5. Etc... My point is; these changes need to be made throughout the SPEC BOOK and should have been made prior to printing. Now, the changes are not significant enough to be made so soon to a brand new SPEC BOOK.

Response: Unfortunately, the printing of the book requires significant lead time so all changes cannot be incorporated..

\*\*\*\*\*

Ken Zinck  
386-740-3471  
[ken.zinck@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:ken.zinck@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

I think under 102-7 that # 1 should be something like: Instead of not in use to use when Traffic Signals are not being used in their intended function or something to the effect that if the signals are in flash mode or off that we should have ODLE on site to direct traffic.

Response: The language is clear as written, no problems have been experienced. No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Chris Sweitzer  
386-961-7418  
[chris.sweitzer@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:chris.sweitzer@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

102-7, condition 4: I realize this is probably to harmonize the Spec with Index 600's section "Overhead Work", but how is the officer going to control traffic in an open lane on a limited access facility given the speeds traffic normally moves on such facilities? This usage seems more of a risk to the officer than anything else.

Response: The officer is there in case of an emergency. Index 600, Sheet 2 of 13, addresses this.

\*\*\*\*\*

Karen Byram  
414-4353  
[karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

1. Throughout Section 102 there is an inconsistent method of referencing whether or not a product is on the QPL or APL. Sometimes QPL is mentioned and other times 990 is reference. The preferred spec language is to a contractor is “Use only (product name) listed on the Qualified Products List (QPL), and that meets the requirements of 990. The Engineer will take random samples of the materials in accordance with the Department’s Sampling, Testing and Reporting Guide schedule.”
2. 102-9.5.1 Retroreflective collars should reference the QPL requirement.
3. 102-9.5.3 Glare Screen should reference QPL or 990.
4. 102-10.3.4 Removability belongs in section 990. This is a function of the product and a requirement to the manufacturer, not the contractor.

Response:

1. This can be reviewed as possible future changes to this Section to be consistent with other Sections.
2. Agree. Change made.
3. Agree. Change made.
4. No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Comments from Missy Hollis

Comments are appreciated. They will be considered for specification revisions for July 2010.