

9900202 TEMPORARY TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE MATERIALS  
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Comments:

Regarding 990-4.11, I note that FM test method 5-541 no longer has provisions for a test deck for removable tape, but instead just reverts back to NTPEP test data in which you must demonstrate the removability after 90 days. If a vendor did not want to go to NTPEP for additional testing, would FDOT conduct a field test deck to test the removability?

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Cheryl Adams  
414-4327  
[cheryl.adams@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:cheryl.adams@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

Please update the specification during your review comment period to allow standard type sheeting to be used for Bands for Tubular Markers, I made an error in identifying type 6 (vinyl) as the only material. This change should not impact industry, it's more of a correction. 990-2.1.1 Sign Panels, Bands for Tubular Markers, Vertical Panels, Barricades and other Devices: Sign Panels, Bands for Tubular Markers, Vertical Panels, Barricades and other Devices shall meet the requirements of ASTM D 4956 for Type III or higher retroreflective sheeting materials identified in Section 994 except for mesh signs shall meet the color, daytime luminance and nonreflective property requirements of Section 994, Type VI. 990-2.1.2 Collars for Traffic Cones : Collars for Traffic Cones shall meet the requirements of ASTM D 4956 Type VI.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Paul Gentry  
414-4118  
[paul.gentry@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:paul.gentry@dot.state.fl.us)

Comments:

990-4.11 Removability: Ensure that the manufacturer shows documented reports that the removable tape meets this requirement after being in place for a minimum of 90 days and under an average daily traffic count per lane of at least 9,000 vehicles per day. Moving this from 102 to 990 is correct. One question is what group will be ensuring that the above is met? Is this a test to be looked for by the Product Evaluation group in a Product Application submission or is to be enforced by Construction? At present, Florida Method 5-541 states for the evaluation of Temporary Tape striping to be performed by "utilizing data submitted by an independent testing

organization, such as NTPEP." The NTPEP Traffic Project workplan specifies in section 4.2 as having a minimum ADT requirement of 5000. This would make it difficult for someone to ascertain that a specific material meets the above "at least 9000 vehicles per day" until a final NTPEP report is issued. Once again, what happens if the NTPEP report states that the ADT for that report has a ADT of less than the required 9000? There is no provision in 5-541, at present, for the material to be tested by Product Evaluation on a field test deck, since this was removed with the latest revision of that Florida Method. That being said and NTPEP being the above stated independent testing organization used as an example, what is the intention of the above language "requirement"? The NTPEP Project workplan has specific language in 9.3 "Removability" that addresses the test procedure and rating system used for their data reporting. Is this the "requirement" testing that is being looked for? Can the manufacturer self-certify that they meet the intent of this requirement by producing their own documented reports with their product submission? How will this affect temporary tapes that are presently on the Q.P.L.? Can they also self-certify or will they have to also produce documented reports, if they do not have, or in the past had, NTPEP reports?

**Response:**

\*\*\*\*\*

Duane Brautigam  
414-4130

**Comments:**

A few comments for your consideration ...

- It would be better to add the reference to QPL in 990-4.3 instead of 990-4.1. The QPL is already mentioned there.
- In 990-5, the first sentence is awkward and a bit overcomplicated, in my opinion. For example, it seems to read that it is not necessary to certify Class E markers, which I do not think is the intent. It might be better to break up the sentence a little bit.
- In 990-5, I have some concerns over removing the "Work Zone" RPM terminology. I liked having a clear distinction between RPMs and WZRPMS in our specs. What would be wrong with leaving this as WZRPMS or TRPMS (temporary RPMs) to maintain the distinction. My fear is there will be confusion for some between permanent and temporary markers, that RPMs will be RPMs.

**Response: (As per State Specifications Office)**

- Looking at this article, there is really no great place for this sentence. 990-4.3 does mention QPL but the title of that article is thickness and only refers to the QPL for the thickness. We will leave this sentence in 990-4.1 for now. The MOT comm. is going to be looking at this entire section so it can get moved to a better location then.
- I agree. Class E are to be certified. The last part of that sentence will be deleted "except for Class E markers as noted below" because the specifics for Class D and E are listed.
- "Work Zone Raised" is being replaced with "Temporary Retroreflective" here and in Section 102 to be more consistent with Design Standard Index 600 Sheet 12. Distinction is still made because "temporary" is used. The proposed changes will remain.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Comments:

1. The reference to manufacturers seeking evaluation of their products for the QPL and the APL should be moved to the Section 990-1 General to make the submittal requirements consistent throughout this document. The method for submitting a QPL or an APL application should be expanded. For the QPL the information should be “Manufacturers seeking evaluation of their products shall submit product data sheets, performance test reports from an independent laboratory showing the product meets the requirements of this section, and a QPL application in accordance with Section 6.” (I cannot suggest for the APL language).
2. In Section 990-4 Temp tape - why is this section not part of 971-7? All the requirements are identical except adhesion and the new removability. This would be consistent with the references to painted pavement markings. a. 990-4.3 thickness states the QPL will list the thickness. This is not the case and should be removed. b. 990-4.10 references 971-1.7. This reference is incorrect as section 971 has changed.
3. Section 990-5, why is this section not part of 970 with the other raised pavement markers? This would be consistent with painted pavement markings.
4. 990-6 Temporary Glare Screen was a QPL product. There is no mention of that in this change. Was the omission intentional? In (f) alternative designs as referenced to VECP. Is that reference still correct?
5. In the new section 990-8, the requirements for the QPL are not clearly defined. In section 102 you have stated that drawings are required and this is not mentioned in this section. The requirements for what the vendor is expected to submit for approval must be more clearly defined.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*