

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

William Sears
954-934-1115

Comments: (7-11-12)

This change goes against ASTM D 4280(see attached) which indicates that if a raised pavement marker is located at a construction joint it should be moved. The wording is on Page 9 in the appendix. It has been my understanding that placing them on the joint causes pavement markers to come off the road sooner.

Response: ASTM D 4280 recommends that the marker should be relocated longitudinally from a construction joint in the non-mandatory information. Also, moving the marker longitudinally doesn't solve the problem for a longitudinal joint. To prohibit RPMs on joints is unachievable. For example, on a two lane, two way roadway, RPMs for skip/broken markings are required by the FDOT Design Standards to be in line with the pavement marking. The pavement joint is typically in the middle of the road, which is not a problem until you come to a passing section where the skip/broken line goes right on the joint. It is not practical to require the contractor to change the location of this pavement joint as the road changes from passing to no-passing (double yellow where the RPM is not on the joint). We did discuss this in detail with Maintenance, and they could not conclude that markers failed prematurely on a joint. No change made.

Dave Villani
678-296-9910
davev@ennistraffic.com

Comments: (7-11-12)

The only change you are making to this spec is to strike this:
Do not install RPMs over longitudinal or transverse joints of the bonding surface.
I have no issue removing that statement as long as the pavement surfaces on either side of the joints they are bridging are the same height - - otherwise the marker will sit askew and will be asking to be popped off.

Response: I agree that the joint should match, which is a requirement in Section 330-5.2.2 of the Specifications.
No change made.
