

1020901 MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Steve Nichols  
FDOT, Turnpike  
[stephen.nichols@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:stephen.nichols@dot.state.fl.us)  
(407) 264-3005

Comments: (11-26-14)

1. Appears the first sentence of the proposed change countermands the adjoining paragraph. Is that the intent, or should the sentence read "Traffic control devices that are dirty shall be replaced, and cleaned off site for future use."?

Response:

2. Can the CDS maintain traffic control devices other than channelizing devices? If so, would the required documentation reflect this?

Response:

3. Are arrow boards, water filled barriers, and ped fences included as channelizing devices?

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Maria Connolly  
FDOT, Turnpike  
[maria.connolly@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:maria.connolly@dot.state.fl.us)  
(954) 934-1209

Comments: (11-26-14)

I may be misinterpreting this proposed spec change. The memo says that the proposed changes are intended to implement the phasing of removal of lights from temporary traffic control devices but the actual changes seem to be related to the maintenance of the devices by an independent Channelizing Device Supplier.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Kenneth Weldon  
[tallyther@centurylink.net](mailto:tallyther@centurylink.net)

Comments: (12-2-14)

I have no problem with the proposed changes but at the same time it is appropriate to correct one other area in the cited spec. In paragraph 1 it says "Use only those devices that are on the APL." The problem is that not all currently used items are on the APL or QPL now. Note not all items shown in the Std Index Series 600 are on the APL. I already supplied information and presented questions on this to Stefanie Maxwell so you may want to contact her directly and follow her

example of why this is the case and how to resolve it in the spec. This presents an issue in the MOT Training as well.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Maria Connolly  
FDOT, Turnpike  
[maria.connolly@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:maria.connolly@dot.state.fl.us)  
(954) 934-1209

Comments: (12-2-14)  
Section 102-9.1.1 1 (d) Recommend changing "with its own inventory or channelizing devices" to "with its own inventory OF channeling devices.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Krystal Philip  
[plkrystal@gmail.com](mailto:plkrystal@gmail.com)

Comments: (12-2-14)  
Removal of lights from traffic control devices does not seem like a good idea. I think the lights make a good guidance visual thru work zones. The opinion has not changed over the years. Seniors and people with slight eye issues benefit from the added luminus provided by the lights. The cost and savings factor for FDOT is minimal. As it is the state gets barricades with lights for about \$.20 per day. There will be no drop in prices when removed. You are taking away jobs from those in the barricade business. I think this is not a good deal for Florida.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Burleson  
Florida Transportation Builders Association

Comments: (11-26-14)  
Prime contractor certification should apply only to cones and not all devices.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

FDOT, D5  
Construction

Comments: (12-22-14)  
102-9.1 Why the devices can't be cleaned while being used. Is the intent that when you have a big project that has 500 barrels you have to remove them all and replace them with clean barrels or can you clean them in place?

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Comments: (12-22-14)

Do the requirements for having to have a CDS on the project apply to the temporary lane separator or low profile barrier? Both devices have “channelizing” devices as accessories to them. Having to replace the channelizing component in order to clean it will be more complicated than simply sliding a drum out of place. In the case of the temporary lane separator, it will require either a mobile operation and road closure to facilitate.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*