

6540202 MIDBLOCK CROSSWALK ENHANCEMENT
ASSEMBLIES
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Karen Byram
FDOT
karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (5-14-15)

The phrase 'to avoid frequencies that might cause seizures' in section 654-2.2.2 is unnecessary. It is an explanation and does not add to the requirement.

Response: Document edited to remove explanation. Change made.

Dan Hurtado
FDOT
(850) 414-4155
dan.hurtado@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (5-14-15)

2nd paragraph, 1st sentence, strike the phrase, "to avoid frequencies that might cause seizures." Spec's are written to tell the Contractor what to do, not why.

Response: Document edited to remove explanation. Change made.

Richard B. Morrow
FDOT
386-943-5309

Comments: (5-14-15)

Is the confirmation light directed at the pedestrians intended to be a separate light from the actual RRFB's? If it is, I'll suggest it should be described as a separate light. Otherwise it could be argued that the RRFB itself is a "light directed at and visible to the pedestrians... to give confirmation that the RRFB is in operation."

This is an important issue for us because in some locations we need to place the RRFB assembly on the leading side of the crosswalk while in other installations it is physically possible to put on either side of the crosswalk.

Response: The confirmation light is not required to be separate light. It is typically a small light on the side of the RRFB light bar that is visible to pedestrians in the crosswalk. This design characteristic is verified during APL product evaluation and all RRFBs currently on the APL comply with this requirement. Document modified for clarity. Change made.

Nahum Fernandez
305-592-3580
fernan@miamidade.gov

Comments: (5-27-15)

Please add the following (or something to its effect) at the end of "654-2.2.2 Beacon Flashing Requirements" (after the description of the FHWA flash patterns) in order to provide the local agencies with the utmost flexibility in establishing flash pattern uniformity within their jurisdictions: "The controller shall provide for installer-selectable setting of the aforementioned flash patterns and be readily reconfigurable if future MUTCD or State guidelines specify a different flash pattern."

Response: Both flash patterns are approved and acceptable. If a specific pattern is necessary to maintain uniformity within a jurisdiction, then it can be indicated in other contract documents, such as the plans. No change.

Jose Kandarappallil
FDOT, D4
772-429-4936

Comments: (6-9-15)

Supplement specs to notate the color of flashing lights to be in compliance with the Traffic engineering Manual (section 3.8.3) as flashing yellow followed by solid red so as to read section as "654-2.2.3 RRFB Operation: RRFB assemblies shall be normally dark, initiate operation only upon pedestrian actuation via a pedestrian pushbutton, and cease operation at a predetermined time after the pedestrian actuation or, with passive detection, after the pedestrian clears the crosswalk. Flashing lights color to be in compliance with the Traffic Engineering Manual (section 3.8.3) as flashing yellow followed by solid red .The duration of the predetermined period shall be programmable and capable of matching the pedestrian clearance time for pedestrian signals as determined by MUTCD procedures. The timer that controls flashing must automatically reset each time a pedestrian call is received."

Response: RRFBs do not require or include a solid red indication. The Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon Assembly uses a solid red indication. The reference in 654-2.3 to MUTCD, Chapter 4F is sufficient to describe the physical and operational requirements of pedestrian hybrid beacon assemblies. No change.
