5270000 DETECTABLE WARNINGS ON WALKING SURFACES
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

****

Bouzid Choubane/Charles Holzschuher
SMO
352-955-6302
bouzid.choubane@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

For section 527-2.2, MINIMUM THRESHOLD column,
Slip Resistance ASTM E-303 (British Pendulum) requires a 35 BPN, but shows a comment (include recessed areas between truncated domes). The pendulum device has 1 pad dimension (1"x3") for flat surfaces. If the recessed area cannot accommodate the dimension with a slider contact path of 4-5/16" ± 1/16" then the comment should be removed. See attached E303 Test Method for reference.

pendulum.pdf

Response:

****

Bouzid Choubane
SMO
352-955-6302
bouzid.choubane@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

DETECTABLE WARNINGS ON WALKING SURFACES.
(REV 4-~~1-08~~*~~28-09~~6-1-09*)

SECTION 527 (Pages 598-600) is deleted and the following substituted:

SECTION 527
DETECTABLE WARNINGS ON WALKING SURFAC

Note 6/4/2009 9:01:40 AM
rt826an Options
Indicate the relevant design standard index.

527-1 Description.
Furnish and install Detectable Warning devices on newly constructed and/or existing concrete *or asphalt walking surfaces (*curb ramps, ~~and~~ sidewalks*, shared-use paths, etc.)* constructed in accordance with the Design Standards.~~, where indicated in the plans.~~

527-2 Materials.

Response:

****

Howard Webb
DDE – D4
954-777-4439
howard.webb@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:
In the subject specifications, there are several references made about "*the substrate".* Is this defined somewhere?

Response:

****

Stefanie Maxwell
414-4314

Comments:
I recommend the pay item description to say:
Payment will be made under:
Item No. 527- 1- Detectable Warnings on Existing Walking Surfaces - each.

It helps to clarify it, if the word "existing" is in the description.

Response:

****

Marshall H. Dougherty, Jr.
mharddjr@tampabay.rr.com

Comments:
The original utilization of the mat alternate required concrete surfaces only for installation. Later, more recent updates strengthened this concept with suggesting the inlaying of areas of concrete within asphalt trails and bike paths for a suitable installation surface. Making the jump to any surface should be strengthened with a better defining of "substrate" within the proposed verbiage. I would like to suggest, for clarity's sake, the following revision: reword the first incidence of "substrate" within the phrase "…or mats that are adhered to the substrate…" to read as "…or mats that are adhered to a concrete or asphalt substrate…" This should eliminate any confusion about past required application practices and allow for a better understanding for future users of the mat devices.

Response:

****

Chris Sweitzer
386-961-7418
chris.sweitzer@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:
Suggest changing the last sentence in 527-4 to read "Detectable Warnings applied to existing walking surfaces will be paid per each location where Detectable Warnings are furnished,

installed and accepted." Since some of the methods potentially include multiple DW pieces at each location this would keep the Department from possibly paying for each piece separately.

Response:

****

Jack Knowlton
813-435-2608
jknowlton@ace-fla.com

Comments:
In 527-1 Description you remove the statement" where indicated in the plans" from the specification. The effect of this removal is to shift the requirement for installing the detectable warning devices in the correct location from the designer to the contractor. This causes 2 potential problems:

1. The small contractors who are putting in sidewalk projects and do not have advanced education will be placing detectable warning devices in locations where they may not be needed.
2. The larger contractors who have engineers (and lawyers on staff) will understand the potential liability that you are shifting onto the contractor and they will raise their bids accordingly.

The Engineer of Record should be responsible for the correct location and type of detectable warning device. That is why they have professional liability insurance. Contractors do not and the first time this goes to court because a detectable warning device is not installed where it was needed, the lawyers will have to fight it out, and in my opinion (as and FDOT Expert Witness) that the contractors will win that it is not their responsibility to do the job of the EOR.

Response:

****