

---

## Index 102-660 Pedestrian Control for Closure of Sidewalks

### ORIGINATION

**Date:** May 20, 2020

**Name:** Derwood Sheppard

**Phone:** (850) 414-4334

**Email:** derwood.sheppard@dot.state.fl.us

### COMMENTARY

Sheet 1: Updated Symbols; Revised 'Pedstrian Detour' Detail; Revised Notes; Moved 'Sidewalk Diversion' Detatil to Sheet 2; Deleted 'Sidewalk Detour' Detail; Renamed Index.

Sheet 2: Added Sheet 2; Added 'Temporary Pedestrian Way Diverting Traffic Into Traveled Way' Detail; Added and Revised 'Sidewalk Diversion' Detail from Sheet 1

### COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

**BLACK** = Industry Review Comments    **RED** = Standard Plans Response

**Name:** K.C. Hose and Rick Peterson / FDOT District 4

**Date:** September 9, 2020

#### **COMMENT:**

Sheet 2: concerns are: -

- SPI Index 522-002 advise to install DWS in accordance with Specification 527
- Standard Spec 527 states DWS utilized are to be on the Department's APL list.
- The issues we have in the field is that DWS products listed on the APL can be placed on concrete surfaces only. Many times, temporary sidewalk is constructed with asphalt. How do we direct the contractor in that scenario?

Please verify the necessity of installing RPM on the Roadway taper per SPI 102-660 Sheet 11/11.

**RESPONSE:** There are now products on the Department's APL that allow for temporary pinning of the Detectable Warning to asphalt surfaces. Otherwise, the contract must use a temporary concrete pad for use with other Detectable Warning products. The requirements for use of RPMs is controlled by Index 102-600; as such, there is no need to repeat or cross-refence requirements.

**No Change**

*Date: 09/26/2020*

**Name:** Rich Endrzejewski / Element Engineering Group

**Date:** September 9, 2020

**COMMENT:**

I would like to request more details for how to route pedestrians around a signalized intersection when working in each corner (for example ramp upgrades), without a nearby signalized intersection to route them around to. Most of our projects need to include a ‘corner-by-corner’ TCP plan and we typically aren’t compensated for that level of TCP. It would be nice to have a standard that addresses these concerns.

There are many other Pedestrian TCP situations that seem ‘standard’ but they are not depicted in the Standard Plans.

**RESPONSE:** Agreed, the Department will continue to work with the Districts and Consultants to try and provide additional Typical Applications to address a wider range the standard conditions. Your suggestion is noted and will be evaluated for inclusion in future version of the Standard Plans.

**No Change, at this time.**

*Date: 09/26/2020*

**Name:** Bogdan Piorkowski / Balm Beach County

**Date:** September 14, 2020

**COMMENT:**

Sheet 1: Why was the sidewalk detour removed? Why was notes # 1, 8, and 11 removed?

**RESPONSE:** The Sidewalk Detour is just a variation of the “Pedestrian Detour” included within the revised Index. The notes were removed because they either deal with usage criteria, which should be addressed by the TTC Plans, or items that are addressed in the Specifications.

**No Change**

*Date: 09/26/2020*