

5270201 DETECTABLE WARNINGS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Richard Creed
(954) 234-6027
Richard.creed@winc.com

Comments: (7-11-19, Industry)

"Immediately install detectable warnings on newly constructed surfaces. For installations on newly places concrete, install detectable warnings during casting or immediately upon completing the concrete curing period specified in 520-8." Did you mean to say ".....newly placed..."

Response: Per Specification Office, thank you for your comment. Change made.

Brian Bliar
(863) 519-2676
Brian.blair@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (7-11-19, Industry)

"Newly places" should be changed to "newly placed".

Response: Per Specification Office, thank you for your comment. Change made.

Jesus Mustafa
(954) 744-4691
jmustafa@bma-ce.com

Comments: (7-11-19, Industry)

SUBARTICLE 527-3.1, the word should be "placed" not "places."

Response: Per Specification Office, thank you for your comment. Change made.

Mary Anne Koos
(850) 414-4321
Maryanne.koos@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (7-11-19, Industry)

Since the ADA Standards show he Domes in a rectangular grid pattern with dimensions, you might not need the sentence regarding the older diagonal pattern. <https://www.access-board.gov/guidelines-and-standards/buildings-and-sites/about-the-ada-standards/ada-standards/chapter-7-communication-elements-and-features> Language is still a little rough. How about: Within x hours of the newly constructed walking surface being installed, apply detectable warnings before opening to pedestrian traffic. For installations on newly placed concrete, install detectable warnings during the final surface finishing (need better words here, but I don't think casting works) or immediately upon completing the concrete curing period specified in 520-8. Install surface-applied tiles or mats as soon as the walking surface has cured and using adhesives applied over the entire surface and mechanical fasteners (if required). I'm not sure that casting is the best term to use and not all applied products use metal fasteners.

Response: Thank you for your comments. The first comment is outside of the scope of this change. Consideration will be made for a future revision. As for your second comment, we feel the proposed language concisely addresses the installation requirements for all surfaces and

materials. However, a minor change was made to address opening all surfaces immediately after installing detectable warnings.

Dan Borden, E.I.
(407) 587-7572
Dan.borden@stantec.com

Comments: (7-11-19, Industry)

I'm probably not the first to comment about this. There is a typo, please change "places" to "placed" in red revised text. Another question in regard to section 527-2.3 of STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION. STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION 527-2.3 Color/Contrast: Use safety yellow, brick red or black colored detectable warnings on concrete walking surfaces. Use safety yellow colored detectable warnings on asphalt walking surfaces. vs. FDM 222.3: The detectable warning systems on the APL are designed to work with concrete surfaces. In areas where the pedestrian facility has an asphalt surface, such as a shared use path, specify an appropriate detectable warning system or consider including a short section of concrete. In section 527 there is no mention that the APL has no Detectable Warnings surface that can be applied to asphalt. See wording from FDM 222.3 for including a short section of concrete. 527-2.3 should include additional information as stated in FDM 222.3. Thank You, Dan Borden, E.I.

Response: Per Specification Office, thank you for your comments. The typo has been corrected. As for the comment about 527-2.3, this is beyond the scope of this revision and will be considered for future revisions.

Gene Giambra
(813) 975-6110
Eugene.giambra@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (7-11-19, Industry)

After the deletion of the last sentence from Subarticle 527-2.1 the Subarticle reads the same as the July 19 E-Book. This subarticle should be removed.

Response: Per Specification Office, thank you for your comment. Subarticle 527-2.1 was left in the document for the second review to show the proposed language was being removed from the Subarticle 527-2.1 to Subarticle 527-3.1.
