

1020300 SPECIFICATION
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Karen Byram
850-414-4353

Comments: (1/7/21, Internal)

In Subarticle 102-3.1 Pedestrian and Bicycle accommodation, are you adding any usage of Detectable Warnings used in a temporary application? At one time there was a push to using the S527 Detectable Warnings on temporary substrates in workzones. As I recall the reason was that if there had been a ramp with the Detectable Warning there in the past, a the temporary path and ramp had to have a Detectable Warning.

Response:

In Subarticle 102-9.5.2, you have specified Pedestrian LCDs. The APL has Longitudinal Channelizing Devices (LCDs) in Section 102 with Pedestrian use in the comments. Are you proposing changing the APL category? I propose the following language:

102-9.5.2 Pedestrian Longitudinal Channelizing Devices (LCDs): Use pedestrian LCDs listed on the APL for pedestrian use and meeting the requirements of Section 990 and the Standard Plans.

Then remainder of the subarticle can continue to reference 'pedestrian LCDs.

Response:

Kevin Earley
215.360.9661
Kevin.Earley@oldcastle.com

Comments: (1/7/21, Industry)

The proposed change does not recognize the use of unit concrete pavers and slabs manufactured with truncated domes in conformance with ADA and FDOT requirements. These products are used throughout Florida and satisfy State and Federal requirements as detectable warnings. These manufactured concrete products, detectable warning pavers, have been successfully used for decades in Florida. Please include the use of detectable warnings manufactured into concrete pavers and slabs since the detectable warnings are integral to each concrete paving unit, providing proven durability and performance. On behalf of Oldcastle Architectural Products Group, the largest producer of concrete paver products in Florida, please consider amending this to include unit concrete as follow: For permanent installations, use detectable warnings that are cast in place "or manufactured as part of the surface of paving units" for newly constructed concrete walking surfaces.

Response:

Kevin Hayden
386-943-5284
kevin.hayden@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12/30/20, Industry)

Under Specification Section 102-5.8, the language regarding payment for pavement damage caused by pavement marking removal has been deleted. This language being removed made reference to use of the Lump Sum MOT pay item. What is the reason for this removal? Is it because Section 102-11.1 already covers this with the blanket statement "Include the cost of any work that is necessary to meet the requirements of the Contract Documents for MOT under Maintenance of Traffic, lump sum when separate payment is not provided."? If this is the reasoning, why is this same language that is being removed from Section 102-5.8 being added to Section 102-11.22?

Response:

Mitchell Hollohan
Work Phone: 9022090566
mitch@site2020.com

Comments: (12/22/20, Industry)

As per 1020300. Under 43. Two flaggers are available on-site to provide normal flagging operations should an AFAD malfunction. This will make using AFADs much more difficult for staffing reasons. I believe if the system is to go down and the back up modes fail, you will have to close down your site. This is the same procedure if there are two flaggers on a job and one decides to quit mid day. (This happens quite often!)

Response:

Joy Christiano
813-416-7887
joy.christiano@keystonecivil.com

Comments: (12/11/20, Industry)

102-5.8 indicates to remove all existing pavement markings that conflict with temp paths of vehicles, etc. when conflict will not exceed 24 hours. Then the next paragraph indicates to remove all conflicting pavement markings that will be in conflict with "the next phase of operation" for vehicle, etc. before opening to traffic. These seem to somewhat contradict each other. What is the intended difference? 102-5.12 - Limited Access Temp Openings - is there a way to either incorporate into the 102 spec, or the standard plans, what our expectation is for a contractor ingress/egress? The standard plan and this spec is a great guide, but isn't necessarily enforceable. It would be simpler to have something to have the Contractor adhere to. For the detectable warnings to be installed on temporary ramps, how is the Contractor compensated for those and where is in indicated?

Response:
