

1020300 SPECIFICATION  
COMMENTS/RESPONSES 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 work zones. 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: Language requiring the usage of detectable warnings for temporary ramps was added to 102-6.2 prior to industry review.

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: Language was modified.

---

Kevin Earley  
215.360.9661  
[Kevin.Earley@oldcastle.com](mailto: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: Thank you for your comment. However, Section 102 speaks to detectable warnings used in temporary conditions. Permanent installations of detectable warnings are not within the scope of this specification. No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*

Kevin Hayden  
386-943-5284  
[kevin.hayden@dot.state.fl.us](mailto: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: Thank you for your comment. The language regarding payment will no longer be deleted.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mitchell Hollohan  
Work Phone: 9022090566  
[mitch@site2020.com](mailto: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: Thank you for your comment. The language has been modified to state, "In the event of an AFAD malfunction, restore normal flagging operations with flaggers or immediately cease the flagging operation and reopen the roadway."

\*\*\*\*\*

Joy Christiano  
813-416-7887  
[joy.christiano@keystonecivil.com](mailto:joy.christiano@keystonecivil.com)

Comments: (12/11/20, Industry)

1. 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?
2. 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.

3. For the detectable warnings to be installed on temporary ramps, how is the Contractor compensated for those and where is in indicated?

Response:

1. The statement "to remove all existing pavement markings that conflict with temp paths of vehicles, etc. when conflict will exceed 24 hours" is intended for existing permanent markings that conflict with temporary vehicle paths that are in place for more than 24 hours. The statement "the next phase of operation" for vehicle, etc. before opening to traffic" is intended for both temporary and permanent markings during different phases of the work. No change made.

2. General requirements for contractor ingress/egress are covered by 7-7 Control of the Contractor's Equipment. No change made.

3. Payment for detectable warnings would be made under the appropriate 527 pay item. No change made.

\*\*\*\*\*