

5270000 – DETECTABLE WARNINGS ON WALKING SURFACES
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

Dwayne Kile
dwayne.kile@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

The specification should address both concrete and asphaltic concrete surfaces. The title (which I believe is appropriate) addresses "walking" surfaces. We have instances where the walking surface is a shared use path and not portland cement concrete. Asphaltic concrete is used on occasion. Unless we want to change the direction in the PPM and other documents it may be beneficial to include either the wording or a separate section. Some of the materials can be used with either material. Others are specific to PCC.

Steve Bentz
921-7352

Comments:

Dark red is less descriptive than "brick red" to me. Is there an industry standard or number that can be provided?

The other question I had, unrelated, is the pricing...the sidewalk is listed as per yard while the detection device pricing unit is not provided. Is it per yard, square foot, or bump?

Hope the comments help, and have a nice day!

Calvin L. Johnson, Sr.
(850) 414-5287

Comments:

Spec. revision looks fine. I assume "federal yellow" is defined somewhere?

Aaron McConachie
aaronm@engplastics.com
(800) 682-2525 x105

Comments:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on specification 527. I am writing to inquire about the decision to remove the UV stability requirement for detectable warning surfaces. I suspect that the reason may have to do with the fact that the specification requires a delta E of greater than 3 instead of less than 3. A lower delta E rating is more

desirable because it suggests a low change in color over time indicating a material's ability to resist fading and maintain its visual contrast.

What concerns me is that instead of simply fixing the typo, the requirement is being removed entirely. Is there a plan to reintroduce a requirement for color fastness?

Not only is color contrast an explicit Americans with Disabilities Act requirement, it has been proven to assist visually impaired pedestrians with locating the edge of a potential hazard. If there is no requirement for a detectable warning surface to maintain its color contrast, the warning surface will be permitted to fade into the adjacent concrete and be virtually indistinguishable by people with low vision until detected at the road's edge by cane or underfoot.

If a detectable warning surface fades it will have to be replaced in order to maintain full ADA compliance. The cost to replace failed products on an annual basis can be quite significant. A more cost effective, long term solution would be to require that any acceptable detectable warning surface maintain its color to avoid having to be replaced. One way to prove that a product has good UV protection is to subject it to a standardized accelerated weathering test performed by an independent laboratory. We suggest ASTM G 155-05a which uses the more stringent Xenon Arc light versus Fluorescent light.

Certain detectable warning products currently being produced are able to achieve a delta E rating of much less than three so such a requirement is not unreasonable especially since visual detection plays such an important role in the safety of a visually impaired pedestrian.

I would greatly appreciate a response to my inquiry. I am very interested to know the reason for removing the UV stability requirement.

Joe Lesstino
561.248.1878

Comments:

The lowering of requirements doesn't give us any improvement in an already flawed process. It seems to me that the requirement for color contract is extreamly important and therefore UV stability would have to be a part of it. Tax payers are already paying for inferior products being installed by contractors cutting corners in order to win the bid and put more in thier pockets. Owners are getting short changed when the standards are not enforced. In the end the visually impared pedestrian suffers and that's what it's all about.

Mark Fox
paveway1@verizon.net

813-632-3500

Comments:

S527 is bid/paid by "each". This seems to leave the department open for higher prices from contractors. The contractor can not allways determine whether the "each" location will require 10sf or 50sf of product. So he may try to bid high to cover the cost and try to install for cheaper if the cost was not covered well. If S527 was bid/paid by "square foot" the department should benefit by allowing the contractor to provide and install without any guessing or compramising.

Karen Byram
Karen.byram@dot.state.fl.us
(850) 414-4353

Comments:

In the section identifying the acceptable colors. There is not enough information to quantify the color, this leaves room for interpretation. I would suggest adding the acceptable color coordinatates similar to what is done for traffic striping.

Michael Kopotic
Michael.Kopotic@dot.state.fl.us
(813)744-6062

Comments:

The need for truncated domes was recently noticed on multi-use paths. As these are normally constructed with asphalt, we feel the specification should be revised to include asphalt surfaces. Currently, the only direction is concrete.