

1020302 MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Duane Brautigam
414-4130

Comment: (4-21-11)

Assuming the last paragraph of this spec is meant to apply to all detours, the addition of the proposed language at the end of 102-6.2 appears out of place. As drafted, it follows a very detailed discussion of detour bridge components, and could be construed as applying only to bridge detours. Also, please consider utilizing the cross reference to Design Index Nos. 600 and 660 as proposed in 556-3.1 of the concurrent proposed modification 5560200.

Response: The text referred to has been deleted from the end of 102-6.2 and moved to the first paragraph of 102-6.2 as follows:

102-6.2 Construction: Plan, construct, and maintain detours for the safe passage of traffic in all conditions of weather. Provide the detour with all facilities necessary to meet this requirement. *Where pedestrian facilities are detoured, blocked or closed during the work, provide safe alternate accessible routes through or around the work zone meeting the requirements of the ADA Standards for Transportation Facilities.*

C. A. Harper
414-412

Comments: (5-3-11)

Suggest changing the last paragraph to read:

*Where pedestrian facilities are detoured, blocked or closed during the **workconstruction**, provide a **safe** alternate accessible route through or around the work zone meeting the requirements of the ADA Standards for Transportation Facilities.*

Response: In keeping with the general language of the specifications, we recommend leaving “work” as being consistent with other language. “Safe” has been added to the text. Also, 102-3.2(6), second paragraph, has been revised as highlighted below:

Advise the project personnel of the schedule of these inspections and give them the opportunity to join in the inspection as is deemed necessary. Submit a comprehensive weekly report, using the Department’s currently approved form, to the Engineer detailing the condition of all traffic control devices (including pavement markings) being used. Include assurances in the inspection report that pedestrians are accommodated with a safe, **accessible** travel path around work sites ~~and safety~~ separated from mainline traffic *in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards for Transportation Facilities, that.....*

James T. Barfield
415-9200

Comments: (5-4-11)

Per Roadway Design Bulletin 11-04, Volume I, Chapter 8, Section 8.1.1 Pedestrians and Bicyclists of the PPM has been modified to clarify a shoulder (paved or unpaved) or footpath meets the need for a pedestrian way when one mile outside of the urban area. Using the term “sidewalk” could lead to these

less obvious pedestrian ways not being accommodated during the bore. Consider revising the term “sidewalk” or include “pedestrian way.”

Response: The word “sidewalk” has been changed to “pedestrian way” in 5550301 and 5560200. Section 102 does not contain the word “sidewalk”.

Ken Zinck
386-740-3471

Comments: (5-17-11)

In comparing the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) and Jack and Bore (J&B) spec changes, shouldn't these be consistent? MOT 102 mentions compliance with ADA, J&B 556 mentions compliance with our design standards. Since they are both talking about pedestrian facilities. Why would they not both reference the same standard or criteria. Or list both ADA and the standards in both specs.

Response: The intent of these revisions, in conjunction with those for 556, is to place ADA compliance language in the 'general' sections of the Specifications to cover all aspects of a project, and remove specific reference to ADA in the 'technical' sections of the Specs. The Section 556 reference to the Design Standards provides more specific criteria on how to provide accessible alternate pedestrian paths through/around a work zone. We'll also be looking at Index Nos. 600 & 660 to make sure they are detailed enough.

Loreen Bobo
407-858-5900

Comments: (5-17-11)

Section 102-3.2 mentions compliance with ADA; Section 556-3.1 mentions compliance with our design standards. Since they are both talking about pedestrian facilities, why would they not both reference the same standard or criteria? Or list both ADA and the standards in both specs?

Response: See response to Ken Zinck, above.
