

Greetings, everyone. I'm posting an e-mail that had 4 interesting pictures (see below). To respond to Carroll's question below, FHWA would want the retrofitted average level of the mats recessed flush to the sidewalk surface. This is typically done by grinding down the nominal thickness – looks about ¼ - ½ inch in the photos - to prevent a tripping hazard, which seems evident in the first photo, assuming the mat has been glued down (although it could just be resting on the sidewalk surface). Another technique is to prepare a recess when the concrete is being finished, by either putting in a surrogate structure to be removed after concrete cures (probably wood, might be sacrificial and just ripped out later), and then putting in the detectable warning mat. This mat also seems to have an 'edge' most clearly visible on right side in picture two. Perhaps the vendor intended this to be removed in the field, or maybe it is a feature from the manufacturing process. But if this product had been through the approval process for use by Wisconsin's DOT, we would have jointly agreed the 'edge' would not be allowed.

If the retrofit mat was flush to the nominal sidewalk level, and the 'edge' was taken care of one way or another, this looks like a reasonable product for many situations (for more information, see <http://www.tfhrc.gov/pubrds/04sep/10.htm>).

If you are contractually required as a vendor or local entity, here is the enforceable language (<http://www.access-board.gov/adaag/html/adaag.htm#4.1>): **4.5.2 Changes in Level.** Changes in level up to 1/4 in (6 mm) may be vertical and without edge treatment (see [Fig. 7\(c\)](#)). Changes in level between 1/4 in and 1/2 in (6 mm and 13 mm) shall be beveled with a slope no greater than 1:2 (see [Fig. 7\(d\)](#)). Changes in level greater than 1/2 in (13 mm) shall be accomplished by means of a ramp that complies with [4.7](#) or [4.8](#). [However, I will point out that tripping hazard could still get you (a federal agency, local government, or vendor) sued. WisDOT requires insets to be used either new or for this type of retrofit.]

Related to local entities and FHWA's oversight response, FHWA has an oversight and stewardship agreement with the state DOTs, and in Wisconsin FHWA has passed oversight to WisDOT for projects involving federal funds at local level. So locally, the use of federal funds on a project is the FHWA key. But ADAGG is federal law, and local agencies not now following ADAGG requirements at their peril. I think we have had previous discussions in this forum on this topic. I think we are way past the point where local governments can plead ignorance if there is a lawsuit, or if the U.S. Dept. of Justice or Transportation take issue with a local non-ADAGG compliant situation and require remediation.

Thank you for the photos, Carroll, and I wonder if there is any further discussion on this topic? Please identify yourself if you respond, or don't respond in this forum. I have a little time this week, and I may start enforcing my requirement for identification of those who post in this forum.

Best regards, everyone

Mark

Mark R. Chandler, PE, CMfgE
U.S. DOT - FHWA Wisconsin Division
fax: 608-829-7526

office: 608-829-7514
office cell phone: 608-287-4226
mark.chandler@fhwa.dot.gov
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/widiv/index.htm>
Field Operations Engineer
Asst Coord for WisDOT's SW & NE Regions

Detectable Warning CoP: <http://knowledge.fhwa.dot.gov/dw>

From: CS [mailto:escalante00@centurytel.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 8:59 PM
To: Chandler, Mark
Subject: double decker detectable warning system

Dear Mr. Chandler:

If you would like to post any of these pix for your fhwa knowledge forum, feel free.

I'd be curious to read any fhwa comments about this unique application of double stacking detectable warning systems, truncated dome mats over top of grooves.

If local entities were using this type of mat and installing them this way, what might be your agency's oversight response?

Sincerely,
Carroll

First



Second



Third



Fourth

