



Final Transcript

STATE OF CA – DEPT OF GENERAL SERVICES: The Detectable Warnings Task Force

April 3, 2019/1:30 p.m. PDT

SPEAKERS

Susan Moe
Kristin Vandersluis
Jonathan Adler
Chris Downey
Kaylan Dunlap
Michael Gibens
Rosa Gomez
Marsha Mazz
Tim McCormick
Vidal Medina
Steven Twist
Gene Lozano
Derek Shaw
Jessica Axtman
Ida Clair
Debbie Wong
Rachelle Golden
Steve Dolam

PRESENTATION

Moderator Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for standing by, and welcome to the Detectable Warnings Task Force. At this time, everyone joining by phone has an open line or fully interactive line. [Operator instructions].

I'll now turn the meeting over to our host, Susan Moe. Please go ahead.

Susan Good afternoon, everybody. This is Susan Moe here at DSA headquarters and we're ready to get started with our four out of five task force

meetings. I can't believe we're at four already. So, what we're going to do today is first, we're going to tally up the top three in each category from the homework that you gave [audio disruption] for the topics for discussion. Then, once we've tallied that up, then we'll go ask everybody to share their thoughts on these different items that we put in your homework after our last meeting.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Kristin and we can go ahead and get started.

Kristin	Thank you, Susan. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Kristin Vandersluis, the facilitator and we're really happy to have our task force group together again today. On behalf of the Division of the State Architect, thank you, each and every one of you for your participation. We have a small group here in person [audio disruption] understand we have quite a few of you joining us on the phone. We will begin here doing our role call in the room. We did just hear from Susan Moe and this is Kristin Vandersluis. Let's go ahead and do our introductions, moving next to Gene.
Gene	Gene Lozano.
Jessica	Jessica Axtman.
Debbie	Good afternoon. Debbie Wong.
Derek	Derek Shaw.
Ida	Ida Clair.
Kristin	Now we'll move to our remote participants so please take turns taking yourself off of mute and let us know you're here.
Rachelle	Rachelle Golden.
Kristin	Hi, Rachelle.
Rachelle	Hi.
Vidal	This is Vidal Medina from Fresno, Resources for Independence.
Kristin	Hi, Vidal. Welcome.

Chris	Chris Downey is on the phone.
Kristin	Hi, Chris.
Chris	Hi.
Steve	Steve Dolam.
Kristin	Hi, Steve.
Steve	Hi.
Marsha	Marsha Mazz.
Kristin	Welcome, Marsha.
Jonathan	Jonathan Adler.
Kristin	Hi, Jonathan.
Jonathan	Hi.
Rosa	Rosa Gomez.
Kristin	Hi, Rosa.
Rosa	Hi.
Kristin	We also understand we have Rachelle Golden joining us and she is suffering from laryngitis so—
Sue	No, that was Kaylan.
Kristin	Oh, I'm so sorry. Thank you. We saw a note pop up, so that's Kaylan Dunlap that has laryngitis, so some of her comments today may be coming in through the chat function. Rachelle, I did see you're also with us.
Rachelle	Yes, I'm here.
Kristin	Thank you.

Tim Tim McCormick.

Kristin Hi, Tim.

Tim Hi, everybody.

Kristin Alright, is there anybody else on the phone lines? As a reminder as we move forward today, technology wise, our remote participants have multiple ways that they may participate. You do have the chat function via our blackboard collaborative that you can use and we will be monitoring those comments that come in. You do also have the symbolic hand raising function. You can raise your hand if you want to get in line, so to speak, to share input.

And as a reminder, for some of our group agreements, encourage everyone to stay on topic as much as possible, turn taking and, as much as you can, please be succinct with your comments and when you hear someone else sharing something that you would also like to say, as a reminder, please don't repeat their comments, but to simply say, I agree with so-and-so's comments. To help all of us know who's speaking, remember to say your name before each comment and project your voice as much as possible. So, thank you for that.

Before we dive in, we wanted to also remind folks that we are not voting on these topics today. I know that we will be taking a tally of everyone's input, but know that isn't an official vote that would go anywhere, more it's so it's going to help guide our discussions. Our hope, as before, was that we don't look at existing code language but instead, really our hope is to hear from each and every one of you on your personal experiences so that we can learn from you. So thank you for that.

We'll next do a quick check in on accessibility, so summary notes and materials were sent out a few weeks back and we're hoping that that format works for everybody. Is there anyone that would like to make requests in terms of file formats or anything that may or may not be working for you, you would like us to help with?

Yes, Gene?

Gene I did get the announcement, reminder about the meeting and the agenda, thank you, as an email, but I was hoping to get an email Word version document sent by email attachment. I had difficulty getting into the box

and I haven't been able to see anything recently because my hard drive on my computer crashed so I haven't seen anything in the last five days.

Kristin

Thank you.

Susan

And, Gene, thank you for that and when we did our, after our last session, that email that I sent out with the agenda, that also had that Word document for everybody to take a look at with the three different categories. Beyond that, other than sending out today's reminder, we haven't sent out any other documents or posted anything else, as yet, to the box.

Gene

I apologize about that and I also apparently missed that second attachment so I apologize for that too, the one addition to the agenda.

Susan

Yes, no problem.

Kristin

So we will make sure to go over that file today which was part of what we were going to do anyway, so that works well. Thank you, Gene. Anybody else?

Vidal

Do we have a password for the box?

Susan

No. You should just be able to, with the link that we sent you, you should just be able to go into box and open up that folder.

Ida

So, to get into box, Vidal, you will need to create an account which is your username and your own password that—you don't? No. Okay, so then you have to use the direct link. If you go just to box, it will request a username and password.

Vidal

Okay, so direct link would be from an email that Jessica sent right?

Susan

Yes, and what I can do, Vidal is I'll send you another email with that link. You don't have to go back and look at a prior email.

Vidal

Okay terrific. That would work. Thank you.

Marsha

Would you mind sending that to everybody?

Susan

No, I can do that. Yes.

Marsha Great. Thank you.

Susan You're welcome.

Kristin And is that link needed for today's discussion purposes?

Susan No.

Kristin It's our impression it's not but do we have everyone's permission to send that out afterwards for future viewing?

M Yes.

Marsha That's fine with me.

Kristin Great. Other requests? Alright. So—

Steve Sorry, I just got in front of my computer. So this link in the reminder is what everybody's trying to get on now and we need a password to get in?

Susan No, the reminder link, if you just click on that, Steve, that should just take you right into blackboard and you shouldn't have to put a password or username or anything into it. You should just be able to click on that and join in the session.

Steve Thank you.

Susan You're welcome.

Kristin Alright. Susan, would you like to queue up our discussion?

Susan Sure. So, after our last session, we started to think about the pertinent information and really what we're looking for in all these discussions, I mean, we've gotten some really good information from everyone, but what we've put together are topics for discussion for our session today. Our first topic for discussion, and like I said, what we would like to do, I'll read through these and then we'd like to tally up from everyone what their top three elements were and then we'll go from there and discuss it even further. So, what we looked at for participants with vision impairments, we asked that you choose three of the following locations that you feel detectable warnings provide—

Kristin We're just going to pull up the file right now.

Susan Oh, sorry. I was busy [overlapping voices]. Yes, let me pull that up. Here we go. Right there. Alright. Okay, so taking a look at that and starting from the top, we started, like I said, with the participants with vision impairments and we asked that you choose three of the following locations that you feel detectable warnings provide the most benefit. So we have a total of nine items here. First one is street crossing, second is alleyway, then we have driveway, rail track crossing, mass transit platform edge, bus stop, reflecting pool, island or cut-through median and a route through parking lot from a public way to entrance, so that would be like the entrance of a building.

Then the second grouping that we have is for the participants who use mobility devices. What we're looking at there, what we ask for is three of the following locations that you feel detectable warnings provide the most difficulty. So, first one is continuous detectable warnings parallel to and within the accessible route, outside the maneuvering clearance at door landings, within the maneuvering clearance at door landings, at parallel curb ramp landings, island or cut-through median and locations where you perceive they are not required.

Then the last group we have are the participants who are code users and we ask that you choose three of the following locations that you feel the detectable warning provisions of Chapter 11B are the most ambiguous to interpret and apply. For that, we have curb ramps, island or cut-through medians, route through parking lot from public way to entrance, a parallel curb ramp with long landing adjacent to parking spaces, alleyway, driveway, and reflecting pool.

So, I guess, Kristin, from that do we want to start tallying up?

Kristin Yes, thank you. So, let's begin with the first segment, which is participants with vision impairments and what I would like to do is to, again, with the prompts, which is to choose three of the following locations that you feel detectable warnings provide the most benefit. I am going to read the nine options and ask—this will be fun, let's see if we can do this—ask each of you with vision impairments to just say yes or aye when you hear one that you would like to, I don't want to say vote on, but choose.

So, let's try this and see how it goes. The first one—yes, Gene.

Gene Clarification. To be honest with you, I'm a little uneasy about identifying three [audio disruption].

Rosa I'm having a hard time hearing.

Kristin Okay, we're moving the microphone and we'll have Gene speak up.

Gene Okay. I just want clarification. If we rank these nine items, since there's not a number ten which would be that they all are equally as important. I just want to be certain that this is just for focus of discussion and not the fact that we're trying to target some detectable warnings that maybe are not as important which may be something that would be looked as deletion. I'm sorry to be—this is something that's really, to me personally, and as an advocate for a major organization for the blind, all these are equally as important for different reasons, but they are important. That's the only reason I'm asking for clarification. I don't want to appear that I'm committing to something myself or as an organization that say that these are the ones that are important and that's all we need.

Ida Thank you, Gene. That wasn't our intention at all. It was just to try to target the discussion and focus the discussion on ensuring that in the myriad of uses of which detectable warnings are provided in the code, we wanted to be able to ensure, now that we're at Section 4 that we're actually touching upon the ones that merit the most discussion, perhaps, because they have the most difficulty, like we're asking another question.

 In other words, we're trying to focus the discussion among our group so that we can make sure that for the most salient concerns that we have, we can address because we've discussed the detectable warnings in various different locations but we haven't touched on others and we just want to make sure. Some, where they're required by federal law, we can't get rid of them and it's not that it's our intent to get rid of them in any location, but is focusing the conversation to where we can at least ensure that where they are the most concern, whether they're not addressed adequately in the code or very important for you to get right, maybe that's a benefits discussion sort of. It's like, out of all of this, if we have the ability to influence the language just to make sure that we hear the concerns thoroughly for those most salient ones because there's so many right now that we're addressing. Does that make sense?

Gene It did and just I assumed that it was to direct focus on the discussion so that's acceptable to me what you said and I have no problem with it. I just wanted clarification to what—I think there was one of them about, I'm not voting on it, but a pedestrian street crossing. Does that mean curb ramps and blended transition at corners? Is that what that means?

Ida Yes, that would be a curb ramp at a street crossing.

Gene Okay, thank you.

Ida Or anywhere you're crossing a public street. And so maybe our question, especially to those for vision impairments wasn't asked adequately. It's really that we wanted to make sure that we, for those where you feel that there are probably more prolific, provide the most benefit, but yes, people don't get right, is there one that we really need to more thoroughly discuss.

Gene Alright, thanks.

Susan You could have a street crossing with no curb ramp.

Gene Yes, you're absolutely right.

Ida True, exactly. Thank you.

Kristin Rosa. Please share your input.

Rosa So my understanding or how I, as I'm voting on these and how I would interpret it is, beneficial in terms of I clearly understand what it's indicating, which I think is different than, it's there. I think having as [audio disruption] said, having the warning detections available is helpful, some are more beneficial in terms of I have a clear understanding of what these are, so when I vote for my three, that's how I will be interpreting it, that I clearly understand what these warning detections are there for.

Kristin Thank you. That was helpful.

Marsha I have a question.

Kristin Yes, go ahead, Marsha.

Marsha I don't know which group you have put me in. I'm a professional code developer and I'm visually impaired so where would you like me to speak up?

Kristin Both. Yes, you can do both.

Ida Anyone who wears multiple hats can do both.

Marsha Thank you.

Steve I can't seem to get past to see anything on the blackboard. It's asking me to allow permissions. I have no microphone, I have no camera.

Marsha There's a small x in the upper right hand corner. If you can find that small x and click on it, you'll get there. I have to relearn this each and every time.

Steve Thank you.

Kristin So, let's give this a shot, and be reassured that when we do our summary notes, that would be made public in the future, that in no way will we share people's names or in terms of what your comments were. We won't say Gene raised his hand for this one, so please know that this discussion for the intents of what will be shared publicly, we'll not be identifying each person or their comments.

Ida [Audio disruption] not identify yourself as doing so so that way the transcriber does not think it's anonymous, because our transcripts are put out there.

Kristin Thank you. Alright so, participants with vision impairments, I'm going to read the nine options and again, please say yes, or aye, make any sort of a noise so that we know that when I've read one of the nine that you think you would like to have discussion around as one of the scenarios where you feel detectable warnings provide the most benefit. So the first one is street crossings, which we've heard was crossing at any public street.

M Aye.

M Aye.

W Aye.

Kristin I have three tallies next to street crossing. Next option is alleyway. Our third option is driveway. Fourth option is rail track crossings.

M Aye.

M Aye.

Kristin Next we have mass transit platform edge.

M Aye.

M Aye.

W Aye.

Kristin Bus stops. Moving on to reflecting pools. And our final two options, number eight would be island or cut-through median.

W Aye.

M Aye.

Kristin Next and final option is route through parking lot from public way to entrance.

M Aye.

M Aye.

Kristin Thank you, everybody. So, for intents and purposes of taking a tally to direct our conversations, the top two topics both with three ayes would be street crossings and mass transit platform edge. We do have three additional topics that each had two ayes which would include the rail track crossing, island or cut-through median and route through parking lot from public way to entrance. So, what we would like to do now is to begin our discussion of those topic areas—

Ida Well, actually, I think we want to finish [overlapping voices].

Kristin I apologize.

Susan Can we go through all three because some of this will have overlap.

Kristin Apologies for that, next we'll move on to our second topical area and ask again, for those who this applies to to weigh in. We'll then do the third topic area as well and then begin discussion after we've completed all three. This next topic is for participants who use mobility devices. The request is that you choose three of the following locations that you feel detectable warnings provide the most difficulty. We have six options that Susan read earlier. Would anybody like those re-read before we go ahead and—

Chris Yes please.

Kristin Okay. So as an overview to your six options, they will be one, continuous detectable warnings parallel to and within the accessible route. The next one is outside the maneuvering clearance at door landings. The third option is within the maneuvering clearance at door landings. Fourth option is at parallel curb ramp landings. The fifth option is island or cut-through medians. And the sixth option is locations where you perceive they are not required. So, again, we are asking participants who use mobility devices to choose three of the following locations that you feel detectable warnings provide the most difficulty. I will now read those six options one by one and ask for each of you to weigh in on the three you would hope we can have a discussion around.

Number one, continuous detectable warnings parallel to and within the accessible route.

W Aye.

M Aye.

Kristin I heard two.

Susan And then we have one more from Kaylan.

Kristin Thank you. So, Kaylan, we have your vote. So we have taken into account everybody's input that has multiple options to provide that. The second option would be outside the maneuvering clearance at door landings. The third option was within the maneuvering clearance at door landings.

- W Aye.
- Kristin The fourth option is at parallel curb ramp landings.
- W Aye.
- W Aye.
- Kristin Followed by the fifth option, island or cut-through medians. And the sixth option, locations where you perceive they are not required.
- W Aye.
- M Aye.
- M Aye.
- Kristin Fantastic. So, what this looks like for our tally, the top two options were number one, continuous detectable warnings parallel to and within the accessible route, that had three ayes. Number six, locations where you perceive they are not required, and the third option would be at parallel curb ramp landings with two. And just for information purposes, the fourth one was within the maneuvering clearance at door landings with one vote.
- Ida [Indiscernible] probably with the previous groups as well, is there something that you feel [audio disruption] any of this issues. In other words, we don't want to just make it a closed list if you feel there's something we overlooked. So I will address it to both the previous groups and the group that we just asked. Does anyone want to volunteer an additional, that maybe they can say yes, that's a really good topic.
- Susan We had one comment on the mobility devices.
- Ida Yes, I think Kaylan just spoke up and I agree with what she just added.
- Kristin Thank you. We are making a note of that: mobility devices on sloped surfaces.
- Susan To clarify, does that mean on ramps in general or all curb ramps or—

- Ida I think it's on any sloped surface from my perspective, but yes, Kaylan said ramps and curb ramps and I agree with that as well.
- Kristin Thank you and as Ida had invited, would anybody else like to provide suggestions for either of our first two topic areas that they would like to have be discussed? Something you feel might have been missing on our list. Okay. So we are now going to move on to our third topic area which was for participants who are code users. We are asking that you choose three of the following locations that you feel the detectable warning provisions of Chapter 11B are the most ambiguous to interpret and apply.
- I'm going to go ahead and read all seven and then I'm going to ask, actually at that point, if somebody wants to add anything to the list and then we can go ahead and do our input. So, the first option, as a reminder, is curb ramps. The second option is island or cut-through medians. The third option is route through parking lot from public way to entrance. Fourth option is parallel curb ramps with long landing adjacent to parking spaces. Number five is alleyway. Number six, driveway. Number seven, reflecting pool. Would anyone like to suggest a scenario that we should add to this?
- Jonathan Yes, this is Jonathan, I would.
- Kristin Thank you. Please, what would you suggest we add?
- Jonathan Well, the first item you're calling curb ramps encompasses both perpendicular and parallel and for myself, I don't find any ambiguity in the regs concerning perpendicular, but the profoundly ambiguous requirements concerning placement of detectable warnings at parallel curb ramps, so maybe you could call it 1a and 1b, 1a being perpendicular, 1b being parallel.
- Kristin Absolutely. Thank you. I will adjust accordingly.
- Ida Or maybe the option [overlapping voices] amendment is the first one being perpendicular curb ramps and then the fourth one being parallel curb ramps in general of any type maybe, because then we can have that discussion. That's just a suggestion.
- Jonathan Alright, well. One more thing to add to that, if you don't mind. Number four isolates a very specific thing and it's very interesting to address by itself, whereas parallel curb ramps in general, I think that the route of the

ambiguity is a wholly different issue and that's the placement of the detectable warning. So, I'm suggesting that you not group all parallel. It's good to have number four stand alone and then create a whole other one for the other issue.

Kristin Thank you. I—

Marsha I think number four is too refined. I would agree with Jonathan. You want to do perpendicular curb ramp versus parallel curb ramp. If you want to refine it later on the parallel curb ramp side, that's fine. Also, there's nothing here on hazardous vehicular ways, which is the biggest problem I have, I think.

Kristin So we can add that. Yes. Do we have any other additions?

Susan Steve Dolam had—

Steve Yes. I found number four to be confusing and I'm hoping I'm not repeating, I couldn't quite hear Marsha, but I would like the flat walking surface in the same plane as the accessible parking stall when it's at the head of the accessible parking stall.

Susan That's what we're describing here.

Steve Okay. Thank you.

Kristin We don't see anybody else in line so to speak to—

Ida Can I add a little more clarity? I know that hazardous one, I think that we were trying to capture where hazardous vehicular ways might occur in our questions instead of just one grouping, because we discussed that a lot in our discussions in the first three sessions and so I think when we're looking at driveway, alleyway, parallel curb ramp with long landing, route through parking lot from public way, all of them actually address a hazardous vehicular—at least a hazardous location. So, I'm apprehensive of saying in bulk, hazardous vehicular way because then we have to take it in all considerations of where it exists, so I think we tried to break it down here in that requirement. I guess I'm trying to look for a better way to address it so you guys can address your concerns.

Marsha Susan, the problem, Susan, is with definition and you've pulled out some examples, but they're your examples according to what you deem to be

hazardous vehicular way. I don't deem some of the things you deem to be hazardous, hazardous.

Ida I don't either, Marsha, I'm saying that there is a question as to whether or not it is applied in these conditions, the hazardous. I'm not saying they are hazardous. I do agree that's subjective, so that's where I want to have the discussion. So, if we can refine—maybe we ask that question with the top three if that's a component to determine how do you address hazardous then, when you're saying this is important at this location. I don't know. Is that a better way to address it? I'm looking for input because I know that that's the biggest question, but—

Kristin It seems to me that we're really focusing on where is there ambiguity for interpreting and applying detectable warnings, so it sounds like we're asking people to look at their own personal experiences and this is just a draft attempt to think of some scenarios and it does sound like there is a desire not to clump all hazardous vehicular ways together so I'm going to scratch that at this moment.

However, we would like to hear if you have other topics you would like, any others, and also, again, this is not a vote that's going anywhere in terms of being tallied or influencing decisions in the future. This is just a guide for our discussion today and so what I will do as your facilitator is after each of our three larger topics that we're going to focus on, I'll make sure that we ask if there's any other input because that's the whole intent of our task force is to hear from each and every one of you on your personal experiences and so if something has been left off, that doesn't mean it can't be mentioned and shared in that way.

Marsha Can we at least clarify whether we're talking about crossing an alleyway or driveway versus finding your route through the length of an alleyway or driveway, which are entirely different.

Susan That's true. I would say it's crossing and alleyway or driveway.

Ida And maybe that's a perfect example, Marsha, maybe that's what we can discuss. So rather than just say hazardous vehicular way, let's define other places where you've seen them used in that manner that we can address the condition as to ranking whether if it's the most—

Marsha Because those alley pictures that we looked at last time, that wasn't crossing the alley, it was along the length of the alley.

Ida So then maybe number eight could be a route parallel to vehicular way, right? Separating accessible route from vehicular way.

Marsha That would be good. Yes, and not say where.

Ida Right.

Susan Which is sort of what we have under item number three. But I think Steve has had his hand up for a little bit.

Kristin Steve, we would like to hear from you.

Steve One eighth item potentially is interior applications like in an auto service area where you have a pedestrian door adjacent to the vehicular drive in/drive out/pick up area. It just drives everybody nuts with those areas.

Ida Is that similar where we put it in item two, outside maneuvering clearance at door landing—

Steve Yes, similar to that.

Ida Okay.

Kristin Am I hearing that we are going to separate that out as another option or would we like to have a catch all option that says other areas of concern?

Ida No, because then we can't target the discussion. That would be too big. My recommendation would be to add it as another option.

Kristin And, Steve, or Ida, can you repeat what—I don't know what we would call that ninth option.

Ida Doors that open to a vehicular way without a defined separation. Does that sound—I'm looking for reinforcement.

derek [Overlapping voices] surface, and auto surface area?

Susan And I thought he said that the detectable warnings were at the interior location. Is that correct, Steve?

Ida Why don't you describe a scenario that you're talking about.

Ida And Steve, you want to—

Chris I think Steve's muted. Can you unmute, Steve?

Marsha I'm sorry. You were breaking up.

Kristin Steve, if you are there, we would like to hear your clarification on the scenario you were describing.

Susan He must have dropped off.

Kristin My guess is Steve had to step away for a moment. Would it work—

Moderator This is the operator. Steve has reconnected to the call.

Kristin Thank you.

Steve Sorry. I lost my mute button and hung up.

Kristin We know it's challenging. Steve, we are adding a ninth option and we are hoping you can describe that scenario a little more to make sure that we give it the correct topic title. Right now we have doors that open to a vehicular way but we're not sure if that fully describes what you were intending.

Steve Doors that open to a flush vehicular way. Doors that open on a flush surface with a vehicular way. It's really not a vehicular way, it's really autos move through at a very low speed because they're interior to a building. I don't know what else to call it.

Chris If I could. Steve had called me to discuss this item before. Am I correct in my memory of this, Steve? About what to do with that and I said say it's an auto dealership and they have a service department and you're let's see, I think, stepping from the interior area into that service bay where you might pick up your car or speak to the mechanic or whatever, so it's that transition point. It's a very specific location. So it's an interior location into a car service area.

Steve Perfect.

Ida Or you can address that too, if I may, Chris, is it similar to also a hotel at a porte-cochere where there's a driveway—

Chris I can't spell it so I didn't know how to use that word.

Ida Would that be similar?

Chris It's similar but no.

Ida Okay.

Kristin And Gene has input.

Gene Question. When you're talking about the service bay, is that where you have the lift and the pit?

Steve No. I was trying to describe where you meet with the service writer to discuss what needs to be attended to on your vehicle. They prepare your estimate and all that.

Chris You drive up there, you get out of the car, you step in to the building, you might go back out, talk to them, but it's almost like the valet service at a hotel where you drive up, you hand off the keys, they take it from there but there's some back and forth, some communication.

Steve Perfect example, yes.

Kristin Yes, Gene.

Gene To me, I would interpret that as a hazardous vehicular way. I don't like the word hazardous, but it's a vehicular way, separation from the pedestrian from a mode of transportation.

Kristin I suggest that for now, we make number nine say doors that open to a flush surface with vehicular way and unless anyone else has some quick edits, I think we all know what we mean. Is that correct?

Chris Sounds good.

Kristin Okay. Thank you. So we apologize we were unable to edit the list that you are looking at on blackboard collaborative, so I'm going to read our options, the prompt and the options again. There will be a total of ten

options. Choose three of the following locations that you feel the detectable warning provisions of Chapter 11B are the most ambiguous to interpret and apply. So we have 1a, which is perpendicular curb ramps. And then 1b, parallel curb ramps.

M

Aye.

Kristin

Oh, you know what, I'm so sorry, we're not doing the voting quite yet. We can but I was thinking with all of our changes would it be helpful for the group to hear what the new list is first?

Tim

Yes, let's hear them again.

Kristin

Okay, so this is just for the purpose of letting you know what our new list will be. Option 1a is perpendicular curb ramps; option 1b, parallel curb ramps; option two is island or island or cut-through median; option three is route through parking lot from public way to entrance; number four parallel curb ramps with long landings adjacent to parking spaces; number five, alleyway; number six, driveway; number seven, reflecting pool; number eight, separating routes from vehicular way; number nine, doors that open to a flush surface with a vehicular way.

So now I'm going to read that list again asking everyone to say aye or yes, whatever you'd like to say, when you hear your three options that you think are the most ambiguous to interpret and apply. So, 1a is perpendicular curb ramps. I see one—we are pausing for a question from Gene.

Gene

This is the code users?

Kristin

Thank you. That's a wonderful clarification. So as a reminder, I'm speaking solely to participants who are code users. That is who we're asking to have speak now.

Gene

And I just wondered how loose on that—I mean, I'm not an architect or a building official but I do use it in advocacy, use it for interpretation and I assume I'm not included in that.

Ida

If you feel you meet the definition, Gene, you're welcome to provide your vote. So, if you're a code user and you provide in any capacity, you're welcome to provide your vote. In other words, you use the language of the code to explain or plan review or design or—I would say that that's—

Gene Okay. Thank you.

Kristin So for everyone who considers themselves a code user, we are now going to hear from you on your three choices on this list of ten for locations that you feel the detectable warning provisions of Chapter 11B are the most ambiguous to interpret and apply. Option 1a, perpendicular curb ramps. Option 1b, parallel curb ramps.

M Aye.

M Aye.

Kristin I heard two ayes. Option two, island or cut-through median. Option three, route through parking lot from public way to entrance.

M Aye.

W Aye.

M Aye.

Kristin I heard three ayes. Option four, parallel curb ramps with long landing adjacent to parking spaces. Option five, alleyways.

M Aye.

Kristin Thank you. Option six, driveways.

M Aye.

Kristin Okay. Option seven, reflecting pools. Option eight, separating routes from vehicular way.

M Aye.

W Aye.

M Aye.

M Aye.

M Aye.

Kristin I heard five. That will definitely be discussed. And option number nine, doors that open to a flush surface with vehicular way.

W Aye.

M Aye.

Kristin I heard two—yes.

Tim This is Tim and I only voted twice. I'd like to make the third vote on the long parallel curb ramps landing question.

Kristin Yes, thank you. Number four. Thank you so much for that. Yes, Steve?

Steve I'll add a vote there because I only gave two previously.

Kristin For our summary, the topics that we will absolutely be discussing would be separating routes from vehicular way, followed next by option number three, which is route through parking lot from public way to entrance, and then we'll get to figure out how we choose, there are three options that all tied for third place with two ayes each. Those include parallel curb ramps, parallel curb ramps with long landings adjacent to parking spaces and doors that open to a flush surface with a vehicular way.

Well you've all been very patient with us as we went through this exercise. Thank you so much. So, we would like to now go back to our first topic and begin discussions. So our first topic, the question that we asked for participants with vision impairments and I'd like to clarify from Ida and Susan, we're only looking for input from—or from everybody?

Ida I think what I'd like to do is see if there's some kind of—our intent was is there some alignment between all three that we can discuss first. And this may be difficult to put together but let's look at the top vote getters from all three and see if there is a synchronicity on one so that we can elaborate that discussion.

Kristin Absolutely. So for this topic area, we had street crossings and mass transit platform edge, both had three votes, followed then by three options that all had two votes, which were number four, rail track crossings, number

eight, island or cut-through medians and number nine, route through parking lot from public way to entrance.

Susan It seems like that is the one if we look at all three of the topics that route through the parking lot from public way to entrance—we also got on item one, I think we had three votes and that seems like that's pretty similar and then we had, I can't remember how many votes we had, and actually that's the item number three, the route from a parking lot from the public way to the entrance and the separation of route from vehicular way. So, it seems like that might be the one—what do you think?

Ida Lets talking about that now and getting into some discussion with that as a focus, that maybe this is the question we can pose and if we can determine otherwise is that, I see this as ways to handle it, how would you handle this ideally in a newly constructed facility and how you would deal with this applying conditions in an existing facility and maybe having that discussion. What issues you would encounter, are there some that you would say yes for a new facility, let's assess, try to come up with an ideal design and then maybe for testing that theory on an existing facility and determining where, perhaps, you know, that there may be some exception because obviously improper use also creates its own issues.

Susan And Chris Downey has his hand up. Chris?

Chris I did have it up then I put it down, but I'll throw it out there. I was just questioning, we're trying to find the comment, concerns across the three different user groups or classifications and it seemed like the questions don't necessarily line up if you consider the first one being which ones are most—I think the question was most helpful, or most clear and then the others, there was like where do you get the most ambiguity or confusion, so it seemed like they weren't, you couldn't really combine across all three different classifications to get to a shared answer.

Ida And you are correct. I think it was really us trying to address each group's primary, perhaps, concerns and ways so that knowing that as the three top up there when we're discussing some of the other ones, keeping that in mind that it provides the most benefit to them, is I think the way I was trying to generate [overlapping voices] discussion.

Chris Okay.

- Ida And so Sue has made a point that it seems that if they were on a newly designed site, by an architect and we are trying to get from the public way to the entrance of the building, what would your ideal—what is the design that provides the most clarity for you if you're a user? What kind of separation do you need? What separation do you feel is ideal, say, from when you're walking on it, where do you feel the most safe if you are a visually impaired person, where do you feel as an individual who uses a mobility device, provide also that perspective so that then we can see if there's some way to address those concerns in language that provides clarity and maybe sets up an ideal situation and then we can test that theory to a non-ideal situation which may be an existing facility of which we need to apply the code. Does that make sense?
- Kristin It does and I'm going to ask everyone as a reminder to say your name first so everyone knows who's speaking.
- Susan I guess, going back to, I keep thinking about what Marsha said about this idea of what's, with our title of a hazardous vehicular way, so I guess looking at that and bearing in mind sort of I guess we go through this discussion, what do you see as a hazard in going from that public way to the front entrance and just exactly what are they. I mean, I can see the way traffic moves through parking lots any more, I mean, even in parking lots, people drive really fast, so sometimes the speed is a factor because one of the things we looked at before, speed limits in parking lots and on private property, there isn't a speed limit on a parking lot, but I think it was the vehicle code, whatever that kind of looked at 15 miles an hour, but that sort of speed limit isn't enforced in a parking lot. So how does all that factor in to that way from the public way to the entrance?
- Rosa I'd like to get in the queue.
- Kristin Yes, thank you, Rosa. So let's take a couple comments and then I'd like us to get clarification on our process and jump in with input because we really want to hear from all you.
- Ida And I'd like to say that if anyone has a better way to generate this discussion so that we can focus the conversation and address these concerns, we're open to it. We have [indiscernible] is what we're addressing and sometimes we have shown by our previous discussions that that [indiscernible] are not equivalent in all situations or not used well in all situations, so it's either looking at the [indiscernible] or it's really trying to address as much as we can individual situations and how to adapt

it. So maybe that's what we come up with is that providing it in general and saying except they should not provide x and x. Do you see what I'm saying? It's like we're looking for that kind of discussion, I guess I should say.

Rosa That's why I want to get in the queue around this discussion trying to get clarity.

Kristin Thank you, Rosa. So, Rosa, did you want to ask a particular question or just share that you wanted us to provide more clarity?

Rosa Well, I think I want to ask a question, kind of make a comment. So at the beginning what is the most beneficial and, to me, it's kind of like what we're indicating is that we understand these warning detectors work for us and it's beneficial so I'm not sure why we're necessarily focusing on what is working when it seems like the purpose is that we need to understand for the codes, like are you guys understanding the codes, or for the end user do you understand the purpose of this. It seems like maybe the focus should have been on what is ambiguous or where do we need to provide clarity in order for the detectors to be more beneficial. I think for the second set, it sounds like where is it problematic but I'm not sure why for the visually impaired, you're focusing on what's working when we're trying to get clarity.

Ida Very good question. We are trying to focus the discussion—I think it was my intention, whether or not it was the group's intention at providing this, is so that we keep in mind specifically where we know they work and provide that as a test but then maybe we're still missing some other aspect of—because we do know sometimes where they are problematic, maybe we can address that question to everyone again and test these out to most problematic specifically for that group and align that condition as well. So, maybe that's a good idea and if you find that that's beneficial, I encourage the group to say, yes, let's take that vote.

Kristin Thank you, Ida. Would Rosa's suggestion to reframe our first topic for participants with vision impairments work for everybody, where we take a revote on that topic looking at the nine options and instead of answering by what you find to be most beneficial, you would then vote by what you find to be most problematic. Can everyone please say yes, if you would like to do that?

Ida So what's the best way to write the question? Problematic means problematic how? [Audio disruption] to create the reason of problematic how, meaning we don't need them, meaning they're not used appropriately, meaning—define problematic, I think is what I—because Rosa brought it up, maybe she can better define it for the group so that they can provide [audio disruption].

Kristin Rosa?

Rosa So there's two parts. I mean, I think there's two parts of when I think of problematic, like it doesn't provide—we're unclear of what the intended communication is or it doesn't necessarily need to be placed there because there's a clear understanding of what is already going on, so maybe somebody else wants to help with that.

Steve I'd echo that two stage decision, do we need it, and then is it problematic.

Rosa Like is it communicating clearly to the end user what its function is, what it's trying to tell us that's there?

Kristin Thank you. And we have had Chris Downey's hand up for a while and would like to hear from Gene after that. Chris, go ahead.

Chris My comment is I'll save it for later, we ended up in a different direction in the conversation, so I'll put my hand down and raise it when we clear that.

Kristin Thank you, Chris. Gene?

Vidal It's Vidal.

Kristin Vidal, can we hear from Gene first and then—

Vidal Absolutely, absolutely. I was just getting in the queue.

Kristin Great. Thank you.

Gene I guess I'm still having an issue and I respectfully—I say this with respect to Rosa, but I don't understand—I need help. I still don't understand what might be the confusion when the detectable warning is to alert someone that you're leaving the pedestrian area and you're entering a non-pedestrian area and it has just one meaning and no other meanings, not directional, nothing. Then, I guess, where I'm having a problem is what

more understanding is it supposed to have? It's supposed to be a standardized surface and that's what it is.

Rosa

Thanks, so I think in some situations where there are detectable warnings, it's clear that yes, we're entering a danger zone but sometimes it's like, okay, what is this communicating? Is it communicating that this is because we're at a light rail, a train area or that—I guess what type of situation that we're in. Again, I understand if the purpose of these detectable warnings is just to say warning, then it's doing its job, but in terms of what kind of warning is sometimes unclear.

Like, for example, an alley, an unfamiliar area, if it's an alley, and sometimes alleys can feel like it's a crosswalk, like the end of the sidewalk coming up to the street. I don't necessarily know that oh, this is just an alley and you're telling me it's an alley so approach it as an alley versus approaching it as coming up on an intersection kind of thing. So sometimes the information is just not clear as to why it's being placed there. I would like, as an end user, to have a little bit more clarity versus just saying warning. Again, if that's just the purpose, then it's just doing its job, but it would be nice, as a blind user, that we have a little bit more information.

Kristin

Thank you for that. So Gene, I'm sorry if we don't have clarification quite yet. Let's hear from Vidal and then Marsha and then go from there. And it looks like Steve Twist has joined us. Welcome, Steve.

Steve T.

Thank you. I'm having a little trouble getting on the video part of it though, but we can wait. I can just listen this time for now.

Kristin

Thank you. So, Vidal?

Vidal

So, I want to share a little bit about my blindness. It happened in '94 and I have peripheral blindness and I only see very little out of my left eye, central vision. So I have been walking and I went to the school for the blind, was taught how to get around with sleep-shades on so I can really know what it would feel like and there wasn't any truncated domes back when that happened and there wasn't any truncated domes until recently. When they came about here in the city of Fresno, I thought they were a nuisance, to tell you the truth, because I was taught to pick up warnings by other ways rather than man-made warning devices, like the truncated domes.

So, one of the problems I have, I do an exercise with my adult children, I used sleep-shades because my prognosis isn't very good, so I'd go through the neighborhood that I usually walk with my cane and I am walking with sleep-shades and I come to those domes and one of the messages that it sends me is even though I've crossed that intersection many times, is it directional or is just warning me that there's traffic I'm going into. Now, my brain's doing this as I'm trying to figure out where I'm going. There's other stuff going on, because I completely can't see at that point.

So it's a good exercise, because what it does, for me, it clarified that I don't know who came up with these warnings devices because if I'm at a corner, I know where the traffic's coming from. There's no doubt about it, so in a way, it's confusing me and I'm just sharing this to kind of get some clarity in a real life experience what people can translate those detectable warnings as, and for me, they can be confusing.

Kristin

Thank you so much. Marsha, share your thoughts?

Marsha

Thank you. I appreciate both Rosa and Vidal's points of view. Detectable warnings under the federal law are simply warnings, they are not directional. There are directional tiles that are used in other parts of the world, but in the United States, they are not used as directional tiles. The only way you can infer direction is that the width or length, depending on how you view it, of the detectable warning is 24 inches in the federal law, so you have 24 inches of detectable warning and when you discover that, the width versus the length, then you know what it's trying to demarcate.

I don't think detectable warnings, as we know them, these truncated domes, can really be used to give you any greater directionality. There are other tools for that and they're used internationally. They're not used in the United States, but they could be. I really have a problem with the way detectable warnings are used in some parts of the country because it's impossible for a lot of people to figure out, or to infer the direction of the warnings. In other words, should I cross it? Should I trail it? Should I trail along the length of it? What should I do?

And if you're going to use these to run parallel to your direction that you're walking, then they need to be different than what they are now so that the user can know, okay, I go parallel to this rather than cross it, or if I cross it, I'm crossing at a drive. But right now, the way they're configured and the way they're designed, you really can't obtain that information with just one pattern. I think that the group has to decide first and foremost,

what do we want to warn of and what are the most significant issues that we want to warn people of. Then we should decide whether the tool we have, the pattern that we have is appropriate for that. Thirdly, I think we have to decide whether we want to use detectable warnings for wayfinding, because again, if we do, they're not the right tool.

Rosa Thank you, Marsha. I really appreciate what you said.

Marsha No problem, Rosa.

Kristin What we would like to do and I do still see, I see Chris has his hand up as does Gene, but I would like to let you know what we're thinking direction wise for the rest of our meeting today. So, we would like to take our break right now. We're over an hour into our two-and-a-half hour time together, so let's take a break and come back together in ten minutes. It's about 2:40. We will reconvene our discussion at 2:50 and in the meantime, Ida and Susan and the team are going to put their heads together and make sure that we have a real clear direction to move forward because we want to make really good use of everyone's time. So we appreciate all of the input. Chris or Gene, do either of you, as you both had your hand raised, have something you'd like to share before the break?

Chris I was just going to quickly share some things that are sort of along the lines of where they are confusing and not where they're intended to be used and that's in things like protruding objects, to protect around protruding objects. I cannot tell you how many times I've been asked about that, but I was going to submit a photograph and never got it in to you of hazardous warnings for a script surrounding a drinking fountain on the approach to the Golden Gate Bridge that I think has been fixed, but it used to be there, and all sorts of instances of attempts to use them to provide warnings via diagonal braces or head clearance, deficiencies in head clearance areas. Nice to have a warning, but not the right use of that material, so there's some areas where they can be used, but are really confusing with severe consequences.

Kristin Thank you. And, Gene?

Gene I just wanted to echo what Marsha had just said and I'm looking forward to discussion of what Chris brought up because like braces, guide wires—

Chris Yes.

Gene There needs to be something, or overhead something protruding out that cannot be taken away from back from the pathway. You do need something to be a same sort of a warning system, so I'm looking forward to the discussion. Thank you.

Kristin Thank you, everybody. As it is now 2:42, let's actually reconvene now at 2:52. Thank you.

Welcome back, everyone. Thank you for your flexibility in taking our break. So hopefully everyone can hear us. We are going to jump back in to hear from each of you. What we'd like to do first is to focus on our first topic area, which is directed towards participants with vision impairments and we would like to begin with some background information that Derek, a DSA staff member here, will be providing, giving some context. He's just quickly gathering a few files.

Alright, Derek. Take it away.

Derek Okay, thank you. What I wanted to address were two specific items on the list and then generally address the original intent in developing and requiring detectable warnings. The original intent was to be a demarcation proceeding from a pedestrian area, which is generally considered safe and to mark that line beyond which you are actually starting to walk into a vehicular way or a vehicular area. Now, this is consistent with what we see in the definitions of a couple of terms within the code, but specifically the vehicular way is defined in the building code as a route provided for vehicular traffic such as in a street driveway or parking facility.

Then the second aspect where this comes into play is the infamous section on hazardous vehicular areas and detectable warnings there. Consistent with the original ADA standards, the requirement for detectable warnings at hazardous vehicular areas never actually uses the term hazardous. It doesn't rely on the title of the section and, in fact, the section here is pretty specific. If a walk crosses or adjoins a vehicular way and walking surfaces are not separated by curbs, railings, or other elements between the pedestrian areas and vehicular areas, then it requires detectable warnings.

Now, this phrasing had been discussed both prior to and after the '91 and '94 ADA standards came out that included this requirement for hazardous vehicular areas and I'm going to zero in on one particular phrase here. It's the lead in phrase and it might be the most important. It says, "If a walk crosses or adjoins a vehicular way." As has been discussed, there are

some areas where this is quite applicable, for example, where a person is proceeding down a sidewalk along a street and they get to a street corner and they'd like to cross the street. Clearly then, the pedestrian is crossing the vehicular way. That's very different, I think, than a condition where a vehicle is crossing the pedestrian way.

So, for example, when we go through residential neighborhoods, even where we've built through the commercial neighborhoods and driveways are crossing the sidewalk, that is a condition that doesn't conform to the phrasing in the building code and the '91 ADA standards. That would be a condition of having the vehicular route crossing the pedestrian route, so it's swapping these terms.

Now, when we look at a couple of the examples that have been potential discussion points for today, we have two, particularly, that come to mind. That would be number two, alleyways, and number three, driveways. These have been discussed extensively in the Public Works community as well as in the active community at the federal level and generally, with regard to alleyways, that was considered to be an area where the vehicular way then crosses a pedestrian way and wouldn't typically be provided with detectable warnings.

Now similarly, we have the issue of the driveway and, through the same discussions, it was—well not codified—it was typically agreed upon that driveways would not require detectable warnings where they crossed the pedestrian way except where those driveways were constructed and they acted somewhat like street intersections, so for example, where they were controlled by traffic signals. That's some of the background on hazardous vehicular areas. I'm lending this in an effort to hopefully clarify on where the code is requiring and not requiring detectable warnings in the language of the code.

Marsha I'm confused by the distinction you made between a walk crossing a vehicular way and a vehicular way crossing of a walk.

Derek Okay.

Marsha I think that's six of one and half dozen of the other. It's a cross. One intersects the other. I think that's somewhat serious.

Derek I actually, from the years of reading the discussions on the issue, I believe that the people in the midst of the discussion thought it a very salient

point. For example, where one proceeds from the safe state of a sidewalk into a street, it's a region, an area where drivers typically are proceeding unencumbered, okay? So the vehicular way is processing the normal flow of vehicular traffic. In contrast to the occasional occurrences of a vehicle that's exiting a driveway from a small commercial facility, that is a rather occasional use.

Marsha I understand the logic behind wanting to distinguish between those two types of vehicular routes. However, the standard, the regulation, the language in the code doesn't support your interpretation, it goes far afield from what the language will support. I understand the reason to want to do that. I would agree with you. I totally agree with you. I think when someone's pulling into a parking space, they're driving differently than they are when they're driving down the highway. I agree that when someone's pulling into a blind alley, they're driving differently, or when they're pulling into their own driveway. All of that, I agree with. I just don't see how you get there with the language of the code.

Derek It's not me coming up with this as an original view on this language of the code. This was extensively discussed by the Federal Highways Administration.

Marsha Yes, I understand that. I was part of that discussion, but what I don't understand is how you—the Federal Highway Administration now tells people to use the Public Rights of Way Requirements. The Public Rights of Way Requirements only require detectable warnings at street crossings. Street is a defined term and it doesn't include a driveway or an alley.

Derek Which is a reflection of the same concept that I'm discussing here, isn't it?

Marsha Yes, but you're saying that that's how these requirements are interpreted. I don't see how that's true in terms of how California interprets the code. That was discussions about the direction that we would go as a Federal Agency in establishing requirements for detectable warnings in the Public Right of Way. It has no bearing whatsoever on detectable warnings, for example, on sites, because Federal Highways has no control over that issue.

Derek I think all of my examples were within what we would call the Public Right of Way.

Marsha No.

- Kristin Marsha, thank you so much. This is really helpful to hear how this all is interpreted or is even actually confusing to users, so thank you for that. I do have a comment from Gene. I'd like to move us on because we may not all agree, but let's keep moving forward and so we're going to hear from Gene and then we're going to jump back into discussions.
- Gene I guess move on, unless we're come back to have a discussion on this, I'll just move on.
- Ida I would like to say that if the intent everyone can agree on, and we can agree that we better need to clarify the requirements, that's one discussion. In other words, either DSA has to provide more education, either we have to include that in our advisory manual, either we have to take a look at the language. We need to discuss is the concept good, because if they're agreeing on the same concept, these two, you know Marsha and Derek, and disagreeing on whether or not the language suffices, so obviously if someone, let's get us a vote on that. Let's also get a vote on this is the correct interpretation. We don't need them on driveways, we don't need them on alleyways.
- That's where I want to get from here because it seems—language, we can work on. We need to see where the language suffers and where our language creates unintended uses and where—do you see what I'm saying? So I think we have arrived at a point where this discussion sits, and if you have something to add to that, Gene, then yes, let's address that now, and others as well may [indiscernible] that discussion.
- Gene I actually was going to ask if we could just deal with agreeing first, just like you just said, one that this needs clarification, which I think it does, and then having whether there is a need for detectable warnings for alleyways and driveways to be two separate items, so I'm in agreement with you, Ida.
- Ida So why don't you tell us your opinion on this. First of all, if we believe the code and language required it and b) tell us why you feel it's beneficial. It may be that it may not be—right now, it doesn't require it, so we have to understand that there is this confusion, so tell us your reasoning of why do you think the code says it's required and why you think it's beneficial.
- Kristin Ida, can you clarify just regarding alleyways?

Ida Alleyways and driveways. Because right now they are not required in the code so there is no intent to proceed with them further—if the question is we need to clarify our language so that application is correct, we can do that.

Kristin Great.

Ida If it is—unless there's this overwhelming need that no, they're required there, we can investigate that further. It doesn't mean they're going to be included but I want to be able to say they're not required right now. Is it just language or is it a perception that we're diminishing something?

Kristin Thank you so much. So we're talking about alleyways and driveways now and we're first going to hear from Gene.

Gene Alleyways, I feel can be rationalized as a street. Most transportation or avenue where vehicles go, agree it's not as frequent as a regular street and I'm going to use many examples of alleyways here in Sacramento, it is not at a grade, usually there's a sloped surface that you go down basically a steeper than from 1 to 12 usually, but the thing is, you have traffic coming out and some of the research has found that at least 36% of the people, where there's idling traffic, still enter streets, that are blind.

So, you have that where a car comes up, there's idling there, that's something to warn you that can warn you that a vehicle will be coming up there, you may not have that clue. Two is, it's just—otherwise if you go down the sloped surfaces like our alleyways, many of them here in downtown, you could take it just like it's the rolling terrain of the pavement, of the geography of the area there and not be able to pick up any cues that you're crossing a form of a vehicular way where there could be moving traffic that could come out and you could have a conflict.

Driveways, I can't and I will not argue in defense of them for residential driveways. It makes no sense at all. It would be really super confusing, but commercial, I think that should be a discussion about commercial driveways, parking structures or malls, parking lots where there's actually a curb ramp, you go down, you're crossing, there's even sometimes a crosswalk, sometimes a signal light and you go up there but it's still technically a driveway from entrance or exiting from a parking lot into the street, so I just feel that we need to have more discussion about clarification.

Kristin Thank you, Gene. We would like to hear from others now. I see a number of people have their hands raised, so I'm going to read that list out, let you know that we have you on the list. So I see Michael Gibens, I see Chris Downey, it looks like that's actually it for now.

Rosa Rosa would like to get on that list, in the queue.

Steve T. And Steve would too.

Kristin And I'm hearing Tim as well. Is that right?

Ida And Steve Twist.

Steve T. Yes, Steve Twist.

Kristin Great. So I have Michael Gibens, and then Chris Downey, and then Rosa, and then Steve Twist, and then Tim McCormick. So, I'm hoping there's clarity around our discussion area. I'm just going to reiterate that it's alleyways and driveways, we're looking at both of them together and I'm looking at Ida for clarification. The two sort of questions we want people to answer is, regarding alleyways and driveways and the use of detectable warnings there, is more clarification needed? Is that kind of the first question?

Ida No. Recognizing the code does not require them in these locations, is it only language we need to clarify to substantiate that or is there a situation, Gene was very specific as to why he feels there should be at alleyways, maybe there's a specific condition where we can address them over with curb ramps and that's already covered in the code and driveways, residential driveways, he said no, he agrees. Commercial driveways, he made the qualification that a driveway needs to be clarified in terms of definition because there are interior driveways that are signaled and so maybe that's what I'm saying is language clarified. I think that there could be some alignment here that already of what's provided in the code an appropriate use, it's a matter of providing clarity. There's different ways we can provide clarity. Advisory manual, education and code language.

Kristin Fantastic. So, let's first hear from Michael Gibens.

- Michael Okay. Just on answering those questions, I don't believe they should be scoped for alleyways or driveways. That should be clearer in the language. I think they should only be scoped for hazardous streets, heavy duty hazardous streets to begin with. That's where I'm at right now.
- Kristin Thank you, Michael. Chris Downey.
- Chris Actually the clarification offered of at streets, not at alleys and driveways is helpful and I get these questions all the time. A Certified Access Specialist told me, he's not on this call, he will remain anonymous, that looking at a property area of the hotel that has a drive approach into the porte-cochere for all pickups, drop offs, checking in, all that good stuff, in an urban area, the drive across the sidewalk is a brick drive that goes into the plaza there in front of the hotel. The question was, does he need one and it's a flush condition at the door. Question one was, is a hazardous warning material required at the door? Question two was, on approach from the sidewalk as you approach the brick surface that's the drive aisle off the street, are hazardous warning strips required to go across the sidewalk to mark that?
- So, it's confusing, I think, at least in the way it's been used, how it's been questioned, the code as stated here was very clear. I don't think that that clarity is reaching even the Certified Access Specialists, if not others. If they can't get it, then certainly others. So I think there's some confusion and ambiguity that needs to get clarified there.
- Ida Do you have an opinion, Chris, with regard to alleyways and driveways and conditions that the code already covers to address curb ramps or whether is it flush, do you have an opinion on any of that?
- Chris When it's curb ramp going to an alley or even a driveway and you're going from a concrete sidewalk to an asphalt paving, I don't personally see the need for it there, never have. It's not as hazardous. It doesn't have the volume of traffic. I see it as vehicular drivers know who has the right of way at that point, whether they abide by it or not is another issue, but they seem unnecessary there whereas they do at the actual intersection, street intersections. Likewise at driveways, it's confusing is those things we've talked about where the cars drive across the sidewalk, but especially in those cases, any driver should respect the right, they're crossing into the pedestrian zone, the pedestrians, they're in their space, the driver, by definition should exercise caution.

When you get these multiple driveways one after the other, it gets confusion when you're in and when you're out, we've had this discussion, so it's a repeat, but it's hard. Even the signal when coming out of a commercial garage in an urban area, the signal goes off to alert you that a car is coming out, but you don't necessarily know where to stop. You don't know if you're standing right in front of the car coming out so thinking you better hurry up and get the hell out of the way or if you're about to step in it or if you're clear. It's not clear based on the single source of where that sound is coming from. So it's confusing. It's a lot more than you asked for, but it's where I think there is some legitimate confusion and question about those high volume commercial crossings over a sidewalk.

Ida Thank you, Chris.

Kristin Thank you, Chris. Next, we'll hear from Rosa.

Rosa So, in terms of the alley and driveways and I'm going to also do street crossings, the intent of the detectable warnings is to say warning. Then having the truncated domes on alleys and driveways, I would say, is too much information. I'd rather it just be a streets and I'd rather be able to walk knowing that I know that I'm on the sidewalk and if I hear a car in front of me I can then assume that it could be a driveway or an alley.

I will leave it up to the individuals who utilize code to inform you if the code is clear, but my concern is for the end user. It's great that the person can establish hey, we have put it up according to code, but if the end users don't understand what it means then it's pointless to have the warning detectors there because it's not giving information enough to distinguish between and alley, a driveway and a street crossing and it sounds like there are different lengths or widths or something. I have this information that you guys have sent, but prior, the general public end user and even mobility instructors do not have this information, so it would be very beneficial in interpreting the code and identifying how to establish maybe clearer code that the detectable warnings are somehow different, more distinguishable from one another so that the end user understands, oh, this feels like an alley, that feels like a driveway and now we're at the street.

Kristin Thank you, Rosa. Next, Steve Twist.

Steve T. Thank you. The discussion back a bit earlier kind of leads me into where I'm going, the discussion about whether the traffic is crossing the sidewalk

or the pedestrian is crossing in to the traffic area, that part really confuses me and I don't quite get it. It depends on who you are. Are you the driver or are you the pedestrian. I think in terms of the driver, that person is not the end user, as Rosa was just talking about. The end user is the person—so in the code, I think it comes back to the language in the code, that I think the language in code needs to be more specific. When it says when a pedestrian way crosses or adjoins a traffic area, well then if I'm on a sidewalk crossing an alley, then I am a pedestrian on a pedestrian way crossing a traffic area.

Personally, I think it would be crazy to put them every driveway on everything. I think we should be simplifying where they go rather than complicating where they go. So, I don't quite get that whole thing about whether if I'm stepping off of a curb ramp, I'm still the pedestrian, I'm still the end user, or if I'm stepping, walking down a sidewalk and crossing driveways and that sort of thing, so I think it comes back to the code and the language.

We need to be more specific about, first of all it needs to be decided where they need to be placed and what they're trying to—I agree with Rosa, I believe it was Rosa, the end user is the one that we're, I think, mostly concerned with and the more we use the truncated domes, they just become overused and I don't think meet their intent. So I guess I made my point that I think it depends on the language, the language needs to be more specific and it needs to be determined where they actually, what we are trying to say with the domes. What exactly are we trying to say?

Kristin Thank you, Steve. Next we have Tim McCormick followed by Chris Downey and then Marsha.

Ida Marsha, then Chris.

Kristin Got it. Marsha and then Chris. So, Tim, you're up.

Tim Thank you. First of all, I want to thank Rosa for eloquently stating half of what I had to say, which is my way of saying I agree with everything she had to say. And so, I think it is important that we concentrate these features to where they're making an important message and they're not overused so that they have value for the end user.

I do think that we've touched upon a point about clarity in the code provisions. I want to take it one step further. There's general rules the

courts follow with interpretation of regulations and one of them is known as the plain language rule which means rules were approved that they meant what they said and the said what they meant and that if that language is clear, if there's no reason to look beyond that language or any advisory recommendations or background as to intent. So, I think it's really critical that when we talk about what our goal here is that the end game since, this is as a code user speaking, a person who advises many other code users, is that the language stands on its own, that it's clear and if we need to greatly expand these sections and make it clear where they don't apply then I think that's going to be the most effective end result of where we want to go.

I think part of the ambiguity, besides the language itself which is very broad and can be read to put these things all over construction sites, there is still the issue of confusion in the regulations as to whether or not DSA's 11B regulations apply to the public way and should be used in the public way or they're only for the onsite improvements. I think that's an issue of clarity that needs to be addressed because it affects very clearly if detectable warnings are included. I think state law says the DSA has the authority and that the sidewalks have to conform to their standards and 11B doesn't really differentiate between sidewalks that are on the private side of the property line or those that in the public way and I think that creates confusion where we see driveways and walkways that are partially on the public way, or not in the public way or they have one at the public way and then because of a large landscape setback we have another walkway and driveway closer to the building and we say that one is subject to 11B and we really aren't sure about the one in the public way.

So, that's an issue, I think, that needs to be clarified and it causes confusion and I would agree that driveways and alleys just probably aren't worth the effort of including because they create more confusion by adding too many references to a hazardous area. Those are my thoughts.

Kristin

Thank you, Tim. Next, let's hear from Marsha.

Marsha

Okay. Thank you. I agree with everything that the last speaker said as well as Rosa and others and I have some pretty concrete suggestions. First, I think we need to divide the requirements between onsite and in the public right of way and with respect to the requirements in the public right of way, I think we should follow what was laid out by Scott Winlay and other at the Access Board in the Notice of Proposal Making for public rights of way. We should be looking at blended transitions and curb

ramps at street crossings and if you want to be technical about it, you could say street or highway crossings, because both would be covered. So it doesn't matter whether it's a curb ramp or it's a level transition, otherwise known as a blended transition, you have to have something. You have to have your detectable warning there.

When it comes to on site, there's a whole lot of places I wouldn't want to see them. I wouldn't want to see them, for example, in a parking garage. I wouldn't want to see them in an alley or at a driveway crossing. If we separate between public rights of way and sites, in the public rights of way section, we only say street and highway crossings, that by itself eliminates other types of vehicular ways. The problem with 11B is the use of the word vehicular way because that encompasses every place a car can go, just about. So, that's what leads to an awful lot of confusion. I, again, wouldn't use the word vehicular way. I would be clear about what types of vehicular ways on sites we want to separate pedestrians from with a detectable warning or warn pedestrians with a detectable warning.

Let's see, I would lose all the language about adjoins a vehicular way. That gets you into all kinds of weird paving the road with detectable warnings and other things that really aren't very decipherable and aren't very understandable and the Access Board dropped them for good reason. The Access Board in the 2010 standards retained the requirements for boarding platforms, rail crossings, and I think we should retain those as well for sites. That's it.

Kristin

Thank you, Marsha. Next, we'll hear from Chris Downey, followed by Gene.

Chris

I appreciate a lot of the clarification that Marsha shared, Tim and others previously. In the concern of not overusing them, which can create confusion, I think there's also the question that might be outside the scope of this group, but within the larger view of not where they create confusion, but where they result in an unintended hazard for others, that hazard being those using walkers that they often can get toppled over. I've heard too many anecdotal stories of that and had told evidence of such a log of incidents reported at the San Francisco airport, not just of people walking and walkers, but also of luggage carts. So a very specific location, but they have consequences that aren't necessarily always intended so the more defined, the more absolute and essential we can be, the more respectful we can be of other needs and other concerns besides those that have long been considered as part of this—it seems we have to

balance in terms of issues for people in wheelchairs with spinal cord injuries and other things. So being essential is important.

Finally, in the issue that Marsha just identified about separating for the walk area from the road, it is coming up more and more often now. It's a deep subject we probably don't want to get into, but in shared space and urban planning methodologies today of completely removing the curb from the street condition to create a safe, control speeds of vehicles by making it more—not having clearly defined zones for cars versus pedestrians. It's a deep subject but a solution often considered by cities considering this is to line that entire vehicular zone from the pedestrian zone with a hazardous warning strip down the entire length on both sides. I'm not sure that's what we want and we need to find ways to create clarity but also find workable solutions.

Kristin

Ida's going to respond.

Ida

Thank you, Chris. I appreciate that. I think sometimes what, you know, there's this discussion of universal design and the perception that providing greater access is better and the perception that detectable warnings in greater use is better, because it is an element or a tool used to define things as, in some ways, accessible. I think that that's incumbent upon us to, perhaps, try to clarify as best as we can, the intended use so that mixed messages don't arise. I really think that sometimes when you see that there's no curb separation in a lot of these areas, many times, it's for the use of everyone, shopping carts, you can go wherever, but sometimes it's also intended to be flush is better, we don't have curb ramps, everyone's universal design but then, of course, it doesn't take into consideration issues that arise with that. So, perhaps with us, it's some ways where we can in some method educate better as to when we're discussion purposes for a lot of these tools.

It seems that everyone, I think, unless Steve needs to chime in on this specific, and Gene, I do want to propose another question after both of them respond.

Steve

I just simply try to summarize this, there's a maintenance factor that goes with each of these things, when you get the hundred foot strip so when truck routes or crossing alleys and whatever these other applications are, the trucks just crack them and ruin them and we have to be sensitive to that because it becomes a hazard for all, not just disabled folks if we don't be judicious. That's all I need to say.

Kristin

Thank you, Steve. And, Gene?

Gene

One of the very basic principles of orientation for people with visual impairments is consistency and predictability. To start distinguishing between private and public whether a curb ramp should have detectable warnings in the public right of way but not in a private area, like a parking lot, a mall where you're going down a ramp and into the parking area into vehicular aisles, there is no difference on the potential dangers that could occur. If you get hit by a vehicle going 15 miles in the private area versus in the public area, it's still going to have the same impact. You need that—it's almost sounding like okay in the public right of way we'll require curb ramps, in others we won't require them. Everyone should have access and have that ability to have the warning there.

All these things just like, to have a list of hazardous vehicular ways, I don't see a problem removing the word hazardous at all because they're all potentially hazardous, but detectable warnings is an option, it's not the mandated requirement when you have the length of a pedestrian walkway adjoining a vehicular way. You could have a raised sidewalk there, a curb. You could have fences, other things. The detectable warnings, in the list it's the last one.

I don't like the idea of having from corner to corner a place where you have the detectable warnings, but I've also seen in a medical facility here in town, because of the compliance board having removed that requirement for a particular area, that they have a whole walkway adjoining this large parking lot, there's nothing to warn you until you get to what would be akin a mid-block crossing where you have the crosswalk lines that goes across this drive and then the parking in stalls on the other side and there's detectable warnings between the crosswalk lines. And you're talking about maybe something like 700 feet of nothing there that should have been easily, just for the blind person, you could just veer out there and not realize that you're going there.

That could easily have been solved by simply having hazard raised sidewalk and I guess the thing is, there's really—to put the detectable warnings outlying crosswalk line, I think we've all been in agreement that's misuse, that's not a warning, that's using it as a wayfinding guide and there's something else that could be used and that's then a question mark whether even something should be put there, but the point is it shouldn't be outlining the crosswalk there. So there shouldn't be the

maintenance of a vehicle goes over these unless the driver is not staying where they're supposed to be.

Two is, you need the warning all different times of vehicular [indiscernible] even stretching it to the thing of a park where there's a park where there's a nature trail, pedestrian, crossing where there's a horse trail. Okay, you can't always know there's going to have, a horse may be going there, some other [indiscernible] driving there [audio disruption] vehicle. I'm just saying to distinguish between private and public breaks down the whole thing of predictability, standardization and the fact that we need to be conscious that there's different degrees of people's abilities, multiple disabilities and this whole detectable warnings, these regulations just like the federal ones, it was based on a lot of research that was done on these.

Part of the problem is what we started here and never finished and that was the product certifications. There's issues where different manufacturers use different means of like slip resistance and it's because of the features, the elements they use, they're not as good as some others. And the thing is the regulations should have been more descriptive so that they know what type of material to use. That sometimes can cause slips and falls while you could have another detectable warning that doesn't have some of these features and that doesn't happen.

So, one of the biggest recommendations that could come out of this committee is get that detectable warning evaluation committee back together again, get the funding to finish the project. Unfortunately, I believe, the underwriters laboratory research work has probably been totally lost. There was a significant amount of research that came in on a lot of what we're talking about, the product and [indiscernible] for businesses and that's what's needed. It's outside of this task force focus but we need to get that—that will address many of these concerns that everyone has brought up. Thank you.

Kristin

Thank you, Gene. Ida has a new question for us to consider.

Ida

I'd like to—we now have, if we can because we have 20 minutes but we do need to spend a little bit of time for wrap up, Gene had started the discussion between a parallel alignment of accessible route and a vehicular way and I'd just like to hear everyone's thoughts on that issue. I think it has been proposed that aligning that whole way with detectable warnings is an issue but that some measure is needed. Now, it's not DSA's—the

code does permit a warning to be provided. It does not specify, it could be a sidewalk. It says a curb or other barriers, right? So, I understand that there are other methods. It is not for DSA to come up with any of surface applied measure. We're not going to go there. That involves too much testing, too much [indiscernible], but I want to discuss the issue of one over the other and if, perhaps, in this condition, if detectable warnings is a—should it be a default condition because of the issues that arise. I'd like to discuss the issues that arise when aligning a long distance with a continuing strip of detectable warning from both users, code users and code beneficiaries.

Kristin Thank you. So, we're going to jump in and first hear from Chris Downey.

Chris In thinking about your question here, I was in my mind combining it with a question that was thrown out there a while ago and we never quite got to it, which was that accessible route from the street to the front door in new construction. It sort of starts to overlap with this a little bit. In the case of new construction, who would like to see the blended condition of the shared surface for the vehicular and pedestrian traffic, that should be discouraged that there should be a curb or a planter or some solid barrier between the two which could be any kind of linked bollards across there that clearly define it and limit the crossover between, but something that clearly delineates between the two, preferably a sidewalk, separated, a curb, a planter, whatever. I don't know if a hazardous warning strip should even exist as a last case option on there. It's just too confusing, too ambiguous, so I would prefer to see code languages somehow steers especially in new construction, steers away from these ambiguous patterns that are developing out there.

Kristin Alright, thank you. So, Gene agrees. So let's hear from the rest of you.

Rosa Rosa would like to get in the queue.

Kristin Rosa, you're up first.

Rosa Okay, great. So, the thing about if it's the long strip to distinguish between the walk path for pedestrians and where this, let's say, like in a parking lot, I think that makes sense. However, the concern is sometimes there are those crosswalks that pedestrians should utilize to get to the other side. If we have this long strip, we are then, as an end user, missing that cue of where we're able to cross. So while I can appreciate and understand the code supporting the end user being able to identify where

that is, we lose something and I just wish that we could have something that's a little bit different, a little different type of detection. I guess we would then refer to that a wayfinder, but there should be something that distinguishes between I'm separating the sidewalk for the parallel versus a perpendicular crossing. So we missed that perpendicular crossing when the parallel runs the span. Does that make sense?

Kristin Yes. Thank you, Rosa. We want to hear from others.

Susan Do we want to read what Kaylan says so that it's—

Kristin Yes. Thank you so much. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Sure. First, Marsha agreed with Chris. She said Chris makes a great point about shared streets. This is occurring all over Great Britain and people who are blind are complaining loudly. Unfortunately, I don't think there's a viable solution that uses detectable warnings. And Rachelle Golden said she agrees with what Chris said and then Kaylan Dunlap said she would agree with what Chris said as well because the long strips of detectable warnings for mobility device users is extremely uncomfortable and dangerous when they aren't installed or maintained properly and in reality, it pushes some of us into the vehicular way because it's more comfortable and, in some ways, safer to travel in that dangerous area as opposed to travelling on long strips of detectable warnings. And Rachelle Golden said she seconds what Kaylan has said as well and then Kaylan said we have heard of cases where ambulatory people have tripped over compliant detectable warnings and ultimately died from their injuries.

Kristin Thank you so much for reading it. So, to clarify, those were comments that were submitted via the chat function, so everyone should have that option on blackboard collaborate. We did see Marsha had her hand raised. Marsha, did you still want to speak?

Marsha I did want to just briefly address the difference between the public right of way and onsites. Generally, when we're talking about on a site, we're talking about someone not walking into a street, but walking into a vehicular way of some kind or an area that's shared between pedestrians and vehicles. I think Chris, or somebody, made the point, a couple of people have made the point that drivers are, or at least should be, more on their guard when they're driving in a parking lot versus driving down the highway and I would agree with that. They know that it's quite likely that people are going to be walking through parking spaces, walking down

aisles, parking aisles, crossing parking lanes etc., so I think there is a significant difference between what happens on a site versus what happens in a public right of way although I can't disagree that if you get hit by a car driving 15 miles an hour, you're just as hit, regardless of whether that car is in a public right of way or on a site. The difference is that in the public right of way, the driver is less likely to slow down to 15 miles an hour than they are in a parking lot. So, I think there is a difference.

I think because you do want to remain consistent with the federal standards, carving out the public right of way versus what happens on a site does give you the opportunity to align yourself more closely with what's in the federal proposed requirements at this point in time and what's being enforced by federal highways for the public right of way. I can tell you that because there was an advanced notice of proposed rule-making on shared use paths, the outcome of that rulemaking will also be embedded in the public rights of way final rule and it does try to address areas where a shared use path intersects another kind of path which is something that Gene brought up.

So, I honestly think that we do need to make that separation and I do think we need to have a blanket rule for any street crossing. Whether it's a mid-block or at an intersection, it should have a detectable warning at both curb ramps and blended transitions and call it a day. That's it. I think that a median strip is part of a street crossing and if you look at what the Federal Government did in the rights of way proposed rule, they actually treat median strips a little differently than California does, so you might want to take a look at that.

Then when you deal with the sites, I think we really need to have a discussion about what we really need to protect people from and I don't think we've done that. I don't think we've come to any consensus that we do or we don't need to protect people from walking into a parking space or inadvertently walking through a parking lot when they didn't intend to walk through it and I think we have to have that discussion because I think we're going to find that we have pretty differing views on some of that.

Kristin

Thank you so much, Marsha. We do have a comment that came in from Steve Dolam. He says that I agree with Chris, Kaylan and Rachelle. Strips of detectable warnings are the most frustrating for end users as well as the public, and Michael Gibens, I see your hand is raised. It's your turn. Michael, you might want to take yourself off mute so we can hear you.

- Michael Thank you. I just want to say, I agree with Marsha on that and just note when we adopted the truncated dome requirement, we did it to comply with Government Code 4450A so that we would be in alignment with the ADA. Then they rescinded the requirement and they haven't picked it back up yet. They still have—we're still talking weeks later about the same distinctions and the problems that we've had before. I would like to really seriously consider going back and dropping everything back to where we are at the Federal position and make use of all the information that they're using in their studies too so that we're all aligned at the same time, so we comply with the ADA.
- I don't believe that dropping back down, we adopted to comply with the ADA and dropping back down to that standard to comply with the ADA would not, in my opinion, be in violation of 4459, so we'd still be in compliance with minimum standards of the ADA and if they adopt those and increase that use in the future, then it would be prudent obviously to do that. I really do think it should be a serious consideration to remove the requirements on private property and just deal with the street sections like Marsha's talking about. Thanks.
- Kristin Thanks, Michael. Do we have any other thoughts on this topic?
- Susan I think it's probably a good time to think about what we plan for for our next meeting and, this is just my thought, but it seems like we've had some pretty lengthy discussion on hazardous vehicular areas and what that entails and what happens with parking structures and the route from the public way to the main entrance of a facility so Ida is the priority is that for our next session let's talk about some things that we haven't discussed yet?
- Ida If there's an issue or a location or a specific. I don't want to receive let's discuss hazardous vehicular ways. I want to hear things like let's discuss the location of detectable warnings at doors. That's a specific issue. If there are specific issues that you feel it's important to have discussed and that we have not addressed, email it to Sue and we'll see which ones actually garner the most, you know, we'll prioritize based on how many people have submitted that request so that we can discuss at length at our next and final discussion. So, if you feel that an item we have discussed enough, please let's not—this is not your most important issue that you want to address. This is an item that you have great concern about that you feel has not been adequately addressed in our discussions, that you

feel passionately about one way or the other. That way at least we can ensure your voice is heard, and ensure that you've heard the voice of others on the same subject matter.

Susan And I know Jonathan Adler sent in an email and he has some photographs and some figures to sort of back it up and it was some things on curb ramps that we haven't discussed so that might be one of the ones that we want to look at for next session.

Kristin Gene?

Gene Well, do I have to resubmit—I submitted some proposed language, particularly two; one was to do with what I feel are some loopholes in the track crossing. The other one is about the loophole in the requirement for color, yellow for curb ramps and for cut-throughs consistency, so those two issues, but I've actually heard of track crossing issues because of how it's written in the language where places, you only have it on one side of the track or not at all if there wasn't a boarding platform.

Ida So Gene, to respond to your question, I would prefer that we discuss the issues and not proposed language so I'd like to know—

Gene Okay, but the issue—

Ida You're welcome to discuss what the problem is with the language we already have—

Gene Okay, so the question is do I have to resubmit, that's all I'm asking.

Ida If those are what you want you can make notes to Sue right now that those are your top topics and you don't have to resubmit.

Gene Thank you.

Susan Yes.

Marsha In light of what you just said, are you not planning to talk about the technical requirements?

Ida No, this detectable warnings task force is to raise the issue and discuss the concern—

- Marsha Okay, because we've been talking about both.
- Ida —proposed by DSA and there is an opportunity for that through the ACC and through the Access Code Collaborative and the public process, but we're trying to formulate the basis of code amendment language and so we want to discuss the issues more than discuss any proposed language at this time. We're still in the investigation stage of what it is—
- Marsha Alright, well as a broad issue, there's different geometry and different color requirements, contrast requirements in the Federal law, or in the Federal NPRM as well as in the ADA standards. So I think we should look at those differences and decide whether or not we want to align with the Federal Government. The one thing that I know that is not adequately done in the NPRM yet, it will be done in the final rule, is address situations where you have that grid pattern and then you have a radius like you would at a curb ramp.
- So if you have a radius curb, like a corner curb ramp, which the Federal Government discourages, let's just say you have one curb ramp on the radius, then you have to jigger your detectable warnings just a bit and I know Scott plans to address that in the final rule but it's not perfectly addressed in the NPRM. There was a lot of comment on that. So, as an issue, I guess the question is do we align the technical requirements with the Federal requirements or do we maintain different requirements. The reason that is an issue is because you require more costly installations when you're unique in the world. You also, in some ways, dilute the uniformity that we all seek across the country so that someone from California goes to New York, they still recognize that detectable warning as a detectable warning.
- Kristin Thank you, Marsha. Did we have any questions or clarifications regarding what is homework, but it sounds like it's optional homework if I am understanding correctly, if you do feel that there are issues that still need to be discussed that have not been raised yet, to email those to Sue. Do we have any questions or comments for clarification?
- Steve T. I was having problems with breaking up there so I wasn't quite clear what Ida was trying to say was the topic or direction for the next meeting so I'm hoping Sue or somebody maybe could outline that and send it via email.
- Susan Yes, we'll do what we normally do where we have a follow-up email.
Yes.

Steve T.	Great.
Kristin	So in the next week or so, you will be receiving a summary from today's meeting and an agenda for our fifth and final task force meeting. We will be meeting again, it's Wednesday, May 1 st , the same time, 1:30 to 4:00. Ida or Sue, does anyone have any final comments they would like to share?
Susan	I just thought that there was some really informative information—I just thought the discussion today and especially hearing from Rosa and Vidal and Chris, well, from everybody, I think that there was just some really good comments that came out of today's session.
Ida	Thank you, all.
Kristin	Thank you, everyone. We'll talk to you next month.
All	Thank you. Bye.
Moderator	Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes our teleconference for today. We thank you for using AT&T Executive TeleConference Service and you may now disconnect.