Final Transcript

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

May 1, 2019/1:30 p.m. PDT

SPEAKERS

Susan Moe
Kristin Vandersluis
Jessica Axtman
Jonathan Adler
Chris Downey
Kaylan Dunlap
Rachelle Golden
Tim McCormick
Ida Clair
Steve Dolan
Debbie Wong
Derek Shaw
Gene Lozano

PRESENTATION

Moderator — Ladies and gentlemen, we thank you for standing by and we welcome you to the Detectable Warnings Task Force conference call. Everyone joining by telephone will have an open line for speaking. You may want to use a mute key to help cut down on background sound. [Operator instructions]. As a reminder, the conference call is being recorded.

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

Susan — Thank you. This is Susan Moe here at headquarters at DSA and thank you, everybody. This is our last meeting of our Detectable Warnings Task Force.

What we're going to look at today—we're going to talk a little bit about public right-of-way guidelines and one of the items that we're going to

discuss is the parallel and perpendicular curb ramp. Then, we're going to take a look at some of the California specific requirements.

Before we go any further, I'll turn it over to Kristin, our facilitator, for anything that she'd like to offer and maybe a little bit of housekeeping.

Kristin — Thank you, Susan. This is Kristin Vandersluis, and it's amazing how fast time flies that we're already at our fifth of five meetings together. I thought before we went any further, we should start with our roll call. So, I just introduced myself.

I'm going to move to next to Ida next to me, and we'll ask each person to share their first and last names.

Ida — Ida Clair.

Jesse — Jesse Wong.

Susan — Susan Moe. You already heard from me.

Steve — Steve Dolam.

Derek — Derek Shaw, DSA.

Jessica — Jessica Axtman.

Gene — Gene Lozano.

Kristin — Now we go to our remote attendees. I see we have four of you so far, so go ahead and please take turns.

Chris — Hello, it's Chris Downey.

Susan — Oh, great. Hi, Chris.

Chris — Hi, there.

Kaylan — Hi, this is Kaylan Dunlap.

Kristin — Welcome, Kaylan.

Kaylan — Thank you.

Tim Tim McCormick.

Kristin Hi, Tim.

Tim Hi, everybody.

Jonathan Jonathan Adler.

Kristin Hi.

Jonathan Hi.

Rachelle This is Rachelle Golden.

Kristin Good. Do we have anyone else? Alright. Well, welcome, everybody. Susan just reviewed the agenda and we will be together until four o'clock. As a reminder to those of you who are joining us remotely, you do have multiple options for participation today, so do remember that you can use the raise your hand function with the hand symbol to notify us that you would like to get in line to speak. You also do have the chat function where you can type in a question and we will be monitoring that and can either read your insight or questions to the group, or if you just have a private, administrative question, we can respond to that as well.

As a reminder, as we finish up our series of meetings, we are very interested in everybody's experiences, how they personally interact with detectable warning regulations as they go about their everyday lives and reminder that we will not be doing any voting. We also will not be picking apart, so to speak, the existing code language. Let's just be mindful to avoid that.

From there, let's jump into our accessibility check-in. We have begun our meetings this way each time and wanted to open the floor again to give everyone an opportunity to speak up if there is any materials today perhaps that they might need to have resent as we begin our meeting or any feedback they would like to provide for DSA staff about accessibility of files and our meeting today.

Susan No comments? No concerns? No?

Jonathan Okay. This is Jonathan.

Kristin Hi, Jonathan. Go ahead.

Jonathan — Hi. I just would like to express my hope that I sent in a number of items that I thought I crafted that served well for discussion and I hope that time management works such that we can still go over them, maybe not at great length, but at least so that you at DSA can get the feedback of the various people in the group on those particular items.

I see that you brought up one of them today and we did discuss this one before, and there are three others and if you like, I'd even send them out as a group mail, but you already have them.

Susan — Thank you, Jonathan.

Kristin — Yes, thank you, Jonathan. That's really appreciated. We do think our first couple of discussion items may take a good chunk of time, but we are leaving quite a bit of time at the end of our meeting today to ask each person to share any final thoughts and that might be a good time for you to bring up any of those topics that you wanted to touch on if they haven't already been discussed as we roll along today.

Jonathan — Okay. Well, then, I'm going to add one more comment. I think that on some discussions in your great effort to be fair and considerate, you've let some discussions go on too long and I encourage you—the purpose of this is so that you get feedback. You're the ones who are going to craft changes if you do. So, I encourage you to be more ruthless in cutting off discussions and just be in charge and say, let's move on.

Kristin — Got it.

Jonathan — Alright.

Kristin — I appreciate that feedback for me and I think all of us can hear that here nodding our heads that we will jump in if today that happens, so thank you.

Is there anybody else that had any accessibility input or questions, any needs they wanted to express before we move ahead? Alright, so let's go ahead and begin.

Susan — Alright, well, I think this is an item and this is something that Jonathan, and thank you for sharing this, this is an item that you see quite often and Jonathan, I'm going to bring up the documents and do you want to go ahead and explain the three different—you have an option A, B, and C.

Then we can also—as you're describing these three different scenarios, if you can do it in such a way—I know like for Gene, he likes to have that in an orientation, so if he's heading north, what's in the east, what's on the south and what's on the west. So, if you wouldn't mind, if you want to go ahead and you can describe these three different options and then we discuss this.

So, Jonathan, I'm going to turn this over to you, so you can go ahead and describe what's indicated in this document you submitted.

Jonathan Okay. The document has three pictures, each of them grouped, a number of accessible parking spaces that abut a sidewalk. On the page, the sidewalk goes left to right and the parking spaces are aligned and they are long access vertically. In each situation, the scenario A, B or C—well, I'm looking for which ones people consider compliant or non-compliant or preferred and so forth.

In the first one, the access aisle that serves the various—the multiple access aisles that serve the accessible spaces are served by a parallel curb ramp. The parallel curb ramps are such that they are ramped from both their left and right. So, they're opposing ramps that descend to a common bottom landing or turning space and so, the conventional way that parallel curb ramps, such as these are treated, there's truncated domes at the interface between the turning space and the access aisle. So, that's scenario A.

Scenario B is rather than having multiple parallel curb ramps such that when I sit up and down on the page, so I'll call that north/south, so that someone on the east side who wanted to travel to a destination to the west, might have to go up a ramp, and then down a ramp and then up a ramp and so forth, because scenario A was created so that there would just be flush transitions only at those parallel curb ramps turning spaces. B is different in that the ramp goes down at the left side and goes down on the right side, and it has one very long bottom landing and in this scenario, the truncated domes run flush with the face of the curb from the toe of one ramp to the toe of the ramp. It could be 30, 40, 50 feet away depending on how many parking spaces are there.

Scenario C, has the same ramp configuration as what I just described. It descends only at the east and the west side down to one long common bottom landing, but instead of a detectable warning that runs the full length, there is detectable warning at the base of each ramp at the point

where the ramp descends. So, if the ramp was 4 feet wide, the detectable warning would be 4 feet wide and continue from the grade break at the bottom of the ramp for a distance of 3 feet at each end.

I hope I did well Gene, Kris, well enough.

Kristin — Thank you, Jonathan. I'm going to let Gene ask a clarifying question.

Gene — Jonathan, on your C option, the third option, if I understand correctly with that, if you're going from east going to west, you just, you go down a ramp and then it levels out and then that goes maybe 30, 40 feet and it goes up again and you're talking about the detectable warnings at the very bottom of the ramp as it levels out in that landing and that is a depth of 36 inches that would be going inwards, in other words, towards the center of this long walkway that that grades. Would that be correct?

Jonathan — That would be exactly right and the purpose of C is an option that myself and colleagues that I think who are smart and thoughtful consider as a good option. I should say as a better option is because A makes a person with mobility disabilities go up and down, up and down, many times. Option B, if the ramps and its bottom landing were only 4 foot in their north/south dimension, 3 feet of it is covered with detectable warnings, so those folks have to travel 30, 40, 50 feet continuously on detectable warnings. Option C, the one that you just perfectly described, Gene, the concept that it's detectable warning that's in the name, that warning has been provided in the way you just repeated. So, I yield the floor.

Kristin — Thank you. Steve Dolan has a question. Steve?

Steve — I think, Jonathan, in your option C, if you're proceeding opposite of a parking stall, do you have a raised curb intended in there separating something from the walking surface, or is it a flush planter, or what do you envision on the non-parking side of that 50-foot length?

Jonathan — Well, so flush—what do you mean by a flush curb, like a curb with a 5- or 6-inch face of curb?

Steve — Like a blended transition to a planter or a raised curb separating a planter or a raised curb or building on the edge? What is it that those two lines represent?

Jonathan — Okay, and I have a hunch that I might have lost Gene. So, I'm going to repeat what I think you said. If you're traveling from—the full elevation

height of the sidewalk, we'll say is 6 inches high and each curb ramp descends 6 inches to its bottom landing, if you're traveling from the east to the west, with the parking on your left, and it's only the parking that has the flush transition, only the parking that has a flush transition with the long bottom landing, on your right side, I'm imagining a building or a guard rail or a raised planter, not a walking surface.

Steve — So, it wouldn't be anything flush with the walking surface if let's say it was a planter, so there would be no confusion with two flush surfaces, one on the south and one on the north side of this long flush—

Jonathan — No, for the sake of discussion, let's just say on the north side is a building.

Steve — Okay. Thank you.

Kristin — Did we have one other comment? Was that Chris Downey that was beginning to speak earlier?

Chris — Yes, I apologize, I'm having problems with my computer, so I'm not online to be able to raise my hand. But anyway, my question generally has been answered in that I was curious about whether or not there was a parallel sidewalk that continued along what I guess is the north side, but it sounds like that's not the case. It's a building, in which case, I do assume that for the parking areas that they're wheel stopped and everything to keep cars from going forward into that space between the bottoms of the parallel ramps.

Jonathan — Yes. The answer is yes and the purpose of this question had to do with the proper placement of detectable warnings.

Chris — Yes.

Jonathan — So, there's a lot of questions you can ask about wheel stops or if there was a walkway on the north side, I think that would even be wrong, unless it was separated by a non-walking surface.

Chris — Okay, and the question would be does the walking surface, the lower landing, does that contain—I'm assuming it's concrete for the walk-in and asphalt for the parking area. If that's the case, is the bottom landing concrete or asphalt?

Jonathan — Bottom landing is concrete.

Chris Okay.

Jonathan The reason I bring it up was because I focus on that section of the code, 11B-103 that says, "Nothing in these requirements prevents the use of designs, products or technologies alternative to those prescribed provided they result in substantially equivalent or greater accessibility and usability." My question essentially is do people agree that it provides equivalent accessibility? I think it provides equivalent accessibility, but I'm open to dispute. Equivalent accessibility and greater usability, equivalent per person with visual disabilities, because warning has been given and greater for people mobility disabilities, because you don't have to do the up down, up down or long traveling on truncated domes.

Kristin We have Gene's hand raised and then we have Tim McCormick.

Susan Tim was first and then Gene and then—

Kristin Sure. So, let's begin with Tim.

Tim Okay, so I have a thought and a question. I'm really glad to see Jonathan raised the issue of equivalent facilitation because the code can't always address every issue and I think we have to get back to basic principles sometimes. I still have a question for you then. If we looked at the ramp going down on each side as being something similar to a perpendicular ramp without side flares, we would locate the detectable warnings on the slope surface instead of at the landing. This seems to be an interesting distinction between parallel and perpendicular curb ramps. What are your thoughts if they were actually located on the slope surface instead?

Jonathan I have wondered myself but then they're not perpendicular. They are parallel with—I mean, they're more similar to a parallel ramp than to a perpendicular ramp, so that drives me towards doing it. I hear you. I don't know.

Tim Do you think it would also work on the slope surface, I guess, is the question?

Jonathan Well, yes, but if the whole point is to provide warning, I think you'd do it either way and why add a difficulty factor for people with mobility disabilities to go up the ramp if you can do it equally on the level surface?

Kristin — So, now we have—Ida wants to speak to this particular comment and then, we'll move along online. I see we have Gene followed by Derek and then Rachelle. Go ahead, Ida.

Ida — My question is for those who use a wheelchair in our group. Do you have a preference as to whether you see it, you like this? I mean, which is more accommodating, the detectable warning on the surface of the ramp, or the detectable warning right at the base of the landing?

Rachelle — I'll un-raise my hand to answer Ida, because that was what I was going to bring up exactly. Absolutely not, no truncated domes on any sloped surface, period, end of story.

The reason being is because if you look at example C and that's the one where they're running in conjunction, in a straight line as the access aisle, if they're on the sloped surface, now especially because oftentimes curbed ramps are not installed correctly and then you put truncated domes on them and so now I'm dealing with something that's steeper and it's bumpy all the way down. My thought in that situation, I believe, Kaylan shares the same thought, is we would rather jump off a curb or find some other route in order to avoid those truncated domes.

In my opinion, the second example is the best example, which is the continuous line of truncated domes along the entire length of the flat surface and the reason is because if I'm going down a ramp, I have flat, un-truncated parts of my chair that are coming in contact with just smooth concrete and then I have parts of the—you know, bottom of the transition where it may hit a truncated dome, but I can position my chair as such or line up my chair as such where my wheels can go I between that, so I'm not really encountering any obstruction.

For me, it's more difficult to do that on a sloped surface especially because, people often, if it's a longer curb and their using different planks of truncs, they don't line them up. So, where there may be a gap, it is then at the next panel filled in with another trunc because the tracking of it doesn't line up. It's not a design problem, it's a construction problem almost 100% of the time.

Jonathan — I'd just like to point out, it might be a shortcoming of the drawing, but I want to ask you, did you realize that in drawing C that the detectable warnings are on the level surface and not on a slope? The slope is only—

Rachelle — Yes, I did.

Jonathan Okay, good.

Rachelle Yes, I still prefer B and the reason is because even though C is on the level surface, I've been going into a ramp and hitting another surface and so there's more chance for me to flip out of my chair at that point, because it's hitting something else that's not smooth. Especially if it's not inset in the concrete and it's laid on top, then I have to do a wheelie onto that trunc on the flat surface and continue my path, whereas B, I have more control, because half of my chair is on an un-truncated surface all the way down.

Jonathan Oh, I see. Okay.

Rachelle Yes.

Kaylan If I may add on to that?

Kristin Yes, please.

Kaylan It's [audio disruption] problem but it also is usually a maintenance problem, because if there are detectable warnings that are applied to the surface, and not built into the concrete, those edges often come up and so you get even more of a vertical distance that we have to get over and even if they're on a level surface, if you have a slipped surface that meets that level surface that they're on, you just have to be paying attention so that your casters don't catch it and your nose ends up on the concrete. Does that make sense?

Kristin Yes. I see heads nodding here in the room.

Kaylan Okay, and I would back up Rachelle's comments about item C, but I would prefer the first one just because it's a smaller stretch of detectable warnings to get around instead of trying to navigate that skinny area of the adjacent to that long stretch of detectable warnings.

Jonathan Yes.

Rachelle I see that point, too. I mean, so A or B. I could back that up, Kaylan.

Kaylan Great minds. It's just—you know, just with the typical width of those walkways and sidewalks, it just puts up against a concrete curb or a brick wall or something like that and it just scratches our knuckles if it's a wall, and stubs our chairs up if it's up against the concrete curb.

Rachelle Totally. Alright, I changed my answer. Kaylan's is better.

Kaylan That wasn't my intention.

Kristin It sounds like you are now agreeing with option A being the preferred set-up. Is that the [overlapping voices]?

Kaylan Yes.

Kristin Okay.

Rachelle Yes, Kaylan's smarter than I am.

Kristin So, we're going to let Steve Dolan here say something quickly about this particular topic and then we're going to jump back into our line. So, go ahead, Steve.

Steve I'm sorry, I have a question about option A. I guess, what I'm hearing expressed is a preference. The non-detectable warning part of that bottom landing between the opposing curb ramps it looks like only [indiscernible]. No, go to your left a little further.

That where the detectable warning occurs at the bottom landing separating the access aisle from the walking surface, there's about 12 inches of non-detectable warning covered surface at that bottom landing at a minimum, and I haven't heard anybody express if that were 3 or so feet wide, can wheelchairs continue to scoot around that and avoid the detectable warning in totality? I know it takes more space. I'm just asking if that's been discussed previously and I just didn't remember.

Rachelle I don't think I've heard that. I don't think I've heard that discussion. I certainly have missed it if it's been discussed.

Kaylan I think some chairs could get around it. I just don't know how many.

Tim I have a question on the spacing of the domes. Does it help to have a wider spacing for at least one wheel in the chair?

Rachelle Yes. Yes, absolutely.

Tim So you could possibly line it up if you're successful with one wheel on the concrete and one wheel in between the domes?

Rachelle Yes, absolutely.

Kristin We're going to let Gene ask his question.

Gene Well a comment and then a response as we were asked to give a preference. Chris did ask about the wheel—

Chris Wheel stop.

Gene Wheel stops. Thank you. In this scenario, is the wheel stop but also in front of that, going away from the car and curb? So, the wheel stop doesn't have the automobile's bumper hanging over the walkway, because sometimes you do find that. Jonathan, is that one of the elements in that design?

Jonathan It's not actually drawn, but the presumption is yes. The code would require that in such a location.

Gene None of these scenarios I find ideal. I think in proper enforcement both scenario A and B, if there was proper—it would be that you would have to have a walkway that would have to be a minimum of 6 foot rather than 4, so 3 feet would be detectable warning and then 3 of clear space. I don't personally like the idea seeing somebody with a mobility device trying to negotiate one foot clear space and then cross the detectable warnings on the other side.

I don't feel C is equivalent because you go down there and the bottom of that long landing, and even if there is a curb, there is with the access aisle, there is a gap there and you can't—let's say there's no cars there parked at the time, you for any reason, or ability or whatever, hearing, you can still veer between those curbs and go out into the area where there is the parking and it could go further. So, really, I see what, Jonathan, you're trying to do with C.

A—there'd be less detectable warnings. That's a real plus, but it may get even for somebody with the mobility device going up and down and like if you're in a walker that could be really exhausting or trying to push yourself up the—so many of those ups and downs in a short distance.

Jonathan Sometimes, there's 20 cars.

Gene Yes.

Jonathan Twenty accessible spaces.

Gene Yes, and that would be like a roller coaster ride.

Kristin We're going to—Ida was going to interject.

Ida I just have a question for clarity and for opinion. I understand with this proposal that you had put out, Gene, was a 6-foot wide sidewalk, 3-foot walk detectable warnings, 3 foot where they could—so, increasing when they're long width to 6 feet.

Gene Yes.

Ida So, that being an option—

Gene B.

Ida The question that I have with that, how significant is providing the necessary detection, is a 3-foot wide walk and 2-foot wide detectable warning in these instances where in essence it's letting you know not to veer off that path into the parking lot, but continue straight if you're traveling in that direction? Does that make sense?

Gen Yes, I know it does and it's actually unfortunate case by case situation of different individuals there. It's really a distance to stopping, detecting. Of course, the angle you're hitting it at, but it's the footwear. That is one factor—thick sole versus a leather sole. A leather sole is going to pick up more.

There's also a difference on the material of the detectable warning. If they were more of a resilient surface, rubbery-like, you're going to pick that up more quickly in most cases than a solid, firm concrete one, granite. Two, your reaction time as we get older and the larger majority of the blind are in the latter part of life, so your reaction time is slower to respond to that.

I see what you're doing—the parallel to the platforms, the transit boarding platforms there, which originally was 36 and then it compromised 24 to 36 with the idea existing platforms versus new construction and then it went to the 24. So, I guess I'm not giving you a definitive answer, but it's just too many—there are a lot of variables and it's like a case by case situation. From 90% detectable if you're 24 inches versus 36—I'd still be leaning to

the 36 for consistency and not having one place 24 and 36 in another location.

Kristin Thank you, Gene. I don't know if any of the others wanted to chime in and—

Susan I think we're [overlapping voices].

Chris I apologize. I'll put an audible hand up. [Overlapping voices].

Gene Ida asked a question and I was just going to finish what I was going to say.

Kristin Go ahead.

Gene That was that if we have the 6-foot wide, then option B would be my choice, the best equivalent, and I think that would be less impact on everyone. Thank you.

Kristin And, Chris Downey is after Derek has—

Susan I think Kaylan took her hand down.

Kristin Alright. Thank you so much. So, Derek, you're up.

Derek Great. Thank you. I really do appreciate everybody expressing their preferences and sharing that in as well as discussing reasons why they have their particular preferences. I did want to point out though that one of Jonathan's overriding question here is which of these options, A, B or C, are compliant and I would opine that option A and B are both compliant with the current requirements of the code and option C, if it is to be considered, would have to be considered under equivalent facilitation as Jonathan has indicated in his description. That's all. Thank you.

Kristin Thank you. So, next, I believe, we have Chris Downey.

Chris Hi. Thank you. I'll start this with a question and it might be a rhetorical question but it occurs to me that there is, let's say, in this scenario to see if I understand it, with the longer sort of lower landing level and the detectable warning strip along that entire length, thereby leaving the one foot clearance.

Given the challenges of people walking on or rolling across, I wonder if it's ever appropriate to have a space like that where the hazardous warning strip is within the accessible way. So, you're having to walk along it, but you're having to walk along the distance of that. Even at one foot, it's going to be hard to keep one foot off of that. So, it's something that I would never want to see. It's something I would never want to put out there in the environment, because I think it's wholly inappropriate. I think if that could move out, the hazardous warning strip, so that it's out of the line of that accessible way so that it's actually aligning, let's say, with the—I can't see it, but know there's a curb on the south side up against the parking area or if it's where it is a raised sidewalk.

I'll unwind that. The concrete, the lower landing, if the hazardous warning strip was sort of south of that line, or in line with what might be a curb along the south side of the ramp going down, so that as you go down the ramp, you're never on the hazardous warning strip if you're going from side to side across there. That would seem preferable to people in wheelchairs. It would seem preferable to anybody walking by there not intending to turn out into the parking area. It could be two feet, it could be three feet. It doesn't matter at that point. So, I'm just curious about that.

Kristin Steve had his hand up first and then—do you have a—

Steve Quickly, if we looked at option B with that long, continuous strip—

Chris That's the one, yes.

Steve Detectable warnings that are at the head of maybe 100-foot long flush surface, my question was at the head of two accessible parking stalls that do not share an access aisle, if those detectable warnings at the head there were omitted, I'm suggesting maybe it's a raised plantar island or curb island, we would really reduce the number of these detectable warnings, number one.

Number two is have a 3- or a 4-foot smooth walking surface around the plantar island and then, detectable warnings would be placed only where access aisles occurred. It would be more like a walk-through island in a street median, an extra-wide street median consideration and then, wheelchairs only have to deal with detectable warnings when they turn out to the appropriate accessible parking stall and pedestrians on the curb ramp really don't have to deal with it, period, until they decide to go out into the accessible aisle between parking stalls.

Anyway, that takes a lot more space, costs a lot more money and it's just my two cents.

Kristin — Thank you, Steve. So, next we'll here from Susan followed by Gene.

Susan — In thinking about the public right-of-way guidelines and how that is outside the boundary at this site and what's required within the boundary of this site, I guess, what I'm wondering because there are so many locations where you see this very type of configuration with this perpendicular parking that is at a parallel curb ramp where there are no detectable warnings at all. So, I guess, my question is how effective are they and how often—I guess that's what I'm really wondering. Is this really a necessary and effective solution and is it absolutely required where traffic is moving very slowly because somebody is pulling into a parking space?

And I can understand that yes, there are going to be a lot of times when vehicles aren't parked there. I guess, that's just my question. I mean, it's how effective are these and especially where you typically see this location is at accessible parking stalls? So, that's what I'm wondering.

Kristin — I see, Rachelle, you have your hand raised and we'll have you in line with Gene as well, but have folks respond to [overlapping voices].

Ida — So, why does her name show up?

Susan — Oh, it's just that's she's a participant.

Kristin — Oh, we're sorry, Rachelle. Before we move back to Gene, I'd like to see if anyone would like to respond to Susan's question so we can sort of piece each—you know, talk about each subtopic before we move onto the next one. Would anyone like to respond?

Jonathan — Sure, I think Susan's bringing up yet another issue and that's questioning what is hazardous or not and even if they're not accessible spaces, some places have the sidewalk running such that on one side it's a building for its full length—let's say 100 parking spaces, the distance of what would be 100 perpendicular parking spaces and the parking lot is flush with that sidewalk. I know Gene would say well, you necessarily have to have detectable warnings or you should at that flush transition, because cars are not always parked there and there's not continuous wheel stops.

Then, Marcia, I think we've heard that she would say they should be limited to street corners, and if not useful in such a location. So, it's just interesting, Susan, you're bringing up kind of a fundamental question about whether detectable warnings are useful in this scenario at a parking lot.

Kristin — Thank you. We'll next hear from Ida.

Ida — Adding on to that question that Susan posed, that if perhaps the group could address, is normally in this situation you would be perhaps on a concrete surface on the walk and on an asphalt surface for parking. So, due to a different change of materials, does that make a difference from the perspective of those visually impaired in a situation like this that would keep you on the walking path that is the detection of different surfaces?

Susan — And, then, you'd probably want to require that because, typically, civil engineers like to use concrete at the parking spaces because they can control that a little better as opposed to asphalt, so they can actually get the cross slopes and everything correct. It's just a material that they have a little more control over. Usually, that's what—even if they have this massive asphalt parking lot, then typically at the accessible parking spaces, they want to use concrete.

Kristin — Thank you, Susan. Gene and Rachelle, do either of you have a response to this?

Gene — Yes.

Kristin — Okay, great. So, we're going to begin with Gene.

Gene — Something's screwed up. That thing about my reaction about the detectable warnings—there is at least two steps. One is the negotiability on slope surfaces or physically [indiscernible] here. That's not quite the right term. [Indiscernible] is one of them. It really got into about the whole issue of contrasting the textured materials first since there are different kinds of finishes and you get the different finishes of more aggregate concrete versus the, comparing to asphalt, the detectability is reduced.

You have to get to a really rough asphalt and a real smooth concrete to really get adequate detection with your cane, too, and you're not [indiscernible] course. But the guide dogs are not going to help you with

that. The guide dog is just going to veer out there, because you don't know where you're going. The number of people using guide dogs is increasing.

If I understood the description of the island using planters and I assume like 36 inches in depth and then the cut-through there being the detectable warnings and then having on the other side a minimum of 36 or preferably wider of accessible [indiscernible]. Oh, that's ideal.

There's also the research showing that you can have fast-moving traffic and slow-moving traffic. There are still people that are not going to detect it. You don't have consistent traffic. Potentially you're putting someone out there in unnecessary risk out there where they're going to have conflict, whether it's going five miles an hour, you could still walk right into it. With the quiet vehicles now and again, the electric ones there, it's hard to detect and say, oh gee, there's a vehicle there, I better stop, and they're getting better and better. I mean, a wholly different technology, totally different.

It is really difficult in a lobby of this building with the elevators. The ding is they don't exist or they're so loaded, you can't tell and the doors open so quietly, you can't tell where they're at. That's kind of some reality of the quiet vehicles and then we're masking, I'm sorry, it's just the masking of other auditory sounds there, that are out there and the ambient noise there. You need to have something there to be [indiscernible].

I'm sorry, I just feel it's the amount of reduction and access of safety for all parties.

Kristin Thank you, Gene. Rachelle?

Rachelle Yes, I just wanted to comment. Here in Fresno, our lead building or plan checker for the CASp has eliminated truncated domes at all points of access aisles in the city, which I know—I just heard Gene's perspective and I appreciate that. So, I'm grateful for that, because they don't require it at access housing anymore at all, so there is an interpretation issue with how the code is written now. She's saying it's not putting you into hazardous vehicular traffic and so therefore, you don't need to have truncated domes at the access aisles. So that was point number one. I just want to make you aware of that.

Point number two is to answer Sue's question or to rather kind of support Sue's comment about contractors using concrete in the field. Whenever

I'm counseling my client, especially a client who's in litigation about remediation, I mandate that it's done in concrete because it's more—especially, if you're in Fresno with the heat, it's more easily to be maintained, it's able to be kept at the proper slope for a longer period of time. Asphalt moves and so, if we're dealing with a truncated dome issue, on the hand, but then we're dealing with ADA liability on the other hand, I know this is not a design standpoint, but just from a practical analysis, it's how we interpret this in the legal world, it absolutely must be in concrete. The dual surface is a great idea, but it's not practical in reality.

Kristin — Thank you, Rachelle. We're moving to—I saw Steve had his hand up and then Ida.

Steve — A quick question to the group. With the depth of a parking stall at 18 feet, as I recall, that's established in California only. The ADA does not establish a depth. So I'm wondering out loud as the planter island-thickened separation, could California allow bumper overhangs again and recognize the different dimension that would accommodate moving these truncated domes into what we traditionally call the first couple of feet of the access aisle, which would coincide with a bumper overhang space and still preserve our 48-inch walking surface that's ahead? It's just a question, what if.

Kristin — Ida?

Ida — In this design, this option B, I also want to address, because taking into consideration all the issues that we discussed and options that have been tossed out in discussing these, and including the one you just mentioned, Steve, that's obviously something we need to look at. But for our colleagues here that use mobility devices, how difficult is it to get out into the access aisle and turn up to go onto that ramp with detectable warnings there?

Rachelle — On option B?

Ida — Yes.

Rachelle — So going from east to west, how hard is it get back up onto the west-side ramp?

Ida — No. Coming from the parking access aisle and turning onto, how difficult—

Rachelle Oh, it sucks. It's hard.

Kaylan Yes. It's difficult to turn on detectable warnings in a manual chair.

Rachelle Yes, absolutely.

Susan Of all these, and how we're going to allow and take into consideration all—consideration.

Kristin Derek?

Derek Yes, I wanted respond to Steve's question about addressing the overhang in regulations. DSA, actually did go down that road about six years ago.

Steve Okay.

Derek We were—we encountered quite a bit of controversy over the proposal. We worked more on the idea of defining the overhang space as 2 feet and some jurisdictions objected because they said in their jurisdiction they define it as 3 feet. And we additionally handled or tried to address some related issues such as how much overhang would be allowed over a planter with the graded curb around it, for example. It is ended up that there was such a diversity of opinion on the issue and so much contentiousness about the issue that we withdrew the items that we were considering. It's a little bit of background.

Susan And different jurisdictions in their zoning ordinances have different requirements for how far back those wheel stops need to be from the front end of a parking stall.

Kristin Thank you, Susan. Do we have any other thoughts on this particular drawing set?

Susan I have one question. When we started taking a look at this, I took a look at what is said about parallel curb ramps and this would just be parallel curb ramps in general, and in the public right-of-way guidelines—I'm trying to remember exactly how they phrase it, but it's where the landing is constrained on more than one edge of the parallel curb ramp. That landing as you were coming down the curb ramp and in your direction of travel, that landing space would actually be 6 feet in depth.

I just wanted to ask that question when you take a look at the parallel curb ramp. In other words, you have a parallel curb ramp, but you only have

the ramp on just—it's like a half a parallel curb ramp. So, for users of mobility devices, is that something that would be a good idea to look at a little further?

Kristin — Let's have responses to Susan's question and then, we'll move to Ida and then, Tim McCormick.

Rachelle — Sue, can you repeat that code section again unless Kaylan has a response? I had a hard time visualizing what you were saying.

Susan — Sure. It's in the public right-of-way guidelines, and I remember reading through that and it said something about for the parallel curb ramps. I should have found that and had that available before we came to this session, but it says that when you have a parallel curb ramp, you come down the slope surface and then you have the landing.

In other words, what would happen on one edge of the parallel curb ramp—let's say you have a curb—you come down your slope surface and then, there's a landing. Then at the opposite edge of that landing, maybe you have another vertical curb. What they're saying is then you would actually make that a deeper landing. You'd add another foot to that landing, because now you've constrained that bottom landing.

So, I was just wondering if that would be something that maybe, at least, we'd want to consider and take a look at that.

Gene — Sue, can you explain—

Rachelle — I guess, I don't understand what the benefit of that would be, so our—

Susan — I think this gives you a little more turning space at that bottom landing because what would happen when you come down and you have that flat surface on two sides you'd have a vertical curb, so it would give you another foot as you came down that sloped surface. Then you'd have more space in that bottom landing to be able to make that 90-degree turn.

Rachelle — Oh, I understand now. I get it. Yes, that would be fine for—I think that would be helpful.

Susan — Okay.

Kristin — Gene, do you have a clarifying question?

Gene — Yes, I don't understand the description. You're talking about you go down a 6-foot wide sidewalk, the width, and you're going down the slope, then the landing. And on the landing, let's say for discussion, the left side of the walkway is the vehicular area, and you have 36 inches detectable warnings from that edge going inwards, and then, the right side there'd be 36 inches of clear space. Is that what you're describing? That's what I understood we have in the code right now.

Ida — Well, what it says, and thank you, Steve, because he found the section and this is in the public right-of-way guidelines and it talks about a turning space 4 feet by 4 feet minimum shall be provided at the bottom of the curb ramp and shall be permitted to overlap other turning spaces and clear spaces. Then, it says if the turning space is constrained on two or more sides, the turning space shall be 4 feet minimum by 5 feet. The 5-foot dimension shall be provided in the direction of the pedestrian street crossing.

So, like I said, then you have a bottom landing that is a little bit deeper, so when you come down that sloped surface, because if you just kept going straight, let's say, right ahead of you there would be a vertical curb. So, it gives you another foot in order to be able to come down that sloped surface and then turn at that bottom landing.

Susan — Gene, this is not a discussion on detectable warnings. I think this is an aside discussion on the length of the curb ramp when you're coming down the ramp. I mean the length of the bottom landing when you're coming down the ramp.

Gene — A one way parallel ramp—

Susan — Right, but this is the next—this is outside the discussion of where detectable warnings are.

Ida — Yes, and it's just—the questions were, you know, users of mobility devices. I mean, that's something that we currently don't have in the California building code, so I guess my question was, is this something that as we move through this process, that might be a good idea to take a look at that?

Rachelle — Yes, and Kaylan actually sent me a drawing of it so I could get a better visual. The city of Fresno is already doing this in and around town. And it is extremely helpful for wheelchair users because there is a turning radius outside the scope of where the truncated domes are. So if you are

going down a sloped surface, there's enough room to make that 90 degree turn without having any interference with the truncated dome. But yet the trunks are still available and able to be used, and a warning is able to be provided for those with visual impairments.

Kaylan — Yes. I would agree with that.

Kristin — Okay. Let's move to Tim McCormick who's had his hand raised for a while.

Tim — Okay, I just wanted to share some comments. From my experience of looking at design projects, most architects and civil engineers are choosing option B in practice. So we do see a lot of lengthy detectable warnings on strips. Sites tend to be somewhat constrained, making a wider walkway which create challenges, especially on high-density residential projects.

I think trading off a width of getting a goal of 3 feet for a walkway through would be more palatable to a lot of people if the detectable warning surface was changed from 36-inch steps to 24-inch to match the federal standard and then that would be only a 5-foot as opposed to a 6-foot walkway.

On a practical note, I helped my brother build out his restaurant in Corona, and we faced this issue exactly in option B. We did choose to make the walkway larger. And that was, even at his request, knowing that they had a lot of people who simply found it difficult to walk on a very long stretch of these detectable warnings.

So that's some of my feedback from design. And then another issue I would like to see addressed on these parallel curb ramps is the California building code shows them flush to the actual parking space whereas the right-of-way guidelines show them on the backside of the curb. And I think that's important from just a constructability standpoint of not having these go over the curb break in the construction joint.

We also typically see, not inset concrete, but we see another material besides the paving because most people are concerned about meeting the different sound on the cane contact requirement, making sure the materials are different. So this is just offered for feedback.

Jonathan — Can I give some feedback on that?

Kristin — Yes, Jonathan, please go ahead and then we'll hear from Ida.

Jonathan — The California code doesn't actually require—on the parallel curb ramp, the code doesn't require them at the flow line. In other words—sorry, the curb—but there is a figure that shows them. And we know that figures are not the enforceable requirement. But that figure happens to show them flush with the flow line. But that figure has entirely to do with the width of a curb ramp. The section to which it references is that it be 48 inches by 48 inches.

And then one other thing you said, Tim, I'd just add to that. The public right-of-way guidelines at R305.2.2, if people were wondering, doesn't just show it. It explicitly says detectable warning located at the back of curb. So I'm glad you brought it up though, Tim, because maybe that will be part of the discussion today. That is a content issue that people anguish over as well. That's all.

Kristin — So we'll hear from Ida and then Steve Dolan.

Ida — My only question is in understanding the width of that walkway, if there is the pull of the detectable warnings to behind the curb line, we have now increased that walkway by technically 6 inches. I mean at minimum, right? I mean, yes, so we're looking at [overlapping voices]. Huh?

Derek — No, it doesn't add any dimension at all.

Ida — No, I'm saying on a proposed solution, if we start bringing it back. Right now it's on that curb. If we pull it back does it not increase it by 6 inches because we're specifying that it's on the sidewalk surface and not where the curb is?

Derek — No, the width of the detectable warnings placed in that location, as long as we didn't make amendments to the width requirements, the width would remain the same. And so, that would be 3 feet.

Susan — We've just been shoving the detectable warnings over?

Derek — Yes, where you're taking the [overlapping voices] unencumbered or the area where the detectable warnings are not.

Ida — Right, so what I'm saying, if we were going to propose a 3-foot wide minimum clear and then you have a 2-foot—

Derek — That's the difference.

Ida — That was my question, is that we were talking about a 6-foot wide walk or a 5-foot wide walk, right now the detectable warnings are placed on that edge where they transition. If we were going to require to set it back, we have now increased that dimension by 6 inches, possibly yes? No?

Tim — Well, Ida, from my experience most people are still measuring the 4 feet from the inside of the curb and not using the curb as part of it. At least in design practice this is what we routinely see.

Ida — But when they're placing the detectable warnings today, are they not placing it as a transition of the concrete to the asphalt?

Tim — They are.

Ida — On top of that joint. That's my point. If we specify to move it back behind the curb, while the walk dimension is still measured as a walk dimension, we still have now increased that 6 inches because we're shifting where it is and we need to increase if we've proposing to increase the 36 inches.

Tim — In the practical sense of what's left, I agree with you.

Ida — Okay.

Kristin — I want to remind everyone to please say your name before speaking simply for the use of those who either aren't in the room or on the phone that we know who's talking. So let's go ahead and hear from Steve.

Steve — In the proposed right-of-way guidelines, the figure that Jonathan referenced, R305.2.2, it calls for detectable warnings if the back of the curb line, as a point of commencement. Directly below that is the figure R2305.2.3, this says that when it's a blended transition, if I'm reading that right, to pull the detectable warnings forward to the front face of curb.

So when I look at option B in our diagram, and realize we might have a 50-foot or 100-foot long bottom landing, I'm really scratching my head. Is this a blended transition or a bottom of a parallel curb ramp condition? And it's just not clear to me at what length—100 feet—is that blended transition or is that 100-foot bottom landing? So if we're going to come up with something, let's be clear somehow. It's hard. It's a goal.

Kristin — Do we have any other input on this set of drawings before we move on?

Susan — And it looks like it's what, a quarter to three? And we'll be done at four o'clock today? So maybe if we don't have anything else that we want to discuss on this topic, it might be a good time to take our break and then we can start with the remainder of our agenda when we get back. What do you think?

Kristin — Sure. At four? I mean at three.

Susan — At three? Sound good?

Kaylan — Can I just tell you something very quickly?

Susan — Sure.

Kaylan — I'm on the east coast and I'm going to have to pop out now at this point. So sorry. I'm going to miss the last half of today, but I really appreciate the opportunity.

Kristin — Kaylan, we're so glad you participated in the task force. And because we're about to say goodbye to you, do you have any final thoughts you wanted to share? I'm looking around the room and I think folks would probably be okay with any final input you would like to give before we take our break.

Kaylan — Well the being able to talk about what the detectable warnings on a sloped surface does for some of us was really important. I think how DSA addresses the maintenance of these things, and maybe that pushes you into an area where you don't want to go about what the detectable warnings were made out of and what kind of surfaces they're applied to could be really important to address some of those maintenance issues. So I know that's a bigger issue for another day.

Kristin — Okay, Kaylan. Any other final thoughts?

Kaylan — No, that's it. I'll see some of y'all next week.

Ida — Safe journey.

Kristin — Derek is just going to quickly respond to that, Kaylan, and then we'll take our break.

Derek If you had some thoughts on the durability of the maintenance of detectable warnings, I'd certainly welcome you shooting me an email.

Kaylan Okay.

Derek Okay. And I'll be sure to share it with the team.

Kaylan Great, thank you.

Kristin Thank you, everyone. So let's take our break now and we'll reconvene at three o'clock.

[Break]

Susan Alright, three o'clock. Time to start up again. Okay, where are we? I think we finished our discussion on the parallel and the perpendicular curb ramps. Correct?

Gene No debate.

Kristin No debate. Do you have a comment?

Gene Yes, I just would like—because we were talking about detectable warnings on slopes—what kind of ramp it is for [audio disruption]. And I asked Derek if he could read the citation so that any of you who maybe find the library—I don't know whether it's electronically on the internet but it is a study on negotiability on sloped surfaces and detectable warnings for people with mobility devices and the blind.

So just if we could allow for the record for Derek to read from just the title citation so you [audio disruption] it and read it. [Audio disruption] on our website. Derek?

Derek Yes.

Gene Could you read that? Just the citation of the state [audio disruption].

Kristin Everyone, we are beginning again and Susan had opened us up. And Gene was just posing a question, and Derek just stepped in the room. So, Derek, do you need Gene to restate the question?

Gene I was just explaining that there's a study out there that was done many years ago but still valid about the negotiability of sloped surfaces by

people who use mobility devices and the blind with detectable warnings. And just I think that would be a good background and it also deals with contrasting textured materials.

Derek — Yes, I thought it was a very interesting study. This study is dated Final Report September 1994, and this study was published by the US Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration. The title of the study is somewhat lengthy so I'll read it a few times here. The title is *Detectable Warnings: Detectability by Individuals with Visual Impairments and Safety and Negotiability on Slopes for Persons with Physical Impairments*.

Steve — I got that from Gene's summary. I think he did a great job. [Overlapping voices].

Gene — Do you have the authors here?

Derek — Well the US Department of Transportation.

Gene — Oh I thought that the researchers, I thought, okay.

Derek — Yes, the authors, the lead author listed here is Billie Louise Bentzen. That's B like boy, E, N like Nancy, T, Z, E, N like Nancy. Billie Louise Bentzen.

Ida — What is that?

Kristin — He's referencing a study. Gene was asking about a study and they are reading some specifics. Gene, does that answer your question?

Gene — Well, I just wanted everyone to have that and be able to hopefully find it so it gives them some actual hard data on why certain things have happened about detectable warnings on curb ramps and the impact it's had on safety and ability of people with impairments. That's it. Nothing more than that.

Kristin — Thank you, Gene. Alright. Welcome back from our break. We are going to go ahead and move on to our next topic discussing California-specific requirements and some scenarios where detectable warnings are problematic, to my understanding at least the way they are currently written. We have something up on the blackboard collaborative right now. And I know several of you are calling in, so I'm going to go ahead and read this out loud.

The beginning, it's an overview, and it says, "Following is a list of California Building Code (CBC) required locations for detectable warnings. Each paragraph describes distinct CBC requirements and includes a reference to any corresponding federal standard or guideline. The referenced federal standard is the 2010 ABA Standard for Accessible Design (ABAS), and the referenced federal guideline is the July 26, 2011 Proposed Accessibility Guideline for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right of Way." And there's an abbreviation there. It's Prowag.

What we have up on the screen for folks to see is item 1. It looks like it's long. It's a long list but I believe it was sent out to everybody ahead of our meeting. This is a file that had accompanied our meeting summary that was sent out several weeks back. We have a listing of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. It's a full-page listing of different sections.

I'm looking to our DSA team now. Susan had just stepped out of the room, but I'm looking to see exactly what we wanted to discuss here specifically.

Ida I think if I recall—Derek, go ahead. It seems like you were taking charge.

Derek No, I was just [audio disruption]. I believe what Sue and I had intended here was just simply to go through our—[audio disruption] placed on the bottom of the item list—is to go through the scoping requirements that are currently in the code and provide some context for each of them. The scoping requirements are in California Building Code, Chapter 11B, Section 11B-247. And that's where these comments that are listed in items 1 through 10, that's what these comments are addressing. So I think that's the purpose, if this information helps the discussion.

Ida I think that's mostly [indiscernible] here.

Kristin Does that make sense to everybody?

Ida So should we read them so everyone—

Kristin Yes, I'm happy—

Derek We can certainly do that.

Kristin We can take turns even. I know it's a long list. There are ten items to read. So, Derek—

Derek I'll go ahead and start.

Kristin Yes, please do.

Derek So item 1, and this is regarding CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.1, Platform Edges. So this is the requirements for detectable warnings at platform edges. In this case, in this section, the CBC requirement is equivalent to the ADA standards Section 705.2. And, well, without going into the technical requirements, the code language said simply, "Platform boarding edges shall have detectable warnings complying with Sections 11B-705.1.1 and 11B-705.1.2.1." Okay?

The next item on the list is regarding CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.2. This section covers curb ramps, so it's been split up into items two and three. Item two that we're talking about now covers perpendicular curb ramps and this CBC requirement is similar to what we find in the public right-of-way guidelines section R208.1, item number 1.

Okay now the next item in our list is item number 3, and here this is again regarding CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.2. In this case we're dealing with parallel curb ramps. And this CBC requirement is also similar to public right-of-way guideline Section R208.1, Number 1.

And moving to the next item, this is item 4 in our list, and this is regarding islands. This makes reference to CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.3, which I'll mention that CBC section also addresses cut-through medians, which we'll address in the next item on the list.

But for this item on the list, item 4, we're looking at islands. In this CBC requirement, it's similar to the public right-of-way accessibility guidelines Section R208.1 number 2 except where the island is cut through at street level and less than 6 feet in length in the direction of pedestrian travel. In that case, I think that we differ due to our typical requirements for 3 feet in depth of detectable warnings versus the Prowag requirement of 2 feet. I'm sorry, they're guidelines for 2 feet in the direction of travel.

Okay the next item on our list is item number 5, and this is again dealing with CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.3, but here we're looking at detectable warnings at cut-through medians. This CBC requirement is similar to public right-of-way accessibility guidelines Section R208.1 number 2 except where the item is cut through at street level and less than 6 feet in

length in the direction of pedestrian travel. Again, the difference is due to our 3-foot versus 2-foot requirements in comparison.

Item number 6 references CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.4. This is for detectable warnings at bus stops. Here this CBC requirement is similar to the public right-of-way accessibility guideline Section R208.1 number 4.

And the next item on the list is item 7. This references CBC section 11B-247.1.2.5. This section indicates where the walk crosses the vehicular way—and, oh, I'm sorry. This was separated from and distinguished from item 8 because this section, CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.5, addresses two conditions. The first condition is where the walk crosses a vehicular way and is not separated by curbs, railing, or other elements. And that's under the section for hazards, vehicular areas, in the CBC. But this requirement is similar to the Prowag Section R208.1 number 1, which is titled in Prowag as *Blended Transitions.*

The next section is also in the CBC under the section of hazardous vehicular areas. And in this, CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.5 addresses the condition where the walk adjoins a vehicular way and is not separated by curbs, railings, or other elements. The CBC requirement is similar to Prowag R208.1 number 1, which is titled *Blended Transitions* in the Prowag.

Item 9 in our list is regarding CBC Section 11B-247.1.2.6. This is detectable warnings at reflecting pools, and currently there is no corresponding federal standard or guideline.

And then the last one, item 10 on our list, covers detectable warnings at track crossings. And this references CBC section 11B-247.1.2.7. We know that the CBC requirement is similar to Prowag R208.1 number 3. That's the end of our list.

Susan has returned in the meantime. Sue, did you want to add anything to this discussion?

Susan I think we were just looking at where the CBC is similar with the federal requirements and guidelines and it made me realize the constraints that we have to deal with when we start taking a look at some of these coping provisions as we decide to move forward from this and what we can actually do.

Ida — Well these are all generally in excess of minimum federal because federal requires them only in the Prowag except for the track crossings, the forwarding platform. So I think part of the discussion is just maybe tossing out a few questions.

Are there any—for me, I would love to have a discussion on reflecting pools. What is a reflecting pool? It's not identified. Is this a critical issue? Is this something that—this has been in the code for a very long time. How are we addressing this? Should we address this? Does it warrant a definition or—

Susan — And that was one of the comments that came up. I think from—I know from Tim McCormick and maybe from Jonathan Adler as well because the question is, like you said, what's a reflecting pool? What about a koi pond? So yes, that was definitely a question that came up.

Kristin — So before we give jump into that, Gene, go ahead.

Gene — Well it's just going to be we're going to touch on that. Or we're bringing up [audio disruption] scoping. I just want to be able to ask when appropriate.

Susan — I think the platform is open for any of these comments so you can start, Gene, if you want.

Gene — Let me start. I want to talk about reflecting pools briefly. Reflecting pools, I—and the reality is it's probably a small item. But I think to keep in mind that detectable warnings are the last option [indiscernible]. At koi ponds, usually there's no spray or anything going on there. It's just for meditation there. You don't know at grade you're walking, you could walk right into it. You may remember, some of you that for a long time 8th Street Mall, when it's earlier date, before light rail, it had ponds that were fountains.

And there were times those weren't working [audio disruption]. I know I was contacted by the city [audio disruption] because there was several blind people walking into right those and getting hurt. They were floundering around and hitting flocks and whatever was in there trying to get out. So, there is a need for something to alert you, like a wall curb or something like that.

There is a need for something and it probably should be defined like [audio disruption] because I know close to the river here there's—now I

don't know if it's called reflecting pool but there's some big fountains where it goes on. Water goes up for a while and then it drains right at the slope and you go right in there and you can walk in [audio disruption] of the sidewalk. And then it turns on. I don't know what you call that but that's something [audio disruption].

Steve It self-activates.

Gene No, it's on a timer that it just goes and you can just walk right into this gradual slope 1 to 20. The idea is water goes there and it drains, stops, and then it drains, and then it goes back. So, it's recycled. It's a water feature. So, I mean there's just different kinds. I'm saying we probably should define it.

One is the track crossing. That track crossing, the scoping language it says that you have the detectable warnings where, I'm paraphrasing, you're crossing the tracks to reach a transit boarding platform. Well, there's a heck of a lot more than just transit boarding platforms. You can enter it on the other side [indiscernible] sidewalk.

And then, two is, as I've been told by some people where this has been building officials that actually interpreted that you only needed on the side that you're approaching the tracks and crossing to get to the transit boarding platform. But if you're leaving the transit boarding platform, going the opposite direction, there's no need for detectable warnings on that side as you're going between the tracks. This is where there needs to be clarity that where you're making a track crossing, regardless of what the purpose is for making the track crossing, where is the legal track crossing, where it's legal and it is not prohibited to make the crossing that there's detectable warnings in both sides so that you don't end up on the tracks, unbeknownst that you're standing there. There may not even be a crossing bar.

The other thing is, we have it here in Sacramento, two different blind people before the detectable warnings were put in, they heard the dinging but they could not locate the dinging of the arm because it was just so loud to know where they're standing and they both got hit by the arm coming down because they were standing right directly beneath it. They didn't realize it. If the detectable warnings, which solved the problem afterwards, if there's a way to set it back a distance so that the crossing arm was in front of them but they weren't there.

I'm just saying that this is something that should be looked at, maybe not this cycle but some cycle about the track crossing provisions. Thank you.

Kristin — Thank you, Gene. Ida had put out this request that we discuss the reflecting pools in a bit more depth, so thank you, Gene, for touching on that. I wrote down some of the questions she was posing. The first one was, "What exactly is a reflecting pool? How do we identify those and should they be addressed?"

I did see some examples that our group had brainstormed when we were thinking about including this on the agenda. We had discussed fountains, koi ponds, other water features, and I'd like to put this out to our task force to weigh in. What do you consider to be a reflecting pool? How are they currently identified or do you think they should be? Do you think this is a topic that needs to be addressed?

Gene has a clarifying question first.

Gene — What is the problem that's been presented about this section? Since there's various options as warning, not just detectable warnings, so, I'm just wondering what has been the issue that's been brought up.

Ida — At least from my perspective is what is the definition of a reflecting pool and where does say a fountain or another pool or something else is different. Is there a specific feature about a reflecting pool that warrants detectable warnings as opposed to other water features?

Gene — Just on that, then I would say it shouldn't be exclusively reflecting pools. It should be all kind of water features like that where there's water there, whether there's audible sounds, sprays that can muffle or obscure any outdoor [indiscernible]. I think it's all in there. It's not one kind.

Ida — Thank you. I have a question.

Kristin — Yes, so Ida and then Steve.

Ida — Gene, you had brought up the water feature previously and I know that there's a lot of water features designed that are in open parks. Right now especially in California you're trying to address cold water availability for kids at play. And so, those features are required to be accessible so creating barriers that other than say detectable warnings around them is a problem because part of that is to have children of all different abilities engage in play but yet also you have brought up the issue that for those

who do not wish to engage in play and are walking through is a problem because they could activate.

And so, I'm having some difficultly reconciling both needs, I guess, in some way. And so maybe a discussion of is there an alternative solution then having detectable warnings provide that need. Because if we have a positive requirement where all water features require detectable warnings so you don't enter in them, that may solve one issue but it could create an ability to solve another which means that if it is for play, having that ability to participate in play. So I don't want to issue a clarification on some requirement that then starts to limit others.

That's why I was tying it to reflecting pools, is there something unique to that because the reflecting pool, to me, does conjure up a specific image whether or not it's a literal process of that. I don't know. I'm just tossing that out there.

Kristin — Thank you, Ida. So, let's hear from Steve Dolan and then we have Jonathan after that.

Steve — On reflecting pools, I guess a fountain if it's flush with pavement seems to be different because it makes noises. But then, maintenance happens and the pump goes down. Does it then become a reflecting pool? So, I think the distinction of what makes a reflecting pool, is it momentary, is it design, is it a permanent feature, would be helpful.

I've had some that are a quarter the size of Lincoln Memorial's reflecting pool, set down two steps. It was different than what I envisioned a flush and raised reflective pool. So, do steps create another potential warning? What is it that creates the notice besides just the detectable warning? Is there any other option? So, those are just food for thought. I don't know.

Kristin — Thank you. So, Gene, I see your hand up. I'm going to let Jonathan go first. Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan — Just adding to the quandary, in terms of what creates the hazard, how is it any different than the swimming pool at a hotel, where there's no barrier and there's water? I guess in the back of my mind is the concern of consultants and architects with the great need to cover their rear ends interpret that and say, well, I guess we need to put detectable warning around all sides of a swimming pool.

I hear Ida said clarification is needed so that that kind of thing doesn't happen unless the consensus is hotel swimming pools need detectable warnings as well.

Kristin — Thank you. So, Gene and then followed by Derek.

Gene — Well, I think the first thing is that the enclosures that mandatory sensing enclosure around with the gates there at a swimming pool location at a hotel or somewhere, does give you at least some warning, okay, you're entering a hazardous area there and use your cane. But, a fountain, there's nothing like that. You don't have enclosure.

The thing about sometimes you have steps to go into them, the hard problem is there you could be entering steps and think, oh, these are steps from elevation to another elevation on a pedestrian pathway, rather than that you're going down some steps that are going to lead you right into water. And just like earlier, and Steve's asking me a question and I hadn't thought about until now is like curb ramp having detectable warnings, rather a sloped surface. Well, you can go from a landing to—well, one deck to another deck with a short ramp there, and you might interpret a sloped surface, oh, this is going from one deck to another deck. Where, it might be a sloped surface that will take right into water, like I was describing with the feature.

Or, it could be going from one deck level that dips down into a parking lot. So, I mean, the detectable warning, just focus on right there, some kind of warning you do need to have at some things where you could have something to alert you that there's a distinction. You want a distinction from an area that it's okay to proceed versus one where you have to be cautious.

Jonathan — That's a good point about the enclosure, Gene. And that would be true at a Motel 6, but many hotels have large areas within which the pool is only one thing. There's dining tables, and other park-like areas that all are inside the enclosure.

Gene — Jonathan, I absolutely agree with you. I know 31 years ago, another young lady and I were at a conference and we got disoriented on this large patio in Arizona in this hotel. There wasn't that sensing thing there and we had a difference of opinion which direction to go. I should have listened to her because as I was saying, Sally, this is the right way, and she said, are you sure. I said, oh, I'm absolutely certain. The next thing I know she had a nice evening gown and I was wearing my suit and we

walked into the 10-foot end of the swimming pool. She was pissed with me afterwards, but she was right.

What I'm saying is yes, you can walk right in there. I've never pitched for detectable warnings around the perimeter of a swimming pool but I guess you could argue for that. That's where having, looking at textures, maybe little gradual elevation there like a little—other means of doing it without actually having a barrier to anyone getting into the pool, even getting into the lift.

Ida — I have a question. Is, in identifying the hazard, because this is a detectable warning, are we detecting the presence of water or are we just detecting the presence of falling into water? A reflecting pool I don't have and so is it like stepping into water or falling into water?

Gene — Falling into—

Ida — Like a ground hazard or a being wet hazard?

Gene — Both. [Overlapping voices] or busting your face. [Audio disruption]

Ida — No, I get the falling part. I just didn't know if it was a depth issue. [Overlapping voices]

Steve — Some of the reflecting pools where I've been at private residences and things like that they have kids. They want to limit the death in pools so the kid doesn't drown. It's 1.5 inch, or 2 inches deep. Is there a gap where a reflecting pool becomes a hazard or a depth where it's just a nuisance?

Kristen — Derek, please.

Derek — I'd like to suggest that a reflecting pool by its very nature, in other words, a contained area of water for which visual aids there is an intentional design to minimize the apparent transition between the walking surface and the water area purposely creates a hazardous condition for anybody, whether they're sighted or not sighted.

And, sure it looks nice. It's an attractive and aesthetic feature, but I think we need to be very careful here. Frankly, I've never understood why reflecting pools with a zero edge line or invisible edge or some of the other descriptive terms, why they wouldn't be subject to a warning curb requirement. In most cases, that would be an abrupt level change

exceeding 4 inches in vertical dimension. But, reflective pools are, I guess, unique in the way they're treated by enforcement.

Ida — Just in response to that, that was why my question because we had started to discuss before entering where these fountains, and to me just because there's a fountain doesn't necessarily mean there's a pool of water. So, that's why I wanted the clarification of is it a water issue or is it a drowning issue, because like in the act of play usually a less active play is happening, there is no pool of water.

I just didn't want to start discussing a whole bunch of things and not tying it to what was the original purpose to understand what the regulation covered.

Derek — I think for that I would suggest that most play areas that incorporate water features are fenced. And so that people who enter into these facilities start out with the expectation that there are water features there and some may present a hazard. Now it may be that within these enclosed areas there might need to be some more distinction between walking surfaces and non-walking surfaces. But, you do get a fair warning, though.

[Overlapping voices]

The art installation down in the new state complex over on N Street, the east end complex. There was a water exhibit, a piece of art, and essentially it was an inverted capital L shape. And the horizontal element at the top was a water trough where water was pumped and then at random times it would dump water over the pedestrian area that extended immediately below the water feature.

Gene — Oh, I'd love that.

Derek — It was apparently not reviewed prior to the installation of the project [audio disruption]. Eventually, it was taken down and it's been non-operational since a few weeks after it opened.

Ida — That's a sculpture art. That is not a water play feature where kids go to play and they're encouraged to play and they're out in the open.

Derek — The encouragement might be the problem there but I don't believe there's a lot of difference

Kristin Can we spend maybe five more minutes on this one and then we'll talk about a few of the other requirements because I know we've just got about 20 minutes left together? Gene, go ahead.

Gene I'd like to know, why—I don't know what these areas look like so I apologize. But, it sounds like there's an area that—you're saying where children go in there and it's dry and then there's water that might spout out. But if it's a grass slope or anything, I don't understand why a concrete detectable warning is a problem.

Susan Some of them don't have like—when you go over to that water intake that's over off of Jaboom Street? You go to that water intake area, and it'll just be no water shooting out at all. And then all of a sudden there'll be water that will shoot up and kids are out there running around and playing in the water. But, there's nothing there—

Ida But there's no pool.

Gene That's what I'm talking about, detectable warnings should be—

Ida My point is there's no pool.

Susan No.

Ida There's no pool of water.

Gene I don't want to walk in there when I'm not even knowing that that's what's there and all of a sudden it turns on, and I'm totally clothed. Why should I have to be hit by water?

Ida I'm not saying that you should be. I'm just addressing that that's not my question. I'm trying to clarify what is a reflecting pool. The reason that the regulation was put in place to begin with is what we're evaluating and I'm trying to understand. Does it merit a definition?

Gene And that came from the fed, US—

Ida So that's my question. I think it's interpreted. So, I'm not necessarily looking to expand or narrow, my question was, what is the reason? Is it a drowning hazard? Is it a water hazard? And, should we have a clarification on the definition?

Kristin Chris Downey, we'd love to hear from you.

Chris — Hi. That scenario we were just discussing, I started to wonder if you were to surround that area with a hazardous warning strip what does that mean. Typically it means you're moving into a vehicular way. You expand it perhaps just from unknown yet to be discovered type of hazard, one of which could be—one of 20 might be water or a spout that might shoot water up. How would you know what that's telling you? How would you know not to walk through that area since a hazardous warning strip doesn't mean do not go there, do not pass? It certainly doesn't say reflecting pool or intermittent spouting water.

So, I'm just curious why clarity? What help comes from that? Would you hit it and know to walk around it? Or is it just—it's like walking across the street and somebody just says, watch out, and offers nothing more. Or, duck, and nothing more. I don't know where this would—I'm not sure if we're solving a problem or creating other problems.

Kristin — Thank you. I'm going to let Gene speak but I want to make sure everyone has a chance, too. Did anybody else want to share their thoughts that maybe hasn't spoken?

Susan — No hands raised.

Kristin — Okay, go ahead, Gene.

Gene — Chris, I guess we keep in mind that the detectable warnings is such to say risk, be cautious, where are you going after here. It doesn't give you any more, as you know, information. It doesn't indicate whether it's a [indiscernible] or whether it's a pool of water or whatever it is. It's just to let you know be cautious.

And yes, I would agree with you, you run into that, then you either decide to proceed forward and just find out what it is, or you just work your way around it. But it doesn't give you any more information than be cautious, here's a risk. Just like a painted white, red, yellow line with the colors, it just says risk or proceed with caution. That's all it's going to do.

Kristin — Would anybody else like to weigh in on our reflecting pools before we move on?

Chris — I'm trying to raise my hand here. I just find that answer unsatisfactory. There's some areas where you could be inside it or you might have been in it for a while and you don't know if you start moving and the next time

you hit it, you're now going out but you're not sure if you're going in. It's the frame of reference is so ambiguous and the hazard is so ambiguous, especially when you start warning all sorts of different things. It just becomes really messy to the point where I just question to know at what point is it helpful.

Kristin Ida, would you like us to stay on this anymore?

Ida I think we've discussed this. I would like to see if there's any other issues. I have one that I'd like to throw out there. On the medians and islands, where in California I think we have 2 feet and then 2 feet of a break and then another 2 feet as a minimum. Correct?

Kristin I believe so.

Derek That is an exception—

Ida When it's less than 6 feet? Less than 8 feet?

Derek Specifically you would have 3 feet of detectable warnings, 4 foot landing, and then 3 more feet of detectable warnings.

Ida Right. So that would be 10. Right? So, my question is, when we have these islands that are less than 6 feet, is providing an entire strip of detectable warnings the whole way an ideal solution and what issue does that cause?

Steve I thought it was—

Gene We don't have that.

Steve It was less than 6.

Ida What?

Steve I thought when it was less than 6 they're omitted.

Ida No, they're not omitted.

Susan I see what you're saying because if you're, and there are a lot of those types of [overlapping voices].

Gene — The thing is, and I see your point, Ida, it's timing is like—if it's something like 4 foot or less there should be—you cut through where—there shouldn't be a reason for you to stop. There's traffic there. You should have either sufficient time to cross it but when you get into wider, that's where you're looking for a safety thing where maybe there's so much moving traffic on each side.

But the part that whole 4-foot wide, yes, it's really like you're saying. It can be very confusing, and it becomes meaningless.

Ida — Go ahead, he'll summarize the requirements.

Derek — I just wanted to make sure since we were talking about specific fine detail here. In Section 11B-705.1.2.3, this the detectable warnings on islands or cut-through medians, the detectable warnings for pedestrian islands or cut-through medians shall be 36 inches minimum in depth extending the whole width of the pedestrian path or cut-through, that's 2 inches minimum each side, placed at the edges of the pedestrian island or cut-through median, and shall be separated by 24 inches minimum of walking surfaces without detectable warnings.

The exception there is for pedestrian islands and cut-through medians that are less than 96 inches or less than 8 feet, and it says detectable warnings shall be 24 inches minimum in depth in those locations, still separated by 24 inches minimum of surface without detectable warnings.

Ida — And so my question if there's an issue where it's less than 4 feet then obviously the requirements do [audio disruption]. Less than 60, yes, the requirement is correct. Thank you. Less than 60 the requirement would be to carpet the entire surface in detectable warnings. Correct?

Derek — Yes.

Ida — It's not. So that's what I'm trying to clarify. Is that beneficial to our friends with visual impairments? Is it problematic to those who are in wheelchairs? Just having that discussion and concerns.

Kristin — Would anybody like to weigh in? I see Gene, I see you, Gene. I absolutely want you to talk. I just want to make sure other folks also get a chance. Rachelle, did you have any thoughts on this or anybody else? I know Kaylan has left.

Gene, go ahead [overlapping voices]. Rachelle, is that you?

Rachelle — Yes, I was just going to say I really don't. I mean, this is such a minor, like this is such an infrequent encounter that I don't really have an opinion on it.

Kristin — Thank you. Gene, go ahead.

Gene — I was going to say, and maybe it's connected to what is the definition of refuge area. I think that's where maybe the definition in there. Because, when you're getting something like—this was less than 6 feet, or let's say 4 foot by 4 foot, yes, detectable warnings there, it's really not going to tell you anything where you basically need to proceed on, going right on through there, in my opinion.

I think that maybe the only thing you could do is come up with defining what a refuge area is and how wide that can be so that it then gets into Cal trans, the signal, how much time it is to make the crossing there. So, where you don't have to hang out there at the median right there, which is so narrow.

Kristin — Thank you. Steve?

Steve — Yes, I'm on a slightly different topic. I just don't want to lose the 12 minutes we have left. I would appreciate consideration on detectable warnings to have a better statement more similar to the Prowag R305.2.1 that the direction of the domes were oriented in the direction of the slope as I find that is helpful when you get to some of these curb bottoms of ramp there's a lot of confusion. And if the domes get set with their orientation towards the radius, at the center point, then it's contrary to the slope and it makes it extra difficult for a wheelchair to, in my opinion, go down and I'd like to see many of the mobility device users would find that to be helpful.

Kristin — Thank you, Steve. Would anyone like to respond to that?

Jonathan — I'd like to chime in on an aspect of it. And that is, the grade break at the bottom of a curb ramp under the code is required to be perpendicular to the run of the ramp. So, technically, I think you're supposed to be holding the detectable warning back so that it doesn't begin until the grade break begins. Because, if the grade break is at the outer curb, it's no longer perpendicular to the run of the ramp.

But, that raises another conundrum. People look at that and they go, well, there's this empty pie shape space without detectable warning if you do that. And I think the way the code leaves is you're wrong if you do and wrong if you don't. Because, if you extend it 3 feet, this is hard to do without a diagram, sorry if this is too wordy. If you extend it 3 feet long and then you fill in that pie, you're longer than 3 feet and the code says the detectable warning shall be 36 inches, period. I don't know how well that did with just words without a diagram.

Do you follow me?

Derek If I could just follow-up on your comments, and please jump in and stop me if I go astray? I think the condition that Jonathan was describing would be one where you would have a street corner but instead of having sidewalks on approximately—90 degree street corner. But instead of having sidewalks coming from both streets to the corner, you have a sidewalk only coming from one street to the corner.

And then furthermore, instead of having a sharp corner that we would have a typical radius corner or rounded corner. And so what that does is that creates a perpendicular curb ramp situation, which the Prowag would, I believe, require that the curb ramp there be in line with the direction of the walk.

So, what happens is is that the bottom of the curb ramp—I'm sorry the bottom of the sloping portion of the curb ramp, again referencing a section that Jonathan had mentioned that requires a grade break and the grade break, just for folks who don't look at these things in the code, but the grade break is where the slope of the curb ramp ends and the bottom landing begins. So, it's that transition from a slope surface to the approximately level surface at the bottom of the curb ramp.

The Prowag says that the grade break has to be perpendicular to the direction of travel. Now, in order to have that grade break be perpendicular to the direction of travel, you need to stop the curb ramp or pull the curb ramp back a little bit so that the full width of the curb ramp can have a grade break. Because, if you don't pull that grade break back, a little ways from the corner of the street, what happens is is that you end up having a curved portion of the curb ramp that's going to create a fall-off condition. It'll create a raised curb for a portion of that. It would be in line with the sidewalk and so it would suggest that people who were blind or visually impaired that you could continue in that same width and direction of travel as you're coming down the sidewalk and then down the

curb ramp, but in reality, the geometry there creates a drop off where the curb comes around.

So, what the Prowag solution is to this problem is to require that that grade break be pulled back. And by being pulled back I mean up towards the approaching sidewalk. What that would do is it would leave a pie shape, as Jonathan had said, or a semi-circular shape at the bottom beyond the grade break but before you actually stepped into the street. So, this pie shaped space would be roughly, generally level and in the Prowag the detectable warnings are indicated to be provided at the bottom of that sloping section.

So, that leaves this pie shaped space that's level, it's beyond what is the feel of the curb ramp, but it's not quite into the street. The Prowag treats that as beyond detectable warnings and provides the safety by putting that detectable warning back a little ways rather than extending it out or minimizing the detectable warning.

Kristin — Thank you, Derek. So, Rachelle has her hand raised and then after that we only have about 5 minutes together and so I'd like to give folks a chance to share any final thoughts quickly after Rachelle speaks. Go ahead, Rachelle.

Rachelle — Yes, this will be really quick. I totally screwed up. I thought when Ida was asking me about it, I thought we were still talking about reflecting pools. So, I got lost. Ida, what was your question about—was it about reflecting pools?

Ida — No, it was in cut-through medians, like when you're crossing the street and there's a cut-through median. The code says that if it's less than—the code does not define how to approach detectable warnings if it's less than 6 feet in depth. It says if it's less than 8, it's a 2, 2, 2, but less than 6 feet. And so, because it's not addressed, the default generally, the way I understand it, is as the entire surface of detectable warnings which could lead to detectable warnings for 5.5 feet.

And so, my question is, is that an issue for either? Like normally, detectable warnings the way I've interpreted as somehow addressing the issue is that, especially in cut-through medians, is where you enter and where you exit, and so that break in between, basically, maybe tells you you're okay and in a safe space. But then if it's completely carpeted, do you know what the length is going to be and is it sending an alternate

message? I don't know if there is a proposed solution, but I'm just throwing it out there for discussion.

Rachelle — No, from a person with mobility disability standpoint, if it's a flat median and there's no ramp to get up and off of it, it's annoying to have truncated domes, but it's not—it doesn't cause much of a barrier from my perspective because it's flat the whole way through. So, if it's laid properly that I can track my wheels down the gaps and use it normally and not really experience any difficulty. But, if there's a slope up or a ramp up to get up to the median, and then it's trunked all the way and then there's a ramp down, then that's really when it becomes a problem and I have seen that.

Because as we've discussed earlier with Jonathan's first example of when you're putting trunks at a grade break or on a slope, they're typically not in-set in the concrete. They're placed on top. So, when you're going up a ramp and then there's trunks all the way across or vice versa, you're still having to do a wheelie to get up on that truncated path. So that's really when the problem does arise is when it's not on a truly flat surface.

Kristin — Thanks, Rachelle. So, we'd love to hear any parting thoughts you have. I know there's been a lot of good input shared throughout our five meetings together. Is there perhaps a point you would like to reiterate briefly or just a statement? Something you would like to have the DSA team here consider as they move ahead with their drafting process? We welcome that at this time.

Let's go ahead and start with our remote attendees. So, any of you that would like to chime in here?

Rachelle — I'll say really quickly, I really do like the Prowag design from a mobility user standpoint. It is from a mobility user's standpoint the least intrusive and the safest design that I have seen actually work out in the field. So, if you're looking at the Prowag for guidance in this particular area, I'm a huge fan from a mobility user standpoint. So, that's my final thought. And, this has been really fun and I really enjoyed it. That's all.

Kristin — Thank you, Rachelle. So, Chris or Jonathan or Tim, would any of you three like to share any final thoughts?

Jonathan — I would like to but I don't feel like I need to go first. I'd be happy to wait for others.

Kristin The time is now.

Jonathan I feel like I've talked a lot. Okay. I'm going to put my pitch in for my perspective that the whole 6 to 8 inch back issue on parallel curb ramps, in the code, as it now stands, is very ambiguous. Whereas, a perpendicular ramp is told to be 6 to 8 inches back, but then there's an exception for parallel ramps.

The way the language reads can be read three different ways by a reasonable person. It says to put it on the turning space at the flesh transition between the street and sidewalk. I think a person could read that as saying simply that do not put it on the ramp but put it on the bottom landing that whole thing is the flesh transition. And if it's really meant to be an enforceable requirement that it be flesh with the asphalt, so to speak, it should mirror the curb ramp section. If you're doing an exception to the 6 to 8 inches, then it should say, zero inches from the street, but it doesn't. It simply says at the flesh transition.

Some people read that and say for them to put it on the landing, not the ramp, but the 6 to 8 inch still applies. If it's worth making it an enforceable requirement to hold it tight to the asphalt because it provides more space for the one wheel of a wheelchair to track on an untruncated section, well then make that clear in the code.

But, in the interim, if the interpretation at DSA that parallel ramps must have their detectable warning tight to the asphalt, and I think that's the best way to describe it, that we all understand, well then, interpretation and regulation should be published.

Kristin Thank you. Chris or Tim, would either of you like to say final thoughts?

Tim I just want to piggy back a little bit on Jonathan's comment. I think it would be good if we clarified some of the language that he was referring to. That's actually a frequent construction question.

I would also like to say it is a bad idea to have detectable warnings go over the construction joint that normally occurs from the back of the curb to the walkway because they're going to both move at different rates and over time I think you're just asking for either bonding problems or cracking problems. So, I think Prowag has it right in showing it behind the curb, even though it's only referenced in the figure. I think language would be helpful there.

Overall, I think I would just hope that we would bring clarity to the issues and reduce the use of detectable warnings to where they're actually valuable. I think we have too many of them and it's causing more confusion than good and I think that's the problem that hopefully now that it's been teed up for DSA that they can start making serious progress on because I think that's what most people are looking for to coming out of our work on this today.

So, those are my thoughts. Thank you.

Kristin Thank you so much. Chris?

Chris Yes, so it's down to me. No, I agree with what's been said in terms of pushing for more and more clarity and sometimes that clarity might need to come in the form of what not. And, it is challenging to have the question of the illustration versus the text and if something is not in one and in the other, plenty of architects, plenty of designers look at the drawing. Maybe they'll try to get clarity from the text, maybe not. So the more clarity we can bring in the illustration, the figure, the better and getting the two to work together all for greater clarity.

Kristin Thank you so much. And, I know we're a few minutes over. I'm hoping the group will allow our final two task members here to share their thoughts as well. Steve or Gene, either of you may—yes, go ahead.

Steve I'll start by just simply, I appreciate the opportunity. I think it's a hard issue that I feel like Captain Kirk, before there's only [indiscernible] mission. Good luck. It's a challenge. So, making the parallel curb ramp more clear certainly would be a benefit, and detectable warnings are one of the confusion. So that would be my strongest focus. Thank you for letting me participate.

Kristin Thank you so much. Gene?

Gene I appreciate the opportunity for discussions. It's been several years since we've had one on this subject.

I would like to give a—I'd like to request re-establishing, reactivating, the detectable warning product certification committee. There are things in the code that are unclear that we were starting to get at like defining how many decibels are needed for an audible distinction, measurement of resiliency for detectable warning. We were getting to that and getting

better slip resistant measurement, taking account of all the different products.

I do acknowledge that some of the products, they're like made of plastic. When they get wet, they can get slippery. And, sometimes perhaps some of the elements that make that slip resistant surface on some of the products may provide traction for mobility devices. On the other hand, it may be a hindrance. That's something, I think, that product certification committee was looking at and with the research underwriters lab was looking at.

I know the resiliency and sound difference, I know they were stretching their RFP to do that but it was something that is needed. It is in the code and I think we really do need that. I think it will solve some of the access and safety concerns. Thank you.

Kristin — Thanks to you, Gene. Would anyone from DSA like to share next steps or any final words?

Susan — I just want to thank everybody because I know what a big commitment time-wise this has been, so thanks to everybody that they took time out of their busy schedules to participate, and share some of their experiences and their thoughts.

Derek — Well, I just appreciate everybody's input and sharing their opinions and experiences here. It helps not only the DSA staff but it helps all of the rest of the participants here to understand things from the other person's point of view. That's always helpful when we're trying to write or to discuss building code requirements because certainly we want to provide the highest level of safety that we can in the building code and still be respectful of the limitations of other people's personal boundaries.

Ida — I want to thank everyone for participating, for taking the time, for being candid, for being respectful to each other, and for listening to each other. As we amend the regulations and determine the courses of action that we'll take, we may actually send emails out to you and ask for your opinion. So, while we don't have meetings scheduled, it doesn't necessarily mean this is the end of your personal input on this task force. It just remains to be seen as we move forward if there is a further specific issue that we want to address.

And so, thank you so much for your participation and we also look forward to your participation in the public meetings, and in the 45-day

comment period because your input will be valuable because you participated as well in this task force and understand a lot of the issues that arose that with whatever regulation we're amending, we're trying to address.

Derek — And if I could follow-up just briefly on Ida's comments, especially the last part. We always prefer comments to come in at the earliest point possible in our rule-making cycle. And so, don't be afraid to pipe up and submit your comments during our earlier public meetings portion because a lot of times as we get down to the 45-day comment period, we have a little bit less latitude in our progress through the rest of the rule-making.

Ida — Derek is correct. In our pre-cycle public meetings, you have an opportunity to comment. Then it gives us an opportunity to amend further. If it's the 45-day, if we amend, it will require another 45-day or a 15-day and sometimes when that happens, we actually have to withdraw provision rather than amend due to time constraints. So, understand that your comments in the public comment period in our pre-cycle activities are very much appreciated because it gives us an opportunity to continue working and actually target a resolution as opposed to pushing it over into the next code cycle because they come too late.

Kristin — Wonderful. Thank you, everybody. Gene, did you have a final—

Gene — Yes, just for staff to think about, because not everyone is involved in the certification process. But, the industry, the detectable warning industry since day one, even though they were competitors and so forth and still are, the one thing they've always asked for and were frustrated with the ADA, ADAG and the public right-of-way guidelines, is they want prescriptive dimensions, and standards for their product there. It reduces, saves some money, but also by prescriptive they know they're doing it right, rather than what the feds have it very vague.

And the ADAG, it was 33 products, they took the dimensions, the full spectrum. It wasn't done in research, where what we have in California is based on research, and that's something that they supported and it became clear that they did not want to see generalizations, but prescriptive language. Thank you.

Kristin — Thanks, Gene. Thank you, everyone. This will conclude our task force meeting. Take good care. Thank you.

Moderator Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes our teleconference for today. We thank you for using AT&T Executive TeleConference Service. You may now disconnect.