

North Carolina Department of Transportation
Work Zone Safety & Mobility Final Rule Committee
 May 15, 2006
 Traffic Control Conference Room, Century Center B2



Committee Members attending:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Sub-Committee</i>
Greg Fuller, PE	NCDOT ITS & Signals Unit	Significant Projects
Joe Geigle	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Significant Projects
Wendi Johnson, PE	NCDOT Division Construction	Significant Projects
Steve Kite, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Significant Projects
Meredith McDiarmid, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Significant Projects (Lead)
David Wasserman, PE	NCDOT Systems Planning Group	Significant Projects

Committee Members not present:

Joey Hopkins, PE	NCDOT Division Maintenance	Significant Projects
Nicole Hackler	NCDOT Feasibility Studies Unit	Significant Projects
Kelly Damron, PE	NCDOT ITS Operations Unit	Significant Projects
Burt Tasaico	NCDOT Program Analysis Unit	Significant Projects
Scott Capps, PE	NCDOT State Road Maintenance Unit	Significant Projects
Deborah Hutchings, PE	NCDOT Systems Planning Group	Significant Projects

Others attending:

Jessica Kuse, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Significant Projects
Michelle Long, PE	NCDOT Construction Unit	Significant Projects

The Significant Projects Sub-committee met to discuss the definition of a significant project, and the criteria levels to be used in selecting significant projects. The sub-committee also discussed the proposed timeline for completing the finalized draft of North Carolina's Work Zone Safety and Mobility Policy which will include the definition and criteria to select significant projects. This draft policy will be presented to Len Sanderson on July 19, 2006. After his comments are implemented, we will follow his recommendations to finalize the policy and have it approved by the Executive committee, the Board of Transportation, and other groups as needed. The committee will also be providing ongoing updates to committees/groups as deemed necessary by our committee to ensure as many groups are aware of the policy as possible.

Steve Kite gave a brief presentation on the steps the Significant Projects Sub-committee needs to complete as part of the Work Zone Safety and Mobility Policy. These steps include 1) Defining what a 'Significant' Project is, 2) Setting criteria to determine 'Significant' Projects, 3) Determining procedures to implement 'Significant' Projects. Future steps will also include setting performance criteria and criteria for exemptions.

The proposed draft definition of a "Significant" Project was discussed and finalized to be presented at the June 1st committee meeting. The definition is as follows:

A project is considered "Significant" if it meets level 1 or level 2 criteria, as described in this policy, and is one that alone or in conjunction with other projects is anticipated to cause sustained work zone impacts to the motoring public, businesses, or communities during it's construction or will substantially relieve existing congestion on the highway network upon it's completion. Projects may be on a Strategic Highway Corridor and the National Highway System (NHS).

In addition, all Interstate projects within the boundaries of a Transportation Management Area (TMA) that occupies a location for more than three days with either intermittent or continuous lane closures will be considered significant.

The proposed draft criteria levels to determine a “Significant” Project were discussed and finalized to be presented at the June 1st committee meeting. The criteria levels are as follows:

Level 1 Projects

Anticipated adverse network impacts to the traveling public at the National and Regional levels to include the Interstate and Intrastate systems, and have a perceived High Level of Public Interest

Criteria: Level 1 Projects meet ANY of the below criteria:

- Either Existing or Anticipated ADT per lane > 15,000
Examples as follow:
 - 60,000 ADT for a 4 lane road
 - 90,000 ADT for a 6 lane road
 - 120,000 ADT for an 8 lane road
- 20% total truck traffic
- Duration of Construction using conventional estimating/letting methods \geq 3 years
- User Value \geq \$50,000/day (Dollar amount may be adjusted based on user value calculations to be determined by a formula developed by Steve Kite and Chris Howard)
- Anticipated Additional Travel Times exceeding 15 minutes
- Anticipated High Adverse Impacts to existing transportation infrastructure (mass transit, rail, pedestrian)
- Anticipated High Adverse Impacts to high traffic generators such as stadiums, large shopping centers, tourist destinations, etc.

Level 2 Projects

Anticipated adverse network impacts to the traveling public at the regional, metropolitan and local levels, and have a perceived High Level of Public Interest

Criteria: Level 2 Projects meet 2 of the below criteria:

- Either Existing or Anticipated ADT per lane > 10,000
Examples as follow:
 - 40,000 ADT for a 4 lane road
 - 60,000 ADT for a 6 lane road
 - 80,000 ADT for an 8 lane road
- 15% total truck traffic
- Duration of Construction using conventional estimating/letting methods \geq 2 years but < 3 years
- User Value \geq \$25,000/day (Dollar amount may be adjusted based on user value calculations to be determined by a formula developed by Steve Kite and Chris Howard)
- Anticipated Additional Travel Times exceeding 10 minutes
- Anticipated Moderate Adverse Impacts to existing transportation infrastructure (mass transit, rail, pedestrian, etc.)
- Anticipated Moderate Adverse Impacts to high traffic generators such as stadiums, large shopping centers, tourist destinations, etc.

Level 3 Projects

Anticipated low adverse network impacts to the traveling public at the regional, metropolitan and local levels, and have a perceived Moderate Level of Public Interest

Criteria: Level 3 Projects meet 2 of the below criteria:

- Either Existing or Anticipated ADT per lane > 7,500
Examples as follow:
 - 30,000 ADT for a 4 lane road
 - 45,000 ADT for a 6 lane road
 - 60,000 ADT for an 8 lane road
- 15% total truck traffic
- Duration of Construction using conventional estimating/letting methods \geq 1 year but < 2 years
- User Value \geq \$12,500/day (Dollar amount may be adjusted based on user value calculations to be determined by a formula developed by Steve Kite and Chris Howard)
- Anticipated Additional Travel Times \geq 5 minutes but < 10 minutes
- Anticipated Low Adverse Impacts to existing transportation infrastructure (mass transit, rail, pedestrian, etc.)
- Anticipated Low Adverse Impacts to high traffic generators such as stadiums, large shopping centers, tourist destinations, etc.

Level 4 Projects

Anticipated low impacts to the traveling public at the local level, and have a perceived Low Level of Public Interest

Criteria: Level 4 Projects meet ANY of the below criteria:

- Either Existing or Anticipated ADT \leq 7,500
- Less than (<) 15% total truck traffic
- Duration of Construction using conventional estimating/letting methods < 1 year
- User Value < \$12,500/day (Dollar amount may be adjusted based on user value calculations to be determined by a formula developed by Steve Kite and Chris Howard)
- Anticipated Additional Travel Times < 5 minutes

There was a brief discussion during the meeting regarding when a project should be evaluated to determine which level it is categorized and if it is significant. Since some projects follow different paths to construction, the preliminary decision was made to have multiple points to evaluate a project. Evaluation points for a project included Feasibility Studies, Scoping, Functional Design, and Preliminary Design Point. Further discussion is needed on this matter to finalize the evaluation points. This information will be included in the procedures.

Sub-committee members agreed to be thinking about the procedures to implement a “Significant” Project and be prepared to discuss at the next sub-committee meeting on June 22nd. Below are some ideas regarding the implementation procedures. These ideas may be used as a starting point of discussion.

Proposed Procedure to Implement Significant TIP Projects

Step 1) Using the definitions (Qualitative Analysis) for “Significant Projects”, establish these at the Planning Scoping Meeting by DOT Management, Planners, FHWA and MPO’s. (See Flow Chart)

Step 2) Once identified, these are to be “tagged” by the PDEA Branch and communicated to the Division, PreConstruction Units and the “Innovative Processes Committee”...formerly the Design/Build Executive Committee

Step 3) The “Innovative Processes Committee” will use the Level 1 and 2 Criteria (Quantitative Analysis) to confirm or remove the project as ‘Significant’. If ‘Significant’, then initiate the proper actions such as combining of projects, adjust scheduling, finalize traffic management strategies, establish project durational range, Design/Build option, ‘A+B’ contracting, Pay Incentives, 8 week advertisements, etc.

Proposed Procedure to Implement Significant Division Projects

Step 1) Projects originated at the Division (ex. Resurfacing, DDL, BPOC) are to be evaluated using the ‘Significant’ project definitions (Qualitative Analysis) and/or Criteria (Qualitative Analysis) 6 months prior to Letting.

Step 2) Once identified, these are to be communicated to the “Innovative Processes Committee” formerly the Design/Build Executive Committee.

Step 3) The “Innovative Processes Committee” will then review and if necessary request exemptions to FHWA or notify the WZTCU to design a TMP. This Committee will also initiate the appropriate actions such as accelerated construction techniques, scheduling adjustments, project durations, 8 week advertisements etc.

Next Meeting and Follow-up Information

- Committee Meeting June 1st, 1pm Traffic Control Conference Room
- Subcommittee meeting, June 22nd, 1pm, Signing Conference Room

ACTION ITEMS:

- Begin thinking of ideas for the proposed procedure to identify Significant Projects, performance measurements for Significant Projects and criteria for exemptions. Discussion on these items will begin on June 22nd.