

**North Carolina Department of Transportation  
Work Zone Safety & Mobility Final Rule Committee**

April 20, 2006

Traffic Control Conference Room, Century Center B2



**Committee Members attending:**

Name	Representing	Sub-Committee
Stuart Bourne, PE - Chair	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Policy
Gus Jordi, PE	Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT)	Policy
Joe Geigle	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Significant Projects
Max Tate, PE	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Policy
Joey Hopkins, PE	NCDOT Division Maintenance	Significant Projects
DeWayne Sykes, PE	NCDOT Roadway Branch	Policy
David Wasserman, PE	NCDOT Systems Planning Group	Significant Projects
Kevin Lacy, PE	NCDOT Traffic Engineering Branch	Policy
Terry Hopkins, PE	NCDOT Traffic Safety Unit	Policy
Mike Bruff, PE	NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch	Policy
Joseph Ishak, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Policy (Lead)
Lawrence Gettier, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Policy
Meredith McDiarmid, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Significant Projects (Lead)

**Committee Members not present:**

Jimmy Travis, PE	NCDOT Construction Unit (Public Information)	Policy
Wendi Johnson, PE	NCDOT Division Construction	Significant Projects
Derrick Lewis, PE	NCDOT Feasibility Studies Unit	Policy
Nicole Hackler	NCDOT Feasibility Studies Unit	
Greg Fuller, PE	NCDOT ITS & Signals Unit	Significant Projects
Kelly Damron, PE	NCDOT ITS Operations Unit	Significant Projects
Burt Tasaico	NCDOT Program Analysis Unit	Significant Projects
Charles Cox, PE	NCDOT Project Development & Environmental Analysis	Policy
Scott Capps, PE	NCDOT State Road Maintenance Unit	Significant Projects
Deborah Hutchings, PE	NCDOT Systems Planning Group	Significant Projects
Steve Kite, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Significant Projects

**Others attending:**

Jennifer Portanova, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Policy
Jessica Kuse, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Significant Projects

**Report from the Policy Sub-Committee**

The Policy Sub-Committee presented a draft vision statement to the Committee for approval. The Committee revised and finalized the vision statement as follows:

*NCDOT applies comprehensive transportation management strategies throughout the planning and project development process, purposefully provides safe and efficient projects, and uses innovative techniques in design, contracting methods, and construction to minimize impacts, crashes, and delays.*

The next area of the policy to be developed is the Goals and Objectives. Policy Sub-Committee Members, listed below, were assigned a component of the policy and asked to use the general goals previously identified, Department's Business Plan, Work Zone Self-Assessment, and/or any new goals to:

- Identify what the Department is doing now to support this component.
- Identify which draft goal(s) fits into the specific component.
- Identify any new goals that could fit into the component.

Terry Hopkins/ Gus Jordi	1. Overall policy issues [e.g., establishing a committee to discuss and coordinate agency work zone activities; developing memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with utility operators to coordinate schedules; acceptable levels of work zone performance such as queue thresholds].
Joseph Ishak	2. Work zone options (e.g., night work, full-closure, detours).
Charles Cox/ Derrick Lewis	3. System planning strategies (e.g., grouping and sequencing of projects in a corridor; including the costs for work zone management strategies in plans).
DeWayne Sykes / Mike Bruff	4. Design strategies (e.g., traffic control, choice of materials, use of positive separation, temporary structures).
Jimmy Travis	5. Contracting strategies (e.g., low bid, design-build, lane rental, A+B bidding, incentive/disincentive contracting).
Stuart Bourne	6. Work zone management strategies (e.g., use of intelligent transportation systems, traveler information, real-time work zone monitoring, traffic incident management, and enforcement).
Max Tate	7. Agency use of work zone reviews, process reviews, or safety inspections/audits.
Kevin Lacy	8. Strategy for use and collection of work zone data.

SP Sub-Committee	9. Criteria for identifying significant projects. (Significant Policy Sub-Committee)
SP Sub-Committee	10. Exception criteria and procedures for significant projects.
Committee	11. Procedures for determining transportation management plan (TMP) needs for projects

It was agreed that the Policy Sub-Committee Members would bring their draft goals to the next Policy Sub-Committee Meeting on May 11<sup>th</sup>.

The Committee recommended the goals and objectives and/or the processes:

- Identify how a systematic consideration is accomplished
- Include consideration of our industry partners
- Include both Federal and State Funded projects
- Define impacts (financial or other)
- Define users (roadway, businesses, residents, etc.)

### **Report from Significant Project Sub-Committee**

The Significant Projects Sub-Committee presented the Committee a draft definition, criteria for level one and two, and procedures for implementing of Significant Projects. The Committee was asked to review the proposed as listed below and provide comments to Jessica by May 14<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Proposed Definition of Significant Project**

A project is considered "Significant" if it 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.

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

#### **Proposed Criteria**

##### **Level 1 Projects**

---

Anticipated adverse network impacts to the traveling public at the National and Regional levels to include the Interstate and Intrastate systems, projects may be on a Strategic Highway Corridor, and a perceived High Level of Public Interest

- Criteria: Project is Significant if ANY of the below criteria are met:
- ADT > 60,000
  - Duration ≥ 3 years
  - User Cost or User Value ≥ \$10,000/day
  - Anticipated Travel Times exceeding 15 minutes
  - Anticipated Adverse Impacts to existing transportation infrastructure (mass transit, rail, pedestrian)
  - Anticipated Adverse Impacts to high traffic generators such as stadiums, large shopping centers, etc.

##### **Level 2 Projects**

---

Anticipated adverse network impacts to the traveling public at the regional, metropolitan and local levels, Projects may be on a Strategic Highway Corridor, and a perceived High Level of Public Interest

- Criteria: Project is Significant if 2 of the below criteria are met:
- ADT > 40,000
  - Duration ≥ 2 years
  - User Cost or User Value ≥ \$2,500/day
  - Anticipated Travel Times exceeding 10 minutes
  - Anticipated Moderate Impacts to existing transportation infrastructure (mass transit, rail, pedestrian, etc.)
  - Anticipated Moderate Impacts to high traffic generators such as stadiums, large shopping centers, etc.

#### **Proposed Procedure to Implement Significant Projects**

Step 1) Using the definitions (Qualitative Analysis) for "Significant Projects", establish these at the Feasibility Review by DOT Management, Planners, 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, etc.

The Committee recommended investigating travel time versus delay to consider possible scenarios that would be exceptions.

### **Timeline**

The Committee discussed the steps needed to implement the Final Rule in order to form a timeline. Steve DeWitt recommended meeting with Executive Management (Steering Committee) to get their agreement before determining how to move forward. The Committee identified additional ways to ensure a successful implementation:

- Continue to provide an update of progress at the Operations Staff Meeting
- Identify ways to tag the significant projects (possible changes in PMii)
- Involve MPO Association and municipalities at some point
- Identify how to educate and work with municipalities to implement
- Present the final rule and progress of the Committee at conferences such as NCSITE meeting and the Traffic Engineering Conference
- Identify at what point in the project development process that the project is tagged as significant. Mike Bruff suggest the decision should be made at the PDEA prescoping meeting since all projects do not go through the feasibility scoping process (interstate widening, maintenance). However, significant projects may need to be identified prior to the PDEA prescoping meeting so that the correct funding can be established.
- Identify financial impacts to the Department when this policy is implemented
- Consider any relationship to the Turnpike Authority

Possible steps for adoption (to be determined by the Steering Committee) are as follows:

- Implementation Committee
- Board of Transportation

Target dates for presentation to the Steering Committee will be discussed at the next sub-committee meetings.

### **Strategic Highway Corridor**

David Wasserman made a presentation to the Committee about the Strategic Highway Corridor plan. The presentation included an explanation of the long-range goals for the Strategic Highway Corridor. This provided an insight into a parallel initiative that the Committee can learn from.

### **Next Meeting and Follow-up Information**

- Policy Sub-Committee Meeting May 11<sup>th</sup>, 1pm in Traffic Control Conference Room
- Significant Projects Sub-Committee Meeting May 15<sup>th</sup>, 1pm in Signing Conference Room
- Committee Meeting June 1<sup>st</sup>, 1pm
- MPO Association declined to send a designate as representative for the committee

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Committee Members will provide comments on the proposed definition, criteria, and procedures for Significant Projects to Jessica by May 14<sup>th</sup>
- Policy Sub-Committee will bring draft goals for assigned component to the May 11<sup>th</sup> Policy Sub-Committee Meeting. Any goals sent to Jennifer prior to the meeting will be distributed to the sub-committee.
- Sub-committees will discuss target dates at the next sub-committee meeting.