

North Carolina Department of Transportation
Work Zone Safety & Mobility Final Rule Committee
 November 16, 2006 Meeting
 Traffic Control Conference Room, Century Center B2



Committee Members attending:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Sub-Committee</i>
Stuart Bourne, PE - Chair	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Policy
Gus Jordi, PE	Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT)	Policy
Joey Hopkins, PE	NCDOT Division Maintenance	Significant Projects
Kelly Damron, PE	NCDOT ITS Operations Unit	Significant Projects
DeWayne Sykes, PE	NCDOT Roadway Branch	Policy
Terry Hopkins, PE	NCDOT Traffic Safety Unit	Policy
Joseph Ishak, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Policy (Lead)
Jimmy Travis, PE	NCDOT Alternate Delivery Unit	Policy
Meredith McDiarmid, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Significant Projects (Lead)
Michelle Long, PE	NCDOT Construction Unit (Public Information)	Policy
Tammy Stewart	NCDOT Construction Unit (Public Information)	Significant Projects
Deborah Hutchings, PE	NCDOT Systems Planning Group	Significant Projects

Committee Members not present:

Joe Geigle	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Significant Projects
Greg Fuller, PE	NCDOT ITS & Signals 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
David Wasserman, PE	NCDOT Systems Planning Group	Significant Projects
Kevin Lacy, PE	NCDOT Traffic Engineering Branch	Policy
Mike Bruff, PE	NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch	Policy
Wendi Johnson, PE	NCDOT Division Construction	Significant Projects
Brad Hibbs, PE	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Significant Projects
Rodger Rochelle, PE	NCDOT Alternate Delivery Unit	
Max Tate, PE	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Policy
Nicole Hackler	NCDOT Feasibility Studies Unit	Significant Projects
Steve Kite, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Significant Projects
Derrick Lewis, PE	NCDOT Feasibility Studies Unit	Policy
Lawrence Gettier, PE	NCDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Unit	Policy

Others attending:

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

The full committee met on November 16, 2006 and was provided an update on the Division Meetings and the progress of the Subcommittees. All meeting handouts can be found online at www.ncdot.org/~wztcu under [Final Rule](#). Stuart Bourne began the meeting by presenting to the attendees the [Division Presentation](#) and the [Division Comments](#). The attendees discussed the following:

➤ *Maintenance Activities*

- Joey Hopkins commented that the use of the word “every” in the bullet “Every activity will be evaluated for its level of significance” may be intimidating the Divisions. He stated that 98% of their work is done using Roadway Standards. He agreed that each Division might be evaluating every activity in an informal way.
- At the Division 1 meeting, Anthony Roper, Division Engineer, suggested a small working group be formed to work through some of the maintenance issues with the policy. Joey Hopkins mentioned that he would like to see a few county maintenance engineers on the working group.
- The committee discussed whether the “Significant” project charts should be broken into type of activities/type of facility or for TIP and Maintenance Activities. The Significant Projects Subcommittee will discuss this again at the next subcommittee meeting. The committee agreed that regardless of the activity, the important point is to consider its impact to traffic.

➤ *Documentation* – The committee discussed the concerns from the Divisions on documentation. Some of the Divisions were concerned that documentation would increase their liability. Others were concerned with the extra work this documentation would entail. The committee addressed these concerns with the following comments:

- At this point, documentation has not been defined.

- Documentation could only improve liability from a safety and mobility standpoint.
 - This policy only applies to significant projects. Therefore, this policy is only requiring significant project to be documented.
 - It is implied that if you do not document then the project is not significant.
 - Documentation could be as simple as using a Roadway Standard Drawing, Traffic Operation Plan could be listed on the back, and TIMS (Transportation Information Management System) printout used for Public Information Plan.
 - Several Divisions have requested a type of checklist to help with the documentation. The idea of incorporating the decision tree into an existing checklist was mentioned. The Significant Projects Subcommittee is currently working on a decision tree to help with this process. Kelly Damron recommended that the checklist be placed into TIMS.
 - Brad Hibbs suggested a “pilot county” implement the documentation process for “significant” maintenance activities. This process could be shared at the Maintenance Conference in the spring. Joey Hopkins volunteered for Division 5 to pilot this program. The committee agreed that it might be useful for the pilot county to also keep a list of all the activities that were determined not to be significant. Kelly Damron will coordinate getting a slot to discuss this topic at the next Maintenance Conference.
- *Policy* – The “Policy” will consist of the first four pages of the [document](#) attendees were given. The remainder of the document will be “Guidelines for Implementing the Policy”. If the document has to be approved by the Board of Transportation, then only the first four pages will be presented. The “Guidelines” is a working draft document.
- On page 12 and 13 of the “Guidelines”, there was some discussion regarding the discrepancy between the overview of a significant project and the chart. Originally, the idea from FHWA was that North Carolina should have one or two projects to fall in the level one category. The Significant project subcommittee will discuss the criteria to determine if it is too strict.
 - The committee discussed many examples of activities that may or may not be determined to be significant, such as replacing signal bulbs or a location where one car has to wait for more than 15 minutes for a construction activity. The consensus from the committee was that we have to determine the impact the activity has on traffic and remember the spirit of the rule. It is not necessary to take a strict interpretation of the criteria chart because only one car has to sit and wait for longer than 15 minutes.
 - In future meetings, the point needs to be made that the policy is requiring that all three components of the TMP be satisfied for projects labeled as “significant”. Non-significant projects/activities may include the same three components, but they are not required.

Jessica Kuse explained how the work from the Significant Projects and Policy Subcommittees fit together in the [Work Zone Safety and Mobility Policy](#) document. The changes in the introduction included the traffic impacts on the network. Jimmy Travis mentioned getting the documentation approved by the DOH Management Committee that has been formed with upper executive management members. Jimmy also mentioned that the FHWA would like to have the Policy approved by the Board of Transportation. Comments on the policy need to be submitted to Jessica by December 15, 2006 to be incorporated into the final draft.

The Policy Subcommittee presented a [Draft Expectation & Owners](#) document that outlines the unit responsible, units affected, and the committee contact for each of the strategies under the Goals and Objectives. The subcommittee has begun defining the intent and expectations for each of the strategies. The group will continue to define the intent and expectations during these meetings. The subcommittee is accepting any comments from the full committee on these expectations.

The Significant Projects Subcommittee has finished the procedures for planning and design phases and has started work on the decision tree / checklist / flow chart for determining project significance. This checklist will be discussed at the next subcommittee meeting. On page 14 of the “Guidelines” the evaluation procedures for during/after construction will be discussed at the next meeting.

The FHWA has released a [Notice for Proposed Rule Making](#) (NPRM) on temporary traffic control devices that may have some affect on the development of the Policy. The Work Zone Traffic Control Unit will be forming comments on the NPRM and would like any comments from the Committee by February 2007.

The committee discussed the future steps that are needed to implement the policy. Some of the suggestions that were discussed were as follows:

- Ask FHWA to unofficially review the draft Policy
- Submit the Policy to the DOH Management Committee
- Give the Divisions one last opportunity to provide comments
- Present to the Operations Staff Meeting
- Present to the Board of Transportation at the April Meeting (if required)

The next Subcommittee meetings will be at 1:00pm on December 7, 2006 in the Traffic Control and Signing Conference Rooms. The next full committee meeting will be at 1:00pm on December 21, 2006 in the Traffic Control Conference Room.