Implementation of the FY 2020-21 Standard Plans, Series 102 Indexes
(Temporary Traffic Control)

Questions and Answers:

Q1. **There is a concern about the governing order of documents.**

   a1. The governing order would not impact this change, as the information is not redundant or conflicting with other documents. If a Project Specific change is needed it should be handled through a MSP, Modification to Standard Plan, or specific details in the Contract Plans, as appropriate.

Q2. **The new index and manuals directs to the MUTCD for a lot of information, but is unclear where in the MUTCD. A lot of the information in the MUTCD is very generic. It will be up to the designer/contractor interpretation in most cases.**

   a2. The criteria in the *FDM 240* provides the Department based requirements for the planning and design of Temporary Traffic Control Plans (TTCP). The *Standard Plans, Series 120 Indexes* provide Department specific adaptations of the MUTCD Typical Applications. The *Standard Specifications* provides the overriding Contract Controls and Contractor instructions for the use of TTC devices in the work zone. Finally, the *MUTCD* provides typical applications in *Section 6H (Typical Applications)*, which can be used as the absolute minimum requirements for applications not covered in any of the other documents. The Typical Applications in the *MUTCD* have as much detail for an application as the *Standard Plans*. For example; Figure 6H-21 (Typical Application 21) in the *MUTCD* provides specific information that would be used in lieu of *Standard Plans, Index 102-617*.

Q3. **The MUTCD is in a different revision cycle than the other manuals.**

   a3. The *MUTCD* is controlled and published by the FHWA; however, it is not updated in the same manner as Department documents. New additions (Typical Applications in this case) do not become effective until the next version of the *MUTCD*. The current version was published in 2009 (with May 2012 Revisions), and although a newer version is expected in the next few years, the Department will have ample time address any revisions within our routine publishing cycles.

Q4. **The notes in the index were very specific to each condition, placing them in the Spec 102 make them very general.**

   a4. This was intended. In general, many of the notes where repeated within the various applications included in the previous Standard Plans and overtime additional notes had been added to specific Indexes that should have applied to all. For instance, the
Q5. **Analyzing and producing a TTCP is a complex process. Construction prefers visual aids like the ones produced by the index.**

a5. No details (visuals) were removed from the Indexes and replaced with narrative in the Standard Specification. The only details that were removed are those for *Work within Intersection* along with a few other Indexes, which are now only covered by the MUTCD.

Q6. **They (Construction) prefer the information all in one place, is easy to lookup.**

a6. We understand that there is a preference for information to be in one place; however, to effectively communicate information between the Department, Designers, and Contractors it must be included in the appropriate document. *Standard Plans* are provided for details (visuals) and notes specific to those details. Contract, Process, Definition, Workmanship, and Payment information should be provided in the *Standard Specifications*. The FDM contains the information specific to the design criteria and guidance that must be addressed by the designer in the Contract Plans. All of the documents are needed to properly prepare and execute a successful TTCP, which was the case before the FY 2020-21 Standard Plans revisions.

Q7. **Why were in the Work with Intersections Standard Plans Indexes Removed?**

a7. There are a couple reasons for removing these Indexes. The Indexes are very specific regarding applicable speeds and location of the work. However, these Indexes are being misused to cover all forms of intersection work and there are no such provisions. Additionally, intersections and work types vary significantly. Some work is simply paving through an intersection via lane closure, while other work is reconstruction and requires a bit more thought on how to maintain traffic. There is no realistic means of capturing all or enough of the scenarios necessary. MUTCD, Part 6 contains Typical Applications covering options beyond those previously or currently included in the Standard Plans. MUTCD, Part 6 can be accessed using the following link: [https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/pdfs/2009r1r2/part6.pdf](https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/pdfs/2009r1r2/part6.pdf)

Q8. **Will a TTC Design Training be developed and delivered?**

a8. A web-based TTCP design training is under development and will be available in mid-2020. The value of the training cannot be overstated; however, the changes to the FY 2020-21 Standard Plans, 2020 FDM, and July 2020 Specifications were not critical to the basic understanding of TTCP design and the training is not required to understand the changes. The training content is heavily dependent on the final
published version of all of the documents; therefore, it could not be developed simultaneously with the changes being produced for this cycle.

Q9. Contractors often develop their own TTCP after a project is Let. Why don’t we leave it up to the Contractor to develop their own TTCP and remove them from the Contract Plans?

a9. TTCPs have always been required in the Contract Plans. This is a separate issue that has not been changed due to these updates. Although Contractors commonly create alternative TTCP’s after project lettings, having a complete and constructible TTCP in the Contract Plans is needed to ensure that; a project can be adequately bid, the project duration estimated, and contractor understands the TMP and commitments made during its development.

Q10. Will consideration be giving to delaying the Implementation of the FY 2020-21 Standard Plans TTC requirements?

a10. The FY 2020-21 Standard Plans were developed in close coordination with the July 2020 Standard Specifications, the 2020 FDM, and other companion documents. Delaying the implementation would have implications well beyond a projects TTCP. For this reason, projects let on or after July 2020 must use the FY 2020-21 Standards Plans. If the Districts or their Consultants feel that there is a specific issue that will result in a projects delay, please provide the State Roadway Design Office with those details so that we can work to resolve any issues or provide an agreeable solution to keep projects on schedule.

Q11. Where changes made to the Revised Documents since the April 2019 Review Package was sent to the Districts.

a11. No major changes were made after the draft version was circulated for review by the Districts. A draft version of the July 2020 Standard Specifications, Section 102 (Maintenance of Traffic) is attached with this Q&A. The review package, with redlines (i.e., visual cross-walk of relocated or deleted information), is available on the Standard Plans Industry Website at the following link: https://www.fdot.gov/design/standardplans/IRR/Default.shtm

Q12. There seems to be big impacts to the Maintenance (Utility and Permit Work) and Construction, have they been included in the redevelopment process and how are their issues being resolved?

a12. Both Central Office and District Maintenance and Construction offices, along with the Departments construction industry partners were included in the review process. Modifications required for the Maintenance Special Provision of
Specification 102 which will be finalized after approval of the *July 2020 Standard Specifications*. The UAM (i.e. utilities) and Permitting requirements will have to be revised; however, these elements are controlled by F.S. (i.e., Rule Documents) and previous versions of the Standard Plans (aka, Design Standards) and Specifications are required at this time.

Q13. **Are there any Policy Changes/Standard Plans Revisions that affect projects designed using prior Standard Plans, Specifications, and FDM Criteria?**

a13. In some instances, it may be necessary to include special details for work that is not covered by the Standard Plans. The MUTCD has some basic scenarios covered, but any ambiguous situations should be clarified with project specific details. This should not require “rework” (i.e., significant plans updates), as the situation was probably ambiguous under the previous Standard Plans. There are some items that moved to the *FDM* and should be called out for use in the Plans. These are the MAS items and temporary raised rumble strips. Also, the Minimum Radii for Normal Crown is only found in the *FDM* now.

Q14. **We are looking through the QA Implementation of TTC Updates provided by CO. You mention that MUTCD figure 6H-21 can replace 102-617. The buffer space listed in MUTCD is listed as optional. I’ve looked but can’t find where any of the other three manuals state this isn’t optional on FDOT projects. Is the intent to now allow the buffer space to be optional (per MUTCD) or am I missing the link requiring buffer space?**

a14. Per the MUTCD, the buffer length is optional. The Department generally includes buffer length as a preference. However, there is no policy that mandates buffer length as required. This may be an opportunity for a future note in the Standard Plans.

Q15. **Indexes 102-010, 102-045, and 102-050 call for a 6” white line in front of the channelizing devices. Previous Indexes such as FY 2019-20 Index 102-613 also called for a white line, but allowed it to be omitted if the work was less than 3 consecutive days.**

a15. This is a general requirement for all Temporary Traffic Control and has been moved to the Standard Specifications, Sub-article 102-5.8. The three days has been revised to 24 hours (to complement the requirement for post-mounted signs). This change is not intended to alter current practice on milling & resurfacing projects.

Q16. **The only comment I have is regarding the payment of LCDs. There is no way a designer can get close to a per linear foot per day quantity when they have no control over contractor sequencing or production rates. The closest we could get would be a linear foot of LCDs needed and even that is going to be somewhat of a guess.**
a16. The unit of measurement for pedestrian longitudinal channelizing devices has been an industry concern since the previous unit of measurement of “each day” was changed to “linear feet”. As with the “each day” items, the “linear foot per day” may prove difficult to estimate. However, the alternatives seemed more prone to issues.

Q17. The challenge with the MUTCD is that it is not in the Governing Order of Documents in our contracts. It’s also not written as a directive contract document. Probably won’t be able to hold a contract to it.

a17. The Governing Order of Documents is intended for resolving conflicts between Department-produced documents. The Standard Specifications contains many similar references to external documents (e.g., NEC, ASTMs, manufacturers’ instructions). The Department has successfully enforced requirements contained in external documents.

Q18. How do I reference the MUTCD in the TTCP?

a18. The reference and instructions for when to use the MUTCD is included in the Standard Specifications. Providing an additional reference in the TTCP to use the Standard Plans or the MUTCD is not necessary. The TTCP should contain enough information for the Contractor to maintain traffic. This may entail special details for complicated scenarios (e.g., traffic islands, ramps, pedestrian facilities), narrative, notes, and typical sections. More complex phasing requires detailed plans.

Q19. It appears that guidance for reduced lane widths has been removed from the Standard Plans (previously under 102-600). Are reduced lane widths no longer recommended during MOT?

a19. Reduced lane widths may still be used for TTC. The language was moved to the Standard Specifications (Subarticle 102-5.17). The minimum lane widths are the same as they were previously.