
102 Series Temporary Traffic Control

ORIGINATION

Date: 8-27-19

Name: Rick Jenkins

Phone: 850 414-4355

Email: Rick.Jenkins@dot.state.fl.us

COMMENTARY

Updated and Reorganized Index. Added new Sheet for General Notes.

Deleted Design Notes. Updated Notes language.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

BLACK = Industry Review Comments **RED** = Standard Plans Response

Name: Internal

Date: 5-10-19

COMMENT:

My comments are as follows:

- Radar speed display unit acronym (RDSU) is transposed twice in Index 102-000 sheet 3 of 8.
- Strongly recommend leaving Indexes 102-604, 102-605, 102-615, 102-616, 102-617, 102-628. These are Department-specific typical applications of commonly encountered situations.
- There is inconsistent numbering throughout the indexes.

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

1. The RDSU appears correctly.
2. Those Indexes contain some erroneous information and should probably not exist now. The MUTCD covers those situations just as well and there are no significant deviations beyond speed restrictions (which negates any potential value).
3. Numbering has been revised.

Name: Internal

Date: 5-17-19

COMMENT:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment.

In general, our District Construction Office is supportive of the ongoing initiative to refine the Design Standards to include only the relevant information to construct the Index items, and move design guidance to the FDM and payment information to the Standard Specifications.

However, as an exception, we feel that since Index 102-600 is intended to be a compilation of definitions and general MOT requirements for the specific MOT layout schemes that follow in subsequent indices, it is best to take a “one-stop shop” approach rather than separating the information into the FDM, Specs, and Design Standards.

- 1.) These proposed changes likely introduce more inefficiencies than intended from the perspectives of contract administration in the field, researching issues during plan reviews, and training new staff due to having to flip back and forth among several documents to verify standard MOT requirements. Examples of this include the proposal to move the temporary sign requirements and overhead work options into the Standard Specifications.
- 2.) There are several deletions proposed without indication that the information being deleted is either moving to another place or covered elsewhere in the contract.
- 3.) Moving information from the Design Standards to the Standard Specifications: a.) increases the risk of introducing unintended conflicts among the Contract Documents which increases claim potential, and b.) moves the requirements to the lowest level in the Governing Order of Documents (Standard Specifications) as described in Section 5-2.

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

The “one-stop shop” has bred a widely-held belief that temporary traffic control is the Contractor’s responsibility alone. If temporary traffic control was an area in which the Department excelled, it would make sense to keep doing what has been done. However, Florida just became #2 in the nation for work zone fatalities.

- 1) Yes, some items have moved and it will take time to learn. That is standard for any change.
- 2) Some items have been deleted.
- 3) Placing information in a consistent manner is less likely to cause a conflict. The governing order only comes into effect for a conflict.
- 4) The policies for external elements are generally locked to a particular version. Those will not need to be addressed until the next version. External users are important, but the Department policy has to work for the Department’s goals.

Name: Internal

Date: 5-10-19

COMMENT:

1. Page 3 of 12: Overweight/Oversize Vehicles – Recommend that this section remains in the Standard Plans. The Structures Maintenance Section reported that they are being notified of projects that impact the mobility of oversized/overweight loads. Recommend revising the wording as follows.
2. Page 3 of 12: High-Visibility Safety Apparel – Where will this requirement be located?

3. Page 4 of 12: Recommend leaving Extended Distance Advance Warning Sign and End Road Work Sign information in Standard Plans.
4. Page 5 of 12: Recommend leaving note 3 in the Standard Plans.
5. Page 8 of 12: Recommend leaving Advance Warning Arrow Boards in Standard Plans.
6. 102-000 Page 7 of 8: The note refers the use of Raised Rumble Strips to Specification 102, however, I did not see under what conditions they were to be used in the specification (posted speed/work duration). Will Maintenance have to develop plans for the use of these?
7. General Comment: There may be some MOT plans not included in the Standard Plans that may be needed by Maintenance, such as Two-Lane and Multi-Lane Work In and Near Intersection.
8. Why was 102-651 removed (Multilane, Divided, Maintenance and Construction)?

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

- 1) Specification 7-7 covers oversized/overloaded equipment.
- 2) This is a requirement of the MUTCD. The only variation from the requirements of the MUTCD is the flagger equipment.
- 3) "End Road Work" signs are required per the Indexes.
- 4) Unless there is an exception (e.g., some detour materials), all TTC devices must be listed on the APL. Table Note 3 is incorporated into the new Note 2.
- 5) Arrow Board messages have been incorporated into the applicable Index.
- 6) Per the note, the use of temporary raised rumble strips can be determined by the Engineer. Moving the criteria out of the Indexes eliminates some problems that are being encountered. There are no Plans required, that is just the means of inclusion on a construction project.
- 7) Per Specification 102-5.1, any Typical Application from the MUTCD not listed on sheet 1 of Index 102-000 can be used. There is no drawing or Plans required. The Typical Applications are the basis of the Indexes, but the Indexes are modifications to those Typical Applications.
- 8) All multilane diversions have been consolidated into Index 102-065. Previously, there were a number of multilane diversion Indexes, but the reverse curve diversion is the most cost-efficient form of diversion. Index 102-651 would not have been frequently used by Maintenance, but Index 102-065 can be used for the structure situation shown on sheet 1 of Index 102-651. The design work would be extensive for Maintenance, though.

Name: Industry

Date: 8-2-19

COMMENT:

Proposed standard plan 102-000 sheet 3 of 8

-Omits criteria for when MAS is to be used. We are now relying solely on plans to tell us when MAS is required? Many plans now simply incorporate index 670. Going forward plans would need to specifically state what conditions require the MAS on the project. For example: a project that has multiple roads with different speed limits would require specific details in the plans telling us what roads and/or speed limits require the MAS. Wouldn't it be easier to simply leave the criteria in the new index?

-The plan is confusing as to what signs come after the RSDU

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

Yes, information regarding MAS usage must be included in the Plans. The detail has been revised to improve clarity. Change made.

Name: Industry

Date: 8-2-19

COMMENT:

Proposed standard plan 102-000 sheet 8 of 8

-eliminates language limiting cones to only “active work zones with workers present”. We are in favor of including the current language limiting cones to active work zones with workers present.

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

Additional language for cone usage has been added to proposed Standard Specifications, Section 102. Change made.

Name: Industry

Date: 8-2-19

COMMENT:

Proposed plan 102-010

-eliminates Men Working Sign for shoulder closures. Don’t know the justification for eliminating signs, but it seems that eliminating signs is not safer. We are in favor of maintaining the requirement for both the road work ahead sign and men work sign for shoulder closures.

-allows work less than 2ft from travel way without a lane closure for speeds of 45mph or less. The proposed revisions start with a narrative of how important worker safety is and that these changes are intended to increase workers safety. We believe that allowing workers to work closer to the travel way without a lane closure does the exact opposite of increasing workers safety and should be reconsidered.

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

As a general rule, optional MUTCD signs have been removed in an effort to reduce sign clutter. No change made.

Name: Industry

Date: 8-2-19

COMMENT:

Proposed plan 102-025

-eliminates “Be Prepared To Stop Sign” and changes flagger symbol sign to “Flagger Ahead Sign”. Again, eliminating signs is counter to everyone’s goal of increased worker safety. We see no reason to change from a flagger symbol sign to a “Flagger Ahead” Sign. This change does not seem to benefit safety and makes obsolete a sign that we have a huge and costly inventory of.

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

As a general rule, optional MUTCD signs have been removed in an effort to reduce sign clutter. The “Flagger Ahead” sign with symbol is allowed per note #2. No change made.

Name: Industry**Date:** 8-2-19**COMMENT:**

Proposed plan 102-070

-eliminates the 1 week advance notice by VMS of the pacing operation. Seems counter to goal of safety. We believe that advance notice to the public via VMS of a pacing operation increases the safety of the operation.

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

Revised Index to keep the advance-notice message. Change made.

Name: Industry**Date:** 8-2-19**COMMENT:**

The proposed plans eliminate many current standard plans such as 102-604, 605, 615, 616, 617, 618 (Intersection work), 102-614 (Center Lane) 102-628 (double left turn lane), and 102-667 (Toll Plaza). I don’t know why these were eliminated. They seemed to serve a purpose, as these are all real scenarios that are encountered commonly. Are details for these scenarios expected to be included in all temporary traffic control plans going forward? It is also important to note that these scenarios are encountered frequently on non-FDOT roads projects and for non-FDOT maintenance work. It is important and helpful to have standard plans for these scenarios to follow. Does FDOT expect all cities and counties to develop individual standards and/or plans for these scenarios?

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

The exact answer depends upon the Index. Some Indexes (e.g., intersection work) were removed because the Typical Applications in the MUTCD show the situation as well or better. Index 102-628 is

fast-becoming an unlikely scenario on Department roadways and may be infeasible as shown. Also, very specific Indexes (e.g., 102-667) have been removed. If a local entity finds the removed Indexes to be necessary to their operations, that municipality can “lock-in” to a specific year of Design Standards or Standard Plans. No change made.

Name: Industry

Date: 8-2-19

COMMENT:

Standard Plans Index 102-600 sheet 11 of 12 “Sheet 8” “Temporary Barrier Notes”.

As the years tick by, it seems like we see more barrier wall from design and it is my opinion, in a concrete jungle like South Florida, the wall is just as much of a hazard if not more than a minor drop off. I absolutely strive to come up with better ways to build every job we are blessed with by utilizing drop off protection in lieu of wall and in our case just like many other Contractor’s...it has served us very well and does not create unsafe conditions for the drivers! The issue is that the MOT plans will never be designed like that!

The current drop off condition notes are great and the chart is excellent as well. What confuses some of these young people is the “Temporary Barrier Notes”. Note 1 states “Where a barrier is specified, any of these types may be used in accordance with the applicable index”. Well what about slope protection in lieu of wall...that is allowed as well!

I would like to see these temporary barrier notes completed deleted because to me it does nothing but cause confusion. It is without a doubt that indexes speak for themselves and if note #2 pertaining to “Trailer Mounted Barriers” need’s a home...I read it as very general in nature so there are countless options as to where it can be placed.

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

Those notes have been removed. Change made.

Name: Industry

Date: 8-2-19

COMMENT:

Comments on Proposed Index 102-600 changes.

Having spent a good portion of my career on the project site, and overseeing MOT operations, my comments are below;

- There is no issue with moving the various pieces of info (device spacing, definitions, etc.) to the correct document (FDM, etc), BUT, it seems counterproductive to require the field user to go and look up definitions in Spec book, or dig through the FDM to find info. The Index 102 (formerly Index 600) provided a One Stop Shop for use by field personnel (end user). Design

engineers can sort through various manuals, but in the field, this is not conducive to effective implementation of traffic control operations. Recommend keeping the Index 102 as a single reference point for field users, combining info from Specs, FDM, and MUTCD. Make life easier on field personnel, not harder. Don't make info harder to find. Make it easy to find and use.

- This will inadvertently create more work for the design teams, and now they will need to detail day-today operations, such as lane closures, that are currently covered under Index 102.
- Sign Spacing / device spacing tables need to be retained for field staff reference.
- Index 102-622 is very useful for urban settings, and should be considered to remain.
- Utilities / Maintenance work use these all the time. Is it now the intent that every lane closure must be designed? A fully designed traffic control plan is not necessary for all of these activities, and removal of information from the Index would hinder these essential operations.

RESPONSE:

Date: 8-26-19

1. There is no information in the FDM that field users need. The Standard Specifications, Section 102 has always worked with the Standard Plans, but that perception of a "one-stop shop" has misled many users. No change made.
2. This comment is unclear. Lane closure Indexes still exist. It is intended that designers show more information in the Plans. Many projects currently have little to no TTCP detail. No change made.
3. This comment is unclear. Sign spacing and channelizing device spacing tables are in the Standard Plans. No change made.
4. That typical section is infrequently encountered on Department roadways. Regardless, combining a merge and a shift into a single movement is not advisable. No change made.
5. Utilities are, for the most part, locked to the 2017-18 Design Standards. No change made.