

1020908 Maintenance of Traffic
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Marshall Dougherty
Marshall@rxengsol.com

Comments: (12-12-11) There are several issues with the proposed verbiage that I feel should be addressed prior to acceptance within this process and eventual use within the specifications. They both deal with corresponding additions to the Design Standards. The issues are: Subarticle 102-9.8 - Arrow Board: The proposed change mentions Type B and Type C arrow boards which are relatively unknown to many under that naming convention. They are contained within Part 6 of the MUTCD (pages 601 – 603), but nowhere else within any DOT publication. How about Type A, even if not allowed on DOT projects, which has a viable use with many local applications? An addition to Design Standard Index 600, outlining the different “types” and uses, should be a complementary and necessary component to support the new monikers. Subarticle 102-11.8 – Channelizing Devices: I can’t figure out exactly what a “longitudinal” channelizing device really is. It’s not defined, or mentioned, in our DOT publications or the MUTCD. What is it? I, again, think it would be an excellent complementary component to Index 600, either by detail or definition, to further support release of this proposed change. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes. Please don’t hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Response: Longitudinal channelizing devices are in the 2009 MUTCD. We will look at including some of your comments in future revisions to Index 600, but the 2012 Booklet has already been finalized. No changes made.

Paul Gentry
paul.gentry@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-15-11) If the wording for the Type B arrow boards states use as being on low to intermediate (0 to 50 mph) facilities, what justification would allow use for maintenance or moving operations on any speed facility? Anything above 50 mph should require the bigger Type C board period.

Response: I would agree, but the information added to Section 102 is the same wording that was in Section 990. We will look at this for a future revision. No changes made.

Woerner, Bert
386-943-5351

Comments: (1-4-12) 1) Why differentiate maintenance operations- the type of board should be based on speed not whether it’s construction or maintenance?

102-9.8 Arrow Board:

Type B arrow boards may be used on low to intermediate speed (0 to 50 mph) facilities ~~or for~~ ~~maintenance~~ or moving operations on any speed facility.—Type C arrow boards shall be used for all other operations on high-speed (50 mph and greater) facilities and may be substituted for Type B arrow boards on any speed facility.

2) Recommend it start on day the original signal detection is taking out of service not on when time starts- we could pay for a lot more unnecessary days the way it’s currently written.

102-11.19 Temporary Traffic Detection and Maintenance: For existing intersections, the quantity to be paid for will be the number of signalized intersections per day beginning the day the existing signal actuation is taken out of service ~~contract time begins~~ and ending the day the permanent detection is operational *and the final lane configuration is in place*. For temporary and new intersections, the quantity to be paid for will be the number of signalized intersections per day beginning the day the temporary detection is functional and ending the day: the permanent detection is operational and the final lane configuration is in place for a new intersection; or, when the detection is removed for a temporary intersection.

Response:

Item 1 - I would agree, but the information added to Section 102 is the same wording that was in Section 990. We will look at this for a future revision. No changes made.

Item 2 – Some of the maintaining agencies will not maintain the signals after the Notice to Proceed. That is why we used that date. No changes made.
