

MEMORANDUM

To: Greenbook Committee Members and Cheryl Adams
From: Allen Schrupf, Chapter Subcommittee Co-Chair
Subject: Should we update Chapter 11 – Work Zone Safety?

In reviewing the current Florida Greenbook Chapter 11 – Work Zone Safety, it looks like the chapter has not changed much since I first came to Florida in 1989. Changes have been made from time to time, but most changes are more of an administrative nature, not as much of a technical one. Since I am an Instructor for the Florida T2 Center, teaching Advanced MOT, I'd like to make sure the current Greenbook is valid. I have received many questions on this issue during teaching AMOT. Both the MUTCD and also the Design Standards have changed significantly in the past 4-5 years. I am interested to know if there is a need to review the content of this chapter and identify any issues which need to be updated, added or deleted from the current version.

As I review it, I think the content of the chapter is rather general in nature, and that seems to be the appropriate intent. My concern is that there may have been issues that have arisen more recently that we should consider including. Examples of these newer concerns are:

OBJECTIVES (this is the heading in the current Greenbook)

1. Should an additional objective to limit serious congestion on the facility be added? *THIS IS INTENDED TO ACHIEVE CONSISTENCY WITH THE LATEST FHWA DIRECTION (Transportation Management Plan now includes three (3) components - Temporary Traffic Control Plan + Traffic Operations Plan + Community Awareness Plan)*
2. Should an additional objective to limit impacts to transit, commercial deliveries to adjacent property and emergency vehicle operation be added?
3. Should the objective to maintain safe passageways for pedestrians in the work zone be modified to require ADA compliance?

PLANNING OF OPERATIONS (specifically the section on Traffic Control and Protection)

1. Should the plan include consideration to include buffer spaces in front of the work zone and in front of barriers? What about attenuators on barrier ends?
2. Should the plan include consideration of protecting dropoffs within the clear zone?
3. Should the plan include Access to the WORK ZONE (by construction vehicles)?
4. Should the plan include Access to ADJACENT PROPERTIES? The current reference seems too vague as to what "Access" refers to.

WORK ZONE OPERATIONS (specifically the section on Contracts and Permits)

1. Should the second paragraph be amended to require that ANY work effort be PRECEDED by the development /selection of a plan?

EVALUATION

1. Should the text refer to “Utility” as well as Construction and Maintenance operations? I know some Utilities (Progress Energy and FPL are the best examples) are under the UAM, but there are so many utilities that may not be under it, because they subcontract so much of their field work.

******* ADDITIONAL ISSUES I DID NOT CATEGORIZE *******

1. Should we add a requirement that all TCP planning and TCP field personnel be trained in accordance with FDOT Policy? MUTCD now requires training, but does not specify methods. Perhaps FDOT’s training is best here.
2. Do we need to require (or suggest) all individual pay items for all projects?
3. Do we need to require all roadsides to be “crashworthy”. By this I mean adding language to require NCHRP Category 4 Devices (Advance Warning Arrow Panels, etc.) to be moved behind barrier or beyond the Clear Zone).
4. Do we need to require ANSI Class II apparel (or Class III for Flaggers at night). Also, do we need to require materials, equipment and clothing to be reflectorized if used at night?
5. Do we need to require permanent warning signs installed at 7’ height in areas where pedestrian traffic occurs, 5’ where pedestrians are not likely.
6. What about requiring warning lights on the traffic side of the sign?
7. Do we need to add a requirement to have warning signs sizes and advance distance a function of speeds on high speed facilities? MUTCD allows 24” x 24” & 100’ on very low speed roads, 36” x 36” on moderate facilities, and 48” x 48” & 1000’ on high speed facilities.
8. Do we need to address the concern that posts be able to endure the severe weather that can be expected (FDOT standards require stronger post installations, and due to deeper imbedment, more utility conflicts are anticipated).
9. Do we need to add a requirement for dimming certain devices at night?
10. Do we need to add a requirement that Portable Changeable Message Sign – messages be stated in the plans?
11. Do we need to add a requirement that Arrow Panels in the Arrow are ONLY to be used for Lane Closures on a multilane facility, with a separate panel for each lane closed.

END OF MEMORANDUM