

TEO TTC Committee – Quarterly Meeting Minutes

January 22, 2015 - Arden Hills Training Center

CO Members:	Greater MN Members:	Metro Members:	Guests:
X - Ken Johnson X - Ted Ulven - Michelle Moser X - Craig Mittelstadt X - Leigh Kriewall - Bob Vasek X - Sue Lorentz X - Kathy Schaefer - Todd Haglin	X - David Mavec D1 - Todd Larson D2 X - Tom Dumont D3 X - Tim Janski D3 X - Les Bjerketvedt D4 - Jeff Rieder D6 X - Adam Wellner D6 - Scott Thompson D7 X - Brad Bruegger D7 - Ryan Barney D8 X - Jeff Knofczynski D8 X - Rachel Guan D8	X - Tiffany Dagon - Anna Schwartz - Scott Meier X - Kevin Farraher X - Sheila Johnson X - Dave Tody - Jeff Gibbons - Rod Clark - John McClellan	X - Mike Kronzer X - Ashley Roup

DISCUSSION TOPICS (Updates, new business, and questions for the committee):

Minutes from the October meeting:

The minutes and action items from the October 28th quarterly meeting were reviewed and approved.

Membership update:

The membership list is updated to include Tom Dumont as a DTE member from D3 and Anna Schwartz from Metro who specializes in Striping and WZ analysis.

A report from the Nov. 12th Midwest WZ Roundtable virtual meeting:

- Main topics included the appearance of full matrix CMS boards in several states. With more capabilities, KS wanted to know if others modified their guidance. Most still use MUTCD guidelines, 18" letters, 8 per line, and 3 lines. Some allow more with special approval. It was noted that MnDOT Maintenance used Full Matrix but follows MN MUTCD guidance.
- MN asked about maintaining TPAR during construction. Many states have had "no issue" or don't do much. Some are in transition, adding layouts, guidance, and standard drawings. Wisconsin was nearly finished with their drawings and promised to share upon completion.
- MN asked about portable sign supports being stored on the roadway in a manner that was not crash tested. Others have not noticed problem, remove them when not used, or use fold up signs. Those that have seen this, agree it is an enforcement issue with construction.
- Ohio asked about LEO (Law enforcement Officer) use in WZ's. Every agency has used them in some aspect. Some assist only as part of their job. Others have dedicated funds thru either the project or some agency budget.
- Ohio also asked about contractor's use of median U-Turn breaks. Usage is mixed with MnDOT vehicles using them but contractors sometimes getting a ticket.
- And, working over live traffic. Most would not allow, sometimes citing OSHA regulations. Others might do that, but with a flagger/spotter.
- Illinois asked about the MUTCD update progress. Ken Wood said there are not many major changes for Part 6. Some sections are being reorganized. Part 6I will be moved but no changes to it. Should be a Notice of Proposed Amendments in early 2016 and published in 2017. Typical applications for roundabouts will be added. Pedestrian channelizers will be added including a figure. There will be no additional guidance on temporary rumble strips.
- Michigan asked what other states require for flagger training. Most states have some type of training or video type instruction. Most have a registration or certification program.

- Iowa asked about lane shift calculations. Most use the MUTCD guidance of L/2 with some adjusting for field conditions and encouraging judgment be used.

OTST website updates of TTC Design Tools:

OTST has updated all of the WZ design Templates. Currently under development are template layouts for the new Workers Present speed limit, 24/7 Construction Speed Limit, and TPAR. Some committee guidance is needed to proceed.

The WZ speed reduction layouts were presented. The Microstation drawings that mimic the layouts in the “Speed Limits in Work Zones Guidelines-October 2014” were selected. From the discussion, it was directed to remove the optional indication from the “\$300 fine” plaque. An additional layout showing a multilane undivided was requested.

Action Item: These additions and modifications will be performed and they will be posted to the OTST webpage for TTC designer use.

TPAR layouts were discussed. Some layout drawings were shown and discussed. There were some concerns about the layout that shows a mid-block crossing. The committee wanted another drawing of the same situation without a mid-block crossing as to not promote that strategy except in the most necessary situation. When the mid-block crossing is used, the layout should show and note the use of temporary pavement markings. If the crossing is not directly across from each landing, some other tactile guidance will be needed. There was also a desire for Microstation drawings of “Typical TPAR Devices”.

Action Item: The TPAR layouts in Microstation for the TTC Design Tools section will include the typical devices and layouts similar to the drawings in sections 6K and 6J of the MN MUTCD.

Discuss application of WZ SL guidelines and intent of Worker Safety Legislation on roads closed to thru traffic but open to businesses and residents.

Detours are often established at some distance before the work area. At that point the MN MUTCD guidance is to use “Road Closed to Thru Traffic” signs to close the road. This is appropriate because the detour now becomes the Trunk Highway. Access to businesses and property owners must be maintained. This situation was not considered in the legislation. Since the intent was to increase worker safety, if there is no work being performed until the total closure, the committee decided the Workers Present Speed Limit (WPSL) would not be required. If there is work occurring the WPSL might be needed if workers were present. In the case of intermittent or random work areas, some districts instead chose to post a 24/7 Construction Speed Limit. An advisory speed was suggested as being appropriate in that situation, but would not be in compliance with the legislation.

The final thoughts were that the road should be considered open if there are other than work vehicles using it. If workers are present, the WPSL might be needed or a 24/7 Construction Speed Limit. The identified best practice is to reduce the SL using the 24/7 Construction Speed Limit.

Action Item: OTST will suggest the research effort, The Online Community, be asked if they understand the differences between the signs indicating Road Closed, Road Closed to Thru Traffic, and Road Closed Open to Local Traffic.

Review proposed modification to the SP2014 language for a new SP2015 special provision for the Workers Present Speed Limit.

The (2563) WORKERS PRESENT SPEED LIMIT was modified to:

- Refer to the correct reference document
- Clarify that it is to be installed and then removed as workers are present
- To cover all inconsistent signing

Discussion directed that the reference to a lane closure be removed as this may be used without a lane closure. The change is to when workers are adjacent to traffic. To achieve a high rate of compliance, the driver must feel it is appropriate. At what distance from traffic would workers be “adjacent”. The committee decided within 12 feet would be adjacent.

Action Item: OTST will make the changes described above.

Is guidance needed for controlling the speed of a Pilot car thru a WZ?

A county asked if the WPSL was needed in a flagging operation. The discussion found that flagging operations were relatively short distances and for lengthy ones, a pilot car would typically be used in MnDOT operations. The districts have not seen a problem with pilot car speeds but thought some guidance could preempt any concerns about the lack of a WPSL. It was indicated that present practice typically has the pilot car operating at a maximum speed of 45 mph but slowing to about 30 mph as it passes workers. These are the limits the committee decided should go in the 1404 Flagging section, the Boilerplate Special Provisions, and chapter 8 of the Traffic Engineering manual.

Action Item: OTST will add guidance on typical speeds for Pilot cars to the TEM.

Motorcycle Road Guard Update.

Ken Johnson updated the committee on the status of the Road Guard program for motorcycle group rides. Some groups had been doing this unofficially for some time. Legislation and the formulation of rules and training requirements will now make this practice legal and safer. A “Minnesota Motorcycle Road Guard Field Guide” contains instructions and layouts for this practice. Delay times for motorists are capped at 5 to 10 minutes and may occur sunup to sundown. High Viz Vests and Stop/Slow paddles are required. No permit is required but they have to notify the cities affected. Only cities of the first class may refuse the request.

ATV use on MnDOT right-of-Way, particularly limited access, freeway designs.

A few districts have been affected by MnDOT Geodetic contracts that are utilizing 4 wheelers to set survey monuments. There have been reports of them driving against traffic on the shoulder, crossing traffic lanes, and high speed operation on pavements. No traffic control is used in these operations and the contract specifications only states to use safe procedures.

Tiffany consulted the Attorney General’s office and their opinion is the use of ATV’s is not legal due to DNR regulations and a MnDOT Commissioners order. However, several MnDOT districts use these vehicles for survey and maintenance work. Some on the committee see these as work vehicles no different from a mower or bobcat. There is an exemption in state law for ATV use by utilities and a proposal is to add MnDOT employees and contractors to the exemption.

There is a desire for some guidance and layouts for their use. Some items to address are the operating speeds, driving against traffic, shoulder use, ramp locations, and crossing roadways. An inquiry was made of OSHA and they did not have many concerns other than if a roll cage is used, the vehicle should have a seat belt.

As more investigation is needed of this topic, a Task Force was set up to more deeply explore the issue. Ken, Ted, Tiffany, Sue L., and Les B. volunteered to meet and report findings back to the committee.

Review TEM Chapter 8 progress.

The Task Force for the Chapter 8 rewrite continues. The review yielded some questions for the committee to decide.

- There was a reference to the “Road Information Unit” and nobody knew what that unit was. It was decided to change this to the 511 construction information system.
- Portable sign supports located on walkways need to be detectable, more guidance will be included.
- The sheeting requirement for permanent signs is changing from Type 9 to 11. Since the APL for Type 9 sheeting will be discontinued, the committee decided the requirement for temporary rigid signs will change too. A 4 to 5 year transition was recommended to allow for current signs to be used thru their expected lifespan.
- Consideration was given to a recommendation from the Statewide Work Zone Safety Committee to implement 6 inch pavement markings in TTC zones. There was discussion for and against this with increased scarring and costs the overhang occurring on permanent lines being among the concerns. The committee agreed this would be a good practice for transition areas.
- A question of whether TPAR devices should be itemized on TTC plans. Kevin F. says no, and if it is done, Estimating might want quantities for other L.S. items. Tiffany agreed saying Estimating does not want quantities for L.S. pay items. Adam suggested adding prices to the “extra traffic control” list in 1404. It was thought that the template sheets for TPAR when included in plans may be helpful.

Action Item: The Task Force will continue to meet and report progress at the next quarterly meeting.

Round Robin:

- Adam Wellner has worked with design to develop temporary OH sign structures and offered to share the information with other interested districts. Tiffany said Metro would like the information. Adam asked if other districts used PPCB when they had a bypass with 2 lanes one direction and 1 lane the opposing direction. He thought PPCB had to be used for multilane bypasses. Other districts didn't think this was a standard practice and would be similar to bypass or truck climbing lanes. As with other decisions of where to use PPCB, duration, volumes, and speed are all considerations. Tube delineation of the centerline would be a typical practice.
- Dave Mavec says that as a result of a 34 car pileup in a tunnel last fall, the State Patrol wants plans for emergency closures of interstate highways. He is looking for anything other districts might have regarding incident management traffic control.
- Sue Lorentz shared some information from the ATSSA Positive Protection class and some discussions with MN OSHA. Of particular interest was the ATSSA information that crossing live traffic was an OSHA violation. MN OSHA says this is not much of a concern and discussion included the difference of crossing a low volume road and a major freeway. A rule of thumb from old training classes is that if you can cross at a walking pace it is OK, but if you need to run, it is not a good practice.
- Rachel says they had a request from CO for TTC for a “Welcome” sign restoration project with not much time for design. She wanted to know if other border districts have experienced similar requests. No other districts had this request yet.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Tuesday, May 5th, 2015