

ODOT District Work Zone Traffic Managers Meeting

(OCA & ATSSA Representatives Included)

October 11, 2018 @ 9:00 A.M., Room GA

MEETING MINUTES

LIST OF ATTENDEES		
NAME	REPRESENTING	EMAIL
Duane Soisson	ODOT Roadway Engineering	Duane.Soisson@dot.ohio.gov
Bill Feehan	ODOT Roadway Engineering	William.Feehan@dot.ohio.gov
Scott Roeder	ODOT Roadway Engineering	Scott.Roeder@dot.ohio.gov
Emily Willis	ODOT Roadway Engineering	Emily.Willis@dot.ohio.gov
Gary Angles	ODOT Construction	Gary.Angles@dot.ohio.gov
James Cook	ODOT Maintenance	James.Cook@dot.ohio.gov
Derrick Schierloh	ODOT D1	Derrick.Schierloh@dot.ohio.gov
Michael Stormer	ODOT D2	Michael.Stormer@dot.ohio.gov
Mike Simpkins	ODOT D4	Michael.Simpkins@dot.ohio.gov
Joshua Otworth	ODOT D5	Joshua.Otworth@dot.ohio.gov
Vimal Patel	ODOT D6	Vimal.Patel@dot.ohio.gov
Scott Kraus	ODOT D8	Scott.Kraus@dot.ohio.gov
Patricia Wetzal	ODOT D9	Patricia.Wetzal@dot.ohio.gov
Dennis Oneil	ODOT D12	Dennis.Oneil@dot.ohio.gov
Ron Garczewski	Ohio FHWA	Ron.Garczewski@dot.gov
Scott Porter	City of Columbus	scporter@columbus.gov
Parr Peterson	ATSSA	parrp@ppco.net
Chris Engle	OCA	cengle@ohiocontractors.org

1) Meeting Minutes

Meeting minutes for the July 12, 2018 meeting have not yet been prepared but will be sent out once they have been prepared.

2) Lane Closure Notification Process & Communication with the TMC..... TSMO Coords/TMC/CO

This topic was scheduled to discuss concerns that the TSMO Coordinators had raised in one of their meetings. Scott Ockunzzi was not able to attend so, as on the of DWZTMs that also wear a TSMO hat, he sent thoughts ahead of time. He shared what D3 does:

Detours:

- 1) County garages/project engineers email HMA AP4 with the proposed detour route, closure and duration.
- 2) The AP4 makes a detour map and distributes it to the PIO, district staff, special hauling, etc.
- 3) The PIO updates Buckeye Traffic and sends out a weekly construction report.

Lane Closures:

- 1) County garages/project engineers tell PIO what lane closures are upcoming for the following week and PIO updates Buckeye Traffic and sends out the construction report.

Adam Kieffer was unable to attend but sent comments via email. He noted that Scott Ockunzzi's description captures the typical process used by many districts; however, from the TMC's perspective sometimes they are not notified but even more concerning is when there is a change or cancellation of the planned closure. More often than not information about a change or cancellation does not get communicated to the TMC which is particularly problematic when it's an area without camera coverage. This leads to our overhead signs warning of a closure and OHGO having an alert posted when there isn't really a closure. Credibility is very important.

Duane reminded the districts of the email that was sent out on 8/30/18 encouraging field personnel on the project to communicate with the TMC when there are changes to ensure messages displayed to the driving public are timely and accurate. It was suggested to add this to the MOP; however, it is our understanding that ODOT personnel are not always on site during these times. Ron G suggested considering a plan note (maybe the notification of traffic restrictions plan note 642-58). For now, we have given a reminder and will see if the reminder is effective at encouraging appropriate communication. If it doesn't improve then we will consider other measures such as adding a requirement either for the contractor, ODOT personnel, or both.

3) Learning from Others Segment..... E. Willis/D. Soisson/B. Feehan
ORE and/or Districts will go over some of the latest situations that offer opportunity to provide teachable moments. If you discover a teachable moment that you would like to share, please send information to Duane, Emily and/or Bill.

- 1) *Flagger near miss: This occurred on a City of Columbus project where construction workers were presumably stopping one or more lanes to let a truck leave the work area. A [dash cam video surfaced online](#) from the vehicle that was following the black pickup truck seen below swerving around a flagger. A few of the lessons learned regarding the flagging activity: this occurred outside the permitted hours; use of flags rather than a STOP/SLOW paddle; appropriate flagging warning signage not in place; etc. This was a teaching moment for the flaggers and was addressed with the project.*



- 2) *Short merge taper: This occurred in a City of Dayton area zone. Due to two exit ramps they had a lane closure in approximately 80 feet which caused an issue with the flow of traffic. County Maintenance told them to correct it and the correction wasn't any better and then told them to get off the road until there was a better plan. This traffic flow issue was captured by the TMC and per our arrangement the District was notified due to observing excess queuing due to a work zone. The notification plan worked in this case.*



- 3) *Tree trimmers on interstate: A school district in D8 area was having their trees trimmed and the trimmers decided to set up on the ramp using only 28" cones and without a taper. They also did not have a permit. They were told to get off the road due to no permit and the unacceptable MOT set up. Although this case didn't have a permit, there is also difficulties with internal permit communication with lane closures.*



4) Contraflow Lane Emergency Access Gate D8/Scott Kraus

D8 has added emergency access gates to the contraflow area on I-71. It is a 6-mile project with 3 miles in long term MOT (contraflow). Previous use of emergency access gates didn't go so well because when they went to use them they would find that they didn't work or were frozen closed. This time they added a requirement for them to be tested monthly. The district specified how many gates but allowed them to be located in the field. The gates near each end is approximately 1 mile in and then there is one additional in between (total of 3). They are placed primarily for appropriate sight distance for the opposing direction (if they need used they would be opened and traffic would come out of the zone through the emergency gate and into the opposing side of traffic, so they wanted to maintain sight distance on that side). In the contract they are paid by each emergency access gate. They recently were scheduled for a monthly testing of the gates, but it was postponed. Once it is held D8 will share information from the monthly testing.

D4 has also used emergency access gates in some projects as well. They cite a specific number of gates but not the actual locations. They let them be located determined with Traffic Incident Management (TIM) input.

5) Drums in Tapers Day and Night D6/Vi Patel

D6 would like other's thoughts on possibly requiring the use of drums in tapers at all times rather than just at night on freeways and other multi-lane highways (TEM 605-11.3). Several SCDs currently require drums in tapers at night on freeways and other multi-lane highways as well as some additional facilities as well (two-lane, etc). D6 would like this for better visibility and more target value in the taper areas and just propose this for multi-lane highways with speed limits of 45 mph or greater. D6 maintenance likes using drums in tapers.

OCA/Chris would just want to make sure that it is applied evenly throughout (via SCD or standard) rather than just some contracts so that the contractors know what to expect but would like to run it by the industry.

D12/Dennis would like the opposite and would like to get rid of drums in tapers. What is the benefit? Are people blowing through the tapers? He reports that their maintenance says that when intrusions occur it is typically in the tangent area, not from the taper area. He suggests putting devices transversely across the closed lane at set intervals, such as 500'. What are other states doing? Do any other states require drums in tapers at any or all times? If the buffer space is provided and protection vehicle is present, then cones should be fine. The OMUTCD doesn't require drums at night in tapers, the ODOT standards do. Why?

D4/Mike – Take it to the HMAs and ask them at their next meeting. D4 counties only follow the flip book and OMUTCD and not the SCDs. Using devices in a transverse manner cyclically through the work area is an issue because the workers have to stop at each set and move them to get through. It is highly likely that in time you will just have a group of devices off to the side at the intervals.

FHWA/Ron – Indiana has used the devices in a transverse pattern throughout the zone.

Cols/Scott – Have not seen driving through a taper being a problem. If require this then you might need additional vehicles for your crew to carry equipment.

Maint/Jim – In his former position he always made his personnel set all tapers with drums. It was a safety measure. It provided a big orange wall. They also used tighter spacing on the tangents (every other line). Trucks often blow cones over when driving by them. The drums don't get blown over like the cones do.

ATSSA/Parr – The requirement was for all drums then allowance for cones came for specific instances.

CO/Emily – I believe the current requirements relate back to the evaluation that was done when ODOT first considered allowing 42" cones to be used at all. Prior to this, drums were required all the time (taper and tangent). After the evaluation of 42" cones they were permitted for use in certain places during certain times. We kept some places and times when we were not ok with allowing cones.

ACTION ITEM: Ask the HMAs at the November meeting what they are doing now and how they feel about requiring drums in tapers on multi-lane high speed facilities. =>UPDATE: We were not able to get on the November or December agenda. We have a request in for January's agenda..... PENDING
ACTION ITEM: Ask what other states are doing at the Midwest Work Zone Roundtable virtual meeting on 11/8/18. => UPDATE: We were only able to ask one question in the time allotted and did not get to this question. States are to follow up with answers to questions that could not be discussed. We will watch for any responses..... PENDING

6) Signage Duration D6/Vi Patel

D6 has noticed many instances where signage removal/covering has been lax after the conditions no longer apply (for example lane closures and lane closure warning signs). D6 asked for feedback on possibly specifying allowable timeframes for how long signs may be up (and displaying) before the related condition is in place and how long after the related condition is removed before the signs shall be removed/covered. Should we set a maximum timeframe? Seems difficult as each closure is sized differently and make take more time on some to loop back around to get all the signs than others.

CO/Emily – Reopening the lane or ramp but not taking down the signage the indicates that it is closed begs the question as to if the lane or ramp has effectively been opened on time. The signage can impact choices people make and you may have last minute maneuvers if they see that it is actually open even though the signs say closed. They might think the same thing next time and it might actually be closed still.

D4/Mike – Is this covered in the 100 spec?

D2/Mike – Has seen this issue too (flagger ahead, etc) and agrees that it needs addressed but unsure how.

Cols/Scott – If the signs are still up, is it considered closed even if physically open?

FHWA/Ron – OMUTCD says as soon as practical...short duration.

OCA/Chris – When does the clock start?

D8/Scott – It would be difficult to come up with one time that would be appropriate for all projects of different closure sizes. Even if did come up with a certain duration then it would be difficult to enforce a specific amount of time after the reopening.

D12/Dennis – Suggests holding the WTS responsible if the signs do not come down in a reasonable amount of time.

ATSSA/Parr – Will ask ATSSA if they have suggestions.

FHWA/Ron – Can see why the MUTCD doesn't set a specific time as "as soon a practical" seems appropriate. Needs a culture change.

D4/Mike – We don't want signs confusing drivers during peak times (PLCS times). Suggests including sign removal/covering in the allowable hours. The contractor knows how long it will take them and they will need to budget that in to their allowable hours.

D2/Mike – Agrees with D4 but will still need something to address other facilities that are not covered by the PLCS (2 lane, etc). Maybe require them to be removed/covered within a reasonable amount of time, as determined by the Engineer.

D5/Josh – Could focus on the most egregious (3+ hrs or whatever we can all agree).

ACTION ITEM: Consider requiring sign removal/covering to be completed by the end of the allowable hours for the applicable closure and for all other facilities within a reasonable amount of time as determined by the Engineer. This will only cover some signage (closure related) and may address other signage that lingers in the field longer than it should. **PENDING**

ACTION ITEM: Ask what other states are doing at the Midwest Work Zone Roundtable virtual meeting on 11/8/18..... **PENDING**

- 7) **Queue Warning System**D12/Dennis Oneil
Dennis shared information about two queue warning systems he has used, one is a Class 1 and the other is a Class 2. Dennis suggest getting with the supplier and driving the zone before having it set up.
- 8) **PCMS on unified platform**.....D12/Dennis Oneil
Dennis would like to be able to see all message boards on one map in one platform rather than manufacturer specific. He has not been able to do this yet despite NTCIP. If this can be done it might be able to be integrated into Buckeye Traffic. CO/Emily noted that it would need to be viewing only, not editing, as to keep the responsibility roles clear.
- 9) **3M Roadshow**.....D5/Joshua Otworth
Josh asked if there were any new technologies from the roadshow that ODOT was looking to implement? Not at this time. There was some discussion about QR codes in sign faces and wet reflective paint. D12/Dennis said that Michigan has gone with all wet-reflective and got rid of WZRPMs.
- 10) **WTS Prequalification Testing Dates** OCA/Chris Engle
Chris asked if the dates were filling in now for the WTS Prequalification testing. No they are not. Each session holds 15 people and if you go to LTAP’s website just like you are registering you can see how many seats are remaining.

CO/Emily - The WTS Prequalification list has been posted online.
- 11) **Ohio Traffic Incident Management (OTIM) Training**CO/Emily Willis
The OTIM training has been launched and one training session has been completed. Training can be requested online at ohioTIM.com.

Internal ODOT Meeting portion convened after a 10 min break.

Next Meeting

January 10, 2019 @ 9:00 AM, Room GA

Future Scheduled Meetings

April 11, 2019 @ 9:00 AM, Room 4A
July 11, 2019 @ 9:00 AM, Room 4A
TENTATIVE October 10, 2019 @ 9:00 AM, Room TBD

- For planning purposes, we keep 4 meetings scheduled at all times (1 yr).
- After each meeting the date relating to a year in the future will be scheduled to reserve Room 4A. Reservations for this room may be made no earlier than 360 days in advance.
- 180 days in advance of each scheduled meeting date (when the reservations open) I will attempt to move the meeting location to GA so that non-ODOT attendees do not need escorted to the meeting room from the front desk.