**TRAFFIC CONTROL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (TC²) MEETING AGENDA**

# 9:30 AM – 11:00 AM

# May 22, 2024

TEAMS

1. **Introductions**
	1. Phone: Amanda Lealaua, Andy Bakker, Brian DuPont, Andy Heidtke, Jason Voelker, Kathy – Safemark, Lance Mauel, Bill McNary, Nick Bigelow, Matt Rauch, Ryan A Cecchini, Josh Falk, Mike Seifert, Sharon Sohrweide, Taylor Hancock, Rodney Taylor, Tim McChesney
2. **New Topics**
	1. **Work Zones**
		1. Crash Cushion
			* *Brought up for NCHRP crash cushions still being used in lieu of MASH approved devices. Most likely occurring in the SE Region.*
			* *Have we done training to WisDOT staff to identify MASH vs NCHRP devices?*
			* *Erik Emmerson – noted projects may have been LET when NCHRP devices were approved.*
			* *Rodney – Erik couldn’t make the meeting, BPD’s goal is to have MASH 2016 devices that are compliant, NCHRP devices are no longer posted on the APL*
				1. *July 2023 – note posted on the HCCI about MASH Crash Cushions*
				2. *Feb 7, 2023 – no NCHRP devices since that date.*
			* *Nick L– mega rentals, LET in April that were still using the NCHRP crash cushions. What is the proper process to notify someone that there are NCHRP devices on projects?*
				1. *Brian DuPont - Contact the Regional Traffic Engineer, Project Manager, Construction Oversight Engineer or Andy Heidtke and CC Erik Emerson. Andy may be able to give you the correct names on who to contact.*
		2. PCMS Updates
			* *Put together some guidance on feedback from the TTC, everyone was not on board with the potential changes. Discussed possible SPV or pilot projects, the Regions were not particularly interested in this due to the uncertainty.*
			* *Would like to get the working group back together and include the WZE in the discussion to try to come to a resolution on how to move forward.*
		3. Pedestrian Audible Devices (Audible Information Device – AID)
			* *Received devices from Empco lite, trying them for 30 days in the SW Region, getting installed in the next week or two.*
			* *These are for temp ped accommodations, lacked on providing audible information to people who are blind so these devices will provide audible instructions.*
			* *Trying out a few messages to determine what is the best option.*
			* *PSS is also rolling out a device and would like to trial them.*
			* *Expectation – SPV together for the 2025 spec so they are available for sure.*
			* *11th Edition MUTCD is requiring states to adopt these within 2 years and WisDOT will be in compliance.*
			* *Rodney – how do these work? They are motion censored and are placed along the detour route. Who programs these? Likely the contractor. Who creates the message? Likely standard messages to be consistent statewide. Brian – WisDOT would approve the messages, shouldn’t need to detail out message ahead of time.*
			* *Nick L – increase in ped barricades since November, should we start to see an increase in the devices for 2025? Yes – most likely with the November letting.*
			* *Place these at decision points along the detour route and start of detour route, anywhere there is a ped detour sign, there would be an AID.*
			* *Brian – how are we paying for them? Likely a BID item.*
			* *PSS, Empco Lite, MDI – 3 manufacturers with AID*
		4. Traffic Control Interim Lane Closure Item
			* *Added to standard spec in 2023, was previously an STSP for 5 years.*
			* *Questions about its use from contractors and WisDOT staff*
			* *Nick’s example that showed some confusion – full lane closure vs small adjustment for lane closure*
			* *Amanda-Expressway Lane closure vs shoulder closure – struggle with how that gets paid and it comes up on almost every job. If expanding, would like to see this addressed. Used to be a local lane closure price as a special and have not been seeing those lately but are being told that local lane closures you are only being paid for signs, not labor to set a 9A-3P closure. Lack traffic control plan for signal work, need a lane closure and how does that get paid? (Pay for Barrels, signs for closures – not the labor, so there is the interim closure item for this scenario) Something to consider on the longer projects, limit the distance on the closures, 4 miles seems reasonable. – this is sometimes put in the specials, but the contractor is unorganized and doesn’t know where they are working. Inconsistent on closure length, sometimes 2 miles -3 miles or more. Can get messy.*
			* *Nick L. – same issue as Amanda, winter work and electrical work. Additionally – long term lane closures on the job, left lane closure, then two weeks later, needs a right lane closure so have to go out and change everything to switch from left to right – should we get the interim lane closure item and paid for?*
			* *Nick L. – willing to help if needed if a committee is formed?*
			* *Nick B. – agree with Nick L. Why isn’t a shoulder closure considered a lane and included in the interim lane closure item?*
			* *Andy discussed that the original intent of the lane closure item was only on moving the items involved in a lane closure. At the time of its creation it was to eliminate a couple of regional SPV’s that existed.*
		5. Material Certs
			* *Requesting of material certs for items that were already on the APL which is redundant.*
			* *Liquid markings – requesting material certs months before marking was being put down, this is not reasonable to ask for a cert 3 months before you are going to use it. May not have the paint that far in advance.*
			* *Made updates to the CMM, published in May. Provided information that they are on the APL and no cert is needed*
			* *Nick L- does this impact the e reporting??? At this point, it does not impact the e reporting. At some point, the e reporting will be updated, by a third party. For now, no impacts.*
		6. Temporary Tape Removals
			* *Looked at performance of temp tape on projects and NTPEP test deck and talked with industry*
			* *Made some changes to the current APL – removed 2 tapes with the June 2024 letting – ATM series tape and swarco tape*
			* *Nick B. – should we not be using adhesive? Matt – tape on APL does not require primer, the adhesive on back of tape should be able to hold it down. Is there something that would ban the use of primer on those tapes? There is guidance on the approval criteria. Matt – make sure there is language out there for installation specs, Brightline still says to utilize a primer in application when at all possible. In following up with Jeannie, it was indicated that if a contractor wishes to use a primer than can, however any temporary tape projects that require the usage of a primer are no longer included on the APL.*
		7. Wet-Reflective Paint Testing
			* Looking to improve markings
			* Mega is testing 1 mile white and 1 mile yellow in the NE Region on IH 41
			* Focusing on freeways and expressways in all weather conditions – specially rain
		8. SPV for Performance Spec for Wet Reflective Paint/Epoxy
			* *Working on a draft of Performance Spec for temp markings*
			* *Tim - Are you changing the bead package or changing the Type 1 with White? WisDOT plans to leave the Wet Reflective elements/beads selection up to the contractor.*
			* *Andy will send out draft spec once it is ready, come out as SPV and will pilot initially and use the mobile retro meter to confirm results.*
		9. 4-foot skips
			* *Looking to make updates to SDD 15c08, what projects should we put these on? 12.5 feet on freeways/expressways*
			* *Tim – labor vs materials, trip basis cost, 4 ft vs 12.5 foot. Minimal additional cost, most likely similar.*
			* *Tim - Any concerns with crashes/incidents – is there a concern with 4 foot when requirements are 10-12 foot. Don’t usually see 2-4 foot in zones for temp. BTO to look into it.*
			* *MUTCD says states should stay with the same cycle pattern*
			* *Would take some time to implement if we made a change, late 2025/early 2026.*
	2. **Pavement Marking**
		1. Minimum 180-day Surface Epoxy Retros
			* *Years ago, had spec for 180 days for surface applied epoxy, removed that retro spec requirement because of snow plowing and other things out of our control.*
			* *Revisited the issue again due to the FHWA min retro standards for pavement markings. Min value for white and yellow is 100 for the Fed guidance*
			* *Should we revisit this again with the spec and have a minimum retro after 180 days for a retro value*
			* *Some projects were in the 80’s which would be below the 100 for surface applied epoxy*
			* *Don’t use a lot of surface applied epoxy with the change last year for the grooved center line*
			* *Tim – nothing to add, other than with snowplow to mandate a retro could be challenging. Who is responsible when the states snowplows damage the markings?*
			* *Brian – would any of this be grooved? No, grooved we have retro values in spec book*
		2. Permanent Bead Pilot
			* *Invested interest in long lasting markings, looking at different bead configurations for grooved markings to enhance the retros*
			* *Have 4 different bead combinations that we are working with industry and material suppliers to try out on projects,*
			* *Current 3M elements AASHTO Type 1, Visi Max with AASHTO type 1*
			* *Time to get a better product out there include – Utah Blend (mixing with 3M elements for dry retros), Visi Ultra 318+4, Visi Ultra 1.9,*
			* *Looking at application rates for double drop bead system*
			* *Tim – 3M element, 50 series elements or 70 series? Matt – 70 series Tim – try the 50 series and the retros are outstanding both dry and wet.*
			* *Provide update at a future meeting on this topic.*
	3. **Other**
		1. Nick B – used to have a WZE in the SE Region (Rebecca Klein – amazing), held everyone to the same standard on all projects on a state highway. There is not anyone in the SE Region and it is very noticeable in the industry and that people are not being held to the same standards – sheeting, signs, detour routes, mounting, font on signs. It is starting to look terrible in the region.
	4. **Next Meeting**
		1. August 28th 9:30 AM – 11:00 AM