

Monday afternoon 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM

1:00 PM to 2:00 PM Economic Recovery: What Can We Learn From It?

2:00 PM to 3:00 PM Regional Topics

3:00 PM to 3:15 PM Break

3:15 PM to 5:00 PM Regional Topics

WYDOT'S	1. Are the other Region 4 states calculating haul (CYMI) in earthwork designs and either paying for it directly or providing the estimated quantity on the plans for informational purposes for the contractors?
WYDOT'S	2. For those states bidding alternate surfacing sections, are you making the overall surfacing thickness the same, which simplifies the grading design, or designing with two different thicknesses? Do you provide two grading designs?
WYDOT'S	3. Are you designing roundabouts with 6" vertical curbs on (a) splitter islands, and (b) the outside of the circle, and do you have problems with snow plowing the roundabouts – especially conflicts with the curbs? Note: We're designing our first three locations and some maintenance people are pushing hard for sloped, lower height, curbs in hopes they'll be more forgiving for their plowing operations.
South Dakota's	1. Are states considering "Shoulder Widening" in lieu of "Reconstruction" to improve safety on roads (reduce run-off road accidents) that currently have no or minimal shoulders? What items are being reviewed to consider if "Shoulder Widening" is a viable option (i.e. horizontal alignment, vertical alignment, cross slope and/or superelevation, ditch sections, pipe/culvert condition, sub-grade/surfacing strength, constructability of narrow wedge, etc.)? Do you have different specifications for Shoulder Widening (i.e. compaction for shoulder only) than reconstruction projects?
South Dakota's	2. What guidelines do states have for when Rumble Strips and/or Rumble Stripes are considered for shoulders and/or centerline? What are your standards for Rumble Strips/Stripes?
Nevada's	1. I would like to see a discussion and solution of Passing Sight Distance with regard to the MUTCD and Green Book and why they don't agree. I know the statement on Page 123-125 of the 2001 Green Book state "These minimum passing sight distances for design should not be confused

	<p>with other distances used as the warrants for placing no-passing zone pavement markings on completed highways. Such values as shown in the MUTCD (6) are substantially less than design distances and are derived for traffic operating-control needs that are based on different assumptions from those for highway design.”</p> <p>This troubles me. For instance if you alter the profile on a section of two lane roadway you design it for Green Book passing sight distance. Then the next existing vertical curve for passing sight distance you use the MUTCD “less than design distance”. Driver expectancy has been thrown to the wind. The Driver thinks he’s got all that distance he had on the last hill and the Peterbuilt coming over the rise tells him otherwise. The MUTCD Committee and Green Book Committee need to get together and agree on maybe a midrange. It might help to understand the differences if you had a table which showed the assumptions for each side by side.</p>
Hawaii’s	<p>What are the other states doing (best practices) in ARRA projects reporting?</p>
Montana’s	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do other states deal with the following pedestrian accessibility issues in construction work zones: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Detectable edging when the pedestrians are detoured from the existing side sidewalks and placed on a temporary route. b. Temporary ramps for pedestrians when the existing sidewalk cannot be used and we have to detour pedestrians off full height curbs. c. Temporary barricades that have been used to separate pedestrians from the work activities and/or traffic. d. Any drawings, details, or special provisions that show how these pedestrian accessibility issues are being handled would be greatly appreciated.
Montana’s	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. In Montana, utility companies use our R/W(right-of-way), but we have no power to get them to move out of the way for construction projects in a timely manner. Depending on the situation, MDT may pay a percentage of the relocation costs. Sometimes it seems that they move at their leisure and other times they claim that they lack the resources. What are other states doing to create a situation where the utility companies relocate quickly to avoid construction conflicts?
Montana’s	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Have other states had issues with artwork and monument signs in the public right-of-way? Does anyone have guidelines and/or design considerations that they can share?

Oklahoma	<p>1. Shoulder Width vs. Lane Width Design Exception for Multilane Facility (additional ROW or Utility Relocation not an option): When the HCS output is basically the same LOS, what do the states do/use to help justify their decision?</p> <p>We are adding a lane to the median in each direction to an existing four lane facility. One option is to have a barrier with a 10' inside shoulder, 3 - 11' driving lanes and a 10' outside shoulder. Another option is to have a barrier with a 7' inside shoulder, 3 - 12' driving lanes and a 10' outside shoulder. (There have been several opinions on how this should be done). Other options would be those in between these two options. When you run the Highway Capacity Analysis for these two options, the free flow speed is reduced by maybe 1.7 mph but still gives the same overall LOS for each option. Our Geometric Engineer has looked on websites and has read a bunch of information to help in this decision. Maybe my question should be more like, "Are there any documents/studies available to guide us in the decision as to whether full width shoulders are better than narrow lanes (or vice versa)?"</p>
Oklahoma	<p>2. Are other states producing a Life Cycle Cost Analysis for all projects with alternate bids for surfacing?</p>
Oklahoma	<p>3. What were the most challenging issues to overcome during the project delivery phase of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act?</p>
North Dakota	<p>1. 3D Design inception through construction: 3D use in preliminary studies; 3D use in plans; 3D models provided for contractors (before and after bidding); and 3D models used with GPS equipment for construction. Discuss pros and cons, and capabilities.</p>
North Dakota	<p>2. Feed back on alternative pipe materials under highways.</p>
Utah	<p>1. How are other states dealing with lateral offset to obstruction? What is your standard? Do you treat repetitive or expected items differently? For preservation projects are items that do not meet the lateral offset requirements brought within standard, documented, or not considered?</p>
Utah	<p>2. For freeways and multilane highways do you require a 6:1 constant slope to clearzone or do you allow 4:1 or a variable slope?</p>
Utah	<p>3. What tools have other states been using or developing in</p>

	<p>order to improve the accuracy of the engineer's estimates? Do other states reveal their estimates? Are they posted at advertisement or after the bids are opened?</p>
Nebraska	<p>1. Width of centerline/ edge-line rumble stripes. What are other states using for rumble stripe width on centerline and edge-line?</p>
Nebraska	<p>2. Entrance curbs on roundabouts in rural high speed areas. It seems by placing them outside the tracking for the WB-62, they are too far out to be useful in slowing most traffic. What are other states doing.</p>
Arizona	<p>1. What do states have in place for ADA Transition Plans and where can they be found (specific website link)?</p>
Washington	<p>1. Emerging issue related to sustainable design: it has been proposed, at the recent AASHTO-sponsored peer exchange on sustainable transportation, that there be a "de-coupling" of standards for new and reconstructed roads. In other words, develop guidelines for reconstructing roads that consider sustainable practices (conserving materials, minimizing expanding the footprint and re-work, etc.) rather than completely rebuilding as if it were new alignment. There were a lot of heads nodding agreement at the peer exchange (including some FHWA attendees). It would be interesting to start mulling this over collectively.</p>
Washington	<p>2. Highway Safety Manual adoption and implementation (AMF's, etc).</p>
Washington	<p>3. Revisit the resolution endorsing an international scan tour for universally accessible design. It was endorsed in 2008, and made it into the processing stream, but unfortunately was lost in the shuffle. It would be good to re-submit this year.</p>

Attendance

	State	No Reply	Yes	No
1	Alaska	X		
2	Alberta			X
3	Arizona		X	
4	British Columbia	X		
5	California		X	
6	Colorado	X		
7	Hawaii			X
8	Idaho	X		
9	Montana		X	
10	Nebraska		X	
11	Nevada		X	
12	New Mexico			X
13	North Dakota		X	
14	Oklahoma		X	
15	Oregon			X
16	Saskatchewan	X		
17	South Dakota		X	
18	Texas			X
19	Utah			X
20	Washington		X	
21	Wyoming		X	