

1. Report No. FHWA/VA-89-R24	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Temporary Asphalt Medians for Two-Lane, Two-Way Operation		5. Report Date March 1989	
7. Author(s) B. H. Cottrell, Jr.		6. Performing Organization Code	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Virginia Transportation Research Council Box 3817 University Station Charlottesville, VA 22903		8. Performing Organization Report No. VTRC 89-R24	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Virginia Department of Transportation 1401 E. Broad Street Richmond, VA 23219		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
15. Supplementary Notes In cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.		11. Contract or Grant No. 2462-081	
		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report October 1985 - February 1989	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
16. Abstract A typical temporary asphalt median for two-lane, two-way operation is 12 to 18 in wide, 4 in high, is painted with yellow reflectorized paint, and has orange tubular markers with reflectorized white collars mounted at a spacing of about 50 ft. This highly visible median is a cost-effective alternative to portable concrete median barriers which separate opposing traffic streams during reconstruction. The objectives of this research were to evaluate the performance of temporary asphalt medians for use in two-lane, two-way operations as an alternative to portable concrete barriers and, if appropriate, to develop guidelines for the use of temporary asphalt medians. Use of the temporary asphalt median was evaluated at one site. The median was installed and removed at least twice as fast as concrete barriers, thereby reducing the time traffic is exposed to such activities by at least 50 percent. There was no difference in the cost per linear foot of the median and concrete barrier because of a relatively high contract cost for the median compared to median costs in other states. However, use of the median will save a minimum of \$40,000 (\$80,000 on this project) by eliminating the use of impact attenuators at the concrete barrier end sections. It is expected that the costs will decrease as more medians are used. In fact, the cost per linear foot of the median was 40 percent lower on the second project in Virginia using the median. There is no evidence to suggest that the temporary asphalt median directly contributed to any accidents. However, it does appear that the presence of an intersection within two-lane, two-way operation may have been a factor in some accidents. The median performed well. Guidelines were developed for the use of the median.			
17. Key Words work zone traffic control; two-lane, two-way operations		18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the NTIS, Springfield, VA 22161	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 29	22. Price

FINAL REPORT

TEMPORARY ASPHALT MEDIANS FOR
TWO-LANE, TWO-WAY OPERATION

by

B. H. Cottrell, Jr.
Research Scientist

(The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this report are those of the author and not necessarily those of the sponsoring agencies.)

Virginia Transportation Research Council
(A Cooperative Organization Sponsored Jointly by the Virginia
Department of Transportation and the
University of Virginia)

In Cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Charlottesville, Virginia

March 1989
VTRC 89-R24

TRAFFIC AND PLANNING RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- A. L. THOMAS, JR., Chairman, State Traffic Engineer, VDOT
- M. G. ALDERMAN, Regional Sign Shop Coordinator, VDOT
- W. S. BLACK, District Traffic Engineer, VDOT
- G. R. CONNER, Assistant Rail & Public Transportation Administrator, VDOT
- J. C. DuFRESNE, District Traffic Engineer, VDOT
- D. L. FARMER, Chief Transportation Planner, Southeastern Virginia
Planning District Commission
- C. F. GEE, Assistant Construction Engineer, VDOT
- C. D. HALL, Assistant State Traffic Engineer, VDOT
- T. A. JENNINGS, Safety/Technology Transfer Coordinator, FHWA
- P. L. KRUSE, District Traffic Engineer, VDOT
- YSELA LLORT, Assistant District Engineer, VDOT
- C. E. MORRIS, Assistant District Engineer, VDOT
- T. W. NEAL, JR., Chemistry Laboratory Supervisor, VDOT
- R. L. PERRY, Assistant Transportation Planning Engineer, VDOT
- R. N. ROBERTSON, Senior Research Scientist, VTRC
- R. L. SAUVAGER, Assistant Urban Division Administrator, VDOT

ABSTRACT

A typical temporary asphalt median for two-lane, two-way operation is 12 to 18 in wide, 4 in high, is painted with yellow reflectorized paint, and has orange tubular markers with reflectorized white collars mounted at a spacing of about 50 ft. This highly visible median is a cost-effective alternative to portable concrete median barriers which separate opposing traffic streams during reconstruction.

The objectives of this research were to evaluate the performance of temporary asphalt medians for use in two-lane, two-way operations as an alternative to portable concrete barriers and, if appropriate, to develop guidelines for the use of temporary asphalt medians.

Use of the temporary asphalt median was evaluated at one site. The median was installed and removed at least twice as fast as concrete barriers, thereby reducing the time traffic is exposed to such activities by at least 50 percent. There was no difference in the cost per linear foot of the median and concrete barrier because of a relatively high contract cost for the median compared to median costs in other states. However, use of the median will save a minimum of \$40,000 (\$80,000 on this project) by eliminating the use of impact attenuators at the concrete barrier end sections. It is expected that the costs will decrease as more medians are used. In fact, the cost per linear foot of the median was 40 percent lower on the second project in Virginia using the median. There is no evidence to suggest that the temporary asphalt median directly contributed to any accidents. However, it does appear that the presence of an intersection within two-lane, two-way operation may have been a factor in some accidents. The median performed well.

Guidelines were developed for the use of the median.

FINAL REPORT
TEMPORARY ASPHALT MEDIANS FOR TWO-LANE,
TWO-WAY OPERATION

B. H. Cottrell, Jr.
Research Scientist

INTRODUCTION

Two-lane, two-way operation (TLTWO) describes the traffic flow pattern that results when one side of a four-lane divided highway is closed for reconstruction or repair and its traffic is diverted to the other side where traffic flowing in opposing directions is limited to two lanes. A TLTWO is used when there is no feasible alternative. In Virginia, portable concrete median barriers are typically used to separate opposing streams of traffic in TLTWO. Because the portable concrete median barrier is expensive, there is a need for a safe cost-effective alternative as a positive barrier for separating opposing traffic streams in TLTWO. Moreover, although experience with TLTWO in Virginia is limited, its use is expected to increase given the current and expected levels of bridge rehabilitation activities.

A typical temporary asphalt median (also called an island) is 12 in to 18 in wide and 4 in high, is painted with reflectorized yellow paint, and has orange tubes with reflectorized white collars mounted about 50 ft apart as shown in Figure 1 (1). The median is highly visible and provides more positive delineation than the concrete barrier, especially at night. Since the median is narrower than the barrier, it occupies less of the travel lane. Several state departments of transportation, including those of North Carolina, Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, have successfully used the medians typically on roads with average daily traffic (ADT) volumes under 30,000. The medians are generally not recommended where physical separation of the opposing lanes is required or where the traffic volume is high, for example, where the ADT is above 50,000.

The estimated costs of installing, maintaining, and removing temporary asphalt medians was expected to be about a third to a sixth of that for portable concrete median barriers in Virginia. The time required to install and remove an asphalt median was found to be substantially less than that required for installing and removing a concrete barrier (2). This difference in time is an important safety consideration if the installation and removal must be done under exposure to traffic.



Figure 1. Temporary asphalt median.

OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objectives were to evaluate the performance of temporary asphalt medians for use in TLTWOs as an alternative to the portable concrete median barrier and, if appropriate, to develop guidelines for the use of temporary asphalt medians for the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). Both the medians and concrete barriers were studied.

METHODS

Five activities were conducted to accomplish the study objectives.

Development of Specifications

Specifications for the temporary asphalt medians were developed based primarily on a telephone survey of state departments of transportation (DOTs) that have used the median. Following the survey, the respondents sent additional information such as specifications and guidelines on the temporary asphalt medians. A computerized literature search and a literature review supplemented the survey. A synthesis of this information resulted in a proposed specification that was reviewed and revised by VDOT staff.

Selection of Sites

Much effort in soliciting sites for this study was directed toward the district traffic engineers and the Location and Design and Traffic Engineering Divisions. Criteria for site selection were developed. The solicitations were made periodically throughout the study period.

Field Evaluation

Data were collected at the study site on three phases of the field evaluation: (1) installation of the median and TLTWO, (2) maintenance of TLTWO, and (3) removal of the median and TLTWO. Traffic volume, speed, and vehicle classification data were collected. Research Council staff collected data during the installation and removal phases, and they also collected the traffic data. The VDOT on-site project inspector provided data on the maintenance of the TLTWO work zone.

Comparative Analysis

An attempt was made to comparatively analyze the temporary asphalt median and the concrete barrier. Comparisons were made of the installation and removal rates and cost.

Development of Guidelines

Guidelines for the use of the temporary asphalt median for TLTWO were developed based on the study activities.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Survey Results and Specifications Development

Survey Results

Information on the use of temporary asphalt medians in five states was obtained through telephone surveys of five state DOTs (Tables 1 and 2). The median cross section was either the shape of a trapezoid or a rectangle with rounded corners. The base width ranged from 12 in through 18 in with a height of 4 in. The median is painted with yellow reflectorized paint. A curb machine is typically used to install the median (a small pavement-widening machine may also be used). Orange tubular markers, 18 in to 36 in high, spaced 50 to 55 ft apart, with white reflectorized sleeves or collars, provided additional delineation for the median. Raised pavement markers were used in one state as an alternative delineator. Drainage openings were provided in the median at a spacing of 25 ft to 500 ft, depending on drainage requirements.

Table 1

Design Features from Other States

<u>State</u> <u>Dot</u>	<u>Median Shape</u> <u>and Size</u> ¹	<u>Tubular Marker</u> <u>Spacing and Attachment</u>	<u>Drainage Slot</u> <u>Spacing</u>	<u>Section Length/Time Period</u>
Ohio	Trapezoid Base = 18 in Top = 14 in	50 ft; tube mounted in steel plate	6 in openings at regular intervals	Typically 5 to 6 miles long with a maximum of 7 miles. The use of the median is not a factor in determining length. Typically 3 to 4 months.
North Carolina	Rectangle width = 18 in	55 ft (speed limit in feet) ² ; Steel base tube is nailed to 4 in x 6 in x 3 in wood block in median	200 ft or depend on superlevation	Typically 2 miles with a maximum of 6 miles. Project length depends on volume, grades, and presence of interchanges. Typically 3 months to 1-1/2 years depending on type of work
Pennsylvania	a) Trapezoid base = 15 in top = 9 in b) Rectangle width = 12 in	50 ft; epoxy	300 ft or depend on superlevation	PA regulation limits TLTWO to 5 miles. District 12—rural (typically 3-1/2 mi long for 6 months). District 11—urban (ranged from 1-1/2 to 3 mi for 2 to 6 months).
West Virginia	Trapezoid base = 15 in top = 12 in	100 ft in drainage slot; manufacturer recommendation	100 ft	Typically 6 miles for convenience.
Florida	Rectangle Width = 12 in	Speed limit in feet; nailed to wood block	25 ft	4 miles

¹The median height was 4 in for all states.

²North Carolina also uses alternating tube marker and raised pavement marker or raised pavement marker only.

Information on the Temporary Asphalt Median

<u>State DOT</u>	<u>Speed Limit</u>	<u>Accident History</u>	<u>Any Reservations?</u>	<u>Other</u>
Ohio	45 or 55. The speed limit is determined by factors unrelated to the use of the median such as volume, road geometrics, work zone conditions.	Minimal number of accidents. For 9 projects, there were less than 12 accidents with less than 6 accidents involving vehicles crossing the median. These are rough estimates. Some injuries. The initial project had a fatal accident due to driver error.	Very happy with results.	The median is used on major pavement rehabilitation projects. One project included a section of I-70 with 6 lanes and 60,000 ADT. The work zone was a 4-lane, two-way operation with the shoulder as a travel lane.
North Carolina	55. Speed is not reduced unless geometrics require it.	No know accident problems.	The median is used frequently. They are very selective on where it is installed. The median is generally not used on interstates with ADT greater than 22,000.	NCDOT, developer of the median, has used the median more than any other state DOT
Pennsylvania	50. PA regulation allows the work zone speed limit to be lowered up to 15 mph without an engineering study. Traffic governs self regardless of the speed limit, i.e., most people travel about 60 mph unless the volume prevents such higher speeds.	The median did not contribute to any accidents. No known head-on collisions. Mostly rear-end accidents.	Median has been very successful. District 12 would not use median where it would restrict heavy left-turn volume. Drivers may turn left across median. Volume has not been a limiting factor.	No problems with the median. Used on ADT of 50,000; no other options existed. Used on 6-lane, ADT of 65,000 to 100,000; with extensive alternate routing, TLWFO had ADT of 30,000. Had a problem as to how to clean tubular markers where heavy volume exists.
West Virginia	40 or 50. Reduces speed through work zones when workers are exposed to traffic without a barrier or on a project by project basis.	Very good safety record for projects covering more than 80 miles. One across the median fatality.	None	A median width greater than 12 in is preferred. Now using 15 in width. Used on toll road widening; ADT of 17,000. Also used on section of I-64; ADT of 18,000 to 20,000.
Florida	45. Actual average was 60 mph			Used on ADT of 10,000

Use of a temporary asphalt median is not a factor in determining the speed limit for TL TWO. There have been no accident problems as a result of using the median on four- and six-lane divided roads under ADT volumes ranging from 10,000 to 60,000. On one project, a six-lane, divided roadway was converted to a four-lane, two-way operation on one side of the road using the shoulder as a lane. Overall, the median was successfully used by all five state DOTs.

Specifications

The specifications used for the study are shown in Figure 2. These were developed based on a synthesis of the survey of state DOTs with minor revisions by VDOT personnel.

Site Selection

There were three criteria for site selection for using the temporary asphalt median: (1) ADT between 6,000 and 30,000 vehicles per day, (2) TL TWO maintained a minimum of two months, and (3) a four-lane highway. Additionally, sites satisfying these criteria that used the New Jersey concrete barrier to separate traffic were of interest as comparison sites.

One site selected for use of the temporary asphalt median is described below. Additional study sites were not found because of (1) infrequent use of TL TWO, therefore limiting the number of potential sites, and (2) reservations by VDOT to using the median.

Route 360, Westbound, Mattaponi River Bridge Reconstruction

The temporary asphalt median for TL TWO was selected for installation on the eastbound approach of Route 360 during reconstruction of the westbound Mattaponi River Bridge in the Fredericksburg District. The study site is a four-lane divided, rural highway section in King and Queen and King William Counties. A unique feature of this site is the presence of an intersection with Route 600 within the TL TWO section. The vertical alignment was relatively level. There was a slight horizontal curve near the western end of the TL TWO. The temporary asphalt median was used from the beginning of the crossover transition through the tangent section to the beginning of the exiting crossover transition.

Field Evaluation

Median Installation

A temporary asphalt median was installed on August 10 and 11, 1987. The total length of the median was 2,280 ft. About one-half of the median was installed on the first day before the asphalt curb machine malfunctioned. It was noted that the asphalt mixture (VDOT Type I-2) was crumbling. Conse-

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION
SPECIAL PROVISION FOR
TEMPORARY ASPHALT MEDIAN

October 29, 1986

I. Description:

This work shall consist of the construction, maintenance and removal of a temporary asphalt median for maintenance of traffic.

II. Materials:

- (a) Asphalt median shall be Type 1-2 bituminous concrete conforming to Section 212 of the Specifications.
- (b) Raised pavement markers shall conform to Section 243 of the Specifications, except both sides of the pavement marker shall be yellow.
- (c) Tubular pavement markers shall be from the Department's approved products list.

III. Construction Methods:

The bituminous materials shall be placed and compacted, on a clean pavement surface without using a tack coat, at the locations and to the dimensions shown in the provisions or as directed by the Engineer.

Drainage openings shall be 12 inches in length and spaced at 300 foot intervals or as directed by the Engineer.

The Department will paint the temporary asphalt median, before the Contractor installs the tubular and raised pavement markers; installation shall be in accordance with the provisions and manufacturer's recommendations.

The Contractor shall maintain the temporary asphalt median until its removal is required and replace any missing or damaged tubular or raised pavement markers within 24 hours of notification by the Engineer.

IV. Method of Measurement:

Temporary asphalt median will be measured in units of linear feet.

Tubular pavement markers will be measured in units of each.

V. Basis of Payment:

Temporary asphalt median will be paid for in units of linear feet, complete-in-place, which price bid shall include furnishing, placing and maintaining raised pavement markers, removal of temporary median and markers and all materials, labor, tools, equipment and incidentals necessary to complete the work.

Tubular pavement markers will be paid for in units of each, complete-in-place, which price bid shall include furnishing, placing and removal of tubular pavement markers and for all materials, labor, tool, equipment and incidentals necessary to complete the work.

Payment will be made under:

<u>Pay Item</u>	<u>Pay Unit</u>
Temporary Asphalt Median	Linear Foot
Tubular Pavement Markers	Each




Figure 2. VDOT special provisions.

quently, on the second day, a finer, modified Type I-2 asphalt mixture was used. Four workers were involved in the median installation: (1) the curb machine guider, (2) the dump truck driver, (3) the monitor of the asphalt entering the machine, and (4) the inspector of the median and cleaner of loose asphalt (Figure 3). The asphalt median was installed at a rate of 420 ft per hr.




Figure 3. Median installation process.

After a section of the median was installed, the median was painted yellow with a spray gun and reflectorized, glass beads were manually spread on the top of the median. Three problems were encountered in the paint process: (1) the manual painting with the spray gun was slow, (2) the paint was absorbed by the hot asphalt, and as a result (3) the glass beads did not adhere to the paint. Therefore, there was little or no reflectorization from the paint. Next, raised pavement markers and tubular markers were installed on the median. The two markers were alternated every 40 ft.

Traffic Data

The ADT was about 7,000 vehicles, 87.7 percent of which was passenger cars and long, two-axle, four-tire vehicles; 5.4 percent was two-axle with six tires and three- and four-axle vehicles; and 6.7 percent was five-axle (or more) vehicles. The 85th percentile speed for westbound and eastbound approaches were 48 mph and 58 mph, respectively. The westbound traffic may have been lower because (1) it was the approach that crossed over the existing median, and (2) the data collection point was about 200 ft from the first crossover.

Data collected on lateral placement and headway were omitted because of an equipment malfunction.

Monitoring TLTWO

The VDOT project inspector monitored and recorded the activities related to work zone traffic control (Figure 4). The contractor maintained the TLTWO. A summary of the incidents are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Incidents by Frequency of Occurrence

<u>Type of Incident</u>	<u>Number of Incidents</u>
Tubular markers broken/damaged	9
Type II barricades hit	6
Accidents at the intersection	5 (9 based on accident reports)
Type III barricades or barrels vandalized	2
Warning signs hit	2
Type II barricade stolen	1
Vehicle crossed median	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	28

There were nine incidents in which a total of 23 tubular markers were hit by vehicles, primarily farm machinery. Additionally, cold weather and wind appeared to cause 6 tubes to break, while hot weather resulted in the bending of 5 tubes. A total of 34 tubular markers were replaced. Initially, 29 tubular markers were installed and 4 more were added to mark the ends of the median for snow plows. The replacement rate for the tubes was about 100 percent. Four of the six incidents of Type II barricades being hit in the transition occurred in the first five weeks of TLTWO. Accidents at the intersection of Rtes. 360 and 600 occurred throughout the duration of the project. Accidents are discussed in the next section. Based on tire marks, it appeared that in one incident an eastbound vehicle drove onto the right shoulder and then crossed over the median. It is not known if this incident was intentional. This was the only incidence of a vehicle crossing the median, and it occurred about two months after installation. No damage was reported.

Accidents

Between August 11, 1987, and August 8, 1988, 11 accidents occurred during TLTWO: 9 angle accidents at the intersection, 1 overturn, alcohol-influenced accident, and one run-off-the-road (ROR) accident. There were no fatal accidents, 5 injury accidents, and 6 property damage accidents.

The following trends were noted: (1) 7 of the 11 accidents occurred during the daytime on the weekend; (2) 9 of the 11 accidents occurred during the daytime with clear weather, (3) 5 of the 9 accidents involved drivers aged 60 or over failing to yield (3 of the 9 angle accidents involved a driver aged 79 or over failing to yield the right-of-way); (4) 7 of the 9 angle accidents involved a westbound vehicle on Rte. 360 and a northbound vehicle on Rte. 600.

In the one-year period before the installation of TLTWO--August 11, 1986, through August 9, 1987--there were no accidents. Two years before, there were 3 accidents, 1 angle at the intersection and 2 ROR accidents. In the third year before, there was 1 accident, an angle accident at a store entrance.

Intersection control beacons (flashing overhead caution signals) were installed at the intersection several years before construction as a countermeasure to reduce intersection accidents. The beacons were removed during construction because the support poles were in conflict with temporary pavement construction. It is possible that maintaining intersection control beacons during construction may have resulted in a lower accident frequency.

In the traffic control planning phase of this project, there was some concern about the presence of this intersection within TLTWO. A special effort was targeted at providing temporary and permanent advance warning signs on the approaches of Rte. 600 and delineation of travel through the intersection.

It is suspected that violations in driver expectancy at intersections of four-lane divided roads may have contributed to the seven angle accidents involving a westbound vehicle on Rte. 360 and a northbound vehicle on Rte. 600. Usually, the driver of a northbound vehicle stops at the intersection, looks left (for eastbound vehicles) to see if it is safe to proceed, then proceeds to the median opening, stops and looks right (for westbound vehicles) to see if it is clear; but with TLTWO on the eastbound approach, it is necessary for the driver of a northbound vehicle to look both left and right to see if it is clear before entering the intersection.

Some older drivers have some difficulty at intersections with information processing and decision making (3); these difficulties are compounded by the presence of TLTWO.

It is further suspected that the conditions of the intersection would be worse with the use of the concrete barrier in lieu of the median because the higher barrier would further restrict sight distance at the intersection.

Initially, a before-after accident study with a comparison group was planned. This study was eliminated because the zero accidents one year before reconstruction would have resulted in division by zero in the analysis (4).

Because the accident experience during reconstruction was high, it appears that the accidents were connected with the presence of an intersection within the TLTWO. There is no evidence to suggest that the temporary asphalt median directly contributed to any of the accidents.

Removal of the Median and TLTWO

TLTWO ended on August 8, 1988, with the opening of the new westbound bridge. The median was removed on August 8 and 9, 1989, in three phases (Figure 5): (1) a front-end loader was used to push the asphalt median into a pile toward the left shoulder; (2) a tractor with a sweeper attachment swept the loose asphalt from the travel lane toward the shoulder; (3) a second front-end loader loaded the asphalt from the median onto a dump truck for transport to a storage area. During the first two phases, the second front-end loader was removing the median crossover pavement.

The median was removed under traffic conditions. The front-end loader operator moved the median out of its position and into the closed left lane during gaps in the traffic stream. The median was then pushed into piles about 500 ft apart. The average rate of removal by the loader was 606 ft per hr (with a standard deviation of 144 for four samples).

Field Evaluation Finding

The temporary asphalt median performed well at the study site.

Comparative Analysis

Two comparative analyses were made between the temporary asphalt median and the New Jersey concrete barrier for TLTWO: (1) installation and removal rate and (2) cost.

Installation and Removal Rate

Using an asphalt curbing machine, the temporary asphalt median was installed at a rate of 420 ft per hr. The concrete barrier was installed at a rate of 200 ft per hr based on a study on I-64 in Louisa County on September 1, 1987. The temporary asphalt median can be installed two times faster than the concrete barrier. Therefore, the time that traffic is exposed to installation activities is 50 percent lower for the median than the barrier. The rates are not for a complete installation since painting the median, installing markers for the median, installing warning lights on panels, and painting the temporary pavement marking adjacent to the barrier is not included. Since these are typically done concurrently with the median or barrier installation, it is expected that the additional time would be relatively small.

The removal rate for the median was 606 ft per hr. It is estimated that the removal rate for the barrier is equal to the installation rate of 200 ft per hr since the procedure is reversed. If the removal rate for the median is reduced to 450 ft per hr to allow for complete removal, this will mean that the median can be removed 2-1/2 times faster than the barrier, thus reducing exposure to traffic by 60 percent.



a. Front-end loader removing median.



b. Sweeping loose gravel.

Figure 5. Median removal.

Cost

The contract price for the complete installation and removal of the temporary asphalt median was \$10.00 per linear foot. Since the average cost of the concrete barrier is \$10.00 to \$11.00 per linear foot, there was no difference in cost in Virginia. The tubular markers were priced at \$50.00 each. Average costs for temporary asphalt median projects in other states are shown below.

<u>State</u>	<u>Asphalt Median Cost/Linear Foot</u>	<u>Unit Cost/Tubular Markers</u>
Pennsylvania	\$2.10	\$18.00
Ohio	\$2.35	\$18.70
West Virginia	\$7.18	\$34.00

In every case, especially for Pennsylvania and Ohio, the costs are substantially lower than in Virginia. It is expected that the prices will decrease as VDOT uses more temporary asphalt medians. In the second project in Virginia using a median, the contract price was \$6.00 per linear foot. This project, on Chippenham Parkway (Rte. 150) and Forest Hill in Chesterfield County, was initiated near the completion of this study.

In the initial project plans, four G.R.E.A.T. impact attenuators were proposed for the two ends of the concrete barrier at both sides of the break in the barrier at the intersection of Rte. 600. At a unit cost of \$20,000 for the impact attenuators, \$80,000 was saved by eliminating them when the temporary asphalt median was chosen over the concrete barrier. Additionally, sight distance at the intersection was improved with the use of the temporary asphalt median rather than the concrete barrier.

Development of Guidelines

The second project objective was to develop guidelines for the temporary asphalt median, if appropriate. The Location and Design Division was directed to develop guidelines for the use of temporary asphalt medians as an instructional and informational memorandum to provide information and instruction on the temporary asphalt median and to promote or encourage use of the median. The guidelines were developed with input from the Traffic Engineering Division and the principal investigator of this research. Consequently, instead of developing separate guidelines for the temporary asphalt medians in this research, this researcher reviewed the Location and Design Division's guidelines and special provision and made comments and suggestions.

Guidelines

The VDOT's guidelines for the use of temporary asphalt medians are shown in Figure 6. The guidelines consist of two parts: general notes and a detailed drawing of the temporary asphalt median.

May 16, 1988

Instructional & Information Memorandum
LD-87 (D) 93.8
Sheet 7(1) (Added 5-16-88)

ERRATA SHEET


INSTRUCTIONAL AND INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
LD-87(D) 93.8
CONSTRUCTION ZONE SAFETY
Sheet 7 of 10 (7 sheets added)

This revision is to add, under the subheading GENERAL, the following guidelines for the use of Temporary Asphalt Medians and for the use of Police Patrols in construction zones:

Temporary Asphalt Medians

- Temporary asphalt medians are to be considered on two-lane, two-way temporary detours for traffic volumes between 4000 and 15,000 VPD.
- Each location is to be reviewed and have the joint approval of applicable District, Traffic Engineering and Location & Design personnel.
- Each location should use geometrics that provide an operating speed equal to that of the existing roadway, where possible, to minimize operational problems. (See Standard GS-10)
- The SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION/TRAFFIC CONTROL PLAN is to include the required temporary asphalt median layout details along with the included "DETAIL OF TEMPORARY ASPHALT MEDIAN" that is available in the CADD SECTION for inclusion in the plans.
- Payment will be made under:

Pay Item	Pay Unit	Item Code
Temporary Asphalt Median	Lin. Ft.	24285
Flexible Post Delineator	Each	24286



Instructional & Information Memorandum
LD-87 (D) 93.8
Sheet 7(1) (Added 5-16-88)

Figure 6. VDOT guidelines for use of a temporary asphalt median.

Considering the median for TLTWO with traffic volumes between 4,000 and 15,000 vehicles per day is restrictive when compared to other state DOTs. However, this restriction reflects VDOT's cautious approach to using the median. Although it is mostly used on four-lane divided roads, the median in TLTWO is suitable for use on four-lane undivided roads. The guidelines do not address four-lane, two-way operations (FLTWO). However, FLTWO is being used on Chippenham Parkway and, therefore, FLTWO should be mentioned in the guidelines. The decision to use the asphalt median is made on a project-by-project basis, typically using traffic analysis methods. The volume guidelines are not very useful compared to the traffic analysis. Therefore, volume guidelines may be omitted.

Based on the experiences at the study site, two suggestions are noted below.

1. Tubular markers should be placed at the ends of the median to delineate them for snow removal activities.
2. When an intersection is within the TLTWO, special attention should be given to traffic control at the intersection, especially the side street approaches. Special attention may include extensive advance warning signing, supplemental pavement markings, and intersection control beacons.

Special Provision

Based on the experiences at the study site and this review, additional notes and changes on field practices for the installation, maintenance, and removal of the median are suggested below.

1. For better quality, faster application, and better reflectivity, the median should be painted using a paint truck instead of manually with a spray gun. (Since at maximum height, the paint truck carriage can apply a 10-in swath of paint and glass beads, two passes are necessary.)

The hot asphalt median should be allowed to cool before painting for better paint adhesion and less paint absorption. Other options to consider are the use of (1) temporary pavement marking tape on the side of the median and paint on the top and (2) raised pavement markers on the side of the median to supplement the paint.

2. Some districts prefer that the contractor instead of VDOT be responsible for painting the median. In some districts, much of the painting related to construction, as well as other construction-related traffic activities is done by contract. This not only allows VDOT traffic forces to focus on maintenance activities, but it also relieves them of tying up a paint crew that is dependent on the contractor's schedule. It is suggested that the district determine whether VDOT or the contractor will paint the median.

3. The two 6-in reflective sleeves on the tubular marker should be replaced by the option of a 13-in reflective sleeve as shown in the guidelines or a 6-in (at the top) and 4-in sleeve spaced 2 in apart. The 13-in sleeve was recommended based on a study to optimize the tubular marker design (5) while the latter option is in accordance with a recent change in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (6).
4. The contractor should be encouraged to use efficient methods for the installation and removal of the median.

These VDOT guidelines and the special provision should be expected to change as VDOT gains experience with the temporary asphalt median. To aid in the evolution of the guidelines and the special provision, it is important and necessary to document each use of the temporary asphalt median by VDOT. The report should include

1. project title and location
2. time period of median use and location of TLTWO
3. contract price for the median and tubes
4. median installation and removal methods
5. description of any deviations from the guidelines, including the reason and the result
6. general description of incidents and accidents during TLTWO
7. description of any problems encountered and their solutions
8. name, address, and telephone number of project inspector or person submitting the report.

The report should be submitted to the Traffic Engineering Division.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

1. The temporary asphalt median was installed two times faster than the concrete barrier, thereby reducing the time traffic was exposed to installation activities by about 50 percent.
2. The median was removed roughly 2-1/2 times faster than the concrete barrier, thereby reducing the time traffic is exposed to removal activities by about 60 percent.
3. There was no difference in the cost per linear foot of the median and the concrete barrier because of the relatively high contract price for the median (\$10.00 per linear foot) compared to median costs in other states (28 to 79 percent less). However, an \$80,000 savings was achieved with the median by eliminating the need for impact attenuators at concrete barrier end sections. It is expected that the cost will decrease as VDOT uses more medians. In fact, the median cost per linear foot was 40 percent lower on a recent project.

4. There is no evidence to suggest that the temporary asphalt median directly contributed to any accidents. However, it does appear that several accidents can be attributed to the presence of an intersection within TLTW0.
5. The temporary asphalt median performed well at the study site.
6. VDOT has guidelines for the use of temporary asphalt medians for TLTW0.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The use of the VDOT guidelines and the special provision for the use of temporary asphalt medians should be continued.
2. The VDOT guidelines and the special provision should be revised to include changes listed in the Appendix.
3. The VDOT guidelines and the special provision should be reviewed and revised if necessary as VDOT gains experience with the temporary asphalt median. To aid in the process, a report as outlined in Report Items for the Temporary Asphalt Median in the Appendix should be prepared to document each use of the median.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The contributions of the following are appreciated: K. R. Quesenberry for monitoring and reporting on the study site; J. D. Shelor and C. E. Giannini for traffic data collection; W. S. Black, N. T. Talley, and W. A. Robertson for providing information on the study sites; R. A. Mannell for assistance in selecting study sites, G. A. Venable and C. L. Wooten for providing accident data; Jan Kennedy for preparing the final report; Roger Howe for report editing; and W. S. Black, R. E. Blankenship, and K. D. Person for reviewing the draft final report.

This study was supported by HPR funds administered through the FHWA.

REFERENCES

1. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. 1983. "Temporary Asphalt Islands for Maintenance of Two-Way Traffic Through Construction Zones" (brochure with information provided from the North Carolina Department of Transportation). Washington, D.C.
2. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. 1983. Design Considerations for Two-Lane, Two-Way Work Zone Operations. Report No. FHWA/RD-83/112. Washington, D.C.
3. Transportation Research Board. 1988. Transportation In An Aging Society: Improving the Mobility and Safety of Older Persons. Volume 1. Special Report No. 218. Washington, D.C.
4. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. 1979. Evaluation of Highway Safety Projects: Procedural Guide. Washington, D.C.
5. Transportation Research Board. 1981. Evaluation of Traffic Controls for Highway Work Zones. NCHRP Report 236, Washington, D.C.
6. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. 1978 (updated). Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX

1768

GUIDELINE CHANGES

Add:

1. Tubular markers should be placed at endpoints of the median to delineate the median ends for snow removal activities.
2. Special attention should be given to traffic control at intersections within the TLTWO. This may include consideration of extensive advanced warning signing, supplemental pavement markings, and intersection control beacons.
3. Use of 6-in (top) and 4-in reflective sleeves spaced 2 in apart is an option.

Change:

4. (First item in guidelines) Temporary asphalt medians are to be considered on two-lane, two-way and four-lane, two-way temporary detours. (Omit the volume range.)

SPECIAL PROVISION CHANGES

Add:

1. The hot asphalt median should be allowed to cool before painting. Use of a paint truck is recommended for median painting. Other options to consider are (1) temporary pavement marking tape on the side of the median in lieu of painting the sides and (2) supplemental raised pavement markers on the side of the median.
2. The contractor should be encouraged to use efficient methods for the installation and removal of the median.

Change:

3. (Part III, 3rd sentence in special provisions) As directed by the Engineer, the Department or contractor installs the tubular and raised markers; . . .
4. Use the tubular marker reflective sleeve requirements of the guidelines; that is, a 13-in sleeve as depicted or 6-in (top) and 4-in sleeves spaced 2 in apart as an option.

REPORT ITEMS FOR THE TEMPORARY ASPHALT MEDIAN

1. Project title and location.
2. Time period of median use and location of TLTW0.
3. Contract price for the median and tubes.
4. Median installation and removal methods.
5. Description of any deviations from the guidelines including the reason and the result.
6. General description of incidents and accidents during TLTW0.
7. Description of any problems and/or solutions encountered.
8. Name, address, and phone number of the project inspector or person preparing the report and sending it to the Traffic Engineering Division.