Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
UKTRP-86-19		

4. Title and Subtitle	5. Report Date
Evaluation of I-75 Lane Closures	August 1986
	6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s)	8. Performing Organization Report No.
J.G. Pigman and K. R. Agent	UKTRP-86-19
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Kentucky Transportation Research Program College of Engineering University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0043	10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS) 11. Contract or Grant No. Federal Aid Research Task No.30
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Kentucky Transportation Cabinet State Office Building Frankfort, Kentucky 40622	13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final 14. Sponsoring Agency Code

15. Supplementary Notes

Study Title: Evaluation of Construction Zone Traffic Control on I-75 in Whitley and Laurel Counties

16. Abstract

A project on I 75 in Whitley and Laurel Counties during the 1986 construction season involved numerous lane closures associated with spot pavement replacement and joint sealing. Traffic congestion associated with heavy volumes and late merges resulted in the use of the following traffic control devices to supplement standard lane closure devices; 1) variable message signs, 2) supplemental lane closure warning signs, and 3) rumble strips placed in the lane to be closed in advance of the taper.

Results showed a decrease in the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed with each successive traffic control device in addition to the standard lane closure devices. There was a general decrease in speeds as traffic approached the taper. The percentage of trucks in the lane to be closed was lower than the percentage in the open lane when the closure was a left lane. Hourly traffic volumes observed in this study (800 to 1,300 vph) did not appear to influence the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed. The percentage of trucks in both lanes (8.5 to 14.7 percent) did not influence the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed.

Recommendations from the study included the following: 1) supplemental signs for all long-term closures in high-volume, high-speed, four-lane roadways; 2) variable message signs when one-way hourly volumes exceed 1,000 (ADT exceeds 20,000); and 3) application of rumble strips when other devices do not reduce late merges and there is excessive congestion.

17. Key Words		18. Distribution Statement
Construction Zones	Variable Message Signs	Unlimited with approval of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
Safety		
Lane Closures	Rumble Strips	
Lane Distributions		
Traffic Control Devices		

19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security Classif. (of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price
Unclassified	Unclassified	20	

Research Report
UKTRP-86-19

EVALUATION OF I-75 LANE CLOSURES

by

Jerry G. Pigman
Transportation Research Engineer

and

Kenneth R. Agent
Transportation Research Engineer

Kentucky Transportation Research Program
College of Engineering
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

in cooperation with the
Transportation Cabinet
Commonwealth of Kentucky

and the

Federal Highway Administration
US Department of Transportation

August 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Construction and maintenance work zones have traditionally been hazardous locations within the highway environment. Safety in work zones has been recognized as a significant problem for several years and the subject has received additional attention with the shift from construction of new facilities to the improvement or rehabilitation of existing facilities. However, with recent increases in the volume of traffic and changes in compositions of the traffic streams, congestion on some highway sections has increased and there is a greater potential for accidents. Several studies have shown that accident rates within construction or maintenance work zones are higher than for similar periods before work zones were established (1, 2, 3). Among the many factors cited as reasons for the increase in accident rates are the following; inappropriate use of traffic control devices, poor traffic management, inadequate layout of the overall work zone, and a general misunderstanding of the unique problems associated with construction or maintenance work zones.

The closure of a lane on a four-lane, high-speed facility during construction or maintenance activity presents potential safety problems. Lane closure problems are related to changes in the driving environment that require adjustments to be made by the driver in order to safely travel through a work zone. On high-volume, four-lane facilities, problems occur when two lanes of traffic must be warned sufficiently in advance so that motorists may travel through the transition zone of merging two lanes into one lane at the work site. Frequently, there are vehicles that fail to merge to the open lane, which leads to congestion and erratic maneuvers at the beginning of the taper.

The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices provides details on standard applications for lane closures and those applications appear to be adequate for most situations (4). However, as volumes increase and geometric conditions place additional constraints on the flow of traffic at a lane closure, consideration should be given to additional traffic control devices. The effectiveness of variable message signs has been evaluated previously and the results were increased advance lane change activity, smoother lane change profiles, and significantly fewer lane changes near the taper (5). As a result of that study, suggestions for additional research were: 1) use of arrows in barricade design, 2) multiple variable message signs, 3) audible signals such as rumble strips, and 4) combined use of symbols and words on variable message signs (5).

A project on I 75 in Whitley and Laurel Counties during the 1986 construction season involved numerous lane closures associated with spot pavement replacement and joint sealing. Traffic congestion related to heavy volumes and failure to adhere to the traffic control messages resulted in a decision by the Kentucky Department of Highways to use additional traffic control devices to encourage merging properly for smoother flow of traffic through the lane closures. Included as additional traffic control devices were supplemental signs, variable message signs, and rumble strips. Because these additional devices were not typical applications for work zones, it was decided that their effectiveness should be evaluated.

DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected at lane closures on I 75 in Whitley and Laurel Counties between June 6, 1986, and August 8, 1986. Included were data collection periods of six hours on each of five Friday afternoons and four Sunday afternoons. Table 1 is a summary of data collection dates, locations, and traffic control conditions for each of the data collection periods. All data were collected from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Fridays and from 12:00 noon to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays.

Because the objective of this study was to determine whether supplemental traffic control devices could be used at work zones to improve the flow of traffic through lane closures, it was necessary to add devices to the standard control devices by an incremental process. This required selection of sites where the lane closure would exist for a sufficient duration to permit addition of the supplemental devices and data collection before the closure had to be moved. Obvious constraints to these requirements were construction schedules and holiday periods. It was undesirable to extend the time of lane closures from the standpoint of prolonged congestion and increased accident potential. Therefore, some variability in the data was expected due to inability to evaluate all increments of supplemental traffic control at the same location. Geometric constraints included vertical curves, horizontal curves, and interchange ramps.

As shown in Table 1, data collection included four days for southbound traffic and five days for northbound traffic. For southbound traffic, one site (I 75 at MP 42.2) was used for the first three lane closure traffic control conditions, and another site (I 75 at MP 46.4) was used for the fourth lane closure condition. The first lane closure condition consisted of the standard left lane closure traffic control devices as shown in Figure 1. To evaluate the effect of lane closure advance warning devices, it was necessary to station observers at four positions in advance of the closed lane. For the standard lane closure control condition, observers were positioned at the following points with respect to data collection needs:

1) in advance of construction zone signs where free-flowing traffic could be observed,
2) at a point where the variable message sign was to be placed,
3) between the variable message sign position and the beginning of the taper, and
4) at the beginning of taper.

Several observation points were necessary to monitor the effect of various traffic control conditions on lane distributions and speeds. Data also were collected to represent total volumes and percent trucks.

Data were collected on June 6, 1986, to document lane distribution and speed conditions for standard lane closure traffic control devices. On the following Friday (June 13, 1986), data were collected at the same observation points with the variable message sign (message was MERGE RIGHT with arrow progressively moving to the right) placed 1.8 miles in advance of the lane closure. Sight distance requirements necessitated placement of the variable message sign either 1.8 miles in advance or very near to the beginning of the

taper and the standard arrowboard. The third data collection date was June 20, 1986, and this same lane closure at MP 42.2 on I 75 was modified by adding signs 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles in advance of the closure indicating left-lane closed. These supplementary signs were in addition to standard lane closure devices and the variable message sign 1.8 miles in advance. The fourth traffic control condition was the addition of sets of rumble strips 1.5, 1.0, 0.6, 0.3, and 0.1 miles in advance of the beginning of the taper. Because the lane closure had been moved prior to the fourth day of data collection, it was necessary to delay additional data collection in the southbound direction until July 11, 1986. The site for evaluation of the rumble strips was at MP 46.4 on I 75 and there were geometric constraints in the form of both vertical and horizontal curvature that may have influenced the lane distribution and speed data.

Rumble strips used in advance of the lane closure consisted of eight strips per set placed with 24 inches between strips. As noted previously, the strips were installed in the lane to be closed 1.5, 1.0, 0.6, 0.3, and 0.1 miles in advance of the taper. The strips were made of a hard plastic-vinyl material having dimensions of 1/2 inch x 4 inches x 23-3/4 inches. Each set required 48 strips, or 240 strips for five sets. The installation process included the following steps:

1. preparation of the surface by brushing,
2. application of solvent cement to the back of the strip,
3. placing the strip on the pavement,
4. application of pressure to the strip so a coating of cement was deposited on the pavement,
5. removing the strip from the pavement for approximately 30 seconds so the cement was exposed to the air to dry, and
6. again applying pressure to the strip to bond it to the pavement.

The rumble strips used in the installation were purchased from Astro Optics and the solvent cement (Type SC-1958) was a product of the H. B. Fuller Company.

After installation, traffic was allowed to pass over the strips after about two hours, even though the solvent cement remained soft and flexible. The solvent cement proved to be a very good adhesive for application of the rumble strips. The cement was relatively easy to apply with caulking guns, it remained somewhat flexible for several hours but sufficiently bonded the strips to the pavement, and the strips were relatively easy to remove. After removal of the strips, the cement remained on the pavement, but was thin enough so there was no noticeable noise when vehicles passed over it. At the northbound installation of rumble strips, the number missing after 9 days totaled 12 of the 240 (5 percent). This loss of a few strips did not appear to diminish their effectiveness.

The first data collection at a northbound lane closure was on June 8, 1986, at MP 27.2. Traffic control at this location was a standard right lane closure. That same location was used again on June 15, 1986, with the addition of the variable message sign 1.25 miles in advance of the closure. However, on the third Sunday of data collection, it was necessary to move to a new site at MP 30.1 because the closure at MP 27.2 had been removed. This

resulted in data being collected at a different location with supplemental signs at 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles in advance of the closure. The difficulty of evaluating those signs was complicated by the observation points having to be located very near an interchange ramp.

Because roadway geometrics had complicated the evaluation process for determining potential impact of adding rumble strips to the three previous control conditions, it was decided that data should be collected at a site with and without rumble strips. That required two additional data collection periods with all other traffic control conditions in place on the first date and rumble strips added to the existing control devices on the second date. The final two data collection dates were July 27 and August 8, 1986. Again because of unanticipated construction scheduling problems, data could not be collected at the same site for two consecutive weeks at a northbound site. However, there did not appear to be major geometric differences that would prevent a comparison of those two lane closures with and without rumble strips.

RESULTS

The primary measure of effectiveness for evaluating the various traffic control alternatives was percent of traffic remaining in the lane to be closed. As noted previously, data were collected at the following points in advance of the lane closure:

1) in advance of the construction zone signs,
2) at the variable message sign or where it was to be placed,
3) between the variable message sign and the beginning of the taper, and
4) at the beginning of the taper.

Other data collected included average speeds at the observation points in advance of the construction zone and at the observation point between the variable message sign and the beginning of the taper. Percent trucks and average hourly traffic volumes were also tabulated for each of the observation points. Summaries of the various types of data collected at southbound and northbound sites are presented in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

For southbound sites (Table 2), the data generally indicated a decreasing percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed as the distance to the taper decreased. When comparing the various traffic control conditions, there was also a decrease in the percentage of traffic in the closed lane with the addition of traffic control devices beyond the standard lane closure devices. The data showing the relationship between percent of traffic in the lane to be closed and the distance from the taper are presented graphically in Figure 2. The general trend over approximately 3.5 miles in advance of the taper indicated the effectiveness of various traffic control devices. Specifically, it may be noted that the addition of a variable message sign (MERGE RIGHT or LEFT with arrow) has a positive effect on decreasing the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed. For example, the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed decreased from 14.9 percent to 11.6 percent at 0.1 mile in advance of the taper. By examining the data in Table 2 further, it may be seen that the addition of supplemental advance warning signs reduced the percentage of traffic in the closed lane to 10.4 percent at 0.1 mile in

advance. The effect of adding a variable message sign and then supplemental construction zone warning signs to the standard lane closure signs could be evaluated without questioning the results because data were collected at the same lane closure site. However, the addition of rumble strips to the standard lane closure signs, variable message sign, and supplemental signs was complicated because data had to be collected at a new lane closure site. The site where rumble strips were installed included both horizontal and vertical curvatures which may have resulted in the greater probability of a higher percentage of vehicles to be in the closed lane. The results presented in Table 2 show 7.8 percent of the traffic in the closed lane (at 0.1 mile before taper) with rumble strips added as compared to 10.4 percent without rumble strips but with the other three traffic control conditions. To better show the effect of various traffic control conditions within one mile of the taper, Figure 3 was prepared. That figure allows comparisons to be made within 0.9 mile of the beginning of the taper.

Similar data summaries were prepared for northbound lane closure data and the results included in Table 3 indicate a pattern similar to the data presented for southbound lane closures. Again, there were factors that complicated evaluations regarding the differences in traffic control devices. The first two days of data collection for northbound traffic were right-lane closures at the same location. A standard right-lane closure was in operation on the first day and there was 21.9 percent of the traffic in the lane to be closed 0.1 mile in advance of the taper as compared to 10.9 percent in the lane to be closed with a variable message sign added 1.25 miles in advance of the taper. This clearly shows the effectiveness of the variable message sign as a device to promote earlier merging and a smoother flow of traffic through the lane closure. The third traffic control condition of supplemental signs being added to the standard left-lane closure and variable message sign was at Milepoint 30.1 on I 75 northbound. This was a left-lane closure rather than a right-lane closure as used for the first and second data collection sites northbound and the results indicate a much lower percentage (5.6 percent) of traffic in the lane to be closed 0.1 mile in advance of the taper.

In an effort to determine the impact of rumble strips used in addition to the other traffic control devices, another site was selected at a northbound closure (Milepoint 17.9) where data would be collected with all devices except rumble strips and then at that same location with the addition of rumble strips. However, an unanticipated change in the construction schedule resulted in the left-lane closure not being in place two consecutive weeks and data being collected at Milepoint 17.9 without rumble strips and at Milepoint 14.2 with rumble strips added to the other types of traffic control. Results presented in Table 3 show that the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed at 0.1 mile in advance of taper decreased from 11.0 percent with all traffic control devices in place except rumble strips to 4.1 percent with rumble strips added at distances in advance of the taper of 1.5, 1.0, 0.6, 0.3, and 0.1 miles. Even with the change in locations for evaluation of rumble strips, there were relatively minor differences in geometrics that may have affected the results. It appears the rumble strips were effective in decreasing the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed 0.1 mile in advance and at the beginning of the taper. The relationship between percent of traffic in the lane to be closed and distance from the taper is presented for northbound lane closures in Figure 4. The effects of various traffic

control measures within one mile of the taper are presented in Figure 5. Data presented in Figure 5 allow a more detailed comparison of percent traffic in the lane to be closed at 1.0 mile, 0.1 mile, and at the taper.

Additional data are presented in Tables 2 and 3 that document speeds, percent trucks, and average hourly traffic. Speed data were collected in advance of the construction zone signs and at a point between the variable message sign and the beginning of the taper. Results indicate a general decrease in speeds as traffic approached the taper; however, speeds still averaged more than 55 mph in the range of 1 mile to 1/2 mile in advance of the taper.

The percentage of trucks was determined for all data collection points and the results are presented as percentage of trucks in both lanes and the percentage of trucks in the lane to be closed. When averaged for both lanes, the percentage of trucks ranged from 8.5 to 14.7 percent. There were generally more trucks on Fridays than on Sundays. Another measure of compliance with the traffic control devices was the percentage of trucks in the lane to be closed. For almost all data collection points, the percentage of trucks in the lane to be closed was lower than the percentage in the open lane when the closure was a left lane. For a right-lane closure, there were more occurrences of a higher percentage of trucks in the lane to be closed than in the open lane. This was obviously affected by the higher percentage of trucks that typically travel in the right lane on four-lane roadways.

Average hourly traffic as summarized in Tables 2 and 3 show a range from approximately 800 to 1,300. With data being collected on Fridays and Sundays, the highest volumes were generally on Sundays. For the six-hour data collection period, the lowest average volumes were on Friday, June 6, and the highest volumes were on Sunday, June 22.

Because average hourly volume was expected to have an impact on the percent of traffic in the lane to be closed, the relationships between these variables 0.1 mile in advance of the taper and at the taper were investigated. The general perception had been a higher percentage of late merges and interrupted traffic flow at the taper with increasing volumes. The data presented in Table 4 indicate relatively little change in volume for the southbound lane closures; therefore, it was assumed that decreasing percentages of traffic in the lane to be closed were related to the effectiveness of traffic control devices. For northound lane closures, the volumes were generally higher but did not appear to influence the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed.

The interrelationship between percent trucks, hourly traffic volumes, and percent traffic in the lane to be closed was also analyzed (Table 4). It does not appear that higher percentage of trucks resulted in a higher percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed. For example, at northbound lane closures on July 27 and August 8, there was a decrease in the percent traffic in the lane to be closed (11.0 to 4.1 percent), even though the percent trucks increased from 8.7 to 10.9 percent. It should be noted that average hourly traffic volumes decreased from 1,070 to 950, which also may have contributed to the reduced traffic in the closed lane. In addition, there does not appear to be a relationship between percent trucks in both lanes and the percent trucks in the lane to be closed.

SUMMARY

As referenced previously in the report, there are guidelines for standard applications of lane closures detailed in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. However, at work zones on some high-volume, high-speed interstate-type facilities, there may be a need for traffic control devices in addition to those specified as standard applications. For the I 75 pavement restoration project in southern Kentucky during the summer of 1986, a decision was made by Department of Highways personnel to use the following traffic control devices to supplement standard lane closure devices: 1) variable message sign placed 1 to 2 miles in advance of the taper; 2) supplemental lane closure warning signs 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles in advance of the taper; and 3) rumble strips 1.5, 1.0, 0.6, 0.3,and 0.1 miles in advance of the taper.

Following is a summary of primary findings from the evaluation of traffic control devices used in addition to standard lane closure devices.

1. For all southbound and northbound sites evaluated, there was a decrease in the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed with the addition of traffic control devices beyond the requirements for devices at standard lane closures.

2. There was a decrease in the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed for southbound sites with each successive traffic control device in addition to the standard devices. The order of adding devices to the standard lane closure devices was as follows: 1) variable message sign, 2) supplemental lane closure warning signs, and 3) rumble strips placed in advance of the taper.

3. Geometric constraints reduced the reliability of data collected at the southbound site when rumble strips were installed in addition to standard lane closure devices, variable message sign, and supplemental signs.

4. For one northbound site, the effectiveness of adding the variable message sign to the standard lane closure devices was clearly shown with a decrease from 21.9 percent to 10.9 percent of the traffic in the lane to be closed 0.1 mile in advance of taper.

5. The effectiveness of rumble strips was demonstrated at the northbound sites when the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed 0.1 mile in advance of the taper decreased from 11.0 percent with all devices, except rumble strips, in place compared to 4.1 percent with rumble strips added.

6. Results indicate a general decrease in speeds as traffic approached the taper. However, speed still averaged slightly more than 55 mph in the range of 1 mile to 1/2 mile in advance of the taper.

7. For almost all data collection points, the percentage of trucks in the lane to be closed was lower than the percentage in the open lane when the closure was a left lane. Overall, the average percentages of trucks for both lanes of traffic ranged from 8.5 to 14.7 percent.

8. Average hourly traffic for all sites ranged from 800 to 1,300. Hourly traffic volumes in the range observed in this evaluation did not appear to influence the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed.

9. The percentage of trucks in both lanes did not influence the percentage of traffic in the lane to be closed.

10. There does not appear to be a relationship between percentage of trucks in both lanes and percentage of trucks in the lane to be closed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, results of this evaluation indicate that variable message signs, supplemental signs, and rumble strips are effective devices to reduce late merges and provide smoother flow of traffic through lane closures. However, application of these devices in addition to standard lane closure devices should be reserved for special locations where volumes are high and geometric constraints suggest a higher probability for late merges or erratic maneuvers at the closure. Supplemental signs indicating a lane closure 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles ahead should be considered for all long-term closures on high-speed, high-volume, four-lane roadways. Variable message signs should be considered at long-term lane closures (in addition to supplemental signs) when one-directional hourly volumes exceed 1,000 (or AADT exceeds 20,000). Application of rumble strips should be reserved for locations where supplemental signs and variable message signs do not reduce late merges and there is excessive congestion due to late merges or other erratic maneuvers at the lane closure.

REFERENCES

1. Graham, J. L., et al.; "Accident and Speed Studies in Construction Zones," Report No. FHWA-RD-77-80, Federal Highway Administration, June 1977.

2. Paulsen, R. J., et at.; "Status of Traffic Safety in Highway Construction Zone," TRB Record 693, Transportation Research Board, 1978.

3. Nemeth, Z.A. and Migletz, D. J.; "Accident Characteristics Before, During, and After Safety Upgrading Projects on Ohio's Rural Interstate System," TRB Record 672, Transportation Research Board, 1978.

4. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways, U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1978.

5. Hanscom, F. R.; "Effectiveness of Changeable Message Displays in Advance of High-Speed Freeway Lane Closures," National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 235, Transportation Research Board, 1981.

TABLE 1. DATA COLLECTION DATES, LOCATIONS, AND TRAFFIC CONTROL CONDITIONS

DATE	LANE CLOSURE LOCATION	TRAFFIC CONTROL CONDITIONS
6-06-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	Standard left-lane closure traffic control devices.
6-08-86	I 75 NB MP 27.2	Standard right-lane closure traffic control devices.
6-13-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	Standard left-lane closure traffic control devices and Variable Message Sign placed 1.8 miles in advance of lane closure.
6-15-86	I 75 NB MP 27.2	Standard right-lane closure traffic control devices and Variable Message Sign placed 1.25 miles in advance of lane closure.
6-20-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	Standard left-lane closure traffic control devices, Variable Message Sign placed 2 miles before lane closure, and supplemental construction zone signs placed 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles in advance of lane closure.
6-22-86	I 75 NB MP 30.1	Standard left-lane closure traffic control devices, Variable Message Sign placed 0.9 mile before lane closure, and supplemental construction zone signs placed 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles in advance of lane closure.
7-11-86	I 75 SB MP 46.4	Standard left-lane closure traffic control devices, Variable Message Sign placed 2 miles before lane closure, supplemental construction zone signs placed 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles in advance of lane closure, and rumble strips placed 1.5, 1.0, 0.6, 0.3, and 0.1 miles before the lane closure.
7-27-86	I 75 NB MP 17.9	Standard left-lane closure traffic control devices, Variable Message Sign placed 1.9 miles before lane closure, and supplemental construction zone signs placed 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles in advance of lane closure.
8-08-86	I 75 NB MP 14.2	Standard left-lane closure traffic control devices, Variable Message Sign placed 1.9 miles before lane closure, supplemental construction zone signs placed 5, 4, 3, and 2 miles in advance of lane closure, and rumble strips placed 1.5, 1.0, 0.6, 0.3, and 0.1 miles before the lane closure.

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED AT SOUTHBOUND LANE CLOSURES

DATE	LOCATION	TRAFFIC CONTROL CONDITIONS	DATA COLLECTION POINT	DISTANCE FROM TAPER (MILE)	AVERAGE SPEED (MPH)	PERCENT OF TRAFFIC IN LANE TO BE CLOSED	PERCENT TRUCKS IN LANE TO BE CLOSED	AVERAGE PERCENT TRUCKS (BOTH LANES)	AVERAGE HOURLY TRAFFIC (BOTH LANES)
6-06-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	Standard Left-Lane Closure	Free-Flowing	3.6	60.1	35.8	4.9	12.1	913
			Free-Flowing	1.8		29.0	5.8	12.8	808
			Intermediate	0.9	58.2	35.7	7.9	12.2	953
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		14.9	9.6	11.3	967
			At Taper	0		3.7	9.2	11.3	967
6-13-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	Standard Left Lane Closure and Variable Message Sign	Free-Flowing	3.6	60.8	50.8	4.9	11.7	1,042
			Free-Flowing	1.8		20.3	5.2	11.2	1,096
			Intermediate	0.9	60.3	23.6	7.4	11.2	1,018
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		11.6	17.3	11.9	1,068
			At Taper	0		3.2	9.0	11.9	1,068
6-20-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	Standard Left-Lane Closure, Variable Message Sign, and Supplemental Signs	Free-Flowing	3.6	62.4	37.0	4.1	10.6	1,095
			Free-Flowing	1.8		17.7	5.8	10.6	1,104
			Intermediate	0.9	61.1	21.7	8.0	10.5	1,076
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		10.4	5.3	9.6	1,096
			At Taper	0		3.0	1.5	9.6	1,096
7-11-86	I 75 SB MP 46.4	Standard Left-Lane Closure, Variable Message Sign, Supplemental Signs, and Rumble Strips	Free-Flowing	8.1	62.6	37.7	6.2	11.2	1,082
			Free-Flowing	2.1		24.0	7.2	10.9	1,075
			Intermediate (at Rumble Strips)	1.25	57.2	26.2	7.8	11.6	1,030
				0.8	55.5	22.8	3.9	10.6	1,013
				0.45	48.4	24.9	2.5	11.2	952
				0.2	51.6	11.4	5.3	10.4	1,114
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		7.8	3.6	9.2	1,063
			At Taper	0		2.1	3.0	9.2	1,063

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED AT NORTHBOUND LANE CLOSURES

DATE	LOCATION	TRAFFIC CONTROL CONDITIONS	DATA COLLECTION POINT	DISTANCE FROM TAPER (MILE)	AVERAGE SPEED (MPH)	PERCENT OF TRAFFIC IN LANE TO BE CLOSED	PERCENT TRUCKS IN LANE TO BE CLOSED	AVERAGE PERCENT TRUCKS (BOTH LANES)	AVERAGE HOURLY TRAFFIC (BOTH LANES)
6-08-86	I 75 NB MP 27.2	Standard Right-Lane Closure	Free-Flowing	1.8	64.8	59.8	14.5	11.7	1,005
			Free-Flowing	1.25		61.9	12.4	10.2	1,083
			Intermediate	0.5	61.1	59.1	12.9	12.0	1,075
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		21.9	9.1	11.3	1,047
			At Taper	0		6.7	5.9	11.3	1,047
6-15-86	I 75 NB MP 27.2	Standard Right-Lane Closure and Variable Message Sign	Free-Flowing	1.8	61.0	55.8	12.2	9.4	1,133
			Free-Flowing	1.25		19.3	14.6	9.6	1,085
			Intermediate	0.5	54.2	19.3	15.6	9.6	1,139
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		10.9	13.1	8.9	1,117
			At Taper	0		6.9	12.4	8.9	1,117
6-22-86	I 75 NB MP 30.1	Standard Left-Lane Closure, Variable Message Sign, and Supplemental Signs	Free-Flowing	3.5	61.9	35.6	8.7	9.8	1,253
			Free-Flowing	0.9		20.3	7.8	10.2	1,224
			Intermediate	0.5	54.0	9.9	10.7	10.2	1,299
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		5.6	12.9	8.5	1,273
			At Taper	0		3.3	11.6	8.5	1,273
7-27-86	I 75 NB MP 17.9	Standard Left-Lane Closure, Variable Message Sign, and Supplemental Signs	Free-Flowing	5.9	57.6	38.3	4.3	10.0	1,018
			Free-Flowing	1.9		33.0	3.6	9.5	1,059
			Intermediate	1.1	57.1	25.6	6.0	9.7	1,064
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		11.0	4.3	8.7	1,070
			At Taper	0		3.0	6.3	8.7	1,070
8-08-86	I 75 NB MP 14.2	Standard Left-Lane Closure, Variable Message Sign, Supplemental Signs, and Rumble Strips	Free-Flowing	5.8	63.7	33.6	8.2	12.7	882
			Free-Flowing	2.2		30.3	5.3	11.8	1,015
			Intermediate (at Rumble Strips)	1.4	58.6	22.3	9.2	14.7	975
				0.8	57.4	23.2	8.2	13.8	1,006
				0.4	61.0	18.9	7.6	11.1	955
				0.2	57.6	8.9	11.4	13.2	889
			500′ Before Taper	0.1		4.1	9.0	10.9	950
			At Taper	0		0.1	6.4	10.9	950

TABLE 4. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN HOURLY VOLUMES, PERCENT TRUCKS, AND PERCENT TRAFFIC IN LANE TO BE CLOSED

DATE	LOCATION	PERCENT TRAFFIC IN LANE TO BE CLOSED		PERCENT TRUCKS IN LANE TO BE CLOSED		PERCENT TRUCKS (BOTH LANES)	AVERAGE HOURLY TRAFFIC
		0.1 MILE BEFORE TAPER	AT TAPER	0.1 MILE BEFORE TAPER	AT TAPER		
6-06-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	14.9	3.7	9.6	9.2	11.3	967
6-13-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	11.6	3.2	17.3	9.0	11.9	1,068
6-20-86	I 75 SB MP 42.2	10.4	3.0	5.3	1.5	9.6	1,096
7-11-86	I 75 SB MP 46.4	7.8	2.1	3.6	3.0	9.2	1,063
6-08-86	I 75 NB MP 27.2	21.9	6.7	9.1	5.9	11.3	1,047
6-15-86	I 75 NB MP 27.2	10.9	6.9	13.1	12.4	8.9	1,117
6-22-86	I 75 NB MP 30.1	5.6	3.3	12.9	11.6	8.5	1,273
7-27-86	I 75 NB MP 17.9	11.0	3.0	4.3	6.3	8.7	1,070
8-08-86	I 75 NB MP 14.2	4.1	0.8	9.0	6.4	10.9	950



APPLICATION

This drawing applies to lane closure of shoulder or median lanes on two direction multi-lane highways with medians over six (6) feet in width.

SIGNING AND SPACING TABLE

NORMAL POSTED SPEED LIMIT	"L" FT.	SIGNS REQUIRED	SIGN SIZE (1 THRU 5)	SPEED ADVISORY	ADVISORY SPEED PLATE SIZE	"A" FT.
55 and above	900	1 thru 6	48"X 48"	45 ①	24"X 24"	500
45 to 50	600	3thru 6	48"X 48"	35 ①	24"X 24"	500
35 to 40	440	3thru 6	48"X 48"	25 ①	24"X 24"	250
Less than 35	360	3thru 6	48"X 48" or 36"X 36"	None Req.①	24"X 24"	250

① Or as directed by the Engineer

LEGEND

- Portable Flashing Arrow
- Flagman
- Sign
- L Length of Transition
- CHANNELIZATION DEVICES
  - Cones
  - Drums
  - Type II Barricades
  - Tubular Markers

Traffic Cones, Tubular Markers, Drums or Type II Barricades shall be maintained throughout the entire length of the immediate construction area. Spacing of Channelization Devices shall not exceed forty(40) ft. throughout the work site and the transition zone. (Note: Skip lines on pavement are normally forty (40) feet from begining of line to begining of line.)

The Engineer may require the use of Drums or Type II Barricades in lieu of Cones or Tubular Markers if the closure time exceeds four(4) days.

The signs shall be moved behind the ditch line, and made inaccessible to the view of traffic or covered, at any time the lane is not physically closed. The portable flashing arrow shall be required when the normal posted speed limit is greater than 45 MPH. At speeds less than 45 MPH, a flagman may be used in lieu of the portable flashing arrow as specified in the plans or as directed by the Engineer. When a flagman is used, the "Flagman Ahead" sign shall be substituted for the "(Left) Right Lane Ends Sign." All traffic control devices required on this drawing shall conform to the requirements shown on the current edition of Standard Drawing No. TSC 260, TSC 270, and to the Department's "Manual On Uniform Traffic Control Devices". Use "750 Ft." on sign No. 3 when the normal posted speed limit is 40 miles per hour or less.

Sign spacing may be modified or adjusted slightly to fit the physical conditions encountered such as driveways, approach roads, etc. Such modifications shall have the approval of the Engineer.

When approach roads and intersecting streets are encountered, some additional signing may be required on these roads and streets which is not shown on this drawing. Such signing shall conform to the requirements of the Department's "Manual On Uniform Traffic Control Devices" as directed by the Engineer.

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

LANE CLOSURE CASE III

STANDARD DRAWING No. TSC 210-03

SUBMITTED _____ DIRECTOR DIVISION OF TRAFFIC DATE 10/1/86

APPROVED _____ STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER DATE 10/15/86



Figure 2. Distribution of Traffic From 3.5 Miles in Advance to Beginning of Taper



Figure 3. Distribution of Traffic From 0.9 Mile in Advance to Beginning of Taper



Figure 4. Distribution of Traffic From 3.5 Miles in Advance to Beginning of Taper



Figure 5. Distribution of Traffic From 1.1 Miles in Advance to Beginning of Taper