

regulations and guidelines need to be enforced better. In general, respondents also acknowledged that mobility considerations should be incorporated in planning, designing and implementing work zones.

When queried about the adequacy of the current regulations, about 40 percent of respondents who provided comments on specific questions in the ANPRM indicated that the current regulations are not adequate for addressing work zone safety and mobility concerns at all stages of project evolution; while 34 percent indicated that the current regulations are adequate. The remaining respondents who commented on specific questions in the ANPRM did not provide information that led to any conclusive inference as to whether the current regulations are adequate or not. Of the respondents who indicated that the current regulations are not adequate, 56 percent belonged to DOTs, 4 percent represented other public agencies, 7 percent were from private agencies, 30 percent belonged to trade associations, and 4 percent did not indicate their agency affiliations. All the respondents who stated that the current regulations are adequate belonged to DOTs.

In response to the need for stratifying work zone regulations according to varying levels and durations of risk to road users and workers, and disruptions to traffic, about 76 percent of respondents who provided comments on specific ANPRM questions recommended that work zone regulations should be stratified. Of these, 75 percent belonged to DOTs, 4 percent were from private agencies, 16 percent represented trade associations, and 6 percent did not indicate their agency affiliations. The different stratification factors that were presented in the ANPRM included: duration, length, lanes affected, Average Daily Traffic (ADT), road classification, expected capacity reduction, potential impacts on local network and businesses. Out of these factors, ADT, road classification and expected impacts /capacity reduction were often referred to as the most appropriate stratification factors. However, while it was evident that regulations should be stratified, several respondents also indicated that it may be cumbersome to implement such stratification, and it may lead to confusion in interpretation of regulations.

Currently there are four different definitions of the term "work zone", as stated in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances (NCUTLO), the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

(NHTSA), and by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) (proposed).

The MUTCD defines a work zone as an area of a highway with construction, maintenance, or utility work activities, and that it is typically marked by signs, channelizing devices, barriers, pavement markings, and/or work vehicles. The MUTCD also states that a work zone extends from the first warning sign or rotating/strobe lights on a vehicle to the END ROAD WORK sign or the last temporary traffic control device.

The NCUTLO adds to this definition by stating that a work zone may be for short or long durations, and may include stationary or moving activities. The NCUTLO also provides examples for the different types of work zones, and indicates that the work zone does not include private construction, maintenance or utility work outside the highway.

The NHTSA definition for work zone is very similar to that of the MUTCD, the difference being that NHTSA indicates work zones may or may not involve workers or equipment on or near the road, and that work zones may be stationary or moving, and short term or long term in nature.

The ANSI, in its Manual on Classification of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents, American National Standard—ANSI D-16, is proposing a definition for work zone, which is similar to the NCUTLO definition.

The ANPRM inquired whether there ought to be a common National definition for the term "work zone." About 84 percent of the respondents who provided comments on the specific questions in the ANPRM indicated that there should be a common National definition for "work zone." Of these, 77 percent belonged to DOTs, 2 percent were from other public agencies, 2 percent belonged to private agencies, 14 percent represented trade associations, and 5 percent did not indicate their agency affiliations. In response to specific language for a common national definition, a majority of the respondents suggested adopting either the MUTCD or the ANSI definition. Several respondents mentioned that adopting a common National definition for work zone will enhance and standardize work zone data collection and crash reporting processes.

ANPRM "General" Section—FHWA Response and Proposed Action

The ANPRM comments indicate strong support for the development of a National policy on work zone safety and mobility and document the need to amend FHWA's current regulations in

23 CFR part 630 subpart J to address both safety and mobility issues associated with work zones. The respondents indicated that the preferred method for FHWA to advocate the regulation is by establishing a broad policy, supported by detailed guidelines for implementation. The FHWA therefore proposes to amend its regulation in 23 CFR part 630 subpart J to include the consideration of work zone mobility in addition to safety.

The proposed amendments would result in a broad regulation that addresses a wide range of issues, and provide implementation flexibility to States in meeting their individual program goals and needs. Therefore, the proposed amendments to the regulation recognize the need for stratification, and provide flexibility to States in applying the provisions of the regulation to different projects, based upon their respective program goals and their understanding of the needs and work zone impacts of individual projects.

With regard to the issue of a common National definition for work zone, the ANPRM comments indicate the need for a common National definition for work zone. However, the FHWA realizes that the four different definitions for work zone are essentially similar in content and implication. Therefore, for the purposes of this regulation, we propose to incorporate the MUTCD definition for work zone. Further, one of the reasons the FHWA raised the issue of a common National definition for the term "work zone," was to gauge public opinion on whether there is any recognition that the impacts of work zones may not always be restricted to the work zone itself, and that the impacts may be felt in the advance area of the work zone, other roadway corridors, the regional transportation network and on other modes of transportation. This concept of broader impacts of work zones is however addressed in the proposed amendments by incorporating it into the definition of "work zone impacts," rather than incorporating it in the definition of work zone itself.

The definition and explanation for the phrase "work zone impacts" is available in the section-by-section discussion of this NPRM and the "Definitions and explanation of terms" section of the proposed regulation language.

ANPRM "Transportation Planning and Programming" Section—Comments Summary

The purpose of the Transportation Planning and Programming section was to identify whether the road user safety and mobility impacts of work zones, and work zone safety requirements are