

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State                | Usage | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments  | Web Link or other comments   |
|----------------------|-------|---|--|
| Alabama              |       |   |  |
| Alaska               |       |   |  |
| Arizona              |       |   |  |
| Arkansas             | Yes   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Federal and State funds</li> <li>2. Usage - Visual presence and traffic control assistance.</li> <li>3. Statistics - No</li> <li>4. Documentation - Resident Engineer's Manual guidelines were provided.</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - We do not allocate a specific amount. The Arkansas Highway Police (AHP) assist us as needed on a case by case basis as outlined in the Resident Engineers Manual. If additional enforcement is required, we would typically process a change order into individual projects to utilize AHP. FHWA participates in these project changes. AHP officers are paid overtime to work construction projects in addition to their regular duties.</li> </ol>   |  |
| California           | Yes   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - California DOT uses the Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program (COZEEP), based on an interagency agreement between the California DOT and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). COZEEP was created as an enhancement tool for construction zones and is not intended to be used as a replacement for other temporary traffic control measures. The need for COZEEP services is assessed through the project's constructability and safety reviews. The services needed are based on the project specific conditions. COZEEP funding is allocated as part of the project funds. In the detailed estimate, the initial funding level for COZEEP will be shown as supplemental funds for state-furnished materials and services. If additional funds are required during the life of the project, available contingency funds can be transferred to "state-furnished materials and services—COZEEP."</li> <li>2. Usage - The services that can be provided by the CHP, include but are not limited to the following: 1. Roving patrol vehicle(s) (including but not limited to speed, enforcement, queue control, limited monitoring of traffic control devices, etc.); 2. Stationary patrol vehicle(s); 3. Traffic control</li> <li>3. Statistics - No, but they are required to complete a COZEEP daily report. When the officer or officers arrive at the project site, the senior CHP</li> <li>4. Documentation - See attached file: ConstManualCOZEEP_Ch2Final_03_2004.pdf</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - An average of \$28,000,000 are allocated per year statewide.</li> </ol> | <p>We wanted to follow-up and provide you with information regarding our California Department of Transportation Maintenance Program's use of law enforcement in our work zones (we commonly refer to it as MAZEEP, the "Maintenance Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program") . The Department's Maintenance Program has a state-funded inter-agency agreement with the California Highway Patrol for officers to enhance safety for highway workers and motorists within state highway maintenance work zones. The role of the officers is to provide a visual presence, and in some circumstances, to provide active enforcement within, and alongside, these zones. We have attached a copy of our MAZEEP Guidelines (a PDF version) as a reference. We have approximately \$8.3 million budgeted (annually) for our MAZEEP statewide.</p> |
| Colorado             | Yes   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Combination of Funds</li> <li>2. Usage - Primarily Visual Presence, with Active Enforcement in certain corridors and for certain situations. Traffic Control Assistance is performed on corridors without Courtesy Patrol, when necessary.</li> <li>3. Statistics - Not required</li> <li>4. Documentation - Provided documentation includes: Project Special Provision Worksheets, Policy Memos and CDOT Guidelines for the Use of Positive Protection in Work Zones (Section 2D)</li> <li>5. Annual Amount -</li> </ol>   | N/A  |
| Connecticut          |       |   |  |
| Delaware             |       |   |  |
| District of Columbia |       |   |  |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State    | Usage | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments   | Web Link or other comments  |
|----------|-------|--|---|
| Florida  | Yes   | 1. Funding - State and Federal* (*on federally funded projects)<br>2. Usage - Active Enforcement<br>3. Statistics - Yes, quarterly and posted on the website, see link below.<br>4. Documentation - The following is the link to FDOT's Hireback contract with Florida Highway Patrol (select "Executed FHP Hireback Contract - BDI55" from link below), includes citation summary (select "FDOT Hireback Report" from link below).<br><a href="http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Engineers/MOT/MOTMain.shtm">http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Engineers/MOT/MOTMain.shtm</a><br>5. Annual Amount -   | <a href="http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Engineers/MOT/MOTMain.shtm">http://www.dot.state.fl.us/construction/Engineers/MOT/MOTMain.shtm</a>   |
| Georgia  |       |  |   |
| Hawaii   | Yes   | 1. Funding - Funding for use of police officers on our projects are through individual project construction funds. Therefore, it is either a combination of state and federal funds or just state funds, which depends on how the project was programmed. Police officers are specified per contract by our standard specifications (weblink at right)<br>2. Usage - Use of officers are for visual presence and traffic control assistance. We do not hire officers for on-site law enforcement.<br>3. Statistics - Not required<br>4. Documentation - see weblink<br>5. Annual Amount -  | <a href="http://hawaii.gov/dot/highways/specifications2005/specifications/specspdf/specspdf-641-699/645C_Traffic_Control_Work_Zone_Print.pdf">http://hawaii.gov/dot/highways/specifications2005/specifications/specspdf/specspdf-641-699/645C_Traffic_Control_Work_Zone_Print.pdf</a> |
| Idaho    | Yes   | 1. Funding - When we have major projects where we want expanded law enforcement presence we include the cost of the enhanced enforcement in the cost of the project. This is most typically on larger federal aid projects and is used to pay overtime for officers who would otherwise be off-duty.<br>2. Usage - Active enforcement.<br>3. Statistics - We get a regular summary of all work zone enforcement activity, including hours; miles covered; total number of contacts; citations and warnings broken out by type such as speeding, DUI, inattentive, etc.<br>4. Documentation - I'm not aware of any documentation. Our district offices work with their law enforcement counterparts to determine what is appropriate on a project-by-project basis.<br>5. Annual Amount - \$1,450,000 total for 3 corridors | N/A   |
| Illinois | Yes   | 1. Funding - 99% of the time it is funded through state construction funds. Occasionally, the enforcement will be project specific and federal funds will be used.<br>2. Usage - Active enforcement.<br>3. Statistics - Yes. I believe every month.<br>4. Documentation - Please contact Priscilla Tobias at Priscilla.Tobias@Illinois.gov<br>5. Annual Amount -   | N/A   |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State     | Usage                  | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments  | Web Link or other comments |
|-----------|------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Indiana   | Yes, only state police | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - State funds, federal funds, combination of funds</li> <li>2. Usage - Combination of all three, depending on specific needs at the time.</li> <li>3. Statistics - The Indiana State Police provides INDOT monthly a report of the number of hours worked on each project, the breakdown of activity written, the number of citations, warnings, and jailed arrests, and they report the miles driven per project.</li> <li>4. Documentation - Attached is our latest policy concerning the use of law enforcement in work zones.</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - Les than \$1,000,000 by agreement.</li> </ol>   | N/A                        |
| Iowa      | Yes                    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - State funds</li> <li>2. Usage - Visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, and traffic control assistance</li> <li>3. Statistics - Not specifically, but oftentimes we do receive this information attached to their billing statements.</li> <li>4. Documentation - Guidelines for Use of Extra-Enforcement in Iowa Department of Transportation Construction Work Zones was provided</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - Annual Average is \$113,000</li> </ol>  | N/A                        |
| Kansas    | Yes, on critical projs | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Federal Aid FTP Flexible funds 80/20</li> <li>2. Usage - Visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, occasionally traffic control assistance.</li> <li>3. Statistics - Not required</li> <li>4. Documentation - Once we are made aware of how much funding we have, we work it out with our districts.</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - \$250,000</li> </ol>   | N/A                        |
| Kentucky  | Yes                    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Combination of funds, charge to project.</li> <li>2. Usage - Visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance.</li> <li>3. Statistics - Not every time, but we have.</li> <li>4. Documentation - No.</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - We don't allocate a specific amount and it varies from year to year how much we spend. We consider this a "tool in the toolbox." We use it on projects when it makes sense to us to do so. When we decide it needs to be on a project, we find the money. Certain areas of our state are big believers in Work Zone Law Enforcement. They use it almost every time we touch the Interstate.</li> </ol> |                            |
| Louisiana |                        |   |                            |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State         | Usage | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments   | Web Link or other comments |
|---------------|-------|--|----------------------------|
| Maine         |       |  |                            |
| Maryland      | Yes   | 1. Funding - State funds allocated to each District Office.<br>2. Usage - SHA's underlying usage is visual assistance. However, the other elements (active enforcement and traffic control assistance) have law enforcement participation.<br>3. Statistics - Not required<br>4. Documentation - Reviewing the following weblinks provides insights on how law enforcement are utilized in SHA's work zone context:<br><a href="http://www.marylandroads.com/Index.aspx?pageid=405">http://www.marylandroads.com/Index.aspx?pageid=405</a><br><a href="http://stko.maryland.gov/WorkZoneTraining/tabid/155/Default.aspx">http://stko.maryland.gov/WorkZoneTraining/tabid/155/Default.aspx</a><br><a href="http://www.marylandroads.com/OOTS/SHA-MSP%20Agreement_revised_December2009.pdf">http://www.marylandroads.com/OOTS/SHA-MSP%20Agreement_revised_December2009.pdf</a><br>5. Annual Amount - | See websites at left       |
| Massachusetts |       |  |                            |
| Michigan      | No    | 1. Funding -<br>2. Usage -<br>3. Statistics -<br>4. Documentation -<br>5. Annual Amount -  | N/A                        |
| Minnesota     | Yes   | 1. Funding - Mn/DOT utilizes law enforcement in our work zones in two different ways. The main enforcement is Mn/DOT has a partnership with the Public Safety State Patrol to monitor our work zones. The primary purpose of this enforcement is to decrease vehicle speeds in advance of the work site. There is a special funding source which is from both state and federal dollars. Mn/DOT does not record the number of tickets that have been handed out on our projects.<br>The second type is to hire local law enforcement to patrol our work zones. This type of enforcement is generally utilized to control traffic when we are working through signalized intersections. This enforcement is paid for using project specific dollars.<br>2. Usage - See above<br>3. Statistics - Not required<br>4. Documentation - N/A<br>5. Annual Amount -  |                            |
| Mississippi   |       |  |                            |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State    | Usage | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments  | Web Link or other comments  |
|----------|-------|---|---|
| Missouri | Yes   | 1. Funding - We use a combination of state funds and federal funds<br>2. Usage - Primarily active enforcement<br>3. Statistics - Required<br>4. Documentation - See text at right for an excerpt from our Engineering Policy Guide<br>5. Annual Amount - \$507,000 programmed for FY2011  | <p>616.16 Law Enforcement Services (From Engineering Policy Guide)</p> <p>The use of law enforcement, both active and passive, is an effective tool to ensure traffic complies with work zone requirements arising from certain construction projects and maintenance operations. Law enforcement use will vary from project to project and the core team decides whether to use these services.</p> <p>616.16.1 Guidelines for Providing Law Enforcement Services</p> <p>The following are recommended procedures to provide law enforcement in MoDOT construction zones.</p> <p>A. Funds for work zone enforcement will be transferred and administered by Highway Safety.</p> <p>B. Each district is to forecast the number of enforcement hours needed and the designated routes scheduled for the year's construction projects. The average hourly rate for law enforcement is approximately \$50.00 +/- \$15.00 per hour.</p> <p>C. Each district is to set up and include in the STIP their funding levels for the activity needed. Highway Safety will reimburse the city, county and state law enforcement agencies. Each district should establish a contact, if possible, to work with Highway Safety to avoid conflict.</p> <p>D. The district submits these estimates and designated roadways to Highway Safety for review.</p> <p>E. Highway Safety will work up the appropriate contract agreements and send these to the state.</p> <p>F. A pre-construction meeting will be held with the district, construction companies and law enforcement.</p> <p>G. Districts will work directly with law enforcement agencies to ensure proper enforcement coordination.</p> <p>H. Enforcement activity billing will be sent to Highway Safety for review and approval. All activities are subject to the following:</p> <p>616.16.2 Guidelines for the Selection of Law Enforcement Services</p> <p>To foster the continued use of and streamline the process for securing this service, MoDOT has identified the following types of facilities and operating speeds greater than the posted speed limit:</p> <p>Types of Facilities - Freeway, Expressway, Multilane with shoulders<br/>                     Speeds, Normal posted speed greater than or equal to 55 mph, Operating speeds greater than 55 mph</p> <p>Traffic Control, Lane closure, Moving operation in lane</p> <p>When discussing the possibility of using law enforcement services, the core team should also consider the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Past experience in an area or with a type of work</li> <li>Availability of law enforcement</li> <li>Complexity or impact of a project/operation</li> <li>Output from MoDOT's Transportation Management Strategy Matrix</li> <li>Whether there is a propensity for traffic back-ups</li> <li>Whether law enforcement would aid a project performed as night work</li> </ul> |
| Montana  | Yes   | 1. Funding - State and federal funds (we charge the cost of the patrol to the federal aid project so it's roughly a 90-10 split. But we treat it as a project cost.)<br>2. Usage - Active enforcement<br>3. Statistics - Not required<br>4. Documentation - We use uniformed law enforcement on a case by case basis as needed. We execute a standard agreement with the Montana Highway Patrol that outlines the terms of the agreement and the maximum hours allowed. MHP invoices us. A copy of the agreement is attached.<br>5. Annual Amount - We don't actually allocate funds for enforcement. If our District Construction Engineer's determine a particular project is in need of focused enforcement they execute the agreement I sent you. Typically we spend \$25,000 to \$50,000 per year, charged to the project. | N/A   |
| Nebraska |       |   |   |
| Nevada   |       |   |   |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State         | Usage | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments   | Web Link or other comments   |
|---------------|-------|--|--|
| New Hampshire | Yes   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Combination of funds.</li> <li>2. Usage - We try to use Police for presence, enforcement, emergency assistance, and traffic control. We prefer not to have a uniformed officer perform standard flagging operations.</li> <li>3. Statistics - Not to my knowledge, but number of citations are communicated to the field people.</li> <li>4. Documentation - Yes, we completed our guidelines last year. They can be found at the following link:</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - ~ \$3,500,000</li> </ol>   | <a href="http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/construction/documents/FlaggerPoliceUseGuidelines">http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/construction/documents/FlaggerPoliceUseGuidelines</a>  |
| New Jersey    | Yes   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - The NJDOT has two programs for uniformed law enforcement in work zones. 1. A NJ State Police program which is funded using state funds appropriated on a statewide basis and 2. A Municipal Police program which may be funded with state funds or federal funds appropriated on a project specific basis.</li> <li>2. Usage - Traffic control assistance for activities that require uniformed law enforcement services which are; Traffic direction at signalized intersections to override the signal operation and full shutdown of state highways and interstates. Usage of uniformed law enforcement for other activities such as visual presence in work zone and active enforcement is considered as enhancement of the Traffic Control Plan.</li> <li>3. Statistics - No, as this is not an underlying usage of uniformed law enforcement for NJDOT.</li> <li>4. Documentation - The primary source of documentation is the NJDOT 2007 Standard Specifications, Section 159.03.08 Traffic Direction Paragraph B. Police. The link to Division 150 of the NJDOT Specifications is <a href="http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/eng/specs/2007/spec150.shtm">http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/eng/specs/2007/spec150.shtm</a></li> <li>5. Annual Amount - NJ State Police usage in work zones: FY 09 \$11.56 million, FY 10 \$12.10 million, appropriated amount for FY 11 State Police</li> </ol> | <p>If I am not mistaken, NJ was the first state to start the use of State Police (as a separate construction unit) to enhance work zone safety. We were having a very difficult time paying different rates to different municipalities. So, we decided to create a unit within State Police, so that we wouldn't have to negotiate all the time and have trained officers, who know what they are doing. The unit started small but has grown recently to a much larger unit. Last year the unit was about 37 troopers/supervisors strong. The unit would also utilize out-of-unit troopers on overtime, when the demand for lane closures would be more than what the unit could handle. FY 2009 budget was at one point heading towards \$5.6 Million with additional \$5.9 Million in Overtime (All State funds). As we all are facing tough economical times, existence of this unit was also threatened. We were asked to to revisit the MOU with our State Police partners to cut down the huge OT cost and a heavy supervisor-troop ratio. In regards to what they do, I have to say that they do it all. They help close lanes, slow downs, visual presence in work zone helps slow down traffic etc. They do enforce speed limits.</p> |
| New Mexico    | Yes   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Combination of Federal and State funds out of our Traffic Safety office.</li> <li>2. Usage -</li> <li>3. Statistics - Yes we have a central database for this.</li> <li>4. Documentation - I believe so I will send this to our Traffic Safety Bureau Chief .</li> <li>5. Annual Amount -</li> </ol>   | N/A  |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State          | Usage                 | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments   | Web Link or other comments |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------------|
| New York       | Yes, on select proj's | <p>1. Funding - State funds</p> <p>2. Usage - We recently switched from presence to active ticketing. We used to have dedicated enforcement where the Dept paid for off-duty police to be present for specified time periods. Now the state police fund their own dedicated team of troopers who move between work zones at their discretion with input from the Department.</p> <p>3. Statistics - We request information on number of tickets as needed</p> <p>4. Documentation -</p> <p>5. Annual Amount - In the past when we were funding police presence through MOUs we would typically spend between \$5M and \$10M per year. The figure varied because the funds came out of the associated project budget. We did not set aside money in a dedicated fund for police. Funding the police out of our capital program made it difficult to fund police presence in maintenance work zones. The NYS Work Zone Safety Act of 2005 requires police presence to the extent practicable in work zones on high speed roadways where workers are exposed to traffic. Now the State police fund about 100 troopers out of their budget. We do not use MOUs to supplement these 100 troopers because the State police told us that taking money from us would adversely affect their budget. Budget people would subtract what we paid to the State Pol</p> | N/A                        |
| North Carolina | Yes                   | <p>1. Funding - The NCSHP patrols work zones and Local law enforcement agencies also work these areas when a State Trooper is not allowed by our agency policy. Our DOT funds the overtime money and I would say it is through federal and state funding.</p> <p>2. Usage - The SHP actively enforces work zone speed limits and maintains and active visual presence.</p> <p>3. Statistics - The SHP carefully documents all activities to ensure compliance with DOT requirements. I don't believe local agencies are held to that standard.</p> <p>4. Documentation - I'll try and find some, but it is usually on a case-by-case situation.</p> <p>5. Annual Amount -</p>  | N/A                        |
| North Dakota   | Yes                   | <p>1. Funding - Combination (80% Fed, 20% State)</p> <p>2. Usage - Active enforcement, safety, visual presence in work zone</p> <p>3. Statistics - Yes required</p> <p>4. Documentation - Yes, provided work zone safety initiative contract documentation.</p> <p>5. Annual Amount - \$62,000</p>   | N/A                        |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State    | Usage | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments  | Web Link or other comments |
|----------|-------|---|----------------------------|
| Ohio     | Yes   | 1. Funding - Usually through project funds - set number of hours are included in the plans. We also do some separate enforcement funding through our safety program.<br>2. Usage - Both setup/tear down sort of stuff as well as enforcement.<br>3. Statistics - We don't get this information from enforcement through project funds but we can get it when we contract separately through the safety program.<br>4. Documentation - Not really other than some plan notes<br>5. Annual Amount -   | N/A                        |
| Oklahoma |       |   |                            |
| Oregon   | Yes   | 1. Funding - FHWA Funds (STP)<br>2. Usage - Active Enforcement<br>3. Statistics - We identify work zones we want overtime work zone enforcement on and then we grant dollars to our state police and various city/county police agencies because our state police can't do all the work and when they work overtime we require them to provide a monthly summary of activities in the work zones e.g. cites, warnings, dui, speed etc. by officer and date and time officer worked overtime in the work zone. Then we also require the police agencies to provide us a certain amount of straight time match in our work zones.<br>4. Documentation - Numerous documents were provided.<br>5. Annual Amount - We receive funds per a biennium and for two years we have approximately \$3.6 M. These funds are available for use for work zone enforcement, educational campaigns statewide on work zone safety e.g. billboards/bus boards, radio and television public service announcements and then potentially equipment for work zone related policing if any can be identified. We typically don't spend much money on equipment. | N/A                        |



## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State          | Usage | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments  | Web Link or other comments |
|----------------|-------|---|----------------------------|
| Pennsylvania   | Yes   | <p>1. Funding - There is a line item in the construction project for this (basically however the project is funded is how the Police service is funded as well).</p> <p>2. Usage - Mainly Visual presence, although they do provide enforcement and traffic control as noted in the attached MOU. In addition, local authorities can be used, and are typically used for traffic control assistance at intersection locations. They are occasionally used for queue protection, too. The line item for the local police assistance has a project item number. 1) Queue Protection, and 2) Vehicle Code Enforcement operations (only when the Queue is not present or anticipated). Any traffic control assistance is not included</p> <p>3. Statistics - Not required</p> <p>4. Documentation - The MOU was provided. The guidance for the local police assistance is included in the project's special provision for an 'off-duty uniformed police officer'.</p> <p>5. Annual Amount - \$6,750,000</p> | N/A                        |
| Puerto Rico    |       |   |                            |
| Rhode Island   | Yes   | <p>1. Funding - The cost is added to the funding request to FHWA for all projects.</p> <p>2. Usage - The primary function is visual presence, traffic control at busy intersections and also on the limited access roadways, we use them as pace cars (drive through the work zone at a set speed) to set speeds through the work zone when traffic volumes are light and traffic speeds pick up.</p> <p>3. Statistics - We do not use (enforcement info) them as active at this time. But looking into this for the future.</p> <p>4. Documentation - RIDOT's Policy entitled Guidelines for the Use of Traffic persons and Flag persons in Work Zones was provided.</p> <p>5. Annual Amount - In FY 2010, the RIDOT spent approximately \$2.5 million dollars for State Police law enforcement details used on its Construction Projects.</p>   | N/A                        |
| South Carolina | Yes   | <p>1. Funding - We have a contractual agreement with the Dept. of Public Safety (DPS) to provide a team of 24 troopers to be used exclusively in work zones. Federal funds (STP)</p> <p>2. Usage - Active enforcement within work zones</p> <p>3. Statistics - DPS is required to provide an annual report at end of each contract year which includes summary of statistics such as tickets, warnings, crashes investigated, etc.</p> <p>4. Documentation - Attached is copy of latest agreement with DPS</p> <p>5. Annual Amount - Maximum of \$1,750,000</p>   | N/A                        |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State        | Usage                | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments   | Web Link or other comments  |
|--------------|----------------------|--|---|
| South Dakota | Yes, but limited use | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - State funds or officers on duty.</li> <li>2. Usage - Visual presence and active enforcement.</li> <li>3. Statistics - Not required</li> <li>4. Documentation - No, just general guidance on hiring of law enforcement officers. In the past we certified DOT employees to run radar guns and issue tickets, but we are currently not using that practice.</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - \$50,000</li> </ol>  | N/A   |
| Tennessee    | Yes                  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Construction cost and state funds</li> <li>2. Usage - Tennessee DOT use 2 "methods" to secure police officers on our projects. The first is to include our Special Provision 712PO which requires the contractor to secure Police for speed enforcement. (<a href="http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/construction/Special%20Provisions/712PO.pdf">http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/construction/Special%20Provisions/712PO.pdf</a>) Since this is a contract pay item, it is paid with Construction costs. The second method, we have an interdepartmental agreement with the State Troopers whereby we request troopers to be used for traffic enforcement and safety. We have an annual budget of ~\$1.4 million this year to use the troopers (mostly overtime for off duty troopers).</li> <li>3. Statistics -</li> <li>4. Documentation - The attached guidelines is what we use to determine when to use police/troopers in the work zone.</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - See above</li> </ol> | <a href="http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/construction/Special%20Provisions/712PO.pdf">http://www.tdot.state.tn.us/construction/Special%20Provisions/712PO.pdf</a> |
| Texas        | Yes                  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Force Account within the construction project</li> <li>2. Usage - Visual preference in work zone</li> <li>3. Statistics - Not required</li> <li>4. Documentation - Documents provided</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - Not easily identifiable.</li> </ol>  | N/A   |
| Utah         | Yes                  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding - Project funds paid through the contractor, therefore, both Federal and State</li> <li>2. Usage - Almost exclusively visual presence. Occasionally projects request active enforcement.</li> <li>3. Statistics - Not required</li> <li>4. Documentation - No</li> <li>5. Annual Amount - Estimated at \$100,000</li> </ol>  | N/A   |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State    | Usage                             | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments  | Web Link or other comments |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Vermont  | Yes                               | <p>1. Funding - Both are eligible project expenses. The State Police direct bill us for their labor and the UTO's are a bid item in the contract and reimbursed via the project.</p> <p>2. Usage - We have both State Police conducting speed enforcement in the work zones and hire Sherriff's as uniformed traffic officers. State Police are for speed enforcement and the Sherriff's provide both a visual presence and traffic control when required.</p> <p>3. Statistics - I believe we receive an annual report of activity from the State Police.</p> <p>4. Documentation - We have a MOU with the State Police.</p> <p>5. Annual Amount - Our current MOU with the Vermont Department of Public Safety, State Police Division, is for a period of 4 years and the Maximum Limiting Amount for the contract is \$1,000,000.00, and the yearly (July 1 - June 30 Fiscal Year) amount is around \$60,000.00. The State Police generally are providing Work Zone Traffic Safety Enforcement on our Interstate and National Highway Systems. Once in a while if a Secondary Route is a highly traffic route, the Resident Engineer may request to have the State Police on site also. Generally funding is approved by FHWA prior to the project being let for bid. If no funding was requested prior to bid, it can be after the contract is let. Again, the re</p> | N/A                        |
| Virginia | Yes on a project by project basis | <p>1. Funding - This activity is built into the project budget if needed on a project by project basis. We have used both State and Federal funding for this activity depending on the project. When used on a Federal Project, the use of federal funds for this activity is approved by the FHWA through the project development process. It is also funded through state funding assigned to each district.</p> <p>2. Usage - Predominantly visual presence and active enforcement. Traffic control assistance is offered during slow roll traffic control operations. If an emergency (accident, etc) would arise when they are present then they would also be involved in the traffic control.</p> <p>3. Statistics - Not required</p> <p>4. Documentation - Interagency Work Zone Safety Patrol Enforcement Agreement was provided as well as a copy of the log used to track hours worked, Guidelines for the Use of VSP in Work Zones from our version of Part 6 to the MUTCD, and an excerpt from an Instructional &amp; Informational Memorandum on how to establish the use of VSP in construction zones.</p> <p>5. Annual Amount - It varies depending on the projects we use this service on so the annual cost would not be consistent from year to year. Ba</p>   | N/A                        |

## Work Zone Law Enforcement - AASHTO SOC/SSOM and Operations Academy Inquiry

Inquiry questions: (the question of annual funding was sent to respondents after submittal of original response)

- Does your agency use uniformed law enforcement in work zones?
- If yes, how does your agency fund this activity (state funds, federal funds, combination of funds, requested but unfunded, project cost, etc.)?
- What is your underlying work zone law enforcement usage (visual presence in work zone, active enforcement, traffic control assistance, etc.)?
- Do you require a summary submittal of tickets, warnings, citations, etc. on a regular basis?
- Do you have any documented guidance or procedures that you can share?

October 2010

| State         | Usage | Specifications / Usage Guidelines / Comments   | Web Link or other comments  |
|---------------|-------|--|---|
| Washington    | Yes   | <p>1. Funding - State funds, WSDOT reimburses WSP as a below the line fund to contract. A "below the line" item is used for law enforcement assistance on construction projects and is covered by project funding, state or federal. Law enforcement assistance in our maintenance work zones is set up through a work order with state funds. Also, we have an informal process where we ask for law enforcement assistance as a function of routine patrols that provides some emphasis in work zones.</p> <p>2. Usage - Active enforcement patrolling the work zone. All of the above, but we prefer to emphasize active enforcement.</p> <p>3. Statistics - Not required</p> <p>4. Documentation - WSP Guidance Traffic Manual Appendix 5.A, <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/publications/manuals/fulltext/M51-02/Appendix5A.pdf">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/publications/manuals/fulltext/M51-02/Appendix5A.pdf</a> and WSDOT &amp; WSP Master Agreement: <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/204060BB-EE12-472E-9513-A917E35D5B7C/0/GCA5080.pdf">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/204060BB-EE12-472E-9513-A917E35D5B7C/0/GCA5080.pdf</a></p> <p>5. Annual Amount - \$200,000</p> | <p>See websites at left and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Safety/ATSC.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Safety/ATSC.htm</a> and <a href="http://wsdot.wa.gov/Safety/WorkZones/resources.htm#Policy">http://wsdot.wa.gov/Safety/WorkZones/resources.htm#Policy</a></p> |
| West Virginia |       |  |   |
| Wisconsin     |       |  |   |
| Wyoming       | No    | No, they patrol the construction as part of their daily duties. There have been a few projects where they were asked to patrol (this case they charged to the project). Patrol is part of our Transportation Agency.   | N/A   |