

Outline

- Project Overview
- Research Findings
- Signage
- Challenges
- Guidance Document
- Lessons Learned



EST PRACTICES FO

R



R

G

PROJECT OVERVIEW

B

EM

ER

G

E N



EST PRACTICES FO

CY

TICES FOR REROUTING

Michigan Road Network

• 7 Regions

- MDOT Responsible for Trunkline Routes
 - Direct vs. Contract
- Counties/Municipalities Responsible for their Respective Routes
- Predominately Rural Areas
 - Detroit and Surrounding Suburbs
 - Grand Rapids
 - Lansing



EST PRACTICES FO



Project Overview

- Research Project
 - -1 year
- Guidance Document
 - Recommendations for a consistent approach to developing emergency reroutes and signage on those routes



EST PRACTICES FO



Assumptions

Manual Intended

- Serve as a reference that summarizes best practices from other states
- Provide information stakeholders should consider when developing emergency reroutes
- Be a guide on how to evaluate the effectiveness of reroutes
- Present recommendations on signage for the developed routes
- Be updated periodically as technology changes, lessons learned are revealed, or other supporting information is identified as beneficial to include

ER

Manual <u>Not</u> Intended

- Describe how to handle incident management
- Provide or document specific emergency rerouting plans
- Specify when and how to implement emergency rerouting plans
- Require specific signage for all reroutes implemented
- Remain a static unchanging document



BEST PRACTICES FOR

RER

0





RESEARCH FINDINGS

B

ΕM

ER

G

E N



EST PRACTICES FOR

CY

RER

0 U T

R G

N

Methodology





BEST PRACTICES FOR EMERGENCY REROUTING



Best Practices

- Areas of Commonalities
- Areas of Divergence
- Challenges
- Process Recommendations



EST PRACTICES FO

R



R

Stakeholder Feedback

- Half Day Workshops
 - 3 locations
- Break-Out Groups
 - 2 hypothetical locations for emergency rerouting vs. incident management
- Conference Call



ESI PRACIICES FO



Existing Elements

- Existing Reroutes

 Varies among regions

 Existing Signage

 Less frequent and not the same
 - MMUTCD







EST PRACTICES FOR MERGENCY REROUTING





SIGNAGE

B

EM

ERG



F O R P E R S F REROUTING E N

CY

LANCE

Guidance

- Urban/Suburban/Rural
- Placement
- Density



Recommended Sign Design



Non-Recommended Sign Design



BEST PRACTICES FOR EMERGENCY REROUTING





CHALLENGES

B

Ε

Μ



F O R Ε P S R F REROUTING

CY

EN

ERG

LANCE

Considerations

- Challenging Interagency Relationships
- Regional Stakeholder Relationships
- Local Decisions
- Resources
- Commercial Freight
 - Oversize/Overweight
 - Permits



EST PRACTICES FO



GUIDANCE DOCUMENT



B

E

М

EST PRACTICES FOR

ERGENCY REROUTING



Guidance Tools

• Tools to Help Guide Stakeholders:

- Evaluation Methods
- Letter of Agreement Draft (or Memorandum Of Understanding)
- Case Study
 - Examples
 - Response Plan
- Checklists



EST PRACTICES FO



R

Guidance Tools

- Checklists Include:
 - Stakeholder Identification
 - Roles and Responsibilities
 - Road Network Considerations
 - Intersection Analysis
 - Regional Considerations (Urban/Rural)
 - Communication
 - Evaluation
 - Signage



LANCE



BEST PRACTICES FOR

Date:

Timeframe: During the development of emergency rerouting plans.

Involvement: State and local transportation agencies.

Process: Choices for rerouting traffic will depend on the length of the detour, available roadways for the detour and their characteristics, and connections to intersecting roadways along the detour. All potential characteristic should be considered when deciding on potential alternates. It is important for the estimated volume of detoured traffic to be evaluated against the capacity of the identified reroute. It is understood that the roadway likely will be over capacity, but this analysis will assist in planning effective traffic control measures in response to the projected traffic conditions. References for this include: local maps, ADT, weight restriction maps, and/or height restriction maps.

| | Characteristics | | Alternate Emergency Route 1 | Alternate Emergency Route 2 | Alternate Emergency Route 3 |
|--|---|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Identify segment of each alternative route (road name, and end points) | Segment 1 | | | |
| | | Segment 2 | | | |
| | *Note: see intersection checklist for specific analysis of intersections. | Segment 3 | | | |
| | | Segment 4 | | | |
| | | Segment 5 | | | |
| | | Segment 6 | | | |
| | | Segment 7 | | | |
| | | Segment 8 | | | |
| | | Segment 9 | | | |
| | Length of roadway (mainline and alternative route) | Mainline: | | | |
| | | Alternate: | | | |
| | Volume thresholds by time of day | Mainline: AM/PM | | | |
| | | Diversion: AM/PM | | | |
| | Capacity of roadway | Mainline: | | | |
| | | Diversion: | | | |
| | Background V/C levels of diversion roadway(s) by time of day | Mainline: AM/PM | | | |
| | | Diversion: AM/PM | | | |
| | Queue length adequacy | | | | |
| | Roadway geometry | | | | |
| | Lane geometry | | | | |
| | Horizontal curvature | | | | |
| | Vertical curvature | | | | |

Checklist: Review the characteristics of the potential alternate routes and determine if they may impact the plans.

LESSONS LEARNED

B

E

М

ER

G

E N



EST PRACTICES FOR

CY

RER

0 U T

G

I N

Lessons Learned

- I. Stakeholders had a hard time distinguishing between alternate route process and incident management
- II. Several areas unaware of the types of pre-planned routing strategy in place
- III. A regional contact list can help impact the coordination
- IV. Stakeholders wanted an interactive format for the document



EST PRACTICES FO

R

R

0



QUESTIONS

B

ΕM

R

E

G

Presenters: Amanda Good Angie Kremer

G

Ν



EST PRACTICES FOR

Ν

F

RER

0

U

