

**Work Zone Safety and Mobility
Statewide Peer Review Team (SPRT)**

Project Identification:	CS:		JN:	
Route:				
Location:				
Work Description:				
PM/TMP Contact:		Phone:		
Review Date:				
SPRT Members:				
WZSM Thresholds	V/C	LOS	Travel Time	Delay
Existing:				
Work Zone:				
Let Date:				
Construction Start Date:				
Construction End Date:				
TMP Review	Yes	No	Yes	No
TMP Summary:			TTCP:	
Vicinity Map:			TOP:	
TMP Package Complete:			PIP:	
SPRT Recommendation:				
	Red: Do not Proceed , Review SPRT comments; Region Engineer to discuss with COO			
	Yellow: Proceed , Review SPRT comments; Office incorporate changes as appropriate			
	Green: Proceed , Review SPRT comments			
SPRT Summary Comments:				

**Work Zone Safety and Mobility
Statewide Peer Review Team (SPRT)**

Traffic / Mobility Analysis

1.	Traffic data source(s) is appropriate and reasonable.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

2.	Traffic analysis methodology is appropriate and reasonable for the scope/complexity of the job/location and the results are clear and understandable.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

3.	The delay assumptions and calculations are reasonable and the approach is consistent with current policy and practice.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

4.	Please provide any general comments that do not appear to fit under the other questions.
----	--

Comments:

**Work Zone Safety and Mobility
Statewide Peer Review Team (SPRT)**

Temporary Traffic Control Plan (TTCP)

1.	The TTCP concept seems reasonable and logical given the type of work, the system level, the duration of the project, and the traffic volumes.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

2.	Staging and constructability is well thought out and seems reasonable. The review team should note any show stoppers.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

3.	There is evidence of analysis with respect to similar projects and job specific characteristics (shy distance, slopes, attenuation, horizontal/vertical sight distances, etc.); the work zone is designed accordingly.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

4.	There is analysis of the alternatives considered, with an appropriate comparison of benefits and costs.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

**Work Zone Safety and Mobility
Statewide Peer Review Team (SPRT)**

Temporary Traffic Control Plan (TTCP) continued

5.	There is a work zone crash analysis and comparison to crash statistics for similar project work zones and locations (prior to work zone and during work zone). Note any elements of risk for the public or highway workers that should be addressed.	Yes	No	N/A

Comments:

6.	There is guidance on the development of an internal work zone traffic control plan (contractor's operation) for contractor ingress and egress.	Yes	No	N/A

Comments:

7.	There is an appropriate plan to monitor safety and mobility and adjust the work zone/project during construction as needed.	Yes	No	N/A

Comments:

8.	Please provide any general comments that do not appear to fit under the other questions.
----	--

Comments:

**Work Zone Safety and Mobility
Statewide Peer Review Team (SPRT)**

Traffic Operations Plan (TOP)

1.	The TOP is complete and reasonable. If necessary, it should include provisions for pedestrians, emergency responders, commercial vehicles, transit operations, etc.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

2.	Delay mitigation techniques are evident and are applied appropriately. Please list other techniques that you would recommend the office consider be added to the project at this stage.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

3.	There is adequate discussion of projects packaged or bundled with this project.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

4.	There is adequate discussion and explanation of corridor impacts and/or an explanation of mobility influences beyond the project area including adjacent regions.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

**Work Zone Safety and Mobility
Statewide Peer Review Team (SPRT)**

Public Information Plan (PIP)

1.	The PIP is appropriate for the scope of the project and the scale of the impacts.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

2.	The list of affected stakeholders is comprehensive and it is evident that stakeholders have been or will be engaged.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

3.	Please provide any general comments that do not appear to fit under the other questions.
----	--

Comments:

**Work Zone Safety and Mobility
Statewide Peer Review Team (SPRT)**

General TMP Comments

1.	There are best practices in the area of mobility analysis, mitigation techniques, TTCP or TCP development evident in this TMP that should be shared with others.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

2.	There are recommended areas of focus for further review by the respective office.	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

3.	There are show stoppers or areas of concern that the team feels should be documented for review by either the Region Engineer or Chief Operations Officer	Yes	No	N/A
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

4.	Please provide any general comments.
----	--------------------------------------

Comments: