

01/05/2020

# Temporary Traffic Management Vehicle Selection and Operation on High Speed Dual Carriageways including Motorways





### Temporary Traffic Management Vehicle Selection and Operation on High Speed Dual Carriageways including Motorways

Issue v1.0 Published 01/05/2020

## Forward

Whilst TMCA understands that every care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of the contents of this publication, no responsibility for any loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any statement in it, can be accepted by TMCA and (any of) the Author(s).

The information contained herein is intended to represent industry best practice. No liability is accepted by TMCA for any damages caused to property or personal injury resulting from using the guidance contained within this document.

The publication is not intended to be an exhaustive review of the subject and it is incumbent upon any person to undertake their own research and formulate their own conclusions.

All rights including translation reserved. No part of the publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means of electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the publishers.

This document is published in an electronic format and a PDF file can be downloaded from the TMCA website <u>www.tmca.org.uk</u>

#### TMCA is the Traffic Management Contractors Association, a trade association representing all TMCA members and other interested parties in establishing and leading the highest industry standards in health, safety, innovation and technology for the installation, operation, maintenance and removal of temporary traffic management.

Document History										
Version	Purpose description / Status	Originator	Review	Authorised	Date					
1.0	Issue	TMCA Tech Officer	T&F Group	TMCA Tech Officer	01/05/2020					

#### **REVISION LIST – AMENDMENTS MADE IN THIS ISSUE**

This document is subject to an annual review process, the current version is the version published at <u>www.tmca.org</u>.



## Our liability

The TMCA shall not be liable in respect of any event of default for loss of profits, goodwill or any type of special, indirect or consequential loss, including loss or damage suffered by you as a result of any action brought by a third party even if such loss was reasonably foreseeable, or that the TMCA had been advised of the possibility of you incurring the same. Notwithstanding that all warranties are hereby excluded to the fullest extent permitted by law, in the event that the TMCA is found to be liable in damages for breach of contract (however caused) then the TMCA's total liability shall not in any circumstance exceed [£5M].

Subject in all respects to the other provisions of this clause 1 the TMCA's entire liability in

respect of any single event of default shall be limited to damages of an amount equal to [£5M] in respect of your tangible property resulting from the negligence of the TMCA or any of their employees, agents or subcontractors.

The TMCA shall not be responsible for loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of using the 2018 Guidance in accordance with the performance of this Contract.

For the avoidance of doubt, the TMCA shall not be liable for any loss resulting from, or in any way arising out of or in connection with, your or any other third party's:

- inappropriate use of this Guidance.
- failure to exercise reasonable levels of due care and attention when using this Guidance; or
- failure to exercise reasonable levels of professional skill and competence when using this Guidance.
- Nothing in these Terms and Conditions excludes or limits the TMCA's liability for:
  - death or personal injury caused by our negligence.
  - o fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation.
  - $\circ~$  any breach of the obligations implied by section 12 of the Sale of Goods Act 1979 or
  - $\circ~$  section 2 of the Supply of Goods and Services Act 1982
  - $\circ~$  defective products under the Consumer Protection Act 1987; or any other matter for
  - $\circ$   $\;$  which it would be illegal for us to exclude or attempt to exclude our liability".



## Scope

This Advice Note provides information on Temporary Traffic Management Vehicle (TTMV) selection during works undertaken or controlled by TMCA members on High Speed Dual Carriageways and Motorways.

## Purpose

To ensure temporary traffic management providers to adopt a safe system of work (SSOW) for temporary traffic management (TTM) schemes, in order to reduce risks to road workers whilst not transferring risk to road users.

This advice note is written with the expectation that it represents good practice and as such if the provider is involved in this type of activity, this advice will normally be followed unless a better site-specific solution has been devised as a result of a provider risk assessment.

## **Definitions and Notes**

Vehicles are those as defined in Traffic Signs Manual TSM Chapter 8 Part 2 (2009) O.5 and O.10 including TSM Chapter 8 Part 3 (2020)

#### Contents

For	war	d1			
Our	r lial	bility2			
Sco	pe				
Pur	pos	e3			
Def	initi	ons and Notes			
1.	Gu	idance4			
1.	.1.	Vehicle Selection for High Speed Dual Carriageways including Motorways4			
1	.2.	Safe system of work			
2.	Re	commended Vehicles and TTM Methods subject to the Safe System of Work 6			
3.	Со	nsiderations for Dual Vehicle Working7			
3	.1.	Taper Installation with IPV parked "upstream" of taper			
3	.2.	Taper installation and removal with IPV parked "downstream" of taper9			
4.	Со	nsiderations for Single Vehicle Working in a Live Lane			
5.	Withdrawal Conditions11				
6.	Normative References11				
7.	Informative References				



## 1. Guidance

#### 1.1. Vehicle Selection for High Speed Dual Carriageways including Motorways

High Speed Dual Carriageways and Motorways are recognised as a high-risk environment in which to install, remove and, maintain static temporary traffic management. As is normal when working in a high-risk environment organisations need to reduce risk to their workforce to be as low as reasonably practicable; in so doing however they must not transfer risk to the road user.

The selection of the vehicles and method of working, including whether to use a dual vehicle or single vehicle working approach, is an important part of ensuring the risk to road workers and road users is reduced to a level that is as low as is reasonably practicable (ALARP). The safe system of work should be site and task specific, should be written down and understood by persons relevant to the works operation.

- **Dual Vehicle Working -** should normally be used when installing, maintaining and removing TTM, during activities such as those in which road workers operate on the rear of a vehicle in a live lane, in order to substantially reduce road worker exposure to risks from traffic.
- **Single Vehicle Working** may be considered for use when installing, maintaining, and removing TTM, during activities which do not require road workers to operate on the rear of a vehicle in a live lane or where dual vehicle working is impractical.

#### 1.2. Safe system of work

The safe system of work shall document the choice of dual or single vehicle working (and the spacing between the vehicles if dual vehicle working is used) based on the specific circumstances in which the works will be carried out. The choice of technique should be made whilst taking into consideration all of the relevant factors which may affect the risk involved with an operation, examples are listed below.

Site Constraints – the characteristics of the site which do not change on a regular basis; for example this includes (but is not restricted to):

- Number of lanes on the carriageway
- Availability of safe taper locations
- Presence of a hard shoulder
- Dynamic use of the hard shoulder as a running lane (if present)
- Presence of Variable Signs and Signals (VSS) to support lane closure
- Road geometry and sightlines
- Presence of junctions, slip roads, roundabouts, access roads etc.

Fixed environment assessments should be carried out in advance of the works. Sites that have been pre-assessed should be reassessed on a regular basis, or immediately following any changes to the road layout.

Static operational requirements – the characteristics specific to the type of works being carried out at a given site. The risk assessment shall consider the traffic management technique used, including the choice of dual or single vehicle working (and the spacing between the vehicles if



dual vehicle working is used). This should be based on characteristics which are specific to the operation being carried out and the predicted characteristics at the site during the period of the works; for example, this includes (but is not restricted to):

- Lane(s) to be closed
- Lighting conditions
- Expected traffic flow per hour per lane
- Expected HGV's per hour per lane (Are they excluded)
- Likely speed of approaching vehicles (not the speed limit of the road)
- Any known issues with compliance with signing or signals
- Availability of an escape route for operatives
- Type of vehicle(s) to be used to install/remove equipment
- Requirement for carriageway crossings by operatives
- Manoeuvrability when installing/removing TTM using two vehicles

Appropriate mitigations must be put in place to reduce the risk to road workers and users ALARP. Assessment of these characteristics should be planned and assessed out in advance of the works, such that operatives have sufficient time to familiarise themselves with the techniques and mitigations required at different times during the operation. This can be achieved through effective engagement and briefing sessions

Dynamic operational requirements – characteristics of the working environment which can vary during the operation itself; this includes (but is not restricted to):

- Visibility of oncoming traffic for operatives
- Weather conditions
- Actual traffic flow
- Actual HGV traffic
- Actual traffic speed

These factors must be assessed at the site and recorded via a Point of Work Risk Assessment (POWRA) immediately prior to the start of the on-road work and reassessed regularly to validate the SSOW, throughout the operational period of the TTM system.

## 2. Recommended Vehicles and TTM Methods subject to the Safe System of Work

Dual Carriageway with H/S	Approach Signing Installation and Removal working from Hard Shoulder	Lead Taper Installation	In situ, signs, taper and closure install / set aside	Taper Collection	Longitudinal Coning Install and Collect	Maintenance of Temporary Traffic Management		
Type of Closure								
H/S		Impact Protection Vehicle or Traffic	Impact Protection Vehicle or Traffic Management Installation Vehicle or Traffic Management Maintenance Vehicle	Impact Protection Vehicle or Traffic				
Lane 1 (Working from H/S) Lane 1,2 (Working from H/S)		Management Installation Vehicle	Impact Protection Vehicle or Traffic Management Installation Vehicle	Management Installation Vehicle		Impact Protection		
Lane 4 Lane 4.3		Impact Protection Vehicle and Traffic	Impact Protection Vehicle and Traffic Management vehicle with Impact Protection	Impact Protection Vehicle and Traffic	Impact Protection	Vehicle or Traffic		
Lane 4,3,2 Lane 3	Traffic Management Installation Vehicle	Management vehicle with Impact Protection or Traffic Management Installation Vehicle	or Traffic Management Installation Vehicle (Live Lane, operatives on rear) Or	Management vehicle with Impact Protection or Traffic Management Installation Vehicle	Traffic Management	Installation Vehicle or		
Lane 3,2		Or Impact Protection Vehicle	Or Impact Protection Vehicle	Or Impact Protection Vehicle	Installation Vehicle	Traffic Management Maintenance Vehicle		
		(No operatives on the rear of the vehicle)	vehicle) Or Impact Protection Vehicle, Traffic	(No operatives on the rear of the vehicle)				
Lane 2			Management Installation Vehicle (Non Live Lane)					
Dual Carriageway without Hard Shoulder including All Lane Running Motorways	Approach Signing Installation and Removal	Lead Taper Installation	In situ, signs, taper and closure install / set aside	Taper Collection	Longitudinal Coning Install and Collect	Maintenance of Temporary Traffic Management (Non Live Lane)		
Type of Closure								
Lane 1						Impact		
Lane 1,2	Impact Protection Vehicle and Traffic Management vehicle with Impact Protection or Traffic Management Installation Vehicle P							
Lane 1,2,3	(Live Lane)							
Lane 4								
Lane 4,3	Or Impact Protection Vehicle, Traffic Management Installation Vehicle							
Lane 4,3,2	(Non Live Lane)							
Lane 3								
Lane 3,2						Maintenance		
Lane 2						Vehicle		

Additional Notes

All vehicle definitions and specifications as described within TSM Chapter 8 O5 And the working vehicle 0.10

All working methods must be reasonable and practicable and assessed through Risk Assessment at each location.

It is strongly recommended that all working vehicles parked in the live lane on High Speed Dual Carriageways and Motorways, when operatives are unloading, installing, maintaining, removing, temporary

traffic management will be afforded dedicated impact protection unless alternative working methods reduce overall risk.

For the avoidance of doubt, the hard shoulder is **NOT** classified as a live lane, unless it is being used by public traffic as part of an ALR section of motorway.

## 3. Considerations for Dual Vehicle Working

When operating using dual vehicle working, a suitable separation distance must be maintained between the works vehicle/operation (TMIV) and the impact protection vehicle (IPV) upstream at all times. This distance should be 75m (+/-25m) (as shown in the Plans in Chapter 8 Part 2: Operations Section O10). Selection of an appropriate distance between the vehicles/operation should consider that:

- Shorter distances decrease the risk of road users re-entering the closed lane between the two vehicles but may but present a greater likelihood of road users cutting back into the gap between the two vehicles and colliding.
- Longer distances decrease the risk of the upstream vehicle being shunted into the rear of the works vehicle, but present a greater likelihood of road users cutting back into the gap between the two vehicles and colliding with the rear of the works vehicle. If the works vehicle is not fitted with an LMCC, the severity of such a collision is likely to be greater.

This requires specific attention and need to be considered when installing or removing lead tapers with two recognised dual vehicle methods available.

Since 2018 the TMCA have strongly recommended that the most suitable method to be adopted by providers is the upstream method as this places an IPV between the workforce on foot and approaching traffic and have created a number of visual method statements to support its use. The downstream method remains available but should only be used when the upstream method is not reasonably practical.



#### 3.1. Taper Installation with IPV parked "upstream" of taper

Generally, the "**upstream**" method affords;

- Additional protection to the operatives whilst the taper is being installed
- Affords protection to the taper equipment whilst installation is being completed
- Does not afford protection to the working vehicle when over 100m from the IPV without 'boxing in'.
- The potential issue that once the taper has been installed the IPV has to attempt the re-join the live lane
- The potential issue from operatives that their view upstream is restricted
- Operatives must work facing oncoming traffic even when 'boxing in'



Through a suitable and sufficient risk assessment the most appropriate positioning should be determined to maintain ALARP.

Additional visual resources describing the upstream method can be found at <u>www.TMCA.org.uk</u>.

An effective and hands free communication system must be in operation between both the vehicles to ensure clear communication is maintained with both vehicles throughout the ongoing operations.

The Impact protection vehicle (IPV) should meet the requirements of O5.5.5 and the TTM installation vehicle (TMIV) the requirements of O10.6.6.



Historically there has always been a focus on the training of the IPV driver in terms of a live lane situation. However, providers also need to consider the training of the driver in the installation vehicle, who would have received no training in working with a dedicated IPV (unless they are another operative who holds the IPV live lanes qualification). Providers should ensure that the training/briefing delivered minimises the chance of a confliction i.e. where one part of the formation commits and manoeuvres into one lane whilst the other stays positioned in the other. Training is regularly considered at the National Highways Sector Scheme Reviews.

The benefit from Dual vehicle Working is an overall reduction in the risk population as the vehicle most likely to be struck only has one person in it in a properly designed restraint system rather than a potential crew of 3 operatives.

Providers have a legal duty to reduce the risks to our workforce to as low as reasonably practicable and the provision of the impact protection vehicle is seen as being reasonably practicable by the HSE in the conditions outlined in this guidance.

## 3.2. Taper installation and removal with IPV parked "downstream" of taper

Generally, the "downstream" method affords;

- Consistent cover by the IPV if deployed 75m (+/-25m) from the working vehicle
- Avoids the need to merge with traffic
- Can cause access issues (identification of safe passing places in single lane closures) if the IPV is utilised as the TMIV working vehicle for the remainder of the operation
- does not afford impact protection to the operatives but to the TMIV working vehicle.
- Affords a clear view upstream of the oncoming traffic





## 4. Considerations for Single Vehicle Working in a Live Lane

Single vehicle working refers to the use of a single vehicle for installation, removal or maintenance of TTM. This vehicle may or may not be equipped with a lorry mounted crash cushion (LMCC); if it is not fitted with an LMCC, it cannot operate as a single vehicle in a live lane of a carriageway open to vehicular traffic (TSM Chapter 8, Section O5.9.5).

This method is not recommended on High Speed Dual Carriageways when operatives are required to work on the rear of the single vehicle (TMIV) in a live lane. The TMCA strongly recommends that the dual vehicle upstream method be used with a supporting IPV.



This method should only be considered when the operatives are working in a Non-Live Lane situation or where they are working on foot with a lookout / installer in a position that affords a clear view of the oncoming traffic, with an effective communication system in use and / or additional measures are provided to exclude traffic approaching the operation such as a rolling road block.

Single vehicle (combined) working may be considered, in some or all the example circumstances below. These considerations and the decision to use single vehicle working must be recorded in a risk assessment supporting the safe system of work.

- No operatives working on the rear of the vehicle when the vehicle is deployed as an IPV with operatives working on foot, with the IPV acting as a support vehicle.
- Dedicated look out in place who has a clear unrestricted view of the oncoming traffic and has effective communication with all the team members.
- No Heavy Goods Vehicles in the lanes to be closed where the IPV vehicle is deployed e.g. Lane 3 or 4 on motorways
- All the approach zone signing is erected and in position.
- Where dedicated impact protection (dual vehicle) may increase overall risk e.g. entrances to slip roads and junctions, or roundabouts with a tight radius and multiple exits.



## 5. Withdrawal Conditions

This Advice note was created in March 2020 when the HTMA guidance note was incorporated permanently in to DfT Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 8 volume (2020) but the HTMA soon after ceased to exist as an organisation representing the industry.

The TMCA agreed to take over the guidance so that it remained available to the industry, not just TMCA members and shall remain in force until agreed otherwise.

## 6. Normative References

DfT Design Manual for Roads & Bridges GG104 Standard for Safety Risk Assessment on the Strategic Road Network.

http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/dmrb/vol0/section2/GG%20102%20Quality%20management%20systems%20for%20highway%20works-web.pdf

DfT Traffic Signs Manual (TSM) Chapter 8 (2009) Traffic Safety Measures and Signs for Road Works and Temporary Situations, Part 1 – Design, Part 2 – Operations & Part 3 - Update. <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/traffic-signs-manual</u>

Safety and Street Works and Road Works - A Code of Practice 2014

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/safety-at-street-works-and-road-works

The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999

https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1999/3242/contents/made

## 7. Informative References

TRL Report CPR1323 (2012): IPV collisions – exploratory risk investigation and possible countermeasures.

TRL Report RPN2600 (2013): IPV Guidance Supporting Documentation

Highways Agency INTERIM ADVICE NOTE 181/14 Guidance on the use of Impact protection vehicles for Temporary Traffic Management replaced by TSM Chapter 8 Part 3 (2020). HSE CIS 53 Reducing risk in temporary traffic management operations.

https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/cis53.pdf

HSE free publication "Five steps to risk assessment".

https://www.hse.gov.uk/risk/controlling-risks.htm

End of text





A trade association representing all TMCA members and other interested parties in establishing and leading the highest industry standards in health, safety, innovation and technology for the installation, operation, maintenance and removal of temporary traffic management.

## www.tmca.org.uk

Traffic Management Contractors Association Registered address: 4 Strawberry Close, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN2 5PD