



## *Florida Department of Transportation*

RICK SCOTT  
GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450


JIM BOXOLD  
SECRETARY

### **ROADWAY DESIGN BULLETIN 16-08**

*(FHWA Approved: August 17, 2016)*

DATE: August 24, 2016

TO: District Directors of Transportation Operations, District Directors of Transportation Development, District Design Engineers, District Construction Engineers, District Geotechnical Engineers, District Structures Design Engineers, District Maintenance Engineers, District Consultant Project Manager Engineers, District Roadway Design Engineers, District Traffic Operations Engineers, District Program Management Engineers, District Materials Engineers

FROM: Michael Shepard, P.E.   
State Roadway Design Engineer

COPIES: Brian Blanchard, Phillip Gainer, Tim Lattner, Rudy Powell, David Sadler, Amy Tootle, Dan Scheer, Gregory Schiess, Trey Tillander, Mark Wilson, Dan Hurtado, Robert Robertson, Kevin Burgess (FHWA), Nick Finch (FHWA), Chad Thompson (FHWA), Phillip Bello (FHWA)

SUBJECT: FHWA Controlling Design Elements

In 1985, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued a policy establishing the 13 controlling criteria for design on National Highway System (NHS) roadways. On May 5, 2016, the FHWA published a final notice of policy change reducing these controlling criteria to include 10 design elements for high-speed facilities and two (2) elements for low-speed facilities. Additionally, FHWA established formal documentation requirements to be included in all Design Exception submittals. Roadway Design Bulletin 16-08 formally adopts these FHWA changes to the controlling elements and extends those requirements to the State Highway System (SHS) in Florida.

On October 13, 2015, FHWA adopted the 2011 edition of the AASHTO "A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets," commonly referred to as the AASHTO Greenbook. This Bulletin formally adopts the 2011 AASHTO Greenbook for use in the evaluation of AASHTO criteria on FDOT projects.

### **REQUIREMENTS**

Replace *Plans Preparation Manual (PPM), Volume 1, Chapter 23*, dated January 1, 2016 with the new chapter dated August 24, 2016. See attached document.

## **BACKGROUND**

NCHRP Report 783 “Evaluation of the 13 Controlling Criteria for Geometric Design” was published based on the findings of research project NCHRP 17-53, and was completed on November 27, 2013. This report describes and evaluated the impacts of the controlling roadway design criteria on safety and operations for urban and rural roadways.

On October 7, 2015, FHWA published a notice in the Federal Register that proposed changes to the 1985 policy that established the original 13 Controlling Design Elements. The notice also clarified when design exceptions are required and the supporting documentation that should be provided with the request.

FHWA published a final policy change notice in the Federal Register on May 5, 2016. This new policy reduced the number of controlling criteria from 13 to 10, and applies only two (2) of the 10 criteria to low speed roadways (Design Speed < 50mph).

A link to the FHWA Policy change: [Federal Register - Revision of Thirteen Controlling Criteria](#)

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

The requirements of this bulletin are to be implemented effective October 31, 2016 on all conventionally let projects, and effective on all Design-Build projects advertised after October 31, 2016.

## **CONTACT**

Jeremy Fletcher, P.E., P.S.M.  
Roadway Quality Assurance Administrator  
Phone (850)-414-4320  
[jeremy.fletcher@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:jeremy.fletcher@dot.state.fl.us)

Mary Jane Hayden, P.E., PMP  
Roadway Design Engineer  
Phone (850)-414-4783  
[MaryJane.Hayden@dot.state.fl.us](mailto:MaryJane.Hayden@dot.state.fl.us)

JF/jb

## Chapter 23

### Design Exceptions and Design Variations

|          |                                   |       |
|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|
| 23.1     | General .....                     | 23-1  |
| 23.2     | Identification .....              | 23-3  |
| 23.3     | Justification for Approval .....  | 23-5  |
| 23.4     | Documentation for Approval .....  | 23-6  |
| 23.5     | AASHTO Controlling Elements ..... | 23-8  |
| 23.5.1   | Design Speed .....                | 23-9  |
| 23.5.1.1 | AASHTO Criteria .....             | 23-9  |
| 23.5.1.2 | Documentation .....               | 23-9  |
| 23.5.1.3 | Mitigation .....                  | 23-10 |
| 23.5.2   | Lane Width .....                  | 23-11 |
| 23.5.2.1 | AASHTO Criteria .....             | 23-11 |
| 23.5.2.2 | Documentation .....               | 23-11 |
| 23.5.2.3 | Mitigation .....                  | 23-11 |
| 23.5.3   | Shoulder Width .....              | 23-13 |
| 23.5.3.1 | AASHTO Criteria .....             | 23-13 |
| 23.5.3.2 | Documentation .....               | 23-15 |
| 23.5.3.3 | Mitigation .....                  | 23-15 |
| 23.5.4   | Horizontal Curve Radius .....     | 23-16 |
| 23.5.4.1 | AASHTO Criteria .....             | 23-16 |
| 23.5.4.2 | Documentation .....               | 23-16 |
| 23.5.4.3 | Mitigation .....                  | 23-16 |
| 23.5.5   | Superelevation Rate .....         | 23-18 |
| 23.5.5.1 | AASHTO Criteria .....             | 23-18 |
| 23.5.5.2 | Documentation .....               | 23-18 |

---

|         |           |   |       |
|---------|-----------|---|-------|
|         | 23.5.5.3  | Mitigation.....                               | 23-18 |
| 23.5.6  |           | Stopping Sight Distance .....                 | 23-20 |
|         | 23.5.6.1  | AASHTO Criteria .....                         | 23-20 |
|         | 23.5.6.2  | Documentation .....                           | 23-21 |
|         | 23.5.6.3  | Mitigation.....                               | 23-21 |
| 23.5.7  |           | Maximum Grade.....                            | 23-22 |
|         | 23.5.7.1  | AASHTO Criteria.....                          | 23-22 |
|         | 23.5.7.2  | Documentation .....                           | 23-22 |
|         | 23.5.7.3  | Mitigation.....                               | 23-22 |
| 23.5.8  |           | Cross Slope.....                              | 23-24 |
|         | 23.5.8.1  | AASHTO Criteria.....                          | 23-24 |
|         | 23.5.8.2  | Documentation .....                           | 23-24 |
|         | 23.5.8.3  | Mitigation.....                               | 23-24 |
| 23.5.9  |           | Vertical Clearance .....                      | 23-26 |
|         | 23.5.9.1  | AASHTO Criteria.....                          | 23-26 |
|         | 23.5.9.2  | Documentation .....                           | 23-26 |
|         | 23.5.9.3  | Mitigation.....                               | 23-27 |
| 23.5.10 |           | Design Loading Structural Capacity .....      | 23-28 |
|         | 23.5.10.1 | AASHTO Criteria.....                          | 23-28 |
|         | 23.5.10.2 | Documentation .....                           | 23-28 |
|         | 23.5.10.3 | Mitigation.....                               | 23-28 |
| 23.6    |           | Crash Analysis .....                          | 23-29 |
|         | 23.6.1    | Historical Crash Method (HCM).....            | 23-29 |
|         | 23.6.2    | Roadside Safety Analysis Program (RSAP) ..... | 23-31 |
|         | 23.6.3    | Highway Safety Manual.....                    | 23-31 |
| 23.7    |           | Design Approval Request.....                  | 23-34 |
|         | 23.7.1    | Submittal Package .....                       | 23-34 |
|         | 23.7.2    | Design Exception Approval .....               | 23-34 |
|         | 23.7.3    | Design Variation Approval .....               | 23-35 |

|              |                                 |       |
|--------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| 23.7.4       | Signature Requirements.....     | 23-36 |
| Exhibit 23-A | Submittal/Approval Letter ..... | 23-40 |

Tables

|               |   |       |
|---------------|---|-------|
| Table 23.5.1  | AASHTO Design Speed (Minimum) .....                 | 23-9  |
| Table 23.5.2  | AASHTO Lane Width (Minimum).....                    | 23-11 |
| Table 23.5.3  | AASHTO Shoulder Widths (Minimum).....               | 23-13 |
| Table 23.5.4  | AASHTO Bridge Widths (Minimum).....                 | 23-14 |
| Table 23.5.5  | AASHTO Horizontal Alignment.....                    | 23-16 |
| Table 23.5.6  | AASHTO Superelevation (Maximum) .....               | 23-18 |
| Table 23.5.7  | AASHTO Stopping Sight Distance (Minimum).....       | 23-20 |
| Table 23.5.8  | AASHTO Vertical Alignment.....                      | 23-20 |
| Table 23.5.9  | AASHTO Minimum Passing Sight Distance.....          | 23-21 |
| Table 23.5.10 | AASHTO Grades (Maximum).....                        | 23-22 |
| Table 23.5.11 | AASHTO Cross Slope .....                            | 23-24 |
| Table 23.5.12 | AASHTO Vertical Clearance (Minimum).....            | 23-26 |
| Table 23.5.13 | AASHTO Structural Capacity (Minimum Loadings)       | 23-28 |
| Table 23.6.1  | FDOT Average Crash Costs by Facility Type .....     | 23-30 |
| Table 23.6.2  | FDOT KABCO Crash Costs .....                        | 23-30 |
| Table 23.6.3  | HSM Calibration Factors for Florida (2012-2016) ... | 23-32 |
| Table 23.6.4  | HSM Crash Distribution for Florida (2012-2016)..... | 23-33 |

---

Table 23.7.1      Central Office Approvals .....23-38

## Chapter 23

# Design Exceptions and Design Variations

### 23.1 General

The Department's roadway design criteria and standards are contained in this Volume and are usually within the desirable ranges established by AASHTO. The values given in this Volume have been accepted by FHWA and govern the design process. When it becomes necessary to deviate from the Department's criteria, early documentation and approval are required. There are two approval processes used by designers: Design Exceptions and Design Variations. This chapter does not address the Utility Exception Procedure Topic No. 710-020-002 used by Utility Agencies/Owners to relieve their obligation to comply with a design requirement.

When the Department's criteria are not met, a Design Exception or Design Variation is required. This requirement applies to all entities affecting planning, design, construction and maintenance.

For projects using safety funds and developed to improve specific safety problems, only the elements identified under the scope of work for the safety improvement project are subject to these approval processes. Existing non-compliant features, within the limits of a safety improvement project do not require approval to remain, as long as the project does not create a non-compliant condition. The Safety Study must identify all applicable Variations and Exceptions required based on the proposed scope. For these projects, all applicable Design Variations and Design Exceptions must be approved prior to the beginning of the design phase.

For drainage projects, only elements identified in the scope of services for the drainage project are subject to these approval processes. The existing features, within the limits of the drainage project that do not meet design criteria, do not require approval to remain (if the project does not create a nonconforming condition).

Maintenance Resurfacing, Ride Rehabilitation and Skid Hazard Projects do not require Design Exceptions or Design Variations other than for ADA curb ramp requirements. If compliance with ADA curb ramp requirements is determined to be technically infeasible, documentation as a Design Variation is required. Maintenance Resurfacing Projects can only be programmed on routes that meet the requirements identified in **Chapter 28** of the [Work Program Instructions](#).

For Landscape Only projects, intersection sight distance Design Variations may be processed by the Responsible Landscape Architect of Record. For design projects with landscaping, intersection sight distance Design Variations must be processed by a Professional Engineer. In cases where intersection sight distance falls below stopping sight distance, a Design Exception for stopping sight distance must be processed by the respective professional according to the above guidelines.



## 23.2 Identification

To allow time to research alternatives and begin the analysis and documentation activities, it is important that proper approval processes be identified as early as possible in the Planning and Design phases. This is preferably done during the PD&E process for major projects and the scope development process for minor projects. It is required that approval be obtained no later than the initial engineering phase.

**Design Exceptions** are required when proposed design elements are below both the Department's governing criteria and AASHTO's new construction criteria for the Controlling Design Elements.

The 10 Controlling Design Elements for high speed (Design Speed  $\geq$  50 mph) roadways are:

- Design Speed
- Lane Width
- Shoulder Width
- Horizontal Curve Radius
- Superelevation Rate
- Stopping Sight Distance
- Maximum Grade
- Cross Slope
- Vertical Clearance
- Design Loading Structural Capacity

The 2 Controlling Design Elements for low speed (Design Speed  $<$  50 mph) roadways are:

- Design Speed
- Design Loading Structural Capacity

**Section 23.5** provides AASHTO's minimum requirements for the above elements.

**Design Variations** are required when proposed design elements are below the Department's criteria and where a Design Exception is not required.

Modification for Non-Conventional Projects:

See RFP for additional requirements.

## 23.3 Justification for Approval

Sufficient detail and explanation must be given in order to justify approval to those reviewing the request. The 10 Controlling Design Elements are considered safety related and the strongest case possible must be made to lower these requirements. At some point, this justification may be used to defend design decisions made by the Department and the designer. All deviations from Department criteria and standards must be uniquely identified, located, and justified; no blanket approvals are given.

A strong case can be made if it can be shown that:

- The required criteria are not applicable to the site specific conditions.
- The project can be as safe by not following the criteria.
- The environmental or community needs prohibit meeting criteria.

Most often a case is made by showing the required criteria are impractical and the proposed design wisely balances all design impacts. The impacts required for documentation are:

- Safety and Operational performance
- Level of Service
- Right of Way impacts
- Community impacts
- Environmental impacts
- Costs
- Usability by all modes of transportation
- Long term and cumulative effects on adjacent sections of roadway

A case should not be made based solely on the basis that:

- The Department can save money.
- The Department can save time.
- The proposed design is similar to other designs.

## 23.4 Documentation for Approval

Supporting documentation that is generated during the approval process is to accompany each submittal.

Design Exceptions and Design Variations needing Central Office approval should include the following documentation:

1. Submittal/Approval Letter (**Form 23-A**)
2. Project Description: general project information, location map, existing roadway characteristics, project limits (mileposts), county section number, work mix, objectives, and obstacles. Include any associated or future limitations that exist as a result of public or legal commitments.
3. Project Schedule and Lifespan: Include the letting date and other important production dates associated with the project. Provide a discussion of whether the Design Exception is a temporary or permanent condition. Include any future work planned or programmed to address the condition.
4. Exception/Variation Description:
  - a) Specific design criteria that will not be met (AASHTO, Department value, or standard). Detailed explanation of why the criteria or standard cannot be complied with or is not applicable. Description of any proposed value for the project or location and why it is appropriate.
  - b) A plan view, plan sheet, or aerial photo of the Design Exception location, showing right of way lines, and property lines of adjacent property. A photo of the area of the deficiency.
  - c) Typical section or cross-section of the Design Exception location.
  - d) The milepost and station location of the Design Exception.
5. Alternative Designs Considered: meeting Department criteria, meeting AASHTO criteria, partial correction, and the no-build (existing) condition.
6. Impacts of the Exception/Variation to:
  - a) Safety Performance:
    - Description of the anticipated impact on safety, long and short term effects.

Description of any anticipated cumulative effects.

- Summary of the most recent 5-year crash history including any pertinent crash reports.
- For non-existing or proposed conditions, a comparison of the predicted or expected crash frequency should be included along with a discussion of the 5-year crash history.

b) Operational Performance:

- Description of the anticipated impact on operations, long and short term effects. Description of any anticipated cumulative effects.
- Traffic information: Amount and character of traffic using the facility.
- Compatibility of the design with adjacent sections of roadway.
- Effects on capacity (proposed criteria vs. AASHTO) using an acceptable capacity analysis procedure and calculate reduction for design year, level of service.

c) Right-of-way

d) Community

e) Environment

f) Usability by all modes of transportation

7. Costs: Description of the anticipated costs associated with the Design Exception or Variation.
8. Mitigation Measures: Description and explanation of any practical mitigation measures or alternatives that were considered and any selected treatments implemented on the project.
9. Summary and Conclusions

## 23.5 AASHTO Controlling Elements

AASHTO criteria, required documentation, and mitigation strategies for the controlling elements is provided in the following sections. Detailed discussions on criteria and mitigation are provided in the AASHTO Greenbook: ***A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 2011***, and the FHWA Guide: ***Mitigation Strategies for Design Exceptions, July 2007***. The AASHTO criteria provided are in no way intended to replace Department design criteria.

The criteria used for determining Design Exceptions on Interstate projects must be based on AASHTO's ***A Policy on Design Standards Interstate System 2005***.

## 23.5.1 Design Speed

### 23.5.1.1 AASHTO Criteria

**Table 23.5.1 AASHTO Design Speed (Minimum)**

| Type Facility    | Other Factors               | Design Speed (mph) | AASHTO                   |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Freeways         | Urban                       | 50                 | pg. 8-1, 8-2             |
|                  | Rural                       | 70                 |                          |
| Urban Arterials  | Major                       | 30                 | pg. 2-58                 |
|                  | Other                       | 30                 |                          |
| Rural Arterials  | Rolling terrain             | 50                 | pg. 7-2                  |
|                  | Level terrain               | 60                 |                          |
| Urban Collectors | Major or Minor              | 30                 | pg. 6-11                 |
| Rural Collectors | Level                       | ADT < 400          | pg. 6-2, Table 6-1       |
|                  |                             | ADT 400 - 2000     |                          |
|                  |                             | ADT > 2000         |                          |
|                  | Rolling                     | ADT < 400          |                          |
|                  |                             | ADT 400 - 2000     |                          |
|                  |                             | ADT > 2000         |                          |
| Ramps            | Highway Design Speeds (mph) | 30                 | pg. 10-89,<br>Table 10-1 |
|                  |                             | 35                 |                          |
|                  |                             | 40                 |                          |
|                  |                             | 45                 |                          |
|                  |                             | 50                 |                          |
|                  |                             | 55                 |                          |
|                  |                             | 60                 |                          |
|                  |                             | 65                 |                          |
|                  |                             | 70                 |                          |
|                  |                             | 70                 |                          |
| Loop Ramps       | Minimum                     | 25                 | pg. 10-89                |
| Connections      | Direct                      | 40                 | pg. 10-90                |
|                  | Semi-Direct                 | 30                 |                          |

### 23.5.1.2 Documentation

Provide the length of section with reduced design speed compared to the overall length of the project. Include any existing or proposed measures used within the transitions to adjacent roadway sections having higher or lower design (or operating) speeds.

### **23.5.1.3 Mitigation**

A potential mitigation strategy for design speed is:

1. Cross-sectional elements to manage speed to reduce operating speeds to the design speed.



## 23.5.2 Lane Width

### 23.5.2.1 AASHTO Criteria

**Table 23.5.2 AASHTO Lane Width (Minimum)**

| Type Facility                  | Lane Width (feet) | AASHTO                                   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Freeways (including Auxiliary) | 12                | pg. 8-2, 10-76, DSIS pg.3 <sup>(1)</sup> |
| Rural Arterials                | 11                | pg. 7-5, Table 7-3                       |
| Urban Arterials                | 10                | pg. 7-29                                 |
| Urban Collectors               | 10                | pg. 6-13                                 |
| Rural Collectors               | 10                | pg. 6-6, Table 6-5                       |
| Low Speed                      | 10                | pg. 4-7                                  |
| Residential                    | 9                 | pg. 4-8                                  |
| Auxiliary (Non-Freeway)        | 10                | pp. 4-8, 6-13                            |
| Continuous TWLTL               | 10                | pg. 4-8                                  |

1. DSIS = AASHTO's *A Policy on Design Standards Interstate System* (January 2005).

### 23.5.2.2 Documentation

Provide locations of alternative routes that meet criteria and a proposal for handling drainage. Include a typical section or plan of the proposed signing and pavement markings associated with the lane width exception.

### 23.5.2.3 Mitigation

Potential mitigation strategies for lane width are:

1. Select optimal combination of lane and shoulder widths based on site characteristics to optimize safety and operations by distributing available cross-sectional width
2. Signing to provide advanced warning of lane width reduction;
3. To improve the ability to stay within the lane:
  - a) Wide, recessed, or raised pavement markings

- b) Delineators
  - c) Lighting
  - d) Centerline and edge line rumble striping, (See **Section 7.6.1.2**)
  - e) Shoulder rumble strips
4. To improve the ability to recover if the driver leaves the lane:
- a) Paved or partially-paved shoulders
  - b) Safety edge treatment
5. To reduce crash severity if the driver leaves the roadway (See **Chapter 4**):
- a) Remove or relocate fixed objects
  - b) Traversable slopes
  - c) Breakaway safety hardware
  - d) Shield fixed objects and steep slopes

## 23.5.3 Shoulder Width

### 23.5.3.1 AASHTO Criteria

**Table 23.5.3 AASHTO Shoulder Widths (Minimum)**

| Type Facility            | Other Factors                           | Median (feet) | Right (feet) | AASHTO             |
|--------------------------|---|---------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Freeways                 | 4 lanes                                 | 4 paved       | 10 paved     | pg. 8-3            |
|                          | ≥ 6 lanes                               | 10 paved      | 10 paved     | pg. 8-3            |
| Rural Arterial           | ADT > 2000                              |               | 8            | pg. 7-5, Table 7-3 |
|                          | ADT 400-2000                            |               | 6            |                    |
|                          | ADT < 400                               |               | 4            |                    |
|                          | 4 lane Divided                          | 4 paved       | 8            | pg. 7-13           |
|                          | 6+ lane Divided                         | 8             | 8            | pg. 7-14           |
| Urban Arterial           | Low Type (Gravel, Other)                |               | 2            | pg. 4-10           |
|                          | High Type (Asphalt, Conc.)              |               | 10           | pg. 4-10           |
|                          | Heavily Traveled/High Speed/High Trucks |               | 10           | pg. 4-10           |
| Rural & Urban Collectors | ADT > 2000                              |               | 8            | pg. 6-6, Table 6-5 |
|                          | ADT 1500-2000                           |               | 6            |                    |
|                          | ADT 400-1500                            |               | 5            |                    |
|                          | ADT < 400                               |               | 2            |                    |

**Table 23.5.4 AASHTO Bridge Widths (Minimum)**

| Type Facility   | Other Factors  | Bridge Widths                  | AASHTO   |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------------|----------|
| Freeways        | New Bridges  | Approach Roadway Width         | pg. 8-4  |
| Rural Arterials | New Bridges (Short)  | Approach Roadway Width         | pg. 7-6  |
|                 | New Bridges (Long) (> 200 ft.)   | Travel Lanes + 4 ft. each side | pg. 7-6  |
|                 | Existing bridges   | Travel Lanes + 2 ft. each side | pg. 7-6  |
| Urban Arterials | New and Existing Bridges (Short)   | Curb to curb width of street   | pg. 7-38 |
|                 | New and Existing Bridges (Long) without shoulders or parking on arterial | Curb to curb width of street   | pg. 7-38 |
|                 | New and Existing Bridges (Long) with shoulders or parking on arterial    | Travel Lanes + 4 ft. each side | pg. 7-38 |

| Type Facility              | Other Factors | Bridge Widths                                     |                       | AASHTO                                |
|----------------------------|---------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                            |               | New or Reconstruction                             | To Remain             |                                       |
| Rural and Urban Collectors | ADT Under 400 | Traveled Way + 2 ft. each side <sup>(1)</sup>     | 22 ft. <sup>(2)</sup> | pg. 6-7, 8<br>Table 6-6,<br>Table 6-7 |
|                            | ADT 400-1500  | Traveled Way + 3 ft. each side <sup>(1)</sup>     | 22 ft. <sup>(2)</sup> |                                       |
|                            | ADT 1500-2000 | Traveled Way + 4 ft. each side <sup>(1),(3)</sup> | 24 ft. <sup>(2)</sup> |                                       |
|                            | ADT > 2000    | Approach Roadway Width <sup>(1),(3)</sup>         | 28 ft. <sup>(2)</sup> |                                       |

1. If the approach roadway has paved shoulders, then the surfaced width must be carried across the bridge.
2. Bridges longer than 100 ft. are to be analyzed individually.
3. For bridges > 100 ft. in length, the minimum bridge width of traveled way plus 3 ft. on each side is acceptable.

### 23.5.3.2 Documentation

Provide a proposal to address stalled vehicles, enforcement activities, emergency operations, and drainage in the documentation for the exception.

### 23.5.3.3 Mitigation

Potential mitigation strategies for shoulder width are:

1. Select optimal combination of lane and shoulder width based on site characteristics to optimize safety and operations by distributing available cross-sectional width
2. Signing to provide advanced warning of lane width reduction
3. To improve the ability to stay within the lane:
  - a) Wide, recessed or raised pavement markings
  - b) Delineators
  - c) Lighting
  - d) Centerline and edge line rumble striping (See **Section 7.6.1.2**)
  - e) Shoulder rumble strips
4. To improve the ability to recover if the driver leaves the lane:
  - a) Paved or partially-paved shoulders
  - b) Safety edge treatment
5. To reduce crash severity if driver leaves the roadway (See **Chapter 4**):
  - a) Remove or relocate fixed objects
  - b) Traversable slopes
  - c) Breakaway safety hardware
  - d) Shield fixed objects and steep slopes

## 23.5.4 Horizontal Curve Radius

### 23.5.4.1 AASHTO Criteria

**Table 23.5.5 AASHTO Horizontal Alignment**

**Minimum Radius (feet) with Superelevation** (page 3-32, Table 3-7)

| Type Facility                               | Super-elevation e-max | Minimum Curve Radius (feet) for Design Speed (mph) |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |      |      |
|---|-----------------------|--|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|
|   |                       | 15   | 20 | 25  | 30  | 35  | 40  | 45  | 50  | 55   | 60   | 65   | 70   |
| Rural Highways and High Speed Urban Streets | 0.04                  | 42   | 86 | 154 | 250 | 371 | 533 | 711 | 926 | 1190 | 1500 | ---  | ---  |
|   | 0.06                  | 39   | 81 | 144 | 231 | 340 | 485 | 643 | 833 | 1060 | 1330 | 1660 | 2040 |
|   | 0.08                  | 38   | 76 | 134 | 214 | 314 | 444 | 587 | 758 | 960  | 1200 | 1480 | 1810 |
|   | 0.10                  | 36   | 72 | 126 | 200 | 292 | 410 | 540 | 694 | 877  | 1090 | 1340 | 1630 |
|   | 0.12                  | 34   | 68 | 119 | 188 | 272 | 381 | 500 | 641 | 807  | 1000 | 1220 | 1480 |

**Minimum Radius (feet) for Section with Normal Cross Slope** (2001 AASHTO, page 168, Exh. 3-26)

| Type Facility                       | Minimum Curve Radius (feet) for Design Speed (mph) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |
|-------------------------------------|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                     | 15   | 20   | 25   | 30   | 35   | 40   | 45   | 50   | 55   | 60    | 65    | 70    |
| Freeways, Arterials, and Collectors | 960  | 1700 | 2460 | 3350 | 4390 | 5570 | 6880 | 8350 | 9960 | 11720 | 13180 | 14730 |

**Minimum Radius (feet) for Intersection Curves** (2001 AASHTO, page 201, Exh. 3-43)

| Design Speed (MPH)                  | 10   | 15   | 20   | 25   | 30   | 35   | 40   | 45   |
|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Minimum Radius (feet)               | 25   | 50   | 90   | 150  | 230  | 310  | 430  | 540  |
| Assumed Minimum Superelevation Rate | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 |

### 23.5.4.2 Documentation

No additional documentation beyond what is covered in **Section 23.4** is required.

### 23.5.4.3 Mitigation

Potential mitigation strategies for horizontal curve radius are:

1. To provide advanced warning:

- a) Signing
- b) Pavement marking messages
- c) Dynamic curve warning systems
2. To provide delineation:
  - a) Chevrons
  - b) Post-mounted delineators
  - c) Reflectors on barrier
3. To improve the ability to stay within the lane:
  - a) Widen the roadway
  - b) Skid-resistant pavement
  - c) Enhanced pavement markings
  - d) Lighting;
  - e) Centerline and edge line rumble striping (See **Section 7.6.1.2**)
  - f) Shoulder rumble strips
4. To improve the ability to recover if driver leaves the lane:
  - a) Paved or partially paved shoulders
  - b) Safety edge
5. To reduce the crash severity if driver leaves the roadway(See **Chapter 4**):
  - a) Remove or relocate fixed objects
  - b) Traversable slopes
  - c) Breakaway safety hardware
  - d) Shield fixed objects and steep slopes

## 23.5.5 Superelevation Rate

### 23.5.5.1 AASHTO Criteria

**Table 23.5.6 AASHTO Superelevation (Maximum)**

| Type Facility                               | Superelevation Rate | AASHTO    |
|---|---------------------|-----------|
| Highways (Rural)                            | 12%                 | pg. 3-30  |
| Urban                                       | 6%                  | pg. 3-31  |
| Urban: Low Speed w/severe constraints       | None                | pg. 3-31  |
| Ramps and Turning Roadways at Intersections | 10%                 | pg. 9-114 |

Note: Maximum Superelevation is pro-rated value (based upon radius) from rate tables cited above.

### 23.5.5.2 Documentation

Provide side friction factors for each curve at the PC, Midpoint, and PT of the curve, and at the location of maximum provided superelevation. For multi-lane facilities, provide values for each lane. Use the following equation:

$$f = \frac{V^2 - 15Re}{V^2e + 15R} \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{array}{l} f = \text{Side Friction Factor} \\ V = \text{Design Speed (mph)} \\ R = \text{Radius (feet)} \\ e = \text{Superelevation (ft/ft) at the station evaluated} \end{array}$$

### 23.5.5.3 Mitigation

Potential mitigation strategies for superelevation rate exceptions are:

1. To provide advanced warning:
  - a) Signing
  - b) Pavement marking messages
  - c) Dynamic curve warning systems
2. To provide delineation:
  - a) Chevrons
  - b) Post-mounted delineators
  - c) Reflectors on barrier



3. To improve the ability to stay within the lane:
  - a) Widen the roadway
  - b) Skid-resistant pavement
  - c) Enhanced pavement markings
  - d) Lighting
  - e) Centerline and edge line rumble striping (See **Section 7.6.1.2**)
  - f) Shoulder rumble strips
4. To improve the ability to recover if driver leaves the lane:
  - a) Paved or partially paved shoulders
  - b) Safety edge
5. To reduce the crash severity if driver leaves the roadway: (See **Chapter 4**)
  - a) Remove or relocate fixed objects
  - b) Traversable slopes
  - c) Breakaway safety hardware
  - d) Shield fixed objects and steep slopes

## 23.5.6 Stopping Sight Distance

### 23.5.6.1 AASHTO Criteria

**Table 23.5.7 AASHTO Stopping Sight Distance (Minimum)**

(AASHTO page 3-4, Table 3-1)

| Design Speed (mph) | Stopping Sight Distance (feet) Computed for Design |
|--------------------|--|
| 15                 | 80   |
| 20                 | 115  |
| 25                 | 155  |
| 30                 | 200  |
| 35                 | 250  |
| 40                 | 305  |
| 45                 | 360  |
| 50                 | 425  |
| 55                 | 495  |
| 60                 | 570  |
| 65                 | 645  |
| 70                 | 730  |

**Table 23.5.8 AASHTO Vertical Alignment**

(AASHTO Table 3-34, Table 3-36, and Table 6-3, and based on a 2' object height)

| Design Speed (mph) | Minimum K Value <sup>(1)</sup> for Vertical Curves |     |
|--------------------|--|-----|
|                    | Crest  | Sag |
| 15                 | 3  | 10  |
| 20                 | 7  | 17  |
| 25                 | 12   | 26  |
| 30                 | 19   | 37  |
| 35                 | 29   | 49  |
| 40                 | 44   | 64  |
| 45                 | 61   | 79  |
| 50                 | 84   | 96  |
| 55                 | 114  | 115 |
| 60                 | 151  | 136 |
| 65                 | 193  | 157 |
| 70                 | 247  | 181 |

1. Rate of vertical curvature, K, is the length of curve per percent algebraic difference of the intersecting grades. ( $K = L/A$ )

**Table 23.5.9 AASHTO Minimum Passing Sight Distance**

(AAHTO page 3-9, Table 3-4)

| Design Speed (mph)            | 20  | 25  | 30  | 35  | 40  | 45  | 50  | 55  | 60   | 65   | 70   |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|
| Passing Sight Distance (feet) | 400 | 450 | 500 | 550 | 600 | 700 | 800 | 900 | 1000 | 1100 | 1200 |

### 23.5.6.2 Documentation

Provide profiles in the area of vertical alignment related Design Exception or Design Variations for stopping sight distance. Provide plan views with sight triangles for horizontal stopping sight distance evaluations.

### 23.5.6.3 Mitigation

Potential mitigation strategies for stopping sight distance are:

1. To mitigate sight distance restrictions
  - a) Signing and speed advisory plaques (crest vertical curves)
  - b) Lighting
  - c) Adjust placement of lane within the roadway cross section (horizontal)
2. Cross-sectional elements to manage speed
3. To improve the ability to avoid crashes:
  - a) Cross-sectional elements
  - b) Wider clear recovery area
4. To improve driver awareness on approach to intersections:
  - a) Advance warning signs
  - b) Dynamic warning signs
  - c) Larger or additional STOP/YIELD signs
  - d) Intersection lighting

## 23.5.7 Maximum Grade

### 23.5.7.1 AASHTO Criteria

Table 23.5.10 AASHTO Grades (Maximum)

| Type Facility                  | Type Terrain | Grades (%) For Design Speed (mph) |     |     |     |    |    |    |     |     | AASHTO                 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|-----|-----|------------------------|
|                                |              | 30                                | 35  | 40  | 45  | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65  | 70  |                        |
| Freeway <sup>(1)</sup>         | Level        | ---                               | --- | --- | --- | 4  | 4  | 3  | 3   | 3   | pg. 8-4,<br>Table 8-1  |
|                                | Rolling      | ---                               | --- | --- | --- | 5  | 5  | 4  | 4   | 4   |                        |
| Rural Arterial                 | Level        | ---                               | --- | 5   | 5   | 4  | 4  | 3  | 3   | 3   | pg. 7-4,<br>Table 7-2  |
|                                | Rolling      | ---                               | --- | 6   | 6   | 5  | 5  | 4  | 4   | 4   |                        |
| Urban Arterial:                | Level        | 8                                 | 7   | 7   | 6   | 6  | 5  | 5  | --- | --- | pg. 7-29,<br>Table 7-4 |
|                                | Rolling      | 9                                 | 8   | 8   | 7   | 7  | 6  | 6  | --- | --- |                        |
| Rural Collector <sup>(2)</sup> | Level        | 7                                 | 7   | 7   | 7   | 6  | 6  | 5  | --- | --- | pg. 6-3,<br>Table 6-2  |
|                                | Rolling      | 9                                 | 9   | 8   | 8   | 7  | 7  | 6  | --- | --- |                        |
| Urban Collector <sup>(2)</sup> | Level        | 9                                 | 9   | 9   | 8   | 7  | 7  | 6  | --- | --- | pg. 6-12,<br>Table 6-8 |
|                                | Rolling      | 11                                | 10  | 10  | 9   | 8  | 8  | 7  | --- | --- |                        |

- Grades one percent steeper than the values shown may be used for extreme cases in urban areas where development precludes the use of flatter grades and for one-way downgrades.
- Short lengths of grade in rural and urban areas, such as grades less than 500 ft. in length, one-way downgrades, and grades on low-volume rural and urban collectors may be up to 2 percent steeper than the grades shown above.

### 23.5.7.2 Documentation

No additional documentation beyond what is in **Section 23.4** is required.

### 23.5.7.3 Mitigation

Potential mitigation strategies for maximum grade are:

- Signing to provide advanced warning
- To improve ability to stay within the lane:
  - Enhanced pavement markings
  - Delineators
  - Centerline and edge line rumble striping (See **Section 7.6.1.2**)

- d) Shoulder rumble strips
- 3. To improve ability to recover if driver leaves the roadway (See **Chapter 4**):
  - a) Paved or partially-paved shoulders
  - b) Safety edge
  - c) Remove or relocate fixed objects
  - d) Traversable slopes
  - e) Breakaway safety hardware
  - f) Shield fixed objects

## 23.5.8 Cross Slope

### 23.5.8.1 AASHTO Criteria

Table 23.5.11 AASHTO Cross Slope

| Type Facility    | Other Factors | Minimum | Maximum              | AASHTO   |
|------------------|---------------|---------|----------------------|----------|
| Freeways         | ---           | 0.015   | 0.025 <sup>(1)</sup> | pg. 8-2  |
| Arterials        | Rural         | 0.015   | 0.02                 | pg. 7-4  |
|                  | Urban         | 0.015   | 0.03                 | pg. 7-29 |
| Divided Highways | ---           | 0.015   | 0.02 <sup>(1)</sup>  | pg. 7-13 |
| Collectors       | Rural         | 0.015   | 0.02                 | pg. 6-3  |
|                  | Urban         | 0.015   | 0.03                 | pg. 6-13 |
| Shoulders        | Paved         | 0.02    | 0.06                 | pg. 4-11 |
|                  | Gravel        | 0.04    | 0.06                 | pg. 4-11 |
|                  | Turf          | 0.06    | 0.08                 | pg. 4-11 |

1. Values given are for up to two lanes in one direction. Additional outside lanes may have cross slopes of 0.03.

### 23.5.8.2 Documentation

Provide a proposal for handling drainage and details on how the cross slope impacts intersections.

### 23.5.8.3 Mitigation

Potential mitigation strategies for deficient cross slope are:

1. Signing to provide warning of slick pavement
2. To improve surface friction:
  - a) Pavement grooving (PCC Pavement)
  - b) Open-graded friction courses (HMA pavement)
3. To improve drainage:
  - a) Transverse pavement grooving (PCC Pavement)
  - b) Open-graded friction courses (HMA pavement)

- c) Pavement edge drains
- 4. Modified shoulder cross slope to mitigate cross-slope break on the high side of superelevated curves.

## 23.5.9 Vertical Clearance

### 23.5.9.1 AASHTO Criteria

**Table 23.5.12 AASHTO Vertical Clearance (Minimum)**

| Type Facility                                      | Vertical Clearance (feet) <sup>(2)</sup> | AASHTO                            |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Freeways   | 16 <sup>(1),(4)</sup>                    | pg. 8-4, 10-21                    |
| Arterials (New Structures):<br>Rural<br>Urban      | 16 <sup>(1)</sup><br>16 <sup>(1)</sup>   | pg. 7-6, 10-21<br>pg. 7-38, 10-21 |
| Arterials (Existing Structures):<br>Rural<br>Urban | 14<br>14                                 | pg. 7-7, 10-21<br>pg. 7-38, 10-21 |
| Other Highways                                     | 14                                       | pg. 5-8, 8-4                      |
| Sign Trusses                                       | 17                                       | pg. 7-7,38, 8-4                   |
| Pedestrian Overpass                                | 17                                       | pg. 7-7,38, 8-4                   |
| Tunnels:<br>Freeways<br>Other Highways             | 16<br>14                                 | pg. 4-53<br>pg. 4-53              |
| Railroads  | 23 <sup>(3)</sup>                        | pg. 10-22                         |

1. 14 feet allowed in highly developed urban areas if alternate route has 16 feet.
2. An allowance of 6 inches should be added to vertical clearance to accommodate future resurfacing.
3. See **Section 6.3.5** of this Volume and the latest version of **American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA)** guidelines, or the design office of the high speed rail line of interest for specific high speed guidelines and specifications. Over Electrified Railroad, the minimum vertical clearance is 24 feet 3 inches. (See **Topic No. 000-725-003: South Florida Rail Corridor Clearance.**)
4. Design Exceptions to the 16-ft vertical clearance standard on rural Interstate routes or on a single Interstate route through urban areas must be coordinated with Surface Deployment and Distribution Command Transportation Engineering Agency (SDDCTEA) as described in **Section 23.3**.

### 23.5.9.2 Documentation

Provide locations of alternative routes that meet criteria.

For Interstate Projects, the District is responsible for completing an **Interstate Vertical Clearance Exception Coordination** form, (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/design/090415.cfm>) for Design Exceptions to vertical clearance requirements above interstate facilities



(mainlines and ramps). The District will submit the form to the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command Transportation Engineering Agency (SDDCTEA) via e-mail for approval, copying the FHWA Florida Division. Allow for 10 working days after SDDCTEA receipt for action before requesting notification of disposition (via email or fax). A copy of the approval must be provided with the Design Exception. A request for coordination must take place before the District Design Engineer can recommend the Design Exception.

A written evaluation and recommendation by the State Office of Maintenance is required and should be attached to all Vertical Clearance Variations and Exceptions.

### **23.5.9.3 Mitigation**

Potential mitigation strategies for vertical clearance are:

1. Signing to provide advance warning;
2. To prevent impacts with low structures:
  - a) Alternate routes
  - b) Large vehicle restrictions.
3. Bridge Jacking may be a consideration to address bridges with minor deficiencies.

## 23.5.10 Design Loading Structural Capacity

### 23.5.10.1 AASHTO Criteria

Table 23.5.13 AASHTO Structural Capacity (Minimum Loadings)

| Type Facility                             | AASHTO                                       |
|---|--|
| Freeways,<br>Arterials, and<br>Collectors | See <i>AASHTO LRFD</i> for minimum loadings. |

### 23.5.10.2 Documentation

Load rating calculations for the affected structure.

Verification of safe load-carrying capacity (load rating) for State unrestricted legal loads or routine permit loads.

Verification of Federal legal loads for bridges and tunnels on the Interstate.

A written evaluation and recommendation by the Office of Maintenance.

### 23.5.10.3 Mitigation

Potential mitigation strategies for design loading structural capacity are determined on a case by case basis.

## 23.6 Crash Analysis

For areas with crash histories or when a benefit to cost analysis is required, provide a time value analysis between the benefit to society (quantified in dollars) and the costs to society (quantified in dollars) over the life of the Design Exception. The benefit to society is quantified by the savings associated with the projected reduction in crashes. The cost to society is a summary of the construction, operation, maintenance, and other costs anticipated over the life of the project. The Discount (interest) rate to be utilized in benefit/cost analysis is 4%.

Both Historical (HCM) and Predictive (RSAP and HSM) methods are acceptable for performance of a benefit/cost analysis.

In accordance with the Department's *Highway Safety Manual Implementation Policy (Topic No. 000-500-001)*, "the transportation analyst is encouraged to use the Highway Safety Manual (HSM) methods, where applicable, to measure safety benefits from proposed improvements."

### 23.6.1 Historical Crash Method (HCM)

This method can be used for sites with a crash history. It is the ratio (benefit/cost) of the estimated annual reduction in crash costs to the estimated annual increase in combined construction and maintenance costs. The annualized conversion will show whether the projected expenditure of funds for the crash benefit will exceed the direct cost for the improvement.

The HCM uses the *Highway Safety Improvement Program Guideline (HSIPG)* cost per crash by facility type in **Table 23.6.1** to estimate benefit to society, while the cost to society is estimated by the expected cost of right of way, construction, and maintenance.

**Table 23.6.1 FDOT Average Crash Costs by Facility Type**

| FACILITY TYPE | DIVIDED   |           |           | UNDIVIDED |           |           |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|               | URBAN     | SUBURBAN  | RURAL     | URBAN     | SUBURBAN  | RURAL     |
| 2-3 Lanes     | \$109,686 | \$187,990 | \$342,662 | \$125,974 | \$245,281 | \$526,887 |
| 4-5 Lanes     | \$119,072 | \$216,234 | \$464,901 | \$107,908 | \$161,173 | \$115,320 |
| 6+ Lanes      | \$117,867 | \$153,957 | \$313,317 | \$62,606  | n/a       | n/a       |
| Interstate    | \$153,963 | n/a       | \$341,754 | n/a       | n/a       | n/a       |
| Turnpike      | \$147,939 | n/a       | \$254,951 | n/a       | n/a       | n/a       |

Average Cost/Crash: **\$155,695**

The above values were derived from 2010 through 2014 traffic crash and injury severity data for crashes on state roads in Florida using the formulation described in *FHWA Technical Advisory "Motor Vehicle Accident Costs", T 7570.2, dated October 31, 1994* and from a memorandum from USDOT, *Revised Departmental Guidance: Treatment of the Value of Preventing Fatalities and Injuries in Preparing Economic Analyses, dated February 5, 2008* updating the value of life saved to \$5.8 million, updated from \$5.8 million to \$6 million on March 18, 2009, to \$6.2 million on July 29, 2011, and to \$9.1 million on February 28, 2013.

<http://www.dot.gov/sites/dot.dev/files/docs/VSL%20Guidance%202013.pdf>

When utilizing predictive methods or crash severity distributions for analysis, the following crash severity level costs should be used:

**Table 23.6.2 FDOT KABCO Crash Costs**

| Crash Severity           | Comprehensive Crash Cost |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Fatal (K)                | \$10,230,000             |
| Severe Injury (A)        | \$580,320                |
| Moderate Injury (B)      | \$157,170                |
| Minor Injury (C)         | \$97,650                 |
| Property Damage Only (O) | \$7,600                  |

Source: Florida Department of Transportation Crash Analysis Reporting (C.A.R.) System, analysis years 2010 through 2014.

## 23.6.2 Roadside Safety Analysis Program (RSAP)

This method complements the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide, dated June 2011. When hazards cannot be removed or relocated, designers need to determine if a safety device, such as a guardrail or a crash cushion, is warranted to protect motorists from the roadside obstacle. This method can be used to perform a benefit/cost analysis comparing a potential safety treatment with the existing or baseline conditions (i.e., the do-nothing option) or alternative safety treatments. Based on the input of information available to the user (e.g. offsets, traffic, slopes, crash history, traffic accident severity levels), the program will offer results which can be used in comparing design alternatives.

## 23.6.3 Highway Safety Manual

The AASHTO Highway Safety Manual (HSM) provides analytical tools and techniques for quantifying the potential effects on crashes as a result of decisions made in planning, design, operations and maintenance. The new techniques and knowledge in the HSM reflect the evolution in safety analysis from descriptive (historical) methods to quantitative, predictive analyses. In the HSM, crash frequency is the fundamental basis for safety analysis and is used to reduce crashes and severities through the selection of alternative treatments.

The HSM includes Safety Performance Functions (SPFs) for many roadway segment and intersection applications. SPFs are equations used to estimate or predict the expected average crash frequency per year at a location as a function of traffic volume and roadway characteristics. Adjust SPFs to local conditions by applying calibration factors shown in **Table 23.6.3**. The use of Highway Safety Manual (HSM) Safety Performance Functions (SPF) and Crash Modification Factors (CMF), with an Empirical Bayes (EB) adjustment, provides research based solutions for use in Benefit/Cost comparisons. Crash distributions presented in **Table 23.6.4** and KABCO costs as specified in **Table 23.6.2** should be used in determining benefits from an HSM analysis.

**Table 23.6.3 HSM Calibration Factors for Florida (2012-2016)**

| <b>FDOT Segment Calibration Factors</b>            |                     |   |
|--|---------------------|---|
| <b>Segment Type</b>                                | <b>Abbreviation</b> | <b>Calibration Factor (C<sub>x</sub>)</b> |
| Rural 2-lane, 2-way Undivided                      | R2U                 | 1.00                                      |
| Rural 4-lane Divided                               | R4D                 | 0.68                                      |
| Urban 2-lane Undivided                             | U2U                 | 1.02                                      |
| Urban 3-lane with a Center Two-Way Left Turn Lane  | U32LT               | 1.04                                      |
| Urban 4-lane Undivided                             | U4U                 | 0.73                                      |
| Urban 4-lane Divided                               | U4D                 | 1.63                                      |
| Urban 3-lane with a Center Two-Way Left Turn Lane  | U52LT               | 0.70                                      |
| <b>FDOT Intersection Calibration Factors</b>       |                     |   |
| Rural 2-lane 3-Leg Stop-Controlled Intersection    | RTL3ST              | 1.27                                      |
| Rural 2-lane 4-Leg Stop-Controlled Intersection    | RTL4ST              | 0.74                                      |
| Rural 2-lane 4-Leg Signalized Intersection         | RTL4SG              | 0.92                                      |
| Rural Multilane 3-Leg Stop-Controlled Intersection | RML3ST              | 2.20                                      |
| Rural Multilane 4-Leg Stop-Controlled Intersection | RML4ST              | 1.64                                      |
| Rural Multilane 4-Leg Signalized Intersection      | RML4SG              | 0.45                                      |
| Urban 3-Leg Stop-Controlled Intersection           | USA3ST              | 1.14                                      |
| Urban 4-Leg Stop-Controlled Intersection           | USA4ST              | 1.87                                      |
| Urban 3-Leg Signalized Intersection w/o Ped. CMFs  | USA3SG w/o Ped.     | 2.58                                      |
| Urban 3-Leg Signalized Intersection w/ Ped. CMFs   | USA3SG w/ Ped.      | 2.50                                      |
| Urban 4-Leg Signalized Intersection                | USA4SG              | 2.27                                      |

**Table 23.6.4 HSM Crash Distribution for Florida (2012-2016)**

| Facility Type                     |          | Rural Roadways         |                        |                      | Urban & Suburban Arterials |                      |                        |                      |                      | Freeways |       |       | All Roadways & Ramps |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------|-------|-------|----------------------|
|                                   |          | 2-lane Undivided (R2U) | 4-lane Undivided (R4U) | 4-lane Divided (R4D) | 2-lane Undivided (U2U)     | 3-lane TWLTL (U32LT) | 4-lane Undivided (U4U) | 4-lane Divided (U4D) | 5-lane TWLTL (U52LT) | Rural    | Urban | Ramps |                      |
| <b>Fatal</b>                      | <b>K</b> | 0.032                  | 0.029                  | 0.030                | 0.009                      | N/A                  | 0.005                  | 0.008                | N/A                  | 0.019    | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.008                |
| <b>Incapacitating Injury</b>      | <b>A</b> | 0.116                  | 0.111                  | 0.112                | 0.062                      | N/A                  | 0.037                  | 0.055                | N/A                  | 0.081    | 0.043 | 0.039 | 0.049                |
| <b>Non-incapacitating Injury</b>  | <b>B</b> | 0.196                  | 0.182                  | 0.206                | 0.166                      | N/A                  | 0.126                  | 0.158                | N/A                  | 0.165    | 0.131 | 0.124 | 0.141                |
| <b>Possible (or minor) Injury</b> | <b>C</b> | 0.196                  | 0.219                  | 0.197                | 0.223                      | N/A                  | 0.209                  | 0.239                | N/A                  | 0.177    | 0.216 | 0.223 | 0.224                |
| <b>Property Damage Only</b>       | <b>O</b> | 0.461                  | 0.460                  | 0.453                | 0.540                      | N/A                  | 0.623                  | 0.540                | N/A                  | 0.558    | 0.604 | 0.610 | 0.577                |

Tools and spreadsheets for use with these analytical methods have been developed and are available on the following websites:

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/safety/11A-SafetyEngineering/TransSafEng/HighwaySafetyManual.shtm>

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rddesign/QA/Tools.shtm>

## 23.7 Design Approval Request

### 23.7.1 Submittal Package

The submittal package is to include the following:

1. Cover letter: The cover letter is the ***Plans Preparation Manual Volume 1, Exhibit 23-A, Submittal / Approval Letter*** for Design Exceptions and Variations.
2. Signed and Sealed Report: The signed and sealed documents including all required documentation and justification. Multiple design elements and signed and sealed reports may be included in one submittal package.
3. Appendices (as needed): Include any support documentation to facilitate an understanding of the report. Supplemental documents do not alter the sealed analysis or design.

Sign and seal the report in accordance with ***Chapter 19*** of this Volume. A Submittal/Approval Letter (***Exhibit 23-A***) is to be attached to the Sealed Report and submitted to the District or Turnpike Design Engineer. The District or Turnpike Design Engineer then approves or denies the request and notifies the Responsible Engineer. When further approvals are required, the District or Turnpike Design Engineer will forward the Submittal/Approval Letter and Sealed Report to the State Roadway Design Office.

### 23.7.2 Design Exception Approval

The request will be reviewed by the State Roadway Design Engineer and may be forwarded for approval to the Chief Engineer, the State Structures Design Engineer, the Planning Office, and FHWA, as appropriate.

Each request will be reviewed on a case by case basis and approved on its merits. When approval is obtained, the State Roadway Design Office will email the disposition to the District or Turnpike Design Engineer along with the signed Submittal/Approval Letter. The State Roadway Design Office will keep an electronic copy filed under the assigned reference number.

When a request is denied, the State Roadway Design Office will notify the District or Turnpike Design Engineer of the disposition. Denied requests can be resubmitted when all deficiencies, noted in the denial notification, have been addressed. This may require only a new Submittal/Approval Letter if the Sealed Report does not need to be amended.



However, if the Sealed Report requires revision, a new Sealed Report and attached Submittal/Approval Letter must be submitted.

### 23.7.3 Design Variation Approval

Design Variations only require District approval unless identified as requiring Central Office approval in **Section 23.7.4** (see **Table 23.7.1**). Design Variations requiring Central Office approval from the Chief Engineer, State Roadway Design Engineer, and the State Structures Design Engineer (see **Section 23.7.4**) follow the processes in **Sections 23.7**. Design Variations approved solely in the District may be submitted as a formal Design Variation or as a signed and sealed Design Memorandum for approval by the District or Turnpike Enterprise Design Engineer.

A formal Design Variation is required for any design criteria impacting clear zones, sight distance, or Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. In these cases the Responsible Engineer or Professional attaches a Submittal Approval Letter (**Form 23-A**) to the sealed report and submits the package to the District or Turnpike Design Engineer. The District or Turnpike Design Engineer then approves or denies the request and notifies the Responsible Engineer or Professional accordingly.

At a minimum, Design Variations are to include:

1. Design criteria versus proposed criteria.
2. Reason the design criteria are not appropriate.
3. Justification for the proposed criteria.
4. Review and evaluation of the most recent certified 5 years of crash history for Central Office approved Design Variations and formal District Design Variations.
5. Background information which documents or justifies the request.

For Lateral Offset Design Variations, provide a tabulation of stations (or mileposts) and lateral offsets for aboveground fixed objects.

## 23.7.4 Signature Requirements

Obtain all required approvals as described in this section. Approvals from multiple individuals may be required for certain issues. The Director of Design must resolve any approval authority issues if conflicting objectives arise. Approval signatures are required by the following Department and FHWA personnel as specified:

### Chief Engineer:

- Design Exceptions for Design Speed on SIS facilities, following review by the State Transportation Planner.
- Design Variations for Design Speed on SIS facilities, following review by the State Transportation Planner.

### FHWA Division Administrator:

- Design Exceptions on Projects of Division Interest (PODIs) with FHWA oversight.

### District (or Turnpike) Design Engineer:

- Design Exceptions
- Design Variations

### State Roadway Design Engineer:

- Design Exceptions for elements other than Design Loading Structural Capacity.
- Design Variations involving the use of fencing around stormwater management facilities.
- Authority for approval of Design Exceptions and Design Variations on Florida Turnpike facilities has been delegated to the Turnpike Design Engineer by the State Roadway Design Engineer.

### State Structures Design Engineer:

- Design Exceptions for Shoulder Width, Design Loading Structural Capacity of bridges and Vertical Clearance impacting Category 1 and 2 bridge structures.
- Design Variations for Shoulder Width, Design Loading Structural Capacity of bridges and Vertical Clearance impacting Category 2 structures.
- Design Variations for Design Loading Structural Capacity due to deficient load ratings impacting both Category 1 and 2 bridge structures.

- Design Variations for Traffic Railing impacting Category 1 and 2 bridge structures.
- Design Exceptions or Variations involving lateral offsets or vertical clearances for railroads not meeting the requirements of **Rule 14-57 F.A.C.** or the clearance criteria for the South Florida Rail Corridor (**Topic No. 000-725-003 - South Florida Rail Corridor Clearance Policy for 25 KV service**).
- Authority for approval of Design Exceptions and Design Variations for Shoulder Width and Vertical Clearance on Florida Turnpike facilities has been delegated to the Turnpike Design Engineer by the State Structures Design Engineer.

**District (or Turnpike) Structures Design Engineer:**

- Design Exceptions for Shoulder Width, Design Loading Structural Capacity of all structural items and Vertical Clearance impacting Category 1 and 2 bridge structures.
- Design Variations for Shoulder Width, Design Loading Structural Capacity of all structural items and Vertical Clearance impacting Category 1 bridge structures.

**Table 23.7.1 Central Office Approvals**

| Design Element  | State Roadway Design Engineer | State Structures Design Engineer | State Transportation Planner | Chief Engineer |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
|   | Approval                      | Approval                         | Review                       | Approval       |
| Design Speed Exception  | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Design Speed Exception- SIS                                       | X                             |                                  | X                            | X              |
| Design Speed Variation-SIS  |                               |                                  | X                            | X              |
| Lane Width Exception  | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Shoulder Width Exception  | X                             | X                                |                              |                |
| Shoulder Width Variation<br>(Category 2 Structures)               |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| Design Loading Structural Capacity Exception                      |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| Design Loading Structural Capacity Variation                      |                               |                                  |                              |                |
| -Category 2 Structures  |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| -Deficient Load Ratings<br>(Category 1 and 2 Structures)          |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| -Traffic Railing<br>(Category 1 and 2 Structures)                 |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| Vertical Clearance Exception                                      | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| -16' for rural Interstate routes or single urban Interstate route | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| -All Category 1 and 2 Structures                                  | X                             | X                                |                              |                |
| - RR-South Fla Rail Corridor                                      |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| Vertical Clearance Variation<br>(Category 2 Structures)           |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| Maximum Grade Exception   | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Cross Slope Exception   | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Superelevation Rate Exception                                     | X                             |                                  |                              |                |

\*FHWA Approval is required on all Design Exceptions for FHWA Projects of Division Interest (PODIs).

| Design Element   | State Roadway Design Engineer | State Structures Design Engineer | State Transportation Planner | Chief Engineer |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
|  | Approval                      | Approval                         | Review                       | Approval       |
| Horizontal Curve Radius Exception  | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Stopping Sight Distance Exception  | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Lateral Offset Variation   |                               |                                  |                              |                |
| -RR-South Fla Rail Corridor  |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| -Category 1 and 2 Structures   | X                             | X                                |                              |                |
| Lateral Offset Variation (Category 2 Structure)                          |                               | X                                |                              |                |
| Design Variation: Crossovers on Limited Access Facilities                | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Design Variation: Patterned Pavement Technical Special Provisions        | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Design Variation: Use of fencing around stormwater management facilities | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Roundabout Designs-All   | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Colored Bike Lane Assessments (The first 3 years after installation)     | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Design Variation: Community Aesthetic Features Non-Interstate            | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Design Variation: Community Aesthetic Features Interstate (FHWA)         | X                             |                                  |                              |                |
| Lump Sum Contracts (Non-Typical)   | X                             |                                  |                              |                |

\*FHWA Approval is required on Design Exceptions for FHWA Projects of Division Interest (PODIs).

## Exhibit 23-A Submittal/Approval Letter

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
District or Turnpike Design Engineer

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Financial Project ID: \_\_\_\_\_ New Const. ( ) RRR ( )  
Federal Aid Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
State Road Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Co./Sec./Sub. \_\_\_\_\_  
Begin Project MP: \_\_\_\_\_ End Project MP: \_\_\_\_\_  
Full Federal Oversight: Yes ( ) No ( )  
Request for: Design Exception ( ), Design Variation ( )  
Community Aesthetic Feature: Conceptual ( ), Final ( )  
Re-submittal: Yes ( ) No ( ) Original Ref# \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

Requested for the following element(s):

- ( ) Design Speed ( ) Lane Width ( ) Shoulder Width ( ) Cross Slope  
( ) Design Loading Structural Capacity ( ) Vertical Clearance ( ) Maximum Grade ( ) Stopping Sight Distance  
( ) Superelevation ( ) Horizontal Curve Radius ( ) Other \_\_\_\_\_

1. Include a brief statement here describing the project and the Design Exception, Design Variation or Community Aesthetic Feature requested.
2. Attach the Signed and Sealed Report including applicable documentation as per Section 23.4.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Recommended by:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Responsible Professional Engineer or Landscape Architect (Landscape-Only Projects)

**Approvals:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
District or Turnpike Design Engineer

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
District Structures Design Engineer

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
State Roadway Design Engineer

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
State Structures Design Engineer

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Engineer

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
FHWA Division Administrator