

State of California

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
November 5, 2020

Voting Committee Members in Attendance:

David Fleisch, Chair
Robert Bronkall, Vice-Chair
Lt. Rick Hatfield
Xavier Maltese
Mike Sallaberry
Marianne Kim
Monica Kress-Wooster

Voting Alternate Committee Members in Attendance:

Rock Miller acting for Bryan Jones
Virendra Patel acting for Pratyush Bhatia

Non-Voting Alternate Committee Members in Attendance:

Zoubir A. Ouadah
Steve Finnegan
Tony Powers

Committee Staff:

Nicolas Esquivel, Executive Secretary
Arshad Iqbal, Senior Transportation Engineer
Hasibullah Mohabbat, Transportation Engineer Civil

Presenters:

Nicolas Esquivel, Caltrans Division of Safety Programs
Atifa Ferouz, Caltrans Division of Safety Programs
Aleesah Herup Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy
Larry Hernandez, Caltrans District 10
Rob Stinger, Caltrans District 2
Charles Suszko, Caltrans Division of Construction
Chih-Hoa Chou, Caltrans Division of Safety Programs
Arshad Iqbal, Caltrans Division of Safety Programs

Public Comment

Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration
Zoubir A. Ouadah, County of San Diego

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Fleisch opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. It was held via WebEx. Mr. Mohabbat explained some pertinent information on using WebEx for the committee, including how Public Comment would be held. There was some initial confusion about how to reach the meeting site, but eventually seven voting members and two alternate members joined the meeting to constitute a quorum. It was suggested that for future meetings that the meeting web link be included in the CTCDC web site, not just in inside the agenda. The committee and staff introduced themselves. Ms. Kress-Wooster informed the committee that Vijay Talada moved to another office, so Nicolas Esquivel is officially the new CTCDC Executive Secretary.

2. Membership

No changes

3. Approval of Minutes of the July 9, 2020 Meeting

MOTION: Chair Fleisch moved to approve the July 9, 2020 California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as reported. Vice Chair Bronkall seconded. There was no opposition and the Motion passed by majority.

4. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

5. Items under Experimentation

There were no items under experimentation.

Chair Fleisch commented that there appears to be no requirements for periodic updates to experimentation. Ms. Kress-Wooster noted that the CAMUTCD includes a guidance for time period of experimentation of between 6 months and two years. Chair Fleisch commented that a committee member is the sponsor, but only introduces the person in proposal. That there is nothing in bylaws about a continuing role of a sponsor. It was proposed that Caltrans and the committee work together to bring the prior experiments back to the committee at next meeting. Vice Chair Bronkall agreed.

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

20-15: Proposal to include new parking sign in the CA MUTCD-Back in Angle parking

Ms. Kress-Wooster introduced the item. Mr. Esquivel gave the presentation.

Initiated out of Mono County, the intent of the sign was to help drivers understand how to use the marked diagonal parking stalls that are at a different angle that they may be used to seeing, and to help enforcement. Ms. Kim asked if these would be used on highways with higher

speeds. The concern would be vehicles stopping in the through lane preparing to back into the parking stalls. Nicolas responded that it would be intended to be used in areas with slower speeds such as civic centers with other traffic calming features. Someone else brought up the possibility of using a graphic sign but it was recognized that that would require the experimentation process and no formal request was made to initiate that process. Another comment was the concern that using “should” in the guidance would create a burdensome requirement to add the more signs in areas already experiencing sign clutter.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the item with the “*should*” be changed to “*may*” under “*guidance*”. Ms. Kress-Wooster seconded.

VOTE: There was no opposition and the Motion passed unanimously.

20-16: Proposal to modify Figure 3B-24 (adding two additional turn-lane arrow details), modify Figure 3C-4 to 3C-14, and replacing Figure 3C-2 with Figure 3C-2(CA), revise sections 3B.20, 3C.01, and 3C.06

Ms. Kress-Wooster introduced the item. Mr. Chou gave the presentation.

Figure 3C-2 in the CA MUTCD does not provide the detailed dimensions for a fish-hook arrow. To address the need for improved guidelines for marking roundabout, Caltrans has developed new pavement marking details for fish-hook arrows to be used as lane-use arrow pavement marking options for roundabout approaches on Figure 3C-2(CA). Minor revisions are proposed to the language in Sections 3C.01 and 3C.06 to reflect these changes. Additionally, minor revisions are proposed from Figure 3C-4 to 3C-14 by adding/ updating the fish-hook arrows to the existing Figure. In addition to proposing pavement marking details for roundabouts (fish-hook arrows), Caltrans is proposing additional pavement marking arrow details to be added to Figure 3B- 24 (CA) for turn-lanes. Minor revision is proposed to the language in Sections 3B-20 to reflect the change.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Miller asked if there would be an obligation to change existing markings. Ms. Ferouz responded that not unless a compliance date was set. Two members asked why the U turn arrow was needed since U turns are allowed with left turns unless prohibited. Ms. Ferouz responded that the U turn arrow would be optional.

MODIFIED MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the item without the Type IX arrow from Fig. 3B-24. Mr. Miller seconded.

VOTE: There was no opposition and the Motion passed unanimously

20-17: Proposal to include National Heritage Area Sign Policy in the CA MUTCD

Ms. Kress-Wooster introduced the item. Ms. Herup gave the presentation.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area was created on March 12, 2019 when the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act was signed into law. Although there are now 55 National Heritage Areas (NHAs) nationwide, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta NHA is California's first. National MUTCD allows the states to develop word message signs. Therefore, other states have developed signs for NHAs. Examples were presented. The intent is to place signs in safe locations along Caltrans rights-of-way. Ms. Herup submitted two designs for approval, one including the National Park Service (NPS) name and logo if approved by the NPS, the other design without the NPS logo.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Chair Fleisch – suggested changing the language to plural to allow for future NHAs. Steve Pyburn of the FHWA voiced no support for the NPS banner. Concern was raised about the size of the upper portion of Alternative 1. Questions arose as to whether the signs would be used only at boundaries or also to be used inside the NHAs. Ms. Herup answered that these were intended to be used for entering the heritage area, administered by NPS, but not on national land. Chair Fleisch asked Ms. Herup if the Conservancy would be open to amending language requiring approval by NPS before that version could be used. Ms. Herup responded that due to expiring project funding, they did not wish to hold up CTCDC approval waiting for NPS approval. Mr. Miller initiated discussion about the sign font. Mr. Iqbal explained that the proposed sign is presented to the committee for their approval/recommendation and will make sure that the correct fonts will be used when finalizing the sign. Mr. Iqbal will work with Mr. Miller to finalize the proposed language for the location of signs “at or near” the National Heritage Areas

Public Comments

Steve Pyburn of the FHWA voiced no support for the NPS banner. Concern was raised about the size of the upper portion of Alternative 1.

MOTION: Mr. Miller moved to approve Alternative 2 of the item without the National Park Service name and logo, adding “s” to “Area”, and use of FHWA fonts. Ms. Kress-Wooster seconded.

VOTE: There was no opposition and the Motion passed unanimously

20-18: Proposal to add Figure and Language for Exit Ramp with Enhanced Pavement Markers for Wrong Way Details

Ms. Kress-Wooster introduced the item. Ms. Ferouz gave the presentation. The proposal is to revise the CA MUTCD figures and the text to include additional details for using wrong-way retroreflective pavement markers on exit ramp on limit lines/ stop lines, yield lines, crosswalk markings, right/ left edge lines and Type V Arrows, to prevent wrong way driving

On March 3, 2016, the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) approved Caltrans request for experimentation to use wrong-way retroreflective markers for ramp edge

lines and ramp directional arrows. Caltrans' San Diego and Sacramento regions developed pilot projects to test these new countermeasures. The pilot projects successfully demonstrated that additional red-backed retroreflective markers are both low cost and highly effective at reducing wrong way drivers. It is recommended that CTCDC approve the use of red reflective markers on ramps and freeways. New lane line and edge line patterns will be added to the CAMUTCD including new Detail 9A and Detail 12A as lane lines and a revised Detail 25A left edge. Detail 14 and Detail 14A will be taken out of the CAMUTCD since the red marker pattern would now be included in the new Detail 12A. Changes will be made to the Standard and Guidance narratives in Sections 3B.01 3B.04 3B.06 and 3B.13. A new Figure 3A-114(CA) will be added to the CAMUTCD to present details of the new marking patterns using red markers on exit ramps. Also, a new detail "TYPE V ARROW AT EXIT RAMP" will be added to Figure 3B-24 (CA) to show the layout of red markers added to the TYPE V arrow pavement marking.

Public Comment:

Steve Pyburn of FHWA commented that the proposed revisions using the word "freeway" for detail 9A and Detail 25A, may imply exclusion of non-freeway and non-state highways. Ms. Ferouz will adjust wording to allow options for non-state highways. Mr. Ouadah, noting the 4-inch stripes in the details, asked "isn't Caltrans using 6-inch lines? Ms. Ferouz replied that 4 inches are meant to be minimum. Four to six inches is the standard. Local agencies are still allowed to use the 4-inch width. Mr. Ouadah asked to change the "4 inches" to "4 inches minimum". Ms. Ferouz replied that "4 inches" would be consistent with the other line details in the CAMUTCD.

MOTION: to approve item with wording corrections made to allow use of Details 9A and 25A on non-state highways. Chair Fleisch moved to approve the item. Ms. Kress-Wooster seconded.

VOTE: There was no opposition and the Motion passed unanimously.

20-19: Request for approval of new word message signs

Ms. Kress-Wooster introduced the item. Mr. Hernandez gave the presentation.

Caltrans District 10 requests CTCDC approval to use two new word message signs: "Traffic Approaching" and "Traffic Entering" at two locations within Caltrans District 10. These two signs along with flashing beacons and traffic detection systems would provide automated real time information to drivers of the suitability of available gaps for making turning and crossing maneuvers, as outlined in FHWA's NCHRP Report 500/Volume 5: [A Guide for Addressing Unsignalized Intersection Collisions](#). These signs along with real time traffic detection systems have been used in Minnesota DOT and other County DOTs. These signs would be installed on State Route (SR) 26 at the intersection of Olive Orchard Road/Garner Place in Calaveras County, and on SR 88 at the intersection of Jackson Valley Road in Amador County to potentially reduce the number and severity of collisions.

The intersection of Olive Orchard RD/Garner Pl is two-way-stop controlled. Most of the collisions are broadside. Analyses of collisions indicate not enough gaps or clear sight distance to cross or make turns. The intersection of SR 88 at Jackson Valley Road is two-way-stop controlled. Analyses of collisions indicate drivers stopped at the stop signs but claimed they did not see the cross-traffic vehicles.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Chair Fleisch asked what about the traffic volumes on SR26 and suggested placing the “TRAFFIC APPROACHING” signs where the minor-road vehicle can see it at the right time. Mr. Hernandez agreed to adjust specific locations for each project. Mr. Miller noted that he has seen this arrangement in other states and called it promising. Vice-Chair Bronkall suggested “WATCH FOR APPROACHING TRAFFIC” as a sign with the use of a beacon as added emphasis. Mr. Sallaberry suggested to consider an extinguishable message sign. There was discussion among the group about the possibility of using “WHEN FLASHING” sign plaques or incorporating the phrase into the signs. “WATCH FOR VEHICLES WHEN FLASHING”. Chair Fleisch verified that the use of “WHEN FLASHING” is prohibited in CAMUTCD.

Public Comment:

Steve Pyburn of FHWA commented that the national MUTCD team was not opposed to the concept, but has concerns, such as a fail-safe in case beacons were not working. Alternate Member Zoubir commented that locals should have the option to use the “WHEN FLASHING” plate. That sight distance should be calculated on prevailing speed, not speed limit. What about considering a square rapid flashing beacon?

MOTION:

Vice-Chair Bronkall made a motion to approve the use of the signs with modifications; remove “when flashing”. Ms. Kress-Wooster seconded.

NEW MOTION:

Chair Fleisch reiterated concerns brought up in the discussions. Mr. Miller made a motion for District 10 to come back with a revised, clarified approach looking at other state installations, clarifying sign wording and locations, number of beacons, fail-safes for power outages. Vice-Chair Bronkall seconded. Chair Fleisch asked Caltrans to bring to the next meeting the history and reasons why “When Flashing” is prohibited.

MOTION: Mr. Miller moved to not approve the signs. Vice-Chair Bronkall seconded

VOTE: There was no opposition and the Motion passed unanimously

20-20: Request for approval of new word message sign “TRAFFIC CONTROL/WAIT AND FOLLOW TRAFFIC”

Ms. Kress-Wooster introduced the item. Mr. Suszko gave the presentation.

The Proposal is to include a new sign in the CA MUTCD as C36 (CA) (TRAFFIC CONTROL – WAIT AND FOLLOW TRAFFIC) in the CA MUTCD. This sign is a variation of the C37 (CA) (TRAFFIC CONTROL – WAIT AND FOLLOW PILOT CAR) which is currently the standard sign for use at intersecting approaches to a work zone when pilot cars are controlling reversible one lane traffic. There is a need for a new sign to be used at intersections and driveways when traffic is under reversible one-way traffic control but without the use of a pilot car. The C36(CA) would be available with either a white background or an orange background similar to the C37(CA) already in the CAMUTCD.

Public Comment:

Mr. Miller asked if people would understand what it means? Mr. Suszko answered that it would be used with a stop sign. Ms. Kress-Wooster asked if the orange background would make it clearer? Alternate Member Ouadah agreed that the orange is clearer.

Committee Discussion

Vice-Chair Bronkall suggested a hybrid sign with both orange and white background. Chair Fleisch asked if this sign wouldn't only be used on low volume since no pilot car was in use; and what is the practice to ensure awareness? Mr. Suszko answered that usually the residents are contacted Vice-Chair Bronkall suggested the orange background since the white background would create a situation with citable violations. Motion was made to approve the new C36 (CA) (TRAFFIC CONTROL – WAIT AND FOLLOW TRAFFIC) as presented with the option of either a white background or an orange background

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the sign policy. Ms. Kress-Wooster seconded.

VOTE: There was no opposition and the Motion passed unanimously.

20-21: Request for approval of new word message sign “LEFT TURN YIELD ON FLASHING YELLOW ARROW”

Ms. Kress-Wooster introduced the item. Mr. Stinger gave the presentation.

The purpose of the sign will be to educate motorists about the meaning of the flashing yellow arrow for making left turns. This sign will be installed on traffic signal mast arms adjacent to signal heads with flashing yellow arrow indications at three intersections along Main Street (SR-36) in Red Bluff, CA. The segment of Main Street in the downtown area was restriped from four through lanes to two through lanes with a center turn lane as part of a paving project in the summer of 2020.

The sign is included in the NCUTCD Proposal for Changes to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Item number 18B-RW-02. There was minor discussion about an alternative design including a yellow flashing symbol. However, a study indicated approximately equal effectiveness between the all-word alternative and the alternative with the yellow flashing symbol. Additionally, the alternative with the yellow flashing symbol would require

experimental status. The committee opted to approve the all-word “LEFT TURN YIELD ON FLASHING YELLOW ARROW” alternative.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the sign policy. Mr. Miller seconded.

VOTE: There was no opposition and the Motion passed unanimously.

20-22: Request for approval of usage of new word message sign recommended by the FHWA (Push or Wave at Button for)

Ms. Kress-Wooster introduced the item. Mr. Iqbal gave the presentation.

At the July 9, 2020 meeting, the CTCDC voted to approve agenda item 20-14, the sign proposed by the County of Santa Clara. Caltrans Division of Traffic Operations, Traffic Signal Branch is in process of developing standard specifications for the new sign and are looking for sign specification drawing and sign number. Mr. Iqbal also mentioned that County of Santa Clara contacted Caltrans for such sign specification drawing as they want to be consistent when installing signs in their County. Caltrans has developed policy to incorporate the new sign R10-3j (CA) in the CA MUTCD. Caltrans is requesting that the CTCDC review the proposed policy and provide a recommendation.

Committee Questions and Discussion

No comments from the committee members.

Public Comment

No comments from the public.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the sign policy. Mr. Sallaberry seconded.

VOTE: There was no opposition and the Motion passed unanimously.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Fleisch stated that the next meeting would be February 18, 2021.

8. Adjourn

Chair Fleisch adjourned the meeting at noon.