



California Traffic Control Devices Committee Agenda Item Report



State of California

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
November 4, 2021

ATTENDEES

Voting Members (Present):

- David Fleisch, CEAC (Chair)
- Robert W. Bronkall, CEAC (Vice Chair)
- Jason C. Welday, LOCC
- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC
- Xavier Maltese, AAA Northern CA, NV & UT
- Marianne Kim, Automobile Club S. CA
- Lt. Noah Hawkins, CHP
- Lee Haber, CALTRANS
- Mike Sallaberry, Caltrans – Active Transportation
- Bryan Jones, Caltrans – Active Transportation

Voting Members (Absent):

- None

Alternate Members (Present):

- Zoubir A. Ouadah, CEAC
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC
- Virendra Patel, LOCC
- Lena Whittaker, AAA Northern CA, NV & UT
- Steve Finnegan, Automobile Club S. CA
- Denise Dobson, CHP
- Gurinderpal (Johnny) Bhullar, CALTRANS
- Tony Powers, Caltrans – Active Transportation
- Rock Miller, Caltrans - Active Transportation

Alternate Members (Absent):

- None



California Traffic Control Devices Committee November 4, 2021 - Meeting Minutes



Committee Staff:

- Gurinderpal (Johnny) Bhullar, CTCDC Secretary, CALTRANS
- Russell Wenham, CALTRANS
- Hasib Mohabbat, CALTRANS
- Christian Clarion, CALTRANS

Presenters:

- Catalino Pining III, CALTRANS
- Joe Rouse, CALTRANS
- Gurinderpal (Johnny) Bhullar, CALTRANS
- Russell Wenham, CALTRANS

Public Speakers:

- Jim Esparza, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
- Rock Miller, Southern California Traffic Engineering Consultant
- Richard Moeur, Executive Secretary, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD)
- Zoubir Ouadah, County of San Diego
- Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Manual on Uniform Traffic Devices
- Craig Rhodes, Traffic Management, Inc.
- David Sforza, Assembly Transportation Committee
- Laura Wells, City of San Jose
- Gordon Wang, CALTRANS

Other Attendees:

- Camille Aboufadel, CALTRANS
- Rupinder Jawanda, CALTRANS
- David Royer
- Giselle Finley
- Josh Shaw

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Fleisch opened the meeting, held via Zoom, at 9:02 a.m. He had the Committee Members and Alternate Committee Members introduce themselves.

2. Membership

Chair Fleisch welcomed new Committee Member Jason Welday, who represents the League of California Cities.

3. Approval of Minutes of the August 12, 2021 Meeting

MOTION: Mr. Haber moved to approve the August 12, 2021 California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as reported. Mr. Sallaberry seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments

Secretary Bhullar and Mr. Mohabbat reported that they had not received any public comments on items not listed on the Agenda.

5. Updates on Items under Experimentation

Chair Fleisch stated that the Committee and Caltrans staff have been working to try to obtain information on the Items under Experimentation that are behind schedule. At the next meeting, a recommendation will be made to send a final letter to close out those items upon which no updates have been obtained.

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

6a. Consent Items (minor discussion with vote expected)

None

6b. Action Items (Continuing discussion from prior meetings with vote expected)

21-12: Proposal to modify preferential lane striping in the CA MUTCD

Joe Rouse, Caltrans Managed Lane Program Manager, presented the item. He stated that Caltrans had made an effort to address the concerns as much as possible that were voiced by the Committee at the August meeting. He thanked the team at the Caltrans Division of Safety Programs for their work with him.

Mr. Rouse explained the proposal as follows.

Proposed changes to the striping details used for managed lanes that provide continuous access. Currently Caltrans uses Detail 12 on those managed lanes that operate on a part-time basis (4-inch or 6-inch stripe). Caltrans also uses Detail 42 on managed lanes that operate on a full-time basis. For consistency, Caltrans is proposing to use Detail 42 for all of these cases. They believe it will help with motorist education and awareness and reduce violations; the consistent standard will also reduce driver confusion.

The National MUTCD has never made a distinction between part-time and full-time operation when it comes to managed lane striping.

Proposed technical changes to the striping detail used on managed lanes where access is discouraged. This detail is a single solid white stripe; Caltrans traditionally uses Detail 43 for that purpose. However, Detail 43 is exactly the same as Detail 38A, and this duplication is not necessary. In addition, Mr. Rouse found that Detail 38B, which has reflectors, is also used for this purpose.



California Traffic Control Devices Committee November 4, 2021 - Meeting Minutes



Caltrans is proposing to replace Detail 43 with Detail 38B. They are also open to the idea of using Detail 38A when the managed lane is on the right side of the highway.

Proposed technical changes to the striping details used on managed lanes where access is prohibited. Detail 44 is used for contiguous managed lanes, meaning there is no buffer between the managed lane and the general-purpose lane. When created, it was actually intended for use with contiguous or buffer-separated managed lanes. Detail 44 is proposed to be broken up into Detail 44A which will have a 4-inch gap between the two lanes, and Detail 44B which will have an 8-inch gap between the lanes, to be used when there is a buffer separation of two feet between the two lanes.

The end result is that Detail 44B will be used for 2-foot buffers while Detail 45 will be used for 4-foot or wider buffers.

Mr. Rouse explained the outreach he had conducted with some of the regional transportation agencies that operate express lanes on the state highway system. Several agencies have expressed concern about making the switch to Detail 44B, which would necessitate restriping their express lane facilities. Areas of concern were the cost as well as the operational and safety impacts of switching to the narrower buffer. Mr. Rouse pointed out that for more than 30 years, Caltrans has promoted the 4-foot buffer as the preferred width. Some express lane operators are also concerned about being able to put in channelizers with the reduced buffer. Because of these expressed concerns, Caltrans has withdrawn this proposed change.

Mr. Rouse stated that regarding the proposed use of Detail 42 instead of Detail 12 for continuous access, agencies had provided feedback. The City and County of San Francisco had no objections. The City of Los Angeles had no objections but pointed out that they use Detail 43; they asked that Caltrans consider using Detail 38A instead of 38B. Caltrans is open to modifying this proposal such that we would use Detail 38B on left-hand side managed lanes and 38A with managed lanes on the righthand side.

Santa Clara County has not responded to the proposed switch to Detail 42.

Mr. Rouse did not speak with any agencies regarding the changes to Detail 44 since those are strictly technical in nature.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the proposals. Mr. Haber seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

6c. Information Items (New items that may be voted on or brought back as an Action Item in a future meeting)

21-09: Interim Approval for the Optional Use of an Alternative Signal Warrant 7 – Crash Experience (IA-19)

Secretary Bhullar reported back to the Committee on the timeline of the close-out of the item, which is now complete.

21-15: TRUCKS OK Panels on Overhead Arrow-per-Lane Signs

Mr. Haber presented the recommendation: to include the proposed changes to the CA MUTCD Section 2B.31 “TRUCKS USE RIGHT LANE Sign (R4-5)” and related Figure 2B-10(CA) and Table 2B-1(CA).

Secretary Bhullar reported that the request had come from District 3. He described the situation in Sacramento on I-5 near the Capitol, with lanes expanding from two lanes to five, then decreasing back to three, creating weaving and congestion issues during the morning and afternoon commutes at the on-ramps and off-ramps. About 20 years ago, District 3 had come up with a solution in which truck traffic uses lane 2 all the way through from the north to the south. This has improved the operation of the freeway.

The issue is the existing signs. Caltrans needs to comply with the new arrow-per-lane signs which are larger, wider, and higher. Secretary Bhullar displayed a mockup of the proposed sign panels which would place the TRUCKS OK plaques on the standard guide signs. He then displayed the proposed changes to Section 2B.31, Figure 2B-10(CA) and Table 2B-1(CA) in the manual.

Questions and Discussion

Mr. Welday asked if there would be any problem with fitting the sign on other lanes. Secretary Bhullar responded that the situation was isolated. We could limit this to Lane 2.

Chair Fleisch commented that the two words could be stacked. Secretary Bhullar agreed that this might be preferable. Mr. Haber noted that there may be applications where the plaque would be placed at Lane 3 or Lane 4 on a seven-lane freeway. The need to place it at Lane 1 would be unlikely. Secretary Bhullar stated that this could be taken as an amendment, and he accepted Chair Fleisch’s idea to stack the two words.

Vice-Chair Bronkall asked about placing the plaque at Lane 1. Mr. Hawkins answered that currently the Vehicle Code does not allow for trucks to use Lane 1 – it would have to be the right two lanes.

Public Comments

Steve Pyburn, FHWA, saw value in the sign. He asked for a Note to state what section of the manual allows this configuration. He also said that stacking the words TRUCKS OK would be inconsistent with the other banners of this type. He had not received feedback from Headquarters yet; his division does consider their feedback when making a determination of substantial conformance. Finally, the text should clarify if this is on the advanced guide signs or at the gore as well. He stressed that he appreciated Caltrans moving toward the overhead arrow per lane signs, which has been a requirement since the 2009 manual. When he receives feedback from Headquarters on how to move forward with this or revise it, FHWA will work with Secretary Bhullar.

Richard Moeur, NCUTDCD, asked for confirmation that the expected text design would be 12-inch Series E. Secretary Bhullar replied that Caltrans would be using standard minimum letter heights.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the recommendation as is, but to allow an option, if approved by FHWA, to stack the words TRUCKS OK to the right side of the arrow.



California Traffic Control Devices Committee November 4, 2021 - Meeting Minutes



Mr. Haber asked if this provides the CTCDC enough flexibility to work with FHWA to make any modifications they may come back with in their review process. Secretary Bhullar replied that Caltrans is agreeable to waiting to work with FHWA, and the Motion provides the needed flexibility to incorporate FHWA modifications.

Mr. Bhatia asked if the stacking would need to be on a particular side of the arrow; or is that subject to FHWA's response? Secretary Bhullar replied that Caltrans' preference would be to have it on the right side so that there is no confusion with Lane 1.

SECOND to the MOTION and VOTE: Mr. Bhatia seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

21-16: Assembly Bill (AB-43) on Traffic Safety Signed by Governor 10-08-2021 relating to speed limits

Mr. Haber stated that the recommendation was for inclusion of the proposed changes to the CA MUTCD Section 2B.13 "Speed Limit Sign (R2-1)" and Table 2B-101(CA).

Chair Fleisch recommended for the Committee to consider not working toward a Motion for this but moving it to the February agenda, as it is a lengthy item with many changes. The legislation was just signed into law by the Governor less than a month ago. Secretary Bhullar agreed about the time constraint. He wanted to look at additional areas of the manual that may be changing. Between now and the end of the year, Caltrans will be going through district reviews and key expert reviews. In addition, the draft presented today is not the final draft. The risk for Caltrans is that the law takes effect on January 1, and if the manual is not revised or Caltrans does not issue a Traffic Safety bulletin, the manual will not be compliant with the new law. The earlier we can get the CTCDC reviews and recommendation, the better.

Chair Fleisch noted that this Assembly Bill actually relaxes the process for speed-setting and gives more options to local authorities and Caltrans.

Questions and Discussion

Ms. Kim asked the consequence of being out of compliance. Will cities not be able to proceed with the new procedures as law? Chair Fleisch answered that the Vehicle Code sections that were amended will take effect, and they explain a lot of this. The manual is more about traffic control devices. Without guidance in the manual, the Vehicle Code sections would be open to different interpretations by the local entities. Vice-Chair Bronkall stated that local entities could go ahead and prepare their ETS based upon the state law, even though the manual does not necessarily coordinate directly with the changes in the law. Because of the quantity of pages involved, it would best be served by a subcommittee working closely with Caltrans on the technical review before it is presented at the February meeting.

Mr. Welday agreed and felt that this recommendation would benefit from having additional time to work on it.

Mr. Bhatia asked for clarity on the comment that this allows more flexibility in terms of lesser need for speed service. Secretary Bhullar explained that there are caveats in the law that allow you to retain the previous speed or the current speed limit, or in some cases to extend the seven years to 14 years.

Public Comments

Zoubir Ouadah, County of San Diego, commented that some agencies such as San Diego want to start using sections of the law; those sections do not need the MUTCD changes. He suggested that the CTCDC tackle the issue section by section, easy ones first. In the meantime, Caltrans is working on the hard issues such as defining the safety corridors and the business district parameters.

Rock Miller, Southern California Traffic Engineering Consultant, stated that he had worked on the Zero Fatalities Task Force Committee as well as the Legislative Office in forming this legislation. He would be happy to serve on an advisory committee should one be appointed. He added that there are city officials who were closely involved in the crafting of the legislation who would probably like to review the content of this before it is approved. He addressed Mr. Ouadah's comment about getting some of the simpler sections into the MUTCD as quickly as possible: he thought they could wait until February. For the more complex requirements such as defining the high-injury network, there was much concern that it be a realistic requirement, and the Legislative Office is comfortable going to Caltrans for that requirement.

David Sforza, Assembly Transportation Committee, commented that he had staffed this bill for Assembly member Friedman. He had seen a couple of things in the posted draft that were not consistent with the laws intended, including the ability to reduce an additional five miles per hour after you round down the speed limit. However, the safety corridor provision and the high concentration of bicyclists and pedestrians' section will not take effect until June 2024 or when an online system for traffic adjudication is put into effect. Some of the easier sections include the 14-year versus seven-year, the business activity district, and the ability for cities to roll back existing speed limits based on previous traffic surveys.

Laura Wells, San Jose Assistant Director of Transportation and City Traffic Engineer, stated that she had also been a member of the Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force, and had provided technical support to Assembly member Friedman's office. She strongly recommended that a subcommittee take the time to ensure that it is right. A few practitioners should be included on the subcommittee who were involved in the drafting of AB 43. Changes are being made to current options that would diminish the impact of AB 43 but would also take away options that cities have now to set safe speeds for corridors and roadways not covered by the bill. Ms. Wells also stated that she could see where the sequencing of the information could be confusing for those who are just reading the CA MUTCD and do not understand what is in the bill. She supported the delay to the February meeting to get it right.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Secretary Bhullar explained how subcommittees are established. A Chair must be appointed, and CTCDC members can volunteer. The subcommittee is then opened up to others, who can be solicited by CTCDC members.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to form a subcommittee. Mr. Welday seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Bhatia volunteered as Chair. Volunteering as members were Ms. Kim, Mr. Miller, Mr. Welday, Lt. Hawkins, Mr. Ouadah, Ms. Wells, and Mr. Sallaberry.

Mr. Pyburn stated that the job of FHWA's California Division is to ensure that the CA MUTCD is in conformance with the National MUTCD. Certain things in California's manual, including speed limits, have a lot more definition of detail than the national manual. This is by design to allow for

the variation of state laws. Standard statements in the national manual should not be modified by changes to the local manual. In Mr. Pyburn's first review of the changes, he did not have a lot of concern. He will monitor the product as it moves forward.

Secretary Bhullar commented that Caltrans has started working on the two caveats for the safety corridor definition, as well as the high concentration of pedestrians and bicyclists. In the meantime, the Judicial Council is working on their section. Secretary Bhullar will update the subcommittee when sections are completed.

Secretary Bhullar briefed the CTCDC on the speed limit policy revisions to the MUTCD.

Mr. Miller requested a copy of the most recent version, as he had received calls from people asking him how to apply this.

Mr. Ouadah pointed out that the National MUTCD does not tell how to set the speed limit. The CA MUTCD tells how to do that for the state of California. There is not much impact here for the National MUTCD.

Mr. Sforza stated that as a consultant for the Assembly Transportation Committee, he may not be able to serve on the subcommittee. He asked not to be placed on it. Chair Fleisch informed him that he could serve as an unofficial advisor.

Secretary Bhullar confirmed comments by Mr. Pyburn and Mr. Ouadah: nothing here conflicts with the National MUTCD, so the FHWA should not have an issue. Mr. Pyburn will look at the final recommendations just to validate.

21-19: Proposal to add options to cones and portable delineators allowing retroreflectorization to bases

Mr. Wenham provided the presentation. The proposal has two parts:

- To allow the option of putting retroreflectorization on cone and portable delineator bases.
- The elimination of the outdated option to use removable retroreflectorized sleeves on cones.

Mr. Wenham provided photographs of cones with the retroreflectorization.

He noted that he found two vendors that still sell the removable reflective cone sleeves but that the sleeves are not marketed to the roadway traffic control industry.

The recommendation is for inclusion of the proposed changes to the CA MUTCD – Section 6F.64 “Cones” and Section 6F.65 “Tubular Markers.”

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the recommendation. Mr. Haber seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

21-20: Proposal to edit figures for red reflectors on exit ramps to address recessed marker issues

Mr. Wenham provided the presentation. There are four aspects to the proposal:

- Caltrans has implemented red-backed reflectors for wrong-way drivers in multiple facilities, notably on exit ramps. This proposal clarifies what to do in snow country – all of the previous experimentation had been done in the Central Valley and the San Diego area.
- One-way recesses on exit ramps must be constructed backwards in order to be visible to the wrong-way driver.

- We are proposing to use one recess only rather than two side-by-side recesses for the wrong-way arrow.
- An editorial correction to Figure 3A-114 (CA) is necessary.

Mr. Wenham showed aerial photographs of an example of the proposed recessed marker location changes in snow country. He then showed the proposed limit line and wrong way arrow details.

The recommendation is for inclusion of the proposed changes to Figure 3A-114(CA) “Exit Ramp with Enhanced Pavement Markers for Wrong Way Details” and 3B-24(CA) “Examples of Standard Arrows for Pavement Markings (Sheet 2 of 8)” of the CA MUTCD.

Mr. Wenham noted that the change only impacts Caltrans facilities – there are no exit ramps in snow country on urban facilities, only the state highway system.

Public Comments

Jim Esparza, CPUC, asked if the markers are just for crosswalks or also for pathways adjacent to railroad crossings. Mr. Wenham replied that there is always some form of limit line or crosswalk on an exit ramp. The current standard is that the markers are put on the intersection side at exit ramps. The change is to make sure that where we are doing ground-in recesses, we pull them back and there is no conflict with non-motorized traffic. Secretary Bhullar clarified that Caltrans’ intent does not involve railroad approaches.

Mr. Ouadah commented that the proposal impacts mostly the state highway exit ramps. If that is correct, this exhibit could completely be a part of the Caltrans Standard Plans, not the MUTCD. He also suggested that the definition of *limit line* be taken out of the CA MUTCD; the stop line is the limit line according to the CA MUTCD per the California Vehicle Code. Secretary Bhullar answered that the *limit line* definition needs to stay within the manual because there are situations where agencies want, in addition to the crosswalk, to set a limit line in advance of a crosswalk.

Mr. Pyburn addressed Mr. Ouadah’s point about the use of standard specs versus the details in the manual. He saw this as the ability to put the red RPMs along the stop bar, the limit line, etc.; the standard specs would say that in areas with snow plowing you would use one detail, and in places without snow plowing, you would use another detail. He agreed that Engineering Judgments are important, but he has seen local agencies exploit them.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the recommendation. Mr. Bhatia seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

21-21: Proposal to add figures and to make text revisions for temporary traffic control at roundabouts

Mr. Wenham provided the presentation. He stated that Caltrans has reviewed what other states have done in terms of temporary traffic control for roundabouts and other circular intersections. They have also reviewed the draft National MUTCD. There have been numerous requests from within Caltrans and the local agencies to bring this proposal forward. It has two areas:

- Modify section 6G.13 to include “Support” consistent with the draft National MUTCD.
- Add new figures that will be consistent with the draft National MUTCD.

Mr. Wenham provided two examples: Figure 6H-106(CA) and 6H-107(CA). The figures and notes provide the basic guidance for practitioners.

The recommendation is for inclusion of the proposed changes to Section 6G.13 “Work Within the Traveled Way at an Intersection,” Table 6H-1(CA), and Figures 6H-106(CA) and 6H-107(CA) in the CA MUTCD.

Public Comments

Craig Rhodes, Traffic Management, Inc., commented that with reference to Typical Application 106(CA), an item is missing regarding Typical Application 10 and 10A – this one does not show W3-4 as optional. Mr. Wenham responded that at this particular time, they had intentionally decided simply to be consistent with the federal draft. Practitioners will have to read the notes and go above and beyond the minimum presented when warranted or required by their jurisdiction. As we work our way through the full update to the CA MUTCD, which will come after the full update to the federal MUTCD, there will be plenty of opportunity to look at each of these items.

Mr. Ouadah commented on Figure 107. With due regard to the active transportation and the use of the bikers through this construction zone, he suggested adding a note that says that you should leave a wider lane for them around the roundabout.

Mr. Pyburn commented that this is a detail that does not belong in the MUTCD. The need for and use of the warning signs is defined in the manual. The Standard Plan should show how the requirements in the MUTCD are to be applied on the roadway. Duplicative details could result which could lead to discrepancies and confusion. He added that if there are similar figures in the manual that have a sign listed as optional, in a similar situation a different figure should show the sign as optional as well.

Secretary Bhullar stated that in his role as Editor of the CA MUTCD, we recognize that there is an inherent risk that the final version of the MUTCD, once published by the FHWA, could be revised or different. However, right now there is nothing. He would rather revise the CA MUTCD as per the federal MUTCD when that gets changed.

Secretary Bhullar said the regarding the Standard Plans, if we start adding things there but not in the CA MUTCD, we need to be mindful that Standard Plans do not apply to local agencies, and local agencies are not required to follow them. The CA MUTCD is applicable to local agencies. In a total liability situation, local agencies will be hard-pressed be able to use a feature in the Standard Plans but not the CA MUTCD.

Mr. Moeur stated that the National Committee submitted comments on the proposed Typical Application 6P-54 in the draft NPA version of the MUTCD. In Docket Comment FHWA2020-001-5566 they made some editorial corrections to Figure 6P-54 which may affect Figure 6H-107(CA). Regarding bicyclists at roundabouts, the Bicycle Technical Committee at NCUTCD has looked at this issue over the years. Mr. Moeur recommended for the CTCDC to use the most recent technical guidance on cyclist accommodation at roundabouts to guide any modifications that might be made to this typical application. He noted that channelizing bicyclists to the right of other traffic approaching and entering the circular roadway may not be optimal.

Gordon Wang commented on behalf of the UC Berkeley TechTransfer program. These typical applications are badly needed for local agencies. Local agencies have been asking Mr. Wang to provide these typical applications because they need legal protection in maintaining roundabouts. The agencies would appreciate finding something in the manual regarding conducting temporary traffic control while people are working in the center of the roundabout. Figure 6H-107 reduces speed and provides needed worker safety.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the recommendation. Mr. Bhatia seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

21-22: Planned editorial changes to Part 3 and Part 9 to incorporate green-colored pavement, bikeway separator post and editorial cleanup

Chair Fleisch noted that the item was lengthy and had just been received the previous Tuesday, so the Committee would need time to look at it in detail and it would not be approved today.

Mr. Wenham gave the presentation. He stated that the first part of the proposal is to create a new Bikeway Separator Post Category.

- The terms *Channelizers* and *Delineators* really mean different things depending on how the terms are used.
- Creating this category is the first step of growing into a new category of traffic control devices – flexible posts that can be used for Class IV bikeways. It will eventually lead to approved and authorized materials, and to standard specs on the Caltrans side.

Mr. Wenham stated that the next large change is to include the green-colored pavement marking option. The first goal is to ensure that we are in alignment with the Interim Approvals already issued, which Mr. Wenham listed. The second goal is to ensure that we are consistent with the draft federal MUTCD.

Mr. Wenham displayed three examples from the current CA MUTCD with green pavement markings included.

He stated that when Section 9C.102(CA) “Class IV Bikeways” was added to the manual in 2018, it mostly rolled in as a specific section. At that time the entirety of Section 9 was not gone through to add *separated bikeways* where necessary. The proposal adds that phrase throughout.

Mr. Wenham gave examples of editorial cleanup of language and text formats in Section 9.

Questions and Discussion

Mr. Sallaberry had two specific comments. On pages 30 and 32, the Bike Routes signs had been deleted; it would be helpful for people to know that there is another bikeway they can use. On page 73, One Way signs should be added because vehicular traffic is allowed in only one direction. Overall, he was leaning toward supporting a recommendation to clean up the section in order to keep it as up to date as possible for practitioners.

Public Comments

Mr. Ouadah commented that the agenda and items that he had received did not include this item. He noted that when Class IV was created, it was an easy way for public agencies to incorporate these Class IV options in a public roadway. The use of the channelizers and delineators were meant for construction but not permanent conditions. What is being proposed makes a lot more sense. Mr. Ouadah’s issue was that you are introducing the design of an element of a roadway that is not a traffic control device. The posts do not belong in the MUTCD but in a Caltrans guide for design of bicycle facilities.

Mr. Wang commented that Figure 9B-5 on page 30 should not have the guidelines crossed out. Also, similar to Part 6, the proposed language addresses the issue that the separator should not be considered a traffic control device. Because of the retroreflective bands and the coloring, they give the appearance of traffic control devices. The proposed language is consistent throughout the

manual. Last, Mr. Wang noted that in the past, Caltrans has been reactive instead of proactive and this agenda item would have been brought to the Committee by a local agency. Mr. Wang noted a beneficial change in Caltrans' management style in which they are being proactive. If the Committee denies this package it may discourage Caltrans from this kind of action in the future. Mr. Wang also noted that bike lanes being painted green are consistent with the NPA and this is appreciated by many local agencies.

Mr. Moeur commented that on page 82, 21-22 calls for the addition of Figure 9C-110(CA) Sheet 3, which is similar to Figure 9E-6 in the NPA. The National Committee's docket comment recommends that the figure be replaced by the one developed by the Bicycle Technical Committee and approved by the National Committee in NCUTCD Proposal 18B-Bike-305. He also commented that, regarding Mr. Sallaberry's comment, there had been a decision by the National Committee to avoid the use of ONE WAY signs.

Mr. Esparza noted the CPUC's concern with the safety of bicyclists crossing railroad tracks, especially those at angled crossings – there is the possibility of the bicyclist's wheels falling into a field gap or gate gap. Has Caltrans looked at any sections of Part A or any recommendations to Part 8 that reflect the green markings at or near railroad crossings?

Mr. Miller commented that he would welcome more time to look closely at the changes. There was much that the Bicycle Technical Committee and the National Committee had recommended to the National MUTCD; we do not know if any or all will be incorporated into the final document.

Mr. Pyburn commented that at this point, the only thing that FHWA can support, including in the current manual, is what is covered under the Interim Approval.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Bhatia commented on language on page 13 that states, "...all signs shall be retroreflectorized for use on bikeways including shared use paths, separated bikeways, and bicycle lane facilities." Maybe separated bikeways are a type of bicycle lane facility, and it may not be necessary to call them out in specific locations.

Mr. Sallaberry responded to Mr. Moeur's point regarding One Way signs: that approach would reduce the number of cues to a motorist that they might only have to look in one direction, and it reduces sign clutter to not have One Way signs. At some point we would have to modify Section 2B-40. Also, he had only been able to skim the document in the short time available, so he agreed that this should be rolled over to the next meeting.

Vice-Chair Bronkall suggested that, as people have a chance to examine the document, they could provide feedback directly to Caltrans. A month before the next meeting, Caltrans could release their updated document. Mr. Wenham responded that the context is to do only what is already out there, with the exception of the bikeway separator posts. The intent of the separator posts definition is to acknowledge that the devices are clearly regulating, warning, and guiding. Caltrans wants to ensure that when separator posts serve that role of regulating, warning, and guiding, we should expect the devices to comply with the CA MUTCD. Therein lies the challenge. In addition, he stated that there may be some better figures coming down eventually from the federal government, but it would be wise not to wait for them. Last, he answered the question from CPUC: Caltrans has not yet worked on updates to Part 8.

Chair Fleisch asked about the possibility of sending the document out separately, with a due back date in early January so that Caltrans can incorporate the comments and provide a final version with



a list of the comments as part of the agenda item. Mr. Wenham agreed. Right now, the document is available on the website so there may not be a need to distribute it. Comments should go to Secretary Bhullar. He will send out an email to the Committee requesting comments to be received by a certain date and providing a link to the document. Caltrans will be working with Mr. Pyburn, who will be looking at the document from the prospective of Interim Approval, but maybe not for the NPA portion.

Chair Fleisch thanked Caltrans for all their work thus far and for being forward-thinking.

6d. Request for Word Message Signs Approval

None

6e. Request for Experimentation

21-17: Request to allow Dual Language (Spanish and English) Changeable Message Sign Messages

Catalino Pining III, District 8, began with some background. He stated that in District 8, 50% of the population is Hispanic according to census data. Use of the changeable message sign (CMS) in Spanish promotes safety and enables Caltrans to reach out. We want to find out its effectiveness. The pilot will require coordination with Headquarters, local partners, and FHWA to make sure the message is legible.

Mr. Pining displayed two examples of the bilingual CMS in other countries.

The district will be working on ensuring that the message is legible and not confusing for the traveling public.

Questions and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bronkall did not find anything in the current MUTCD that creates a prohibition on using additional languages, especially for CMS signs. Secretary Bhullar explained that the message was coming to the CTCDC because although the CMS device is an approved sign, according to Section 1A-10 the device would be used in another manner or application.

Mr. Bhatia asked if any research has shown that messages in another language are distracting. Mr. Pining answered that the district could share that information in the future. Right now, they are just presenting the request to the Committee. This effort will take a lot of coordination statewide and with our partners.

Mr. Welday asked if this would be a single-panel setup and if there would be any limitation to that. With multiple CMS panels, there is the practical aspect of how many panels can be seen at any given time by drivers. Also, how would the decision be made on which languages to display?

Public Comments

Mr. Rhodes pointed out that the two photos displayed are probably from Canada, where dual languages are mandated. He also pointed out that with portable CMS signs there would be a problem with how many screens could be shown. In downtown Los Angeles, an experiment with dual language signs showed that they were very ineffective for temporary messages.

Mr. Pyburn stated that FHWA issued an official ruling on proper syntax for CMS signs and what messages can and cannot be displayed. Caltrans Headquarters had asked FHWA for a determination



on the use of foreign languages on CMS signs, to which FHWA issued a resounding no. The applicant has the right to approach Caltrans Headquarters for a determination. This particular request is deficient on a couple of points: there is limited detail in measures of effectiveness; and how distraction would be measured. For this request to move forward, Caltrans Headquarters would have to endorse it, after which it would go to FHWA. It should be modified to include real measurable effectiveness and also address how the low-density LED signs prominent in the state would show special characters.

Mr. Ouadah commented that this should not be in the Experiment category but should be more of a research paper, where you hire professionals. If District 8 thinks this really has merit, it should allocate thousands of dollars for research.

Chair Fleisch noted that this does not follow either of the forms on the CTCDC website for an experiment – there is much missing. He asked if District 8 would like to take this back to consider a more formal request. Mr. Haber agreed to further evaluate and determine the course of action.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Fleisch stated that meetings are normally scheduled for the first Thursday of the months of February, May, August, and November. Secretary Bhullar stated that he would publish a schedule.

Chair Fleisch stated that the next meeting will be held on February 3, 2022.

8. Adjourn

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to adjourn. Ms. Kim seconded. There were none opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 12:04 p.m.