

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

March 17, 2006

Meeting Minutes

Marion County Public Works
Salem, Oregon

Members Present: [Randall Wooley](#), Vice-Chair, City of Beaverton; [Brian Barnett](#), City of Springfield; [Ed Fischer](#), Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; [Alan Hageman](#), OSP; [Joseph Marek](#), Clackamas County; [Eric Niemeyer](#), Jackson County; [Charles Radosta](#), ITE/Kittelton & Associates; [Cynthia Schmitt](#), Marion County

Members Absent: [Joel McCarroll](#), Chair, ODOT Region 4; [Robin Lewis](#), City of Bend

Others Present: Nick Fortey, FHWA; Doug Bish, Kevin Haas, Chris Rowland, Massoud Saberian, Greg Stellmach, ODOT Traffic Engineering & Operations Section; Luci Moore, ODOT Maintenance Services; Bill Brownlee, Jerilyn Wen, Marion County; Rob Burchfield, City of Portland; Orville Gaylor, Retired ODOT; Tom Larsen, City of Eugene; Tom Tushner, Washington County

Introduction – Approval of Minutes – Additional Agenda Items

Vice Chairperson Randall Wooley called the meeting to order. Attendees introduced themselves. There were no additional agenda items. Ed Fischer moved to accept the January 27, 2006 meeting minutes, Joe Marek seconded and they were approved.

OLD BUSINESS

[Automated Flagger Assistance Device](#)

In a change from the preliminary agenda, Ed Fischer updated the committee on the progress made regarding Oregon's possible approval for use of AFAD's in construction in the state. He noted the [letter](#) that was sent to approved vendors of the product requesting a demonstration be scheduled at a future OTCDC meeting. He provided information on current states that have allowed the device (Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio Texas and Washington), a [study](#) done in Minnesota, and an [article](#) by a labor organization on the utility of the new product(s). The Minnesota limitations on use to less than 1500 ADT seems to limit its practicality in Oregon due to limited locations that 'fit' under the limit. There was also a question of how many injured

flaggers in Oregon might have benefited from having the device in use. The committee still wants further information and a demonstration of the AFAD's.

✓ **Action Item** – A demonstration may be scheduled for a future meeting, more information will be reported at future meetings.

Oregon Temporary Traffic Control Handbook Update

Ed reported to the committee on proposed FLAGGER NEXT MILE sign as part of Oregon's "Pink Book" rewrite and asked if the committee was ready to approve it. The plan is to have the draft rewrite done by the first of April so that the public review can begin. The temporary OAR for the errata is only good through mid-June, so there is a deadline approaching. The proposed new sign, in combination with cones spaced out along the shoulder would be for intermittent operations like coring, brushing, pothole patching, and other short term or slow moving work operations. It would be used instead of the flagger symbol sign and move away from the 500-1000 feet distance requirement between the flagger and the sign. ODOT maintenance crews aren't happy with the current requirements, it isn't practical to always be moving the sign and they have been allowing the flagger to move as much as 3500 feet or more distance from the sign for a number of years safely.

Greg Stellmach passed around a sign design proposal and a copy of the proposed layout from the temporary traffic control handbook. Ed Fischer provided a layout from [Wisconsin's work zone safety guidelines](#). Cindy does not like going away from the public being conditioned to understand that the sign is shortly followed by seeing a flagger. She'd prefer to stick closer to the MUTCD standard. Others worry about increased exposure to maintain signing within a certain distance from the flagger. Use of cones, and picking them back up concerns some. Brian said he thought they were probably valuable and probably would be good to base spacing requirements on the speed of the roadway. With the various issues, the committee wasn't ready to approve the signing yet. However since the deadline for a new OAR is approaching, there will be further core meetings and electronic communication with committee members to get something hammered out in time. An informal poll of the committee members present indicated a majority supported the concept of a new sign along with cones to allow a flagger to be more than the normal 1000 foot maximum.

✓ **Action Item** – The core committee will continue working on this issue and be in communication with committee members. Committee members should help get a decision made as soon as possible.

Joint OTCDC / Transportation Safety Conference

Ed wanted to be sure the committee agreed that holding OTCDC meetings in conjunction with ACT Oregon's Transportation Safety Conference was of sufficient value to continue with this year. Committee consensus was that it was helpful both to the committee and to others in the transportation safety community. This year's conference will be at the Inn at Eagle Point in September.

Traffic Signal Policy & Guidelines Update

Massoud Saberian handed out a "[final draft](#)" and [cover memo](#) regarding the update of the 1999 [Traffic Signal Policy & Guidelines](#). He went over the background of the publication, list of important changes and asked for direction from the committee on Section IV and Section X-E(c). Massoud reminded members that they can view updates on the [ODOT FTP website](#). Massoud indicated he would like to have the update approved at the May OTCDC meeting and encouraged committee members to email comment's directly to [Massoud](#) by April 14, 2006. He will then put out a final document for review a week prior to the May meeting.

Regarding Section IV, Eric Niemeyer believes there are just as many studies that support permissive left turn phasing as those supporting protected phasing. He has a proposed [addendum to Section IV.A](#). Ed said the committee would need to see the studies. Ed was willing to see language encouraging engineers to remember to consider efficiency in deciding whether to use permissive or protected left turn phases on signals.

✓ Action Item – Massoud Saberian will continue to put draft guidelines on web and receive, collate, & discuss comments from all interested parties, in preparation for a final approval at the May OTCDC meeting.

SCHOOL ZONE SIGNING

Greg Stellmach reported on work to [update Chapter 7](#) of the Sign Policy & Guidelines in conformance with the changes in School Zone laws in the last session of the Legislature. It needs to be completed in time to get ready for the required changes in the statutes this July. Regarding 7B.09, the committee had concerns about requiring 48" x 48" minimum size for optional overhead School Advance Warning sign.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved that the 48" x 48" minimum size be required (when used) for speeds of 45 MPH and above and that 36" x 36" be the minimum allowed for lower speeds. Brian Barnett seconded. The committee passed the motion.

Condition A School Signing triple asterisk language appears to have changed in the update process, and Cindy asked that it be restored. The committee agreed. It was also noted that the Oregon Supplements in the OAR on school zoning may need to be updated to comply with the new school zoning law.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved that the triple asterisk language on pages 7-9, 7-10, and 7-11 be edited to read as follows: “Locate the SCHOOL/SPEED 20 sign assembly at the beginning of the school speed zone, which is typically 100-200 feet from the school property line or as established by an engineering study”. Charles Radosta seconded. The committee passed the motion.

The committee saw the need for language or a diagram showing that the school crosswalk warning assembly is not required at a STOP sign controlled crosswalk. The committee asked that Greg come back with a proposed diagram for advance warning signing for a two-way or all-way stop condition.

For optional school signing at school crosswalks (where there is not a school speed limit assembly) away from a school building, a new diagram was proposed. Cindy thought that the diagram requires some further guidance regarding where reduced school speed zones are appropriate. [“A Guide to School Area Safety”](#) has just that guidance. Ed suggested adding language to the text on page 7-3 referring to the Guide for further guidance, as well as an asterisk on page 7-16.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved that the Guide to School Area Safety reference be added to the text and to page 7-16. Cindy Schmitt seconded. The committee passed the motion.

The new SCHOOL DAYS 7AM-5PM rider replaces the old school hours rider.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved that the new rider on page 7-21 be adopted. Brian Barnett seconded. The committee passed the motion.

The sign background and material came up on pages 7-27 and 7-28. “Hi-intensity” and “Diamond Grade” shouldn’t be specified. The SCHOOL panel portion should be as on page 7-18, “Yellow or Fluorescent Yellow-Green retroreflective sheeting” to allow for matching existing signing when replacing partial school speed zone signing.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to adopt pages 7-27 and 7-28 with the changes as discussed. Brian Barnett seconded. The committee passed the motion.

Doug Bish pointed out that the general information regarding prohibition of permanent or temporary devices in the roadway in or around a school zone on page 7-3 ought to have an exception: “except as allowed in the MUTCD”, perhaps with more specifics. The committee consensus was to have Greg write that concept in and bring it back to the committee.

- ✓ Action Item – The committee agreed to look at updating the [OAR](#) covering the [Oregon Supplements to the MUTCD](#) on school zoning at the same time as the adoption of the updates to Chapter 7 of the Sign Policy.

Sign Policy & Guidelines Update

Greg Stellmach continued review of [proposed updates](#) of the [Sign Policy and Guidelines](#) begun at the September OTCDC meeting. Greg advised the committee that he wanted to skip the text part of the update packet and just address the sign changes. The committee reviewed Chapter 6 on construction and maintenance signs.

The sign changes were approved except the CW 15-10 sign [page 6-56] will go back to the committee. It was pointed out that coral was the incident response sign color – and suggested that an incident response section was needed in the publication.

Non-Agenda Items

There were no non-agenda items.

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held May 19th, 2006. It will be at 9:00 a.m. in conjunction with the ITE meeting at [Hayden's Grill](#) in Tualatin, OR. See [map](#).

Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned promptly at noon.