

# Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

May 19, 2006

## **Meeting Minutes**

**Hayden's Grill**  
Tualatin, Oregon

Members Present: [Joel McCarroll](#), Chair, ODOT Region 4; [Randall Wooley](#), Vice-Chair, City of Beaverton; [Brian Barnett](#), City of Springfield; [Ed Fischer](#), Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; [Alan Hageman](#), OSP; [Robin Lewis](#), City of Bend; [Joseph Marek](#), Clackamas County; [Eric Niemeyer](#), Jackson County; [Charles Radosta](#), ITE/Kittelton & Associates; [Cynthia Schmitt](#), Marion County

Others Present: Nick Fortey, FHWA; Doug Bish, Scott Cramer, Paul Davis, Kevin Haas, Katie Johnson, Scott McCanna, Chris Rowland, Massoud Saberian, Greg Stellmach, ODOT Traffic Engineering & Operations Section; Dan Dorrell, ODOT Region 3 Traffic, Jerilyn Wen, Marion County; Rob Burchfield, Mike Coleman, City of Portland; Orville Gaylor, Retired ODOT; Bret Goss, First Call Flagging

### **Introduction – Approval of Minutes – Additional Agenda Items**

Chairperson Joel McCarroll called the meeting to order. Attendees introduced themselves. Ed Fischer said if time permitted, he had a non-agenda item regarding a proposal by FHWA. It concerns some definitions the committee ought to be aware of dealing with "substantial compliance". Randy Wooley moved to accept the March 17, 2006 meeting minutes, Joe Marek seconded and they were approved.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **[Automated Flagger Assistance Device](#)**

Ed Fischer updated the committee on previous discussions regarding AFADs and a [letter](#) Ed sent to approved vendors of the product requesting a committee demonstration. He introduced Bret Goss of [First Call Flagging](#) who had responded to the request. Bret provided information on his device. He said he was trying to get the name for the devices changed because by no means are they automated. They are intended to be operated by human beings. He explained the safety utility and operations of his AFAD which utilizes signal lights and a safety arm bar and then provided a demonstration of the equipment in operation. The committee consensus was that the device is

acceptable for use in Oregon, that the conventional flagger sign (CW23-2) is adequate for the application and that one flagger should be required for every AFAD in use.

✓ **Action Item** – Greg Stellmach will bring a proposed revision to the CW23-2 back to the committee which indicates that sign is acceptable for use with an AFAD application.

### **Traffic Signal Policy & Guidelines Update**

Massoud Saberian went over the latest draft update of the 1999 [Traffic Signal Policy & Guidelines](#). He reviewed the background of the publication and went through the sections seeking resolution of any outstanding issues. Brian Barnett asked about having a policy on timing. ODOT's signal timing manual covers that and the committee agreed it should be referred to.

Eric Niemeyer had an issue with sight distances in protected only left turn phasing. He thought restricted sight distance should be a "shall" condition. He also suggested the table on sight distance guidelines should be more like AASHTO's. His point was to elevate sight distance as a factor needing consideration. He provided proposed alternative Section IV-A wording to accomplish that. The committee agreed the issue could be better addressed by removing the table and adding language referring to AASHTO standards for approval by the committee.

Regarding Section VI, 1a (Basis for Installation) on emergency traffic signals, the question of whether [roundabouts](#) are or can be considered included as approved locations. It is problematic and Ed suggested Brian, Joel and Robin get together and work on clarifying language.

Regarding standard practice on ramp meters in the same section, Nick Fortey suggested that including the wording on the State Implementation Plan for air quality unnecessarily limits the potential of applicability of the meters. The committee agreed it needed to be removed or reworded.

✓ **Action Item** – Massoud Saberian will address the issues in consultation with committee members in preparation for a final approval at the July OTCDC meeting.

### **Sign Policy & Guidelines Update**

Greg Stellmach continued review of [proposed updates](#) of the [Sign Policy and Guidelines](#) begun at the September 2005 OTCDC meeting. The committee reviewed changes in Chapters 5, 6 and 8. All changes were approved with the exception of the Flagger NEXT MILE roll-up Sign CW20-7b, which Greg will come back with proposed wording referencing the use of this sign as indicated in the [Oregon Temporary Traffic Control](#)

[Handbook](#), specifically addressing the placement of cones with the sign, and the speed that it should be used at. Greg will be back with more at the next meeting.

### **Oregon Temporary Traffic Control Handbook Update**

Ed reported to the committee that the [OTTCH rewrite](#) is virtually completed. The [Oregon Transportation Commission](#) will be asked in the next week to adopt the revision to the OAR that will adopt the May 2006 version of the book. The color will change from pink to orange and should be published within about a month. Ed thanked Cindy Schmitt and others who were instrumental in getting the job done.

### **Passive Highway-Rail Grade Crossings**

Ed advised the committee regarding his memo to ODOT region and district managers in support of a [FHWA memo](#) giving guidance for use of YIELD or STOP signs at passive highway-rail grade crossings. The [ODOT Rail Division](#) is out looking at passive railroad crossings to get STOP and YIELD signs installed. He would rather put in YIELD signs than STOP signs and doesn't believe STOP signs should be installed unless the ADT is low and the sight distance is so restricted that approaching traffic must reduce speed to 10 MPH or less in order to stop safely. If those conditions don't apply, the YIELD sign is the standard sign if signs are needed at all. ODOT region traffic staff are being asked to coordinate and participate in on-site engineering investigations with Rail Division staff at each affected crossing on state highways. Ed asked if the committee would have any objection to the OTCDC putting out a similar message with guidance to counties and cities on the subject.

There continues to be some debate over who has authority to determine traffic control device installation that affects roadway traffic. Members have concerns that road authorities need to have input in the decision and that it shouldn't apply to tracks that are out of service and it shouldn't supersede or change logical traffic control for tracks that are in the streets. Ed Fischer will have conversation with Charles Kettenring prior to drafting a letter from the OTCDC to local jurisdictions. Time is an issue since Rail Division is already moving fast on this. Nick Fortey asked to be involved with discussions between the Traffic Section and Rail Division because they are involved in funding Rail's programs and want to be sure that funding is expended judiciously.

✓ **Action Item** – Ed and Joel will work on a draft letter from the OTCDC to local jurisdictions giving them some guidance on the matter. Ed will coordinate review of the letter with ODOT Rail Division and FHWA.

### **Non-Agenda Items**

Kevin Haas advised the committee on a federal rulemaking process [notice in the Federal Register](#) dated April 25, 2006 concerning the MUTCD. The rule defines the terms "substantial conformance" and "roads open to public travel". The big issue is

“substantial conformance” defines that state supplements to the National MUTCD cannot be less restrictive than the National MUTCD even if state law differs from Standards or Guidance listed in the National MUTCD. Also under the definition “roads open to public travel”, any shopping center or other private roadway that is accessible to the public should conform to the MUTCD even though the local road authority has no jurisdiction or enforcement capabilities on these types of facilities. ODOT is drafting a comment to FHWA in opposition to the proposed rulemaking and other jurisdictions are advised that they can and should become involved if this issue concerns them. Jurisdictions desiring a copy of the final draft language should contact [Kevin Haas](#).

### **Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting will be held July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2006. It will be at 9:00 a.m. at the Marion County Shops in Salem, Oregon.

### **Meeting Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned promptly at noon.