

# Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

June 24, 2008

## Meeting Minutes

Marion County Public Works

Salem, Oregon

Members Present: [Brian Barnett](#), City of Springfield; [Ed Chastain](#), Vice-Chair, Lane County; [Ed Fischer](#), Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; [Alan Hageman](#), OSP; [Joel McCarroll](#), (teleconference) ODOT Region 4; [Joseph Marek](#), Clackamas County; [Charles Radosta](#), ITE, Kittelson and Associates; [Massoud Saberian](#), City of Lake Oswego

Members Absent: [Cynthia Schmitt](#), Chair, Marion County; [Robin Lewis](#), City of Bend;

Others Present: Debby Corey, Kevin Haas, Katie Johnson, Greg Stellmach, ODOT Traffic-Roadway Section; Jim Renner, Oregon Travel Info Council; Bill Brownlee, Marion County; Kevin Hottmann, City of Salem


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



Vice Chairperson Ed Chastain called the meeting to order. Members and other attendees introduced themselves. Joel McCarroll was attending by teleconference call from Bend. Alan Hageman then moved to accept the June 6, 2008 meeting minutes. Ed Fischer seconded and the committee voted unanimously in favor.

### OLD BUSINESS

#### [Draft 2009 MUTCD Review Subcommittees](#)

Kevin Haas coordinated continuing committee review of the same [spreadsheet](#) utilized at the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, detailing subcommittee work on the draft MUTCD revision the committee has been working on for 2009. Ed Fischer and Jim Renner went to a National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices in June. Jim was in the Guidance and Motorist Information (GMI) technical committee. They provided information throughout the meeting on relevant information developed there on the draft manual. Kevin said he hoped to have a cover memo and a final format of Oregon's comments for committee approval at the July meeting in Bend. It will be signed by the Chair of the OTCDC and by Ed Fischer, assuming there are no objections. 

Greg Stellmach started review of remaining proposed changes in Part 2 (Signs). He noted that he had drafted proposed responses to the wayfinding signs in case FHWA doesn't agree to set that segment aside for a separate update to the MUTCD and they would be reviewed at the end

of his presentation on other changes as time allowed. Jim Renner said at the National Committee meeting, the subcommittee had approved of this section with the exception of recommending change references to diagrammatic signs to arrow-per-lane sign design.

The committee agreed to go forward with proposed submissions on Section 2E.10 which would change the guidance of three lines of legend to four lines of legend in harmony with Table 2E-1. Jim Renner noted that at the National Committee of Uniform Traffic Control Devices last week the subcommittee he attended agreed with an identical proposal.

The committee also agreed with forwarding subcommittee proposals for Sections 2E.19, 2E.21 and 2E.27 regarding diagrammatic signs (or arrow-per-lane). They decided that Section 2E.32 and 2E.40 were not requirements but there were still issues with it. Also they agreed that Section 2E.20 needed to be raised to a high priority with a suggestion that the sign we use should be a “may” condition. Greg said he thought it would be helpful for him to go back and rewrite his comment to combine 2E.20, 2E.21, 2E.32 and 2E.40.

The committee agreed to suggest deleting the D5-12 option in Section 2E.40. They agreed with the proposal regarding wi-fi signing in section 2F.02 with the addition of adding an option for just using a WI-FI plaque as an alternative. The committee also agreed with the other two proposals in Section 2F.02.

On Section 2F.05, the committee agreed to suggest deleting language stating that signs for rest areas should be suitably enlarged for freeway and expressway standards. We should instead rely on the existing oversize designs that the MUTCD has for freeways and expressways.

Regarding Sections 2F.10, 2F.11, and 2F.12, the committee agreed that BREAK CHECK AREA, CHAIN UP AREA, and TRUCK ESCAPE RAMP signs be returned to Section 2C with other warning signs with black on yellow, not white on blue sign colors.

The committee agreed with the proposal in Section 2G.02 on specific service logo signing, but also that Oregon will put out a supplement as well.

Section 2G.03 proposal that the layout, design and colors depicting names in logo sign panels should be considered equivalent to a logo and replicated proportionally on all follow up logo panels. They also agreed that language regarding minimum letter heights be changed to a “may” condition and changed into an option statement to modify the standard in Section 2G.05. The change proposed in Section 2G.05 was also approved.

The committee agreed to increase the limit of logo sign panels from 4 to 8 on follow-up panels, and Oregon will also issue a supplement to that effect. They also agreed with the objection stated in Section 2G.10 where the text doesn’t match Figure 2G-1. The panel agreed it would be desirable to send examples (pictures of Oregon signs that illustrate our issue) for both of these sections to FHWA.

Figure 2H-1 depicts both upper case and upper/lower case legend. The committee agreed this should be optional. Jim Renner stated that TIC would stick with upper case. The committee indicated that the lower case legend tends to crowd the space between the lines if there are letters like g,j,q,p, and y.

The committee agreed to recommend deleting signs D10-4 and D10-5 from Table 2I-1. They also agreed that in Section 2I-3 the committee recommend that the minimum route shield either

“should be 12 inches” or the minimum route shield “shall be 8 inches”, and that the top line “should” consist of the cardinal direction rather than “shall”.

On Section 2I.08, the committee agreed that we should tell FHWA that our signs don't necessarily match the route shields and that we want to continue to be able to use national trail signs on freeways and expressways.

The committee agreed not to do anything regarding Figures 2J-5 through 2J-11 since the new manual will apply to all roads open to public travel.

The committee agreed not to recommend increasing the legibility distance required for both nighttime and daytime in Section 2M.03. In Section 2M.04 they agreed that Oregon will recommend going to 55 mph and higher use 18” high characters, between 45 mph to 55 mph use 12” high characters and below 45 MPH use 8” characters. In Table 2A-4, they agreed with the recommendation that the color requirement for VMS signs be removed and the use of the message and its enforceability be left up to each transportation authority. The details of these color requirements in Table 2A-4 needs to be removed as well.

In Section 2M.05, the committee decided they'd like to recommend that language return to the 2003 MUTCD that VMS signs should be timed so that the driver can read them twice while driving by. The 2-panel “shall” requirement needs to be changed to a “should” to go along with the change above.

For Section 2M.06, the committee agreed that there should be specific guidance that VMS signs on freeways and expressways be a minimum of 800 feet from other signs.

Section 2M.07 line 33-36 would require that no new permanent VMS signs installed on freeways in a major metropolitan area or along a heavily traveled route unless operating agency has the capability to display travel time messages as the default information available to motorists. The committee agreed that the requirement is unnecessary, and the decision to display travel times should remain at the discretion of the roadway agency.

Ed Fischer and Jim Renner gave further information on discussions of the [NCUTCD meeting in Mobile, Alabama](#) and the committee discussed various issues that came up. The committee agreed that it would be a good idea to be clear in our recommendations to FHWA that we really like anything we didn't comment on so that it will balance out any responses that do object to other portions of the 2009 draft.

Greg Stellmach then went over his [proposed comments](#) regarding wayfinding signs in Section 2D.52.

Ed Fischer and other committee members had hoped for more specifics on what qualifies for a community wayfinding sign, something related to general public need destinations in cities and counties. But Section 2D.52 seems to take a wide-open approach that will make it hard for traffic engineers to keep this kind of signing from overwhelming basic traffic control signing. Current logo signing is so relatively inexpensive and competitively pursued that it would appear wayfinding signs will be a huge magnet for various commercial and other organizations. There are likely to be a lot of these getting in line for their own wayfinding signs. Jim Renner and others lamented the lack of reference to adopting standards or guidance for standards as a glaring omission in Section 2D.52. The committee was supportive of Greg's recommended comments.

Following this discussion the committee adjourned at about noon.

### **Future Meeting Dates**

July 18, 2008 - ODOT Region 4 Office (Bend)

September 19, 2008 - \*[Marion County](#), 5155 Silverton Road, NE., Salem)

October 20, 2008 - \*(Canyonville, OR)

November 21, 2008 - \*

*\* The ODOT Oregon Transportation Safety [Conference](#) will be held October 20-22 at the Seven Feathers Conference Center in Canyonville. The committee tentatively decided to replace either the September or November OTCDC meeting with the October meeting. We will finalize that decision at our July 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.*