

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

July 16, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Jackson County Library
Medford, Oregon

Members Present: [Robin Lewis](#), Chair, City of Bend; [Joel McCarroll](#), ODOT Region 4; [Eric Niemeyer](#), Vice-Chair, Jackson County; [Charles Radosta](#), ITE/Kittelson & Associates; [Cynthia Schmitt](#), Marion County; [Randall Wooley](#), City of Beaverton; [Brian Powers](#), OSP, sitting in for [Jim Rentz](#), OSP; [Ed Fischer](#), Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer;

Members Absent: [Rob Burchfield](#), City of Portland; [Joseph Marek](#), Clackamas County; [Jim Rentz](#), OSP

Others Present: Doug Bish, Massoud Saberian, Greg Stellmach, Julia Wellner, ODOT Traffic Engineering & Operations Section; Dan MacDonald, ODOT Rail Section; Alex Georgevitch, City of Medford; Brian Barnett, City of Springfield; Robert Kortt, RDK Engineering

Introduction – Approval of Minutes – Additional Agenda Items

Chairperson Robin Lewis called the meeting to order. The committee and other attendees introduced themselves. Randall Wooley moved and Cindy Schmitt seconded approval of minutes from May 14, 2004 and May 21, 2004. The committee approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Draft OAR Revisions & Significant Changes for Part 2

Julia Wellner handed out a packet of significant changes to Part 2 of the 2003 MUTCD for the committee to look through when they have time. She also passed out list of draft supplements to cover the new Part 2 which is not complete but should be straightforward enough to get committee approval of at the meeting. Included are proposed supplements that were apparently discussed and approved by the committee in 2001 for the Millennium Edition of the MUTCD but didn't make it into the document at that time. In some cases they were dropped because of FHWA opposition, but in other cases it appears to be by oversight.

The first of these, under 2A.02 Definitions concerned retaining "RT and LT abbreviations rather than going with the MUTCD's requirement to use RHT and LFT. FHWA was opposed to this in the previous 2000 manual. The committee recalled there was a previous motion to see if FHWA was at all flexible on this and the consensus was to renew that discussion. Ed Fischer can also see if other state traffic engineers prefer the shorter definitions.

Under 2A.06, Design of Signs, Julia said the 2003 manual says internet addresses shall not be placed on signs and phone numbers longer than 4 digits should not be placed on signs except as otherwise allowed in the manual. Julia's subcommittee proposed allowing, in limited circumstances, with approval of the OTCDC. Further suggested was that the same limited approval be given to phone numbers on signs. ODOT does have some such signs up already under the old MUTCD and the Sign Policy and Guidelines. The committee and the state traffic engineer saw drawbacks in becoming a sign approval authority for these exceptions. The committee decided on balance that they liked the very limited flexibility allowed in the 2003 MUTCD and any present signing would be grandfathered.

Decision – Cindy Schmitt moved to not approve the proposed supplement. Ed Fischer seconded and the motion passed.

Section 2B.13 would allow Oregon to continue to allow omitting the word LIMIT on speed zone signs. It was noted that the proposed rule needed to have ORS 811.123 replaced by ORS 811.111 to keep up with the last legislative session.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to approve the proposed supplement as amended. Randall Wooley seconded and the motion passed.

Section 2B.40, an existing supplement was proposed to be deleted since the new manual has changed the use of TURNING TRAFFIC MUST YIELD TO PEDESTRIANS signs from SHOULD to MAY, consistent with the supplement.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to delete the existing supplement. Charles Radosta seconded and the motion passed.

Section 2C.24 on Speed Hump Signs is actually part of a proposed edit that separates out an existing supplement that used to include both signing and pavement markings in the same supplement. The hope is that this will make it harder for someone looking for supplements on markings to miss the supplement because of it being co-located with the signing issue. The supplement requires that speed hump signs or markings shall be placed on a public roadway speed hump to identify its location. When several speed humps are placed in a series along a roadway between intersections, a single SPEED HUMP sign with a rider indicating the series of humps ahead may be posted for the series. (A separate supplement will be added for Section 3B.26 to address the markings.)

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to accept the revised supplement. Cindy Schmitt seconded and the motion passed.

Section 2C.35 [formerly .32] – (also referenced at 2B.29 [.24] & 2B.30 [.25]) Julia said her subcommittee had no problem with the new manual's practice of using the NO PASSING ZONE pennant on the left side of the road when needed to supplement pavement markings and regulatory DO NOT PASS signs on the right side of the road. Therefore, supplement 2C.35[32] which provided for the use of DO NOT PASS signs on the left side of the road and prohibited NO PASSING ZONE pennants, is recommended for deletion. The Sign Policy will also need to be modified to reflect the change. Ed said that ODOT will decide some kind of standards for deciding when the pennants may be needed.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to delete the supplement. Charles Radosta seconded and the motion passed.

Section 2C.37 - Julia said her subcommittee strongly opposed the use of the TRAFFIC CIRCLE educational plaque (W16-12p) under the Circular Intersection (Chasing Arrows W2-6) sign, believing it unnecessary, and in the case of roundabouts, inaccurate.

She proposed adding language that prohibits use of the plaque. She said Rob Burchfield had some proposed alternative circular intersection warning signs but wasn't there to present them. The committee discussed the problems with the educational plaques and differences between traffic circles and roundabouts. They agreed that prohibiting the plaques was a separate issue from Rob's suggestions and could make a decision on that immediately.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to accept the supplement. Charles Radosta seconded and the motion passed.

Section 2C.50 - Regarding the CROSS TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP plaque, Julia said the majority of her subcommittee was in favor of removing the prohibition in the Supplement because the new Manual removed the ambiguous arrow from the design, and allows for alternate messages. Since the new MUTCD only allows for use of the plaque under STOP signs, a revised supplement was proposed to also allow installing the plaque below STOP AHEAD signs. The new supplement would adopt the MUTCD's practice of utilizing warning (black on yellow) signs rather than regulatory (black on white). The committee agreed after further discussion.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to adopt the change. Cindy Schmidt seconded and the motion passed.

- ✓ Action Item – Julia will also need to revise the SIDE STREET TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP (OR 3-13) sign in the Sign Policy from a regulatory to a warning sign.

Section 2D.06 Julia said that approval by the committee back in 2001 to allow 4-inch minimum sized lettering for the principal legend on Adopt-A-Highway signs and riders, Historical Trail riders and Recreational Symbol riders instead of the 6-inch letters had apparently not been officially adopted. There appeared to be no verifiable reason for the omission and she recommended that this change be readopted. Further, since the MUTCD defines Principal Legend as “place names, street names, and route numbers placed on guide signs” and these aren’t used on Adopt-A-Highway sign, she suggested they needn’t be mentioned. There was discussion of the implications and whether the Supplements are exceptions and not allowed by the FHWA. The committee agreed that if the committee agreed to supplements and the FHWA approves them, it’s allowed, but that when a state or other federal manual or supplement is required, that manual or supplement shall be in substantial conformance. After further discussion the committee agreed to reapprove the supplement without the Adopt-A-Highway signing included. These are usually kept at 4-inch minimum but may occasionally be smaller when the name of the sponsor is too long to fit otherwise.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to adopt the change. Charles Radosta seconded and the motion passed.

Section 2D.30 - Another previously approved but not implemented supplement was regarding 2D.30 on Directional Assembly (route markers). Julia believed we should conform to the MUTCD at the beginning of routes (JCT plaque + route shield), or at least only downgrade the requirement to a “Should”. She agreed that signing the end of a route (END plaque + route shield) is not as critical and could be made an option (“May”). There was long discussion on the value of these markers to the traveling public, tourism, etc, as well as the effect of many route segments that have been returned to local jurisdictions, sometimes to allow them to pursue local strategies that aren’t allowed on state highways. Routes that drop at city limits and resume at the other end of town also become an issue in terms of excessive and confusing signage. In some cases, folks are being cited for violations based on the road being considered a state highway when it’s not anymore.

The committee finally agreed to return this issue to subcommittee and bring it up again at the September 22nd meeting in Wilsonville. A conversation with the AOC and LOC were also suggested.

Decision – Charles Radosta moved the sub-committee revisit this supplement and that it be brought back to the September meeting. Ed Fischer seconded and the motion passed.

- ✓ Action Item – Julia will bring this issue back to the subcommittee and return to the next meeting for further discussion/possible action.

Section 2D.45 – General Service signs, 24-hour pharmacy signing. Julia said this is a change that just came out after the fact as a revision 1 of the 2003 MUTCD. It would allow for 24 pharmacy symbols and signs in the general service signing categories, along with specific service and even recreational versions of those signs, so also effects Sections 2E, 2F, and 2H. It would allow 24-hour pharmacies as another category to general service signs along with gas, food, lodging, and camping and would allow for signing for those businesses that are within a certain distance of an interchange or highway. Ed Fischer is not in favor of this. It is not a requirement, it allows for states and local jurisdictions to provide that signing if we choose to do so. Since ODOT opposes the use of the pharmacy signs the subcommittee proposed adding a supplement that those types of pharmacy signs will not be permitted to make it consistent state-wide.

Ed Fischer said this had come up in meetings at the NCUTCD and for the first time, as far as they could tell in the history of the manual that Congress has dictated what should go into the manual. So a lot of the states want to go on record suggesting this is a bad practice, that Congress ought to stay out of trying to set the engineering standards in this country because it was clearly political.

The committee agreed with the supplement with minor revision as follows: “Pharmacy signs shall not be permitted. Revision 1 of the 2003 MUTCD, which allows for 24-hour pharmacy signs is not adopted”

Decision – Ed Fischer moved the supplement be adopted as amended above. Joel McCarroll seconded and the motion passed.

2F.04 Number and Size of Logos and Signs. This was an existing supplement that Julia changed the reference to the page number to reflect it in the new manual

Decision – Charles Radosta moved the supplement be adopted. Eric Niemeyer seconded and the motion passed.

2F.05 Size of Lettering, another previously approved supplement that didn't make it into the publication. The original idea was to limit the size of logo ramp and off-interstate signs by allowing 4" legend use for the mileage portion of the legend: "A 102 mm (4 in) letter or numeral may be used on logo signs placed on conventional roads or interchange ramps for the mileage portion of the legend."

The committee discussed this and Julia's proposed alternative wording: "The legend used to indicate distance to a specific service may be 102 mm (4-inch) on conventional roads and ramps, if 152 mm (6-inch) legend would require the size of the sign to be increased."

Decision – Cynthia Schmitt moved the supplement be adopted. Joel McCarroll seconded and the motion passed.

2F.09 Signs at Intersections (Specific Service) – Julia said this is a clarified rewrite of an existing supplement which provides continuity for the driver. The supplement changes the Standard to an Option as would be rewritten as follows: "Where both tourist-oriented information (see Chapter 2G) and specific service information would be needed at the same intersection, the design of the tourist-oriented directional signs may be used, and the needed specific service information incorporated."

After minimal discussion regarding "Shall/May", the committee agreed with the supplement.

Decision – Randall Wooley moved the supplement be adopted. Eric Niemeyerl seconded and the motion passed.

Julia then advised the committee that she had another handout for them to consider prior to the next meeting. It's entitled "Additional Oregon Supplements to be Considered for Part 2." These may take more discussion.

✓ Action Item – Julia will bring this issue back to the next meeting for further discussion/possible action.

Approval OAR Supplements Part 3

Greg Stellmach handed out a half sheet of proposed supplements on Section 3B.16 – Stop and Yield Lines (should also be added to 7C.04) and 3B.26 – Speed Hump Markings. He said the committee went through them in May and he'd updated them to respond to comments and was now hoping to have them adopted. He didn't know that they needed to be discussed extensively. They were reviewed by Nick Fortey in the last few days and Nick had no problem, finding them "considered in reasonable close conformance with the 2003 MUTCD."

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to approve all changes as discussed. Joe Marek seconded and the motion passed.

Approval of OAR supplements Parts 7 & 9

Doug Bish handed out a revised Part 7 on School Signing. The committee discussed 7B.01 which specified sign and legend sizes depending on the number of lanes and speed zone. One provision would require that when posting times in school zones the oversized School Speed Limit assembly shall be used on highways 35 mph or greater. Some members had problems with this due to the size of the sign and it's blocking sidewalks, requiring further supports, increased cost and the fact that some jurisdictions have already ordered or installed the smaller sized sign. Compliance date was discussed as being in line with the MUTCD.

Decision – Eric Niemeyer moved to disapprove 7B.01. Ed Fischer seconded and the motion passed.

7B:08 required that Advance Warning signs shall be installed not less than 150 feet nor more than 700 feet in advance of the School Speed Assembly. In response to question, Doug said this is the one that, because of how the manual is worded to put that assembly in front of the school grounds, and then it says it has to be in advance of any speed 20 signs but it doesn't say how far in advance. So this allows us to put it in that same category of 150 to 700 feet from the school speed sign, school zone which is what we had before.

Decision – Charles Radosta moved to approve 7B.08. Joel McCarroll seconded and the motion passed.

7B.09 was proposed in order to allow the use of the School Advance Warning sign without a supplemental arrow plaque overhead at marked crosswalks. It was meant to allow this sign as a supplemental sign for crosswalks in addition to ground-mounted signs. The committee spent quite a bit of time discussing adjustments to the language to satisfy all concerns without quite getting concurrence.

Finally it was suggested that this supplement be tabled and allow Doug Bish to bring back revised wording.

Decision Randall Wooley moved to table the proposed supplement, have the committee express its intent that if you have a supplemental sign above the crosswalk that you have to have the ground mounted sign as well and ask Doug Bish to create the wordage. Joel McCarroll seconded and the motion passed.

✓ Action Item – Doug Bish will rework the language and bring it back to the committee.

7B.11 School Speed Limit Assembly – In order that the appropriate parts of the school speed sign assembly are clarified as allowed by ORS 811.111 this supplement was proposed. Doug said it was modified as discussed before to take out all the confusing language. After discussion and minor amendment to add plaque numbers, it was suggested that an editing committee go over the language once more, not changing content but making sure that it reads right.

Decision – Eric Niemeyer moved to approve 7B.11 as amended. Charles Radosta seconded and the motion passed.

Doug Bish said that 7C.04 was the same as Greg Stellmach proposed earlier. They worked together on the language.

Decision – Randall Wooley moved to approve 7C.04. Charles Radosta seconded and the motion passed.

7E.05 – Operating Procedures for Adult Guards – This supplement was written so that adult crossing guards could use the school flags recommended by the Oregon Department of Education. The second paragraph of the Guidance was proposed to be deleted and the following Option added:

“Adult crossing guards may use flagging devices similar to student patrols. When the desire is to create safe gaps, adult crossing guards may use a STOP paddle.”

In order that adult crossing guards do not violate appropriate driver response to a traffic signal governed by ORS 811.260, the following Standard was also proposed:

“Adult crossing guards shall not use STOP paddles at crosswalks controlled by traffic signals.”

The committee was uncomfortable with the idea that adults without formal flagger training might be using traffic control devices, and whether the changes in Shall/Should/May language was adequate. It was suggested that the matter be tabled in order to contact the Oregon Department of Education because they have a whole guideline developed on traffic control, traffic control menus and the committee would not want to say “should” here when they're saying they “should not” use those.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to table 7E.05. Charles Radosta seconded and the motion passed.

✓ Action Item – Doug Bish will bring it back to the committee at a future meeting.

Doug then went over the routine exceptions to Part 9 regarding Bicycles and with some minor revisions to the sign numbers in 9C.04 as were in 9B.04, the committee had no objections.

Decision Joel McCarroll moved to approve 9A.01, 9B.04, and 9C.04 as amended Charles Radosta seconded and the motion passed.

Discuss Draft OAR Revisions & Significant Changes for Parts 4, 8 & 10

Massoud Saberian handed out his revisions. He said 4B.02 was already in the MUTCD so it can be removed altogether.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to delete the old supplement for 4B.02. It was seconded and the motion passed.

Massoud went over other changes under consideration. It was decided by the "Subcommittee for review of Parts 4, 8, 10) to separate the review of Part 4 from Parts 8 and 10 due to Rail Division's proposed additions to the supplement.

Not all changes to Part 4 were clear and final, so it was hard for OTCDC to make a final decision.

The committee directed Massoud and his subcommittee to take the proposed changes to Part 4 in the language and clean it up, make proposed changes final, and bring it back in September for their consideration.

✓ Action Item – Massoud's subcommittee will continue working on their wording and proposals on Parts 4, 8 & 10 and bring them back to the next meeting for consideration/approval.

Discussion and Approval of Part 1 Supplements

In the absence of Jan Gipson, this was put off until the next meeting if Jan has any changes.

✓ Action Item – Jan will report any proposed changes at the next meeting.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Draft Guide to School Area Safety

Doug Bish noted the draft he'd passed out and asked for any comments from the committee as soon as possible, hopefully by August 15th.

✓ Action Item – Doug would like to have any comments from OTCDC and ACTS members by August 15th.

Flat Black Backplates

Massoud brought up the issue of the color of signal backplates and whether a supplement is needed to prevent all manner of colors being used statewide. The MUTCD has removed any requirements in that regard. He will bring proposed language to the September meeting

✓ Action Item – Massoud will bring proposed supplement language to the next meeting.

Robin handed out a flyer from FHWA and then adjourned the meeting at 12:39 pm.

Future Meeting

The next meeting will be held September 22, 2004 in Wilsonville in conjunction with the Traffic Safety Conference.