

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

July 19, 2002

Meeting Minutes

Lane County Public Works, Eugene, Oregon

Members Present: Charles Radosta, Chair, ITE/Kittelson & Associates; Ed Fischer, Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; Joseph Marek, Vice-Chair, Clackamas County; Randall Wooley, City of Beaverton; Gordon Renskers, OSP; Robin Lewis, City of Bend; Bill Ciz, ODOT Region 1; Eric Niemeyer, Jackson County; Rob Burchfield, City of Portland; Cynthia Schmitt, Marion County.

Others Present: Orville Gaylor, Rick Wood, Doug Bish, Paul Davis, Jan Gipson, Michael Ronkin, Julia Wellner, ODOT Traffic Management Section; Al Sovey, ODOT Rail Section; Brian Genovese, Cole Olsen, City of Eugene; Cathy Ardanaz, 3M Corporation; Nick Fortey, FHWA; Ed Chastain, Lane County; John Irwin, JRH Engineering.

Introduction – Additional Agenda Items – Approval of May 2002 Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Charles Radosta called the meeting to order and thanked Ed Chastain for hosting the meeting. After introductions, the committee approved the minutes from the May 17th meeting. It was noted that the review of the proposed updated Traffic Line Manual was going to be postponed to a future meeting due to the need to deal with the proposed MUTCD Revision 2.

NEW BUSINESS

MUTCD Subcommittee Review

Ed Fischer advised the committee that as advisory committee to ODOT, we need to get their perspective of FHWA's proposed Revision 2 to the MUTCD (FHWA Docket No. [FHWA-2001-11159](http://www.fhwa.gov/dockets/2001/11159)). He noted the short time frame for getting responses to FHWA and asked members to avoid wordsmith work and focus discussion on major issues with the proposed changes. The committee discussed the process and the likely future need to revise the Oregon Supplements to the MUTCD.

- ✓ Action Item – OTCDC members must get any written comment in to Jan Gipson by August 10th so a consolidated OTCDC response can be provided to FHWA prior to their August 19, 2002 deadline. Individuals or jurisdictions can also comment directly to FHWA. Comments may be submitted to FHWA online at: <http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/>. Comments submitted to FHWA may be reviewed at: <http://dms.dot.gov/search/searchResultsSimple.cfm?numberValue=11159&searchType=docket>.

The committee then heard subcommittee reports on the supplement revisions as follows:

Part 6 (Temporary Traffic Control) Jan Gipson noted that this section is very specifically not just Work Zone anymore, with a new segment on incident management which is an overview without much real impact yet (giving guidance and options rather than standards). She summarized the most significant items from her Part 6 Review Guide handout.

One issue requiring clarification from FHWA is the removal of the 'optional' designation for arrow boards on all figures involving lane closure while still holding it as a guidance item in the text.

A new section 6G.19 requires traffic control plans for nighttime work zones.

One of the most significant changes in the proposed revision has to do with accessibility issues. The ADA Accessibility Guidelines are added and referred to as Standard. The new standards regarding pedestrian facilities - which has a very broad definition, beyond just where there are sidewalks - now requires channelization cones set side by side along the whole work zone area including short- and long-term work zones. The purpose is to provide visually impaired pedestrians tactile guidance through the area. Michael Ronkin pointed out that Oregon statute defines sidewalks as being present along any road in the state, whether or not it's paved as such. So Oregon has very little room to get around the requirements in more rural areas. Closing a facility seems to be the only way around the requirement and is supposed to be a last resort and it requires giving audible notice to the visually impaired. The committee discussed alternatives for giving audible notice.

ANSI/ISEA clothing standards for workers are provided in the revision, going beyond what was required in the Millennium MUTCD and a requirement that supervisory workers are specifically trained in knowing what degree of visibility is required for any job. Ed Fischer said this should be in OSHA publications, rather than the MUTCD. Jan said OSHA didn't agree but said that others have had similar comments.

Jan said the qualifications for flaggers have been rewritten and they left out a couple that she thinks should have been retained (not further identified).

Part 7 (School Areas) and 9 (Bicycles) Doug Bish discussed Section 2B.52 and Section 7C.04 in the proposals regarding stop and yield lines in mid-block crosswalks (including school crosswalks). ODOT adopted "STOP HERE FOR PEDESTRIANS" signs and put stop lines in. The new MUTCD references yield lines, and "YIELD HERE TO PEDESTRIANS" signing for mid-block crosswalks. He said the committee should consider whether or not to switch to the MUTCD version. Oregon state law requires motorists to stop and yield the right of way to pedestrians in crosswalks. If a YIELD sign is used, the pavement marking must be the "sharks teeth" pattern and not the stop bar pattern. Michael Ronkin said his observation across the country is that the "sharks teeth" don't show up well at all and isn't necessarily a good idea outside of traffic circles.

The committee decided to suggest that the MUTCD allow for either version, by adding an option with a "STOP HERE FOR PEDESTRIANS" sign and stop line for mid-block crosswalks.

Then discussed were In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Signs in Section 2B.53 and the same for school crosswalks in Section 7B.08 These used to be prohibited, but now would be allowed at unsignalized mid-block school crossings (schools) and unsignalized crossings (others). Section 7A.04 allows portable school signs. The committee discussed the advisability of in-street signs and agreed to suggest consistency in that either all signs are allowed only at mid-block unsignalized crossings or at all unsignalized crossings. The committee discussed breakaway mounting language to prevent projectile hazards.

Doug then noted Section 7B-12 which removes rectangular "School/Reduced Speed Ahead" signing and adding diamond-shaped "20 MPH School Zone Ahead". The philosophy being reflected here and elsewhere is to further distinguish between regulatory and warning signs. Orville Gaylor warned that this would reduce the effectiveness of the message in many such cases. Committee consensus was that this change did reduce effectiveness but was at least consistent with the logic of regulatory and warning signs. The use of fluorescent yellow-green signing for schools is not affected. The committee agreed to comment that there was no pressing reason beyond consistency for this change and that it was likely to make the subject signs less effective.

Doug then went on to Section 9B-04 regarding bicycle lane signs, where the wording went from Should to Shall, from guidance to standard. This may require re-wording of the correlating Oregon Supplement. The committee decided it was worth recommending back to FHWA that they keep the Should language so Oregon can keep it's "May" supplement language.

Rob Burchfield asked about how ODOT plans on removing/replacing old bike lane signs that include the diamond symbol and whether it will be completed within the 5-year compliance period. He's interested because he has over a hundred of his own. Ed said the state intends to comply but hasn't yet finalized plans/identified budget for doing so. As it is, signs are being removed when opportunities present themselves. Whether/what signs will replace them hasn't been decided yet.

The committee had a discussion about Section 9C.04 prohibiting bicycle lanes on the circular roadway of a roundabout. The committee agreed to recommend it instead say that bicycle lanes should not be marked on the circular roadway of a roundabout, making it guidance instead of a standard.

Part 8 (Railroad Crossings) and 10 (Light Rail) Rick Wood condensed his original handout since there were no major changes to be concerned about. Al Sovey said at the national level the rail subcommittee agreed to throw out in-roadway lighting. The national signal committee did likewise. They don't seem necessary and introduce more questions and complications than they're worth. The proposed changes say "If used..." and talk about them being unidirectional, away from normal tire track paths, and based on engineering judgement. The committee agreed to go along with the national subcommittees in recommending against inclusion of in-roadway lighting standards. Al Sovey said one item that wasn't mentioned in the handout was a blank-out, no left/no right turn sign that has a railroad track running down the middle of it that his group threw out at the national level for it's confusing message.

Preferential lane marking for light rail was discussed, particularly the use of the letter, "T" as a lane marking. It seemed like it wouldn't have meaning for people.

Al Sovey said that ODOT Rail Division has draft OAR's out for comment until the end of July. He said one difference between the proposed OAR's and the MUTCD is the stop clearance line at a gated crossing. The ODOT standard is one foot in advance of the gate whereas the MUTCD has it as eight feet. The other difference is ODOT says "SHALL", whereas the MUTCD says "SHOULD". ODOT feels like it makes sense to be closer and have better visibility of the train/tracks. When the gate is down, it's not so much of a concern since vehicles don't get too close. But when the gate is up and busses need to stop and check for trains before proceeding, they need to be far enough forward to have decent visibility both ways.

Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update

After a break Michael Ronkin briefed the committee on the subject update and asked for any comment from panel members. He will get a copy of a letter to staff to email to members and interested others after the meeting.

✓ Action Item - Staff will email Oregon Bike & Pedestrian Plan Update letter to members

Gordon Renskers Appreciation/Plaque Presentation

Ed Fischer expressed the appreciation on behalf of the committee for the valuable enforcement perspective Gordon Renskers has provided to the committee during his tenure on the committee. He presented Gordon with a Certificate of Appreciation.

MUTCD Subcommittee Review, Continued

Part 3 (Markings), Part 5 (Low-Volume Roads) Julia Wellner said that her handout covers mostly the more significant changes although there were some grammatical suggestions as well. She noted that some of these were just her own opinion since there wasn't a lot of input from her subcommittee. She indicated a desire to get more input from committee members.

Julia noted changes in cycle lengths on pavement markings, starting with Section 3A.06 providing a finite range of gaps for dotted lines used as Line Extensions and a separate cycle for dotted lines used as Lane Drops/Add.

The proposed revision to Section 3B.08 specifies that Edge Lines should not be extended into/through intersections although it seems to still be okay to extend through interchanges as in Section 3B.11 and adds a recommendation to use a single line to extend a double line through an intersection.

Figure 3B-11 updates examples of extensions through intersections or interchanges to reflect single line extension for double lines and adds acceptable use for blue Raised Pavement Markers (RPM's) for marking fire hydrant positions.

Julia noted the next few listed revisions addressing RPM spacing and suggested grammatical corrections thereto.

Section 3B.16 Guidance on Stop and Yield lines seems ambiguous and Julie offered alternate wording depending on whether the intent is to recommend that stop lines be used or to specify the location where stop lines should be installed. She also offered comments on ambiguous language regarding crosswalk markings at controlled intersections and at mid-block crosswalks with suggested changes, and also noted that as written the proposed changes would eliminate a minimum 4-foot stop-line-to-crosswalk distance requirement for mid-block signalized crosswalks. She asked for written feedback from any committee members on this section.

Revision to Section 3B.21 eliminates requirement for signs to supplement No Parking curb markings when controlled by local statute/ordinance where they are frequently obliterated by snow/ice and eliminates requirement for curb markings to be supplemented with signs and word markings when used to convey statutory law.

There was considerable discussion of revisions to Section 3B.22 on preferential lane word and symbol markings. It adds light rail transit to the list of acceptable HOV lane uses and adds the letter, "T" as the required preferential lane use marking for light rail transit lanes, removing the diamond. The committee discussed the origin of the "T" considered alternatives. The committee had no specific recommendations but were encouraged to pass on anything they come up with to Julia.

For Section 3B.25 & 3B.26, Juila noted some additional corrections regarding line width illustrations and text.

Regarding Section 3B.24 markings for roundabouts, the new Standard prohibits bike lanes on roundabouts and the Committee has already agreed it should just be a Should Not condition.

Section 3E.01 on colored pavements defines colored pavement between crosswalk lines as a NON-traffic control device and removes RED from the list of allowable colors for pavements used as traffic control devices. It appears the point is to maintain that colors other than white and yellow and surfaces such as brick don't constitute traffic control devices and when used, like brick crosswalks, there must still be white crosswalk marking lanes bracketing the brick in order to legally constitute a marked crosswalk. The committee agreed that some clarity was needed for this section.

Going to Part 5, Julia Wellner first pointed out that Table 5A.1 decreases minimum size for TP&DT signs on low volume roads to 24x24. She recommended and the committee agreed they should be kept at 36x36.

Then Julia asked why red circles are proposed on regulatory speed signs in Figure 5B-1 and black circles on advisory (warning) speed signs (metric). Both have removed METRIC plaques. She suggested black for both, seeing red as hinting at prohibition. It was suggested that the red circles were in conformance with international metric speed signs but the committee saw no need to object since metric speed signing isn't in use in Oregon

Part 4 (Signals) Rick Wood discussed a revision to his handout including late comments included therein, signs related to signals, and four pages of related ORS's for reference. He invited committee members to take the handouts with them and get back to him with any additional comments. The committee agreed not to discuss less significant changes that will be submitted to FHWA.

Rick pointed out that the standard for Section 4D.04 has omitted the opening phrase, "Unless otherwise determined by law..." His said the phrase should be retained.

He noted that other changes in Section 4D.04 conflict with Oregon law and suggested that the current Oregon Supplement on the section be retained. The committee agreed, although the OTCDC response to the Feds will include objecting to removing the "Unless otherwise determined by law" phrase.

In Section 4D.04 Rick noted sign R10-15 sign is not needed and recommended retaining the current Oregon Supplement

Moving on to Section 4D.05 on page 4D-6 of the MUTCD, Rick said that ODOT currently has a supplement to the standard which should be maintained. He said Item B has proposed signs that are too wordy and may not make sense to many drivers. He also said the sign in paragraph (d) would need to be installed anywhere a permissive movement is subject to emergency vehicle or railroad preemption. He suggested a new Oregon Supplement modifying Item B.4 by deleting (c) and (d) and the required signs and noted that sign references to 2C.54 should be to 2C.53.

Still on Section 4D.05, on page 4D-7, Rick said the meaning of the red arrow is inconsistent with Oregon law and said Oregon should retain it's current supplement. The committee discussed the public understanding of the red arrow and agreed to retain the current supplement. The requirement on page 4D-8 for a new sign, "U-TURN YIELD TO RIGHT TURN" doesn't apply to states like Oregon where U-turns aren't permitted except where specifically signed. Therefore, Rick said we need take no action.

Section 4D.06 redefines Permissive Only Mode left turns. Rick said if the proposed change is approved then Oregon should write a new supplement deleting all changes to Permissive Only Mode. Ed Fischer said he wasn't sure it would hurt Oregon, since it's not generally used here. Consensus was that Oregon should not allow the traffic signal display variations proposed in the standard and to object and write a supplement if not reversed.

The last major item in Section 4 is in Section 4F.04 on a new emergency beacon. Rick said this proposed standard would introduce a new signal display and a new sign to explain it. The signal would stay dark most of the time. The section is written such that the flashing yellow and steady yellow change interval would need to be provided by a single section within the signal head. Rick said Oregon doesn't need and shouldn't permit this display because we already have fire signal signs and emergency signal signs. Oregon law doesn't require a motorist to stop at blacked out signals while other states do, which could cause rear-end accidents. The committee agreed to object to this option.

After a short break the committee considered MUTCD and other matters during a working lunch

Part 2 (Signs) Orville Gaylor said he'd gotten a couple comments back from committee members on the proposed revisions to signing and would like to have any others who have comments to email them to him. He then went on to discuss significant changes/concerns as summarized below.

Orville pointed out the definition for Bicycle Lanes in Section 1A.13 refers to signs and pavement markings as requirements for establishing these lanes. He said Oregon often uses only pavement markings, not both, and so will either have to take exception or start using both. He suggested asking FHWA to allow the option of signs and/or pavement markings. Rob Burchfield said that bike lane markings or signs at frequent intervals are important; the wide line alone isn't enough to distinguish bike lanes. People mistaking it for another travel lane, turn lane or parking area can otherwise be a problem.

Orville also advocated continuing to object to the acceptable abbreviation standards in Part 1, Table 1A-1, He said they aren't desirable in the State because they're often too wide in application. The committee discussed whether it was desirable or worthwhile to write FHWA about . The committee agreed to submit, but to segregate such comments.

Orville noted a new sign design standard in Section 2A.06 which "Unless otherwise stated in this manual for a specific sign..." prohibits phone numbers or internet addresses on signs. The numerous exceptions include word message signs such as for road conditions or regulatory or motorist guidance information.

Table 2A-3 removed "Emergency Evacuation Route Markers" from the list of approved circle signs. They now must be on a square shape similar to the Oregon Trail signs. Orville said if this is approved, ODOT will retain the circle shape within the federally approved sign shape.

Section 2A.22 allows a 2-inch strip of retro-reflective material on sign support of the same color as the background of the sign. This may be an extension of a requirement for reflective strip on railroad crossbucks. Orville said ODOT's not going to use them but sees no reason to object since they're not required.

He noted new tables for regulatory signs on page 2B-2 to 2B-5 and significant changes in metric sign designs, addition of FINES HIGHER, PHOTO ENFORCED, and TRAFFIC LAWS PHOTO ENFORCED signs in the proposed revisions. The committee discussed whether current standards are better than the new ones for PHOTO ENFORCED signs. Putting this type of text on a warning vice regulatory sign raises a debate about strict interpretation of "regulatory" and "warning" vs. most effective signage.

Sections 2B.06 and 2B.10 prohibit putting any sign other than DO NOT ENTER signs back to back with STOP or YIELD signs. The committee agreed to object to this in favor of a prohibition to any sign that obscures the sign shapes from being attached to the backside.

The committee discussed meaning and implications of proposed Section 2B.11 regarding rounding of 85th percentile speeds. It shouldn't affect Oregon since we're covered by ORS/OAR. Members also briefly discussed the proposal to allow use of VMS signs in appropriate colors as regulatory speed signs.

Orville went on to point out a new Section 2B.15 on FINES HIGHER signs that eliminated section on REDUCED SPEED AHEAD SIGNS. Orville said we should object about this and his handout said we should go ahead with using these signs by including them in the Sign Policy.

Orville Suggested objecting to Section 2B-51 on PHOTO ENFORCED signs because they aren't site specific and could mislead drivers. Since it's a "May" condition, committee consensus was to let it be.

Regarding Section 2B.53, Orville was in favor of reminding FHWA they were the ones who had forced removal of in-street pedestrian crossing signs some years back because they can become flying objects when struck by a vehicle. This caused many an outcry from local jurisdictions when ODOT had to tell them to remove them. Committee consensus was to forgive and forget.

Gaylor suggested recommending that the W1 sign series of signs in Table 2C-2 be moved to the box with the 36 inch signs for conventional roads, because they're for curvature and one of the most important warning signs used. The committee, however thought that since the 30" is just a minimum, no objection was necessary.

The Table 2C-4 Guidelines for Advanced Placement of Warning Signs appeared to be excessive and unrealistic to Orville and the committee agreed to comment as such to FHWA.

Under Figure 2C.06, Orville pointed out that the Truck Tipping Symbol signs may be confusing and suggested ODOT send Oregon's sign design to FHWA and ask them to use it instead.

The Example of Advisory Speed signing for a turn or curve requires more signs than seemed reasonable to Orville. The committee agreed to suggest making this "Optional" to FHWA.

Figure 2C-5, adding W8-13 BRIDGE ICES BEFORE ROAD sign was discussed. The problem is that if signs are placed at one bridge and an accident occurs at another bridge, there is a possibility that the road authority will be sued for not placing the sign at that bridge. Orville said we should take exception to this sign.

Regarding the BE PREPARED TO STOP sign in Section 2C.26, Orville said we should suggest an alternate legend such as WATCH FOR STOPPED TRAFFIC because BE PREPARED TO STOP is currently used for flagging operations. The committee saw this as an optional sign that doesn't need to be objected to.

Orville approved of new signs W4-1a and W4-3a which add utility in cases where curves happen before merges and before adding lane situations. The new W4-2 Lane End Signs is also an improvement which Ed wanted to note support for since the NCUTCD almost unanimously voted that it wasn't necessary.

Mr. Gaylor then turned to Section 2C.33 regarding advisory Exit, Ramp, and curve speed signs. There is a requirement to use RAMP SPEED signs in addition to EXIT SPEED signs. He said that the use of curve warning signs give the motorist better guidance than the word message on the RAMP SPEED sign and that the committee should object to this.

Section 2C.37 on Crossing signs requiring that when used at the crossing, non-vehicular warning signs be supplemented with a diagonal downward pointing arrow plaque showing the location of the crossing. The committee agreed that this would be excessive signage and to ask FHWA for a change to "May" language.

Section 2C.42 on advisory speed plaques says they may be used to supplement any warning sign to indicate the recommended speed for a condition but requires an engineering study prior to doing so. Orville thought this was excessive since the plaque can be used under any warning sign. The committee agreed to recommend changing the requirement for a engineering study to allow the use of engineering judgement.

Orville said that Section 2C.49 allowing the use of a PHOTO ENFORCED plaque in conjunction with Signal Ahead Symbol signs should be deleted in favor of regulatory riders or signs since Oregon already uses a regulatory sign for the purpose. The committee decided not to do so, since it is permissive only and won't change Oregon practice.

The committee agreed with Orville that the new sign in Section 2C.50, HILL BLOCKS VIEW sign is an improvement over the old LIMITED SIGHT DISTANCE sign that was removed in the old MUTCD.

Section 2C.51 contains new speed reduction signs that are advisory rather than regulatory. Orville suggested these should not be added and that the current provision for regulatory signs (such as XX SPEED ZONE AHEAD, REDUCED SPEED AHEAD, and SPEED ZONE AHEAD signs. The committee agreed that the warning signs aren't as effective as regulatory signs) be maintained.

Orville said that Section 2D.38 requires larger legends of 8 inch high capital letters on street name signs, and 12 inch high on overhead street name signs. The committee went back and forth on whether or not to go along with this as a "Should" condition or to ask FHWA to make it a "May" condition. This is an extremely expensive change that ODOT can't afford to make. Most signal poles and arms cannot hold up a sign with 12 inch legend. No consensus was achieved.

Moving on to Section 2D.39 on advance street name signs, with 6 and 8 inch minimum letter sizes, the committee had a similar discussion. Some objections to making streets look more like freeways were voiced. Things like concrete barriers now seen on Ashland streets are already drawing negative reactions. No consensus was achieved.

➤ Note - The ODOT/OTCDC comments to FHWA were sent in on August 19th. They may be viewed at the following link: http://dmses.dot.gov/docimages/pdf1a/184782_web.pdf. Randall Wooley was also noted to have commented. See that at http://dmses.dot.gov/docimages/pdf1a/184560_web.pdf.

Access Board

Charles Radosta, noting the late hour, asked for committee input on what to do about the final agenda item. He had provided a memo summarizing draft guidelines for accessible public rights-of-way that was published June 17, 2002. Ed hopes to have a report to give to Bruce Warner in advance of the October 8th meeting in Portland at which Mr. Warner is expected to speak so that he will be well informed whether he chooses to endorse the draft guidelines or not. Various meetings/task forces were discussed. Michael Ronkin assured that there should be more time after the October 8th meeting. Additional information can be obtained at the following website: <http://www.access-board.gov>. Michael Ronkin volunteered to spearhead an effort for others to review. Robin Lewis, Charles Radosta and Cindy Schmitt volunteered to work with Michael.

The meeting adjourned at: 2:06 p.m.

Future Meetings, Including the ACTS / OTCDC Joint Meeting

Our next meeting is scheduled for October 23, 2002, at 9:00 a.m. at the Embassy Suites Hotel, October 23, 2002 in Tigard, Oregon in conjunction with the ACTS Oregon conference. Our September meeting has again been displaced by this meeting and the November meeting is subject to cancellation as well.