Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

Meeting Minutes

March 6, 2001

Marion County Public Works, Salem, Oregon

Members Present: Stephen Wilson, Chair, ODOT Region 4; Rob Burchfield, City of Portland; Ed Fischer, Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; Gary Judd, Deschutes County; Randall Wooley, City of Beaverton; Lt. Gordon Renskers, OSP; Robin Lewis for Mike Wilson, City of Bend; Charles Radosta, ITE/Kittelson & Associates; Cynthia Schmitt, Marion County

Members Absent: Joseph Marek, Clackamas County; Mike Wilson, City of Bend

Others Present: Orville Gaylor, Rick Wood, Doug Bish, Lyle Misbach, Michael Ronkin, Allan Troyer, Sam Johnston, Steven Lindland, Chris Monsere, Jerry Morrison and Paul Davis, ODOT Traffic Management Section; Lew Garrison, City of Salem; John Shearer, Capital Enterprise & Engineering, Salem, Oregon

Approval of January 2001 Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Stephen Wilson called the meeting to order promptly at 9:00 a.m. The Committee voted approval of the January 19, 2001 meeting minutes as written.

Old Business

MUTCD 2000

The chair announced that the agenda was going to be flexible in order to accommodate all necessary deliberations on review of the MUTCD 2000. Each subcommittee provided handouts on their review work that include segments on suggested supplements, significant changes to be brought to everyone's attention, and things to forward to FHWA for reconsideration (errors or omissions). Items receiving substantive comment and/or decision by the committee are summarized below.

MUTCD Part 2 (Signs)

Orville Gaylor presented his subcommittee's review of the signing segment of the manual (from handout). Substantial comment/changes to the recommendations of the subcommittee were as detailed below, starting with suggested MUTCD Supplements:

Suggested MUTCD Supplements

Section 2C.32 - reference @ Section 2B.24 & 2B.25 (Page 2B-28) -- The subcommittee recommended continuing prohibiting use of the NO PASSING ZONE pennant (W-14-3), in place of the DO NOT PASS sign (R4-1).

Decision: The committee agreed to retain the prohibition in the Oregon Supplement to the MUTCD of using the NO PASSING ZONE pennant in Oregon.

Section 2D.35 (Page 2D-27 -- The subcommittee recommended retaining current wording in the Oregon Supplement that the standard for guide sign location is the far right of the intersection. When using advance destination signs in high-speed areas, destination signs should be located 60

m (200 ft) or more in advance of the intersection, and following any Junction or Advance Route Turn assemblies that may be required.

Decision: The committee agreed to remove this wording from the Oregon supplement, but to include it instead in the Oregon Sign Policy and Guidelines.

Significant MUTCD Changes to be Brought to Everyone's Attention

Orville then turned to his subcommittee's list of significant changes to the MUTCD that everyone should be aware of. Substantial comment/changes to the recommendations of the subcommittee were as detailed below.

Section 2C (Page 2C-2) Table 2C-4 -- The subcommittee noted that Tables 2C-1 through 2C-4 are new. They recommended that ODOT make comments in the Sign Policy and Guidelines manual for to clarify use of the new Table 2C-4 regarding sign placement.

Decision: The committee agreed to the comments in the Sign Policy and Guidelines, and that ODOT will begin utilizing all four new MUTCD tables for future signs.

Section 2C.27 (Page 2C-23) CROSS TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP sign -- The subcommittee noted that this sign can be regulatory or warning. They believe that since it is not required and may be misleading, the committee should continue using Oregon's SIDE STREET TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP sign.

Decision: The committee agreed to continue using the SIDE STREET TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP sign rather than the optional MUTCD sign, and to document this in the Oregon Supplement.

Section 2C.36 (Page 2C-30) EMERGENCY SIGNAL AHEAD sign -- The subcommittee reports this as a new sign, the Emergency Vehicle (W11-8) sign with the Emergency Signal Ahead (W11-12P) supplemental plaque that must be used in advance of all emergency vehicle traffic control signals.

Decision: The committee agreed that there aren't many cases where this will be necessary in Oregon but noted we need information on the compliance date.

Action Item: Jan Gipson will provide committee members more complete information on compliance dates

Section 2C.37 (Page 2C-32) Crossing Signs -- The subcommittee noted that the appropriate Crossing signs shall be used adjacent to the crossing location of bikes, pedestrians and animals in any case where the crossing activity is unexpected or not readily apparent. Further, if the location isn't delineated by crosswalk pavement markings, the signs shall be supplemented with the diagonal downward pointing arrow plaque (W16-7P) showing the location of the crossing.

Decision: The committee agreed that we need clarification as to whether crosswalks are required for all the known animal crossings or, failing that, the diagonal, downward pointing arrow at each such location.

Things to Forward to FHWA to Reconsider (Complaints, Errors and Omissions).

Gaylor then went over his preliminary list of things to forward to FHWA to reconsider (handout). Substantial comment/changes to the recommendations of the subcommittee were as detailed below.

Section 2B.15 (Page 2B-16) - Orville expressed opposition to the use of the word "shall" in regards to placement of speed zone signs, as well as confusion as to just where signs are required to be placed in cases where roads cross jurisdictional boundaries of metropolitan areas.

Decision: The committee agreed that Oregon should oppose the "Shall" condition, since among other things, it appears to rule out the use of END SPEED ZONE signs. The committee also agreed we need clarification, feeling the MUTCD committee probably had eastern states in mind when they wrote the provision regarding signing at jurisdictional boundaries.

Section 2B.40 (Page 2B-47) - Orville said the subcommittee wanted the word "should" replaced with "may" in the statement: "When right turn on red is permitted and pedestrian crosswalks are marked, the word message TURNING TRAFFIC MUST YIELD TO PEDESTRIANS should be used."

Decision: The committee agreed with the subcommittee position on this and agreed that if FHWA doesn't change it accordingly, it could be fixed by a note in the Sign Policy and Guidelines that other signs can be used.

Section 2B.48 (Page 2B-53, 54) - The subcommittee felt this section requiring the use of preferential lane signs should not be mandatory, particularly regarding bike lanes. If this doesn't get changed, they suggest we maintain our current practice by inserting it into the Oregon Supplement to the MUTCD.

Decision: The committee agreed that Oregon opposes the "shall" condition although there are cases where we do want to use them. The committee also agreed to the added wording in the Oregon Supplement to the MUTCD if FHWA fails to change the MUTCD.

Section 2C.07 (Page 2C-10) - Orville expressed wonder at why the footnote to new TABLE 2C-5 is in there since historically anything 30 mph and lower used the turn sign and the subcommittee doesn't know why that should change. They would like this footnote deleted Ed Fischer pointed out there's also an erratum in the table where the Reverse Curve sign W1-4) is mislabeled as a Reverse Turn sign.

Decision: The committee agreed that it was worth mentioning to FHWA but didn't require any change to local publications or practices.

Section 2C.34 (Page 2C-28, 29) - The subcommittee noted that the Circular Sign W2-6 is not consistent with the Roundabout (Chasing Arrows) sign.

Decision: The committee agreed that because Circular Sign W2-6 may be misinterpreted to mean a left turn is permitted and in order to promote uniformity, a note in the Oregon Supplement to the MUTCD should be included that states the Chasing Arrows sign should be used for roundabouts.

Section 2D.30 (Page 2D-22) - The subcommittee believes that the "shall" regarding directional assembly standards should be changed to "may", particularly in regards to directional arrows pointing to a starting or continuing straight-ahead route, and to the "End" plaque. The committee discussed the pros and cons of this.

Decision: The committee agreed that this would be forwarded to FHWA for correction and if there is none forthcoming, to bring it back to the committee for consideration of a supplement to the MUTCD.

Section 2E.50 (Page 2E-69) - The subcommittee believes that the drawings of No Left Turn and No Right Turn signs are in error and should be listed as optional. The committee discussed the value of the sign and the clarity of the international symbolism.

Decision: The committee agreed that this would also be forwarded to FHWA for correction and if there is none forthcoming, to bring it back to the committee for consideration of a supplement to the MUTCD.

Correction on Chapter 7 & 9 Handout

Rick pointed out two changes to his handout. The first was on page 6 where Letter B near the bottom had the words, "pedestrian walk interval and/or" deleted so that it reads:

> "B. The shortening or omission of any pedestrian change interval shall not be permitted *unless the shortening or omission results from an unexpected railroad or drawbridge preemption.*"

The second correction was on page 11 of Rick's handout, wherein the same words are lined out as above so that it reads the same as the above.

Future OTCDC Meetings on Millennium MUTCD

Progress in the agenda was such that the committee then went into discussion of when to meet next to continue the committee's review of subcommittee recommendations. It was agreed to meet again on March 20th in Corvallis at 1 p.m. and then again on April 10th.

MUTCD Part 3 & 5 (Markings & Low Volume)

Lyle Misbach then reported on his subcommittee's review of Parts 3 and 5 of the MUTCD. Substantial comment/changes to the recommendations of the subcommittee were as detailed below.

Suggested MUTCD Supplements

Section 5B.03 (Page 5B-1) - The subcommittee originally suggested the full committee continue the inclusion of a segment of the Oregon Supplement to the MUTCD noting that Oregon has speed zones, not speed limits and therefore the word "Limit" should not go on our speed signs. However with the current Legislature revisiting this section of the law, he suggested the committee hold off on this until the legislative process runs its course.

Decision: The committee consensus was to hold off on this possible Oregon Supplement until the legislative process clarifies.

Section 3B.16 (Page 3B-32) - Stop and Yield Lines - The subcommittee thought that Oregon should provide additional guidance on the use of yield lines, specifically addressing the use of yield lines as shown for roundabouts in Figure 3B-26, Page 35-57. Misbach said that at this point he didn't think a supplement was needed since the MUTCD doesn't require the shark teeth. The committee discussed the fact that thus far Oregon has not felt it necessary to use the shark teeth yield line for roundabouts, that it is not a requirement and that the drawing shows both shark teeth and dashed lines. The roundabout committee about two years ago decided to wait to see what the new MUTCD said prior to taking action on yield markings at roundabouts.

Decision: The committee decided to take no action on this optional marking. It may be useful in the future, particularly in advance of crosswalks on slip lanes.

Related to the yield pavement marking and not in the handout, Lyle pointed out the new Yield Ahead Symbol Sign (W3-2a) which may be used, suggesting we may want to provide guidance if we decide we don't want it used.

Section 3B.26 (Page 3B-56) - Speed Hump Markings - The subcommittee wanted a supplement providing a "shall" condition in Oregon for speed humps, as well as other options for the type of markings used. The wisdom and legality of speed humps that are unsafe to travel at the posted speed were discussed. ODOT hasn't got a strong opinion on this issue since speed humps are virtually unheard of on the state highway system. Others were divided, between wanting the markings to be required and wanting them to be optional considering the prevalence of unmarked humps on private property and the possibility of their use on non-maintained county roads where keeping the markings painted would be problematic. The fact that various jurisdictions use different markings was brought up. Also considered were advanced markings for speed humps, which are a "may" condition.

Decision: The committee agreed to shelve this issue without action, the "may" condition leaves room for everyone to operate as they see fit.

Action Item: Ed Fischer asked that copies of the Attorney General 's opinion to ODOT on speed bumps and established speeds be provided to committee members. (The opinion essentially stated that speed bumps or other physical devices may not be used to restrict or hinder driving that would in effect regulate speed in a manner incinsistent with the legally established speed.)

Significant MUTCD Changes to be Brought to Everyone's Attention

Lyle then turned to his subcommittee's list of significant changes to the MUTCD Part 3 that everyone should be aware of. The committee discussed just one of these items in substantial detail and decided as follows:

Section 3B.03 (Page 3B-11) - Other Yellow Longitudinal Pavement Markings - The standard in relevant part states that: *"If a continuous median island formed by pavement markings separating travel in opposite directions is used, two sets of double solid yellow lines shall be used to form the island as shown in Figures 3B-2 and 3B-4."* The subcommittee had an issue as to whether this means that the 'reversing curves' in all left-turn bays shall be striped, or if it is acceptable in certain locations (still to be defined) to terminate the double yellow lines, leave an adequate gap, and then continue with the wide white line. The committee discussed the utility of closing the reverse curves, difficulties in striping it, its efficacy in view of how often drivers don’t follow it, and whether it should be addressed in the Oregon Supplement.

Decision: ODOT is still unclear on intent. Once determined, it will be included in the Traffic Line Manual and standard drawings.

Things to Forward to FHWA to Reconsider (Complaints, Errors and Omissions).

Lyle then turned to his subcommittee's list of two items that they'd like to see corrected, one of which aroused interest and discussion as follows:

Section 3B.02 (Page 3B-6) - No Passing Zone Pavement Markings and Warrants - The standard for this section reads *"No-passing zone markings shall be used on approaches to highway-rail grade crossings (see Section 8B.16) and at other locations where the prohibition of passing is appropriate."* This used to be a "may" condition in the previous MUTCD. Misbach said the CFR stated that the "shall" condition would not extend to the "other locations" part of this standard. The

subcommittee was concerned that placing no passing zone markings at all intersections might be appropriate, and therefore necessary.

Michael Ronkin said his study of statute revealed no prohibition of passing in intersections. Others thought it was legal to change lanes in intersections, but not to pass.

Decision: This will be brought to FHWA for comment and correction.

Action Item: ODOT will review state law regarding passing/lane changes in intersections and take findings back to the April 10, 2001 committee meeting.

Michael Ronkin brought up crosswalk markings briefly, saying his reading of Section 3B.17 made him question whether the new MUTCD was not only allowing "continental" markings, but encouraging them. The consensus was that it didn't. Previously the ACTS Oregon School Zone Safety Committee had put out a booklet recommending use of continental crosswalks in school zones. Others are trying to limit them to school zones but Ed said the state's guidance has been to allow them where added emphasis is needed. The recent update of the ODOT Traffic Manual allows them at school crossings, mid-block crossings, roundabouts and other places where an engineering investigation shows the need for added emphasis.

New Business

Legislative Update

Jerry Morrison presented a handout to members summarizing current legislation of special interest to the OTCDC. He said if anyone wanted more detail they could talk to him. Ed said there was a request for his more extensive notes on legislative issues.

Action Item: Jerry will provide his more extensive notes to interested parties indicating ODOT's concerns and opinions regarding particular bills.

October Meeting

Gary Judd reminded members of the Joint Meeting in Bend that will be followed by the Traffic Safety Conference. Anybody with agenda items for the conference should contact Gary.

Action Item: The ODOT Traffic Management Section will prepare for a session on updates to the MUTCD at the Traffic Safety Conference in Bend.

Other Business

Action Item: Updates to the Traffic Line Manual, Sign Manual, Oregon Supplements, ODOT Traffic Manual, Striping Guidelines and Short Term Workzone Handbooks as time allows upon completion of the MUTCD 2000 review and errata process.

Action Item: The ODOT Traffic Management Section will get and provide information on bulk purchase options for the new MUTCD and provide to the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 to reconvene in Corvallis March 20th.

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

Meeting Minutes

Continuation of March 6th MUTCD 2000 Review

March 20, 2001

OSU LaSells Stewart Center, Corvallis, Oregon

Members Present: Stephen Wilson, Chair, ODOT Region 4; Rob Burchfield, City of Portland; Ed Fischer, Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; Gary Judd, Deschutes County; Randall Wooley, City of Beaverton; Mike Wilson, City of Bend; Charles Radosta, ITE/Kittelson & Associates; Cynthia Schmitt, Marion County

Members Absent: Joseph Marek, Clackamas County; Lt. Gordon Renskers, OSP

Others Present: Orville Gaylor, Rick Wood, Doug Bish, Lyle Misbach, Michael Ronkin, Allan Troyer, Sam Johnston, Steven Lindland, Jan Gipson, David Greenberg and Paul Davis, ODOT Traffic Management Section; Craig Black, ODOT Region 2 Traffic Operations; Lew Garrison, City of Salem; Jay Heck, Lincoln City; Bill Brownlee, Marion County; Jane Lee, Travel Information Council; Ed Chastain, Lane County

Greeting Introductions and Agenda Reminder

Chairperson Stephen Wilson opened the meeting at 1:00 p.m, and reminded members that we were continuing to review the new MUTCD. Committee members and other attendees then introduced themselves.

Old Business

MUTCD 2000

Ed Fischer reviewed progress on the MUTCD review and the committee agreed to work until around 3-3:30 p.m and get as far as possible on the remaining sections.

MUTCD Part 4, 8 & 10 (Signals, RXR & Light Rail)

Rick Wood noted that he'd handed out corrected copies of his handout. He described his handout as a summary of what the subcommittee did on the three sections of the MUTCD, draft supplements, and an appendix with some definitions from the Oregon Revised Statutes. He suggested going directly to his draft of possible Oregon Supplements on Page 10, and going back to discuss specifics of the subcommittee discussion as needed to answer any questions.

Suggested MUTCD Supplements

Rick noted retention in the Oregon supplement of the meaning of "shall", "should", and "may" and went on to summarize other possible supplements. The committee agreed without much comment with the changes as outlined in Rick's handout. Substantial comment/changes to the recommendations of the subcommittee were as detailed below.

4D.06 Application of Steady Signal Indications for Left Turns - The subcommittee wanted to change Standard C.4 on page 4D-10 of the MUTCD, requiring the supplementary sign, LEFT TURN YIELD ON GREEN with a symbolic green ball (R10-12) be used in Oregon.

Decision: The committee decided to scrap this supplement considering the cost of signs, the "may" condition allowing for use when needed and the desire to keep the Supplement of a manageable size.

4D.13 Preemption and Priority Control of Traffic Control Signals - The subcommittee believed that shortening of pedestrian walk intervals should not be permitted whenever it could be avoided and therefore suggested the supplement language *"The shortening or omission of any pedestrian change interval shall not be permitted unless the shortening or omission results from an unexpected railroad or drawbridge preemption."* The committee agreed with this, noting that it's required by Oregon law.

Decision: The committee agreed with this supplement with the addition of a reference to OAR 734-020-0320(4)(e), which prohibits the termination of an active pedestrian or vehicular clearance interval by emergency preemption or bus priority.

4D.15 Number and Location of Signal Faces by Approach - In this instance the subcommittee didn't give verbatim the proposed wording for the supplement. The subcommittee thought the guidance at the bottom of page 4D-22 should state "should be considered" rather than "should be used'. References to 85th percentile approach speed in the text and in Table 4D-1 should also apply to posted speeds. There was some question as to why the 85th percentile shouldn't be considered since it would usually come close to or exceed the posted speed. Rick said this was a protection from legal liability since in most cases we wouldn't want to go out and do a speed study and the posted speed is what we would want to apply.

Decision: The committee suggested this as an erratum and agreed with this as a supplement if it doesn't get corrected.

8A.01 Introduction - The subcommittee offered the following language to replace that in the current Oregon Supplement regarding authority of the ODOT Rail Division: *Under Oregon law the ODOT Rail Division is authorized to determine the character and type of traffic control devices used at all highway-rail grade crossings."* This simply updates the language of the current version which refers to Rail Division as being under the auspices of the PUC Commissioner. Additionally in the introduction the subcommittee suggested adding two new standard definitions for Pedestrian Clear Out Interval (PCOI) and Vehicle Clear Out Interval (VCOI) that are terms of Oregon law.

Decision: The committee agreed with this supplement with the addition of a citation of ORS 824.202 where the ODOT Rail Division is authorized to determine the character and type of traffic control devices used at all highway-rail grade crossings. They had no objection to the new definitions.

8B.02 Highway-Rail Grade Crossing (Crossbuck) Sign (R15-1, R15-2) - The subcommittee wanted to add to the Option to the first Standard, *"The supplemental Number of Tracks sign shall be used at all multiple track highway-Rail Crossings."* This is necessitated by the fact that Oregon law requires the number of tracks to be posted at gated crossings as well as non-gated crossings.

Decision: The committee agreed with this supplement with the addition of a citation of OAR 741-110-04-(8) and OAR 741-110-0060(3).

8B-09 Emergency Notification Sign (I-13 or I-13a) - The subcommittee suggested a supplement statement that *"All Emergency Notification signs and markings shall conform to the requirements of the Oregon Department of Transportation, Rail Division as set forth in Administrative Rules and Crossings Orders served by the division."*

Decision: The committee agreed with this supplement with the addition of a citation of OAR 741-115-0040.

8D.07 Traffic Control Signals at or Near Highway-Rail Grade Crossings - The subcommittee recommended the standard that starts on the bottom of page 8D-10 and continues into the next page be supplemented with three more paragraphs. The committee accepted the first two regarding the VCOI and PCOI without objection.

The third paragraph stated, "*If supported by an engineering study that indicates circumstances warrant it, the State Traffic Engineer may authorize a signalized intersection operation that deviates from the standard."* This one brought up considerable discussion regarding whether the Rail Section consults with ODOT, whether the State Traffic Engineer, or local road authority should be the one authorizing and interpreting an engineering study, etc. Ed Fischer thought the important thing was that a standard is established, that there can be a deviation, but an engineering study must be done in order to do so.

Decision: The committee agreed to send this paragraph back to the subcommittee for another look at final wording.

Part 10 - Rick said that the subcommittee didn't have time to finish this.

MUTCD Part 6 (Work Zones)

Jan Gipson's subcommittee handout consisted of suggested additions to the Oregon Supplements which she went over for the committee. Substantial comment/changes to the recommendations of the subcommittee were as detailed below.

Suggested MUTCD Supplements

6F.03 Guidance - The subcommittee found that the language on page 6F-3 and in other places was too strong, and felt the intent could be better conveyed by specifying the decisions to be made when placing sign supports. They felt this was probably best addressed in a supplement to Section 6A that conveys the following: *"Care should be taken that pedestrian and cyclist traffic is provided for in the work zone. Signs should be located so that adequate access for pedestrians and cyclists is maintained if possible. If the movement of pedestrian and/or cyclist traffic must be impeded, appropriate warning signs and/or detours should be provided."* There was discussion as to what appropriate warning signing would be. It was agreed that signs such as SIDEWALK CLOSED AHEAD, ROADWORK AHEAD, BICYCLES SHARE ROADWAY would be some possibilities. There are often situations where there's no choice but to impact pedestrian/bicyclist access, but the committee agreed attention should be given to providing for them.

Jan said the Revisions to Section 6 constitute a change in business practice in that a lot of new detail on how to handle the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists is scattered through the section.

Decision: The committee agreed to have the subcommittee summarize all the new provisions for pedestrians and bicyclists and bring it back to the committee. The committee will then again look at proposed wording for the supplement.

6G.10, Subsection B - Bicyclists - The subcommittee felt that the standard statement which requires adequate access be provided to bicyclists when the work area affects their movement didn't adequately define when this is the case. The committee found the suggested supplementary wording somewhat confusing and hopefully unnecessary.

Decision: The committee agreed to scratch the proposed supplement.

6H-4 Typical Application 4 - The subcommittee agreed the distance allowed between advance signs and the work, up to 5 miles/8 kilometers, to be too far. They suggest a supplement to restrict this to one mile or less during adverse conditions. The committee discussed what kind of work zone this would apply to.

Decision: The committee agreed to the proposed supplement for mobile operations on the road shoulder.

Jan said the draft Short Term Traffic Control Handbook was distributed at the subcommittee meeting for review nd will be revised after the adoption of the Part 6 is approved by the OTCDC.

Adoption of the Oregon Supplement to the MUTCD

Ed said it didn't seem like a good idea to go forward with adoption of the Oregon Supplement until we see FHWA's issue of erratum to MUTCD 2000 which has been delayed by the hold put on the Federal Register.

MUTCD Part 7 & 9 (Schools, Bicycles)

Doug Bish acknowledged his subcommittee had taken a little more liberty in making their suggestions for the committee. Substantial comment/changes to the recommendations of the subcommittee were as detailed below.

Suggested MUTCD Supplements

7B.08 (Page 7B-4) - School Advance Warning Sign (S1-1) - The subcommittee felt requiring use of the AHEAD or XX FEET plaque to the school Advance Warning Sign added no value and unnecessarily increased costs. They suggested a supplement to that effect.

The committee discussed the utility of the plaque, the different scenarios of school zones (with or without school crossings, etc), and the slightly modified wording for the supplement: *"If used, the School Advance Warning sign may be supplemented with a supplemental plaque with the legend AHEAD (W16-9) or XXX METERS (XXX FEET)(W16-2 or W16-2a)."*

Decision: The committee agreed to the proposed supplement as modified.

7B.08 (Page 7B-4) - School Advance Warning Sign (S1-1) - A second problem the subcommittee saw was that specific direction is given to the location of the sign. Sometimes a reduced school speed is determined to begin outside of the limits of the standard to where a School Advance Warning sign could not be located within the specified distance. The two standards could be in conflict.

Decision: The committee agreed to the proposed supplement after some clarification.

7B.11 (Page 7B-7) - School Speed Limit Assembly - Doug said the subcommittee's proposed supplement was to comply with agreed upon wording at a previous OTCDC meeting as follows:

7B.11 When a 20 mph school speed zone is established, the school speed sign assembly shall be used. It shall consist of the “SCHOOL” sign, a “SPEED 20” sign, and a “WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT” sign and/or a “WHEN FLASHING” sign.

The school speed sign assembly “SCHOOL SPEED 20 WHEN FLASHING” sign should be used together with flashing lights to indicate when children are scheduled to arrive at or leave school. The preferred placement of flashing lights is to mount them on the same structure as the speed sign assembly.

A 36" wide School Speed sign assembly shall be used on all four-lane highways and rural highways. A 24" wide assembly may be used on urban 2-lane streets.

The committee discussed this again, with disagreement on whether both indications should be on the sign. It was pointed out that the Attorney General has made it clear that there is nothing illegal about enforcing both in the same school zone.

Decision: The committee agreed to the proposed supplement after some clarification.

7E.05 (Page 7E-2 - Operating Procedures for Adult Guards - Doug said that the new MUTCD says that adult crossing guard should use a STOP paddle. The STOP paddle should be the primary hand-signaling device. He said the subcommittee didn't think the crossing guards had to use STOP paddles and we shouldn't be saying they should. Doug said Oregon law says STOP paddles should not be used at crosswalks controlled by traffic signals or STOP signs.

The committee discussed whether this was entirely accurate and Orville pointed out that you cannot flag on state highways without a flagger's license. Whether or not the Department of Education should providing flagger training was discussed. There was a question as to why it would be a problem at a stop sign. The subcommittee's efforts were to make it clear that adult crossing guards could be using the same flagging devices that student patrols use.

Decision: The committee agreed to send the proposed supplement back to the subcommittee to further inquire as to the legality of STOP paddles at stop signs.

9B.04 (Page 9B-4) - Bicycle Lane Signs - The subcommittee noted that the new MUTCD says that *"Bicycle Lane signs shall be used in advance of the beginning of a marked bicycle lane…"*, whereas the 1988 MUTCD said "*should*", and ODOT currently does not use these signs.

The subcommittee's suggested supplement would state that *"Bicycle Lane signs may be used in advance of the beginning of a marked bicycle lane and shall not be required at the beginning of a marked bicycle lane or at periodic intervals."* The committee thought the *"…shall not be required at the beginning of a marked bicycle lane…" portion was superfluous.*

Decision: The committee agreed to the proposed supplement as amended.

New Business

The committee discussed the April 10th meeting agenda and agreed to use that meeting to review rewrites and any new material. Ed said members should try to compile erratum for FHWA prior to the meeting so that it can be sent.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Our next meeting is scheduled for April 10, 2001, at 9:00 a.m. at Marion County Public Works, 5155 Silverton Road, Salem, Oregon. The agenda will include Jan Gipson summarizing all the committee's work thus far in agreements to Oregon Supplements to the MUTCD, erratum, etc.