Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

Meeting Minutes

May 18, 2001

New Kings Inn/Best Western, 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; Joseph Marek, Clackamas County; Randall Wooley, City of Beaverton; Gordon Renskers, OSP; Mike Wilson, City of Bend; Charles Radosta, ITE/Kittelson & Associates; Cynthia Schmitt, Marion County

Members Absent: Ed Fischer and Rob Burchfield arrived late due to other commitments.

Others Present: Orville Gaylor, Rick Wood, Doug Bish, Sam Johnston, Jan Gipson Steve Lindland and Chris Monsere, ODOT Traffic Management Section; Willard Bradshaw, ODOT Region 2; Nathaniel Price, FHWA; Ed Chastain, Lane County' Mike Coleman, Willie Rotich & Bill Kloos, City of Portland, Jimmie Collier, Vaughn Lewis & Robert Morast, Washington County; Lew Garrison and Terry Hockett, City of Salem; Robert Kortt, RDK Engineering; Somkeart Sartnurak, City of Corvallis; John Irwin, Capital Enterprise; Roger Boettcher, Group Mackenzie; Ronald Failmezger, Kittelson & Asssociates; Dwayne Hofstetter and Jeff Drago, David Evans & Associates; Walt Clay, Lancaster Engineering, Kristi Mayes, City of Springfield, David Jardin, City of Tualatin; Scott Robinson and Sandi Taylor, Econolite Control Products, Anne Sylvester, Parametrix Incorporated; Carl Springer, DKS Associates, Dan Keifer, Advanced Trafffic Products; Vern Tabery, Tabery & Associates

Introduction/Approval of April 2001 Meeting Minutes/Additional Agenda Items

Chairperson Stephen Wilson called the meeting to order. The Committee voted approval of the April 10, 2001 meeting minutes after introductions.

Old Business

Final Review Supplements to MUTCD 2000

MUTCD 2000 Part 3, Proposed Oregon Supplement

Jan Gipson reported first on Part 3 regarding speed humps. The standard in 3B.26 states that if used, speed hump markings shall be a series of white markings placed on a speed hump to identify its location. The committee had agreed that speed humps on public roads should be marked rather than going with other alternatives. Therefore the following standard was proposed for the Oregon Supplements to the MUTCD:

> **"Speed hump markings shall be placed on a public roadway speed hump to identify its location."**

The committee had no objections.

MUTCD 2000 Part 4, Proposed Oregon Supplement

Rick Wood reported on 4D.05, Standard D was overlooked in previous proposed supplements and that it conflicts with ORS 811.260 and 811.360. It states that a steady red arrow signal shall be displayed when it is intended to prohibit traffic from entering an intersection to make the indicated turn. Therefore Standard D should be deleted in it's entirety.

The committee had no objections.

MUTCD 2000 Part 7, Proposed Oregon Supplement

Doug Bish reported initial inquiry with the director of ACTS Oregon as to whether they are interested in creating a task force to come up with guidelines and standards for student and adult school crossing guards. He reported on the Oregon Department of Education's Traffic Patrol Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which does set up some standards. He said the DOE is given the authority in the ORS to set forth the standards for them, and there is an OAR that says the school patrols will be operated as per the DOE Manual unless a school district has other guidelines for it. He also reported that any changes to current standards would probably have to go into the DOE manual.

Doug summarized what had lead to this research. He explained that in order for adult crossing guards to use the school flags distributed by the Oregon Department of Education, the second paragraph of the Guidance should 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."

Additionally, in order that adult crossing guards do not violate appropriate driver response to a traffic signal, governed by ORS 811.260, the following standard should be added:

> **"Adult crossing guards shall not use STOP paddles at crosswalks controlled by traffic signals."**

Orville asked if there was a requirement for adult crossing guards to have a flagger card to stop traffic on state highways. Steve Wilson said he didn't think there was such a requirement. Doug said Sheila Giambrone asked whether OSHA covers crossing guards, and they're researching that issue. He said paid crossing guards are covered by OSHA and even some volunteers are depending on insurance coverage used. Anybody covered by OSHA is required to have some kind of training.

Cynthia Schmitt asked if it wasn't ODOT policy to require training and certification in order to stop traffic on state highways. She said that in Marion County, crossing guards aren't permitted to create gaps in traffic like a certified flagger may, with the standard 3-sign setup. She thinks the new MUTCD creates a serious inconsistency in this practice. She said she's noticed crossing guards also flagging traffic in and out of side streets and school driveways. Mike Wilson reported the same problem in Bend and said there should be some sort of certification and training. Ed Chastain said they don't have any adult crossing guards in the county proper. Vaughn Lewis said Washington County has training for crossing guards. Doug said Sheila Giambrone also points out there is no enforcement mechanism to force training. Vaughn said they were trying to encourage uniformity in Washington County cities to minimize differences between adjacent county/city schools. He said the county's premise is that crossing guards are there to control the pedestrians, not stop traffic.

Rob Burchfield said the City of Portland doesn't have any current program for adult crossing guards but they're interested in investigating it. He feels that in at least some circumstances it would be appropriate for them to pursue the idea that trained adult crossing guards *can* stop traffic and create gaps. With some of the traffic volumes they deal with, the only other option is a signal and he's not sure a signal is the better solution. The crossing guards would only be doing it for 20 minutes or so per day saving the cost of a signal that's not otherwise warranted.

The committee considered more formal requirement for training and enforcement of any training requirements. Doug said he wasn't sure including something in the Supplements would help. He suggested it would be better to get the DOE to agree to update their manual and get OSHA to back it's requirement. Gary Judd said his experience is that the school districts want no part of the liability. They'd prefer the road authority be held responsible.

Doug said we'd have to change the law because the law in ORS 339.650 and 339.665 defines and gives the district school boards authority to organize, supervise, control or operate traffic patrols after consultation with ODOT DMV, ODOT Highway Division and the State Police.

Rob Burchfield asked Vaugn how Washington County enforces training of crossing guards. The county provides the training, and requires before any school crossing is put in that trained adult crossing guards are provided by the school. This is monitored and if a school doesn't continue to comply, they remove the school crossing. Vaugn said Sheila Giambrone is a good contact on how the program is set up.

No objections were finally voiced against the proposed supplements.

MUTCD 2000 Part 10, Proposed Oregon Supplement

Rick Wood discussed the proposed supplement to 10A.01. The first paragraph under "Support" should be revised in a supplement as follows, consistent with the requirements of ORS 824.202, "Policy; authority vested in state and department":

> "Part 10 provides standards and guidelines for the design, installation, and operation of traffic control devices at grade crossings of highway traffic and light rail transit vehicles to facilitate the safe, orderly, and integrated movement of all traffic. *Except where light rail transit operates at-grade and within highway right-of-way and no Crossing Order is served by the ODOT Rail Division, the traffic control devices, systems, and practices for highway-rail grade crossings described in Part 8 and these supplements shall be used.*"

Rick explained that essentially the idea is that light rail crossing shall be treated the same as heavy rail crossing if there is an order issued for gates and lights.

There was no objection expressed to this proposed supplement.

MUTCD 2000 Part 2, Proposed Oregon Supplement

Orville Gaylor said he'd noticed in updating the Sign Policy and Guidelines that the new 6" requirement for guide sign lettering would include Adopt-a-Highway signing. He calculated that this change would make these 24" x 24" signs 42" x 36", and would require a 6" x 8" x 20' post to install them (with a 7-year phase-in). With over 1000 adopted sections, 2000 signs, the replacement costs would be at least $977,000. This doesn't include the cost of Historical Trail riders and Recreational Symbol riders. Since these signs aren't major guide signs, he suggested supplemental guidance as follows:

> The principal legend on Adopt-A-Highway signs and riders, Historical Trail riders, and Recreational Symbol riders should be a minimum of 4 inches in height.

There was no objection to this proposed supplement.

MUTCD 2000 – Future Action & Approval of Today's Supplements

Jan said the plan now is to wait for FHWA to come out with their errata, at which point the OAR process could begin. It would go to the Transportation Commission for approval about three months later. There have been indications that the errata list could be fairly extensive so it doesn't make sense to go forward until it comes out and we can review it. The supplements presented today need to be approved, then a complete list can be mailed out to committee members.

Decision: The committee voted to approve the 5 latest supplements without objection.

MUTCD 2000 – Bulk Orders

Jan said there has been preliminary discussion with Larry Christianson to get a grant to purchase a base total of the publication for ODOT and other city/county jurisdictions. If a jurisdiction wanted more, they would have

to make their own purchase arrangements. It was asked if partial or sections of the publication would be available. This has not been determined.

New Business

Legislative Update

Jan Gipson filled in for Jerry Morrison on the legislative news front. A handout, up-to-date as of the morning, was handed out to attendees. She reported Ed was involved in a hearing on the legislation raising rural highway speeds.

Jan briefed the committee on other legislation, including motorized scooters (SB 173), passing and right-of-way in roundabouts (SB 844) pedestrian right-of-way at crosswalks (SB 938), photo red-light expansion (HB 2380), safety corridors sunset elimination (HB 2569), Travel Information Council Signing (HB 2937), etc.

After a break, Ed Fischer briefed the committee on what he'd learned at the Legislature that morning. He noted that HB2991 which called for a rural residential 35 mph in collectors, arterials in residential district is dead without a hearing.

On SB 844, Ed reported that the provision prohibiting passing had not survived, but the rest regarding yielding right of way to vehicles exiting from ahead in the left lane had been sent to the House floor with a "Do Pass" recommendation.

Ed also briefed on HB 3840 which would allow raising the rural interstate speed to 70 mph and off-interstate to 65/70 mph. The Governor is still willing to entertain this measure, which replaces SB 502. ODOT's desired caveats that all speeds become limits, and we still have violation of basic rule for conditions appear doable. The bill would also do some housecleaning to the speed statutes. It essentially guts ORS 810.180 and makes it four sections. The state police, concerned about putting limits everywhere, suggested studies to raise speeds to 65, particularly in Eastern Oregon. Passage would involve need for safe speed on curve signing on some roads. No consideration has been given to lowering any particular speed limits in view of the addition of the "limit" caveat.

Sign Policy and Guidelines

Orville Gaylor then went through the latest changes to the Sign Policy and Guidelines from a handout. And asked for committee approval.

Decision: The committee voted to approve the changes without objection.

Non-Agenda Items

Ed updated the committee on the draft signal power/maintenance agreement.

The committee discussed Beaverton issue regarding the length of the yellow light cycle when photo radar is in use. Also discussed the need to turn off the camera/ticketing software when the signal is on all red flash. Bill Kloos suggested the subcommittee that reviewed Section 4 of the MUTCD get together to see if they can come to a consensus on signal timing at photo radar locations – will try to get this done by the July meeting.

In-Roadway Warning Lights for Crosswalks

Scott Robinson and Sandy Taylor of Econolite Control Products, demonstrated their new product, the "smartstud" in-road marker guidance system. The led-lighted buttons are inductively powered through wire buried in the roadway and have always on and two flashing patterns. They have uses from runway guidance, to crosswalk and traffic delineation. Scott and Sandy answered committee questions and later did an outside demonstration of smartstud visibility in daylight.

Non-Agenda Items

Rick reported a new Federal Register article about accessible pedestrian devices that changes some parts of Part 4 of the new MUTCD. Rick reviewed it and said it wasn't monumental. He said it does reference a document he hasn't read yet called "Accessible Pedestrian Signals", publication number A-67 by the U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (US Access Board) Bill Kloos said the publication was done a couple years ago, so it's getting dated now.

Bill Kloos said there was a new publication out by an ITE technical committee that he's ordered on in-roadway lighting. He's not sure what the committee came up with in the publication.

Bill Kloos said with the energy issues or crisis they're facing, Portland is planning to do a complete change-out of incandescent lamps—both red and green. He thinks there is an issue about approval of the greens in Oregon which he intends to discuss with Mark Rodgers and TSSU. He said there's a lot of power rebates available right now that agencies should be checking on. He said a 2.2 million dollar project in Portland is expected to get $800,000 in rebates from PGE and Pacific Power. He said there was an incentive to get it done by December, so if other agencies are considering it, they should look into rebates from the utilities.

Rick Wood thought the LED green was now acceptable. Ed Fischer said ODOT's been looking into it as well, although he hadn't heard about the rebates. He thought that could change some opinions. He said ODOT had done some inquiries to get some green LED's set up at TSSU to evaluate. He also heard CALTRANS is specifying green LED's exclusively, and that WASHDOT is as well. He's got some AASHTO traffic engineers from around the country that are going exclusively LED on red and green lights. Ed said when ODOT looked into it, they were finding that green LED's section heads were costing $308 apiece. They're a little less than that now, but when you do the math that's 6 cents a kilowatt hour, meaning more than five years payback in terms of cost. Rebates may make it more doable, but ODOT is not yet ready to start specifying green LED's, although they are closer. Rick said there is some question about availability.

Gary Judd asked if there was any question about green LED's are allowed. Ed said his understanding is that green LED's are approved for use since so many states are now specifying them.

The meeting Adjourned at: 11:50 a.m.

Our next meeting is scheduled for July 20, 2001, at 9:00 a.m. at the Marion County Shops.