

# OTCDC Meeting Minutes

## November 19, 1999

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

**Members Absent:** Joseph Marek, Clackamas County;

**Others Present:** Lew Garrison, City of Salem, Terry Hockett, Salem Public Works; Robert Morast, Washington County; Alan Hollen, Advanced Traffic; Diane Bishop, City of Eugene; Jeffrey White, Exec Director of ACTS Oregon; Orville Gaylor, Doug Bish, Paul Davis Richard Wood, Alan Troyer and Sam Johnston, ODOT Traffic Management Section, Michael Ronkin, ODOT Project Support Section

### Approval of September Meeting Minutes

The September 17, 1999 meeting minutes were approved with minor change noted.

### Old Business

#### **A Guide to School Zone Safety**

Doug Bish reviewed Committee action to date on the subject. He pointed out shaded areas as revisions to the document. Doug said he'd taken a few liberties in terms of changes that were suggested by the Committee. He noted a change in this agenda item from decision item to discussion item since it wasn't ready for approval

Who determines if a school speed zone is appropriate? Doug noted that ODOT is considering making establishment of school speed zones a responsibility of local road authority jurisdictions and asked for Committee input. ODOT could delegate on speed zone order documents any school speed zoning to the local jurisdiction. The committee discussed this and preference was for local jurisdiction control. The difference between school zone and school speed zone and whether it should be more clearly delineated in the document was also discussed.

Page 7: Two sentences lined out as discussed at previous meeting. (~~These signs may be added to posted speed signs if there is room for only one sign post.~~ & "The school Advance signs should have the SCHOOL rider sign added." Regarding the S2-1 sign, Orville Gaylor said he learned in a presentation by FHWA at a recent meeting that new rules in the MUTCD will drop S2-1 sign, will add second advance sign and arrow pointing down 45 degrees at the crosswalk to replace the S2-1 sign. There wasn't time for any discussion of overhead advance

school signing at that meeting but there could be problems with this since adding an arrow sign below the signs could leave insufficient clearance below. There should be a 10-year phase in period for this change.

Doug wanted Committee input on using both "When Flashing" and "When Children are Present" signing in one school zone. Gary Ludeke thought both would be appropriate to cover likely and unlikely times when children could be present and to cover any power problems to the flashers. He noted that the City of Eugene was still struggling with the definition of "When Children are Present". Lew Garrison said that was why Salem liked just using the "When Flashing" signing, because they get much better compliance because it's clearer, simpler. He said it's a clearer indication to the driver with simply "When Flashing" signing. Orville talked of looking for way to incorporate both messages in one rider since his reading of the MUTCD leads him to believe that only one rider is allowed. Ed Fischer noted text talking about alternate legends and how he thought it could be and should be combined to be logical and cover legally in terms of enforceability. He suggested a rider reading "When Flashing or Children are Present". Cindy Schmitt still has major problems with using both. She is concerned if the manual says it's okay to use both it will give those jurisdictions who don't use both problems with people asking why they didn't. Steve Wilson said that until the courts decide we won't know what the legal definition is. Cindy said it went beyond legal enforceability, noted problems with definition of "children" and again stated political problem with ambiguity. Rob Burchfield talked of Portland's desire to maintain logical best time of school zone activity using "When Flashing" and maintain enforceability outside those times since schools are often centers of activity outside school hours. Ed noted his preference in the non-shaded portion in the middle of page 11 to strike the last sentence reading 'On State highways either the "WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT" rider or the "WHEN FLASHING" rider shall be used, but not both.', and possibly the clause starting "...however it may be necessary..." in the prior sentence. Ed said it might be good for anybody with strong feelings one way or the other to give input. Gary Judd said it's not supposed to be all inclusive but to provide guidance to small cities who don't have a traffic engineer. It was clear that more work needed to be done on this section.

Jeffrey White, new ACTS Oregon Executive Director, introduced himself. He said he'd sent the school zone document out to members of the task force for further comment.

Page 12: Regarding use of supplemental devices in the third paragraph, Doug Bish changed wording in third paragraph from what ACTS recommended to some language off of the yellow diamonds criteria that the Committee has since incorporated. Lew Garrison noted it should read "Zone" not "Zones" in second paragraph .

Page 15: Doug noted change in second paragraph for closer compliance to MUTCD because typically crossing guards shouldn't be directing traffic.

Page 13: Lew asked about crosswalk marking, whether the Committee had expressed a preference for the ladder or continental pattern over the old standard crosswalk lines. Doug said that the Committee hadn't gone that far but that both were still possible.

It was noted again that this is still a discussion document. Comments are welcome. Jeffrey White noted that the ACTS School Zone Task Force was given two weeks to comment on this draft, and a meeting of that group was recommended. Jeffrey White and Doug Bish will set it

up.

## **Traffic Signal Policy & Guidelines**

Rick reporting on the progress of the Subcommittee on Traffic Signal Policy and Guidelines, noted handouts, and availability of other committee data if desired. He noted five new pages of changes after the Subcommittee meeting.

He noted the help of others on the Traffic Engineering Section staff and people involved in providing other comments regarding the draft which helped refine the draft product, including Craig Black, John Deskins, Lew Garrison, James Hanks, Gary Ludeke, Joe Marek, Charles Radosta, Willie Rotich, and Randall Wooley.

Rick noted preface material that the guidelines are primarily for use on state highways and may not be appropriate for use on local roads.

Rick started on comments starting with the Traffic Signal Approval process from the cover memo dated November 1, 1999.

The traffic signal approval process started as part of the AMAC process for determining access management issues with regard to ODOT. An ODOT group was trying to determine how best to write an OAR that covered access management and a group from outside of ODOT including realtors, developers and other cities and counties trying to look at the same issue from their perspective. Rick said that early on in the process they saw that traffic signalization was a key element of the access management issue and rather than write an access management rule that had a lot of traffic elements in it, they elected to pull that out of that process and write ODOT's own rule in Division 20 where Traffic Engineering rules are located. The rule has gone to the Attorney General's office and should go to the Transportation Commission for adoption at the December meeting. The guidelines follow the OAR and a continuing effort was made to update the guidelines so they agree with the administrative rule. Rick reiterated that the guidelines apply only to state highways and local roads only where they intersect state highways. He noted that nothing should surprise anybody since it's the same process we've been involved in for a long time.

Rick noted in response to Comment 5 at the top of the second page dealing with projected warrants in planning reconstruction projects at major highway intersection, the history of projecting the daily volume down to the eight hour volume having been fairly accurate, so Rick created a table looking at daily volumes and MUTCD warrants 1 and 2.

**Ed Fischer asked for preference of the Committee to include Rick's new handout as appendix to the guidelines. Consensus was that it should be added, and it will be.**

Bob Morast asked about what if volume would be met in three years, do you put in then or later. Discussion ensued affirming within three years from completion for major reconstruction projects, but that it's different for developers. Rick noted that local jurisdictions look to site generated traffic. Rick's form makes decisions simple when volumes are way over or under benchmarks. The decision is tougher and based on engineering judgement when volumes are right at the volumes listed .

Gary Ludeke asked about need for something about needing to meet pedestrian warrant, such as around a major event center where forecasting may be possible. Rick indicated there may be a need to examine other warrants in some circumstances.

Page 3 bottom: Signal spacing is a part of the OAR. The Committee had no comment.

Rick noted that the majority of comments on page 5-9 regarding left and right turn signalization resulted from the change in speed for allowing protected/permissive. Originally the draft lowered the speed to 35 mph but raised back to 45 mph in response to comments. City of Salem had most comments and was partly satisfied by change, still had problems restricting protected/permissive across three lanes of traffic when 50 feet down the street you can make permissive left turn into a driveway Protected/permitted turns is a new area for the state highways which hasn't had any major problem so far. Discussed table 2 at bottom of page 17 in Guidelines regarding minimum sight distance for permissive left turns.

Rick offered to come back and revisit this area if necessary. A comment from Charles Radosta regarding changing arrow from green to yellow arrow in the same signal section was briefly discussed. Rick noted that in the past color blind people could count on the positional change to determine signal meaning.

Lew Garrison commented on page 8 regarding signing differences between "LEFT TURN YIELD ON GREEN =" and "LEFT TURN YIELD TO ONCOMING TRAFFIC" signs. He noted that he couldn't see a substantial difference between the two and would prefer to use the "GREEN =". Rick noted the response in the text at the bottom of page 8 which states that ODOT reserves the former sign for *permissive* left turns, while the latter sign is used for *protected/permissive* turns.

There followed a general discussion on the historic and possible uses for each sign

It was noted that the MUTCD doesn't recognize "LEFT TURN YIELD TO ONCOMING TRAFFIC" sign --only Oregon uses. "MAY" is used because so many signs are still out there. Lew Garrison thinks this signing is redundant. Ed asked for suggestions on how to phase out the sign. Left turn yield on green ball is "SHALL" in doghouse situations. Ed noted Texas sign "Obey Traffic Signs". Lt. Dennis Carr noted after 23 years on job, his experience is that we're dealing with the lowest common denominator -- and some obvious signs do save lives. Lew wants optional left turn yield to oncoming traffic or left turn yield to green ball. Orville noted it's in sign policy and he could bring back to them.

**Ed Moved we swap the two signs in Signal Policy and Guidelines page 18 Sign OR 17-1 and page 19 sign OR 10-12. Seconded. Adapted unanimously.**

Rick noted that Oregon law was changed to make it clear that allowable turns may be made against either the red ball or red arrow.

Regarding comment number 44 on page 11, Lew Garrison asked when a right turn arrow is not required. Allan said that was the normal situation, done with a programmed three section head. Bob Morast noted green ball being used as protected by some drivers without regard to pedestrians. Rick noted the text did not preclude either option at this time.

Rick noted page 12, Portland's comment on preemption, but no comments were expressed by Committee members.

Terry Hockett brought up flashing yellow or red flashing options note #52 page 13. Rick said ODOT wanted consistency. We want to keep maintenance flash and operational flash the same colors. Bob Morast noted on new installations operation prior to regular turn on they have a procedure of using flashing lights and asked if it is against state rules. Rick said we don't have any rules but ODOT turns signals on when they are installed.

Lew Garrison noted on page 14 optional use of 24/30 inch interior illuminated signs. Orville Gaylor said anything overhead is now required to be a 30/36 inch sign. Anything smaller wouldn't comply with the MUTCD.

Rick noted changes in appendixes C, D, & E– supplemented appendix E.

Rick noted that use of auxiliary heads not covered in this edition as commented on by John Deskins. However we do want to form a committee to look at all the issues involved.

Gary Ludeke noted decision item listing in agenda, versus discussion status he thought Rick was implying. Rick said he would like a decision made to approve the draft.

**A motion was made for endorsement of 11/19/99 ODOT Draft Traffic Signal Policy and Guidelines with revisions by Steve Wilson. The motion was seconded by Cindy Schmitt and passed unanimously.**

Ed Fischer effusively thanked and praised Rick Wood and his fellow Subcommittee members for their untiring efforts on the draft and redrafts.

### **MUTCD Year 2000 Proposed Amendments**

Ed Fischer questioned whether Committee wanted to comment to FHWA, requested members review handouts and discuss any concerns at January meeting as to whether we do want to respond.

Orville Gaylor passed out revised schedule for the rulemaking activity team and said they were going to stick to it and get manual out on time.

Orville concerned about new requirements for reflectorization Still being discussed by AASHTO. Proposal to have minimum standard for retro-reflectivity for signing and striping. Ed may go and vote if necessary

### **Shared Bike Lane/Right Turn Lane Signing**

Diane Bishop passed out diagrams of Portland and Eugene combined bike/right turn lane treatments proposed as standards for the State. She discussed reasons behind the proposed treatments and history of their development in Eugene. She noted, however, that the signing/striping hasn't been brought back to the Committee for adoption. Diane noted the Committees' May discussion brought forth by Portland, and that Rob Burchfield brought up

some design issues needing resolution.

Diane said she would just like to see something usable adopted but Mike had brought up issues that needed to be addressed prior to adopting a standard treatment for these combined or shared lane situations, and that Mike would speak to those concerns.

Rob Burchfield discussed shared bike lane treatments where bike lanes must be interrupted like on a narrow bridge where they want something more definitive than "Bike Lane Ends". This would be a potential application that goes beyond that. The best pavement marking and signing to use is still an open question.

Rob Burchfield discussed possible solutions from other parts of the country like bike symbol "house" used in Denver and San Francisco.

Rob acknowledged that in any case at intersections where parked cars don't preclude it that vehicles use the bike lane as a turn lane and therefore it is practical to deal with that reality through some kind of treatment like Diane is proposing. He expressed concern, though, that the design that had striping dividing the lane between bike and car presented a problem if the car can't fit inside their lane. Striping used can be interpreted to mean exclusive bike lane use, not combined, setting up an impossible appearing situation for some drivers. Moreover he said his understanding of the bike symbol is that it is exclusionary to other vehicle use, compounding the problem.

Rob said one possible solution in Oregon could be use of bike in house marking without striping the lane split.

use of sign figure 111 joint use of a right-turn lane for through bicyclists.

Gary Ludeke asked if the proposals under discussion included the blue lanes Rob had talked about in May. Rob said the blue lanes were a separate issue.

Ed Fischer asked what direction the National Committee was leaning on the issue. Mike Ronkin responded that such lanes are not considered yet at the national committee level. He said Denver has been pushing the bike in house symbol without success at the national level.

Ed asked about the distinction between the words "combined" and "shared". Diane said with the "combined" lane her understanding was that there was an overlaying of two features, the through bike lane and the right turn lane that people are using in a combined manner whereas the shared symbol used in Denver and San Francisco is more what's expected of people when there's not enough room to have a separate bicycle lane then people are expected to share the road. Rob Burchfield said that as applied in Oregon, shared lane implied a lane of sufficient dimension to accommodate more than one vehicle operating side by side. Mike Ronkin said that was no longer the definition in Oregon, that "shared" can now be any dimension and is therefore "dimensionless".

Diane Bishop said that bicyclists are clear that if we provide them with the facility, don't drop at the intersection where they could really use them.

There was continued discussion of the conflict and pro's and cons of proposed solutions. Rob

Burchfield made and subsequently withdrew after some discussion, a motion to adopt a combined lane sign/pavement marking concept to be firmed up later. After further discussion was agreed that a decision package with a couple of options be brought back at a later meeting.

## **New Business**

### **Determine Meeting Schedule for Year 2000**

Suggestion was made that the Committee might want to schedule more combined meetings next year such as the ITE meeting. A few possibilities were discussed but not firmed up due to lack of precise data on dates. In view of this, the next meeting was scheduled for January 21, 2000, at which point the rest of the year's schedule should be decided.

### **Nominations for New Chairperson**

Gary Ludeke says he doesn't mind continuing to serve but is willing to cede to others if there is interest. The nomination process comes close to coinciding with Gary Ludeke's personal term ending in February.

Cindy Schmitt nominated Gary Judd. Gary Judd accepted the nomination and election was by acclamation. He will preside at the January Meeting. Steve Wilson Nominated Gary Ludeke as Vice Chair. He also accepted and was elected by acclamation of all members.

### **Non Agenda Items**

Gary Ludeke asked about any Y2K problems regarding power for traffic control devices. Ed Fischer said the State asked districts to identify critical intersections and what they will do. He said I-5/ORE217, I-5/Market Street, I-5/Mission Street looks like they will use alternate power if necessary. Ed said they will put out public service announcements regarding Y2K as well as big storms, regarding how to act if the power goes out.

Cindy Schmitt commented regarding predetermined detour routes. She said the latest truck accident on I-5 in Salem closed I-5 in both directions and they weren't expecting both ways. They set a detour on Cordon Road. Cindy said this raises the issue of whether we should bag signs/signals when flagging. Gary Judd said that flagging should not be done through stop signs that aren't bagged.

Lt. Dennis Carr suggested the County should write some kind of guideline about when or for how long they should bag signs/signals. Ed Fischer noted a committee is working on this right now – ODOT's Emergency Preparedness Committee. They will look into resolving concerns.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:25 pm.

**To suggest agenda items or for further information regarding Committee meetings, please contact [Paul Davis](#) of ODOT at (503)986-3609.**

OTCDC November 1999

**Oregon Department of Transportation**  
**Traffic Management Section**  
355 Capitol St. NE  
Phone(503) 986-3568 Fax: (503) 986-4063  
email: [odottrafficmanagement@odot.state.or.us](mailto:odottrafficmanagement@odot.state.or.us)

The ODOT is committed to accessibility. Materials on this Web page that do not meet the accessibility standards defined by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0, Conformance Level "A" are available in alternate formats upon request.

Last Updated: 05/20/2004