

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

November 19, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Corrected

Marion County Public Works
Salem, Oregon

Members Present: [Robin Lewis](#), Chair, City of Bend; [Joel McCarroll](#), ODOT Region 4; [Eric Niemeyer](#), Vice-Chair, Jackson County; [Charles Radosta](#), ITE/Kittelson & Associates; [Cynthia Schmitt](#), Marion County; [Randall Wooley](#), City of Beaverton; [Ed Fischer](#), Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; [Rob Burchfield](#), City of Portland; [Joseph Marek](#), Clackamas County; [Alan Hageman](#), OSP

Others Present: Nick Fortey, FHWA; Doug Bish, Paul Davis, Jan Gipson, Kevin Haas, June Ross, Massoud Saberian, Greg Stellmach, Julia Wellner, ODOT Traffic Engineering & Operations Section; Dan MacDonald (arrived late), Al Sovey, ODOT Rail; Brian Barnett, City of Springfield; Ed Chastain, Lane County, Mike Coleman, City of Portland; Orville Gaylor, Retired ODOT; Terry Hockett, City of Salem; Tom Larsen, City of Eugene

Introduction – Approval of Minutes – Additional Agenda Items

Chairperson Robin Lewis called the meeting to order. The committee and other attendees introduced themselves. The agenda item on Section 8 was moved back due to Dan MacDonald's unavoidable delay in arriving. Ed said if there was time, he'd like to get feedback on updating the committee's "Interested Others" list. When approval of the October minutes came up, Cindy Schmitt said that her meaning under Section 2C.36 & 2C.46 on Page 4 of the October minutes wasn't accurately portrayed. More accurately, it should be as follows: "Cindy was still concerned that while there should be a standard to be followed, the use of the ball bank should not be the only allowable methodology. She felt there were a number of small cities and rural counties that did not use ball bank indicators that would need the other options provided by the manual to set speeds on their curves." The committee discussed this and further reviewed the subject supplement. They agreed to further edit the proposed supplement by removing the statement, "Although current research indicates that drivers favor speeds on curves closer to a 16 degree ball bank reading, Oregon favors a more conservative approach to Advisory Speed signing". This is subject to future change if FHWA and others studying the issue come up with any better alternatives.

Decision – Randall Wooley moved and Joel seconded amending the minutes to reflect Cindy's intent as well as amending the proposed supplement to Section 2C.36 and 2C.46 of the new MUTCD. The committee passed the motion.

OLD BUSINESS

Draft OAR Revisions & Significant Changes for Part 2

Julia Wellner handed out her latest last change proposals for Part 2.

2B.38 Street Name Sign (D3-1) – New guidance recommends that overhead street name signs should be considered in urban areas, especially if advance street name signs aren't used, and that legend on

such overhead signs should be at least 12 inch high capital letters, or 12 inch upper-case/9 inch lower-case letters. Julia proposed a couple options to modify the guidance but after discussion, the committee decided that a supplement wasn't needed.

Decision – Eric Niemeyer moved and Rob Burchfield seconded that an amendment wasn't needed and ODOT should consider adding further guidance to the Sign Policy & Guidelines. The committee passed the motion.

2B.11 – This new section of the MUTCD addresses the use of Yield lines and new Yield Here to Pedestrians signs in advance of unsignalized mid-block crosswalks which is contrary to Oregon law. The committee agreed to delete this standard requiring these and add a supplemental Standard as follows:

“Oregon law (ORS 811.010) requires that drivers stop for pedestrians within an unsignalized, marked, midblock crosswalk. Yield lines and Yield Here to Pedestrian signs shall not be used in advance of these crosswalks. Delete the standard and replace with the following:

Standard:

If Stop lines are used in advance of a marked crosswalk at an uncontrolled location, Stop Here for Pedestrians (OR22-25R, OR22-25L) signs shall be placed adjacent to the stop line (see Section 3B.16 for line placement).”

Decision – Ed Fischer moved and Joel McCarroll seconded that an amendment be approved as stated above. The committee approved the motion.

2B.12 – This new section introduced the In-Street Crossing signs. Use of the Yield to Pedestrian Within Crosswalk (R1-6) sign is contrary to Oregon law. Only the Stop for Pedestrian Within Crosswalk (R1-6a) is appropriate. Julia proposed a supplement as follows:

“Oregon law (ORS 811.010) requires that drivers stop for pedestrians within a crosswalk. Delete all references to the STATE LAW YIELD TO (Pedestrian symbol) WITHIN CROSSWALK (R1-6) sign. Add the following Standard:

Standard:

“In-Street Pedestrian Crossing signs incorporating YIELD shall not be used. If used, In-Street Pedestrian Crossing signs shall include a STOP symbol or legend.”

The committee agreed that this supplement was needed.

Decision – Randall Wooley moved and Ed Fischer seconded that the amendment as stated above be approved. The motion was approved.

Discuss Draft OAR Revisions & Significant Changes for Parts 6

Jan Gipson said that she didn't think any supplements would be necessary for Part 6. Rail Division is still reviewing and she will advise if/when this changes. She expects to be ready in January with no changes to Part 6. Cindy said it would be a good idea for members to go through the 2003 MUTCD and review it for changes from the 1988 edition, not just the millennium edition. Jan said the 2003 version now cites references, and when the references change, the MUTCD changes with them. When changes occur, Jan will try to get the word out.

Part 7 & A Guide to School Area Safety

Doug Bish passed out background material on his proposed supplements for the new Manual.

7B.09 – In order to allow the use of the School Advance Warning (S1-1) sign without a supplemental arrow plaque overhead at marked crosswalks, the following paragraph is added:

“If used overhead at a marked crosswalk, the School Advance Warning (S1-1) sign may be installed without the supplemental arrow plaque. A ground mounted School Crosswalk Warning Assembly is required at overhead installations of the School Advance Warning sign (S1-1).”

Decision – Eric Niemeyer moved and Robert Burchfield seconded that the amendment as stated above be approved. The committee voted in favor.

7E.05 – The proposal is to change the supplement to the Manual by deleting the second paragraph of the Guidance and adding an Option as follows:

“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.”

The committee wanted to try to tie in training to this and agreed to add this to the supplement as follows:

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

Decision – Rob Burchfield moved and Ed Fischer seconded that the amendment as stated above be approved. The motion was approved.

The committee then discussed a proposal to add the following standard so that crossing guards do not violate appropriate driver response to a traffic signal governed by ORS 811.260:

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

Decision – Rob Burchfield moved and Ed Fischer seconded that the amendment as stated above be approved. The committee voted in favor.

Then Doug brought up an issue that Rob Burchfield had come across regarding an apparent discrepancy between ORS language that specifies that a school zone is “adjacent to school grounds” and the standard of starting the zone 100 to 200 feet in advance of school property. Currently if any part of a school zone is adjacent, the whole is said to be an adjacent school zone. He gets requests to make the school zone bigger, and uses this language to avoid overly long school zones. Issues with unusual situations regarding school locations, more than one school close by another, school warning signs use around schools that don’t have school zones, etc. were discussed by the committee. Engineering judgment is essential in these cases and the Sign Policy and Guidelines provides more guidance on how to handle various situations.

Doug asked for committee approval of the revised Guide to School Area Safety.

Decision – Rob Burchfield moved and Ed Fischer seconded that the Guide to School Area Safety be approved. The motion passed.

Discuss Draft OAR Revisions & Significant Changes for Part 8

The Part 8 review subcommittee met and discussed the subject proposed changes, and what could be included in 8A.01 to prevent repetition through the rest of the section. They proposed adding at the very beginning prior to the Support language the following:

“Standard:

Authority to control and regulate the construction, alteration, and protection of railroad-highway crossings is vested exclusively in the state, and in the Department of Transportation as provided in ORS 824.200 to 824.256. Authority to alter, construct, or eliminate a highway-rail grade crossing, including all traffic control devices at the crossing, must be obtained from the State through the issuance of a crossing Order by the Rail Division of the Department of Transportation.”

In addition an existing supplement between the first two paragraphs of the existing Standard in 8A.01 would then be removed. The supplemental Standard to be deleted states:

~~“Under Oregon Law, ORS 824.202 ‘Policy; authority vested in state and department’, the ODOT Rail Division is authorized to determine the character and type of traffic control devices used at all highway rail grade crossings.”~~

Decision – Ed Fischer moved and Randall Wooley seconded that both changes be made. The committee voted in favor

8A.02 – With the addition of the supplemental Standard at the beginning of 8A.01, Massoud said and Dan McDonald agreed that the following supplemental Standard was unnecessary, so although the committee had approved the supplement at the October meeting, the subcommittee recommends deleting it:

~~“Before a new or modified highway rail grade crossing traffic control system is installed, approval shall be obtained from the Oregon Department of Transportation, Rail Division as documented in a Rail Crossing Order.”~~

Decision – Randall Wooley moved approval of deleting this supplement. Eric Niemeyer seconded and the committee voted in favor

8B.04 As the committee turned to this supplement on advance warning signs, Rob and others said that they’d like to go over some of the proposals on pavement markings (8B.20 & 8B.21) to be sure how it was all going to work together. The committee then discussed the various changes proposed in 8B.20 and 8B.21 and possible modifications there prior to returning to 8B.04.

The proposal was to remove the first Standard paragraph below in its entirety and replace it with a new Standard, Option and Standard:

STANDARD:

~~A Highway Rail Grade Crossing Advance Warning (W10-1) sign (see Figure 8B-2) shall be used on each highway in advance of every highway rail grade crossing except in the following circumstances:~~

- ~~A. On an approach to a highway rail grade crossing from a T intersection with a parallel highway, if the distance from the edge of the track to the edge of the parallel roadway is less than 30 m (100 ft), and W10-3 signs are used on both approaches of the parallel highway; or~~
- ~~B. On low volume, low speed highways crossing minor spurs or other tracks that are infrequently used and are flagged by train crews; or~~

- ~~C. In business districts where active highway-rail grade crossing traffic control devices are in use; or~~
- ~~D. Where physical conditions do not permit even a partially effective display of the sign.~~

~~Placement of the Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Advance Warning sign shall be in accordance with Chapter 2A and Table 2C-4."~~

The new proposed language was substantially as shown below. A minor change was to add the words "When used", " in front of the second standard. A second suggestion was to place parenthesis around "OR" in the proposed Figure 8B-6(OR) which would replace Figure 8B-6 of the MUTCD. Dan also agreed to strike references to the OAR on the replacement figure.

Standard:

A Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Advance Warning (W10-1) sign (see Figure 8B-2) shall be used on each highway in advance of every Highway-Rail grade crossing except as noted in the Option below:

Option:

A Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Advance Warning (W10-1) sign may be omitted:

- A. On an approach to a highway-rail grade crossing from a T-intersection with a parallel highway, if the distance from the edge of the track to the edge of the parallel roadway is less than 100 ft; or
- B. On low volume, low speed highways where pavement markings are installed crossing minor spur tracks that are infrequently used if an engineering study indicates such installation would be of minimal benefit, and absence of the sign is authorized in a crossing Order; or
- C. In business districts where active highway-rail grade crossing traffic control devices are in use and pavement markings are installed, if an engineering study indicates such installation would be of minimal benefit, and absence of the sign is authorized in a crossing Order; or
- D. Where physical conditions do not permit even a partially effective display of the sign as determined by engineering judgment, pavement markings are installed, and absence of the sign is authorized in a crossing Order.

Standard:

When used, placement of highway-rail grade crossing advance warning signs shall be in accordance with Figure 8B-6(OR)"

The committee discussed whether the speed table on Figure 8B-6(OR) was posted or observed and agreed that it is best left to the discretion of designers and the road authorities, and that Rail Division would work with them.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved approval of the above changes to 8B.04. Charles Radosta seconded and the committee voted in favor

8B.08 The subcommittee agreed to add a Standard to this section. Dan said that this was the only place where Rail had insisted on having the following standard in place due to the nature of the signs being installed (STOP or YIELD). The proposed standard is as follows:

"Authority to install STOP or YIELD signs must be obtained from the Rail Division of the Department of Transportation through the issuance of a crossing Order"

Decision – Ed Fischer moved approval of the added Standard. Randall Wooley seconded and the committee voted in favor.

Joel McCarroll asked for clarification in the case of an emergency situation. Dan said yes, if the signal lights go out or there is another situation, a quick message to Rail Division will get the necessary action taken.

8B.17 This was approved at the October meeting. It changed the existing Standard to Guidance. The subcommittee agreed to recommend adding the following new Option for further flexibility in those cases where it might be useful:

“ When the Low Ground Clearance sign is authorized for installation in conjunction with the side road Advance Warning sign (W10-2, W10-3, or W10-4), the Low Ground Clearance sign or the supplemental plaque may be mounted on the same post, with the Low Ground Clearance sign or supplemental plaque located below the Advanced Warning Sign.”

Ed Fischer and committee members agreed this was not a great option but that it should be allowed for.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved approval of the added Option. Cindy Schmitt seconded and the committee voted in favor.

8B.20 Beyond some minor amendments, the following additions and deletions from the current supplement recommended by the subcommittee were approved by the committee:

Insert the following sentence at the end of the 2nd Standard paragraph:

“When used, placement of highway-rail grade crossing pavement markings shall be in accordance with Figure 8B-6(OR).”

Delete the 3rd Standard paragraph as seen below:

~~“Identical markings shall be placed in each approach lane on all paved approaches to highway rail grade crossings where signals or automatic gates are located, and at all other highway rail grade crossings where the posted or statutory highway speed is 60 km/h (40 mph) or greater.”~~

Replace the 3rd Standard paragraph (deleted above) with the sentence below:

“Identical markings shall be placed in each approach lane on all paved approaches to highway-rail grade crossing except as noted in the Option below.”

Delete the fourth Standard paragraph as seen below:

~~“Pavement markings shall not be required at highway rail grade crossings where the posted or statutory highway speed is less than 60 km/h (40 mph), or in urban areas, if an engineering study indicates that other installed devices provide suitable warning and control.”~~

Delete the first sentence of the Guidance as seen below:

“Guidance”

~~When Pavement markings are used, a portion of the X symbol should be directly opposite the Advance Warning sign. The X symbol and letters should be elongated to allow for the low angle at which they will be viewed.~~

Insert new Option as seen below:

“Pavement markings may be omitted at highway-rail grade crossings where the posted or statutory highway speed is 25 mph or less, an advance warning sign is installed, an engineering study indicates that other installed devices provide suitable warning and control, and absence of the markings is authorized in a crossing Order.”

Decision – Rob Burchfield Moved acceptance of the changes 8B.20. Eric Niemeyer seconded and the committee voted in favor.

8B.21 The discussion was revisited on proposed language regarding the location of the stop line at rail crossings. Rail Division’s OAR requires specifics and all the jurisdictions aren’t so sure it should be so absolute or that it’s the safest place for vehicles to stop. The committee had already agreed to strike the sentence from Guidance that said the stop line should be placed approximately 2.4 m (8 ft from the gate (if present), but no closer than 4.6 m (15 ft) from the nearest rail in accommodating Rail’s position. However committee members were not all in favor of adding a standard that read as follows:

“The stop clearance line described in OAR 741-110-003030(2)(e) shall be located perpendicular to the roadway centerline and not less than twelve feet from the nearest rail. When automatic gates are installed, the stop clearance line shall be located one foot in advance of where the gate arm crosses the roadway surface.”

Dan commented that the National committee was going to be looking into the issue of stop line placement in January and he would keep the OTCDC informed of any developments. After some discussion Dan suggested the following as a supplement for guidance (instead of the proposed Standard):

“The stop line should be placed in accordance with Figure 8B-6(OR)”

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to accept the proposed Guidance and delete the proposed Standard for 8B.21. Joel McCarroll seconded and the committee voted in favor.

8D.02 Massoud said this was a proposal to change the first Option to Standard as follows:

“Bells or other audible warning devices shall be included in the assembly and shall be operated in conjunction with the flashing lights to provide additional warning for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to adopt the proposed Standard. Randall Wooley seconded and the committee voted in favor.

8D.06 Massoud proposed deleting the option that reads:

~~On tracks where all trains operate at less than 30 km/h (20 mph) and where flagging is performed by an employee on the ground, a shorter signal operating time for the flashing light signals may be used.~~

~~Additional warning time may be provided when determined by an engineering study.~~

It was pointed out that the Standard above made reference to the Option, stating “Except as noted in the Option Below.” The committee agreed this phrase should also be deleted.

Decision – Charles Radosta moved to delete the option as proposed and modify the Standard as noted. It was seconded and the committee voted in favor.

8D.07 Massoud said the current supplemental standards should be retained and the subcommittee proposed that the second Standard shall be supplemented by the following paragraphs:

“When a vehicle clear out interval (VCOI) is required, the indication for the clearance phases shall be green.

Advance railroad detection or other appropriate methods shall be used to provide a pedestrian clear out interval (PCOI) before the vehicle clear-out interval. This should be designed to minimize the occurrence of abbreviated pedestrian clearance intervals.”

Dan said he thought the last sentence should say “PCOI shall be designed...” rather than “This should be designed...”, according to his notes from the subcommittee. The committee agreed.

Decision – Charles Radosta moved to adopt the Standard as modified. It was seconded and the committee voted in favor.

U-turn Study

June said that the U-turn Study couldn't wait until the next meeting to be considered. Ed said that it has to go to the Legislature in January and if it was not covered at this meeting, another meeting will need to be arranged, whether by phone, email, or in person. June said that her concern was that when the report goes to the Legislature, it would be nice to know what the local jurisdictions think because they will need to implement the outcome. The committee needs to look at the conclusion and see if they agree or think it should be modified.

June handed out a draft report and identified things she'd like the committee to consider:

1. Is the information accurate?
2. Think through the implementation process if the statute were changed, what issues should we be concerned with regarding the conversion process as to the interval between the current and any new signing installation.
3. What if some cities said they didn't want to accept the law and pass their own ordinance to that effect, causing inconsistency in the state.
4. Alternative 3 assessing new intersections in the design phase to determine whether U-turns should be permitted, is described for the ODOT process. Would this be workable for local jurisdictions?

The committee needs to decide whether to give the Legislature options or give them a strong recommendation. Ed said that Doug Tindall advised to just make conclusions and let the Legislature hash it out. Joe said he thought the state should go ahead and make U-turns legal wherever possible since drivers are already making them. Joel thought criteria would need to be changed if more U-turns were to be allowed in the state in the absence of a change in the law. Several folks expressed concerns on how the Legislature might or might not implement recommendations, including whether there were unfunded mandates involved. Concern on whether the Legislature would be able to fund anything in the next biennium was also expressed.

A fundamental issue is that many Oregon drivers don't understand that the law in Oregon is different from most other states. These and other issues need to be hashed out and it will take another meeting to be finished in time for the Legislature in January. Ed suggested that committee members read the study as if they were Legislators. The committee agreed to hold a video conference arranged after the Thanksgiving holiday to complete this agenda item. Members should study the report in the interim.

✓ Action Item – June Ross will work with staff to set up a video conference for the committee as soon as practical after Thanksgiving

Next Years Meeting Dates

Cynthia will coordinate meeting room scheduling at Marion County Public Works for the following Fridays in 2005: January 21, March 18, May 20, July 15, September 16, and November 18.

Nomination for 2005 Chair and Vice Chair

Decision: Charles Radosta nominated Eric Niemeyer to serve as Chair and Joel McCarroll to serve as Vice Chair. It was seconded and the committee voted to approve.

Non-Agenda Items

The committee ran out of time for the discussion of the Interested Others mailing list.

Next Meeting Date

The committee will reconvene via videoconference in the near future on a date to be determined.

Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 pm.