

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 24, 2001

Inn of the Seventh Mountain, Bend, Oregon

Members Present: Stephen Wilson, Chair, ODOT Region 4; Ed Fischer, Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; Joseph Marek, Clackamas County; Randall Wooley, City of Beaverton; Gordon Renskers, OSP; Robin Lewis, City of Bend; Charles Radosta, ITE/Kittelton & Associates; Jason Torrie for Gary Judd, Deschutes County; Cynthia Schmitt, Marion County

Members Absent: Rob Burchfield, City of Portland; Gary Judd, Deschutes County (arrived late)

Others Present: Orville Gaylor, Rick Wood, Doug Bish, Chris Monsere, Jerry Morrison, Jan Gipson, ODOT Traffic Management Section; Bill Brownlee, Jim Jirek, Marion County; Dave Brown, Deschutes County; Alan Hollen, 3M Corporation, Marion County; Bob Morast, Washington County; Deborah Hogan, City of Bend; Nick Fortey, FHWA.

Introduction/Approval of July 2001 Meeting Minutes/New Member Introduction

Chairperson Stephen Wilson called the meeting to order. He introduced Robin Lewis from Bend. After other introductions, the Committee voted approval of the May 18, 2001 meeting minutes as amended.

Old Business

MUTCD Millennium Edition Status Report

Ed Fischer said the biggest piece of business was approving some supplements that have not yet been approved by the committee. He said Doug Bish would talk about the OAR process, and get a decision as to whether to go forward with that, and then the committee can discuss possible bulk purchase of the new MUTCD. Jan Gipson went over two new supplements in her handout that have been proposed since the last OTCDC meeting as follows:

2B.11 Speed Limit Sign – Jan said the purpose of this supplement was to allow, but not require, the use of the word, LIMIT on speed signs so the signs don't have to be changed immediately in those jurisdictions that choose to change signs. Ed said this has been discussed before but the last time it came up, the legislature was still in session and there was a bill being considered that dealt with speed zones. He said the final bill only covered rural interstates. He had been in favor of using the word LIMIT on all Interstate speed signs if the Legislature raised the rural interstate speed. Also there was a bill under consideration that would have changed all speeds to limits. No bill actually got through the legislature without being vetoed but even so, Oregon still has the existing situation where LIMIT is not used and so the proposed supplement opens the door so that it can at least be used where local jurisdictions desire. Ed said that since the Governor vetoed the rural speed increase, he'd be happy to keep the status quo, just retaining the wording of the old supplement.

Ed then summarized the history of speed zone legislation in the last session for the committee. The committee discussed possible legal ambiguity if state highways aren't signed with LIMIT while local roads in the same jurisdiction are, whether there would be confusion or court cases thrown out if the signing isn't in compliance, causing a ticket to be written imprecisely, and whether this was likely to be much of a

problem. The consensus of the committee was approval of the flexibility of the proposed supplement. A suggestion was also approved to cite the appropriate statute, making the supplement read as follows:

2B.11 All signs posting the designated speed or speed limit in Oregon per ORS 811.105 and ORS 811.123 may omit the word LIMIT. This includes truck speed restrictions, school speed zones, and other special speed restrictions allowed by law as well as the designated speed or speed limit by statute, rule or written order.

Decision: Randall Wooley moved and Joe Marek seconded the proposed supplement. The committee then unanimously approved adding the supplement.

3B.16 Stop and Yield Lines – Jan said the reason for this proposed supplement was to allow the option to use solid yield lines rather than just permitting the row of isosceles triangles (“sharks teeth”) design. It was clarified that the dashed lines at the entrance of roundabouts is not considered a yield line and thus may still be used. It was also clarified that the supplement would allow the “sharks teeth” design to be used at any yield location. The proposed supplement reads as follows:

3B.16 If used, yield lines shall consist of either a row of isosceles triangles as detailed in Figure 3B.14 of the Millennium Edition of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices or a 12 to 24 inch (300-600 mm) wide white solid stop line. If used, a yield line shall be placed extending across the approach lanes to indicate the point at which the yield is intended or required to be made. If the isosceles triangle yield line is used, the isosceles triangles shall be placed in a row pointing toward approaching vehicles.

Decision: Ed Fischer moved and Cynthia Schmitt seconded the proposed supplement. The new supplement was then unanimously approved by the committee.

6F.53 Arrow Displays – Jan said this proposed supplement that the committee previously approved has since been struck because the MUTCD errata replaced the horizontal bar as a standard display for Caution Mode. The committee agreed with this omission.

Administrative Rule Process

Doug Bish then went on to describe and the committee discussed going forward with the administrative rule process to have the MUTCD, the new Oregon Supplements and the Short Term Traffic Control Handbook adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission.

The current legal advice as to whether the administrative rule can cite the current edition and errata of the MUTCD and all revisions that come out later in one action was discussed. Jan Gipson said it appears we would need to revise the administrative rule to adopt each new revision of the MUTCD. The committee lamented this situation.

Decision: Ed Fischer moved, Joe Marek seconded starting the process for OTC approval of the draft Administrative Rule 734-020-0005 described above. All committee members voted in favor.

Bulk purchase of MUTCD

Ed Fischer said he talked to Ernie Huckaby of FHWA’s Office of Transportation Operations (HOTO) and learned that Revision 1 of the new MUTCD, which just addresses accessible pedestrian signals, was expected to be out in December but there is delay. This is due in part to a requirement to make all federal web sites accessible to the handicapped including the use of “tags” (audible descriptions of figures or illustrations). Revision 2 also is in the works and is expected to have extensive revision. Therefore, it is recommended that no more than a minimal number of books be purchased at this time,

pending these revisions. The committee discussed whether it was cheaper to download copies or purchase them. In response to a question from Bob Morast, Ed Fischer went through a long listing, citing some of the examples of proposed changes from the NCUTCD back in June, many having the potential of being included in the new manual. Committee consensus was to hold off on mass purchases at this time but to look into requesting a grant in order to make such a purchase later next year.

Compliance Dates

Ed handed out a listing of compliance dates from the MUTCD website in response to a request from Rob Burchfield.

Red Light Running (RLR) Camera Enforcement

Ed gave background on a draft guide for highways in Oregon subsequent to the 2001 legislature's expansion of the program to all cities over 30,000 populations (and Newberg). He said the purpose was to be helpful to jurisdictions. It should promote a consistent process for ODOT to follow in dealing with city requests for the camera system on state highways where the expectations are out there for everybody to understand so that decisions are consistent from one region or district to another. On a broader scale, Ed thought the OTCDC and ODOT could provide leadership and guidance to put something together to help local authorities to address various issues before they make decisions and sign contracts to implement the cameras in their jurisdiction. This is in light of some shrill notes from Washington, D.C. and elsewhere about "Big Brother" getting out of control and it being a revenue generating device having nothing to do with safety. The new legislation builds on a 1999 Oregon law and is set down in Chapter 851 based on House Bills 2071 and 2380 from the 70th and 71st Oregon Legislative Assemblies. It is effective on December 31, 2001. A subcommittee has been working on the document and now the full committee is being asked for comments and suggestions. The intent is to send the guide out to all cities that qualify under the legislation. Rick Wood explained that the handout actually is two different documents. The first is a vehicle (yellow light) clearance time calculation tool, which could be put into the Traffic Signal Guidelines or kept as an unpublished in-house ODOT document. The main part of the handout is the actual Red Light Running Guide.

Cynthia Schmitt asked for clarification as to whether there were reporting requirements for local jurisdictions or just for ODOT. The answer was yes, as stated in Paragraph (3) of Section 1. She also asked why counties were not included in the authorization to use the cameras for red light enforcement. It was explained that the legislature was reluctant to approve the legislation under the conditions of negative publicity and wanted to get more experience with a smaller sample before opening the door to further jurisdictions.

Ed suggested going through the draft and getting feedback. Randall Wooley had a general suggestion to divide the document, separating out ODOT requirements for state highways from guidelines and suggestions for local jurisdictions. Ed said ODOT thinking was to contain it all in one document since most cities big enough to qualify under the law would also have highways running through town that would likely have intersections that were candidates for red light camera enforcement. He suggested the document could be modified to more clearly delineate what is a state highway requirement and what are local requirements or guidance.

The committee discussed the pro's and con's of various levels of requirement vs. good advice to the local jurisdictions. It was concluded that current legislation doesn't leave a lot of room to require cities to follow state requirements on local non-state highway roads. Ed said that the procedures in the guide will be required on state highways.

Ed asked if the committee liked the idea of quoting the whole law in the Guidelines, including those portions on the enforcement and judicial aspects of the law. Rick said the partial law was put into the first draft but somebody on the subcommittee suggested having it all in there. The committee consensus

was that it was good and not taking up too much space to have it completely cited. The idea was that the more that everybody involved understands about the whole process, the better off everyone is.

Ed went on to ask about system implementation language. The committee agreed to two changes in the draft for this section as follows:

The first change makes it clear that RLR Camera systems should differentiate between vehicles running a red light and those vehicles stopping slightly beyond the stop bar or those vehicles which, after stopping, make a legal turn against a red indication.

The second change replaces a possibly negative connotation with language that enhanced traffic safety is the principal aim of the RLR Camera enforcement program.

Under general requirements, the committee agreed to change "shall" to "should" language for signals located exclusively on city streets, and to more specifically state where it's required on state highways.

Further, the committee agreed to add an item allowing signal timing changes to be made in response to substantial changes in approach speed, design changes, etc. Other changes included removing the restriction on changing signal yellow-time and just requiring them to be made prior to operation of the RLR Camera. They also agreed to add an item specifically allowing signal timing changes in response to substantial changes in approach speed, design changes, etc. Also a separate power source was considered a desirable option instead of having the red light running system subject to existing signal agreements.

Under the Safety and Operations Report, the committee agreed to change the opening paragraph to require the report on state highways, strongly recommend it for all other highways, and to explain that it provides the basis for the process and outcome evaluation as required in ORS Chapter 851, Section 1(3)(b).

It was suggested that an explanation regarding why some locations should be avoided selecting RLR Camera systems. Locations where geometric or traffic signal design changes are scheduled within the next two years was modified to be where design changes are scheduled and an engineering evaluation indicates such changes may substantially alter the need for RLR Camera enforcement.

Decision: The committee agreed that Rick Wood would review other suggestions given by members and other interested parties. He will provide updated drafts to members via email in order to get agreement on a final guide by the effective date of legislation, December 31, 2001.

New Business

Update to Sign Policy and Guidelines

Orville Gaylor went over the latest proposed changes for the committee. Orville said the majority of the changes aren't controversial since they just change the section numbers over in the sign policy to match the new MUTCD.

Robin Lewis asked about using the REDUCED SPEED AHEAD (R2-5a) sign instead of the SPEED ZONE AHEAD (R2-5c) sign. Orville said normally the reason for use of the SPEED ZONE AHEAD sign is because there are a lot of basic rule sections that aren't posted, so when you come back into an area where there is speed zoning it's desirable to use the SPEED ZONE AHEAD sign. However the wording on the signs does not prohibit use of the REDUCED SPEED AHEAD sign if the road authority believes it appropriate.

Orville then pointed out that OR 10-13, EMERGENCY SIGNAL sign, is a new one in the manual. FHWA hasn't provided any design criteria yet so this is what ODOT has started using and is already installing.

Doug Bish asked regarding the SPEED LIMIT (R2-1) sign whether the plan is to leave it as not using LIMIT for now and review it after the OAR is adopted that allows the use of LIMIT. Orville said what's being presented in the update is what's already existent and is not the final version. When the OAR comes out, any other necessary changes will be made. He also still needs to go through the new MUTCD again to look for any further changes necessary in the Sign Policy and may have to put out another change after that.

Orville then pointed out the new RED LIGHT & SPEED PHOTO ENFORCED IN _____ (OR 22-19), the RED LIGHT PHOTO ENFORCED (OR22-20), and the SPEED PHOTO ENFORCED (OR22-21) signs. They are required on state highways and optional on other roads. The committee discussed whether the camera symbol was understandable and desirable since not all jurisdictions (Beaverton) want to use them. Orville said he is using the same camera as is used on photo/scenic opportunity type signing, which is also the federal standard for camera. The committee agreed to accept the proposed signs.

Regarding warning signs, Orville said that he wanted to provide flexibility in the exact placement of warning signs, considering visibility, adequate warning to the driver (reaction time), and use of the proper warning sign. Variations in sign size and material, among other things, may make the suggested placement set forth in Table 2C-4 inadvisable.

Gary Judd suggested, and the committee agreed to change the wording in the second sentence of the third paragraph under Placement of Warning signs to read as follows: "When the road authority uses two or more warning signs *for the same condition* in sequence, the table is no longer valid.

Gary Judd had further issue with the last sentence under Design of Warning Signs saying that he didn't think it could happen that sign sizes on city streets or county roads will be determined by the local jurisdiction if the MUTCD overrules. He suggested the sentence be stricken and the committee agreed.

Robin Lewis had some concern about the use of SIDE STREET rather than the MUTCD's CROSS STREET DOES NOT STOP. The committee then discussed wording for signing that warns that side traffic on the intersecting street ahead is not required to stop. After some discussion on the difficulty of finding unambiguous wording for this sign, Orville pointed out that OR3-13 allows flexibility when needed. However the committee was not yet ready to decide on this issue so Orville said he'd strike this from the update and bring it back at a later date.

Orville went over the remaining items in the update without substantive comment from the committee.

Decision: Cynthia Schmitt moved, Gary Judd seconded adoption of sign policy update as amended. The committee voted in favor.

Guidelines for the Operation of Highway Advisory Radio on State Highways

Since time was short, Ed suggested members look over the handout and we will put it on the next agenda.

Electronic Mailing of Meeting Minutes

Doug Bish explained the hope of saving time and money through emailing minutes and other OTCDC material to members and interested others whenever possible, rather than using the regular mail. Those without email may still be served by regular mail. It was also pointed out that meeting minutes may be viewed on ODOT's website

Decision: Cynthia Schmitt moved and Joe Marek seconded the proposal to utilize email for OTCDC correspondence whenever possible. It was unanimously approved by the committee.

Nominations for OTCDC Chairperson

Gary Judd nominated Charles Radosta to be chairperson for the next year. Joe Marek seconded. Then Gary nominated Joe Marek to serve as vice chairperson. Charles Radosta seconded that nomination. There being no further nominees, the nominations were closed

Decision: The committee voted unanimously for Charles Radosta as chairperson and Joe Marek as vice chairperson. Their terms will be effective the first meeting in January.

Next Meeting Date & Location of Joint ITE/OTCDC Meeting in May

Charles Radosta said the ITE would like to have their next meeting in Portland at the Kennedy School. The committee agreed to hold the joint OTCDC meeting at that location on May 17, 2002.

Non-Agenda Items

ITE Meeting In Portland at Kennedy School on May 17, approved

Orville asked for a decision on changes to the Disabled Parking Standards, changing the fine for disabled parking on signing from \$300 to \$450, since the legislature changed fine, and we need to get new standards approved so he can get changes out by end of year. Also we need to change the striping permitted to white only instead of yellow.

Decision: Gary Judd moved to change fine and using white only instead of yellow striping. Charles Radosta seconded. The committee voted in favor and Ed Fischer declared the motion passed.

The meeting Adjourned at: 12:24

Our next meeting is scheduled for January 18, 2001, at 9:00 a.m. at the Marion County Shops.