

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

September 22, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Corrected

Wilsonville Holiday Inn
Wilsonville, Oregon

Members Present: [Robin Lewis](#), Chair, City of Bend; [Joel McCarroll](#), ODOT Region 4; [Eric Niemeyer](#), Vice-Chair, Jackson County; [Charles Radosta](#), ITE/Kittelsohn & 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; [Jim Rentz](#), OSP

Others Present: Doug Bish, Paul Davis, Kevin Haas, Massoud Saberian, Greg Stellmach, Julia Wellner, ODOT Traffic Engineering & Operations Section; Cathy Ardanaz, 3M; Brian Barnett, City of Springfield; Orville Gaylor, ODOT Retired; Kevin Hottmann, City of Salem, Tom Larsen, City of Eugene; Bob Morast, Washington County; Fred Sawyer, ODOT Region 1; Katie Johnson; Robert Trevis; Kristy Burkett, Shriners Childrens Hospital Stephen B Wilson, ODOT Region 2 Traffic; Roger Smith, Coral Sales Co.; Jeff Ruscoe, GAC on DUII; Mike McCarthy, Jim Jirek, Marion County; Bill Kloos, Keith Orr, City of Portland; Gary Miller, OSP

Introduction – Approval of Minutes – Additional Agenda Items

Chairperson Robin Lewis called the meeting to order. The committee and other attendees introduced themselves. Ed Fischer said if there were time, the committee might get an update on the U-Turn Feasibility Study. Eric Niemeyer moved and Randall Wooley seconded approval of minutes from July 16, 2004. The committee approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Draft OAR Revisions & Significant Changes for Part 2

Julia Wellner handed out a packet of Draft Oregon Supplements for Part 2 of the 2003 MUTCD, and related sign designs.

The first of the proposed supplements, under 2B.46, PHOTO ENFORCED Signs and 2C.53 PHOTO ENFORCED Plaques contained two options. She said the subcommittee couldn't agree on the issue. Some favored keeping the existing stand-alone ODOT sign designs, and others favored adopting the new FHWA versions. The latter are more generic and don't specify which laws are photo enforced.

The first option was to continue using Oregon's signs and not adopt the federal sign designs. Unless a separate supplement for 2C.53 is written, the federal PHOTO ENFORCED warning plaque could still be used below SIGNAL AHEAD signs instead of Oregon's stand-alone regulatory sign, RED LIGHT PHOTO ENFORCED (OR22-20).

The second option was to adopt a supplement that said that either Oregon or federal signs could be used. It would add an option to Section 2B.46 that said that where the law allows photo or radar enforcement of traffic laws, the appropriate Oregon sign (OR 22-190 through OR22-21 may be installed instead of federal signs R10-18 and R10-19).

A third possible option, dropping Oregon's signs and adopting the federal signs (remove the current supplement) was also discussed. Issues with whether federal signs met all conditions under ORS, particularly in cases of mobile enforcement vans made that problematic. The size of signs and placement requirements would be difficult

to comply with using a combination of MUTCD-approved signs/plaques. Rob Burchfield suggested at the least a reasonable compliance date would be needed.

Decision – Joe Marek moved that the committee adopt the MUTCD for permanent installations and that ODOT develop a supplement covering portable signs that addressed the requirements of ORS 810.434-810.439. Randall Wooley seconded and the committee passed the motion.

Section 2C.06 includes a new guidance recommending a supplemental sign beyond a Hairpin or 270-Degree Loop warning sign for horizontal alignment cases. The committee consensus was that the need for these signs was minimal in the state and a supplement changing “should” language to “may” wasn’t needed.

Decision – Cindy Schmitt moved to not adopt the amendment, Rob Burchfield seconded and the committee approved.

Section 2C.28, regarding BRIDGE ICES BEFORE ROAD signs is a new section allowing these signs to advise bridge users of winter weather conditions. It is optional but the subcommittee was concerned that as it is, this might cause liability in any case where the sign is not used. Therefore it was proposed that the option be replaced with a standard prohibiting use of the sign statewide to eliminate unnecessary signage and prevent inconsistent use statewide. The committee wasn’t enthusiastic about totally prohibiting this sign, nor with providing additional guidance about when it would be appropriate for use. Instead it was agreed that ODOT’s Sign Policy would have additional guidance inserted.

Decision – Cindy Schmitt moved not to approve the supplement. Rob Burchfield seconded and the motion passed.

Section 2C.36 and 2C.46 were proposed in response to a new MUTCD option that allows for use of the 85th percentile speed, speed corresponding to a 16-degree ball bank reading, or that speed otherwise determined by an engineering study because of unusual circumstances in setting advisory exit, ramp, and curve speed signs and advisory speed plaques. However ODOT’s current Sign Policy includes a long-used table recommending setting advisory speeds based on ball bank readings of 7-13 degrees. The idea in the new manual appears to be that modern vehicles drive at speeds approximating a 16-degree reading and the old standard is no longer reasonable. It was suggested that if the OTCDC wishes to maintain current practice, it should adopt a proposed supplement stating that the ball bank readings in ODOT’s Sign Policy be used. Some on the committee thought this wasn’t significant enough to deviate from the MUTCD. Others weren’t so sure, particularly considering trucks, who may be using these signs as necessary guidance to safe speeds on ramps and curves. Ed Fischer was concerned about the safety effects of possibly having to remove some higher speed advisory signs such as 45 MPH, 50 MPH, and 55 MPH on interstates. Questions were raised as to what other states were doing and how much of a change the 16 degree setting would have on current signage. Joe Marek and Rob Burchfield volunteered to have his staff do some testing on a representative sample. The item was tabled in the interim.

✓ Action Item – Joe Marek and Rob Burchfield will report back to the committee on the results of his staff’s tests. Ed Fischer will check with other states as to their practice/experience and the committee will reconsider at its next meeting.

Section 2D.30 – Julia reviewed progress at the previous committee meeting on this issue, which would change the guidance on the use of Directional Assemblies. She had not gotten back with the subcommittee on this item but had proposed text for the input of the committee as follows:

In some instances, the beginning of a route may be sufficiently identified by the use of Advance, Junction, and/or Confirmation route assemblies. Delete Standard “B” and add the following Guidance:

“Guidance:

- A. The beginning of a route (indicated in advance by a Junction assembly) *should* be marked by a Directional assembly with a route sign displaying the number of that route and a single-headed arrow pointing in the direction of the route.”

In many cases, the end of a route is evident due to highway geometry or other signing. Delete Standard “C”, and add the following

“Option:

- A. The end of a route *may* be marked by a Directional assembly with an END auxiliary sign and a route sign displaying the number of that route.”

After some discussion, the committee was ready to move forward with the suggested language.

Decision – Rob Burchfield moved to adopt the proposed language as is. Cindy Schmitt seconded and the committee approved.

Section 2I.03 Julia noted that the MUTCD now mandates the use of a sign with a plain round EVACUATION ROUTE legend. She noted that Washington and California also use the Tsunami sign design used in Oregon, which has also been adopted and approved by the NOAA. In order to continue use of this design, she proposed adding a supplement to require the signs as shown in the Sign Policy in lieu of the FHWA standard sign:

To maintain signing consistent with neighboring coastal states, the Evacuation Route (EM-1) sign shall not be used in Oregon when signing for Tsunamis. Add the following paragraph to the first Standard:

“When used to identify a tsunami evacuation route, the Tsunami Evacuation Route (OD-463) sign with directional arrow plaque shall be used. Associated signs OD-462 through OD-466 should be used to provide additional information about the tsunami zone.”

The committee discussed the value of uniformity with the MUTCD approved sign, the shortcoming of its less specific message, and reported cases of some jurisdictions opposing the Oregon design because it might scare tourists. Julia suggested if Oregon continues to use its sign, that it be redesigned to eliminate the 12” size in accordance with the MUTCD’s minimum 18” requirement and to include a square white background, also consistent with the new FHWA design.

Decision – Ed Fischer moved to adopt the proposed supplement as written. Rob Burchfield seconded and the committee voted to approve it.

2C.05 Julia pointed out that in the 2003 MUTCD, Table 2C-4, *“Guidelines for Advance Placement of Warning Signs”* has been revised. Suggested distances for Condition “A” maneuvers (Right Lane Ends, Merge) have been significantly increased while distances required for all other Condition “B” deceleration maneuvers have been decreased. The changes reflect changes in perception/reaction time, deceleration rates, and visibility distances in the 2001 AASHTO “Green Book”. She noted that the first guidance paragraph in 2C.05 reads: “Warning signs should be placed so that they provide adequate PIEV [Perception, Identification, Emotion and Volition] time. The distances contained in Table 2C-4 are for guidance purposes and should be applied with engineering judgment. Warning signs should not be placed too far in advance of the condition, such that drivers might tend to forget the warning because of other driving distractions, especially in urban areas.”

Decision – Cindy Schmitt moved that there be no supplement. Randall Wooley seconded and the committee approved.

Discuss Draft OAR Revisions & Significant Changes for Parts 4

2B.40 Massoud Saberian then reported on Part 4. He started out by pointing out that current supplement 2B.40 is no longer needed since Oregon law is addressed in new section 2B.45 and this supplement will therefore be deleted. There were no objections from the committee.

4B.02 The current supplement regarding the basis of installation or removal of traffic signals as described in OAR 734-020-0500 is covered in the 2003 MUTCD and since this is an option, Massoud’s subcommittee consensus was that it’s no longer needed.

Decision – Randall Wooley moved to remove the supplement. Ed Fischer seconded and the committee approved.

4D.04 The appropriate driver response to traffic control devices and the conditions when a vehicle turn is permitted at a traffic signal are governed in Oregon by ORS 811.260 and 88.360. Since Oregon law allows a

vehicle to make left turns into a one-way street in the direction of traffic on a one-way street after stopping on a red signal, Standard C.1 and C.2 need to be revised to allow for this in the Oregon Supplements. Further, Massoud said that the option following Standard D-3 needs to be removed from the supplements since there is no longer such an option in the 2003 MUTCD.

Standard C.1 revised to read:

“Except when a sign is in place prohibiting a turn on red, vehicular traffic facing a steady CIRCULAR RED signal indication may enter the intersection to turn right into a two-way street, or to turn right or left into a one-way street in the direction of traffic upon the one-way street, after stopping. Such vehicular traffic shall yield the right-of-way to pedestrians lawfully within an adjacent crosswalk and to other traffic lawfully using the intersection.”

Standard C.2 replaced in its entirety by:

“Except when a sign is in place prohibiting a turn on red, vehicular traffic facing a steady RED ARROW signal indication may enter the intersection to turn right into a two-way street, or to turn right or left into a one-way street in the direction of traffic upon the one-way street after stopping. Such vehicular traffic shall yield the right-of-way to pedestrians lawfully within an adjacent crosswalk and to other traffic lawfully using the intersection.”

Decision – Randall Wooley moved to approve the changed supplements as written. Joe Marek seconded and the committee approved.

4D.05 – Massoud said this essentially just wordsmiths the existing supplement on Application of Steady Signal Indications on turn movements. However the committee spent some time discussing why the supplement was no longer needed with the new MUTCD. Eventually the committee concluded that the supplement was not needed except for the part that deletes Standard D which prohibits turns on a steady red arrow since these turns after stopping are permitted into one-way roads in Oregon. Therefore the Supplement shall only say:

“Standard D shall be deleted.”

Decision – Randall Wooley moved to not retain most of the supplement except for the part that prohibits left turns on a steady red arrow. Eric Niemeyer seconded and the committee approved.

4D.07 – Massoud explained that the current supplement which was written in order to provide for the use of a three section programmed signal display for exclusive right turn lanes was revised to read better. The committee discussed the definition of “Faces”, “Sections”, “Lenses” and which wording described Oregon practice. The subcommittee’s proposed language was amended to read as follows:

“Protected/Permissive Mode – A separate signal face is not required for the right turn, but if provided, it shall either consist of all visibility limited signal sections, or it shall be considered an approach signal face, and shall meet the following requirements.”

Decision – Charles moved for adoption of the supplement as amended. Eric Niemeyer seconded and the committee approved with all but Ed Fischer in favor.

4D.13 – The current supplement, which is in conformance with OAR 734-020-0320(4)(e) and prohibits the termination of an active pedestrian or vehicular clearance interval by emergency preemption or bus priority, was recommended to be retained by Massoud’s subcommittee.

“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.”

Decision – Randall Wooley moved to accept the subcommittee recommendation. Charles Radosta seconded and the committee approved.

4D.15 – This was another case of proposed revision to the current supplement in which the subcommittee proposed removing language regarding the 85th percentile speed in favor of language referring to the posted approach speeds. Rob Burchfield said that the posted speed doesn’t always reflect the 85th percentile speed and

others had the same concern. As the discussion was running over time, the committee agreed to table the discussion of this item and send it back to the subcommittee for rework before the next committee meeting.

- ✓ Action Item – Massoud will report back to the committee at the next meeting on this and remaining supplements.

Mobile InfraRed Transmitter (MIRT) Update

With the committee running out of time, Ed Fischer asked Bill Kloos if his update could wait. Bill agreed, saying that he'd like it if the committee reviewed the handout he had delivered and they could discuss further at a future meeting if there are any questions.

- ✓ Action Item – Committee members will review the handout in preparation for Bill Kloos's next appearance.

Next Meeting Date

The committee agreed that an October meeting was needed to complete the revisions to the Oregon Supplements. The date for that meeting was set for October 22 at 9:00 a.m. It will be held in Salem at the Marion County Shops.

- ✓ Action Item – Cindy Schmitt will reserve the room

Discuss Draft OAR Revisions & Significant Changes for Parts 4 (Briefly Continued)

4D.18 regarding the design, illumination and color of signal sections, Massoud said was no longer needed in the Oregon Supplement since the 2003 removed the guidance.

Decision – Randall Wooley moved to accept the subcommittee recommendation. Cindy Schmitt seconded and the committee approved.

Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.