Memorandum

All District Traffic Engineers

Attn: Electrical Design Engineers

Date: February 19, 1982

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Division of Traffic Engineering

Subject: Use of 150-Watt HPS Luminaires

Attached is a copy of the results of a two-year study by District 06 on the use of 150-watt HPS luminaires at intersections. The study shows that when four luminaires are installed at an intersection, the minimum foot-candle requirements specified in the Traffic Manual can be met by using 150-watt units.

Since the 150-watt units use approximately 19 percent less energy and the utility company's rate is about 21 percent less than 200-watt units, it appears to be to our advantage to use the smaller units whenever possible. Additional savings may be realized by using 120-volt ballasts in lieu of 240-volt ballasts. For example, PG&E's LS-2 schedule (7-14-81) shows $4.272 per month for a 150-watt unit at 240 volts and only $3.645 per month at 120 volts. This 15 percent saving is well worth the small effort of providing 120-volts to the ballasts.

We anticipate that Section 9-13.6 of the Traffic Manual will be revised to include the use of 150-watt HPS luminaires.

Therefore, whenever more than two luminaires are to be installed at an intersection, the use of 150-watt units should be considered. Examples of when the 150-watt units are not required would be when there is an existing continuous lighting along the roadway uses units greater than 150-watt or when it would be impractical for maintenance to stock 150-watt lamps for only a few locations. Hal Garfield 485-5063 may be contacted if there are questions.

C. S. Watt, Jr., Chief
Division of Traffic Engineering

Attachment
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cc: HGarfield
   WWeight - 04 ProjDev B
   FShoemaker - 04 ProjDev B
   BCutter - 07 ProjDev D
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Memorandum

All District Traffic Engineers
Attention Electrical Design Engineers

Date: April 21, 1982
File:

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Division of Traffic Engineering

Subject: Use of Lower Wattage HPS Luminaires

We have been asked if luminaires of lower wattages than those indicated in Section 9-13.6 of the Traffic Manual may be used. My memorandum of February 19, 1982 indicated that the use of 150-watt HPS luminaires should be considered for intersection lighting whenever two or more units are installed. This applies to either 30-foot or 40-foot mounting heights.

The luminaires shall be selected to meet the illumination requirements in Section 9-13.1. Thus, for mounting heights greater than 30 feet; 150-, 200- or 250-watt units may be used in lieu of the 310-watt unit indicated in Section 9-13.6.

In addition to intersection lighting, the luminaire delineating the entrance to an on-ramp may be 150-watt or larger to match the units at the intersection.

Where a local agency has continuous lighting along a roadway, the lighting at the intersection shall be equal to or greater than the lighting between intersections. If you have any questions on this, contact Hal Garfield on ATSS 485-5063.

C. P. Giroux, JR., Chief
Division of Traffic Engineering

cc: W. Wright - 04 Proj. Dev. B
F. Shoemaker - 04 Proj. Dev. B
B. Cutter - 07 Proj. Dev. D
H. Simpkins - Sacto. Des. Branch
H. Garfield
C. Giroux
I. F. /WAIH/WRJ
Operations Files
Memorandum

To: All District Traffic Engineers
Attention Electrical Design Engineers

Date: October 15, 1982

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Division of Traffic Engineering

Subject: Red and Yellow Arrow Signal Indications

Effective January 1, 1982 the California Vehicle Code describes the meaning of red arrow and yellow arrow signal indications. Thus, California is in complete agreement with the MUTCD on the meaning of these indications.

The FHWA has recently published its final report on Report No. FHWA/RD-82/051, "Evaluation of the Left Turn Red Arrow". This report shows that the violation rate for red arrow indications is less than that for the circular red indications. The results of this 1982 study tend to contradict the results of FHWA's Report No. FHWA-RD-76-2, "Efficacy of Red and Yellow Turn Arrows in Traffic Signals", published in November 1975. A copy of the FHWA's 1982 report is attached.

At new signal installations (and where the left turn indications are being modified) the left turn indications shall consist of 12-inch red arrow, yellow arrow and green arrow indications. Conventional signal faces will prove satisfactory for most left turn lanes in lieu of programmed visibility units. The use of programmed visibility signal faces shall be restricted to those locations where exceptional visibility control is required, such as adjacent parallel roadways, acute-angle intersections, closely spaced intersections or other places where the signal indication could be a problem to the approaching driver.

If you have any questions regarding this new policy, contact Hal Garfield at ATSS 485-5063.

Original Signed C. P. Sweet, Jr.
C. P. SWEET, JR., Chief
Division of Traffic Engineering

Attachment
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To: All District Directors

Attention Traffic Operations Engineers
Maintenance Engineers

Date: August 29, 1983

File No.: 

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Director's Office

Subject: Model 170 Traffic Controller Assemblies

PURPOSE

To establish policy for the use of State-furnished Model 170 Traffic Signal Controller Assemblies on the State highway system (SHS).

To provide procedures for State-furnishing these controller assemblies.

BACKGROUND

In the mid-1970's, Caltrans, with New York, designed a traffic signal controller assembly—the Model 170—that provided complete interchangeability of controller units, cabinets, detector sensor units, isolation modules, switchpacks, conflict monitors, flashers and MODEMS.

Caltrans has had six years of favorable experience with the Model 170. Because of demonstrated significant improvement over conventional controller assemblies in cost, reliability, flexibility of operation and ease of maintenance, Caltrans has standardized on the Model 170.

Since 1977, Caltrans has been purchasing and warehousing the Model 170 in OBM warehouses. From this source, the traffic controller signal assemblies can be requisitioned by the Districts.

POLICY

Only Model 170 Traffic Signal Controller Assemblies will be installed on the SHS.

This policy applies to each new and existing traffic signal including those at the intersection of freeway ramps and local streets, whether they be maintained by the State or by a local agency.

All new traffic-actuated signals shall use Model 170 Traffic Signal Controller Assemblies. Consideration shall be given to using Model 170 for a pretimed signal where pre-emption or actuated phases are involved.
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All electromechanical traffic-actuated controller assemblies shall be replaced with Model 170's. Solid-state (Type 90) traffic-actuated controller assemblies shall be replaced with Model 170's as they become obsolete or develop high maintenance costs. Electromechanical pretimed controller assemblies may also be replaced with Model 170's.

IMPLEMENTATION

State Project

On a State project, the cost of the controller assemblies will be identified in the project report and the preliminary report and will be included in the PS&E. Funding will be from the appropriate allotment.

If the State project is cooperatively financed by the State and a local agency, in accordance with the provisions of the Traffic Manual, the cost of the controller assembly will be included in the cost of the project.

Local Agency Project

The State will furnish a Model 170 Controller Assembly at no cost to the local agency if:

a) The project includes the replacement of an existing controller assembly in advance of the State's planned replacement. The approval document will be the encroachment permit.

b) The project includes the installation of new signal(s) or the modification of existing signal(s) and the project is financed solely by the local agency. The approval document will be the project report.

Private Party Project (Permit Project)

If, as a mitigating factor, the project requires a private party to install a new signal or to relocate or modify an existing controller assembly, the State, in the encroachment permit, will require the private party to install a Model 170. The private party must obtain the Model 170 from the private sector and have it tested by the State's Transportation Laboratory—both at his expense.

However, when a private party is relocating an existing controller assembly as part of a signal modification and the controller assembly is of a type that is scheduled for replacement, the private party will be directed to install a State-furnished Model 170.
PROCEDURES

Ordering

a) All Model 170 Controller Assemblies that are State-furnished will be requisitioned from the Office of Business Management (OBM) warehouse inventory on standard local request (LR EDP) forms.

b) Assemblies that are back ordered by the warehouse may be purchased by the Districts directly from manufacturers/suppliers if they are urgently needed—through individual District contract delegations, with prior approval from Materiel Operations Branch.

c) Assemblies that are not routinely stocked by the warehouse will be requisitioned from OBM on purchase estimates or through individual District contract delegations.

Charges and Coding

a) When Model 170 Controller Assemblies are requisitioned for either a State or State/Local Agency project, the appropriate EA will be used and the assemblies will be transferred by the warehouse on a Transaction Code 200 (TC 200).

b) Assemblies may also be requisitioned at any time as a transfer from OBM warehouse inventory to a District’s inventory. EA’s will not be used in these transactions and the warehouse will transfer assemblies on a TC 220.

Maintenance should order all their requirements on a TC 220.

Districts will transfer assemblies from their inventory to specific projects on a TC 100 using an appropriate EA.

c) When a controller assembly is to be supplied at no cost to a local agency or to a private party, the District can take the assembly from their own inventory or requisition one from OBM on a TC 220 for shipment to the District for pretest. In either case, the assembly will be transferred out of the District’s inventory to the local agency or to the private party on a TC 451.

Permit numbers will be used on these documents.

Original Signed J. R. Cropper

R. G. ADAMS
Deputy Director
Highway Maintenance and Transportation Operations
Memorandum

All District Traffic Engineers
Attention Electrical Design Engineers

Date: November 5, 1984

File:

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Division of Traffic Engineering

Subject: Stop Signs at Signalized Intersections

Senate Bill No. 1870 (Royce) has been passed and signed by the Governor. This bill amends Section 21355 of the Vehicle Code to prohibit stop signs to be erected at any entrance to an intersection controlled by official traffic control signals. A copy of the Bill is attached.

For many years, Section 9-02.3 of the Traffic Manual (Case D) has allowed the use of R1 STOP and R41 RIGHT TURN ONLY signs to be used to control egress from private driveways at a signalized intersection. SB 1870 no longer allows us that option.

In addition, SB 1870 requires us to bring existing intersections into conformance with the new requirements by January 1, 1990.

There are several options available to you in bringing an intersection into conformance with this new law. They include:

1. Remove the STOP sign and control egress with red flashing beacons. The R41 may be removed or may remain in place.

2. Remove the STOP sign and provide three-color signal indications for the private driveway. The R41 may be removed or may remain in place.

3. Remove the STOP sign and provide three-color signal indications/detectors, separate signal phasing for the private driveway. The R41 may be removed or remain in place.

4. Close the access and egress for the private driveway.

5. Remove the signal.

C. D. BARTELL, Chief
Division of Traffic Engineering

Attachment

cc: VWaite - 4; FShoemaker - 4; HSimpkins - SactoDesign; HGarfield; cGilbert; PLowden; NWinderd
Memorandum

Electrical Design Engineers

Date: June 11, 1986

File:

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Division of Traffic Engineering

Subject: Short-Circuit Current Interrupting Rating

Section 110-9 of the National Electrical Code states:

"Equipment intended to break current at fault
levels shall have an interrupting rating
sufficient for the system voltage and the
current which is available at the line terminals."

Section 86-2.11, "Service," of the Standard Specifications states:

"Circuit breakers used as service disconnect
equipment shall have a minimum interrupting
capacity of 10,000 amperes, rms."

While an interrupting capacity of 10,000 amperes is adequate for most
of our service installations, it will not cover all situations. For
example, San Diego Gas and Electric requires an interrupting capacity
of 40,000 amperes. Other utilities have indicated that the available
short circuit current in major CED areas often exceeds 10,000
amperes.

It is the responsibility of the electrical design engineer to
determine the short-circuit fault current available at each service
point. To assist you in making these calculations, I have attached
the formulae for determining the fault current and an example of how
the formulae are to be applied. The pages were taken from the
"Electrical Protection Handbook" published by the Bussman Division of
McGraw-Edison.

Harold Garfield

HAROLD GARFIELD
Assistant Traffic Engineer

Attachment
Memorandum

To: Electrical Design Engineers

Date: October 30, 1986

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Division of Traffic Engineering

Subject: Median Mounted Traffic Signal Standards

Section 9.24.2 of the 1986 revision to Chapter 9 of the Traffic Manual includes the following paragraph.

"The preferred locations for new installations of signal faces for fully-protected left turn movements at a typical intersection are on mast arms of sufficient length to place one signal face as nearly as practicable in line with the left turn lane and to place the second face on a standard at the far left corner. Unusual roadway geometrics, wide medians, wide roadways, more than one left turn in the same direction or other factors may require the left turn signal face(s) to be mounted on standard(s) located in a median to satisfy visibility requirements."

In order to expedite the review of any project where the preferred mast arm installation is not possible and you anticipate installing a signal standard in a median for a new signal or where you propose to leave or relocate an existing signal standard in a median as part of a major revision of the signal, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) reviewer and the Headquarters signal reviewer should be notified very early in the design stage. They realize that every effort is being made in your designs to eliminate as many fixed objects in the right of way as possible. Therefore, a minimum amount of review and revision will be necessary. The FHWA has agreed to allow the installation of our 2-1/2-inch pedestrian push button posts in medians, so you will not be required to get a separate okay if that is the only pole going in the median.

While the use of long mast arms for the left turn face may increase the cost of the project over the use of a Type 1-A standard in the median, the reduced maintenance costs associated with replacing a "knockdown" could provide an overall benefit to the State.

If you have any questions regarding the installation of signal standards in medians, please call me (ATSS 485-4555) or your District's electrical reviewer.

R. L. DONNER, Chief
Office of Electrical Systems
On February 5, 1987, I attended a meeting in CALTRANS, District 7, to discuss median mounted signals. The following were in attendance:

- Kwan Lau, Headquarters Traffic
- Bob Donner, Headquarters Traffic
- Fred Erbe, District 7, Traffic Operations
- Ozzie Baele, District 7, Traffic Operations
- Ben Cutter, District 7, Traffic Operations

We discussed the general philosophy of using median mounted signals and where we will allow their use.

It was agreed that median mounted signals would not normally be used but that we would normally not question their use in the following situations:

1. Intersections where the mast arm length required to place a signal head at the mid point of a lane would exceed the 45' standard. (CALTRANS probably should be working to get a standard for longer mast arms).

2. Locations where there are double left turn lanes and it is felt that a separate indication is needed for each left turn lane.

3. Short intersections where a left turn indication needs to be mounted lower than could be provided with a mast arm.

4. Unusual intersections at oblique angles where the far side indication may be too far to provide good visibility.

We also discussed specific projects in District 7 with median signals and discussed which should be allowed to proceed and which should be analyzed further and redesigned without median signals if possible. Our general guideline was that any project with the design essentially complete and scheduled for PS&E in the near future should continue on schedule, but if design is in the early stage and/or PS&E is not scheduled soon the project should be reanalyzed and median signals eliminated if possible.
### SUBJECT
Median Mounted Traffic Signals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>MESSAGE/COMMENT</th>
<th>FROM/DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D. Kamnikar   | The attached October 30, 1986 memo from Bob Donner provides policy guidance for median mounted traffic signal standards. | J. H. Lamb  
HPO-CA    
3/11/87 |
| D. Eyres      | Because of "pipe line" projects, additional time is required to fully implement this policy. Accordingly, we have agreed with Caltrans that all projects submitted after April 30, 1987 will comply with the October 30 memo. A special review was made by Lee Onstott of District 07 "pipe line" projects. Our action on these projects will be according to Lee's agreement. | |
| G. Clinton    |                 |           |
| M. Cook       |                 |           |
| E. Sheldahl   |                 |           |

**File:** 722.05

**CC:**
Mr. Bob Donner, Caltrans
Mr. J. H. Lamb, FHWA
Memorandum

To: District Traffic Engineers

Date: August 5, 1987

File No.: 

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Division of Transportation Operations and Toll Bridges

Subject: Traffic Signal Removal Guidelines

While the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) lists 11 "warrants" for the installation of a traffic signal, it gives very little guidance on the removal of an existing signal. Section 4C-2 "Warrants for Traffic Signal Installation" states in paragraph one "If these requirements are not met, a traffic signal should neither be put into operation nor continued in operation (if already installed)."

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published its Report No. FHWA/RD-80/104, entitled "Criteria for Removing Traffic Signals", (September 1980). This report discusses the signal removal activities of 31 jurisdictions. The most notable example was Buffalo, New York, where nearly 100 traffic signals were removed in 1976 as a cost reduction measure.

IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE LOCATIONS

Because of manpower and financial constraints, a continuous program for reviewing and evaluating all signalized intersections on the State highway system with regard to installation warrants should not be initiated at this time.

However, as pointed out in the FHWA report, the identification of candidate locations for traffic signal removal is most often an intuitive process. The local traffic engineering staff determined which signals should be considered for removal based on their personal knowledge of conditions at the intersection.

At intersections where the traffic signal was installed under Warrant 6 "Accident Experience" or at signalized locations that continue to have a large number (four or more) intersecting-type accidents, special attention to changing conditions is necessary when considering the removal of the signal.

A School Area Traffic Signal should not be considered for removal due to the politically sensitive nature of such an action.
SIGNAL REMOVAL CRITERIA

The MUTCD has added three new warrants for the installation of a traffic signal since the FHWA report was published in 1980. These are:

1. The Four Hour Volume Warrant
2. The Peak Hour Delay Warrant
3. The Peak Hour Volume Warrant

The addition of these new warrants justifies a decision to classify a traffic signal as "unwarranted" if it fails to meet the requirements for warrants 3 through 11, and the intersection volumes are less than 90 percent of the MUTCD volume requirements for at least eight hours.

NOTIFICATION

The local agency traffic engineer or Public Works Department shall be notified whenever the removal of a traffic signal is contemplated. Concurrence of the local agency in the decision to remove a signal is desirable.

In addition, the local Office of the California Highway Patrol and the local law enforcement agency shall be notified of the contemplated removal of the signal.

PUBLICITY

The use of press releases, letters and special signing are discussed in the FHWA report. The advantages/disadvantages of each method are listed.

INTERIM CONTROL METHODS

Where the intersection is being converted to multi-way "STOP" control the STOP signs should be installed and the signal placed on all-red flashing operation for at least 30 days before removing the traffic signal.

Where the intersection is being converted to two-way (one way at "T" intersections) "STOP" control, the STOP signs should be installed and the signal heads covered for at least 30 days before removing the traffic signal. In lieu of covering the signal heads, the signals may be placed on flashing operation with flashing red for the approaches with STOP signs and flashing yellow for the approaches that are not required to stop. The visors on the flashing yellow signals may be removed.
Special attention to the signal indications may be required where railroad and/or other pre-emption circuits are involved.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
P. KAY GRIFFIN

P. KAY GRIFFIN, Chief
Division of Transportation Operations
and Toll Bridges

SBalog/HGarfield:cf
bcc: SBalog
      HGarfield
      NWingerd
      JPerry
      KCGilbert
      Operations Files
January 9, 1991

Mr. L. Wayne Shealy, President
Shakespeare Fiberglass Pole Co.
P.O. Box 733
New Berry, S.C. 29108

Dear Mr. Shealy:

The testing and evaluation of Shakespeare Fiberglass Lighting Poles has been completed. I am pleased to inform you that the AHW27 through AHW35 series of poles with grooved breakaway anchor bases and maximum 12-foot mast arm lengths have been approved for use on California state highways.

Enclosed, for your information, is a copy of the memorandum prepared by the Transportation Materials and Research Laboratory describing the testing of the poles.

If you should have any questions or comments, please contact Mr. Charles Perry at (916) 445-5063.

Sincerely,

C. D. Bartell, Chief
Division of Traffic Operations

Original Signed by

CPerry:ph
bcc: CPerry
RDonner
CBartell
Operations Files
File: SHA074CLTR021

Enclosures
Memorandum

To: ALL DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTORS
    Project Development and Operations

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
    Division of Traffic Operations

Subject: Curb Ramp

Date: March 15, 1993

File No.: 

As noted on Standard Plan sheets NSP A88 and ES 8, effort should be made to relocate pull boxes out of the boundaries of a curb ramp prior to its construction. No new pull boxes shall be installed within the boundaries of any existing curb ramps or new ramps at an existing signalized intersection of a project involving extensive reconstruction that requires relocation of poles and pull boxes.

When it is not cost effective and practical to relocate all pull boxes in a retrofit case, a pull box may be located on the non-grooved side slope areas of the ramp and the top of the pull box must be flush with the slope area.

[Signature]
ROBERT L. DONNER, Chief
Office of Electrical Systems
Memorandum

To: ALL TRAFFIC ENGINEERS

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Traffic Operations

Subject: Project Plans Reviews

Date: February 16, 1995

It has been the policy of the Office of Electrical Systems to review all projects that contained electrical facilities for compliance with the California Department of Transportation Electrical Design Standards. This has been done in conjunction with the Office of Office Engineer, who prepared the contract documents in compliance with the State Contract Act, and other departmental standards.

It has been determined that in the future there is no need to send the projects to the Office of Electrical Systems. When requested by the Office of Office Engineer, the Office of Electrical Systems will provide assistance and support to assure conformance with electrical standards.

Original Signed By
LES KUBEL, Chief
Office of Electrical Systems

ARastegarpour: dc

bcc: LKubel
GCCorrigan
CPerry
ARastegarpour
Traffic Operations
Memorandum

To: DISTRICT TRAFFIC ENGINEERS  Date: June 28, 1996

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Traffic Operations

Subject: Main Circuit Breakers in Service Equipment Enclosures

We received an opinion in 1990 from the National Electrical Code Committee that the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) service equipment enclosures should be classified as lighting and appliance panel boards. Caltrans service equipment enclosures as defined should comply with Section 384-16 of the National Electrical Code and be protected on the supply side by main circuit breakers. The National Electrical Code Section 384-16 allows the use of up to two main circuit breakers for each lighting and appliance panel board.

To comply with the National Electrical Code requirement, a memorandum to the District Traffic Engineers was issued July 31, 1990 by this office. This memorandum required the use of main circuit breaker(s) in Caltrans service equipment enclosures. Since that memorandum was issued, additional confusion has been encountered because Section 86-2.11, service of the standard specifications requires that "each service shall be provided with a circuit breaker which shall simultaneously disconnect all ungrounded service entrance conductor." This requirement can be interpreted as allowing only one main circuit breaker in Caltrans service equipment enclosures even when the National Electrical Code interpretation allows a maximum of two main circuit breakers.

To clarify this issue the Caltrans Standard Special Provision 86.19 (Service), will be modified to agree with the National Electrical Code Section 384-16. This will affect the wording of Standard Specification Section 86-2.11 service and the main circuit breaker requirements shown on standard plan drawings ES-2D, ES-2E and ES-2F and allow the use of up to two main circuit breakers in Caltrans service equipment enclosures.

Original Signed By
LES KUBEL, Chief
Office of Electrical Systems

CPerry: dc
bcc: LKubel
CPerry
Traffic Operations
EMORANDUM

DISTRICT DIRECTORS

DISTRICT DIVISION CHIEFS
Project Development, Construction and Operations

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Traffic Operations
Mail Station 35

District: State-Furnished Equipment Policy

Data: March 19, 1997

The following is to clarify existing policy regarding State-furnished equipment:

- All Model 170 Controller Assemblies, regardless of application, installed on the State highway system that are included in contracts that the State advertises, awards or administers shall be State-furnished.

When the Model 2070 Controller units are introduced, all Model 2070 Controller Assemblies, regardless of application, installed on the State highway system that are included in contracts that the State advertises, awards or administers shall be State-furnished.

We are currently working on a new Model 170 and 2070 Controller policy for traffic signals installed on the State highway system. Until the new policy is implemented, traffic signal controller assemblies that are not covered under the criteria listed above shall be State-furnished, if possible, or contractor provided with testing being performed by Material Engineering & Testing Services or an independent lab.

We also will further explore the possibility of future contractor furnishing of Changeable Message Signs and Model 170 Controller equipment by establishing a task force to examine all the issues. On a statewide basis; Steve Hancock from the Office of Electrical Systems will organize this task force. Please contact Steve Hancock at 654-5309 for input to and/or participation on the task force.

JAMES B. BORDEN
Program Manager
Traffic Operations

Attachments
Memorandum

To: STANDARD SPECIAL PROVISION/
    STANDARD PLAN OWNERS

Date: April 15, 2003

From: BRIAN LEE
    Chief
    Office of Project Scheduling and Support
    Office Engineer
    Division of Engineering Services

Subject: Dual-Unit SSP and Standard Plan Updates

The Department has made available for local agency use, dual-unit versions of its
these documents current:

- New requests for SSPs and Standard Plans must include a dual-unit version in
  addition to the metric version. Any requests received without a dual-unit version
  will not begin processing until the dual-unit version is received.

- For requests received prior to this memo but not yet approved, the Standards
  engineer processing the Request will be contacting the appropriate representative
  regarding the submission of a dual-unit version. Approval will not occur until the
  dual-unit version is received.

- For requests approved prior to this memo, the Standards engineer will prepare a
dual-unit version that will be forwarded to your representative for concurrence.

The dual-unit SSPs are available on the Department's website at

If you have questions regarding these procedures, please contact Joyce Hirano at Calnet
8-498-6254.

c: John McMillan
   Don Scheel
   Paul Burdick
   Joyce Hirano

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Memorandum

To: DISTRICT DIRECTORS

Date: August 8, 2003

From: RANDELL H. IWASAKI
Deputy Director
Maintenance and Operations

File: BRENT FELKER
Deputy Director
Project Delivery

Subject: Expediting Safety Improvements

The purpose of this memo is to reaffirm the Department's commitment to safety and provide guidance to expedite delivery of highway safety improvements. The Department has established safety as the top strategic goal.

The Department investigates all high collision concentration locations. Where data indicates a collision pattern susceptible to correction, safety projects are initiated to improve roadway features. The scope of the improvement can vary from a simple sign installation order to a SHOPP Safety project.

Upon identification of the improvement, Districts must initiate immediate action. Early buy-in by the Project Development Team on the scope, cost, and schedule is essential to expedite the delivery of the safety improvement. If the recommendation is a SHOPP Safety project, Headquarters Traffic Safety Program approval is needed. To help expedite this process, early coordination with the Headquarters Traffic Safety Program is encouraged to minimize delay with programming. As soon as the district has an approved scooping document, a SHOPP amendment should be prepared to program the project. Once programmed, many steps can be initiated concurrently to expedite the project. Other work will be set aside if necessary to complete this project in the shortest possible time. Project Delivery Teams need to establish aggressive but realistic schedules to ensure the timely delivery of safety projects and make every effort to meet their commitment.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
The importance of delivering safety improvements must be stressed with externals to expedite environmental review and approvals. Partnering with local agencies can help resolve mobility issues before they become safety issues.

The Department's target is to deliver all safety projects as soon as practicable and program no long lead safety projects. Timely delivery of safety projects will help in achieving the Department's strategic goal of safety. Guidance on expediting safety improvements is available at:

http://onramp/hq/trafops/ksi/

Please share this statement of priority with all staff involved with the delivery of safety improvements.