



# California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



## State of California

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting  
November 3, 2022

#### ATTENDEES

##### Voting Members (Present):

- David Fleisch, CEAC, Ventura County Public Works Agency (Chair)
- Robert Bronkall, CEAC, Humboldt County (Vice-Chair)
- Lt. Noah Hawkins, CHP
- Bryan Jones, CAT, Greenlaw Partners
- Marianne Kim, AAA-S
- Xavier Maltese, AAA-N
- Mike Sallaberry, CAT, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Yue Wang, Caltrans Traffic Safety Engineering Manager
- Jason Welday, LOCC, City of Rancho Cucamonga
- Virendra Patel, LOCC, City of Concord

##### Voting Members (Absent):

- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin

##### Alternate Members (Present):

- Gurinderpal (Johnny) Bhullar, Caltrans
- Rock Miller, CAT, Rock E. Miller & Associates
- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC, Placer County
- Andrew Maximous, LOCC, City of Culver City
- Tony Powers, CAT, Dokken Engineering

##### Alternate Members (Absent):

- Denise Dobson, CHP
- Steve Finnegan, AAA-S
- Lena Whittaker, AAA-N

##### Committee Staff:

- Johnny Bhullar, CTCDC Secretary, Caltrans
- Janelle Halog, Caltrans Transportation Engineer
- Ejaz Shaikh, Caltrans Transportation Engineer

##### Presenters:



# California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



- Johnny Bhullar, CTCDC Secretary, Caltrans
- John Bamfield, Caltrans
- Michael Robinson, Caltrans
- Sarah Horn, Caltrans
- Chi Cheung To, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
- Kevin Schumacher, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
- José Ornelas, Caltrans

## Public Speakers:

- Steve Pyburn, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Richard Moeur, Executive Secretary, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD)
- Laura Wells, City of San Jose
- Ricardo Olea, City Traffic Engineer, San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Commission

## **ORGANIZATION ITEMS**

### **1. Introduction**

Mr. Bhullar stated that he would be representing Committee Member Yue Wang for the first hour of the meeting. Janelle Halog would be filling the Secretary role during that time.

Mr. Bhullar stated that eight voting members were present, and a quorum was confirmed.

Vice-Chair Bronkall opened the meeting at 9:07 a.m.

The CTCDC members introduced themselves.

### **2. Membership**

Chair Fleisch recognized new Alternate Member Robert Scharf, appointed by the CEAC, representing Southern California.

### **3. Approval of Minutes of the August 4, 2022 Meeting**

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the August 4, 2022 CTCDC Meeting Minutes as reported. Mr. Bhullar seconded. The Motion passed with Ms. Kim and Chair Fleisch abstaining.

### **4. Public Comments**

There was no public comment.

### **5. Updates on Items under Experimentation**

Mr. Bhullar stated that Caltrans staff has been looking at the active experiments and working with the agencies actively involved. Three experiments are on the agenda to be closed. There are two experiments with conceptual approvals – once the agency implements the device in



the field, the experiment’s two-year window will begin. There are 12 total active experiments.

Mr. Bhullar displayed the Experiments Spreadsheet Summary. The status listed for each of the 12 experiments is current as of the last quarter, per the agencies involved.

Chair Fleisch noted the importance of the agencies keeping Caltrans updated.

Mr. Bhullar stated that Caltrans is mindful of the policies and the process established for CTCDC experiments. The next step for staff is to update all documents related to the process.

Vice-Chair Bronkall commented on the tremendous amount of work this has been for staff. Their work is greatly appreciated.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**6. Public Hearing**

**6a. Consent Items (minor discussion with vote expected)**

*None*

**6b. Action Items (Continuing discussion from prior meetings with vote expected)**

**21-06: 6in Longitudinal Traffic Lines on SHS**

Mr. Bhullar stated that the issue for this item has been that with the 6-inch-wide minimum standard, sometimes consultants working on a State Highway System project miss this fact as they are looking only at the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) minimum standard.

John Bamfield stated the request for a recommendation: on a motion by the committee to include a minimum requirement of 6-inch-wide longitudinal traffic lines for permanent pavement marking delineation on State Highway Systems, and to clarify the use of the 4-inch width as optional for local agencies, in the CA MUTCD.

Mr. Bamfield provided some background for the item. It concerns MUTCD Section 3A.06.

He explained that the purpose of increasing the width of longitudinal striping is to benefit older drivers and increase visibility of lane line delineators for all road users by providing increased roadway guidance, especially during periods of impaired visibility such as wet conditions and night.

The Caltrans May 19, 2017 memo “Implementation of six-inch wide traffic lines and discontinuing use of non-reflective raised pavement markers” states that when a State Highway intersects with a local road, only the mainline State Highway System is required to have the 6-inch-wide striping.

The proposed revision includes a change to the text and the addition of figures to show details for 6-inch-wide traffic lines and their applicability only on the State Highway System, while retaining the 4-inch width for local agency roadways. Mr. Bamfield read the proposed text changes.

**Committee Questions and Discussion**



## California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



Vice-Chair Bronkall suggested a minor clarification: to identify that the width of the lines is 6-inch minimum, however, there is an option for local agencies to use a 4-inch line. Mr. Bhullar accepted the suggestion.

Steve Pyburn, FHWA, commented that the text in red was ambiguous – it needs to be clear in allowing the local agencies the option for 6-inch. Mr. Bhullar and Mr. Bamfield accepted the clarifying suggestion.

Ms. Kim pointed out the difference between “shall be a minimum of 4 inches” and “the option of 4 inches.” She preferred the latter.

Mr. Patel asked if this would be reflected in the standard plans. Mr. Bamfield replied that the standard plans pertain to the State Highway System only. The Caltrans standard plans already reflect the 6-inch striping.

Chair Fleisch noted that the issue had come up a couple of years ago: for small rural counties especially, with their narrow roadways and limited traffic volumes, going to the 6 inches was going to be extraordinarily expensive. They also felt it was unnecessary given their limited volumes on the road. Chair Fleisch felt that the wording was clear, and no additional text was needed.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Bronkall made a motion to approve, with a clarification to be made to the graphics that better articulates the option for 4-inch lines for local agencies; and to coordinate with FHWA to ensure that it will all get approved. Mr. Bhullar accepted that as a Friendly Amendment and seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

### **21-16: Assembly Bills AB-43 and AB-1938 Implementation – Speed Limit Policy Revisions**

Mr. Bhullar stated that last November the CTCDC had formed a subcommittee on AB-43. They met in December. After that, they have had several other meetings related to the Vehicle Code provisions that were provided by AB-43. Essentially, the provisions are to allow more flexibility in lowering speed limits from the pre-AB-43 law and Vehicle Code. There were 16 specific provisions.

The Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force (ZTFTF) had been established. They produced a report with recommendations, of which seven required a change in law for lowering speed limits; AB-43 was that law. However, once AB-43 was issued last year, there were a number of engineering and legal concerns raised by the subcommittee. The authors of AB-43 had tried to focus on the perspective of local agencies in lowering the speed limits, and they had not included the other aspects such as the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Some clarification had thus been needed on the text, as well as the intent of AB-43. As a result, Caltrans had brought the issue to management as well as to the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA). CalSTA had worked with the authors of the bill and provided direction to Caltrans. The result was a revision to the law: AB-1938, now approved by the Governor. It clarifies some of the provisions of AB-43.



## California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



At the previous meeting, Mr. Bhullar had brought in nine of the 16 provisions that were straightforward and did not need interpretation. The CTCDC had given its recommendations. Two provisions did not involve the CA MUTCD. However, there were five that needed clarification.

AB-1938 is going to become effective in January 2023. This agenda item clarifies the remaining five provisions. Mr. Bhullar was now describing the complete AB-43 implementation for the Committee, including the clarification in AB-1938.

Mr. Bhullar had supplied further written details for the CTCDC on the history of the subcommittee, Caltrans management, and the CalSTA Review.

He then focused on the actual proposal. As part of AB-43, among the 16 provisions was one provision, 22358.7, that required Caltrans to come up with a statewide definition for “safety corridor” and criteria (or definition) for a roadway segment that is adjacent to a land or facility that generates a high concentration of bicyclist or pedestrian activity. Caltrans has come up with a statewide definition that can be used to apply the additional 5-mile reduction that the AB-43 provisions allow. It is reflected in this proposal.

The proposal completes all the provisions of AB-43 and the clarifications in AB-1938.

Mr. Bhullar displayed the staff report with the current proposal, which focuses on the five provisions that were part of AB-1938. There are four new sections that AB-43 created in 22358: .6, .7, .8, and .9; some of the language is moved to a different location.

From the previous meeting until now, the Steering Committee had formalized a new action item under the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). The Steering Committee was tracking the seven ZTFTF report recommendations, and had formalized this effort under the SHSP as a new Action Item that Caltrans is following to implement by incorporating the recommendations into the manual.

Mr. Bhullar displayed the proposal with CA MUTCD current text shown in blue; National MUTCD current text, adopted by California without modifications, in black; new proposed text in red; and text recommended at the previous meeting in green.

Mr. Bhullar explained the new portions of red text as follows.

1. The subcommittee wanted to ensure that engineers and practitioners were aware that engineering solutions are needed when lowering a number on the speed limit sign for safety improvement.
2. CVC 22358.6 includes the rounding – the 5-mile increment and the maximum speed reductions which are now part of AB-1938.
3. In place of examples, a table now clearly lays out how to apply the policies according to the wording, resulting in fewer interpretation differences between practitioners. A new requirement was clarified in AB-1938 that the maximum speed reduction allowed from the 85% percentile from the speed survey will be 12.4 – the intent of the bill’s authors.
4. The authors of the bill as well as the agencies involved in the effort were clear early on that the intent was that AB-43 was applicable only to local agencies, not the State Highway System.
  - o CVC 22358.7: the safety corridor definition and the high concentration ped/bike area.

- CVC 22358.8: the ability to retain the current speed limit or the prior posted speed limit, rather than increasing the speed limit only because a new survey shows that the speed needs to be increased; this addressed speed creep.
  - CVC 22358.9: local agencies through an ordinance can now designate a business activity district.
5. Further details.
  6. In the table toward the end, the correct Vehicle Code is named.
  7. A new table shows the applicability of rounding and additional speed reductions on the State Highway System.
  8. The next new table is for local agency applicability. It adds a column showing the additional 5-mile reduction allowed with the safety corridor and the high concentration ped/bike aspects.
  9. A new table lists the safety corridor definition requirements, revised by the subcommittee after Caltrans' initial proposal. The impact on the safety corridor is more for local agencies.
  10. A new table gives the requirements to determine land or facility that generate high concentration of pedestrians or bicyclists. For the time being, this is how we are proposing to start out, per the comments and input received from local agencies through the subcommittee.

Mr. Bhullar displayed the SHSP Action Item, formalizing all the efforts on AB-43 implementations as they satisfy the ZTFTF report recommendations.

Chair Fleisch expressed appreciation for the tremendous amount of work that Secretary Bhullar and staff had done on this. There had been a sense of urgency from the local agencies to get this resolved, and staff had taken the time to work it through and to provide clear guidance.

### Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Welday had a suggestion regarding 2B.13 in the staff report, red section, on speed bumps: we typically do not use speed bumps on local roads, but instead use speed humps or “vertical deflections” to include raised crosswalks, etc. Those terms would be more appropriate to the context of local roads. Mr. Bhullar agreed.

Mr. Welday also commented on page 12 of the staff report, second option at the top: it might be helpful to add the exception for the safety corridor high concentration of all the road users. Mr. Bhullar agreed.

Mr. Sallaberry commented on page 14 beginning at CVC Section 22358.7: the reference to “serious injury” should be changed to “severe” which is more commonly used by CHP. Jessi Downing of Caltrans responded that the subcommittee had concluded that “serious” was the terminology used by CHP. Lt. Hawkins confirmed.

Mr. Sallaberry referred to the same page, the last line on the Option statement. He wondered how #1 was determined as a substitute. Ms. Downing responded that the idea is that no death or serious injury is acceptable; they were also trying to create as much flexibility as possible.

### Public Comment

Laura Wells, City of San Jose, commented on page 25: the option in red seems to contradict the standard above. If an agency has established a speed limit on a highway, the E&TS may



be extended to 14 years when all the above conditions are met. She said that she would forward some suggested language.

Ms. Wells then referred to the table on page 31. AB-43 had made no changes to 22357; in the CVC, it is intended to be where a local agency is determining that the prima facie 25 MPH on a local street should be increased to between 30 MPH and 60 MPH. The new rule is still worded incorrectly: it should be the same as the first row above – that on any street other than a State Highway, by ordinance, local authorities may post a prima facie speed limit where the limit of 65 MPH is more than is reasonable or safe. Mr. Bhullar agreed to fix it.

Ms. Wells referred to the table on page 37. It would be helpful if there were clarification to the earlier language that when it refers to one or more of the requirements being listed, it is not interpreted to mean that the requirement is the category. Ms. Downing suggested that instead of referencing in the table to the right, “factor” instead of “description” could be used. We could modify the language to make it clear that we are requiring one of the factors from that table.

**MOTION:** Mr. Bhullar made a motion to accept the staff recommendation with the word changes discussed and accepted today. Vice-Chair Bronkall seconded with a Friendly Amendment to include also fixing typographical errors found in final proofreading. The Motion passed unanimously.

*At this point Mr. Wang joined the meeting and Mr. Bhullar returned to his role as Secretary.*

### **22-10: Leading Pedestrian Interval Legislation AB-2264**

Secretary Bhullar stated that the Vice-Chair had requested someone from the office of the bill’s authors to come and provide background, etc. However, as of this morning, Secretary Bhullar was not able to obtain someone from that office to speak.

Mr. Robinson read the recommendation and provided some background. AB-2264, Pedestrian Crossing Signals, was authored by Bloom, Haney and Portantino and approved by the Governor on September 23, 2022. AB-2264 amends the Vehicle Code Section 21450.5 to require State-owned or operated traffic actuated signals, upon first placement or replacement, to include leading pedestrian interval (LPI) with accessible pedestrian signals (APS) and detectors. Existing State-owned or operated traffic actuated signals will be required to have LPI installed when maintenance work is performed.

From Caltrans’ perspective, it is not clear who performs the maintenance work. Typically, Electrical Maintenance does not adjust signal timing and therefore cannot implement LPI. Traffic signal timing changes are performed by Signal Operations, which periodically performs field investigations and operational reviews. The CA MUTCD update needs to be clear that maintenance work performed on traffic signals refers to Signal Operations work.

Mr. Robinson explained the paragraph that staff wants to strike regarding APS.

He displayed the proposed changes to Section 4E.06, Pedestrian Intervals and Signal Phases.



## California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



This only applies to State-owned or operated traffic signals, and only if they reside in certain designated areas.

Mr. Robinson noted that the Support Section explains that some locations (such as a T-intersection with one-way movement) will not benefit from an LPI.

### Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Welday suggested considering some form of Engineering Judgment regarding the exception. The legislation does appear to allow the MUTCD to make those exceptions.

Mr. Patel asked about the intersections that are maintained and operated by the city, even though owned by Caltrans. Will there be language to address this? Mr. Robinson replied that if it is owned by the State and fits into one of these zones, it must have LPI. An on-ramp intersection may not be part of a residential or business district.

Mr. Robinson indicated the paragraph that Caltrans wants to strike. Also, in the second line they wanted to strike "...a field investigation."

Mr. Miller asked about a large city agency that maintains a lot of signals owned and operated by Caltrans; would they need to be upgraded? Mr. Robinson confirmed that they would need to be upgraded for LPI.

### Public Comment

Ricardo Olea, City Traffic Engineer at San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Commission, asked about semi-actuated operations – the legislation refers to actuated signals, but there are situations where the main highway may be fixed, and the actuation is only on the side street. In those situations, the LPI could make more sense for crossing the main highway facing the cross street, as opposed to putting an LPI facing the State route, which would be the main delay. If the guidance is not clear, we should consider those as potential situations where the LPI is not all phases but only certain phases. There are situations where you probably could have an LPI for only one approach, if having an LPI for a major highway is not necessary. Chair Fleisch felt that it might be best to leave this as is, and to obtain some clarification language from the bill's authors.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Bronkall made a motion that Caltrans reach out to the bill's author to clarify what maintenance in particular would trigger these improvements, as well as to clarify the semi-actuated signals. Mr. Welday seconded with a Friendly Amendment to add an Engineering Judgment to the list of questions. The Motion passed unanimously.

### **22-11: Additional retroreflective bands on 36" cones**

Mr. Bamfield stated that 36" down to 28" cones use a two-band reflective material. Greater than 36" uses four bands. This proposal is to allow the inclusion of the 36" cone into the four-band reflective material use. This would increase their visibility in temporary work zones.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Bronkall made a motion to approve. Mr. Patel seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.





## **22-15: Option to allow pedestrian walk or clearance intervals during railroad preemption**

Secretary Bhullar provided some background. This item came from the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) and the Caltrans Traffic Signal group. The CPUC is the owner of the CA MUTCD Part 8, which is Railroad Grade Crossings. However, there is much overlap between Part 8 and Part 4, which is Traffic Signals.

Chi Cheung To, CPUC, stated that he was presenting a change to the CA MUTCD Section 4D.27, “Preemption and Priority Control of Traffic Control Signals,” to provide an Option statement. It would allow for a pedestrian walk interval or pedestrian clearance interval during the right-of-way transfer time, where sufficient time has been allocated to serve pedestrians during railroad preemption. The current CA MUTCD defines the right-of-way transfer time to include railroad or light rail transit or highway traffic signal control equipment time to react to a preemption call, and any green traffic signal, pedestrian walk and clearance, and yellow change and red clearance interval for conflicting traffic prior to displaying a track clearance interval to clear vehicles off the track. Mr. To continued providing details.

He displayed the requested change to Standard 8, last sentence. The proposed Option statement is more in line with current practice. Technology has improved during the last 10 years in railroad signal equipment and traffic signal controllers.

Advance preemption is currently implemented by Caltrans for new installations of railroad preemption or where traffic signals and railroad warning devices are being constructed and reconstructed on State Highways. For most projects on local roadways, advance preemption has been implemented as well.

CPUC’s safety concern with the existing language is that it shortens or omits the potential pedestrian clearance interval at preemption locations with vulnerable users or high-volume pedestrian traffic. The proposed Option statement provides for a local agency to have a pedestrian walk or clearance interval, if such interval has been implemented as part of the right-of-way transfer time.

### Public Comment

Richard Moeur, Executive Secretary of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, had a minor editorial comment: where you have an Option statement modifying a Standard, if you do not place something in the actual Standard that says that the Option statement modifies it, you may have problems with claims litigation. Mr. Moeur suggested adding an Exception statement to the Standard.

### Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Powers questioned why this is optional. What we are doing in the Standard is creating a direct conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, with the intent of clearing vehicles that did not bother to stop at the Stop line, at the expense of the pedestrian who pressed the button and is in the crosswalk legally. This situation happens every 7½ minutes at train crossings with 15-minute headways. This should not have become a Standard, and it should not be optional to fix it where it is feasible to do that.



Mr. To responded that CPUC recognized the shortfall in the existing language, which is why they are proposing to change it. Most existing crossings in California have simultaneous preemption; with this, we do not have time to clear both vehicles and pedestrians off the intersection. Thus, we maintain priority with the vehicle and have to shorten the pedestrian walking clearance interval. Mr. To then explained the burden on local agencies, who want to provide a pedestrian walk and clearance interval, but do not want to go against the Shall statement in the CA MUTCD. He added that this Option statement is more in line with the current Caltrans practice, where advance pedestrian preemption and advance preemption is included with all State Highway projects.

Mr. Maximous asked about the Standard under Section 4D.27, line 8, Part B – is it in conflict with the California-specific portion? Perhaps this section could be utilized by Caltrans to provide the advanced pedestrian interval. Mr. To responded that the language in both the CA MUTCD and the National MUTCD permit the shortening or omission of the pedestrian clearance interval. The California-specific language, however, calls for an immediate abbreviation of the walk and pedestrian clearance interval – a contradiction to someone who wants to do a walk and pedestrian clearance interval.

Mr. Maximous suggested revising the California portion so that it is not a Shall statement. He noted that all the major railroads have the option to provide the advance pedestrian preemption when requested. Mr. To responded that CPUC has considered that as well. It is very important for a crossing with simultaneous preemption that they follow the existing language of 4D.27, particularly the California-specific portion because they do not have time to clear both pedestrian and vehicle. CPUC sees the value of the existing statement. A second point they have considered is that the National MUTCD is going to be published next May, where the language in 4D.27 as well as Part 8 has been substantially improved to address preemption. Rather than going through a major update at this point, they want to use an Option statement to address the shortfall in the existing language.

**MOTION:** Chair Fleisch made a motion to approve the item as proposed. Vice-Chair Bronkall seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

**22-16: Bipartisan Infrastructure Law – Rebuilding CA Sign**

Ms. Horn stated that California will receive funding from President Biden’s Infrastructure Investment and Job Act (IIJA) for existing and new projects on State Highway Systems. Caltrans is creating a new C50 sign.

Ms. Horn displayed the sign. Caltrans already has three logos on the top of the sign, so local agencies can add two of their own.

Ms. Horn displayed the IIJA policy for using the sign.

Public Comment

Steve Pyburn, FHWA, stated that this was a hot topic not only in the State but also in Washington. FHWA appreciated the desire to inform the public of the use of SB-1 funds; the sense of urgency Caltrans has expressed to FHWA in getting these signs in the field quickly; and that the proposed sign is very similar to funding signs previously approved for California.

(The MUTCD team in FHWA in Washington D.C. does not really like the signs, but their approval is designated to the California office.) Mr. Pyburn requested that the use of the sign be limited, like other funding signs, to one per direction leading into the construction site. He commented last that the sign is under review by the Secretary of Transportation and Federal Highways. FHWA is working on an MUTCD-compliant sign, and he could not say how that would affect the approval of the sign by the California FHWA office. Mr. Pyburn asked that approval of the sign include the caveat that it is pending FHWA review, and some modification of the sign may be forthcoming.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Bronkall made a motion to approve the recommendation with the caveat that it is pending approval from FHWA. Mr. Wang seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

### **6c. Information Items (New items that may be voted on or brought back as an Action Item in a future meeting)**

#### **22-08: SHSP Action SM.3 California Manual for Setting Speed Limits Revision**

Secretary Bhullar stated that Caltrans has a kind of best practices manual created in 2014 for implementation of speed limit policies. It was intended to assist new Caltrans engineers with continuity in setting speed limits, conducting engineering and traffic surveys (E&TS), the process, those involved, locations, etc. Every couple of years Caltrans has been revising the manual.

As part of the ZTFTF report, Caltrans received a recommendation that the manual was not really helpful for local agencies or non-Caltrans practitioners, because it was too oriented to Caltrans and was too detailed and complex. The SHSP Steering Committee was now asking Caltrans to expand and revise the manual to address this need. They also requested simpler terminology for courts and judges.

This agenda item was calling on Caltrans to engage and garner input from other practitioners. Caltrans needs experts in conducting E&TS from local agencies and has also engaged its Division of Local Assistance. Secretary Bhullar put out a call to those representing local agencies, and also private consultants who work on E&TS, to nominate volunteers to help with this effort.

Chair Fleisch asked those representing the LOCC – Mr. Patel, Mr. Welday, and Mr. Maximous – to seek assistance. Chair Fleisch and Vice-Chair Bronkall will do the same.

#### **22-09: SHSP Action SC.7 Formalize Existing Traffic Control Device Uses in the CA MUTCD**

Secretary Bhullar stated that this item would be the basis for a future Action Item. It had come from the SHSP Steering Committee in the ZTFTF report. Caltrans is constantly reacting to field issues and policies because agencies shy away from coming to CTCDC and

FHWA for experimental processes, which are elaborate and laden with requirements. Only after the completion of experiments is Caltrans able to include devices in the manual.

Rather than using this long process, Caltrans should have a proactive approach to survey and look for non-standard traffic control devices. Caltrans could tap agencies to learn from their experiences with new devices, rather than waiting for them to come to Caltrans and FHWA. Caltrans could look at the devices and their applications and use the information as a basis for recommendation of inclusion.

Caltrans had conducted informal surveys a couple of years ago. They then conducted a formal survey earlier this year in which they reached out to all the national DOTs; within California they reached out to the LOCC and the California County Association. Caltrans engineers are analyzing the survey.

### **22-12: 2009 National MUTCD Revision 3 Final Pavement Ruling**

Secretary Bhullar stated that the Feds do not like to revise the National MUTCD on a regular basis; since 2009, this is only the third revision and is effective at the national level. Within two years of the issuing of the final ruling with its effective date of September 6, 2022, we have until September 6, 2022 to incorporate it into the CA MUTCD and issue it formally.

Mr. Bamfield reviewed the updates to the MUTCD. The primary issue of the revision seems to be the retroreflectivity of the longitudinal striping; this is the first official ruling published for the MUTCD that has a required retroreflectivity of 50 millicandela for speeds greater than 35 MPH, and an option recommendation for speeds greater than 70 MPH to be a minimum of 100 millicandela retroreflectivity with specified entrance angle and observation angle specified. Mr. Bamfield continued with details of the ruling.

#### Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn commented that the required final rule also requires an inspection program to be established by the State. Is that going to be covered in an MUTCD revision as it is for signs, or will that be separate? Secretary Bhullar responded that he would review to see whether it was part of the revision they had shared in that final rule, or if it was in the narrative of the Federal Register item. Mr. Pyburn explained that the inspection program for signs is noted in Section 2; it may or may not be required for Section 3.

### **22-14: Assembly Bill 1909 Vehicles: bicycle omnibus bill**

Secretary Bhullar stated that once staff is aware of any bills that affect traffic control devices, they bring them to the attention of the committee. He displayed the language of the bill, which would remove the prohibition of Class 3 electric bikes on those facilities. The CTCDC may be asked to come up with a new sign in the future.

Ms. Downing stated that provisions in the bill might change existing laws:

- Where bicycles can use the pedestrian Walk signal.
- The addition to the Three Feet for Safety Act, which would require vehicles to move over into an adjacent lane if it is safe.
- The prohibition for authorities to adopt licensing or registration for bicyclists.

**6d. Request for Word Message Signs Approval**

**22-06: BIKE TURN-OUT Signs**

Ms. Horn explained the proposal for two special guide signs for the BIKE TURN-OUT. It was very similar to VEHICLE TURN-OUT, which is a regulatory sign. It applies to where existing law says drivers must pass a bicycle with a minimum of three feet, but the roadway may not have that space. Ms. Horn displayed the signs.

Secretary Bhullar explained that this came from the District 4 Bay Area office, which is designing small terminals that are a kind of refuge area for bicyclists.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Sallaberry asked if we have a standard bicycle symbol to use instead of the word BIKE. Secretary Bhullar answered that FHWA does not like Caltrans to mix symbols with words – then it becomes a new sign that requires Federal involvement. Mr. Pyburn agreed: the word message is much easier to move forward.

Vice-Chair Bronkall commented that on certain two-lane roads, you will see signage stating that slower traffic must use turn-outs. He asked why more regulatory-type signage is not being used to direct slower bicycles to utilize turn-outs. Ms. Horn replied that there is an existing law for vehicles in the CVC. We do not have a law for bicycles. Vice-Chair Bronkall asked if bicycles are not considered vehicles that are subject to the law. Secretary Bhullar responded that staff had checked with Legal, and the best way to address it was to use BIKE TURN-OUT rather than trying to extend the CVC.

Mr. Maximous pointed out that the Federal MUTCD already has Sign D4-3 that includes a mix of the bike symbol and words, as well as on the regulatory side Signs R4-11, R9-5, and R9-6. Secretary Bhullar responded that they were aware of that. For Caltrans to mix the symbol and words, they would have to go to FHWA who would review and approve. Staff could do that if the Committee wishes.

Mr. Miller suggested asking the Feds for approval. In addition, he did not like the word BIKE but would prefer BICYCLE, which does appear on signs. BIKE could be confused with motorcycles. Secretary Bhullar said that he would check into it. If we are using BIKE on other signs, he would prefer it because it is shorter for quick recognition.

Public Comment

Mr. Moeur commented that a majority of the technical experts at the Bicycle Technical Committee within NCUTCD were in favor of using the bicycle symbol. FHWA’s position is that once you get beyond the current MUTCD’s wording on the use of word legend-only signs, they typically want human factors data showing that road users understand the mix of symbols. It is a situation where FHWA has historically reserved the right to raise this issue. Mr. Moeur also commented that the frequently used R3-17 BIKE LANE sign does use the term BIKE and seems to be reasonably understood.

Committee Comments and Discussion

Ms. Kim had thought that all bicycles were required to use turn-outs when there were more than five cars behind them. Secretary Bhullar answered that those were regular turn-outs. This sign was for small refuge areas for bicycles only.

Lt. Hawkins felt that the sign would be appropriate as a regulatory sign. Secretary Bhullar responded that Caltrans had not felt that they could extend the law for vehicles to this. He requested Lt. Hawkins to check with CHP's Legal department on moving forward with this as a regulatory sign.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Bronkall made a motion to recommend that the sign be approved with the word BIKE as proposed, and that clarification will be sought from CHP as to whether it should be a regulatory sign or a guide sign. Mr. Welday seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

### **22-07: REPORT PEDESTRIANS CALL 911 Sign**

Secretary Bhullar stated that the request was coming from District 11 in San Diego for a unique situation. Their local CHP supported it.

José Ornelas, Caltrans District 11, provided background for the item. The District had a significant increase in fatal collisions last year due to several pedestrians crossing the US/Mexico border near Interstate 8 as they tried to cross the freeway. Discussions at the local level have occurred for some type of signage to be placed in the area to warn motorists. District 11 has been approached by the CHP Commissioner's Office due to the increase in fatalities. Installation of the proposed sign will encourage road users to report the presence of pedestrians to CHP by calling 911.

The district had come up with REPORT PEDESTRIANS / CALL 911, similar to the drunk drivers sign that is standard operational procedure already. Based on engineering judgment, in segments where there are unanticipated or existing crossing of pedestrians, the drivers can be encouraged to call CHP.

Mr. Ornelas displayed an example of the sign.

Secretary Bhullar noted that earlier, a symbol of a running family created by District 11 had gotten a lot of public interest. However, that symbol was not approved by the Feds. The request had come in to use that symbol officially, but Caltrans discouraged it. The District was now trying to come up with a solution to address the situation at hand, with a limit of five words.

### Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Jones expressed the concern that we are asking drivers to start reporting illegal immigration to Border Patrol. This could lead to potential future issues for CHP. There are going to be some blurry lines; he cautioned about the perceived intent of this sign versus what it is actually doing. You might want to contact attorneys representing the other side. Mr. Ornelas agreed that it is a very sensitive issue, and that is why the District was very careful in considering the wording to use. They approved a traffic investigation report to install signs regarding wildlife crossing as supported by Fish & Game. He said that he is a Border Liaison





and will look into it. The District had chosen to use the term “PEDESTRIANS” versus anything else because they have had numerous unsheltered people who have been killed, as well as people getting struck next to stranded vehicles as they repaired flat tires. The signs would only be for areas with a high incident rate.

Secretary Bhullar added that the sign would only be used in areas where pedestrians are prohibited; pedestrians are allowed even in some freeway segments.

Mr. Ornelas stated that he will contact partners and activists sensitive to the issue.

Public Comment

Mr. Moeur observed that there have been a number of signs proposed to address a specific issue on a specific highway. Two issues have resulted: if the sign is only to be used on freeways, the language needs to be clear; road users seeing the sign in one location think it applies to all roads open to public travel. Secretary Bhullar responded that in this case, CHP is part of the request. If they get more calls, we will let that guide us. It is a serious situation requiring a unique solution for now. Mr. Moeur suggested the wording REPORT PEDESTRIANS ON FREEWAYS.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Sallaberry agreed with the suggestion – being a pedestrian is not illegal and the sign needs to be more specific. Secretary Bhullar responded that the language in the policy addresses that; we will reserve use of the sign to areas on the highways where pedestrians are prohibited.

Chair Fleisch suggested PEDESTRIANS PROHIBITED / CALL 911. Mr. Ornelas accepted the wording.

**MOTION:** Chair Fleisch made a motion to change the sign to read PEDESTRIANS PROHIBITED / CALL 911. Mr. Patel seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Moeur commented that FHWA had made a policy decision on the R5 series signs to get away from the word PROHIBITED. It would read NO PEDESTRIANS.

Secretary Bhullar requested to reopen the item to consider rewording the sign accordingly.

Mr. Pyburn asked that the sign be approved pending FHWA review. The revised wording has some implications that he needed to research.

Chair Fleisch suggestion amending the Motion to say NO PEDESTRIANS as opposed to PEDESTRIANS PROHIBITED.

Mr. Welday was not comfortable with the new wording: it sounded more like a regulatory sign than a guide sign.

Vice-Chair Bronkall suggested a more traditional warning sign that read, WATCH FOR PEDESTRIANS. Secretary Bhullar replied that the District has tried some of those measures and was trying to find a way to encourage 911 calls so that CHP could respond to the location right away.



Lt. Hawkins highly encouraged the use of CALL 911 because of the urgency involved. This is a serious issue with pedestrians being struck and killed on our freeway systems.

Mr. Ornelas stated that the District would entertain anything that could be incorporated now and make modifications later as we see fit.

John Cinatl, Retired Caltrans Bike Coordinator District 6, suggested PEDESTRIANS AND ANIMALS / CALL 911. Mr. Ornelas responded that the concern with that had been that some people might interpret it as the District referring to people coming in illegally as animals.

Mr. Pyburn agreed with Secretary Bhullar that the sign text was not within FHWA review of approval but the language in the manual is. He was still reserving the right to request a change to the wording.

Chair Fleisch stated that the Committee would leave the previously approved Motion as is.

**6e. Request for Experimentation**

**15-12: Experiment Closure Request Traffic Calming Treatments in Princeton, CA**

Secretary Bhullar stated that this experiment was terminated long ago, but staff was using due diligence. The request was from the County of Colusa, and the actual experiment was conducted on Caltrans District 3 roadways for optical chevron markings as a safety improvement. In a matter of months, the County had realized that some issues and a number of safety concerns had arisen. Caltrans had decided to terminate the experiment and informed the County of Colusa; however, the loop was never closed with the CTCDC. Caltrans has finally received a letter from them requesting formal termination.

**MOTION:** Mr. Sallaberry made a motion to approve closing the experiment. Mr. Welday seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

**17-15: Experiment Closure Request Red Colored Pavement Markings for Transit Only Lanes in Left Turn Only Lanes**

Secretary Bhullar stated that the request was from the City of Santa Rosa (City). The experiment has been going on for more than five years in the field, and they have been submitting reports. They had a unique situation involving public motorists mistakenly entering a fire station when trying to access an adjacent shopping mall. The request was to mark the pavement red in the lane involved. The City reports had data indicating that wrong maneuvers had decreased.

The uniqueness of the situation does not lend itself to modifying the MUTCD. Also, the surveys come only from the public. Secretary Bhullar checked with the City, who said that they want the experiment closed and have the red marking retained.



## California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



**MOTION:** Chair Fleisch made a motion to close the experiment. Vice-Chair Bronkall seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

### **19-05: Experiment Closure Request Bidirectional Pavement Marking for Wrong Way**

Secretary Bhullar stated that the request came from Districts 3 and 11 to try out wrong way devices for deterring wrong way drivers. Wrong way collisions in these two areas of Sacramento and San Diego continue to happen, so Caltrans has been trying out a lot of new devices and features.

The experiment involved a Lane Alert 2X product that could go over the markings. Once the experiment was approved, the manufacturer provided the material and contractors installed it. However, problems soon surfaced with material deterioration. The manufacturer tried to change the product's chemical mix but to no avail – it also began to remove the markings underneath. District 11 felt that it was not helping but was actually causing damage. Caltrans stopped using the product and it was pulled. Staff was requesting that the experiment be formally terminated.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Bronkall made a motion to approve the close-out. Mr. Patel seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

### **7. Next Meeting**

Chair Fleisch stated that the next meeting was scheduled for February 2, 2023. It will be in-person in Sacramento. A new Chair and Vice-Chair will be elected at that time.

### **8. Adjourn**

Chair Fleisch adjourned the meeting at 12:29 p.m.