

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
February 6, 2025

ATTENDEES

Voting Members Present (8 Total):

- Robert Bronkall, County Engineers Association of California (CEAC), Humboldt County Public Works (Chair)
- Jason Welday, League of California Cities (LOCC), City of Rancho Cucamonga (Vice Chair)
- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin
- Lt. Brad Hopkins, California Highway Patrol (CHP)
- Marianne Kim, American Automobile Association of Southern California (AAA-S)
- *Amjad Obeid, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ). *Present. Delegated voting authority to Alternate Bhullar
- Mike Sallaberry, CAT, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Mahmoud Zahriya, American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah (AAA-N)
- *Bryan Jones, Caltrans Active Transportation (CAT), City of Menifee.
*Arrived later. Rock Miller was the voting member until Bryan arrived.

Voting Members Absent (2 Total):

- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works

Alternate Members Present (6 Total):

- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans HQ
- Melainie Boyack, CHP
- Rock Miller, CAT, Rock E. Miller & Associates
- Virendra Patel, LOCC
- Tony Powers, CAT
- Wei Zhu, CEAC

Alternate Members Absent (4 Total):

- Tim Chang, AAA-S
- Michelle Donati, AAA-N

- Andrew Maximous, LOCC
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC

Committee Staff:

- Timothy Kong, Caltrans HQ, CTCDC Secretary

Presenters:

- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans HQ
- Jose Camacho Jr., Caltrans DRISI
- Timothy Kong, Caltrans HQ
- Mario Lozano-Cisneros, Caltrans HQ

Public Speakers:

- Richard Moeur, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD)
- Steve Pyburn, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Welday opened the meeting at 9:02 a.m.

The CTCDC Members present introduced themselves.

2. Membership

Chair Welday reviewed the changes to the CTCDC membership.

Sergeant Kirk Bailor, who will replace Lt. Brad Hopkins as the CHP representative on March 1, 2025, also introduced himself.

A new Chair and Vice Chair were elected:

MOTION: Mr. Bhatia nominated Bob Bronkall for Chair, seconded by Mr. Welday. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall nominated Jason Welday for Vice Chair, seconded by Mr. Bhatia. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

The new Chair Bronkall took over meeting hosting duties.

3. Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

MOTION: Vice Chair Welday moved to approve the November 7, 2024, California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Bhullar. The Motion passed unanimously by

voice vote with Mr. Bhatia, Ms. Kim, Mr. Miller, Mr. Patel, Mr. Sallaberry and Ms. Zhu abstaining.

4. Public Comments

Mr. Bhullar noted the following:

- A brief discussion of three items not on the agenda was provided. (Part 5, Part 7, 2026 CA MUTCD status)

5. Active Experiments

Mr. Kong highlighted a number of active experiments for the Committee.

AGENDA ITEMS

Note: Item 25-01 was the last item heard in the Public Hearing portion of the meeting. These minutes reflect the agenda items as listed on the agenda and not as taken in chronological order.

6. Public Hearing

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

None

6b. Action Items (Continuing or new items with vote expected)

23-12: AB 1320 - CA MUTCD Table 2D-102 (CA) Revision

Mario Lozano-Cisneros highlighted the following:

- AB 1320 was passed and approved on July 27, 2023.
- Table 2D-102 (CA) Revision was discussed.

MOTION: Mr. Bhullar made a motion to approve Item 23-12, Vice Chair Welday seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

25-01: Review and Finalize CA MUTCD 2026, Part 1

Mr. Bhullar gave updates on the CA MUTCD 2026 progress. Parts 5 and 7 were brought to the CTCDC in the 11/7/2024 meeting. Part 1 is being presented today.

CA MUTCD Parts are being reviewed in three phases, followed by an optional public review period, then submittal to FHWA for Substantial Conformance.

- Phase 1 - Review Standard and Guidance text changes of the National MUTCD
- Phase 2 - Review National text that was deleted from and blue text that was added to the CA manual

- Phase 3 - Review Figures and Tables
- Due to staff shortages, we will be skipping the optional public review and bringing the drafts directly to the CTCDC

Part 1 changes highlighted:

- Removed a lot of relation to other documents/publications. Consolidated lists to include those that are directly related.
- Reworded a Chapter 1B section that describes how the manual is applicable (e.g. to private property...)
- Current Code of Federal Regulations make it clear that the CA MUTCD cannot supersede the National MUTCD, so we have clarified that.
- States cannot contravene or negate Standard and Guidance statements from the National MUTCD
- Supplemental state-issued documents need to comply with the National MUTCD
- Minor edits to experimental process. Currently working on more revisions.
- New target compliance dates added. Will keep the current compliance date table, as compliance in the field still may not have been met yet for some.
- Some definitions (e.g., Class II Bikeways) have been updated, and many new definitions have been added.
- Consolidated list of acronyms

The Committee Members gave recommendations for editing the Manual:

GENERAL

- Mr. Moeur - Instead of providing the changes as proposed CA MUTCD content, is it possible to provide comments saying that, yes, this is the adoption process, these are the adoption, this is the adoption timetable. Just for the information of the people reading the draft.
 - Mr. Bhullar - I can lay out that process, yes. I have on some of the markup documents, there is an introduction page on each of those markup documents that does, in a narrative way, say what you are saying. Maybe can use a depiction of a timeline or something like that.
- Chair Bronkall - Using hyperlinks for links to manuals and code references to make it easier for others that want to do a deep dive.
 - Mr. Bhullar - Back in the 2006 or 2010 version we did start including hyperlinks. We even started linking the figure - you could click on the figure number in the text, and it would take you to the figure. When we revised the manual there was not too much interest, so we stopped doing it.

- Vice Chair Welday - I am all for anything that helps to link parts of the document together or to outside references. The only thing I would be cautious of is overextending the staff time needed to complete the manual on time or keep it updated.
- Mr. Bhullar - The Feds just made a version with links, releasing that as a separate version (with no changes except the links). So that's what we will do. We won't let this hold up our efforts. They will be on the side as an enhancement rather than delaying anything.
- Mr. Moeur - When I worked as served as a state traffic standards engineer for Arizona DOT we ran into situations where links were broken/became dead links when websites were reorganized. If you are going to include hyperlinks to external references, that requires a commitment to periodically validate and update them.
- Mr. Pyburn - Federal Highway will have another look at this when all of the public comments from like this forum and the public forum are reviewed and included in the Manual by Caltrans. There may be some changes from what you see and what you discuss today based on our review of that final draft.

CHAPTER 1A

- Section 1A.01, Paragraph 08
 - Vice Chair Welday - references the previous MUTCD being Revision 8, dated January 11, 2024. May not be necessary to reference because by the time the new MUTCD is adopted, that will no longer be in play. I would consider removing that reference to the previous version.
 - Chair Bronkall - perhaps it needs to say that it is based on the FHWA Manual along with prior California revisions, revisions from prior California Manuals. But that may be stating the obvious.
- Section 1A.05, Paragraph 05
 - Chair Bronkall - List of documents here is slightly inconsistent with Section 1B.02 later on. Also, may want to include California Building Code for ADA.

CHAPTER 1B

- Section 1B.02, Paragraph 02a
 - Vice Chair Welday - may be unnecessary to say that California has two years from the 2024 date to adopt, since the manual will have been adopted by the time this is actually part of the manual. Maybe the comment could be a more general statement about the process. Chair Bronkall supported that change.

- Mr. Bhullar - that is included to inform users of the two-year adoption period for the states, because certain agencies start jumping to the National MUTCD as soon as it is issued and question why we are not using the new manual immediately. Suggestion accepted.
- Mr. Moeur - Like other people have mentioned, there may be a better way to deal with those kinds of dates in the regulatory part of the document, being that the adoption time will be about the time that the date is in there.
- Section 1B.02, Paragraph 06
 - Chair Bronkall - Not sure what the "Proven Safety Countermeasure publications" references in its entirety.
 - Mr. Bhullar - All the CA MUTCD supplemental documents have to conform to the National MUTCD, so I provided some examples of what those supplemental documents could be. Caltrans has started drafting and preparing guidelines for each of the FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures.
 - Chair Bronkall - Maybe add another Support paragraph. After paragraph 09, you could have a hyperlink to the web page that better articulates what exactly Proven Safety Countermeasure publications are.
- Section 1B.03, Paragraph 14
 - Vice Chair Welday - Recommend using past tense, to be clear that it complied at the time that it was approved. Where it says, "Agencies may install traffic control devices included in previously approved plans...", I would say "...that complied with the previous version of the CA MUTCD at the time of plan approval."
 - Chair Bronkall - That paragraph is somewhat nebulous. Was there intended to be a cutoff date of how far back?
 - Mr. Bhullar - We tried to match the Code of Federal Regulations saying that you can still use the previous manual as long as the construction plans were approved with the previous manual.
 - Mr. Pyburn - The thought process for us is, for example, if you put in a device that does not comply with new the 11th Edition and you are complying with CA MUTCD Revision 8 (based on previous National MUTCD), when the CA MUTCD is updated next year your device could be out of compliance and therefore you have to upgrade it at some point in the future. So, the agency has a choice. Do you want to pay for that device twice, or do you want to just comply with the 11th Edition now. So, we are taking a case-by-case approach if you will. I do make a distinction between projects in construction or even out to bid, and those in design now. I have told project managers around the state that I am evaluating their

projects based on the 11th Edition, but if they see something in the Revision 8 that is starkly different from the 11th Edition, they can reach out to us for guidance on what to do.

- Mr. Bhullar - I am telling local agencies, they can review our drafts as a preview, but that is a risk they have to take. I can only give a definite response once the new manual is officially issued. In the meantime, I can connect them with CA MUTCD Part Owners for discussion.
- Chair Bronkall - Perhaps a Guidance section is needed here that could articulate the obligation of an agency, regardless of where the project is, to go ahead and go back to do change orders, swap things out, or fix things. And make a note that once the effective date occurs, that will be an obligation and people need to figure out how to move forward. Offer those suggestions that Steve has.
- Section 1B.05
 - Vice Chair Welday - Johnny, I think you addressed this earlier. There were some things for the experimentation process that need to be updated, but if we will be having a separate effort then I will withhold my comments until then.
- Section 1B.07, Paragraph 08a
 - Chair Bronkall - In lieu of using the word "currently," perhaps something like "As of the effective date of this Manual the following interim approvals have occurred."
 - Mr. Bhullar - Actually there now has been an interim approval issued, which should be presented at the next CTCDC meeting. So, we do have the first interim approval for the 11th Edition and will need to revise. I will be creating a table.

FIGURES

- Vice Chair Welday - These flow charts were very helpful. We may need to reverse engineer the flow charts to update the process in the text.
 - Mr. Bhullar - Yes, the flow charts and the text need to work with each other.

TABLES

- Table 1B-1
 - Mr. Pyburn - I don't disagree at this point with Johnny's comments about resetting the compliance dates as five years from adoption from the CA MUTCD, but I am verifying that with our headquarters. Once we get a response from headquarters, we can address this.

- Table I-2, California Target Compliance Dates
 - Chair Bronkall - There are prior versions of the Manuals over time that have other compliance deadlines that have long since passed. I think it is a good idea to keep a compendium of all the compliance deadlines to make sure that agencies that may have missed changes could have a way to track everything that has been removed. That may be especially helpful for smaller size agencies. Documenting that certain items are no longer allowed is a great way to help bring them along should they come across the table at some point.
 - Mr. Bhullar - If I understand correctly, there are tables that were in the manual probably before the 2009 Edition; we should also include those as well. Overall, I agree with the concept.

CHAPTER 1C

- Section 1C.02, Item 31a
 - Ms. Zhu - When it says "in paragraphs (1) to (4)" do you mean paragraphs (a) to (d)?
 - Mr. Bhullar - Thank you for pointing that out, I will correct that.
- Section 1C.02, Item 43a, Consulting Engineer
 - Chair Bronkall - Is Consulting Engineer used elsewhere in the Manual? Are we just adding things for the sake of adding things, or is that intended to be used somewhere farther down the line?
 - Mr. Bhullar - Inclusion should be if there was a need and there was some reference in the Manual. I cannot say on top of my head, but if that is not the case then we will remove it.
 - Chair Bronkall - Maybe at the end of the review process, review the section on definitions, going through the whole Manual to make sure that proposed additions are actually being referenced and used.
- Section 1C.02, Item 44a, Contraflow
 - Chair Bronkall - The National Manual uses Counter-Flow. We should try to match National language and avoid introducing similar language that could be confusing.
 - Mr. Bhullar - Agreed, we can do that. Our challenge was how to reconcile our Class I, II, III, IV definitions (that are part of the law or regulation) and the narrative of the National MUTCD (doesn't exactly have Class I, II, III, IV, but there are some overlaps). So this contraflow terminology was introduced to sort that out.
 - Mr. Miller - Historically at the national level we did a proposal called contraflow bike lane. When the 11th Edition came out they chose

to use the term counter-flow. I agree only one should be in there. My suggestion is to shift the three lines of text in 44a down to 47a, because I think that is the direction that FHWA wants us to go. If the term contraflow appears anywhere else in the MUTCD, we probably need it as a cross-reference. If it isn't used, then we don't need it here at all.

- Mr. Powers - I think there is some value in having some reference to contraflow because the Caltrans Highway Design Manual uses that term with reference to Class II bike lanes.
- Mr. Bhullar - I will work with the Highway Design Manual team so the terminology can be consistent.
- Chair Bronkall - It may be that you will need an entry for contraflow, where it says, "see Counter-Flow".
- Section 1C.02, Item 59
 - Vice Chair Welday - there is an extra comma there before the parenthetical for including motorcycles.
- Section 1C.02, Item 61a
 - Chair Bronkall - A couple periods in a row.
- Section 1C.02, Item 113
 - Vice Chair Welday - The definition in blue from the CVC seems identical to subparagraph (a). Suggest including the reference, CVC 365 provides a definition.
- Section 1C.02, Item 124b
 - Vice Chair Welday - Suggest adding "Bicycle" to the phrase "Limit Line Detection Zone": Limit Line Bicycle Detection Zone. In common usage, Limit Line Detection Zone could also refer to a vehicle.
- Section 1C.02, Item 146b, Non-motorized Traffic
 - Ms. Zhu - Here it says bicycle and pedestrian. On Item 272 later on, another definition mentions animal riding.
 - Mr. Bhullar - Okay I will look into that. Non-motorized was a generic term that was used in the 2009-2010 time period with the Caltrans Complete Streets effort.
 - Mr. Bhatia - Where would micro-mobility, especially the non-motorized scooters and similar, fall into the definition as it relates to non-motorized traffic?
 - Ms. Zhu - I saw the definition for pedestrian already included anyone on a scooter.
 - Mr. Bhullar - The Vehicle Code says a pedestrian is a person who is afoot or who is using any of the following: A means of conveyance propelled by human power other than a bicycle. The next one is an

electric personal assistive mobility device. And then it also includes a person who is operating a self-propelled motorized tricycle or motorized quadricycle. Maybe we should remove the term non-motorized, as it does have overlaps. We will work on the ambiguities that are present after we included a lot of new definitions from the Vehicle Code.

- Chair Bronkall - As part of that effort when you look at 141c, 141d and 141e, these other items, it may be appropriate to add in, as part of that definition, that it is considered non-motorized traffic.
- Section 1C.02, Item 200a
 - Chair Bronkall - Resident District is supposed to be Residence District.
- Section 1C.02, Item 219
 - Vice Chair Welday - "Refer to the Caltrans' Highway Design Manual Index..." - That is the only place in the definitions I think we reference the Design Manual. I am not sure if we need that there, or if it is being inconsistent.
 - Mr. Bhullar - In theory I agree with your comment. I can confirm, then we will remove it.
- Section 1C.03
 - Chair Bronkall - This list of acronyms and abbreviations needs to be updated. As an example, on Page 25, Item 27, CELSOC has been ACEC since around 15 years ago. The definitions, acronyms, and abbreviations should be cross-checked to the Manual in its entirety and only include items that are referenced.
 - Mr. Miller - Item 92 says ITE. I am pretty sure it is the same as the organization that is now ITE, and they are referenced in the MUTCD with traffic signal specifications. Also, several of the blue acronyms also appear as black ones, and probably could be deleted if they are in both blue and black.

CHAPTER 1D

- Section 1D.01, Paragraph 04
 - Chair Bronkall - It is adding in the words "by the engineer." I recommend removing that.
 - Mr. Bhullar - Some small cities don't have a fulltime engineer and sometimes the plans get accepted by the clerk that is at the counter. So maybe this was trying to address situations like that. We will explore this further.
- Section 1D.02, Paragraph 01a
 - Chair Bronkall - Getting back to hyperlinks and looking at consistency with the prior section in 1B.

- Section 1D.02, Paragraph 12
 - Chair Bronkall - References Streets and Highways Code 891. The language used there doesn't match 891, so review and make sure that it is consistent.

Mr. Bhullar - We have received all the comments, so we are going to address these comments and bring Part 1 back to the next meeting.

25-02: Construction Project Funding Identification Signs

- Changing the logos for construction project identification signs was discussed.
- In order to align with updated branding, Caltrans and other departments has developed a revision to the construction project funding identification signs to incorporate the new "Building California" logo.
- "Building A Better America" logo has also been incorporated.
- Proposed revisions to Section 6F.109 (CA) were discussed.
- Revisions to Table 6F.1 (CA) were highlighted.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn commented:

- URL was previously requested on a state funding program sign (SB1). Our office did not support this. I don't know if this request will be supported.
- FHWA does not have control on URLs coming from the White House.
- All of these revisions are subject to change.
- At this point we cannot support the "Building California" logo with a URL.

Chair Bronkall emphasized that if Caltrans was granted the authority to internally approve these sorts of signs without coming before the Committee, this would streamline the process of review and approval. Caltrans could then present it as an informational item. How does Caltrans and the Committee feel about this?

Mr. Bhullar stated that Caltrans has the obligation to consult with local agencies and conduct a public hearing so this could be a consent item as opposed to an action item. This would streamline the process.

Vice Chair Welday supported changing future items to consent items.

MOTION: Mr. Bhullar made a motion to approve Item 25-02 subject to FHWA approval as well as moving future construction sign changes to the Consent Calendar, seconded by Mr. Bhatia. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

25-03: Supplemental Destination Guide Signing for State Special Schools

- AB 2367 was passed and approved on July 18, 2024.
- The CA MUTCD shall be revised to reflect changes made.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn commented:

- "State Special School" is not defined in the CA MUTCD. Caltrans needs to define what a "Special School" is.
- It is not clear if these "State Special Schools" are for profit which would prohibit these types of signs from being used.

Mr. Lozano-Cisneros commented:

- Agree that we should define "State Special School" in Part 1. A definition for State Special School was presented: A publicly funded educational institution designed to serve students with specific disabilities or exceptional needs that cannot be adequately met in traditional public-school settings.
- To my knowledge, State Special Schools are public schools (not for profit).

Vice Chair Welday commented: Suggest to include a reference to State Education Code or to somewhere that State Special School is legally defined.

MOTION: Vice Chair Welday made a motion to approve Item 25-03 with the suggested edits, seconded by Mr. Bhullar. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

6c. Informational Items (Continuing or new items that may be brought back as an Action Item in a future meeting)

23-10: CTCDC Agenda Items Status

Mr. Kong:

- See the table in the agenda item for latest statuses. Highlighted the items from 2024 that will be included in the upcoming CA MUTCD Revision 9.

25-04: Legislative Information - Session Year 2025-2026

Mr. Kong stated:

- We are starting a new legislative two-year session.
- Not many bills relating to the CTCDC yet.

6d. Word Message Sign Items

None.

6e. Experimentation Items

20-09: Request for Closure of Experiment for Variable Speed Advisory Signs

Mr. Kong noted:

- This was started in 2020 and was closed with no further action a year ago per the lead of the experiment.
- Results and conclusions are included with agenda item.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn commented:

- The state experimental process runs parallel to the federal process. We take the results from these experiments to determine whether or not to make it part of the Manual.
- The results of this experiment are pending in FHWA and so Caltrans is not able to add it to the Manual until a federal determination is made.

Chair Bronkall commented:

- Hopefully this will encourage better merging onto the highway in an effort to reduce the stop-and-go traffic.
- There may be potential for a variety of signage to be experimented with such as "Merge Like A Zipper" found in other parts of the world.

MOTION: Vice Chair Welday moved to close experiment 20-09 without any revisions to the manual (pending FHWA concurrence), seconded by Mr. Bhullar. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

7. Upcoming Meetings

Chair Bronkall stated the next meetings are scheduled for May 1, August 7, and November 6.

Discussion on future meetings:

- Having at least one in-person meeting per year has been suggested.
- Mr. Bhullar favored an in-person meeting and any additional meetings needed to complete work on the CA MUTCD.
- It is difficult to get sufficient in-person attendance to make a quorum, and this does not appear to be a problem with virtual meetings.
- Chair Bronkall suggested having an in-person meeting at Sacramento Airport due to the convenience and ease of not securing ground transportation to a specific location.
- Limiting multi-day meetings to five hours or less lessens mental fatigue.
- A virtual meeting once a month dedicated to the CA MUTCD could be useful.

- The May 1, 2025, meeting will be virtual.

MOTION: Chair Bronkall moved that Caltrans be able to schedule additional meetings on the first Thursday (and Friday if necessary) of each month dedicated to the CA MUTCD 2026 effort, seconded by Vice Chair Welday. We will continue with our regularly scheduled May, August, and November meetings, with the November meeting being in-person (possibly at the Sacramento Airport). The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote of the Committee.

8. Adjourn

Chair Bronkall adjourned the meeting at 12:21 p.m.