

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, September 4, 2025
Hosted on Webex

ATTENDEES

Voting Members Present (7 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)
- *Amjad Obeid, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ)
- Lt. Kirk Bailor, California Highway Patrol (CHP)
- Bryan Jones, Caltrans Active Transportation (CAT), City of Menifee
- Marianne Kim, American Automobile Association of Southern California (AAA-S)
- Mike Sallaberry, CAT, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

* Delegated voting authority to Alternate Bhullar

Voting Members Absent (3 Total):

- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin (Vice Chair)
- Mahmoud Zahriya, American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah (AAA-N)
- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works

Alternate Members Present (4 Total):

- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans HQ
- Rock Miller, CAT, Rock E. Miller & Associates
- Virendra Patel, LOCC
- Wei Zhu, CEAC

Alternate Members Absent (6 Total):

- Tim Chang, AAA-S

- Michelle Donati, AAA-N
- Andrew Maximous, LOCC
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC
- Melainie Boyack, CHP
- Tony Powers, CAT

Committee Staff:

- Timothy Kong, Caltrans HQ, CTCDC Secretary
- Ejaz Shaikh, Caltrans HQ

Presenters:

- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans HQ, CA MUTCD Editor
- Caroline Chen, Caltrans HQ
- Michael Robinson, Caltrans HQ

Public Speakers:

- Richard Moeur, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD)
- Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), CA Division
- Ricardo Olea, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
- Kevin Schumacher, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

[Note: Agenda Items were taken out of order. These minutes reflect the agenda items as listed on the agenda and not as taken in chronological order.]

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Bronkall opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. The CTCDC members introduced themselves followed by Alternate Members.

2. Membership

No changes to the CTCDC membership were presented.

3. Approval of Previous Meetings' Minutes

None.

4. Public Comments

There was no public comment.

5. Active Experiments

No active experiments were presented.

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

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

None

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

25-10: CA MUTCD 2026, Part 4 (Highway Traffic Signals)

Mr. Johnny Bhullar, CA MUTCD Editor, and Mr. Michael Robinson, CA MUTCD Part 4 Owner and Secretary of Caltrans' Signal Committee, presented Part 4 of the CA MUTCD 2026 - Highway Traffic Signals.

Comments:

- 4A.05, Subpoint E (Vice Chair Welday) Why are there support paragraphs discussing National MUTCD website FAQ throughout this Section.
 - (Mr. Bhullar) Those FAQs were added due to the complexity of the topic. We will not be adding all the National MUTCD website FAQs into our manual.
 - (Mr. Robinson) added that this was done to prevent confusion of potential discrepancy.
 - (Chair Bronkall) "A flashing YELLOW BICYCLE signal indication has no meaning and shall not be used." Seems to conflict with added blue text "Can a flashing yellow Bicycle Symbol Signal indication be used?" Perhaps revise subpoint E should be revised to "shall not be used, except when in flash mode".
 - (Mr. Pyburn) This falls into "known error" category. We have been directed to not allow the states to change the standard statements, even based on known errors. Those will be addressed in a revision to the Manual all at once.
 - (Mr. Miller) The National Committee did identify this provision E as a conflict and advised FHWA that a flashing yellow bike signal needed to be allowed when a signal was in normal flash mode. I

think it is appropriate to direct to the FAQ. I think the intention is to prohibit it only when signal is in normal operation.

- (Mr. Sallaberry) Why does a flashing yellow arrow and a flashing yellow circular indication have meaning, and a flashing yellow bike does not?
- (Chair Bronkall) The primary issue I have is the words "and shall not be used" and then we lead into a support statement with the "yes you can but only in flash." Is there some other language in that support statement that Caltrans could add to indicate that the support is essentially an exception to the "shall not be used."
- (Mr. Pyburn) Caltrans can make a proposal and I can ask our headquarters the opinion on adding the support.
- Chair Bronkall and Mr. Bhullar will discuss offline.
- 4A.04, Subpoint C, Number 4 (Vice Chair Welday) CIRCULAR RED symbol, not allowing a right turn on red arrow, and its consistency with the Vehicle Code needs to be evaluated.
 - (Mr. Robinson) We will review it.
- 4B.102(CA), Par 02 (Vice Chair Welday) Maintenance, ownership of the pole, and liability should be left to the agency and the utility to work out amongst themselves. As a local agency I am going to defer to my legal counsel and our negotiations with utility companies in that effort. I think this puts a little bit of onus on the local agency to take that responsibility when it may not be that they are responsible.
 - (Mr. Robinson) In general we removed a lot of the statements involving collaboration with local agencies, but it was recommended that we retain this statement.
 - (Mr. Robinson and Mr. Bhullar) We can remove this and place it in another Caltrans document, like we do with the other sections. Also noted that this paragraph should be Support, not Guidance.
- 4B.101(CA), 4B.102(CA), CA-specific Sections in general (Mr. Moeur) Support, Option, and Guidance statements use the terminology "needs to" or "need to." At the National Committee we deliberately try to avoid using this verbiage, as imperative statements typically are designated by "shall". Guidance - use "should". Option - use "may". Support - use "can".
 - (Mr. Bhullar) Agreed. We need to check the entire Manual for "needs to" and "need to", and revise if it is used improperly. We'll definitely fix this for 4B.

- 4C.101(CA), subpoint D (Mr. Miller) In a string of fixed time signals I am not sure that there is a reason to require this one to be actuated, and I think that the "should" may be a little bit too strong a statement for that reason.
 - (Mr. Bhullar and Mr. Robinson) No response right now. We will review.
- 4C.101 (CA) (Vice Chair Welday) Why is the criterion for school crossing traffic signals separate from discussion on Warrant 5 for school traffic signals or school crossings?
 - (Mr. Bhullar and Mr. Robinson) Good comment. We should combine those into the same section.
- Table 4D-101(CA) (Vice Chair Welday) The two right-hand columns are labeled identically. If I remember correctly, this had to do with whether it was a posted speed limit or a 85th percentile. It just was not clear why we have two separate columns there.
- 4F.06, Par 03, 04, 05 (Mr. Sallaberry) The proposed language includes guidance that is not included in the MUTCD, and the guidance seems to be more driven by design rather than uniform traffic control device. I believe it should be left out.
 - (Vice Chair Welday) This has been historically used as a Warrant and there are references to warrants for left turn phasing. I suggest reconsidering the numbers and move it into the Warrant section.
 - (Mr. Miller) I agree that this section is out-of-place. It is more for designing traffic signals. Also not sure the five or more in a recent year is the right criteria, but it is important that there be a criteria.
 - (Mr. Bhullar) We will look into it and return with our disposition.
- 4F.11, Par 05, subpoint D, 4F.13, Par 02, subpoint D, 4F.15, subpoint G (Vice Chair Welday) There is a reference that says you would use the red arrow when the intent is to stop and remain stopped. But then there is an exception that says "except when a traffic control device is in place permitting a turn on a steady RED ARROW signal indication)". I don't believe that is permitted by the Vehicle Code in California. I believe a red arrow means you cannot turn.
 - (Mr. Bhullar) We will review.
- 4F.19, Par 17 (Chair Bronkall) That paragraph should include some indication that that only applies to state highways.
- 4F.19, Par 18 (Chair Bronkall) On the next page, you have "When The permit"...something is not reading right there.

- 4F.20, Par 03a (Chair Bronkall) Discussion on encroachment permit - need clarification if it is only for a state highway.
 - (Mr. Moeur) Looks like there are two 03b paragraphs in this section.
 - (Mr. Bhullar) Agree with the comments. Every time we mention encroachment permits, that is in reference to a Caltrans encroachment permit. We need to clarify.
- 4I.04, Par 06 (Mr. Sallaberry) What is the reason for the strikethroughs and blue text? I would like the CA MUTCD just to reflect the language in the National MUTCD. If there needs to be an additional section regarding railroad preemptions, that could be added as needed.
 - (Mr. Schumacher) Based on comment from CPUC. The concern is when you have a countdown and you get a railroad preemption call, it may say you have 15 seconds left, and then you get the railroad preemption call, and that 15 seconds disappears.
 - (Mr. Bhullar) We will report back with the background behind the change.
- Figures 4I-2 and 4I-3 (Chair Bronkall) Add an additional footnote indicating to verify compliance with state and federal ADA. If Caltrans feels appropriate, add in the sections that I will provide you for more specific guidance. Noted that ADA is in flux, with PROWAG not yet adopted.
- 4J.02, Par 10 (Vice Chair Welday) "Support" needs to be shifted down.
- 4K.01, Par 16 and 17 (Chair Bronkall) There could be some requirements in state and/or federal ADA regarding Accessible Pedestrian Signals. I will work with you, Johnny, offline on that.
- 4S.05, Par 03, 05 (M. Sallaberry) The Guidance and Standard contradict each other. I suggest deleting the California standard.
 - (Mr. Moeur) At the National Committee, we probably would just strike through the Guidance statement in front of Par 03 and make it a Standard. Then change the shoulds in Par 03 to shalls. That way you don't have to add any paragraphs or change any paragraph numbering.
 - (Mr. Robinson) I will talk to the Caltrans Traffic Signal Committee about whether to remove ours by lowering the standard to a guidance or maybe revising the National MUTCD guidance to make it a standard.
- 4S.102(CA), Par 01 (Chair Bronkall) "State highway" should be deleted.
 - (Mr. Bhullar) Agree.

MOTION: Vice Chair Welday moved to bring CA MUTCD Part 4 back to the Committee for final approval after Caltrans addresses the comments received during the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sallaberry. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

25-16: Speed Camera Pilots - Letter to Cities

- Chair Bronkall reviewed the item and asked for input.
- MOTION: Vice Chair Welday moved to approve the letter as presented and for Caltrans to send it out. The motion was seconded by Lt. Bailor. The motion passed by voice vote with Mr. Sallaberry voting Abstain and all other Members voting Aye.
- Mr. Sallaberry requested the item be reopened because there had not been an opportunity to receive public comment earlier. After Committee discussion the item was reopened.
- Mr. Olea of SFMTA addressed the Committee:
 - In compliance with AB 465 which requires a text photo enforced sign within a certain limit of a speed device, we have installed National MUTCD-compliant signs per legislative requirements in the California Vehicle Code.
 - Because our signs are already active and Caltrans has not issued any alternative guidance, we feel our program is in compliance with both the legislation and the MUTCD. No further discussion is necessary.
 - Since Caltrans was required to consult with the CTCDC (not the cities), it is not fair for the cities to have a discussion this late in the process.
 - I propose that you not send this letter and instead refer this to the amendments in the signage chapter of the CA MUTCD.
- Mr. Sallaberry: CVC 22425 seems to indicate that the decision needs to be made by Caltrans in consultation with the CTCDC.
- Ms. Chen from Caltrans interpreted the legislation to mean that while Caltrans helps to determine the necessary signage location, the cities are responsible for initiating consultation with Caltrans/CTCDC, as necessary. In addition:
 - The cities were granted authority to conduct the pilot programs on their roadways.
 - She was not aware of any consultation with Caltrans by San Francisco regarding the locations of automatic speed cameras.
 - The sign used by San Francisco is in the National MUTCD, but not in the current CA MUTCD.

- The cities will consult with CTCDC and decide on an individual basis whether to adopt the recommendations or not.
- Mr. Olea: Why couldn't Caltrans tell the legislature that the pilot would require a sign that we cannot use in CA? It is a federal sign, and is understood by the public.
- Mr. Bhullar: The current effective manual in California is the CA MUTCD. Also, any communication between Caltrans and the legislature is confidential and cannot be discussed.
- Chair Bronkall: The legislature made the decision and CTCDC has to carry out the will of the legislature. That legislation requires consultation with the CTCDC and the process must be adhered to. While you may disagree that we need to go through the process, it appears that a majority of the Committee believes that there is this process and we do need to go through it. The sooner we get through it, the sooner we all can carry on with our operations.
- Mr. Sallaberry: The legislation is only about signs, but the proposed letter goes beyond just discussing signage.
- Ms. Chen: My interpretation is if the cities need our assistance/input for the sign locations, they reach out to us. Caltrans doesn't actively interfere with and control their pilot programs. Also, the sign San Francisco is using will be adopted in our upcoming 2026 CA MUTCD.
- Mr. Olea stated that San Francisco needs to have the photo enforced sign be allowed. Can Caltrans issue some sort of administrative allowance?
- Mr. Chen emphasized that she is not a part of CTCDC and is just collecting information pertinent to this matter.

MOTION: Vice Chair Welday moved to approve the letter as presented. The motion was seconded by Chair Bronkall. The motion passed by voice vote with Mr. Sallaberry voting No and all other Members voting Yes.

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

None.

6d. Word Message Sign Items

None.

6e. Experimentation Items

None.

7. Upcoming Meetings

Chair Bronkall stated the next meeting was scheduled for October 2, 2025. It will be a virtual meeting with no in-person location.

Mr. Bhullar stated Part 8 of the CA MUTCD 2026 would be posted today and Parts 2, 3 and 6 within the next two to three weeks.

8. Adjourn

Chair Bronkall adjourned the meeting at 10:39 a.m.