

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, October 2, 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)
- **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
- Mahmoud Zahriya, American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah (AAA-N)

* Delegated voting authority to Alternate Malyy

**Joined at 10:54am

Voting Members Absent (3 Total):

- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin (Vice Chair)
- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Lt. Kirk Bailor, California Highway Patrol (CHP)

Alternate Members Present (6 Total):

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

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
- Ejaz Shaikh, Caltrans HQ

Presenters:

- 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
- Kevin Schumacher, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
- Tim Fremaux, Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)
- Joseph Keung, City of Los Angeles
- Jim Baross, California Association of Bicycling Organizations (CABO)
- Scott Mace, CABO
- Ricardo Olea, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
- Craig Rhodes, Traffic Management Inc.

[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)

25-09: CA MUTCD 2026, Part 3 (Markings)

Comments:

- General (Mr. Baross) Federal MUTCD refers to "separated bicycle lanes". The closest thing that California has is "Class IV (separated bikeways)". There is room for confusion for enforcement and developing bikeway signs and markings. In part 9, "separated bicycle lanes" is used many times. For California, we should be using "Class IV separated bikeways" or "Class IV cycle track".
- General (Mr. Baross) California distinguishes between separated bikeways (Class IV) and bicycle lanes (Class II). When a Class IV bikeway is signed and marked incorrectly as a Class II bicycle lane, then bicyclists have to comply with CVC 21208 and 21202 (which actually do not apply to Class IV bikeways).
 - (Mr. Mace) Example of confusion is the recently created Class IV bikeways on El Camino Real in Palo Alto and Mountain View. New Bike Lane signage was installed in the area of a Class IV bikeway. There may be confusion about CVC 21208's applicability for motorists, law enforcement, and bicyclists.
- General (Mr. Miller) Concerned about disregard for green pavement marking under sharrows, the helmeted bike rider pavement marking, and green plastic posts for bikeways.

- (Mr. Sallaberry) These items will still be implemented, may set precedent for disregarding standards.
- (Mr. Pyburn) The experimental process and the National Committee provide an outlet for these concerns to be brought forward and that has been done. Green under sharrows has undergone extensive experimentation across the country, and the policy in the manual now is the result of that experiment and research. My job is to ensure that the California manual meets the requirements of the Code of Federal Regulations. We can't support deviation from the standards and guidance unless it complies with the CFR. The designer who chooses not to go with the standard has to make that choice.
- (Mr. Miller) Suggested that the AASHTO bike guide may provide justification.
- Figure 9A-1 (Mr. Powers) Have a couple issues with the Note on the Figure. Not sure I understand the purpose of it. If you have a Class I path that is adjacent to a sidewalk, it is no longer a shared-use path because the pedestrians are required by law to use the sidewalk. Secondly, I don't think there is a state ADA. The Americans with Disabilities Act is a federal law. There are state accessibility guidelines, but they are not ADA standards, in my understanding. And regardless, those accessibility standards apply to a shared-use path or to a sidewalk. So, I am not sure where the distinction is here that required that note to be added.
- 9B.15, Par 01c (Mr. Powers) Refers to the CVC definition of a substandard width lane as a lane too narrow for bicyclists. Why is this paragraph here? There is no reference to substandard width lanes in this particular section.
- 9E.02 (Mr. Powers) Refers to Figures 9E-4 and 9E-4(CA). The first reference seems incorrect. It may be part of 9E-3(CA).
- 9E.06 and 9E.07, Par 00a (Mr. Powers) Definition of Class IV bikeway should not include the term "bike lane", to comply with Streets and Highways Code.
- 9E.07, Pars 22 and 24 (Mr. Powers) There is reference to cycle track on a sidewalk. By definition, a cycle track cannot be on a sidewalk. It might be raised behind a curb, but cycle tracks by definition do not allow pedestrians so a cycle track cannot be on a sidewalk.
- 9E.09, Par 03a (Mr. Baross) Request to include CA MUTCD Revision 8 exception to the prohibition of shared lane marking use: "Option: The Shared Lane Marking may be placed on roadways that have a speed limit above 35 mph, where there is bicycle travel and there is no marked

bicycle lane and the right-hand traffic lane is too narrow to allow motor vehicles to safely pass bicyclists."

MOTION: Vice Chair Welday made a motion to ask Caltrans staff to continue reviewing/resolving comments for Part 9 and bring this item back to a future meeting. Chair Bronkall amended the motion that Caltrans staff work with those who commented on this item today and Steve Pyburn to resolve the comments. Chair Bronkall seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

25-09: CA MUTCD 2026, Part 3 (Markings)

Mr. Malyy gave a short introduction to the agenda item, noting that Caltrans has adopted a lot more of the National MUTCD this time around and is moving away from providing design details.

Comments:

- 3A.01, Par 07 (Chair Bronkall) Suggest including considerations about grinding out longitudinal lines/tape application on east-west roads, such as considering the effect of the sun when low/on the horizon.
- 3A.03, Par 02b (Mr. Miller) Should the black stripe between the two yellow stripes be 4 inches instead of 3 inches?
 - (Chair Bronkall) I had a note for that same area saying to see Figure 3A-107(CA).
 - (Vice Chair Welday) The black stripe between the double stripes has been 3 inches.
- Figure 3A-102(CA)(Sheets 1 and 2)(Mr. Varghese) Could we have an option to use Detail 8 for speeds of 45 mph or more?
 - (Mr. Miller) From my experience, a lot of agencies follow that practice.
- Figures 3A-107(CA) and 3A-108(CA) (Vice Chair Welday) Details 28 and 31 have formatting issue on the bottom stripes.
 - (Mr. Malyy) Acknowledge that error. We will fix it.
- 3B.02, Par 07 (Tim Fremaux) Making the use of raised retroreflective pavement markers a standard seems heavy handed. We use those markers selectively.
- 3B.02, Par 08 (Chair Bronkall) Suggest using "may" instead of "can".
 - (Mr. Miller) That would violate MUTCD terminology rules. "May" implies Option.
- 3B.02, Par 15 (Chair Bronkall) 1-mile intervals for alternating direction of passing lanes seems like a somewhat short distance.

- 3B.06, Par 14 (Vice Chair Welday) According to the CVC, a single solid white line, regardless of width, does not prohibit crossing over.
 - (Chair Bronkall) Suggest changing "a climbing lane" to "a truck climbing lane".
- 3B.07, Par 15 (Vice Chair Welday) There is no paragraph 18. I think it is supposed to refer to paragraph 16.
- 3B.11, Par 10 (Vice Chair Welday) Support should be moved to the next line.
- 3B.14, Par 10 (Chair Bronkall) Consider adding "; unless recessed" at end of statement.
- 3B.17, Par 05 (Vice Chair Welday) The first sentence with all the strikeouts seems to be an incomplete thought. It seems to be there is usually something after "a group of three to five markers."
- 3B.22, Par 09a (Chair Bronkall) My concerns are with Caltrans' Standard Plans and how they may not match both federal ADA and the State of California accessibility standards. On Standard Plan A90A, Note 4 says parking spaces and access aisles shall be level with surface slopes not exceeding 1.5% in all directions. ADA code allows for slopes up to 2%. By requiring through a shall statement in the California MUTCD to use this, this would further restrict the ability of agencies to go upwards of 2% in all directions as allowed under federal ADA and by California accessibility requirements.
 - (Mr. Sallaberry) This is another example of design details that should not be in this manual.
 - (Chair Bronkall) Anything dealing with ADA should just have a generic note that refers the practitioner to California and federal accessibility standards that need to be met. Then it is up to the practitioner to ensure that they are doing that.
- 3B.27, Par 02 (Vice Chair Welday) The Option need to be moved down to the next line.
- 3B.27, Par 08 (Vice Chair Welday) This statement should include "affecting state highways", because it is not required on local streets.
- 3B.27, Par 09 (Mr. Varghese) City of LA has been using 18 feet and above parking space stall length. Parking is in high demand in commercial areas in city of LA. It is unclear if it is optional.
 - (Chair Bronkall) This is just a Support statement and not a standard, but could be better clarified.

- 3B.27, Par 13 (Vice Chair Welday) There is a reference to AB 413. Suggest referencing the CVC section instead, as legislation numbers change or are repeated every year.
- 3B Figures, General (Mr. Rhodes) Why are north arrow on Figures? Do we really need them? They seem to serve no purpose other than possibly causing confusion.
 - (Mr. Miller) The National Committee has recommended north arrows be removed where they are not needed.
- Figure 3B-19(CA) (Chair Bronkall) I think there should be another Note added, a Note 5 referring practitioners to also see CVC chapter 11. Improvements must comply with both federal and state accessibility requirements. Where there is a conflict between state and federal ADA, standards that provide the greatest accessibility should be used.
- Figure 3B-23 (Mr. Olea) This is a federal figure that refers to the Uniform Vehicle Code (UVC) and has values that don't correspond to those that have been approved under AB 413 for daylighting approaching intersections. The 30 feet minimum, is now 20 feet for California. One way to fix this would be to cross out the left and middle drawings and just go with the rightmost. There would still be a reference to the UVC and not the CVC.
 - (Mr. Moeur) If you cross out the other drawings, then those won't be official options for marking parking spaces in California. I don't know how much those ones are used, but the details are significantly different between the three. If California wants to be able to use all three on all levels of highways, it might just be easier to modify the parking space daylighting or distance on each of those. That way you get to keep them and it is compliant with state law.
 - (Mr. Sallaberry) Agree with Mr. Moeur's comment. Perhaps we just not mention the length of the no parking zone at crosswalks.
 - (Chair Bronkall) Additional comment that this figure depicts an accessible parking stall. There probably should be a note to see California accessibility standards and federal accessibility standards for parking stalls.
- Figure 3B-104(CA) (Chair Bronkall) Why is the optional dotted lane line included on this figure, instead of going with the federal standard?
 - (Mr. Kong) The optional dotted lane line was added to match federal lane-reduction transition markings (see Figure 3B-14).
- 3C.02 and 3C.03 (Mr. Sallaberry) There seems to be bit of duplication between Section 3C.02 and 3C.03, particularly references to an

engineering study and the criteria that should be considered. Perhaps there can be some consolidation of the two sections to shorten it.

- 3C.07, Par 04 and Figure 3C-1 (Vice Chair Welday) "...transverse lines used to establish the limits of the ladder crosswalk shall not be less than 6 inches or greater than 24 inches in width." To be consistent with other parts of the Manual where we define a crosswalk transverse line, I think that should read 12 inches or greater, not 6 inches.
- 3C.12, Par 01 and General (Vice Chair Welday) I have a general comment and I just happened to notice it on this page. There is a reference to US DOJ ADA Standards of 2010. I think I have also seen 2023. They seem to be flip-flopping back and forth throughout the Manual, so I don't know if there is a need to look for consistency on that.
 - (Chair Bronkall) Tying into what Mr. Welday said, federal ADA calls for detectable warning surfaces that are two feet in length, while California calls for three feet in length. So it is important that we also reference California accessibility standards as well.
- Figure 3E-2 (Sheet 1) (Mr. Powers) In drawing B, what is the garbled text underneath DISCOURAGED?
 - (Chair Bronkall and Vice Chair Welday had the same comment)
- Figure 3E-3 (Mr. Varghese) In drawing B, it says to See Detail 38B. We suggest that it also includes Detail 38 and 38A.
- 3G.03, Par 21 (Mr. Powers) There is a note on bikeway separator posts, and at the end it refers to, it says "See Section 9E.102(CA). I don't believe there is a section 9E.102(CA), I believe that is referring to a figure. Secondly, that figure doesn't seem to be addressing Class IV bikeways. I think the reference is incorrect.
- 3G.101(CA) (Chair Bronkall) It has a standard statement to not include post mile information. That is a huge deal for rural counties, in which we reference culvert locations by post mile. We need to have a post mile to help identify them, particularly when they may not be readily apparent when driving down the road. Is there a reason why that information was not to be included? Caltrans can reach out to me.
 - (Mr. Miller) It says kilometer. I am wondering if it is to not allow metric?
 - (Mr. Malyy) We will have to look into this.
 - (Mr. Moeur) Is the culvert marker intended to be a traffic control device? Because if it isn't one of the standard object markers, Type 1, Type 2, Type 3 or Type IV, and it is a maintenance reference device, is it a traffic control device? And if it isn't a traffic control

device it may not need to be mentioned in the CA MUTCD and instead handled in the Maintenance Manual.

- 3I.01, Par 11 (Vice Chair Welday) "The retroreflective unit used on channelizers shall be a minimum of 3 x 12 inch. The 3 x 24-inch minimum retroreflective unit shall be visible..." I don't remember if it is supposed to be 3 x 12 or 3 x 24, but it looks like there is a dimension conflict there.
- 3J.01, Par 05 (Vice Chair Welday) Wondering if this actually should just be in a design manual. A and B seem to be conflicting, so I am not quite sure. If one is for less than 40, one is for greater than 40. Re-read this and make sure that it is saying what it is supposed to say.

25-11: CA MUTCD 2026, Part 6 (Temporary Traffic Control)

Comments:

- 6C.101(CA), Par 01, Subpoint E (Mr. Miller) "Bicyclists shall not be led into direct conflicts with mainline traffic..." I have seen that interpreted to mean you can never end a bike lane. Then you follow the Support of the figures, and it shows End Bike Lane signs, so the presumption is you really can't do that without a warning. But the standard gets interpreted that you can't end the bike lane and have the bikes move into the travel lane. I think some alternate wording of that standard should be composed to be consistent with what the figures show.
 - (Mr. Powers) Also, that is followed by a fragmented sentence, "Except when flagging operation." It seems like something is missing there.
- Table 6G-1 (Mr. Rhodes) The new R9-12 Bike Lane Closed sign is currently being called out as 24 x 12. You can see by the progression in the table that this is an extension of the Sidewalk Closed signs. Who is this sign for? Is it for pedestrians, bicyclists, or for the cars? One item that has been brought up as a possible proposal to the National Committee is to increase the size of this sign. There is nothing that precludes the state from making the sign bigger, we just can't make it smaller. What will be recommended to the National Committee is to change the size to 36 inches x 18 inches, making the font larger.
 - (Mr. Moeur) Just clarifying that there hasn't been a formal proposal yet to the NCUTCD. We are looking at it, but don't have any official recommendation.
- 6I.101(CA), Par 01 (Vice Chair Welday) Says Construction Project Funding Identification Signs, and they are for use on projects with estimated contracts costs of over \$1,000,000 and 60 or more working days. I would

suggest adding in there an option for local agencies to do it whenever there is a funding agency requirement. We have had federal funds/state funds that have required us to put signs up for much smaller dollar amounts.

- Chapter 6P/Caltrans Standard Plans, General (Chair Bronkall) Caltrans has also prepared Standard Plans for various lane closure scenarios. There are a few scenarios that aren't fully articulated in 6P, that could probably benefit from having a Caltrans Standard Plan detail. Through separate correspondence to Caltrans, I'll provide him a list of suggested Caltrans Standard plan details that Caltrans may wish to take on.
- Notes for Figure 6P-47, Par 07 (Mr. Rhodes) It says "The speeds used for the shoulder taper calculations should be of bicyclists in the project vicinity or if special events such as a bike race, the expected speed of bicyclists approaching the temporary traffic control zone." What is the speed of bicycles? The only thing I could find was in the Highway Design Manual; for a separated bike pathway, the design speed is 25 miles per hour. That is the lowest speed that we actually have a table for, for merging tapers. Are we supposed to go below to 20 mph/15 mph using the equation, or do we just stay at 25 miles per hour? In which case, maybe that could be a clarification. How do I interpret that when I am closing bike lanes? We are going to have to close a lot of bike lanes with our work.
- Notes for Figure 6P-50, Pars 06 and 07 (Mr. Powers) These don't seem to apply. They both refer to a bicycle lane on a roadway being closed and/or not wide enough, and the figure is for application of On-Road Detour for a Shared-Use Path.
- Figure 6P-2 (Vice Chair Welday) It looks like something got blown out on the sign image for the R22-2.

25-12: CA MUTCD 2026 - Part 8 (Traffic Control for Railroad and Light Rail Transit Grade Crossings)

Comments:

- 8D.01, Par 05 (Vice Chair Welday) There is a reference to CVC 22451 as far as the definition of the meaning of a flashing light. Looking at the text of that CVC section, I am not quite sure that applies. Verify that that's the correct reference.
- 8D.09, Par 44 (Vice Chair Welday) As far as I can tell, the federal manual does not prohibit the use of flashing yellow arrows, because you can reservice and not have a yellow trap problem. This has come up in a design situation we had. Suggest that we revisit the prohibition, or at least

refine the prohibition, on protected/permissive left turns at grade crossings, and allow for FYI protected/permissive left turn as long as you can confirm that there wouldn't be a yellow trap.

- (Mr. Schumacher) It was a Standard in Part 4 and has been reworded and reduced to a Guidance here. The intent is to provide a clear track clearance phase off the tracks and ensure that it is not blocked in any way by any conflicting movements. The specific issue of the flashing yellow arrow is something we can consider further. We want to make sure there is some guidance in here to avoid the permissive left turn trap upon a railroad preemption.
- Figure 8E-4 and General (Chair Bronkall) There are a few references in here only mentioning federal ADA. They should also mention California accessibility requirements. One of those appears on Figure 8E-4.
- Figure 8E-8 (Vice Chair Welday) There is a blank ft MIN, blank ft MAX (missing dimensions).
 - (Mr. Schumacher) There are a number of discrepancies in these figures. There was a font issue that got into this draft. Those are known errors and a number of corrections will be made.

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

- Additional October Meetings
 - Caltrans will be scheduling 1-2 meetings per week to cover the returning items for Parts 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, and start on Part 2 and Appendices.
 - Please respond to correspondence related to those meetings. There are many moving parts, so thank you for receiving all the content and changes.
- 11/6/2025 - In-person at Sacramento International Airport, Terminal A Media Room

8. Adjourn

Chair Bronkall adjourned the meeting at 11:24 a.m.