

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, June 9, 2026
Virtual Meeting hosted on Microsoft Teams

ATTENDEES

Voting Members Present (7 Total):

- Jason Welday, League of California Cities (LOCC), City of Rancho Cucamonga (Vice Chair)
- Virendra Patel, LOCC, City of Concord
- Wei Zhu, CEAC, Orange County Public Works
- Robert Bronkall, County Engineers Association of California (CEAC)Humboldt County Public Works (Chair)
- Marianne Kim, Automobile Club of Southern California (AAA-S)
- Devang Vora, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ)
- Bryan Jones, (CAT), City of Menifee

Voting Members Absent (3 Total):

- Mahmoud Zahriya, American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah (AAA-N)
- Lt. Kirk Bailor, California Highway Patrol (CHP)
- Mike Sallaberry, Caltrans Active Transportation (CAT) San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Alternate Members Present (3 Total):

- Julian Garcia, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Melainie Boyack, CHP
- Tony Powers, CAT, Dokken Engineering

Alternate Members Absent (6 Total):

- Andrew Maximous, LOCC, City of Culver City
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC, Placer County
- Michelle Donati, AAA-N
- Tim Chang, AAA-S
- Mike Malyy, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ)

- Rock Miller, CAT, Rock E. Miller & Associates
- LOCC (Northern CA member selection pending)

Committee Staff:

- Timothy Kong, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ), CTCDC Secretary
- Jaime Sanchez, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ) CTCDC Alternate Secretary
- Ejaz Shaikh, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ)
- Mario Lozano-Cisneros, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ)

Presenters:

- Jesse Solorio, Caltrans District 2

Public Speakers:

None

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Bronkall opened the meeting at 2:01 p.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

N/A

4. Public Comments

N/A - Focus meeting for Agenda Item 26-02 (Truck Lane Signs)

5. Active Experiments

N/A - Focus meeting for Agenda Item 26-02 (Truck Lane Signs)

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

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

None

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

None

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

26-02: Truck Lane Signs

Comments

- Mr. Bronkall: Today is somehow of a focused meeting, although it is agendized and it does require us to have a quorum in order to go ahead and take action on it. That is the continuing item 26-02 which is the truck lane signs on I-5 near Redding. And before Jesse gets started with his presentation that he could remind the committee of the specific outcomes of what's supposed to happen in these lanes during the restricted time and during the unrestricted time. The way the committee can understand the desired goals and outcomes.
- Mr. Solorio: Today I will be presenting a revised sign package for the Fix 5 Cascade Gateway Project. The revisions on this are based off our May 26 meeting that we had with CTCDC and then a subsequent meeting with FHWA. I will be going over the project limits, the project description, the north and southbound improvements, the prior MUTCD guidance and what we have based the proposed sign package off the proposed sign package. The project limits are as shown here (Power point presentation). This is the City of Redding; in the Northbound direction the proposed truck-only managed lane will start at Hilltop Drive and end at State Route 151 to the North. And the Southbound direction will start there at 151 and extend past Hilltop all the way down to Hartnell. The yellow dotted line that you see is the section of Northbound that is bounded by three lanes in both up North and down South on I-5 leading into it. So, it is this existing bottleneck that drops down to the two lanes through the City of Redding. The green dashed lines there are two of them are new proposed auxiliary lanes that will link State Route 44 with 299 and then State Route 273 with the Oasis Road interchange. The intended operation here is for trucks, which by statue should be in the right lane though in Redding South of this map at the Southbound view overpass, we have regulatory signs stating that trucks are allowed to use the number two of the three lane section. This was implemented about eight years ago in response to what we perceived as a merged related conflicts at the intersections or interchanges coming through Redding. This has been operating for like eight years and we believe it is operating well. The idea is that trucks that

do not need to use the 299, 273 Oasis or Pine Grove or Shasta Dam Blvd interchanges should utilize the number one quote on quote number one lane bypass, enter into this, stay within without merging or weaving and then exit as they get to the Northern end. Here we have the Southbound strategy. Again, the yellow dashed line is the area where we have the existing two-lane section that will be expanded to three. And then we have auxiliary lanes from Oasis to 273 and from 299 to 44. In this instance trucks heading Southbound will, at the 151 interchange, if they are going through and they don't have to exit at any of the intermediary or intermediate exits, will hop into that lane, merging left and then stay in there until they get to Hartnell Ave, where they will exit out of that lane and then by South Bonnyview Rd we will have gone back to the third of the three lane sections. This operation is expected to occur from 6am to 7pm, which is the peak truck volumes during the day. At the off hours, the lane will be open to general purpose vehicles, not trucks but there will be a dual white stripe on the pavement separating that lane. So, it is intended that people who get into that bypass lane will stay there until the exit. The prior MUTCD guidance and what our sign package was based off the federal MUTCD figure 2G-8. This is primarily used for HOV lanes, it is also a specific sign package four of those guide signs leading up to the trap lane, because this is intended for an instance where a lane becomes a managed lane rather than an exit to a new managed lane. The truck-only lane will require signage and striping similar to the general-purpose lane, that transitions to preferential lane as you saw before. The signage striping package will be unique as the lane will serve as a preferential truck only lane serving 3 axles or more from 6am to 7pm and general vehicles from 7pm to 6am. Again, the double white stripe will limit merging and weaving and will make it enforceable by CHP. Since the last meeting, we received comments from the board and the substance of changes that we have made are one, adding the work bypass to all the guide signs. The idea is that it will entice drivers to use this as it implies some savings for either time or merging conflicts. And it will reinforce that there are no exits within that lane. Second, on another one of our guide signs we had a list of the exit numbers, which would not be available if you were to enter the bypass. And we had the word local exits, though several of those exits were State Routes. We removed the word "local" and now the new sign will just say exits. So, here is our justification for comments, which we did not respond to. Several commenters did not like the idea of the trap lane. I don't disagree with that. Unfortunately, this is the design as it has been completed and we are unable because of right

of way constraints, costs, or many other reasons to redesign to create a new exit for a new lane. There was confusion over the type of vehicle for use. We believe that the black on white regulatory signs with trucks only, and then regulatory signs state defining trucks are 3 axles or more will sufficiently dictate who is allowed to use the vehicles. And then the off peak or the off operational hours. We believe that will operate like an HOV in which all vehicles or general purpose will know to be able to use it, though it will remain a bypass with that dual white stripe. So, it is anyone who enters that needs to understand that they are stuck in there for 6 to 8 miles. There was concern over the truck restriction ends. Maybe there was an offer for lane restriction ends. Personally, I tend to like that idea, but that sign is mirrored off a MUTCD sign R3-12c "HOV RESTRICTION ENDS". And so, to be in substantial compliance and mirror the existing signs and the sign's intent, we have left it with truck restriction ends. There were comments on speed limits and whether or not a truck would perhaps believe that they can travel over 55 mph while in that lane, but we believe the existing R2-1 and specifically R6-3(CA) signs will define vehicle speeds and so no changes were made there. Let's look first at the beginning or the entrance to the lane. Again, this is a general purpose lane which converts to a managed lane. So similar to federal MUTCD 2G-8 we have this sign package. I will be going through these signs in more detail and this is what we envision for the exit of the manage lane. Again, all these signs are closely mirrored off existing signage. So, we believe that the truck only signs developed for the Cascade Fix 5 project are in substantial conformance with the MUTCD manual. We see here the addition of the word bypass to this first guide sign. Again, modeled off of a MUTCD sign, this regulatory sign, the word local was removed from the left guides or guide sign, which will be mounted on the column of the overhead sign structure the half mile entrance guide sign. At the beginning of the solid white stripe, because we have the dashed white for the lane exit, then the solid white will have this guide sign. And then finally, the regulatory sign which now dictates that we have trucks only from 6am to 7 pm. Now, on the exit, we have our intermediate throughout the length, we have these optional signs, which we will elect to install at one-mile intervals in the City of Reading project. And then we have the regulatory truck restriction sign 1/2 mile before the end of the managed lane. Then here would be the official end of the truck restrictions. Then at the very end, we have the standard trucks used right lane R4-5 signs. We have these warning signs here, though in our project, we will be installing the last set of those warning signs on both sides of the roadway. These are

the signs that we are looking to add to the manual. As I spoke of earlier, the truck restriction ends was mirrored off the HOV restriction and the sign. So, our schedule in just short 13 days, we are going for allocation request and RTL, looking to open bids in October and award in December.

- Ms. Boyack: The exit signs, the ones that tell you the numbers that you will not be able to access, are those going to be also put on the right side as well? Because if you put them only on the left side, right before the entrance to the express lane, now they have to merge back over if they realize that they do need to exit in that area. So if they are on the right side as well earlier, they will know whether or not they should be moving over into that bypass lane.
- Mr. Solorio: Our plan does not have those signs on the right-hand side, but I will write down and discuss that with the design team.
- Ms. Boyack: My next comment was, and pardon my ignorance, but have we considered making this experimental? Because now we are in this phase where this is going to set precedent for the state to be able to use these signs and try this traffic model in other places. Have we thought about just doing it in an experimental phase? Or does this have to be entered into the book, the manual now?
- Mr. Lozano: A lot of these signs are already kind of in substantial conformance, so a lot of it won't really be going to the manual. What is going to be going to the manual is like those warning signs, for example, those warning signs (W76-1(CA)) don't really exist in the manual, the trucks merging from left, the one would be going into the manual but this overall figure (Attachment A) that you guys are seeing won't be entered. For example, like the guide signs that say truck bypass lane entrance, none of that language would be going into the manual because the manual allows for preferential lanes and for signs to be utilizing the names of the vehicle classifications of that preferential lane. In this case it was truck and the word bypass. We tried to absorb as much of the comments from the committee as previously mentioned and in order to stay in substantial conformance we had to kind of bring it in here but it's still substantially conforming to the existing preferential signage, the one didn't really need to be incorporated. Like another sign that would have to go into the manual, for example, would be that trucks 3 axles or more only (SR70-1(CA)) that definition one in the right, but that's just like allowing for basically anyone to kind of define what a truck is or for example in the future they will be able to use that sign to define what a bus is. Obviously, it will get tailored

to what a bus is but so basically there will be language in there that would, it didn't have to be just trucks. A lot of this, like this figure right here won't be incorporated in the manual and we are working heavily with FHWA to make sure it is in substantial conformance. For example, that sign on the left that says Exits 680 to 685 that's substantially conforming so, it didn't really need to be entered into the manual because the manual already allowed for it. Unlike, for example the truck restriction ends on the top right the SR73-1 (CA) that would be a new sign, but the word trucks can be taken out and used for buses. The manual would allow flexibility for practitioners in the state of California, whatever their preferential lane is, that if they have a preferential lane that is ending and being converted back to a general-purpose lane, that they can switch it to whatever their classification is. Because the federal manual just has it for HOV and they have the diamond on top. Unfortunately, they had a bus lane end, but they didn't really have one for this type of configuration. What you are seeing here won't be a figure that is added to the manual. It will just be individual signs that practitioners in the future can utilize for whatever their condition that they are experiencing in the future. And all this right here has been worked thoroughly with FHWA to make sure it is in conformance.

- Mr. Solorio: Mario correct me if I'm wrong, but this wouldn't preclude anyone from doing an experimental sign in the future correct? You know maybe learn from what we find in our monitoring once this project is in place.
- Mr. Welday: I appreciate the background, Mario, that helped to clarify a little bit of the concern that I had as far as applicability across the state as well.
- Mr. Bronkall: I would like to echo the sentiments that Jason said and his appreciation for all the hard work that Jesse and his team at Caltrans have done together with Steve at FHWA and his team trying to figure out how to make a good signing package. Well, the signing package is better than what was first presented. I'm still a bit concerned with vehicles, particularly non-trucks or automobiles, not necessarily knowing that this lane is available for their use when the lane restriction isn't in there or isn't in effect. With that, my suggestion would be within the green signs, remove the word truck and just call it a bypass lane and that way it would indicate that automobiles and other vehicles could use that lane when the

restriction is not in place. The second item, which Jesse covered, was the trucks restriction and sign, and I think lane restriction and sign seem to fit a bit better in this case. And then lastly, because this is going to affect 6 to 8 miles of Highway length. In addition to the green signs, perhaps a green placard beneath it that would indicate not exits X miles would be appropriate to help someone driving along the corridor get an idea of what they are in for if they do enter the bypass lane. I do have one last comment, and that is regarding the green exit sign. Because of the length of the bypass and the fact that there are several State Highway off-ramps and on-ramps in this area, it would be beneficial to include the shields for those highways. That way, as someone's contemplating entering the bypass lane, they understand that they might be missing their exit to one of the intersecting State Highways. So, in terms of a motion, the one thing I would throw out there for whoever chooses to make a motion would be to allow flexibility for Caltrans to install whatever they install, see if it's working and make modifications to it. Because I suspect that once the sign package is installed, they may not see that they are not getting any automobiles in that lane during off hours. And that would be evidence that the signing is not quite right and perhaps some tweaking, some other experiments might need to happen in order for the public to be able to better utilize the bypass lane. Anyone want to make a motion on this?

- Mr. Vora: This is Devang from Caltrans; I can make a motion. The one thing before I make a motion, Bob we are documenting these comments, so it will be part of a comment, what you said right. So, I'm making a motion for Caltrans to move forward with item 26-02, contingent upon coordination with an approval from FHWA, while also considering CTCDC and public comments if we have any from today's meeting and those comments are going to be in the notes, I believe.
- Mr. Welday: I'll second the motion.
- Mr. Powers: I support Bob's recommendation for modification along with motion.
- Mr. Bronkall: I would like to suggest a friendly amendment to the motion, which would be that Caltrans has the authority to adjust the signage after implementation. I think that's critical to the success of this project. Is that acceptable to the motion maker and the seconder?
- Mr. Vora: Yes, it is acceptable.

- Mr. Welday: Yes
- Mr. Pyburn: I appreciate the flexibility to make the adjustments and I'm comfortable with using this graphic as a starting point, but also upon monitoring, making adjustments as needed. And we are happy to work with Caltrans to do that.
- Mr. Bronkall: We have got a good motion and a second with the friendly amendment that's been accepted by the motion maker and the seconder.

MOTION: Mr. Vora made a motion that Caltrans move forward with item 26-02, contingent upon coordination with FHWA, while also considering CTCDC and Public comments. Mr. Bronkall amended the motion to include Caltrans has the authority to adjust the signage after implementation. Mr. Welday seconded the motion. The Motion passed by majority votes. CHP abstained.

6e. Experimentation Items

None.

7. Upcoming Meetings

- 08/06/2026 - Virtual Meeting
 - There are enough items to keep the meeting
 - District 5 still has some signs items.
 - Caltrans may also have a safety corridor item.
- 11/05/2026 - TBD
 - Agenda items need to be in by August 5th

8. Adjourn

Chair Bronkall adjourned the meeting at 2:41 p.m.