

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, August 6, 2026

Virtual meeting hosted on Microsoft Teams

ATTENDEES

Voting Members Present (8 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)
- Mahmoud Zahriya, American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah (AAA-N)
- Marianne Kim, Automobile Club of Southern California (AAA-S)
- Devang Vora, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ)*
- Bryan Jones, (CAT), City of Menifee

Voting Members Absent (2 Total):

- Lt. Kirk Bailor, California Highway Patrol (CHP)
- Mike Sallaberry, Caltrans Active Transportation (CAT) San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Alternate Members Present (4 Total):

- Julian Garcia, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Melainie Boyack, CHP
- Mike Malyy, Caltrans HQ*
- Rock Miller, CAT, Rock E. Miller & Associates

Alternate Members Absent (5 Total):

- Andrew Maximous, LOCC, City of Culver City
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC, Placer County
- Michelle Donati, AAA-N
- Tim Chang, AAA-S
- Tony Powers, CAT, Dokken Engineering

- LOCC (Northern CA member selection pending)

* Joined the meeting at 9:45 am

Committee Staff:

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

Presenters:

- Timothy Kong, Caltrans HQ, CTCDC Secretary
- Tasha Higgins, Caltrans District 7
- Thomas Nguyen, Caltrans HQ
- Bojana Gutierrez, Caltrans HQ

Public Speakers:

None

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

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

2. Membership

No changes to the CTCDC membership were presented.

3. Approval of Previous Meetings' Minutes

MOTION: Vice Chair Welday made a motion to approve May 7, 2026, and June 9, 2026, CTCDC Meeting Minutes. Chair Bronkall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments

Jim Baross, I have two items under the auspices of active transportation and hopefully for future consideration. One is that after the adoption of the CA MUTCD in compliance with the federal MUTCD. Class IV separated bikeways are a special situation in California and don't exist in most other jurisdictions or States and that means that the signs that are available to distinguish bike ways don't

exist for class IV. The only signs available are Bike Class II bike lanes, in California, there is a special requirement for bicyclists to use Class II bikeways when they exist. But there is no requirement for the use of Class IV separated bikeways. They are completely optional for bicyclists because there is no differentiation, and signs for Class IV separated bikeways. There is confusion among bicyclists, motorists and traffic enforcement personnel, which results in inappropriate enforcement efforts and harassment of bicyclists who choose not to use the Class IV facilities. I hope there is some way that we can distinguish the signs and pavement markings for class IV facilities, So the requirement for use of Class II bikeways is not confusing for enforcement personnel, motorist or bicyclist. The other issue related to Class IV facilities is that the design criteria that is available for Class IV facilities does not seem to take into account the issues that were recently brought up related to the desirability of something called day lighting. Daylighting for pedestrians crossing and parking limitations have been put in place for intersections to make it easier for motorists and bicyclists and pedestrians to see each other and account for each other when crossing intersections. The concept of daylighting and the need for providing sight lines at intersections, including driveways and other access across separated bikeways. Class IV doesn't seem to be in place, and we are encountering situations where crashes have occurred, in some cases even fatalities when a motorist attempts to make a turn, either right turn or left turn across a bikeway. I hope in the future request for changes and modifications of design guidance for bikeways that the concept of daylighting can be included in the design criteria, which would in my estimation preclude the use of barriers separated facilities like on street parking that reduces the sight lines available for those facilities.

5. Active Experiments

Mr. Kong provided an update on ongoing active experiments. For the experiment with part time travel on left shoulder (20-13), there has been a construction contractor awarded and they are starting early construction activities. For the LA28 experiment (25-15), the Caltrans District 7 LA 28 team and Caltrans HQ has been making progress on various items and working with FHWA to finalize the LA28 Supplement to the CA MUTCD 2026.

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)

24-15: LA28 Supplement Update

Comments

- Mr. Kong: The LA 28 supplement was developed to support the LA 28 experiment. Which is related to using light blue on traffic control devices for the games. As the experiment has progressed and developed since it was brought to the CTCDC on August 7 2025 meeting received and approved both the experiment request and the supplement which supports the experiment request that was received and approved a year ago. On August 13th, shortly after that meeting, Caltrans received FHWA approval for the experiment request with the conditions that future changes to the experiment would have to be coordinated with FHWA and submitted for review and approval. The supplement was submitted along with that at that time to FHWA and they had some comments. Since the experiment has progressed, there have been certain changes. Previously we had wanted to use to experiment with light blue on signs as a background for signs and pavement markings. But throughout the process, now we are not experimenting with light blue for pavement markings just for the signs. Throughout this past year we had submitted the FHWA for initial approval but there been changes, comments and a lot of back and forth and coordination between headquarters, District 7 and FHWA and now finally this current version of the supplement has been accepted by FHWA and is now effective. Has been posted and is now effective July 15th 2026 and it is available on the MUTCD website. LA 28 supplement to the California MUTCD 2026 and one of the major things we have to work through was the original supplement was based on the pre manual and since early this year the new manual was released, we had to convert the whole thing to be based on the new manual.

25-15: LA28 Experiment Update

Comments

- Ms. Higgins: We have been working hard to make safe games so that the backbone of civilization, which is transportation goes smoothly and without incident. One of the first things we did was request experiment to use one of the two available colors in the National MUTCD which was

coral or light blue. So, in consultation with the Olympic Organizing Committee, as well as all the local municipalities and vendor cities, we decided that light blue was the best color and in August FHWA approved the experiment and our team began moving forward with implementing light blue as the background for our signs. Earlier this year, we completed our first semi-annual report outlining our progress and one of the first things we did was decide on the nighttime color for the light blue. And we did this with great help from our partners at 3M. Part of our experiment also was to decide on the white legend versus the black legend. We did a couple different nighttime locations, different cars, different LED lights on the vehicles, distances and such. We have concluded at this point that the black actually is a better reflection against the light blue background. We are still working on our experiment, and the next semi-annual report is due very shortly. Timothy already shared with you that the supplement is live. We have subsequently shared this supplement with all of the cities that are working on their games route network and implementing signs in their city. We are waiting to hear any comments or any changes or any additions that they may have. But other than that we are working closely with the municipal so that they can enter in these variations into their municipal code. I expect that there may be some supplement to this supplement or an addendum or amendment in the coming months but we are waiting to see.

26-07: Agenda Items Status

Comments

- Mr. Sanchez: We have been keeping track of the agenda items and the incorporation since the last meeting, we only have a few pending items, depending on the revision. Once the items are worked out with FHWA or if they are approved, we just need to wait for the next revision to be incorporated. The rest of the items are just informational items from the previous meeting. We do have a returning item for wide turning trucks, is a different sign for "DO NOT DRIVE BESIDE TRUCKS".

26-08: Legislative Info 2025/2026

Comments

- Mr. Sanchez: There are no changes, but we do have a presentation/update for the AB 289 that is going to be presented later.

26-10: National MUTCD 11th Edition Revision 1

Comments

- Mr. Kong: This item is just to make the committee aware and the public that FHWA has released their revision 1 to the 11th Edition dated December 2025 and with the final rule effective March 5th, 2026. So, we will have two years to adopt those changes from that effective date of the final rule.
 - Mr. Welday: So, it appeared that most of the changes here, although there wasn't a clear change log that I could find were more spelling, grammar, type of things. Is there an item coming up forth the committee that kind of outlines anything that was substantive out of the change.
 - Mr. Kong: We are just starting our efforts for our revision 1 stated for next year and reviewing the FHWA, their manual's revision one will be part of that and we will share once we start the effort and get farther along we can share if there are any substantial changes or things we need to know.
 - Mr. Miller: At the federal level we were advised that this change was pretty much limited to incorporating some technical corrections that were noted in the version released a couple of years ago and we have in the chapter I'm an expert I noted that those are the only changes that would be the bikeway chapter. But it's certainly good to look but I would be surprised to find anything of significance in there based upon they didn't issue a preliminary notice.
 - Mr. Kong: We are planning to incorporate as much as we can or at least review those changes along with all the other changes we are going to have and have it incorporated for revision one of The California MUTCD, which hopefully will be released early next year or so.

26-11: Transit Executive Order

Comments

- Mr. Kong: Make everyone aware there was an executive order by the governor on 7/26. This is about new technologies and services for California's local transit and passenger rail networks. Among all the directives orders, in the orders Caltrans was directed on one of the points was that Caltrans was directed to update the California MUTCD to address transit infrastructure, including but not limited to transit signal priority and bus lanes. That was signed and actually right now we are just submitting our

plan for how we are going to address that and that for us that would include starting coordination with all our internal stakeholders and all our groups within that deal with transit and things like bus lanes. We are going to engage those groups and start discussion. Also, with those that are affected related to the MUTCD such as CPUC for part 8, as they have some kind of transit in that part regarding light rail and of course with the CTCDC. We will keep you updated on those discussions if new strategies related to transit improving transit infrastructure come up in those discussions, lead to potential provisions that need to be added to the MUTCD maybe new traffic control devices or anything related to traffic control devices and of course we will be in discussion with FHWA as well.

26-12: Safety Corridor

Comments

- Mr. Nguyen: I will be presenting the safety corridor, which is the change to the California MUTCD section 2B.21. Quick overview of AB1014. Late last year in October of 2025. The bill essentially asked the Caltrans to come up with a definition for safety corridor and then to consider highways that have the highest number of serious injuries and fatalities based on collision data and we published the California MUTCD in early 2026. This topic is to talk about whether we are keeping the current definition or exploring two other proposals that we have. The first option that we have is keeping the current definition, which is as it's currently written ring now in the most recent version of CAMUTCD. The second one is a formula based approach analyzing crash density and then the third one is the average crash rate comparison. The pros of the current definition is that it's approved by FHWA already and already incorporated into the CA MUTCD and I guess one of the drawbacks is it does not layout an explicit method for determining what is a safety corridor. So the first proposal that we have is the formula based approach and we are ranking the top 25% crash density within the jurisdiction. So the formula is essentially total injuries and fatal crashes times 100 million over the years of data times 365 days times the roadway length in miles times annual average daily traffic to the .5 power. This is the proposed language for the formula based approach For that proposal it gives a formula, so its more systematic objective and data driven. One of the drawbacks is that it would require additional efforts for the users to maintain crash density data for all the roadway segments within their jurisdiction. The second proposal that we have is the average crash rate comparisons and crash rate is defined as crashes with fatalities and serious injuries per million vehicle miles travel and then we are comparing those rates with the overall crash rate of

the jurisdiction. The pros for this approach is its more simplified and systematic it gives greater flexibility for districts and statewide consistency. The average crash rate is something that we do have data for. I have confirmed with the other units within that they are still tracking AADT and centerline miles throughout. Some of the cons is that local jurisdictions they may lack the sufficient data if it only goes back a couple of years. We did give them some flexibility saying that they could use data from three to five years. Smaller jurisdictions may not have that ready.

- Ms. Kim: I have a question on the three to five years, the option to look back three to five years for some local jurisdictions that extra two year flexibility can make a huge difference. Along some corridors one year it's pretty significant and it's like by not having a hard number like three years or four years are we providing too much variation too much flexibility in that calculation for safety corridor or to meet the threshold for safety corridor.
- Mr. Nguyen: It does provide more flexibility but that was goal of it because there are some jurisdictions may not have data that goes back so far and then if they want to be more strict like use the most recent data that definition still allows them to use more.
- Ms. Kim: But what I'm saying is that if you cut it off at three years, I understand the need for giving more flexibility but you are allowing them to or we allow them to play with the numbers so that it's like something that shouldn't or should qualify one or the other. I mean because that two year difference it's a lot. Lets say they can go back five years on one corridor and three years on another corridor and just play with the numbers then.
- Mr. Nguyen: Are you recommending just three years rather than just cut out the five? Just say three years of the existing data.
- Ms. Kim: I'm asking my colleagues on this committee for their input on this because I have seem corridor issues, having worked on safety campaigns with the CHP where just one year fatality they left data on corridor to make a huge difference as to where it stands relative to other corridors.
- Ms. Zhu: I have a very simple comment I believe Statewide Integrated Traffic Records Systems (SWITRS) is no longer active it's being replaced by CCRS. The California Crash Reporting System. So, you might want to update that language.

- Mr. Jones: I just bring up the fact that sometimes when we dilute a fatality or severe injury by a million miles traveled or a million vehicle miles. We are devaluing the human life and I know we are trying to figure out how to get a way to compare roadway segments but it sometimes has us focusing on lower volume roadways that maybe have fewer crashes and severity than higher volume roadways that have a lot but not proportionally of 1,000,000 miles or a million vehicles. I think there needs to be some component like if you have a corridor that has 10 fatalities on it but you have 10 million cars going on that vs a corridor that has one fatality and 100 cars on it. Is 1 fatality more important than 10 fatalities kind of thing. I think we just have to consider this works really well for Caltrans on their freeway segments but for local jurisdictions sometimes we need to have greater tools or abilities to just look at sheer numbers of fatalities or severe injuries sometimes and say this intersection is our number one but it has a lot of traffic volume in it and so therefore it dilutes the significance of it.
- Mr. Nguyen: It is a simplified approach, but the goal was to give districts more flexibility and then laying out a method for them to calculate it.
- Mr. Jones: Maybe you could say, you can apply the state thing or if you develop and adopted a different approach for your agency or something like that justifies or there is a balance between dividing it by 1 million miles traveled and just sheer number of fatality or severe injuries or stuff like that.
- Mr. Weldon: The first question I have is what's broken? Is this because it's now being applied to freeways and now you need to come up with a methodology that works for freeways? The methodology that was provided in the MUTCD was the result of a lot of effort by the committee, by communities, by interest groups, to ensure that the application of the state law changes were beneficial at the local level that people could lower their speed limits that they could identify their corridors based on the kind of nuance of those locations. That's where all those factors and all that flexibility. I fear that by making it just a pure number thing to Brian's point that it basically cuts out the opportunity for local jurisdictions to actually work with their communities to identify where the safety corridor should be. I don't know that we need to change this. I'm trying to figure out the why behind that, if it's because freeways don't work well with this, then

maybe there's an additional calculation that is specific to freeways. The other thing is just really a detail thing, I want to make sure that as you read those sections you kept saying jurisdiction shall but the language said should. And there is a very big difference there and so I want to make sure that if there is a flexibility for the jurisdiction that we don't get rid of that flexibility because as a practitioner in a city that has to deal with speed limits and speed setting within a community, we need to have the flexibility that we need to have to be able to do what's best for our community.

- Mr. Nguyen: We are exploring those three options. One of them is one possibility of keeping the current definition. Within our own organization, some districts have been asking us to provide more guidance saying that the current definition is too broad. They are not sure how to approach it. How do they define the highest number of crash ratings, but we were asked to come up with two approaches. But then the feeling that I'm getting from a lot of these comments is that the current definition is what the majority of the committee prefers.
- Mr. Bronkall: From a broad approach, which is dealing with the concepts of the different approaches and if there truly is a need to develop an additional approach to this. The thought that comes through my mind is allowing these things to be called methods, method a, method b, method c, etc. And agencies would have the opinion than using a particular method that works best for what their needs are. That is assuming that there truly is a need to add additional methods down the line. It may be that what is truly needed is more of a guidance or an implementation document that Caltrans would produce that explains how you go about. Doing these calculations and running through different examples and scenarios, whether it be on state highways system or on a local road to give examples of, this is how it's done to help in the ambiguity about how to do things.
- Mr. Nguyen: Not like written in stone in the CA MUTCD just like if they were to reach out to us we would provide that document on the side.
- Mr. Bronkall: Similar to the pamphlet, the guidelines for setting speed limits it's not in the MUTCD, it's a guidance document that supplements the MUTCD.

- Mr. Baros: This looks like a good effort it's unfortunate seems to me that this whole process is called safety corridor. It really should be identified as hazardous corridor. That is what we are trying to do, identify a hazardous corridor and be there for attention toward mitigating that. One other comment, several of the methods say that the applications of this does not apply to freeways. There are freeways where bicycling is not prohibited. It seems to me freeway sections that on which bicyclists are not prohibited apparently my understanding is they have a good safety record, lack of crashes and others but it seems to me that to the extent we are trying to identify hazardous corridors, we should not exclude corridors to which bicycling is not prohibited and therefore allowed. Lastly in terms of criteria, vehicle miles travel has no relationship to pedestrian volumes or bicycle volumes. And although I'm unaware of good systems providing counts of bicycle travel or pedestrian travel it seems to me if we are going to identify high hazard areas to which speed limits might be applicable we should be counting and responding to the volume of bicycle and pedestrians.
- Mr. Nguyen: The language that said that it doesn't apply to freeways that we were advised by legal to included that based on the language in AB1014.
- Mr. Vora: In AB1014 there is another clause that allows to have or called safety corridor if we have a high volume of bicyclists and pedestrians. So what we are doing there are couple of clauses in AB1014. This one is based on non-freeways where we see a higher rate of crashes with mostly vehicles and sometimes pedestrians and bicyclists. But there is a whole different business district thing and pedestrian thing, bicycles thing in the law. So that will be implemented where we have a higher volume of pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Mr. Nguyen: I forgot about that, the other clause that allows for the five mile reduction, whether it's a safety corridor or like the area generating the high concentration of pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Mr. Miller: I do a lot of work with crash rates inside cities and I couldn't help but noticed the reliance on the engineering and traffic surveys as crash data. Actually, is almost a step backwards, most of the high injury network corridors are busy, busy streets with a lot of traffic signals. And the rates in the engineering and traffic surveys for cities often exclude that the crashes that are at or attributed to signals

because they are not considered to be speed related. The formula probably would work well for semi-rural corridors, places that don't have a lot of busy intersections and I'm thinking state highways right now and it's probably a good formula to underlay the Caltrans the TSN program that works this way already. But this would apply to that program very easily. It just not going to apply well to cities that have really identified the corridors based upon a lack of controls of adequate control along the corridor. Also, there was a power of, I think it was the ADT was to the .5 power. I'm not even sure I know how to do that. I don't know if that is going to penalize or if it's going to award what Brian was talking about a road with a very low volume and has one fatality and does that one fatality create an extremely high rate because not very many vehicles traveled along that road in that one year. If you did get to a system other than what's being used now, I would definitely want to test that formula against some of the current high collision injury rate networks that are there to see if it duplicates the network that's already there or if it actually identifies a very substantial network. If it did, I would be very interested in wondering if the changes are going in the right direction.

- Mr. Nguyen: The .5 power, I believe like that was a control factor for an excess amount of trucks.
- Mr. Vora: The power was mainly initially like how you mention even if we have one fatality and if we don't have like a very low ADT and then it will flag a safety corridor. The speed coordinator, the district and Caltrans they suggested we should have at least some influence of the traffic volume and but then some of the rural areas have a low ADT and going to have those area mainly showing up as a safety corridor and some high traffic area will not show up for some reason, if we have ADT as a vector. Some other group of people we're saying don't consider ADT at all and there are other consequences because of that. So we wanted to consider ADT but we want to minimize it. That is why we have a power of .5 to minimize the impact of ADT. But still we wanted to consider ADT. We only don't show up safety corridor in rural areas where we have very few fatalities but because of ADT it will show up like very high rate. Right now Caltrans is preferring the one without a vehicle mile travel. A million vehicle mile travel that was an option and based on what I'm hearing, I'm thinking we may have to have an option in CA MUTCD. One concern was raised if we put this as a guidance and not as in

CA MUTCD then it will not be implemented. Lots of people don't read the guidance but they go by the law, which they believe is just CA MUTCD That's what they need to follow and if its not there then they are questioning the integrity of this safety corridor implementation, why we are doing this and why we are not doing this. So, that was our main request to put in CA MUTCD but it looks like we can have a separate option. But at the same time, I believe lot of this process we follow should be follow uniformly throughout the state. But then we can have different means and method I understand, but if there is an illegal consequence and then one city is doing differently then how Caltrans is doing that all could be a concern and question. Like why city is not calling a safety corridor or why state is calling this safety corridor or all that.

- Mr. Miller: Your comments make me again think your formula should be tested against some existing networks to see if it reveals surprises or consistency.
- Mr. Sidhu: Definitely agree with what Bob mentioned earlier regarding like having this as an option, just to give local jurisdiction a little bit more flexibility and it would be very helpful if we could be given some examples for each option. Even the existing method that is laid out. But my main question would be have agencies coordinated with Caltrans or are you aware of other local jurisdictions. I currently work at the county and on the traffic engineering side and I want to know is there a formal list to have now for these safety corridors and how is that kind of affected enforcement if you guys are aware of any of those issues.
- Mr. Nguyen: I'm not aware of any inventory of safety corridors across state, but I think that the objective of changing the definition was because there were some jurisdictions like I mentioned before asking for more guidance on it. The safety corridor it it's an option that they can pursue if they want to, but is not mandatory. There seems to be misunderstanding among that even within other districts. To answer your question Bobby, I don't think that there is any statewide inventory of all the safety corridor districts, safety corridors like statewide.
- Mr. Olea: I do share the concerns that have been expressed form the local perspective that making this new methodology would be a severe problem for us. We would actually object severely to having a definition of a safety corridor that is based on ADT or VMT,

San Francisco developed a high injury network about more than 10 years ago based on concentration of severe and fatal crashes that are geographically based. So, if you have a street network in a city, you need to know whether each block is in or out of a safety corridor safety network and you don't typically have crash data and traffic volume data that is accurate to that level of analysis. So, using ADT or VMT for a city is really tricky because then how are you going to estimate accurately what the traffic volumes are for each block in your city? Now our high injury network which has become our safety corridors network because it is not based on ADT, is looking at streets that perhaps are the major arterials the more busier streets but its consistent with the philosophy that it created all this legislation which is cities, counties and state should focus where the most severe fatal and crashes are and not ignore those because a rate tells you that they are ok. So, we have talked a lot about this sort of overemphasis on rural roads and maybe have on fatal but very low ADT. There is an equal problem at the other end where the profession has typically ignored corridors that have a lot of fatalities and severe crashes because the rate is ok. The philosophy is no. If you have a lot of fatalities, if these streets or this highway is where you know the majority of or the fatalities for that community are or this segment or group of streets, that is where the majority of severe and fatal are, that is where you should focus. You shouldn't look at these streets and say, oh, its fine because there is lot of people there. No, that's where the majority of people are being severely injured and killed and there fore you should do something about those streets and maybe not do something about those streets where very few people are getting killed or severely injured. Actually using a rate or VMT is going in the wrong direction and I think there are people who are not at this meeting where are the public health experts or develop these high injury networks or help develop the safety corridor legislation under AB43 that would severely object for the state to give a message to everyone that we are now going to be using rates to make streets that are really bad from a total perspective, look ok from a rate perspective. I think we need to have more consultation with Caltrans and the public health experts that led to this stuff being created so that there is a meeting of minds so that there is an understanding of how things are being done and places like San Francisco that have been doing this for a while. Other cities that have adopted this methodology and have already made decisions

on speed limits based on the prior definitions or the current definition. And if the definition changes, all those things are being now like are questionable. As well as the new cities that need guidance and are not going to be like San Francisco and have different geographic or analysis challenges. So, I don't dispute that we may need to provide more guidance but I don't think that using VMT is either helpful for most places that don't have that accurate of volume data. I also agree with the comments that VMT is very car based. It ignores pedestrian and bicycle activity, which are very hard to measure at the microscopic level. So, I do have concerns, definitely would object to making this a "shall" that applies to cities like San Francisco and other urban areas. And also have methodological concerns that this is moving us in the wrong direction. If we adopt a rate based safety corridor definition.

- Mr. Nguyen: It seems like the majority of the panel prefers keeping the current definition.

26-13: AB289 Speed Safety Camera-Construction/Maintenance Areas

Comments

- Ms. Gutierrez: I'm here more for the questions but the key points are that Caltrans has been authorized to use up to 35 speed safety systems. So typically those are cameras and the things that are specific to this, is that they can only be used in work zones and the workers need to be present. Those work zones include construction work zones as well as maintenance work zones. So it's part of the AB 289 legislation. We also have the specific language to work with you all and I don't have any additional information related to that and the reason for that is that we are still kind of in the development phase and there is no funding for this. There is actually not even funding to develop the program. So, there's been some reshuffling and things like that to get creative, in hopes of receiving funds. And we are working with road safety division and traffic operations here within Caltrans to kind of look into the details as they pertain to traffic delineation and signage. Just traffic control devices in general and so I expect we will come back to you in several months and just kind of present again what we have come up and also determine if any changes or approvals are needed as part of this.
 - Mr. Miller: I have been involved in crashes on freeways where the detours was in place, only the night the crash happened. I have also been involved in crashes where the detour was in place for years.

You'd better have some criteria for when you are going to do this versus when you are not going to do this because you will get criticized if you say we are only going to do it for major projects and you didn't do it for that place, the one crash happened the one night the freeway was closed, the lane was closed not the freeway, the lane.

- o Mr. Bronkall: I want to address more of systemic issue that I have experienced when driving throughout the state through various temporary traffic control scenarios. Those that are temporary in terms of maintenance and those that are more long term in terms of capital improvement projects. The main thing that I see is there are several main things. Lets start with one of them, which is inconsistency in the step down of speeds when the speed limits going to go ahead and be lowered for a construction work zone. Sometimes it seems that the step down is done miles well in advance of a work zone. Other times it seems like you just about come out on top of it and you're slowed down there. The second thing that comes up is understanding when a construction work zone, lower speed limit needs to be in effect 24/7, 365 there is a lot of work zones where a lower speed limit may one be needed during certain times of the day. Such as when workers are present, but in the evening everything is fine and the speed doesn't need to be lowered. In those cases, states like Indiana have their MUTCD modified to allow for flashing lights that lower speed in effect when the lights are flashing and that helps encourage or alert drivers that hey there is work going on, we need a lower speed and its critical that everyone drive at lower speed. One of the other things that I have observed in construction zone is oftentimes when work conditions change when you look at a project its going through various stages of construction and not necessarily all stages require a lower speed zone. Once a project is essentially complete and they might be in the final closeout phase, the road has been rebuilt, its been restriped. The contractor has demoed and the only thing remaining are the construction ahead signs, the lower speed limit signs and there is absolutely no cones on the road. So what is the reason for having a lower speed limit? When we are just in the closeout phase and that's the last thing to be removed. Once the projects effectively closed out. So I'm seeing just a lot of greater issues with the way that temporary traffic control is being implemented throughout the state by the different division districts and that it does

send somewhat of a confusing message, especially if we are now going to go ahead and allow for automated photo capture for people speeding through there. Then lastly, this is probably the more critical one because this ties in to the legislation that was passed for the cities and the city, county of San Francisco, a while back which is creating a uniform signing and striping method for how these cameras are going to be deployed. So that when folks are traveling down the road they are aware of what's going to happen and where the cameras are and what to expect and that way it's not creating an issue of some form of speed trap. The cities are obligated, much like Caltrans is, with this language to come before the CTCDC to have their plan reviewed and commented on by the CTCDC and I think this is a good step for Caltrans to take some early comment of what the committee and the public are concerned with and how you come forward with your official proposal to the CTCDC. I do want to thank you and your team for considering all of our different comments and input along the way, as you develop how these things are going to be implemented.

26-05: CAUTION WIDE TURNING TRUCKS (Old-DO NOT DRIVE BESIDE TRUCKS sign)

Comments

- Ms. Dostalek: The item before you now is a request for approval for a special word message sign. CAUTION WIDE TURNING TRUCKS to be used at multi lane roundabouts as an option. So, the reason for this sign is that multi lane roundabouts are not typically designed to accommodate large trucks to stay in their own lane. If we did that we would have to have much larger roundabouts more right of way, more cost and it also is difficult to maintain speed control through the roundabout the bigger they are because then people can just scoot through really fast if they are super wide and our own highway design manual says that the roundabouts of multi lane entries should be designed with the understanding that most truck drivers will not stay within lane lines. The only exception to that is a turbo roundabout where they are designed to for vehicles stay in their own lanes. There are raised dividers between the lanes that keep people in their lanes. So the California Vehicle Code provides no provision for prohibiting motors to drive beside a truck in a multi lane roundabout. Other states do have laws that prohibit vehicles from driving next to a truck in the multi lane roundabout, California doesn't. And that puts unsuspecting motorists at risk. They don't understand that these trucks may off track into their lane and because of that we might have near misses and sideswipes that occur from that truck

off tracking. And if so, what happens? The truck drivers are cited if they cause a crash because we don't have a law that says otherwise. Here is an example of a multi lane roundabout it's a new roundabout (Power Point Presentation) it is on a four lane divided Expressway with two lane entries and then two lanes circulating around. In this particular location we have a large truck volume in the 10 to 14% and these trucks are mostly going on the through route. So they are not making lefts they are going straight and because of that they are in the number 2 lane into the roundabout because that's where trucks are supposed to be. And the use of the truck apron its not helping on the off tracking because they are not in that lane. So they are in the number two lane going through and everybody got their own lane but then all of the sudden they get into the roundabout and the trucks start off tracking. This is a common occurrence not just in California roundabouts but nationwide. So if this is sounding familiar to you, it is because we brought this sign to you back on May 7th. We brought a sign to you, it was "DO NOT DRIVE BESIDE TRUCKS". We modeled that after an Oregon sign which was actually a regulatory sign because Oregon does have a law that you can't drive beside the trucks but the CTCDC denied that request, saying it sounded too much like a regulatory sign and you sent us back to the drawing board. So we met on June 11th with FHWA Representative Steve Pyburn and our HQ sign people and district 5 and we came up with this new sign which says CAUTION WIDE TURNING TRUCKS. On June 29th we presented that to the informal meeting with Caltrans and CTCDC members to discuss this and the members seem to be in support of that sign. At the May 7th meeting, I just want to point out we had the CHP there at the meeting and they spoke passionately about the need for some kind of sign here to let unsubjecting motorist know to be aware of this issue that could happen. And this is what is being proposed for the MUTCD, adding it in there and it would be an option statement, so not required but maybe use in advance the multi lane roundabout where there is potential for commercial vehicle off tracking and if so desired an educational plaque could be at such same roundabout maybe mounted below that sign. And yet just to stress we want you know we've had sideswipe crashes and we need roundabouts to be successful and every time we put in a roundabout and people start complaining about it, other people when we go to new communities and want to install roundabout people keep pointing back to these other roundabouts like this has happened and this is happening. So we want to try to make what we can to make these roundabouts successful. So that we can encourage more roundabouts to be built because roundabouts do save lives and we feel that the sign would

help with that, at least to help unsuspecting motorists know that there is something they need to be aware of.

- Mr. Miller: It's probably fine for roundabouts trucks turn wide everywhere. Its not particularly danger to most motorists it is danger to people that are trying to pass to the right of the truck turning right. I was a part of a recent lawsuit in which somebody said there was a failure to warn, which is a way of getting out of agency immunity from cases. And this would have been the sign they would have recommended to be there if the sign was in the MUTCD and they felt it would be warned. I'm therefore thinking on my mind. I don't really want to put this everywhere and I don't see language. It does say its intended for roundabouts but it doesn't say anything about not being intended for other intersections. I would like to think maybe we should consider some thought that it should be clarified, perhaps in the guidance level that its not intended for a standard turn by truck onto a local st.
- Mr. Lozano: That is something that we can add Rock, is because I don't want this sign to be used everywhere either. So that's something that we can look into is just adding a guidance statement.
- Mr. Jones: Isn't that sign on the back of most semi trucks already?
- Mr. Lozano: Brian yes, he is correct. Not every semi has it, but signs on the state highway system have to be kind of easily recognizable and since this sign was kind of modeled after that on the back of the trucks that you mentioned (Warning Wide Turns)(Caution Wide Turns)we are trying to have a consistent message that's something we did take into account when designing the sign. Only some trucks have it, but it is a common message that people are getting. So it was kind of modeled after that.
- Mr. Bronkall: I think the sign is a good start. I don't think it is necessarily the best sign that is available and my thought is that this is a sort of sign we as a committee should likely approve with the suggested language change that Rock came up. But also provide another recommendation back to Caltrans. Which would be to further develop a sign with graphics that better articulates what the true problem is. The warning sign for the average motorist approaching a roundabout with the signage may not fully appreciate that a large truck is going to off track into their lane.
- Mr. Lozano: With the one with graphics, I think FHWA or some committee on the national roundabout team, they were testing out

a variety of different signs. Some of them have graphics, some of them were just word messages. So until the feds adopt a new sign which should take a few years, then we will proceed and take this sign off the MUTCD due to redundancy. But yeah, this one we worked with FHWA on trying to come up with the wording. This one was a little tricky because due to the CVC code, it's a passenger vehicles that have the right of way and not the trucks and we had to work to come up with a word message that didn't make trucks think they had the right of way. When they were inside the roundabout because they don't. So this sign was a really good sign due to the fact that it says caution while turning vehicles or right turning trucks and it's just letting the motorists know that they need to just be cautious of trucks in general, especially inside the roundabout. So this didn't give the impression to the trucks that they can take the lane. I think the feds are working on a new sign, maybe with graphics it would just take a few years. But until then, this sign is a great sign to let people know to be cautious of trucks especially in the roundabout.

- Mr. Jones: I think this is starting to get like where McDonald's has the warning on coffee that content may be hot right?. Because we are treating roundabouts like a foreign traffic control device and they are not. And when we use this sign often, it is about trucks turning right and pinching a car on the right hand side, and a lot of the graphic collisions on the back of a truck's warning sign is to the right and this would be occurring to the left of the truck. Which a lot of people aren't aware of that that is a scenario in which they could get trapped, pinched on the side of the roundabout and be forced up onto the apron or something like that. When we design traffic signals, Caltrans requires these huge curb return radiuses so semi trucks can turn right which then makes it very dangerous for pedestrians to use Caltrans intersections because the curb return is designed for a 45 mile an hour passenger car to do that turn. And I think you are right, we don't want to be designing roundabouts where there isn't over tracking or what not but I don't know that this sign is going to, it's like caution semi trucks might run you over or switch lanes without warning. And they might not see you and there are blind spots and all these kind of things and if we put them all over the place. If you follow Caltrans rules for signs at a roundabout there is about 200 % too many signs going into a roundabout already. And you can always tell when a Caltrans designs a roundabout because

there are some many signs you are looking all over the place. You have these chevron arrows, this arrow on all these signs. And its like one of my professors when I was in college said. If you are using a sign to fix a problem a sign is not a solution to the problem and we probably need to figure something else out. And so I just caution that when I went to driver's training all those warning were don't pass on the right of a truck. Even if you think you can sneak by because they could be making a wide right turn and they are going to pinch you. It was never but same thing could happen in a dual left turn lane at a traffic signal right? And you know they put the tracking lines out there but sometimes semi trucks don't pull out they are far enough or what not. And a lot of times when a semi will do when they are turning right is they will straddle the outside travel through lane and the right turn pocket. So that they can track if the curb return radius and that's how the operators of semi trucks are driving in my experience with commercial drivers licenses. But I'm not sure that this is going to do what we are trying to accomplish.

- Mr. Lozano: I think actually this sign is perfect because like how you mentioned most of the drivers are worried about the right turns. However, this one just makes it caution about just wide turning trucks in general, including left. So they will be cautious of just trucks in general specially at the roundabout and that's why we added the plaque and I also agree there can be a lot of signs leading up to it and that's one of the reasons why we added the option statement for to add word roundabout just in case if the sign does get proposed a little bit further upstream from the roundabout. The way we let people know, caution wide turning trucks because this situation is taking place in the roundabout. There is a roundabout and that way they know as they are driving into the potential situation to be cautious of wide turning trucks due to the potential safety issues.
- Ms. Dostalek: It's a situation with the roundabouts. Like I said its just an unexpected thing, I think for drivers to bleed because when they are entering the roundabout everybody is in their own lane. The trucks and at least in this particular location and other ones with high volumes, they cant move over and block the other lane because there is too much volume there. They have to stay in their lane on the entry and the just because the way they are designed, drivers don't know that this truck is going to come over into their lane. Not everybody takes driver's training anymore. You are 18 years old and

you don't have to do that. You just go pass a test. I mean its not great that we have to have signs to tell people stuff but that is the purpose of a warning sign is to let people know of a condition that they may not be aware of.

Motion: Mr. Jones made a motion to incorporate a recommendation to clarify the signs intended for roundabouts and not intended for simple intersections. Mr. Welday seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- Mr. Bronkall: This item passes and as I mentioned before, I do encourage Caltrans to continue to work to develop a much more informative sign because I don't think this one really provides the average motorist with what to expect.

6e. Experimentation Item

None.

7. Upcoming Meetings

Mr. Kong stated the next regular CTCDC meeting is scheduled for November 5, 2026

Discussion on future meetings:

- Mr. Kong: We had tried to get more of a sense of what will be at the November meeting by at least posting a deadline of August 5th for agenda submittal. It looks like there is one request for a new sign coming from Caltrans. I do anticipate maybe some of these items that we discussed today may be returned such as AB 289 or safety corridor. I think the main item at least from our office would potentially be the CA MUTCD revision one. We are hoping to get this workgroup started to review and develop content for that and hopefully have something for the committee to look at either November meeting or February 2027.
- Mr. Welday: Given the fact that it sounds like its going to be a fairly light meeting and the in-person format would require planning and an additional time. I would prefer to do it virtual over in person. I appreciate the in-person meeting but to go for one action item might be a bit much for a travel day.
- Mr. Bronkall: If is not imperative for Caltrans to have action on it in November, that perhaps it be rolled to the February meeting because I believe we have held the minimum number of meetings that the

committee's required to have each year as of this point. So getting us all together even on zoom is a large lift for Caltrans to go ahead and even pull that off. My suggestion would be perhaps cancel the November meeting. Then if there is sufficient number of items for the February meeting we could hold that in person in Sacramento. That would be the proposal that I'm putting out there for the committee to comment and discuss.

- Mr. Moeur: Just wanted to point out that February in person meeting sounds like a good idea, however, just be aware that the ATSSA annual meeting and traffic show and Expo is going to be starting on February 6th in Long Beach. I don't know how many people from the CTCDC attend. But it would seem that if there were people who attend both a Southern California location might be more convenient. At least for the particular meeting.
- Mr. Bronkall: My proposal is agnostic to where the in person meeting would be. I know that we have worked hard on selecting a convenient Northern California Location and I don't know if Caltrans has been able to find an appropriate SoCal location yet that's easy for people to get to that are traveling down from the north. But I think in either way, if we are looking at in person meeting, Caltrans could figure out the logistics and what works best whether its in Northern California or Southern California.
- Mr. Jones: Is it worth spending 6 to 8 hours getting to Northern California for a 60 to 90-minute meeting.
- Mr. Bronkall: The whole principle is that we only want to have an in person meeting when there is sufficient quantity of items to discuss and it seems that our February meetings, our earlier in the year meeting seem to have a lot more items on, than the later in the year meetings for what is worth. If we don't have items for February to make an in person meeting worthwhile, lets go virtual. We can keep kicking it the in person on day until there are sufficient.
- Mr. Kong: At least for his upcoming November meeting if we could postpone or cancel that one. I will discuss with the agenda item requester and for the item we have and then we could plan to postpone or cancel. But I would like the option maybe say a few more important items come up. We at least be able to have a virtual meeting. A short virtual meeting it doesn't have to be exactly November 6th but if things come up and maybe some important items, I would like to have the flexibility for us to be able to call a meeting with the committee. Of course given enough advance notice but if it works out that they are able to do it in

February and we don't have any other items then I think we will be fine postponing or cancelling the November meeting.

- Mr. Bronkall: But Timothy, I would caution you on meetings later in the year after early November. It seems that everyone's calendar gets extremely busy. The end of the year festivities that seem to occur. Availability to get a quorum may be very challenging.

- **Motion:** Mr. Welday made a motion to cancel the November meeting under the assumption that the Caltrans item is not critical, meaning the requestor does not need it to be heard in November and carry that item forward to February and February meeting would potentially be an in person meeting in Southern California if there are sufficient number of items, otherwise it will be a virtual meeting in February. Mr. Jones seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Adjourn

Chair Bronkall adjourned the meeting at 10:47 a.m.