



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



State of California

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
May 4, 2023

ATTENDEES

Panel (8 Members Total):

- Jason Welday, League of California Cities (LOCC), City of Rancho Cucamonga (Chair)
- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin (Vice-Chair)
- David Fleisch, County Engineers Association of California (CEAC), Ventura County Public Works Agency
- Robert Bronkall, CEAC, Humboldt County
- Lt. Brad Hopkins, California Highway Patrol (CHP)
- Bryan Jones, Caltrans Active Transportation (CAT), Greenlaw Partners
- Mike Sallaberry, CAT, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Yue Wang, Caltrans Traffic Safety Engineering Manager

Voting Members Present (8 Total):

- Jason Welday, LOCC, City of Rancho Cucamonga (Chair)
- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin (Vice-Chair)
- David Fleisch, CEAC, Ventura County Public Works Agency
- Robert Bronkall, CEAC, Humboldt County
- Lt. Brad Hopkins, CHP
- Bryan Jones, CAT, Greenlaw Partners
- Mike Sallaberry, CAT, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Yue Wang, Caltrans Traffic Safety Engineering Manager

Voting Members Absent (2 Total):

- Marianne Kim, American Automobile Association of Southern California (AAA-S)
- VACANT, American Automobile Association of Northern CA, NV, & UT (AAA-N)

Alternate Members Present (4 Total):

- Denise Dobson, CHP
- Tony Powers, CAT, Dokken Engineering
- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC, Placer County

Alternate Members Absent (6 Total):

- Andrew Maximous, LOCC, City of Culver City
- Virendra Patel, LOCC, City of Concord



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



- Steve Finnegan, AAA-S
- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans
- Rock Miller, CAT, Rock E. Miller Associates
- VACANT, AAA-N

Committee Staff:

- Janelle Halog, Caltrans Transportation Engineer, Acting CTCDC Secretary
- Robert McNew, Caltrans Transportation Engineer
- Tariq Baha, Caltrans Transportation Engineer

Presenters:

- Kevin Murai, Caltrans
- Robert McNew, Caltrans
- Janelle Halog, Caltrans
- Stephanie Leslie, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Ricardo Iraheta, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Abdul Zohbi, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Johannes Hoevertsz, Sonoma County Public Infrastructure

Public Speakers:

- Steve Pyburn, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Jim Baross, California Association of Bicycle Organizations (CABO), League of American Bicyclists (LAB, and San Diego County Bicycle Coalition (SDCBC)
- Kevin Schumacher, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
- James Esparza, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
- Richard Moeur, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Jason Welday opened the meeting at 9:01 a.m.

The CTCDC members introduced themselves.

2. Membership

Chair Welday stated Lt. Brad Hopkins is now the Voting Member as the CHP representative on the CTCDC. This will also be David Fleisch's last meeting with the CTCDC. Robert Scharf will be taking Mr. Fleisch's place as the Voting Member representing CEAC. In addition, the AAA Northern California representatives for Voting Member and for Alternate Member are both currently vacant. Caltrans is working with AAA Northern California to nominate Voting and Alternate Members to represent them on the CTCDC. AAA Northern California is being contacted to get nominees.

3. Approval of Minutes of the February 2, 2023 Meeting

Janelle Halog, acting CTCDC Secretary due to Johnny Bhullar’s absence, stated the meeting minutes need to be revised to reflect that Alternate Member Tony Powers attended in place of Mike Sallaberry.

MOTION: Mr. Fleisch moved to approve the February 2, 2023 California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as amended, seconded by Yue Wang. The Motion passed by voice vote with Robert Bronkall and Mr. Sallaberry abstaining.

4. Public Comments

There was no public comment.

5. Updates on Items under Experimentation

Chair Welday asked for Committee questions on any experiment updates.

Mr. Fleisch thanked Caltrans for all the work on getting all the old experiments cleaned out and all the current information on the experiments to them. This is something that has been a struggle for several years. This helps since changes are moving forward. A note of thanks for Caltrans and their staff.

Chair Welday gave kudos to the Caltrans staff as well. The background information received has been helpful.

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

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

None

6b. Action Items (Continuing discussion from prior meetings with vote expected)

23-01: Destination Signing Update to Section 2D.37

Kevin Murai, Caltrans, presented this agenda item.

This proposal is to revise Section 2D.37 paragraph 21 in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) to clarify the authority regarding supplemental destination signs.

Caltrans Headquarters has been getting requests from Districts to approve anything that cannot meet Table 2D-102. However, this authority lies with the District Director.

Hence, Caltrans wants to revise Section 2D.37 of the CA MUTCD to make it clear for the Districts that the District Director has that authority, not Headquarters.

There were no Committee or public questions pertaining to this agenda item.



MOTION: Mr. Fleisch made a motion to pass the item, seconded by Mr. Bronkall. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

23-02: Scaling of Pavement Word, Symbol, and Arrow Markings

Robert McNew, Caltrans, presented this agenda item.

This deals with CA MUTCD Section 3B.20.

The current language for paragraph 11 says, “Pavement word, symbol, and arrow markings may be proportionally spaced to fit within the width of the facility upon which they are applied.” In some cases, in scaling lettering and etcetera, a lot of extra effort is required to do the scaling. In many cases, just reducing the spacing between letters would make it workable.

The idea is to give agencies an option of just narrowing the width between the lettering versus scaling the whole thing to make it fit within the lane or the space that is available.

There were no questions from the Committee on this agenda item.

Steve Pyburn with FHWA during public comment noted that the proposed item has a proposed paragraph 11 and paragraph 11a, where 11a is an option. Mr. Pyburn commented the wording appears to be the same and did not understand the practical difference.

Mr. McNew replied that the practical difference is that with scaling, the size of the entire symbol is being scaled whereas with the spacing, narrowing the space between lettering or symbols is done so that they fit within the space. In some situations, spacing can be more convenient versus trying to scale something, which may result in having to modify the stencil or order to get the lettering or symbol to fit in the limited space.

Mr. Pyburn offered clarification. The proposed language has a paragraph 11 and paragraph 11a.

Mr. McNew stated that the one difference is the word “scaled” in the proposed paragraph 11 and “spaced” in the proposed paragraph 11a.

Mr. Pyburn stated that he understood this. Is the item going to have both paragraph 11 and paragraph 11a?

Mr. McNew stated it would, yes.

Mr. Pyburn stated that he did not see a need for both paragraphs and that it can be dealt with when it comes to him for review and approval. He stated he has no issue with the item but is going to ask for clarification from Caltrans on this item.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall made a motion to approve, seconded by Vice Chair Pratyush Bhatia. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.



6c. Information Items (New items that may be voted on or brought back as an Action Item in a future meeting)

22-12: 2009 National MUTCD Revision 3 Final Pavement Ruling

Mr. McNew, Caltrans, presented this agenda item.

This is an informational item that is being continued from previous meetings. FHWA issued a final ruling revising the National MUTCD 2009 Edition and California has two years from the effective date of September 6, 2022 to adopt the final rule and incorporate it into the CA MUTCD. The MUTCD is the national standard for traffic control devices used on all streets, highways, and private roads open to the public. This ruling addresses the minimum retroreflectivity standard. It is intended to address visibility for older drivers. It is also going to improve the ability to work with advanced driver assistance systems and automated driving systems.

This final rule established a maintained retroreflectivity for the longitudinal pavement markings on all roads open to the public with speeds of 35 mph or more. We have a two-year window to implement this in the CA MUTCD. Then all agencies that have longitudinal striping are allowed to develop their compliance process for implementing a method that allows them to maintain that illumination standard.

This is an informational only item. There is no vote required at this time. Are there any questions?

Mr. Fleisch asked Caltrans has an idea when they are going to bring back the proposed change to the manual. This will be of concern to a lot of local agencies, particularly the smaller ones.

Mr. McNew stated that this item has been out there for a while. At this point, updates for the most recent revision on the CA MUTCD are finished. Caltrans is now moving forward to make changes to address the updates in the 11th Edition of the federal MUTCD that is coming out soon and to adopt the new material in the CA MUTCD. It is going to be an extensive rewrite in a number of areas, and therefore there is no date of how soon it will be done.

Ms. Halog noted that as far as the update goes, the release of the 11th Edition of the federal MUTCD is still pending. Once the 11th Edition does come out, Caltrans has two years to incorporate it into the CA MUTCD.

Mr. Wang stated that the original deadline for the release of the 11th Edition is by May 15, 2023.

Chair Welday stated that it sounds like once the 11th Edition comes out, staff will begin processing that into the workflow for the Committee to review the changes and better understand how it is going to change the CA MUTCD.

Mr. Fleisch addressed the Chair in asking if Caltrans had any information or has there been any research done on what the impact is on the final pavement ruling. You have to physically go measure it and then how much more frequent is it going to be for local agencies? Is it going to drive agencies more toward thermoplastic rather than paint? Agencies are going to need to be prepared for some sort of impact on this and the smaller ones just do not have the ability to do that kind of research.



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



Mr. Wang agreed and said that right now we have not had any content shared with us. We are waiting for their final release. Internally, we already have a contract ready to adopt it. We will share the information with everyone. At Caltrans we have to adopt this within two years.

Mr. McNew said that currently Caltrans has developed a process. We are doing our own monitoring. We do meet the criteria that is required in the regulation. The analysis has to focus on what we can do as far as addressing the local agencies. We want to make sure they determine the appropriate material to use.

Mr. Bronkall stated that he thought it would be helpful if this continues to roll out, is to have a presentation from Caltrans of the best management practices they have developed in implementing this so that all the cities and counties are not going through the same learning curve of figuring out the best way to go ahead and perform the necessary testing. So having more research done by Caltrans and being presented to the CTCDC will be a great benefit, especially to smaller organizations.

Mr. Wang stated that this is a great idea, and that Caltrans will reach out to their communities and make sure to share information.

Chair Welday added that he was also thinking of some sort of presentation of what Caltrans is doing. Another thing is, are there resources that are going to be available to local agencies that could be shared?

Public Speaker Mr. Pyburn with FHWA stated that there are two things going on here. Certainly the 11th Edition of the federal MUTCD is on the horizon, but the revision for retroreflectivity was effective in September of last year. Caltrans has two years from September 2022 to update the CA MUTCD to reflect these requirements. This would be in addition to revising to address the changes in the 11th Edition. As long as all revisions are completed by September 6, 2024, then compliance is completed. We can process other revisions anytime. Another thing that is going on is what this will require. It does require not only maintaining retroreflectivity but monitoring retroreflectivity. This requirement is already in the Manual for Signs. So, every agency must go out and inspect their signs every year for nighttime retroreflectivity. One way to do this is with a retroreflectometer and the other is the drive-by method which Caltrans employs. We actually have a review of Caltrans' methodology and effectiveness a couple of years ago. As agencies are inspecting their signs annually, they will also be inspecting their lane line retroreflectivity or the paved marking retroreflectivity as it is required by this amendment. The requirement is already in there for signs and if agencies are not doing that, they are not following what is legally required of them.

23-03: Legislative Information for Session Year 2023-2024

Ms. Halog with Caltrans stated that this agenda item is an informational item regarding the legislative information for Session Year 2023-2024. Caltrans is providing a list of the current legislative items. Attachment A in the agenda item has all the current bills listed with their number and topic for the session year. For additional information, there is a link on the first page of the agenda item.



Mr. Fleisch stated that we asked for this because we do not want to be surprised by legislation that might affect the CA MUTCD. Is there any way that Caltrans can have their personnel highlight the ones that they think would have effect on the Manual?

Mr. Wang replied that internally Caltrans has the full analysis of every single bill. It is a holistic review of every single bill. We usually share our analysis with counties and cities.

Mr. Fleisch stated that if Caltrans highlighted the bills that might have an impact on the Manual, that would be helpful.

Mr. Bronkall elaborated and said that the entire goal of this agenda item is to make the whole Committee aware of what our legislature is doing. Once these bills become finalized, the Committee will not be blind sighted by the action taken by legislature. We have had challenges in the past in implementing the legislation into the Manual based upon not being involved to the extent that we should have been. This agenda item should have two or three sentences under each of these topics like an executive summary of the analysis that Caltrans has done on these that highlights the sections of the Manual that are potentially affected by the legislation. That allows the Committee to further look into these as they move forward as well as having an update from Caltrans on which bills seem to be gaining traction and moving forward.

Mr. Wang stated that the real challenge is that this is a dynamic process. It is a constantly changing process.

Chair Welday suggested that maybe this could become a matrix where there is a column for each one that shows what the status is. We could have another column that identifies what sections of the CA MUTCD would be affected. We can then just easily scan down the list and see what might affect us.

Mr. Fleisch opined that it might be simpler to just have a column that says, “Does it affect the Manual? – yes or no.” Mr. Wang agreed with this and stated that this is a great idea. We will work with our staff and come up with a list based on our conversations.

Mr. Bronkall had a final comment and said, I expect that this will be an ongoing effort to develop this into a version that works well for the Committee. He also thanked Caltrans for all their work on this.

No public comments were received on this agenda item.

6d. Request for Word Message Signs Approval

None

6e. Request for Experimentation

23-04: Request for Experiment for Left Turn Gates in the City of Los Angeles (K-line)

Stephanie Leslie, Project Manager for Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro), introduced herself and addressed the Committee. She stated: We just finished construction of the Crenshaw LAX Line and that is 8.5 miles of new light rail. One mile of this line is street running, running down the median of Crenshaw Boulevard. It is Metro’s desire to install left-turn gates along this one-mile section of the new line. Our

reasoning for this is to be able to reduce car-to-train collisions by preventing motorists from making illegal left turns in front of ongoing trains.

Ricardo Iraheta, Assistant Resident Engineer with LA Metro presented the following:

The slides that you will see are essentially the same thing that was approved for the East San Fernando Valley job. We are ready to implement this since the K-line is open. We have LADOT approval on drawings. We have LA BOE approval on drawings. We have Council support as well.

Mr. Iraheta presented slides detailing the project and pertinent information.

Vice Chair Bhatia noted that in the presentation it said that there would be loops underneath the gates to prevent activation. I want to understand, does it refer to activation for the vehicle to open the gate? Or does it mean activation of the signal for the train?

Mr. Iraheta explained that it is for the vehicle to make sure that the gate does not go on in a down position when there is a vehicle present on that loop.

Vice Chair Bhatia continued by asking when the gate stays up and the vehicle is able to go through; is that associated with any kind of signal timing change preventing the train from coming at the same time?

Mr. Iraheta noted that if it is up that means they have a green left-turn arrow or yellow. Once the train comes in and starts the priority on the signal, then the gate will come down and will have a red left-turn arrow as well as the gate coming down.

Vice Chair Bhatia asked, have you looked at any signal timing changes that might have helped to reduce the collisions? Have there been any signal timing fixes that could have been used to prevent collisions?

Mr. Iraheta replied that as far as LA Metro is concerned, we have done the best that we can by adding all these safety measures. The actual signal timing is done by LADOT. We have no control over that. They calculate a signal timing. LADOT goes out there and monitors, especially if they get complaints. We are trying to be proactive and try to minimize accidents.

Abdul Zohbi with LA Metro added that this is a major thoroughfare. It is the entrance to one of the busiest freeways in the nation. Changing the signal timing would be difficult because we are going to create a backlog and we are going to have storage issues with cars attempting to get on the freeway. We might provide a false sense of security and people will negotiate the left turn illegally just to get on the freeway. People are always in a hurry. We tried everything and this is what we have come up with. We have had zero accidents over the past six years.

Mr. Scharf, Alternate Member Southern California Counties' Representative, stated he is the sponsor for this item. I do want to add that within LA County jurisdiction which Metro is the rail operator, I can foresee if this experiment is successful that there are additional applications within LA County and possibly outside of LA County and possibly statewide as well. Metro and LA County have worked together to install every device possible to prevent these illegal, left-turn movements. I see applicability elsewhere. I also want to add some clarification to the presentation; the experiment that was referenced in which these were put in on an experimental basis on Flower, was CTCDC Item 17-16. That experiment as presented was not directly associated with the gates. It was more so viewed as an experiment for red-colored, in roadway lighting to discourage left turn movements when the trains were present.

I will second that the desire is for immediate installation following experimental approval if it is obtained.

Mr. McNew stated that the initial experiment in 17-16 was for the internally illuminated pavement lights to help reduce traffic. When the analysis was done on that, there really was not a positive or a negative on those being installed but it did not help eliminate the left turns. They opted to place a gate there. That seems to have addressed the issue. These are solely across the left turn lanes making a turn across the tracks themselves. It is just a limited space that they are looking at.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn, FHWA, reminded the applicant that FHWA approval is required for the experiment in addition to the CTCDC approval before the objects can be implemented in the roadway.

Mr. Zohbi, commented on applicability – we have Seattle Town Transit and VPA in San Jose both interested in the same application. There will be pending applications to the CTCDC. We just submitted an application to FHWA for the experiment.

Jim Baross, CABO, LAB, SDCBC, asked if the detection of a vehicle that precludes the strong arm from coming down on the vehicle will also detect bicyclists who happen to be there and do not want to be bashed in the head? And if not, why not?

Mr. Iraheta stated that those loops are good for motorcycles. The bicycle loops are normally a little bit smaller. I am not entirely sure if it will detect a bicycle although there are bicycle lanes here on this thoroughfare, the way the striping is done. If a bicyclist wants to make a left, he is not supposed to make it from that left-turn pocket. In downtown LA there is an experimental signal for bicycles only that gives the bicyclist a way to make a left turn.

Mr. Zohbi added that it will not detect a bicycle. If the gate is in the process of coming down and a vehicle turns to go beyond the limit line and goes over the loop, the gate will go back in the up position. However, if the car does not step over the loop and is still behind and the gate is coming down and is horizontal, it will lock. It will not go back up.

Mr. Baross acknowledged and added that it brings up the situation of if the City of Los Angeles is attempting to preclude bicyclists from using the general travel lane, they are acting illegally even though there is a bike lane available. So, my request stands that if there is a need for this strong arm to detect the presence of someone, a vehicle or a bicycle, it seems to me it ought to be able to detect a bicycle.

Kevin Schumacher, CPUC, stated that we generally support this proposal. The CPUC and our Rails Crossing Group – we have been familiar with this, and we have seen its effectiveness. It was mentioned in the presentation that this would be proposed as a permanent treatment. My question to Metro is whether CA MUTCD language would be proposed in the future to allow for use by other agencies and keep it as a permanent option?

Ms. Leslie noted that as part of our request we did ask if the CTCDC would approve language in the CA MUTCD to allow future installations. That is a part of our request and hopefully that will be addressed by the Committee. If it proves to be a positive experiment, it would be wonderful if other projects could implement them without having to go through this experimental phase.



Mr. Pyburn, FHWA, stated that the point that was made that it would have to go to FHWA is appropriate. FHWA in Washington compiles and tracks all experiments like this, and they take the data from all the similar experiments and determine if they want to make a permanent addition to the Manual or not. If they do, they will issue what is called an interim approval, that says how states can use this. It is totally out of the purview of Caltrans and out of the CTCDC at that point. Once FHWA issues an interim approval, any agency can adopt it per those conditions and then Caltrans can choose to adopt it per those conditions or not.

James Esparza, Senior Utility Engineer Specialist, CPUC, stated that I do not know whether the issue of the 18-inch clearance was already discussed or not. We just want to make sure that this is being looked at and that the normal and clearance distance of this device is two feet, and the request is for a variance of those 18 inches. That should be included in the approval for the experimentation.

Mr. Sallaberry, CAT, stated following up on the concern of cyclists getting hit by the arm, which I share. I feel like that should be at the very least part of the evaluation process. Ideally, I would like to see some pavement markings or something on the ground to indicate that the area should be kept clear directly under the arm. Cyclists are allowed to be there legally. As part of the evaluation process any collisions or injuries by cyclists should be noted.

Chair Welday noted that the request included a one-year experiment from 2023 to 2024 but the slide presentation appeared to state two years. Is it a one-year request or is it a two-year request?

Ms. Leslie stated that she thought it was a two-year request. I will go back and look at the written paper we submitted to you. We were anticipating a two-year request.

Chair Welday mentioned the comments about bicycle detection. I am not sure that you can fit standard markings in that area. I do believe that if it is going to be detecting, it should be detecting users that are legally allowed to be in that lane which bicyclists are by state law. I think that should be incorporated into the design as well.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall made a motion to approve a two-year experiment with an 18-inch clearance and with any reported collisions with vehicles or bicyclists be noted and appropriate mitigation included if needed, seconded by Mr. Fleisch. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

23-05: Request for Experiment for Modified Detail 22

Mr. Bronkall introduced this agenda item and stated he is the sponsor of the proposed experiment. One of the challenges that rural areas in California has been often times the paved roadway area is very narrow. There is insufficient room to implement striping as set forth in the CA MUTCD. It is something that not only affects counties and cities, but it also affects the state in the rural areas.

Johannes Hoevertsz, Sonoma County Public Infrastructure, presented the following: We have a rural community, Fitch Mountain in Sonoma County, with very narrow roads. We are getting ready to repave the roads this year. We would like to get authorization to implement a modified version of Detail 22 and Detail 23 that allows for retroreflective markers that will fit

better within the geometry of the road. When we tried to install a regular standard detail, vehicles are trying to avoid the markers because the road is so narrow. The vehicles are getting off the road. The retroreflective markers also make noise, so we are getting complaints on the regular detail when we try to install it.

I think the proposal is safe for the community. We probably have about 450 residences. On Fitch Mountain, there are a lot of service trucks and residents that travel those roads. There is access to the Russian River from Fitch Mountain. So, we get a significant amount of traffic. These are not high-speed roads.

Vice Chair Bhatia wanted to know if this was specific to the CA MUTCD or is it really a change that would be required in the Caltrans Standard Plans? Does it need experimentation if the CA MUTCD just gives examples of central line striping, and it does not go into details of where the reflectors should be?

Ms. Halog with Caltrans stated that right now in the CA MUTCD Detail 22 and 23; those are in the Manual. Right now, an option for Detail 22 would be to put those markers that are on each side, directly on top of the lines. That would be the only other option. Detail 22A and Detail 22B shown in the proposal are not in the Manual. I believe the reason Johannes suggested Detail 22A and Detail 22B was mainly for construction reasons to other than the fact that the current ones in the Manual would reduce the lane width. With Detail 23, based on the proposal, having too many of those raised pavement markers will present an issue because they could get knocked off with the narrow lanes. Mr. Hoevertsz agreed with this.

Chair Welday asked if there were any more questions from the Committee. (No additional questions were voiced) He moved on to Public Comment.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn, FHWA, stated that Federal Highways will also have to approve this experiment to use a marking configuration that deviates from what is in the approved National MUTCD.

Mr. Pyburn also stated the following: My second comment is that I am assuming that Sonoma County has done an engineering study or determined that a centerline stripe is necessary here. It does not appear to be mandatory for this situation for Section 3B.01. I am thinking that maybe the National MUTCD team may not be in support of the experiment, and if Sonoma County wants to go ahead before Federal Highway issues an official determination on this experiment request, they can refer to 3B.01 to determine which is the appropriate marking for this section of roadway. It does not appear to be mandatory for this configuration. It is mandatory on arterials and collectors that are 20 feet wide and 6,000 ADT and on rural roadways. At 18 feet and 3,000 ADT, it is recommended but not mandatory.

Mr. Wang stated that the speed limit here is 35 MPH, so this is a pretty low speed limit. He wanted to add that for the record.

Mr. Baross, CABO, LAB, SDCBC, commented that he noticed the detail on the roadway does not allow for space for pedestrians. There is no sidewalk or even shoulder. He also stated the following: I am pretty sure that there is an advisory bike lane configuration on narrow roadways which is used in some countries; I think it is an experiment in the United States in some places might be useful in that it – just to remind everyone – the advisory bike lane puts a stripe on both sides of the roadway, which some people would consider to be a shoulder. But the effect has been to, especially on a narrow roadway when it is difficult for two motor

vehicles to pass each other and certainly hard for accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians, but the advisory bike lane striping would without a center line, would allow for the motorists generally to use the center of the roadway thereby leaving space for pedestrians and bicyclists. But, when encountering a motorist coming in the other direction, they would move into the advisory bike lane space. I want to suggest that as an alternative. This would probably need to be an experiment.

No additional public comments were voiced.

Mr. Bronkall stated that working with Johannes on his proposal, there are a couple of things that probably were not fully articulated. The geometrics of the road that the pictures do not quite fully show; it is a narrow, winding road and as such, the use of turning the road into an edge-lined road where there are curves that have narrow site visibility combined with 35 MPH is not necessarily the best type of solution for the road. It is his understanding that Sonoma County has determined that there is a need for a center line stripe to channelize traffic appropriately and due to the inclement weather that the northern part of the state typically sees that the raised pavement markers add an additional level of safety for those using the road. Where the County is trying to go is making the road as safe as possible and dealing with the fact that it does have a narrow, total travelled way width that precludes the installation of standard striping and that, perhaps, something is needed for these roads that just are not quite wide enough for traditional center line striping.

Mr. Hoevertsz added that Sonoma County has determined that there is a need for the center line on the road. The road width varies from 20 feet to probably less than 18 in some areas around the mountain. There is really no room to widen this road. There is no room for bicyclists, and the site distances on the turns around the mountain are very, very limited. When you have two vehicles on a turn, it is very difficult to not try to cross the center line or to see the other vehicles coming in the opposing direction. So, we have analyzed that, and this is probably the best solution that we can come up with considering the limited width that we have on this road.

Mr. Sallaberry opined that this is a fairly common situation, not only in California but probably the United States in rural areas. His inclination is to think that Detail 22A is problematic because it has a single line of raised markers and that could be misconstrued as allowing passing when passing is not allowed. 22B is very similar to Detail 23 and that perhaps 22B would be more acceptable in the sense that they are replacing the raised markers with the stripe and the reflective markers fit within the stripe itself. Installation-wise he does not know how simple it would be to do that, leaving gaps for the reflective raised pavement markers. He is concerned about Detail 22A as proposed and is more inclined to approve 22B. This also will require federal approval of the experiment. Generally, Mr. Sallaberry is surprised that the request itself did not include the width of the roadway, the volumes, and the 85th percentile speeds, which is basic information for people to make decisions based on the request. He would hope that would be provided.

<p>MOTION: Mr. Bronkall made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Wang. The Motion passed by voice vote with Mr. Sallaberry voting “No.”</p>



20-12: Request for Extension of Experiment with Orange Striping in Construction Zones

Brian Hadley, Caltrans, District 11, San Diego, is the Senior Resident Engineer on a project that implemented the orange contrasted striping.

Mr. Hadley shared a PowerPoint presentation with the Committee reviewing project progress and developments.

Chair Welday called for questions from the Committee.

Mr. Bronkall liked the pictures depicting different weather conditions to see how visible the stripes are. In the past there have been visibility issues on roads where you have lane shifts and you have grinding marks and the sun is low in the mornings going into the driver's eyes and affecting visibility. He is glad that Caltrans is considering all those things with the striping. He think it is a great way to enhance the striping for the work zones.

Mr. Hadley added that I talked to you about the southbound direction, and I know of some other districts where they have these east and west routes, the sunrise and sunset is glaring their striping in construction zones. We would definitely like to be enhancing east and west routes during construction.

Vice Chair Bhatia commented that this was a really good presentation, especially the pictures; it helped to understand how the experiment is going. Is there any data that has been collected on reduction in collisions in the work zones or is it still too early to have collected sufficient data to be looked at that kind of fine-grained information?

Mr. Hadley replied that currently the research team from the University of California, Davis is reviewing that data right now. We are going to be a little limited on what we have for pre-construction data. Since we started construction in October 2021, we had about a six-month window where we had construction striping without orange contrasts and then we got the orange in April 2022. It is not a long window of data. In November in the meeting, they could present that data.

No other comments were voiced by the Committee.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn, FHWA, reminded Caltrans headquarters and district that you have to receive approval from Federal Highways to extend the experiment.

Mr. Hadley stated that he had emailed Federal Highways three or four times already with no response. Perhaps you can work with us in trying to get a response to our emails.

Mr. Pyburn said he could help if sent an email, he would set something up, understanding that they are under a Congress-mandated deadline for provisions.

Mr. Hadley acknowledged this and added that we would really like to start next month and does not know how to do this quickly because he has been trying.

Mr. Wang informed Mr. Hadley that he would like to be included in the comments loop and email so can be included in the communication loop.

Bryan Jones stated that as a user of that state highway multiple times, that orange paint is impressive and very eye catching that something unique and special is going on in the



corridor. It does have an impact to help people drive safer and better in the cone zone. From his perspective, it is very effective and he really likes it.

Chair Welday called for a motion to approve this agenda item.

MOTION: Mr. Fleisch made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Jones. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Welday stated that the next meeting is scheduled for August 3, 2023, in-person in the City of Rancho Cucamonga in Southern California. About six months ago there was discussion about returning to in-person and it was discussed doing a mix-and-match approach with two in-person meetings and two virtual meetings a year to see how it went. We scheduled in-person for February and August and virtual in May and November. After our first in-person meeting in February there was some discussion about whether we should lift those for next year and possibly revisit this altogether.

I will take comments from the Committee regarding whether we should schedule virtual or in-person meetings and possible adjustments.

Mr. Fleisch noted that one of the comments that was made was, would it be possible for the in-person meetings to allow the public to be virtual? Caltrans said they had some concerns about that with their facilities. We talked about if it was in a city or county facility that is set up for that; particularly for some of these experiments or things where the public has the desire to comment, it is a pretty hefty lift for them to get somewhere from southern to northern California. I do not have any issues with the meeting agenda the way it is in terms of in-person and virtual, but if meeting in-person, it would be nice for the public to be able to join virtually.

Chair Welday concurred with the desire to have the options available to the public.

Mr. Bronkall agreed with Mr. Fleisch’s comments and suggested that we attempt the schedule next year as proposed with the modifications that in-person meetings include a virtual option as it be hosted at a facility that would allow that to occur.

Chair Welday stated that this option is available at Rancho Cucamonga, where the next meeting is scheduled to be held.

Mr. Bronkall added that he would like to try to include this public option in the August meeting if possible.

Mr. Wang agreed that this was a good idea.

Public Comment

Mr. Baross, CABO, LAB, SDCBC, stated that this venue allowed people to participate virtually from locations around our large state. The Brown Act requirements have gone from virtual meetings to in-person meetings and for the members the Brown Act requires that the members actually attend when they are participating in an in-person meeting but does allow for teleconferencing participation to watch and hear and also to be called upon when it is appropriate. I look forward to the opportunity with the CTCDC although you are not required to under the Brown Act per my understanding. I want to suggest that there is a device



available from Owl Labs and it plugs into a laptop and provides for teleconferencing and real-time participation, and we have had good success with it here in San Diego and I recommend it.

Richard Moeur, Executive Secretary of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, stated that he has tried to attend these meetings when he can. I am planning to attend the August meeting in person. What we looked at here at the National Committee is that we have been faced with a lot of the same issues. In 2020/2021 we had to pivot to all virtual meetings. It was successful but it cut out a lot of the interaction. I was instructed to look at hybrid meetings as a suggestion. What we found out with hybrid meetings is that the in-person attendees interact very well and the virtual attendees, depending on the platform and the technology, interact very well but there seems to be limited interaction between the virtual attendees and the in-person attendees. For that reason, we will not be moving forward with hybrid meetings for any of our activities. We are doing a lot of virtual meetings in between our in-person meetings such as technical committees and working groups. Our main meetings, the annual meeting in January and our mid-year meeting in June, are in-person meetings and do not have a hybrid component because of that limited interaction. I wanted to let you know how we dealt with it.

8. Adjourn

Chair Welday adjourned the meeting at 11:16 a.m.