



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



State of California

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
August 3, 2023

ATTENDEES

Panel (8 Members Total):

- Jason Welday, League of California Cities (LOCC), City of Rancho Cucamonga (Chair)
- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans
- Robert Bronkall, County Engineers Association of California (CEAC), Humboldt County Public Works
- Lt. Brad Hopkins, California Highway Patrol (CHP)
- Bryan Jones, Caltrans Active Transportation (CAT), Greenlaw Partners
- Marianne Kim, American Automobile Association of Southern California (AAA-S)
- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Mahmoud Zahriya, American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah (AAA-N)

Voting Members Present (7 Total):

- Jason Welday, LOCC, City of Rancho Cucamonga (Chair)
- Robert Bronkall, CEAC, Humboldt County Public Works
- Lt. Brad Hopkins, CHP
- Bryan Jones, CAT, Greenlaw Partners
- Marianne Kim, AAA-S
- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Mahmoud Zahriya, AAA-N

Voting Members Absent (3 Total):

- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin (Vice Chair)
- Mike Sallaberry, CAT, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Yue Wang, Caltrans Traffic Safety Engineering Manager

Alternate Members Present (2 Total):

- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans
- Wei Zhu, CEAC, Orange County Public Works

Alternate Members Absent (8 Total):

- Tim Chang, AAA-S
- Michelle Donati, AAA-N
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC
- Andrew Maximous, LOCC



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



- Rock Miller, CAT
- Virendra Patel, LOCC
- Tony Powers, CAT
- VACANT, CHP

Committee Staff:

- Janelle Halog, Caltrans Transportation Engineer, Acting CTCDC Secretary

Presenters:

- Florencia Allenger, Caltrans
- Janelle Halog, Caltrans
- Kevin Murai, Caltrans
- Robert McNew, Caltrans
- Kathryn Kleinschmidt, Caltrans District 5
- Randell Ishii, County of Monterey

Public Speakers:

- John Cinatl, Caltrans, Retired
- Steve Pyburn, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Richard Moeur, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD)
- Marcos Ortega, California Department of Parks and Recreation

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Jason Welday opened the meeting at 9:04 a.m.

The CTCDC members introduced themselves.

2. Membership

Mahmoud Zahriya is now representing AAA-N as a Voting Member. Michelle Donati is now representing AAA-N as an Alternate Member. Tim Chang is now representing AAA-S as an Alternate Member. David Fleisch has been replaced by Robert Scharf as a CEAC Voting Member. Wei Zhu is now representing CEAC as an Alternate Member. Denise Dobson is no longer the CHP Alternate Member, and that position is currently vacant. Timothy Kong is replacing Janelle Halog as the Alternate CTCDC Secretary.

3. Approval of Minutes of the May 4, 2023 Meeting

MOTION: Robert Bronkall moved to approve the May 4, 2023 California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as presented, seconded by Bryan Jones. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote with Johnny Bhullar, Marianne Kim and Mr. Zahriya abstaining.



4. Public Comments

John Cinatl, retired Caltrans Bicycle Coordinator from District presented: In November 2020 the project manager out in Ventura County called and asked me to review a project along the Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) that was going to be really impacted for bicycles. The route is part of the Adventure Cycling Pacific Coast Route. The ocean is eroding the highway, so they are going to put a new seawall in. On the north side there are unstable cliffs, so the four-lane highway was reduced to two narrow lanes with K-rails on both sides. There is an extremely high traffic count plus bicycles. A lot of times two hundred to three hundred bicycles go through there at a time in large groups. Looking at Part 6 of the MUTCD and Figure 6H-32, the only bike provision was a Share the Road sign for this constricted area. Here are some photographs and I think that this figure in the MUTCD needs to include a couple more signs. I am suggesting that signs be added to Figure 6H-32 of the MUTCD: Bikes May Use Full Lane with pavement sharrows adjacent to that, No Passing, (or if there is passing) 3 FT MIN Passing.

5. Updates on Items under Experimentation

Robert McNew, Caltrans Safety Programs, presented the Committee with a summary of related actions and Committee meeting details: Last meeting an experiment was closed out. We are still catching up with some experimental requests that are for things quite a way in the future. Three are covered by federal experiments that we got feedback from FHWA on. We recently added two more requests from the previous meeting. We got another project that is about ready to wrap up; they completed the work and are working on the final report.

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

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

None

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

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

Chair Welday: We have had this as an informational item for a while, and are now bringing this forward as an action item. Johnny Bhullar will make the presentation.

Mr. Bhullar, from Caltrans: Last summer the Feds issued the third revision to the 2009 National MUTCD. When the Feds issue a formal official revision to the MUTCD it takes effect in thirty days, but the states are given two years to review and adopt those changes into their manuals. We began that process last year and we kept this as an informational agenda item. We have been giving all the agencies, the public, and the practitioners of traffic control devices time to digest, review, and look at and assess the item as to how they will be addressing it. We have around one year left.

Florencia Allenger, from Caltrans: Looked for a motion by the Committee to recommend adoption of the 2009 National Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Revision 3,



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



Federal Highway Administration, Final Rule on Maintaining Minimum Pavement Parking Reflectivity.

Mr. Bhullar: We have all the proposed changes and show exactly how they are going to be incorporated if we were to move forward with the federal language as is. It is Caltrans' responsibility to issue, adopt, and incorporate the revisions.

Mr. Bronkall: In the Federal Manual the implementation date was to be four years from the effective date of the revision. The effective date was 9/6/2022. Wouldn't that make our compliance date 9/6/2026?

Ms. Allenger: The four-year compliance date should be 9/6/2026. We have two years to adopt it and four years to implement it.

Mr. Bhullar: We have to incorporate the changes into the CA MUTCD as policy within two years and field implement within four years.

Mr. Scharf: This is highly impactful from a financial and liability exposure perspective. Is there any discretion on adopting this.

Mr. Bhullar: For revision three on the markings, we can determine whether it is a standard, guidance, or option. For guidance and option, we can discuss with FHWA California Division Office and the MUTCD team in D.C. to receive their input and buy-off on whether we can choose to adopt their optional portion of the language. For guidance and options that are not a standard practice, we can discuss with FHWA California Division Office to see if we can adopt a different policy that could be considered equal or higher. By next summer we will have to incorporate our version of that official federal revision into the CA MUTCD.

Mr. Scharf: As has been the case with other similar mandates from the Federal Manual, will Caltrans eventually develop guides for the local agencies as a tool kit to be in compliance?

Mr. Bhullar: That is something that we can approach as a statewide matter. If there is a need, certainly Caltrans can work with the local agencies to come up with those types of tools.

Steve Pyburn, FHWA: This is very similar to the program we have for sign inspection and maintenance that is already incorporated in Part 2. Every sign has to be inspected annually and those that are deficient have to be fixed because the public relies on those signs (the reflectivity, the accuracy, that they are not falling down) for safety. The manual, for signs and markings, will say that each jurisdiction responsible for signs and markings has to have a program for inspection and maintenance. Caltrans will have to create a program and likely incorporate it in their Maintenance Manual. Local agencies can use that as a model or create their own, as long as the inspection program meets the federal requirements as defined in the MUTCD. The September 2026 compliance date is accurate. Federal Highways felt that after the public review period, four years was adequate for compliance.

Mr. Bhullar: On page 14 of this agenda item, the implementation date of September 6, 2024 is incorrect.

Mr. Pyburn and Richard Moeur, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices: Confirmed that the incorporation date should be September 6, 2024 and the field implementation date should be September 6, 2026.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall made a motion to approve the item with a change to Table I-2 to include the correct compliance date of 2026, seconded by Mr. Jones. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

23-06: Placement of Exit Plaques on Guide Signs

Kevin Murai, Caltrans Signs Branch: Item 23-06 is in regard to the exit number plaques that should be displayed separately from the sign itself and the plaque includes the exit number or LEFT exit number that should be above and abutting. This was a previous agenda item in 2020. There were some edits that required some changes so that the "above and abutting" would be more of a standard than an option. This agenda item is basically editing the MUTCD so that the "above and abutting" standard is a standard rather than an option.

Mr. Pyburn: Back in 2020 I reviewed this item. There is some ambiguity between some of the graphics and the text in the current Manual that is not consistent with an official ruling published by Federal Highways. This is a critical safety element, especially the LEFT plaques. So we have requested these editorial changes to bring it to be consistent with the National Manual and provide clarity for Caltrans districts and the local agencies. We have seen inconsistencies in the application of exit number plaques on new projects and retrofits. Our first step in addressing that is to make sure all of the information provided to the local agencies and districts is appropriate, then we can address the actual implementation in the field.

Mr. Moeur: NCUTCD takes no official position on this particular agenda item and these comments are provided just for the information of Caltrans and the members of CTCDC. As of the 2000 rewrite of the MUTCD, it was broken up into the four different sections: standard, guidance, support, and option. Our Edit Committee focuses on ensuring language is consistent within each of these sections for the intended level of that information and avoiding including statements in guidance, support, and option that could be interpreted by practitioners or readers or litigators or others as creating a standard condition. "Is to be placed", "Are to be placed" are terms that have been an issue. At the national level there has been a concern that if you use those kinds of statements in an option or support statement, it could be interpreted as a standard. This opens the door for reinterpretation of other option and support statements. The National Committee tries to avoid that type of language and tries to be consistent using "shall" for standards. For guidance and options, we use "should" and "may". For support statements we use clarifying language, avoiding wording that creates a perception of a standard.

Marianne Kim, from the Auto Club: How common is it for states to deviate from the standard? What is the prevalence of these non-standard signage out there?

Mr. Moeur: A lot of states publish their own state supplements or manuals. The AASHTO Committee on Traffic Engineering has discussed that because typically the state DOTs take the lead on that. Each state has a relationship with their division office. Right now, every state is preparing for the final rule on the 11th Edition to come out. That starts the two-year window for adoption by each state. A lot of the chief traffic engineers in each state are looking at that regarding their standards and practices. The 2009 Edition, from FHWA Headquarters, clarifies that standards are standards. There is a little bit of flexibility in Revision 1, but as was stated in 23 CFR 655, a state typically cannot deviate from a standard on a programmatic



basis unless a state law that was adopted before 2007 overrules it. With state laws adopted after 2007, most state DOTs don't really want to make their legislatures unhappy. So they work through that and negotiate with their division offices. Some states have some latitude and flexibility, and some states stay pretty close to the National Manual.

Mr. Murai: We are currently creating a work plan to identify how many signs are in non-compliance and how we're going to handle the costs and implementation of converting these exit plaques.

Mr. Bhullar: Paragraph 27 on page 3 of 3 of this agenda item is an option that has been struck out. Instead of being an option with "may be used", it has been changed to a support statement using "is to be placed". That is what has been referred to?

Mr. Moeur: "Is to be used" and "are to be used" were used in several inserted options or support paragraphs. One of them was in 2E.31 replacing a guidance. The other one might be the one that you are referring to, but there were multiple instances.

Mr. Murai: Based on what Johnny and Steve have shared, because it is a standard, instead of changing it to "shall" it was going to be crossed out and deleted. We will include a standard statement of "shall", not under guidance but under standard.

Mr. Bhullar: Paragraph 27 is an option in the current Manual, but the proposal in this agenda item is to change it to say, "is to be placed". What is the take from FHWA if it were to be made a standard?

Mr. Pyburn: I looked at the context of the placement of the exit number sign in the whole chapter. I made some corrections that were related to this issue. What I wanted to avoid was a "must be placed" in a support or guidance statement because there is standard statement in 2E.31 that says "it has to be placed". A later section has a support statement that says "it is to be placed per an official ruling by Federal Highway". That was okay because it referenced an official ruling by Federal Highway. The standard statement uses "you shall", and the support statement uses "it is based on this official ruling". I thought that format was alright. I would be happy to continue to work with Caltrans to take the intent or the direction of the Committee and massage the language as the Committee suggests. We have our own standard of looking at things. So by taking the Committee suggestions and putting them through our filter, I am sure we can come up with some clarity.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall made a motion to approve the item subject to final revisions incorporating FHWA comments regarding the specific language being used in the revisions, seconded by Mr. Scharf. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

23-07: Construction Project Funding Identification Signs

Mr. Bhullar: This is an item that has been on our agenda in past meetings. Caltrans has been making changes and modifications in collaboration with the FHWA California Division Office.

Mr. Murai: With regards to the additional construction funding signs, there was a previous agenda item that approved the IJA funding. In addition to that, we had to modify and include additional construction funding signs for state funds and local funds. The C48A(CA) and 49C funding signs included the SB1 symbol, which was replaced with Rebuilding California. Both



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



construction funding signs are being modified to include the Rebuilding California logo. We are modifying the 50 series signs because Building a Better America was just replaced this week. We will be in the process of modifying just the logo itself for FHWA. Considering Caltrans projects with only local funding, we removed and modified 47A and included C51(CA) as a new funding sign that identifies the local agency as the main funding agency. Those are the signs being proposed to be accepted into the CA MUTCD as additional funding signs.

Mr. Bronkall: It seems that every few years we have to go through this exercise of revising the Caltrans funding signs as new funding sources come along. Has any thought been given about allowing Caltrans more blanket authority to just create the signs as necessary for the funding and not have to bring it back to the Committee each time a different funding source comes along?

Mr. Jones: Couldn't we just allow logos of the funding source to be put on and the standard of how the sign looks is where the logos are placed?

Mr. Bhullar: Caltrans wouldn't mind that, but we would be in violation of California Vehicle Code 21400. We have to consult with the local agencies and the public anytime we are making changes to traffic control device policies and signs. If we start with this then where do we stop?

Ms. Kim: When counties put up those signs on the highways referencing the sales tax money used to build those facilities, are those also included in this part of the Manual? Do they have to go through the Manual?

Mr. Bhullar: Those are considered construction funding signs and are supposed to be in the Manual. A lot of signs that are not even applicable to Caltrans are in the Manual. However, Caltrans does not have any enforcement authority. Our obligation is only to issue the Manual. If signs are brought to this Committee, then certainly we should entertain them and include them in the Manual. If agencies are using signs that are not in the Manual, even if they are construction funding or major signs, we do not have any jurisdiction to comment on those because we do not have enforcement authority on non-state highways.

Mr. Jones: I have been on this Committee for 12 years and I don't think any county has ever come to us for approval of any funding construction signs that are used in every county as a self-help county in California except for 3 out of the 48. That is where Caltrans may be the only one following the rule to the letter of the law. These are not really traffic control devices. These are informational funding construction signs saying your tax dollars are hard at work. Can we just put the logo on the sign, say if the logo can fit within an 18 inch by 18 inch area? Maybe we can work towards giving you guys a little bit more guidance, and then that also reduces the liability that the counties are not all coming to us with their funding signs.

Mr. Bhullar: We consult with the FHWA California Division Office, receiving their input and determining if those are traffic control devices. The results have not been that conclusive. So we can certainly look into that and report back to the Committee.

Mr. Jones: I would rather figure out a way to help the counties stay in compliance and not cause any unnecessary liability by determining that these informational signs are not traffic control devices.



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



Mr. Bhullar: This specific sign has been a politically sensitive topic, involving the White House, the FHWA, and Caltrans Director's Office. That is the reason we have had so many iterations.

Mr. Moeur: In the draft NPA version of the 11th Edition of the MUTCD, Section 2H.09 establishes an I2-5 Project Information Sign. When the 11th Edition becomes a final rule and is eventually adopted at the national level, there will be a standard design and a standard sign code at the national level for project information signs of this type. This will be in Chapter 2H, not in Part 6.

Mr. Pyburn: US DOT and the Secretary's Office in the White House have a vision for construction funding signs, and this (points to the agenda item on the screen) is not that vision. As Richard noted earlier, there is discussion and negotiation between the FHWA Division Office and Caltrans that brings us things like this agenda item. It was a long negotiation at management level that brought us to this sign. This is not in conformance with what we would see a construction funding sign looking like. Our direction in the current Manual, pending Revision 11, is that construction funding signs should be green general information signs. That is what allows counties to post those signs. There are some rules on pictographs that allow the pictographs and there are some rules on wording that allow the wording. So you could take a fairly liberal view and say, the counties having these signs can fit within the context. What allows us to support this sign (pointing at screen) is a Code of Federal Regulations that says, the division administrator, my boss, can approve changes to the California Manual if there is not an impact to safety. We do not think that there will be an impact to safety because you get one of these signs per direction, per construction, and they are way outside of the construction zone. We don't see an impact, and that is what allows us to support this sign. The policy revision that Johnny mentioned, is actually in the text. That is why we have to have a public hearing under state law. If it were just changing logos, we would not have a problem. Perhaps, going forward, changing of logos doesn't come to this. But we are changing the policy in the Manual standard statements and that is why we are here today. It is intriguing that 2H.09, the proposed in the 11th Edition, will establish these signs as traffic control devices. This takes them out of the discussion of not being traffic control devices and being able to treat them differently. Hopefully we can maintain the low impact of these signs. I appreciate the patience and the negotiation between the Governor's Office, Caltrans management, and my management that brought us here in supporting the sign.

Mr. Jones: So the new Edition is going to clarify that this is a traffic control device?

Mr. Pyburn: If it is added to the Manual under 2H.09, apparently it will. However, what was in the Draft Notice for Public Comment may or may not match what is in the final document. I have to give that disclaimer because things could change.

Mr. Bhullar: Thanks to Richard for letting us know that this will be coming in as a formal traffic control device. It will rest a longstanding question on that. Once the National MUTCD 11th Edition arrives, we will entertain and keep bringing these signs. Some of our internal challenges are that everyone wants their logo to be the largest and trying to determine the amount of logos you can have.

Mr. Bronkall: Is Caltrans willing to entertain losing the specification, in paragraph two of handout page four, of the five-inch minimum letter size and leaving that to the actual sign specifications?



Mr. Pyburn: This was a particularly difficult point of negotiations. There are some at the table who were steadfast that they wanted this banner. We said, okay, you can have two lines at the most. The first iteration of this had seven specific lines that you could use for project type. This language allows more flexibility. However, our concern is two lines. It is a very busy sign. The picture in the middle is going to attract most of the drivers' attention. The banner at the top and at the bottom are going to get little attention. If somebody wants to look at them, their eyes are going to be on the side of the road and not in front of them for longer than we think they should be. So two lines maximum. Now if you have a sentence that you can have seven-inch letters because of the length of the word, that is fine. Our key point is two lines maximum at the top. Increasing letter height increases visibility from a longer distance and decreases the perception time. That is fine, but two lines maximum is critical.

Mr. Bronkall: Signs should have the flexibility to be scaled based upon the speed of the roadway. It also allows for local agencies to utilize these signs when they can be scaled to a more appropriate size for local roads when the project funding meets that threshold where it is eligible for the signage.

Mr. Pyburn: I don't remember the wording for scaling for lower speed roads. This is a wide sign and is intended for a high-speed roadway. There was a lower speed version, but I believe there is scalability allowed in the Manual. There is some flexibility for lower speed roads. I see the point that on lower speed roads you don't need the five inches and the huge 96-inch sign. So I would be willing to work with Caltrans on verbiage for scalability.

Mr. Bhullar: I believe the Manual does include legibility criteria: one inch per how many feet of legibility distance. That should be controlling, so is there a need for the five-inch?

Chair Welday: I recommend to have another section that we could refer to, saying that the minimum height is per Section X of the Manual. That takes it out of specifying it in this location and allows it, like all other signs, to be scaled appropriately.

Mr. Jones: I like that option.

MOTION: Chair Welday made a motion to approve the item with the change that the five-inch minimum letter size be changed to refer to the appropriate section in the Manual for scaling, seconded by Mr. Jones. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

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

23-03: Legislation Information - Session Year 2023-2024

Janelle Halog, from Caltrans: This item is regarding the legislative information for Session Year 2023 to 2024. This is to make everyone aware of our running list of bills that could potentially affect the CA MUTCD at some point in the future. In Attachment A, you will see the list of bills. A version of this was shown in the previous CTCDC meeting in May. Since then, it has changed based on comments that we received from that meeting. The main change is just the addition of the explanation column which provides a brief description and gives you a better idea of what each bill is about. If it looks like we are missing a bill or you are aware of a bill that should be on this list, let Johnny Bhullar or me know so that it can be included moving forward. If any of these bills are of particular interest to you, there is a link on the first page of the agenda item where you can search the bill and look into it for more information.



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



Mr. Bhullar: We are looking into adding a column for current bill status because a lot of these new bills start at the beginning of the year. We update the list by identifying bills that relate to traffic control devices under the CA MUTCD. A current status column could be helpful because sometimes bills die through a legislative vote and when bills get chaptered they are going to have a life of their own. Chaptered in legislative terminology means that they have been voted through and approved by the legislature, and are waiting for the governor to sign. Caltrans, because of confidentiality rules, can share bill details and legislative status, but cannot provide any comments, stance, or recommendation on any of these bills. We have internal discussions and input that we provide to the governor. Since we represent the governor as state government, we cannot provide input on any of these bills in this meeting. We do want to highlight them so that agencies, traffic control device practitioners, vendors, manufacturers, and consultants are aware that these bills are affecting traffic control devices.

Ms. Kim: I think a status column would be really helpful. The scheduling for this Committee works out really well because in the first two meetings of the year we can get a glance. Right now a lot of the sessions are in recess. We should have a good idea of where a lot of these bills are. Many of these bills have fallen off or are already dead. When we meet again in November, we will know which ones have been chaptered and will be able to move forward. I would very much appreciate Caltrans' guidance on how this will impact the devices manual or the signage requirements that are going to be required.

Mr. Bhullar: Once bills get chaptered and signed by the governor, they will take effect by January 1 of this coming year. Then we can share in these meetings all the details about those bills' impact and our plans for implementation and incorporation into the Manual.

Mr. Bronkall: I would like to thank Caltrans for getting this together. This is something that I, along with Dave Fleisch, had started. It is a long ongoing process. The need for this became evident when we struggled with trying to figure out how to implement the legislature's will with the changes to the policies for adopting speed limits. Sometimes there is a disconnect between what the legislatures do and the reality of implementing it on the ground. The goal for this process was to be able to have a mechanism where the Committee, who is in charge of making things happen, has a way to inform the legislature about potential pitfalls of what they might be dabbling with as they are considering new legislation. The vision that was inspired for this is that the Committee would slowly be able to look at each of these items and determine, based upon the draft status of the legislature, if those are high-priority items that the Committee as a whole should be providing feedback to the legislature about potential issues and encourage the legislature to have further outreach to Caltrans, other local agencies, or the Committee itself to make legislation that will be good and effective. On the list right now, AB 645 is one that has been getting a lot of publicity. That is automated speed cameras. I imagine Highway Patrol is concerned about enforceability of those cameras. What sort of signage is needed for uniformity so that motorists know when they are going down a particular road that this camera is there and will be taking pictures of vehicles? I am hoping that this will allow the Committee to provide feedback to the legislature that there are things that need to be done and considered.

Mr. Bhullar: Our purpose here is to share ongoing legislation, to bring to everyone's attention the bills that are being put forth. We leave it up to agencies to work with the lawmaker's office. The issue came to the forefront with AB 43, which was regarding speed management. We found that even though it had been chaptered and became effective, we could not



implement it the way it was written. Then we had to involve CalSTA, which is our parent organization. Then there was a new bill the next year, AB 1938, that revised the previous bill. So it came to the forefront with AB 43 and AB 1938.

Chair Welday: While I am not sure that this Committee's position or purview is to necessarily take a position on a bill, (I believe that is for each of our agencies or organizations to do if they feel it is necessary) but the input is an important factor. This item could be an opportunity for Committee members to say, I've identified this particular bill and here are some technical things that we may want to consider providing as input to Caltrans and to the legislature. This forum provides that to help with the formation. The biggest problem we had with AB 43 was, it got fully baked and approved and then there were some things that we couldn't quite execute on because there were some things that had to be worked out. If we had the opportunity to have that discussion a little bit earlier in the process, it would have helped to streamline that process and get it out on the street faster for agencies that were interested in getting that out. I believe there is a balance there that can be struck, and this item provides the opportunity for that input.

Mr. Bhullar: Caltrans has its own Legislative Affairs, and we were fully dialed in with the authors and the lawmaker's office and were providing input throughout the entire process for AB 43. We had made them aware of the language as well as a lot of the issues with implementing this bill if it were to be chosen. However, for political reasons the lawmaker's office chose to act as they did. That is why we could not implement it. From Caltrans' perspective, we are engaged through our Legislative Affairs. It is not that we do not work with the authors. We work with the authors of the bills and try to provide our input and feedback in terms of whether the policy can be implemented. I would not want this Committee to undertake the collective effort to offer comments because we will not be able to participate in that aspect. We can certainly share or at least hear the comments, and through our own efforts work with the lawmaker's office. But we do not want to have this Committee take a formal position on any of the bills.

Chair Welday: I recognize that and please don't mistake my comments as questioning Caltrans' input. Part of the purpose of the Committee is for the local agencies to provide Caltrans with input. From my perspective, I think this is an opportunity to at least hear the input without taking a formal vote on it. This is kind of where I see that balance.

Mr. Bhullar: Yes, every agency also has the opportunity to directly provide input to the California Legislature.

Chair Welday: Any other comments on this item? (no comments were offered) We will go ahead and receive this item. There is no action or vote required on this item.

23-09: Caltrans Process in Adopting NMUTCD 11th Edition

Mr. Bhullar: This item is on the agenda so that the Committee members, agencies, and practitioners statewide that use the CA MUTCD for applications are made aware of this effort that we have been internally working on and that is headed our way. We have been having a lot of internal discussions with the CA MUTCD part owners and Caltrans is starting to plan. Once the feds issue the 11th Edition, the Committee will get really busy. There will be extensive work that we will be requiring from the Committee and agencies. We will be



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



seeking input from a lot of experts moving forward because of the huge effort that Richard has already alluded to.

Ms. Halog: Caltrans is waiting for the 11th Edition of the NMUTCD so that we can incorporate it into the CA MUTCD. Once it is released, Caltrans will be ramping up efforts to adopt it into the CA MUTCD within two years. We do have a process currently. On Attachment A, you will find a three-page document that outlines step-by-step what Caltrans is planning to do in order to successfully adopt the 11th Edition into the CA MUTCD. If you have any comments on anything, feel free to let Johnny Bhullar or me know so that we can address them. We ask that you in particular look at steps 14 through 19, as those are the steps that involve CTCDC engagement. Are there any questions, comments, or concerns?

Mr. Bronkall: Thank you for giving us a heads-up on the heavy load that will be before us in the near future. One of the things that the counties have been talking about is the California Manual taking the Federal Manual and adopting it for specific needs of California. As we are going through the process of having a new Manual, it is important that we review the California revisions to see if they are still valid and needed and try to make the California Manual conform more to the Federal Manual whenever possible. We can reevaluate our reasons for deviating and if those are still valid.

Mr. Bhullar: Once the feds issue the new Manual, typically it is going to be a thirty-day period before it becomes effective nationwide and we get two years to adopt it. This is a work-in-progress that has been extensively discussed at the national level through the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which has eight technical committees and over three hundred members. It has been extensively discussed and reviewed by AASHTO and a number of other organizations. The feds have shared with us their proposed changes and have held webinars. So a lot of information is available. Now we are waiting for the release of the Federal Manual. It does represent a huge change, involving a lot of new devices. I estimate a thirty percent change to the Manual. It will not be easy. As with the two previous adoptions of the MUTCD in California, we will be conducting multiple workshops and engaging practitioners and experts from local agencies, the public, consultants, vendors, and manufacturers. In these workshops we will review all the changes and seek input. There will be groups for different signs and markings. There will be separate groups, with some overlapping. Through that, we are going to formulate the version that California will be moving forward with. Also, whenever there is a big change, we change our CA MUTCD cover so you will get a totally new feel and look. Once the feds issue the revision, it is going to start a fixed timeline. There will be no flexibility that we have with that timeline. So we won't have that much time even though it appears like we have a lot of time. We will be conducting multiple efforts. Start identifying your bike/bike facilities and work zones experts because we will be asking this Committee to provide us with staff that are technical experts on work zones, markings, school areas, and grade crossings. Caltrans will be leading all the working groups. We will be seeking input and doing all the editing work to put the Manual together. We need the experience and knowledge of those experts who will be providing us with input. Then it will be brought back to the Committee for a formal vote, either on the separate parts if the Committee decides, and then on the entire Manual at the end. We will be issuing the Manual together, but will have the initial workshop process go through and develop the initial proposals. Then the proposals will come to this Committee for all those changes, and they will follow the agenda item process.

6d. Request for Word Message Signs Approval

23-08: “NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE” Sign

Mr. Bhullar: This is a word message sign. The FHWA has allowed flexibility for agencies to develop word message signs. In California there are restrictions with the Vehicle Code. The Committee typically does not experiment with word message signs. So with this word message sign, we just want to entertain the request as is.

Kathryn Kleinschmidt, from Caltrans: This agenda item is for inclusion of a new word message sign, “NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE”, into the CA MUTCD. There has been a lot of work with this, involving Caltrans District 5, the County of Monterey, and other stakeholders. Ms. Kleinschmidt presented the Background via a slide presentation. Illegal camping and sleeping in vehicles in highway right-of-way are perpetual issues in Monterey County, Caltrans District 5, and other locations in the state. This presents a traffic safety issue for road users and emergency responders. Many locations have narrow and constrained shoulders with a steep drop off so when these areas are occupied there is limited room for others. Tents and campfires are being set up close to the highway, resulting in unexpected pedestrian traffic entering the roadway. There is a maintenance issue with illegal dumping of trash and biohazard contaminants. Many discussions were conducted over the years on the preferred word message for the sign.

Randell Ishii, Director of Public Works, Facilities and Parks, for the County of Monterey: The Big Sur area was highlighted because of the large amount of visitors and limited resources (spotty cell phone coverage and sanitation issues). Thousands and thousands visit the area, but they are not good about hygiene and sanitation, and traffic safety (being too close to/in the traveled way) practices. Illegal fires have led to other public health and safety issues. This was such an issue, that the County of Monterey passed a local ordinance in 1986 to prohibit illegal camping along a forty-mile portion of State Route 1. Over time, our law enforcement partners have found it challenging to enforce the ordinance and prevent people from continuing this practice. In July 2022, the county passed an urgency ordinance that increased the fine to \$1,000.

Ms. Kleinschmidt: presented Data Collection from the Community Association of Big Sur 2021 Illegal Activities Data Collection Project. Identified hot spots for illegal camping along Hwy 1 in Big Sur. Identified 57 illegal campfires prior to Plaskett Fire. Illegal fires and illegal camping connected to the 2016 Soberanes Fire (\$250M, 1 dozer operator died, 59 homes lost) and 2021 Vista Point Fire. Erosion and vegetation destruction and trash near camp sites. Property destruction and trespassing on private property. Various “No Camping” signs are installed at several locations in Monterey County. There was a preference for "NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLES", and we would like a supplemental plaque with a fine amount per the ordinance underneath the sign.

Mr. Ishii: Since 1986 there have been various iterations of the sign placed along the State Route 1 corridor. There is a committee established by the County of Monterey called the Big Sur Byway Organization. They have a subcommittee that evaluates signs, and they there was a preference for "NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLES".

Ms. Kleinschmidt: There are other No Camping signs being used in Caltrans District 5, showing the need for this type of sign. Examples include on a Refugio State Beach County Road in Santa Barbara County and on Highway 1 near Elephant Seal Beach in San Luis Obispo County. The proposed addition to the CA MUTCD:

Section 2B.113(CA) NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE Sign (R111(CA))

Guidance:

01 *The NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE (R111(CA)) sign (see Figure 2B-106) may be used to inform the public that it is unlawful to camp or sleep in the vehicle along a state highway or local roadway where there is an adopted resolution or ordinance that supports the use.*

Option:

02 The NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE (R111(CA)) sign may have a supplemental plaque installed below the sign for the applicable fine amount per the adopted resolution or ordinance (e.g., \$1000 FINE).

Support:

03 Do not use the NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE (R111(CA)) sign when there is no adopted resolution or ordinance to support its use or enforcement of the sign.

It is more of a camping issue rather than a parking issue. Enforcement is based on the California Vehicle Code (CVC) sections 21100 and 21400, though the CVC doesn't currently address illegal camping. Enforcement on Highway 1 in Big Sur is currently being conducted by the CA State Parks. In your packet, there are letters of support from law enforcement agencies and supervisor Adams.

Mr. Ishii: The intention of the sign is not the same as a No Parking sign. The competing interest that is outside of vehicle code is the California Coastal Commission's jurisdiction as it applies to the Coastal Act. There are many locations where these signs are placed where illegal camping occurs. There are places outside of the California Coastal Commission's jurisdiction because they are outside of the coastal zone. A tenet, very specific and very heavily enforced in the Coastal Act, is access by the public to the beach areas. Camping is not the access issue. Parking prohibition would prevent people from accessing the coastline.

Ms. Kim: On the word message sign, since this is a public safety issue, was there any thought or consideration given to non-English speakers or illiterate motorists who might not be able to read it or understand what it says?

Mr. Ishii: The sign subcommittee considered graphical iterations of the signs. However, they did not convey the same message nor were they as uniform as having that word message. The word message was meant to be consistent with the procedures as laid out for adopting new signs.

Ms. Kim: But you can do a combination of both a tent with a cross over with the overnight message? Do you have any concerns that there might be people who will not be able to understand what is going on?

Ms. Kleinschmidt: If we propose a legend like a symbol, that has to go through an experimentation process. The locals have expressed a real need to have this addressed right away. We could possibly pursue another opportunity for a different sign later, but that would take another process if we did have a symbol on there. We would have to work with FHWA and do an experimentation process because there is no "NO CAMPING" sign in the MUTCD.

Ms. Kim: The change or addition in the language you have as an option to include the supplemental fine plaque. A \$1,000 fine is pretty substantial, and it looks like in some of the other examples the fine amount is in there. And right now, you have it in there as well. It seems like most counties would probably opt to put the fine in there. Why make it an option? Why not put, "should" or "must"?

Mr. Ishii: This is something that could be considered. We tried to provide versatility in the proposed policy language for how the supplemental plaque would work. But we also recognized that it was our county whose board decided to adopt an urgency ordinance for the \$1,000 fine as a civil penalty. For other entities and agencies, whether on the coastline or anywhere in this part of California or the central areas, it was meant to provide them with an optional supplement that they could add to the sign later on to help reinforce that message. That would be up to those jurisdictions.

Ms. Kim: Yes, the fine could be \$500 or \$100. The language here would just be that you have to put the fine amount so that they know what they are facing.

Ms. Kleinschmidt: That could be a consideration.

Lt. Brad Hopkins, CHP: We were mentioning the optional sign for the \$1,000 fine. With this sign, there is not a code for the state to make this universal to support it. There has to be an ordinance or resolution in place. So from county to county the language in that ordinance could be different. Would it be helpful to require that the ordinance is actually posted on that sign or supplemental sign? That way, the public sees the specific details. It would not be as vague as just saying, "NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE." They could then research the ordinance and get the specific details.

Ms. Kleinschmidt: Excellent point. That is a consideration that the ordinance could be added to the sign because we did notice some of the signs that I showed had an ordinance and some did not. I think we could look into something like that.

Mr. Ishii: Monterey County would certainly be open to that.

Lt. Hopkins: Being from county to county, that would make the difference. Another comment I had was ensuring that this language is in here to support this sign: do not use the R111(CA) sign when there is no adopted resolution or ordinance to support its use or enforcement of the sign. Without that language in there, these signs could end up being placed anywhere in the state without a way of enforcing them. We do not have a specific code for the state to support it. Typically, a lot of black and white regulatory signs are enforced by the Vehicle Code for when there is a driver of the vehicle. That is obviously not the case in this circumstance.

Ms. Kleinschmidt: Point taken Lieutenant Hopkins. I agree that we do not want these signs on our roadways unless there is a local resolution or an adopted resolution or ordinance to support its use, as well as the enforcement is key.

Mr. Zahriya: This is definitely a public safety issue. It is important for the sake of ability equity and serving unhoused communities and drivers alike, that as we look into placing new signs we also revisit and ensure legal and appropriate signs are available as well and our compliance still intact. For example, resting stops or legal camp sites being still available and intact.

Mr. Scharf: The presentation was very informative, and I was listening to see how you were going to frame this. It was nice to see that the focus is on traffic safety. It is reinforcing an underlying ordinance. So that was good to hear. In some of the pictorial examples you gave, it appears that some of this concern is off the roadway, outside of the road right-of-way. Would your county be using this sign to inform of prohibited camping outside of the roadway?

Mr. Ishii: The county does have other ordinances. One of those relates to unhoused facilities on private properties. That is a separate matter under different portions of county code. This one was specifically meant for the state facility/property within the state highway right-of-way, as well as maybe some other county roads. There are large turn-outs in some locations as well, which is where our law enforcement partners from either State Parks or U.S. Forest Service have noted the illegal camping occurs. Having these additional signs help reinforce the message that this state property, or if the side of the road is closer to USFS property, that it is not intended for illegal camping uses.

Ms. Kim: Following up with putting ordinance information on the signs, I think that is great so that people can follow up and know which ordinance they are violating. They might not have internet access in some of those locations to look up the ordinance, but I don't think having that ordinance on the signs negates the need to communicate the consequences of their overnight parking. A \$1,000 fine is pretty significant to many households. It is a pretty good deterrent. So no one should be surprised with that.

Chair Welday: The proposed wording on the sign is, "NO OVERNIGHT CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLES". There is a question about whether the ordinance and fine plaque should be requirements. My question has to do with the word, "OVERNIGHT". Is there a particular reason to include that? In glancing through the county's own ordinance, it does not seem to have a timeline. I just fear that the word "OVERNIGHT" might be difficult to enforce, because when does "OVERNIGHT" begin? I have installed timed parking signs in my career that we had to actually get to 11:59 p.m. because midnight was abstract. Is it necessary to have the word "OVERNIGHT" in there? If not, then should we remove that for the sake of simplicity and flexibility in the application of the sign?

Mr. Ishii: We do have members of law enforcement on Zoom who can probably speak to that better than us here. We certainly understand the point and the challenge that this imposes. In our county we also have some timed parking as well and have found that putting in an exact start time and end time is more effective than some descriptive wording.

Marcos Ortega, Captain with State Parks (phone call): I also serve on the Big Sur Byways Organization Subcommittee for Illegal Roadside Camping. Officer Jonathan Eridstrum from the United States Forest Service had to leave for another meeting, but he wanted me to relay that he voiced support for the adoption of these signs. The urgency ordinance that Monterey County did and also for moving forward for adopting these signs. There was a question regarding removing "OVERNIGHT". From someone who manages a staff of ten rangers who do most of the law enforcement, along with the Forest Service, CHP, and the Sheriff's

Department here, it would make it more easily enforceable. This is a huge issue. As a manager of parks in this area, we do cover about 60 miles of the coastline where this ordinance is enforced. The verbiage we employ on the existing sign is to make it easily usable for other counties that may be having similar issues. I have also worked in Santa Barbara County and recognize some of the same issues there as well. The placard that has the \$1,000 fine would be extremely valuable as approved. This was an already existing ordinance and fine that we were enforcing on Highway 1 along the Big Sur coast. Because the fine wasn't enough, we weren't getting enough adherence to it. With the adoption of this urgency ordinance and the addition of that placard, we have already seen that be extremely effective in trying to curtail some of the illegal activities along Highway 1.

Mr. Scharf: The presentation helped clarify some of my questions and concerns. My understanding on the word message sign is that it does not necessarily need to be included in the Manual. In a previous meeting we got into a discussion on the politics and placement of signs that could be politically controversial. I can see the potential that many local jurisdictions will solve other issues by the placement of these signs where traffic safety may not be the focus. I wish to express that concern and open up the door for the option that this Committee could approve this sign without including it in the Manual.

Mr. Bhullar: I disagree that the word message sign in the past meetings or otherwise does not need to be included in the Manual. In our initial adoption of the Manual back in 2004, in Section 2A.06 we struck out the language that local agencies can develop their own word message signs in support of the law (Vehicle Code) which was 21350, 21351 and 21400. Only the signs that are in the CA MUTCD or in the Department of Transportation Manual are considered to be official traffic control devices. Due to legal reasons, word message signs need to be included in the Manual. In the interest of overall uniformity, we want to standardize a sign rather than having 10 or 20 different versions of that sign causing confusion. A lot of the parking signs in the CA MUTCD that were added a few years back were through subcommittee consolidation efforts. The codes were not upholding many of the parking signs in the City of San Francisco because the signs were not as per the CA MUTCD. So for the word message sign to be official, it needs to be included in the CA MUTCD. Including a symbol in a new sign, even if it is an approved symbol or if mixing the symbol with words, requires FHWA approval. That FHWA approval is a very laborious and extensive process. That is the reason for sticking to a word message sign in this proposal.

Mr. Ishii: There was a comment earlier from Mr. Zahriya related to equity issues and other factors that need to be considered and that could come up in the course of the usage of these signs. As noted in the Draft Policy language and it was done by Monterey County, it was the adoption of an ordinance or an instrument by that local agency which effectuated the application of signs. When it comes to enforcing the code, there is the adoption of ordinances, resolutions and so forth on the legislative side. Then the enforceability matter is generally with the signs and law enforcement officers of various agencies out in the field. It is up to that local agency to have made those findings, address those issues, and have that discussion amongst the governing body of equity availability of housing and availability of the resources. It is up to that local agency to have made those findings of the constitutionality of adopting their ordinance first before they apply the sign. The sign in and of itself is a sign. It is up to that local entity to have made those findings, adopt it themselves, and have assumed everything that goes with adopting that ordinance or resolution on that local agency.



California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)



Mr. Bhullar: Jason I do support your comment regarding deleting “OVERNIGHT”. The CA MUTCD alludes to trying to have minimal wording on signs (see Chapter 2A). I have heard an unwritten rule of trying to keep wording on signs to five words or less. Having minimal wording makes it easier to comprehend a sign. So I support removing the word “OVERNIGHT”.

Mr. Bronkall: I would like to make a motion to approve the sign with a modification to the text in Section 2B.113 where the option would include the ability to put the time restriction in there, such as 10 p.m. to 5 a.m. So the motion would be to strike the “OVERNIGHT” as Johnny suggested and add a new option that would allow the hours that might be specified in an ordinance.

Chair Welday: If I understand your motion, it is to strike “OVERNIGHT”, but allow an option so that if the agency has a time limit on that they could add that onto the sign.

Mr. Bronkall: Correct. In some instances, it may be 24/7, and in other cases it could be certain hours.

Chair Welday: But as an option it is up to the agency to align it with their ordinance.

Mr. Bronkall: Correct.

Mr. Jones: I think the sign is so unique it almost needs to be two signs. “NO CAMPING” and “NO SLEEPING IN YOUR VEHICLE”. I am going to ask the CHP officer, how do you determine if somebody is sleeping in the vehicle? Are they snoring? Are their eyes closed? Is their car in park or in neutral? Are their keys in the ignition? For enforcement purposes this might be difficult.

Lt. Hopkins: I think every circumstance would be unique to where it would be what the observations are of whoever the law enforcement officer is at the time. Depending on the circumstance in which they see somebody. They may be in park idling and just kind of relaxing there. The discretion there where the officer would have to be able to support what they are observing. From my understanding, there may be cases like that where they have this code to enforce it but may utilize a verbal warning. I think you add that discretion to it. It is just like many other violations too. Such as if someone is doing something with their cell phone while they are driving, and they try to make an excuse for whatever it may be. It would be different in every circumstance.

Mr. Jones: I think if we were creating a California sign in the CA MUTCD, “NO CAMPING” seems like an appropriate sign to be on its own. And then if there were a sign, just like in downtown L.A. where they have 27 “NO PARKING” signs that say, on Monday here are your parking restrictions and you have to have an algorithm to figure out if you can park there. I think maybe there are two signs: one says, “NO CAMPING” and one that says, “NO SLEEPING IN YOUR VEHICLE BETWEEN [CERTAIN] HOURS”. I can see a lot of cities needing “NO CAMPING”, but maybe not to the same degree “NO SLEEPING IN THE VEHICLE”.

Ms. Kim: I see your point and also there is a whole drowsy-driving issue as well. A lot of people are just wanting to pull over without camping. Regarding the motion that is put forward, is there an opportunity to change the option of putting a supplemental sign with a plaque to just change the word from, “MAY” to “MUST”?



Chair Welday: At this point we have a motion on the floor. So we really are looking for a second. If there is no second, then we can go ahead and entertain an alternative motion or let the item go back for further discussion with staff. Do we have a second on Bob’s motion? (No second was voiced) Do we have an alternative motion? Otherwise, my recommendation would be that this gets sent back to staff for further discussion and re-presentation to the Committee.

Mr. Bhullar: CHP brought forward that the sign shall include an ordinance. I would like to put forth a motion to move forward with this sign as a single sign, “NO CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE”, adding language in there that requires an ordinance to be posted on the sign. Regarding the fine, my motion would be to include the fine as a “should” which is a guidance.

Mr. Jones: This only applies in a vehicle, right? So if they are sleeping or camping next to the vehicle, it doesn’t apply right?

Mr. Bhullar: Yes, in the vehicle.

MOTION: Mr. Bhullar made a motion to approve the item as a single sign with the verbiage “NO CAMPING OR SLEEPING IN VEHICLE” with the appropriate ordinance also posted on the sign, and guidance that a fine plaque should be placed. Seconded by Mr. Bronkall. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

6e. Request for Experimentation

16-25: Closure of Experiment on Through Lane Bicycle Boxes

Chair Welday: This item is an experiment that the City of South Pasadena entered into several years ago for through lane bike boxes and it is a request to close that experiment.

Mr. McNew: The City of South Pasadena requested this so they could experiment and evaluate the impact on traffic and how the bicycle boxes were used and what kinds of issues and problems came up. They installed the bike boxes, did an investigation, and analyzed observations of the traffic that was going through there. Their final report was inconclusive. They decided they wanted to go ahead and move forward and retain the bike boxes. We have an Interim Approval 18 that was approved by FHWA in October of 2016 for bike boxes in those types of situations. At this point the City is comfortable with closing this out, concluding the experiment, and retaining the bike boxes. The recommendation is to approve closure of this experiment.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall made a motion to approve closure of the City of South Pasadena bike boxes experiment, seconded by Mr. Bhullar. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Welday stated that the next meeting was scheduled for November 2, 2023. It will be a virtual meeting with no in-person location.

8. Adjourn

Chair Welday adjourned the meeting at 12:08 p.m.