

State of California

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
November 14, 2019

City Chambers
12363 Limonite Ave, Suite 900
Eastvale CA 91752

Committee Members in Attendance:

Robert Bronkall, Chair
Hamid Bahadori, Vice-Chair
David Fleisch
Lt. Rick Hatfield
Bryan Jones
Andrew Maximous
Tony Powers
Duper Tong

Alternate Committee Members:

Doug Bilse
Rock Miller
Zoubir Ouadah

Committee Staff:

Vijay Talada, CTCDC Executive Secretary
Christian Clarion, Transportation Engineer, Caltrans
Atifa Ferouz, Senior Transportation Engineer, Caltrans
Arshad Iqbal, Senior Transportation Engineer, Caltrans
Samira Zalekian, Transportation Engineer, Caltrans

Presenters:

Jessica Kuo, City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation
Chris Rider, City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation

Public Comment

Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration
Craig Rhodes, Traffic Management Inc.
Kevin Schumacher, California Public Utilities Commission

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Bronkall opened the meeting. The committee, staff, and audience introduced themselves.

2. Membership

MOTION: Committee Member Tong nominated Vice-Chair Bahadori as Chair and Andrew Maximous as Vice-Chair. Committee Member Fleisch seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes of the August 8, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Talada reported that the Minutes had been changed to reflect comments provided by the committee members on the Draft meeting minutes.

MOTION: Committee Member Maximous moved to approve the August 8, 2019 California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as reported. Vice-Chair Bahadori seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments

Zoubir Ouadah, San Diego Traffic Engineer and Alternate CTCDC Member, commented on two items. First, since Caltrans has adopted the 2018 standard plans with a six-inch rather than a four-inch lane line (as reflected in the MUTCD), the Committee may want to consider adopting the six-inch at a future meeting or to give the option to the agencies. Second, the Figure 9C-104 (CA) regarding the buffered bike lane needed a correction.

5. Items under Experimentation

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

Consent Items (minor discussion with vote expected)

19-07: Legislative change by AB 634 and the proposed changes to the CA MUTCD

Committee Member Tong introduced the item, which required Caltrans to look into additional criteria for memorial signs in roundabout locations.

Mr. Iqbal stated that AB 634 has added Section 101.15 to the Streets and Highways Code. It requires that roundabouts be added as a type of facility that may be used for memorial or dedication signing. As such, language is proposed to be added to Section 2M.10 of the CA MUTCD.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Committee Member Fleisch asked about why the verbiage specified having signs placed at each entrance of the roundabout. He suggested specifying a minimum of two signs or something similar.

Committee Member Maximous commented that on the sample sign in the handout, the correct font was not used. Mr. Iqbal responded that once approved, the sign coordinator would use the proper software to develop the signs.

Alternate Committee Member Miller commented that there are already many signs required in approaches to roundabouts. He suggested providing more guidance for placement of the memorial and dedication signs. Mr. Iqbal responded that the sign coordinator would go to the job site and ensure that the new signs do not conflict with the existing signs.

Alternate Committee Member Miller asked if the State would be responsible for posting signs on all the approaches. How would this apply if the State did not have an ownership role in the roundabout, but it was declared a memorial? Mr. Iqbal answered that this guidance is for the state highway facility and would be done by the state department. If someone wants to do it on their own, it would be done through an encroachment permit.

Chair Bronkall asked if there would be a benefit to providing additional guidance that perhaps the sign should be listed below the advisory sign of the roundabout. Mr. Iqbal answered that they could look into it.

Public Comment

Mr. Ouadah commented that local agencies need more guidance on how many signs to place and where to place them. Vice-Chair Bahadori responded that this section applies only to Caltrans and the state highways. Cities and counties can place whatever sign memorials they wish on their facilities.

Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), stated that they fully support installation of roundabouts, but have raised a concern with Caltrans regarding approaches of high-speed rural roundabouts. There are number of things Caltrans can do to improve the visibility of those roundabouts on the high-speed approaches. Adding a memorial sign could dilute the warning signs on the approaches. Careful placement of the memorial signs is appropriate. Placing the memorial sign on the post of the guide sign may distract the drivers from looking at the destination.

Committee Comments and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bahadori suggested adding a guidance to caution that placement shall not interfere with appropriate visibility of other traffic control devices in the roundabout area. Committee member Maximous stated that such language was included in Section 2M.10 where it has been mentioned that memorial or dedication signs shall not interfere with the placement of any other necessary signing.

Chair Bronkall commented that when local agencies get a request to name a local roundabout, they look for some standard in the MUTCD and apply it in signing their roundabout. Having more specifics about placement is a benefit.

Committee Member Fleisch suggested thinking about this differently from a bridge or freeway, and more like a vista point. The memorial signs could be placed in the center of the roundabout, one facing each direction, so they are not interfering with the traffic signs. Mr. Iqbal stated that this might present a safety hazard when people cross the street to the center of the island to take pictures.

Committee Member Powers commented that given the safety concerns associated with placement of these signs and local agencies seeking to follow the standards, he would be in favor of providing the guidance. Chair Bronkall asked if there is a generic position that

should be looked at first before placing the sign elsewhere. Mr. Iqbal responded that it depends on the site condition – each location is unique.

Committee Member Tong said that the idea is to have the sign in the approach to the roundabout. Feedback from the District is not to put the sign in the middle to prevent people from walking there. The area in mind is the right side before getting into the circle of the roundabout.

MOTION: Committee Member Tong moved to approve the language, unless the members want to discuss the number of signs, and possibly to restrict this to state highways only. Vice-Chair Bahadori seconded.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Chair Bronkall suggested that Caltrans add guidance language to make the sign locations uniform, so that state and local agencies can standardize their guidance. Committee Member Tong and Vice-Chair Bahadori agreed.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

19-09: Bicycles travelling straight from Exclusive Turn Lanes

Committee Member Tong explained that this was a recent change of legislation to allow bicycles in the right-hand and left-hand turn lanes to go straight. Language in Part 9 would be changed.

Mr. Talada stated that AB 1266 was approved by the Governor in September 2019. The amendment allows bicycles to go straight through intersections from left turn only lanes or right turn only lanes. The law indicates that the Department of Transportation shall develop standards for pavement markings and regulatory signs. Mr. Talada continued that Section 9C.07 has been revised. He explained the proposed text changes, figures, and support statement.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Committee Member Fleisch asked if, once the bicycles get through the intersection, would it be advisable to add sharrow markings to guide them? Chair Bronkall agreed. Committee Member Jones commented that you have the option to put sharrows through the intersection; there are other places in the MUTCD where those tools are already available.

Vice-Chair Bahadori stated that AB 1266 had been unnecessary; the Vehicle Code already allows it and turn movements at intersections are within jurisdictions of locals. He reviewed the interactions during the development of AB 1266. He expressed concern that all practitioners are wise enough to take adequate precautions in terms of lane widths. Mr. Talada referred to the shared lane markings text in the Lateral Positioning section.

For the signage in the two new figures, Vice-Chair Bahadori recommended the word “EXEMPT” rather than “EXCEPT” in this case.

Committee Member Powers felt that “EXCEPT” would be much more easily understood by the public. He mentioned that NACTO provides an option for a dashed line on the right side of the bike lane within the lane. Was that considered as an option? Mr. Talada answered that they had considered it and looked up the FHWA guidance as well. Striping a bike lane within

the right turn pocket might have some legal and safety issues. It was his understanding that when a lane has a dashed line with a bike symbol, it becomes a bicycle line.

Committee Member Maximous referred to markings through an intersection and offsets. In Santa Monica, the typical case is when bike lanes exist on the street on both sides of the intersection, and the bike lane must be dropped before the intersection. That is when sharrows are used as in the figures. He suggested a minimum offset number of feet on the other side for the markings. Mr. Talada agreed to modify the figure to indicate more shared lane markings within the intersection to delineate the bicycle line of travel. He believed there was other policy language within this section where has already been addressed. The maximum spacing for shared lane markings is 250 feet, but the shaded lane markings can be placed more frequently based on site conditions.

Public Comment

Alternate Committee Member Miller commented that the national committee has adopted a sign. If the sign is consistent with the national committee's recommended sign that is expected in the next MUTCD, the committee should adopt the recommended sign. This is probably going to be most important at signals. It is going to be more important to have the bicycle to the left than in the interference with the wheel track. He did not like the wheel track issue to always obviate proper design. He requested that the figure shows a limit line or crosswalk with the sharrow to the left, even if it is within the wheel track. Probably the most common figure would show a bike lane on the far side, which would eliminate a lot of questions on how to handle it.

Alternate Committee Member Doug Bilse asked about putting a sharrow in the middle of the lane instead of overlapping it. He also suggested that when going from a bike lane to the sharrow to the left of the lane, you might want to clarify where green paint would be put in. Mr. Talada responded that at this time they could not have any figures indicating green paint because it is still under interim approval. He also explained that there are many cases where bicycle travel cannot be facilitated from the right turn only lane; the agency should look at the site specific conditions such as signal phasing, and make the determination on a case by case basis. Overlapping phasing would not work when you have left turn phasing overlap with the protected right turn and in other cases as well. We leave it up to the agencies to determine when to allow the bicyclists to go straight from the right turn or left turn only pocket. Mr. Bilse suggested including guidance. Mr. Talada responded that they had considered that, but there are many exceptions.

Mr. Ouadah suggested having the option of putting in sharrows in the leading approach. For the question of the offset itself, he warned the committee that geometric design is outside the domain of traffic control devices.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bahadori noted that if there is another sign within the next round of MUTCD updates, we will have to throw this one out. Maybe it is better to go with what national has already approved. Alternate Committee Member Miller suggested that if the national sign that is pending is different from the sign being recommended, we should consider modifying it.

Vice-Chair Bahadori asked if there is an urgency to this item. Alternate Committee Member Miller stated that there are white and yellow national versions of the sign that say “EXCEPT” with the bicycle symbol underneath. If the CTCDC goes with this sign, they are 80% likely to be consistent with the next national manual. Vice-Chair Bahadori withdrew his earlier suggestion regarding the word “EXEMPT.”

MOTION: Committee Member Tong moved to approve the agenda item with the figures modified as discussed. Committee Member Fleisch seconded.

Chair Bronkall requested Caltrans to consider using the word “optional” when showing the additional sharrows through the intersection to make clear that it is not standard,

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

Committee Member Jones, the meeting’s host, spoke about the new, fast-growing city of Eastvale. They are preparing to build a downtown area on 160 acres. They are home to the largest Amazon fulfillment center which is state of the art, and they are also home to a Delta Electronics warehouse and customer service facility. A number of large infrastructure projects are underway. All the neighborhoods are represented in a Neighborhood Watch.

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

19-10: NTSB report recommendations and the proposed changes to the CA MUTCD

Committee Member Tong explained that the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) was looking to add guidance language.

Ms. Ferouz explained that the NTSB had published a report in response to a fatal collision that happened in San Jose at the interchange of US Highway 101 and State Route 85.

NTSB submitted recommendations proposing changes to the CA MUTCD language for exit gores. Ms. Ferouz referred to the changes proposed to the CA MUTCD in Section 3B.05, Section 3B.24, and Figure 3B-8 (CA), which require adding chevrons at gore areas of all entrance and exit ramps.

Public Comment

Mr. Ouadah suggested that because the study focused on the exit gores, to take the exit gores and make that a guidance statement as recommended by the NTSB, leaving the entrance gores as optional.

Mr. Pyburn stated that the FHWA had been requested by the NTSB to work with Caltrans on this issue. He asked that the crosshatch be mandatory at the gore areas. The FHWA and NTSB are silent on the entry gore areas. He added that if the white line is on white concrete, the adjacent black line should be shown on the standard plans.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bahadori asked the reason for including the entrance areas as well, since NTSB has not requested it. Committee Member Tong answered that Caltrans was going to do both entrances and exits, so they proposed the same for statewide.

Vice-Chair Bahadori suggested making it mandatory as a standard for the exit ramp gore areas. Committee Member Tong responded that it was open for discussion; for Caltrans it will be a standard.

Ms. Ferouz clarified that for the CA MUTCD, the standard would be for the exit ramps and the guidance would be for the entry ramps; for Caltrans, it will be a standard for both entrance and exit ramps. Committee Member Fleisch felt that these are two different issues and that entries should be an option or guidance.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bahadori moved to make the exit ramp gore areas mandatory with the chevron, and for the entrance ramp gore areas, an option. Committee Member Fleisch seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

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

19-06: Proposed Change to Section 2B.13

Committee Member Tong introduced the item. When speed limits change in either a state highway or a local jurisdiction, the two agencies need to communicate the change to each other.

Mr. Talada gave the details of the final language. (The item had been discussed in a previous meeting.) The posted speed limit affects the signal operations; any time there is a change in the posted speed limit, signal timing may need to be changed to reflect the new speeds. Sometimes the agency establishing the speed limit is different from the agency maintaining the signals. New language is being proposed to Section 2B.13 of the CA MUTCD to require that the agency changing the speed limit within its jurisdiction shall report the speed limit change to the agency operating and maintaining traffic signals within the speed zone.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bahadori stated that this is a critical issue, particularly when it comes to freeway interchanges; Caltrans maintains the signals at many of those locations, but the cities or counties operate and maintain the street. He recommended inserting a timeline for the notification, as with any reporting requirement. He suggested no later than 30 days before the posting of the new speed limit.

MOTION: Committee Member Fleisch moved to accept the item with the addition of Vice-Chair Bahadori's suggestion for the timeline. Committee Member Tong seconded.

Committee Discussion on the Motion

Committee Member Powers questioned whether 30 days was enough time, particularly if loops are being moved. Mr. Talada responded that in most cases the loops will not need to be changed. If they do, more than 30 days' notice may be needed.

Mr. Ouadah asked for specifics on the 30 days. Vice-Chair Bahadori explained that typically you go through two readings with the City Council; after that it takes 30-45 days to put through and complete the work order. That time would be afforded to the other agency to note that the change is coming so they can get ready.

Chair Bronkall commented that the proposal would help to foster agency-to-agency communication to make the changes seamless.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

18-11: Yellow time subcommittee

Vice-Chair Bahadori stated that within the past two years a subcommittee had been looking at changing the minimum yellow timing requirement for exclusive turn lanes at intersections. They found that no one is really using the three-second minimum for left-turn lanes in California – they are using values beyond three seconds. Vice-Chair Bahadori stressed that it will only be successful if Caltrans supports the idea of changing the values in the CA MUTCD Table 4D-102 for the minimum yellow on left turn; without that the Caltrans Director is not going to approve the change. At this time the Caltrans technical people do not feel comfortable supporting the change to the CA MUTCD; they would prefer that each agency handle it on their own.

Vice-Chair Bahadori recommended de-activating the subcommittee; maybe we can return to the subject in the future. He thanked Mr. Talada for his help facilitating the subcommittee.

Committee Member Powers asked if consideration was given to bicyclists in the left turn yellow timing. Vice-Chair Bahadori answered that the issue had been more focused on long left-turn pockets with double or even triple lanes; vehicles approach the signal at the prevailing speed. Three seconds are adequate for a speed of 25 MPH but not in locations such as these.

Vice-Chair Bahadori recognized Mr. Ouadah’s valuable contributions to the subcommittee discussions.

MOTION: Committee Member Fleisch moved to deactivate the subcommittee. Committee Member Tong seconded.

Chair Bronkall thanked the subcommittee for the hours of time they had devoted to the attempt to achieve a standard. As red-light cameras become more prevalent and the Legislature starts to want to drive mandates, perhaps the issue will be reignited.

Committee Member Tong acknowledged Vice-Chair Bahadori for working tirelessly and patiently with Caltrans staff.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

Request for Experimentation

19-11: Red colored transit-only lanes

Committee Member Maximous introduced the item. The city of Los Angeles has a current network of about 18 miles of transit-only lanes. The network is proposed to keep expanding and growing. Staff from the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) were present to discuss adding red paint to two of those locations.

Chris Rider and Jessica Kuo of LADOT presented the Request for Experimentation. Mr. Rider stated that as with many transit-only lanes, there have been issues with compliance. In the interest of self-enforcing actions – making the lanes more visible to drivers – adding the red color has been shown in other cities to improve compliance, reduce illegal driving, reduce illegal parking in the lanes, and reduce transit time in those lanes. The primary user of the two experimental locations (Figueroa and Wilshire) is the Los Angeles County Metro Transportation Authority (LA Metro). As part of the evaluation, the LADOT will be working

with them to get the transit times before and after installation. LADOT will be presenting reports to CTCDC semi-annually under this experiment.

LADOT is not settled on the material yet; they are looking at locations that include both asphalt and concrete. They are looking at “MMA” material and a thermoplastic-based material. There is no guidance in the MUTCD specifically for a red color on lanes, which is partially why that color has been chosen so far in other experiments.

LADOT is looking at painting the entrance area at each block as well as some conflict zones – a shared right turn that traffic is allowed to use for the turn.

For the evaluation LADOT plans to collect before-and-after data on violations, working with the LAPD as well as volunteers or other staff to do counts of violations separate from the enforcement agency. For bus vehicle travel times they will get data from LA Metro. They may also look at other regional partners who use these lanes.

Provided that permission for the experiment is granted in December, they plan to begin procurement in January, do installation in March, obtain “after” data collection in June, and in August submit a report to CTCDC and FHWA.

Mr. Rider gave details of the two locations.

LADOT will be the sponsoring agency and may use consultant services as needed.

Ms. Kuo stated that red bus lanes have been a tried and true global approach to bus rapid transit, used effectively in New York and San Francisco.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bahadori asked why they do not want to follow the San Francisco model. Mr. Rider answered that the primary reason was the cost component and the secondary was that it will be useful to gather data to see if this other approach can obtain similar results to what San Francisco did. They want to provide more data, as this is a potential treatment to be added to the MUTCD in the future. Ms. Kuo added that the bulk of LA bus lanes are concrete – in San Francisco the majority are asphalt. New York City does not paint concrete roads red because they have never gotten it to stick. LADOT can innovate and experiment with the bus paths to see what actually sticks.

Ms. Kuo stated that there is no mix of red and green lanes on Figueroa. Even though bikes can go into the bus lane, they are separate. The more north you travel, the more bus-boarding islands there are separating the bus lane and the protected bike lane.

Vice-Chair Bahadori cautioned that CTCDC still receives emails of complaint from businesses in San Francisco, although CTCDC is only in charge of improving the technical part.

Committee Member Fleisch agreed with the need for outreach to the business owners. Using stripes at the entrance to businesses is a good idea to try – there will be less pushback from the businesses.

Ms. Kuo confirmed that LADOT is very cognizant of the need for outreach, and that they will use dashes in front of driveways to ensure that drivers will go through.

Mr. Talada requested that LADOT let CTCDC and FHWA know if they plan to expand the scope of the experiment to other streets.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn gave the reminder that all experiments have to be approved by FHWA. He stated that a key issue about the San Francisco complaint is the quality of the “before” data. He recommended to make sure to have very good performance metrics and a very good process for collecting the data.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Chair Bronkall mentioned the driveways to private parking lots with respect to data collection. He recommended finding good ways to see how people maneuver them in the current condition, and observing the post-condition – possibly video surveillance.

Committee Member Maximous commented that this more minimalist approach to the red markings for bus lanes was a good addition to the growing list of variations. It will be interesting to see the results of allowing on-street parking in the off-peak hours in the West LA location. He noted that the full red tended to be confusing in other experiments.

Chair Bronkall commented that another consideration for data collection could be what is going on with on-street vehicle parking in the existing condition.

MOTION: Committee Member Maximous moved to approve the Request for Experimentation as outlined in the presentation. Committee Member Fleisch seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion Items

19-12: Electric Bicycles on Class I Bikeways

Committee Member Tong introduced the item which concerned Class 1, 2, and 3 electric bikes, which have been becoming popular. At this point the CTCDC should have a discussion on using Class 2 and 3 electric bicycles on Class 1 bikeways.

Mr. Talada explained the different classes in detail per the CVC. Class 1 and 2 electric bikes are allowed on Class 1 bikeways and Class 3 electric bikes are not. There may be ordinances prohibiting the operation of any class of Electric bike on Class I bikeways. Section 9B.08 has a policy on the type of road users not allowed on the bike paths, but there is no provision for indicating that only Class 3 electric bikes are prohibited.

A couple of local agencies have contacted Caltrans districts about the need for signage to indicate that Class 1 and 2 electric bikes are allowed, while Class 3 electric bikes are not. The local agencies have also requested the flexibility to modify the sign to indicate that there is an ordinance allowing Class 3 electric bikes.

At this meeting Mr. Talada requested to know if the local agencies have received any such requests in their jurisdictions, and to discuss signage at trailheads.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Committee Member Powers asked if “motorized bicycle” is defined in the CVC. Mr. Talada answered that it has a very specific meaning that does not include e-bikes.

Committee Member Maximous commented that in Santa Monica they are at ground zero in terms of scooters and shared e-bikes. It would help to look into some kind of signage to post.

Committee Member Tong asked regarding enforcement: if this committee were to create some signage, how would the enforcement agency enforce the different classes? Committee Member Hatfield answered that CHP has a definition for small pocket bikes. Enforcement for the three classes of electric bikes when properly defined should not be an issue, especially with outreach to the public.

Committee Member Maximous noted that the speed limit of the device is listed in the CVC. Incorporating that can also be effective.

Mr. Talada noted another issue: Class 3 electric bicycles have a top speed of 28 MPH. If they are going below 20 MPH, should they be allowed on the Class 1 bikeway?

Committee Member Jones noted that the same thing happens on our freeways – there are cars that can perform beyond the speed limit on the freeway, but we do not prohibit them. He cautioned about over-regulating or having a “one size fits all.” There are different needs on the trails and the local agency should decide what is appropriate. He noted that electric bike owners may not know the class of their bike. Another challenge is that a human-powered bike can go faster than 28 MPH depending on the human engine.

Committee Member Hatfield cautioned against omitting the operator element by defining a bike to a certain class.

Vice-Chair Bahadori pointed out that if the owner does not know the class of the electric bicycle, what is the point of classifying the equipment in the CVC? Maybe we should go with speed instead for the posting. Committee Member Jones agreed – many of the electric bikes have a display that tells you how fast you are going.

Mr. Talada pointed out that electric bicycles manufactured after January 1, 2017 have a permanent label affixed that shows the classification number, top assisted speed, and motor wattage.

Vice-Chair Bahadori asked if people are actually complying with the law regarding the classes.

Committee Member Jones noted another challenge: the rental bike programs are starting to use more electric, and the renters may not be checking the class of the electric bike.

Chair Bronkall commented that we seem to be looking for a solution to a problem that does not really exist. An operator of a Class 1 trail can simply designate whether motorized bicycles are going to be allowed, and if so, the maximum speed. That would probably provide enough guidance for safe operation on the Class 1 trail.

Committee Member Tong summarized that at this time the committee’s feedback is not to recommend electric bicycle class signage.

19-13: Target Compliance Dates

Committee Member Tong brought some target compliance dates to the committee’s attention. They are listed in the CA MUTCD as established by the FHWA. There are three items: the curve warning sign, the ONE WAY sign, and the grade crossing sign.

- With the curve warning sign, Caltrans is taking a proactive approach. They are doing data collection now and will then assess the situation and make sure they comply with all the curve warning signs.
- The local jurisdictions are more impacted than the highways by the ONE WAY signs. They have identified no more than 50 locations statewide.
- For the grade crossing sign, there are not a lot of locations on the state highways that are uncontrolled (meaning that there is no gate). Most railroad crossings will not need a change in signage.

Mr. Pyburn spoke about the compliance dates and the expectations. He noted that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has reminded FHWA that the reflective posts on the crossbucks are required.

He also noted that a number of compliance dates have come and gone, and Caltrans has a retrofit program.

Regarding the horizontal alignment warning signs, Vice-Chair Bahadori requested a report on how many locations statewide needed to have the signs changed and what the changes were. There is some concern that people are ignoring the curve warning signs because the warning speeds are far too low. Committee Member Tong reported that Caltrans will do the needs assessment for the state highways. Some district work has been done; the goal is completion by the end of June for all state highways. They will then know how many locations need to change and how many curves are impacted. Vice-Chair Bahadori suggested doing some PR work as the time gets closer to observe the posted speeds, which will be more realistic.

Public Comment

Mr. Ouadah commented regarding the horizontal alignment: about four years ago the National Committee approved the research done by TTI to change the methodology on how to sign horizontal curves. This may be coming in the new national MUTCD.

Alternate Committee Member Miller spoke regarding the last agenda item. There is a need for a bike sign making it clear that you can ride e-bikes on bikeways. Regarding the present agenda item: the current guidance tends to require more signs for the same curves than the old guidance. The problem is that many agencies have not looked at the current guidance. He recommended agencies to wait for the next MUTCD because fewer signs may be required.

Alternate Committee Member Bilse pointed out that sometimes if you have a motorized bike, you are not in a position to go to an alternative safely – you can just ride your Class 1, 2, or 3 bike without activating the power. He agreed that posting the speed limit is much preferred over posting the kind of bike you are using.

Craig Rhodes, Traffic Management Inc., commented that at one time Caltrans considered Class 1 bikeways to be designed for a 25 MPH speed limit. This would be another reason to use speed limit posting.

Kevin Schumacher, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), Rail Crossings Group, commented that CPUC is working with the railroads and local agencies regarding the last two items on the list regarding the crossbuck sign and the reflective strip, to coordinate the compliance dates. There are roughly 1,000 crossings that need some sort of upgrade.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Bronkall stated that the next meeting will be February 6, 2020 in Northern California. Mr. Talada reported that they are trying to get the City of Sacramento to host.

8. Adjourn

Chair Bronkall adjourned the meeting at 12:26 p.m.