

State of California

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

August 12, 2021 Meeting

Minutes of Meeting
Conducted via Webex



Committee Members in Attendance:

David Fleisch, Chair
Robert Bronkall, Vice-Chair
Lt. Noah Hawkins
Bryan Jones
Xavier Maltese
Mike Sallaberry

Alternate Members in Attendance:

Faridun Javed
Virendra Patel
Rock Miller
Zoubir Ouadah
Tony Powers

Committee Staff:

Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans CTCDC Secretary
Hasib Mohabbat, Caltrans Safety Programs Transportation Engineer

Presenters:

Sarju Patel, Caltrans Safety Programs Traffic Signs Manager
Joe Rouse, Caltrans Traffic Operations Managed Lanes Program Manager
Russ Wenham, Caltrans Safety Programs Pavement Delineation and Traffic Control Manager
Jessica Downing, Caltrans Safety Programs Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Manager
Ananth Prasad, Principal Civil Engineer, Santa Clara County Roads & Airports Department

Public Speakers:

Timothy Bilash, MD
Andrew Malizia, Stanislaus County Public Works
Steve Pyburn, FHWA MUTCD Liaison for California

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Mr. Bhullar reported that a quorum was present.

Chair Fleisch opened the meeting, held via Webex, at 9:05 a.m. The committee, staff, and audience introduced themselves.

2. Membership

Chair Fleisch stated that the CTCDC had a member vacancy for representation of the League of Cities from the Southern California region. There were Alternate Member vacancies to be filled as well. Mr. Bhullar stated that every member should have an Alternate Member in place.

3. Approval of Minutes of the May 13, 2021 Meeting

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the May 13, 2021 California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as reported. Mr. Sallaberry seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

5. Updates on Items under Experimentation

Chair Fleisch stated that there was a list of about 14 open items that went back as far as 2016. Over the last three months, Mr. Bhullar and Mr. Mohabbat had done outreach to the agencies involved, in an attempt to establish their status and get final reports.

Mr. Mohabbat displayed a list of the items which specified those of unknown status. Chair Fleisch noted that CTCDC may not have the names of current contacts. He requested the sponsors of the items assist Mr. Bhullar and Mr. Mohabbat in reaching out to the agencies in the attempt to establish whether the items were completed and closed out.

Mr. Sallaberry stated that he had contacted the city of Princeton, and would also reach out to Pasadena.

Chair Fleisch pointed out that two of the items had consultants rather than agencies listed as the responsible agency. Moving forward, agencies should be assigned responsibility rather than consultants.

Vice Chair Bronkall suggested taking an action directing Caltrans, along with the sponsor or successor sponsor, to move towards getting status reports for all the open experiments in order to bring them to a conclusion. Chair Fleisch accepted this as friendly guidance and stated that the direction would be for staff to come back to the next meeting with a status report and recommendations. Mr. Bhullar accepted. The CTCDC will then decide as to the final outcome of those experiments.

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

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

21-06: Proposed 6-inch width lane markings with optional minimum 4 inch on local streets/roads

Mr. Bhullar introduced Russ Wenham, the new Caltrans engineer who has responsibility for pavement markings and Part 3 of the CA MUTCD. Mr. Wenham then turned the item over to Mr. Bhullar who displayed the Caltrans memo that had introduced the discussion on pavement marking widths.

Mr. Bhullar stated that in 2003, a task force had looked at research from 1995 that indicated that wider lane markings are beneficial, especially for older drivers. In 2017, Caltrans adopted 6-inch lane markings on May 19, 2017 for all longitudinal lanelines, edgelines, and centerlines, for state highways with the optional 4-inch markings allowed for local roads that intersect a mainline highway. Mr. Bhullar's request was to have this subject discussed again and to receive comments from the CTCDC and public.

Mr. Bhullar shared details to support the discussion and noted that the CA MUTCD contains no direction related to 6-inch lanelines, edgelines and centerlines. It is undesirable for Caltrans to have traffic control device policies that are not in the CA MUTCD. but are in internal memos or standard plans, it creates problems within Caltrans and with the federal guidance.

Mr. Bhullar requested that as a minimum, Caltrans should have a one-line reference in the manual indicating, to Caltrans engineers as well as consultants using the CA MUTCD, the standard plan requirements for 6-inch lanelines, edgelines and centerlines on the state highway system.

Mr. Bhullar also stated that to the road users of California, it does not really matter whether they are on Caltrans roadways, county roadways, or city streets – they should encounter the same devices and the same expectations for how to respond. It is up to this committee to make this applicable to all roadways.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Sallaberry said that he was disinclined to approve mandatory use of the 6-inch line for all jurisdictions. Was there data that could be shared regarding the efficacy of a wider stripe? Mr. Bhullar answered that staff could present the data from the report cited in the memo as well as additional data.

Lt. Hawkins asked where the reduced space from the increased lane marking width would be pulled from – the traffic lane, the shoulder? Mr. Bhullar answered that it is pulled from within that lane, indicating the 12-foot lane width on the plans. Chair Fleisch noted that many rural roads are not that wide.

Vice-Chair Bronkall commented that in Humboldt County, they have a significant number of lane miles where the paved roadway is too narrow to allow painting a center line stripe. Vice-Chair Bronkall stated that as the center line striping gets wider, it will increase the lane miles that do not have a center line stripe at all – making them one-lane roads with two-way traffic.

Vice-Chair Bronkall then commented regarding the need for the wider lines: at the CEAC conference years ago, the autonomous vehicle industry showed that the cameras and sensors in vehicles like a wider lane line for the computers to be able to pick up.

Vice-Chair Bronkall stated that he supported the inclusion of 6-inch lane lines as guidance for Caltrans to mandate on their highways, while remaining optional for local agencies to implement.

Chair Fleisch stated that in Ventura County, the vast majority of the lane miles are not Caltrans-controlled. He had no problem with having separate requirements for local agencies and Caltrans; because in his opinion state highways have very different needs and requirements from rural roads. Chair Fleisch stated that in residential or lower-speed roads, 6-inch striping isn't necessarily a need. He also noted that a distinction for Class 3 bike lanes is a 6-inch stripe; having that requirement for all lanes may detract from that distinction.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration, commented that mandating the 6-inch striping for non-state highway systems sets up a potential inconsistency but could also be beneficial. Possibly a guidance statement or option for roads over certain speeds and widths could be appropriate. Regarding Mr. Bhullar's request to have a sentence that references the standard plans and specs in other documents: the federal law states that the manual is the standard for traffic control devices. As such, the standard plans and specs cannot supersede the CA MUTCD. Anything in the standard specs regarding traffic control devices needs to be in the manual. Mr. Pyburn asserted that the manual can have general depictions of striping, as is shown in the Standard Plan without the dimensions. The Standard Plan can also have additional information and details for such striping. But if it is not in the manual, it is not legal to use in California as defined by federal law. Mr. Pyburn would be leery of adding a statement about referring to the Standard Plans exclusively.

Mr. Ouadah, County of San Diego, stated that because the details are in the CA MUTCD, the text at the bottom of the appropriate pages could be changed from "4 inches yellow or white" to "4 or 6 inches yellow or white." An option could be included indicating that the state or local agency can choose whether to use 6 inches while Caltrans always uses 6 inches. Speed is important in determining whether to use six inches or four inches. He referred to Section 21.121 of the California Vehicle Code which stated, "Any traffic control devices erected by the city or county shall conform to the uniform standards and specifications adopted by Caltrans."

Mr. Bilash, M.D., San Diego County, commented that from his perspective as a consumer he was interested in how the autonomous vehicles for local roads would impact Caltrans standards. Traffic congestion is also a rural road issue, and the effects of these changes if they encourage autonomous vehicles on rural roads might be something to consider.

Committee Questions and Comments

Mr. Sallaberry referred to Section 3A.06 in the MUTCD which states that a normal line can be four to six inches wide. This type of change in the CA MUTCD would seem to be compliant with the MUTCD. Mr. Bhullar confirmed that they do comply. Right now the CA MUTCD is silent regarding the 6-inch; he was seeking to bring the content of the aforementioned memo into the CA MUTCD.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to bring forward specific language for approval on the Consent Calendar at the next meeting; it would allow for local agencies to use 4-inch lane lines as deemed appropriate. Mr. Sallaberry seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

21-07: Proposed changes to CA MUTCD on bikeway memorial signage

Representing Faridun Javed, Mr. Bhullar introduced the item. Mr. Bhullar introduced S. Patel, new Caltrans Engineer with the responsibility to handle traffic signs and the CA MUTCD Part 2.

Mr. S. Patel presented the recommendation to revise the CA MUTCD to include standard language for bikeway memorial signage. He displayed the proposed language.

Mr. Bhullar stated that at the last meeting this had been an Information Item.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Chair Fleisch suggested changing the language slightly to not limit the body to the State Legislature only.

Vice-Chair Bronkall referred to the definition of bikeways in the MUTCD: since roads can also have memorial plaques, this could potentially result in a road having two memorial plaques side by side, one designating the road itself and a second designating the bicycle facility that might be on it. Mr. Bhullar responded that this was for separate roadways, not for shared Class 2 or Class 3.

Chair Fleisch asked if this was for Class 1 only. Mr. Bhullar answered that staff was just trying to address the request based on the recent five or six legislative resolutions, which were for Class 4 (the totally separate bikeways).

Public Comment

Mr. Ouadah thought it acceptable to let the agency determine whether to do this on a bike lane or on a Class 1 bikeway. He also suggested that for long segments that may cross intersections, the agency could place more than one sign, so the language should read, “One *at a minimum...*” or the word “One” should be deleted. Mr. Bhullar responded that the reason for having “one” for each terminal is that this is just a recommendation; Caltrans does not want to have a proliferation of signs that detract from regulatory and warning signs.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Chair Fleisch noted that the actual standard (paragraph 17) refers to highway facilities named by the Legislature specifically. It is redundant to say “...memorialized by the Legislature” throughout #1-7. Mr. Bhullar agreed.

Chair Fleisch commented that local agencies are not prevented here from deciding they want to put up a sign. Mr. Bhullar responded that memorial signs can be done by any agency. In the past, the requests have come from the State Legislature. As long as there is a legislative or official body, a memorial sign can be done.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the recommendation. Mr. V. Patel seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

21-09: Interim approval for the optional use of an alternative signal warrant 7 – crash experience (IA-19)

Representing Mr. Javed, Mr. Bhullar introduced the item.

Mr. Bhullar provided background on the federal Interim Approval process. He explained the new process: any time the feds issue an Interim Approval, Caltrans staff tries to share the Interim Approval with the Committee at the next CTCDC meeting and seek a recommendation on whether it is doable for California. If it is introduced into the next version of the federal manual, staff asks if the Committee would be amenable to recommending it for inclusion in the CA MUTCD. If yes, Caltrans will seek blanket approval for all public agencies in California which the feds will grant.

Mr. Bhullar discussed the specific Interim Approval. Traffic Control Signal Warrant 7 has a crash criteria condition that five or more crashes “of types susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal” within a 12-month period at a location becomes a consideration for having a traffic signal. This threshold came from Section 307 of the 1935 edition of the MUTCD. Recently the feds devised criteria for the crashes and issued a report that the feds and the National Committee on Traffic Control Devices reviewed and now support. The feds have issued an Interim Approval.

Mr. Bhullar has discussed it with the Caltrans Traffic Signaling Committee, which supports it. He then took it to the Caltrans internal Traffic Safety Steering Committee. Caltrans has received responses of support with no opposition from eight of the 12 districts. Mr. Bhullar was now asking the CTCDC to find this acceptable. The districts had responded that this would be very beneficial for rural districts in improving safety.

Mr. Bhullar was requesting that the CTCDC recommend for Caltrans to apply for a blanket approval to FHWA for any agency in California to use it. That will also grant Caltrans permission to start including this criteria in their manuals and publications.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bronkall liked the idea of increased options that may help in locations where crash history has been a reported indicator by the public as a need for the signal, but was not sufficient to warrant a signal.

Mr. V. Patel asked what sort of crashes will be involved in reviewing this. Mr. Bhullar replied that Caltrans will look at the severity of the crash – property damage only, or injury as well – and whether the crashes could be mitigated if there were a signal. The data used will be the most recent 1-year or the most recent 3-year.

Public Comment

Mr. Ouadah commented that the change to this collision warrant has been approved by the National Committee for inclusion in the upcoming manual. It is important to have blanket approval from the federal government so that local agencies as well as Caltrans can use it. He felt that the three years of data are important because although accidents keep occurring, you may not accumulate five in one year. In addition, a fatality at an intersection will carry a higher weight.

Mr. Malizia, Stanislaus County Public Works, asked if the All-Way Stop Warrant will also have any changes to the Crash Experience Warrant. Mr. Bhullar answered that it will only be for the traffic signal aspect of it.

Committee Questions and Discussion

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the recommendation. Chair Fleisch seconded. The Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Fleisch returned briefly to Item 21-07. He asked Vice-Chair Bronkall if his Motion was as-is, or if it did not include the language regarding the Legislature. Vice-Chair Bronkall answered that it was the original language.

21-10: Proposal to adopt new No Right (or Left Turn) on Red Arrow signs in CA MUTCD

Representing Mr. Javed, Mr. Bhullar introduced the item.

Mr. S. Patel discussed the item which was to propose new signage for No Turn on Red Arrow signs. Currently at signalized intersections where we have a red arrow for right turns or left turns from a one-way street to a one-way street, we have the No Right Turn on Red. There are certain situations at signals where we do not have the solid red ball, so the proposed language and signs would reference the red arrow.

Mr. S. Patel displayed the proposed signs.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bronkall commented that this would be a limited-use sign for unusual circumstances, such as when state highways snake their way through towns.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn stated that FHWA was not likely to support this request. The signal would have either a red ball or a red arrow; the existing sign is appropriate for the red ball while the red arrow already says you cannot make a movement. FHWA will consider specific locations where this might be appropriate when Caltrans brings this to them for final approval for inclusion in the manual. Further, the proposed sign is redundant with the red arrow, and we typically do not want multiple signs that say the same thing.

Mr. Ouadah reminded the Committee that Section 21453(c) of the California Vehicle Code already indicates with an arrow that you are not to move. The proposal is redundant with state law. Mr. Bhullar responded that Caltrans had brought this request because in the Bay Area there are a few agencies having issues with enforcement. The proposed signs are supplemental – additional reminders for addressing the situation being confronted. It is not a standalone sign. There may be other areas in the state which have a need for this sign.

Mr. Prasad, Santa Clara County, stated that the sign makes it clear that there are situations in the Bay Area with double right turns: there is a right turn arrow signal and also a ball signal for the through movement. It is confusing. The proposed signs clarify this situation.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Sallaberry agreed that this is redundant. However, we do find that illegal right on red turns despite arrows are very common and problematic.

Vice-Chair Bronkall requested to hear from CHP on the legality of making a right or left turn on a red arrow from a one-way street to another one-way street. Lt. Hawkins answered that per the Vehicle Code, it is illegal to make a right or left against a red arrow.

Vice-Chair Bronkall asked about the procedure for Caltrans to work with FHWA to resolve the conflict. Mr. Bhullar stated that he would like to take this back and work with FHWA. Staff does not want to get a recommendation from CTCDC and then find out that FHWA will not allow its inclusion into the manual. He requested to withdraw the item and bring it back at the next meeting.

Vice-Chair Bronkall asked if the CTCDC could give a conditional approval. Mr. Bhullar affirmed.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the item conditionally pending FHWA approval. There was no second and the Motion failed.

21-12: Proposal to modify preferential lane striping in the CA MUTCD

Representing Mr. Javed, Mr. Bhullar introduced the item.

Mr. Rouse, Caltrans Managed Lanes Program Manager, presented the item. Caltrans is seeking to standardize striping practices on managed lane facilities. Striping patterns are determined by restricted or unrestricted access to the lane.

In Southern California:

- Wide or normal broken white lines are used for continuous access.
- One or two sets of wide solid double white lines are for limited access (when Caltrans does not want people changing lanes).
- “Wide” is defined as eight inches.

The purposes of the proposed changes are to narrow down the variety and use consistency especially for autonomous vehicles; to enhance visibility for continuous access managed lanes; and to allow for maximum use of roadway space by reducing buffer widths.

Mr. Rouse reviewed the different patterns. Caltrans wants to do away with the 6-inch stripe and use only the 8-inch white stripe on continuous access managed lanes as shown in CA MUTCD Detail 42. For limited access managed lanes, Caltrans uses the pattern shown in CA MUTCD Detail 44.

Mr. Rouse showed the proposed details for limited access managed lanes in Detail 44A (no buffer) and Detail 44B (buffer present). The proposed Detail 45 is for limited access managed lanes that are buffer-separated with prohibited access.

Detail 43 would be eliminated because it duplicates Detail 38A. Whenever Caltrans wants to use a single solid white stripe, they will use Detail 38B.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Vice-Chair Bronkall asked if they have reached out to agencies such as San Francisco that are managing exclusive bus lanes and taxi lanes which will be impacted by these changes. Mr. Rouse answered that they had; the agencies were not all that supportive of Caltrans restricting the use of Detail 45. They did not like the idea of going from the four-foot to the two-foot

separation, being concerned about bearing the cost of restriping. However, Mr. Rouse's leadership had given the direction to try to reduce the number of details available.

Mr. Bhullar requested Mr. Rouse to share which external groups he had worked with. Mr. Rouse replied that the Managed Lanes Working Group is comprised of all seven districts that have managed lanes. Many of these details had been discussed there at length. Most of the districts had not had an issue with discontinuing the double white stripes. Mr. Rouse also worked with the California Toll Operators Committee, specifically the members who operate express lanes and would be directly impacted by this decision. The majority were not in favor of eliminating Detail 45, again because they were concerned about bearing the cost of restriping. Caltrans would need to look at the agreements in place with those agencies to determine who would pay for those projects. A couple of the agencies expressed concern about potential impacts on operations: by reducing the space between the express lane and the general purpose lane, traffic could be impacted.

Mr. Rouse stated that CHP has participated in the Managed Lane Working Groups in the past. Lt. Hawkins has seen this proposal. Mr. Rouse has also consulted with Mr. Pyburn from FHWA.

Chair Fleisch commented that typically when there is a change to the manual involving striping, the next time the agency restripes they change them then. Is there a timeline for restriping to occur? The agencies involved may be able to budget the restriping if it does not have to be done right away. Mr. Rouse answered that Caltrans is working on a policy directive that will implement it, assuming that CTCDC approves the change. The policy directive will state that any projects implemented after a certain date will need to incorporate the new standard. For facilities with no project planned for the near future, Caltrans will have to deal with those on a case-by-case basis.

Chair Fleisch commented that Caltrans has many existing lanes striped in different ways – it may take a long time to get to standardization unless they set a drop-dead date. Mr. Rouse agreed and said that Caltrans would consider this as they finalize the policy. There had been talk of the state setting aside some funding to get this work done. Chair Fleisch added that it would help the agencies involved to know the marker on the expectation. Mr. Bhullar asserted that a target compliance date will be discussed.

Mr. V. Patel asked how the striping is going to be maintained on a concrete pavement. Mr. Rouse answered that contrast striping – painting black first with white on top – is an option as part of the standard. Mr. V. Patel then asked whether the general purpose lane width or shorter widths will be standard lane widths. Mr. Rouse answered that in cases where Caltrans may reduce the buffer space from four feet to two feet, they need to decide what to do with the extra two feet. They could go back into the shoulder or into the lane width of the managed lane or general purpose lane. It will be a case-by-case basis – the policy Caltrans is developing to roll out this standard will require that its traffic engineers and design liaisons look at these issues.

Public Comment

Mr. Miller, Southern California Traffic Engineering Consultant, expressed concern over distinguishing the difference between a 6-inch skip stripe and an 8-inch skip stripe. He relies more and more on the painted diamonds in the lane to discern whether they are HOV. He

noted that the spacing between diamonds is a quarter mile, and in many cases there is no diamond visible within the next quarter mile. Has there been any consideration to modify the spacing so that one is always visible? Mr. Rouse affirmed Mr. Miller's point about distinguishing between the 6-inch and the 8-inch. Originally Caltrans was looking at reducing the spacing between the stripes on Detail 42 in order to help the striping stand out more but a few districts were opposed to the concept. Regarding the second question: diamond spacing is about 500 feet for HOV lanes. With limited access lanes, the spacing is less frequent: a quarter mile. Caltrans' historical practice has actually been half mile spacing. Mr. Rouse stated that he would check with the MUTCD standard.

Committee Questions and Discussion

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved for the applicant to present the changes to the MUTCD language and present the written concerns of the other agencies to try to reach consensus. Mr. Sallaberry seconded. Motion passed with Mr. Bhullar abstaining on behalf of Caltrans.

21-14: Proposal to modify guide sign lighting policy (Section 2D.03)

Representing Mr. Javed, Mr. Bhullar introduced the item.

Mr. S. Patel explained the item. Currently Caltrans has a policy that gives guidance on overhead signs: lighting may or may not be provided. In special cases with overhead action guide signs, lighting may be omitted if retroreflective luminance from headlights provides effective nighttime legibility.

Mr. Bhullar asked for clarification that the guidance on lighting for overhead guide signs is being extended to all action guide signs, and the guidance is being reduced to an option. Mr. S. Patel confirmed.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn requested that the following be added, for the review for the manual change, to the red sentence displayed on the screen: "Lighting on overhead action guide signs may be omitted if *retroreflectivity as required by 2A07 and 2A08 is provided.*" Mr. S. Patel agreed.

Committee Questions and Discussion

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to approve the proposal with FHWA's recommended language. Mr. V. Patel seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Request for Experimentation

21-13: Request for approval of new marking in the bicycle transition area in a right turn only lane

Vice-Chair Bronkall introduced the item.

Mr. Prasad gave a presentation regarding the request for an additional marking for Figure 9C-4 in the MUTCD. He explained that bicycle transition from a right shoulder to the left of the right turning lane is a standard practice for bicyclists. But in a through lane that turns right only, this is a very difficult maneuver for bicyclists, as the vehicles are already established in the lane. Bicycles rather than vehicles are expected to yield in this situation.

Mr. Prasad showed the documentation in NACTO and AASHTO. He described a project on a high-speed local expressway where they added an auxiliary lane to address the congestion issue. Feedback from bicyclists was negative. – they called it a “death trap.”

Mr. Prasad then looked at options in other cities. Santa Clara County representatives liked an arrangement of green skip stripes (markings) in the transition area derived from examples in Davis and Mountain View. The bike lane stops on the right just before the transition area and picks up on the left of the right turn lane after the transition area. This marking is intended to be in the gap in this transition area. Feedback from bicyclists has been positive.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Sallaberry asked if any representatives from Davis or Mountain View were able to provide before-and-after data or crash data. Mr. Prasad answered that he was not able to make any contact with either city.

Chair Fleisch commented that usually when CTCDC gets an experiment request, it is a specific location laid out in a specific way. In this case, Santa Clara County is providing some alternatives. He added that the other cities using this arrangement should also put in a Request for Experiment. An interim change to the manual is a different process.

Mr. Bhullar commented that the item came in as a Request for Change, but he had placed it under Request for Experiment because Caltrans would need supporting data before considering a Request for Change to the manual.

Chair Fleisch asked if Mr. Prasad had a specific location in mind. He answered that it was the auxiliary lanes (northbound and southbound) on Foothill Expressway between San Antonio and El Monte. They will be happy to collect data and obtain feedback from the biking community. Chair Fleisch suggested having the County follow the proper format for an experiment, and that Mr. Prasad bring back the request at the next meeting. It may be possible to collect some data from the other agencies who have already implemented the green marking treatment.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn stated that this action is already covered by an Interim Approval from 2011: IA-14 allows the use of green colored pavement not only in bike lanes, but also in extensions of bike lanes in intersections and in vehicle conflict areas. Green can already be used in the vehicle conflict points at turn bays. Since California has requested and received blanket approval for the Interim Approval, no further action is needed by any agency except for compliance with the Interim Approval. Each agency can look at the Interim Approval and see how they want to implement the design criteria as required.

Mr. Bhullar said that the state requested blanket approval in August 2011.

Mr. Wenham requested FHWA to put their interpretation in writing that the Interim Approval applies in this situation; it is a bit ambiguous. Mr. Wenham recommended for the CTCDC to come up with a Motion today so that it can be approved specific to the location, so that Santa Clara County will not be left without an answer until November 2021,

Mr. Ouadah pointed out that according to the national IA, the striped green pavement color must be within the two dashed lines of the bike lane line. Mr. Pyburn stated that the IA is clear that it can be used in the proposed configuration – even without two dashed white lines.

For the exact format of how it is used, the agency needs to review the IA and determine if their application meets the letter of the IA.

Mr. Powers, Alternate Committee Representative, concurred from personal experience that this is a major issue. He asked how this item relates to Item 21-05 – will they work together?

Mr. Miller agreed with Mr. Pyburn’s interpretation. The IA definitely indicates that you can go from the skip line to the right side of the roadway; it is commonly done where a traditional bike lane ends in a skip bike lane not adjacent to a right turn lane. He would like to see the effectiveness and performance data of this treatment since it is in use by only a few agencies. Making this a state experiment might be an appropriate action to take. He agreed with comments that this condition should be eliminated long-term.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Sallaberry noted the wording of IA-14 that states, “...if a pair of dotted lines are used...” showing that it is not a requirement.

Vice-Chair Bronkall also pointed out that this item is very similar to Item #21-05.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to table this item, as it will be addressed in Item #21-05.

The Committee members agreed to return to this item after hearing Item #21-05.

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

21-05: Proposed changes to the Shared Lane Markings Section 9C.07

Representing Mr. Javed, Mr. Bhullar introduced the item.

Ms. Downing was represented by Mr. Wenham on this item. Mr. Wenham stated that this item was providing the opportunity to have a bigger discussion about how to present options that have an entire continuum of ways to address the unique conflict just presented by Mr. Prasad. In looking into the issue, Caltrans discovered that there are many good options being used. You could start by adding shared lane markings, which is allowed now. The next step would be to provide optional green markings at the beginning and end of the turn lanes. Optional line extensions could be added next, then full “greening up” by adding optional green dashed markings. Mr. Wenham also proposed allowing an optional green background for the shared lane markings. At any time the visibility of the sharrows could be increased by using the line plus a green backdrop. After today’s discussion and feedback, Mr. Wenham, plans to bring the item back to the November meeting with a complete package. The draft 2020 MUTCD at the federal level fully incorporates green markings and green pavement. Mr. Wenham asserted that because of the void in the guidance, some cities have made bad decisions.

Ms. Downing said that she supported Mr. Wenham’s statements.

Public Comment

Mr. Pyburn reiterated that the treatment is acceptable under the Interim Approval issued to Caltrans in 2011.

Committee Questions and Discussion

Mr. Sallaberry suggested as an optional treatment to add pavement markings for motorists that state “Bike Merge Ahead” prior to the bike lane shifting. Mr. Wenham requested for Mr. Sallaberry to send him an example.

Mr. V. Patel asked if we will be keeping the optional Share the Road sign shown on the figure displayed. Mr. Wenham affirmed.

Mr. Jones reiterated that it is important to have different options for safety improvements to apply to this right turn situation. Allowing the engineering judgment for the particular situation or what that community is aware of – whether green or dashed – is important.

Chair Fleisch directed the Committee back to the previous item, 21-13, with this information in mind.

Vice-Chair Bronkall stated that with confirmation from FHWA, no action from the CTCDC is necessary for Santa Clara County to install this treatment. Mr. Bhullar affirmed.

Mr. Sallaberry agreed that no action seems to be needed and Santa Clara County can move forward with reasonable lack of risk. At some point he would like to see an official figure added to the CA MUTCD.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to deny the Request for Experiment, with the understanding that under the Interim Approval no experimentation is necessary to install it.

Mr. Sallaberry asked what the lead staff on this item would like the CTCDC to do. Mr. Prasad replied that if the interpretation provides the necessary direction and he has no problem in withdrawing their application. The County does need to take action immediately for installation. Mr. Sallaberry suggested to collect data if resources are available, and to document for themselves why they are moving forward.

Vice-Chair Bronkall withdrew the Motion.

Chair Fleisch suggested for Mr. Wenham to collect data from as many of these examples as possible, for what he wants to present for the greening up of Section 9.

Mr. Bhullar suggested for Mr. Prasad to send a request in writing to Mr. Pyburn to make the formal interpretation.

21-08: Reinstatement of Interim Approval for Use of Clearview Font for Positive Contrast Legends on Guide Signs (IA-5)

Representing Mr. Javed, Mr. Bhullar introduced the item. He stated that he had not placed this item as an Action Item because it was the second item not addressed on the website. An IA issued by FHWA in 2004 had cleared provisional use of the Clearview font on certain highway guide signs. There had been some issues and the IA was pulled back after Caltrans and other agencies had requested and received blanket approval. The feds have now taken a neutral stance and reissued the IA. Mr. Bhullar emphasized that the IA reinstates the blanket approval previously issued to any agency.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Fleisch stated that the next meeting is scheduled for November 4, 2021.

8. Adjourn

MOTION: Vice-Chair Bronkall moved to adjourn. Mr. V. Patel seconded.
Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.