MINUTES

CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC) MEETING

Thousand Oaks, January 31, 2008

The first CTCDC meeting of year 2008 was held in Thousand Oaks, on January 31, 2008. Chairman Farhad Mansourian opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. with the introduction of Committee members and guests. The Chairman also thanked the City of Thousand Oaks and the Mayor Pro Term Thomas P. Glancy for hosting the CTCDC meeting in their facility. The following Members, alternates and guests were in attendance:

ATTENDANCE	ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE
Members (Voting)		
Farhad Mansourian Chairman	CA State Association of Counties Marin County	(415) 499-6570
Hamid Bahadori Vice-Chairman	Auto Club of Southern California	(714) 885-2326
John Fisher	League of CA Cities City of Los Angeles	(213) 972-8424
Wayne Henley	Caltrans	(916) 654-6246
Ed von Borstel	League of CA Cities City of Modesto	(209) 577-5266
Deborah Wong (Alternate)	California State Automobile Association	(415) 241-5847
Jacob Babico	CA State Association of Counties San Bernardino County	(909) 387-8186
Steve Lerwill (Alternate)	CHP	(916) 657-7222
Alternate		
Jeff Knowles	League of CA Cities City of Vacaville	(707) 449-5349

ATTENDEES	ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE/E-Mail
Ahmad Rastegarpour	Caltrans	ahmad_rastegarpour@dot.ca.gov
Dave Royer	Consultant	droyerpe@earthlink.net (661) 255-6556
Mina Layba	City of Thousand Oaks	mlayba@toaks.org
Walter Laabs	City of Santa Rosa	wlaabs@srcity.org
Don Howe	Caltrans –HQ Traffic-Ops	don_howe@dot.ca.gov
Matt Schmitz	FHWA	
Norman Baculiano	City of Pasadena	nbaculiano@cityofpassadena.net (626) 744-4263
Janka Bahman	City of Pasadena	nbaculiano@cityofpassadena.net (626) 7445349
Jim Brunner	City of Simi Valley	jbrunner@simivalley.org (626) 583 6794
Damon Curtis	City of San Francisco	(415) 701-4500
Kevin Davis	CHP	kmdavis@chp.ca.gov (916) 657-7237
Jack Fleck	City of San Francisco	(451) 701-4500
Anthony Gallo	County of Ventura	Anthony.gallo@ventura.org (805) 654-2589
Bill Golubics	City of Camarillo	(805)388-3556
John Helliwell	City of Thousand Oaks	jhelliwell@toaks.org (805)449-2412
Jeff Hereford	City of Ventura	(805) 654-7744
Richard Herrera	County of Ventura	(805) 654-2063
Herb Hutchinson	Retired System Safety Engr	hrobhtch@aol.com (805) 370-071
Kai Leung	Caltrans – HQ	kai.leung@dot.ca.gov
Kathy Lowery	City of Thousand Oaks	(805) 449-2416
George MacDougall	CHP	radar@chp.ca.gov (916) 657-7237
Chuck Pedersen	ABATE	chuck.pedersen@abate.org (805) 432-5918
Roc Pulido	City of Camarillo	(805) 388-5346
Javier Robles	County of LA	(626) 458-1700
David Rossman	City of Long beach	david_rossman@longbeach.gov (562) 570-6665
Robert Shanteau	Self	rmshant@gmail.com (831) 394 9420

Steven Shladover	UCB-PATH	(510) 665-3514
Jay Spurgin	city of Thousand Oaks	jspurgin@toaks.org (805) 449-2444
Tai Lawrence	City of Riverside (951) 955-6800	ltai!rctlma.org
David Torfeh	County of Ventura	
Mark Walkin	City of Thousand Oaks	mwalkin@toaks.org (805) 449-2399
Laura Wells	City of San Jose	laura.wells@sanjoseca.gov (408)975-3725

MINUTES

Adoption of October 11, 2007 CTCDC meeting minutes.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Wayne Henley, to adopt the minutes of October 11, 2007 CTCDC meeting held in Sacramento, California. Motion carried 7-0.

Election & Membership

Hamid Bahadori suggested holding an election for the Chairman and Vice Chairman at the end of today's meeting. He suggested that a number of items on the agenda were discussed during the current Chairman's term, and he would like to see those items concluded under his term. Also, one voting Member Jacob Babico was late, so having an election at the end of the meeting would include his participation.

Public Comments:

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments on any item not appearing on the agenda.

Mayor Pro Tem Thomas P. Glancy, City of Thousand Oaks, stated that his entire city welcomes the CTCDC for having the meeting in their facility. He added that he attended the workshop on October 10, 2007 in Sacramento and learned about the role of the CTCDC in developing standards for traffic control devices. Mayor Glancy gave an overview about the city including the size and activities, and added that Thousand Oaks has been declared the safest city in the United States. He informed the Committee that the Transportation Committee for the City of Thousand Oaks has been updated about the discussion on the establishment of speed limits, which took place during the October 10, 2007 workshop. He will also update the Transportation Committee on the decision taken by the CTCDC in today's meeting. He suggested that there is a need for awareness and education for political people in regards to the role of the CTCDC and the traffic control devices used on California roadways. He stated that having CTCDC meetings in different areas will help educate locals. It is helpful to inform local entities that there is a process to handle traffic control devices, if there is a need for a revision or to introduce a new one. He added that the City of Thousand Oaks, Public Works Director, is attending the meeting and he will speak later. Mayor Pro Tem Thomas P. Glancy welcomed the CTCDC again for having the meeting in the City of Thousand Oaks.

An unknown audience member (no name mentioned in the recording) asked whether AB351 under the information items will be discussed today.

Chairman Mansourian responded that the item will be discussed; however, no action will be taken by the Committee today, because it is an information item only. It may be under the action items during the future meetings.

Herb Hutchinson stated that he has reviewed the California Vehicle Code very thoroughly, and nowhere in the CVC does it impose any speed limit on local streets. He stated that he had a conversation with Caltrans and also with the Governors office in regards to this issue. He stated that if a street has a posted speed limit in 5 mph increments based on the 85th percentile speed, he would like to see if the prevailing speed also goes up in 5 mph increment. He would like to request the Committee to place this item on the agenda for discussion in a future meeting.

Chairman Mansourian asked if he could share his correspondences taken place with Caltrans and the Governors office with the Committee members.

He responded that Don Howe, Caltrans should have all the information. Don Howe stated that he will search for those.

There were no other public comments.

07-16 Amendment to Section 2B.13 of the CA MUTCD – Speed Limit as Discussed during the Oct 10, 2007 Workshop and Oct 11, 2007 CTCDC regular meeting (Formerly known as SB 848, as Amended)

Chairman Mansourian shared the process of public hearing with the Committee and audiences. He stated that the Committee will discuss the staff report and then the item will be opened for public hearing. Once the public hearing is closed, no public comments will be entertained unless a member wants some clarification. Then the item will be discussed among the Committee members for deliberation. Chairman Mansourian asked Hamid Bahadori if he could provide background information about this item.

Hamid Bahadori stated that this issue was brought to the notice of the Auto Club of Southern California by local agencies, that the new standards adopted in California during the May 2004 has caused some challenges to the local agencies in regards to the establishment of a speed limit. He asked the Committee to place this item on the agenda to take another look, maintain the objectives of the new policy while providing some flexibility, and understand the local's sensitivity and political issues. As a result, the Committee held a Workshop on October 10, 2007, which was attended by over 40 participants including politicians, attorneys, public works directors and traffic engineers. The workshop was very productive and a few alternatives were suggested by the workshop participants. The next day, October11, 2007 during the regular CTCDC meeting, the Committee made recommendations to Caltrans to revise Section 2B.13 Speed Limit sign of the CA MUTCD and bring it back for the Committee to make final recommendations. During the October 11, 2007 meeting, the Committee recommended to have flexibility and adopted language similar to the federal MUTCD 2003 edition. However, the Committee recommended that if a 5 mph further reduction is used based on the conditions not readily apparent to drivers, it must be documented. The Committee further suggested that the final speed limit shall not be below the 50th percentile of the speed. The committee believes that the majority of drivers should not be penalized by setting an arbitrarily speed limit. He added that Chairman Mansourian has sent out a letter to the 58 counties and 440 cities in regards to this issue with the proposed amendment to Section 2B.13.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the Committee members. There were none.

Chairman Mansourian invited the public for comments.

Walter Labbs, City of Santa Rosa, stated that due to the proposed revision, there is a need to upgrade the whole section, which contains 10 pages. He also suggested that the proposed option statement is contradicting with the standard statement and it needs some clarifying language.

Hamid Bahadori stated that during the October meeting, he raised the same concerns. However, the Caltrans response was that they need final language and some time to clean out the whole section.

Chairman Mansourian stated that in his experience working with the Committee, whenever the Committee makes a recommendation to Caltrans, Caltrans always agrees with the Committees' recommendations. In this case, when the Committee makes final recommendations to Caltrans, Caltrans staff will clean out the whole section, and the State's Traffic Engineer will issue a final policy. The policy will have all the outlines in regards to the implementation date and how to treat the current speed limits which are posted based on the current policy.

Wayne Henley agreed with Chairman Mansourian's comments.

Chairman Mansourian stated that Mayor Pro Tem Glancy brought up a very good point in regards to the awareness of this body and education. He stated that after the completion of this item, he will propose a sub-committee, who will volunteer their time to come up with a pamphlet with the help of both Southern and Northern California Auto Clubs. That pamphlet will be distributed to all the local agencies, public works directors, and to the traffic engineers to help keep consistency and uniformity throughout the whole state.

Chairman Mansourian invited the next speaker from the audience.

Dave Rossman, Traffic Engineer, City of Long Beach, stated that parts of the proposed changes are a good step. However, creating an artificial 50th percentile floor is not a good step. The 50th percentile floor curtails the abilities of traffic engineers to use their judgment. He added that speed limit does play a role in accidents. In Long Beach, 25% of the accidents are due to excessive speed. Also many drivers drive at a speed which they feel comfortable and speed limit signs do not change their behavior. Also he believes that on certain roads, driver behavior does not change with the use of speed limit signs. He cited one example in Long Beach, where they used a series of devices to warn the speed limit. The devices used were those such as speed display signs, larger signs, and pavement markings. When the City resurveyed the roadway, the speed limit went down. He stated putting a 50th percentile floor will restrict the traffic engineer's ability to attack driver behavior. Although he supported the changes, he felt this topic is not complete because it restricts the engineer's ability to tackle aggressive drivers. He added that in school zones, the 25 mph speed limit can be used, so why wouldn't this option be allowed in business districts, where a rate of accidents are high. He stated that in Long Beach, it will be difficult to implement this policy on roads with high accidents rates. In summary, he stated that the discussion on this topic should continue and that new innovative technology, such as speed feedback signs, will be helpful to control driver behavior. He asked not to take tools away from the engineers and continue looking at this item with new ideas.

Mark Watkins, Public Works Director, City of Thousand Oaks, appreciated the Committee holding the meeting in their city and also supported the changes proposed by the CTCDC to Section 2B.13 of the CA MUTCD. He supported the flexibility and as well as the minimum floor proposed by the CTCDC.

Laura Wells, City of San Jose, stated that while the Committee indicated at the October 2007 meeting that more flexibility should be provided to local agencies, and that local agencies should still be able to utilize the 5 mph additional reduction, the 50th percentile floor actually provides less flexibility to local agencies than the current CA MUTCD. In San Jose, the 50th percentile floor will force the city to increase the speed limit on more than 200 roadways, approximately 60% of all surveyed streets. She used a PowerPoint presentation to show the Committee members and audience three impacts of the proposed changes. The first example involved streets where the 50th percentile speed and the 85th percentile speed are within the same 5 mph band. San Jose has 97 streets in this category, primarily at the lower speed limits, 25 mph – 35 mph, which tend to be residential neighborhood. The sample provided was a 25 mph residential street with a 50th percentile speed (25.8 mph), slightly above the 25 mph posted speed and an 85th percentile speed (28.3 mph), slightly below 30 mph. With the proposed 50th percentile floor, the speed limit must be increased to 30 mph. On these 97 streets, the posted speed limit will be above the 85th percentile speed. She provided a second example where the posted speed limits are currently 6-7 mph of the 85th percentile speed. San Jose has 120 streets in this category that will also require an increase in the speed limit. The sample provided was a street currently posted at 35 mph, however with the amended policy the speed limit would be 40 mph. The 50th percentile speed is 36.6 mph and the 85th percentile is 40.9 mph. This 35 mph street is located between two 25 mph prima facie residential streets. Raising the speed limit to 40 mph would create a 15 mph differential in speed zoning across the intersections at either end of this street. The MUTCD recommends 5 mph speed zone changes, with no more that 10 mph. San Jose would now be potentially forced to raise the prima facie 25 mph speed limit on the residential streets to 30 mph with these proposed changes, in order to prevent 15 mph speed zone differential. This would be negatively received by these neighborhoods. The third example provided was the impact with implementing Assemble Bill 321 that provides the ability for local agencies to lower the prima facie speed limit in school zones to 15 mph. Cities choosing to implement the reduced 15 mph speed limit in school zones, while at the same time being forced to raise the same speed limit on these streets to 30 mph, will create confusion in the neighborhoods. She stated that the process of conducting speed surveys would be less flexible and would become a mathematical exercise, and the ability for engineers to take into consideration unusual conditions is basically gone. In San Jose, only 10 streets, representing 2 percent of the total surveyed streets, are eligible for the additional 5 mph reduction with the proposed changes. She encouraged the Committee to rethink this proposed amendment.

Chairman Mansourian asked Laura Wells if radar for enforcement is used on every single street. He further suggested that the law enforcement agencies, due to staffing or manpower shortage they might not enforce speed limits on all the streets.

Laura Wells responded that the enforcement agency only uses radar and they might not be able to enforce the speed limit on all streets due to staffing.

Chairman Mansourian stated that an engineering and traffic survey only becomes effective if radar is used for enforcement. You could post whatever speed limit you want, as long as you are not using radar for enforcement. If 100 streets are affected by the new policy and the law enforcement agency is not enforcing by using radar, then the posted speed limit does not matter. Secondly you are raising an objection to having a floor, meaning if there is no floor, then many drivers are penalized with a speed trap.

Laura Wells stated that the majority of their surveys are current to provide appropriate tools to the enforcement agency. Secondly, most of the speed limits are within 6-7 miles from the 85th percentile. With the revised policy, there will be an increase on approximately 100 streets, even within the first 5 mph of the 85th percentile.

John Fisher asked what margin or latitude was used by the enforcement agency over the posted speed limit when they gave citations.

Laura Wells stated that generally they are using 10 mph to the posted speed limit on residential streets.

John Fisher asked what about on an arterial?

Laura Wells responded that they are using around 12-15 mph over the posted speed limit.

John Fisher stated that the reason the police are using 10-15 latitude or margin over the posted speed limit is because they know the posted speed limit does not represent the majority of drivers, it means it is not consistent to the 85th percentile. If the posted speed limit is appropriate for the majority of drivers, then the police could reduce the latitude or margin for a citation purpose to 5 mph.

Hamid Bahadori commented on Laura Wells' presentation and that in his observation, every one driver out of two or even more are exceeding the posted speed limit because the posted speed limit is not representing the majority of drivers. He stated that this type of arbitrary posted speed limit defeats the whole purpose of the posted speed limit. The California law is very clear and says that the majority of drivers are prudent drivers. State law is very clear on the establishment of the speed limit, and agencies should not penalize the majority of drivers by posting a speed below the 50th percent. If the posted speed limit is not going to be enforced until it is over 10-15 mph, then why not post a speed limit which is reasonable and could be enforced over 5 mph. He added that the City of San Jose is a very large city with adequate staff and resources and they should be posting the speed which is representing the majority of drivers. He also commented on the prima facie speed and stated that the agencies do not need an engineering and traffic survey to post those speeds. He suggested to Laura Wells that the agencies should rethink the practice to posting speed limits which represent 50% of the motoring public.

John Fisher stated that the City of Los Angles faces similar conditions as mentioned by Laura Wells. On certain roads, if the city follows the process without having a 50% floor, then the posted speed limit will be below the 50th percentile of all drivers. He stated that he sympathize with San Jose's concerns, however he does not support penalizing the majority of law obedient drivers.

Laura Wells stated that some local agencies will try to come up with creative ideas to slow the traffic down, such as unwarranted stop signs, and unwarranted traffic control devices which will frustrate the drivers. By taking away the flexibility which was given in the 2004 CA MUTCD, the policy will increase the speed limit by having a floor.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the Committee understands that the cities and counties may go to the legislature and try to change the law, which is fine, however, the Committee is following the law and does not want to put the majority of drivers in violation by setting an arbitrarily set speed limit. If the political body changes the law that is their prerogative, then the engineers will follow the technical experts.

Bob Shanteau stated that he worked as a Traffic Engineer with the City of Concord and Monterey and one time he got the opportunity to take the speed limit report to the local Traffic Commissioner. He asked the Traffic Commissioner if he understood the report. The Traffic Commissioner told him that he does and added that the court used latitude to enforce traffic speeding violations. The Traffic Commissioner stated that he does not trust the radar system and he will not enforce a citation unless the citation is 12 mph above the posted speed limit. Bob Shanteau added that the Traffic Commissioner told him that the speed citation needs to be proven beyond reasonable doubt. Bob Shanteau stated that traffic engineers establish a speed limit with honesty, and law enforcement enforces that speed limit with honesty too. However, there is a need to educate Traffic Judges/Traffic Commissioners about the latitude they are using to enforce citations and why they do not believe in the radar system. The margin above the speed limit to enforce a citation needs to be brought down to 5 mph.

Hamid Bahadori commented on Bob Shanteau statement and stated that he deals frequently with the Traffic Commissioners/Judges, and he was not aware of the 12 mph cut of line for citations..

Bob Shanteau responded that he is not familiar with other jurisdictions, however in Monterey, the Traffic Judges/Commissioner has set up a margin of 12 mph over the posted speed limit.

Bahman Janka, City of Pasadena, stated that he has a few questions and comments on the proposed language included in the agenda packet. The first question is if the Committee recommends Caltrans to adopt the proposed policy, when it will be implemented.

Chairman Mansourian responded that it will be a Caltrans decision. Usually, when the Committee makes recommendations to Caltrans, Caltrans staff develops a policy based on the recommendations and the State Traffic Engineer approves that policy through a directive for statewide implementation.

Bahman Janka stated that his second question is in regards to the proposed standard and option statement. Under the standards, the wording is the posted speed limit "shall be within 5 mph of the 85th percentile speed of free flowing traffic" and under the option it allows further reduction of 5 mph based on the unusual conditions not readily apparent to drivers, which directly contradicts the "shall" requirements.

Chairman Mansourian responded that the Committee will look over this point during the Committee's discussion.

Bahman Janka further stated that he is not sure how to handle the 50th percent floor requirement. The major issue is lawyers are interpreting CVC in different ways. He agreed with the Committee's comments that the posted speed limit should represent the majority of drivers, however, he is not sure how to handle some roads in Pasadena where the speed limit will be increased due to the 50th percent floor.

Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans, stated that he would like to clarify the question raised by Bahman Janka in regards to the standard and option statement. He stated that the CA MUTCD as well as the federal MUTCD does allow modifying the standard statement by the guidance and options.

Chairman Missourian asked if that is written in the CA MUTCD or in the federal MUTCD.

Johnny Bhullar stated that it is mentioned in the Part A Introduction and it is listed on Page 1-3 of the CA MUTCD. It states that standards some times are modified by the options.

Bahman Janka asked Johnny Bhullar that if the 85th percentile speed is 37 mph, under the standards it can be rounded to 35 mph. Under option, it is allowed to reduce to 30 mph if the conditions not readily apparent to drivers exist. Now the 30 mph speed limit will not conflict with the standard statement, which

states that the speed limit shall be within 5 mph of the 85th percentile speed of free-flowing traffic. The 30 mph is 7 mph below the 85th percentile.

Johnny Bhullar responded that the CA MUTCD and federal MUTCD do allow modifying standards with the option and the scenario you stated is fine with the CA MUTCD/MUTCD.

John Fisher commented that he disagree with Johnny Bhullar's interpretation because each standard stands alone. If there is a modification to the standards, it should add a statement in the standards saying, "except as shown in the option."

Johnny Bhullar stated that there are numerous sections which states as shown in the options or guidance, however, the introduction of the CA MUTCD and federal MUTCD does allow standards to be modified by options.

Chairman Mansourian asked Johnny Bhullar, since the speed limit section will be used a lot by agencies, it would be helpful for the agencies if the language is clear and easy to interpret. He agreed with John Fisher's comment to add verbiage in the standards which allow deviation under options.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he does not have a problem clarifying this section, however, there are sections in the CA MUTCD/MUTCD, which allows different criteria under standards and allow modifying under guidance and options.

Wayne Henley stated that Caltrans follows the protocol of the federal MUTCD.

Jeff Knowles, Public Works Director and CTCDC Alternate Member from the City of Vacaville, stated that after the discussion of the last meeting he reviewed their all traffic surveys and found out that 60 segments including 13 arterial roads will be affected with the new policy. He stated that 67% of their speed limit will go up with the 50% floor requirements. He suggested that the Committee consider pace speed the minimum requirement to establish the speed limit as compared to the 50% floor. Examples cited by the City of San Jose are similar to other cities. Even the accident data would not allow the engineers to use their judgment with the proposed amendment. He suggested to use the lower limit of the pace speed which is reasonable in practice to establish a speed limit. If the 85th percentile is 25.8 mph, with this policy the posted speed limit will be 30 mph which is above the 85th percentile and that is quite high to the 85th percentile. That is a problem and most agencies will face in the real world.

Hamid Bahadori asked Jeff Knowles the same question he asked to the City of San Jose and the City of Pasadena. The City of Vacaville has a posted speed limit that is violated by 67% of the drivers, because it is not posted for the majority of drivers. He asked Jeff if he believes this is good practice to continue in California, why do agencies post a speed limit which will be violated by the majority of drivers. He further added that during the last meeting it was stated that pace speed is not common terminology and the public or a judge would have a hard time to understand. The CVC states that the speed limit should be for the majority of drivers. The 50% floor will be easy to understand and also complies with the CVC requirement.

Jeff Knowles stated that the reason courts are giving latitude from 10-15 mph is because they do not have exact data or complete reports. He stated that he does not have a problem with providing detailed information to the court. Also, judges are giving 10-15 mph latitude due to political reasons.

John Fisher questioned Jeff Knowles about how many streets in the City of Vacaville have roadside conditions not readily apparent to drivers to justify a further 5 mph reduction to post a speed limit.

Jeff Knowles stated that he does not have an exact number, but he believes around 25% of streets were used for further reduction based on the roadside conditions not readily apparent to drivers.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he would like to see the minutes reflect the actual numbers presented by different speakers.

Bahman Janka stated that he would like to see Section 627 of the CVC be included in the policy to make it clear because lawyers interpret this section differently.

Hamid Bahadori stated that there are other CVC sections which relate to the speed limit process. He commented that the Committee may want to look into it as to not confuse courts and the public.

Bob Shanteau commented that there was an earlier comment that the drivers are ignoring the speed limit. He stated that drivers are not ignoring the speed limit, however, they are factoring the 10-15 mph latitude which law enforcement and courts allows in the enforcement.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the majority of drivers do not know the posted speed limit, they drive at a speed which they feel comfortable.

Chairman Mansourian asked if there were any other comments from the public. There were none. He closed the public hearing and opened discussion among the Committee members.

Chairman Mansourian stated that at the beginning of this item, Hamid Bahadori gave a brief background about this item. He stated that he would like to share his thoughts with Committee members and with the audience. He stated that the Committee has a major task in front of them to make this amendment technically correct, politically sensitive with the minimum amount of interference by elected officials, who might or might not like the Committee's decision. At the beginning, Hamid Bahadori stated that there are 440 cities, 58 counties and if you assume each public agency has five elected officials, then there would be approximately 2000 elected officials. Everybody has different ideas and the decision made today will not please all the public agencies and elected officials. He sympathized with the City of San Jose, City of Pasadena and the City of Vacaville. However, you cannot have different standards from one city to the next. The Committee will never be able to close this issue. He further added that some agencies may want to use political tools and try to change this policy. They need to keep in mind that the Committee members also represent the local agencies and they will be standing against any move which will not represent the majority of drivers. If you recall why we are here, it is because of SB848 which proposed to throw away the engineering tools for the speed limit process and use the law enforcement method to post a speed limit. Some of you did not like SB848, which was going to create speed traps and suggested to the political body to let the CTCDC address this issue. The 500 local agencies never will be agreed on this issue. He stated that the Committee has draft language in front of them and they need to provide comments if they agree with the language or if they want some amendments as shared by some of the speakers. There was a suggestion to mention CVC Section 627 and insert language to standards which states "as shown in the Option".

Chairman Mansourian asked Committee members to provide their comments.

Ed von Borstel stated that he supports the adoption of the proposed language.

Deborah Wong also supported the proposal.

CHP agreed to adopt the proposed language.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he supports the proposal and was not sure if CVC 627 needed to be included.

Wayne Henley supports the proposal.

John Fisher supports the proposal with two modifications, first, to insert verbiage to the standard statement saying "as shown in the options below", and second, to mention CVC 627 in the policy.

Jacob Babico stated that he does not agree with the proposal and he would like give explanation. He stated that the speed limit was changed during the adoption of the CA MUTCD, first in 2004 and then in 2006. The old Traffic Manual policy was simple and workable. Now, the CA MUTCD has 10 pages versus the federal MUTCD which has two pages. The federal policy is simple and clear compared to the CA MUTCD. That is the reason he suggests adopting the federal MUTCD policy in lieu of the CA MUTCD and the proposal in front of the Committee.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the majority of the members would like to adopt the proposal with some modification. He asked for a motion.

MOTION: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Wayne Henley to make recommendations to Caltrans for the adoption of Section 2B.13 Speed Limit Sign as proposed in the agenda packet.

John Fisher proposed two friendly amendments. First, he suggested to add language "except as shown below in the option," to the standard statement. Second, add "CVC 627" to the option statement and the revised language would be as follows:

Standard:

After an engineering study has been made in accordance with established traffic engineering practices, the Speed Limit (R2-1) sign (see Figure 2B-1) shall display the limit established by law, ordinance, regulation, or as adopted by the authorized agency. The speed limits shown shall be in multiples of 10 km/h or 5 mph.

Guidance:

At least once every 5, 7 or 10 years, ~~States~~ State and local agencies should reevaluate non-statutory speed limits on segments of their roadways that have undergone a significant change in roadway characteristics or surrounding land use since the last review (see CVC 40802).

No more than three speed limits should be displayed on any one Speed Limit sign or assembly.

Standard:

When a speed limit is to be posted, it ~~should~~ shall be within ~~established at the nearest~~ 10 km/h or 5 mph ~~increment~~ of the 85th-percentile speed of free-flowing traffic, except as shown below in the option.

Option:

The posted speed limit may be reduced by 10 km/h (5 mph) from the 10 km/h or 5 mph increment of the 85th-percentile speed~~, where engineering study indicates the need for a reduction in speed to match the existing conditions with the traffic safety needs of the community~~ if unusual conditions not readily apparent to drivers, such as significantly higher collision rates or other factors exist, as long as those conditions are in compliance with all the appropriate sections of the CVC, especially CVC Sections *627* and 22358.5.

Standard:

If used, a one-time 10 km/h or 5-mph reduction, according to CVC Sections 627 and 22358.5, shall be documented in writing. The final, posted speed limit shall not be less the 50th-percentile speed

John Fisher added that the language should be clear without any confusion, because it will be used regularly by the local agencies, lawyers and by the traffic courts. There should be no confusion or misinterpretation. The Committee should do all to provide clarity, because it is a sensitive issue.

Wayne Henley supported John Fisher's amendment.

Steve Lerwill stated that there was a comment before in regards to clarity and it was stated that the language is clear.

Chairman Missourian asked the Committee members their opinion on the two amendments proposed by John Fisher.

The Committee members supported the first amendment with five in favor, two opposed and one abstain.

The Committee members supported the second amendment, four in favor, three opposed and one abstain.

Chairman Mansourian asked if the original motion sponsors consider John Fisher's amendment and would like to move a motion again.

MOTION: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Wayne Henley, to include the amendment proposed by John Fisher and make recommendation to Caltrans for the adoption of Section 2B.13 of the CA MUTCD as amended:

Motion carried 7-1, Jacob Babico voted against it.

Action: Item completed. Caltrans will revise the whole section based on the recommendation and keep the Committee informed about the progress.

06-8 FHWA's Interim Approval for Optional Use of Flashing Yellow Arrow, Traffic Control Devices

Chairman Mansourian informed the Committee members and the audience that a Sub-Committee was formed to address this item. However, the Sub-Committee was not able to meet due to a conflict of priorities and he suggested continuing this item for the next meeting.

Committee members agreed with Chairman Mansourian's recommendation.

04-10 Slow for the Cone Zone Sign

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to introduce agenda item "Slow for the Cone Zone."

Wayne Henley stated that a few years back Caltrans introduced a concept to educate the public about work zone areas. They initiated a campaign by using a slogan "Slow For The Cone Zone". At that time, Caltrans requested an experiment with these signs and received approval from the CTCDC. However, due to the cost involved to conduct an experimentation, the signs were not installed, except one as shown on page 11 of 51 was used on the construction funding (shown on page 10 of 51 of the agenda) sign to alert motorists to slow down in work zone areas. Wayne Henley stated that in the agenda packet there is a typical plan showing the installation of signs if they considered to be used in an individual project. He added that based on the input from Resident Engineers and from the Caltrans Public Relations Department, these sign has positive impact on the motoring public, therefore Caltrans requests the Committee to makes recommendations for the adoption of these signs.

Chairman Mansourian asked the Committee members if they had any comments or questions for Wayne Henley.

Jacob Babico asked whether the sign showing on page 11 of 51 with logo could be used by local agencies by replacing with their logo.

Wayne Henley responded that the logo could be optional and agencies should be able to use their own logo on this sign.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the logo should be restricted to the public agencies only.

Chairman Mansourian opened the item for public comments.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the FHWA is very lenient on logos, however, the cones are symbols and it may require approval from the FHWA.

Bob Shanteau stated that anybody can do the traffic engineering in California and asked whether the signs will be part of the Traffic Management Plan or if they will be considered by the contractor.

David Royer, Consultant, suggested that he believes it is a great program, however the diamond sign shown on page 12 of 51 has a blue background and that was a concern. Blue signs are used for information purposes.

There were no other comments. Chairman Mansourian opened the discussion among the Committee members.

Chairman Mansourian pointed out to Wayne Henley a few concerns raised by the public. One, the sign might need approval from the FHWA. Second, if the signs will be part of the Traffic Management Plan, and lastly, the color of the sign.

Wayne Henley stated that the signs will be part of the Traffic Management Plan, and he will defer the color issue to the sign expert.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the Committee needs to be careful adding to many signs to the work zone area signs. However, if the signs are optional, he will support the proposal. He added that most of the local agencies and contractors are using the WATCH manual. If the Committee makes recommendations for the adoption, he will suggest including these signs into the WATCH manual. Also, if they are adopted, all public agencies should be able to use them.

Chairman Mansourian asked Matt Schmitz if he would like to provide comments on the proposal.

Matt Schmitz stated that the MUTCD is flexible on safety message signs, however, he is not comfortable to say that the sign with cone symbols will be acceptable without consulting with MUTCD team. The diamond shape sign on page 12 is a just verbal message and it is acceptable as long as color is consistent

with the message. He stated that if Caltrans approaches the FHWA team in regards to the symbol sign, he believes it will be acceptable as a safety message.

There were comments from the audience suggesting that the sign used on page 10 of 51 could be used in lieu of the page 11 of 51 sign.

Chairman Mansourian stated that we can proceed by two ways, either continue this item and ask Caltrans to get concurrence from FHWA, or give them conceptual approval subject to FHWA approval.

Wayne Henley stated that he would prefer a conceptual approval subject to FHHWA approval.

John Fisher stated that he remembers approving this as an experiment, however, he is not sure if a blue sign was part of the experiment request. He is not sure if these signs will do any good in work zone areas. Secondly, there is no policy statement indicating when and which conditions these signs could be used. He is not comfortable with the diamond sign.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he could move a motion recommending a conceptual approval subject to collaboration with FHWA, making these signs available to public agencies and bringing back to the Committee a language or policy statement. The sign policy should be optional use of these signs.

Ed von Borstel seconded the motion.

John Fisher stated that there is no language on how to apply these signs, and approval of the blue diamond is not consistent with work zone signs. He will support the rectangular sign not the diamond sign as proposed.

Hamid stated that he agrees with John Fisher's comment and would amend his motion.

Chairman Mansourian asked Ed von Borstel if he agrees with the amendment.

Ed von Borstel responded that he supports the changes.

MOTION: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommends a conceptual approval for the rectangular sign shown on page 11 of 51 with the collaboration of FHWA. Also bring policy for the sign to the next meeting and if Caltrans wants to pursue a diamond sign, then change the color and bring it back to the Committee with a policy statement.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will follow up if they would like to use these signs.

08-1 Amendment to CAMUTCD Section 2B.112(CA) Daylight Headlight Signs (S30(CA) Series)

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to address the agenda item amendment to the Daylight Headlight signs.

Wayne invited Johnny Bhullar and asked him to address the Committee in regards to the proposed amendment.

Johnny Bhullar stated that current Section 2B.112 does not have actual policy, it says when used under the guidance. The current policy is silent on the installation of theses signs. The amendment will add an "Option" statement as follows:

Option: (Proposed)

Daylight Headlight (S30(CA) Series) signs may be used after consultation with the local CHP office as a countermeasure in high accident locations on two lane highways where there is a potential for head-on collisions.

Guidance: (Current policy)

When used, the DAYLIGHT HEADLIGHT SECTION (S30-1(CA)) sign should be placed approximately 150 m (500 ft) in advance of a daylight headlight section.
When used, the TURN ON HEADLIGHTS NEXT X MILES (S30-2(CA)) sign should be placed at the beginning of a daylight headlight section.
When used, the END DAYLIGHT HEADLIGHT SECTION (S30-3(CA)) sign should be placed at the end of a daylight headlight section.
When used, the TURN ON HEADLIGHTS (S30-4(CA)) sign should be placed at the entrances from major side roads to a daylight headlight section.
When used, the CHECK HEADLIGHTS (S30-5(CA)) sign should be placed approximately 150 m (500 ft) beyond the end of a daylight headlight section.

Support:

Refer to CVC 21461 for enforcement of Daylight Headlight (S30(CA) Series) signs.
See Figure 2B-101(CA) for S30(CA) Series signs.

Chairman Mansourian suggested adding "local CHP/law enforcement agency," so if local agencies consult with their police department, they could consider these signs.

Johnny Bhullar stated that is fine with Caltrans.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he would suggest replacing the word "countermeasure" with "traffic safety improvement measure". Hamid further added that if local agencies want to use these regulatory signs they must have ordinance approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Jacob Babico suggested adding, "a traffic investigation" before the word "consultation." This will make it more reasonable.

Chairman Mansourian asked for public comments.

There were no public comments.

Chairman Mansourian stated that there were three suggestions to add to the proposed option as follows: Replace "countermeasure" with "traffic safety improvement measure", insert "local law enforcement" and insert "a traffic investigation" before the word "consultation". He asked Committee members if they had any further comments.

Wayne Henley suggested to strikeout the word "when used" from the guidance.

John Fisher stated then it becomes requirement, and secondly, this is the way that the federal MUTCD has been written.

Hamid Bahadori asked whether CHP is fine with the word "consultation" in the proposed option.

Steve Lerwill, alternate member, CHP, stated that CHP is fine with consultation because that is what they do now.

There were no other comments.

MOTION: Moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by Ed von Borstel, revise the option statement as suggested by the Committee members and recommended that Caltrans adopt the amended policy of CA MUTCD Section 2B.112(CA) by adding the option statement as follows as follows:

Option:

Daylight Headlight (S30(CA) Series) signs may be used after a traffic investigation *and* consultation with the local CHP/and/or law enforcement office as a ~~countermeasure~~ traffic safety improvement measure in high accident locations on two lane highways where there is a potential for head-on collisions.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will revise the policy and post on the CA MUTCD website until the next CA MUTCD revision.

08-2 Amendment to Handicap Parking Signs and Striping (Required due to AB1531)

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to discuss agenda item Handicap Parking signs and striping amendment, which resulted from AB1531.

Wayne Henley stated that legislature has amended CVC Sections 22511.59, 22511.7, 22511.8, and 42001.13 of, and added Section 22511.95 to, the Vehicle Code, related to vehicles. The proposed amendment has changed the signs and pavement marking for handicap parking. Page 20 and 21 of 51 shows the existing sign and proposed sign based on the new language. Page 22 of 51 has the revised marking. He stated that the changes are due to legislation, Caltrans does not have control of that. He asked the Committee to review the amendment and if they agree, would like to see a recommendation for the adoption of the revised signs and pavement markings.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori asked whether the sign installations will be retroactive.

Wayne Henley responded no, the new signs and marking requirements would be limited to parking space construction on or after July 1, 2008.

Chairman Mansourian opened the item for public comments.

Laura Wells, City of San Jose, stated that the existing sign is 18”x24” in size and that AB1531 requires a sign not less than 17”x22”, however, the proposed sign has dimensions 24”x30”. She believes the proposed sign is too large compared to the bill’s requirement.

There was some confusion about the existing signs and the AB1531 minimum requirements. The Committee members and audience were comparing the existing and proposed sign without knowing that legislation has revised the sign message and it is longer than the current message. The existing sign has a shorter message compared to the amendment approved by the legislation. The approved new language has seven words more than the old message. Secondly, even though AB1531 talks about the minimum sign size being not less than 17”x22”, the law also states: “with lettering not less than one-inch in height”. To accommodate the message with a one-inch lettering size requires a larger sign for the new message, and the proposed sign shown on page 20 of 51 fulfills the requirements of AB1531. The exact message is as on the following follows:

> “Unauthorized vehicles parked in designated accessible spaces not displaying distinguishing placards or special license plates issued for persons with disabilities will be towed away at the owner’s expense. Towed vehicles may be reclaimed at:

Proposed Sign
24" X 30" Sign
1" Series C Letters

The white on blue R99(CA) is revised with two options as follows:

Proposed R99 (CA)
with new R99B (CA)
supplemental plate
Plate 12" x 9"

Proposed R99C (CA)
new combined sign
12" x 24"

When Committee members were clear on the legislation and on the proposal, there were no further comments.

MOTION: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommended that Caltrans adopt the proposed signs and marking as shown on page 21, 21 and 22 of the agenda.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will inform the Committee when they will adopt these amendments.

08-3 Amendment to CAMUTCD Section 4D.17 Visibility, Shielding, and Positioning of Signal Faces

Chairman Missourian asked Wayne Henley to address agenda items "positioning of signal faces".

Wayne Henley stated that this is another oversight while adopting the CA MUTCD to replace the Traffic Manual. He invited Johnny Bhullar to address this amendment because he is the keeper of the CA MUTCD.

Johnny Bhullar stated that he discovered a conflict between Caltrans practice and the policy included in the CA MUTCD. He added that the Caltrans Standard Plans calls out the minimum clearance from the bottom of the signal housing over a roadway shall be 5.2 m (17'), however, the CA MUTCD states that it shall be 4.6 m (15'), which is in conflict with the practice. He further added that if local agencies want flexibility then the standards could be modified so that local roads shall have a minimum of 4.6 m (15') and State Highways shall have a minimum of 5.2 m (17'). He asked the Committee for their opinion.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments from the Committee members.

John Fisher stated that he is aware that the Caltrans Standards Plans requirement has a minimum clearance from the roadway to the bottom of the signal phase, that it shall be a minimum of 5.2 m (17'), and questions why there is need to have two different standards in the CA MUTCD.

Johnny Bhullar responded that the minimum requirement on State Highways is 17', while the CA MUTCD has a minimum of 15' which is a conflict between the two documents.

Chairman Mansourian stated that the CA MUTCD has a minimum of 15' while in practice it is a minimum of 17'.

John Fisher stated that he supports to clarify the standards, however, he gave a few examples in Los Angles where the freeway overcrossings doe not have enough height to provide visibility if the signal faces are 17' high above the roadway. In those cases, where overcrossing/bridges doe not have the height to provide visibility to signals at 17' in height to provide a visibility to signal heads, the height has been lowered. He added that he totally supports the concept, however in certain conditions deviation from the 17' is a necessity. He stated that the standards may be modified saying that the minimum shall be 4.6 m (15') and it should be 5.2 m (17').

Johnny Bhullar stated that will accommodate Caltrans practice and also the condition as mentioned by John Fisher.

Chairman Mansourian noticed that Matt Schmitz wanted to add his comments.

Matt Schmitz stated that on this specific issue, a California standard supersedes the federal standards. It seems like the Committee is looking at specific standards for local roads and State Highways. Based on comments from John Fisher, it seems like there are situations where signal heads require a lower height such as lower bridges/overcrossings.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he does not have a problem with John Fisher's suggestion. However, he does not want any conflict between the Caltrans Standard Plans and the CA MUTCD. The Standard Plans calls for the minimum clearance from the bottom of the signal housing over a roadway to be 5.2 m (17').

Chairman Fisher opened the item for public comments.

Bob Shantou asked Johnny Bhullar if the 15' height is from the federal MUTCD, and he added that the Traffic Manual says 17'.

Johnny Bhullar responded that the Traffic Manual refers to the mounting for vehicle signal faces to the Caltrans Standards Plans and the Standards Plans requires a minimum clearance of 17'.

There were no other comments from the public.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion to the Committee members.

MOTION: Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommended that Caltrans adopt the Section 4D.17 of CA MUTCD as follows:

> "The bottom of the signal housing and any related attachments to a vehicular signal face located over a roadway ~~shall~~ should be at least 5.2 m (17 ft). ~~on State highways and 4.6 m (15 ft) above the pavement for other roadways~~.

Chairman Mansourian asked for discussion.

Hamid Bahadori asked Johnny Bhullar that if the "shall" is changed to "should" in the CA MUTCD as suggested by John Fisher and Caltrans Standard Plans requires that the minimum shall be 17', then it will be a discrepancy between the two documents. Would Caltrans consider changing the language from the Standard Plans to be consistent with the CA MUTCD?

Johnny Bhullar responded that he supports the suggestion made by John Fisher and Caltrans will modify the Standard Plans showing that 17' is the recommended height above the roadway.

Hamid Bahadori stated that as long as the CA MUTCD and Caltrans Standard Plans are consistent, he supports the motion.

Chairman Mansourian asked for further comments. There were none. He asked for the vote on motion moved by John Fisher, seconded by Ed von Borstel.

Motion Carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will follow-up and inform the Committee when the amendment will be implemented.

08-4 Bus Preferential Only Lane Signs

Chairman Mansourian asked Deborah Wong to address agenda item 08-4.

Deborah Wong stated that this proposal is to follow-up the last meeting addenda item 07-23, "Bus Preferential Only Lane" signs, which were recommended by the CTCDC to Caltrans for adoption into the CA MUTCD. The City of San Francisco is proposing four signs as shown on page 27 of 51. She asked Jack Fleck, Municipal Transportation Agency, the City of San Francisco, to address this item.

Jack Fleck stated at the request of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the CTCDC, at its meeting in October 2007, recommended that Caltrans adopt signs R3-10a, R3-11b, R3-14b and BUS LANE ENDS into the CA MUTCD. The adoption of these signs allows California agencies to use preferential only lane signs for buses on urban streets. The signs R3-10a, R3-11b, R3-14b as shown on the MUTCD, Figure 2B-7 and shown on the page 27 of 51 of the agenda packet do not display any diamond symbol in line with the MUTCD 2003 standard: "The diamond symbol shall not be used on the bus, taxi, or bicycle Preferential Only Lane signs", Section 2B.26, Page 2B-26 of the MUTCD. These MUTCD signs and the BUS LANE ENDS sign are to be used in California following the CTCDC's decision on October 11, 2007. Jack Fleck further stated that all these signs signify bus preferential only lanes, yet each of their design is quite different. In order to provide a uniform design, similar to the series of "Car Pool" lane signs, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency proposes the following bus (transit) preferential only lane signs: R3-10a (CA), R3-11b (CA), R3-14b (CA), and R3-10c (CA) as shown in Attachment A, page 27 of 51. Their design is identical with of R3-11b (CA) or based on the design of R3-11b. Jack Fleck requested the Committee for the adoption of the proposed signs.

Chairman Mansourian asked for comments and questions from the Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori asked for clarification, if the proposal is to replace the MUTCD signs with the proposed signs or if the proposed signs will be a supplement to the existing MUTCD signs.

Jack Fleck responded that there is a slight variation to the current R3-10a, R3-11b and R3-14 MUTCD signs. The proposed new signs will have the CA code and with addition of wording "Right Lane" plus a new sign, "Right Lane Bus Lane Ends" R3-10c(CA) signs.

John Fisher asked whether the MUTCD signs are overhead signs.

Jack Fleck responded that the R3-14b with downward arrow is an overhead sign.

Deborah Wong asked if the R3-14b(CA) will be placed on the right lane as an overhead sign.

Jack Fleck responded yes.

Chairman Mansourian opened the item for public comments. There were no public comments.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion among the Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori stated that this is a good proposal, because the proposed signs are a supplement to the current MUTCD signs. He stated that the proposal showing only the use of these signs in a right lane, he would prefer to have an option so that the signs could be used when the bus lane is in left lane or depending upon the application.

There were no more comments.

MOTION: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Deborah Wong, recommends that Caltrans adopt the proposed signs as supplemental signs to the CA MUTCD and provide the option to use these signs in a left or right lane, depending on the application.

Motion Carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will follow up with the CTCDC recommendations.

08-5 "No Double-Parking Anytime Commercial Vehicles Included" Double Fine Imposed, ?? AM – ?? AM, ?? PM – ?? PM, MON – FRI

Chairman Mansourian asked Deborah Wong to introduce agenda item 08-5, "No Double Parking Anytime Commercial vehicle" proposed by the City of San Francisco.

Deborah Wong stated that the City of San Francisco is proposing additional "No Double Parking Anytime Commercial Vehicle Included" to prohibit the double parking of the commercial vehicles for loading and unloading purposes. She asked Damon Curtis to address this proposal.

Damon Curtis stated that page 29 of 51 shows the proposed signs. He pointed out that the CVC Section 22502(c) states that local authority may, by ordinance, prohibit commercial vehicles from stopping, parking or standing on one side of a roadway in a business district with the wheels of such a vehicle more that 18 inches from the curb. The ordinance shall be effective only if signs are placed in the area to which it is applicable clearly indicating the prohibition. The sign shown on page 29 of 51, the left sign is larger than the middle sign with the same message. The City of San Francisco also has an ordinance in certain areas to impose a double fine, therefore the sign on the right is proposed to inform motorists that the fine is double if they park within the prohibited area. He requested the Committee to make recommendations for the adoption of the signs shown page 29 of the 51.

Chairman Mansourian asked the Committee members if they have questions for Damon Curtis.

Steve Lerwill asked if there is double parking, according to the CVC that is illegal, the same CVC Section applies to all vehicles. He asked why the City wants to include commercial vehicles on the sign.

Damon Curtis responded that right now the CVC Section 22502(b) does allow commercial vehicles to Double Park if they are 18 inches away from the curb to accomplish the loading and unloading of merchandise or passengers on or from such vehicles. The city found out there is some ambiguity about this, and judges have thrown out citations based on that section of the CVC.

Steve Lerwill asked whether it means if a commercial vehicle is 18 inches away from the curb, the city wants to cite them under double parking. These vehicles are 18-wheelers with loads, and sometimes they might have difficulty to park exactly 18 inches from the curb. Under this sign, the city will cite them.

Damon responded that wasn't exactly true, the purpose of the sign is if they are really double-parked, then they are blocking traffic. He added that there are certain streets where the city would like to use these signs because the priority is to keep traffic moving on those streets.

Steve Lerwill stated that there might be an issue with the California Trucking Associations.

John Fisher stated that the Committee should be thanking the City of San Francisco to bring all these "no parking" sign to the Committee's attention. These signs are allowed under various sections of the CVC, however, there is no corresponding signs existing to satisfy the requirement of the CVC. A few meetings back, the Committee recommended for the adoption of a series of "No Parking" signs, which is allowed under various sections of the CVC. During that time, this section was overlooked. He was surprised to see that a CVC section does allow commercial vehicles to Double Park when they are loading or unloading unless jurisdiction installs a sign. He stated that he has concerns with the double fine imposed sign. If someone is visiting the city, he or she does not know the meaning of double fine unless there is a fine amount posted. That is the only concern he raised about the "Double Fine Imposed" sign.

Damon Curtis stated that the city has an ordinance in place which imposes a double fine and that is the reason the sign is proposed.

John Fisher asked what the standard fine is.

Damon Curtis responded that it is $50 for a regular fine and $100 for the double fine.

Hamid Bahadori also raised a concern on the double fine imposed sign, he stated that the double fine sign is a statewide sign, and that sign has a minimum fine amount with the message Double Fine. He asked wherever these signs are not installed, it means double parking is allowed for loading and unloading.

John Fishes responded yes, based on CVC Section 22502(c).

Hamid Bahadori asked the representative of the CHP if a law enforcement agency will not impose a double parking unless signs are installed.

Steve Lerwill commented that there are other CVC sections that deal with illegal double parking and the vehicles can be cited if they are blocking the roadway.

The Chairman opened the item for public comments. There were no comments from the public. He opened the item for the Committee's discussion.

Hamid Bahadori asked how important the double fine sign is. He stated that he is not comfortable with this sign. He is not sure if other jurisdictions have double fine ordinances for no parking. Most of the times this type of sign has some kind of code which represents the fine.

Jack Fleck asked Hamid Bahadori if he was suggesting using an actual dollar amount of fine on the sign.

Hamid Bahadori stated yes, the sign could state the amount with the reference of the ordinance number.

Jack Fleck responded that would work for the City.

John Fisher stated that the Committee has asked to make a recommendation for the adoption of these sign as new standards for the State. The cities that have a double fine ordinance, they can add a plate indicating the amount of the fine. He stated that the City of LA has different fines for different categories of no parking signs and they do post the fine on the sign. He supported to adopt the first two signs and not the double fine imposed sign.

Chairman Mansourian asked if this was John Fisher's motion.

MOTION: Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Deborah Wong, recommended that Caltrans adopt the "No Double Parking Anytime Commercial Vehicles Included" signs in two different sizes.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will keep the Committee informed on the status of Committee's recommendation.

08-6 Supplement Sign "No Hybrid Decals" with R93A

Chairman Mansourain asked Wayne Henley to address agenda item 08-6, No Hybrid Decals supplement sign.

Wayne Henley stated that currently the carpool lane does allow vehicles with "white decals" and "yellow decals". White decals are issued to vehicles which use "natural gas and electric", yellow decals are issued to vehicles which use "gasoline and electric". Due to the carpool lanes get congested, federal law requires that Caltrans prohibit the use of carpool lanes by vehicles with yellow decals. Caltrans wants to install a supplement plate to the existing R93A sign with a message "No Hybrid Decals". This is a contingency plane so that when Caltrans is ready to prohibit hybrid vehicles from using the carpool lanes, they could use this sign.

Chairman Mansourian asked whether the Committee members had any comments or questions.

John Fisher commented that he understands by allowing certain types of energy efficient vehicles, they have degraded the capacity of carpool lanes. However, the proposal is to prohibit certain types of vehicles and allow the vehicles which use natural gas and electric, so why not allow hybrid vehicles?

Wayne Henley responded that electric vehicles are qualified as clean air vehicles with zero emission, while hybrid vehicles are considered to produce some emissions because they use some gasoline too.

John Fisher stated that someone could make the argument that electric vehicles also degrade the occupancy.

Wayne Henley responded that he does not know exactly why one with zero emissions is allowed and with low emissions proposed to be prohibited.

Deborah Wong asked if low emission vehicle stickers have an expiration date.

John Fisher responded that low emissions have a 2011 sunset date, but he does not know about the zero emission vehicles.

Hamid Bahadori stated that zero emission vehicles are covered under the federal statue and low emission vehicles are covered under California statue. He commented that it was not a good idea to begin with to allow hybrid vehicles in carpool lanes. There was no study conducted as to what type of impact it would be, so he has no problem with the contingency plan to have a sign ready for implementation. The message "No Hybrid Decals" is not clear, what message a driver receives. He does not have an exact suggestion, however he would like to see some clear message to the drivers who are driving hybrid vehicles.

Wayne Henley asked the Committee members for suggestions to see which gives a clear message.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the rule of thumb is the message should be clear to the driver.

Deborah Wong suggested that a larger sign with message "Vehicles with Hybrid Decals Not Allowed Clean Air Decal OK.

Hamid Bahadori agreed with suggestion.

Chairman Mansourian opened the item for public comments. There were no public comments. Chairman Mansourian opened discussion to the Committee members.

John Fisher stated that this will be a major change and the message should be stronger on a larger sign. He suggested considering, "Hybrid Vehicles With Decals Prohibited". This will give a clear message to the motorists.

Deborah Wong commented that would not allow a hybrid vehicle with even two or more person in to the carpool lane.

John Fisher agreed with Deborah Wong's comment.

Hamid Bahadori suggested that Caltrans should also develop a supplemental advisory sign in advance of the carpool lanes stating that hybrid vehicles are not allowed in the carpool lane.

There was no consensus on the message and the Committee suggested that Caltrans develop a sign which is clearly understandable, because the proposed sign is not clear.

MOTION: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by John Fisher, suggested that Caltrans develop a sign which provides a clear message to the drivers and also develop a supplemental advance sign for carpool lanes indicating that single occupied hybrid vehicles are not allowed in the carpool lanes, and they bring back to the Committee's review and recommendation.

Motion carried 8-0.

Action: Caltrans will review the Committee's suggestions and take appropriate action.

6 Request for Experimentation

08-7 Request for Experimentation with new Warning Sign for Bicyclists

Chairman Mansourian asked Deborah Wong to introduce agenda item 08-7, experimentation request with new bicyclist signs.

Deborah Wong stated that this request was initiated due to a particular intersection where motorists make illegal right turns causing conflict with bicyclists. She asked Jack Fleck to address his proposal.

Jack Fleck, City Traffic Engineer, City of San Francisco, stated that the City and County of San Francisco, Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), requests CTCDC permission to experiment with the installation of a new warning sign directed at bicyclists with the message "Bicyclists Watch For Prohibited Right Turns". He pointed out two different options included in the agenda packet on pages 35 and 36 of 51. Jack Fleck stated that the purpose of the signs is to alert the bicyclists that automobiles are making illegal right turn. The signs will alert the bicyclists that vehicles are traveling in the lane to their immediate left across their path on prohibited movement. Jack Fleck stated that the proposal is to handle the problem at the intersection of Market Street and Octavia Boulevard/Central Freeway. Octavia Blvd opened to traffic on September 9, 2005, replacing the elevated portion of the Central Freeway north of Market Street. Octavia Blvd included a prohibition of right turn from the EB Market Street onto the entrance to the Central Freeway. He stated that the majority of the motorists complied with the no right turn regulations at the subject location, but a few motorists began to violate it. He stated that illegal right turns vary from 8 to 33 per hour based on the observation conducted from September 28, 2005 though October 26, 2006, see table below:

TABLE 1

Date	Time of Counts	Illegal Right Turns
September 28, 2005	7a-8a	33
January 24, 2006	7a-8a	30
January 24, 2006	4p-5p	8
January 25, 2006	7a-8a	36
January 25, 2006	4p-5p	16
October 26, 2006	8a-9a	19

He stated that SFMTA took some preventive measures to reinforce the no right turn regulations as follows:

Three No Right Turn Signs were installed including one in the median. Straight vertical green signal arrow facing EB traffic to emphasize that turns are not allowed. NO Right Turn pavement markings. Painted white traffic island and safe-hit posts on the right side of the right most vehicular traffic lane. A larger guide sign at, in advance of, and past the subject intersection indicating alternative routes to the freeway and an advance bicycle warning sign (W11-1). He stated that observation taken after the installation of these devices resulted in reduction of the violation but the problem still exists.

Jack Fleck stated that in the 14-month period prior to installing additional measures to reinforce the no right turn restriction, there were six right turn/bicycle collisions at the subject intersection, an average of 0.5 collisions per month. In the 9-month period after, there were seven such collisions, an average of 0.8 collisions per month. The SFMTA had success in reducing the illegal right turns, however the same efforts have proven unsuccessful in reducing the rate of bicycle-involved collisions. The SFMTA believe it would be prudent to give bicyclists advance notice of this unexpected condition, providing them with adequate time to slow down, stop, or take other evasive action, if needed. He stated due to these reasons the SFMTA asks the CTCDC for consideration of this request for experimentation.

Chairman Mansourian asked for question or comments from the Committee members.

Steve Lerwill asked Jack Fleck that the bicyclists are required to obey all the traffic rules of the roadway, if the no right turn sign is also applicable to bicyclists too.

Jack Fleck stated the bicyclists could not make a right turn because that movement leads to the freeway.

Steve Lerwill commented that the word "cars" from the sign should be removed.

Jack Fleck responded that there are two options, one without the word "cars" and a second with "cars" and the purpose is to see which one the Committee prefers.

Hamid Bahadori stated that there is an assembly bill AB 23 (Ma and Leno, with coauthor Migden) which proposes to use of a red light enforcement camera for the illegal right turn movement. AB23 is proposed for this particular intersection. He commented that the bill should not give blanket approval to the local agencies, if there is a problem in one city at one intersection, the bill should only specify that intersection in the particular city. He asked Jack Fleck, if the Committee gives permission to experiment with the sign, and if the experiment is successful, then the City would recommend the signs to be adopted as statewide standards. He added that he has not heard of any other problem locations as described by the City of San Francisco. He asked the Committee members and Caltrans if the Committee could justify these sign only for this location and not to go through the experimentation because the result of experimentation may require developing a standard, which is not needed statewide. If they want some type of protection that is good, the same comments their organization made during the review of AB 23 applies.

Wayne Henley stated that would be fine with Caltrans.

John Fisher asked if the right turn goes to the freeway, what other mitigation has been considered to satisfy the demand of the motorists.

Jack Fleck responded that there are numerous advance signs to advise motorists about the freeway entrance.

John Fisher asked if the paved island with yellow and black diagonal lines would make it physically almost impossible for a vehicle to make a right turn and still be on the right side of the double yellow stripe after completing the turn.

Jack Fleck responded it is true with big trucks, however cars could make it without any problem.

John Fisher asked about the degree of police enforcement that has been used at that location.

Jack Fleck responded that police are very helpful and they are there a lot, however, they cannot be there 24-hours a day.

Wayne Henley asked what the reason was for prohibiting the right turn.

Jack Fleck responded due to heavy traffic, traffic is backed-up especially during the morning hours.

Hamid Bahadori suggested that the city could include an urgency clause to AB 23, so as soon as Governor signs the bill, the city can implement the red light enforcement cameras.

Jack Fleck responded that the city would prefer to go ahead and try these signs. The city has experience with the red light enforced cameras, however, cameras cannot prevent illegal movements. The red light cameras issue many citations, however, people still run red lights. If it is true that, even with the photo enforcement, some drivers continue to make turns, then the collisions will continue.

Matt Schmitz, FHWA, stated that he was not able to find any section/sign in the MUTCD/CA MUTCD which fits to this situation. He stated he would like to see some evaluation to determine if the proposal is effective. If you are proposing to conduct an experiment, he asked whether the city would consider some other options such as a tractor-trailer which shows a visual conflict between a vehicle and a bicyclist.

Jack Fleck stated that the city did consider a diagram displaying a bicycle crashing into a car, however the city decided to design something creative and also stay within the parameters of standard traffic control devices.

Wayne Henley asked if you have considered positive barriers, such as pop-up tubes which could be tied with signal phasing.

Jack Fleck responded that was also looked and it was decided against. The positive barriers were also considered, however, the city does not want to solve one problem and create another by cars hitting the barriers.

Bob Shanteau asked whether the city has consulted the California Bicycle Association on this proposal.

Jack Fleck stated that the proposed sign idea was formed from a meeting with the SF Bicycle Coalition.

Bob Shanteau stated that as a traffic engineer, he is very familiar with bike lane issues. The bikes are going downhill on the right of vehicle traffic when cars are turning right. He stated that Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual does not recommend bike lanes on a downhill grade, therefore he suggested that the biker should merge with the vehicle and use the same lane.

Chairman Mansourian asked Jack Fleck about the comments and suggestions made by Bob.

Jack Fleck responded that the bicyclists want a bike lane, if the proposed concept did not work, then the city would consider eliminating the bike lane.

Wayne Henley asked whether the city has any signing upstream to slow down the bikers.

Jack Fleck responded he does not believe there is one.

John Fisher stated that the LA City has installed CMS signs or electric signs in certain problematic locations with a No Right Turn message. He suggested trying all other options available such as electric signs and one in advance with the same message. He suggested that the sign targeted on vehicles would be more effective instead of installing sign for bikers.

Jack Fleck responded that the city did use CMS signs and the batteries were running down frequently. He stated that from experience, he has seen people making left turns while facing a solid red left turn arrow.

There were no other questions for Jack Fleck.

Chairman Mansourian opened discussion to the Committee members.

Deborah Wong stated that she would like to move a motion.

MOTION: Moved by Deborah Wong suggested to authorize experimentation with either of the signs included in the agenda packet.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he would second the motion if his amendment were included. His amendment was that the Committee's intent is not to include these signs in the CA MUTCD, the purpose of the signs is to address one isolated location in one city.

Chairman Mansourian commented that he would suggest the city to consider doing experimentation with the proposed signs and also by merging the bike lane with regular traffic and see which one works better. As Hamid Bahadori stated before, the problem is only for one particular intersection and the Committee does not want these signs to be adopted statewide. He added that his suggestion is not part of the motion, however, it is a request to the city to consider comments made by the Committee members and by the public.

John Fisher stated that this is a single isolated problem that is unique for a particular location and it is not a statewide problem. When the Committee is approached for an experimentation request and the Committee authorizes experimentation for a single location to accommodate the jurisdiction to help them

to find a solution of the problem. After three years, the results come back and the agency asks the Committee to develop standards which are applicable statewide. He added that he is not in favor to adding signs to the CA MUTCD, which are not applicable statewide. He suggested that if the Committee considers experimentation then it should be compared with other available tools. They may be more expensive, such as an electric LED "No Right Turn" sign, and consider bicycle lead signal phase.

John Fisher stated that he would like to make a friendly amendment that authorizes the experimentation with the signs as well as also test electric LED "No right Turn" signs at the intersection and in advance, and also evaluate providing a bicycle lead signal phase. Then the city analyzes which device works more effectively.

Chairman Mansourian asked Deborah Wong and Hamid Bahadori if they agreed with John Fisher's amendment and would like to make motion. He also asked Jack Fleck if it is acceptable to him.

Both Deborah Wong and Hamid Bahadori agreed with the amendment suggested by John Fisher. In addition, Jack Fleck stated that the city would consider other tools available.

Steve Lerwill commented that this is one location which has a particular problem that is not a statewide issue, the Committee is approving a sign for one particular location and after three years if the sign is proven effective, would the Committee adopt as a statewide standards?

Chairman Mansourian responded that the part of the motion is that the sign will not be included in the CA MUTCD even it is proven to be effective at this location. He further added that the cities and counties that have problems to provide adequate safety, they come to the Committee. It is the Committee's responsibility to try to help them within the parameters of the CA MUTCD.

Hamid Bahadori commented that with the passage of AB23, the city will deploy a red-light enforcement camera and with the implementation of the red-light cameras, he believes this problem will go away, because most of the commuters are daily commuters and they will learn quickly from the citations. He hoped that when the city comes back to the Committee, the problem would go away with the use of red light enforcement.

Chairman Mansourian asked Deborah Wong and Hamid Bahadori to revise their motion.

MOTION: Moved by Deborah Wong, seconded by Hamid Bahadori, authorize experimentation with signs as requested by the City/County of San Francisco. In addition, to compare other devices such as electric LED "No Right Turn" signs and bicycle leading signal phase to see which device is more effective. In the end, if signs are proven successful, they will not be included in the CA MUTCD because they are for an isolated location.

Motion carried 8-0

Action: Item approved for experimentation.

7 Discussion Items

08-8 Bicycle and Motorcycle Detection (AB1581) at the Signalized Intersection

Chairman Mansourian asked Wayne Henley to introduce agenda item "Bicycle and Motorcycle Detection".

Wayne Henley stated that this is another one which came from legislature through AB1581 to develop standard to detect bicycles and motorcycles at the signalized intersections. Wayne Henley invited Ahmad Rastegarpour, Caltrans HQ ITS Branch, to address this item.

Ahmad Rastegarpour stated that the Governor signed AB1581 in October 2007 and the bill required that Caltrans in consultation with cities and counties to establish a uniform standards, specifications, and guidelines for the detection of bicycles and motorcycles by traffic-actuated signals and related signal timing. Caltrans requires CTCDC guidance in this process. There are existing standards which are working to detect motorcycles, the study will focus on the bicycles detection. Caltrans is sending instructions to all their Districts to start installing Type D detector to detect bicycles on all the new projects and any modification to the existing signals. Even though the law does not require retrofitting existing signals, however, Caltrans will work with the bicycle community to see if there is a need and funding is available, then they will consider retrofitting existing signals to install bicycle detectors. Some locations may not be accommodating these detectors and AB1581 does allow deviation. Caltrans has used type D detectors and has been using them in certain locations. They are successful in detecting bicycles. Santa Clara has developed bicycle guidelines and they have included Type D detectors to use at signals to detect bicycles. Caltrans is also including the bicycle symbol with the Type D detector so that the bicyclist knows where to stop to activate a signal. Type D has been recommended by the MTC, UC Berkeley and it is also included in the federal handbook.

Ahmad Rastegarpour stated that Caltrans is also using video detection to detect the bicycles. Caltrans is using video detection at 62 intersections in San Diego and the bicycle community is satisfied with that. Video detection technology still needs some improvement. He stated that Caltrans is looking at guidance from the Committee in developing the standards, specifications, and signal timing for the bicycles. He stated that Caltrans is using the current standards for the immediate deployment which has been tested by Caltrans. Ahmad Rastegarpour talked about the scheduling of the testing and for the approval of final standards. He stated that Caltrans would start experimentation on the signal timing for the bicycles and collect data for the next five months. That data will be shared with the Committee and if Committee is satisfied with the results, then Caltrans will ask for the recommendation to adopt the standards in California. The item will be placed on the CTCDC agenda after the completion of the experimentation. Finally, these standards will be incorporated into the next revision of CA MUTCD. Ahmad Rastegarpour introduced Dr. Steven Shladover, UC Berkeley, PATH, and asked him share the bicycle timing with the Committee members and audiences.

Steven E. Shladover, California PATH Program, Institute of Transportation Studies University of California, Berkeley, stated that the information on bicyclist crossing time is not complete. He stated that incomplete data is available, collected under diverse conditions. There is a wide range of start-up time as well as speed of steady riding, because of the different age groups of bicyclist population such as, small children, teenagers/college students, mid-life adults and seniors.

Steven E. Shladover stated that there are some data and the literature available on bicyclist speed and acceleration from the Taylor study in Austin, TX from 1993 and ITE Journal, 1995. AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 1999 and most recent data in Rubins and Handy from Davis. Recently, UC Davis collected data in 2005 at the 10 intersections, 11 hours of video data which contains over 2000 valid crossings. The Speed range was found from 2.9 – 33 ft/s which are from 2 – 22 mph. Approximately, 95% were within 3.8 – 23.1 ft/s which are 2.6 – 15.8 mph and mean speed was 13.5 ft/s (9 mph), standard deviation 4.8 ft/s (3.3 mph). He stated that there is wide variation in bicyclist speeds,

children and seniors need longer time to cross. AAHSTO recommends 2.5 seconds as a reaction time. To accommodate all the bike riders to cross an intersection, 2.5 seconds reaction time plus 8 ft/sec speed to be considered to provide bicycle timing.

Steven E. Shladover added that based on existing data, an experiment could be conducted considering a crossing time of 2.5 s (reaction time) plus width of the intersection divided by12 (12 ft/s bicycling speed) that would accommodate 98% of general adult bicyclists. According to the AASHTO the bicyclist timing is Green + yellow + all red. He stated that the experiment conducted in Caltrans District 4, with increased green on minor Cross Street at an intersection, simulates effects on mainline traffic. The experiment would observe actual bicyclist crossing times before and after change, video image would be used to process and track bicyclists for count and speed measurements.

John Fisher commented that the legislature requires coming up with a detector to detect bicycles. Does legislation require coming up with signal timing too?

Ahmad Rastegarpour responded yes, legislation also requires coming up with related signal timing.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the Committee needs to handle this legislation very carefully because with all those extra signal timing there will be a very negative impact on traffic. He appreciated that Caltrans is looking at every angle before the standards are developed. Legislation is silent on how many bicycles are required for implementation of this program. This is just like pedestrian timing.

Ahmad Rastegarpour commented that the detector installation would be based on need. The timing increase due to the bicycle signal in a few cycles will be 4 seconds to a maximum of 8-10 second, versus if a bicyclist pushes the pedestrian push-button, it will take more time.

John Fisher asked that all red clearance needs to be looked at closely, because an intersection 60 to 80 feet wide will require an extra 5 to 7 seconds of red clearance time, which is more than currently used for all red clearance.

Ahmad Rastegarpour responded that the purpose of yellow and all red clearance will be subtracting from the timing based on the 12ft/sec. The existing yellow and all red will not change.

John Fisher pointed out that it will not change the yellow timing, however a bicyclist enters the intersection at the end of a yellow phase and since he enters the intersection at yellow phase, he will require an extra 6-8 seconds to cross an intersection of 60 to 80 ft wide. He further asked if the drawing shows a bicycle detector in all lanes, and asked why it is required in all lanes. If the bicyclists are turning left, then they required in the left lane, but if a bicyclists are crossing through, then they needs to be in the right most lane with no bike lane.

Ahmad Rastegarpour responded that the Type D detectors also detect vehicles too, therefore they were shown in all lanes. For safety reasons, bicyclists are supposed to be in the far right lane if they going straight.

Kai Leung, Caltrans ITS Branch, stated that if there are no actuated signals, then the bicyclists push the pedestrian button and that will be activated for more time and the intersection will lose more time compared to the bicycle actuated signals.

Chairman Mansourian commented that there was a presentation from Caltrans. The Committee members asked some questions which needed to be looked at during the data collection, and now the question is if there is a need to place the item on the agenda.

Bob Shanteau stated that he has given technical information related to this item to Caltrans, however, he has not heard back from them. He added that his technical information is valuable in the development of bicycle standards.

Chairman Mansourian stated that this is a discussion item and the Committee needs to decide if they would recommend placing the item on the agenda as an action item. Since this is legislation, the

Committee does not have the option to say no, so this will be an action item during a future meeting, and at that time, the public is invited to present there pros and cons on the proposal. He added that the public will get full attention during that period. He also urges Ahmad to work with Bob Shanteau to see how he can help in this process. He asked Committee members if they recommend placing this item on the agenda for a future meeting as an action item.

It was suggested unanimously to place this item on the agenda.

Ahmad Rastegarpour stated that once the Type D and video cameras are installed to detect bicycles, then motorcycles detection will not be a problem.

Hamid Bahadori stated that a very small portion of Caltrans signals will be affected with this legislation, most intersections would be affected in local jurisdictions. He suggested involving the local agencies in the process so they can provide their input.

Ahmad Rastegarpour asked if to nominate some individual from the local agencies to participate in the process.

There was response to Ahmad Rastegarpour requesting to having a Sub-Committee, the City and County of San Francisco, City of Long Beach and Shean Skehan will represent the City of Los Angles.

Chairman Mansourian nominated Ahmad Rastegarpour to lead the Sub-Committee.

Note: Chairman Mansourian stated that due to other assignments, he has to leave meeting and asked the Committee members to elect CTCDC Chairman and Vice Chairman. He asked Hamid Bahadori, Vice Chairman, to run the remaining agenda in his absence.

The Committee members agreed to that.

Election of Officers

Motion: Moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by Ed von Borstel, to elect John Fisher as Vice Chairman of the CTCDC. Motion carried 8-0.

Motion: Moved by John Fisher, seconded by Jacob Babico, to elect Hamid Bahadori as Chairman of the CTCDC. Motion carried 8-0.

08-9 Turn Prohibition Signs on a Stop Sign Post and Boundary (City Limit) Signs {Outside Inquiry}

Wayne Henley stated that on and off Caltrans receives very constructive comments and suggestion from individuals. This suggestion is having two signs on a stop sign post and Caltrans would like the Committee's opinion. Wayne Henley invited Johnny Bhullar to discuss this item further.

Johnny Bhullar stated that in the agenda packet there is correspondence between Caltrans and Mr. Martin Lyon, there are two questions that needs discussion. First, putting a second sign with the stop sign, and suggesting the stop sign should be on top. Johnny stated that generally the MUTCD and CA MUTCD discourage the installation of two signs on the same post. He stated that there are signs, e.g., one-way sign, divided highway signs that are placed with a stop sign. Sometimes route shield signs have supplemented with directional signs. He added the suggestion from Mr. Lyon is that since the Stop sign is the main message, it shall be on top of the post. Johnny Bhullar stated that he tends to be agreeing with his suggestion and it will require changing the policy for stop signs.

Jacob Babico stated that in San Bernardino County, they have street signs on the top of the stop sign post and then a third sign below which says cross traffic does not stop.

Acting Chairman Bahadori asked the Committee members if they would like to clarify this issue and further stated that he has not seen a sign on top of the stop sign post. Since, Caltrans received this complaint, it means someone has installed a sign on top of the stop panel.

John Fisher stated that assuming there is a problem, particularly if there is a second sign on the same post with a stop sign, the stop sign message will be very high. The minimum stop sign is a 30" size and if there is a No Right Turn sign on the same post, then you provide 7' clearance from the bottom of the sign, in this case the stop sign will be very high.

Steve Lerwill asked if this is a statewide problem or just one complaint.

Johnny Bhullar responded that there is one individual raising this issue, however, he has a point. The stop is a critical message and it should be on top except for street signs.

John Fisher stated by reviewing the stop sign policy, it is not addressed and he would suggest Caltrans to bring an amended policy which address this ambiguity.

There was a unanimous decision to place this item on the agenda for the next meeting under Public Hearing Items.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the second question raised by Mr. Lyon was about the city/county limit signs. Mr. Lyon pointed out that the city boundary signs are not placed at the boundary lines. Johnny further added that the CA MUTCD is not consistent either. There are two policies, one for unincorporated limits, it says the sign "shall" be at the limit line, however for the county boundaries it says the sign "should" be at boundary lines.

John Fisher stated that sometimes there is not a possibility to install a sign at the boundary lines due to some physical restrictions. He commented that the boundary sign should be at the boundary line or where practical to the boundary line.

Johnny Bhullar stated that he believes the policy should be consistent for both unincorporated area and for the county boundary lines.

John Fisher stated that he would recommend that Caltrans bring revised policy with "should" conditions that city limit signs should be placed as close to the limit line as practical.

The Committee recommended unanimously placing this item on the agenda under Public Hearing Items.

08-10 Watch for Stopped Traffic

Wayne Henley stated that Caltrans District 8 has a situation where the traffic backs up and there is a vertical curve where the sight distance is limited. There are signs available such as "Be Prepared To Stop" however, the District Traffic Engineer believes that "Be Prepared To Stop" sign means that you have to stop for some reason, while "Watch For Stopped Traffic" is more of an advisory sign for motorists to be aware of the approaching conditions. He asked for the Committee opinion. Wayne Henley stated that his long-term goal is to have a sign in the CA MUTCD.

John Fisher stated that he supports the idea, because the "Be Prepare To Stop" sign has a different meaning as the "Watch For Stopped Traffic" sign.

Committee members unanimously asked to place this item on the agenda under Public Hearing Items for the next meeting.

8. Information Items

99-12 Speed Striping FOR Smart Crosswalks

Wayne Henley informed the Committee that this speed striping for smart crosswalks was approved in 1999 and Caltrans District 7 was not able to implement the project due to funding issues. He suggested the item be removed from "Items Under Experimentation", Caltrans District 7 will be informed that experimentation authorization has been cancelled and if the District 7 would like to proceed with this experimentation in the future, they need to submit a new proposal to the Committee for approval.

Committee members agreed with the suggestion.

08-11 Section 7B.101(CA) TRAFFIC FINES DOUBLED Sign (SR59(CA)) Delete this section, sign, and CVC reference, as it has sunsetted.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the law which was passed for the three counties Alameda, Santa Barbara and Ventura has been sunsetted as of January 2007. Therefore, the Traffic Fine Doubled sign is not any more an official traffic control device and this section will be deleted from the CA MUTCD. This is just information to the Committee members and the three counties will be informed about this.

The Committee unanimously agreed with the suggestion.

08-12 Report Drunk Drivers – CALL 911 Signs

Johnny Bhullar informed the Committee that this was not an official traffic control device, however, there was a campaign by the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS), California Highway Patrol (CHP), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) to crackdown on DUI drivers during the holidays. The plan includes the installation of 'Report Drunk Drivers Call 911' roadway signs throughout California in conjunction with the media campaign. In response to this campaign, Caltrans will be installing 759 signs, resulting in one sign every 40 miles in each direction on the entire State highways by June 2008.

Jacob Babico asked the color of the sign.

Johnny Bhullar responded that it is white on blue

John Fisher asked whether the MUTCD or CA MUTCD covers any slogan signs which can be used in this kind of campaign.

Acting Chairman Bahadori stated that the Committee might want to consider items to be placed on the future agenda as a discussion item to address future signs like this.

Steve Lerwill asked the Committee members if they would consider developing policy and standards for this type of sign, because FHWA is pushing for this type of slogan and campaign.

John Fisher stated that if there is a need to develop standards for a device, it must be consulted with local agencies to fulfill the requirements of CVC Section 21400.

Steve Lerwill suggested that there is a process to develop signs or any traffic control devices, and it should rest with the CTCDC.

Johnny Bhullar stated that numerous times OTS, Caltrans and CHP want to promote safety. They develop signs and install on public roadways without following the process.

John Fisher asked whose idea this was.

Steve Lerwill responded that it was the idea of the Office of Traffic Safety, they receive grants for these types of campaigns.

Hamid Bahadori commented that there should be an evaluation of this type of campaigning to see if they are effective or not.

Steve Lerwill responded that they could collect some data on the effectiveness of the sign.

Acting Chairman Bahadori asked if the Committee would consider placing a general item on the agenda for discussion of how to handle campaign type signs in the future.

Johnny Bhullar suggested that might be a general item to discuss about local agencies considering safety campaigns, and what they should do when they use these types of signs for campaigning.

Committee unanimously agreed to place a general item on the agenda under discussion for the upcoming meeting.

08-13 Minimum Levels of Sign Retroreflectivity

Wayne Henley stated that the FHWA has issued Revision No. 2 to the MUTCD 2003 Edition. A Final Rule on Sign Retroreflectivity has been published in the Federal Register on December 21, 2007 and it primarily deals with minimum levels of sign retroreflectivity. He informed the Committee that Caltrans is working to develop in house policy on how to satisfy the requirement.

Jacob Babico asked what method Caltrans used to measure the retroreflectivity?.

Wayne Henley responded that it is by eye-balling.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the implementation will be two years after the adoption on the revised MUTCD, however, the Committee might want to review MUTCD language to see if the MUTCD language adequate for the adoption in California.

John Fisher stated that there are different ways to handle this, such as the life span of the signs guaranteed by the supplier (manufacturer). There are devices available to measure the retroreflectivity of the signs.

Dave Royer commented that he has attended two-day training on this subject in Texas. Agencies could eyeball the sign appearance. There is a chart to follow for the requirements. He stated that it is not a complicated subject.

Acting Chairman Bahadori asked Johnny Bhullar to place this on the CTCDC agenda for further discussion.

The Committee members suggested placing this item under the discussion items.

08-A **Assembly Bill No. 321**

Approved & filed on October 10, 2007, it amends CVC 22358.4 to allow an additional 15 mph prima facie speed limit when approaching at a distance of less than 500 ft from a school and to provide a 25 mph prima facie speed limit when approaching a distance of 500 ft to 1000 ft from a school.

Wayne Henley stated that this is another legislation which requires that the speed limit could be reduced to 15 mph in school zones if local authority determines upon the basis of an engineering and traffic survey that the prima facie speed limit of 25 miles per hour established by paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 22352 is more than reasonable or safe, the local authority may, by ordinance or resolution, determine and declare a prima facie speed limit of 20 or 15 miles per hour, whichever is justified as the appropriate speed limit by that survey. He asked Johnny Bhullar if he would like to add to this.

Johnny Bhullar stated that there is need to amend school sections of the CA MUTCD to implement AB321. He asked the Committee members if they are clear about the legislation.

Acting Chairman Bahadori stated that this item needs to be placed on the agenda under Public Hearing items and Caltrans bring back a guideline for the implementation of this legislation.

John Fisher stated that the first thing is to see what the legislation is asking to do. In his opinion, the language is not clear. How this Committee or Caltrans will interpret the language of AB 321 is questionable. Other speed limit laws are very clear for implementation. Before Caltrans comes up with the amendment language, this legislation need exact interpretation.

Acting Chairman Bahadori stated that before Caltrans brings any amendment, they need to check with their attorneys and also cities and counties representing the Committee members should consult their attorneys about the exact meaning of the legislation.

Jacob Babico stated that the CVC Section 22358.4 has been established and has the same language. The only difference is AB321 increases the distance from 500 feet to 1000 feet and there are no other changes.

Johnny stated that Caltrans would check with their legal department and bring their interpretation back to the Committee.

Wayne Henley and Steve Lerwill suggested placing this as a discussion item.

The Committee agreed placing this as a discussion item for the next CTCDC meeting.

General comments:

There were comments by the Committee Member John Fisher about the agenda format. He recommended that the **AGENDA ITEMS** requested by the individuals should contain the the following information:

Public Hearing Items Should Contain the Following Information:

- Recommendation
- Sponsor Name
- Public Agency making Request
- Summary (Executive Summary)
- Background
- Discussion
- Attachment

Experimentation requests should Contain the Following Information::

- A statement indicating the nature of the problem.
- A description of the proposed change, how it was developed, the manner in which it deviates from the standard, and how it is expected to be an improvement over existing standards.
- Any illustration, photograph, or video which would help explain the experimental device or use of this device.
- Any supporting data as to how the experimental device was developed, if it has been tried, in what ways it was found to be adequate or inadequate, and how was this choice of device or application arrived at.

Specific Guidelines For Experimental Proposal:

A specific proposal shall be submitted for each request. This proposal may be submitted with the initial request or may be a follow-up to specific comments by the Committee. The proposal, after approval by the Committee, shall become an integral part of the approved experimentation. Each proposal shall include:

A. **Scope:** A detailed description of the experimentation, locations of installation, and number of experimental projects.

B. **Work Plan:** A description of the proposed plan of study; the variables that are to be measured; the criteria against which the devices is to be evaluated; observations, measures and data which will be collected; whether the experimentation will b carried out in the field or under laboratory conditions; how installations of the experimental device or application will be made; the indication if any adverse effects on safety or traffic operations can be anticipated, together with the means that may be taken to minimize them; and the factors which will be held constant or measured and controlled in order to ensure that the true effects of the device are measured.

C. **Time Periods:** Time periods for experimentation shall normally not be less than six months nor more than two years.

D. **Evaluation Procedures:** The Committee shall approve criteria which will be used to evaluate experimental devices or applications. To permit meaningful comparisons with standard

installations, advice from specialists such as human factors experts, statisticians, etc., may be included.

E. Reporting: A written status report must be forwarded to the sponsor 45 days prior to each public meeting. A final report must be completed within 90 days of the terminal date of the experimentation and forwarded to the Executive Secretary. Status reports shall describe the progress of the work, any particular deviation from the work plan and anticipated time of conclusion. The final report shall contain, as a minimum, the basic information on the problem, the preliminary investigations, the proposed solutions, the study procedures, the detailed analysis of the data, the results of the work, a discussion of the results, and whatever conclusions are drawn. If a change in the State Traffic Manual is proposed, specific wording of this change should be included.

F. Administration: All experimentation proposals shall include the agency sponsoring the study, the agency conducting the study, and the name and titles of principal researchers. There must be proof of professional traffic engineering capabilities and other related professional expertise to perform the experimentation and related evaluation processes.

TERMINATION OF EXPERIMENTATION:

The project must terminate at the end of the approved period unless an extension is granted, and all experimental devices and applications must be removed unless specific permission is given for continued operation. The Committee may, at any time, terminate approval of experimentation if significant safety hazards are indicated to be directly or indirectly attributable to the experimentation. Approval of any experimentation may also be terminated if no status report is received 45 days prior to each public meeting or no final report is received within 90 days of the terminal date of the experimentation.

REMOVAL OF EXPERIMENTATION INSTALLATIONS:

All experimentation installations shall be removed upon termination of the experiment when a decision is made by the Committee that a change in the State Traffic Manual to permit the device is not warranted.

10. Next Meeting:

The next CTCDC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 29, 2008 at 100 Van Ness Street, San Francisco, CA.

Adjourn: Motion: Moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by John Fisher, adjourn the meeting at 3:15 PM.

Motion carried 8-0.