State of California

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
June 30, 2016

City of San Carlos
610 Elm Street
San Carlos, CA 94070

Committee Members in Attendance:
Mark Greenwood, Chair
Hamid Bahadori
Lt. Scott Baland
Robert Bronkall
Bryan Jones
Emma Olenberger
Mike Sallaberry
Duper Tong
Jay Walter
Bill Winter

Alternate Members:
Pratyush Bhatia
David Fleisch
Tony Powers

Committee Staff:
Chris Engelmann, Committee Executive Secretary
Don Howe, Chief, Signs Branch, Office of Traffic Engineering
Rachel Carpenter
Atifa Ferouz
Araceli Rosas

Also Present:
Jay Beeber, Safer Streets L.A.
Shirley Chan, Daly City
John Ciccarelli, Bicycle Solutions
Laurentiu Duscius, Ata Planning
Jim Esparza, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
Vivien Hoang, Federal Highway Administration
Edward Moore, City of Napa
Maurice Palumbo, Golden Gate Bridge
Craig Rhodes, Traffic Management, Inc.
Massoud Saberian, City of Santa Rosa
David Stillman, City of Cupertino

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Greenwood called the meeting to order. Committee Member Walter welcomed the committee and the public to San Carlos.

The committee, staff, and members of the public introduced themselves.

2. Membership

Secretary Engelmann announced that Committee Member Bob Brown was retiring. Committee Members Bahadori and Tong thanked Mr. Brown for his service and wished him well in his new venture as a consultant.

Committee Member Tong introduced new staffer Atifa Ferouz, Acting Editor of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the CTCDC.

3. Approval of Minutes of the March 3, 2016 Meeting

> **MOTION**: Committee Member Walter moved to approve the March 3, 2016 California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as presented. Committee Member Baland seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comments

Jay Beeber, Executive Director of Safer Streets L.A. and a member of the Subcommittee on Yellow Signal Timing, provided an update. The new protocols had gone into effect in August 2015.

The City of Beverly Hills had begun a program with a new vendor and changed all of their yellow light timing to new protocols. Violations data at their prior locations showed that they averaged about 1,743 tickets per month; after the change, they averaged about 300 tickets per month – meaning that intersections are safer.

Some of the cities are now starting to concentrate on left and right turns, as they have lost revenue at straight-through intersections because of the improved timing.

Mr. Beeber will be presenting some new protocols and information at the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) convention in August.

He described an issue regarding interpretation of the new protocols. The City of Los Alamitos initially said that they did not have to comply with the new regulations, but they were convinced otherwise by a court case. They now claim that they do not have to look at the approach speed going towards the intersection – that they can average both speeds in each direction.

Mr. Beeber suggested for the CTCDC to clarify this by either adding the word *approach* to the MUTCD, or supplying a directive from Caltrans that this concerns the 85th percentiles approaching the intersection to be used to set the timing.

Committee Member Bahadori commented on how encouraging it was to see this improvement, as the CTCDC had spent a couple of years on the subject, concluding that the yellow timing standards for California had to be changed. A reduction of 75-80% in violations shows that people are not going through red lights; we have improved traffic safety.

Mr. Beeber thanked the committee and requested them to look at the turning lane issue for stronger protocols.

Committee Member Walter thanked Mr. Beeber for collecting data rather than reporting anecdotal information.

Committee Member Jones commented that this is a good example of engineers not using the minimum – maybe we should be putting in a preferred. Sometimes people do not realize that there is a collision history, and that they can do something else besides the minimum.

5. <u>Items under Experimentation</u>

Secretary Engelmann issued a reminder that any agency submitting a Request to Experiment with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires updates every six months, but in the California MUTCD the requirement is that an update be provided prior to each meeting.

AGENDA ITEMS

6. <u>Public Hearing</u>

CONSENT ITEMS (Minor discussion with vote expected)

16-13: Modify Section 6F.88, Screens

Secretary Engelmann stated that the goal of the item is to provide dimensions that are equal between the Caltrans standards and the MUTCD.

The Caltrans specifications give a minimum height of 24 inches for screens mounted on temporary traffic barriers, while the MUTCD gives a height of 32 inches. Secretary Engelmann proposed to change the latter to 24 inches.

Committee Members Bahadori and Tong discussed the issue.

> **MOTION**: Committee Member Walter moved to change the language in the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* as recommended. Committee Member Bahadori seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

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

16-11: Modify Shared Lane Markings Offset

Secretary Engelmann stated that Caltrans had received comments from Orange County that the current standard for the offset for sharrows is 11 feet; additional emphasis could go beyond that to 13 feet.

Committee Member Jones suggested postponing the item until Committee Member Sallaberry was present.

16-12: Proposal to Reinstate "CAMPING PROHIBITED" SR-21-1(CA) Sign

Secretary Engelmann gave a quick history of the request. Caltrans San Luis Obispo County has a county-wide ordinance prohibiting parking in public places or roadways. An issue is RVs parking along Highway 1 along the various vista points – it becomes a nuisance.

The S22 sign is posted and prohibits parking of vehicles 30 feet or longer. However, RVs can be less than 30 feet long. The District Traffic Engineer asked if they could bring back the SR-

21-1 sign. Secretary Engelmann's preference was to use the NO CAMPING sign (indicated in the Agenda) because it's coming in the future.

Committee Member Winter asked if the ordinance requires placement of a sign in order for the county to enforce it. Secretary Engelmann replied that at the county line there is a sign stating that there is no camping within the county and listing the ordinance number, but people arriving at the vista point may not recall ever seeing the sign.

Committee Member Winter commented that there is ample signage and ample vehicle code provision that allows already in the manual that allows local agencies to restrict parking, even for vehicles 6 feet high or greater. Secretary Engelmann responded that parking would still be permitted at a vista point, even at night; the county just does not want people camping there.

Committee Member Winter voiced the possibility that the "campers" in question may be homeless – the issue may be a social one rather than traffic engineering. In Los Angeles County, the Sheriff's Department uses the opportunity to direct the homeless population to Social Services or some other kind of support. Mr. Winter was not supportive of this type of change because it concerns a larger social issue.

Committee Member Bahadori said that camping is not regulated by the Vehicle Code; this is not a traffic issue. Although he had no problem with the sign going back in, he understood and supported what Committee Member Winter had said.

Committee Member Walter commented that the regulation, based on provisions in the Vehicle Code, would be related to parking. The Vehicle Code does address restricted and time-limited hours of parking. Perhaps we should recognize the parking aspect of this rather than camping.

Committee Member Winter noted that there have been plenty of legal challenges in L.A. regarding the existing camping ordinances. Part of the difficulty has been the definition of camping. Perhaps this could be dealt with as an encroachment to be regulated.

Secretary Engelmann explained the S-22 sign. Committee Member Jones suggested modifying it to have an *X* in the vehicle dimension for the local agency to determine lengths. Secretary Engelmann replied that it could be modified. The committee could also consider eliminating the term *parking*.

Committee Member Walter asked what authority the Department uses to place the S-22 sign. Secretary Engelmann replied that there is a vehicle code that prohibits parking in offramp areas. Committee Member Bahadori noted that cities have the instrument of their own local ordinances where we do not.

Committee Member Bronkall stated that Vehicle Code Section 21461(a) states *failure to obey a regulatory sign*. He read the text. Committee Member Bahadori commented that this section could be used for any type of sign. The catch phrase comes at the end: …*erected by local ordinances*. In the case of the state there is nothing that says camping is illegal.

Committee Member Winter noted that a key word is *traffic* ordinance. L.A. County's ordinance has a Traffic Code; the camping provision is in the Highway Code, which deals with encroachments.

Chair Greenwood stated that the committee would continue the item for more investigation.

(16-11: Modify Shared Lane Markings Offset)

Committee Member Sallaberry stated that in 2000, the CTCDC had had discussion on the distance. They had chosen 11 feet based on a percentile of where they felt doors were opening. It was a minimum and left it to local jurisdictions to choose wherever they felt was appropriate. Times have changed and now there is more discussion about doorings and bicycle safety. Committee Member Sallaberry felt that 13 feet makes sense.

Committee Member Bahadori asked about places that do not have a minimum of 13 feet available, but still want 11 feet as they have had before. Committee Member Sallaberry answered that having 11 feet as a minimum provides more flexibility and more room for engineering judgment.

Committee Member Bahadori expressed concern that we may be hurting the cause by increasing the minimum and thereby restricting people who may otherwise have put in sharrows.

Committee Member Jones suggested having 13 feet as a preferred distance with 11 feet the minimum, to encourage people to get the sharrows out of the door zones.

Committee Member Sallaberry stated that instead of setting hard and fast standards, we should defer to guidance.

Committee Member Winter supported having 11 feet minimum, 13 feet preferred.

Secretary Engelmann felt that the key is to provide flexibility. In some cases you want the sharrow in the middle of the travel way.

Chair Greenwood commented that having some data would be helpful.

Public Comment

John Ciccarelli, Bicycle Solutions, stated that experienced cyclists decide where to ride in the lane according to two factors.

1. The presence or absence of parallel parking which involves the door zone; opening doors can injure cyclists. He discussed handlebar widths and open door widths.
2. What is to the left in the lane – whether the space is wide or narrow so that cars behind must defer passing or pass in another lane.

Mr. Ciccarelli said that where there is no parking, the cyclist's decision just involves the lane width – to ride far enough out from the right edge not to run into debris, and to allow cars to pass comfortably on the left. Studies have shown that 14 feet is the lane width needed to allow a cyclist to be passed by a car within the lane with adequate shy distance.

Mr. Ciccarelli argued that if the effective lane width – the safe, ridable lane width – is less than 14 feet, the practitioner should center the marking in that lane. Any framework for shared lane marking placement that does the right thing regarding cyclist safety in both the parking and the no-parking cases, must take into account the concept of effective lane width.

Mr. Ciccarelli requested the CTCDC to keep in mind the four cases from a cyclist's perspective: parking, no parking, remaining width sharable, remaining width not sharable.

Commissioner Questions and Discussion

MOTION: Committee Member Jones moved to table the item and look further at the different approaches.

Secretary Engelmann suggested developing some guidance to add to the MUTCD that considers some of the figures that were provided. Chair Greenwood asked if Caltrans would bring the item back at a future meeting; Secretary Engelmann confirmed that it would.

Committee Member Sallaberry stated that in San Francisco they follow the practice that Mr. Ciccarelli had described: they determine how wide the overall lane is, and if it is too narrow to share side by side, they put the marking in the middle of the effective lane width.

16-14: Proposal to Use 6-inch Edge Lines

Secretary Engelmann provided some background. He stated that other states are using 6-inch edge lines, primarily on freeways. The proposal is for freeways and expressways, and would require changes in the figures in the MUTCD details. For changes to local roads, Caltrans would ask district traffic engineers and the locals.

Placer County gave feedback that they do not have resources for the additional paint required, so they oppose the proposal to make 6-inch edge lines required on all roads.

Committee Member Tong stated that District 11 has widely adopted the 6-inch edge line.

Secretary Engelmann stated that the Strategic Highway Safety Plan has a challenge area on older drivers; one of the actions is to consider traffic control devices for the older driver. Using wider markings is supported by this challenge area. It is also a recommendation under the Federal Highways Guide on designing for older drivers.

Committee Member Winter noted that he had found ample reference to the effectiveness of luminosity in any longitudinal marking for older drivers.

Committee Member Walter asked about evidence for Caltrans' decision to go forward with this change for freeways and expressways on right and left lines. Secretary Engelmann replied that it provides more visibility for the line. There is a push to use other materials such as tape versus paint or thermal; District 11 is doing that.

Committee Member Bronkall expressed the concern of rural counties on the narrow nature of their roads. This would decrease the width of roads that are narrow already. There is also a concern that for roads that have wider shoulders, the stripe may imply that there is some form of a bike lane.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Committee Member Walter stated that since Caltrans has already decided to do this on freeways and expressways, he felt that they could have it as part of their standard plans; until counties and cities are ready to move forward with it in their own jurisdictions, we would not need to change the MUTCD.

Secretary Engelmann pointed out that some details in Part 3 identify certain striping patterns used on state highways while local roads have a different detail. That is where we might have to make changes, to show that state highways and expressways use the 6-inch wide detail.

MOTION: Committee Member Bahadori moved not to make the change to the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, but to introduce 6 inches as the state standard. Committee Member Winter seconded.

Secretary Engelmann asked the committee about figures in the MUTCD – this modified detail in 27B for freeways and expressways – should we not show that?

Committee Member Winter had often felt that there is too much on this topic in the MUTCD. He did not oppose adding in another modified detail, but you may want to revisit whether it is time to simply cross-reference Standard Plans.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

16-16: Santa Rosa Bike Boxes

Massoud Saberian, City of Santa Rosa, sought the endorsement of the CTCDC. He stated that the city has four locations with bike boxes. They are hybrids – shared through and left. Bicyclists come between the right lane and through movement, in front of the left turn pocket.

Mr. Saberian showed photos of the four locations. Since the installation of the boxes there have been no incidences of bike crashes.

Commissioner Questions and Comments

Committee Member Walter confirmed with Mr. Saberian that the bike boxes do not have green paint. Beginning this summer, the city is starting to paint green approaches at certain locations.

Committee Member Walter asked Secretary Engelmann about the locations that have requested experimentation and then been installed – have they been consistently installed with green paint and white markings? Secretary Engelmann answered it varies – the green paint is an option for bike boxes but not a requirement.

Committee Member Tong asked about the four-way stop locations – how do they operate with the bike in front of the vehicle? Mr. Saberian confirmed that it was unique because of a project at the time on the south leg of the intersection. When the bicycle is in front, it goes first.

Committee Member Sallaberry asked about the Crash History chart. Mr. Saberian explained that the Bike Related Crashes listed had happened since installation in other legs of the intersection. There had been no Bike Crashes in Bike Box.

Committee Member Bahadori asked how badly bike boxes are needed at the stop sign intersection for a lefthand pocket. Are they really that beneficial? Mr. Saberian replied that the bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee says it is good to have them. Bicyclists have been very receptive to the bike boxes.

Committee Member Bronkall suggested using video recording at Intersection #4 (Middle Rincon Road at Badger Road) to document where bicyclists are actually stopping – in the bike box in front or within the bike lane itself. Mr. Saberian found that to be a good suggestion.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Secretary Engelmann assumed that Mr. Saberian will share the information with the FHWA as well; Mr. Saberian confirmed. He will continue to make updates for the CTCDC.

Committee Member Sallaberry stated that the FHWA website for bike boxes shows that bike box experiments are underway. They suggest collecting data on three factors: crash data; conflicts avoidance maneuvers between motor vehicles and bicycles; and motor vehicle and bicycle compliance with the turn on red prohibition.

16-19: Single and multiple lane drop or option lane w/lane drop Section 2E.24

Secretary Engelmann stated that the FHWA had brought this request to Caltrans' attention. They had identified a double standard in the MUTCD regarding the large overhead guide signs used on freeways and expressways. The FHWA request was to modify the text to go with the federal designated guide signs versus the California-specific guide signs.

Box beam structures are common on California state highways. They are limited to a sign size height of 120 inches. The current Standard Plans do not have any new design standards for larger signs; every new structure being designed has a custom design that can accommodate the larger signs (which may be up to 210 inches tall).

Caltrans came to an agreement with the FHWA to make some changes in the MUTCD to indicate that federal signs are the standard, but that there is an option to go with the California-specific signs because of the height limits that the structures can support.

Secretary Engelmann referred to the modified text of Section 2E.24. Additional verbiage at sentence 4b has been struck out.

Secretary Engelmann did not think there would be much impact on the local agencies.

Commissioner Questions and Comments

Committee Member Walter sought clarification on the changes: was it the height difference of the guide signs between the California state standards and the national standard, and also the exit language? Secretary Engelmann clarified the issue of the use of the federal placards that go on the bottom of the guide signs, for more uniformity – they are not being utilized consistently throughout the state. When it is not feasible to go with the federal placards, the California placards can be used.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

> **MOTION**: Committee Member Tong moved to change the language to include the options as explained. Committee Member Walter seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS (Continuing discussion from prior meetings with vote expected)

15-28: Subcommittee report on School Zones

Chair Greenwood pointed out that many hours of subcommittee work and much discussion had been spent on this item.

Committee Member Bahadori stated that with any change, you must be mindful of why you are making it and mindful of its consequences. He also emphasized that the item had been thoroughly debated by all different points of view.

He continued that the CTCDC had been asked by the Senate Transportation Committee to offer a technical opinion on a bill that is apparently dead. Nonetheless it raises the issue which no doubt will return in the next legislative cycle.

The subcommittee had to prevent situations where highly populated cities such as L.A. and San Francisco do not end up with 75% being covered with school zones, and at the same time giving flexibility to local agencies that need to go beyond the existing legal allowance on certain streets.

The subcommittee had kept the law as is, and permits extending beyond the 1000 feet as long as you can document the reason. This gives flexibility to the people who have a legitimate problem they need to solve. It takes into account political or community pressure to do something that does not make sense according to the principles of traffic engineering.

Secretary Engelmann considered this a draft version. Late last night the subcommittee had come up with another comment related to one of the bullets that had been deleted.

Committee Member Walter clarified that the subcommittee was not recommending any changes to the time the school zone is in effect or the definition and/or interpretation of "when children are present."

Committee Member Bahadori added that the zones are being enforced when law enforcement is available and the tickets are being upheld.

Committee Member Sallaberry noted that it is not clear whether the roadway must be immediately contiguous to school grounds, or if it means a 500 foot radius away from the school.

Committee Member Bahadori explained the problem that we are potentially introducing 40,000-50,000 streets that can have a reduced speed zone when children are present, that have nothing to do with the presence of a school.

Secretary Engelmann noted that the ability to extend to 1000 feet from school grounds was limited to streets that have a 30 mph speed limit and two lanes. The subcommittee had modified that: for a school crossing beyond 500 feet up to 1000 feet on any kind of road, you can now extend the school zone, including reducing the speed limit.

Committee Member Bahadori commented that California is part of an international Vision Zero effort. One of the proposals for dealing with speeding in school zones is the use of speed enforcement if done properly.

Committee Member Jones stated that the subcommittee had a commitment from Caltrans to reevaluate the Assembly A, B, and C and the distances those could be placed from the school, and maybe considering extending the yellow crosswalks. Those devices could bring attention to the school zone or the presence of schoolchildren on an adjacent street.

Public Comment

Tony Powers, Dokken Engineering, CTCDC Alternate Member, expressed concern with the second bullet item; he asked why it is necessary to have a demonstrated collision history. Taking that criteria, normally used in traffic engineering, and applying it to school crossings and schoolchildren disregards the fact that you don't need a collision history for a crossing to be unsafe.

Committee Member Bahadori replied that there are cities with downtown areas where if certain safeguards are not in place, under community or political pressures, large parts of those jurisdictions will be covered by school zones and reduced 25 mph zones. Committee Member Bahadori emphasized that reduced speed zones need to be kept for schools to promote focus where it is needed. He also emphasized that engineering judgment needs to be based on facts, numbers, and data.

Mr. Beeber clarified some of the reasoning used. The mandate had been to give more flexibility; the subcommittee had looked at the restriction on extending up to 1000 feet, which was narrowly focused. He felt that the subcommittee's compromise was a good one.

He had done some minor edits the previous evening, which he explained.

- For the second bullet point, it makes sense to separate the engineering and traffic study from the requirement to look at the location of the protected crosswalk. This creates an additional bullet point.
- Regarding the intervening crosswalks, to add language: "…if there does not exist a crosswalk closer to the school grounds which can serve the need of school-age pedestrians to cross the roadway."

Mr. Beeber commented on the data; he suggested to include some recommendation that there be better data collected regarding school zones in the letter back to the transportation committee.

Regarding the question of whether or not to use a flashing beacon in the state of California: Mr. Beeber still believed that it would be a useful option to jurisdictions that want to use it. Giving better information to drivers that they are approaching a school zone they are or in a school zone and their speed needs to be reduced, is always a good idea and results in better compliance.

He felt that the commitment from Caltrans to look at extending the warning to greater distances is a great idea.

Committee Member Bahadori suggested letting the Senators know how much work was done on it – the number of hours and number of people who worked on it.

Mr. Saberian commented on his experience in Oregon: they made the change to have 30 mph or less, 24/7. It created a huge problem for jurisdictions in enforcement and compliance, particularly in urban areas versus non-urban areas. He cautioned the committee to think carefully about this.

Mr. Saberian clarified for Committee Member Winter that the change in Oregon became three different options: when children are present, when lights are flashing, and time of day.

> **MOTION**: Committee Member Bahadori moved for the committee to approve the proposal from the subcommittee*, and to ask Caltrans staff to prepare a letter replying and outlining the effort and the recommendation from the committee back to the Senate Transportation Committee; this includes Mr. Beeber's recommended clarifications; the letter will come from the California Traffic Control Devices Committee. Committee Member Tong seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

Secretary Engelmann confirmed for Committee Member Walter that his office would make the final edits to the document.

** Maintain the existing law and (1) allow school zones to extend to 300 feet beyond an uncontrolled school crosswalk that is located up to 1,000 feet from school grounds on any roadway contiguous to the school when all of the following conditions are met: The route is designated as a safe route to school; no other improvements are warranted at the crosswalk; there is a documented collision history involving school-age children going to or from the school grounds; there is no alternate, closer crosswalk; and the crosswalk is within 500 to 1,000 feet of school grounds. (2) A local authority may not declare a speed limit of less than 25 mph where a school zone has been extended to greater than 500 feet from school grounds (added to the minutes by Atifa Ferouz – Summary of the School Zone Subcommittee recommendation).*

7. Request for Experimentation

16-17: Request to experiment with bike boxes in the City of Cupertino

Laurentiu Dusciuc, Alta Planning + Design, and David Stillman, City of Cupertino, presented the request. Mr. Stillman described the location and reviewed the function of bike boxes.

Mr. Dusciuc explained some of the issues regarding the intersection. Stelling Road and McClellan Road are major bike routes in Cupertino. Many northbound bikes on Stelling Road make a left turn onto McClellan Road and many go straight through the intersection. The proposed bike box would allow bicyclists to queue up for the left turn; bicyclists also need to continue straight through the intersection. Right turning vehicles would be allowed to make the turn with the supplied right turn lane.

Mr. Dusciuc noted that the request is coming in after installation of the bike box. Mr. Stillman stated that normally the city would come to the committee prior to installation, but the city had a resurfacing project in January and moved quickly after the fresh asphalt was laid.

Secretary Engelmann asked about the signal phasing at the intersection. Mr. Stillman answered that it is an eight-phase signal. A high school and an elementary school are located to the west within half a mile.

Public Comment

Vivien Hoang, Federal Highway Administration, confirmed with Mr. Stillman that the intersection has a pedestrian countdown signal. She asked what they would do if the experiment is not approved. Mr. Stillman answered that the city would remove it.

Commissioner Questions and Discussion

Secretary Engelmann asked if the Federal Highway Administration had approved the request. Mr. Dusciuc replied that the request had been submitted and received; it is under review.

> **MOTION**: Committee Member Walter moved that, based on a contingent approval from the Federal Highway Administration, the California Traffic Control Devices Committee approve the experimentation for the bike box. Committee Member Sallaberry seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

8. Discussion Items

16-18: CalSTA request to expand CTCDC membership

Committee Member Tong stated that the request was a result of the State Smart Transportation Initiative study asking staff to look for recommendations to improve the CTCDC. Johnny Bhullar, former MUTCD Editor, suggested expanding the membership representing suburban areas.

Committee Member Bahadori asked why this was being done – the CTCDC already has a diverse cross-section of the state in its representation.

Committee Member Winter agreed. In representing the southern counties, he reaches out to both urban and rural areas. The structure that the CTCDC has begun to use with various subcommittees, including ad hoc subcommittees, affords a great opportunity to widen the dialogue and engage those who are not normally here – rather than expanding the actual membership of the committee.

Committee Member Walter pointed out the value in considering future subcommittees that might utilize expertise not on the resident committee. Before expanding the existing committee, he suggested to consider the logistics of trying to get all the members in attendance at the quarterly meetings.

Committee Member Sallaberry felt that the committee representation was sufficient.

Chair Greenwood commented that adding a city representative would result in a call to add a county representative, then another non-motorized representative, and so on. He also felt that all of the committee members are conscientious about representing all users, not just those in their particular constituency.

9. Tabled Items

None.

10. Next Meeting

Chair Greenwood thanked Secretary Engelmann for his outstanding work with the committee for the last two years, helping them to become more organized in operation. Other committee members also expressed their appreciation.

September 1, 2016
District 11
San Diego

11. Adjourn

Chair Greenwood adjourned the meeting at 11:46 a.m.