STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC)

In the Matter of:)
)
Regular Meeting)
_____)

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER

1500 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, TOWER 6

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2012

9:05 A.M.

Reported by:
Martha L. Nelson

APPEARANCES

MEMBERS

John Fisher, Chairperson

Devinder Singh, Secretary

Lt. David Ricks

Jeff Knowles, League of California Cities

Michael Robinson, CSAC

Don Fogle

Hamid Bahadori, ACSC

Rick Marshall

Richard Shrader

ALSO PRESENT

Johnny Bhullar

Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans

Gordon Wong, Caltrans

Jacob Babico, County of San Bernardino

David Royer, University of California

Chad Dornsife, Best Highway Safety Practices Institute

Theresa Drumm, Caltrans

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gibran Maciel, Assembly Member Toni Atkins

Jim Baross, California Bicycle Advisory Committee

Andy Handshaw, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition

Samantha Ollinger

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

PUBLIC COMMENT (CONT.)

Hans Wangbichler, Urban Bike and Social Club

Chris Kluth, SANDAG

Brian Stephenson, City of Murrieta

Rock Miller

Robert Stinger

INDEX

		PAGE
Action Items:		
1.	Approval of Minutes (October 20, 2011 Meetings)	13
2.	Membership	14
3.	Introduction	25
4.	Public Comments	44
5.	Public Hearing	
	11-14	14
	12-1	53
	12-2	273
	12-3	--
	12-4	72
	12-5	--
	12-6	267
	12-7	176
	12-8	97
6.	Request for Experimentation	
	12-9	140
7.	Information Items	
	11-1	293
	07-19	--
	07-1	--
8.	Tabled Items	
	11-5	--
9.	Next Meeting	293
10.	Adjourn	295

PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 9:05 A.M.

(The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.)

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2012

MEETING BEGINS AT 9:05 A.M.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Good morning. I'd like to call the meeting to order. This is the February 16th, 2012 meeting of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee. This will be a momentous meeting in that we are going to consider new bylaws, adding additional members, and this is also the first meeting since the adoption of the 2012 California MUTCD.

We are happy to be here today in San Diego. I think we always look forward to our meetings in San Diego, always pleasant surroundings and pleasant weather. I've always wondered about this building as I've passed by on Pacific Highway. I've always wondered about that Art Deco building, so I'm glad we've had an opportunity to have a meeting in this historic building.

The person who helped to arrange this for the Committee is Mike Robinson. So I'd like to have Mike Robinson tell us a little bit about it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Thank you, John. And welcome to everyone here. It's been a little while since we've been down in San Diego. And I don't remember ever having had a meeting here in the County Administration Building. This is actually one of my favorite buildings in downtown. Not -- not

only do I work for the county where this is basically the heart and soul of county operations, but this is just a beautiful building, a beautiful location.

When I reserved this room, for a moment I thought I was -- I was getting a westward view, which -- which lets you see over the -- over the bay. Unfortunately, I kind of miscalculated. But we've got some great views to the north, to the east. And if you go into the stairwell there's actually -- and I'll invite you all to go out there -- there's a window out there and you can see down to the south, too. Just -- just a beautiful location for -- for the building, and some really interesting history, too.

As a matter of housekeeping, there is one restroom here on this floor. But we have first, second, third, and fourth floors, there's just a series of restrooms throughout. So if this one is full and you need -- and you need to use the facilities, floors one, two, three, and four have a number of different restrooms.

At this point I'd like to introduce our Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Helen Robbins-Meyer. Helen has kindly agreed to provide some opening remarks, and maybe tell us a little bit more about the county and the building.

Helen?

MS. ROBBINS-MEYER: And the great engineering of having the building face this way as opposed to the water,

yeah, yeah, that was really a smart thing.

Well, back then the bay was filled with tuna boats. And it was -- it smelled. It was awful. And so the whole vision -- I don't know where this belongs, but I'm going to put it down -- the whole vision was that there would be this grand promenade up to Balboa Park. So the entire building was originally faced and planned to go this way for this grand promenade. And then, of course, decades later they cleaned up all the tuna boats and -- and everybody became million dollar views on water. And we instead have this ugly elevator that destroys the entire westward view of the tower.

Now the other buildings, one, two, three, and four, have phenomenal views. So you can guess where the board of supervisors offices are and where the CAO's office and county counsel and all those, we have these phenomenal views this way. But, unfortunately, the tower view is this way, of the great Jack In The Box, so enjoy that. But do go out in the hallway, and maybe at a break take a walk around the building and you get to see just a phenomenal view.

So really it's my pleasure to welcome you all to San Diego County. How many of you have been here before? It sounds like many of you or probably most of you have. Maybe I should say, who hasn't been here before? All right. Did you all come yesterday, so you had a chance to stay over night at least?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In the rain.

MS. ROBBINS-MEYER: Yeah. That happen very often, so congratulations. Well, it's -- it's a delight to have you all here and -- and allow us the opportunity to show a little bit of our San Diego County pride.

We are very proud of what we've done here in San Diego County. As many of you know because of your positions across the state, the state has always been upside down. It seems like at least as far back as I can remember the state has been upside done. So local entities really have a challenge to come together and figure out best practices and our own lessons learned so that we help ourselves, because sometimes it's difficult because of the -- the state budget challenges that they always seem to face.

So you know, I'm sure you all get a lot of creativity from this group, innovation, great ideas. And I think it's wonderful that Caltrans relies on you to bring those best practices together, and we're honored to have you here.

Mike mentioned to me that your organization came into being in 1933; is that correct?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: That's right. It wasn't the Traffic Control Devices Committee. It was the State Traffic Sign Committee, I believe it was called.

MS. ROBBINS-MEYER: Okay. Well, that should make us all feel young, because your organization is, what, 79 -- 79

years old. And if you're 21 when you joined that, that means you're about 100 years old. Any original members? Any of you feel like original members here?

You're actually older than this building. This building was one of the original WPA projects that FDR's administration put in place. He actually came out for the inauguration of this building in 1938. So we're not quite as old as -- as this organization.

When I speak to groups, schools in particular, I always try to put our county in context, so let me just do that for a minute. When I -- when I'm talking to students I'll always ask them the -- the easy question, what's bigger, a state or a county? And invariably, you know, those that aren't too shy will raise their hands and they'll say, "Ms. Robbins-Meyer, that's an easy question, it's the state." And, of course, for the context of a California student in a California student, they get they. They say, "Yeah."

I say, "You're absolutely right. A county is smaller than the State of California. The San Diego County is smaller than the State of California. But guess what? We have 4,261 square miles. That's about the size of the state of Connecticut. It's larger than two states, Delaware and Rhode Island."

So that helps them to get a framework for the amount of traffic issues and transportation issues that we have.

When I talk about budget, we're a $5.2 billion budget. That's larger than 16 states.

When I talk about population, we have 3.1 million people. That's larger than 20 states.

So the magnitude of what you all have to do in terms of transportation, just for San Diego County alone, is enormous. I can't imagine what it is for Caltrans and what -- what you have to do across the -- across the state.

Our local crews, they're responsible for 2,000 miles of unincorporated roads. We have 194 bridges, 187 traffic signals, 10,000 street lights, 35,000 signs, 3,600 miles of road striping, 11,300-plus pavement markings. That's a lot of activity that goes on.

We have eight -- eight county airports. That's 11 runways that they maintain. We also have about a little over 500,000 operations in those airports a year. That's double what Lindbergh Field has. How many of you flew into Lindbergh Field for the meeting? So again, it puts it into context.

We have mountains, beaches, deserts, forests, flood plains. You name it, we have it in this county.

I think one of the biggest challenges we have is the explosion of Indian casinos. They're all in our back -- back country in our unincorporated areas. We have ten current casino operations. We have 18 tribes, 14 compacts. So you can imagine the number of projects they have on the drawing board

that they're hoping to get approved. That's proving to be one of our biggest challenges. One of our biggest risks in the county is the infrastructure for those casinos and the lack of revenue that they provide. Yes, they have compacts and that -- that does benefit the state, but trying to get that to come back down in -- in a meaningful way to counties is -- is a very challenge -- very big challenge that -- that we have.

I'm really proud of the job that Mike and -- and his team do. I think they have, as I mentioned, a lot of challenges. Most recently the San Diego Foundation, which has -- it has an enormous support from our entire region, it's where most of the big donors put their funds, they did a visioning exercise. And they did it from both top up -- top down and bottoms up. They had citizens, they had all community leaders participate. It took about six months. And they came out with what they thought the biggest issues were and the biggest challenges, and what they wanted to see for this region in the next 50 years.

And it's no surprise that education, homelessness, affordable housing were all on their top priority. But it also is no surprise that uniformly the number one issue was transportation. That flows right down to you all, and the decisions that you all make, and the guidelines that you set forth and -- and give to Caltrans.

Here at the county we pride ourselves on not just

everything we do, but to try to put it into what we believe are the three core competencies. Whether your competent or not will be debated. But the three things that we think are the fundamental responsibilities of government, and that is public safety, public health, and providing quality of life. And I would say transportation is at the heart of each one of those issues. So what you do is extremely important, not just to those of us that sit in the office and work in government, but to every citizen throughout the state. So you guys have a big task ahead of you.

I want to thank you for allowing me to kick this off. I wish you well. I hope some of you get a chance to get out, take a walk along the bay, go down to the Gas Lamp, maybe get a bite to eat or something fun. Mike, please try to allow them to enjoy some fun here in San Diego, and come back. It's a wonderful place. And -- and if you ever do come back and have one of your meetings here, let me know and I'll make sure you get a better conference room with -- with a bay view. Okay? All right. Thank you very much, and good luck to you all throughout the day.

Thank you. Nice to meet you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Helen. Thank you very much.

We want to -- we want to thank the County of San

Diego for their hospitality today. I see there are pastries and coffee in the back there. And I forget whether Mike mentioned it or not, but there is a full-service cafeteria on the fourth floor. So if we break for lunch that would probably be the closest venue to eat and probably given, our time constraints, the wisest place to go to. So that would be -- that would be something that we can consider if we break for lunch.

So the first item on our agenda today is the approval of the minutes from our meeting of October 20, 2011. Do we have a motion to approve the minutes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I make a motion to approve the minutes.

CHAIR FISHER: Any comments on the minutes or amendments to the minutes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: I'll second the motion.

CHAIR FISHER: Oh, thank you. Thank you, Mike.

Moved and seconded. Any comments? If not, all those in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR FISHER: It's unanimous.

And now I'm going to address item number two and turn it over to Don Fogle, who is a new member to this Committee who has replaced Wayne Henley. We'll have more extensive introductions in just a few moments. But this one relates to

the bylaws and the membership of the Committee.

So, Don, why don't you handle item number two for us, which is also combined with item 11-4.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. Thank you. Just so everyone knows, I'm kind of new to the -- the parliamentary procedure game here. So if I'm not asking for motions and all that stuff someone please on the panel jump in and help me out.

It was decided that the Committee needed to include the viewpoints and the concerns of the non-motorized transportation community to better represent a more balanced transportation system. As part of that it was decided to add two members to the Committee to represent those interests. Caltrans solicited self-nominations from the non-motorized highway users and used an expedited process to screen, score and interview the -- the finalists and select the new members and alternates.

Before the new members can participate, however, the bylaws must be amended to increase the membership from eight members to ten. And so at this time I propose the expansion of the membership of this Committee to include the two new non-motorized members.

CHAIR FISHER: And the -- the new bylaws.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: The new bylaws?

CHAIR FISHER: The bylaws that the -- the two new members.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Oh.

CHAIR FISHER: So we're going to adopt these bylaws.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. I'm sorry.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes. Adopt the new bylaws. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. And the bylaws are shown on pages five through nine of your agenda.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I want to ask Caltrans now to ask the Devices Committee for expansion of the membership and not to ask for a vote, and go and do the bylaws. I would like to thank them for accepting to follow that process and make a motion that we approve the new bylaws.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. We have a motion. Do we have someone who would like to second the motion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll second the motion.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Seconded by Mike Robinson.

Don, do you want to quickly just walk us through what's in the new bylaws. I think much of it is editorial, but he big thing here are the two new members representing non-motorized transportation users.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. Yes. Please let me

do that now.

In Article II under purposes, for the amended bylaws, we've stricken the first sentence that had said,

"Represent these" -- or, excuse me, "those local agencies referred to in the California Vehicle Code section 21400 and is designated as the entity which California State Department of Transportation shall consult."

And we propose an amendment to change that to, "Advise the California State Department of Transportation on standards and policy for official traffic control devices in California, thereby fulfilling the requirements of the California Vehicle Code section 21400. The Committee is to take into account the needs of all users of streets, roads and highways specified in Government Code Section 65302(b), prior to advising the California State Department of Transportation."

The substantive change is also in Article III, Membership and Organization, section A,

"California State Association of Counties and League of California Cities shall each designate two delegates and two alternates. The State of California Department of Transportation shall delegate three delegates and three alternates, one of whom will represent all road users, two of whom will represent non-motorized road users."

And the other substantive change is in Article IV,

Practices, Section 2, Officers. We've stricken the first sentence of the second paragraph, "The chairperson and vice chairperson of the Committee shall be elected to serve for two calendar years." And that's been changed to,

"The chairperson and vice chairman are to be nominated, elected and to take officer at the first meeting of the calendar year of the two-year term. The representatives of the California Highway Patrol and the California Department of Transportation are not eligible to be chairperson and vice chairperson."

And the final substantive change is under Article V, Procedures, Section 3, Amendments, "These bylaws may be amended by" -- what had been three-fourths, is now -- "seven votes of the" -- what had been eight, is now -- "ten delegates, either at a meeting or by letter ballot."

So let me please restate what that ultimately says.

"These bylaws may be amended by seven votes of the ten delegates, either at a meeting of by letter ballot."

And those are the substantive changes to the bylaws.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you, Don.

I'll also point out that under Article V it states that the meetings will be alternated between Northern California and Southern California for consecutive meetings. And that reflects a practice that we've had that maybe wasn't explicitly shown in the old bylaws. And something new. It

says, "Voting delegates who miss three consecutive meetings will be relieved of their service to the CTCDC," so that we ensure that we have active participation from those voting members.

So with that I think we've covered the substantive changes to our bylaws. Again, I think it kind of updates, clarifies things, reflects the practices we've had. But the big thing here is adding the two new members to the committee.

So we've had a motion to approve. We've seconded the motion. Any further discussion by members on these new bylaws?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, a couple questions for Caltrans. Since we're shifting from the League of California Cities appointing two people and the counties appointing two people, and generally these appointees have been agency traffic engineers or engineers who handle hundreds of traffic issues a year dealing with pedestrians of all ages, you know, from schools to ADA, elderly, bicyclists of all types, motor issues of all types, so we kind of know the qualifications of the people being appointed by the counties and the cities to express their concerns to Caltrans, but what are the qualifications for -- since Caltrans is now selecting two additional people that give an equal vote to the cities and to the counties, what -- what -- what qualifications are they using in making these appointments?

What kind of background -- who do these -- since they

don't report -- report to agencies, who do they represent and where do they get their -- their background knowledge of -- of all the issues we're facing?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I can not say exactly who they represent or -- or what agencies they are associated with. And hopefully during introductions they can address that issue themselves. However, I can explain the process that was used to select the folks that we've proposed for the new committee members, as well as the alternates.

The self-nominations were submitted to Devinder Singh, the secretary of this Committee, no later than October 31st of 2011. And the nominees were asked to address the following desired qualifications: Knowledge and experience with non-motorized transportation issues, facilities and users; knowledge skills and or abilities related to roadway marking, signage and symbols; experience with roadway marking, signage and symbols; familiarity with the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices; experience with local infrastructure development; and demonstrate ability to work productively in groups. And they were also asked to submit a brief biography of themselves as part of the nomination package.

The folks that ultimately reviewed those nominations and determined who the finalists were, were Caltrans staff in various disciplines within Caltrans, and those included the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Group, the Bicycle Facilities

Group, Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance, the Complete Streets Group, I believe there was one member of the CTCDC, Devinder, Local Assistance in Bicycle and Pedestrian Design. And basically they looked at 16 applicants and screened it down to 7, and then held interviews by telephone with those 7 folks.

And it was the groups unanimous decision on the top two people that we selected, and also, I believe it was also unanimous on the two alternates. And the rationale for this is simply that Caltrans is a firm believer in the Complete Streets concept. And the people who are using our facilities, and city and county roads themselves, are not simply limited to the motorized user. And so we felt that it was very important that we do have a balanced viewpoint of all users, and that's why we believe that this is the right thing to do.

CHAIR FISHER: Any other questions or -- or comments?

Well, seeing none, I'd like to ask for a vote. I will ask you to raise your hands. All of those in favor of the adoption of the new bylaws, raise your hands. Two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. It's unanimous.

And with that new adoption I'd like to welcome and call to the front table John Ciccarelli and Bryan Jones who are the new members to the Committee.

SECRETARY SINGH: Now we need to squeeze two members in front.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That was not in the

bylaws.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. So welcome aboard. And I'd like to have introductions now of the members of the Committee. And because we have two additional members we've just -- oh, wait a second. No. We've got another item we have to take care of. I'm running a little bit ahead of myself.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Election.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. With what we adopted in Article V it states that the chair and vice chair shall be nominated and take office at the first meeting of the calendar year of the two-year term. So we have to nominate and approve a chair and a vice chair.

Do we have a motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Do you want to take them one at a time or --

SECRETARY SINGH: One at a time.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. Let's first nominate a chair.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I'd like to nominate John Fisher as chair.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I second that.

CHAIR FISHER: My comment, I would be happy to continue as chair for an interim period of time. I'll be honest with you. You note that the term of the chairmanship is two years. I will probably retire before the end of the two-year term. But I want to make that apparent to everyone so

that you know that going in with -- so that you can consider if you might want to consider someone else. But I thought I would just be open and up front with you on that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We're going to send you off with a bang, go out as the chair.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. All right. Discussion by members?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: If I might, Mr. Chairman, I've only -- this is only my third meeting, but I'm -- I'm -- I'm rapidly finding that there's -- there's not a whole-whole lot of people that have been around for much longer than even a couple of years. Having -- having served for, in some capacity or another, over 16 years I can't think of -- of a better person to be in the lead for whatever length of time than you, as long as you're willing to do that. As long as we can have you, be it for six months or two years, I think the Committee is better off to have you.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, thank you for that. And I also want to acknowledge that Mr. Bahadori is one of the institutional members of this Committee, as well. But there aren't many others.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Now that makes me feel really old.

CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion on that? Okay. We'll put it to a vote. All those who approved say I?

ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR FISHER: I'll consider that unanimous. Thank you. Thank you for your vote of confidence.

And now we will consider a vice chairman of the Committee for a two-year term. And I would like to -- I move that we nominate Michael Robinson. Do we have a second for that?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I second that.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Don seconded. Discussion among members?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: If I might, Mr. Chairman, when this happened for the first time, which was in Sacramento, or it was just outside of Sacramento, I was quietly intimidated by that -- by that nomination. In the -- in the months since I've kind of become accustomed to it. And I think -- I think it's a challenge that I would be willing to accept as long as -- as long as the group would be willing to have me.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I've been told, Michael, you're -- you're a quick study. And so -- and this is a lot of different personalities, but this is an easy group to work with. So I think the only challenge I see being chair or vice chair is just to make sure that the agenda items are completed in a way which allows us to be efficient at the meeting so that we can properly resolve and dispose of the matters on the agenda. And so I think that will always be something we'll

have to look at as chair and vice chair.

Any further comments, discussion on the motion to make Michael Robinson the vice chair?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I worked with Mike for over eight years now, and I serve on many different committees throughout the state. The traffic committee -- Traffic Advisory Committee in San Diego County by far is the best in the State of California. If anyone has not been to their meetings, they should go attend at least one meeting. It's all under his leadership. I have every confidence he's going to do a great job here.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments among Committee members? Okay.

Seeing none, so I'd like to put this matter to a vote to nominate Michael Robinson as vice chair of the Committee. All of those in favor, say aye?

ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR FISHER: Consider it unanimous. Congratulations, Michael.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Now with that accomplished, I'd like to have introductions among the members of the Committee, starting with John. And because we have so many new members of the committee or members who have been here a short while, I'd like you to not only indicate your name and who you represent,

but tell us a little bit about your background. And for those who have been on the Committee, tell us how long you've been a voting member of the committee.

So we'll start with John.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Good morning, everyone. It's a pleasure to be a new member of the Committee. I'm looking forward to serving.

I'm a planning and design consultant based on San Francisco. I've been in the non-motorized transportation field, both professionally and as a volunteer and advisor, since about 1992 when the first ICE-T (phonetic) federal funding gave some flexibility to transportation. I've been doing it professionally since 1995 when I was Stanford University's first Bicycle Program manager for about four years. At Stanford I was responsible for the care, feeding, parking and circulation of about 15,000 bicycles and their owners, and other non-motorized users including skate commuters, walking commuters and everything that goes with it.

I sort of cut my teeth in the transportation world on advisory committees. The San Francisco/Bay Area started to have advisory committees in place for bicycling, and they later morphed into bicycling and walking advisory committees around 1992. And that gave me an education every month sitting down with public works engineers and the drafting engineers of various committees. I ended up chairing the City of

Mountainview's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and later Santa Clara County's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Since 1999 I have not only been a consultant, but I've been on the evaluator staff of Tech Transfer, which is the U.C. Berkeley program that channels federal and state OTS money for advising cities with a free visit, followed by a detailed report. So I've visited over 70 California cities through the -- the Traffic Safety Evaluation program, and lately the Pedestrian Safety Assessment program of Tech Transfer.

Since 2002 I've been a member of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. I serve on the Bicycle Technical Committee, and we interface with the other technical committees and a national council as our issues overlap theirs.

I'm a member of ITE and a member of the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals. And I've also been pleased to serve in an informal capacity with Caltrans now and then, including the early internal task force which led to what I believe is today called the Complete Intersections Book. Maggie O'Mara and some others at headquarters invited me in to contribute to that.

I look forward to serving on the Committee. I guess the last thing to say about my qualifications is that I'm also an educator in bicycling. I'm a league cycling instructor

which is the national level certification for teaching bicycle driver education.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: My name is David Ricks. I'm a lieutenant with the California Highway Patrol. I've -- I've been employed in that capacity for the past 24-plus years. I have extensive background in -- in the field portion of our department, a little bit here on the administrative side.

So basically my -- my job in the past has -- has been based on the enforcement side of a lot of things this Committee decides and -- and advises on. Unfortunately, my -- my resume won't go quite as deep as John's here. I have been part of the -- the Motorcycle Safety Subcommittee within our department. I'm an avid motorcycle rider. I've been riding for about 30 years. I'm happy to be part of this committee. I was recently promoted to the rank of lieutenant, which put me in the -- the position I'm in now, the unit I'm in, Special Projects section in Sacramento, which the lieutenant position is the member that is designated to the Committee.

I'm happy to be here. I look forward to being an active participant. And thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, David.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Good morning. I'm Mike Robinson. I am the Southern California representative to the County Engineers Association of California. I'm doing my

darndest to replace Jacob Babico from the County of San Bernardino. And I noticed --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: He just stepped out.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: He just stepped out? Well, I just -- then I'm -- then I'm doing better now. But I know he was a long-time member, and I'm still doing what I can to try and fill those big shoes. This is my third meeting. And I'm still challenged by the various different agendas that we -- that we have before us.

I am a deputy director in the San Diego County Department of Public Works. As Helen Robbins-Meyer mentioned, my responsibility to the county is I'm -- I'm in charge of the county's eight airports. I'm responsible for road maintenance. We have something like, I think 13 different road maintenance divisions within the county. Also, traffic, transportation and safety, and loss mitigation.

So, well, I'm a professional. I'm a registered civil engineer, registered traffic engineer, and a professional traffic operations engineer.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Good morning. I'm Don Fogle. I've been working for Caltrans for a little over 32 years now. Currently I'm an office chief in the Sacramento headquarters office in traffic operations. I am replacing Wayne Henley, probably about April 1st or thereabouts. I'm replacing Wayne now on the committee because of a future

reorganization that's planned. Currently Roberta McLaughlin is filling in for Wayne. Roberta is at the end of the table. But for right now I'm in that role. So that means I've been a voting member for about 41 minutes.

Like David, I'm also a part-time motorcycle rider, and also a licensed civil engineer. And I'm looking forward to serving on this Committee, at least for the next four to five years. So thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Great.

CHAIR FISHER: And I'm John Fisher. I work for the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation. My role there is assistant general manager over our operations.

I represent the League of California Cities for the southern half of the state. And I've -- I'm not sure how long I've been on the Committee. I think I've been a voting member of the Committee for about ten years, and alternate member for maybe about six years. And I am a registered civil engineer, registered traffic engineer, and certified as a professional traffic operations engineer.

Jeff?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Hi. I'm Jeff Knowles. I'm the deputy director of public works in charge of transportation for the City of Vacaville, which is a small city outside of Sacramento, kind of midway between Sacramento and San Francisco. And the reason why I wanted to emphasize

transportation, not to take anything away from the new members, but it seems like what's been lost in the discussion of what traffic engineers do is that we're clearly responsible for safe routes to school, for striping the bike lanes, for timing traffic signals that deal with all kinds of users.

I wanted to make it clear that, you know, in 33 years between the Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition, the Berkeley East Bay Bike Coalition, Safe Routes to School Committees, that most of the transportation engineers up here are also -- I don't know why people don't think we're concerned about all the modes of transportation because we're directly responsible for all the modes, and we're the ones that are deposed by attorneys in courts if there are any issues for any of the modes of transportation, any injuries, trip and falls, you know, a collision involving any type of person.

So I wanted to make it clear that from running the transit system, to providing transit priority, to providing emergency vehicle preemption, our finger is in a little bit of everything out there in the field, and that we're not just concerned about vehicle traffic, but certainly concerned about all modes of transportation out there, anything involving the movement of goods, people or services.

And I don't know how I've been the voting member, because I think I voted at my very first meeting as the alternate. So three years-ish I've been voting on the

Committee, I believe.

CHAIR FISHER: Four.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Four?

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But I've been in the business for 33 years.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm Hamid Bahadori. I represent the Automobile Club of Southern California, AAA South. Acting member of the Committee, voting member about eight-and-a-half years. I'm a registered civil and registered traffic engineer in the State of California, about 30 years of professional engineering practice. And my involvement with the Committee started out in 1993 when I had a request for experimentation. And their meeting was in San Diego, I remember. And our vendor, consultant and I were sitting back there waiting for five hours until our item comes up.

And I looked at my vendor contractor, Janet, you know, and I said, "I don't know how these guys do it."

Every time she sees me now she says, "Be careful what you say, you know?"

I ended up being on the Committee. It's been a fun ride so far.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SHRADER: Good morning. Richard Shrader representing AAA Northern California. This is actually

my first meeting as an alternate for Dwight Ku. I've been with AAA for over 20 years, and most of that in the capacity of managing our government affairs operations. And, of course, part of that, our focus has been transportation and traffic safety issues.

So happy to be here today and I look forward to further meetings with the -- the Committee. Thanks.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I'm Rick Marshall. I'm the deputy director of public works for the County of Napa. And as such I'm representing the counties of Northern California on this Committee. I'm a registered civil engineer, traffic engineer, and professional land surveyor. And so among my hats for the County of Napa I'm the county traffic engineer and the county surveyor. And we're a small organization so we do a lot of things with a small number of people. I've been with Napa County for about four years.

Prior to that I worked for San Luis Obispo County for over 20 years where I did similar work in traffic engineering and transportation planning. Most of my career I've had involvement in road maintenance, capitol projects, traffic engineering and safety. I wrote the first county bike plan in San Luis Obispo County. And I'm currently serving on the Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee, representing local agencies there for the Bay Area.

And I'm happy to be here. This is my first meeting,

as well.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: My name is Bryan Jones. I work for the City of Carlsbad, and I'm the deputy director in the transportation department. So we don't have a public works department, we just have a transportation department. And I just started down at the City of Carlsbad about eight months ago.

And prior to that I was with the City of Fresno as the city traffic engineer. I also serve as a city traffic engineer for Carlsbad, so I have duel titles there. I'm a professional traffic engineer, and also a professional transportation planner, as well as AICP planner. And so I have a few alphabet acronyms, like many of you, behind my name.

I've taught academic classes at Fresno State in civil -- in their civil engineering program. And I was instrumental in the development of the Progressive Bicycle Master Plan in the City of Fresno that helped transform it to the first bicycle friendly community by the League of American Cyclists from Sacramento to Los Angeles. And Central California often gets overlooked, Northern California and Southern California, and there's this part of the state in between that connects us. There's two freeways that go between us, but not many people know that much exists out there.

But Fresno is the fifth largest -- fifth -- is the fifth largest city in California. And it was a strategic

change to this beautiful weather down here, to Southern California, to be living in San Diego.

And I have extensive knowledge of working with the visually impaired community closely on -- on helping educate both the National Guide Dog for the Blind on roundabout designs and bringing them onboard, as if you've implemented a roundabout in your community the visually impaired community is one of the largest vocal oppositions towards roundabouts. But what we found with working with orientation mobility specialists is that there's a lot of unknowns about roundabouts. And what we're finding is that with -- through education I often joke that if roundabouts were first before traffic signals they'd be fighting us on traffic signals, because there's a lot of challenges with traffic signals for them. And so -- but it's what they know.

And I've worked really closely with the law enforcement, both CHP and the Fresno Police Department and Carlsbad Police Department on education and awareness and safety programs throughout all of the jurisdictions that I've worked in. I have both public and private experience in Northern, Central and Southern California.

So I'm honored to be representing the non-motorized transportation, as well as the City of Carlsbad, because they're paying for my time to be down here. So I have to thank them, as well. But I'm honored to be part of the Committee and

bring a perspective that crosses disciplines of engineers and planners. Because land use and roadways and transportation are instrumental to a number of factors, whether it's safety, education, economic vitality, sustainability, environmental issues. And so I think there's a lot of components there. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Great. Thank you, Bryan.

And at this time I'd like to have those alternate members introduce themselves and tell us a little bit about your background. And we'll start with one of our new alternate members, Rock Miller.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, John. I'm Rock Miller. I've been practicing in traffic engineering for about 35 years. I'm a registered traffic engineer and civil engineer here in California. That covers through both public and private practice. I worked the City of Costa Mesa -- that was quite a few years ago -- for about eight years. I worked for the County of Orange for a few years before that. But I've been a private consultant in traffic engineering for most of my career.

I also do a little bit of work besides that. I teach -- I work for Stantec Consulting. I've been there for about a year-and-a-half now. I was with another consulting firm for many years prior to that.

I do a little bit of teaching for University of

California, the same program that John described, the Tech Transfer. In that program I teach one of five days of a class called Fundamentals of Traffic Engineering. And I teach another class that should be a little bit familiar to all of you. I teach the update on the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices for one class, which has been a particularly challenging class to teach for the past two or three years. And perhaps my role as an alternate on this Committee will help keep me up to date on all the changes that have been going through lately.

In addition to that, I currently serve as the international president of the Institute of Transportation Engineers. I've worked up through various levels of the organization from my home in Southern California through the western district, and am now really proud to be the international president. There's no place else for me to go to in the institute. So beginning next year I'll have plenty of time to invest in this Committee and other pursuits. That is going to be a challenge for me this year but -- with scheduling, I'm sure. And I'm very interested in helping this Committee, and I'm sure I could jockey the two obligations.

I'm also a member of the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, as John had indicated. I grew up in Northern California, so I do have kind of an understanding of how one half of the state looks a little bit different than the

other half of the state. I went to college in the Central Valley, so I know what the middle part of the state looks like, as well. The college was U.C. Davis. And since I'm here representing pedestrians and bicyclists I think the fact that I went to college in a bicycle environment is probably one of the reasons that I'm here today.

I have done a lot of work throughout my career in pedestrians and bicycles, on the safety side primarily. My first involvement in the pedestrian world was basically doing some studies about 10, 15 years ago, trying to recreate the results of something that many of you in the community are aware of called the San Diego Crosswalk Study. I was largely unable to recreate the results of that study, but found crosswalks work a little bit differently than the -- the conclusions that were drawn by this early 1970s study. That work was later picked up by the federal government, and the federal crosswalk marking guidelines that we follow now largely duplicate the conclusions in my study, which indicate a great risk with great traffic volumes but not so great a risk at the lower traffic volumes.

A couple of confused -- concluding items. I started appearing before this Committee somewhat regularly, doing experiments for the City of Long Beach. Since changing employers a year-and-a-half ago I no longer have a direct professional relationship with the Long Beach Program. I do

keep track of it, however, frequently, and I am aware and up to date on various bicycle and pedestrian experimental treatments throughout California, as well as throughout the rest of the country.

I also do serve as an expert witness in litigation frequently. Most of those cases involve pedestrians and bicyclists, surprisingly.

I am a participant in the District 7 Pedestrian and Bicycle Traffic Advisory Committee. And I did get a lot of encouragement and support from Southern California based pedestrian and bicycle groups to submit my application to the Committee. I'm looking forward to serving you as an alternate in whatever capacity I can. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Daniel?

MR. GUTIERREZ: Yeah. Maybe I'll stand up so you can see me. I'm Dan Gutierrez. I'm actually a physicist and mathematician by training, so I'm probably the odd man out here, though I do satellite systems engineering and development in my professional life. But I've had a passion for bicycling and all things non-motorized for a number of decades. This goes back to when I was eight years old. And when I got out of school and got into my profession I decided that I wanted to do something positive for bicycling, so I learned all that I could.

I'm a league certified instructor. I've developed

video technology for teaching bicyclists how to ride in traffic. I also teach transportation professionals in a one-day class that Caltrans pays me to teach around the state to their districts about bicycle facilities, designs and -- and traffic controls for bicycling.

I've had a lot of experience as an advocate. I'm the District 7 representative for the California Association of Bicycling Organizations. And I've spent a lot of time traveling around the state photographing, examining, and studying bike-ways throughout California. Part of that was motivated by the classes I teach for Caltrans. I've also had a lot of experience working with transportation professionals in Southern California and the traffic engineering liaison for CABO, Dr. Bob Chanteau (phonetic).

So I'm more the self-taught sort of guy who's not as affiliated with as many organizations, but I am very interested in learning and supporting John as best I can in his capacity as a member by being his alternate. And I thank you for allowing me to participate.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Daniel. Other alternate members. Bill, could you just come to the podium so that -- that's recording.

MR. WINTER: Good morning. My name is Bill Winter. I'm a deputy director with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. I've been there for 25 years, and I serve as an

alternate to this Committee for the Southern California counties. This is my third meeting, so -- that I've been sitting in as an alternate. I've seen some great things coming out of this Committee, and I'm very happy to be part of it.

I know from Los Angeles County one of the things that we're recently wrapping up is our Bicycle Master Plan. It was last updated in 1975, so it was very much in need of refreshing, and we're just now wrapping that up.

We, as a department, we have 3,000 center line miles of road. There's approximately 1 million residents just in the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. And we are geographically diverse. We have the Antelope Valley, all the way into the beach communities, and some of our central areas of Los Angeles County. So that diversity I hope to lend to the perspective of this Committee. And again, very happy to be an alternate. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Bill.

And any other alternate members? Is it Robert?

MR. BRONKALL: Hi. Bob Bronkall. I'm the alternate for the California State Associations of Counties, for the northern counties. I represent Humboldt County Public Works Department. We're a very rural county in the very northern part of the state. I think our overall population is somewhere in the neighborhood of 136,000, with a handful of incorporated cities. And I think I can count all the traffic signals that

the county maintains on both of my hands.

I am a civil engineer, I'm a traffic engineer, and I'm a surveyor. I'm also a member of ITE. And this is my first meeting, so I'm happy to be here.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. And I hope you didn't mind our taking a little bit of time to introduce ourselves. I know it took some of our time in the meeting here. But I thought it was important, since there's been such turnover in the Committee, I thought it was important that we get to know each other.

I'd now like to have Caltrans support staff introduce themselves.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin. I'm the interim office chief, after Wayne Henley's retirement. And we're the Office of Signs and Markings. We're kind of behind the scenes staff support for the California Traffic Control Devices Committee. And I'm happy to be here, and just getting good things operating.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Roberta.

SECRETARY SINGH: I'm -- I'm Devinder Singh. I also work for Caltrans Division of Traffic, but I am on the Committee. I'm the secretary.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We'll start in the first row here.

MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I work for Caltrans.

And I'm the editor of the California MUTCD. And I'm really happy that the 2012 is out.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Quite an incubation period for that, wasn't there?

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Oh, yeah. Gordon is here, also, Gordon.

MR. WONG: My name is Gordon. I work for Caltrans. I work for Roberta and Don Fogle. I'm serving as the Part 6 expert for Caltrans. And later on you'll hear -- hear from me because most items are on me.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other Caltrans support staff? Okay.

Seeing none, I'd like to ask other members of the audience who haven't already been introduced just to stand up, indicate your name and what -- what -- and your employer. So start with Jacob.

MR. BABICO: (Off mike.) I'm Jacob Babico, the County of San Bernardino, return retiree.

MR. ROYER: (Off Mike.) I'm Dave Royer, traffic and highway consultant. Also, I'm with the University of California Tech Transfer Unit. I'm retired from the City of Los Angeles. Unlike John, I left after I was eligible for retirement. But I was 32 years with Los Angeles City. And I've actually been attending these meetings since the mid-'70s,

two or three times a year when I can get here.

MR. DORNSIFE: (Off mike.) My name is Chad Dornsife. I'm the executive director of Best Highway Safety Practices Institute. I'm also the west coast representative for the National Motorists Association. And I'm also co-owner of a company called the Highway Safety Program.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

(Whereupon off-mike audience introductions were made and not transcribed.)

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We go item number four, public comments. At this time members of the public may comment on any item not appearing on the agenda. Matters presented under this item can not be discussed or acted on by the Committee at this time. And for items appearing on the agenda the public us invited to make comments at the time that the item is considered by the Committee.

We ask that persons addressing the Committee be limited to a maximum of five minutes to make their comments. And this will allow other interested parties to have the opportunity to speak. So when you're addressing the Committee under this public comment non-agendized item please state your name, address and business organization that you are representing for the record, and come to the podium.

MR. MACIEL: Gibran Maciel with Assembly Member Toni Atkins' office. Did you want the -- did I hear you correctly,

you wanted our address? Okay. Sorry.

Just here to commend Caltrans for appointing the new members in accordance with the Complete Street Principles and to thank Bicycle of California for bringing this issue to us last year. I'm sure they'll continue to monitor this for the assembly member. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

MR. BAROSS: Good morning again. I'm Jim Baross. Do you want my address? San Diego, California.

I'm here speaking for two organizations. As I mentioned before, I'm the vice president of the California Bicycle Advisory Committee to Caltrans. We meet every two months and offer, as often as we can, our advice and recommendations to your body related to traffic control devices. I'm also the president of the California Association of Bicycling Organizations.

And on behalf of that organization I wanted to extend our thanks on the record to Assembly Member Toni Atkins for her introducing and, in some sense, encouraging Caltrans to take on the expanded membership of the organization. And even though Jeff Knowles and I don't agree, we do think it's important to get the expanded representation from a wider variety of -- of users. Even though you all ride bikes, I'm sure, and feel comfortable, we feel more comfortable with this expanded representation.

I should mention that I did not submit my nomination for membership to this body. I'm very happy to have someone else doing the job of sitting around for five or six hours with Hamid and the rest of you trying to cover these issues. So I want to thank you very much for your efforts.

MR. HANDSWAW: Good morning. I'm Andy Handshaw, executive director of the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition. And I want to say pretty much along those lines, thank you for -- very much for your inclusion of non-motorized representation on the panel. It's -- we've seen, obviously, a lot of tremendous growth in the bicycling interests here in San Diego, but also throughout the country. And I think this is an important step that you've taken and we're -- we're grateful for that inclusion of non-motorized, and for the consideration of the safety and -- and -- of all -- all road users, and providing facilities to protect non-motorized road users.

So again, it was mentioned earlier in the opening comments, you know, your work is extremely important, and I would -- I would completely agree with that, because you work with safety, public health and quality of life. All of those things are very important to all of us, but I think it's -- it's extremely relevant to bicyclists and what it means to enhance those things and the role that active participation plays in all of that. So thank you very much.

MS. OLLINGER: Good morning. My name is Samantha

Ollinger. And I'm happy to see that the CTCDC is welcoming of the non-motorized voice.

As someone who gets around primarily by bicycle, public transit and on foot, I look forward to seeing more consideration made with my perspective and my safety in mind. I look forward to seeing a more proactive consideration made that will benefit all users, including non-motorized users, and ensure that others like me have protected, well-designed facilities that will allow all Californian's to make more choices in how we transport ourselves. Thank you.

MR. WANGBICHLER: Hans Wangbichler. I just wanted -- I came today just to commend you on increasing your staff here to two more for the non-motorized transportation, and in particular being focused that way, non-motorized transportation which incorporates pedestrians and everything because everybody's on the road. You guys have always served them in the past, but realizing that more of the demographic is -- more people are walking and riding bicycles today. It's good to see that your Committee is opened up and very progressive and staying with doing the choreography of the streets out there, because it's a crazy state with so many people here. Okay. Thank you.

MR. KLUTH: Good morning again. Chris Kluth from SANDAG, active transportation manager. I'm also here today representing the California Bicycle Coalition. And we're

again, as all the other folks so far, to thank Caltrans very much for adding these two new members to represent non-motorized interests, and also definitely to Assembly Member Toni Atkins for her leadership in this effort.

As you may know, the CBC works on behalf of Californians who use bicycling as everyday transportation to ensure that the transportation network accommodates them fully and keeps them safe. And I have been familiar with John's work for many years. And I've also had the pleasure of working with Bryan one-on-one firsthand. And even though he's been here a relatively short time he's brought very positive changes and a really great attitude of getting things done and figuring out really good best and safe practices, and kind of incorporation protective facilities into what Carlsbad is doing and what we're doing in the region, because there's lots of different situations in retrofitting all these facilities into our urban and rural areas. It's going to be challenging.

So we look forward to having some new tools to use. And as we move forward that CBC looks forward to working with the Committee. Thank you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just on -- just on a personal note, I've had the pleasure of working with Chris at SANDAG for six years on their oversight committee, and I'd like

to comment him for a great job that he's doing with SANDAG and what SANDAG is doing for the region in terms of mobility, especially for folks that he has on the bicycle movement.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I will concur that assessment.

MR. DORNSIFE: My name is Chad Dornsife. I'm the executive director of the Best Highway Safety Practices Institute. On bicycle and pedestrian matters, I just want to make a couple observations.

My dad was a championship bicycle rider from the '30s. And even when I was a small child he'd ride 60 to 100 miles a day just for training, on the roads. My children were also road racers, and I had two of them hit by vehicles. So I'm quite sensitive to these issues.

The one thing that has happened in my home state, this year in particular, we've had a tremendous spike I -- despite an overall downward trend in fatalities, we've had a tremendous spike in fatalities involving pedestrians. We keep going to traffic control devices and devices or policies to eliminate these accidents. And what we keep forgetting is the human factor.

When you were a small child you were told to look both ways before entering a street. When you were a small child you were told to wear light-colored clothing at night when you're out. What we have is people walking in front of

cars assuming the car sees them, and the car doesn't necessarily see the people. And they feel they're protected because they have the mental illusion that they have the right-of-way when they're in the crosswalk. And I think we've had like four or five fatalities alone just in the Reno-Tahoe area since the first of the year.

We need to put into any plan education of the public with asterisks, yes, you have the right-of-way, but before you enter the street make sure the car sees you and is slowing down, wear light clothing at night, do all the common sense things. Because if we don't change the public attitude that they have the right-of-way to it's a conditional right-of-way we're going to lose this battle.

The other thing that has been bothering me is on lighting, especially at night. One of the things I've noticed is every single bicycle company comes out with flashing lights. If you know anything about directional control you know that when a motorists is confronted with a flashing light they become mesmerized by it and unintentionally they have a tendency to steer towards it. It's called the moth effect. You're better off having a bright single light that's illuminated that gives you a closing speed and demarcation point to avoid, rather than having something that you can't judge distance to that attracts your attention.

What I'm saying is, is that the issues that have to

be involved, the human factors aren't being looked at here and they -- because they will save more lives than any of the other things we are attempting to do here. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

MR. STEPHENSON: Hi. My name is Brian Stephenson. I'm a consultant traffic engineer with Rick Engineering Company, and I'm here -- I'm also the consulting traffic engineer for the City of Murrieta, here on their behalf.

I'm here to present a sign request that we had previously submitted to Caltrans to get through an encroachment permit for two veterans' memorial signs. Our request was denied because there was no portion of the MUTCD that allows for monument or veterans' memorial signs on the freeway.

Just to do a brief overview of our project, the City of Murrieta is in the middle of constructing a veterans' memorial to honor those who served in the nation's defense and who have sacrificed their lives and serviced the United States. The memorial will consist of seven granite walls in an oblisque, two walls which currently exist, the World War II and the Korean War. The next wall will be honoring those who served in the Vietnam War and will be unveiled on Veterans' Day this year.

Previous unveilings have been attended by many notable speakers and guests such as war veterans, prisoners of war, congresspersons, the Riverside County supervisor, state

senators and the City of Murrieta mayor and council people. The City of Murrieta is requesting that the CTCDC consider expanding the type of signs allowed along the state roadways to include monuments, which would include veterans' memorial signs and incorporated into the MUTCD.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: A clarifying question. We're not really supposed to discuss it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just a clarifying question. So these proposed granite walls signs, there's -- they're -- they're going to be statewide?

MR. STEPHENSON: These -- these are granite walls on city property within the city. We have --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So why would --

MR. STEPHENSON: We're requesting signs up.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Why would it need a permit from Caltrans?

MR. STEPHENSON: We're requesting signs on the freeway --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh.

MR. STEPHENSON: -- through an encroachment permit, two signs that say "Murrieta Veterans' Memorial, Next Exit."

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Caltrans would like to

propose that this be moved to the next agenda as an item on -- at the next meeting.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: This is just an informational directional signs, like we have for colleges and things like that?

MR. STEPHENSON: Yes. I also brought some leave-behinds.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: They're not the signs themselves?

MR. STEPHENSON: No. No. This is just the Veterans' Memorial --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

MR. STEPHENSON: -- what the signs are directing people towards.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. We heard the -- the comments at this time because it's not on the agenda, but Don advised us that they will -- Caltrans will prepare something for the next agenda, which proposes some changes to the California MUTCD.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Any other speakers wish to make comments for items not on the agenda?

If not, this item is closed. And I'd like thank those who spoke and kept it under five minutes. And I think we heard a lot of thoughtful comments. And I kind of heard a

theme there on the need to be sensitive to the needs of traffic safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. I think that was an overriding theme of many of the comments that we heard.

With that we'll move to our agenda items. And prior to adopting any rules and regulations relating to uniform standards and the California MUTCD for traffic control devices, pursuant to Section 21400 of the Vehicle Code, Caltrans is required to consult with local agencies and the public. And we here on the -- many of us here on the Committee represent local agencies. And you here are from the public, as well. So your comments will be heard on the agenda items that are coming forward right now.

What I'd like to do is to get to some of those agenda items that we think we can resolve relatively quickly, and reserve the items related to Part 6 for the last because there's quite a bit of detail there. And it would probably be better to move forward those other things. And if people want to leave before the meeting is concluded after their item is heard, they may do so. But we didn't want to unduly delay those who have other items on the agenda.

So if it's okay with Committee members I'd like to go to the Part 6 items last on the agenda.

So with that we'll go to Item 12-1, which is a proposal to clarify local responsibility for STAA truck routes.

And, Don, you're the lead on that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Thank you. What the proposing is, is to deal with several specific things, local application and analysis of truck routes, mandatory 24-hour turnarounds at the termination of terminal access, the order of sign placement between the local agency and Caltrans, and also some minor edits for clarity.

I'd like to read what the proposal is into the record.

"Proposal: Proposal to amend Section 2D.45 Page 2D-32 of the California MUTCD 2010 as follows.

"Standard: 2, on local highways signing of egress from a State Terminal Access route to a Local Terminal Access route shall be done only if requested by the local jurisdiction and a) the local jurisdiction has submitted to the Department an application provided by the Department listing the local roads and intersections that have been analyzed on the proposed Local Terminal Access route, and stating that they meet all geometric criteria for STAA trucks, and this application has been approved and signed by the engineer of the public agency, or by the authority jurisdiction over the roadway, and b) the State highway ramp or intersection meets all geometric criteria for STAA trucks. The geometric criteria involves using the STAA design vehicle to design or analyze the intersection, ramp, or curve so that the STAA vehicle can

stay in its lane without encroaching into the adjacent or opposing lane (for more details, see Topic 404 in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual) and, if the Terminal Access Route ends, ensuring that an adequate turnaround location is available for all STAA vehicles 24 hours per day, 7 days per week."

The last change is,

"After the local places signs on the local routes, the State shall place a G66-56(CA) sign on the State route in advance of the ramp or intersection to the local Terminal Access Highway."

And the intent of this is simply to ensure the truckers do have a consistent route, not only on the state highway system, but before they're directed off onto the local agency highways and roadways, that there is some turnaround point, and that someone has actually analyzed the roadway and made sure it's safe.

CHAIR FISHER: So as I understand it, it provides clarifying language and puts the burden fully on the local agency to verify that the criteria are met?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: That's correct. For the local agency highways and roadways.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any discussion by members of the Committee on this item?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Minor edit suggestion.

In the sentence in Paragraph B, beginning "The geometric criteria," there is an extra word "a" before the word "the."

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: That should be stricken.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It is? Okay. Sorry. I missed that.

CHAIR FISHER: I'm sorry. You were --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's already been struck.

CHAIR FISHER: -- striking --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's already been struck. It's already been struck. Retract the comment.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. I'm going to get real picky here. I think criteria is the singular form and criteria is the plural form. I don't want to get hung up on that. So I think it would be "The geometric criteria involved," if you wish --

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- because criteria is plural. Just an editorial thing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Mr. Bahadori.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I remember one -- in my days of practice for local government this quite became an issue always because of where I was working in Caltrans. And I

think Mr. Knowles has some experience. So this approval, what brought this about? What happened?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I'd like to defer that to the secretary.

SECRETARY SINGH: I can give some background. This is Devinder Singh, secretary for the Committee.

I got some information from the --

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Devinder, excuse me. You have to get near a microphone. Thank you.

SECRETARY SINGH: The problem we have with this is right now the local agencies, they're saying that it meets the requirements, but they're not verified. So we sign on the freeway and the truckers go off and they can not negotiate the roadway. So we want to make sure -- the Caltrans wants to make sure local agency is taking responsibility, verifying the geometrics of meeting the STAA requirements. So I know we have problem, so that we want to address. And we want to put this on the local agencies so they can verify.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So, okay, still, this has been the practice for years. Why are we changing it? That's my question. Have you had like a case that the trucker got into an accident or something?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, we do.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

SECRETARY SINGH: We do have some issues we're trying

to resolve.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Now -- now second question, and that was the issue that I always had the challenge when I was doing this, who initiates the process? Is that Caltrans? Because Caltrans technically is going to be responsible to establish the routes when the truckers get off the freeway systems. So who starts the process, is that Caltrans or the local agency? And then the reason I'm asking is that sometimes these -- and I had a case in City of Orange in that these STAA truck routes go through multiple jurisdictions until they reconnect back to a freeway system. So who -- who's the lead person?

SECRETARY SINGH: I do not know that, who the lead person. The question which was told to me was most of the time local agencies, usually they say our routes meets the requirement. And then we sign these highway systems, STAA. And when the driver takes off then he or she is not able to negotiate the roadway. So we want to put the burden on the local agencies before we sign the state highway so locals are verifying their roadway meets the minimum requirement.

Right now there is an issue going on. I don't know since San Diego --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Because the reason I'm asking, Mr. Singh, is that technically any truck can exit a freeway system at any off ramp, except if you're restricted.

So are you saying that now at any off ramp where STAA truck is existing the freeway system there must be trailblazer signs telling him where the established truck routes are?

SECRETARY SINGH: That's what we already practice, basically.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. And if there are none, what does that mean? And there are a lot of places that you exit the freeway and there are no signs that tell you where the truck route is.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That's part of the problem.

SECRETARY SINGH: When we sign a route from the highway we're taking responsibility. But if there is no sign and trucker is taking off the highway they're taking on their own risk. But when we sign --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So if you sign an established truck route then that's when you want the trailblazer sign on it?

SECRETARY SINGH: That's correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So you're not saying that every off ramp there must be -- okay. Got you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Just to clarify, the STAA vehicles are restricted to STAA access routes. So STAA vehicles, as I recollect, should not be traveling anywhere,

anytime, anyplace they want. They are -- because of their geometric configuration the need to stay on STAA access routes.

Caltrans can sign and determine which highways meet those criteria. But again, for -- for the aspect of safety we need to make sure and feel confident that the local agencies have done the thorough analysis of their roadway so that Caltrans doesn't inadvertently send them off the highway onto a local roadway that the vehicles can not safety traverse.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, may I have one last question?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes. .

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So is retroactive? So are you saying that now wherever you have freeway signs for traffic to get off, now locals have to go and put all those trailblazer signs, or this is for future?

SECRETARY SINGH: It's always -- we do not sign from the highway system unless there's trailblazing signs.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So --

SECRETARY SINGH: So this is -- this --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So if you have -- if you are signing them off the freeway system and there are no signs, still this applies, or this is from the time of adoption forward?

SECRETARY SINGH: No. It is already a practice.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

SECRETARY SINGH: It is practiced. But what we're doing, we're clarifying, putting the responsibility on local agencies that -- they're doing their job.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Just sharing the liability, or deferring.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That -- is that what we call CYA in the background?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. A process question. We're being asked to consider the revision to the language here. The 2012 California MUTCD has already been issued. So my understand is this would not be applicable unless it's adopted by an executive director; is that correct?

SECRETARY SINGH: That's what we will do. If the Committee makes a recommendation we will issue TOPD (phonetic) and we will post on the MUTCD website.

CHAIR FISHER: So then it will become effective at that time --

SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- that the executive director is issued?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We'll get comments from the public shortly. But any other questions or comments from Committee members?

COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: If I may, I've worked in the commercial unit for the Highway Patrol for a few years. And from an enforcement aspect of that, we did receive quite a few calls from truckers themselves as they would run into these problems. They'd exit the freeway, not know where to go, or they'd get to the point where they couldn't find the turnaround. Local agencies would then often cite them for those violations. And I don't know if -- not knowing the particulars of the roadway, but if it was a signage problem that made it difficult to them due to the local agency not properly signing once they got off the freeway. But it -- it did come up as an issue with the drivers themselves.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, David.

Any other comments by Committee members? And we'll go to the audience shortly. Okay.

Seeing none at this time, we'll invite members from the public to comment. Please come up to the podium, state your name and affiliation.

MR. MILLER: My name is Rock Miller. You'll have to explain to me the protocol for alternates making comments. Just a brief comment.

It's not clear from what I'm reading whose obligation it is to make the geometric determination for the freeway interchange. I initially was sort of concluding it was the -- the local agency. But the more I read it the more I realize it

really isn't clarified. I don't know if the intent is for Caltrans to make the determination for the interchange or intersections. I think that should be clarified.

SECRETARY SINGH: May I respond to that question?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Devinder, please respond to that.

SECRETARY SINGH: The last -- last bulletin, putting responsibility on Caltrans, if we are signing off the highway we are taking responsibility. If you read the last bulletin, "the State shall place."

MR. MILLER: Just -- yeah. I think the Subparagraph B where it says, "The State highway ramp or intersection meets all criteria," I think it would be wise if the agency making that particular determination was clearly spelled out. It doesn't spell it out, but the A provision clearly assigns it to be the responsibility of the city.

CHAIR FISHER: So as I understand, Rock, you're indicating there's just something left out, and it might say "and the State has adopted the findings from the local agency," or something to that effect?

MR. MILLER: I believe the state probably wants to make the determination with respect to the state highway. But the way the paragraph is written it does not say whether that's the responsibility of the state or of the local agency.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, we can make a clarification by saying the state -- Mr. Chairman, can I --

CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We can say "The State highway ramp or intersection meets all geometric criteria for STAA trucks as determined by the agency that has ownership of the vicinity," which if it's a city facility the city is going to make the determination. If it's Caltrans, Caltrans is going to make that determination.

MR. MILLER: It's clear with respect to Paragraph A that it's the city's responsibility. The responsibility is not set out under Paragraph D.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. And I think in that Caltrans, in the last bullet, will post signs on the freeway after the local agencies post signs on the city street. There probably needs to be something that indicates that Caltrans has made a final determination based on the information provided by the public agency. And maybe when we consider a motion we may want to consider if there's any added language we'd want to have.

Jacob?

MR. BABICO: My name is Jacob Babico. I'm from the County of San Bernardino. The way I understood -- I understand this is that when a local agency requested Caltrans to have a truck route it is the responsibilities of the local agencies to make sure that the intersection meets the geometric criteria of highway design manual. But the intersection itself is within the Caltrans jurisdiction. Local -- local agency, as far as

County of San Bernardino, has no jurisdiction at that intersection.

So shouldn't that intersection meet all the criteria to begin with? Because it's under the jurisdiction of the Caltrans. Let's say "Any local road intersecting the off ramps." Go ahead.

SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Jacob, we're not talking about the off ramp intersection. We're not talking about the ramp intersection, we are talking about the local roads.

MR. BABICO: Well, the way I understood, the minute you exit the freeway it's the first intersection. That first intersection is under your jurisdiction, Caltrans jurisdiction. Who is going to analyze that geometry of that intersection?

SECRETARY SINGH: Caltrans.

MR. BABICO: It doesn't say.

SECRETARY SINGH: If the language is not clear we will clear it.

MR. BABICO: Okay. That's my point.

CHAIR FISHER: And it could be that just because it's a Caltrans intersection doesn't mean that it satisfies all current STAA geometric criteria. It could be a very old interchange.

MR. BABICO: So should it be a burden to the local agencies to -- to verify and analyze that intersection?

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well, the Committee can

consider that comment.

Any other comments from the public? Okay.

Seeing none, we'll take this back to the Committee. I'd like to, at some point, have a motion to either approve or to add some clarifying language that reflects, maybe, some of the comments that we've heard. Do we have any such motion or proposal?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, can I make a suggestion of language?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Rick. Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: For Paragraph B I think it would address the concerns to -- to have it read as follows: "The State has determined that the State highway ramp or intersection meets all geometric criteria for STAA trucks."

CHAIR FISHER: Can you repeat that?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I can. "B: The State has determined that the State highway ramp or intersection meets all geometric criteria for STAA trucks."

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Friends amendment. Word "department" instead of state.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Sure. I was matching some wording I saw elsewhere, but that's fine with me.

CHAIR FISHER: Would that come at the end of B?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Right after the B, it's right parenthesis.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I'm proposing to begin the sentence with this language.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, so B would begin the sentence with that?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And it would in that way be parallel to the way Paragraph A is worded, the local jurisdiction has done these things, and B the -- the department has done these things. That's my suggestion.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So is it clear to every -- I'll take that as a motion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Is it clear to everyone what the motion would do? As I understand it, it would be the lead sentence for B.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I second the motion for discussion purpose.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we have a motion -- a clarifying motion. Is the motion to adopt this with that clarifying language that you just proposed?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Is your second to --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, discussion first.

CHAIR FISHER: Discussion first. Okay. We have a motion, we have a second that would adopt this language with added clarifying language at the beginning of B.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Now, Mr. Chairman, one question, under Paragraph B, the first bullet, I'm reading that several times and I still don't know what does that -- "if the route passes" followed by several dots. I mean --

CHAIR FISHER: I think they're proposing no change in the current language.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh. Okay. So -- so you don't mention the rest of it, but the rest of it follows?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Got you.

CHAIR FISHER: Right. There's no change in that language, right?

SECRETARY SINGH: No. There are no changes, anything in that book.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So is this --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because the way it's written here it doesn't make sense?

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. All right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Caltrans agrees that there needs to be some editorial work done on this to clarify. I'm not certain that what we've -- what we've heard is the limit to that edit. So I would suggest that Caltrans be directed to rewrite that paragraph in toto and come back to the next meeting.

CHAIR FISHER: So instead of identifying the language

now and disposing of the matter you want to bring it back to the next meeting?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes. I'd like to bring it back to the next meeting. This does have a significant impact on not only Caltrans, but the local agencies and the trucking industry. And rather than rush into something for Caltrans representatives here today that may not be speaking directly for the Caltrans unit responsible for this, I'd like to take these edits back and have them approve them.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we have a motion to approve this item.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Do you want me to --

CHAIR FISHER: Are you willing to withdraw your motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I'd be willing to withdraw my motion, yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. The motion is withdrawn. So --

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Would it be appropriate to make an alternate motion to continue the item? Is that the appropriate process here?

CHAIR FISHER: I think the sponsor of the motion can elect to continue the item.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Is that correct --

SECRETARY SINGH: Yes. Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- Devinder?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: So we probably don't need a formal motion --

SECRETARY SINGH: No.

CHAIR FISHER: -- I don't think, to continue this.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So it's not like the board of supervisors then? In my world we --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR FISHER: We're not that formal.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Question on what's before us. By withdrawing the motion is the edit suggestion or the change in Paragraph B, beginning sentence of B, also withdrawn? I'm not quite sure what I heard.

CHAIR FISHER: I think what Caltrans wants to do is sponsor the item to consider the motion that was withdrawn, but to finesse the language and go through it one more time to make sure they've covered it all in a format that makes sense. So I expect the item that would come back at our next meeting would be very close to the language that was proposed, but they may want to finesse it a little bit.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, since we are visiting this section of the manual, just a suggestion for Caltrans, you may want to also look into the issue of multi-jurisdiction issues, that what happens is the STAA truck route,

after the freeway system, goes through several jurisdictions, then who becomes responsible.

SECRETARY SINGH: It's already written, which I just handed over.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. And -- okay.

And then the other thing is just the issue of -- that we're addressing the 24 hour -- 24/7 turnaround area. But also you may want to do a little bit of clarification on the other terminals and what you consider the terminal point, terminal points of the truck route. Because those issues always pop up. You say, okay, we get them off the freeway, then where do they go? Because theoretically you have to have an established truck route all the way back to another freeway point.

CHAIR FISHER: To another freeway point or to the truck terminal?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Truck. To another truck route, yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So we don't want to just go and say we do a couple miles off the freeway and then you're on your own.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. Yeah. Caltrans agrees with that.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: So I think Caltrans has heard some valuable comments and will come back next time with a real tight proposal on truck routes. So thank you for that item.

I'd like to now go -- skip over the Part 6 items. I'd like to go to item 12-4, which is a Part 1 item, a definition item. I think this matter can be handled fairly quickly, but -- but you never know for sure. And it's regarding the definition of night and nighttime. That's also a Caltrans item, Don. Item -- we're on page 64.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes. Caltrans recommends that we define the term night and nighttime as darkness defined by the California Vehicle Code for the entire California MUTCD. The background on that, neither night nor nighttime is defined by Federal MUTCD. Darkness is defined in the California Vehicle Code Section 280. The policy should define the use of the night and nighttime in the California MUTCD as darkness that is defined in the California Vehicle Code.

The actual proposal is Section 1A.13, Definitions of Headings, Words, and Phrases in this manual, and specifically a new Section 124A,

"Night and nighttime is the equivalent of darkness defined by the California Vehicle Code Section 280: 'Darkness is any time from one-half hour after sunset to one-half hour before sunrise and any other time when visibility is not sufficient to render clearly discernible any person or

vehicle on the highway at the distance of 1000 feet.'"

And I would like to ask Johnny Bhullar if he has any additional commentary on that before we move forward.

MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Actually, this is one of the Part 6 issues. And the way Gordon is working on, there's a lot of comments that we were -- we didn't address and we had postponed. So he has done the work, and this came out of that.

And this issue here is that nighttime, darkness, I mean, we mean the same thing in the manual, but it's never defined. However, the California Vehicle Code does define it very specifically to the 30 minutes before twilight that -- or the sunrise-sunset. So that's how the vehicle code defines it, exactly what do they mean by darkness.

So for our work zone or other issues, when we are loosely using the terms nighttime or darkness and not even defining it, first of all, we need to reconcile them so that we don't have different terms, darkness or nighttime, and then what do they mean.

And, actually, as a quick fix what I did is with the 2012 manual and the definitions, I just made a reference to the CVC for the definition of nighttime or darkness, and left it at that. So that was in my liberty just making a reference to CVC code. That -- that's what I did.

But what we need to look at is, I think there are 33

references -- I don't know have it on top of my head -- but they need to be looked at and see how do they impact, and is there intent in every case that we are meaning the CVC definition or not. So -- and that is pretty much the question that we're trying to resolve.

CHAIR FISHER: So, Johnny, you extracted the CVC language word for word?

MR. BHULLAR: No, I did not. And I'll show you on the -- basically, because I do not have the authority to be putting in policies into the manual by myself, but just a CVC reference, I thought it would be okay for me to just add a reference to something that's already in the vehicle code and leave it at that.

So what I did is -- and Gordon was of the opinion that he was going to bring this and run it through the committee, and that's how we will, of course, have the final take on it.

And as you can see here, the definition for night or -- for night or nighttime reference the CVC 280 definition of darkness.

CHAIR FISHER: But what I'm asking is what's before us on page 64 --

MR. BHULLAR: Uh-huh.

CHAIR FISHER: -- in red language, is that the -- an exact duplicate of what's in CVC Section 280?

MR. BHULLAR: I can not vouch for that because Gordon actually was the okay. In fact, we can quickly check that. I have the CVC here, so let me put that up.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

SECRETARY SINGH: That's the exact language.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. It appears to be exactly 280 from the CVC. Okay.

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

SECRETARY SINGH: Johnny, I have that.

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. That was my only question and clarification.

Any other introductory comments by Caltrans on this before the Committee discusses it? Okay.

Seeing none, do we have any discussion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, this I exactly how the feds define the darkness or nighttime for -- for all purposes. And we've adopted it. If you look at the FAA for aviation purposes, they use the exact same thing. They call it civil twilight; a half-hour before, a half-hour after.

I make a motion we approve the -- the recommended changes to the MUTCD as outlined in our report.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We have a motion. Do we have a second? Anyone want -- wish to second it? If not, I'll second it.

Further discussion by the Committee?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Question, Mr. Chairman. I think I heard that there are, I think he said 33 references to night or nighttime; is that correct?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Ninety-six references.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Ninety-six?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I did an Acrobat search of the 2012 MUTCD. There are 96 references to the discreet word "night" and 161 references to "night" incorporated in -- either by itself or in other words.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: If it -- if it were a lower number I was going to suggest that it might be simpler to simply rephrase the use of night and nighttime, using the word "darkness." Since there are that many, though, I think maybe that would be a greater -- a greater challenge. And so I would -- I will merely make that observation, but I think I would vote in support of the -- the motion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I couldn't hear the comment. Sorry. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I did. I think he said --

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: I'm --

CHAIR FISHER: -- he -- go ahead.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: You know, in a longer term I'm saying, never mind. But -- but what I was asking was the number of references to night and nighttime. And it sounds

like the number is so high that it is more -- more appropriate to simply add the definition as -- as staff is doing rather than to try and rephrase every -- every location with the word "darkness."

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Suggestion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Now that -- that -- that's a good suggestion if you have 96, you said?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Ninety-six for the discreet word "night."

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. If you have --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: One hundred and sixty-one for the "night" as part of --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think if we have 96 places we are saying nighttime, we need to have a definition of what we need by nighttime.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: There's -- there's 250 overall changes that would take place, as opposed to the definition.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. So we are -- we are further adding to the definition, but this equivalent to Section 280 of the CVC. That's what we're doing.

CHAIR FISHER: And if we were to consider changing the word night or nighttime to darkness in the MUTCD that would be contrary to the Federal MUTCD. So this might be the easier, benign way out.

Any other comments from Committee members? Yes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Could we have the prior image back on the screen? I want to make sure I'm understanding the difference. So what's on the screen right now has already been incorporated into the California MUTCD. So -- so part of what's in read in our report actually is already in there.

MR. BHULLAR: That's right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And all we're doing is transcribing the definition from the code.

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. In this case what happened there is that when we -- I think that when we were finalizing the manual an agenda was being also finalized. So it was like when this was becoming -- going in, so it was a little bit --

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So this one is already in?

MR. BHULLAR: It is official now.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: So a clarifying question. The proposal before us is to duplicate the language of Section 280. But what you have there is merely to refer to it.

So what is the proposal from Caltrans at this point, to refer to it or to duplicate it?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: To expand it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: To expand it?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: What Johnny is saying is when the agenda was put together we pulled verbiage out of the 2010 manual. What we've got on the screen is the 2012 manual, which took part of that red language, and we're expanding it.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we'll just simply add the words that are reflected in Section 280, rather than merely refer to it. It ends up being the same, but --

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Exactly.

CHAIR FISHER: -- but there you don't have to go to another source document.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Exactly.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further discussion among Committee members on this item? John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes. I wonder whether the intent is for the California MUTCD to be parallel, as this change request, and to remain parallel to California Vehicle Code Section 280's definition.

An alternate way to do this would be to define night and nighttime as a direct lift from the -- according to the CVC, and then just to note that this is also how it's defined in CVC Section 280. It's a subtle difference, but are we copying the definition or enshrining a reference?

CHAIR FISHER: We are copying the definition and referencing Section 280. So the current 2012 MUTCD makes reference to Section 280. If we were to adopt this today we

would simply add the words that are shown in Section 280 so that a person doesn't have to go to another document to see what the vehicle code says.

MR. BHULLAR: But to be perfectly honest, I think that when this was being done probably, like when we do put this in as like just a reference, Gordon probably might did not have -- might not have looked into the details, is that sufficient or still we need to. Because sometimes we try not to copy CVC because it might get changed, and leave it as a reference. However, the fear is that reading this manual and just with the reference, unless you research it, and if it's not common knowledge, what is nighttime, what is darkness? And for that reason we want to put it in, and then we can refer to it. But as of the -- before, I think there was no definition at all.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Any further discussion among Committee members on this item?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I --

CHAIR FISHER: Yes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I think -- I think we just have to be cognizant. And I've heard some kind of rumblings about what is discernible about any person. And -- and we have a visually impaired community out there, and we're not acknowledging that they're able to discern or not discern this. So just -- it's just a matter of comment that not everybody is

able to discern or see 1000 feet because of sight limitations, whether they're visually impaired or -- or whatnot. And I don't know how we address that. But I think we have to be somewhat cognizant of some of our roadway users out there.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. This is -- this is one of the way with codes, that a lot of people, if you ask them, you wouldn't be really aware of 30 minutes. And for work zones, setting them up and picking them up, and the contractors, for them it's very important to what are we intending. We are talking about writing the doctrine. So if they are aware of it, it probably would be a little bit safer for them to target their time.

CHAIR FISHER: Jeff?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I thought one of the subtleties we were talking about before is whether we were linking it directly CVC 280, which would mean if 280 ever were updated that language would apply. I mean, this is currently what it says. But is the main point that it's as defined by CVC Section 280 or is it as defined as darkness, and this is the definition of darkness.

So I thought that that was the key that was being referred to earlier, is the -- is the most important thing that we're linking it to CVC Section 280 so that if it were ever changed it would -- then the definition of night and nighttime

would automatically change also?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I would concur with that, is that it probably -- if it's already defined somewhere else, just to reference that. And then if that's ever changed, then we don't have to change the MUTCD to reflect that other change. That reduces the bureaucracy.

CHAIR FISHER: Interesting point. But these definitions are not changed that often. It's -- it's fairly rare.

So I guess the question is, yes, for efficiency purposes you could reference it, and should the definition change some day merely referencing that wouldn't capture that. On the other hand, you have to weigh that against the convenience factor. If you don't have the words in front of you then you've got to go to another document.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My main concern is that with all of our discussion about the aging population it just seems like this is a segment that may be lagging behind the discussion, and may be updated sooner than you think just because light is something that's -- that aging people are sensitive to. I mean, they do have a harder time.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, one thought is that should this be changed in the future by an act of legislature, a fairly momentous event, I would expect Caltrans to flag that and to bring it to the Committee so that we could take appropriate

action to tweak the language in our manual. But again, I offer that these definitions don't change that often. But, yes, I acknowledge, they do change somewhat.

Johnny, and then Hamid.

MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Working on the California MUTCD and being the editor, I'll tell you, what we have done with the manual is we have done it both ways. And there is a purpose and intent of doing it both ways for a lot of references, not only for the CVC but for others, as well.

The reason is that, of course, if the reference is changed then we have to make sure that we update them. But sometimes engineers will not be able to go to the other references or they don't go to the references, and for the educational element that that particular issue, we need to bring it into the manual so that everyone is aware of the details. So in those cases we then add not only the reference but also list the language and put it in, even though it might change. And then, of course, we should be updating.

But in other cases we just leave it as a reference where it is not as important and it's a little bit more commonly known. And in those cases we don't try to incorporate the entire references and just leave it as a reference. So the manual does it both ways.

CHAIR FISHER: Does Caltrans have a process for

flagging changes to the vehicle code that necessitate corresponding changes in the California MUTCD?

MR. BHULLAR: Yes. The current process is that Hamid is our partner in this. And every year when the vehicle code comes out and they do come out with the publication which highlights all the changes, and that's the one, then we go through and see which ones are related to traffic control devices and what we need to do.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, this is -- I see this more as a technicality. I'd like clarification. I remember, going back over 20 years, and those of us who have been deposed by attorneys, we know that night has always had the technical legal definition. Night is always a half-hour before, half-hour after. And that period is called the civil twilight. And they define it as the time that you can read without the assistance of lighting. And how they define it is by a person of 20/20 vision and whatever.

But night and darkness, whether or not we are playing with semantics here, we have always had a technical legal definition. If some day at the federal and the state level they change it, that's a different story. It's always half-hour before, half-hour after. So I think what we are doing is just -- we are clarifying. And as Mr. Bhullar said, so that the person who reads this doesn't need to go and find it in the

vehicle code also. So we're just making it consistent. So --

MR. BHULLAR: Gordon, is this a problem in the field, education-wise?

MR. WONG: It -- I made this proposal originally because there's many references in Part 6 that talk about night and nighttime. And often we got disputes from the contractor because they're doing work, and then they couldn't quite finish on time. And we told them that you're entering the hour of darkness. You need to start -- setup for night work. And they -- they're arguing with us that were almost done, and it drag on. And sometimes it hits darkness and we're totally unprepared. By doing so we can educate the contractors that half-an-hour prior to complete darkness you need to start setting up and be prepared for or start picking up all traffic control and make sure that the public is aware of it, and that's the idea.

And between the version I proposed and what Johnny has on the projector, I like his way of saying it better. It says "Refer to CVC," which is equivalent of, and that way it's -- it's a reference rather than a replacement term that way, and legally it's -- I think it's better defined.

But then, about spelling out the whole language, I like it easier because there's no way for people to carry so many documents around and just try to teeter-tottering everything at once. And it will be much easier for

practitioners of California MUTCD to use it if somebody is using it.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Gordon. Don?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes. I apologize if Caltrans is giving some sort of mixed messages here. It's not our intent at all.

What I would like to propose as a modification, which I hope the Committee will find acceptable, is that we link or tie down the specific version of the California Vehicle Code that we're referencing so that if, in fact, there were any changes in the future, that it's very clear that we've taken this definition out of the 2010 California Vehicle Code. So I would propose that this be edited to say, before the word CVC, that it say "2010." And that --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Don, that was going to be my suggestion. I like that.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. That would accomplish -- pardon me, Johnny?

MR. BHULLAR: Well, the -- the code numbers don't change on -- on California Vehicle Code. The code numbers, normally, I haven't seen those code numbers change. I mean, they might change the language. They might even skip -- when they are like taking it out, they'll just remove the number altogether. But they don't really change those numbers.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. Well, let me just

explain what my intent is. And, John, you can follow up, as well, if I'm not saying this correctly. I believe that the concern that's been expressed by the Committee is that by referencing the vehicle code and spelling out the words, if the vehicle code changes at some future point there's a discrepancy and no one wants to see that, even if we do come back and at some point modify the language.

Good so far, John?

And so what I'm suggesting is that by basically adding the date that we use the definition, if there were a change later the definition would still be correct as of the time that we put it in this document. And that would also be a trigger later, if we know the vehicle code has changed in 2012 or whatever, that we would go back to this and verify or change the language in the definition?

MR. BHULLAR: Well, Don --

CHAIR FISHER: Don --

MR. BHULLAR: -- Don, a little bit slight, probably, issue in that is the way the vehicle code works, they assign a date when it's put in. And then when it changes that date comes in. And if it's a 12-year gap, like, for example, if it was in 1988 when they changed it last, it's going to change 1988 for that number. And then in 2015 they will say amended in 2015. And, of course, the 2010 is pretty much meaningless then. So we might be better off saying the 1988 definition, or

whichever is the current one. Because at least that date is tied to the number.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. But I see all of this as problematic. If you start referencing old vehicle codes they're not going to be readily accessible. And you always want to refer to the recent ones. So I see this as low risk.

I ask the question, does Caltrans have a process for tracking changes to the vehicle code that would require corresponding changes in the manual, and I heard they do. We also have longstanding members of this Committee, the two Auto Clubs who track legislation. And I would think if Caltrans doesn't catch this, the Auto Clubs would and bring it to the attention of the Committee. So I see it as low risk that the definition could be changed in the vehicle code and that we would let it slip by.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman --

MR. BHULLAR: I agree.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I understand the sensitivity on this, but I totally agree with your assessment that this is such a low probability change that I'll probably not see it in my lifetime. I've seen stranger things, but I don't -- because this is like a century-old definition of night. It's a very well embedded legal definition for all kinds of purposes in transportation, for -- for maritime, for aviation, for roads. We have been defining night for over a

century, what we mean when we say night. So I doubt it very much if they are going to make any significant change in the near future.

CHAIR FISHER: And it's probably an old uniform vehicle code --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- definition that many other states use and have used for decades.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

MR. BHULLAR: Because if we perceive this to be a problem and if you're trying to fix it, then why not include the 30-minute issue and just verbalize it, so still the reference, it doesn't go halfway.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could sort of summarize what I'm hearing. I hear three points. I hear the point that it's convenient for practitioners to have the language in the MUTCD rather than having to chase down CVC 280 and read it, although that has been, for years, available on the DMV website with a numerical lookup. I hear, also, the question of whether the language should be sort of the property of the MUTCD or the property of the CVC and referenced by the MUTCD. And then I hear a third issue, which is which CVC, what year CVC.

And I want to offer an alternate formulation that, I think, addresses all three. And that would be for the -- the -

- the MUTCD, in the red text, to directly quote -- not quote, but to directly state the exact verbatim description as you would find in today's 2010 CVC. And further, to add a support statement noting that this is the identical language that appears in the 2010 CVC. So we have a reference to the CVC. We have the dated reference. But the MUTCD has the text so the practitioner can see it directly.

CHAIR FISHER: How would that change the motion on the floor?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's -- it's nebulous to me as a practitioner and as a MUTCD tea reader -- tea leaf reader whether this is a quote that is like other quotes in -- in the definitions part of the MUTCD, or if it's a reference. It seems like it's sort of straddling the line. I'm not quite sure what it is.

CHAIR FISHER: It is an exact quote of the vehicle code.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I would rather just make it a definition in the MUTCD and support that with a statement that says this happens to be identical to the 2010 CVC. It's a subtlety.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Johnny?

MR. BHULLAR: Well, we are talking about something that's very sensitive. We do not want to take ownership of the definition of 30 minutes because that's going to end up in a

total liability case --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Oh. Okay.

MR. BHULLAR: -- and it's going to be dissected. So we don't want to take ownership of that.

We want to keep it as California Vehicle Code defined. Because if we take ownership of it and then make a reference, then we end up with trying to defend it and why and what, and this nighttime versus, so --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I defer to Johnny.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Gordon?

MR. WONG: This is Gordon from Caltrans. I have an alternative solution to this discussion, is if you look at the next page on the agenda item, it's the list of all the referenced documents. And for the 2012 version we have specifically taken to the addition of each document to make it -- to -- so it will be referenced to the latest. But if -- which addition is concern for the Committee members, what I suggest we can do is put the addition back into that page. That -- that was how we practiced in 2010. And that way when each version of the manual publishes we date it the latest addition of each document and we tie it to the California CVC as 2010 or 2011, or in our case it was 2012 that was published, then we tie it to the 2012 CVC. And that way that's taken care of the year and the publication issues.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We don't -- we don't want to go down that road. You're talking about 20 documents. And these documents are going to be changed maybe like two or three times a year. And not only that, some sections of them go through changes. The manual doesn't change. It becomes extremely confusing. This is like food for the tort lawyers. They just love this stuff. You go and you put in there and you say Construction Manual, Revision 1999, and Revision 1999 has not changed until 2005. But 500 pages of that manual have gone through updates. So you have to go and defend, what did you mean? This is a 1999 manual, but this page was updated in 2002. So do I go with that or do I go with this?

And then making a reference to things like that in the MUTCD, it's just going to make it so complicated for practitioners. I like the way you are doing it now. Just make a reference to the manual and let them figure out that you have to go to that other manual or by the specific -- the latest version, and even in that latest version there are pages that have been updated after that version. But let's not put numbers and dates because it becomes very confusing.

MR. WONG: But -- but that's -- that was our practice --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

MR. WONG: -- since 2003 until 2010 version --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I know. And then we --

MR. WONG: -- which was not done --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And then we changed it.

MR. WONG: -- until 2011, and that caused no problem. The only problem --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: How do you -- how do you know that?

MR. WONG: We have had no one come to the Committee that said that had caused a problem.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But -- but when we do this we don't know really, you know, how these things are being used in the legal proceedings.

I like the way you are doing it now a lot.

MR. WONG: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I don't really see a whole lot of benefit going back to what we were doing.

MR. WONG: Okay. And then I would suggest -- also, one more comment is if we reference that darkness to this particular definition then we have to go back to the manual and find all the hundreds of CVC references and date it for each reference from the CVC. So that's almost -- it's almost not practical to do so. Just -- that's just my last comment. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I'll note for the record, Don showed me the last time that this definition was changed. It

was 37 years ago. So again, I will assert that this is a low-risk item for something to slip through. And I think we've got mechanisms in place to make sure they catch it.

I'd like to start getting comments from the public on this. Any member of the public want to comment on this item?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Seeing none.

CHAIR FISHER: Seeing none, bring it back to the Committee. We have a motion to adopt what Caltrans has proposed. Further discussion on the motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A question on the motion. Did the suggestion to include the word 2010 get incorporated in the motion or not?

CHAIR FISHER: It was not part of the motion. Correct me if I'm wrong.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: 2010 of what, CVC?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: CVC 2010?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, some --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We are already using 2012 CVC.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, I'm just asking a question about the motion. Because I think Don suggested that 2010 be prefixed before the word CVC.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Right. That was part of the

discussion. It was not a motion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So any further discussion on the motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just one of the problems that happens if you start introducing 2010 CVC, then five years from now somebody who reads the California MUTCD is not going to be able to find the 2010 version of CVC

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm not suggesting that it be incorporated in the motion. I was just wondering whether -- where we let the motion stand.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh. Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So any final discussion before we vote on this matter? Okay. Keep in mind, it takes seven votes to adopt something for the California MUTCD. So I'd us to now vote on this motion. Is everyone clear on the motion? Okay. All of those who approve, raise your hands? Okay. Unanimous. Okay.

At this time I'd like to take a ten minute break. Let's resume at 11:25. Thank you.

(Off the Record from 11:15 a.m. until 11:37 a.m.)

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Let the record show that we're resuming the meeting at 11:37. And as I indicated, we'll skip over the Part 6 items for now.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just -- a member of the audience brought something to my attention. I'll just share it for the record for Caltrans to consider.

The lady, I forgot her name, from City of Oceanside, suggested that for places in the manual, that we make references to CVC, since we are going to the electronic age and it's going to be -- and most people are using the document online, it might help if we provide a hyperlink from the CVC references to the California Vehicle Code, which is also online. So therefore, each time that you click on that you always go to the latest version of CVC.

I'm just raising it for -- and Johnny is --

CHAIR FISHER: Very --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And Johnny is going to hate me for this suggestion, but that's something for --

MR. BHULLAR: I didn't hear it.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: He's ignoring you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: He's ignoring me.

MR. BHULLAR: Well, once I'm done with the 2012 --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. No. It's for -- it's something for consideration. And I think it's a good suggestion, because probably five years from now we are not going to print these things anymore. It's all going to be electronic. If any place we are making a reference to CVC, per

se, or other documents, if there is a possibility that a hyperlink is provided so that the person who is reading it online, he clicks on it, it goes to that document. And I know it's like IT and stuff and it's time consuming, but something on the list of things to do for future.

MR. WONG: Okay. Would you like me to answer the question?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That was a suggestion.

MR. WONG: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just -- just think about it, sleep on it, and then come back next meeting with an answer.

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well, it's an interesting thought. And I think ultimately we will have to move in that direction, but probably not -- probably not right now. Okay.

We're going to go to Item 12-8, which is to adopt a new sign that says "Move Over or Slow Down for Stopped Emergency and Maintenance Vehicles" State Law sign. The item is on page 100.

Don, that's your item.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. Thank you. The recommendation is to adopt and establish "Move Over" Law fixed sign, such as the one used in Colorado, for use on California highways.

The background on that is that recently Caltrans has experienced three worker fatalities right here in the San Diego area. And that led to the creation of a new law or was tied to a new law which is in Section 21809 of the California Vehicle Code, requiring people to move over -- vehicles to move over, away from the shoulder area, whenever an authorized emergency vehicle is on the shoulder.

And what we are proposing is to -- just a second here. Oh, yes. I guess rather than me go through this any further at this point, first I'd like to have Theresa and Gordon talk a little bit about the two items. There are two specific things that we'd like to do.

Gordon, would you like to go first?

MR. WONG: Sure. This particular item is going to -- oh, Gordon from Caltrans.

This particular item is going to Part 2 of the California MUTCD. Unfortunately, Don Howe could not be here today. And this proposal was originally generated by CHP and was brought to my attention by Mr. John Caller from the CHP. And he -- then I forwarded it to our maintenance folks. And we had adopted a new law for work vehicles and emergency vehicles and for trucks in 2009. The effective date was January 1, 2010. And this is just an effort of getting the CVC word out to the public.

And the sign is designed based on an existing sign of

Colorado State. And so in the future if FHWA adopts -- oh, and this is a state specific sign. So for FHWA to come in and adopt a similar sign is not very -- we don't have a very good chance on that, so this is the proposed California sign.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: May I ask a question?

CHAIR FISHER: I just note that the sign that you show on page 102 has the word "State Law" on it. But the text doesn't include State Law. Was it your intent to fully show all the words that appear on the sign under the text, the text that appears at the bottom of page 101?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Gordon, is the sign that you're proposing for a fixed sign?

MR. WONG: Yes. This is a Caltrans proposed sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. I've seen several versions. And, unfortunately, I don't know which one was the final version.

Gordon, does it have State Law in the -- the header?

MR. WONG: Yes. It will have the State Law in the header. And that could be just a mistake. We will change the name of the -- the sign.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: And, of course, the "XX" will be changed because that's going to be a new -- new sign. We have not assigned a sign number to it.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Before we have the Committee ask questions or discuss the matter, is there any more of the introduction of this item from Caltrans?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Maintenance, I believe, was also planning to use a sign when they're operating in a work zone, a sign that would be installed or placed on the tailgate; is that correct, Theresa?

MS. DRUMM: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Could you please tell us a little bit about that?

MS. DRUMM: Yes.

MR. WONG: Excuse me. That is under a different item on today's agenda.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Oh.

MR. WONG: So would you like to discuss that, or when that item comes up then we can talk about it? Because it belongs to different parts. That's why they were --

MR. BHULLAR: Let's --

MR. WONG: -- put in different --

MR. BHULLAR: Let's keep separate.

MR. WONG: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Okay. Sorry, Theresa.

MR. WONG: No problem.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: We'll get back to that.

And I believe that's all we have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Questions, discussion from Committee members? Jeff?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just wanted to see the actual California Code. I was aware of the rule with regards to pulling over when passing a stopped emergency vehicle. I was not even aware that the law referenced maintenance vehicles. And I see all of this Colorado Code, but I'm not seeing anything like it for the California Code that the sign is based on.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I think there's a hyperlink.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. I wondered why we were referencing Colorado when we have Vehicle Code Section 21809.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And we need a hyperlink to that. Okay.

Mr. Chair, I have a question.

CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: This is an extremely important issue. And we actually, about a year-and-a-half ago, we ran a piece about it, about half a page in our *Westways Magazine* that goes to like 4.6 million households in Southern California. I have a concern about them, also. But looking at the sign, now I have more concern.

If I am a motorist and I'm not going to go even to the people or -- who English is not their primary language, and our state has a lot of those kinds of drivers, that's another

issue. But the native language speaking driver, I'm going down the highway and I see this on the side, and it says "Move Over or Slow Down for Stopped Emergency and Maintenance Vehicles," what am I supposed to do? I mean, it's a regulatory sign, and it's black and white. It has enforcement associated with it.

But if I'm driving at 45, 50, 55 miles an hour and I see this on the side, and it says "Move Over or Slow Down," first of all, what do you want me to do? Do you want me to move over or do you want me to slow down? Now do you want me to do it -- okay. Which one is the emergency vehicle and which one is the maintenance vehicle?

I understand, the -- the cause is a very good cause, and I agree with you, and there is nothing more tragic than these highway fatalities we have for construction workers and all that, and we have to try to minimize it. I'm not just sure about the effectiveness of this sign.

MR. WONG: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm not saying that we don't need the sign. But what I'm saying is that is this -- like think about an average driver. First, what do you want me to do? Do you want me to move over or slow down? What am I supposed to do here?

MR. WONG: Gordon from Caltrans. To answer the first question, as to why we choose Colorado's sign as the basis, that was originally proposed by CHP. And we looked at many

other states and we have -- both CHP and Caltrans maintenance like the verbiage on the sign, and that's why we decided to adopt the sign as-is.

To answer your question of effectiveness of the -- the sign, the -- the -- the CVC is very wordy. And Chairman is right now looking at it, right now. And I have Johnny trying to bring it up on the Internet so everybody can see it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. See, the --

MR. WONG: Okay. Perfect. The --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The thing -- the thing that I have, Gordon, is that we are mixing two sections of the law. There is -- there is a vehicle code that says move over when the emergency vehicle is approaching you. That's the move-over law.

MR. WONG: No, that's incorrect.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But -- but if there is a stopped police officer on the shoulder, I don't move over for that.

MR. WONG: No, you do.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: See what I'm saying?

MR. WONG: It's -- it's part of the CVC that's being pulled up right now.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Good. Then let's go through that.

MR. BHULLAR: Right here.

MR. WONG: And -- and the main concern is we -- Caltrans worked with -- also with the group on CMS message. And we -- we are very concerned about -- we understand signs are supposed to be the least amount of wording and very easy for motorists to read. But to capture the essence of the law it was very hard to -- to shorten the whole thing. And they were talking about slow to the -- at first, say slow or move over to shorten it. However, that -- the law is if you can move over, then move over. If you can not, then slow down.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That is when the emergency vehicle is approaching you.

MR. WONG: No, that's incorrect. That -- there's a different law for move over -- for move over -- pull over and stop for emergency vehicles. That -- that's not included in the Caltrans working vehicle.

This particular legislation in the CVC only pertains to when a work vehicle and emergency vehicle is stopped and with it's amber light flashing, that motorists approaching it would have to move over and slow down. This law does not cover when emergency vehicle approach from behind to pull over and slow down.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Okay. Let's look at the practical application of this. I'm a motorist. I'm going down the highway. There is a Caltrans maintenance truck on the shoulder with his flashers, yellow flashers on, and I

see this sign; what am I supposed to do?

MR. WONG: Move -- and -- and another issue I want to brought up is --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. No. No. I'm just saying from the motorist's perspective, what are -- what do you expect him to do?

MR. WONG: And then another issue I want to brought up is we put State Law on top is because this is going to be a permanent sign. It's not moved from work zone to work zone. It would not necessarily appear right in front of a work zone or a work vehicle. This is like the seatbelt signs; they're populated throughout the state to educate drivers. The law exists. It's not necessarily when you see the sign you would move over or slow down, because it had no correlation between the sign and the work zone location.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So the seatbelt laws, we put it at the strategic locations and they're always there. So is your thinking that you're just going to mushroom the state with these signs and they're going to be at all the places, whether there's construction going on or not?

MR. WONG: No. Caltrans already identified 100 locations.

MS. DRUMM: A hundred locations, yes.

MR. WONG: And those are traditionally planned for at entrance to the state and --

MS. DRUMM: Freeways, yes. On freeways only.

MR. WONG: State your name.

MS. DRUMM: Theresa Drumm, Caltrans. The signs would be placed at strategic points. A hundred places have been identified with the state on freeways, as the law states, not to provide motorist confusion. It would be incoming from various states, as well as Mexico.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Now I feel a lot more comfortable. Because I thought you were planning to put these in advance of construction areas. Not necessarily. You're just putting it --

MS. DRUMM: Yeah. A hundred places strategically placed. The majority will be at our safety roadside rest areas, much like the "Click It or Ticket" and "Drunk Drivers Call 911" signs. Those have shown effectiveness being placed at those locations. The motorist is entering the freeway at a slower speed, actually exiting the rest area, so they can actually see it.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. The difficulty that I'm having with this is I understand the intent and I understand the need. I don't think the language that we have here reflects what the vehicle code says. If I read the vehicle code correctly, the vehicle has to be stationary, one. Two, the vehicle has to be flashing its lights. And, three, it has to be on or adjacent to a freeway.

Is -- if you have a static sign there you're telling the motorist what he must do, but if you don't have flashing lights or you don't have a stationary vehicle you may be misinforming the motorists of what his expectation is to comply with the law.

So I don't see the language in read that indicates the limitations of where this would be applied. Again, it has to be stationary. The lights have to be flashing. It has to be on or adjacent to a freeway .

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Good point.

MR. WONG: Like I stated from -- Gordon from Caltrans. Like I stated from the beginning, it's very hard to catch the essence of the law because it's written. And we captured the stationary vehicle by stating "FOR STOPPED EMERGENCY & MAINTENANCE VEHICLES."

And on the flip coin -- flip side of the coin, we directed our employees to turn off the flashing amber light when they're not -- when they are more than 15 feet away from the edge of travel way.

MS. DRUMM: Or in an established lane or shoulder closure --

MR. WONG: Or --

MS. DRUMM: -- they will not have their amber lights flashing.

MR. WONG: Yes. So this -- this -- we're -- we're

educating employees on this law, as well, to make sure that they do not abuse what this law gave to Caltrans vehicles. We're educating them not to use it, only when it's necessary, when the -- when they're stopped and when the vehicles need to move over and/or slow down.

CHAIR FISHER: Just a suggestion for your consideration, I see value in having some sort of sign to inform motorists of their responsibility where you have stopped maintenance or emergency vehicles. I think something in the sign needs to refer to flashing. And I think you need language in the text that you're proposing that limits it's application to freeways.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: There is one other item Mr. Shrader brought to my attention, and he refreshed my memory that he actually sponsored that he actually sponsored that bill, that that section of 21809, CVC 21809 also makes a specific reference to two trucks, also.

MR. WONG: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But the sign does not say that.

MR. WONG: No. That's why emergency and maintenance vehicles are --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Tow trucks -- tow trucks

are neither. Tow trucks are not emergency, they are not maintenance.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I think in the law -- the law specifically cites tow trucks.

CHAIR FISHER: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: And so again, for readability, for condensing the message, they were considered to be emergency vehicles --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So --

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: -- for the purpose of this sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So if you are thinking of a sign that says two types of vehicle, I prefer to see the third type in there also.

MR. WONG: So would it -- again, Gordon from Caltrans. Just from what you're suggesting I think maybe Caltrans ought to bring it back --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No.

MR. WONG: -- and massage the language a little bit better. But just to get us into the right direction, would you like to see language like "Move Over or Slow Down for Stopped Vehicles with Flashing Amber Light?"

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. I like where you're going with it because you're not distinguishing a type of vehicle that the driver has no knowledge, but you are

identifying an action, flashing amber or something like that.

As far as the driver is concerned he doesn't know whether it's a Caltrans vehicle, a tow truck, or is this county vehicle. But if you say that, "Move Over or Slow Down for Stopped Vehicles with Flashing Lights," that encompasses all those categories of vehicles. I'm not sure about the language still, but I like the direction that you're going.

MR. WONG: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I look back at Section 1A-02 of the MUTCD which defines the five cardinal principles for a defective traffic control device. And I think the sign as currently proposed, the text sign, fails on one clearly, and may fail on another. And you addressed, Gordon, one of my concerns in that this would be deployed in a fixed location where people would be tending to be moving slower than freeway speeds and get more time for comprehension.

The two points in 1A-02 are to convey a clear and simple meaning. I think we're all wrestling with that. And also to give adequate time for proper response.

I wonder whether instead of following Colorado's message sign model you might consider a graphic sign, or a graphic sign with some carefully chosen text. It seems to me that to depict flashing amber lights, a graphic sign might be a

good approach. And I'm thinking of a sign that used to be a text message sign referring to behavior around school buses. And that was changed recently, I think in Johnny's presentation, it's now a graphic sign with a very clear graphic of a school bus with the lights flashing. And I think it gets the message across better.

It's -- it's kind of complicated because you have three classes of vehicles that the motorist is supposed to respond to. But it seems to me that there might be a chance that a graphic sign, or a graphic sign with a few chosen words, like slow down, might do it.

MR. WONG: Johnny, can you help me with the symbol on the federal approval or --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: John, you're right in the intent and the direction you are taking that symbols are always, of course, better than word messages inherently, because of recognition. But, however, the caveat with that is that the feds said that the symbol has to be universally recognized. And, of course, they have to do the testing it has to be the proper symbol. So right now I'm not aware of a symbol for this condition.

So -- and we are not the party to do the symbol ourselves. So if we can come up with a sign in California with a word message for the symbol we can work with the feds and we'll be down the road. But we don't have the option today to

go with the symbol.

CHAIR FISHER: I'd like to build on what John proposed, and that is I think in trying to capture what Section 21809 says we're dealing with a very complicated, long message sign. The other problem that I see is that it's a static sign. And there could be situations where the lights are not flashing or where the -- or where it's not on a freeway.

But I would think the better approach would be to fit a variable message sign panel on the back of the truck or on top of the hood of the vehicle. Because many maintenance vehicles already have these panels on them, but the panel might say something like "Slow Down," and the driver would be instructed to only display that message when on the freeway and when stopped and when the lights are flashing. And if you had a simple variable message panel, "Slow Down," I think then you would be applying it when it's appropriate, and you would have a very simple message, rather than having a complicated message that, at this time, is incomplete. And if we make it any longer it's going to be too difficult to read.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, on that one -- Johnny, on that one, the reason that -- and, again, Richard was involved in that also, that we supported and introduced a bill for inclusion of the tow trucks. But I think it was 2009 or 2010, maybe 2009, there were seven tow truck drivers who were contacted with us towing members, they were killed in

Southern California freeways. And that's a large number, seven.

So the -- that would not still address the need for further public education of the tow trucks, because tow trucks don't have the CMS signs. I mean, maybe not even all Caltrans trucks have those CMS signs. If there is a possibility, if a truck has a CMS sign, I completely agree with you, that's the best way to do it. But some of their trucks may not have the CMS sign, and tow trucks, none of them have the CMS signs.

CHAIR FISHER: But as a practical matter, you can't post all streets --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I know.

CHAIR FISHER: -- where tow truck may sometimes be present.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I know.

CHAIR FISHER: So tow trucks are out there and they are exposed.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: It doesn't preclude a volunteer installation of a small CMS sign on a tow truck. But I grant you, they aren't widely used. But you can have a two truck on any city street or any freeway at any location and you can't post enough signs to warn people of it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I know. It's a hazard. It's -- I know. I'm just --

CHAIR FISHER: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And the same -- the same goes with Caltrans. I mean, the same goes for maintenance.

MR. BHULLAR: And another angle to this is, of course, the carrier that goes in the manual, that generally signs are not -- shouldn't be use to inform of the laws and regulations.

MR. WONG: May I answer the question of PCMS?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

MR. WONG: Okay. The PCMS is a wonderful tool for Caltrans and for everybody. However, this law is pertaining to a vehicle parked adjacent to a freeway, and that's means we're in the shoulder closure situation. And most of the time, that's why when we told everyone earlier, when there is a full shoulder closure, meaning Caltrans has cones out there, has signs out there, has everything already planned out there, that's when we actually turn off the amber light because we believe the warning is good enough for us to direct the traffic to stay off the shoulder.

This particular application is for 20 minutes or under. And when the vehicle is doing -- like picking up garbage or landscaping, a very short term duration, we need 20 minutes window to do something. So we don't have the time to put the cone out and put the sign out. And that's against safety of our workers for traffic closure. That's the critical

window that we need to complete our job.

And PCMS is a great idea. But by the time you pull the PCMS sign out, situated, set up, leveled, pumped, turn it on, program the message, and our job is already done and we're already moved to the next stop.

CHAIR FISHER: Just for clarification, a PCS -- a PCMS is always an option. I wasn't proposing a portable one. I was proposing one that would be permanently mounted to either the back or the hood of the vehicle.

MR. WONG: Permanently mounted to the vehicle, the problem is I've worked with the CMS group with Caltrans to put this message on a CMS or a PCMS. The portable ones or the truck mounted ones has only three lines of eight characters. And by the direction of California MUTCD we can only flash two frames, not three. And it's very hard to capture the verbiage we need for this in -- in that short a message. And I'm still pushing that internally with Caltrans to try to get it going.

On the other note, we have -- on the permanent sign we have three lines of 26 characters, and we already do broadcast this law for the "Watch for Workers" and educating on the permanent CMS. And we believe the result has been good, but at the same time we received many, many public complaints on putting the message out.

CHAIR FISHER: I'm not proposing three lines of text or 26 characters. I'm proposing a simple message on the

mounted CMS that says "Slow" or "Slow Down." That would be applied, again, only when the lights are flashing, when on the freeway, and when stationary. The driver would be instructed to activate his CMS "Slow" or "Slow Down" message when those three things occur.

The other question I have is that you can have an emergency or maintenance vehicle or tow truck anywhere along the freeway network. How do you decide then where to post the stationary signs?

MR. WONG: Again, the stationary signs --

CHAIR FISHER: The stationary static signs.

MR. WONG: Static signs was proposed by maintenance to place at 100 locations to educate people form out of state or Mexico who are traveling into the state to be aware of our State Law.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further discussion among Committee members?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Can I ask for myself?

CHAIR FISHER: Sure.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: I have an issue with identifying this as a regulatory sign if we're not going to be very specific in the instruction on the sign. And since we haven't identified, for example, the tow truck that -- that needs to be slowed down for or moved over for. And I don't think that we're being specific enough to call this a

regulatory sign.

What was noted first in here is that it's an educational sign. I know the -- the seatbelt signs are intended to be educational signs. Frankly, I question whether or not the applicability of -- of this kind of a sign is -- is appropriate, as opposed to maybe a different kind of educational process. This is a new law, and it is something that the general public may not be aware of. But I'm -- I'm thinking that there -- there were times when Caltrans had their -- the "Slow Down for the Cone Zone." They -- they purchased time on billboards, those sorts of things.

I'm thinking that the educational process should be something more along that line than permanent signs that can't be specific to the -- the law that they're intending to inform of.

CHAIR FISHER: If I may ask a questions?

CHAIR FISHER: And then -- and then we'll go to Hamid. Well, I said Hamid could go next.

But, Roberta, did you want to respond to his comment?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Specifically -- Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans, Office of Signs and Markings. Specifically, this particular sign is a regulatory sign. That -- that's the intent.

The -- a little bit of background on how this sign came to be is that several states, and this is becoming a

nationwide trend is this particular is being placed on each state's individually as a law in their state, so drivers going from state to state are going to see this sign. And we've pulled up an example of Colorado, Utah. I saw -- have seen them in Colorado. And I'm sure some of the neighboring states, as well, are using this sign.

So we wanted to make it clear to our drivers, as well, the educational process, that this is what the current law is in California. It is an educational sign. I believe Office of Traffic Safety did a survey of drivers, and a good -- over 90 percent of the drivers have gotten the message, and through driver's handbook and some other sources, magazines and things, relating the information.

So in an attempt to address some of the safety concerns of not only our personnel within Caltrans, but other highway workers out there, is we've seen other states move ahead with this sign, and this is why we would propose this particular sign. Similar words are appearing on other signs. Unfortunately, we don't have a statewide standard. It's not a federal requirement.

And I just wanted to address one question -- or one issue about the amber lights. Not always are they amber lights. I believe on the police enforcement, the CHP, it's not amber, per se. They have different color lights or flashing lights. And I don't believe amber is in the vehicle code, but

it does say flashing lights.

CHAIR FISHER: Is it in the vehicle code?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Persons --

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Flashing amber warning lights.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: So, Roberta, under this wording, though, if a maintenance vehicle is parked on the shoulder, clearly out of the lanes of moving traffic, and I see this sign posted, I'd be required to move over or slow down when there's no conflict?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right. The vehicle code does indicate flashing lights are part of that requirement. It is a good practice, and a lot of us do that anyway as we go down and we see somebody on the shoulder, out of courtesy we usually pull over to the further lane. And the reason for slowing down, if it's a congested area and you can not move over, then the practice is to slow down when you pass that vehicle on the shoulder.

CHAIR FISHER: But if I'm in the number one lane, three lanes over from the shoulder, am I required to move over and slow down?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I don't remember the specific wording.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Hamid, and then Don.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Thank you. I -- I don't have the statistics, but I would bet a very good lunch that the majority, if not all these accidents, are caused by California drivers. It's not an out-of-state or international driver problem. But that's a good point, actually. I'm going to start looking into who causes these accidents. So it's -- it's -- it's a worthy educational effort for all drivers. And don't worry about the people who come from Nevada and Oregon and whatever.

But again, this -- this is part of the campaign. But in my opinion it's very limited effectiveness because the signs, first of all, are so few; 100 signs for the state the size of California, what's that going to do? And this is going to be competing with 200 other signs that we have put at the entrances to the state that say don't bring agricultural products, safety, and all kinds of stuff, so I don't know how effective it's going to be.

But still, if you want to do this, I still think the language of the sign needs to be a little bit more clarified. I like the direction that Gordon suggested, that instead of identifying the type of vehicles, that we identify the action, maybe saying move over or slow down or stop vehicles with emergency flashing amber whatever, you know, so -- so that they know what the law is.

But just the way it is presented today, Mr. Chairman,

I don’t feel comfortable with this sign to be able to vote on this.

CHAIR FISHER: Don?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I just have a question for David or just, I guess, a comment that maybe David can follow up on. But enforcement can be done, whether there’s a sign out there or not. And -- and the purpose of this sign isn’t to in any way write tickets for people or get anyone pulled over for -- for not doing the right thing. This is to give people the message of what the right thing is to do. Now if there’s a problem with the message, you know, we can -- we can change that.

But again, going back to what John had suggested earlier or mentioned, there are a lot of words. There’s a lot of characters, a lot of letters. And it’s going to be very difficult to get that pushed down any lower. But we are open, I believe; right, Gordon? We’re open to other language for the sign. But this sign is very important to Caltrans, and not only for Caltrans but also for tow truck drivers, law enforcement, anyone else who may be out there performing and emergency job.

CHAIR FISHER: A question for you. Would it be the intent to post these mostly near the state lines?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I’ll defer to maintenance on that. I don’t know what the criteria was.

Do you, Theresa, know what the criteria was for those hundred locations?

MS. DRUMM: The criteria was basically for drivers entering into the State of California from other states and countries to be aware of the law. That was first and foremost. And then also at the safety roadside rest areas.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: So just a question for you to follow up. We have a lot of international airports here in California. Are any of these planned to be near the international airport entrances to freeways, or anything like that?

MS. DRUMM: I do not recall them being near any of the international airports.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Did you have a comment?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I did.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah, John. And then Mike.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm still in the camp that's saying this is too many words for comprehension. But I wonder whether the action requested by the words "Move Over" might be more clearly communicated by the words "Change Lanes," especially since the freeway is always a lane condition.

MR. WONG: To answer -- Gordon from Caltrans. To answer that question Caltrans public affairs has been advertising this law as the move-over law. And this is how public already understand it. And if we change language right

now on the sign I thin it will add confusion and lack clarification.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I only -- I only bring that up because there's other plaque language in other parts -- either in the current manual or under consideration, the words "change lanes to pass." So I understand that you're trying contain that.

MR. WONG: And also, this is -- "Move Over," I have to say other states use variation of "Slow" or "Slow Down," but "Move Over" is pretty much the standard for all the states that have such signs.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, if I might ask a question of staff.

What is the value -- what -- what is the value to making this a regulatory sign. If we've got -- we've got a vehicle code that says specifically what -- what a person is to do, and it occurs regardless of where you are, why would you want to make a sign that you put in just a few locations regulatory when -- when the law applies everywhere?

MR. WONG: Last year, unfortunately, Caltrans lost three employees in a matter of 48 days within the county that we're meeting right now. And I believe two out of three or maybe all three were part of the shoulder closure.

MS. DRUMM: One was involved in a shoulder operation.

MR. WONG: Yes. And that's the most critical moment

for Caltrans, that we're doing shoulder works. And the same thing with CHP, that when they're ticketing the driver for a violation they have their amber light flashing or -- and their vehicle has no protection behind it. Their officer has no time to put cones. And those are the most critical moments for our public employee safety, and that's why it's very critical for both agencies to have such a sign to encourage drivers to do what is right for employees.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And -- and the tow truck drivers.

MR. WONG: And tow truck drivers.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because the statistics and the exposure of tow truck drivers are higher than both agencies, the number of frequencies that they get out there.

CHAIR FISHER: I'd like to get public comment on this but I'd like to make a suggestion, just for your consideration. I realize that Caltrans has a sense of urgency in installing signs at entrances to the state to advise people of what the law says in order to protect agency and emergency workers. I think the Committee clearly understands that.

I think, though, there's a lot of work, and I don't think it would be that difficult, to clarify what the sign needs to say and where it's to be applied, and I think we've discussed all those matters. There's nothing in what you proposed here that says it should be installed at major freeway

entrances to the city, that it's restricted to freeways only, and that it may be installed at major, whatever, welcoming centers or truck terminals, or wherever you want to post them. I think you need language like that.

I think you need maybe, if you want to go with a static sign, a larger sign which adds a few more words to make sure it's consistent with the vehicle code. And I think you need to come back to the Committee so that -- because I don't see a big comfort level here with what's being proposed. In the meantime, if Caltrans feels they need to post something that's a risk that they take. It's -- it's a calculated risk. But I don't sense that the Committee is really ready for a buy-off on this.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If it's going to come back again I would like to maybe highlight very briefly what to discuss.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I would like the -- first of all, if it's good if you know what else is being done, in addition to the signage only, and maybe some general ideas about where these things are going to be installed, as Mr. Fogle said, maybe even including international airports or things like that.

And also, I like Gordon's idea of not going -- identifying the type of the vehicle but the action that the driver has to pay attention to. The average driver does not know the differences going at 60, 65 miles per hour if this is emergency, if it's Caltrans, if it's a tow truck. But if you -- if you are trying to educate, you want to educate people on the action that they -- if you see a flashing yellow light on a vehicle that's move over or slow down, whatever the type of the vehicle.

So with those two things I think they can think about it a little bit and come back.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Let's get some comments from the public. Come to the podium. State your name and affiliation.

MR. BABICO: Jacob Babico from the County of San Bernardino.

One case I would like to tell you about it, is the scenario that when I am driving the freeway and behind me there is an ambulance with the flashing red of fire trucks, and I see the sign in front of me, am I supposed to pull or not? Because it's not a stopped vehicle, what action shall I do -- take? So there's a conflict or confusion of the driver.

And number two, the sign address only stopped emergency, whether it's on travel lane or on the shoulder, because it doesn't say where this is stopped. If it's on the

travel lane, of course, there are some construction signs, advanced work, temporary signs. If it's on the shoulder without any flashing that stopped emergency vehicle is not impeding the traffic on the freeway. Why do you want them to stop or to slow down or move -- move over?

MR. WINTER: Bill Winter, Los Angeles County Public Works.

If this does move forward my -- my only suggestion is on the option statement on page 101 of your agenda, I agree with some of the comments made. This -- this really only applies to freeways, this particular law. So my suggestion is that it be edited, this -- this option statement be edited to simply say, "The 'Move Over or Slow Down for Stopped Emergency and Maintenance Vehicle' maybe used to inform freeway," instead of road, to say, "inform freeway users of the State's Move-Over Law, CVC 21809," and then that that last sentence just be stricken out.

And I agree with some of the other comments being made by the members that, you know, this is a marketing or a public information education sign. From my own sense of those kind of programs, when you come up with a slogan, like whether it's Click It or Ticket or Move Over for the Cone Zone, if there's any kind of that brainstorming that goes into this particular sign, that might be something else to consider, as well. So thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

MR. DORNSIFE: Chad Dornsife, Best Highway Safety Practices.

I've actually studied the Move-Over laws. And, in fact, one state I pulled up five years worth of accident date and looked at every single accident. What we have here -- and you know I'm a political kind of guy or not political, but this is a failure of the U.S. Department of Transportation to set clear guidelines, one. And the law was adopted without any empirical evidence as to the effects or unintended consequences.

What we have are multiple states adopting Move-Over laws. No two states have the same language. You have a driver coming in from out of state. He doesn't know what the expectation is in California. He doesn't even know if it applies to a freeway or a surface road. Some states, actually, in their language have speeds as low as 45 or 35 miles an hour in the statute identified as the slow down value. Some states, like Wyoming and Texas, have turned this into an enforcement exercise that if you don't move over they write you a ticket. And the truckers know this because on the highway they park on the shoulder, turn their lights on, and anyone that doesn't move over they cite a ticket, literally.

What this has caused is the unintended consequence. In Pennsylvania, who didn't have the law at the time, there was

a 63-car pileup involving a tractor-trailer during a weather event where the -- the driver, even though they didn't have a Move-Over law, he came from another state and thought they did, he was approaching the patrol car and the vehicle stopped on the shoulder for an accident. He was afraid he was going to get a ticket so he attempted to change lanes, and the lane he was in was clear, the left lane was clear, but between the two lanes was slush. And in the effort to change lanes he caused the tractor-trailer to jackknife, ultimately collecting up the patrol car, the vehicle on the shoulder of the road, and 60 other vehicles plowed into him.

I was coming back from Vegas about three weeks ago on Interstate 10. Even with four lanes in one direction, an out-of-state trucker came over the crest of a hill in the right-hand lane after climbing a grade, he came over the crest of a hill and started coming down, and there was a CHP officer on the shoulder of the road with his lights on, that driver panicked to change lanes because he didn't know what California Law is. He just assumed he had to change lanes. And he almost took out a truck and a car next to him trying to get over.

Any law that causes flow conflict and friction upstream of what you're trying to protect is a bad idea. But as bad as this law is -- and by the way, the other thing, you're talking about amber lights and red lights and blue lights, there is no national standard. The National Highway

Traffic Safety Administration was given a mandate by congress to uniform all these safety standards. There is no national standard for emergency lighting on vehicles. Some states certain vehicles are green. Some states are red, some are white, some are blue, some are -- some counties think they like white and red better; there's no standardization.

That being said, as distasteful as this sign may be, when it's on a freeway the driver needs to know that they're not mandated to move over. If they can slow down that's a good option. Because the truck drivers and people coming from out of state need to know that it's okay to slow down in your lane, and you're not required to make an emergency lane change to avoid a ticket.

The actual reduction of accidents on state patrols -- I looked at Wyoming in particular, and that's the one I picked up five years of data -- the before and after, there was no change in accident rates. In fact, the cause of the accidents was mostly winter events and a particular type of vehicle and a particular type of event.

The best option you can have on these type of laws is prior to the vehicles that you're trying to protect you want the traffic to stabilize and be uniform going through. You don't want any erratic movements. But the reason the Move-Over is used, because that's the national nomenclature for this classification of law. So the Move-Over needs to say "Move

Over," because then that way people from other parts of the country will know what it is.

Any other questions?

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Any other comments from the public? Okay.

Seeing none, we bring this back to the Committee.

Come up to the podium, please.

MS. WOODS: Okay. Darra Woods from the City of Oceanside.

Just one suggestion, looking over the verbiage of the sign, is it a possible suggestion to say "Slow Down or Move Over" and start it with "Slow Down" first? Kind of going with, you know, a suggestion he had so that it's slowing down versus automatically telling someone to move over right away.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Okay. So we'll bring this back to the Committee. How does the Committee want to handle this item?

Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the last two speakers. And I'm -- I'm thinking that this thing, in some states that most of the freeway system is in rural -- or I shouldn't say lengthwise. Most of the traveled miles are in rural areas. You may want to say move over, like in Wyoming. But in California probably 80-plus percent of our freeway miles traveled are conditions that the

driver, you actually don't want them to move over; you want them to slow down first. Because we are driving in open areas, highly congested. And lane changes, if you -- if you intimidate the driver and you -- he thinks that he has to move over, otherwise he's going to get a ticket, you may actually be doing exactly what Chad said, that kind of causing other traffic safety hazards that are even more dangerous that this.

I like the idea from the lady of -- from Oceanside. If -- just thinking that maybe we want to say "Slow Down or Move Over" so the driver knows that the expected action is first to slow down. And rather than the move over-change lane, which I heard, I don't think that's good because it's going to force the driver to do an unsafe lane, probably. Because a lot of people, they see the black and white and notice a regulatory sign, and they know they're going to get a ticket if they don't comply. So we want to make sure that the compliance that you're asking the driver to do is not causing other safety hazards.

So I like the idea of maybe putting the "Slow Down" first, going with the "Slow Down or Move Over" followed by an action, not the type of vehicle, "Slow Down or Move Over for Stopped Vehicles with Flashing Yellow Light," something like that, so that I know I'm slowing down, I don't necessarily have to change lanes, and I'm doing it when I see a vehicle. I don't care which vehicle it is; as long as there's a flashing

yellow light I slow down.

CHAIR FISHER: So in other words, you're proposing that they eliminate the words "Emergency and Maintenance?"

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Because those are -- those are inside the baseball. Okay. Those are technical jargons. They're important for us. If you want to go verbatim here then you have to include the tow trucks also.

CHAIR FISHER: So you're pointing out that if they've got their lights flashing --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I'm just --

CHAIR FISHER: -- they're emergency or maintenance --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If it's emergency, if it's maintenance --

CHAIR FISHER: -- or a tow truck, most likely?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- or if it's tow truck, the driver could not care less. He's going that 60, 65 miles per hour. He doesn't want to read, okay, what is emergency vehicle, what's maintenance vehicle. You just want to say "Slow Down or Move Over for Stopped Vehicles with Flashing Yellow Light." Whatever the type of vehicle is irrelevant to what we want the driver to do.

CHAIR FISHER: Is there any way to shorten the sign?

Roberta?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans. Just a clarification.

In order to make some of these recommendations we would have to change the law as it is written. The primary -- primary move is to make the lane change first. So the wording is,

"Make a lane change into available lane not immediately adjacent to the authorized emergency vehicle, tow truck, or Department of Transportation vehicle with due regard for safety and traffic conditions if practicable and not prohibited by law."

Paragraph 2, "If the maneuver described in Paragraph 1 would be unsafe or impracticable slow to reasonable prudent speed that is safe and" --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It doesn't -- it doesn't -- Roberta, just the order of the law doesn't mean what the driver is expected to do.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But if it's not practical, but you only change lanes if it's practical.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It says -- yeah, it says if it's not practicable.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But you only slow down if it's no practicable.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: However, the first -- first requirement is to move over if -- if practicable.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If practicable.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That's why we've put "Move Over"

first --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: -- rather than "Slow Down."

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. But -- but please keep in mind that when we put up the sign the driver has not read those nuances of the vehicle code.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Understood.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So we don't want to encourage them to do an unsafe traffic maneuver just because Section A comes before Section B. So if you say "Move Over," the first reaction is that, hey, I've got to change lane. That's the first human reaction. I've got to move over. When in most of the vehicle miles traveled on California freeways you don't want them to move over because it's congested, people are going fast. You want them to slow down first, I think.

CHAIR FISHER: I think your point is A or B is equivalent to B or A.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: There you go. And again, CHP can say that.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I want to retract an earlier comment I made when Roberta was speaking that -- that the CVC said flashing amber. It says that for two classes of vehicles, but it doesn't say that for the patrol cars. It says "Emergency lighting," which is kind of vague.

CHAIR FISHER: But it would be a flashing light; right?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: One would think.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And forget the color, just say "Flashing Lights."

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we can go two ways. We can approve what's been submitted. We can ask that this matter be brought back to us where Caltrans would consider the comments and vet it internally before submitting for the next agenda. What is the pleasure of the Committee?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I forgot to mention, also Mr. Winter's comment is a very good one. If this is part of an education campaign those catchy slogans go a long way; "Click It or Ticket," it's much better than "Fasten Your Seatbelt."

So if you guys have to do some brainstorming inside of Caltrans and come up with some "Click It or Ticket" equivalent for this, that's great.

CHAIR FISHER: Make it part of an educational --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: -- campaign.

What is the pleasure of the Committee on this? Mike?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Personally, I don't like the way things are right now. I can't vote to approve it.

I would like to suggest a slightly different tact with this, and that would be that we, to some degree, disassociate this sign with the specific vehicle code. I think it would be great if this were just an educational type of sign. But to make it a regulatory sign means you have to be very specific in it.

If you were -- if this were an educational sign and it just said "Slow or Move Over for Vehicles with Flashing Lights," there's absolutely nothing unsafe about slowing or moving over for a passenger vehicle that's displaying its flashing lights because it's, you know, changing a tire or something like that. It's an educational thing. It's -- it's a courtesy to remind people to do that.

But I think to try and associate a sign with the -- the vehicle is going to be very difficult to be specific enough that anybody is going to agree to it.

CHAIR FISHER: So in other words, advise rather than regulate?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: It's -- it's advice. It's educational.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So do we have any motion to approve what's before us?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I make a motion that Caltrans staff take into consideration suggestions made by members of the public and members of the Committee and come

back with a revised sign encompassing those suggestions as much as possible.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: I would second that.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. All those in favor of the motion raise your hands. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight; I guess eight out of ten. So that's the sense of the Committee on that item.

SECRETARY SINGH: Who abstained?

CHAIR FISHER: Oh, who?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I did not vote. I have a hard time on this one, that -- that it only involves Caltrans, you know, having a strong opinion one way or the other. I mean, it's not something that is imposed on local streets. It doesn't affect my cities at all. So I was just not expressing an opinion on that one.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I neglected to identify the no votes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I didn't vote no.

CHAIR FISHER: Any -- any no votes? Okay. Don; abstentions?

Jeff, are you an abstention?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So it's eight-one-one. That's the sense of the Committee.

I'd like to go to --

MR. WONG: Before we move on, I have one more comment.

In the past, this happened, one item would -- the Committee would not agree with the language that Caltrans proposed. We revised it, bring it up again, and the Committee, it had more problems with the language proposed. Then the next meeting we bring back version three, and still not passing, then four and five. By the time we finally massage it to something that everybody likes, it's already two years past.

I would like to identify one or two Committee members to work with us on acceptable language. And before the next meeting I would like to send that message to the rest of the Committees and get a consensus and collect more comments and work with the Committee to a language that's acceptable to both the Committee and Caltrans and CHP, and then we can start from there.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, if that's the pleasure of the Committee, I volunteer to work with them.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We have Hamid volunteering.

Would the Highway Patrol like to participate in this, since you cite the motorists who don't comply with the law?

COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. And Mike or anyone else, would you like to be part of the review?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: I'd be happy to

volunteer.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we have CHP, Bahadori, and Mike Robinson who will be glad to work with you. Let's make sure we vet this early on and flesh out the details and come to a consensus so that, to be fair to you, we don't keep taking this to the next Committee meeting.

MR. WONG: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you very much.

I'd like to go to item 12-9, which is a request for experimentation. I would hope to complete this item by one o'clock or before so that we may have a lunch break, and then come back and deal with the items in Part 6.

So we have an item from Caltrans to request to experiment with yellow LED border around a pedestrian signal.

Don?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes. I'd like to refer this item to our -- one of our engineers from District 2. And, unfortunately, I've forgot -- Robert --

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Stinger.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: -- Stinger. Excuse me.

Rob, could you please come up and handle this issue?

MR. STINGER: Sure. Thank you. My name is Robert Stinger. I'm a senior transportation engineer for Caltrans in District 2. I'm the chief of the Traffic Engineering Operations Office. If I could just give you a little

background on how we got here today.

Back in May of last year as part of my office duties we deal with signal operations. We had a difficult intersection, some conflicts between pedestrian and motorists. Had a hospital on one side; a lot of their employee parking is on the other side. This happens to be the last intersection where the city street basically ends and goes into a freeway. So it's -- it's a place where a lot of people are leaving town. We had the dual right from the side street that was conflicting with this heavy ped movement.

And in our discussions we came up with -- we were kind of brainstorming ideas, what's -- what could we do? We talked about lead ped interval, which we've implemented. One of the things that -- that got my attention was a lot of times when the drivers come up they don't even know that sometimes the peds even there because they're looking to the left -- maybe they're trying to make a right on red -- or they're looking straight ahead at the indications, they don't even know maybe that the ped has walked up on the side here adjacent to them and pushed the button.

So the idea that came to my mind was you see a lot of these fancy cars these days, the Audis that have the little lights under there -- they're daytime driving lights -- was what if we were to supplement a ped signal head with light around the border. So that was an idea that came up. And I

floated the idea to headquarters. And I did a quick little mock up. I'm sorry I don't have an overhead or anything. It took me about five minutes to throw this together, just as an idea as is this something we can do? Has it been kicked around before? And if you want I can -- if you guys just want to pass it.

So basically I sent an email to our headquarters operation's folks. It kind of milled around there for a while. Fortunately, Devinder got a hold of the email, and he responded back to me that -- that if we want to pursue this that we need to go to FHWA, because it's basically trying to modify a national standard.

So with that in mind it kind of was like a boomerang, it came back right back to me. I said, fine, okay, well, before we move too far let's find out if this is even viable. I didn't know if another state was perhaps doing something similar to this. The idea was as a ped would come up to the intersection they would push that button and those lights would come on around the head. The rest of the pedestrian signal head wouldn't change its operation at all. It would still have the hand, go the walking signal. It was just more of a visual cue to the motorist that a call had been made, and so they could be aware and expect that a ped is going to enter the intersection.

As a side benefit it would also benefit the

pedestrian, knowing that a call has been made to the signal. You see pedestrians time and time again, they push the button ten times thinking that that will speed up the call and that the signal didn't get their -- it didn't know they pushed the button.

So with Devinder's guidance I went ahead and sent a letter per the guidelines from the FHWA just in concept, is this -- is this an idea worth pursuing? I didn't know if another state had done this, so I sent them a letter with that picture. And they responded back and said, yes, we -- we think it's a viable idea worth pursuing. But we would like to see a fully developed evaluation plan.

So that was the next step that I did. So about December I was able to send the evaluation plan, which is included in the agenda, basically proposing, since it's -- for me to keep it small and something I could manage I decided to propose that we would look at five intersections in the City of Redding.

We worked closely with the City of Redding. Between some of their very busy signals on their city streets and some of ours, we came up with five good candidates, modify the signal heads. We would do a before and after study; use a digital recorder to monitor the intersection seven days before we do the do the treatment. Install the modified pedestrian signal head. Let it take for a month. Let people get used to

it, understand how it works, and then come back in and do an after study afterwards and see if there is a benefit in that there is reduction in the number of times the peds push the button, and also the main point of it was to see if there's better yielding behavior for motorists. It primarily benefits the motorists that are going parallel to the crossing, because the two usually run concurrently. So that's what I proposed to the FHWA.

And they responded back and said that they agreed with this approach and that -- that I can move forward with this, knowing that the next step on this would be to bring it to you to see if you concur with this approach. They basically have given me two years to -- to perform this experiment, and with regular updates on where we are.

Within Caltrans, after receiving approval from the FHWA to move forward, we did bounce it off our Traffic Signal Committee. That's where all the districts have regular meetings every month or so and they talk about signal issues. They are onboard with this experiment, and they're actually looking forward to the results. So that's where we are. That's how -- that's how we got here. So --

CHAIR FISHER: Great. Thank you. Do we have questions?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, a question.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: A couple of questions on this, so most of them -- both of them for clarification.

So the LED around the border is not flashing; right?

MR. STINGER: Correct. I wasn't proposing flashing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So it's a lighted LED?

MR. STINGER: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And it's yellow?

MR. STINGER: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Now it's dark when there is no pedestrian activity?

MR. STINGER: Correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But when you push the button, even though the walk has not come up yet it will come on?

MR. STINGER: Yes. Correct. Thank you for bringing that up. I didn't clarify that, but that's the point.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Because you still have the hand or the "Do Not Walk" or whatever?

MR. STINGER: Yeah. The signal looks just the same. It's dark.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The signal just looks the same? You push the button, the LED comes on?

MR. STINGER: The lights come on.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And it stays on until?

MR. STINGER: It stays on until the walking signal

comes up, all the way to the end of the pedestrian phase.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: All the way until the end?

MR. STINGER: Once it goes back to the red hand the lights go off.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: As soon as you go back to the red hand it stops?

MR. STINGER: It stops until the next person comes. And it would only be for that crosswalk where the button was pushed. The others wouldn't light up, just the one. If someone pushed one to serve a different crosswalk it would light up.

So again, the point is it gives the driver, at a glance they can see, oh, a ped call has been made. Sometimes it's obvious that a ped is waiting to cross. A lot of times it's not. Or a ped has made a call but he didn't know which crosswalk he's going to use because maybe there's two crosswalks that are served from that one corner. So that's kind of the idea behind it.

CHAIR FISHER: So, Rob, under that scenario you could press the button and at locations where we have long cycle lengths, which is the trend nowadays, a pedestrian could wait maybe a minute before he receives -- he or she receives the walk phase. So under that scenario you'd have a steady hand, but you would have the illuminated LEDs. And then when you

complete your walk and pedestrian clearance interval it goes back to steady hand where the light is supposed to be off. So you sometimes have a situation where under the steady hand, which means under no circumstances should you be in the crosswalk, in some cases you can have the illuminated light, in other cases the LEDs would be dark.

So why not display the LEDs only when the walk comes on, or just start it only when the walk comes on?

MR. STINGER: Well, the issue we were having was with people that were turning right on red, or since it was a dual movement usually the car that was on the inside, part of the dual right, didn't know that there was a ped call being made, didn't see the ped over here. So the idea with as soon as the ped pushes the button, right away they're aware. At a glance they can say, oh, a ped call has been made and I can expect a ped. So the idea is then they won't pull right out.

What we've been seeing is people will swerve around the ped. They'll slam on their brakes, you know, as they turn the corner because then they -- whoa, there's a ped in the middle of my crosswalk. So that was the idea.

CHAIR FISHER: Good, good point. But you also indicated you've tried a leading pedestrian interval. And I know in my jurisdiction that the few locations where we still have dual right turns, we try to put in a leading pedestrian interval so it gets the pedestrian out there where he can be

seen before vehicles may turn right. So -- so why didn't the leading pedestrian interval solve that problem?

MR. STINGER: The leading ped interval did help. And the tendency, when we brought this to the Signal Committee was to -- to try to problem solve that one location. When I saw this it kind of sparked the idea that this would be a benefit at every intersection. Any time you approach an intersection, if you see that yellow border lit up you know that a ped call has been made, as you approach it or you're waiting at it. So that was the -- kind of the idea behind it was just a quick little information. It's a very simple little addition. It doesn't change anything else about the way the pedestrian signal works.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. STINGER: We do have ped buttons that have the little light that lights up, but that doesn't help the motorist.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. STINGER: The motorist doesn't know.

CHAIR FISHER: And one final question. I don't want to hog this discussion. But what you described is a process where you have an actuated head signal. What about those situations where you have a pre-timed signal; when would the LED be illuminated, upon --

MR. STINGER: That's a good question.

CHAIR FISHER: -- the beginning of the walk?

MR. STINGER: That's come up. I honestly haven't thought -- had all the -- the -- the little intricacies like that. One of my thoughts, and I'm just throwing this out, is, well, maybe you have it go off for a certain amount of time, and then come back on. If it's going to come to an automatic ped call for -- for that leg is maybe the -- the yellow border goes off for a certain amount of time before it comes back on.

CHAIR FISHER: It comes on some predetermined time before the walk?

MR. STINGER: Exactly.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Back on your question, I suggest that if you want to experiment, experiment only at ped actuated signals first --

MR. STINGER: And that's what we're doing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- to see how effective they are. The pre-timed are usually downtown on the small intersections, grid system. It's a different environment. But if you want, you may want to restrict the experimentation only to ped actuated traffic signals. Because let's measure it, and then let's do the next step, so if you want to do it at pre-timed also.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments from Committee members? John --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. I want to --

CHAIR FISHER: -- and then Mike.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I want to understand the existing condition. With or without the addition of the leading pedestrian interval, at that particular location for that particular ped movement what does the walk signal do if there is no ped call, no button is pressed? Does it stay in steady hand?

MR. STINGER: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So you don't run a default ped cycle on the -- on the ped display if there is not a button pressed?

MR. STINGER: Correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

MR. STINGER: Yeah. It only comes on when a ped actually pushes the button.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Question two is: Do you have a good feeling that this yellow border, which is built into the ped signal housing and therefore would be highly visible to the ped who is actually looking at it, would be effectively visible to the motorist that you're trying to address?

MR. STINGER: I think so. When -- when I first

thought of the idea and I was driving home that night, going through signals, you always see -- you know, because generally the crosswalk we're talking about, the one that is parallel with traffic where you make a right -- right turn, that's where you have the conflict, or you could have a permissive left turn. Those directions that are parallel with the crosswalk that they're going to cross would benefit from this. Generally, you can see that red hand or orange hand.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Had -- had you considered some other already standard device, such as -- I'm not sure this will work with signal operations, it may be categorically prohibited for other reasons in chapter -- in Part 4, but something like a yellow beacon mounted on top of the pedestrian indication? I'm not sure that's a good idea, but had you considered anything else?

MR. STINGER: We were brainstorming. We -- we -- we played with different colors. We even talked about what if the lights counted down. You know, we talked about similar things like that. My approach with the -- again, I wasn't sure if this had already been done -- was, well, what if it's just something simple that was housed inside the grill, if you will, and something that would be visible and simple, not -- not a big adjustment. Maybe, depending on how this plays out, maybe we'll want to try other things. I don't know if you'd want to consider flashing or -- or like what you just mentioned.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And the -- and the last question is: Does, at that approach, does the -- do the lanes from which the right turns are made have an advance stop line, say four feet back from the crosswalk?

MR. STINGER: At this location we actually -- it's -- it's kind of an incremental. We -- we have increased the pavement markings in the crosswalk. We've put diagonal hashers in there.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

MR. STINGER: The hospital, we -- we -- we even put a setback line. We even had a ped warning sign as you approach the signal, which is not --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So you do -- you do -- you do have -- you do have a setback limit line?

MR. STINGER: What's that?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: You have a setback limit line separate from the crosswalk marking?

MR. STINGER: Yes, we do.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

MR. STINGER: And we have even restricted the right turns on red at this location. And according to our local police department, it's like fishing a barrel. People are still doing it. Because like I said, once you make that turn you're on a freeway out of town.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah.

MR. STINGER: So it's really hard. Old habits die hard at this location.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Last -- last question. As -- as someone who considers not only what you hope the device will do but what the intended consequences would be, I might be concerned about, not the first driver in the queue and the pedestrian who is early off the curb, but someone arriving rather later in the -- the walk phase, when they're still legally allowed to walk off the curb, but the button hasn't been activated, they see a green ball and they see an upraised hand, there's kind of a mixed message there. What -- but -- and furthermore, you wouldn't have the -- the yellow border activated because there's not been a button call.

MR. STINGER: Uh-huh. Correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Had you thought about that scenario?

MR. STINGER: No, I hadn't. Yes. No. It's incumbent upon the ped to use the facilities that are before them. And it's -- you know, as far the driver, too, if there's a ped in the -- the crosswalk you should drive accordingly.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, that would -- that would require that a pedestrian arriving during the walk phase, which they wouldn't know was the walk phase because there's no walking person illuminated to know that they would still have to press the button as soon as they got there in

order to cross while they see a green ball. I don't know. I'm just trying to get all the elements on the table.

MR. STINGER: Yeah. Well, and just one thing, too, like you said, with the coordinated system, the ped call, sometimes it takes a long time for the clock to come around and serve that ped phase. We have had cases where the peds get impatient and decide to make a run for it. And that was one of the things that we were going to look, to see if the yielding behavior improves, and also to see if it cuts down on the peds getting impatient. Once -- at least they know that the call has been made. They've got some confirmation; oh, they took my call. Like when you push the button on an elevator you know it's going to get there eventually, or that's the hope.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Brian?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The only thing -- the other -- the only other thing that I had thought about, having worked in a number of agencies with railroads in the jurisdiction where you have the railroad parallel with the roadway, and with that right turn on red while the arms are down, often times what they'll put on the signal head for the cars is -- is a light that's, you know, is like an LED screen that has the right turn arrow, and it has "No Right Turn On Red." And -- and so maybe when the pedestrian button is pushed and there's a pedestrian waiting there that you don't allow the vehicles to make the right turn on red because the light was illuminated

saying don't -- "No Right Turn on Red."

And I don't know if that would -- if that would help in this situation. But I've seen it be very beneficial for the blind corner of the railroad tracks and, you know, with the motorists making the right turn on red from both -- the dual right turn lanes, often that number one inside right turn lane is blind from the pedestrian, and especially if the number two lane has a taller vehicle. So maybe, you know, not allowing that right turn on red to occur while the pedestrian button is pushed and it illuminates when the pedestrian button is pushed, unless there's a lot of pedestrian calls there, and then maybe just eliminating right turns on red. And I don't know if that -- that is also an option.

We -- we've done that a number of places in Carlsbad where our sight visibility doesn't allow a right turn on red, so you can only make a right turn when you have a green arrow because we can't protect you in the other situation.

MR. STINGER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So just -- just -- just some options to consider.

CHAIR FISHER: Jeff?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. I like the experimentation. I don't -- I'm not crazy about this approach. But since the overall goal is pedestrian safety, is there anything else you've thought of comparing this against

statistically. There was an article in ITE about the ped heads with eyes, and now that's an approved device, which I used in downtown Pleasanton. Again, the "Walk" comes on, but it reminds the drivers as the eyes look back and forth -- I mean, it reminds the ped. Because I'm -- I believe that, you know, the pedestrians are most responsible for their safety, to look before they step off that curb. And that tremendously reduced pedestrian conflicts.

And then there was another study out of Salt Lake City where the put the "Look" pavement legend right on the corner.

MR. STINGER: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So as you're stepping off that curb you're reminded to look for traffic.

And so I would hope that in your statistical analysis you might also compare this to other methodologies. Because that's what we're looking for, is what's the most cost effective ways. Because, you know, what you're going to do is going to require another wire --

MR. STINGER: Well --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- that we don't generally have, so it's not easily retrofitted in our existing signals because the yellow is going to be powered off of something different.

MR. STINGER: Well, if it --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But --

MR. STINGER: Oh, not to interrupt --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But just -- just to let you know that those were tremendously effective. Like the "Look" pavement legend in the last ten years --

MR. STINGER: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- I mean, there's no maintenance whatsoever.

And then the eyes, too, were surprisingly -- plus near a university or downtown it was almost like a tourist thing, too. They kind of liked the cute eyes.

MR. STINGER: I read about that. I had never seen that. That's --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. But --

MR. STINGER: That was --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- I would compare statistically your results versus some of the other things that have been tried. Because I think some of the other methods we've actually tried may prove to be more beneficial than the signs. I don't know how much the motorists are that aware that this will affect them as much as, you know, I still think imparting more information to the pedestrian --

MR. STINGER: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- saves them.

MR. STINGER: And just so you know, at our signals we

usually pull extra wires, so that was one of the things we brought up. And we talked to our maintenance and they said we have some extras in there. So this shouldn't be too hard to implement.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But that is an official -- that's an approved control device, I think, in the -- the new MUTCD --

MR. STINGER: It is. It is.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- that does allow you to do that --

MR. STINGER: I saw that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- ped heads with eyes.

MR. STINGER: I -- I wasn't aware of it until I was researching a little bit.

CHAIR FISHER: John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I actually didn't think to ask about the extinguishable message sign that Bryan mentioned.

So just to confirm you do not currently have one -- one of those in place, coupled to your leading pedestrian interval?

MR. STINGER: At this particular location we actually have just a regular sign panel that -- that prohibits right turns on red.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. Well, but the

extinguishable message sign is not about right turns on red, it's about right turns on a fresh green, conflicting with the pedestrians initial movement. It's commonly coupled with a leading pedestrian interval.

So I guess one suggestion, according -- sort of piggybacking on others' suggestions for refinements in the experimentation proposal, you might consider, perhaps, as the last phase of the experiment, but I won't -- I'll leave that up to the Committee and to yourself, including a bagged EMS sign, and then un-bag it and have that be one of the test phases.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I think that the extinguishable "No Right Turn" sign is an interesting proposal. It really grabs your attention.

Had you also considered a right turn phase that would separate the right turn movement from the pedestrian movement?

MR. STINGER: Yes. And at this location -- in the City of Redding we have a ten minute window where everyone is leaving town, and that was one of the problems. Even putting the lead -- the lead pedestrian interval in here did have an impact on queuing on the side street. So to have a ped-only phase was really very difficult to handle all the traffic that we have at that time of the day.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. STINGER: So, yeah, we have considered this thing. And again, I want to emphasize, it's not necessarily

just for this one location. That's what sparked the idea. And we think it would be beneficial at all -- all locations where there's a crosswalk.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: May I ask another follow-up question?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: At this specific location have you had actual pedestrian accidents, or you are just having close calls and pedestrians feeling intimidated?

MR. STINGER: Yes, the second. Close calls.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So --

MR. STINGER: And the hospital has contacted us.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So how will you actually assess the effectiveness of this?

MR. STINGER: That was going to be the before and after. The before is just to show, for seven days when there's good weather, to show -- and hopefully we can -- we can count where there some conflict, where a car had to stop short or swerved around the ped, if we can observe some of that, and then -- and then install the device, and then do an after. That was basically the approach, and try and do that at five different locations. And that's when I -- we're kind of small. This is just being done out of my district. So I've already got my management onboard as far as --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: How many -- how many

pedestrians cross that intersection at peak hour?

MR. STINGER: Peak hour? Probably small compared to the area around here, probably upwards of 50.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Fifty, five-zero?

MR. STINGER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: I'll make two observations. It is after one o'clock. And the other observation is that in the past when an agency has first received approval from the FHWA to experiment, this Committee has generally approved the application of that experiment in the State of California. Perhaps I think some real good ideas have been suggested, and I think those maybe could serve as ideas for your agency. If you do not find that the LED lights produce a significant or statistically significant improvement you have other ideas that you can consider.

So we -- this Committee needs to consider whether they want to grant approval on the experimentation, given that the FHWA has previously approved it. If we want to add on other things for this agency to consider they might have to go back to the FHWA and refine their request.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I just -- for any new thing, like just -- we like -- I mean, the idea is that you have experimented with everything else that's in the toolbox and it didn't work, so you want to come up with

something new. Otherwise there are a billion good ideas out there.

But the other things that I hear is that like the "Look" signs or the "Look" signal or the "Look" legend, is there any way that at least this can be compared so we have -- so we say, okay, is the "Look" legend or the "Look" signal or the LED, which one is more effective? Because I'm sure somebody's going to come up with an idea next time and says, hey, we are going to have these red flags that are going to pop up on top of the pedestrian signal. There are a lot of ideas, but we want to see which one is really effective.

So what Mr. Knowles said is that we already have approval on the "Look" signal. We already have the "Look" legend. So is there any way at this -- do you have another intersection that you can do like some comparative analysis?

MR. STINGER: Possibly. Or -- or maybe I could get some information from where it's been installed, once they've done --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, once things are already installed --

MR. STINGER: Those are installed.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- they can't compare. Yeah. You can't compare something that's already there like two years.

MR. STINGER: I don't know if an evaluation was done

to --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

MR. STINGER: -- to make that wise.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But you want to see right from the beginning which one is really effective, which one really catches the --

MR. STINGER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- attention and raises awareness. So you can't go and compare it with a location that already -- like the -- the watch signal has been there for two years. But if you have another location that you can do some comparative analysis --

MR. STINGER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I think it's going to help.

CHAIR FISHER: You know -- and I want to touch on what you said, Hamid. We are sponsors of items that come before us and are placed on the agenda. And I want to encourage all members of this committee as sponsors to make sure that when an item, a proposed item for the agenda comes before them, that we all make every effort to add value, to critique the proposal, to suggest, you might want to try this, so that when it does come to the Committee all those ideas have been fleshed out. I've always maintained that it's not our job just to take the request and forward it, but to take the

request, work with agency, identify areas they might want to pursue or consider, so that when it comes here it's perceived to be a very strong proposal.

So the Committee has asked some questions. I'd like to let members of the audience make some comments. And then I'd like to bring it back to the Committee. And I note that it's 1:05, and the cafeteria closes at 2 o'clock.

Dave, come up to the podium.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think I'll have lunch while Dave speaks, you know?

MR. STINGER: Easily. Easily. The city I live in and also do some consulting work for, but this -- I wasn't the one that came up with this idea, there is a federal sign that says "Right Turn," black and yellow, underneath, "Yield," big "Yield To" and the symbol pedestrian in black and white.

So what Santa Clarita did, because they have this same problem, they have dual right turns and the car on the far side can not see a pedestrian ever that's waiting there. So when -- well, they tried the static sign, but static signs are only 30 percent effective. So they make it and internally illuminate it so that there's a plate above, black and yellow static, that says "Right Turn." And then the -- then the black and white, which is reversed because it's an LED sign, it comes on when the "Walk" comes on. So it says "Right Turn, Yield to Pedestrian," this big sign above the ped head on the far side

traffic signal. And it says -- and it's been very, very effective.

They also -- they also lead all their -- all their pedestrian movements for things like that. So there's a nicely -- so that signs come on well ahead of time because they -- they've got a couple of places they've got heavy right turns, so they have to allow the -- the right turn on red. And so this -- they -- they did with an internally illuminated sign. And it's -- it's been in effect now for about over a year and solved all the problems.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I --

CHAIR FISHER: You can ask Dave a question.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- follow up what -- what Mr. Royer said is that, see, we already have the "Watch" signal, "Watch" legend. We already have the LED that can come on and say "Watch for Pedestrians" when the light is activated in a kind of advanced phase. So we can always keep adding to the toolbox. But my point is when requests for experimentations come in have they already looked at what is available in the toolbox? At this location, Caltrans District 2, did they look at the "Watch" signal? Did they look at the signs that Santa Clarita is using, and were they not effective? Is that why you are introducing something new?

The reason that this is in my mind, otherwise, we are going to be, especially with the technology explosion, there's

going to be a lot of variety of treating these things. And when you go into a lot of variety of treating, trying to raise awareness of the driver, it actually backfires. Because now you have this garden variety, and every city and every intersection is treated differently, a place you have the "Watch" signal, a place you have the "Look," a place you have these LEDs, a place you have the CMS sign that comes with the signal.

That's why -- that's what my question is, that, okay, I understand that you have a problem at this location, or at least a challenge. You don't have a documented problem, you have a challenge. But have you looked at anything that's already in the toolbox, like what Mr. Royer just explained or what Mr. Knowles explained, to say that those things are not effective, I need something brand new? That's when you start thinking about introducing a new device. I don't know if --

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I don't know if you have looked at anything else or you just -- this is a good idea that you came up with.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I'd like to call other members up to the podium from the audience, but I'd like to just make an editorial comment.

I, too, have been a little frustrated with the FHWA. They'll let you test whatever you propose, but they don't

require you to compare it with other traditional measures that may be available to know if it fulfills a need or if you need to go beyond other measures of signing or signal phasing or otherwise. And lo' and behold, you may find that, whatever, LED lights improved motorist compliance, but maybe the traditional sign would have improved it just as well.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You know --

CHAIR FISHER: So if --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I don't want to trivialize the issue, but in this case you can go and put -- have to place a sticker on the questioned indication, and then do some measurement and show some improvement. Okay. It's going to be very difficult to say how the improvement is.

But the point is that if there is a challenge we already have certain applications that are already approved in the toolbox. We go -- typically, we go through those applications and features. And if they don't yield the result that you want, if you -- if they don't improve then we say, okay, now we need to think outside the box and come up with a creative new idea. What -- what kind of -- and I'll follow our Chairman's concern is that they don't even ask, did you look at what we already have given you in the toolbox? And none of that stuff worked; that's why you're coming with a new idea.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you, Hamid.

I'd like to conclude the comments from the audience

and note that it's 1:11.

Rock Miller.

MR. MILLER: I'll just quickly say, I do believe it's wise to allow experimentation to proceed. I do understand the concerns, that they do allow a lot of experiments. I also know they're under the impression that problems like this have not been solved yet. And if there's value to allowing experiments like this to proceed they are in a position to consolidate the results throughout the country of different techniques, and I do have faith that they will hone in on the most proper technique. And I think it's a very good idea for us to allow an experiment like this to proceed.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I ask Mr. Miller a question, very brief question?

CHAIR FISHER: And I note that it's 1:12.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm probably -- probably -- okay. How often -- how often do we get the opportunity to question the ITE international president?

MR. MILLER: Frequently for the next nine months.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Frequently? Yeah. Now for some perspective.

If I am a traffic engineer and I have a problem at an intersection, without these tools being comparatively analyzed how do I know which one is most effective? We're just introducing tools to the toolbox.

MR. MILLER: I share you concern, but I don't think you're going to find anything in the literature that says the other treatments that you've indicated, such as the -- the meandering eyes, are really effective for this problem. I don't believe we have found a treatment that's really effective for keeping cars from turning right in front of pedestrians. And I personally do believe that the search to continue to find an effective treatment is justified.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments from the public, from the alternate members?

Jacob?

MR. BABICO: Not me.

CHAIR FISHER: Oh. Okay. Okay. So we bring it back to the Committee for a disposition on this.

John, did you have a --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Real quick. I'd like lunch, too.

I'm going to support the experimentation when it comes to a vote. Three -- three items real quick.

Because the city in question has currently operated the signal with a steady hand, unless the button is activated, I'd like to suggest that the city consider in -- in it's experimentation testing whether running the walk cycle, even in the absence of a pedestrian call, might be a measure that actually changes driver behavior, number one. So in other

words, compare a current operating condition of the steady hand if no button is pressed to you actually display the walk and the countdown, even if the call doesn't occur. You can do that for a minimum cycle, regardless. Suggestion one.

Suggestion -- suggestion two is actually a question. Your first measure of effectiveness is percentage of turning vehicles that yield. I'd be real curious to know you distinguish -- how you're going to define that yield. Do you mean someone who doesn't even initiate a right turn over the first crosswalk, let alone stop at the second crosswalk, or would you consider it to be yielding if they initiated the turn and then stopped in the middle of the turn before they cross the next -- the -- the conflict crosswalk? That's a question.

And then the third --

CHAIR FISHER: Do you mean the first half of the crosswalk, then the second half of the crosswalk?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, as I understand it you've got a right turn situation. So they're waiting to make their right turn --

CHAIR FISHER: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- waiting behind a crosswalk that's not the crosswalk in conflict. They -- when the right turners are allowed to go they start their right turn, and now they're potentially conflicting with a pedestrian who's seeing this novel indication. Okay. So in the measure

of effectiveness I want to know whether that is considered to be a vehicle that yields if they hold back entirely or if they turn but terminate the turn and yield to the pedestrians? That's just a question for the -- the requester.

And then a suggestion for a second measure of effectiveness would be to count near misses, as well, which -- which would be defined as the evasive maneuvers.

CHAIR FISHER: So, Rob, let's hear real quickly from you, how intend to quantify that?

MR. STINGER: Well, I did go in here and -- excuse me, I'm trying to find it -- where I did try to define what yield is for the purposes of this study.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right. I see that. It's toward the bottom of page 105.

MR. STINGER: The bottom of page one?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: 105.

MR. STINGER: Oh, yeah. I my actual -- which page? Is it page two on the --

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Page two.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's page -- page -- bottom of your page two, from your Federal Highway memo. The last paragraph says the MOE for vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will be the percentage of vehicles that yield. I'm just curious about how you --

MR. STINGER: Okay. "A 'yield' will be defined as

when a motorist does not initiate a left or right turn through the crosswalk."

So, yeah, so basically they don't start to move forward and the tires don't start to turn.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. So they don't start moving forward. Thank you.

MR. STINGER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That answers my question.

MR. STINGER: All right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So the other is a suggestion that you also add a third MOE. It's a second vehicle-pedestrian conflict MOE which would be near misses-evasive maneuvers.

MR. STINGER: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Time is moving on. I personally will be inclined to vote to approve your experiment. But I think there were some very valuable concepts that were suggested and alternatives that could be considered. But since it's been the practice of this Committee to approve an experiment that has received FHWA approval I'll be inclined to vote for it.

Do we have any further discussion? Do we have a motion on the matter?

Jeff?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The only comment I wanted to make is I don't see anything in the proposal or any of the supporting letters about removing the devices after a set period of time. Since we're going to be introducing a yellow during all the other indications I'd like to make sure those heads come down after a set period of time.

CHAIR FISHER: Is that understood that at the conclusion of the experiment, if not approved as a standard device by this Committee that you will take those devices down and put in standard devices?

MR. STINGER: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We have it on record that --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because it just wasn't in their proposal.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Any other comments from Committee members? Do we have a motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, a procedural question.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Is our motion an approval of perfunctory? Must we first give them the authorization to experiment?

CHAIR FISHER: I think we are required to approve

those devices that are installed in the State of California.

SECRETARY SINGH: We have changed -- we have changed our guidelines.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So hypothetical, if this Committee says no, what happens to the official approval, then no?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: To another state.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Do we have --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just for clarification so I know what we're crossing.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Don?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes. I'd like to make a motion that this experimentation request be approved. And I'd also like to recognize Rob Stinger for his initiative to push this forward. At Caltrans we encourage innovative thinking, and very few people really do it. So thank you, Rob.

MR. STINGER: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Do we have a second?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'll second that for innovation.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We have a motion. It's been seconded. Any more discussion on this matter before we vote? Seeing none, I'll take it to a vote and ask you to raise your hands. All those in favor of approving this experiment raise

your hands and say aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: it's unanimous.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: It's unanimous.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Great.

We will break for lunch. The most convenient place to have lunch is on the fourth floor. It closes at 2:00. I'd ask that we be back here by two o'clock.

(Off the Record From 1:18 p.m., Until 2:07 p.m.)

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. We note that it is 2:07 and we are resuming our meeting of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee.

Before we go to the next agenda items there could be members with flight schedules that will require them to leave at a certain time, in which case we might risk having a quorum here. So I'd like to ask, is there anyone who must leave before five o'clock to -- for travel arrangements?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Everybody.

MR. GUTIERREZ: Does the freeway count?

CHAIR FISHER: Well, nobody. So --

MR. GUTIERREZ: But after 7:00 it opens up.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I don't expect to go any longer than 5:00 p.m. I hope we can conclude this earlier. But, if necessary, I just wanted to know how much time we have. Because we have the Part 6 items, and some of them may take some time to discuss.

But the item that I'd like to go to next, and I'll try to pick the ones that I judge to be easier, and save the longer items for last, I'd like to go to item 12-7, which is a proposed policy chance on the use of audible warning devices for sidewalk closures submitted by Caltrans.

And before we have the introduction on this, I'd like to find out if on this item there is a recommendation on this item from Caltrans. And this item begins on page 90.

And the reason why I ask this is it appears to be that an individual has opined on this matter, but I don't know -- I can't tell if there's a recommendation from Caltrans. So just a clarification. Is there a recommendation on this? I think there isn't.

Don, go ahead.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I was just going to ask Gordon if -- if he knows. This is something I'm not familiar with, so I'm not certain.

MR. WONG: This item was brought to Caltrans attention during a comment process for the 2012 California MUTCD. Again, this is Gordon from Caltrans. It was the direction of the Committee to look through the comments and look for things that can be turned into CTCDC items. So I just did what I was told.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WONG: I --

CHAIR FISHER: And I'd like to ask for at least my remaining time on the Committee, and I'd recommend it to those who succeed me, that whenever a sponsor places something on the agenda that it have a recommendation, so that we have a starting point, rather than say here's an idea, figure out what you want to do. I think that's important for the efficiency of the Committee.

So I will ask in the future that with any future item, if Caltrans recommends it, that's fine; if they don't recommend it, that's fine too. I appreciate these matters coming to the Committee. But I will ask that all sponsors have a recommendation so that we have a starting point in our discussions on it.

So I'd like Caltrans to present this item. And I would ask that for these remaining items that are Part 6, let's try to do it as efficiently as possible. If there's a lot of discussion we really need to have on something, let's do it. If we're just talking really minute details, let's see if we can avoid it.

And also I'd like to express that I really appreciate the fact that Caltrans has looked over the comments that were received during the period when we were considering adoption of the 2012 California MUTCD, and has either forwarded or made recommendations on items that were not a change from the federal manual but where they feel it would be an approval over

the existing manual. And I appreciate their looking at those items and they've looked over a number of items.

So with that said, I guess Gordon is lead on this matter.

MR. WONG: Okay. I can give the Committee my personal recommendation. If you turn to page 92, this is the proposed policy. The guidance policy is to have detectable surface for people with low elevations and/or limited visions. And it's a guidance statement. And I recommend approval of that portion of it.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I see there's a standard, and there's a support statement.

MR. WONG: Okay. On the --

CHAIR FISHER: So which one are you referring to?

MR. WONG: The -- the -- the guidance statement. The -- the -- the red part that's below on the lower part of that page.

CHAIR FISHER: What page?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Paragraph --

CHAIR FISHER: Page what?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Paragraph 5?

SECRETARY SINGH: Page 92.

MR. WONG: Right.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: They're in italics.

MR. WONG: The addition to Paragraph 5.

MR. SADLER: 95?

MR. WONG: Yes.

SECRETARY SINGH: 92.

MR. WONG: Page 92.

CHAIR FISHER: 92 or 95?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: This one. This one.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: Page 92, Paragraph 5.

CHAIR FISHER: I'm with you.

MR. WONG: Would you like me to read it?

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I'd like you to go over the two items that you show in read, the standard items and the guidance statement and kind of brief us on where Caltrans stands on this and the rationale for approving it.

MR. WONG: Okay. And -- and -- and there's -- some new information came forward to me during this past -- actually, this week, on the -- on the standards statement that's in Paragraph 3. What I realized is the recommendation to Caltrans was to adopt this to use Empco-Lite Manufacturing audible warning device. And I just spoke to the manufacturer and they have not brought their device forward to Caltrans to -- as an acceptable product. So at this point I can not recommend to -- there is no -- there is no Caltrans approved product to be used. And I would recommend the Committee consider this standard and maybe with a conformance date in the

future that we would consider to make it a standard.

I want to point out the -- the way I drafted the standards is that the audible device only to be used as a shall, one, where pedestrian with visual disabilities normally use the closed sidewalk. And that's at very few selective locations. And I think that is a device that we were considering for the people of California.

CHAIR FISHER: So, Gordon, what is the audible information device? What does it look like? What does it do?

MR. WONG: We have no -- okay. The audible warning device is a little box sitting on top of a portable delineator. It has a motion sensor. So if a person walked by it would detect the motion and start talking and saying "Sidewalk is closed 100 feet ahead." And then you can record the rest, like a detour information. It's like -- it's like a digital memo recorder with the motion sensor so you can change the message of whatever need to put it in. And the motion detector would detect if somebody is near, and then start talking.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But did you say there's no approved Caltrans device that will do this at this time?

MR. WONG: That's correct.

CHAIR FISHER: Has there ever been an experiment with one of these devices?

MR. WONG: What?

CHAIR FISHER: Has there ever been an experiment with

one of these devices, either in California or in other states?

MR. WONG: Yes. They're -- the product is demoed for the few years past at Caltrans ADADY's (phonetic) demonstration in Minnesota, ADA U.S. demonstration, Washington, D.C., ADA product demonstration. They -- they have demoed it and have had great response from the disabled community, and that they were very pleased with it. And this is -- I show two letters to me personally from the people with disability, the community, and I have a lot more that I have not shown, but people's support of using this device.

CHAIR FISHER: Have the feds approved any experiment for this device?

MR. WONG: The fed's policy is already on there. It is -- let me look.

CHAIR FISHER: By feds, I mean FHWA.

MR. WONG: It is in the Federal MUTCD, as well, for the audible warning device.

CHAIR FISHER: And where does that language appear?

MR. WONG: I'm looking for it right now.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: It's under Support, number 6, Paragraph 6 on page 92.

CHAIR FISHER: Paragraph 6 on 92.

MR. WONG: "The most desirable way to provide information to pedestrians with visual disability is equivalent

for visual signing for notification of sidewalk closure is a speech message provided by an audible information device. Devices that provide speech messages in response to passive pedestrian actuation are the most desirable. Other devices that continuously emit a message, or that emits a message in response to use of a push button, are also acceptable."

CHAIR FISHER: So it's a support statement that describes some radio transmitted devices that are available; correct?

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Then I guess one of the questions --

MR. WONG: Oh, sorry. The -- the guidance statement is in Paragraph 5, just above the edit -- above my proposed changes to the paragraph.

"Because printed signs and surface delineation are not usable by pedestrians with visual disabilities, blocked routes, alternate crossings, and sign and signal information should be communicated to pedestrians with visual disabilities by providing audible information devices, accessible pedestrian signals, and barriers and channelizing devices that are detectable to pedestrians traveling with the aid of a long cane or who have low vision."

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Did you say yes?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: One -- I just -- not a fundamental problem. The section is good. It's just that in support, and when they have to consider it, on second paragraph you are saying,

"The extent of pedestrian should be determined through engineering judgment or by the individual responsible for each TTC zone situation."

I mean, like how would -- because when I look at this thing this is not really an engineering judgment. I mean, what kind of engineering judgment? If I'm on the stand and the deposing attorney what engineering principles did you use to decide whether it's -- whether you need to have the audible device here or not, how would an engineer explain his decision?

MR. WONG: Well --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because engineering judgment is by -- based on engineering principles and engineering training. Here it's more like the number and frequency of the facility being used by pedestrians.

MR. WONG: Again, this is a pre-qualification done by the federal government --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand.

MR. WONG: -- stating where pedestrians with visual

disabilities.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand. But you're a registered engineer. If somebody asks you what engineering principles did you use to decide if this facility needs to have audible devices, it's basically just the number of frequency of the use of the facility. There is no engineering involved there. I don't know, that's just --

MR. WONG: Again, you're questioning federal language that I have no answer to.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, as might as they are, federal government is not beyond reproach. So that's the wrong answer.

MR. WONG: I understand that. I totally understand that. No. I said I --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm just saying -- I'm just saying that we --

MR. WONG: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- use the term engineering judgment so loosely here and there, that if somebody really asks you as an engineer, says what part of your engineering training and qualifications did you use to decide this it has nothing to do with engineering judgment. It has to do with the number of frequency use of the facility by the pedestrians who have this need. It's not an engineering judgment.

MR. WONG: And then --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's all I'm saying.

MR. WONG: My answer to you is I'm the Caltrans Part 6 expert --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

MR. WONG: -- and I have no answer to it because this is the federal language.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Michael?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: I believe what we're being asked to do here on this section is to approve addition to a current standard, which I believe is the -- is the dark -- is the bold statement down here, the addition of the red statement. And since there is no standard --

MR. WONG: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: -- for audible information --

MR. WONG: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: -- and since there is no proponent --

MR. WONG: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: -- here, since we have no -- the actual -- we don't have the actual wording from any federal requirement, I'm inclined not to agree to the proposal

to add this to the standard.

And I think with that I'm going to make a motion that we do not approve the -- the proposal that's considered here.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. That's a motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Do we have a second to the motion?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would second that motion --

CHAIR FISHER: Jeff.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- to not approve this, primarily on the basis that reliable devices have not been approved in the state. And I can not see coming up with a standard that would create liability in local jurisdictions who don't have a device to really meet the needs that are being created here. I agree with this ultimately, but not today. I don't think we're ready for this yet.

MR. WONG: So would you consider with a commitment date in the future, maybe say 2020 or --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, if you come up with a device that's extremely expensive or is almost a test product that isn't very durable, I would then complain on behalf of the cities that we don't have a reliable product to use. So if there just is no track record I guess I'd need -- did you see this test? I mean, I've had devices before that worked temporarily but really weren't field ready, you know, for

installation, so I'd want to make sure, since this is going to be out overnight, you know, it's going to be out in all kinds of weather and construction zones, that it's a hearty device that has a proven track record, not just that it worked in a demo.

MR. WONG: But -- but you're -- if the Committee accepted to recommend to accept it by say 2020 then in case -- then by say 2018 we still don't have a workable product, that we can push back again. But it shows -- I think to me, as an engineer, I would like to see this moving in the right direction, just like you said, showing that we do care and we do have a target to meet, and we do encourage the industry to meet this target with us.

CHAIR FISHER: Moving out from my comment, I think what a wonderful device this might be or could be to provide real-time information to the blind pedestrians. I personally am ignorant of what it looks like and how it works. I've never seen one, and maybe that's my fault. But you go to the vendor shows, I haven't seen one before. I would certainly welcome to be educated on what this looks like, how this works, how reliable it is.

I remember in the early days of accessible pedestrian signals we held off on making it a policy to install them wherever we had push buttons because for us the reliability factor wasn't there. And the reliability has improved greatly

in recent years, and therefore we made it a standard that wherever we use a push button it would be an accessible device.

But I personally would like to be educated. And maybe if the non-motorized members of this Committee have more information on it I welcome to be educated on it. I think ultimately technology will give us improved traffic control devices. But I'm at a loss to understand what it is we're approving.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I would concur with your statement that we haven't seen how this device is going to work, where this device is going to work. And -- and I would also concur with the previous statement that I -- there is no engineering judgment based on any principles or anything on when to use this -- this device.

And, you know -- you know, defining what normal use of an enclosed crosswalk, you know, normally, is that one pedestrian? Is that ten pedestrians, is that 100 pedestrians? Does that mean having a visually impaired school within a quarter-mile walking proximity of a closed sidewalk, or a facility that serves the disabled community? Or, you know, somebody who lives three doors down, how do you know that they're going to be blind -- that they're a blind pedestrian unless you physically observe them, and how do you make that determination whether they normally use the sidewalk or not?

And I think it's going to create some pretty

substantial challenges that opens up a lot of tort liability at this point. And until we come up with some better definitions about where to use this, it think it's -- I think it's great in principle, just like our audible pedestrian signals have been a great addition to our traffic signals, but at this point we don't have enough information, and that's -- you know, I don't want to say we'll implement this in 2020 if technology is there.

I'd say let technology direct us. And if there's a demand and somebody creates a product that we can, you know, throw in the back of our trucks and attach to an A-frame sign and, you know, and it actually works that is fairly cost effective -- because if it costs more than repairing the sidewalk than we're replacing then it's not going to be cost effective to be using. But, you know, I know cost isn't an issue for ADA, but it is an issue for local jurisdictions.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments from Committee members before we go to the public and our alternate members?

Yes, John.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I looked up the Empco Device. It looks like a reasonable thing that might well be proven effective, but it's not right now. And I have a little bit of skepticism about putting language in the manual for something that doesn't -- hasn't been tested yet, sort of

Gordon's reservation. I'm more than willing to rapidly -- to consider rapidly improving this, at least the standard part of the proposal, at such time that Caltrans brings forward something that it would like to use.

As far as guidance, Paragraph 5, the use of detectable warning material, that seems like a much more supportable part of the proposal. I wonder, is Gordon open to us approving the proposal, striking, for the time being, the standard language?

MR. WONG: That is completely up to you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm sorry?

MR. WONG: That's completely up to you --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

MR. WONG: -- to make a recommendation to me.

CHAIR FISHER: Any other members of the Committee want to comment before we go to the audience?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I think this is a solution looking for a problem. And some cities with high densities, like City of Los Angeles, every single location they must use these devices if we go with this language. Because somebody is going to come out and do a statistical analysis at every single crosswalk or sidewalk in the City of Los Angeles has a very high probability of a visually impaired person using it. Therefore, they must comply with this at all their locations. There goes your engineering

judgment.

And then it goes back to the question that Bryan said, where is the technology? How much do these devices cost? How do you secure it against vandalism and things like that? Is this something you can just slap it on a A-frame and put it on a crosswalk, or do you have to go put it -- mount it and put it at a certain elevation so people can not steal it. So a lot of things.

But just approving it is very simple. You can just go and adopt it. But then larger cities, they must do it at all their locations, because somebody is going to argue that there is one single individual who's going to use that facility.

CHAIR FISHER: Don?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yeah. Based on the comments that we've received, and the fact that there isn't a device currently available, and even the -- the portion in Paragraph 5 seems to be somewhat confusing or contradictory, I would say that we'd like to withdraw this at this time and come back in the future with more information.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Before we consider that as an actionable item I'd like to ask if Rock Miller has some comments on this?

MR. MILLER: I don't offer you solutions, but I can tell you, this looks like it's actually a federal provision

that we're looking at amending.

The federal government, I'm sure I don't have to remind you, is currently undergoing a major review of right-of-way accessibility guidelines. I think there's going to be a lot of things coming out of that process over the next 12 months that you're going to have to look at your own guidelines with respect to that. I also think the feds are probably going to do the same analysis themselves.

In terms of responding to this, I'd be inclined to encourage Caltrans to work with potential manufacturers to see if a device could be made acceptable. But I think I would also look to the federal changes in guidelines that are happening underway to see if the federal direction is to allow -- to require these devices. Hamid's comments about it probably will be required everywhere if it becomes allowable anywhere are very reasonable and expected comments, as well.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Any other members of the audience wish to comment on this before we take it back to the Committee?

Seeing none, we bring it back to the Committee. Caltrans, the sponsor, has asked that this item be withdrawn at this time. Is there any further discussion on that? Do we have a motion to approve?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to -- to remove my motion if Caltrans wishes to

withdraw.

I would like, though, if and when this comes back, everything I've read here, there's nothing in here that identifies this as a safety issue, more as an issue of convenience. And to impose something that could significantly increase an agency's liability on a matter of convenience and not safety is a concern to me. And so if this comes -- if and when this comes back I would like to understand the -- the safety implications of implementing this versus not implementing this. And -- and only when I understand the safety part will -- will I make a decision on whether or not something like this should become a standard.

I, personally, having -- having been raised in various different agencies, I recognize that implementation of a standard like this will significantly increase costs of construction and maintenance. And before I do that to any agency within the -- the state I would prefer to understand why I'm doing that and that -- that it's not necessarily just for a convenience thing, but for a safety thing.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I could readily imagine that as a blind traveler, if I reach a point where my routes interrupted and I honestly don't know what else to do at that point, that it could rapidly turn into a safety issue for me. But I think that's for further discussion.

My suggestion for when Caltrans brings this back might be to see which TAs within Part 6 this might affect, and to also give some thought to including those TAs in the proposal, typical applications. I think some of the TAs that are in Part 6 already deal with sidewalk closures. It would be probably useful to see where these devices might actually go in the TA figure.

CHAIR FISHER: You mean with the drawing --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The drawing, yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: -- or the figure?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Typical application figure.

CHAIR FISHER: That's a good point. I'd like to add on to what Rock Miller said. There's -- there are proposals out now for pedestrian and right-of-way access guidelines that are being prepared by one part of the federal government. And so I don't think we've seen the last of this. And I think we're going to see it within the next two years. But they'll have to resolve what they're proposing with the FHWA to make sure that the federal government speaks with one voice. And I have no doubt that things will be going in this direction, but I just think at this time it's -- it's -- it hasn't percolated enough. We're not quite ready.

But any final comments? Caltrans has indicated they want to withdraw the item. But any final comments before we

move on? Okay. So this item is withdrawn.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I would next like to go to item number 12-5, temporary traffic control regulatory warning signs and typical applications for Part 6H. That is also a Caltrans item.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: And once again, I'd like to defer this item to Gordon Wang.

MR. WONG: Gordon from Caltrans. Very quickly, the -- number one is the "Uneven Pavement" sign. And during the last CTCDC meeting, I read through the minutes, and most Committee members believed such a sign exists, but it doesn't. It's not an approved official traffic control device, but it's widely used in the industry, and we're like catching up to it.

Number two, the C20(CA), the "2 Right Lane Closed Ahead" sign that has been brought forth to the Committee once before. The difference this time we're proposing to bring this item back is not to change the signs across the board, but rather making it an option, and that Caltrans wants to go -- move ahead with it. We did studies and tests on it. Later on if we want to look more into it I can do a short presentation on this issue.

CHAIR FISHER: So which sign are you referring to, Gordon?

MR. WONG: The "2 Right Lane Closed Ahead" sign.

It's the one --

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: -- right at the back of the room.

CHAIR FISHER: So one is a patch on and one is a permanent version?

MR. WONG: No. Would you like me to bring those signs up?

SECRETARY SINGH: Let us discuss, first, uneven pavement.

MR. WONG: Oh. Okay. So -- so --

SECRETARY SINGH: One by one now.

MR. WONG: So the Committee would like to go through one item at a time? That will work for me.

CHAIR FISHER: I think that would be helpful. Okay. Please do.

So the first item is "Uneven Pavement" sign. And we have a similar sign as the "Uneven Lanes." And uneven -- not every time an elevation happens on a lane line, and when there is an elevation difference longitudally not at the lane line, we don't have the proper sign to warn the motoring public. That's why the sign is needed.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. As he goes through each one of these, if there are quick questions I'd like to handle them now. If there's going to be extended discussion then I'd like to kind of go through all these, then have those extended

discussions.

So any quick questions of Gordon on the "Uneven Pavement" proposed sign?

Hearing none, we'll go to the next one, "2 Right Lane Closed Ahead."

MR. WONG: Since we're doing one item at a time would you mind to take a vote on each one --

CHAIR FISHER: We'll -- yeah.

MR. WONG: -- as we go through it?

CHAIR FISHER: We could do it that way, or we could hear about all signs and approve it as one motion. What would be the pleasure of the Committee?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I think it may help if we vote one at a time.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we have the "Uneven Pavement" sign. Any discussion among Committee members on this?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes. What's the difference between "Uneven Pavement" and an "Uneven Lane" sign, you know, Section 6F.45, the W8-11? Because it sounds like --

MR. WONG: "Uneven Lane" sign is a federal sign, and "Uneven Pavement" sign will be a California sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But as we discussed earlier when we were talking about head signal indications, if there's already an existing sign what evidence is there that

the federal "Uneven Lane" sign that denotes pavement elevation change of two inches or more isn't working?

MR. WONG: Because not all elevation difference happens exactly on the lane line. There could be chances that a contractor would have overlaid half of the lanes and decided to keep the lane open, and there's a slight difference between the elevation and there's -- or sometimes it's diagnolized due to the -- due to the bridge. Like if you have a bridge approach that's not parallel to the lane line, so you have a scored pavement unevenness elevation difference, and that will continue for the length of the bridge and will be on the other side come up.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You hope that you are not allowing a two inch difference --

MR. WONG: Not two inches.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- on the same lane, because then the car is going to be --

MR. WONG: Yes. No. But that will be for a slight difference.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So this would be used when --

MR. WONG: And -- and it's --

CHAIR FISHER: -- the edge of the pavement uneven portion is somewhere within the middle of the lane?

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: And this sign has been used in the district -- in the industry for a very long time and just -- and you -- if we look at the meeting minutes from two meetings ago, the Committee was talking about the sign and everybody says there is an "Uneven Pavement" sign and we should use it, and there is actually no. so I caught that and I said since everybody believe already there is a sign when there is not, maybe that's a good opportunity to make it an official traffic device.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further comments from Committee members on the "Uneven Pavement" sign?

I have one comment. I support this. But I think when we say "may be considered," that's real weak language. And I've never supported telling you how to think, but telling you what you have to do. So I think you may want to consider having language that says "may be used" or "should be used."

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: And I would think you'd want to go in the direction "should be used" if it occurs in the middle of the lane. But -- so I have to ask you if you would want to -- or I could propose revised language being supportive of this sign.

MR. WONG: Yes. Please do.

Johnny, do you have a preference of making this a guidance or an option?

MR. BHULLAR: Which, on the "Uneven Pavement?"

MR. WONG: Yes.

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) Let's go with the dominant warning and the (inaudible) guidance. So to me this one is warning. The message is warning.

MR. WONG: Yes. No.

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) (Inaudible.)

MR. WONG: No.

MR. BHULLAR: No. No.

MR. WONG: Do you prefer a guidance statement or an option statement?

MR. BHULLAR: Most of the warning signs, by default we start out with may, unless you have a stronger reason to go to a guidance.

MR. WONG: So you're recommending just keep it option statement?

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: So if it's an option statement it wouldn't require you to put in any sign at all?

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. It won't even be recommended. But it's a tool that's available if you choose to use it.

CHAIR FISHER: So that's Caltrans's feeling that on some occasions --

MR. BHULLAR: That's Caltrans's thought. Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- you should not put it in, but you may put it in?

MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Then I would just recommend, if that's the Caltrans recommendation that the language say "may be used" --

MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- instead of "may be considered."

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. Because most of the policies are made -- whenever they are "should" they are either based upon like safety reports or investigations. So there is something more than just like having a tool and a simple policy.

CHAIR FISHER: So the motion is revise the option statement to change the last word from "may be considered" to "may be used." That's --

MR. BHULLAR: "May be used?"

CHAIR FISHER: "May be used." That's a motion. Do we have a second on that?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Clarifying question.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually, it may be a friendly amendment. I wondered if -- if it's -- if the option as -- as proposed, the option language as proposed is sufficiently clear that it means "may be used" in place of the "Uneven Lane" sign or as an alternate to it.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I'm talking about the language in red --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- on the top.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I am, too. If someone interprets that, a practitioner, is it pretty clear from it being an option statement within Section 6F.45 that we are talking about using the "Uneven Pavement" sign as to replace the "Uneven Lane" sign?

CHAIR FISHER: That is a very good point. Because I note that the "Uneven Lane" sign is a guidance statement saying you should use it. So I think your point is well taken that this is an alternate. And, therefore, I would ask -- I would consider that a friendly amendment to say "may be used" instead of the "Uneven Lane" W8-11 sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And I further wonder whether it might be useful to change -- to augment the section title to be "Uneven Lane Sign W8-11/Uneven Pavement CDC41(CA)," so that the two signs are presented as -- as parts of the same engineering decision.

MR. WONG: We have not done this in --

SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) And we tried to find a closer section of the federal MUTCD but we don't (inaudible).

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Got it.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So when I proposed the motion

we had a clarifying statement. There was no second to that. So I will restate a revised motion that the end of the red option language say "may be used instead of the 'Uneven Lanes' W8-11 sign." That would be my motion. Do we have a second on that?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Second. Any discussion by Committee members on this sign?

Seeing none, any comments from persons in the audience?

MR. BHULLAR: Not really a comment. I was just going to ask a question, that if I understand this correctly, basically what we are going to do is the uneven lane sign is more on the lane line, and the uneven pavement is when that is not on the lane line but on the pavement; right?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

MR. BHULLAR: So the language that you are describing does not clearly make the distinction which sign is for which though.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, in the revised statement --

MR. BHULLAR: It implies -- it implies it, but it doesn't clearly say that.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, the guidance statement says you should use an "Uneven Lane" sign. And then the option statement says you can use the "Uneven Pavement" sign where it

doesn't fall on the lane line. You may use the "Uneven Pavement" sign instead of the "Uneven Lane" sign.

MR. BHULLAR: Well, if everyone agrees. But because for me "Uneven Lane" then, it isn't say that it is a lane line. So I just want to make sure that this will stand apart.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Question.

CHAIR FISHER: John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Should -- should we -- should we perhaps consider incorporating what is stated as an option here as a second paragraph under guidance? Because it seems to me that we're trying to strongly indicate the use of this sign, one way or the other. And we want to make it clear that the "Uneven Lane" sign, the federal sign, be used when the break, the discontinuity is at the lane boundary, and that the "Uneven Pavement" sign be used when the discontinuity is not at the lane boundary. It seems to me that they are equally strong statements and they should be both under a "should."

MR. BHULLAR: So if I look at it, basically the way I would propose it, at least, if I may, is that the guidance title say,

"The 'Uneven Lane' sign, all of the Uneven Pavement' sign should be used during operations that create a difference of two inches or more in elevation between adjacent lanes that are open for travel."

Then the option will say,

"When a difference in pavement elevation is on a lane line use the -- or the 'Uneven Lane' sign should be used when it's not on the lane line."

So just clearly or more explicitly to say that.

CHAIR FISHER: So in other words, you're not saying they both should be "should" statements?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. That's --

CHAIR FISHER: Because I asked you before and you said it should be an option.

MR. BHULLAR: Now I think we will have to make it a "should" because we're trying to tell which one for what. So you can't have it as an option because now you're having two signs, and you're trying to say for this one use this. So you can not say "you may use" and "you may," because they become equal then. So you have to say you should be using this for this situation, and you should be using, so --

CHAIR FISHER: So what I'm going to ask is that we go on to the next sign, "2 Right Lane Closed Ahead." And during that interim period could you work on the language --

MR. BHULLAR: All right.

CHAIR FISHER: -- that creates those two should statements, you do this in this situation, you should do this in that --

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- situation.

MR. WONG: Okay. Johnny, just a quick comment. I definitely disagree with you with using that "Uneven Pavement" sign with the two inch difference criteria, because that almost is saying that it is okay to open the lane when there is a two inch difference, and that's not -- the policy will be misinterpreted like so, and that's not something that we're definitely trying to avoid.

MR. BHULLAR: Oh, I see.

MR. WONG: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well, let us consider the --

MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Let me work on that.

CHAIR FISHER: -- next sign, and then we'll go back to this one, once Johnny feels he has the language that you would be comfortable with.

MR. WONG: So this -- this is -- oh, I need to stand right here. Again, this is Gordon from Caltrans. And we're -- this sign was once brought to the Committee's attention, and it was denied due to a lack of study and lack of proof of being effective. So Caltrans did -- for one thing, we elected to making the proposed sign an option to the original sign. Secondly, we did a parking lot test to prove its effectiveness to the traveling public. And if you may turn around and I can start a PowerPoint presentation.

This is -- this PowerPoint was created by our friend

from FHWA, Ken Couture (phonetic), and he has a great -- he is a great safety proponent to Caltrans in our improving safety.

And here are the signs. And as you can see, on the right is the -- is the existing sign, and on the left is the proposed. And this is the parking lot that we conducted. And we drive the car and put video equipment on it. And we have different groups -- ages of people sitting in the car and identify one that either the sign becomes legible to them to read. And you may see people standing right next to the -- the test path. They're not just standing there. They're actually marking where the sign become legible to the passengers in the car.

And here is the result. The -- the -- the standard sign currently to the age group of 45, 50 and 60, and the first sign, the original sign becomes legible to them at 550 feet, 450 feet, and 350 feet. As the age goes up the distance required to be legible are being shortened.

However, with the new proposed sign the distance increase to 650, 550 and 475. And that distance difference that become legible is 100 and 100 and 125, meaning the older the people get the more helpful it is to have the bigger font on the sign.

And we also found out that 25 to 30 percent of crashes happen in the working zone. And also they are mostly rear end or sideswipe kind of accidents that requires people

action, and most of the time it's due to the lane work that causes those accidents.

And there was a different studies that I can provide to you that has -- supports a bigger font and a bolder font to be used, especially for older drivers. And those signs are -- the physical difference is this thing has -- the action -- you can turn around and look at the sign we're looking at -- is that the standard sign has six inch of font with eight inch numbers, and this is the current standard, versus the new sign will have eight inch font on the "Right" and ten inch font on the "2." And it's a bigger and bolder font, but it's not a bold because there is no federal bold font. This bigger on the action required items to alert the older drivers what to do. And it helped them to understand 125 feet earlier than at the critical point of understanding what they need it to do. And that's the end of my presentation.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So as I understand it, Gordon, either sign would be allowed.

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Do you have any text that goes with this, or do you just show the two formats on that sheet that shows --

MR. WONG: Yes. The only --

CHAIR FISHER: -- this other sign?

MR. WONG: The only thing -- again, this is Gordon

from Caltrans. The only thing different in the manual will be the font now on this particular sign, and also in the sign chart that will show both signs side by side with the "or" in it. And the text, I have no changes to the manual.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Discussion by the Committee on the "2 Right Lane Closed Ahead" sign?

Jeff?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I was just wondering, what was the thought behind not also making "Closed" larger so that you -- you know, that you get the abbreviated message, two right closed. I mean, you are indicating "2 Right," but you don't want them to move to the right because they're going to be closed. You actually want them to go to the left. So why -- why keep the "Closed" small, since the "Closed" is the most important message there is that something is closed ahead.

MR. WONG: The question is why not make the closed bigger, as well? And the answer will be this is as much as this particular sign can fit. And all warning signs on the freeways are required to be 48 by 48. And the next signs will be 60 by 60, and they're very cumbersome to work with. And we do not require any contractor to go up to the next size. And to make the closed bigger would decrease the -- the line spacing between each line and making the signs so cramped --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well --

MR. WONG: -- that that's hard to --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What would happen was the "Right" would move much closer to the border. If you made the "Closed" bigger the head would move down slightly, but you can keep the same spacing between the words. You just -- like I said, to me the most important word there is something is closed ahead of me.

MR. WONG: So --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I concerned the "2 Right" doesn't indicate don't go in the two right, you know, that you need to avoid the two right.

MR. WONG: So you -- so your proposal would be making the "2" bigger and --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: "2 Right, Closed"

MR. WONG: Oh, "2 Right" and "Closed?"

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Basically, the sign on the right with the sole change of making "Closed" bigger.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

CHAIR FISHER: And pushing "Ahead" down.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. So you could keep the same spacing just by moving the "Ahead" down, just as you move the "Right" -- you have the "Right" move towards the border.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I like Mr. Knowles idea,

but not getting rid of the word "Lane."

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No. I'm not eliminating anything. It's just I'm emphasizing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh. Okay. I thought --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: They emphasize "2."

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. No.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The emphasize "Right."

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. I --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just wanted to emphasize "Closed."

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, I'm okay. Because I heard saying "2 Right Closed." It should say "2 Right Lane Closed."

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No. It's just simplifying the message the bold "2 Right, Closed," and then the others are just clarifying words that stay on the sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So are we keeping the word "Lane" in there?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Good.

CHAIR FISHER: You know, I note that when I look at these cross signs there's room to move "Ahead" down so that you can increase the size of "Closed." But when I look at the figures that are on page 67 it looks like there is no room to

do that.

MR. WONG: And also, just by how human reads a message it would be from top down continually. And, of course, the first thing -- the first to become legible will be the "2," and then the "Right," and then you continue to read as they become legible, then you will see the "Lane Closed Ahead," versus if you keep the "Lane" small then people will read as "2 Right Closed," and then the "Lane" become legible and "Ahead" becomes legible. And that's not how the sign being read and --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But you're just -- aren't you jumping to a conclusion that the average elderly motorist, when they see "2 Right" isn't going to instantly think those are the ones I'm supposed to avoid, versus "2 Right" is where I'm supposed to go. And to me the most important message there is "Closed." I mean, the whole purpose of that sign is to warn that something is closed ahead. So why wouldn't you make "Closed" one of the -- the bold words?

MR. WONG: I'm -- the big -- the greatest difference is 125 feet at a freeway speed. By the time you pass the 125 feet the whole sign becomes legible. And that's, unfortunately, when you start to read "Lane Closed Ahead." It just became natural to the person who is reading it.

CHAIR FISHER: I, for one, like Jeff's idea if it is possible to move "Ahead" down. Again, it looks like it is there. It doesn't look like it on page 67.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I like Jeff's idea, as well. And we're doing this for the aging population, but the -- the teenage population is going to read it as a text message because "2 Right" means go to the right.

CHAIR FISHER: Exactly.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And that's how they abbreviate how they write. And so --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So we need two signs for two different age groups.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: So --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Because we don't pluralize the lanes.

CHAIR FISHER: Do we have a motion on these signs here from the Committee?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have a question before the motion.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Gordon, how -- how -- given that the two variance, the standard variant and the -- the enhanced variant are both depicted in this figure, how will a practitioner specify and order sign if they prefer the enhance variant?

MR. WONG: They would -- the normal procedure is they would first identify the sign they needed. Then they would go

to Caltrans website to look for the sign spec. And on the sign spec we will change it to be an optional spec that --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Some sort of suffix on -- on the base number, or what?

MR. WONG: Yeah. It will be just more -- it's a table of all the sizes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

MR. WONG: There will be just an extra row stating that right can go up more.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. So -- so will there be a unique abbreviation or identifier that will let me specify that sign, kind of like W8-11 is for the uneven lane sign?

MR. WONG: No.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Then I'm a little bit confused.

MR. WONG: It's almost like this sign can be "Left" or "Right," and then it's only using one sign quote. Because the -- the "Left" being on the sign will be the option. And usually it's a Velcro patch to patch it over.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I understand that part. But what I don't understand is if you have two signs in the catalog, one that you've got the "Left" for, and then one that you've got to the "Right," how do I specify the one to the right?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Probably you could have A and B.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, that's what I'm asking for.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Yeah. It needs to be --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: You need a unique -- you need a unique identifier so I know that when I call up Hawkins Traffic Supply that they give me the one on the right.

MR. WONG: We -- yeah. That can be easily done. I just haven't come up with the proposed text.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's a suggestion.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. I think you need to explicitly identify the modified sign with the distinguishing number, whether you call it alternate or --

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- B or whatever, just so someone can spec it if they want to use the sign that will be more effective with the older driver.

MR. WONG: Okay. And -- and the general practice, when that happen is we identify the original sign as C20(CA), in parentheses, and that the variation will be C20(A), parentheses A.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Perfect.

CHAIR FISHER: Fine.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: My question, and maybe you

guys can chime in and -- and answer this is if I get in a collision in a work zone and we chose the one on the left, and if the one on the right was used and would have prevented the collision, aren't we just opening ourselves up -- up? I mean, why didn't --

MR. WONG: There --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: -- why didn't you use the one on the right?

MR. WONG: There is a third option to this sign, that will be the federal sign. And in the past the federal sign spells out "2 Right Lanes Closed Ahead." And in the 2009 version they changed it to almost exact same layout as our sign, except they added "S" behind the "Lanes." So for tort liability we can say that our sign on the left is based on the -- very similar to the federal sign versus -- and that -- that the optional is just for Caltrans special purposes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Well, and what do you define as special purpose? Because I would say preventing me from being in an accident is a special purpose. So -- so I would say that since all this analysis has gone on to show that eight inch lettering on construction signs is more beneficial, then why do we even use six inch -- I mean, you can start -- an attorney can easily make that claim and say, well, if you would have --

MR. WONG: Well, if -- if that --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: -- at 65 or 70 miles an hour --

MR. WONG: If that's a concern we can spell out the text language as the one on the right being option on the state highways.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, and why not on city and county expressways?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right. I mean, I have roadways that are 55 miles and hour. So I mean --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Just the one I'm thinking, I'm thinking if the one -- well, I know, if the argument is that the one on the right is superior, why not just stay with the one on the right? Why do we need the one on the left? It's not going to cost any different. It's the same to manufacture it and install it.

MR. BABICO: (Off mike.) Well, the only thing is you have to manufacture it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. No. No. What I --

MR. BABICO: Because already you have them on spec.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. No. Those signs, they're going to cost exactly the same to manufacture and carry around --

MR. WONG: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- and install. So if you think that the "2 Right Lane Closed Ahead" on the right,

with the modification that Mr. Knowles proposed that I support, is superior sign, why do we even need two signs? Let's just approve one sign and stay with it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Hamid, we don't want to force agencies to purchase all new signs.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's not what I'm saying. That's another issue.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Well --

CHAIR FISHER: But when they buy new.

MR. WONG: Well, that's -- that's -- that -- that's in a common practice of California MUTCD that we do not force people to go out and stock new signs. Usually it's when an old sign reaches its useful life and it was outside the spec, then the new spec would be used per the -- for the new stock.

CHAIR FISHER: Then once you're exhausted your current supply?

MR. WONG: And why I made it optional was to address the fact that last time the sign was rejected. So I thought maybe the Committee would be more open if I made it optional. But if that's a concern I'm also happy to make it the standard sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's problem with trying to make everybody happy.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I think based on the -- based on the data you presented us and the study you conducted, I think

you've shown that the one on the right is superior. And I think given that data many of us would be inclined just to go with the superior sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. I think you've done a great job of producing the data, and so well that -- that as an attorney, not that I am an attorney, but I work with a number of them, it wouldn't be that hard for them to argue the case, and I'd just be there with my mouth open saying, I don't know why we didn't use that sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: If we accept the -- the premise that people's existing signs that match the one on the left are still valid and it's just whenever purchasing new ones the new standard would apply, what has to happen to make that be the case? Does something go in the text or is that an existing default premise of the manual?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And that was in our workshop yesterday, remember, how -- how -- how you didn't have to run out and replace signs. In fact, you could even use the signs you had in stock at your yard. You didn't -- just because of the standard changes didn't mean you had to throw away all your existing signs and buy the new ones.

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, that's right. In the introduction of the manual, and this something new, and we just

continue to carry forward, which is if you have the signs in your inventory and for the purposes of the previous manual you're still okay to continue using them, unless they are one of the three identified for removal from the field.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: When was that written, Johnny?

MR. BHULLAR: Introduction, page -- I can look it up very quickly.

MR. WONG: It's an existing policy in the California MUTCD.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And so it doesn't have to appear section by section --

MR. WONG: Correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- and side by side. That's good. I like that.

And with that understanding I would support the discussion of just calling the one on the right our new standard.

MR. WONG: With the "Closed" being eight inches long?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And the head being down.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

MR. WONG: Yes. Yes. I like that idea. I don't foresee a technical problem. But if we lay out a sign and there is a technical problem then I will inform the Committee on the next meeting. But if there is no technical problem I

would assess recommendation.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, that's -- that's going to fit, because you're going to need an inch either -- either on the top and bottom of the "Closed." And you have two -- two inches to move "Ahead" down. So --

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Do we have a motion from the Committee on this item? Do we have a motion on this item?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I -- I move that the Committee recommend adoption -- that Caltrans adopt the sign shown on the right, the emboldened sign, with the addition that "Closed" also be shown in eight inch letters.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. And my understanding of the motion is that this would be the only shown sign. The sign on the left -- and the sign on the left would not be shown?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any further discussion by Committee members?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: I would have some concern that if it forces all agencies to -- to replace all of their "Right Lane Closed Ahead" signs.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But -- but that's what we're reading up on --

CHAIR FISHER: No.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- right now on page 57.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. BHULLAR: Okay. I have it up on the screen if you want to -- so basically, the way it works is --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Can you zoom in for the aging population?

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you.

MR. BHULLAR: Sure. And hopefully all of us will want to get there.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: Yeah. Much better.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Paragraph 26?

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) No. Okay. So basically the way it starts out is you have to start from Paragraph 35. And because it's written a little bit cryptic with the -- and this is the best legal quote. Let me do it in plain English, but still it's a little bit cryptic.

So you start out with the standard that says,

> "Unless allowed for the option below in cases involving new highway or bikeway construction or reconstruction, the traffic control devices installed, temporary or permanent, shall be in conformance with the current addition of the California MUTCD before the highway is open or reopens to the public for unrestricted travel pursuant to the vehicle code."

So basically this is telling you, unless other option

below you shall use the current manual.

Then you go into the Paragraph 26 which says,

"In cases involving new highway or bikeway construction or reconstruction the traffic control devices installed may be not in accordance with the previous Traffic Control Device Standards of January 21st, 2010 or September 26th, 2006 California MUTCD, or even prior to that of the 2003 MUTCD and supplement, or even the Traffic Manual, if in the judgment of the engineer incorporating the California MUTCD that it would impose a significant delay or significant increase in cost for the project."

So meaning when you're starting a project, whichever manual you were using you're continuing to retain that with that broad language.

Then (inaudible) it says, "Reconstruction" -- actually, that one is talking about --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Thirty is the most important one.

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You could read 30, because it talks about inventory.

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. I like the manual so much I want to read all of it.

"To limit financial impact on agencies and for fiscal responsibility issues existing inventory of now compliant

traffic control devices, except those identified per table, may continue to be used until these inventory are depleted."

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: As long as you own them already you can keep using them.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So it gives you --

MR. WONG: Also, on this particular sign as an option, if the local agency decides to keep the current standards the federal sign will be the one that you will purchase, and that will still meet the standards. And that's on page 1106 of the manual, if anybody wants to look at it.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we have a motion that's been seconded. We've had some discussion by Committee members here.

I'd like to ask if any member of the public would like to comment on this?

SECRETARY SINGH: Is the motion eliminating the sign on the left?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes. And to include the sign on the right with the exception that the word "Closed" would be in eight inch caps.

SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we bring this back to the Committee, since there's no member of the public who wants to comment on this. We have a motion. We have a second. Any further discussion? All those in favor, raise your hands.

Okay. It's unanimous. Okay.

And are we ready to go back to the "Uneven Pavement" sign or do you need more time?

MR. BHULLAR: I think I'm done. Let's take a look.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We'll go back to the "Uneven Lane" and the "Uneven Pavement" signs.

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) Okay. The proposed paragraph that you see, I'm not proposing it. I just copied it, because that is in the Chapter 2C for permanent warning signs for the same time. So I was just trying to make sure that it is what we have there. So,

"For permanent applications the 'Uneven Lane' sign may be used to warn of the difference in elevation between travel lanes."

That's the wording they use there. So looking at that, the way I'm proposing it from what Gordon was proposing is changes in red. So here, and for this guidance, I'm adding. So if we read it says,

"'Uneven Lane' signs should be used during operations that create a difference of two inch or more in elevation between adjacent lanes that are open to travel and the elevation difference is on the main line."

And the term, "is on the main line," is elsewhere in the manual, too, so that it will be (inaudible).

But I'm going to (inaudible) the two inch or more

criteria we will stay silent. If we go with the two inch or more then it will be (inaudible). So that one I'm saying, "The 'Uneven Pavement' sign may be used during operations that create a different elevation" -- is that (inaudible) -- "that creates a difference in elevation which (inaudible)."

I'm trying to read this from here. Because for the "Uneven Lane" sign it should be okay with two inch or more. But for the "Uneven Pavement" are you applying the two inch or more criteria or not, for the "Uneven Pavement?"

MR. WONG: No.

MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Then we shouldn't have it as a "should," so I'm trying to keep it as a "may."

CHAIR FISHER: Johnny, I'm --

MR. WONG: They shouldn't be -- it should be option.

MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Okay then.

CHAIR FISHER: I'm confused now. It seems like there's three considerations.

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: There's a two inch difference. And when it falls on the lane line you use the "Uneven Lanes."

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: And the parallel part of that is when there's a two inch elevation difference and it falls between lane lines, then you should use the "Uneven Pavement" signs.

MR. BHULLAR: It's not saying that. It doesn't want

to. It's saying the "Uneven Pavement" sign is not for the two inch or more criteria.

MR. WONG: I think the federal language "in elevation between adjacent lanes" is good enough. We don't really have to modify that language.

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. But the -- the issue still is "Uneven Lane" sign, you should be using them when it's two inch or more.

MR. WONG: Okay.

MR. BHULLAR: But for the "Uneven Pavement," regardless of where it's located, is this -- if it's two inch or more then you're going to use it or it could be for the (inaudible).

CHAIR FISHER: Well, why wouldn't you want to use it if it's two inches or more?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think -- I think what I -- what I thought I heard Gordon express concern about earlier was that if the difference is within the lane a difference of less than two inches, it may be potentially significant of steering.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, what if the difference is two inches?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. I want to ask -- ask Gordon to clarify.

MR. BHULLAR: (Off Mike.) John, the reason why is

because Chapter 2C for permanent they added an option and then leave it open, regardless of what the difference is.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. But what if I have a difference of two inches or more and the line is between lane lines, is there -- for which -- is there something that I should do?

MR. BHULLAR: Then it's going to fall under this criteria.

CHAIR FISHER: So if you've got two inches or more, or I've got three inches, it's only going to be an option? It seems like if it's two inches or more you want to prescribe that you do something.

MR. BHULLAR: But if we are going to apply the two inch or more, then in that case what we should be doing is that we can make the distinction that if it is on the lane line then it's this sign. If it's within the lane itself then this one. Yeah, that can be done. But then both of them could be, too.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well, it seems like the easier way to do it would be to have a "may" statement -- two "may" statements and two "should" statements. The "may" statement is that if you have a difference in elevation you should use the "Uneven Lane" if it falls on the lane line. The other "may" statement is if you have a different in elevation you should use the "Uneven Pavement" if it falls between the lanes lines. And then you follow that with two "should" statements of if the difference in elevation is two inches or more and it falls on a

lane line you should use the "Uneven Lane," and if the difference is two inches or more and it falls between lane lines you should use the "Uneven Pavement."

MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Let me work on that, if that is sufficient. But he -- he was saying that the two inch or more for "Uneven Pavement," Gordon wasn't okay with that. So that's the reason why I'm referring to this. But in my opinion, if two inch or more criteria is for both signs then I'm going to keep both as a "should" and then make the distinction which one is used for what.

CHAIR FISHER: It seems like two inches is significant.

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: And at some point your requirement should go with an option to a should, just in my -- my opinion.

MR. ROYER: Well, maybe it should be an option to the "Rough Road" sign, you know, you're "Uneven Lane."

MR. BHULLAR: Let me work on the language then.

MR. ROYER: It's more like the "Rough Road" sign.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I mean -- I mean, that was me talking. Is there a sense of the Committee that should be how we go, to "may" statements, two "should" statements, depending on whether the difference is two inches or more? Any comment from Committee members? Then we'll vote.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I followed your logic and agree with it.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I noticed that the subsequent paragraph measures -- mentions motorcycle operation in the context of differences less than two inches potentially being significant for motorcycles. Two inches is impossible to climb on a bicycle, as well.

It's rare when a bicyclist is confronted with this sort of situation that bicyclists won't move really slow to avoid the hazard. But certainly some consideration ought to be placed in there for bicyclists, as well, maybe in the motorcycle paragraph.

And the -- the place in Caltrans documents where the height of a longitudinal discontinuity is considered significant is a table in the end of Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual, which is the Bikeway Design chapter. And I'll look it up, but I think it's -- it's like an inch-and-a-quarter is considered a significant longitudinal lip. And I've personally been involved with a case on a local street where this was a serious liability issue. People were falling because it wasn't apparent that there was a lip. So --

CHAIR FISHER: Interesting point. You're mentioning an inch-and-a-quarter.

Johnny, what is the origin of the two inch differential?

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) The two inch or more was in the traffic manual. And so when we adopted it in 2004 we -- we adopted the (inaudible) which was generic. And we carried just the two inch or more criteria into it because that was the higher standard.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The -- Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The two -- the two -- the two inch or more comes from a very, very old study that was done nationally. And AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety actually sponsored it. And we did the second and third generation of that, also. The third generation came out, like I think four or five years ago, that showed that it was the edge drop-off issue. And the national study showed that the edge drop-off issue, when the shoulder is less than -- more than two inches different in elevation with the travel lane it causes driver to lose the control of vehicle.

So the two inch actually has some so-called engineering study behind it. So that's the significance of the two inch. So then from the edge drop-off study, then we introduced it into the "Uneven Lane," and then came the "Uneven Pavement" which is new, so --

CHAIR FISHER: And it is a stricter standard than

what it had said.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Let's go to Roberta.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans. I need to interject something. Primarily -- Johnny, don't change any language just yet.

The "Uneven Pavement" sign is primarily used between a lane and a shoulder. So we need to be very careful about using the terminology within the lane.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: "Uneven Lane" between lanes --

MR. BHULLAR: It does say between travel lanes.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Correct. But what I'm saying, the sign, and it's used out there now -- is that -- is that a true statement, "Uneven Pavement" is out --

MR. WONG: No.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay. So "Uneven Pavement," one of the issues is when you have a travel lane and a shoulder that during construction you may have an overlay that doesn't -- hasn't gone back and done the shoulder at the same time, and so you have a condition temporarily that has a lane and a shoulder at uneven elevations. So the "Uneven Pavement," because the shoulder is not considered a lane, is the more appropriate terminology to use. So we need to --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I would like to echo Roberta's comments, that it was never my

understanding that "Uneven Pavement" was supposed to be for elevation differences of two inch within the lane. If you allow elevation differences of two inches within the travel lane you've got bigger problems. You've got a big liability on your hand. It's extremely difficult to steer a vehicle going at even 40 miles and hour when you have two inches difference between the two sides of the vehicle. And I don't know even if Caltrans or any construction design standard allows that kind of difference within the same travel lane.

CHAIR FISHER: Does Caltrans allow a two inch differential within the lane during construction?

SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) I don't recall, John. So I think this item needs more information (inaudible).

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We've kind of kicked this around -- this around a lot. There are a lot of perspectives on this. I would think we would want to adopt something, but I sense we're going to spend a lot of time trying to wordsmith it today.

MR. BHULLAR: I have it. Just give me a few minutes.

MR. WONG: One more comment on this. Again, it's Gordon from Caltrans. This item was brought to my attention, and also this sign is used by my five District 12 person in that I also allowed the sign to be used right by my house on the freeway because it was on an overlay job that the main line -- lanes are already being overlaid, but the merge lane has

not. So there's an elevation difference beyond the lane line and there is the merge point that you have the fog line continue to taper into the main line. And there is the critical point where the "Uneven Pavement" sign is placed. And that will be the -- the most appropriate place to use the sign, and many other places, as well.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. What I'd like to do is go to the next sign, "Pilot Car, Do Not Pass." And then go back to the -- the sign at hand to see if we can get a quick resolution on "Uneven Pavement," "Uneven Lanes." But if we're not of one mind on this then I think we'd have to bring it back at the next meeting.

So, Johnny, in the meantime I'll give you a little bit more time to wordsmith it and maybe talk to your colleagues on the side --

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- to make sure there's a consensus on that.

So right now why don't we go to "Pilot Car, Do Not Pass."

MR. WONG: Okay. "Pilot Car, Do Not Pass" sign was brought to my attention because we encountered a few problems when we use the "Pilot Car, Follow Me" federal sign on the pilot car traffic control situation, that it's a black on orange sign, meaning warning, and the word is "Pilot Car,

Follow Me." So, for one, Caltrans has cars that are trying to pass the pilot car. And in order to enforce it, it needs to be a regulatory sign. And this sign, in fact, back in the '70s in the traffic manual was a "Pilot Car, Follow Me" black on white sign. And it was changed to an orange sign.

And also the field personnel complained about the wording, "Pilot Car, Follow Me," because at the turnaround point there's cars little follow the pilot car into the turnaround and turn back around and start yelling at our pilot cars because they followed the -- the warning sign to -- to the T and turned around with the pilot car, and they do not want not to.

So -- and it was also brought to my attention during the '60s that Caltrans used a different sign called "Pilot Car, Do Not Pass," and it attached the orange no-sign spec to this document. It's on page 71. And as you can see that's a sign spec that was from Department of Public Works Division of Highways, so you know how old that is. However, that was used on Caltrans vehicles and proved to be successful. And we would like to bring the sign back, a black and white application, and make it an official traffic control device.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Discussion by members on that sign?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The fine print of the older specification says that the words "Do Not Pass" were to

be red on white. Would you continue that practice or make it all black on white?

MR. WONG: Oh, no, it will be all black and white.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

MR. WONG: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Further discussion on this sign? Do we have a motion on that sign?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I'll move approval as recommended.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Do we have a second?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I'll second.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. A motion that's been seconded. Any further discussion by members of the Committee at this point in time?

If not, any comments by members in the audience?

If not, we bring it back to the Committee. Any final discussion on this before we vote? Then we go to a vote. All in favor of the "Pilot Car, Do Not Pass" sign that's black and white, say aye.

ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR FISHER: I deem that unanimous. Congratulations. Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Gordon, you have a pretty good slugging percentage today.

CHAIR FISHER: All right. This next sign I find very

interesting, "Move Over or Slow When Amber Light Flashing," to be mounted on a vehicle, given the discussion we had earlier in the day.

Gordon, quickly, you want to cover this?

MR. WONG: Yes. We have a prototype of the "Move Over or Slow When Amber Light Flashing." And this sign will be posted on the tailgate of Caltrans maintenance work vehicles while parked on the shoulder and flashing it's amber light, and give motorists clear direction as what they're supposed to do, follow the CVC -- I forgot the number.

CHAIR FISHER: 21809.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: 21809.

MR. WONG: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Question, Gordon.

MR. WONG: Yes?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Does the vehicle of this type when parked on the shoulder have any other color light that could possibly flash? Do we need the word "Amber?"

MR. WONG: Amber is defined by CVC. And that was -- that came up earlier in a question, that other colors are not defined by the CVC but amber is defined by CVC and is the only allowed color for --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I understand that. But if the light -- if the only light on the truck is amber then the word "Amber" is redundant. And reducing the number of text

characters might, by allowing an increasing font size, improve the glance recognition.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: What if the four-way flashers were on?

MR. WONG: But the -- the --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, that -- that's really what I'm asking. Is it possible that it could be misconstrued in some way if the word "Amber" were deleted.

MR. WONG: Yes. For instance, the flashing turn signals --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

MR. WONG: -- and -- and a flashing emergency have their lights, like both lights. And that's a big no-no for the federal government that prohibits to use the hazard --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That satisfied my question.

CHAIR FISHER: Gordon, I have a question for you. When we discussed the other static sign near the entrances to the state we pointed out that those signs could only be posted on freeways. Would this sign only be used on freeways, for vehicles on freeways?

MR. WONG: The proposed policy does not say that. But is that the intent of the vehicle code?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. WONG: Orange only or red only?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Pardon me?

MR. WONG: I'm sorry. Is it in -- the CVC says use on freeways?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. WONG: Okay.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Freeways.

MR. WONG: Okay. Then, yeah, I have no problem to include that in the policy.

CHAIR FISHER: So does that mean then in Paragraph 2 you would add the word on "Freeways?" In other words, "For lane and or shoulder closures on freeways incident management," blah, blah, blah?

MR. WONG: Uh-huh. "On freeways" would be the first words then.

"On freeways for lane and/or shoulder closure incident management, and for short duration work 'Move Forward or Slow When Amber Light Flashing,' SC22(CA) sign may be mounted on the back of a work vehicle to warn and regulate auto user to move over and/or slow when passing a work vehicle displaying a flashing amber warning light when on or adjacent to the highway."

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So far, so good. Do you need then to make reference to CVC Section 21809?

MR. WONG: I was not proposing that.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So if this Committee is

inclined to approve this sign doesn't that basically resolve the item we heard earlier where you would propose static signs, 100 of them throughout the state?

MR. WONG: The originally idea is to have both options.

CHAIR FISHER: This is such a simple and elegant message, I'll point out.

MR. WONG: And that is -- I'm going to take the credit. That was my idea.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The different is that this is -- this is a situational sign. This is used on the vehicle, so when the driver is approaching it know that this is for this location only. The other one is a generic, informing people of the State Law. There are no amber lights when they see that. I'd like to say "When Amber Lights On Stop Vehicle."

So this one, I have no problem with this one, because this one appears on the back of a truck and it says "Move Over or Slow When Amber Lights Flashing." So you see the amber light are not flashing, he's not going to slow down.

MR. WONG: The question from the chairman was do we still need the other sign?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. That -- that one is -- this is like a specific situation.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, let me play devil's advocate. Why do you need it if you have the sign on the vehicle that's on the freeway that's come to a stop that's got flashing light, doesn't that tell the motorist what to do, here's where it's occurring, rather than having a static sign that may not apply 99 percent of the time?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Let me get that.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Don.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: This would handle Caltrans maintenance vehicles, but it wouldn't handle every vehicle that's addressed in the vehicle code, such as the tow trucks and other emergency vehicles. So Caltrans feels that there's a need for both this sign which is a spot sign, like Hamid at said, as well as the 100 signs that need to be posted throughout the state. We're not willing to, I guess, give on that yet. I hate to say that it is a PR campaign because I don't believe that's the correct terminology to use. But there is a strong -- a strong support in my headquarters that we need to do a better job of alerting the public to this law because of the seven tow truck drivers who were killed, as well as the maintenance staff, as well as the CHP officers.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Any further comment from Committee members?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Could -- could this be made available so tow truck drivers could this on the back of their

trucks? Because the have amber lights on top of their vehicles, as well, so that --

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Well, they could. But from a practical perspective, when a tow truck is doing its job that -- that sign wouldn't be visible because they'd be backed up to a vehicle that they're going to tow off.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Well, they -- they often approach the vehicle from the rear first and -- and they're behind the vehicle.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Well, the proposal was, I believe, specifically for Caltrans vehicles. Is that true or not true, Gordon? Is this for any vehicle?

CHAIR FISHER: It has to be on the freeway.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Any vehicle on the freeway?

MR. WONG: On the freeway, and a work vehicle does not specify if it's a Caltrans work vehicle or tow truck.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Well, then I suppose that it could be used on a tow truck.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If you are going to do this I'm thinking that it might be a good idea, what Mr. Jones brought up, is -- is that it be -- to not restrict this only to Caltrans vehicles, that if a tow truck operator wishes to purchase and install these signs at his own expense to improve the safety of this operator, why not? Let them use it. Because the same law covers them, as well.

MR. WONG: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The only confusing part, could be, is that the tow truck drive works both on freeways and on state facilities, just like Caltrans vehicles work on freeways and highways. So if this is on the back of a two-lane highway and a Caltrans worker pulls over and puts on their flashing lights and then a motorist moves over --

CHAIR FISHER: Crosses it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: -- they're crossing the yellow line, and -- and that could be a safety issue, as well. So you know, does the sign come down and it's removable --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Only on freeway conditions.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Only on freeway conditions, or will it just be fixed, you know, kind of stagnant on the back of their vehicles?

COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Also, with the tow -- involving the tow truck drivers, they normally work solo in the trucks. So you -- you would then be asking that tow driver to get out, walk around the back of his truck, put that on when he could be taking care of the situation right then, where in a Caltrans situation the person in the truck is actually not the one that's actually doing the maintenance work at that time. There's another crew doing that. So you're not thinking any more time for that person, any more exposure for them on the

freeway, which in the case of the tow truck driver it would be. He would be then walking around his truck, spending a little -- a few more minutes doing that, and then he'd have to remove that sign before he leaves --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: -- which increased the exposure of that individual out there.

CHAIR FISHER: Jeff?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I wanted to make it clear that although I, you know, support that on the Caltrans vehicles, there was nothing coming out of the Committee that didn't support the concept of the sign we talked about earlier. We just didn't like that format in the way it was worded. But I don't want it to get back to headquarters that the Committee was not supporting the educational campaign. We just didn't like that particular format. Because I think we do support it, just like we did approve a sign that warned -- you know, educated truckers not to let their diesel vehicles idle. You know, this is even more important than that. We certainly support it. We just want to rework the word message on that sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. I think maintenance workers' safety is of upmost paramount. And I don't think we want to be portraying that we're not conscious of -- and aware and -- and compassionate about that. And I think we all strive

to do that because we all have employees out there in the roadways.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And we all want them to come home safely. Okay. So it's just how -- how do we best communicate that message to the public, and is that on a sign at our airports and our borders and -- and our rest stops, or -- or is there a better way to do it?

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Don?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Just to clarify my comment, I heard a lot of different opinion expressed by this committee. And some of those opinions were do we even have a need for this sign? So those words were spoken today. And you know, I'm not saying I'm taking that back to headquarters. I'm just letting the Committee know that for a variety of reasons that sign, in whatever shape it turns out to be, is very important to us. And it's my belief from conversations I've overheard in headquarters that the Move-Over Law needs to be the focus of that sign, not "Slow," the Move-Over Law.

So all I'm saying is that we need both signs. Caltrans believes that they need both signs. And you know, if this other comes to a vote we may get voted down, but I'm just explaining to you our perception.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But one -- one question is that -- the concern that was raised is that if these signs

are going to be statically fixed on top of maintenance vehicles, what happens when they are not working in a freeway condition and they put their flashers on? Because the -- the case was very specific. We have a lot of state highways that are two-lane facilities. So if they're unsure they're on a state highway, there's a two-lane facility, and they have the sign on and they put the flashers, you're just asking people to move to the opposite lane to comply with the sign?

CHAIR FISHER: Is there any authority for that in the vehicle code?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. None. It's not -- there is no authority and you're just creating a very, very dangerous situation.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: But if you're saying move over, you're not necessarily saying change lanes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But --

COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Somebody can move over within a lane and --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But what I'm saying is that if these signs are going to be used there must be also very careful precautionary measures that they are not fixed on a permanent basis on top of the vehicles. Because these vehicles are being used at different kinds of facilities.

CHAIR FISHER: Gordon?

MR. WONG: Yeah. This sign is particularly designed

for very easy installation removal with three buckles. You go underneath the tailgate. It does not interrupt any tailgate operations.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Just not intended for permanent installation?

MR. WONG: No. Yeah. And we're -- we're -- we're going to have to educate our employee not to use it unless it's on the freeways, and that's basically it.

But again, we can address that policy in the text. But, of course, tow truck driver, it's up to the Committee. We can specify that or --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm just -- I'm just -- I'm now withdrawing my suggestion for tow trucks.

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: So we have had a suggestion that in the red language on the bottom of page 68, Paragraph 2, that we insert the words "On Freeways." And I'm going to make another suggestion that line two where it says "The sign may be mounted no the back of a work vehicle," that we add the word "the sign may be temporarily mounted," just to convey the fact that you take it off when you're not on the freeway itself.

So do we have a motion from the Committee on this? First we'll -- we'll have discussion here, and then we'll go to the audience. Any --

COMMITTEE MEMBER SHRADER: Yes. Just a question.

Again, we're talking about Caltrans maintenance vehicles only?

CHAIR FISHER: There's nothing in here that says Caltrans maintenance vehicles only; 21809 refers to tow trucks, as well, if they so wish to use this sign.

Roberta?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans. Clarification. The intent is to place this when the vehicle is stopped on the shoulder and take it off before they proceed down the roadways, so there's no confusion seeing the sign on a moving vehicle, as well. So I want to make that clarification.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we before we go to the public do we have a motion we'd like to get on the table? John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Operational question for Roberta. Might -- might a sign be permanently mounted but made visible only when desired to be visible by the traveling public? I mean, I'm questioning the word "mounted." Certainly you could think of a permanently mounted sign that would be bagged or covered when not meant to be effective. Do we need some flexibility in the language for that?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That's a good possibility. This is only a prototype of something that was easily mounted and taken off. There was some other suggestions on like a film that can be placed on the tailgate. But the concern was that we didn't want it visible 100 percent of the time.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: One suggestion I might have would be to hinge that sign horizontally at its midpoint so it could be flipped over, closed. Yeah, just like -- like this.

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: So another thought is instead of "temporarily mounted" you could say "temporarily displayed." That would allow you to bag it or cover it or something, whatever you want to do.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I think that's a great suggestion.

MR. WONG: Also, just remember that Part 6 does have strict policies on "when a sign does not apply shall be covered or removed," and that still applies, no matter if it's mounted on the tailgate, on the side of the road, and that it is up to our employees to enforce that. And you see violations everywhere, including our own employees, that when there's no flagger the flag sign would still be there. And that will be true for a short period of time, because from the time they can walk to the sign and start disabling the sign, but -- but for that situation.

And clearly if we're -- we're picking trash on the shoulder, and when we start moving we will turn off the amber light and -- and this sign will not be applied. But not every time we stop pulling trash and we start putting the sign out

first. Would that be acceptable to the Committee? Like we would we start driving, turn off the light, and drive for half a mile, stop again, turn on the amber light, and start picking up trash, and continue to do so every half a mile.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think that's acceptable.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So do we have a motion before we get comments from the public on this?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So I'll make the motion. So I move that we approve Paragraph 2 as written, except it would begin with "On freeways," and then "the language as proposed." And then instead of "Sign may be mounted," as you suggested, instead it will say, "Sign may be temporarily displayed on the back of a work vehicle," and all the other language would be as proposed.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So that's the motion. Do we have a second?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Second by Don. Okay.

At this point I'd like to see if there any comments from the public. Please come up to the podium and state your name.

MR. ROYER: Dave Royer. As an ex-sign designer for the City of Los Angeles for nearly 32 years, the sign is way to small. See your -- your sign there that says right lane -- "2

Right Lanes Closed Ahead," that's posted 1,000 feet in advance of the point the action has to start, to change lanes. So that's the point -- that -- that sign -- the last one of those signs is posted 1,000 in advance of -- of the lane closure.

The sign is -- it's got eight inch letters and it's got six inch letters. And we know the six inch one works. This will work better, no question about that.

From my rough calculations, this sign in the back of a truck is actually at the point that you have to complete that lane change or complete that slowing, you'd have to have letter sizes of over 40 inches. You just aren't going to be able to read that sign. You're driving down I-5 Freeway, light traffic, critical speed on I-5 between Bakersfield and the 580, I saw critical speed was almost 78 miles per hour. That's the 85th percentile speed. No way am I going to be able to read a sign, change lanes, when that sign is posted at the time I have to complete all those actions.

So the sign, even a passing car is not going to be able to read that sign. Even on city streets that's -- and that's one of the reasons, by the way, why we use the arrow board. It's huge, it's big, and it can be seen from over 1,000 feet away. So I mean, it's a great idea for the sign, but it would have to be on a vehicle that was over 1,000 feet down the road for you to be able to read it and make the corrective actions.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I have a question.

MR. ROYER: Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But wouldn't you agree, though, that for the size of a rear tailgate, the limited amount of room we have on a typical vehicle, that this would be a good supplemental placard for this overall advertisement campaign, making people aware that they need to move over or slow down when they're around these vehicles?

MR. ROYER: Yeah, as the advertisement. For -- but for that action -- for the advertisement, no problem. I'd make it as big as I could though. I'd try to have like at least six inch high letters.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. This sign might not stop somebody at the particular indicant from --

MR. ROYER: And -- and this is --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: -- causing an accident.

MR. ROYER: -- by the way, way small. A tailgate of a pickup truck is six feet wide. So a tailgate is six foot wide. The pick up truck itself is six-and-a-half, but the tailgate is around six feet wide. So this sign could be made bigger. You know, this is, what, three foot? So you could, you know, you could have it much bigger. But still, as far as an advertisements sign, great idea. But --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. I think that's what we're proposing here.

MR. ROYER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I agree with you. You could not see this --

MR. ROYER: You could not see this --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- from 1,000 feet away.

MR. ROYER: -- from 1,000 feet away. And I would have, you know, like -- like our construction signs, try to design this with -- with all six inch high letters, so somebody's not trying to -- you know, they'll be able to read it and be able to get around it. So that's all.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any other comments from the public?

MR. WONG: To answer that question, we would park the vehicle, and the worker would get out of the vehicle and could see forward from the point of where the vehicle is parked; right? Usually.

MS. DRUMM: What was that?

MR. WONG: We park the vehicle, display the amber light, and the worker is deployed towards downstream of traffic from where the vehicle is parked?

MS. DRUMM: Often times, yes.

MR. WONG: Yeah. Often times, yes. And then we would have workers picking up trash downstream point from where the vehicle is. And if they can see the sign and start acting and our employees are at 500 feet or 1,000 or even more down

this point, that this sign had worked for the proposed purpose.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I can also imagine a way of constructing this sign where it could be deployed and have quite tall letters, given that you've got a six foot width to work with. It's possible the sign could deploy as -- as a scroll vertically and get close to if not equal 40 inch letters.

MR. WONG: And also we have not drafted the sign spec yet. Usually we have multiple signs as to the same sign. And they're not on the back of a dump truck where we will have a much bigger area to display a much bigger sign. And we would maximize that appropriately, or on the back of TAM there will be a much bigger area that we could use -- utilize this sign and make it a much bigger sign. That's just a spec. And we will continue to work into different equipment as this sign had been approved as the official traffic control device, then we would definitely maximize the real estate we have given for the sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. With the sign, it would almost be better, instead of being rectangular, is to be more square. If you -- if you could fold it up in a safe -- with -- especially since I heard earlier that the "Move Over" is the real campaign that Caltrans is trying to get across. So if the first line says "Move Over or Slow When Amber Lights" and then "Flashing," you know, or something like that you have

-- you know, if you had the sign capability, you know, rather than having something long and linear that you have to read, you know, a teleprompter. You know, a teleprompter is a couple words, then a couple words, you know?

MR. WONG: That -- that's a great, great idea. So you would have -- just say slow -- "Move Over or Slow." And then on the --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: "Move Over" -- "Move Over" --

MR. WONG: -- on the flap -- on the -- the other wide would be "When Amber Light Flashing," and then we folded it up. And on this side would be slow (inaudible) to tell traffic to avoid that vehicle. And then when you're done you un-flap the one thing and then it flaps down and will give us a great enough area to use. And then close it up and keep on going.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: You could even think of something like a projector screen like this where you have an extended ratchet post. Seriously. I'm dead serious.

MR. WONG: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So that the small package goes right up like that. It's easy to manufacture.

MR. WONG: Yes. So --

CHAIR FISHER: Gordon, is that going to be an aluminum sign or a foam board sign?

MR. WONG: Currently, it's made of a material called

Coreplast. And the reason being it's a lightweight, easy to deploy, and makes no scratches on the tailgate.

CHAIR FISHER: So are you confident that if it was the sense of the Committee to approve this device, but to specify that you show a minimum six foot width, that those straps you have would be sufficient to support the larger sign?

MR. WONG: I would imagine on the tailgate sign it may not be much bigger than this versus -- but we will have additional --

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. This is twice as long as that is.

MR. WONG: Yeah. But you have standard pickup, then you have the -- the larger full-size pickup. They have different tailgate with --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: You also have your brake lights that you can't cover. So --

CHAIR FISHER: All right. Thank you. We -- no other public comments, I take it?

So we bring this back to the Committee. We have a motion. We have a second.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: -- we have a desire to use a larger width. Any further comments? Hamid?

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just -- just one comment of clarification, that the paragraph, the last paragraph on

page 68, when we say work vehicle does not necessarily apply to the tow trucks, that we are not making this mandatory use for a tow truck or even implying that they must use it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, it says "may." This whole this is a "may" statement.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Still, you may want to -- I don't want someone to come and argue that tow trucks must have this sign displayed.

CHAIR FISHER: It says "may be temporarily displayed."

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: They should. Well, why don't they, since they may, that this is for Caltrans vehicles.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's not limited to Caltrans.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Well, and I can't imagine that Caltrans is going to be able to deploy this on all 40,000 cars that they might have in their fleet either. So --

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just for the purpose -- if you don't want to change the text I'm okay with that. But I want the minutes to reflect that it's the recommendation of the Committee and Caltrans' understanding that the interpretation of the last paragraph on page 68 does not by any means, shape or form require a tow truck driver to have these signs.

CHAIR FISHER: Agreed. It is an option statement.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we bring it back to the Committee. We have a motion that's been seconded. It's been expressed that there is a desire to use the widest feasible width. And I guess we would entrust Caltrans to determine what that is, in order to approve visibility.

Are we ready to vote on this item? Okay. So the motion is to add the words "on freeways," and to change "mounted" to "temporarily displayed," and to ask Caltrans to show the sign specifications with the widest feasible width of the sign that would be larger than the sign that's been presented to us.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Or the largest characters, even if it was more of a vertical sign than a horizontal sign.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So with that understanding, all of those in favor of approving this sign, say aye.

ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR FISHER: I believe that's unanimous. Okay.

So I've been told by Hamid that he may have to leave now, but you're welcome to stay. So we have only nine members of the Committee left. Seven are required to approve items. And it's my intention that we stay maybe one more hour. And then whatever items we don't complete we bring back to the next Committee meeting.

SECRETARY SINGH: Up to 4:40.

CHAIR FISHER: 4:40?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. What's going on at 4:40?

SECRETARY SINGH: No. After 4:40. We need to stop at 4:40.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Devinder has a plane to catch.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Fair enough. Fair enough.

MR. ROYER: And, also, the parking lot says I have to be out of there by five o'clock.

CHAIR FISHER: Or we're going to tow your vehicle away. Okay. So 4:40. Okay. Because we'll have some small items after the big items to address, like the next meeting date and location.

So we have another item on this matter, notes, and the Figure 106(CA). Gordon, you want to walk us through that?

MR. WONG: This is a typical that was created because on the federal document it only shows minor encroachment -- "Shoulder work with minor encroachment on low speed -- low speed roadways." And our maintenance specifies that we are allowed to encroach up to two feet on the high speed (inaudible) roads, and there's no guidance in the California MUTCD to do so. So this was created

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Excuse me. What page again?

MR. WONG: Page 70.

CHAIR FISHER: On page 69 and 70.

MR. WONG: 69 and 70.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. And then you show a number of --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- optional signs, as well.

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Can you walk us through the optional signs? Apparently these are not shown on the curve figure, or you're just setting the word "optional?"

MR. WONG: It's -- no. This is a brand new figure with brand new notes. And they -- they are optional based on -- all optional signs, except the plaques. The plaques is optional because in other figures they're optional. The signs are optional because they are the -- a typical layout of a speed reduction. And when you do have a narrow lane situation it's recommended to lower the speed to provide the additional safety features.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So the optional signs show the speed reduction due to road work --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- and the end of the road work so that --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- and the end of the lower speed so that they can resume the speed. And then it adds --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- a plaque that shows --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- for how many miles this condition applies.

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: And the key thing here is the ten-foot rule.

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Any question regarding this proposal from Committee members?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Is this intended to apply to any Caltrans freeway?

CHAIR FISHER: Any highway where high speeds.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: High speeds. Okay. There's no consideration for bicycles here. If you have a high speed highway and shoulders being used by bicyclists, which is where a bicyclist is logically going to travel, unlike some of the other TAs that I see in the packet there is no -- the bicyclist is going to see very clearly that they need to -- to merge around the work area. But the motorist may not be alerted that something much slower than them is going to be encroaching. And I think this is a little weak on the bicycle side.

MR. WONG: Okay. Comment statement, I will go back and add the bicycle warning signs.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, I think -- I think at least the bicycle warning sign. But the motorist -- and my question pursuant to that is when you define a minor encroachment -- I'm kind of new to temporary traffic control -- but when you define a minor encroachment is it just -- does it just consist of the shadow vehicle and a work vehicle closely ahead of it and a small cone zone behind? Is there a length that defines a minor encroachment?

MR. WONG: To tell you the truth, I'm not asking for 100 percent approval on this particular item because it's very detailed. And I'm trying to collect comments and -- and try to get the consensus from the Committee that this is on the right track. And I would go back and work in those comments and continue to work on this typical.

CHAIR FISHER: Don, did you have a comment?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: Yes. I believe that, in answer to John's question, the minor encroachment is the lateral encroachment. It's not the length, it's the lateral. So anything that goes into the lane.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: so it's -- it's -- it's a setup that narrows the lanes so that work could be done immediately adjacent to the lane?

MR. WONG: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

MR. WONG: That's correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: In such situations what's typically being done? What's the nature of such work? It's actually --

MR. WONG: Yeah. Please.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's actually a leading question. I'm wondering whether it's possible to consider, at least for some of these work conditions, accommodating the bicyclist by allowing them to proceed dismounted to the right of the work vehicle, along the outside edge of the paved area.

MR. WONG: Shoulder closures, we work both on the shoulder and beyond the shoulder.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's what I thought.

MR. WONG: So detouring a bicycle to the right would be -- would not be very visible and we --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I just -- I just wanted you to rule that out. Okay.

MR. WONG: Yeah. And then we would add a "Share the Lane," a bike-share lane signs into the package, so this will have to share the temporary with -- with --

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think -- I think that's a good start.

MR. WONG: -- the vehicle.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have a -- oh, yes.

Okay. My alternate is suggesting that the -- perhaps a work zone version of the new R4-11, "Bikes May Use Full Lane" sign would be appropriate here.

MR. WONG: Okay. That's a great comment. Just like the other item, I would like to have a few -- and if any volunteers would help me work on this item I would really appreciate it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'd be glad to work on any ones where there is a shoulder closure involved.

MR. WONG: All right.

CHAIR FISHER: Or alternatively, do you want us to consider approving this with the clear understanding that the typical bikeway signing, "Share the Road," you know, that type of thing, would be incorporated as it is on other drawings, or would you prefer to see it and review it before the next meeting?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm actually not prepared to go there because I've looked ahead at the other TAs that are under consideration here, and there are several of them that I think the approach is in need of significant reconsideration. For example, when a lane is closed and traffic has moved onto the shoulder, that has the same affect as this. And I think at least one of the other TAs, that it might be worth considering whether the lane traffic should be moved towards the center shoulder instead. So I think it's a

general issue of what you do on a high speed highway when you do anything impacting shoulder bicycle travel.

I'm not trying to put a cork in all that kind of maintenance activity. I just think that to ask a motorist to respond rapidly to essentially an almost zero speed -- you know, high differential speed is the issue here.

MR. WONG: Due to time constraints, I really want to move forward because we have a few safety items that I really need to go through and get approval from the Committee to change Caltrans existing policies for our maintenance crew.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just have one other comment then. So if you're going to rework this, the only other thing I wanted to bring up again is if you can -- and we talked about this -- this at a previous meeting -- if you can add any language or footnotes to these various TAs that include bicycles to try to avoid blocking the bicycles when placing these signs. Because quite often when I'm riding through construction zones, consequently like weaving into traffic to go around the "Share the Road" sign.

MR. WONG: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And so, you know, although we -- the displays are very good about where they show the signs, it doesn't seem to be where they actually get put in real life.

MR. WONG: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So --

MR. WONG: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- we would like -- I'd like a note to that effect on these various signs.

MR. WONG: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So my understanding is Caltrans wants to bring this back to the next meeting --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- and wants to work with members of the Committee to finesse it to make sure that we've adequately addressed --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- bicycle and pedestrian --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- considerations.

MR. WONG: Uh-huh.

CHAIR FISHER: So, John, I heard you say that you want to work with Gordon offline on this. Is there anyone else that wants to work with Gordon on this? If not, then we'll just -- we'll let you and Gordon prepare it for our next meeting.

MR. WONG: Okay. Okay. The -- the very next page is 12-6. And this was a proposal by Mr. Steven Pyburn, who

already left the meeting. So I will defer this item to the next meeting.

CHAIR FISHER: I'm sorry. No. On what page?

MR. BHULLAR: Page 75.

MR. WONG: 75.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So you want to defer this item, or to continue this item?

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: All right.

MR. WONG: And on item -- for 12-3 --

CHAIR FISHER: On what page?

MR. WONG: Page 42.

CHAIR FISHER: Page 42?

MR. WONG: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: Is that this item?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, 42.

CHAIR FISHER: 42?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

MR. WONG: This is an item that's proposed by local agencies. And --

CHAIR FISHER: Well, wait a second. That's not this agenda item.

SECRETARY SINGH: I'm sorry?

MR. WONG: 12-3?

SECRETARY SINGH: No. No. No. We're not talking

about this one now.

MR. WONG: On Page 42.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. But we haven't resolved this agenda item. We still need to go back to the "Uneven Lane," "Uneven Pavement."

MR. WONG: Oh.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Go back to that. Go back to that.

MR. WONG: Can we do -- do that at the very end? I really have time -- that -- that's a sign that's already using . We're not going to get any -- it's not -- doesn't have an immediate need on that.

CHAIR FISHER: So you want to discuss Item 12-3 now?

MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

MR. WONG: Yes, 12-3 on page 42.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Then we'll have to limit the discussion to 4:30, because we need to go back to the "Uneven Lane" --

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- "Uneven Pavement" sign, and that would only give us ten minutes to do so.

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: So you're sure you want to tackle this now?

MR. WONG: No. That's another I want to skip and I

want the local agency to help me to finish this item. Because this is coming from SFMTA and L.A. County. And again, it's their comments. I just put their comments ad converted into an agenda item, and I really would like local agencies' help on it because I'm not an expert on local agencies. And all these standards are only applied to local agencies now.

CHAIR FISHER: And I note that there was no recommendation by Caltrans on this. So if we're going to continue it and work with local agencies I'd like there to be a recommendation from the sponsor when you bring this back to the Committee so that we know that there's some consensus behind it when -- when we hear it.

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: So on Item 12-3, which members or alternate members want to work with Caltrans on this item?

MR. WINTER: As an alternate I would be fine with working with him. As he noted, one of the comments did come from Los Angeles County.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So Bill Winter will work with you.

Any other members of the Committee want to work with Caltrans on this? Okay. So I see none.

So, Bill, you and Gordon will work closely on this offline and come to a resolution and a recommendation when you bring it back to the Committee.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes, Roberta?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: A point of clarification on sponsors. When these -- a number of these items will come through our solicitation of comments on the new manual that we just produced, and so we're cleaning up a lot of items. Caltrans has -- is listed as sponsors. However, a lot of these comments came from cities and counties. Would it be more appropriate for another sponsor of the Committee to be moving forward with those? For instance, this one being a county where the county -- a county member of the CTC would be a more appropriate sponsor.

CHAIR FISHER: If -- if Caltrans is not comfortable championing this item then it may be advisable to advise the agency to bring the matter to the Committee through a sponsor. I assume when I reviewed the draft agenda that this would have the concurrence of Caltrans. But if Caltrans is not in a position to recommend these items it would be more appropriate to ask the agency involved to come through the Committee through a sponsor.

SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) This is Devinder. In this case I suggest some process be involved. So there are two countirs, from L.A. County, SF counties, who made comments, the two local representative will sponsor the items which is actually overlapping, it's not coming just from one county, it

coming from two counties.

MR. WONG: I'm willing to split them and work with both and come with a resolution.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, the tricky thing is always is San Francisco a city or a county? And it's both.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. But maybe Caltrans could play the broker role and say --

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- San Francisco, we've got your request. It's very similar to L.A. County's. Why don't we convene and see what we can work out --

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- and bring back to the Committee. And you know, that's a valuable role for you to play. And again, I admire the initiative of Caltrans in taking all these previous comments that came to you and to try to improve the manual.

So could you serve as the broker to include L.A. County --

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: -- and -- and the City/County of San Francisco on this and --

MR. WONG: I will be more than --

CHAIR FISHER: -- see if you can't --

MR. WONG: -- happy to.

CHAIR FISHER: Great.

COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: (Off mike.) On the same subject, Mr. Chairman, do you want to ask (inaudible) Part 2, and Part 3, and Part 4, all the comments that we have seen (inaudible)?

CHAIR FISHER: You're asking me?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah. If you want --

CHAIR FISHER: Not at this time. I think we've bit off a little bit more than we can chew with Part 6. I would like to get Part 6 resolved with all these items. It is quite technical. But I do think something we should look ahead to is finessing some of these other chapters. I just think because of the number of outstanding items in Part 6 we want to kind of complete that first, and then maybe we could look at the other parts and figure out how we might improve them. So that might happen under your watch, Michael. Okay. So --

SECRETARY SINGH: Johnny had follow up on the same subject.

CHAIR FISHER: Oh, yes, Johnny.

MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just -- I wanted to, like in a summary form, I wanted to discuss what we are doing with Part 6. We just dove into it and we started working on it. So this one here, what we are trying to do is, of course, trying to resolve the comments that were quite involved. And, of course, we had deferred them. But at the

same time I do recall in our workshops we had discussed that the need is there, of course, because there are a lot of comments on all the parts, and we will work on each part. But at the same time the need was also expressed that we had never taken the liberty to look at each part. And there are a lot of other things that need to be looked at to make sure they are consistent, meaning when we do the (inaudible), apart from the public comments are the comments we received, each part that maybe looks at it from there are other things that need to be correct. So if we do it as one part at a time and do it thoroughly, then at least a few years down the road we will have done a better job.

CHAIR FISHER: Very good point. We handle one paragraph at a time with the mays, shoulds, shalls. And sometimes when you look at the two pages that precede it and the two pages that come after it, it doesn't all flow together. And I think that would be a valuable endeavor, but it's a lot of work. But I think it would be worth undertaking at some point. Okay.

So we deferred Item 12-3. We haven't tackled Item 12-2 or 12-6.

MR. WONG: 12-6 is deferred to.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Continue. So --

MR. WONG: Well, Item 12-2, there is a few urgent matters that I would like to bring to the Committee's attention

right now. And for the rest of it there's lots of work that needs to be done. And I can use the last few minutes and do that. But again, I'm asking the Committee to approve -- take a vote on each line. That way Caltrans have a direction as which way to go.

And I would like to bring attention to page 21 of the agenda item, section 6F-60, Portable Changeable Message Signs. And the proposed policy is on page 22. And please see the deleted policy is,

"If the sign trailer is located within 15 feet of the edge of the traveled way, it should be delineated with a taper consisting of 9 cones placed at a spacing of 25 feet apart."

And that was put in the manual because that was the original Caltrans shoulder closure standards, 9 cones, 25 feet apart, and it adds up to 200 feet. And it does not meet the needs in a lot of urban situations where there at a very low speed and you have a PCMS and stretch it out for a whole 200 feet.

So we replaced that policy with the existing policies that's already in the manual, but just from different part. And then the proposed policy on top is,

"When used, advanced warning delineation is not needed if the portable changeable message sign is behind a barrier, more than 2 feet behind the curb, or 15 feet or more from

the edge of any roadway."

And that's an existing policy in Section 6C-04 for shoulder works -- for work beyond shoulders.

"And if portable changeable message sign is placed on shoulder or partially blocking the shoulder (including overhangs), the shoulder should be closed off by a taper of channelizing devices with a length of 1/3 L using the formulas in Tables 6C-3, 6C-3(CA) and 6C-4."

And that's existing policy from 6C-08. And then, "Option: For incident management before additional resources are available or for short duration use or when portable message sign is placed well beyond the shoulder but partially within 15 feet from the edge of any roadway it may be delineated with a minimum of a 40 feet taper formed by three traffic cones."

That was the intention because lots of portable message signs are used for incident management. And when that happens the timing goes because Caltrans has just arrived on the scene and try to prevent any secondary accident from happening. So we only have time to drop the message, turn it on, and quickly drop three cones and keep on moving until additional personnel is on the scene, then we can place more cones to delineate the portable message signs.

And then the next paragraph describes when it's not used, so,

"If a portable changeable message is not -- is stored within a shoulder or partially blocking a shoulder, the shoulder should be closed according to Section 6G-07. If the portable message sign is stored well beyond the shoulder but within the clear zone, it should be delineated by a taper of channelizing devices with a length of 1/3 L using the formulas in Table 6C-3, 6C-3(CA) and 6C-4."

And that's existing policy from 6C-08, again, and, "Clear zones is defined by AASHTO's 'Roadside Design Guide,' (see Section 1A.11)."

CHAIR FISHER: Gordon, comment.

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: I think I support this.

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: I think I like the words. But my eyes glazed over when I read this. And I think it would be very helpful to depict this in a figure. You've got things here, the 2 feet, the 15 feet, the 1/3rd L, the clear zone, the 30 foot taper. In order to visualize this I think it would be helpful to have a figure that shows these.

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: And I think that would --

MR. WONG: Yes. And --

CHAIR FISHER: You know, I'd be more comfortable

approving it if I could see it delineated in a figure.

MR. WONG: And again, we are going to replace the maintenance policy based on this new policy. And my thought was we're going to create a table, which would be based on the speed, to create a table of how far of a taper and the distance between each channelizing device, and to be inserted here and -- well, the new direction is -- well, what I've been doing is putting the table at the end of the section. So that table would be inserted to the end of the section.

CHAIR FISHER: But do you think you can include appropriate figures?

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: But would you like it to be in the typical or do you want it to be here? It's not -- it -- it's -- this is Chapter 6F, and there's layout figure in this particular parts, not historically.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, I mean, I welcome other points in here.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. But there's a lot going on here.

CHAIR FISHER: But there's a lot there. There's a lot there.

The other comment I had is I was pleased to see that in the background you indicated the section -- I'm on page 12

and 13 -- you indicated the section that's proposed for change, what the change is, the background information. I think it would be helpful for the next meeting to have another column that would say in succinct fashion the rationale for the change.

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: I just think, given the number of items here, it would help the item move more -- more quickly. So I -- I know it would require a little bit of work. But I applaud what you've done thus far.

John?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Paragraph 32, the red text, the first line, the word "stored," I would suggest adding the word "either" after the word "stored" so that it's clear that it's stored either within a shoulder or stored partially blocking a shoulder. And then --

MR. WONG: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And then I'd ask my fellow Committee members to weigh in on whether "stored" in that context is sufficiently clear. To me it's -- it's used to describe a changeable message sign that's not being used at the moment; is that correct? Stored, as in not deployed?

CHAIR FISHER: You mean "stored" instead of "posted?"

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm -- my assumption is that stored means that it's not being used right now; is that

correct?

CHAIR FISHER: It's in the yard, in other words.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, no, it's -- it's under Paragraph 32. So Paragraph 32 begins, "When the signs are not being used." So does this stored condition modify that or augment that?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: How about just carrying the word "relocated" down from earlier in the paragraph?

MR. WONG: Again, we want to reach the end to this particular matter. So I will work with any members that are willing to work with me.

But I would like to take a vote on deleting the existing policy, though, because that's really stopping Caltrans to do up any further policies on this particular issue.

CHAIR FISHER: You mean the policy, as in black text?

MR. WONG: No. It's crossed out at the end of Paragraph 33.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Red strikeout.

CHAIR FISHER: The 9 cones at 25 foot spaces?

MR. WONG: Yes. And that is the current policy.

CHAIR FISHER: Comments from the Committee members on -- on that? I mean, if I can't visualize what all the other red text says I'm having difficulty picturing if this is a superior way of doing it versus --

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- the simple statement regarding 15 feet and 9 cones and 25 feet.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And are you deleting federal language?

MR. WONG: No. This is California language. It's in blue.

Can you pull that up please, Johnny?

MR. BHULLAR: What's that?

MR. WONG: Can you pull that up, Section 6F-60, 6-0.

CHAIR FISHER: Yeah. Probably this should be shown in blue text with cross-out.

MR. WONG: It is in blue text.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's shown in red, what we have.

MR. WONG: Oh. Okay. So next time I will do that. But --

MR. BHULLAR: 6F-60?

MR. WONG: Yeah. And this is for locals and counties and cities, too. If you don't -- because the text is in the current manual, if you do anything less the lawyer may come back and say you didn't do the 200 feet, which is pretty significant. That's over half of -- half of a block, usually. At the end, very end.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. It's Paragraph 33.

MR. BHULLAR: Paragraph 60?

MR. WONG: 33, 3-3.

CHAIR FISHER: Paragraph 33.

MR. WONG: Right there.

CHAIR FISHER: And what's wrong with that language?

MR. WONG: It's -- it work out to be 9 cones of 200 feet stretch. It's really long and it does not work for -- in urban setting when there's -- when you place the -- a PCMS.

CHAIR FISHER: And so what's wrong with 200 foot taper?

MR. WONG: It's too long.

CHAIR FISHER: Too long?

MR. WONG: For cities and counties, for slow speed roads.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So like for -- in an urban area that would take out nine parking spaces with -- with orange cones --

MR. WONG: Yeah.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: -- if the changeable message sign was put in the parking lane, because that's considered in the shoulder of the roadway, and the roadway is 25 miles an hour.

CHAIR FISHER: So it would be based on the taper rate, the appropriate taper rate for that speed; correct?

MR. MILLER: If it's in an unimproved area I read

that it requires the nine cones to be in the unimproved area, also. I think it's not a very well written phrase. It should be crossed out.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So we think it should be rewritten.

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: I think if we have a figure that will help us to know if we like the -- the word set.

MR. WONG: So can we take a vote on just deleting that paragraph so we can further develop the new policy?

CHAIR FISHER: Well, do we want to delete that language separate from adopting new language and new figures?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I was just going to echo that. It doesn't make sense to me that we're deleting a requirement --

MR. WONG: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: -- but we haven't formalized a new requirement.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

MR. WONG: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: So we will just move forward. And -- and so -- so the Committee has the consensus of supporting the policy change and just need to work out the language?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I believe so.

CHAIR FISHER: I believe I support it but I feel I need to see the figures that show it so that I can better comprehend it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because like there is nothing even in this paragraph stating that this only applies to low speed roadways. So it might be in an urban area but a 45-mile-an-hour roadway, I wouldn't want to go with something shorter than 200 feet.

So it seems like there's a whole lot here from incident management in one paragraph to something that's longer term. It seems like we need more -- more meat in here to know exactly what's going on, more clarification.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FOGLE: I think -- I think you need to provide wording such that, you know, you're talking about a taper that's appropriate for the speed on the street.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

MR. WONG: Okay. And we're already almost at the end of the -- our time. And --

CHAIR FISHER: We are six -- we are four minutes beyond the end --

MR. WONG: Okay. And --

CHAIR FISHER: -- because I need to go back to Johnny.

MR. WONG: And as you can see, this item has a lot of

changes. And here's what I would recommend for the Committee is that if there isn't an objection I would like to go ahead and draft the -- a new draft of Part 6 based on all the comments and -- and the -- the -- all the changes that were accepted today, and we post the draft online and open to public comment. And then we can come back and address -- address the public comment and fulfill the needs of public hearing. Then we can adopt it as a whole new manual for the Committee members. You can assign your staff on this particular matter, the temporary traffic contractors to review and comment. Then I will bring the comments back to the Committee.

CHAIR FISHER: That would be an unusual procedure to post the public comment.

SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) I'm sorry, John. We will not post public comments. We will send to the Committee members and take comments from them. The public will have opportunity when I will send it out. They will have 30 days to make comments. If you (inaudible) you see a lot of new comments, so it will be a never-ending process. So let's delete this portion and we can email to the Committee members and ask them comments before we issue -- before we send out a (inaudible).

CHAIR FISHER: So I'd like to ask the experts at Caltrans to work on this and vet it, make sure Caltrans as an organization can support the changes here. And I know that

will require extensive effort. But I think if you do that, then by the time you send it to Committee members their comments will be limited in number, and the discussion, therefore, will be minimized here when it comes to the full Committee. Fair?

MR. WONG: Yeah. In that situation I wild like to -- I can conduct workshops and go through. But because there's 50-plus changes and -- for the Committee to be on every one, that's just -- I think I will easily pick up the next year-and-a-half of all the Committee meetings and just to talk about each item.

CHAIR FISHER: Gordon, Would it -- you know, just for your consideration would it be possible to maybe separate ones that you believe to be more in the area of editorial comments, clarifications, versus policy changes? Because --

MR. WONG: Okay. It was -- it was my -- I did categorize them and I did have 17 items. And I was told by my management to consolidate them into this one huge item. And so if that's the direction the Committee would like I would -- I can separate them back into the little items and we can clear them.

CHAIR FISHER: I just think it would be easier for the Committee to go through the editorial-type comments or clarification comments first, and then save more of the big policy issues for last. Because if we can breeze through the

first ones then, you know, we've accomplished a number of items. And then later we get to the big hairy ones.

MR. WONG: Okay. That is the opposite direction I was given from my management, so I do not know.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, just a suggestion from me, but it's certainly up to Caltrans on they wish to handle that.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. We'll take that under consideration.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROBINSON: John, if I might, I just shared with John -- with Don that it may be a good idea, since you have 50-plus, to identify those that Caltrans can support or does support and would like to see changes to, and come back with those as the sponsor. Those -- those that may not be on that, perhaps a letter to those people who made the request and indicate to them that they should find a sponsor to identify that on a future CTCDC meeting. That would reduce the number that you need to work on as Caltrans staff, and therefore -- and kind of spread the work around the state.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: The current 50-plus changes are from Caltrans. They're not from outside agencies. Those are already split up.

CHAIR FISHER: Those are ones that you recommend?

MR. WONG: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Well, I think we'll have to

feed it to the Committee in bite-sized chunks. And I -- again, I applaud Caltrans for their initiative in going through this. I think over the next few meetings we'll have to address so many of these. And I think we'll have to decide for the agenda how many of these we can handle versus the other agenda items that we have. With that, I would like to conclude this matter.

And, Johnny, if you're ready, if you think we can handle "Uneven Lane" and "Uneven Pavement" I'd like to see if we can quickly tackle that before we adjourn the meeting.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: John, I wanted to confirm that I committed to work with Gordon between now and the next meeting to do a complete pass of all the Chapter 6 submittals -- the Part 6 submittals so that a bunch of pedestrian issues can be tagged and either resolved or sent off for further work. And I heard that somebody from L.A. County will assist MTA L.A. County local agency issue?

MR. MILLER: It reconciles Agenda Item 12-3.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Great. Johnny, are you ready for the "Uneven Lane" --

MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: -- "Uneven Pavement?" And let's try to do this quickly --

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- if you think there's going to be a consensus.

MR. BHULLAR: Let me know if I overdid it a little bit, but I've done my best shot.

So basically it's going to start out with the guidance. There were three paragraphs. The first paragraph is,

> "The 'Uneven Lanes' sign or the 'Uneven Pavement' sign should be used during operations that create a difference of two inches or more in elevation between adjacent lanes or within the physical area of the lane that is open to travel and the elevation difference exists for a continuous length along the roadway based on engineering judgment."

That part at the end, we can skip it if you want or break it into separate paragraphs.

Basically, what that is trying to do, and I picked it up from elsewhere in the manual, is that if this elevation difference is only five feet longitudinally or ten feet versus it's really long, based on engineering judgment, that's when you are going to bring into play the signs. Or do we want to leave it out? Because for the three inch or more the "Low Shoulder" signs, that's where they're using this language that the continuous length along the road will be based on engineering judgment, so there is not a one-spot issue and that makes it --

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Johnny, so as I read it, go the

second paragraph that's in red --

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- that means if you have a one inch difference it still says that the "Uneven Lane" sign should be used where the elevation difference is located in close proximity to the lane line.

MR. BHULLAR: Oh, I see. Basically, I think on the second and third paragraph I should be starting out with,

"If used the 'Uneven Lane' sign should be used when the elevation difference is located on or in close proximity of the lane line, not within the physicality of the lane. Then the 'Uneven Pavement' sign should be used when the elevation difference is located within the physicality of the lane, not on or in close proximity of the lane."

CHAIR FISHER: Well, where is the "may" statements, "it may be used?"

MR. BHULLAR: No. I took out the "may" statement because if we are going to have the two inch or more be the criteria for both the signs, then they will be sure, and here is why. Very similarly, for the three inch of more criteria the feds have it -- okay. So if you see here, Paragraph 2 here, it says, "The low shoulder" -- or, actually, no, Paragraph 3 and 4. It's the same sign. But Paragraph 3, the sign is used --

"Should be used where -- where an unprotected shoulder

drop of a distance to the pavement exceeds three inches in depth for a significant length."

Paragraph 4 is the same sign, maybe -- actually, number two paragraph is, "When the elevation different is less than three then it's an option; more than three it's a guidance."

SECRETARY SINGH: I think, Johnny this needs more work. So we should make the effort.

MR. BHULLAR: Okay. All right.

SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) (Inaudible) and then bring it next time.

MR. BHULLAR: That's fine.

SECRETARY SINGH: There's too many things (inaudible).

MR. BHULLAR: But basically if it's the same criteria we'll have to keep them the same.

CHAIR FISHER: Johnny, where the elevation difference -- let's be quiet. Let's be quiet.

SECRETARY SINGH: Please. Please. Please. Please.

CHAIR FISHER: Where the elevation difference is one inch, I guess the question is: Do you have the option of using the sign --

MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: -- under the language that you propose?

MR. BHULLAR: Under the language that is proposed, basically the "Uneven Lane" sign is an option without any criteria, meaning an engineer's judgment. But that's covered in Chapter 2C, not here.

CHAIR FISHER: Oh. Okay.

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) So that by default is without any (inaudible) it's an option.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. WONG: A quick question. Is there any Committee member who would like to work with me on the "Uneven Lane" sign, since it's deferred to the next meeting?

CHAIR FISHER: On the what sign?

MR. WONG: "Uneven Lane" sign -- "Uneven Pavement" sign. Sorry.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'd actually -- I'd actually like to -- to at least be in the loop on this. Because I look at Table 1003.6 in the Highway Design Manual. And the parallel to travel tolerance for step discontinuity, a longitudinal step, in other words, is three-eighths inch for a bicycle. So if I -- if I am approaching a condition where the roadway is being overlaid and there's a big jump in the lanes I'm going to be extremely cautious and it's probably not going to be a big factor. But when the condition gets to be less high and I may not pick it up, that's the real danger if I steer my bicycle along and I don't realize it's there. So I'd

like to be at least -- at least review the language.

MR. WONG: Okay. That's great. Because current policy does not include any bicycle provisions. So that's a great idea to add bicycle provision into the policy.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's less likely to be an issue for repaving of the lanes of a high speed highway. It's more likely to be an issue for shoulder discontinuities.

MR. WONG: Okay. And then the one last thing is if Caltrans would like to experiment with the PCMS closure policy, do we need authority from the Committee or we do not have the authority to have to --

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) (Inaudible) California MUTCD?

MR. WONG: Well, currently it --

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) (Inaudible.)

MR. WONG: Currently it's 9 cones and 200 feet. And we're going to test to use a shoulder closure.

MR. BHULLAR: The nine cones, is that a guidance or an option?

MR. WONG: It's a guidance.

MR. BHULLAR: (Off mike.) Okay. Then on a location for certain projects you are bending the rules of the California MUTCD to (inaudible).

MR. WONG: So that I would not need Committee approval to experiment with the new policy then?

MR. BHULLAR: Because you're not really proposing a change to the policy. You're trying to just experiment with -- and just reading from the guidance of the current --

MR. WONG: Okay. Perfect.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay.

MR. BHULLAR: That's my opinion.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I'll just quickly, Item 11-1. If you turn to pages 109 through 111 it shows that Caltrans has requested approval from the feds on substantial compliance, and they have granted that. So that's why the --

MR. BHULLAR: And this time around it was -- for the first time we did it in the right order, so to speak. So basically we requested from the feds and the feds review the document. And then once they gave us the substantial conformance then (inaudible). So this is what Steve put a lot of effort into.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you, Johnny. Okay. We go to Item 9, next meeting. Our next meeting will be in Northern California. Do we have some proposals from members who would like to host it in their city or county?

SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) There's one request from John Presley. He was our Committee member who was asking to have Santa Cruz. We can -- we can determine the location, but let's look for days. Do we want to end up in May or the first week of June?

CHAIR FISHER: First week in June?

SECRETARY SINGH: That's --

MR. ROYER: Memorial Day that weekend, so --

SECRETARY SINGH: So we can move to the second week of June.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: That's graduation.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So how about the last week in May, but before the Memorial Day weekend?

SECRETARY SINGH: That's the 24th.

CHAIR FISHER: That would be Thursday, May 24th?

SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So tentatively Thursday, May 24th. Do we want to hold it in Santa Cruz? I seem to recall, you fly into San Jose Airport and you take a car south.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. You actually take an express bus out.

CHAIR FISHER: Can you?

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well --

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: They have nice bike trails.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- that's from the transit center.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. All right. Or is there any other location in Northern California where we want to hold the meeting? But John Presley requested that we meet in that

location?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I wish I had a nice meeting room like this to offer.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No winery is offering space.

CHAIR FISHER: Pardon?

COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I don't think I have a location in my agency that's feasible for the logistics of this meeting.

CHAIR FISHER: Well, if we hear no other ideas we'll tentatively plan to hold it in Santa Cruz.

SECRETARY SINGH: That's one of the possibilities. If not, then I'll go up to Sacramento. That's the last resort.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So with that I guess we conclude out meeting. And I want to thank you all for staying so late in the day. And we'll see you in May.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Meeting adjourned?

CHAIR FISHER: Meeting adjourned.

(Thereupon the California Traffic Control Devices Committee Adjourned at 4:49 p.m.)

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Martha L. Nelson, attest that the foregoing proceedings were transcribed to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney of the parties, nor financially interested in the action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 23rd day of February, 2012.

/s/ Martha L. Nelson