

APPEARANCES

MEMBERS

John Fisher, Chairperson

Devinder Singh, Secretary

Dwight Ku, AAA, Northern California

Larry Patterson, League of California Cities

Jeff Knowles, League of California Cities

Michael Robinson, CSAC

Farhad Mansourian, County of Marin

Wayne Henley, CT

Hamid Bahadori, ACSC

John Keller, CHP and Jim Baross, ExOfficio from CBAC

ALSO PRESENT

Deputy Chief Luna, City of Long Beach

Amy Burton, City Attorneys Office, City of Long Beach

Shirley Land, Land CM Corporation

Jacob Babico, County of San Bernardino

Johnny Bhullar

Jim Baross, California Bicycle Advisory Committee

Dave Royer, University of California

Ryan Snyder, Ryan Snyder Associates

Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration

Bill Winter

Conrad Lapinski, City of Dana Point

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

ALSO PRESENT

David Roseman, City of Long Beach

Andrea White-Kjoss, California Bicycle Coalition

Mark Greenwood, City of Palm Desert

Zhongren Wong, California Department of Transportation

Emanuel Hylee, Marin County Public Works

Paul Barbe, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>Action Items:</u>	
1. Membership	12
2. Introduction	17
3. Approval of Minutes (February 2, 2011 Meetings)	19
4. Public Comments	20
5. Public Hearing	
11-1	29
11-2	31
11-3a	63
11-4a	113
11-6	132
11-7	135
11-8	150
11-9	155
11-10	168
11-11	185
6. Request for Experimentation	
11-12	204
08-20	198
11-13	204
09-13	176
7. Information Items	
11-01	220
11-14	220
8. Tabled Items	131
9. Next Meeting	235
10. Adjourn	237

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 9:10 A.M.

(The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m.)

LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 2011

MEETING BEGINS AT 9:10 A.M.

MR. FISHER: Good morning. I'd like to call to order the summer meeting of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee for July 20th in the -- in the beautiful downtown City of Long Beach. I can't remember having a meeting in Long Beach before, so it's long overdue. Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County, and it's long overdue to have a meeting here.

And we decided to have a meeting here because Long Beach has been very active in the discussions with the committee. And they have a number of bicycle initiatives that we wanted to take a look at and observe. And as I drove in this morning I had an opportunity to see some of them, and I think we'd like to learn a lot more about them. So it's good to be here in Long Beach.

And I'd like to thank Deputy Chief Luna from the City of Long Beach. Is Chief Luna here?

DEPUTY LUNA: Right here.

MR. FISHER: Okay. I want to thank you for your hospitality this morning. I'd also like to thank Dave Roseman who I know made many of the arrangements here. And maybe you could just give us -- you know, tell us a little bit about your

1 city and downtown here.

2 DEPUTY LUNA: Absolutely. And thank you for the
3 opportunity. And some of you are probably wondering why would
4 an officer or a police officer come and talk to this committee?
5 And I'm -- and from my perspective I think most of you, if not
6 all of you, are engineers. And I here you guys get pretty
7 wild. So I've been told to -- to make sure that all of you
8 guys behave while you're in the city. Just kidding. Just
9 kidding.

10 Welcome to the City of Long Beach. Thank you for
11 choosing to have this committee meeting here in the city. Just
12 a quick overview about the City of Long Beach. We're the sixth
13 largest city in the State of California. We were the fifth.
14 Fresno just beat us out. It's amazing when you think of the
15 census information that just came out. All of us in the city
16 believed that the city was actually growing and it actually
17 grew by about 2,000 people, which wasn't much. I guess the
18 economy had an affect from that perspective.

19 Our population is roughly about -- or, I'm sorry,
20 462,000 folks. We're about 50 square miles. We're bordered,
21 which is unusual, by 13 different cities around us, which talks
22 a little bit about the region and the complexity of traffic
23 and -- and the way that things move around.

24 Apart from the population, it's a very diverse city.
25 Basically the split is about 38 percent Hispanic, about 35

1 percent White, 14 percent African-American, and about 12 to 11
2 percent Asian and Pacific-Islander. So it's a very diverse
3 community. It's diverse economically also. And as we'll talk
4 about, it's very diverse from the transportation systems that
5 we use here in the city.

6 The uniqueness about this city, other than what I've
7 just told you, is we have, combined with the City of Los
8 Angeles, the port here at Long Beach is the second largest
9 complex in the world. It's an amazing harbor. It brings some
10 uniqueness here, a lot of positives; some negatives but mostly
11 positives.

12 We have our own municipal airport that's the -- one
13 of the busiest airports in the country when you look at overall
14 the planes coming in and out.

15 We have our own university here, city college, the
16 Long Beach Unified School District which has about 85,000
17 students which present some positives and, again, some
18 challenges as it relates to traffic.

19 We have a very active convention and visitors bureau
20 here in the city. And for all of you who are staying here in
21 the city we hope you enjoy your stay. It's -- again, there are
22 so many things to do here. The weather is beautiful. We have
23 a very vibrant downtown area. We have a very active marina
24 system here in the city. And between the harbor and a lot of
25 the different things going on, very diverse in regards to many

1 things going on.

2 Because it's a tourist destination we also have a lot
3 of special events that occur in the city. Annually we have the
4 Long Beach Grand Prix, the marathon.

5 Fourth of July for us, for example, this last Fourth
6 of July there was an influx of about 250,000 who came to the
7 city to enjoy the beaches here. We have about seven-and-a-
8 half, eight miles of beaches here. So if any of you want to
9 enjoy the beach tonight, go for a run, not too far away, just
10 basically across the street.

11 We host a lot of these special events, so on any
12 given weekend we can have an influx of 30,000 to 40,000 people
13 in town, either for a convention or different events that go on
14 in the city.

15 The city has been recognized through their -- our
16 parks program and some of our schools in the city, so we're
17 nationally recognized. Poly High School, which is one of the
18 seven -- or six high schools in the city is recognized for a
19 lot of the programs, athletic programs they have, and putting
20 out so many professional athletes.

21 As far as transportation goes, by land, sea or air
22 here in Long Beach, again, because it's a large urban area it
23 does challenge us in many ways. But I think between the work
24 on this committee of standardizing the -- everything that you
25 do with the traffic devices, it really helps us out to try and

1 get our population moving, both the people who live here and
2 the people who come in to visit us. At times it's challenging.
3 But I got to tell you, at least for us here locally with Dave
4 Roseman, we have an outstanding relationship between our
5 traffic engineers and the enforcement side or the education
6 side on the police department.

7 And -- and just to give you an example, for us in the
8 police department we hold our commanders, our division
9 commanders, and we have four divisions in the city, very
10 responsible for crime prevention. But another thing we really
11 look at, which you guys come into play, is what's going on from
12 a traffic perspective in the city.

13 For example, on a month-to-month basis we compare
14 each division. We look at the amount of traffic accidents that
15 are occurring. We look at the -- the top three to five
16 intersections of where these accidents are occurring, and we
17 hold our commanders accountable. And accountability, not only
18 through suppression and education, but working hand-in-hand
19 with the traffic engineers office so that we make sure that, if
20 it's a consistent primary collision factor, that we're working
21 through engineering also. So it's a great program that we have
22 together.

23 And if I may, there was a lot of hype about
24 carnageddon on the 405 that we seemed to survive this last
25 weekend. So many people did a good job on that.

1 Here locally in Long Beach we kind of had our own
2 carmageddon. Not too long ago the plans were to close down the
3 Seventh Street off-ramp to the eastern side of our city,
4 heading out to the 405 and 22 interchange. And we had multiple
5 meetings, not only here locally between the police department
6 and the city engineers office, but also with Caltrans, CHP, and
7 so many others involved. And -- and it's funny that there's so
8 much hype leading up to these events that if not properly
9 managed, not properly planned, could lead to so many problems.

10 And it seems like these days, maybe better now than
11 ever, we're working closer together, we're coordinating and
12 communicating better than we ever had. And we've prevented the
13 public who we serve from getting angry at us because of our
14 planning. And we typically don't all get the credit that we
15 deserve. I know you don't get the credit for that.

16 So that's it in a nutshell. Not to take up too much
17 of your valuable time. Again, on behalf of the City of Long
18 Beach I want to welcome everybody to Long Beach. If there's
19 anything that you need to make your stay more enjoyable, please
20 don't hesitate to ask any of us. Our officers and this
21 division know that you're all here. You can stop and ask any
22 of them, any employee that you see. If you want to know what
23 to know what restaurant to eat at, where to go, where not to
24 go, we are here to serve you to the best of our abilities.

25 And again, thank you for your service on this

1 committee. We really appreciate it from our perspective.

2 And if you don't mind, I would like to introduce the
3 next speaker coming.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Absolutely.

5 DEPUTY LUNA: Amy Burt [sic] from our city attorneys
6 office. She's going to come up and -- and speak to you. And
7 I'm sorry, it's Amy Burton, not Burt. She's doing to come up
8 and talk to you.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, Chief.

10 MS. BURTON: Welcome to Long Beach. I just wanted to
11 briefly say that we appreciate all the -- the service that you
12 put in on this committee.

13 I've worked in the city attorneys office here in Long
14 Beach for about four years. And I was in the City of L.A. for
15 20 years before that. And I have to say that one of the -- the
16 best aspects of my job is working with Dave Roseman, because he
17 is just a problem solver to an extent that you rarely see. And
18 I think that there are a lot of citizens who may not be aware
19 of how lucky they are to have someone who can do this on -- on
20 a consistent basis.

21 But another thing that -- about Dave Roseman is that
22 he frequently will -- will come back to both me and to the
23 legislative analyst that we have with the city and tell us
24 about the work that your committee does and how -- and what the
25 impacts are going to be going forward and we need to plan for

1 them. So we do hear quite a bit about your work, whether you
2 realize it or not.

3 Thank you very much. And I hope your meeting is
4 productive and informative. Thanks.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, Amy. And thank you,
6 Chief Luna. And I agree with all your comments about Dave. I
7 had the opportunity to work with Dave when he, too, was with
8 the City of Los Angeles. And I know you're getting a lot of
9 good advice from him being here in the City of Long Beach.

10 So thank you for your hospitality. Thank you for
11 welcoming us to your city. Thank you for the -- this
12 pleasant -- these pleasant surroundings here in the library.

13 Now speaking of the library auditorium here, we have
14 a very large room. And for those of you who want to hear real
15 well I encourage you to come to the front of the room if you
16 can, because we don't have a PA system here. And I can
17 guarantee you that by the end of this meeting my voice is going
18 to go down a few decibels. I was teaching a class this last
19 weekend, and by the fourth hour I was getting down to a
20 whisper. So if you want to hear come close, because we don't
21 have a PA system.

22 Now I'd like to -- oh, by the way, the restrooms are
23 outside. There's coffee outside, and a few snack items outside
24 as well.

25 I'd like to go now to the membership. But before we

1 introduce ourselves I'd like to mention that we have a few new
2 members on our committee due to turnover, and I'd like to
3 introduce them in just a moment. But also I think we'd like to
4 give thanks to those who have served the committee and are --
5 have departed the committee.

6 And that includes Deborah Wong of the Automobile Club
7 of Northern California who had served on the committee as an
8 alternate member, but often was the primary voting member. And
9 so we thank her for her contributions to the committee.

10 There's also Mary Banks, also from the California
11 State Automobile Association, who had been involved with this
12 committee for the last 19 years. And she has retired, and we
13 want to thank her for her service as well.

14 And then there is Robert Maynard from the California
15 Highway Patrol. He's moved on within the organization. And I
16 know he brought a lot of good expertise to this committee from
17 a law enforcement perspective, and we want to thank him.

18 And then finally Jacob Babico from the County of San
19 Bernardino has left the committee. And he had been involved
20 with the committee for ten years. So again, we want to thank
21 Jacob for his contribution.

22 And Caltrans, under Wayne Henley's signature and
23 under my signature, have sent them letters thanking them for
24 their contribution to the committee.

25 And now, with those who have left the committee, I

1 wanted to specially introduce those who are new to the
2 committee. And before we have the general roll call I'd like
3 to recognize Dwight Ku from the California State Automobile
4 Association. And, Dwight, why don't you tell us a little bit
5 about yourself.

6 MEMBER KU: Thank you, John. I'm the -- I served at
7 one time on the CTCDC from 1995 through 2000, moved on within
8 the organization, and now I'm back. And someone just asked me
9 this morning if that was a punishment or a reward, and I
10 definitely see it as a reward.

11 I moved within the organization. I'm now regional
12 director and legislative counsel for AAA of Northern
13 California. And I see that my counterpart from Southern
14 California is seated way down at the other end, at the southern
15 end of the California, and I occupy the northern end of the
16 table.

17 So it's a real pleasure being involved and having an
18 opportunity to serve on the committee. This is a great group
19 to be involved with. And it's -- it's a real honor to be back.
20 So I'm -- I'm looking forward to serving you.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you, Dwight.

22 And then I'd like to recognize Larry Patterson.
23 Larry, I think this is your first time as an alternate member
24 on the committee; is that correct?

25 MEMBER PATTERSON: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Why don't you tell us a little bit
2 about yourself.

3 MEMBER PATTERSON: Yeah. I actually serve as an
4 alternate for the League of California Cities. The regular
5 member Jeff, who is not able to be here today, is so reliable
6 that I seldom get a chance to actually sit on the committee.
7 So it's kind of a pleasure to be here today.

8 I am the public works director for the City of San
9 Mateo, have been for the last 11 years. And my background
10 prior to that was in transportation engineering consulting for
11 about 25 years. So I've been in this business for a long time.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And a new member, a new
13 permanent voting member on the committee is Michael Robinson.
14 Michael, why don't you tell us a little bit about yourself.

15 MEMBER ROBINSON: Well, thanks, John.

16 First off I'd like to say I know Jacob Babico, and
17 his loss is huge. I can only begin to hope to be able to fit
18 into just a piece of his shoes in the coming months. So I'll
19 work real hard to try and do that. But Jacob, I know, is a
20 very capable, knowledgeable person, and what a great person he
21 is. And I'm sure he is going to be something of a loss, a
22 great loss to the committee until I can hopefully come up to
23 some form of speed with what -- all the important issues
24 that -- that we're looking at these days.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Great.

1 MEMBER ROBINSON: I'm deputy director of public works
2 for the County of San Diego. I'm a registered civil engineer,
3 a registered traffic engineer, and a PTOE. I've been doing
4 what I've been doing for about 24 years now. I've been with
5 the county about ten. And I'm in charge of the transportation
6 division, which is county roads, county airports, and traffic
7 and transportation engineering.

8 So I've -- Hamid has been a member of our traffic
9 advisory committee for, what, seven or eight years now, Hamid?

10 MEMBER BAHADORI: Eight years.

11 MEMBER ROBINSON: So I've known several of you for a
12 little while. You've very capably handled a lot of important
13 issues for us down there, Hamid. Thank you.

14 But it's -- it's a pleasure. I look forward to being
15 a contributing member, hopefully in the near term. For right
16 now I want to be able to roll as -- as an active understudy
17 until I can get up to speed.

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sure there will be a quick
19 learning curve on that.

20 I'd also like to recognize Jim Baross who joins us on
21 bicycle matters in -- in the front row there.

22 And then I'd also like to recognize Bill Winter from
23 the County of Los Angeles who is a new alternate member to
24 Michael. So welcome, Bill. Glad to have you onboard, and
25 looking forward to your contributions to the committee.

1 So now let's have general roll call, start --

2 (Colloquy Between Members)

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. Okay. John Keller. But
4 you're not new to the --

5 SECRETARY SINGH: No, he's new. He's new.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, you've been here before.

7 MEMBER KELLER: I've been here before.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Right. John, tell us a
9 little bit about yourself.

10 MEMBER KELLER: I'm John Keller with the California
11 Highway Patrol. I've worked there about 35 years in special
12 projects, long-range planning, research analysis. I've been
13 affiliated or actually working with Caltrans since the first
14 Jerry Brown days, so a little bit of a perspective here. And I
15 look forward to assisting in any way that I can.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you, John.

17 So now we -- let's just have general introductions.
18 Let's start with Farhad.

19 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Good morning, everybody. I'm
20 Farhad Mansourian. I'm public works director for County of
21 Marin, and one of the two representatives of the counties on
22 this committee.

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: Good morning. I'm Hamid Bahadori
24 representing Automobile Club of Southern California.

25 MEMBER HENLEY: I'm Wayne Henley with Caltrans. I've

1 been on this committee now about four years. And prior to that
2 I've had quite a few experiences throughout Caltrans,
3 especially in the area of traffic engineering and traffic
4 operations.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good morning. I'm John Fisher.
6 I'm representing the League of California Cities, Southern
7 Branch. And I'm with the City of Los Angeles Department of
8 Transportation.

9 MEMBER KELLER: John Keller, California Highway
10 Patrol.

11 MEMBER ROBINSON: Again, Mike Robinson. I'm
12 representing the Southern California of CSAC. I'm with the
13 County of San Diego.

14 MEMBER PATTERSON: Larry Patterson. And as I
15 mentioned, I'm the alternate for the League of California
16 Cities, the Northern Branch.

17 MEMBER KU: Dwight Ku, AAA, Northern California.

18 SECRETARY SINGH: I'm Devinder Singh. I'm the staff
19 member for the committee.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, why don't we have the guests
21 in the audience just stand up and give us your name and what --
22 what your affiliation is, starting in the back row, the person
23 with the lime green shirt.

24 (Whereupon members of the audience introduce themselves.)

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you. Now I was mentioning

1 earlier that maybe my voice doesn't carry across real well.
2 But I also recognize that unless I put my glasses on I don't
3 see real well.

4 So sorry about that, Jeff, that I didn't recognize
5 you.

6 The next item will be the approval of the minutes
7 from our February 2nd meeting.

8 MEMBER BAHADORI: A minute for the bicycles?

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah. We had --
10 I'm sorry. We had one other thing that Hamid wanted to
11 present.

12 MEMBER BAHADORI: Just very quickly, Mr. Chairman,
13 thank you for the time. The -- I brought a draft of this
14 Bicycle Safety Guide that we have just updated. Last week we
15 were -- or a couple of meetings ago, asking for you the right
16 advice and suggestions. And thank you, yourself, Mr. Chairman,
17 for catching a mistake, and then we corrected it.

18 A couple organizations and his committee helped us, I
19 would like to thank them, CHP, Caltrans, California Bicycle
20 Coalition. And I have a few copies outside, and I've shared
21 one copy with each member. And we have printed this in large
22 quantities. Any of the organizations that want or any members
23 of the audience that want this for more traffic safety for
24 bicyclists, please let me know. We can share at no cost to you
25 whatever number of quantities you need. Thank you for the

1 time.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. Thank you, Hamid.

3 And you know, represented on this committee are some
4 persons with an engineering background, and we have law
5 enforcement. The other part of the three Es is education. And
6 the Automobile Club really contributes to that effort to
7 educate motorists and all users of the roadway on how to share
8 the roadways in a safe manner. So we thank you for
9 publications such as this called Sharing the Road. And we
10 invite you to take a copy. That is available outside.

11 So we'll go next to the approval of the minutes from
12 the February 2nd meeting. Do we have a motion or any
13 amendments to the minutes?

14 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, it says they're verbatim
15 minutes. We can't deny what you said, so --

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: We said what we said.

17 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I make a motion --

18 MEMBER KELLER: Second.

19 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- to approve the minutes.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All in favor of adoption say
21 aye.

22 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's right. You can't question
24 what you said. Sometimes you say, did I really say that?

25 Next we'll go to public comments. We ask you to come

1 to the microphone if you wish to make a public comment, either
2 now or later in the -- during this committee meeting. And --
3 because we need to get your name and your affiliation for the
4 record.

5 Now at this point in time we invite public comments
6 on any item that is not on the agenda. If you wish to comment
7 on something that is on the agenda save it for that time. At
8 this time we'll entertain any comments on an item not on the
9 agenda. If you wish to comment, please come up to the
10 microphone.

11 MS. LAND: Good morning. Good morning, Chairman
12 Fisher and Committee Members. I see a lot of familiar faces.
13 I'm Shirley Land with Land CM Corporation. I'm located at
14 29642 Alta Terra, Laguna Niguel, California 92677. And
15 currently I have -- I am consulting, working for OCTA. And
16 I've been brought on to assist them with their Measure M2,
17 Program P, which is a signal -- traffic signal timing program.
18 And with that I'm working with Rod Keith to implement this
19 project.

20 So today I'm here on behalf of the Orange County
21 Transportation Authority to submit 19 letters from
22 representatives of our local agencies in support of OCTA's
23 proposals regarding potential revisions to the California MUTCD
24 CTA -- that's not easy to say -- 2011 regarding the pedestrian
25 signal timing, and a request for additional cooperative

1 research to better define bicycle timing requirements. I'm
2 here today speaking at this moment because I understand it has
3 been deferred to the next meeting, so I wanted to provide this
4 input.

5 So as administrators of 16 regional traffic signal
6 synchronization corridor timing programs over the last four
7 years OCTA has been able to work cooperatively with city,
8 county, and state agencies in implementing optimized timing
9 strategies that have achieved measurable travel time
10 improvements on Orange County local roads. While improving
11 mobility and safety for all users, these projects have
12 contributed to reducing delays along major corridors with
13 corresponding fuel efficiencies and reduction in greenhouse
14 gases. And this is something that when it was presented to my
15 previous employer at the City of Mission Viejo. The council
16 was, of course, the most interested in, especially with gas
17 prices today and all.

18 One lesson learned is that -- that we did learn in
19 working with these cities -- and if any of you have ever done a
20 signal timing project before you know getting cities, counties,
21 and states to agree on any type of timing program along a
22 corridor in itself is its own feat. But one of the lessons
23 that we learned is that each corridor is unique. There isn't
24 one-size-fits-all. And that the demand of the users for both
25 vehicle, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians needs to be

1 reviewed in the context of their respective studies.

2 So with that, two of the items that we've identified
3 in our letter that we have previously submitted to the -- the
4 committee is that the signal-ped timing -- excuse me -- the
5 pedestrian signal timing, we are requesting the committee to
6 consider a modification to Section 4E.06, Paragraph 7, to
7 replace the existing 3.5 feet per second rate with a range of
8 3.5 to 4 feet per second as -- as the current rate. We have
9 locally observed that the 4.0 feet per second with the
10 appropriate hand-man display adequately addresses we'd say the
11 85th percentile walking speed of the pedestrians, and
12 eliminates for us on the signal timing side the lost green time
13 for the excessive timing, for pedestrians have already cleared
14 the intersection. So with this the pedestrians will be able to
15 be across the street and we're still remaining -- stopping cars
16 because of -- for the ped timing.

17 The proposed range versus a single rate is a
18 reasonable and proposed guidance in selecting alternate times
19 for peak period demands when volumes and conditions might
20 require a revised timing.

21 The other comment that we made in our -- our
22 previously transmittal was regarding to the -- the bicycle
23 timing, standards that have been adopted. In Orange County we
24 share these roadways with commuter and recreational bicycle
25 riders. And we recognize their need for being addressed and --

1 and incorporated into our decisions. But we are also
2 requesting an offer our participation in conducting additional
3 research with Caltrans to establish and design the bicycle user
4 standard for the signal timing options based on the template of
5 variables such as public roadways, land use, tractors and
6 generators, with additional ridership analysis to develop the
7 appropriate range of bicycle crossing green time and detection
8 carryover times for adoption in future California MUTCD.

9 Using a wider range of data based on measured
10 conditions for a variety of typical street settings common to
11 different regions of California, the goal would be to identify
12 timing guidelines that optimize bicycle safety, address local
13 street settings, and provide the best timing options for signal
14 synchronization which minimizes the amount of lost green time,
15 again, for the main street corridor.

16 In less than one year OCTA and the local agencies
17 will begin 17 new multi-agency signal timing programs. They
18 will be gathering the data for all the existing conditions at
19 every signal light intersection along these projects. These
20 projects are being funded 80 percent by OCTA's renewed Measure
21 M2 through our half-cent sales tax. And it's proposed that
22 several intersections on each project be selected because of
23 their high pedestrian and bicycle activity to be specifically
24 analyzed by video counting measures. So provide more details
25 in terms of the -- the patterns that are observed there and

1 record them.

2 OCTA will perform the analysis on the raw data, and
3 we wish to have Caltrans involvement in this process so that we
4 may produce the unbiased data to CTCDC in a very short. We
5 would hope that this committee would also encourage other
6 agencies in the areas of the state to perform similar type of
7 analysis during the same time on other signal timing projects
8 also.

9 The letters of support that we're presenting today
10 come from the County of Orange and -- and a significant number
11 of local cities that have participated in these cooperative
12 regional signal timing programs for review of their benefit.
13 In some cases we've averaged 20 percent. And I believe Ron
14 mentioned there was a couple of projects that we actually
15 improved or received a 40 percent benefit in terms of our
16 timing. So these regional corridors do work and they help
17 provide significant benefits.

18 Our interest in this process is to raise awareness
19 that the adoption of signal timing changes in the -- in the
20 requirements to the MUTCD that may not seem significant because
21 they are measured in seconds, or in some cases half-seconds,
22 can collectively impact the overall benefits of signal timing
23 strategies including the statewide objectives of reducing
24 greenhouse gas emissions. We would encourage the committee to
25 take this under advisement and delay the adoption of any signal

1 timing changes to the MUTCD from previous California
2 requirements until data can be presented, a design standard
3 developed, and the decisions are made based on the collective
4 impact of these policies.

5 With that I appreciate the opportunity to present
6 our -- our opinion on this, and I submit the letters -- the
7 letters to the recorder. Thank you.

8 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I -- can I ask
9 Ms. Land a question?

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

11 MEMBER BAHADORI: A quick question.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: You can't discuss it, but you can
13 ask her a question.

14 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Just -- just a quick
15 question. The committee will be having two full-day workshops
16 tomorrow and Friday to finalize comments on the MUTCD for
17 adoption. Are all these comments that you raised, the have
18 been submitted formally? They are part of the formal process?

19 MS. LAND: OCTA has submitted it formally. And there
20 are some of these letters that have been submitted.

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. LAND: Uh-huh.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you for your comments.

24 MS. LAND: Yes. Thank you for your time.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do we have anyone else who would

1 like to make a comment on a non-agenda item? Okay.

2 With that we'll move forward. We're going to
3 introduce an item that wasn't on the agenda, simply because it
4 has become urgent to address it at this point in time with the
5 departure of Jacob Babico as our vice chair. And so we need to
6 identify a vice chair for the remainder of the term that I
7 have, which is through the remainder of this year, 2011.

8 So I'd like to entertain a motion to designate a
9 temporary vice chair.

10 MEMBER HENLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to nominate
11 Farhad Mansourian as the vice chair to serve the -- for the
12 remainder of your term.

13 MEMBER ROBINSON: I second that motion.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. It's been moved and
15 seconded. Often we go from city representation to county
16 representation as we go from chair to vice chair.

17 We have a motion, a second. Do we have any
18 discussion on designating Farhad Mansourian as vice chair?

19 MEMBER BAHADORI: I see Mr. Babico walking back in
20 and asking for his position.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I see no discussion. All in favor
22 of the motion?

23 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's unanimous. And thank you for
25 that.

1 Congratulations, Mr. Mansourian.

2 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Now I can go to funerals.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. I'd like to recognize someone
4 who just joined us in the audience, Jacob Babico.

5 Jacob, will you stand? We had mentioned your service to
6 the committee earlier in the meeting. And you've been with the
7 committee for ten years and you've added to the discussion and
8 to the deliberations. You've capably served as vice chair.
9 And with your departure we want to tell you that we appreciate
10 the service to the committee.

11 And Wayne Henley and I have signed a letter that
12 formally thanks you, but we'd just like to publicly thank you
13 at this moment with this letter her Can you come up?

14 And as he's coming up, I'll just read it. It says,
15 "We want to thank you for the ten years of productive and
16 professional service which you have given the California
17 Traffic Control Devices Committee as a representative of
18 the California State Association of Counties. Through
19 your cooperative and concerted efforts as a committee
20 member the interests of the motoring public have been well
21 served. Your participation on the committee has had
22 considerable influence on many of the Caltrans traffic
23 control device policy decisions. Your commitment to
24 traffic safety and uniformity of traffic control devices
25 has been an inspiration to the profession.

1 "On behalf of Caltrans and the California Traffic Control
2 Devices Committee members I want to thank you for your
3 outstanding service to the CTCDC from July 2001 through
4 February 2003 as an alternate member, and February 2003
5 to -- through February 2011 as a voting member. We are
6 grateful for the opportunity to work with you on the
7 committee and wish you the best in your retirement."

8 So, Jacob --

9 MR. BABICO: Yes?

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- thank you so much.

11 MR. BABICO: Thank you. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Now we get to the public
13 hearing portion of our agenda. And with -- we allow public
14 discussion in combination with the deliberations by the
15 committee. Prior to adopting any rules and regulations
16 regarding uniform traffic control devices they're required to
17 be designed, specified, and placed pursuant to Section 21400 of
18 the California Vehicle Code, which requires us to consult with
19 local agencies and to hold public hearings. So these are the
20 items that satisfy -- where we will satisfy that process.

21 And we'll go to item 11-1 which was adoption of the
22 2000 MUTCD -- 2011 MUTCD for California to reflect the 2009
23 Federal MUTCD.

24 Wayne, is there anything you'd like to add with
25 regard to that?

1 MEMBER HENLEY: Well, you know, I'd say we are --
2 we're deferring this to the next meeting. And the reason we
3 are is that, you know, we thought that we'd just, you know,
4 make some changes, some -- you know, our plan is adopt the 2009
5 as much as possible.

6 Well, if you look at the 2009 compared to the 2006
7 there have been a lot of changes, just in the format and the --
8 where the tables are and stuff like that, in addition to, you
9 know, the differences that we have between California and the
10 federal manual. That has turned out to be a much larger job
11 than we thought.

12 So we've managed to do -- put out the first -- the
13 first draft of the document. But we've gotten about almost 600
14 pages of comments on the first draft. So we need to address
15 those comments, which we will be doing in the next couple
16 weeks, and we've been thinking about it for the last six
17 months. And then we will be putting out a new version, another
18 draft, draft version two, probably coming out in the middle of
19 next month and -- with another comment period for that draft
20 before we can adopt it. So we're basically going to ask to put
21 it on the next agenda.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we're getting closer and
23 closer all the time. And we will be holding a two-day internal
24 workshop to sort through all the comments and to identify those
25 proposed changes that we will be voting on at the next meeting

1 of the CTCDC.

2 We'll now go to item 11-2. It is one that I have
3 sponsored. It's regarding new figures, tables and texts for
4 Part 6, temporary traffic control, of the MUTCD. The proposal
5 here is to adopt what's shown on pages 5 through 29, and to
6 incorporate those changes into the 2011 California MUTCD, and
7 to allow Caltrans to make any editorial changes, correction of
8 oversights or revisions that they may identify that are not of
9 a policy nature but really are of a corrective nature, on some
10 of the drawings.

11 And the reason why we put that in is there is so much
12 detail on a lot of these drawings that we need to have a
13 mechanism where we would maybe approve the new policy, but
14 recognizing that a little -- you know, some errors and
15 revisions may have crept in here that may not be of a policy
16 nature but may be more of a technical nature or editorial
17 nature. So I think we want to enable Caltrans to be able to
18 make those types of changes without coming back to the
19 committee.

20 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question
21 on this item?

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. I haven't --

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- introduced it yet.

25 MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh. Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: But if you want to ask a question
2 now you may.

3 MEMBER BAHADORI: The -- this is very extensive. And
4 this is the second time we are looking at it.

5 Just one quick question -- and I see Mr. Bhullar
6 here -- when you go through this, and assuming you're going to
7 approve these changes, I assume there are no contradictory
8 comments as part of the 600 pages that we will be discussing
9 tomorrow and on Friday. Because we don't want to revisit this
10 again. Is that --

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would agree.

12 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I will -- let me give an
14 introduction to these items. And I've tried to summarize them
15 on pages six through eight in summary form.

16 Since the last meeting I've consulted with many
17 others who provided comments at the February meeting. I've had
18 a peer review of this comments. And so as a result of that
19 there are only two items here that are being proposed that are
20 of a policy nature, and I will point them out. Everything else
21 is consistent with the language in the California MUTCD. And
22 what we are proposing is a figure that illustrates that
23 language, basically.

24 One of the reasons for introducing this was because
25 it came to my attention from those who are responsible for

1 preparing the Watch Manual, including Dave Royer who's in the
2 audience, and others, that there just weren't enough
3 illustrations to show conditions in urban areas that come along
4 frequently. So the intent here was to better illustrate them,
5 and in some cases provide a few more words to make the intent
6 clear.

7 Now the only policy changes then that are being
8 proposed, if you look at my Table 1, is in item number 2 where
9 we would change the size of tubular markers to be only 42
10 inches rather than 18 and 28 inches, since I was advised that
11 42 inches is what everyone's using. And -- and then there's
12 the Table in 6C-1, Table 6C-1 and Table 6H-3, which are the
13 same tables, which try to clarify what speeds would apply to
14 what sign spacing to overcome problems that we have with the
15 current table that leaves it pretty wide open.

16 I do need to point out at this time in the discussion
17 so that we're very clear on it, if you go to page 15, and if
18 you go to Figure 6F-102, that there was an error, and I want to
19 correct it now. It was brought to my attention. As much as I
20 tried to edit this, if I'm the only one looking at it I'm not
21 going to catch everything. So in Figure 6F-102, California,
22 where it says 50 miles an hour it should say 40 miles an hour,
23 and that was the intent. And that's consistent with California
24 policy. So no policy change there, but it should say 40
25 instead of 50.

1 With that said, we're proposing four new drawings in
2 the California MUTCD. They would be tentatively numbered 6H-
3 105(CA) to 6H-108(CA). And again, they're intended to provide
4 illustrations of things that are already either said in the
5 traffic application notes or in the text of the California
6 MUTCD. The only policy changes then is the 42 inch tubular
7 marker as the standard throughout the state, and Table 6C-1 and
8 6H-3.

9 If we could go to Table 6C-1 on page 10 and 6H-3 on
10 page 11, they're the same table. What we tried to do here is
11 to identify speed categories where the sign spacing would
12 apply. The way it is in the current table in the California
13 MUTCD there are not enough speed categories.

14 And as a result of that the sign spacing we show
15 falls far outside of the recommended ratios in the guidance
16 section of the MUTCD which says, in effect, that the sign
17 spacing should be four to eight times the speed limit. And
18 with the categories we have it falls far outside that category
19 or that ratio. With the additional speed categories we have
20 they come very close to those -- that 4 to 8 ratio, although in
21 one case it's a ratio of 8.33 at the extreme or 8.1, but it's
22 generally consistent with that. And we feel Table 6C-1 and
23 Table 6H-3 will be better guidance to users of -- or to
24 operators of roadways that operate at a variety of speeds to
25 better help them to know what spacing should be required.

1 Rather than just saying if it's 30 miles an hour or more you
2 use one set of spacing, we've tried to categorize it of 25
3 to -- more than 25 to 40 or more than 40 miles an hour.

4 So with that said, I have no more preliminary
5 comments to make. But again, this has been vetted extensively
6 through some of you who offered comments before, and with
7 others. And if there are any minor oversights we'll take care
8 of those. But I ask for your consideration of this item.

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: Question, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

11 MEMBER BAHADORI: On page 15 will you make a
12 correction. Both speeds are going to change from 50 to 40;
13 right?

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's correct.

15 MEMBER BAHADORI: Next to -- I'm talking about Figure
16 6F-102.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's -- that's correct. I'm
18 embarrassed that the 50 didn't get corrected.

19 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. So but -- but just for
20 purpose of clarification, both of them are going to change to
21 40?

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's correct.

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Now just -- just a general
24 comment I have about the manual and nothing specific about this
25 one, is that we're still not sure when we are using metric,

1 when we are using the imperial system. We were looking at like
2 Table 6C-1 and we're looking at 6H-3, they're only the imperial
3 system. But then right below them on 6C-3 and 6H-4 we are using
4 both metric and imperial for purposes of calculation. That's
5 the general observation that has been made.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. It was my understanding --
7 correct me if I'm wrong, Johnny -- that in the new manual we're
8 just going to show primarily English units?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Which is why I prepared the
11 tables that way.

12 MEMBER BAHADORI: No I understand.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: But I -- we recognize there are
14 other older tables which have both, but I didn't bother to
15 correct those.

16 Yes, Farhad?

17 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Last time we had a discussion we
18 had received a number of concerns from counties on increasing
19 the size of the cones, if you recall.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

21 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Can you elaborate on -- on that
22 issue please?

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I dropped it from this
24 proposal.

25 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. So I want it --

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And that was --

2 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I want it stated so this is not
3 part of this proposal anymore.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

5 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I dropped it -- I dropped it on
7 this proposal. We had, at the last meeting and just prior to
8 that and after that, we had discussions with a number of
9 agencies who pointed out hardships. And as a result of that we
10 became better educated and decided that there wasn't a
11 compelling reason then to propose the -- or mandate the larger
12 cone size given the comments that we heard.

13 Any other comments --

14 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes. I --

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- discussion?

16 MEMBER BAHADORI: I did not get an affirmative
17 answer. But I saw Mr. Bhullar is shaking his head as an
18 affirmative.

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh.

20 MEMBER BAHADORI: So there are no contradictory
21 comments the next two days so we don't need to come back and
22 revisit this decision; right? Nobody has made comments about
23 this?

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I am not aware of -- well, I'm not
25 sure what the question is. I pointed out the two policy

1 changes that we would propose. I submit, the rest of what's
2 here is consistent with the language in the MUTCD, but just
3 illustrates it.

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. No. I'm perfectly okay with
5 this and I'm ready to support it. My only question was that if
6 we vote on this today I didn't want to be in a position that
7 Friday we go into the workshop and there is a comment from the
8 city of such and such, that we need to come back and revisit
9 this when we just voted two days ago.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think we -- I would be well
11 familiar with what we have here, and I think I would be able to
12 identify --

13 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- anything which might be in
15 conflict, should we decide to adopt any comment that we'll
16 review Thursday and Friday.

17 If we have no other questions --

18 MEMBER HENLEY: I have one --

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- from the committee --

20 MEMBER HENLEY: -- more question.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

22 MEMBER HENLEY: And, you know, one of the things
23 lurking in the background here is the need to be substantially
24 compliant with the Federal MUTCD. And I'm just wondering if
25 FHWA has had a chance to take a look at these proposed changes

1 to see, you know, to see if they jeopardize our substantial
2 compliance.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I think when we go to
4 comments in the audience I'd like to invite Steve up there.

5 Again, I'll point out that the two areas that I have
6 identified would be policy changes. But I think a little bit
7 more -- you know, usually there's a lot to this. My
8 understanding is a conflict exists if we go to a lower
9 standard --

10 MEMBER HENLEY: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER HARRIS: -- than what is the Federal
12 MUTCD.

13 With regard to the size of the tubular marker, that
14 would not be a lower standard.

15 MEMBER HENLEY: That would be a higher standard.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: It would be a higher standard.

17 With regard to the -- Table 6C-1 and Table 6H-3, it
18 is just more explicit in that it provides more definition of
19 the speed categories and falls into the range of 40 times the
20 speed to equal the sign spacing. I think one calculation comes
21 out to 8.33. But, you know, that's -- you round it. It's
22 getting pretty close. So you know, I've tried to recognize
23 those. But I think we'll ask Steve to comment on that once we
24 go to audience comments.

25 Any further initial discussion by committee members?

1 Okay.

2 With that I'd like to invite anyone from the audience
3 to speak to this item. Come up to the microphone and introduce
4 yourself so we can get it for the record. So if you'd like to
5 make a comment come up to the microphone.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Good morning. I'm Johnny Bhullar with
7 Caltrans, Editor of California MUTCD. Just a couple of
8 comments.

9 First of all, the answer to Hamid's question
10 regarding metric and English, I believe what's being done here
11 is that since as of today the manual that is in effect is the
12 one that has English and metric. So that's the reason why
13 John, as well as Gordon Wong of my staff, they have been using
14 the current official tables. However, as you might have
15 noticed in the draft that we have posted from 2011, all the
16 metric is out. So -- but we -- that's only draft, so that's
17 not being used here. And that's the reason why, just to
18 clarify.

19 Secondly, John, I have a question. There having a
20 couple of exchanges and emails just over the last couple of
21 days with Gordon Wong. Any issues that came up out of that in
22 terms of how are we going to -- like Hamid was asking -- how
23 are we going to tie this to the finalization of the 2011
24 California MUTCD, timing wise. I just need to know that is it
25 workable so that if we take some actions today can this be done

1 in conjunction with -- for the 2011 finalization or do you
2 think it can come about?

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, here's what I proposed. We
4 brought it forward in February and it needed a little bit more
5 work, and we agreed to that. If we bring it forward now at the
6 very last meeting where we can consider adopting it for the
7 2011 MUTCD -- I've been corresponding with Gordon, your -- your
8 chief expert at Caltrans on Part 6. And my understanding is
9 that if this committee adopts these new figures and amended
10 language as kind of a policy, if an error is discovered on one
11 of the figures, let's say we have the wrong sign, or let's say
12 we show the shift taper as L instead of one-half L, I would
13 propose that we not consider this as a policy issue just an
14 oversight issue and allow the Caltrans expert to make that
15 correction.

16 Now with my eyes, I've looked at this so many times
17 that if I've got the wrong shift taper of length I'm not going
18 to catch it. But the concept would be that we approve these in
19 concept. And if any editorial revisions need to be made or
20 technical corrections need to be made that would be part of my
21 motion of approval that we allow Caltrans to make it. But,
22 certainly, we would be acting on the policy of what's in these
23 drawings as the general policy.

24 For example, if you look at Figure 6H-105(CA) on page
25 17, that illustrates the concept of on a low-volume road of

1 riding traffic to the left side of the double-yellow line. If
2 we believe, for example, that we need to illustrate that we
3 would adopt it. But let's say for the -- for example, we've
4 got the wrong shift length, or maybe the sign is not showing in
5 exactly the right place where it needs to go, we would allow
6 that to be made as a technical correction offline. And I've
7 pledged to work with Gordon offline to adjust -- to make any
8 technical corrections of oversights that may come to our
9 attention and to assist in the development of the drawings.

10 MR. BHULLAR: All right. So basically, if I
11 understand correctly, then since this is your proposal you are
12 quite satisfied with the way it is being shown now, except for
13 minor stuff. So if we take it on from here and make those
14 minor changes we will be very close to what you intended to do;
15 right?

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And I trust, you know, you'll make
19 the technical corrections and wouldn't change completely the
20 drawing in doing so.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Thanks.

22 MR. BAROSS: Good morning. I'm Jim Baross, today
23 representing California Bicycle Advisory Committee. I have not
24 had a chance to have this proposal reviewed by the California
25 Bicycle Advisory Committee, so I can't speak directly to it.

1 And would recommend, as an overall comment, that the Bicycle
2 Advisory Committee have an opportunity to review it. Although
3 this doesn't speak directly to bicycling, bicycling and
4 pedestrian activity does occur in all the situations that are
5 depicted.

6 There's only one, page 17, that shows the shared road
7 bike sign, which apparently is planted right in the middle of a
8 shoulder.

9 So I'm not clear in a general sense how responsive to
10 the Complete Streets legislation DD-64 as revised. This
11 proposal includes the accommodations that were extensively
12 provided by Johnny Bhullar for accommodation of bike and
13 pedestrian in work zones, which as I understand, and excuse my
14 ignorance, how well that has been adopted into the, you know,
15 the process for adopting that into the MUTCD. In the last year
16 we've had several reviews of those extensive drawings and
17 the -- and the work that's been done. I -- it seems to me that
18 that should be, I guess incorporated or worked together with
19 that work that was already included.

20 So also, for instance, as a detail, the -- the
21 selection of temporary work zone signs does not include the
22 shared road sign, even though that is in one of the drawings.
23 And as part of the California MUTCD adoption of the federal
24 standards, there is the potential for adopting the bikes may
25 use full lane sign when there's a lane that's too narrow to

1 share, which probably would be appropriate for potential
2 inclusion in this work zone issue.

3 So raising those questions and not being clear about
4 the work zone accommodation that's already been extensively
5 reviewed works with this, I think I'm in a position of asking
6 that there be further review and an opportunity for the
7 California Bicycle Advisory Committee to review and probably
8 incorporate with a process for the updating of the MUTCD.
9 Thanks.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I'll comment on that, and
11 maybe Johnny can add on to that. Recently Caltrans issued new
12 drawings in Part 6 that we beyond the federal standard. And
13 where the drawing illustrated a constricted width due to
14 construction, it showed the added signs of "Share the Road"
15 with the bicycle symbol to show that the room that had been
16 available was no longer available.

17 And so in the case of Drawing 6H-105(CA) we've added
18 that feature there, because that appears to fit that the
19 constricting of the roadway width.

20 On the other drawings, they were derived from other
21 mother drawings that are in the Part 6 already but just showed
22 a slightly different feature to it. And so went by the queue,
23 that if the drawings that Caltrans had issued had added the
24 "Share the Road" bicycle symbol sign with those we would show
25 them on the drawings that emerge from the mother drawings. But

1 upon further inspection, if Caltrans finds that it's
2 appropriate to show additional "Share the Road" and bicycle
3 symbol signs on the three other drawings that we've submitted
4 and they deem that to be appropriate we will work with them to
5 incorporate that.

6 Johnny, would you like to comment on that?

7 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
8 First of all, Jim, the extensive work that CBAC, as well as the
9 SHS Speed Group (phonetic) did. And so as a result of that, in
10 February finally we have issued an official policy. And, of
11 course, right now it's a separate policy, but it is official
12 and legal in California. It's called the Traffic Operation
13 Policy Directive. It took effect, I believe, on February 1st.
14 And that culminates all the work that we have done. So -- and
15 that will be reflected in the 2011 final edition when we do it.

16 Secondly, I'll leave it up to the committee here as
17 to the suggestion as to looking at the other figures. If you
18 want we can look into it. But this is not our right. Pretty
19 much we will be looking for working with probably John Fisher,
20 since you have originated the item, to see if there is a need.
21 But we -- our purpose, we tried to have in the previous work
22 that we had done on four of those typical applications, they
23 were exclusively on how to handle bicyclists in work zones. So
24 that's why since that was the intention, that's the reason why
25 the notes, as well as those figures, are heavily tilted toward

1 showing how the bicyclists -- but for these, I'm not sure what
2 the intended purpose could be different.

3 So what the merit is or concluding bicyclists
4 probably in all these figures or not. So we can always add
5 notes and make changes, but I'm open for suggestion. But I
6 wouldn't say let's have all these figures show bicyclists or
7 share the road or bicycle lanes, full-lane type of treatments.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. The thing that I'll point
9 out is that there's only one of the four figures here that
10 shows a shift of traffic away from the traffic markings, the
11 lane lines in effect. And I think that's where you have the
12 opportunity to show "Share the Road" with the bicycle symbol is
13 when you shifted them away from the markings that are there,
14 and therefore you've constricted their width. The other three
15 drawings simply use the lane lines that are already present,
16 and so there's no change in effect in the area available for
17 bicyclists.

18 Mr. Knowles.

19 MEMBER KNOWLES: Jeff Knowles, City of Vacaville.
20 One of the things -- and many of the displays show the signs
21 placed properly, like the 6H-107(CA). But I find in common
22 practice contractors tend to put the tripods that these signs
23 are mounted on right in the gutter line and then extending into
24 the street. And what I found riding through construction zones
25 is I'm constantly not only dealing with maybe the rough

1 pavement of the zone, but I'm having to constantly dark out
2 into traffic to go around the construction sign. Because
3 instead of putting them, you know, in the parkway area or on --
4 in our wider sidewalk areas they're always in the street.

5 And if there could be any kind of a paragraph even
6 providing guidance -- and I know you're addressing just
7 specific measures on your proposal -- but since we are talking
8 about revisions to the Watch Book if there's -- could be
9 something added that would specifically recommend that these be
10 put on the shoulder, out of the normal travel path of cyclists,
11 because motorists are already distracted because of the
12 construction. And to having to be constantly going around
13 these signs and darting out into traffic was very
14 uncomfortable. Thank you.

15 MR. ROYER: Dave Royer, University of California.
16 Just a couple of comments, and even on some of the comments.

17 First of all, these proposals I was highly involved.
18 In fact, I was the one that encouraged John to -- to put these
19 changes in, and really to make it simple for the poor worker
20 that's out there in the street. The MUTCD is a very
21 difficult document to follow, even for engineers. And you have
22 a field worker who may have never even gotten through high
23 school trying to interpret what's happening makes it pretty
24 difficult.

25 So a lot of these changes, particularly the diagrams,

1 were really -- came out of the Watch Manual, which was intended
2 just for the field worker to be able to -- to follow something.

3 What we found in very -- just this last year, all of
4 a sudden agencies have found out that there is a California
5 MUTCD, at least the Part 6. Most agencies don't really quite
6 understand it. Now they've come out and they said, gee, these
7 diagrams out of the Watch Manual, there's not identical or
8 similar diagram in the MUTCD, and so we can't do it that way.
9 They somehow think these diagrams are the only way that they
10 can do it. So this further helps explain it.

11 I sit on the National Committee now, Part 6, in fact,
12 on a technical committee for Part 6. I've gone through all
13 these changes several times and there's no conflict at all.
14 Forty-two inch is a higher standard. And believe me, if you've
15 ever seen a 12 or 28 inch delineator post you'd understand why
16 people only use the 42 inch. You can't even see the smaller
17 ones.

18 The spacing, they already given the latitude. It
19 basically -- this is before -- the spacing is to be determined
20 by the agency. So as I teach classes, which I do about once a
21 month, I ask people, what -- what's sign spacing has your
22 agency adopted? Absolutely no agency in the State of
23 California, except for Caltrans, has adopted sign spacing. And
24 Caltrans is all the high-speed sign spacing. And so setting
25 the speed limits so that they can follow it to put in their

1 sign spacing, it really helps the worker out there in the
2 field.

3 Some of the comments from Gordon with Caltrans, I
4 went through those. Some of those are additional stuff I think
5 he would like to see happen and probably should be considered
6 as a submittal with your 600 pages or 600 comments, whatever it
7 was, because some of them are very good. Some of them, things
8 like the one-half L, when you're dealing with narrower lanes
9 you're going to do different calculations for a 10 foot wide
10 lane than you are for a 12 foot wide lane or a 15 foot wide
11 lane. We have a formula for that. So that would work pretty
12 good.

13 Even the comment I've just given on sign placement is a very
14 good one. Maybe there's a place when you go through your 600
15 changes that would -- you'd have for that.

16 But I would certainly encourage you to adopt this. I
17 think it will really help the workers in California. I think
18 it will really also help some of the engineers to be able to do
19 these.

20 The last thing on bicycle stuff, the National
21 Committee is establishing some new typical application and some
22 new wording specifically to address the bicycle issues. That
23 was brought before our committee. In fact, that took one whole
24 day. We had the bicycle and pedestrian community in talking to
25 us for the entire period, and they are actually going to be

1 adopting some that are relatively similar to California.
2 California just is one step ahead of then National committee in
3 putting bicycle and pedestrian information in the new typical
4 applications that are coming out. And then -- and they're very
5 close to what -- the National Committee. And so the National
6 Committee is -- has approved to go out for sponsorship.

7 And included in the next revision of the MUTCD, the
8 federal one, there will be quite significant improvements to
9 make the construction activity more bicycle and pedestrian
10 friendly. And that's something that the National Committee had
11 totally ignored before. California or at least the Watch
12 Manual had a little thing in there. But the -- the new ones
13 out of this committee will pretty well address the bicycle
14 issues as best we can. There's no way you can rubberstamp work
15 zones, but as best we can. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you. Private citizen Babico.

17 MR. BABICO: Yeah. My name is Jacob Babico. I'm
18 from the County of San Bernardino, retiree. I have a couple of
19 questions on Figure 6H-105 CA, on page 17. The black and white
20 sign for the median nose, is that appropriate at this location,
21 and are you considering the cones as a barrier separation? I
22 mean, why it's needed there? I mean, what we are doing is we
23 are converting or creating a temporary shifting lane for the
24 northbound. And the southbound you are saying we need to make
25 that message to them that there is a separation kind of cone

1 replacing the raised median. Is that the concept?

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. The purpose of the "Keep
3 Right" sign and the lead-in cones is that we wanted to make
4 sure that we keep people on the right side of those cones
5 because -- to make sure they don't go to the left side of those
6 cones as part of the detour. When you place cones on a center
7 line there's always a question, oh, do I keep to the right or
8 do I keep to the left. So we wanted to make sure that as we
9 shift traffic on the slow volume road using cones and not
10 striping changes that we make sure that as they enter the work
11 zone they stay to the right.

12 MR. BABICO: I see. All right. The second question
13 I have, you have a note under the bicycle symbol sign that says
14 "See note number ten." Where is that?

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: "See note number ten." Okay.
16 Good -- good question. Good question. Let me see. Well, you
17 know, when I had talked about oversights, I think this would be
18 one of them. And I think what the intent was here, to adopt a
19 note a that's similar on the other Caltrans drawings --

20 MR. BABICO: Oh.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- that talks about where you use
22 the -- the sign "Share the Road" and the bicycle symbol.

23 MR. BABICO: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And that -- there's language there
25 that talk about when you constrict the space to use it. And it

1 was intended that note be added, and I'm glad you brought that
2 up. And I will make sure that we add that note that reflects
3 language on the other Caltrans drawing.

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question
5 on that?

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Uh-huh.

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: If you add note number 10 I suggest
8 that on page 16 it's going to be after note number 9, and note
9 number 9 is a standard. I don't think that your intention is
10 to make note number 10 standard, is it?

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, we'll use the same language
12 under either the guidance or standard that appears in the other
13 ones.

14 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Okay. So -- so after number
15 9 on page 16 it's going to say "guidance," and then say note
16 number 9 -- note number 10. Because if you add note number 10
17 with the format that it is now then it's going to be standard
18 also, as 9 is.

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And you're correct, it may
20 end up being note number three or something.

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. It's --

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And I will --

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, if you move that to the
24 guidance up there on the -- between one and two, and then it
25 becomes three, and you renumber.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll make sure that we --

2 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. The only concern was --

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll make sure we take care of it.

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I know what your intent of note
5 number ten is, and I don't think that you intended it to be a
6 standard, so --

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: It may be note number three under
8 guidance.

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And -- and I'll make sure that we
11 take of that. Thank you for that.

12 Any other comments? Steve, did you want to comment
13 on this?

14 Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't see you. Ron Snyder, go
15 ahead.

16 MR. SNYDER: Thanks, John.

17 My name is Ryan Snyder. I'm a transportation claim
18 consultant. We do quite a few bicycle claims and pedestrian
19 claims for cities in the state. And I just have really a
20 clarification question that in adopting the 2009 MUTCD that we
21 are also adopting the specifications for shared lane markings
22 for bicycles. And in California we're not allowed to use them
23 where there's no on-street parking. In the Federal MUTCD we
24 are, and that's an important distinction. And I hope that
25 we -- we are adopting federal guidelines that enable us to use

1 the shared lane markings where there's no on-street parking.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

3 MR. SNYDER: Is -- I mean, just -- was that -- that
4 was a clarification question.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But it wasn't really
6 Germaine to this agenda item.

7 MR. SNYDER: All right.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: But I think we did note that.
9 Thank you.

10 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
11 Administration. I'm the MUTCD coordinator for the California
12 Division of FHWA. And we oversee -- ensure that the California
13 document is in substantial conformance with the federal
14 document.

15 I reviewed this -- these drawings. They're generally
16 in conformance with the federal guidelines and I think provide
17 additional information. I would like to -- to know on the --
18 on the bicycle aspect I think you should show these figures
19 with bike lanes and without bike lanes. If the person in the
20 field is just looking at the Watch Manual, just looking at the
21 pictures, which I agree is probably fairly common, then what do
22 you do if there's a bike lane or not a bike lane? The -- the
23 manual should show the sign on the parkway, not in the bike
24 lane. These pictures clearly show that those signs should not
25 be in a lane where there's not a bike. But that needs to be

1 obvious and clear because it's consistently not done
2 appropriately.

3 In addition, all of these figures should show room
4 for bikes. And I take, for example, on page 27, 6H-108, on
5 the -- on the approach below the intersection there's an arrow
6 board, and the cones go all the way out from the edge of the
7 travel lane to the lane line. There's no room for a bike
8 there. And what you're doing there is you're forcing the
9 bicyclist to go into the extra travel lane. However, if those
10 cones were pulled back about four feet from that lane line the
11 bicyclist wouldn't have to go into that -- into the number one
12 travel lane.

13 There was a comment earlier that people putting these
14 signs up may not have a high school education. For general
15 edification, you can't put -- you can't do traffic operations
16 on a public roadway unless you're under the direction of a
17 registered engineer. So the guy putting the cones out may not
18 have much of an education, but the guy responsible for the
19 safety of that work zone does have the -- the proper education.

20 And finally, as a regulatory agency we will make all
21 of our final comments on these proposed changes and everything
22 else proposed for the California MUTCD after the public
23 comments are incorporated. But generally these documents are
24 in conformity with the federal standard. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, Steve.

1 Any other comments from the audience? If none, we
2 bring it back to the committee. Any -- any further discussion
3 among committee members now?

4 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Question.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Farhad.

6 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: In following with Hamid said, I -
7 - I also support the proposal with the clarification of the
8 cones, but I had one question. I really like Jeff's idea about
9 the clarification on the -- on the bike. And I also like
10 Steve's idea about if we can show the bike lanes. Is that
11 possible or is this too late in the process, or is -- how --
12 how can we accommodate these two good, good ideas?

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I'll let Johnny come in on it
14 if he wants to. I think it's of a level and a scope far beyond
15 what I intended to accomplish here. I think it's ideally a
16 good idea. We've showed what Caltrans -- the drawings that
17 Caltrans already has shows what you do when you have to share
18 the space or when you constrict the space. There is language
19 in the manual that talks about the need for continuity of a
20 bicycle routing. But certainly it goes beyond what I had
21 intended to accomplish in the agenda here. It's probably a
22 good idea, but probably would be a lot of work to develop in
23 this short period of time.

24 Do you want to add anything to that, Johnny?

25 MR. BHULLAR: That's cool.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

2 MEMBER ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman --

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Mike.

4 MEMBER ROBINSON: -- if I might, adding the bike
5 lines to every one of the -- of the pictures is -- is a lot,
6 and it effectively doubles the size of this area.

7 I wonder if because we're going to be adding a note
8 dealing with bicycles on share the lane, that note could be
9 expanded into something that identifies the potential or the
10 possibility or the probability that there is a bike lane there,
11 and if possible that the bike lane remain clear. If not then
12 the "Share the Road" signs would be implemented.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do you concur with the language
14 that has already been developed for those drawings where the
15 "Share the Road" sign --

16 MEMBER ROBINSON: I do.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- is shown?

18 MEMBER ROBINSON: Yeah. In general I do, yes.

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Okay. Any final comments?
20 Dave, you want to come to the podium, or Jeff?

21 MEMBER KNOWLES: Jeff Knowles, City of Vacaville. I
22 did want to emphasis, though, that bike lane or not the rider
23 is typically riding along the right edge of the roadway. So, I
24 mean, the worst case is the bicyclist has to swerve around the
25 "Share the Road" sign that gets hit, you know, as he's going

1 around the sign. So showing the bike lane isn't necessarily
2 the critical issue. It's just that space. I mean, the diagram
3 is great. If we could just have a paragraph that emphasizes to
4 place the signs out of the shoulder area. You know, because,
5 as I said, bike lanes or not that's where the cyclist typically
6 is, and they're having to weave around those signs. Thank you.

7 You might -- there might be a minimum lane width
8 where it makes a difference. You know, it's not as big of an
9 issue on a 20 foot lane as it is on, you know, a 16 foot or
10 less when you're having to weave over into the 12 foot, you
11 know, travel lane. Thanks.

12 MR. ROYER: Again, Dave Royer, University of
13 California. The National Committee is not going to have one
14 set of plans with bicycles and another set of identical ones
15 without bicycles. It's -- it's going to rely on the additional
16 typical applications to kind of figure out how to do it.

17 The only thing you may want to consider would be, not
18 only on this one where we show the one, "Share the Road," I
19 mean, you may want to show the "Share the Road" with your note
20 ten or whatever number --

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh.

22 MR. ROYER: -- it is, which basically explains that
23 if there's, you know, bicycle activity, particularly if there
24 are bike lanes or a dedicated bikeway or -- or noticeable
25 bicycle activity or whatever, that that is a sign that could

1 always be put on any work zone, on any standard lane. That --
2 that would always be put in or required to be put in by the
3 local agencies, not any standard requirement. So they're not
4 going to be duplicate standard requirements. So it just gets
5 too much, I think. So that's the only comment I have.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thanks for that
7 clarification.

8 Jim, one more comment?

9 MR. BAROSS: I'm going to pull my ex officio card.
10 CBAC has ex officio membership here. And so I'm participating
11 in discussion that should be just the board.

12 I think that there's been sufficient issues raised
13 that this should -- I would request that the proposal be
14 resubmitted -- or actually submitted for the first time to
15 California Bicycle Advisory Committee to help with the
16 incorporation as appropriate and bring forward recommendations
17 so that this important addition can be done as appropriately as
18 possible.

19 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question
20 from Mr. Baross on that issue?

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry?

22 MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I ask just a question?

23 To follow up on that Jim, what you just said, the
24 policy change here at this point for this, as Mr. Chairman
25 mentioned, is only to change of the tubular tube to 42. The

1 rest is pretty much existing manual, existing California MUTCD.

2 Now we need to add --

3 MR. BAROSS: In another place?

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- yeah, adding a couple things.

5 So the CBAC I assume has already reviewed the MUTCD, the --

6 MR. BAROSS: Work zone accommodations, yes.

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: And they have submitted comments,
8 which is part of the 600 page that Mr. Bhullar had.

9 MR. BAROSS: We are in substantial agreement and
10 glad.

11 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Substantial.

12 Now the one that you're just discussing, you
13 submitted a part of those comments or you think that this
14 wasn't even looked by --

15 MR. BAROSS: This particular --

16 MEMBER BAHADORI: This particular one.

17 MR. BAROSS: -- proposal has not been seen by the
18 California Bicycle Advisory Committee.

19 MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh.

20 MR. BAROSS: And it's -- although an initial look it
21 might not have been considered to involve bicycle or pedestrian
22 issues, it obviously does or should, and that's the reason for
23 my request.

24 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Now I'm more clear.

25 Because --

1 MR. BAROSS: If there was a way -- if there was a way
2 to refer to or use some of the drawings that are part of the --
3 not yet included in the MUTCD, that work zone accommodation, I
4 think that would be great.

5 MEMBER BAHADORI: I think I hear you. It goes -- it
6 goes back to my very first question, that if you're reviewing
7 this and then you're going to need to come back again because
8 somebody has made comments as part of the 600 page, but thanks
9 for clarification. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll just point out that, again,
11 the one drawing that shows the shifting from the lane lines and
12 center lines to accommodate a detour, that shows that shift,
13 does show the standard signing that Caltrans has adopted
14 wherever there's a shift on the other drawing. So it is
15 consistent in that regard.

16 The other three drawings derive from drawings that
17 are already in the California MUTCD. They're just minor
18 revisions of it. And Caltrans has not shown that "Share the
19 Road" signing with those situations because there, in effect,
20 no change in the travel lane width that was provided.

21 I'm just concerned that if we go through another
22 cycle this won't get into the 2011 MUTCD because time is
23 drawing short on this. Okay.

24 We've had committee comments. We've had comments
25 from the audience. Just to get the wording right, I would like

1 to present the motion, and I will request a second. But the
2 motion would be to adopt the text, figure and table changes
3 here for incorporation into the 2011 California MUTCD with the
4 understanding that any minor oversights, technical corrections
5 or editorial corrects that may be discovered upon more
6 intensive review by Caltrans staff be allowed to be undertaken
7 without having to come back to this committee since we don't
8 have to time to come back to the committee, and since it would
9 only be of a technical or editorial nature. That is my motion.

10 MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second that motion.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any further discussion?

12 MEMBER ROBINSON: A point of clarification.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes?

14 MEMBER ROBINSON: Does that include the potential for
15 acknowledgment of bike lanes or other facilities or areas that
16 are not -- that are no shown on the plan?

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Does it -- well, it would include
18 the acknowledgment on 6H-105(CA). It would include the
19 appropriate note with regard to where you put in the "Share the
20 Road" signing. And there's language already that has been
21 adopted elsewhere in the manual, and we would extract that same
22 language and put it in the appropriate note number for that
23 drawing.

24 MEMBER BAHADORI: With the understanding that that
25 note is not a standard, it's an option.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, yeah, the appropriate -- no.
2 It -- well, if it's guidance in the manual it would be guidance
3 here and it would be renumbered as necessary.

4 Any other comments, discussion? Okay. All in favor
5 of the motion raise your hands?

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: One, two, three, four, five, six,
7 seven, eight. Okay. Eight votes, unanimous. Thank you very
8 much.

9 Now on the agenda we can have a break if you want to
10 at this point, or I can -- I think 11-2 and 11-3a will be
11 fairly quick. But if you would like a break why don't you --

12 MEMBER BAHADORI: Five minutes.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. A five minute break.

14 (Off the Record From 10:41 a.m., Until 11:01 a.m.)

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Let us call to order the
16 resumption of the meeting.

17 And we go to item number 11-3a, which is a proposal
18 for a standard for the "No Parking of Vehicles for Sale" sign.
19 This is brought to our attention by legislation that was
20 approved by the legislature of Section 22651.9, which allows
21 jurisdictions through the adoption of an ordinance to disallow
22 the parking of vehicle that are for sale, that have a for-sale
23 sign in them. It also allows the jurisdiction to remove those
24 vehicles if it's -- if a notice has been issued to the vehicle
25 as a first warning. And then if it's violated again it may be

1 removed or towed away.

2 In the City of L.A. our city council passed such an
3 ordinance to apply to a couple of streets. And signs had to be
4 developed to allow the city to enforce that regulation.

5 So we are proposing a standard sign here that is
6 shown on page 32. It shows the tow-away symbol, which is a
7 standard symbol. It shows the circle and slash with the big P
8 on it, meaning no parking, and below that it says "Vehicles for
9 sale," and then it shows on the bottom, "To recover the vehicle
10 call" a telephone number to retrieve the vehicle.

11 I'll point out that the two-away symbol is a standard
12 symbol. The circle and slash with the big P is a standard for
13 no parking. What is being -- what is different is the words
14 "Vehicles for sale." That is the proposal and would allow a
15 standard to be used where a jurisdiction adopts such a
16 ordinance and wishes to remove vehicles that have for-sale
17 signs on them.

18 Now I will pass this out to you. The County of Los
19 Angeles has -- let me go through these. Pass those down,
20 please.

21 The County of Los Angeles, during the break, gave me
22 an alternate format for the "No Parking of Vehicles for Sale"
23 sign. And I'd like to ask Bill Winter to come up to explain
24 that.

25 MR. WINTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, My name

1 is Bill Winter. I'm with the Los Angeles County Department of
2 Public Works. We are supportive of the item before you today.
3 We, at the County of L.A., have experienced this problem on
4 the -- on the highways where cars are being parked for sale.
5 It's essentially a criminal enterprise in some cases. Some
6 cases it could be just you, me or others that want to sell our
7 own car. But that's note the typical case for where we've
8 identified locations. And indeed, our -- our county board of
9 supervisors last month adopted an ordinance that -- that
10 certain hot spots where -- where this -- this kind of intense
11 activity is going on of parking of cars for sale, that we can
12 post this sign through an ordinance.

13 And so what I've given and has been distributed to
14 you is simply something that is also allowed in -- in today's
15 MUTCD of -- instead of using the international symbol for the
16 no parking it's -- simply the difference you'll note there is
17 the word parking being spelled out. The other difference is
18 the placement of the tow-away symbol at the bottom of the sign.
19 This was at the suggestion of the L.A. County Sheriff's
20 Department who enforces this provision or will be enforcing
21 this provision of the county code. That was their suggestion.
22 Because under -- the way the ordinance is written, which is
23 consistent with the state law, it's only upon the second
24 offense that the car is actually towed away. So they -- their
25 preference was to somehow minimize that as the -- the

1 repercussion for violation of this.

2 So again, we're supportive of it. Just ask that it's
3 adopted, or if it is indeed adopted in that the uniform sign
4 chart, that this optional sign also be -- be placed in it.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Let's discuss it
6 among committee members. Any questions, comments?

7 Hamid?

8 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes. Just -- Mr. Chairman, this --
9 this is a double-edged sword so we have to be careful.

10 It is a community nuisance. And a lot of the
11 jurisdictions are dealing with this issue. And obviously there
12 is a need. We kind of have a remedy for them to take care of
13 it.

14 At the same time, the way I remember this section,
15 it's just -- the way that it's been drafted, and as Mr. Winters
16 mentioned, is that for a repeat offender. We don't want to be
17 slapping these signs all over the street. And anybody who has
18 a for-sale sign on his car, his car is towed away when he's
19 parked there to go grab a Slurpee from 7-Eleven. So we're --
20 that's why if you do this I -- my -- my preference would be the
21 proposed sign by the County of Los Angeles which mentions the
22 California Vehicle Code so that we know under which condition
23 the -- the vehicle can be towed.

24 And second is that we don't just put this in the
25 uniform sign chart, that there also be a language. Maybe --

1 and on that one I'm not insisting a lot. But it -- my
2 preference would be that there will be at least some guidance
3 language that says under which conditions these signs are
4 installed and enforced.

5 But then again, back to the sign itself, I mean, I
6 just -- I don't have any particular preference whether it's
7 going to be a text sign or -- or an international symbol sign.
8 But whichever way we go -- or maybe we want to have both
9 options. But whatever sign we adopt I would like to suggest
10 that we include the CVC 22651.9 on the sign so that the -- so
11 that the drivers know how -- why they have been cited, and they
12 can challenge if they were towed away illegally. And also the
13 officers and the enforcing agencies know that they have to
14 comply with that section of the code before they tow away cars.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other comments from committee
16 members?

17 MEMBER ROBINSON: And I would speak to the
18 enforcement perspective that without the vehicle code section
19 on there it's conceivable that an officer who is not familiar
20 with this particular section of the law would see the sign.
21 Having the symbol for tow-away zone generally implies that the
22 vehicle can be towed away immediately. And so we could have
23 unfortunate situations where officers were mistakenly towing
24 vehicles on first offenses. So I think the vehicle code
25 section addition is a good step in that direction, if not some

1 language hat said upon second citation.

2 MR. BHULLAR: That would be good. Mr. Chairman, if I
3 can add to that, because there is nothing in California law
4 that prohibits people from putting for-sale signs on their
5 vehicles. So they can place a for-sale sign on the vehicle
6 window. There is nothing in the state law that stops them from
7 doing that.

8 These people drive all over the place, and they park
9 on the street like all the other vehicles. So there must be
10 some safeguard that, as the CHP representative mentioned, that
11 they are not towed away just because they're conducting their
12 normal daily business and they're just parking somewhere\ for a
13 couple hours.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm not sure I understood the
15 comment.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Well --

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Signs would have to be posted on
18 the block to --

19 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. Well --

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- enforce it.

21 MR. BHULLAR: -- when the sign is posted, when you
22 say CVC 22651.9, the officer who is going to call the two truck
23 company or the agency that wants to tow, they need to know that
24 they have to comply with the CVC section before they tow the
25 vehicle away. That if -- okay.

1 There -- there might be actually a problem area, I'll
2 say Broadway in -- in Long Beach, and they post these signs to
3 prevent this problem. But I'm visiting from City of Los
4 Angeles and I have placed a sign for sale on my vehicle. But
5 I'm not using this area for selling my vehicle. I just have
6 business in the area and I'm parking. My vehicle should not be
7 towed without any warning.

8 So if you put the CVC section on the sign the agency
9 knows that they have to check the vehicle. It has to be a
10 repeat offender with a prior notice, that not everybody who has
11 a for-sale sign gets towed away on that block.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll add a comment to that. I
13 think it's a constructive comment to show --

14 (Colloquy Between Chairman Fisher and Secretary Singh)

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Devinder reminded me that we're
16 going to work through lunch. And -- and that for the committee
17 members he's going to order sandwiches.

18 SECRETARY SINGH: If anyone from the public want to
19 order sandwich they can see Dave's daughter outside of the
20 coffee -- coffee area.

21 (Colloquy between Members)

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think it's a constructive comment
23 that I've heard to show the legal authority for the towing. I
24 know that on the signs that we posted in the City of L.A. we
25 showed the LAMC number, just as in the alternative that Bill

1 Winter gave me they show the L.A. County -- what does the other
2 C stand for?

3 MR. WINTER: Code.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: L.A. County code number to make
5 sure that the officer cites the right violation. Probably, I
6 would argue, the L.A. County -- the county code or the
7 municipal code section is probably the more valuable one
8 because the CVC section is just the enabling authority. And it
9 says that a local authority or -- local authority by resolution
10 or ordinance may adopt the restriction. But it's actually the
11 county code or the municipal code that actually codifies that
12 they've adopted such a restriction.

13 So I think that's a constructive comment. On the
14 ones we've posted in the City of L.A. we actually do put the
15 LAMC number on it. And so just a thought that if it's the will
16 of the committee then we could modify it to show the code
17 section XX.XX.

18 Did we have any other comments at the table here?

19 MEMBER ROBINSON: Just some thoughts, Mr. Chair. I
20 agree. I think this provides additional information for both
21 the -- the citing officer and the person who -- who is
22 receiving the citation. It gives them both opportunity to be
23 successful in what they're trying to -- what they need to
24 accomplish.

25 I like -- I like both signs. I know there are some

1 agencies that prefer the wording, some agencies that prefer the
2 symbology. And so I'm a little bit conflicted, though, because
3 the -- the symbol for the tow would, by necessity, have to
4 change locations on both types of signs. And if -- if we were
5 going to consider both I would -- I will then ask, is there --
6 is there a significant implication to the sign in installing
7 the symbol for one and on the bottom for the other?

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'd like to call Johnny Bhullar up
9 to answer some questions regarding the format, but I'll preface
10 that.

11 It's my understanding that there's language under the
12 parking section that says basically you could use the word
13 message or you could use the symbol message. But there's
14 another part that also says -- that states the order of what
15 needs to appear on the sign. And usually the most drastic
16 restriction or action needs to appear on top. And so I think
17 there already is language that says the tow-away symbol or tow-
18 away message would be the first message that would appear on
19 top.

20 Johnny, can you add to that?

21 COMMISSIONER HARRIS: Yes. Johnny Bhullar with
22 Caltrans.

23 You're right, John, in that the way the parking signs
24 and the signs work is that most of them, depending upon, first
25 of all, the color issue regarding whether something has been

1 prohibited or something is allowed, the green and the red takes
2 precedence. And then after that it's the -- the symbol is
3 always -- if there is a symbol that is recognized it's included
4 in the Federal Standard Highway Signs book, then the symbol is
5 the preference to the word message, even on parking signs.
6 And -- but if the symbol is not there then, of course, not to
7 use the symbol, then the second level comes to us in the word
8 message. And of course, there are standard word messages,
9 starting with "No" being the primary word. So in the general
10 sense those are the rules that are set.

11 But for parking signs the federal manual basically
12 does leave a lot of options as to just general guidelines.
13 There are three sections which talk about their principles and
14 how they want you to be designing the parking signs for this
15 type of stuff.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So let me ask you, Johnny, if were
17 to adopt what's in our agenda package would there be anything
18 that would prevent a local jurisdiction having followed the
19 appropriate section of the vehicle code from using a word
20 message sign that says no parking?

21 MR. BHULLAR: That would be perfectly okay.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And in addition, if we adopt
23 this sign would there be anything that would preclude a local
24 jurisdiction from using the tow-away message rather than the
25 symbol?

1 MR. BHULLAR: Actually, the manual does allow both,
2 so it will be fine. It's just that the symbol is encouraged
3 over the word message.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

5 MR. BHULLAR: The preference is that.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Then the third question is under
7 the language we have does it allow the tow-away symbol to be
8 shown on the bottom or does it require that it be shown on the
9 top?

10 MR. BHULLAR: I think it has been shown on the bottom
11 on the signs that the feds have included in their book. So the
12 top and bottom, I'm not sure how much precedent there is. I'll
13 have to look into the manual for that.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. My recollection is that
15 currently in the California manual we state the order of things
16 that things must appear.

17 Devinder, do you have a copy of the California
18 manual?

19 SECRETARY SINGH: I have it on my computer.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Can you look under the
21 parking section as we discuss this and see if it prescribes if
22 the tow-away symbol must be shown on the top versus any other
23 location on the sign?

24 SECRETARY SINGH: Our projector is working. I can
25 pull that up, too.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Okay.

2 MEMBER KNOWLES: And while they're working on that --

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jeff.

4 MEMBER KNOWLES: -- we had a discussion once before
5 when dealing with school area parking and loading zones about
6 to what degree local agencies can take approved language from
7 various signs, like the parking symbol, the tow-away, your
8 vehicle is for sale, and mix and match with other -- you know,
9 what if you needed an arrow sign? I know that you can have an
10 ordinance that applies agency wide. You could just have a
11 problem in a particular area. You know, to what degree can
12 local agencies mix and match symbols like the arrow signs or
13 the two-way arrow signs that designate areas in which this was
14 in effect?

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I believe the -- there's language
16 in the manual that allows you to use symbols that are shown on
17 other signs. But there are so many different signs in the
18 parking section that if you showed every combination --

19 MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- if you say tow away, no stopping
21 4:00 to 7:00, do you have to illustrate tow-away, no stopping
22 4:00 to 6:00, or 4:30 to 7:00, or 4:30 to 6:00. So there are a
23 lot of combinations. I thought there's language that allows
24 that latitude, but I guess Johnny is going to pull it up to see
25 if there is indeed such language.

1 Any other comments from the -- from this table here?

2 MEMBER KU: Mr. Chairman --

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Dwight?

4 MEMBER KU: -- I do have a question. I think as the
5 CHP representative mentioned earlier, it's important to -- for
6 the citing officer to have a reference to the code. Now would
7 both the vehicle code -- not being familiar with the
8 legislation on vehicle code, but would the vehicle code and/or
9 the county code or the municipal code have the language
10 regarding the second citation?

11 So I guess what I was concerned about is if -- if we
12 want to only have the municipal code or the county code, would
13 those always have the language that this is a repeat offense?
14 If not, then you -- you -- it seems like you need the vehicle
15 code. But again, you know, I'm not sure if the vehicle code
16 actually refers to a repeat offense.

17 MEMBER BAHADORI: The vehicle code doesn't.

18 John, can I --

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

20 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. On that one the vehicle code
21 actually does and I'm glad that, Dwight, you brought -- brought
22 up that issue. Because if you're citing two different pieces
23 of law on the same sign then which one is it cited for? For
24 example, the municipal ordinance or the county ordinance may
25 allow towing or removal without having given the notice the

1 last 30 days. But the state law doesn't allow you to do that.
2 The state law, you should have given the vehicle the notice
3 within the last 30 days and then you tow them.

4 So if the two laws are contradictory I don't think
5 that we can put both on the same sign. That's a good point
6 that Dwight actually brought up.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I know on the municipal code
8 adopted by the city for the two streets on which we place these
9 signs the ordinance actually spells out the process that is
10 consistent with the state enabling ordinance, state enabling
11 legislation. So -- but I think if there's language which
12 prescribes that it be on top, that spells out the order.

13 I think there's language that discusses each and
14 every sign type. And then there's language that talks about
15 where you can place arrows, tow-away message, time of day, day
16 of week, that type of thing.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) Are you talking about
18 what the word -- the -- the exception to the word message
19 (inaudible)?

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: No. I'm talking about there's a
21 section that talks about the order in which the -- the message
22 on the restrictive signs appear. For example, if you had "No
23 Parking, Street Cleaning," it spells out in what order the
24 message would occur. In other words, the "No Parking," that
25 comes before the "Wednesday," which occurs before the "10:00

1 a.m. to 12 noon," etcetera.

2 MR. BHULLAR: I'm not exactly familiar.

3 Johnny, you want to look that up?

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. It's not in the discussion
5 of this -- each individual sign. It's kind of a general
6 discussion. Well, I'll work with Devinder on the sidelines
7 maybe.

8 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And let me see. I'll work with
10 Devinder on that --

11 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- on the sidelines.

13 Let's go to comment from the audience. Conrad?

14 MR. LAPINSKI: Yes. Conrad Lapinski, the City of
15 Dana Point.

16 I have a little concern with your sign, John, because
17 the problem from our standpoint, on a 12 by 18 inch, which is
18 okay width of sign, typically when we do these our option has
19 been to stick that tag on top of that sign, the tow-away part
20 of it versus the symbol that goes on the top. Because by
21 putting that on the sign and adding in the vehicle code, and if
22 I have to stick arrows on there the letters are going to be so
23 small you won't be able to read all of the options on that
24 sign.

25 So if you can get that tag or -- or leave me the

1 option of having that tag stuck onto the top of the sign to say
2 this really means tow-away, that's all I'm asking, not that we
3 approve the sign and lock it up with all the extra stuff on
4 there, and I've got to put an arrow or entire block of some
5 other qualifier onto that same size.

6 MEMBER BAHADORI: Can -- can I ask a question, Mr.
7 Chairman?

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Lapinski, have you seen the --
10 L.A. County's proposed signage?

11 MR. LAPINSKI: I have not. But again, I'm saying --

12 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, because it seems like they
13 have done the actual dimension of the letters. And the "No
14 Parking" -- the "No" part is about six -- about seven inches,
15 and the "Parking" is about three inches, which is typically
16 what we use for "No Parking" signs.

17 MR. LAPINSKI: Okay. But we've -- we've also
18 discussed adding on the code section onto that sign. And if I
19 have to add on --

20 MEMBER BAHADORI: They have that also. You may want
21 to take a look. But I agree, if you -- if you get the option
22 of having the plate on the sign, you know --

23 MR. LAPINSKI: Right. That -- that's all I'm asking
24 because --

25 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

1 MR. LAPINSKI: -- if you put the other qualifiers,
2 entire block or arrows or everything else that needs to go onto
3 that, yeah, you're -- you're asking me to put another two lines
4 on here that identify other stuff along with this. So I'm
5 saying as long as I've got that option to stick that tag on
6 there then I can stick the rest of it on and still be okay --

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: Sure.

8 MR. LAPINSKI: Legible.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think you're allowed to do that.
10 It isn't widely illustrated but I think it's -- you're allowed
11 to have a separate tag.

12 MR. LAPINSKI: Okay. I just want --

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: You're allowed --

14 MR. LAPINSKI: -- have that option.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- to have a separate --

16 MR. LAPINSKI: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: You're allowed to have a separate
18 plate -- plate that shows arrows on it, but it isn't widely
19 illustrated.

20 MR. LAPINSKI: Well, I'm just asking for the option
21 to leave the -- the tow-away tag or the tow-away symbol as
22 the -- as the option, other than the arrow.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: You mean, not to show it?

24 MR. LAPINSKI: Not to make it a part of the sign.
25 Have the option to be able to stick that tag in above like --

1 like we do now.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think that option already exists.

3 MR. LAPINSKI: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: The only -- the problem presenting
5 any parking sign is that there are many possibilities. For
6 example, we could have had the tow-away message on here. We
7 could have had the "No Parking" words. Or we could have had
8 the two-away symbol and the "No Parking" words. Or we could
9 have had the tow-away message and the circle and slash P.
10 There -- there are many different combinations. And I'm trying
11 to work with Devinder and Johnny on the sidelines to find the
12 language that actually allows that, but I'm pretty certain that
13 it is allowed.

14 MR. LAPINSKI: Okay. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And, in fact, if you look at the
16 drawing we have on page 32, right under that "Vehicles for
17 Sale," actually, in our city we did show the LAMC number. And
18 now that I hear the comment here we probably should require
19 that the -- the authorization for it be shown so that the
20 officer knows exactly what to cite, and therefore better
21 understands the process he needs to go through.

22 MR. LAPINSKI: I absolutely agree with that. All I'm
23 saying is that I have another couple of things that may have to
24 go onto that sign too. And using up the space for the symbol
25 or not letting me do that tag on top precludes me from doing

1 that. So I just don't want you to take that option away from
2 us.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: In displaying this I don't think we
4 intended to take away the option that isn't widely used but can
5 be used to have a separate tow-away plate, just like you could
6 have a separate plate that shows the arrows or that say "Begin"
7 and "End."

8 MR. LAPINSKI: I understand.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And I --

10 MR. LAPINSKI: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I -- correct me if I'm wrong, but I
12 think there's illustrations and language in there that -- that
13 allows you that option.

14 MR. LAPINSKI: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's my understanding anyway.

16 Mike?

17 MEMBER ROBINSON: Mr. Chair, if we were to approve
18 the -- the sign that's proposed for us today I'm assuming
19 that -- that the -- the engineer and the agencies would have
20 some latitude in determining more specifically the message and
21 the type of symbology to use for this type of application; is
22 that correct? Or would there be a point beyond which the sign
23 would become invalid? I'm trying to accommodate the desires of
24 L.A. County, as an example --

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

1 MEMBER ROBINSON: -- to get to a sign that's --
2 that's more appropriate for them, yet not include ten new "No
3 Parking" signs in the manual.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I still didn't understand the
5 question. Can you --

6 MEMBER ROBINSON: This -- this particular sign --

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

8 MEMBER ROBINSON: -- if were to approve it --

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

10 MEMBER ROBINSON: -- it is -- it's not this specific
11 sign that would be mandatory that all agencies produce out on
12 their -- in -- in their agency. They could, for instance, if
13 they wanted to say "No Parking" as opposed to the no parking
14 symbol they wouldn't be able to do that.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. I think Johnny clarified
16 that that is an option to show the "No Parking" words or to
17 show the tow-away message rather than the symbol, or some other
18 combination thereof. I think Johnny clarified that, that we
19 could do that.

20 I think probably the only issue is does the tow-away
21 message need to be shown at the top or does our language allow
22 it to be shown --

23 MEMBER ROBINSON: At the bottom.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- elsewhere on the sign.

25 Mr. Roseman.

1 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. David Roseman from the City of
2 Long Beach.

3 I guess my comments are more conceptual in nature.
4 We've been aggressive in Long Beach in the last, I don't know,
5 15 years. We believe that we could regulate this prior to this
6 code section. So we have hundreds and hundreds of blocks that
7 are prohibitive for vehicles that park there for sale, and we
8 don't sign it. We do essentially what is in the vehicle code
9 now which is a notice and a warning before -- before a citing.

10 And that's what concerns me about this sign. And
11 really we have some questions that we want to ask about why is
12 such a sign needed. Because I don't know of any other sign
13 that we have in the MUTCD where it's unenforceable until the
14 second offense. Every other sign we have, "1 Hour Parking," "2
15 Hour Parking," "No Right Turn," "No Left Turn," you do that you
16 receive a citation. This you don't receive a citation, you
17 must receive a warning.

18 So I think it's in a different category. And
19 actually, I would like to bring up Amy Burton, our city
20 attorney, that really wants to ask both Los Angeles and L.A.
21 County, why do they believe a sign is even necessary based on
22 the type of wording that's in the vehicle code.

23 MS. BURTON: Dave essentially just asked my question
24 for me. Amy Burton with the City Attorneys Office.

25 But my question, I noticed, Mr. Chairman, in your --

1 in your memo requesting this -- requesting approval that the
2 City of Los Angeles, the city attorney has opined that signing
3 is necessary, but it doesn't seem to be required by the vehicle
4 code.

5 So can you share with us what the basis is for the
6 city attorneys -- is it something that's in your municipal code
7 or --

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. Let me comment on that. The
9 document that I submitted -- and I'm glad you brought this up
10 because it's probably something I should have stated in my
11 comments, is the proposal here is an optional sign. We state
12 here under background,
13 "Some cities would -- some cities would find it necessary to
14 post signs to advise of the streets affected by the
15 restriction. Accordingly, a proposed sign has been
16 developed for optional use by jurisdictions who adopt such
17 an ordinance."

18 So what we're stating here is that consistent with
19 the vehicle code section it doesn't say a sign is required, and
20 we would agree with you on that.

21 In the City of L.A., 470 square miles, extensive,
22 population of 4 million, there have been situations in the past
23 where we were not able to have an ordinance that would apply to
24 parking restrictions unless we properly posted them on the
25 streets that were impacted. So the city attorneys opinion in

1 Los Angeles applied only to the large jurisdiction of L.A.
2 where they felt that the citations would not stick unless we
3 identified not only the specific street but signed for it.

4 So the proposal here would be that it would be
5 optional for a city to use if they wish to inform people of the
6 restriction. But you are absolutely correct, the vehicle code
7 does not require this sign. But if a jurisdiction wishes to
8 use a sign what sign do they use?

9 MS. BURTON: And I can understand that there are good
10 reasons for -- for wanting to sign it.

11 Something that one of your other commissioners raised
12 earlier was that -- that I think would also be helpful, if
13 either L.A. County or L.A. City could share at some point, is
14 sort of what the guidelines are for posting. Because, for
15 example, with our street sweeping signs, you know, there is
16 some guidance in the vehicle code about where they should be
17 posted and how frequently. And with this, as Dave was saying,
18 we have long stretches of some fairly major streets that --
19 that are subject to no parking of vehicles for sale.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Uh-huh.

21 MS. BURTON: So it would be, I think, helpful to know
22 what people view as -- as a necessary frequency of the signage,
23 if -- if anybody has that information.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well --

25 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question,

1 not -- not from the speaker but from the point that you raised?

2 You mentioned that your city attorney has -- at least
3 your city attorneys opinion is that for you to be able to
4 enforce the vehicle code we need to have the signage.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: In the large jurisdiction of Los
6 Angeles.

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: The state law does not distinguish
8 for this section between the size of the jurisdiction. The
9 vehicle code does not say that this is for cities over 500,000
10 or whatever. The section of the vehicle code is uniformly
11 applied to all jurisdictions. So if your city attorney has an
12 opinion that he can not apply this section of the vehicle code
13 because you're a large city then, as the speaker said, then we
14 need to get a lot more specific as to what a definition of
15 large jurisdiction is and what are the guidelines for
16 installations and all that.

17 I'm not particularly fond of the sign. If the cities
18 find it useful, great. You know, adopt it and put it there.

19 But --

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Well, I think what we were
21 told --

22 MEMBER BAHADORI: But don't we need to add language
23 in the MUTCD that under what conditions you put it up, you put
24 the signs up. Because I --

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I was proposing it as an

1 option.

2 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Cities may post where they wish to
4 inform. That's the language that we have here. It would not
5 be a mandate, but it would say if you wish to inform your road
6 users of this unusual restriction then -- then here's a sign
7 that you may use.

8 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: It was always intended to be an
10 option.

11 MEMBER BAHADORI: But this is a regulatory sign. The
12 regulatory signs for placement, they need to have statutory
13 authority, either at the state level or a local municipal or
14 county ordinance. So if you are authorizing a new regulatory
15 sign in California I think that just putting it in the uniform
16 sign chart without addressing some of these issues may actually
17 create more problem for the jurisdictions themselves.

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, it was not proposed that we
19 just put the sign in the sign chart with no knowledge. We'd
20 have to have supporting language that cites the vehicle code
21 section that states clearly what the vehicle code section --

22 MEMBER BAHADORI: That -- the only thing that
23 concerned --

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- states, and that this would be
25 an option.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: But the only thing that concerned
2 me was the language that you brought to our attention, and this
3 is in your -- on page 31. And this is the second paragraph
4 under background and what you highlighted, that your city
5 attorney was giving you a legal opinion that for enforcing that
6 section of the vehicle code you need to have a sign.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: In Los Angeles.

8 MEMBER BAHADORI: The vehicle code does not
9 distinguish between Los Angeles of Vacaville or Long Beach or
10 Mission Viejo.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. So in Vacaville or Mission
12 Viejo if the -- the advice of legal counsel was that they would
13 not need a sign for effective enforcement they would not be
14 required to put up a sign.

15 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But -- but if -- if a city
16 attorney of the largest city in California says you can not
17 enforce this section of vehicle code in my city without a
18 sign -- or is that --

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: They did not say that you could not
20 enforce it. They said as a practical matter if you want
21 effective enforcement you better post the signs. And were
22 advised by legal counsel it would be wise to use the sign.

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: So is this like more to address
24 community issues and political issues, that people may
25 complain, why are you towing my car, I didn't know?

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, because this only applies on
2 two streets out of six -- it applies to two miles of 6,500
3 miles of street, so it's a very unusual restriction. And they
4 thought it would be advisable to let people know where this
5 restriction applies.

6 MR. ROSEMAN: I would like to make just a couple more
7 points, if I could. I would like to reiterate that we have a
8 conceptual problem with the sign in that it's not immediately
9 enforceable.

10 Secondly, there's a whole series of parking
11 restrictions that aren't signed that are enforceable such as
12 "No Parking for Over 72 Hours," "No Parking Blocking a
13 Crosswalk," "No Parking of an Intersection." You don't have to
14 sign for any of those, and of course all of those. So we see
15 this restriction in the same category as those, that it doesn't
16 have to have a sign.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: But, Dave, what if you're not
18 applying this restriction citywide?

19 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. That's -- that's why this
20 section is in the vehicle code that says you have to provide a
21 warning. You can not immediately enforce it. And we -- and,
22 you know, I understand L.A. is much larger, but I get to
23 differ. We probably have the most restrictions in the state of
24 the vehicle -- of no parking vehicles over -- no parking of
25 vehicles for sale. We have hundreds and hundreds of blocks,

1 long stretches. And if the goal of this committee is to create
2 uniformity across the state, especially here within Southern
3 California where in L.A. you may have some signs posted, and in
4 Long Beach we don't post them, I think that adds to some
5 confusion as well.

6 So that's why we would object to this or -- or
7 suggest that more study needs to be done on this. Because I
8 think we're creating potential confusion, and we're creating a
9 sign that's not immediately enforceable and I -- I think that
10 sets a precedent.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you.

12 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Question. Dave --

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, he had a follow-up question for
14 you, Dave.

15 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Dave, just so I can understand
16 the complexity in Southern California, so -- so if one
17 jurisdiction says, hey, for added emphasis we like to have a
18 sign -- and I clearly do get, you know, the point your raising
19 about consistency. So if one jurisdiction says for political
20 reason or for technical or legal, whatever those reasons, we
21 like to have an added emphasis and we like to have flexibility,
22 then would creating an advisory sign solve the problem among
23 other jurisdictions?

24 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. I think that would be probably
25 the better way to go. I don't know what it would look like

1 now.

2 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct.

3 MR. ROSEMAN: But it would be like a warning sign --

4 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct.

5 MR. ROSEMAN: -- as opposed to one that you
6 immediately cite.

7 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right. Because if I'm reading
8 between line, and I don't want to speak for John, but probably
9 what the issue is, is the lack of sign sends two messages.
10 One, the community doesn't know that the police department is
11 dealing with it. And number two, those who get towed say we
12 didn't know.

13 So maybe, John, this is just an idea for you, and --
14 and maybe an advisory sign, you know, is something you want to
15 think about. I just -- I just wanted to get Dave's
16 perspective, and he says that's more acceptable, appears to be.

17 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. I would think that would be. I
18 think I really just have the conceptual problem of a sign
19 that's unenforceable.

20 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Got it.

21 MR. ROSEMAN: And that's why the -- the vehicle code,
22 I believe, was written the way it was, to provide that notice
23 and that warning by -- by letting people know they can't park
24 there, by not issuing them a citation. Most enforcement
25 agencies throughout the state don't do warnings. Their warning

1 is the citation. So --

2 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And I'll just comment on that and
4 then I'll go to others.

5 You are right, the sign in and of itself is not
6 enforceable. It's the process that's spelled out in the
7 vehicle code. And when this was adopted we had to have special
8 training of our parking enforcement staff to make sure that
9 they were thoroughly familiar with the process of issuing the
10 warning first and how to make sure we are consistent with the
11 vehicle code, and it was adopted as part of the training of our
12 parking enforcement officers. So I would agree that you just
13 can't enforce the words on the sign, you have to enforce the
14 whole process as part of that.

15 MEMBER KNOWLES: If I could ask a clarifying
16 question. The -- the vehicle code is authorizing towing. So
17 the part of the sign that prohibits parking of vehicles for
18 sale is separate. So that -- you can -- in fact, the vehicle
19 code requires a parking citation to initiate the -- a prior
20 parking citation to initiate the towing process.

21 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. But you still have to have the
22 warning before you can issue the citation. But let me --

23 MEMBER KNOWLES: I would disagree with that. The --
24 the warning reference in the vehicle code is a warning on the
25 citation that you will -- your vehicle is subject to towing in

1 the future. You can cite the vehicle for parking with -- with
2 a for-sale sign on it. I mean, I don't know. To me, is
3 that -- is that the --

4 MR. WINTER: You're correct. And our account of
5 this, too, is the same as yours. And again, Bill winter for
6 the record.

7 And we've talked to our county counsel on this and
8 how this -- how the county code was formulated. And just maybe
9 to kind of answer some of the -- the questions that have come
10 up and starting with this last point being made, the -- the way
11 this part of the vehicle code is written it is intended to
12 start with a parking citation. On the back of the citation --
13 and so the sheriffs department is working on the language that
14 would appear on the back of the citation -- it will say
15 subsequent violation will result in impoundment of the vehicle.
16 That's consistent with the vehicle code.

17 But the -- the problem that we're -- is trying to be
18 addressed here is the fact that parking citations by themselves
19 are not taking care of the problem. Somebody who is selling a
20 car, these criminal enterprises I'm mentioning, they don't pay
21 that kind of a citation. That's just a nuisance that they
22 don't bother to deal with. To get their attention you do need
23 to impound the vehicle.

24 And so it went through the legislative process about
25 a year or two ago and this is the result, is what you see in

1 the vehicle code today.

2 The county -- in making our findings in the county
3 code worked with the sheriffs department, we worked with DMV.
4 We consulted with several cities, as I've been talking, if
5 you're unaware, county counsel for Long Beach and the City of
6 L.A.'s attorney, several cities have done their restrictions a
7 little differently. Some -- some may say they want to restrict
8 the parking of cars for sale citywide, every street, you know,
9 residential and arterial.

10 In the county we -- we took the approach of looking
11 at hot spot locations. Where are these activities occurring on
12 a frequent basis, on an intense basis. And findings were being
13 made in the county ordinance that those are problem spots.

14 In discussion with our board of supervisors they
15 realized if you cite in one location or -- or begin enforcing
16 in one it just is going to move further and further down the
17 block. So the way the county ordinance was written is on a
18 major or secondary highway this is a prohibited activity. If
19 you park your car for sale on your local street you're not
20 going to be cited. But if you do a citywide ban you could post
21 signs at the entry point to your city if -- if you have the
22 geographic configuration that allows for that.

23 Some cities allow permits to be exempt. I think
24 we've seen this, too, where you can park, but only within 500
25 feet of your place of residence.

1 So every city under -- the way the vehicle code is
2 written today has the ability to kind of tailor it to what
3 their needs are. And then in talking to their attorney,
4 their -- their legal counsel, they're going to have to decide,
5 do they have to go to the added step of signage.

6 Why I'm saying that we're supportive of this
7 particular sign, because he's talking our county counsel,
8 they -- they believe the signs re going to make the effective
9 deterrent for the activity and -- and, again, get the message
10 out there that it's -- it's a prohibitive activity. So that's
11 why we've gone along that same line with the county counsel
12 opinion that the signs are needed at this time, not to say that
13 there could be a change, a subsequent change in state law to
14 clarify that -- that point.

15 And I -- and I should have raised, there was a mobile
16 billboard law that came through about the same time that the
17 cars for sale prohibition came through. If you read that
18 legislation and how that was incorporated into the vehicle code
19 it's very clear, and it says right there, signs are not
20 required to enforce the mobile billboard law. So an unhitched
21 trailer, for instance, with -- with a billboard on it, that can
22 be immediately impounded under the way that provision in the
23 state law is written.

24 That's the difference here with the cars for sale.
25 It doesn't specifically say signs are not required. It's --

1 it's simply silent on that point. So there's that distinction.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Other comments? Those
3 people want to come to the podium, then I need to go to Johnny.
4 He has something to say.

5 MR. ROSEMAN: One last thing is that the sign also is
6 not only for the motorist, but it's for the -- the residents
7 that live next to the sign. And the fact that it says tow-away
8 and the officer can not tow the vehicle away, first off, I
9 think that creates confusion and potential issues as well. So
10 the sign does two purposes, it's the motorist, as well as the
11 people that all right adjacent to it.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Jacob, then we'll go to
13 Johnny.

14 MR. BABICO: Jacob Babico from the County of San
15 Bernardino. Recently I was involved in two cases in the
16 unincorporated area for vehicles for sale. One thing is that
17 looking at the sign I believe the purpose of the sign is they
18 want to impose the no parking tools into the operation of
19 vehicles of sale. Because there is an existing regulatory
20 sign. It reads "Vehicle for Sale Prohibited." So we used that
21 and it worked.

22 And the reason of that is, to me, it's better than
23 imposing no parking in order to prohibit vehicles for sale. Is
24 that what Hamid brought to our attention, the formula, is that
25 what if that person or individual is not intending to sell but

1 forgot to remove the plaque from his car while he was coming
2 from a convenience store?

3 There was a story that happened in the city. A
4 driver came back to home and parked in front of his house and
5 he forgot to remove the plaque, vehicle for sale. He was
6 cited, and he was parked in front of his house. So that is a
7 dilemma.

8 And then what's the -- what are you going to do with
9 that existing regulatory sign? Is that going to be side by
10 side with this sign proposed?

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: What regulatory sign?

12 MR. BABICO: Well, there is a sign -- there is a sign
13 that says, "Vehicles for Sale Prohibited." We used it and it's
14 working. And now we're coordinating working with Rancho
15 Cucamonga CHP and, hey, they have got it. And the reason of
16 that is recently most -- I was told most of the auto dealers,
17 they were invading unincorporated commercial areas where the
18 street is that they park. And we used that sign and it's
19 working.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, that sign pertains to vehicle
21 code section -- or the streets and highway code section 731,
22 and I think that may have something to do with the state
23 highway. Whereas there was a new vehicle code section adopted
24 which is different than that. It reads differently. And it
25 has a warning system applied to it. So one sign applies to one

1 section of the Streets and Highways Code. This proposed sign
2 would apply to that specific section of the California Vehicle
3 Code.

4 MR. BABICO: But again, I'm citing what Hamid was
5 saying. There's an issue. There will be some individual going
6 to park in that zone. Their intent is not to sell the car.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah.

8 MR. BABICO: What do you do with that? Anyway,
9 that -- these are my comments. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you. Johnny?

11 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I
12 believe, John, this is what you had in mind. The guidance
13 there where it says, "Parking signs should display the
14 following information from top to bottom of the sign in the
15 order listed," and then it has A through F. So A being any
16 tow-away message or symbol as the first, on top. And second is
17 the restriction of prohibition. Third, C, is the time of the
18 day that is applicable, not at all ours. And D is the day of
19 the week that it is applicable. It's not every day. And then
20 E and F we have added on. So E -- E and F are what we have
21 added on to this list.

22 And, frankly, to be honest with you, I wasn't even
23 aware of this. That's why I was struggling, because this is
24 the portion of the manual that, thanks, it's educational for
25 me. I never knew that there was such a thing.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. Thank you. Okay. It's
2 a good thing we didn't tackle this before we take our break
3 because things are never as quickly -- go as quickly as you
4 think they would.

5 We've had discussion from members in the audience.
6 We've had discussion here. This issue is a little complex.
7 But the general proposal is to allow the posting of a sign
8 where a jurisdiction believes that it would be helpful in
9 enforcing Section 22651.9 of the vehicle code. We have the
10 alternate version by the County of Los Angeles. If we want to
11 allow -- if we want to allow this option from the County of
12 L.A. we would have to amend another part of the California
13 MUTCD to allow the tow-away message of symbol to be at the
14 bottom of the sign. But we had a statement from Johnny that
15 says if you were to adopt this sign you would not be precluded
16 from using word messages instead of symbols.

17 Now -- so I would -- well, I guess I'll ask, do we
18 have a motion to adopt this sign for optional use pursuant to
19 the vehicle code section? And if anyone wants to propose a
20 motion they may wish to include a requirement that the county
21 code or municipal code section be shown on this sign. Do we
22 have a motion to move forward on this?

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I -- can I ask
24 one question before we --

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: We'll see if somebody makes a
2 motion.

3 I'm still struggling with the fact that the vehicle
4 code does not say anything about the need for the sign. And if
5 the vehicle code does not say anything about the need for a
6 sign, why are we introducing a new regulatory sign into the
7 California Uniform Sign Chart?

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: For optional use.

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Well, in the case of the
10 regulation usually, you know, there is not really -- I'm
11 trying -- I'm just going through the Uniform Sign Chart as fast
12 as I can remember to see if we have any other regulatory sign
13 that is used as optional. Because usually the regulatory signs
14 are signs that you get cited for a violation of -- for doing
15 that kind of activity and their placement is mandatory. You
16 have to place them, speed limit signs, like the stop signs.
17 So --

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll give you an example. There's
19 a vehicle code section which allows local jurisdictions to post
20 no parking between 2:00 and 6:00 a.m. in the morning.

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: There's a standard sign that shows
23 what you can use at the city limits or at the freeway off-ramp
24 and the entrance to the city. There's also a sign that shows
25 what you can use if you elect to post it on the applicable

1 streets. That sign is not a mandate to be posted on the
2 applicable street, but some jurisdictions may wish to do so
3 because of the expanse of their city. And one off-ramp will
4 not notify everyone who enters the city. That would be one
5 example.

6 Farhad?

7 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman, can I ask L.A.
8 County a question through you, please?

9 Bill, I want to make sure I'm understand L.A.
10 County's -- L.A. -- I'm asking you, L.A. County is supporting
11 adoption of such a thing and likes to also include this, or is
12 it you say we don't care but if you do it's this?

13 MR. WINTER: No. The first thing you said. We --
14 we're supportive of -- of adding a sign. But what we're asking
15 is that just as it -- the sign is proposed here by the chair
16 for the international symbol for no parking, we're asking that
17 the text be put in. The only other difference is the placement
18 of the tow-away provision at the bottom. Although if I
19 understand that there's precedence in the MUTCD today that that
20 message must go at the top, I think we maybe take that
21 statement back to our sheriffs department, too, that we're not
22 looking to change that part of the --

23 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right.

24 MR. WINTER: -- MUTCD, in fact, by where the tow-away
25 goes. They are, in the sheriffs department, are suggesting the

1 bottom line to kind of in a subtle way says that's the second
2 part of the offense. The first is -- and always you will be
3 cited for it a crime.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

5 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Thank you.

6 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So, Mr. Chairman, I mean, I
7 clearly feel and understand Hamid's concern. My view is just a
8 little bit different.

9 If -- if two huge agencies in our state have
10 determined they'd like to have the option to use something, I
11 think we should provide them with that option. And whether
12 other agencies wish to use them or not, I think that's --
13 that's all us to us, the 58 counties and 460 cities.

14 So I have no problem with making the motion, and --
15 and I hope it goes correctly, to approve the request and a
16 couple of amendments. One is on the City of L.A.'s proposal
17 that the section of the vehicle code be put on there, at
18 minimum. And then also on the L.A. County's proposal that it
19 be in full compliance with the MUTCD, as Bill described, so
20 that way we don't have to get into another revision. So that
21 would be my motion.

22 MEMBER HENLEY: And we'll see if you get a second.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well --

24 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Is it --

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- there's a motion, and I'll

1 second it. Could I ask for a friendly amendment?

2 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Sure.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Instead of showing the vehicle code
4 we would show the applicable county code or the municipal code,
5 because that actually is the enforcement mechanism.

6 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Let me ask. John, would that
7 take care of your concerns, either/or?

8 MEMBER KELLER: Since I don't have experience with
9 the municipal code or the county code I don't know how fully
10 they reflect what's in the vehicle code.

11 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: They refer to it. They typically
12 don't. Sometimes they do, sometimes they don't. I mean, I'm
13 sure L.A. County and city attorney can tell. But in our county
14 code we don't duplicate what the CVC says, we refer to it.

15 MEMBER KELLER: Well, I guess the concern would be do
16 they reflect -- does the local code reflect the full conditions
17 that -- that the primary purpose of the vehicle be parked for
18 sale, so it -- it prevents the stopping at the convenience
19 store and getting a citation, providing the -- the first
20 citation with the incorporated warning on that citation. So
21 I've been through -- if the local code is fully consistent with
22 the vehicle code then, you know, perhaps it's more or less
23 difficult for somebody to -- to refer to one rather than the
24 other.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I can tell you in the City of L.A.

1 we refer to the process that's spelled out in the vehicle code
2 because we need to make sure that our officers go through that
3 process, otherwise the citation will not stick.

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I -- okay.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well --

6 MEMBER BAHADORI: The way I see this vote is that we
7 are approving a concept. We typically do not approve a concept
8 in one shot. Even if we want to go with this I would be
9 able -- I'm willing to support it, as long as the final signs
10 and the language that goes into the MUTCD comes back here, not
11 that we just approve a sign in concept and we say we think --
12 we think it's a good idea, now go develop it, and whatever the
13 final outcome might be, and then just put it in the Uniform
14 Sign Chart. Whoever wants to use it they use it. If they
15 don't want to use it they don't use it. There's no guidance,
16 there's no option. There's no saying where you can use it,
17 under what conditions.

18 Because it's just -- we typically do not introduce
19 regulatory signs like that. That's my concern. If -- if you
20 want -- and to the maker of the motion, if your motion is for
21 the sign concept to move forward and come back in the final
22 form with the language that approves what section of the MUTCD,
23 I'm willing to support it. But if you are saying, oh, this is
24 a good concept, go and put it wherever you want, I'm --

25 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's a good question.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I'm a little concerned about
2 that.

3 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So looking at, Mr. Chairman, you
4 and L.A. County, do you think you guys, if -- if we would make
5 this a conceptual -- a better word -- approval and then it
6 comes back and you and L.A. County work on the specifics and
7 come back with some, would that -- would that help?

8 MR. WINTER: That's acceptable to me, and I'd be
9 happy to work on the narrative part of --

10 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: RIGHT.

11 MR. WINTER: -- how this sign would be described. I
12 think I could support, in that sense, taking the CVC reference
13 off of our sign if it's then mentioned in the narrative, that
14 as an option to the agency that cares to carry out the
15 provisions of the CVC that they adopt a local ordinance. And
16 our ordinance at the county does cite back to the CVC. It --
17 it follows the exact provisions, with the added step of then
18 making the findings about those hot spots of where this
19 activity is occurring. So I can -- I can work with the city or
20 others if -- if it's a matter of just coming up with narrative.

21 What I was hoping for today, it sounds like if -- if
22 the committee is entertaining this, to allow this in concept to
23 move forward because we do need to -- to begin a production of
24 these. Obviously, they were just approved in our board of
25 supervisors last month. And so they are -- there is an

1 expectation now on us from our legislative body that we move
2 forward in being able to enforce that provision.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. And let me comment on this.
4 If you see in my transmittal letter I said not only adopt the
5 signs, but adopt the text. And I know it's been standard
6 practice for every parking sign we have, there's text that
7 accompanies it. And it sites the vehicle code section so that
8 we know what the authority is for that.

9 It was my expectation, and maybe I glossed over it
10 way too quickly, that the text in the California MUTCD that
11 refers to this sign would refer to Section 22651.9, and would
12 repeat that appropriate text to make sure --

13 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Can somebody read that.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- the process is followed.
15 It's -- it's on page 33 of your handout. So the -- the intent
16 was that --

17 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So I see. So -- so you're
18 saying -- but Hamid is saying in addition to this we usually
19 come up with where you use them and those kind of things.
20 That's what he's saying it's like, not -- not what page 33
21 says.

22 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. What I'm saying is -- okay,
23 let me give you an example. Okay. A city comes and sees this
24 sign in the Uniform Sign Chart and has a municipal ordinance,
25 okay, and goes and puts two of these signs at the entrance to

1 the city and says, oh, I have only 65,000 people. I'm not a
2 large city, I shouldn't be installing it at every single block,
3 and starts towing people away. Is that -- if that's what you
4 want to do, fine. But let the MUTCD be specific that that
5 option is given to the city, that under what conditions these
6 signs are used. Are these for entrance to the city use? Are
7 these for block use? You know, we go through that with every
8 single sign.

9 I have no problem with the sign moving forward, I'm
10 just saying let's do it like we have done all these other
11 signs, that they be -- we come up with a final sign or
12 variation of signs. Mr. Lapinski mentioned the option of
13 having a plate on top and all that. And then also have the
14 text in the MUTCD so that when somebody sees the Uniform Sign
15 Chart and sees this sign where a number is given, he knows
16 where the uniform sign -- where in the MUTCD he needs to go
17 read how to install this. That's my concern, or suggestion I
18 should say.

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can I offer then another friendly
20 amendment, that if this sign -- that -- that the motion be that
21 the sign be adopted with the text indicating that the
22 appropriate municipal code or county code shall be show, and
23 with the understanding that the text that refers to this
24 standard sign repeat in its entirety Section 22651.9, and
25 indicate that for jurisdictions who believe that the posting of

1 the signs would aid in enforcement that this be -- that this
2 sign be an option for those jurisdictions.

3 MEMBER BAHADORI: That's -- that's a good one. The
4 first question that comes to my mind is that we are saying that
5 the sign is going to be fabricated, referring to the municipal
6 ordinance. But the language in the vehicle code is going to
7 refer to the CVC, to the state law.

8 So -- and some of the ordinances like, for example,
9 L.A. County or City of L.A., you may just copy verbatim the CVC
10 and that's your ordinance. But the County of San Bernardino,
11 then they have ordinance that's not really the CVC. They have
12 adopted something else, which they can. So what I'm saying is
13 that -- my suggestion is that I think the signs should be given
14 the option of putting municipal ordinance or the CVC, either
15 one. And in the text the reference is made. I don't think
16 there's a need to verbatim refer -- to repeat the whole CVC
17 section.

18 But my -- my suggestion is more under what conditions
19 the cities or the counties exercise this option for installing
20 the sign.

21 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I think -- I think my intention
22 was -- that's why I asked L.A. County to work with you and come
23 back. And -- and that allows, also, participation by City of
24 Long Beach and others. I think the concept is something we
25 support.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: Sure.

2 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I just don't think we're ready
3 for prime time saying go, start manufacturing this tomorrow.
4 That's -- that's -- you know, so I think that's really what it
5 said. I don't think we're arguing about the concept. That's
6 why coming back and working on one sign, perhaps two signs, you
7 know, with the symbol or the letters, and then taking into
8 account everybody else's, now we're doing our normal practice.
9 That seems to be the best way to proceed if the committee wants
10 to proceed.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

12 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Let's hear from --

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: We have -- we --

14 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- others, yeah, just --

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: We had -- we had a friendly
16 amendment. I guess we didn't adopt that friendly amendment.
17 We had a motion and a second to the motion.

18 I think what it comes down to is whether we wanted
19 this sign to be adopted as part of the 2011 California MUTCD or
20 if we wanted to wait. But this bill has been in effect for
21 some time, and jurisdictions will be pressured to implement the
22 signs so that the --

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: I think you can still adopt it as
24 part of 2011.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. You can state and include in

1 2011 after adopting at the next meeting.

2 MEMBER BAHADORI: If you bring it next meeting, next
3 meeting, that's when we adopt the California MUTCD.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is that true, Johnny?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Yes.

6 MEMBER BAHADORI: We are not adopting MUTCD this
7 meeting. It's next meeting.

8 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: And the sign and the appropriate
10 language can come back next meeting.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is there -- is there -- would that
12 be true, Johnny?

13 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Then we'll come back.

15 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So -- but I mean, but we need to
16 get the input of the committee and approve all concepts, Jeff,
17 as items before he comes back; right? Because when he comes
18 back I think the idea is we don't discuss the concept and
19 whether it's a good idea or not, just move on to technical
20 parts of it.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jeff has a question.

22 MEMBER KNOWLES: What is the remaining issue? I
23 mean, we have a number of options that include guidance, if we
24 simply put in a guidance statement that's stated that this sign
25 may be installed but 22651.9 does not require that the sign be

1 installed. I mean, that kind of guidance would -- wouldn't
2 that relieve what Long Beach is concerned about? And it
3 wouldn't be unique to provide guidance with an option like
4 this. And then we've solved both issues, haven't we?

5 MEMBER BAHADORI: That's -- that's exactly, Mr.
6 Knowles, what -- what I'm saying, that if you put it in the
7 manual that the state law does not require the installation of
8 the sign. If you want to install you use this sign with --
9 with reference to the vehicle code or with your own municipal
10 code, and what are --

11 MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

12 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- the parameters.

13 MEMBER KNOWLES: It could just be a very simple
14 guidance statement. And I think we would --

15 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

16 MEMBER KNOWLES: -- relieve what -- what -- that way
17 no motorists could go to any traffic commissioner and say, you
18 know, they really should have put in this sign because guidance
19 would have clearly stated that the sign wasn't necessary for
20 those agencies that choose not to install the sign but still
21 have a local ordinance.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Well, my sense is that the
23 committee is not yet ready to approve this item. Do I read it
24 correctly?

25 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes.

1 MEMBER KNOWLES: As written.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. We'll bring this back to the
3 next --

4 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So the motion -- I'm sorry. So
5 the motion is we're approving it in concept, we're bringing it
6 back with those ideas for adoption; correct?

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. I think what you're asking
8 is to see the accompanying text that would go in the California
9 MUTCD.

10 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. But -- but not to
11 debate whether this is a good idea or not and start all over
12 again.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right.

14 MEMBER HENLEY: One more quick question. Okay. I
15 think that part of your motion was to put the -- the symbol at
16 the top of the sign --

17 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct.

18 MEMBER HENLEY: -- to be consistent with the MUTCD?

19 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I said to be consistent --

20 MEMBER HENLEY: Okay.

21 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- with MUTCD.

22 MEMBER HENLEY: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Well, I think Bill and I
24 will work together offline and bring this back to the
25 committee. So --

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: And still becoming part of the 2011
2 MUTCD.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you.

4 Item number 11-4a, internal approval for optional use
5 of green colored pavement for bike lanes. This a Caltrans
6 item. Wayne?

7 MEMBER HENLEY: Yes. Since we last met the Federal
8 Highway Administration has given interim approval for using
9 optionally green colored pavement for bicycle paths or lanes.
10 And we've had quite a few people that wanted to do that and try
11 it. And so I think Caltrans is proposing that we write for a
12 blanket interim, you know, exemption or interim approval for
13 California so that any jurisdiction in California could use the
14 green, you know, in the meantime, until it eventually gets into
15 the MUTCD.

16 MEMBER KU: Excuse me. The lunch has arrived. So I
17 don't know. If you want to get down or to hold on that or --

18 MEMBER HENLEY: This may speed this -- this item up
19 if we do.

20 MEMBER KU: Just know it's here.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's a short item.

22 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's true.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So we've -- we're joined on this
24 item, since it is a bicycle related item, by Jim Baross. And
25 the item has been introduced.

1 Jim, do you want to comment on this?

2 MR. BAROSS: Yes. I had a message from the chair of
3 the California Bicycle Advisory Committee. I'm going to read
4 it.

5 "An FHWA interim approval is not an amendment to the
6 National MUTCD in the way that a Caltrans top D (phonetic)
7 is an amendment to the California MUTCD. It simply means
8 that interim approval is automatically granted to any
9 jurisdiction that makes a written request for it and
10 complies with specified conditions pending reviewing the
11 official rule making process. The 2009 National MUTCD was
12 a product of the full rule making process.

13 "Caltrans, in addition, has conscientiously devoted
14 substantial effort and attention, including opportunities
15 for public comment, to deciding whether the changes in
16 that edition should be incorporated into the MUTCD.

17 "I see," that's Alan speaking for the California Bicycle
18 Advisory Committee, "I see no reason for a recent interim
19 federal approval to leapfrog this process. The issue is
20 not urgent in any way. Following established procedure,
21 therefore it should first be referred to CBAC, California
22 Bicycle Advisory Committee, for discussion at its next
23 meeting."

24 We are requesting that the item be tabled and first
25 reviewed by the California Bicycle Advisory Committee.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me ask about a process. I
2 thought under our current process any populated item that comes
3 to the committee is then referred by the executive secretary to
4 the Bicycle Advisory Committee so that they would have an
5 opportunity to take -- take -- render an opinion on it before
6 it comes back to this committee. Did that occur?

7 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

8 MR. BAROSS: I'm sorry?

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Did that occur?

10 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah, that occurred. I emailed
11 this information to CBAC, our Caltrans coordinator, and she
12 forward to CBAC committee. And I have not received any
13 official -- their position. That's all.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: When it was referred to CBAC, from
15 the time it -- when was it referred to them?

16 SECRETARY SINGH: I'm not responsible to work with
17 CBAC. I'm responsible to work with Caltrans coordinator, which
18 is Ann Gray (phonetic). So I forwarded the agenda to Ann, and
19 she's going to get comments from CBAC later and give me their
20 official opinion.

21 At the same time I received four or five letters from
22 different bicycle coordinations supporting this interim
23 approval.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And I think we received
25 these letters of support by email.

1 So I want to make sure that we're adhering to the
2 process that we agreed to adhere to with the Bicycle Advisory
3 Committee. One, was this sent to the Bicycle Advisory
4 Committee? I'm told it has been. And did you have a meeting
5 from the -- after it was sent to you prior to this meeting
6 today?

7 SECRETARY SINGH: No. No. They did not have an
8 official meeting. CBAC hasn't met officially. But our -- our
9 argument is that if we don't have meeting before our meeting
10 they can electronically submit their comments to Caltrans
11 coordinator, and the Caltrans coordinator will submit those
12 comments to me. And then I will forward those comments to
13 CTCDC.

14 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Baross, he -- he
15 raised an issue. What's the urgency of this item?

16 SECRETARY SINGH: There's a lot of agencies.

17 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

18 SECRETARY SINGH: If we don't take action then
19 individual agency can go to the FHWA and they can get approval.
20 So our -- our process is if anything gets approval it should be
21 by the FHWA. We're going to -- Caltrans is going to request a
22 blanket approval. That's our process. Johnny can maybe
23 elaborate more on that.

24 MEMBER BAHADORI: Just on -- one thing, just -- and
25 I'm going to listen to Mr. Baross, if CBAC -- okay.

1 From what I'm hearing, the only reason that CBAC may
2 want to ask for more time or continue this is because they may
3 have concerns. So if they have concerns and you go out there
4 and ask for the interim approval of FHWA and promote the
5 installation of these things throughout California, then coming
6 back and saying that, oh, by the way, our own Bicycle Advisory
7 Committee has problems and we don't want to really do this,
8 they have actually created a problem.

9 So if -- if we are not sure that we want to do this,
10 if an agency wants to do it let them go through their own FHWA
11 approval. But by us going and getting and FHWA approval we are
12 going to give a blank check to everybody in California to do
13 it.

14 SECRETARY SINGH: Then we are in violation of our own
15 policy. Okay. I received letter from San Francisco MTA
16 supporting this (inaudible). I received a letter from
17 California (inaudible) supporting this one. I see the
18 California Bicycle Commission supporting this (inaudible).

19 MR. BAROSS: What organization?

20 SECRETARY SINGH: California Bicycle Commission.

21 MR. BAROSS: Coalition.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I had an agreement with
23 Robert Kaw (phonetic), and we codified in a letter, that any
24 item that's bike related that's referred to this committee
25 would then be referred to the advisory committee so that they

1 would have one meeting opportunity to act on it. My
2 understanding, from what I've heard, is you have not had an
3 opportunity to have a meeting --

4 MR. BAROSS: That's correct.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- to -- to agendize this.

6 MR. BAROSS: That's correct.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I feel obligated to say that
8 we need to respect that process and give you at least one
9 meeting to consider the item before --

10 MR. BAROSS: Our next meeting is August.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- so that we could have the
12 benefit of your perspective on it before we act on it.

13 MR. BAROSS: I think that's fair, and that's what I'm
14 trying to ask for. The California Bicycle Advisory Committee
15 meets every two months.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

17 MR. BAROSS: You meet four times a year. We have
18 more frequency, and there should be opportunity for us. We're
19 not delaying. We plan to hear this at our next opportunity,
20 which would be August.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So, Wayne, would that --

22 MEMBER HENLEY: That's okay with me.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

24 MEMBER HENLEY: I mean, there's not sense of urgency.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Farhad.

1 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'm not getting on part. We
2 approve an experiment for the city-county of San Francisco;
3 correct?

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

5 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay. That went through the BBAC
6 [sic] and that's --

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: CBAC.

8 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: CBAC. That's how we approved it.
9 All San Francisco, and I'm advocating on their behalf, is
10 saying is why are you putting us through an experiment process
11 where the federal interim approval is there? Why are you
12 putting us through this entire process where you have already
13 approved it, and at the federal level it's approved? And
14 Devinder is very right, we have, by policy, said in order to
15 minimize the effort and the expense for the local jurisdictions
16 that if there is a federal interim approval then we will grant
17 that. That's how we tried to expedite it.

18 So the -- the Bicycle Advisory Committee has already
19 reviewed San Francisco's application. Why is it that every
20 single time they have to review the same thing?

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I think when San Francisco
22 came to us the feds had not given internal approval.

23 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I understand.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So --

25 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But they reviewed it and we

1 reviewed it. So all this action does is allows places like San
2 Francisco not to go through an experimental but to go through
3 the actual implementation should they wish to do it.

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: But -- but we still have not gotten
5 the results back from San Francisco.

6 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But we don't need to. You have
7 the federal results.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: Nobody is required now anymore to
9 submit any data (inaudible) interim approval. They not asking
10 any more data.

11 MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. That's for our
12 experimentation.

13 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But they don't need all this.
14 That's -- I think that's the point. Once a federal -- and
15 maybe I'm wrong -- once the federal interim approval is given,
16 correct, Johnny, once the federal interim approval is given
17 can -- let's say on this case -- can County of Marin go out
18 tomorrow and pave one mile of their bike lanes green without
19 coming to this committee?

20 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
21 The short answer, Farhad, is, yes. The county can write
22 directly to FHWA and get a blanket approval. And as you know,
23 it's a very informal procedure that it's almost a given. You
24 just write a letter and the next week you get back and you can
25 do it.

1 However, I did want to go over a couple of issues
2 regarding the background on generally how we look at interim
3 approvals that might help the debate here.

4 Now, basically, what we -- the way we have been
5 working with this, any time the feds issue interim approval I
6 want that to be on the agenda of this committee. However,
7 regarding the decision as to whether we going to go for it or
8 against it, and if we need the time to look at it, for example,
9 the flashing yellow arrow, we took more than two years, there
10 are two other interim approvals right now that Caltrans has not
11 acted on and they have been pending for almost, what, three
12 years, four years.

13 So I would say the urgency is not there. But we do
14 need to at least make up our minds as to whether there's a
15 vehicle code or law or something that is inherently wrong in
16 California for this so that no one can get into that situation
17 that they're seeking interim approval and then running afoul of
18 state laws or something.

19 But -- so the urgency isn't there. But it should
20 stay on the agenda until we make a decision one way or the
21 other. That's all I'm saying.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you. Jeff?

23 MEMBER KNOWLES: And I would urge caution with
24 regards to this issue. And hopefully the bicycle advisory
25 committee will get the available collision data. Because when

1 I was very slowly jogging the Long Beach Marathon and came
2 across one of these roadways that was striped this way, I asked
3 the two police officers that were directing traffic there,
4 "What do you think about that green pavement?"

5 And they said, "It causes a lot of collisions, a lot
6 of driver confusion. It creates a false sense of security."

7 It sounded a lot like a striped crosswalk.

8 I heard from a second source that there's been a
9 significant increase in bicycle collisions where they've put in
10 this green pavement.

11 So I would urge that we limit the number of places in
12 California where they're conducting experiments. Because it
13 looks like for -- even though the intention is very good it may
14 be creating a false sense of security that's increasing bicycle
15 related injuries and collisions. And so we need to be very
16 cautious about this.

17 MEMBER BAHADORI: And, Mr. Chairman, if I can follow
18 up on what Mr. Knowles said, that as far as the California
19 drivers are concerned, California MUTCD or the Federal MUTCD
20 doesn't mean a thing. The California law for driving is the
21 California Vehicle Code. And as long as the California Vehicle
22 Code does not identify and does not regulate any kind of
23 pavement color for whatever purpose we can do whatever we want.
24 But as Mr. Knowles said, it -- it may cause only additional
25 confusion if it's not built into the vehicle code, if it's not

1 built into the California driver education program.

2 If I'm going to the City of San Francisco and I have
3 not seen a green bicycle lane in my life in Southern California
4 and I see it up there, as far as I'm concerned it's just
5 colored pavement.

6 MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, and there's maybe --

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: So that's why we have to be a
8 little bit more careful before we kind of spread out these
9 things all over the place.

10 MEMBER KNOWLES: Or we might need to better define
11 exactly what we're talking about. Because I'm specifically --
12 I am specifically talking about where a portion of a travel
13 lane has been painted green with no other bicycle striping. It
14 was kind of a share-the-road concept down the number two lane
15 on a street, rather than could we use green asphalt within the
16 confines of a bike lane to kind of make pretty bike lane.
17 That would be two separate issues.

18 But on page two of the federal document, the third to
19 the last paragraph where it says, "The FHWA believes that the
20 experimental green colored pavement has a low risk or safety or
21 operational concerns," it sounds like that's a false premise.
22 I'd like to see what data they base that on, because the data I
23 hear coming out of Long Beach is exactly the opposite.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

25 MEMBER HENLEY: Oh, can I just say --

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Wayne.

2 MEMBER HENLEY: -- I think that the green color,
3 number one, is supposed to be supplemental to any other bicycle
4 markings and signs.

5 MEMBER KNOWLES: As opposed to just the shared lane
6 down the center --

7 MEMBER HENLEY: Yes.

8 MEMBER KNOWLES: -- of the number two lane?

9 MEMBER KELLER: Yeah. And the other thing is,
10 though, that we did make a commitment to CBAC that they we're
11 supposed to weigh in on this as a group, and they apparently
12 have not. So I think we should pull the thing from the agenda
13 until they have a chance to weigh in on it. Because what
14 happens, every time we see this, we get these interim approvals
15 we have a lot of people feeding the federal register and we get
16 all kinds of letters saying, oh, we want to do this now, now,
17 now. Well, they can if they want to go directly to the feds.

18 But, you know, I think, you know, we've made a
19 commitment to our Bicycle Advisory Committee to hear what the
20 have to say before we even bring it to this committee. So I
21 think we started off prematurely on this one.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would agree with Wayne. I had
23 the understanding that your committee had a meeting opportunity
24 to see this, and apparently they didn't. And so it would be my
25 intention that we consider the merits of these green bike lanes

1 as an interim approval after we have the perspective of the
2 Bicycle Advisory Committee.

3 MR. BAROSS: I appreciate that, but you do have some
4 public comment.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. We'll -- Johnny.

6 MR. BHULLAR: John, just a quick comment. I think,
7 since it's on the agenda and it will help CBAC, as well as this
8 community here, if we can still -- if we hear from the public
9 as to whatever issues there are.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. I had intended on calling on
11 people in the audience. Yes.

12 MS. WHITE-KJOSS: Andrea White-Kjoss with the Board
13 of Directors of the California Bicycle Coalition. Thank you
14 for the opportunity to speak today. And I wanted to -- the
15 conversation here is actually particularly interesting and
16 shows that we should indeed move forward with some definitive
17 guidance on this item.

18 The comment about sort of the anecdotal evidence on
19 the -- from -- from some of the police officers, from -- from
20 perhaps some of the citizens is an educational issue. It's not
21 a verified numbers issue.

22 The number in -- here in Long Beach clearly show,
23 clearly show that there's a great success in the colored bike
24 lanes. The 12-month review and survey of this project shows a
25 100 percent increase in total bicyclists, a 300 percent

1 interest in cyclists in the correct position in the shared
2 lane, a 50 percent decrease in cyclists on the sidewalk where
3 it's illegal in this business district, and no increase in
4 cyclists in car conflicts.

5 Change is difficult. There's a perception of
6 conflict and difficulty. However, the numbers show exactly the
7 opposite. I speak for the California Bicycle Coalition on this
8 agenda item. And so I don't want you to think that I'm only
9 speaking about Long Beach. I know there are other projects
10 around the state that are -- you know, the numbers perhaps have
11 yet to come back in, or perhaps you guys are aware of them.

12 But I would say that the -- you know, kind of tabling
13 this issue is -- we would not recommend that from the
14 California Bicycle Coalition standpoint at this moment.
15 However, if the process needs to be followed to let CBAC do
16 their review of it then that's something that we would support.
17 But I did not want to leave today without mentioning that
18 there's actual evidence that this is not backed up by numbers
19 that has been stated here. And -- and so I appreciate the
20 opportunity to do that.

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: The California Bicycle Coalition is
24 a member of CBAC, isn't it?

25 MS. WHITE-KJOSS: Jim, do you want to answer the

1 exact status of that?

2 MEMBER BAHADORI: Because -- because -- because what
3 I'm hearing is that the -- because what I'm hearing is that the
4 Bicycle Committee says we have consent, bring it to the
5 committee to CBAC. And then I'm -- I'm hearing the most
6 influential member of the committee saying don't table it and
7 move forward.

8 MS. WHITE-KJOSS: Let me clarify. What I'm trying to
9 say is that if CBAC has not had an opportunity to review this,
10 that I think that process should be followed. However, I think
11 that it, number one, should be followed as quickly as possible
12 because clearly there is confusion. There is a lack of
13 education about bikes out there that can then be propagated to
14 our citizens that they better understand how to interact with
15 these as quickly as possible.

16 And then the second point that I was trying to make
17 were the actual statistics and safety and usage.

18 MEMBER BAHADORI: But you're supporting the tabling
19 of this and taking it back to CBAC; right?

20 MS. WHITE-KJOSS: We do support it because it will be
21 a month or two delay, I believe. That's my understanding.

22 MEMBER HENLEY: Mr. Chairman, you know, the first
23 thing, you know, the feds have had -- you know, been watching
24 these things going on for ten years. So they -- they obviously
25 have a lot more experience with green lanes than we do, number

1 one. Number two, we haven't -- so you know, it may not be a
2 bad idea. I mean, I have heard some anecdotes recently which
3 are kind of anti green pavement. But again, those are
4 anecdotes. And I -- and I do want to see data, and I think we
5 all want to see data.

6 And -- and like I say, CBAC hasn't weighed in. And
7 I'm the -- the proponent of this -- of this measure or item.
8 So I'm going to just pull it off the table right now and we'll
9 talk about it next time.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think Mr. Snyder wanted to speak
11 to this item. Did you? I wanted to make sure we heard you
12 before we go onto the next agenda item.

13 MR. SNYDER: Yeah, just very quickly. And I
14 understand this will be heard at the next meeting so that --
15 and that's -- that's fine. I just wanted to clarify. My
16 understanding of what you're looking at is not the Long Beach
17 style green lane in the number two lane, sort of the share of
18 what I call super share. It's rather a painted green bicycle
19 lane. So it's a different kind of thing that you're really
20 looking at.

21 And I think that one of the reasons this came up was
22 be I prepared an experiment for the City of Lancaster to go
23 ahead and use green bicycle lanes. And so that I -- but I
24 urged that when you do bring this up that you do support it.

25 They're very good at the -- I mean, the issue is that

1 bicyclists are invisible out there. And coloring a lane can
2 make bicyclists more visible. It can also have an impact of
3 slowing the adjacent traffic down. And I've got not only
4 Lancaster, but I've got quite a few other client cities that
5 are interested in using these. So I hope that at your October
6 meeting you are able to support this.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you. I had a question before
8 we move away from this item. I've heard it said that if you
9 apply to the feds for -- for application you could go ahead and
10 do it. I thought, per Section 21401 of the Vehicle Code, any
11 device that you want to use in California must have first been
12 approved by this committee. So the feds provide interim
13 approval, but I thought the committee had to approve its
14 application in each situation.

15 SECRETARY SINGH: That is true. And that -- that --

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is that true, Johnny?

17 SECRETARY SINGH: It is true, John. But we would
18 like (inaudible) do not give anything from this approval if
19 (inaudible) agency is asking. They're not responding to our
20 request. They can still give approval because that's still
21 legal basically. We have special policy in our California
22 MUTCD (inaudible) how to implement interim approval. We are
23 very clear on that.

24 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, for California you
25 need to comply to the California MUTCD. If you can go to the

1 federal government and get a direct approval from the federal
2 government to do something in California, bypassing the
3 California MUTCD, why do you even need to have a California
4 MUTCD? We already have a Federal MUTCD and you can take it and
5 use it.

6 The interim approvals that the federal government
7 issues, if you want to use it in California you need to go
8 through our approval process. By the same logic that we need
9 to have our own documents and the federal government asks us,
10 actually, to -- to treat this document in general compliance
11 conformity with the federal document.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So if I'm hearing correctly you've
13 got to go to both the feds and this committee before you can
14 implement anything.

15 SECRETARY SINGH: One thing that I want to make
16 clear, that that will be between you and Robert Kaw, our
17 associate. If CBAC is not meeting before the CTCDC meeting
18 they need to communicate electronically. So they must submit
19 comment. I'm not saying we have to meet by the next CBAC
20 meeting.

21 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chair --

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Farhad?

23 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: -- apparently this whole process
24 is super confused by everybody. But here is the most important
25 thing, this item was placed on our agenda by Caltrans, and

1 Caltrans is withdrawing this item. So why are we discussing it
2 anymore?

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think we're about ready to
4 conclude this item.

5 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Please.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And we'll go back to CBAC. And my
7 understanding is that you have a meeting between now and our
8 October meeting --

9 MR. BAROSS: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- is that correct?

11 MR. BAROSS: And I do appreciate the discussion and
12 the information provided, even though it is tabled. Because
13 I'll take that forward. And others are welcome to come to the
14 CBAC meeting the first Thursday in August.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you for that. We're
16 going to move on in the agenda.

17 (Off the Record Colloquy Between Reporter and Chair)

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: We'll take a ten minute break.

19 (Off the record from 12:38 p.m., Until 12:51 p.m.)

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. We're resuming the meeting
21 about 12:51 p.m. We would like to conclude the meeting today
22 at three o'clock, that's our goal, because of those who have
23 flight arrangements back. So we really need to move more
24 quickly through the agenda.

25 We're on item number 11-6, the FHWA --

1 SECRETARY SINGH: By what time, John? By what time
2 do you think?

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's our goal.

4 MEMBER HENLEY: A.m. or p.m.?

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: FHWA's interim -- I'm sorry --
6 yeah, interim approval for optional use of an alternative
7 electric vehicle charging general service symbol sign.

8 MEMBER HENLEY: Again, the -- the FHWA back in April
9 gave us interim approval to use a new service -- general
10 service sign for electronic vehicle fueling stations. And this
11 shouldn't be too controversial. It's -- if you look on page 39
12 of -- of the agenda you can see what the, basically the -- it's
13 a sign that's, again, it's optional, and it's pretty well laid
14 out. It looks like a gas pump with an electric power cord
15 connected to it.

16 There was some controversy over -- I think some
17 people suggested instead of having EV on it they -- they have
18 an electric -- it looks like -- it looks like a lightning bolt.
19 But they didn't want to get too -- people too concerned about
20 getting struck by lightning, so they decided they didn't have
21 to do that.

22 And anyway, again, this is an optional sign. And I
23 think we should go after, you know, a statewide approval on
24 this so that any -- any jurisdiction that wants to help let
25 people know that there are electronic fueling stations around,

1 it's a good idea. And it's -- if you're following the markets
2 at all it looks like the electronic vehicles are catching on.
3 I just saw just this morning where the Leaf is going to
4 increase the price of its vehicle by \$2,500, so that means that
5 there are people buying them.

6 Well, I guess what I'm looking for from the committee
7 here is just to agree that we should go after the statewide
8 approval for this.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do you need a motion?

10 MEMBER HENLEY: I need a motion.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. That's the proposal. And
12 it's my understanding that if we approve this then each
13 jurisdiction that wants to use these signs would basically have
14 to get our permission where we would readily grant them
15 approval to do so; is that correct?

16 MEMBER HENLEY: No. I think if we approve do they
17 have to get our permission --

18 SECRETARY SINGH: No. No. No.

19 MEMBER HENLEY: -- or they just have to let us know?

20 SECRETARY SINGH: No. We just ask for blanket
21 approval. And this is not something critical, you know? We
22 don't need to inform us. Because if something is like colored
23 bike lane, flashing yellow arrow, we want that information that
24 they installed. So tomorrow if FHWA somehow (inaudible) can
25 install (inaudible) anyway, you know, standard. So --

1 MEMBER HENLEY: Well, we do -- we do maintain a list
2 of all the people that have put these in, and that's part of
3 the agreement. So, you know, the -- it's not like we approve
4 it or anything. But we do maintain a list so in case something
5 goes wrong with -- with our experiment we can at least inform
6 you that you've got to pull the signs out.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So if we were to approve this item,
8 if the jurisdiction wants to use it what is their requirement?

9 SECRETARY SINGH: Which is going to be from
10 committee. Caltrans go ahead and request blanket approval from
11 the FHWA to use this sign in the State of California. Then the
12 agency don't need any permission they can go ahead and install
13 that sign. That's all.

14 MEMBER HENLEY: But the condition is, and we must
15 agree to comply with the conditions, and basically it's we
16 maintain and inventory list of all the locations where these
17 things are installed. That's all it means. It just means let
18 us know where you put them in. It's like your flashing yellow
19 arrow. You know, we've had a number of agencies put those in
20 since we got the statewide approval.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So if we approve this item they
22 just send us a communication informing us where they've
23 installed these?

24 MEMBER HENLEY: Exactly.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

1 SECRETARY SINGH: And then we place this interim
2 approval letter on our website. So these agencies are aware
3 this sign is approved to use in California.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any discussion by the
5 members of the committee on this item? Any -- any comments
6 from members in the audience?

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: I make the motion to approve the
8 item as requested by staff.

9 MEMBER ROBINSON: I'll second.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's been moved and seconded. If
11 there's no final discussion we'll have a vote. All those I
12 favor say aye.

13 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Sorry about that. I shouldn't
15 swallow when I say aye. Okay. That matter is approved.

16 Now we have item number 11-7.

17 MEMBER HENLEY: 11-7 comes out of our strategic
18 highway safety planning implementation efforts. And if you
19 remember a few meetings ago Johnny's brother came and presented
20 what the strategic highway safety plan was all about. And in
21 fact, they're -- they're implementing. And basically there's
22 one group that's -- that's focusing on motorcycle safety. And
23 I know one of the big issues right now is they're trying to
24 argue about how safe it is to do lane sharing or lane
25 splitting.

1 But in the meantime one of the suggestions they made
2 is they'd like to be able to have a special sign that if -- if
3 we've got, especially in a construction zone if there's more
4 than two inches difference in adjacent lanes, or actually less
5 than two inches, if their -- if their pavement is uneven that
6 they -- they get a sign that basically reminds motorcycles
7 that, hey, things -- you know, you're going to have to be real
8 careful here because you could wind up losing control going
9 from one lane to the next.

10 And so they have proposed and, you know, we have
11 accepted their proposal to basically put a plaque on the
12 uneven -- uneven pavement sign to basically bring motorcyclists
13 attention to the -- to the fact that the -- the pavement is
14 uneven. And it may not -- and it -- and it -- if it's less
15 than two inches we can still put that sign out there just to
16 make sure that the motorcyclists pay attention.

17 MEMBER BAHADORI: Don't we already have an uneven
18 sign?

19 MEMBER HENLEY: We have an uneven pavement.

20 MEMBER BAHADORI: We have an uneven --

21 MEMBER HENLEY: Yes.

22 MEMBER BAHADORI: You have an uneven pavement sign.

23 MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah.

24 MEMBER BAHADORI: So why do you --

25 MEMBER HENLEY: It's -- that's for pavement that's, I

1 think more than two inches.

2 MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

3 MEMBER HENLEY: See, now if it's only an inch, which
4 may not seem like much to us, but to a bicyclist or to a --

5 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

6 MEMBER HENLEY: -- motorcyclist it's a little more
7 critical.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any comments by committee
9 members? Any comments by those in the audience?

10 MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. We revised it a little bit
11 because it was brought to our attention that there was some
12 confusion as to what uneven pavement is.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Why don't you --

14 MEMBER HENLEY: Johnny, I think, has raised his hand.
15 He wants to say something.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Yeah. I'm --

17 MR. BAROSS: Jim Baross speaking --

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Go ahead.

19 MR. BAROSS: -- on his own behalf. Uneven pavement
20 is certainly a hazard for two-wheeled vehicles, ones that have
21 to balance, because the linear difference in height goes to
22 the front wheel with either a bike or -- bicyclists or
23 motorcyclists. And we call it a diversionary fall. It's very
24 hazardous for bicyclists or motorcyclists. So I encourage
25 the -- the signing and marking and warning for even differences

1 down to some minimum.

2 Do you have -- does the -- does the proposal identify
3 the minimum or just anytime it's less than two inches? I
4 suspect you might want to include the minimum. But I encourage
5 the -- the hazard warning.

6 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
7 Basically, as you might have seen the handout that's been
8 passed around, there was a little change between the time
9 from -- the time the agenda was published. And John Keller, as
10 well as Gordon Wong of our staff, they worked together. And so
11 there is a slight change in the proposal, the reason being that
12 new 2009 MUTCD has additional language and section for a
13 motorcycle plaque in traffic control type situations.

14 So because of that, as you can see, now, rather than
15 having two -- a couple of paragraphs of additional language we
16 have only a minor change. And as you can see, the portion that
17 is in red is what we intend to change as part of the current
18 proposal. And I believe John and CHP is okay with that.

19 MEMBER KELLER: Yes, we are.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. So that's the proposal with a
21 slight -- with a slight amendment.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry. Which is the amendment?

23 MR. BHULLAR: On the back --

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, on the back.

25 MR. BHULLAR: -- of the page.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry.

2 MR. BHULLAR: The portion that you see in red, that
3 is the -- the amendment.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you for that.

5 MEMBER HENLEY: You know, I would like to suggest,
6 since, you know, since I think the bicycle people made, you
7 know, has suggested that any two-wheeled vehicle is affected by
8 that, why don't we just say primarily it's two -- two-wheeled
9 vehicles rather than just motorcycles? It doesn't change it
10 too much but it, you know, it --

11 MR. BHULLAR: You okay with that, Jim?

12 MR. BAROSS: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: The plaque would need to change
14 too.

15 MR. PYBURN: I'm sorry. Side question. Is bicycle
16 defined as a vehicle in --

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh, yeah.

18 MR. PYBURN: -- the MUTCD or vehicle code?

19 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

20 MR. BAROSS: A bicycle is not a vehicle. So two -
21 wheeled, it gets complicated.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good point.

23 MR. BAROSS: It could say motorcyclist or bicyclist.

24 MEMBER HENLEY: So you're suggesting we -- we leave
25 it as motorcycle since we don't know what bicycles are?

1 MR. BAROSS: If you want to be bicyclists in there
2 you'd only have to say or bicyclists or and bicyclists.

3 MEMBER HENLEY: Oh, I see. It becomes a pretty big
4 plaque then.

5 MR. BAROSS: Yeah. I don't know. That's not the
6 plaque though.

7 MEMBER KELLER: Well, you wouldn't necessarily have
8 to have --

9 MR. BAROSS: No.

10 MEMBER KELLER: -- all the different plaques on
11 there. If it's intended for bicycles, like between the bike
12 lane and the travel lane, then do a bike plaque.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, Mark.

14 MR. GREENWOOD: Good afternoon. Mark Greenwood, City
15 of Palm Desert. A motorcyclist for 35 years. And -- and I'm
16 also the Director of Public Works for the City of Palm Desert.

17 Implementation of the sign is very problematic. If
18 it just says less than two inch does that mean down to a one-
19 tenth of an inch? Does that mean a normal paving mat overlap?
20 You've got to put a minimum dimension here or you're going to
21 put this sign everywhere.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good point.

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Hamid.

25 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, just our last speaker

1 mentioned, I'm thinking we show a liability if you are saying,
2 again, the language says less than two inches, then if you have
3 like a quarter-of-an-inch difference just because of some
4 slurry seal overlay or whatever, are you required to put these
5 signs up?

6 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Johnny Bhullar. Basically the
7 language here that is in black is the federal language. So we
8 don't want to take ownership of or try to amend the less than
9 two inches language. That's why all we are doing is making the
10 changes in red and relying on the federal language.

11 SECRETARY SINGH: You have to do that. You have
12 California language that states to the federal, California's

13 MR. BHULLAR: Oh, okay.

14 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah.

15 MEMBER BAHADORI: But that's --

16 MR. BHULLAR: It's hard to see with the colors here.

17

18 MEMBER BAHADORI: So -- so Mark -- Mark has point is
19 a very good point.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Oh, okay.

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: Because -- because, Mr. Chairman,
22 what I'm looking at is that on the second page under the red
23 line it says -- it says,

24 "When warning is intended to be directly primarily to
25 motorcyclists or when elevation difference is less than

1 two inch but will affect motorcycle operation."

2 How is a traffic engineer supposed to know how it
3 will affect the motorcycle operation? What's the criteria for
4 that?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Very good question.

6 MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm just thinking like, hey, I
7 haven't put these signs up and there's an accident, and
8 somebody asks me why didn't you put these signs up, what's the
9 criteria that I -- because then it's a should language, you say
10 that it should be considered for installation.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. And then there's where we
12 use the language, "it should be considered."

13 MEMBER BAHADORI: Right. That's true.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I never quite know what that meant.
15 It doesn't tell you what you do, it tells you how you think.
16 And anytime you have something that tells you how to think it's
17 not real clear what action you need to take.

18 MEMBER BAHADORI: Because you're asking the traffic
19 engineer to consider installation of this sign when it's
20 affecting the operation of a motorcyclist. How is he supposed
21 to know what affects the operation of a motorcyclist?

22 MEMBER KELLER: I believe -- I believe that that
23 language was meant to refer more to the volume of
24 motorcyclists.

25 MEMBER BAHADORI: Oh, but it says -- it says -- it

1 says,

2 "If it's less than two inch but will affect motorcycle
3 operation use of the uneven lane W8-11 signs with
4 motorcycle plaque should be considered."

5 So anything less than two inch, if the operation of
6 the motorcycle is affected you should put these in. But how?
7 Based on what you decide is the operation of a motorcycle is
8 affected, bicycle.

9 MEMBER KELLER: If you don't have motorcyclists using
10 that road then --

11 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I mean, just --

12 MEMBER KELLER: -- it can't -- it's not going to
13 affect the --

14 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. It's just -- I mean, I'm
15 thinking I'm -- I'm sitting in a deposition and the plaintiff's
16 attorney is asking me why didn't I put up the sign, how did I
17 decide not to put the sign?

18 MEMBER KU: I think the argument is going to be that
19 given the fact that there's an accident speaks for itself, that
20 it impacted the operation of the motorcycle. So I think the
21 argument would be if it's less than two inches, obviously it
22 impacted the operation of the motorcycle, it should have been
23 posted. And so the city and county or whatever jurisdiction is
24 going to have a problem arguing not putting that sign up
25 potentially.

1 MEMBER KELLER: Yeah. But isn't that same argument
2 for the basic sign that's the existing federal language, you
3 should consider putting up the uneven pavement signs if -- if
4 you had more than two inches of difference?

5 MEMBER KU: That's just it, the black language, the
6 federal language is about two inches or more. The state
7 language in blue allows for less than two inches. So we
8 complicate our lives by adding -- choosing to add the blue
9 text; right? Because only the black text is the federal
10 language.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: No. Wouldn't it be --

12 MEMBER KU: So we have the option of deleting the
13 blue text.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Or alternatively, instead of making
15 the blue text a guidance you could just say it may be installed
16 where the elevation difference is less than two inches without
17 telling you when to do it, but just say you may do it. And I
18 think that would be a little bit cleaner if you want to go in
19 that direction.

20 SECRETARY SINGH: So this is -- basically we can
21 discuss in the workshop if we can go to that language, we can
22 elect the blue language which is always California MUTCD
23 (inaudible).

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So do we want to --

25 SECRETARY SINGH: So we don't need any motion, you

1 know, if we can (inaudible) the blue language during the
2 workshop.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll move for -- I'm worried that
4 we're not going to have time in our workshop. So if we can
5 either resolve it here or handle it at the next meeting, I'd
6 like to do that. But I think it's a quick fix if we just have
7 an option statement that says it may be installed if the
8 elevation difference is less than two inches.

9 MEMBER KELLER: That pretty well -- yeah, that --

10 MEMBER BAHADORI: That takes care of my concern.

11 MEMBER KELLER: That takes care of all of our
12 concerns.

13 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Because if you change that
14 should be considered to may be and make it an option.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So --

16 MEMBER ROBINSON: I'd like to make it a motion. I
17 think you're -- you're not going to completely and totally
18 eliminate liability from -- from an agency, whether or not you
19 include that sign. So if you -- if you remind somebody that --
20 that you might want to consider a sign when you've got
21 something less than two inches, that's an improvement.

22 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Because -- because should is
23 always -- the burden is on the engineer.

24 MEMBER ROBINSON: Yes.

25 MEMBER BAHADORI: You have to say why you didn't

1 install it.

2 MEMBER ROBINSON: I think that may is the appropriate
3 word.

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: But may, I mean, they should prove
5 that you should have installed it and you didn't. It changes
6 the burden and makes it a lot easier.

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: Fine. That's fine.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So, Mike, did you make a
9 motion?

10 MEMBER ROBINSON: I did, to -- to allow the sign
11 using may, under two inches.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So do I have a second?

13 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. We have a second. Before --

15 MEMBER KU: Before we have a vote, Mr. Chairman, can
16 I ask for clarification? Would the language "but will affect
17 motorcycle operation" remain in?

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: That is not --

19 MEMBER KU: -- on that motion?

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- part of the motion.

21 MEMBER KU: No. That is not part of the motion.

22 MEMBER ROBINSON: I would leave that to the -- to the
23 engineer.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. We -- before we go to
25 Johnny, any other comments by committee members here?

1 MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, the motion as it stands does
2 leave that language in because the motion didn't strike that
3 language about reference to the motorcycle?

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: The motion would keep the federal
5 language shown in black.

6 MEMBER KNOWLES: In black.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: The motion would also delete the
8 red and blue language and replace it with an option statement
9 that says, in effect, it may be used for the elevation
10 differences less than two inches.

11 MEMBER KNOWLES: But everything referring to a
12 motorcyclist deleted in blue?

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

14 MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. Johnny.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I do
17 want to point out before you proceed, if you look back there
18 and just for clarification, the language that we have there,
19 even in the -- under Section 6F-45, the very first paragraph,
20 in the first paragraph the text of "two inch or more," that is
21 what we have added to the feds. So that's not a federal
22 language, actually. The federal language is without this.
23 That's the federal language for the first paragraph. And this
24 text here, "all two inch or more," has been added by
25 California.

1 MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Secondly, the second paragraph, of
3 course, is in blue, and that is a California addition. So
4 before you proceed with the proposal I just wanted to point out
5 that don't think that because paragraph was all black and not
6 really by the feds. To ensure more has been added, even in the
7 first paragraph, by California.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: I don't know from where we pick up
9 the two inch or more. We had a policy back in the early '90s
10 that says 1.8 inch, if the elevation difference is 1.8 inch you
11 use uneven pavement signs you use uneven pavement signs. So I
12 don't know how --

13 MR. BHULLAR: So then 1.8 inch became 2 inches.

14 SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

15 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, there is -- actually, the two
16 inch, there is a study behind that. The FAA and AAA
17 Foundations for Traffic Safety did something, I think. This
18 goes back to 2002 or 2003. And there was actually a previous
19 program. We did what we called the edge drop-off problem. And
20 the edge drop-off identified that the edge drop-off causes
21 accidents when normally more than two inches. So there is a
22 study behind the two inches.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Well, yeah, there is a study and
24 there's a basis. If you look into the part 6 here there are
25 like three or four issues regarding when you use the shoulder

1 sign, the low shoulder -- low shoulder, and the difference
2 between numbers that come in are two inches and three inches.
3 When is it an open trench, when is it -- so the two inch and
4 three inch numbers have basis and studies. And there are
5 differences as to when the drop-off is two inches or less. We
6 do the center lane marking overnight when you're in a
7 construction zone. If it's three inches or more is it an open
8 trench or low shoulder? So issues like that. They are
9 filtered throughout.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Johnny, thank you for that
11 clarification that it is California language that talks about
12 two inches or more and not federal language. But I think the
13 motion still stands.

14 MEMBER ROBINSON: It does. I think in this
15 particular case what we're differentiating is the word --

16 MR. BHULLAR: Motorcycle.

17 MEMBER ROBINSON: -- the word should be between may.
18 Right. Should be over two inches, may be under two inches.

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any further comments from
20 anyone in the audience?

21 MR. BHULLAR: Just one comment. I want to point out
22 that the motion is probably okay. And let's just -- we will be
23 amending, of course, our current California. And since it's
24 in blue and it is ours, so with that we should not have an
25 issue with us lowering the (inaudible).

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All right. So I'd like to
2 bring that to a vote. We have a motion that's been seconded.
3 All in favor of the motion say aye?

4 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Opposed? Abstentions? None. It's
6 unanimous. Okay.

7 Item 11-8 is also Wayne's, sign placement on portable
8 supports for longer than three days.

9 MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. This was brought up by one of
10 our engineers in Caltrans. And I think Johnny probably would
11 be in the best position to bring out those, that there was an
12 inconsistency in the MUTCD that was identified by one of our
13 engineers. And he's trying to clear up that inconsistency.

14 So, Johnny, do you want to go into what it really
15 means? It has to do with the height of signs and their crash
16 testability, and that sort of thing.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. Basically here the way it has
18 been written is that you can have the portable signs, only
19 one -- one foot from the bottom, as the mounting height, even
20 though regularly for regular urban, as we know, our signs need
21 to be the five feet and the seven feet, depending upon rural or
22 urban situations.

23 And here what's happening is that in Section 6F.03,
24 the way it is worded in the optional paragraph, the second one
25 on page 45 of 57 on the agenda -- so if you look at -- under

1 Section 6F.03, the second paragraph there under options, the
2 way they have -- have it worded is that all other similar type
3 of signs in the figures 6F-3, -4, -5, basically that extends to
4 all warning signs that are in work zones, that meaning they
5 could be placed in that situation over a barricade just one
6 foot off the ground.

7 And clearly that violates other principles, so that's
8 why it's being cleared up that only the mentioned signs, they
9 are 9-8 through 9-11, they are 11 series, the W-1 through -6,
10 and W-1 through -8 series. And just those that have been
11 mentioned, those are the ones that can be put on barricades one
12 foot from the mounting height from the roadway, but not
13 extending it to all the others, as well. So basically just to
14 clean up or a clarification.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you for that. Any
16 questions by committee members on that?

17 MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jeff.

19 MEMBER KNOWLES: I need clarification just because
20 some -- some of our practices, sometimes we'll shut down an
21 intersection for traffic signal work. They'll put out a bunch
22 of barricades, even on the lane lines. They'll put stop signs
23 on those barricades. They're about a foot off the ground.
24 Those certainly aren't nine-eighths through -- you know, it's
25 not anything that's mentioned here; right? You can't put an R1

1 on an barricade temporarily when you have a signal that's black
2 for scheduled work?

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: For longer than three days?

4 MEMBER KNOWLES: Well --

5 SECRETARY SINGH: If you do have one lane each
6 direction you can still use (inaudible).

7 MEMBER KNOWLES: This doesn't preclude the use of
8 that for a shorter period. This is just over three days.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any comments on this item? Yes,
10 Jim.

11 MR. BAROSS: Jim Baross, once again speaking for
12 myself.

13 Is this an appropriate place for possibly in the
14 future getting direction about not placing the signs in the
15 bike lane or the shoulder space where the bicycles are normally
16 operating, as Mr. Knowles brought forward earlier? Or -- and I
17 kind of realize you probably don't want to deal with that right
18 now. But is this a section that that would be applicable?

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can someone from Caltrans answer
20 that?

21 MEMBER HENLEY: Johnny's probably in the best
22 position. But, you know, the -- the section is sign placement,
23 and it seemed like a logical place to cover that if we put
24 something in there that, you know, we --

25 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. I think -- Johnny Bhullar with

1 Caltrans. Yeah. The section would be correct, Wayne, what you
2 are suggesting, but that's a separate issue.

3 MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. It's a separate issue. But --

4 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. But --

5 MEMBER HENLEY: -- but this would be where it would
6 be.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. So if CBAC wants to create an
8 item we can help you with that, just creating a one or two line
9 simple text and putting it together.

10 MR. BAROSS: Well, be sure and get it on the CBAC
11 agenda first.

12 MR. BHULLAR: Sure. Okay.

13 MEMBER HENLEY: Good idea.

14 MR. BHULLAR: But we'll help you with the right
15 language at least. So that way it's palatable to CTCDC as
16 well.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any further discussion on
18 this item?

19 MEMBER ROBINSON: I would just point out, John, that
20 I think we should -- we'd note that often times during
21 construction signs are not permanently mounted to barricades,
22 they're just simply placed on the barricades. When you do
23 that, you know, typically the guys are going to just,
24 especially on a warning sign, they're going to just drop the
25 pointed end down on top of the first crossbar. And I think

1 that's going to be less than a foot, actually.

2 So the question is, would that be a legally placed
3 sign?

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me see the language. Where is
5 the one foot shown?

6 MR. BHULLAR: On page 45 of 87 on the agenda. It
7 says the standard there, "signs mounted on barricades or other
8 portable supports shall be no less than one foot above the
9 traveled way."

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And that's a federal requirement;
11 right?

12 MR. BHULLAR: That's federal, right.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I guess that wouldn't be allowed,
14 not to say I hadn't seen a few. But, okay.

15 Do we have a motion to approve this item? Anyone
16 want to --

17 MEMBER ROBINSON: I'm -- I'm going to go ahead --

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- move approval?

19 MEMBER ROBINSON: -- and make the motion to approve.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

21 MEMBER ROBINSON: I just don't -- I just -- you know,
22 and I'm pointing out that the, you know, the placement, the
23 temporary placement in the matter that we see contractors do
24 periodically would not be considered a legal sign.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Duly noted. Okay. Second anyone?

1 MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second it.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Wayne seconds. No further
3 discussion then? All those that approve say aye.

4 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. It's unanimous.

6 Item 11-9, enlarged fonts for the C20 California
7 sign.

8 MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. This came out of our -- one of
9 our strategic planning committees. It was challenge area 14, I
10 think. Anyway, they -- they focused on work zone issues. And
11 this -- basically what they're trying to do is through the --
12 to get people's attention to get on the right or go on the left
13 or, in other words, get people through -- safely through
14 construction zones. And they're proposing that the first --
15 you know, basically, they emphasize parts of the sign so that
16 people can, you know, make the appropriate action when they
17 come into a construction zone.

18 Anyway, we're asking you to approve this request, and
19 then we'll put it in our sign chart and our -- and into the
20 MUTCD.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Wayne, by how much does this
22 increase the font size?

23 MEMBER HENLEY: You know, 20 percent is what they
24 say.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Twenty percent?

1 MEMBER HENLEY: On just one -- of one word. Ten
2 percent, I'm sorry.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Ten percent.

4 MEMBER HENLEY: Ten percent, rounded up to the
5 nearest whole number size.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

7 MEMBER HENLEY: So it just gives a little emphasis,
8 you know, which lane is closed, is it the right lane, is it the
9 left lane, that kind of thing.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

11 MEMBER HENLEY: And it's -- actually, it's -- and it
12 addresses a concern for the workers in the work zone, and also
13 maybe the older drivers, trying to keep them from getting into
14 more trouble.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Jeff?

16 MEMBER KNOWLES: Is this slightly speed dependent
17 where this might be an issue more on high-speed roadways than
18 on slower roadways so that it might not be as applicable on a
19 local road?

20 MR. BHULLAR: It might be, yeah.

21 MEMBER KNOWLES: Because I could understand how on
22 freeway construction and 55 mile an hour roadways this could be
23 helpful. But I don't know that it would be applicable to all
24 roadways.

25 MEMBER BAHADORI: Good point.

1 MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah. See, the way -- the way -- you
2 know, the genesis of a lot of these suggestions, they come out
3 of a group of -- and these people are -- you know, they -- they
4 work for construction. They work for traffic ops. They work,
5 you know, maybe in the private health services. There's a
6 whole -- highway patrol. There's a lot of folks that are
7 involved with, you know, sort of trying to help these
8 improvements, and they probably haven't done much research.
9 And so it just seemed like a good idea.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Uh-huh.

11 MEMBER HENLEY: And so that's where we are with, you
12 know, a lot of these that come out of the strategic highway
13 safety planning exercise.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Clarification. It says "the first
15 letter of the cardinal direction words." I'm a little
16 confused. What is the cardinal direction word in right lane
17 closed ahead.

18 SECRETARY SINGH: Johnny can answer. This is --

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Johnny.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. First of
21 all, the background.

22 Basically, the proposal or the initial request came
23 in from the Strategic Highway Safety Plan Implementation Team.
24 And there's was simply a request similar to a lot of all the
25 driver issues, having -- trying to highlight or your eye

1 gravitating towards the certain key element on the sign. And
2 they did not actually suggest any specific size or anything.
3 They just came in with a problem and a suggestion.

4 And while we were looking into it ourselves we looked
5 at it and I said the only precedence that we have in the MUTCD
6 similar to what the request is, is that in the cardinal
7 direction for the north, south, east and west, whenever we use
8 those the first thing letter, like N for north or east for --
9 or E for east, the first letter sets the precedent that it
10 shall be ten percent larger than the rest of them so that the
11 eye gravitates towards it.

12 But that was just our thing comparing, looking at the
13 MUTCD as to similar stuff that has been done. And that's the
14 reason why what we are trying to do here then is trying to take
15 that approach, since that has some precedence, and say that the
16 word right can be ten percent larger. That's the basis for it.

17 But, however, as you can see, this is only -- John,
18 and you're looking at page 47 or the agenda -- that is just a
19 background trying to indicate where we came up with that
20 number. But basically here what we are trying to do is on the
21 sign specifications for this sign we will be allowing them the
22 ten percent larger for the right or the left. And -- but I a
23 nutshell that's where -- how we came up with the proposal.

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So, Johnny, is the proposal to
25 adopt option three?

1 MR. BHULLAR: Actually, the proposal is to adopt
2 option -- option -- no, option --

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Because option two shows the whole
4 word --

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- as being ten percent larger, not
7 just the first letter of the word.

8 MR. BHULLAR: Actually, on page 48 the option one is
9 the one that shows the whole word. Option two --

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, I got --

11 MR. BHULLAR: Option two shows --

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

13 MR. BHULLAR: -- the word, only R. And my preference
14 is option one.

15 SECRETARY SINGH: No. Then you'd have (inaudible)
16 the sign size too. So option two is more appropriate.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, okay. Because the
19 standard --

20 MR. BHULLAR: But basically --

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- says the first letter of the
22 cardinal direction shall be ten percent larger.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. That was for the cardinal
24 direction. And here we are applying the same principal to the
25 right and the left.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, do we need additional
2 language then that say that this would apply to the lane
3 designation?

4 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. I think we should be adding
5 language. And that's -- since Gordon was working on it I
6 wasn't actually too involved in the agenda item here. So I
7 think it is similar to the language that we have in Section
8 3015 (phonetic). We would be adding language for this sign in
9 Chapter 6F, one sentence or so, in beginning, this statement
10 that it be ten percent larger.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

12 MR. BHULLAR: Because trying to just do it in a spec
13 and not mentioning it in the policy does not really -- it leads
14 to confusion, and also does not highlight the fact of what we
15 are trying to do here.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So my understanding now
17 then, the proposal as we just discussed it would be to adopt
18 the format shown in option two on page 48 --

19 MR. BHULLAR: Uh-huh.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- and to add language that would
21 say the first letter of the word that identifies the
22 appropriate lane should be ten percent larger, as well.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. So -- so loosely we'll just copy
24 the same language saying to improve the readability the first
25 letter of the lane -- how do we say, the right or left lane

1 shall be ten percent larger, so something like that.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And if it was the sense of
3 the committee to approve it we would allow you to develop the
4 language without having to come back to the committee?

5 MR. BHULLAR: That's correct.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

7 MR. BHULLAR: But Jeff's question, you know --

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jeff?

9 MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, a follow-up, too, is it's one
10 thing when we're changing an installed sign standard, because
11 as we go through and we do maintenance on that sign when we
12 replace a knockdown we put up the new standard. When we're
13 dealing -- I just to make sure that as opposed to just kind of
14 being a good idea, that there's a sound basis for this.
15 Because we put and down construction signs all the time. Does
16 this mean we'd have to scrap out entire existing inventory of
17 construction signs? Because how do you set an implementation
18 date for construction warning signs that are going up and down
19 all the time.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny can answer that.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.

22 Basically, the short answer to that is, Jeff, any time we make
23 any changes in the manual but we do not verify a specific
24 target date, then there is language currently in the manual in
25 the introduction which states that you can continue to use your

1 existing signs and the ones that you have in your inventory
2 just from the time that the new policy takes effect and the new
3 manual takes effect don't be buying new or purchasing new signs
4 that are not as per the new, that's all. And that's clearly
5 stated in the introduction for pretty much not only this issue,
6 I mean, in general for the manual.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And this is one of the main ways
8 that we differ from the federal manual in that they have
9 distinct deadline dates. And basically for -- for most devices
10 in California it's like what Johnny said, whenever you use up
11 your stock or when you have a program to improve the street or
12 during routine maintenance you change it out to the new
13 standard at that point in time.

14 MR. BHULLAR: And the language is buried in the
15 introduction. Sometimes I have to highlight and bring it out,
16 but it's there. And it has been vetted by our legal when we
17 wrote it up. And so sometimes it gets a little bit tough to
18 read and integrate it. But that's the clearance I got from my
19 legal, they didn't want to make -- to make me put it in more
20 plain language than the way we have done it.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we've had clarification
22 of the proposal. Do we have a motion to move forward with it?

23 MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, why wouldn't this go through
24 the experimentation process? So if we were getting a new
25 device we'd want somebody to say we're going to test this,

1 we're going to provide before and after data. Here we're
2 changing the standard for all these signs. Shouldn't we do
3 it -- I mean, the way it was presented was a group of people
4 just thought this might help, but there's no data whatsoever to
5 support it. We're instituting a statewide change. Shouldn't
6 we go through the experimentation process?

7 MEMBER KU: Good point.

8 MEMBER HENLEY: You make a very good point.

9 MEMBER KU: You make a good point.

10 MEMBER KNOWLES: Please?

11 MEMBER KU: Very good point.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I can offer a perspective on that.

13 I know that for guide signs the cardinal direction now is
14 always larger, where the first letter of north, south, east or
15 west on guide signs in the manual is required to be larger
16 because people recognize the N, E, W, S fairly quickly and then
17 will read the rest of it.

18 I haven't -- I have not seen that required on -- in
19 any other situation regarding the right lane, left lane, middle
20 lane, whatever. So that would be new.

21 Can Caltrans comment on a little bit more about the
22 background of this? Was it just deemed to be a good idea and
23 the larger letter would fit within the format of the sign, or
24 was there any more behind it?

25 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.)

1 MR. BHULLAR: Well, Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
2 All I can offer is this came out of the Strategic Highway
3 Safety Plan Implementation Groups in challenging area 14. So
4 it is -- which is a group that has members from the various
5 different types of organizations. So -- but there is not
6 really any studies or research based idea.

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, Johnny, is -- is this
8 strategic highway group, is that a national group?

9 MR. BHULLAR: No. That's a statewide group.

10 MEMBER HENLEY: It's -- it's -- it's required by
11 the -- the last federal bill, that every -- every state is
12 supposed to have a highway safety plan.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

14 MEMBER HENLEY: And this is, you know, California's
15 version. I mean, they basically, they came up with a plan and
16 now they're -- this is part of implementing it.

17 MR. BHULLAR: And CHP and Caltrans are the lead
18 agencies primarily. But it comprises of a lot of
19 jurisdictions, local agencies, as well as department of health,
20 DMV, and number of multi-jurisdiction (inaudible).

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman --

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I think the way I see it, it's a
24 good idea, but there is no research to support it, that whether
25 we even need it. And we don't know if it's going to work

1 because it hasn't gone through the experimentation process. So
2 if you think it's a good idea coming out of the strategic
3 highway safety plan people, then just go with it. Otherwise, I
4 don't see a whole point of putting this through a wringer of
5 experimentation and all that.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: You know, one other idea, Johnny --

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: Because (inaudible) --

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Sorry.

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: Sorry, to finish my thought,
10 because quite frankly, I don't even know how you experiment
11 with something like this. How are you going to make it
12 (inaudible)?

13 MEMBER HENLEY: Well --

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Go ahead, Wayne.

15 MEMBER HENLEY: I was going to say another one of our
16 favorites, of course, is yellow crosswalks in school zones.
17 We've -- we've done a lot of those. And I don't think there's
18 any empirical data that says it's any better or any worse
19 having them.

20 MR. BHULLAR: The key difference is that's state law,
21 so --

22 MEMBER HENLEY: Well, yeah, it's law.

23 MR. BHULLAR: -- (inaudible).

24 MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: You know, another thought on this
2 Johnny and I sit on a group known as the Traffic Control
3 Devices Pulled Funds Study, and that's where the different
4 states contribute a sum of money each year to conduct
5 experiments on signs to see if their effective. Often they
6 look at symbol signs. But I think this could fit into that
7 category if we want them to experiment with it.

8 Where, on the other hand, if it's the sense of the
9 group that this is a good idea and a no-brainer then we might
10 be willing to approve it. But I think those --

11 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- those are the options here.

13 MR. BHULLAR: That's why we are here. But to be
14 frank and honest, yeah, of course, it's not based upon any
15 research or studies or anything like that, just from the group,
16 something as a recommendation. And we're trying to at least
17 address their recommendation.

18 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I just -- I don't even know
19 if you can really experiment with something like this. It's
20 next to impossible to identify the effectiveness of something
21 like this, except if you spend 20 years or maybe \$5 million.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Mike, and then Farhad.

23 MEMBER ROBINSON: I'm -- I'm having difficulty
24 seeing -- I'm -- I consider myself an aging driver. And I look
25 at this, I look at the pictures here and I'm thinking, not that

1 much difference. I'm having difficulty seeing the real
2 benefit. And I'm thinking until or unless there's benefit
3 demonstrated I would be hesitant to -- to ask the various
4 different agencies to go through the expense of making --
5 making changes that they maybe don't need to make.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Farhad.

7 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Pretty much the same. If we
8 start changing state practice for a good idea then we have
9 lost, you know, not only our process, but then the next time
10 when we don't like the idea we can't send it somewhere back
11 because that idea is on the same base of just we thought it's a
12 good idea. So I think we've done a good job, maybe sometime
13 excessive but at least consistent, on requiring some data or
14 experimentation. And without that I think we're going on
15 dangerous grounds.

16 And as an old driver I'd love to see every sign at
17 least that big. But I still think we need to stick to the
18 requiring the data.

19 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. Just take it that this is
20 (inaudible).

21 MR. BHULLAR: And -- and maybe, if it's a good idea,
22 we should share it with the national community and maybe see if
23 we have their support as well. I'm not sensing that there's
24 going to be a motion to approve this, so maybe we could pursue
25 that other option --

1 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- and see if the Traffic Control
3 Devices Pulled Fund Study might wish to take this on as a low-
4 cost experiment.

5 So we don't -- there's no vote to approve that item
6 then.

7 And therefore we go to item number 11-10 which is a
8 rather long item, but it regards ramp metering. And I reviewed
9 it.

10 Wayne, would you like to give a summary of it?

11 MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. You know, California
12 probably -- in fact, I know it has -- probably more than half
13 the ramp meters in the entire world are here in California.
14 And we've got quite a bit of experience with -- with ramp
15 meters. And there's been some proposals in the -- the new
16 MUTCD that are not consistent with the way we do things here I
17 California. And we are fortunate today to have Caltrans's
18 expert on ramp metering to -- to go into the details of this
19 and give us a little primer on ramp metering and signing for
20 ramp metering.

21 So, Zhongren, do you want to come up and explain the
22 -- you know, what the feds are trying to do and why we may not
23 want to go that way?

24 MR. WANG: Thank you, Wayne. I'm Zhongren Wong from
25 California DOT, and I'm the ramp meter senior out there. And

1 just a little bit of background of this one.

2 I think I have been presenting this in our last
3 workshop, you know, I think the same committee out there I --
4 in our building out there. And at that time I think, you know,
5 if you didn't get a clear picture, you know, hopefully I can
6 give you a clearer picture today. And we do have a statewide
7 ramp metering committee. You know, we have about eight
8 districts. And then we have a lot of senior engineers,
9 engineers out there.

10 And like Wayne said, I think California has about 60
11 percent or more of the nation's or even the world's ramp
12 metering. You know, we have about, you know, 2,400. And then,
13 you know, and we also have another 1,600 to be implemented.
14 And that's the background.

15 And also when we -- the stateside committee who
16 reviewed the ramp metering chapter, that's Chapter 4I, and then
17 they have mentioned quite a few changes. And a lot of it is
18 related to the standard level, you know, change. So that's
19 why, you know, we -- we have to go through this committee. And
20 before this meeting, you know, I also met with Steve Pyburn
21 from the Federal Highway, so we want to have the feds buy in
22 also. So basically, you know, whatever you have in this agenda
23 have some revisions out there. So I hope Devinder can send out
24 the -- the newer version out there.

25 But, audience, if you really care about this topic,

1 you know, I do have some extra copies, you know, that's the
2 revision stuff.

3 That's -- by incorporating whatever, the fed has
4 commented. So we -- we have reached agreements out there.

5 Several things I want to talk about is on the 2009
6 MUTCD out there, I think we have about four big items out
7 there. So I just want to -- do you guys want me to line-by-
8 line or just -- line-by-line?

9 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The major ones.

10 MR. WANG: Just the major ones. I think I have four
11 major ones.

12 In California, you know, we have a lot of side
13 mounted. We -- first of all, let's differentiate this. You
14 know, ramp meter is sometimes is side mounted, and sometimes
15 it's mast-arm mounted. So that's a differentiation out there.

16 And then the meter also have an upper head and it has
17 a lower head; right? The upper head is for the approaching
18 guys, and then the lower ones is for the stop motorists at the
19 stop line. Because the ramp meters most of the time, you know,
20 we just put it right beside the stop bar. So that's why it
21 make the approaching guys impossible to see the lower head, and
22 make the stop guys, you know, impossible to see the upper one;
23 right? So it's like a nearsighted signal.

24 And another one is we have the lower ones, upper
25 ones, side mounted, mast-arm. And then we have another one,

1 it's the -- the advance warning. So that's the four things I
2 want to talk about.

3 The first one, let's talk about just the side
4 mounted. And when we talked about the side mounted the time in
5 the National MUTCD out there, the MUTCD asked or requests as a
6 standard that the signal heads must be mounted in the middle of
7 the lane. It must be mounted in the middle of the lane. So
8 basically it mandated all our practices in California, because
9 most of the time we use side mounted. So that saved money.
10 And it's also serving a purpose.

11 And luckily, you know, by January 2011, this year,
12 you know, the feds issued a memo. They recognized the error
13 they made. And so they recognized, says, okay, California,
14 you're okay to do side mounted. You're okay. Say you have two
15 lanes, you do side mounted, fine. Single lanes you do side
16 mounted, fine. But for three lanes probably you have to do a
17 mast arm because you have a middle lane. If you use side
18 mounted, you know, there is not signal to control it.

19 So that's one thing that's been resolved. And the
20 feds had issued a memo on January 5th, 2011, so we have that
21 memo. And then we have already incorporated into -- I think
22 that's the Section 4I -- 4I.02, paragraph 4, I think. That's
23 what we have incorporated out there. That's the fed's memo.
24 That's why you're going to see, you know, quite -- quite a lot
25 of change out there. But that's the -- whatever the feds have

1 agreed upon. And they already have the memo. So we have
2 incorporated so we make it to the MUTCD, the California MUTCD.

3 And another one is for, also, Section 4I -- 4I.02,
4 paragraph 3. That's for simultaneous operations. In a
5 simultaneous operation means no matter how many lanes you have,
6 you know, all these lanes are controlled by the same signal,
7 you know, green, green. And then the feds only ask for a
8 minimum of two signal heads of the (inaudible) entering ramp
9 out there. So we feel -- that's the paragraph three. Okay.
10 We feel it's not sufficient and it is not clear. Because, you
11 know, say you have two lanes out there, you know, minimum two
12 phases, certainly it's not enough. Because even a single lane
13 you need to phases, one upper and one lower; right? So that's
14 why we said, okay, the feds did not differentiate between upper
15 and lower heads so that's why there are minimum standards
16 for -- minimum two signal heads per ramp is not sufficient. So
17 we put in some (inaudible) stuff out there. And we also have
18 Steve spying out there. Thank you, Steve, for -- for all those
19 supports out there. So that's a big change out there.

20 And I think another big change will be here, that's
21 the advance warning. That's the Section 4I.03 and paragraph
22 02, that's the last page of the handout out thee. And if you
23 guys use probably every day you saw our advance warning out
24 there. We typically use ped-head sign out there that says
25 "Meter On;" right? Once the meter is operating then that thing

1 keeps on flashing. And then in the feds MUTCD out there, you
2 know, they kind of using something else. I think they use the
3 sign W3-8. They said that's the only one they allow to use as
4 advance warning. But in California, because we're kind of
5 grandfathered in already, you know, we have so many ped-head
6 signs. And then we want the feds to recognize our practices.
7 So thank you, Steve, also. You know, Steve also agreed, you
8 know, we put -- we put meter on sign as allowable devices to do
9 advance warning.

10 So I think that's the four major items out there, you
11 know, I talked about. And then I'd like to be in support from
12 the committee and so we can make all these changes of the
13 California -- to the California MUTCD. Thank you so much.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, Zhongren. Could you
15 just briefly clarify when you would use the three section
16 signal versus the two section signal.

17 MR. WANG: Thank you, John. That's one item out
18 there. You know, we do have a change but I didn't mention it.
19 For the three section most the time, you know, car -- ramp
20 meter has two scenarios or regimes of working. One is one car
21 per green, one is multiple per green; right? So once you have
22 multiple -- multiple car per green, especially two car per
23 green, the time you need, like you have a yellow section out
24 there. So that's why most of the time in some districts they
25 like to do multiple car per green. So basically, you know, no

1 matter it's upper head or lower head they -- they want a three
2 section up there.

3 Only when you do one car per green at a time you only
4 need two sections. You don't need the yellow section out
5 there. So that's why, you know, the statewide committee
6 recognized, you know, we need the flexibility to choose, we
7 operate one car per green or two car per green or three car per
8 green. So if you want that flexibility, basically you want
9 both upper and lower heads be three sections. So that's, you
10 know, we make a little bit more stricter than whatever the
11 National MUTCD says. The National MUTCD allow two section
12 heads. But in our ones, you know, we want all the ramp meters
13 be three section.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: But don't you also use a three
15 section head at the bottom of the ramp --

16 MR. WANG: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- to show that you're going from
18 no metering to metering?

19 MR. WANG: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

21 MR. WANG: And that's why this start up. And
22 that's --

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

24 MR. WANG: When we have -- to start off, you know,
25 you -- typical, you use a yellow -- a lot of yellow time,

1 right, trying to, you know, basically give advance warning for
2 the approaching motorists. So that's why we believe, you know,
3 three section heads give us a lot more flexibility. And right
4 now California is moving towards 24-hour metering. And we do
5 have a pretty big project, you know, trying to demonstrate the
6 benefits of 24-hour metering. The meter, we always -- all the
7 meters will be responsive to the project conditions. So you
8 have a special event, you know, it's after hours, but still the
9 meter might kick in. So at that time, you know, we also need,
10 you know, the -- the three section heads. So we feel that will
11 give us a lot more flexibility.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you. So my
13 understanding is that the revised proposal that I guess has
14 been given to us as a handout with the red has been reviewed
15 then by the FHWA, and they would deem this proposal to be I
16 substantial compliance with the Federal MUTCD; is that correct?

17 MR. WANG: Yes.

18 MR. PYBURN: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And I'm seeing a nod on the
20 part of Steve Pyburn.

21 MR. WANG: Thank you, Steve.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So with that information
23 we'll bring it to the committee. And do we have any discussion
24 on this? Yes, John?

25 MEMBER KELLER: Zhongren, have a question on your

1 item number six, the "HOV bypass lanes," changing that
2 terminology to HOV preferential lanes. And I don't know that
3 there is a problem. But because now that's clearly putting
4 ramp bypass lanes in the same category as hot lanes or carpool
5 lanes on the freeway, are there any requirement for signs or
6 markings that, in the concept of Section 2G of the MUTCD or 3D,
7 that those -- those requirements for lanes will somehow create
8 additional cost or requirements for the bypass lanes, just
9 by -- I'm assuming that that's a change in terminology that is
10 an editorial change. It's -- it's not -- you're not meaning
11 that to be substantive. And I'm wondering if there is -- could
12 there be substantive changes required to the bypass lanes
13 because now you're associating them with the broader class of
14 HOV lanes?

15 MR. WANG: In fact, I don't -- because whatever we're
16 talking about here, John -- thank you for the question --
17 mostly what they're talking about here is just the number --
18 number of heads and how you place the heads. Most of the
19 things are like that. I think only one place we talked about
20 HOV preferential lane. And I think that change will give rise
21 to change, mostly in the signing and striping of ramp metering.
22 And I think -- do we have Johnny out there? Maybe we have a
23 plan to really separate it out, you know, the actual -- the out
24 of preferential lanes or the hot lanes, HOV lanes signing and
25 as the ramp metering signing. So basically ramp metering is

1 going to have its own little section for its own signing and
2 striping stuff.

3 So I don't know if I answered your question. But it
4 looks like whatever the terminology here, it didn't really give
5 us too much heartburn. No.

6 MEMBER KELLER: Well, I guess if -- if it's going to
7 require some more language development in the HOV preferential
8 lane section that -- that does seem like work that somebody has
9 to do to distinguish what I thought was working fine with all
10 the major bypass lanes.

11 MR. WANG: Right. But all those -- all those change
12 or amendment are related to only the signing and striping
13 section of the MUTCD instead of this section. This section is
14 mostly talking about, you know, the signal or the control side.
15 Right. So --

16 MEMBER KELLER: I guess I'm not wanting to make you
17 subject to a bunch of requirements that then we have to make
18 amendments to just because somebody didn't like the word HOV
19 bypass.

20 MEMBER HENLEY: I think that you're -- in the long
21 run you're going to see -- the word HOV may disappear from our
22 lexicon. There's all sorts of schemes of, you know, making
23 them managed lanes, preferential lanes, lexis lanes, I mean,
24 there's a lot of names for the and that may change. But it's
25 not going to happen between now and the time we adopt this

1 MUTCD.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Hamid?

3 MEMBER BAHADORI: Basically the same question. Just
4 -- just good work, and Caltrans operates this. And if the FHWA
5 is okay with it and they're okay, I think it's a good product.

6 Only one thing that I think was raised by CHP, and
7 Wayne kind of mentioned it, later this year we are going to
8 revisit the whole concept of HOV striping and signing in
9 California. We put it off last year. So probably we are going
10 to come up with a completely new standard for HOV striping and
11 signing. So the lexicon that you're using here, is that --
12 have you shared it with the signing and striping people there
13 too?

14 MR. WANG: Yes. Yes. In fact, Steve commented,
15 said, you know, we maintained HOV bypass lane. But you know, I
16 kind of counter that in -- after I discussed with our actual
17 senior out there, the guy working with Johnny together to fix
18 the -- the Section 2G, I think, that's all the preferential
19 lane and HOV lane and express lane, right now they might call
20 it express lane, so all the signing and striping.

21 And that's where I got this HOV preferential lane
22 here. That's why I kind of insisted we're going to change it
23 from -- change he bypass lane terminology.

24 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, you know, I just didn't want
25 us to come back and redo this over again when make those

1 changes later in the year.

2 MR. WANG: No. I think that right now the
3 preferential lane is the official word.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. No any other question or
5 discussion by committee members? If not, we'll ask if there
6 any members of the audience who would like to comment on this.
7 Steve?

8 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
9 Administration. I don't agree with Zhongren on his use of
10 preferential lane. And I don't agree with the signing guy on
11 the use of anything but HOV lane. I think that consistency
12 is -- is -- is more important than that, and that you can put a
13 different label on all different kinds of lanes, whether it's
14 express lanes or HOV lane or bypass or whatever. But you have
15 a problem now where you've got -- where California went down
16 the carpool road, I don't know how many years ago, but now
17 you've decided to go back to HOV.

18 We -- we're recommending consistency in your
19 nomenclature, not having a different label for a bunch of
20 different little variations.

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: But -- but -- but we're going to be
24 doing this for -- California is experimenting with a lot of
25 different variations of HOVs. Not only HOVs. We're going to

1 have express lanes. We're going to have managed lanes. We are
2 going to have HOV lanes that single occupants can use. So
3 we're going to have different variations. So should be confine
4 ourselves only to the word HOV, everything else is not
5 acceptable?

6 MR. PYBURN: Well, all of those things fall under the
7 general category of managed lanes as a broad definition. What
8 should you tell the driver? What does the driver care about?
9 Does he care that it's a managed lane, a preferential lane, an
10 HOV lane or a carpool lane?

11 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But what I'm saying is that
12 if you -- if you state it only HOV and there's an HOV lane that
13 is single occupant car can also get in, like you have on 91 or
14 15 in San Diego, then what do you call those? You can't call
15 them HOV because they're not HOV. A single driver car gets in
16 there and they pay.

17 MR. PYBURN: Looking at that coming from a little
18 different perspective, if a person with two people in it which
19 meets the occupancy requirement of that lane, they're an HOV,
20 the can ride in that HOV lane. The fact that you also charge a
21 fee for that lane is something incidental and additional. The
22 basic element, though, is it's an HOV lane. If that HOV lane
23 fails to meet federal standards for -- for maintaining it's
24 speed then you can no longer charge for it, but it's still an
25 HOV lane.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: I understand. Okay. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any further discussion by
3 committee members?

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: So how do we resolve the issue that
5 FHWA is not okay with the language?

6 MR. PYBURN: No, I didn't say that.

7 MEMBER HENLEY: Well, yeah, you did. He doesn't want
8 to see -- if we wants to stay with HOV lanes.

9 SECRETARY SINGH: Well, let me -- let me see. The
10 only thing --

11 MEMBER BAHADORI: And all I'm saying is that you're
12 asking us -- or Caltrans is asking us to vote on something that
13 FHWA just told us he has an issue with.

14 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) (Inaudible.)

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: If I read this correctly the only
16 place where I see this to be an issue is on the second to the
17 last page of the handout in the middle of page where the
18 federal language refers to a non-metered HOV lane, but
19 California is adding he word preferential after HOV to say
20 "Non-metered HOV Preferential Lane." Is that the only
21 difference we're talking about here?

22 Go to paragraph 8 on the second to the last page. It
23 says,

24 "Ramp control signals may be used to control some but not
25 all lanes on a ramp, such as when a non-metered HOV

1 preferential lanes are provided on a ramp.”

2 MEMBER BAHADORI: Why are we changing it?

3 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.)

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: The only thing I’m saying is that
5 why are we changing bypass to preferential? I mean, I’m not an
6 English major, but what’s the point of even changing it? And
7 because this is not something that gets on the sign. This is
8 something for the engineer who reads the manual. So what
9 difference does it make if you call it HOV bypass or you call
10 it HOV preferential?

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, what if it just said HOV
12 lanes rather than HOV preferential or HOV bypass? That’s the
13 way the feds do it.

14 MEMBER BAHADORI: But what I’m saying is that why are
15 you even changing? What’s the point of changing from bypass to
16 preferential?

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Zhongren, you want to comment on
18 that?

19 MR. WANG: Yeah. If I can comment on the bypass.
20 The bypass has -- has an explicit meaning that you can bypass
21 the meter; right? And right now we don’t want any people to
22 bypass our meter. Because -- when we gave them priority
23 treatment or preferential treatment, instead allow them to
24 bypass, bypass means you don’t need to pay anything, you just
25 bypass it, but we gave you preferential treatment. So that’s

1 called a preferential lane. So this one is a little bit kind
2 of to the other realm, all right.

3 MEMBER HENLEY: Let me address this, because I used
4 to have ramp meters a long time ago. And one of the big issues
5 was whether you meter the bypass lane or you don't meter the
6 bypass lane. And let's say if you meter the bypass lane it's
7 still -- then it's not a bypass lane, but it's preferential.
8 In other words, if you're an HOV you get to get in the shorter
9 line, is essentially what it means. And I think that's
10 probably the reason they're going to preferential lanes.
11 Because you're not really bypassing the meter, you just get in
12 a preferred lane.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, let me ask a question though.
14 The way this sentence reads, "such as when a non-metered HOV
15 preferential lane is provided," if we just struck the word
16 "preferential" would that detract in any way from the overall
17 meaning?

18 MR. WANG: Mr. Chairman, I think, you know, even if
19 you delete everything after this comma, you know, I wouldn't --
20 it wouldn't change the meaning of the sentence.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm just asking, what if we deleted
22 the word "preferential?"

23 MR. WANG: Then you are going to refer -- because we
24 have (inaudible) HOV lane, and also we have for the HOV lane
25 onramp. So basically we are referring to the onramp, but

1 actually we call it the appendix.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: That wasn't my question. The whole
3 sentence refers to ramp control. "Ramp control signals may be
4 used to control some but not all lanes on a ramp, such as when
5 non-metered HOV lanes are provided on a ramp."

6 Does it add anything to the sentence to add the word
7 preferential after HOV?

8 MR. WANG: I can live with that.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Is that the only real
10 contention here on this matter?

11 MR. PYBURN: I'm not going to lose sleep over it or
12 anything.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

14 MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm saying that this -- this thing
15 is for an engineer who's sitting in the office who's going to
16 read it and knows exactly what you mean. So if FHWA has a
17 problem with it just drop "preferential".

18 MR. WANG: Why we didn't drop the preferential is
19 that I think in the current National MUTCD, and also Section 2G
20 of their -- they are going to use the preferential lane, and
21 they have a specific definition of what is preferential lane.
22 And this HOV bypass lane, the former HOV bypass lane fits
23 exactly to the current definition.

24 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, more reason to go with our
25 Chairman's suggestion, to drop both of them. Just says HOV

1 lanes are provided, period.

2 MR. WANG: Like I said, I can live with that.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So do we want a motion that
4 reflects maybe some minor revision of the language here?
5 Anyone?

6 I'll move that we adopt the report as revised, in
7 consultation with the FHWA, and we delete the word
8 "preferential" in paragraph 8. Do I have a second?

9 MEMBER HENLEY: I second it.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any further discussion by
11 members? All in favor of the motion say aye.

12 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's unanimous. All right.

14 We go to the next item which appears on page 53 and
15 page -- page 53 to 55. And this is really a format issue item.

16 What is proposed, look on page 55, is -- don't
17 really look at the whole message on the sign. Just look at the
18 tow-away symbol. The proposal here is to use -- to allow use
19 of this symbol when you have an 18-inch wide parking sign. And
20 the difference between this and a 12-inch sign we saw earlier,
21 like we were discussing the "No Parking of Vehicles for Sale"
22 and the tow symbol that went with that, it was an abbreviated
23 symbol that cut off part of the car and part of the tow truck.
24 And the only proposal here then is to allow the use of the full
25 symbol where you see the full car and tow truck because you

1 have a wider width to work with. You have 18 inches, which is
2 common when you have a no stopping description that is
3 illustrated in Part 2 of the California MUTCD.

4 So the proposal here is to allow this symbol, this
5 more explicit symbol, to be used in an 18-inch format, and
6 that's it.

7 So we would include the sign in Figure 2B-16(CA) as
8 an illustration of what that symbol would look like, and we
9 would revise the text in Section 2B.49 as shown on page 54.
10 And let me see. And we would state,

11 "Where the tow-away symbol is used in a 12-inch width
12 format it shall be as shown on the R26K sign." which is
13 the abbreviated version of that symbol. "When it is used
14 in an 18-inch format it shall be as shown in the sign as
15 shown on page 55."

16 So it's really just the width of the tow-away
17 symbol to allow this symbol to be used.

18 MEMBER BAHADORI: That's a very good idea . Do you
19 need a motion?

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Discussion? Any members of the
21 audience want to speak to this item?

22 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just one
23 question or maybe an issue in the -- probably for Steve Pyburn
24 here. The symbol, the way it's shown in the Federal MUTCD is
25 that cut-off symbol. And now extending it to the entire

1 symbol, will this constitute like a new symbol or will that be
2 still okay with the feds?

3 And that's my only question, because we don't want
4 to -- I mean, for symbols in the state, we do not have the
5 authority to create our own symbols. I don't want to really
6 step on FHWA's toes by altering or creating it. Because the
7 one that's shown as the cut-off version is the only one that's
8 shown in the MUTCD.

9 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
10 Administration. I don't -- I don't really have a problem with
11 that. In fact, earlier I looked at the requirements for the
12 use of that symbol and it doesn't -- when they -- you were
13 having the discussion, should it be at the top, should it be at
14 the bottom, it really is not specific. So there's a lot of
15 latitude in the parking sign definition.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any other member of the
17 audience want to speak to this issue? Any further discussion
18 by committee members?

19 MEMBER BAHADORI: I make a motion to approve the
20 request as submitted.

21 MEMBER HENLEY: I second it.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: We have a motion that's been
23 seconded. If there's no further discussion we'll bring it to a
24 vote. All those in favor say aye.

25 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's unanimous. Thank you very
2 much.

3 And now we get to several experiments. And the first
4 one is one I'm sponsoring. It is from the City of Coachella.
5 And it is a request to use the rectangular rapid flash beacon
6 and test it with a circular rapid flash beacon. We had a
7 matter that came to us within the last year from the City of
8 Santa Monica. The City of Santa Monica received approval from
9 the feds to experiment with the rectangular rapid flash beacon.
10 And they're also pleased to allow them to test the circular
11 rapid flash beacon because a number of issues have been raised
12 regarding is it the size, is it the shape, or is the flash
13 pattern that is effective in getting people to heed the warning
14 of it.

15 And so the City of Coachella worked closely with me
16 and with the City of Santa Monica to submit a proposal which
17 closely reflects what Santa Monica submitted. The City of
18 Coachella has received federal approval for the use and the
19 experimentation of a rectangular and circular rapid flash
20 beacon.

21 So I'd like to invite Ron Snyder up who is
22 representing the City of Coachella to tell us a little bit more
23 about their experiment.

24 MR. SNYDER: Very good. Thank you. Again, my name
25 is Ryan Snyder. I'm a transportation planning consultant. In

1 this case I'm representing the City of Coachella. I also teach
2 a course in federal -- for the Federal Highway Administration
3 in pedestrian safety design. And I did a pedestrian master
4 plan and a safe-routes-to-school plan for the City of Coachella
5 and submitted a grant application for them for safe-routes-to-
6 school funds, one of which was approved pending the right to
7 experiment with rapid flash beacons. There were a couple
8 locations where I thought that the best treatment for
9 uncontrolled crossings would be to have rapid flash beacons, in
10 addition to crossing islands and some other measures.

11 The federal research is pretty clear that at
12 uncontrolled crossings, when it comes to low-volume, low-speed
13 streets, two lane, a simple crosswalk can be adequate. But as
14 we add volume, as we add speed, as we add width to the street
15 we need to start adding new devices. And some of those might
16 be crossing islands, curb extensions, higher visibility
17 crosswalks, advanced yield bars, and the like. At some point
18 just below the threshold where you might need warrants for a
19 signal, but where you don't need warrants for a signal you need
20 more devices. And these were two locations, both along school
21 routes, that I felt the rapid flash beacon would -- would
22 significantly enhance pedestrian safety.

23 And so we brought this experiment to -- to this
24 committee. And on recommendation of Chairman Fisher we also --
25 in the plan I had rapid flash -- rectangular rapid flash

1 beacons. He suggested that we do like Santa Monica did and
2 add the circular beacons in as well. And so we've done that.
3 And we -- actually, Santa Monica was kind enough to lend us
4 some of their text for the -- for the letter of request. He
5 said we've already received permission from the feds to do both
6 rectangular and rapid flashing. I'll be available for
7 questions.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any questions for Mr.
9 Snyder?

10 MEMBER HENLEY: What's, you know, what's the timing
11 on this? You know, will you have conclusions by Christmas or
12 next -- this time next year or --

13 MR. SNYDER: No. The experiment will take a couple
14 years because we need to experiment first with the rectangular
15 for a year, and then with the circular for a year. It will
16 take a little bit of time. You know, once we've got permission
17 from this committee we need to go back to Caltrans, get
18 authorization to go ahead and -- and construct. Once the
19 construction has taken place, then we'll begin the -- the two-
20 year experiment.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other -- yes, John?

22 MEMBER KELLER: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any
23 problem with the idea of experimentation of flashing beacons.
24 My concern is more about the location.

25 With school children crossing a highway with an 85th

1 percentile speed of 58 miles an hour at another location where
2 many people are crossing four lanes in an 85th percentile speed
3 of 44, 18,000 ADT, that sounds like perhaps it's reflecting my
4 lack of knowledge about these locations, but that sounds like a
5 very difficult situation for pedestrians.

6 MR. SNYDER: It is. They're both difficult situation
7 for pedestrians. Again, we don't need warrants for a traffic
8 signal. But there are pedestrians crossing at both locations,
9 particularly the Harrison location at Baghdad. There are many
10 pedestrians crossing, not only on their way to school but it's
11 a commercial part of Coachella. It used to be part of State
12 Highway 86.

13 So you're absolutely right, it's a very -- they're
14 both very difficult situations for pedestrians. We might like
15 to prefer to have signals at these locations but they don't
16 need warrants. And so we're -- we're -- we're adding crossing
17 islands on Harrison. We have got a two-lane street crossing
18 out by the Coral Mountain Academy, so it's not (inaudible).
19 But speeds are fast, as you noted.

20 So you know, we're doing everything we can. And I
21 really do feel much more comfortable having the rapid flash
22 beacons than not having them, which is really our other option.

23 MEMBER KELLER: And I guess for adults they -- they
24 realize the larger picture of things. I guess I'm thinking a
25 child hits a button, like perhaps they would at a traffic

1 signal, and perhaps they expect to have it to stop. So I don't
2 know if there's an education component of this so that the
3 children crossing that will understand that they still have to
4 watch out for cars. They can't hit and -- and go when the
5 light starts flashing.

6 MR. SNYDER: Right. Yeah. Yeah. I mean, there
7 should be a type of education.

8 I mean, the -- the issue is that people are crossing
9 at both locations now, and so we need to do something to make
10 it safer.

11 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Ryan, on the -- there will be a
12 push button; correct?

13 MR. SNYDER: This can be activated either by push
14 button or -- or by sensor. But either way it's activated by a
15 pedestrian, either directly or indirectly.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do you propose the push button will
17 passive protection?

18 MR. SNYDER: We haven't gotten to the extent of
19 deciding which.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. The only thing I would add
21 is if you use a push button I think that as a standard language
22 on the plate that says push button forewarning lights, or
23 something to that effect.

24 MR. SNYDER: Yes.

25 MEMBER ROBINSON: I think it's interesting and I

1 thought it was a great idea that you -- that you decided to
2 compare the -- the circular versus the rectangular. What do
3 you think will be -- what will be your evaluation method in
4 terms of differentiating between one or the other? Obviously
5 you want -- you want to see compliance at the limit lines and
6 things like that. But have you considered perhaps interviewing
7 drivers? If it's near a school perhaps you can, you know, get
8 folks there. I'm just curious to know what's -- what goes on
9 in a person's mind. Maybe -- it could be a little bit
10 different than how they react.

11 MR. SNYDER: And off the top of my head I can't
12 remember all the details about the evaluation. It will be
13 primarily compliance evaluation, and we'll do the same
14 evaluation on both. The compliance evaluations that I know
15 have been done comparing sort of conventional flashing beacons
16 with rectangular flashing beacons show the compliance of
17 somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 percent with -- with
18 conventional, but upwards of upper 80s and in the 90s percent
19 for the rapid flash. So I mean, that's the type of thing we'll
20 be -- be looking for in the evaluation.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: The evaluation plan --

22 MR. SNYDER: Yeah. The evaluation --

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- I think it was detailed at
24 .68 --

25 MR. SNYDER: -- plan is in here. And like I said, I

1 can't remember all the details off the top of my head.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- the percentage of drivers who
3 yield at certain distances from the -- from the intersection.

4 MEMBER ROBINSON: Yeah. I didn't see -- what -- what
5 I think might be interesting is to know what goes on in a
6 person's mind. Sometimes you -- you see the -- the same kind
7 of compliance or maybe higher compliance, but you don't know
8 why that is. And if you were -- and I'm not suggesting you do
9 it. I just think sometimes you don't learn everything by -- by
10 just testing the compliance.

11 MR. SNYDER: Right. I agree.

12 MEMBER ROBINSON: An example might be, oh, I thought
13 it was an emergency vehicle as opposed to a crosswalk.

14 MR. SNYDER: Uh-huh.

15 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid?

17 MEMBER BAHADORI: I personally don't think there is
18 any difference. But if you want to experiment, come back and
19 let us know if people pay attention to circular or rectangular
20 flashing. I think it's --

21 MR. SNYDER: Yeah. Yeah. And I'm not --

22 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, I'm --

23 MR. SNYDER: Yeah. I'm not sure there will be any
24 difference between the two either.

25 MEMBER BAHADORI: Intuitively -- intuitively I don't

1 feel -- really think that the type of the and the shape of the
2 beacon is really going to be that much different in how people
3 are going to react to it. But if someone wants to spend money
4 and experiment with this --

5 MR. SNYDER: Well, I mean, the city doesn't
6 necessarily want to do both. I mean, the original proposal was
7 to just experiment with the rectangular. But upon submitting
8 their request we were advised by Chairman Fisher to -- to do
9 both as having a higher --

10 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, but --

11 MR. SNYDER: -- likelihood of getting this approval
12 here. So --

13 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, I mean, just -- if you want
14 to experiment you need to experiment with two different kinds.
15 Because with one kind how are you going to compare -- what are
16 you going to compare it with? But I will be really pleasantly
17 surprised if you can identify any quantifiable discernible kind
18 of difference between how people react to the circular or
19 rectangular shape.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And there may not be any
21 difference. And if there is no difference then that would
22 suggest we should consider allowing circular rapid flash
23 beacons as a standard device, using standard signal equipment
24 that we -- is available readily versus this special type of
25 add-on device to the sign.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: I agree with you.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other --

3 MEMBER HENLEY: I've just got a question.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Wayne?

5 MEMBER HENLEY: Is there a school crossing guard at
6 either one of these locations now?

7 MR. SNYDER: No, there is not. Crossing guards are
8 becoming a thing of the past as budgets are being slashed. And
9 even prior to that usually a school, if they were lucky, they
10 might have one per one location, but not all locations where
11 children are crossing

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jeff?

13 MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, having gone from in-pavement
14 flashers to above-ground flashing yellow beacon solar powered,
15 ped-activated, are we still looking towards the hotbox that is
16 now going to be allowed in California? Did the city -- I'm
17 just very concerned about a test on a street with these
18 volumes, those speeds, and with elementary school children.
19 Did -- did you consider the hotbox instead, the hybrid
20 pedestrian beacon?

21 MR. SNYDER: Oh, the hybrid beacons? No, for -- for
22 two reasons.

23 MEMBER KNOWLES: Because that actually gives you a
24 red indication --

25 MR. SNYDER: Those --

1 MEMBER KNOWLES: -- rather than just a flashing
2 yellow --

3 MR. SNYDER: Yeah.

4 MEMBER KNOWLES: -- hoping that people stop.

5 MR. SNYDER: For two reasons. I mean, I think we'd
6 have a harder time getting those approved. Are you thinking of
7 the hybrid beacons?

8 MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

9 MR. SNYDER: Yeah. Those, I assume, would be -- we'd
10 have a harder time getting them approved since they're -- well,
11 by now they're federal -- there is a federal --

12 MEMBER KNOWLES: It's about to not be --

13 MR. SNYDER: -- interim approval.

14 MEMBER KNOWLES: -- an experimental device in
15 California.

16 MR. SNYDER: Right. Yeah, I understand that.
17 They're quite a bit more expensive. These rapid flash beacons
18 are going to be on the order of 23,000 for a set. And my
19 understanding is that the hybrid beacons are more on the order
20 of 125 or so, in that sort of ballpark. And when you're
21 talking about safe use of school money, which is what these are
22 funded with, that eats up a lot of budget. And -- and the
23 grants are not particularly large.

24 So I mean, yeah, the -- the -- the hybrid beacons are
25 showing compliance rates around 97 percent. So it's probably a

1 little higher than -- than these. But --

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, and the other consideration,
3 too, is that the 2009 MUTCD says they should be installed away
4 from intersections.

5 MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. They'd have to move the
6 crossing location, but at least it provides probably a much
7 safer crossing.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other questions or comments on
9 this item? Again, it does reflect what we approved for the
10 City of Santa Monica just a few months ago. Do we have a
11 motion to approve this experiment?

12 MEMBER BAHADORI: I make the motion we approve the
13 experimentation request from City of Coachella.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I second it. Any further
15 discussion? All those in favor say aye?

16 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

17 MR. SNYDER: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Unanimous. Thank you. Thank you,
19 Ron. Okay.

20 On item number 08-20, that's a final report from the
21 Marin County regarding the flashing yellow arrow for permissive
22 right turns.

23 Farhad, would you like to summarize those results?

24 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd
25 like to recognize Emanuel. If you don't mind, come on up while

1 I talk. Because this young man spent about 2 million years out
2 there, and I want to give him the credit for a very successful
3 experimentation. We're so proud of it that we think you should
4 adopt it as a practice.

5 So with your permission I'll turn it over to Emanuel
6 for bragging rights.

7 MR. HYLEE: Thank you. Emanuel Hylee, Marin County
8 Public Works. I'm here to present the final report on the
9 experimentation for the flashing yellow right turn arrow.

10 This flashing yellow right turn arrow was installed
11 on a permissive right turn movement. It was a high volume.
12 And we had a conflict with pedestrians, conflict with other car
13 movement. So we experimented to see if we can, A, reduce the
14 crashes that we have and, B, to see if the drivers can
15 understand it and they can comply with the -- the movement, and
16 that they have to -- they have to yield to other cars from the
17 other direction.

18 So this installation was first done in August 2008.
19 So we had over two-and-a-half years to look into it. Like I
20 said, we installed it to -- to see if the permissive right turn
21 traffic can be controlled without a red light, basically,
22 because we have that high volume of traffic.

23 So what we did was we modified a three-section signal
24 with a steady right red arrow, which basically is a stop. And
25 then the second one was a steady yellow arrow, which is a

1 prepare to stop. And the lower portion of the three-section
2 signal was the flashing right yellow arrow. And we -- we used
3 the evaluation, basically comparing the crashes that we had
4 before the installation and after the installation. And we
5 also evaluated by going out and making sure that people are
6 stopping on the red arrow or slowing down when it's flashing,
7 just going out and making sure people can -- drivers can
8 understand it.

9 But the whole idea was to communicate with drivers
10 that permissive turns are to be made with caution and
11 appropriate yield behavior should follow. And that's one of
12 the main things of this experimentation that yielded a high
13 performance measure of -- the crash level, basically, was
14 almost reduced by 90 percent.

15 On a number of occasions we got calls from residents
16 asking us what -- what's the definition of this and what were
17 you trying to do. And we were telling them that they have to
18 use caution, they have to yield, and then they have to make a
19 right turn based on those three sections.

20 In conclusion, the safety benefit that we had on this
21 experiment was very significant. Before the installation we
22 had for the last seven years, about 12 accidents in the area.
23 And after installations the first two year years we had about
24 three, and then the last two -- the last -- 2009 up to two
25 months of 2011 we had no accidents. So people are

1 understanding it more and they're following it correctly.

2 It helped us to reduce the queue that we had on the
3 right turn. It helped us to reduce the delay also, and vehicle
4 emission also. And there's -- we had improvement on our signal
5 coordination. But most of all we were able to stop the three
6 right turn movement when pedestrians are crossing. This area
7 was right next to an elementary school. So it helps us also
8 to -- when the pedestrians are crossing that the right turn had
9 to yield or to come to a complete stop.

10 So it was a success story. And we ask that you adopt
11 it, and that way we can keep this as a permanent installation.
12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you. Hamid?

14 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Question, Emanuel. I'm glad that
15 you had good positive results (inaudible). Would it have made
16 any difference -- I remember when we had this discussion on
17 this thing -- would it have made any difference if you didn't
18 even -- if you didn't even use the steady yellow arrow and you
19 would have just the red and the flashing red? What was the
20 benefit of having the steady yellow arrow?

21 MR. HYLEE: The -- the benefit of the steady yellow
22 arrow, I think it would be creating gaps, especially for -- we
23 had driveways that are very close to the intersection. So we
24 were trying to catch as much gap as possible. So after this
25 phase it would be the left turn that comes into it and they

1 were comings fast. So as much as possible creating gaps for
2 the residents, also, in that intersection. This area was a
3 high volume area on both the minor street and the major street.
4 So --

5 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So if we are going to approve
6 this for statewide use following this experimentation what are
7 we approving, the flashing yellow arrow for permissive right
8 turn, or are we --

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think we're just approving the
10 final report on it.

11 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But the whole purpose of
12 experimentation is to authorize the use of the experiment.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But I -- but I think in
14 part of our adoption of the 2011 California MUTCD, flashing
15 yellow arrows are part of that --

16 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- that we are considering.

18 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.)

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I assume it's the right turn.

20 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.)

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah.

22 SECRETARY SINGH: Oh.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. I mean, the federal language
24 that was adopted in 2009 allows flashing yellows for left turns
25 and for right turns in that language that's in there.

1 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So if we proceed and adopt the 2011
3 manual that's consistent with the 2009 MUTCD then that
4 validates your experiment.

5 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So we need to, what, take action to
7 adopt this final report, is that --

8 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes. This motion is to adopt the
9 final report.

10 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

11 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) (Inaudible.)

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Do we have a motion to
13 adopt?

14 MEMBER ROBINSON: So moved.

15 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Seconded, anyone?

16 MEMBER HENLEY: I had a question. My question is --

17 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Second, yes.

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. We have a second.

19 Yes, Wayne?

20 MEMBER HENLEY: You know, when we say we're adopting
21 a report, what does that mean?

22 SECRETARY SINGH: We're authorizing the condition can
23 be -- stay as it is. And they don't have to remove the
24 (inaudible).

25 MEMBER HENLEY: I was -- I was just thinking,

1 accept -- you know, if we accept the report then that means --
2 rather than adopted.

3 SECRETARY SINGH: Accept the report. Yeah. We would
4 accept the report.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Accept the report. Okay.

6 MEMBER ROBINSON: And my motion will change
7 accordingly.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Moved, seconded.

9 Discussion? All those that approve say aye?

10 ALL MEMBERS: It's accepted.

11 MR. HYLEE: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you for your experiment, and
13 congratulations on the results that you achieved. Okay.

14 Item number 11-13 is sponsored by Farhad, and it's
15 presented by L.A. County, reckless driving prohibited.

16 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. So L.A. County, would
17 you come up? Yes.

18 Before Mike was appointed to the committee I was the
19 only county rep. So on behalf of north, south, east, west, I
20 put this on the agenda. And L.A. County will give us a
21 briefing.

22 MR. BARBE: Okay. I am Paul Barbe with Los Angeles
23 County Department of Public Works, Traffic and Lighting
24 Division. I gave Chairman Fisher a stack of these. They were
25 PowerPoint slide. This is a request to experiment with a sign

1 that says, "Reckless Driving Prohibited."

2 We've chosen Glendora Mountain Road and Glendora
3 Ridge Road in the San Gabriel Mountains of East Los Angeles
4 County. They are known places where this type of activity
5 takes place. If you were to go to Google and -- and put in
6 Glendora Mountain Road or Glendora Ridge Road you'd find
7 several videos of -- of cars and motorcyclists racing up and
8 down the roadway.

9 There's a location map in there. Glendora Mountain
10 Road is actually the one that runs up from Glendora here, up to
11 here. And then the one across here is Glendora Ridge Road.
12 And this is Mt. Baldy road for those of you familiar with the
13 area.

14 Collision data is in there. Glendora Mountain Road
15 is about 14 miles long. Glendora Ridge Road is about 12 miles.
16 There's to ADTs given there. The smaller one, the one on the
17 left in each of those is -- is a weekday ADT. And then if you
18 look at the weekends you can see that the ADT goes times by
19 about four times. So you have four times the traffic on -- on
20 the weekends than we do on weekdays. 5:02:37

21 I've outlined the collision data that we've had out
22 there for the last five years. This is our -- the data that we
23 have through the end of February of this year. And at the --
24 on the bottom there's the primary collision factors. And as
25 you can see, we -- on Glendora Mountain we had 33 with unsafe

1 speed, ad 18 with other hazardous movements or -- I also
2 included in that -- wrong side of roadway. And then on
3 Glendora Ridge we had similar results, similar -- similar data
4 with just a few less collisions.

5 The next slide is our proposed wording for the sign.
6 And then the one after that we have sign A and sign B. Sign A
7 would be used at the entrance to the roadway. In this
8 particular it's Glendora Mountain Road going north from Sierra
9 Madre. And we would use sign B at an arrow where Glendora
10 Mountain Road and Glendora Ridge Road intersect as just kind of
11 a supplement to that.

12 We -- we're showing two sections of the vehicle code
13 on there. And I've included the basic parts of the vehicle
14 code that will be -- that we're working with to put these signs
15 in.

16 In the next slide there's a picture. This is up in
17 Angeles National Forest on Angeles Crest Highway. This is
18 another sign that's out there that's an attempt to influence
19 driver behavior, and that's what we're trying to do out here.

20 Go back to the collision data. In December of 2009,
21 I believe it was, we had two motorcycle versus motorcycle head-
22 on collisions within a week. They were one week apart. And
23 each one ended -- ended in a fatality. And that was in 2009.

24 Recently at the far south end where it's a little bit
25 straighter in the City of Glendora at the end of April this

1 year we had a car that hit an equestrian. The rider was not
2 seriously injured, but the horse was killed. And this is
3 typical activity.

4 A lot of the residents around there would like --
5 actually like to see that road closed because there's a lot of
6 people up there, bicyclists, hikers, equestrians up there
7 sometimes, motorcycles, cars. I've even see people
8 skateboarding down Glendora Mountain Road.

9 So to have time to complete this we're asking for
10 three years. That will give us time to coordinate with the
11 sheriffs department, the CHP and Glendora Police Department and
12 set up how we're going to work this program, set up regular
13 enforcement, track collisions, citations, and that type of
14 thing. And then that will last about a year. And then we'll
15 post the signs and we'll do the same type of tracking. We'll
16 compare the data and we'll prepare a final report and bring it
17 back to the committee at that time.

18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, Paul. I note that it's
19 nearly 2:40. So ideally we could address this in hopefully ten
20 minutes so that we can get to the other item that's on our
21 agenda.

22 Do I have any questions for L.A. County? Yes, Jeff?

23 MEMBER KNOWLES: I have a standard question. Why do
24 you think this sign will cause a reckless driver to drive
25 safely?

1 MR. BARBE: Well, there's -- another sign that's on
2 the sign chart is a "No Littering" sign. We use driver
3 feedback or speed display signs in an effort to influence
4 driver behavior. We're hoping that this type of sign will have
5 the same impact.

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, John.

7 MEMBER KELLER: And I would add that vehicle
8 impoundment is a significant reminder to people who might be
9 driving recklessly that they -- that it could be more than a
10 \$300 speeding ticket involved.

11 MR. BARBE: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I have a question. You indicated
13 the problem was drag racing or speeding. Why couldn't the
14 speed limit be enforced here?

15 MR. BARBE: It's a very windy mountain road. We've
16 asked -- we've been asked for speed limits up there. But it's
17 very difficult to find an area long enough where we could
18 take -- gather speed data to determine what an appropriate
19 speed limit would be.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: But if you have a series of winding
21 curves I would think that continuous curvature would mean that
22 the speed limit then would be generally governed by the
23 restrictions of the curvature if there are very few straight-
24 aways.

25 So in other words, if you have 30 mile-an-hour curves

1 or 35 mile-an-hour curves, or 20, then it would be appropriate
2 to consider setting the speed limit in that range if the road
3 is mostly curves. So why not set a speed limit and enforce
4 that?

5 MR. BARBE: Well, if I remember correctly, the MUTCD
6 says that traffic data, speed data should be gathered in areas
7 where you have free-flow traffic and where it's not influenced
8 by curves.

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But conditions not readily
10 apparent, so imagine you have some blind curves. And do you
11 have -- and if you have a bad collision history that's
12 significantly above what you experience on other roads,
13 wouldn't that be a reason for considering the speed limit based
14 on those factors?

15 MR. BARBE: Yes, it would.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: The other comment I had was the
17 sign seems to say the obvious, don't drive recklessly. And I
18 just wondered if signs would be effective that state the
19 obvious. I mean, are there not other signs or traffic control
20 devices that better address this?

21 For example, if you've got a 30 mile-an-hour curve,
22 you sign for that. What about speed feedback signs just beyond
23 those curve warning signs with advisory plates that would
24 remind motorists what their speed is and that it may be
25 creeping up a little bit too high?

1 I'm just wondering if there are better ways to
2 address this problem than putting up a sign that says the
3 obvious.

4 MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question
5 also?

6 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah.

7 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Isn't one of the deterrents that
8 you're trying to put out is for -- for if you try to horse
9 around and play around on these conditions you could also lose
10 your car? Isn't that what that sign -- so this is trying to
11 get the message, I'm going to call it the kids, but to those
12 who are going out there on these windy roads and are playing
13 around and crashing and ending up hurting themselves and
14 killing others?

15 MR. BARBE: Correct.

16 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's where the logic of this is
17 coming from. That's my reading of the proposal.

18 MEMBER BAHADORI: And, Mr. Chairman, could I ask a
19 question?

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm not that fond about the option
22 B. That sign is just not really that effective. Sign A is the
23 one that drives the point that you -- you can lose your
24 vehicle, where it says "Vehicle Impoundment".

25 And the street racing is not only in L.A. County, but

1 it's a serious problem in California, maybe national. And a
2 lot of people are doing a lot of crazy things out there. And
3 maybe a sign that gives the locals the flexibility to at least
4 put signs in the streets or roadways where there is such a
5 problem.

6 Just one -- and I agree with the question that
7 somebody asked from the other side -- I didn't see who -- but
8 most of the reckless drivers, they totally disregard all
9 traffic laws. So no sign is going to change their behavior or
10 no traffic school or nothing like that. They're just out
11 driving reckless in the community.

12 But still, you know, if there's a tool that they can
13 put on the road then I would support that. I'm not that crazy
14 about option B because it really doesn't say much. But sign A
15 is -- is an effective sign.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you believe that the sign A that
17 refers to vehicle impoundment is the real deterrent?

18 MR. BARBE: That's the real deterrent. Yes. The --
19 sign B was an option to use, say within the zone where you
20 were -- that you're looking to -- to control or eliminate this
21 type of activity.

22 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any other questions or
23 comments from committee members?

24 MEMBER BAHADORI: And again, this is a conceptual
25 sign. It needs to go through Caltrans sign group to go with

1 the appropriate letter sizing and all that to make sure that
2 it's even legible at 50 miles an hour.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

4 MR. BARBE: Yes.

5 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) This will be
6 (inaudible) sign. Maybe (inaudible). The sign (inaudible) for
7 that certain speed. (Inaudible) someone would have to stop and
8 read the sign.

9 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Then they won't speed though.
10 That's the whole idea.

11 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) I don't know if option
12 A, if someone will read it though. (Inaudible) any speed.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: How big are the letters on this?
14 They appear to be like --

15 MR. BARBE: Well, the --

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- two inches high.

17 MR. BARBE: The sign layout that I've given you were
18 prepared by our -- by our sign shop. So they're using software
19 that sizes these signs appropriately to -- to Caltrans
20 standards.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Just a thought. What if you, on
22 sign A, kept your "Reckless Driving Prohibited" in the size
23 letter you show, but then use the words "Vehicle Impoundment"
24 in the same size letters, without the words punishable by
25 arrest, and -- and that --

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I follow what you are
2 saying. Maybe to get rid of that line, "Punishable By". Then
3 the arrest and vehicle impoundment are deterrents. So probably
4 you might to mention both of them, that you can get arrested
5 and your vehicle, you can lose it.

6 MR. BARBE: So it would say, "Reckless Driving
7 Prohibited," and then just "Vehicle Impoundment" with the
8 vehicle code sections?

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: Or it can just say "Arrest" and
10 "Vehicle Impoundment".

11 MR. BARBE: Oh. Okay. Just take out "Punishable
12 By"?

13 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Michael suggested that vehicles may
15 be impounded. So one option -- another option would be
16 "Reckless Driving Prohibited, Vehicles May Be Impounded".

17 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, just again, the -- the whole
18 word -- the introduction of the word "May" is going to lose the
19 deterrent factor --

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah.

21 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- because you are saying, yeah,
22 no, I'm taking my changes, maybe they don't impound me. You
23 are not saying anything that like -- you're just reaffirming
24 the law. So if you're reaffirming it you want to be as
25 stringent as possible, I think, in wording.

1 MR. BARBE: The impoundment is at the discretion of
2 the officer too. The 23109.2 of the Vehicle Code says,
3 "A peace officer may immediately arrest and take into that
4 custody that person and may cause the removal and seizure
5 of the motor vehicle."

6 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

7 MR. BARBE: So he can -- he can seize it or he can
8 not.

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: Right. So if I'm a reckless driver
10 I'm going to take my chances if I know that -- that it's not.
11 So you don't want to give him that option.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Would be you be agreeable to a
13 proposal that would require that sign A have letter sizes no
14 less than four inches high, with the exception of the CVC
15 sections? That would create a taller sign, but it would -- you
16 know, as far as I know four inch letters is about the lowest
17 that we use on a regulatory sign.

18 MR. BARBE: Yeah. We'd be agreeable with that.
19 We -- we could find a place to post that.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Then do we have a motion by
21 the committee here regarding --

22 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'll move approval of L.A.
23 County's experimental request as -- and then I'll wait for an
24 amendment for the signage, that way you get the language right.
25 So let me get the main thing done first.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: I second the motion, redefine the
2 amendment that we go with sign A with the proper wording to
3 make the minimum size requirement, but making a reference to
4 the punishes by the law somehow, that they can get arrested and
5 your -- you can -- your vehicle can be impounded, because
6 that's what makes the sign --

7 MR. BARBE: So we'll remove "Punishable By".

8 MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Because that's, I think
9 that's what make the sign more effective. Just saying
10 "Reckless Driving Prohibited," as sign B says, it really
11 doesn't say much.

12 MR. BARBE: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So we have a motion that's been
14 seconded, it's been clarified.

15 MEMBER HENLEY: Is it clear -- clear that minimum
16 letter size height is four inches?

17 MEMBER BAHADORI: No. Whatever Caltrans minimum size
18 letter for those signs are.

19 MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. Yeah.

20 SECRETARY SINGH: Then that (inaudible) in the
21 California MUTCD (inaudible). So whatever speed (inaudible).

22 MR. BARBE: Okay.

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: I don't think you want to design
24 the sign here.

25 MEMBER HENLEY: No. No.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: Whatever the Caltrans standards
2 are.

3 MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. That's using Caltrans
4 standards. Good enough.

5 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is it clear what we're asking L.A.
6 County to do? Clearly, we're asking them to come up with a
7 sign bigger than 24 by 30.

8 MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm -- I'm not asking that. I'm
9 just saying design the sign that meets Caltrans' lettering
10 requirements. I don't know what size sign that's going to be.
11 If they can fit it in a 24 by 30, fine. Otherwise, if it's 36
12 by 48, so be it.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, I don't know what is meant
14 "according to Caltrans' sign requirements". I don't know what
15 that means.

16 MEMBER BAHADORI: Because Caltrans has very specific
17 requirements about the -- the minimum letter size depending on
18 the approach speed. And based on that, your goal that you want
19 to install it, your sign should comply with that -- with those
20 standards.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: What is the minimum letter height
22 for the approach speed?

23 MEMBER BAHADORI: That's why I said that, that --

24 CHAIRMAN FISHER: "Right Lane Must Turn Right" is
25 designated size letters.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: That's why I said that I don't --
2 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.)
3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So who do we want them to work with
4 in the meantime?
5 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Well, we're -- we're approving
6 their experimentation; correct? And the condition or the
7 suggestion on sign A is get rid of the word "Punishable By,"
8 that was one amendment; correct? CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah.
9 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And then, John, you had a four
10 inch idea. And Hamid is saying per Caltrans' standards. So if
11 anybody has specific things let's put it on.
12 MEMBER BAHADORI: I don't see why this sign should
13 comply with anything beyond what Caltrans requires on any
14 regulatory signs on letter size, as long as they're complying
15 with any -- with the standard that we're using for any other
16 regulatory sign for signage -- for letter size. That's what
17 I'm saying.
18 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So who we want them to
19 coordinate with in Caltrans to make sure it meets their
20 standards, anyone or --
21 MEMBER HENLEY: Do you need a name? I can tell you
22 the name.
23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Don?
24 MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, it would be Don.
25 MEMBER BAHADORI: Don. Don Ho (phonetic). And

1 he's -- he's the man, he's the signing man. He's going to tell
2 them if their sign meets the Caltrans' requirement or not.

3 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.)

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: So we have a motion regarding the
5 sign, and then the request that you work through Devinder on
6 any other specifications --

7 MR. BARBE: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- regarding that sign. Are we
9 ready to vote on the matter?

10 SECRETARY SINGH: What are you deleting from the
11 sign? I'm not sure.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: "Punishable By."

13 SECRETARY SINGH: Are you keeping the rest then?

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Correct.

15 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And they agree to that, correct,
16 L.A. County?

17 MR. BARBE: Yes.

18 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah. We don't want to redesign
19 it for you. We want to make sure. We're just trying to be
20 helpful.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So the proposal that a sign,
22 "Reckless Driving Prohibited, Arrest and Vehicle Impoundment"
23 with the CVC sections mentioned at the bottom, and the bulk of
24 the sign would have at least four inch letters, and then there
25 will coordination with Caltrans regarding any other specs on

1 the sign.

2 MR. BARBE: Correct.

3 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

4 MEMBER ROBINSON: And -- and the -- a report -- the
5 final report would not necessarily request addition of a new
6 signing to --

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: We've got to see how the
8 experimentation is.

9 MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, this is not -- this is not
10 introducing sign into California standards. It's just
11 experimentation.

12 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All right. Any comments
13 from those in the audience? Then I'll ask that we bring it to
14 a vote. All members of the -- those in favor of the experiment
15 say aye.

16 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Unanimous. Thank you.

18 MR. BARBE: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

20 MEMBER HENLEY: Okay. The next item, an experiment
21 that's been continued about three or four times that I know of,
22 and there's been absolutely no action. So I'm suggesting that
23 we remove this -- this experiment from -- from the agenda
24 forever.

25 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good idea.

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: Vanished. Laser it.

2 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I'll never see this one
3 again. Okay.

4 Item number 11-01 is an information item regarding
5 the adoption of the 2011 California MUTCD.

6 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.)

7 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.)

9 CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. So we go to the item
10 that was added just a few days ago, 11-14.

11 That's yours, Wayne.

12 MEMBER HENLEY: Yes. You know, we talk about trends.
13 And I remember, oh, about 10 or 15 years ago we started talking
14 about context sensitive solutions. In other words, how to, you
15 know, design our streets through, you know, neighborhoods so
16 that -- that they're not out of scale. And since then there's
17 a question, what they call a complete streets movement. And
18 again, it's trying to look at streets as how they support not
19 just vehicle movement but, you know, pedestrians, the
20 handicapped, bicycles, you know, just -- in other words,
21 anybody that wants to use the highway right-of-way.

22 And at the same time we've had a lot of stakeholders,
23 bicyclists, pedestrians and others, that are saying, wait a
24 minute, your -- your streets aren't really addressing our needs
25 as well as they could be. And you know, they've gotten so far

1 as to actually get some proposed legislation over the last year
2 or so. And our management has taken -- taken -- paying
3 attention to them and they're basically saying that they would
4 like this committee to think a little more a little -- you
5 know, they're -- they think that we focus too much on highways
6 and vehicles, you know, cars, and we should be focusing a
7 little more on bicycles and pedestrians.

8 And then to -- to get us to be more sensitive in that
9 they've suggested that we -- we increase our membership to
10 include two what we call non-motorized or non-traditional users
11 of the highway right-of-way. And what they're asking us to do
12 is, well, to add two -- two members, voting members. And right
13 now, you know, we have one ex officio member. Well, we would
14 not have that ex officio member. We'd have two additional
15 voting members. And exactly how those people would be, you
16 know, selected is still up in the air. But the point is they
17 would be appointed by the director of Caltrans after he or she
18 consults with the -- the various stakeholders that -- that
19 support the complete street. We call it active transportation
20 livable communities.

21 There was some legislation not too long ago that made
22 some suggestions as to how we can affect that. But the
23 department has looked at it and said, wait a minute, you're --
24 you're -- you know, that's a little bit too prescriptive. And
25 so the way the legislation was going we were saying, wait a

1 minute, we don't need to have you prescribing the members of --
2 of our advisory committee, because that's what the CTCDC is an
3 advisory committee to Caltrans. So -- so basically we're
4 suggesting that our advisory committee can basically address
5 the -- the -- the needs of the people that are proposing the
6 legislation.

7 And so what we'd like to do is work with this
8 committee to change the bylaws to recognize that we're going to
9 have two non-motorized representatives on the committee. And
10 you know, obviously, we'll have to change our bylaws somewhat
11 because like or quorum will change and our, you know, our super
12 majority will change, and that sort of thing.

13 And a letter was sent not too long ago. And we hope
14 that in the next -- number one, change our bylaws. Number two,
15 you know, Caltrans is going to have to come up with a method of
16 selecting those two additional members. And I think that we --
17 we have sponsoring organizations and then we -- which basically
18 is, you know, the CSAC and the League and Caltrans and CHP.
19 And anyway, that wouldn't change. So the number of sponsoring
20 organizations wouldn't change. But basically right now
21 Caltrans appoints one person, which in the last few years it's
22 been me. But now they'll be appointing three which will
23 probably be one traffic person, and then two non-motorized
24 people, whether they're from bicycles or pedestrian advocates
25 or, you know, or any -- any other non-motorized group. It

1 could be, you know, ADA folks, they could be on the committee.

2 And that's where we -- you know, that's what our
3 intent is, is to try to get, you know, this committee to get
4 less -- less criticism for being strictly a highway oriented
5 committee or a car oriented committee.

6 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) (Inaudible.)

7 MEMBER HENLEY: Well, I think that's something --

8 SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

9 MEMBER HENLEY: You know, we're going to -- in the --
10 in the next -- in the -- between now and the next meeting we
11 really need to take a look at, collectively, our -- our bylaws
12 and then see where we go from here.

13 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman --

14 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you, Wayne. It is an
15 informational item.

16 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah. I --

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: But I think that's deserving of a
18 few comments.

19 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because we've got 15 minutes or
20 so, and I want to make sure that everybody is clear on the
21 position of the counties, and so I'm going to now repeat myself
22 and say it one time.

23 We disagree with the approach, while the counties
24 fully support the intention. And Caltrans is very much aware
25 of this, as I've been trying to coordinate.

1 When AB 345 was introduced we contacted Caltrans and
2 said what are your thoughts? Do you think this is a good idea
3 or a bad idea? And Caltrans said we want to take no position
4 and no discussion. And we said, okay, if you want to have no
5 comment about your advisory committee we get it.

6 We contacted the author and we wanted to know what is
7 the intention of the author. And we understood where the
8 author wants to go. The counties, we talked to our leadership
9 and we officially submitted a support position. As a matter of
10 fact, I met with the authors' principal person, Justin, who
11 wrote all of these, and I said the counties will support AB 345
12 with the amendment that -- that the two -- because at the time
13 there was no -- there was no clarity on who these two members
14 were. You know, was it bike people, was it transit people, and
15 should it be two, should it be four, whatever number.

16 So the counties position is -- and we have sent
17 letters from CSAC to the author who we thought we had an
18 agreement on, and I still think we have an agreement with the
19 author, that we support AB 345 for a number of reasons. We --
20 we very much need the counties welcome, the input of other
21 people, so that we make sure there's transparency and we get
22 the complete input.

23 So what we also want to do is stop this process that
24 started three years ago where different interest groups have
25 discovered that maybe this committee is way too important and

1 they want to be part of it. And so we're constantly, it seems
2 like, in the last three years we've been battling on who should
3 be on here, who shouldn't be. And we want to bring that to an
4 end so we can continue the very important technical and boring
5 work we do.

6 So we thought the assembly bill is the best way to
7 proceed because it codifies the membership and it says who the
8 members are to city reps, to county reps, to AAA, law
9 enforcement meaning CHP, Caltrans. Interestingly, even they
10 were telling us you don't need Caltrans, and we had to convince
11 them that you really do. It's the largest highway department
12 in the world and we want to have their input. What do you mean
13 we don't want their committee?

14 And so we think by putting it in an assembly bill and
15 mentioning who these agencies are, then once and for all we
16 have clarified not only intention of working with everybody,
17 but then every other day another interest group does not come
18 in and say, well, what about us.

19 And as a matter of fact, if you notice the letter
20 that they passed out to us is unless it's done by -- by an
21 assembly bill we think this committee is just going to be --
22 it's going to be a never-ending show for us. Listen to -- to
23 what the suggestion -- one suggestion is. "We additionally
24 suggest" -- so two -- two livable communities, that's why we
25 want to get this in state law and get it over with. "We

1 additionally suggest any committee of Caltrans that assembles
2 for the purpose of individual interest groups," you're talking
3 about taxi drivers, you're talking about transits, ADA, and all
4 of those are very welcome, but I'm not sure that their
5 technical people on this committee, they're saying they should
6 be part of this.

7 So we think we need to resolve this at the
8 legislation level once and for all, whatever it be, to the
9 wisdom of the legislation, codify what this committee's
10 membership is, and then we're done and we can proceed with our
11 work, as opposed to -- what is it now -- three, four, five
12 times a year we get these proposals from various interest
13 groups. And -- and I think it's -- it's creating a lot of,
14 frankly, animosity, and mainly uncertainty on the committee.

15 So that's the county's position. We would not be
16 supporting the director's request of just adding that because
17 we think there is no end to it. This will be the third
18 practice we've done, and it will continue going on. We'd like
19 to do it legislatively and get it over with. So that's --
20 that's all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you. And I would like
22 to allow one comment from each member on the committee. We're
23 limited in time. But I think we should have at least one
24 opportunity to make comments on this.

25 So, Hamid, do you have any comments on this?

1 MEMBER BAHADORI: Very briefly. I support Mr.
2 Mansourian's general sentiment on the issue and his concern
3 about the process. And --

4 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The county's concerns.

5 MEMBER BAHADORI: The county --

6 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Thank you.

7 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- and not you. It's not our place
8 to speak individually. We speak --

9 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right.

10 MEMBER BAHADORI: -- for the organizations we
11 represent. The county's concern.

12 The -- the committee has been around for like 60
13 years. And for some reason there -- there -- there might be a
14 misconception of the committee out there that this is a policy
15 making committee or it's a funding allocation committee. It's
16 neither of those, and we have no jurisdiction over any such
17 matters.

18 For example, on the concept of the complete-the-
19 street committee, any city or county in California today, if
20 they want they can go and convert all their city streets to
21 only pedestrian (inaudible) only. So there's another set of
22 policies they have to comply with. They have to go through the
23 CEQA process and the RPP process and general plan conformity
24 processes that's got nothing to do with the devices committee,
25 has got nothing to do with Caltrans. It's a purely technical

1 committee.

2 However, understanding, you know, that there is an
3 interest I guess the -- the broader points of view will
4 definitely enhance the technical outcome of the committee's
5 recommendation and it's welcome. And -- but I share in Mr.
6 Mansourian's concerns that the language as it's -- it is in the
7 letter, it can become quite time consuming and the committee
8 can turn into a political community -- committee. And it's
9 going to become ideological discussions which is not going to
10 be conducive to the work of the committee.

11 There is a bill in -- in the works, AB 345. Almost
12 all the stakeholders have had interest in that. They have
13 participated. They have provided comments to the authors'
14 office. AB 345 is moving along pretty well. And my first
15 reaction that I heard from Caltrans is that, hey, we don't
16 care. If legislature wants to -- want to codify the membership
17 of the committee let them do it, but I guess something happened
18 internally and that position was change.

19 But I -- I pretty much -- I wouldn't be able to say
20 it as eloquently as Mr. Mansourian said it, I support the
21 county's position that there is a bill in the hopper that's
22 going through the process. Let's stay with the AB 345, expand
23 the committee's membership as recommended in the bill, and
24 codify it once and for all. I shouldn't say for all. The
25 legislature can always come back and change it.

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you, Hamid.

2 John, do you have any comments?

3 MEMBER KELLER: You know, I guess we're looking at it
4 more that the CTCDC members have broad responsibility no matter
5 what mode of transportation we're talking about. So whether
6 it's trucks which are a particular issue to us, motorcycles,
7 transit, whether it's an ADA issue, whether it's local law
8 enforcement it has some different issues than CHP does, we're
9 not -- we should be so narrow as to require advocates for every
10 possible group that has an interest in signs and markings.

11 So we had an ex officio member that added some
12 expertise to our discussions. The -- the federal MUTCD process
13 has a wide-ranging technical advisory committee. It seems to
14 me that there are some options here beyond mandating a solution
15 that could wind up with even longer meetings and more
16 contentious discussion with perhaps not an improvement and --
17 well, I guess that speaks to a more fundamental point. Is
18 there a problem that we're trying to solve here in terms of the
19 outcome? Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you. Michael, do you have
21 any comments?

22 MEMBER ROBINSON: Somebody said that the CTCDC is
23 boring and technical. I didn't find it that way at all. From
24 my first meeting I've really enjoyed the discussions that we've
25 been having. So thank you all for that.

1 My county just recently updated our public road
2 standards, many of them in view of the fact that we do have a
3 complete streets -- a community, a public that's interested
4 in -- in complete streets. And so we've -- we've -- we've
5 updated our -- our road standards with that in -- in mind.

6 So I think from -- from my perspective and what I
7 will be seeing here, I'm -- I'm looking forward to embracing
8 whatever comes to this committee in this way and -- and working
9 with -- with whoever it is decided that needs to be on it.
10 We -- maybe at one time we were boring and technically, but
11 times changes. And sometimes -- sometimes we expand our view,
12 our vision just a little bit, and it's not already a bad thing.

13 CHAIRMAN FISHER: And, Jeff, do you have any
14 comments?

15 MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. I'm really not clear again
16 the problem that somebody's seeking to solve. I mean, the --
17 most city councils -- and I represent basically a city council
18 as I sit here as their -- their traffic engineer -- think that
19 they kind of own the roadways and the sidewalks, and they set
20 the rules in their community. And we're the -- generally the
21 messengers that go back and say, no, there's this overriding
22 guideline that actually tells you what you can and can not do.
23 And this forum has been set up to allow cities to provide
24 Caltrans some input when they're developing the rules that
25 we're going to later have to live by.

1 But I've already heard from the cyclists in my
2 community, the parents in my community, the schools in my
3 community, the pedestrians, the ADA folks. You know, I think
4 I've worked for six cities and one county. So I take all that
5 into consideration when thinking about now how would this rule
6 affect those dozens of investigations we did on that subject
7 and requests for these signs and these pedestrians and -- and
8 traffic signal operations, and all of the things we do?

9 And I mean, for anybody to think that we're not
10 thinking about pedestrians and school safety and bicyclists
11 doesn't really understand what we do for a living and who our
12 constituents are, because that's exactly what I am thinking
13 about every time a rule comes up on one of those subjects. And
14 I really don't know who these new people will even represent,
15 who they'll respond to. I mean, they're not the people that I
16 deal with when I'm working on school safety issues and bike to
17 school issues.

18 So I'm not really sure what their qualifications
19 would be and what larger -- what their responsibility is.
20 What -- what is the weight? When did they go to court to try
21 to testify on their cities behalf and have to weigh these
22 matters? Are they responsible when there's serious collisions
23 in their city that they're trying to battle? I really don't
24 know what -- what they're bringing -- going to bring to the
25 group and what -- what the perspective is, because they seem to

1 be quite different than the public works directors or traffic
2 engineers from cities and counties and what we deal with on a
3 daily basis.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Dwight?

5 MEMBER KU: Well, I can see this is an interesting
6 first meeting for me to return to the CTCDC. I think very much
7 like what Jeff just said, everyone in the organizations here
8 devote a great deal of time and energy to anyone who may be
9 impacted by traffic control devices, whether they are
10 motorized, bicyclists, pedestrians or otherwise, everyone who
11 is involved in school safety patrols, etcetera.

12 And just listening to -- looking at the proposal and
13 listening to the comments, I think that's the concern that I
14 have is that everyone in the organizations here is -- I think
15 Hamid mentioned earlier, this is an organization that's -- or
16 this committee is 50 or 60 years old. All the entities on this
17 committee have committed to this committee and have devoted 50,
18 60 years of participation and taken the time and energy to
19 support what -- what it does.

20 And one of the, I think, things that I feel most
21 honored about participating on the CTCDC is that everyone who
22 brings an issue, whether to our individual organization or
23 before this committee, they -- their -- their concerns are
24 considered, whether they're pedestrians, bicyclists,
25 motorcyclists, equestrians, etcetera.

1 So I guess part of what we've all heard already is,
2 is this addressing a problem that doesn't exist?

3 And then I think the concern that I have with respect
4 to the longevity of the participation of the members on this
5 committee is are we going to have folks who come and go? And
6 that makes for -- I think someone had made the comment
7 earlier -- making the manageability of the committee very, very
8 difficult. So someone who happens to be the political issue du
9 jour decides to push their agenda, asks for a seat on the
10 committee, is that person going to be accommodating it for a
11 brief period of time, and then cause all sorts of difficulties
12 with respect to the manageability of -- of the committee.

13 So those are my, unfortunately, not very well thought
14 out thoughts because this is kind of new to me. But I just
15 wanted to express my feelings, and I think what our
16 organization would feel with respect to this proposal.

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you. And I'll just express
18 my sentiment. I'm concerned about the artificial distinction
19 that either the assembly bill or this administrative action
20 assumes. And it assumes that those of us here have been the
21 motorized people, and therefore there needs to be the
22 counterbalance of the non-motorized representatives.

23 And like was stated earlier, all of us who work with
24 public agencies, which is all of us here -- even the Automobile
25 Club representatives have to work with public agencies that sit

1 on their boards and commissions -- have to be concerned with
2 the big picture of what the people's needs are. And the
3 people's needs are to be able to travel in a safe manner on the
4 streets through a variety of modes. We've already adopted
5 language in our manual that says we must design for all road
6 users. We must address all road users.

7 And so part of my duties are to be very concerned
8 about pedestrian safety, to design for bicycle facilities, to
9 encourage a shift of mode to transit, to accommodate the
10 handicapped, to accommodate the blind, to accommodate those who
11 are bound by wheelchairs. And I think it has been demonstrated
12 in this committee that we are in many cases way ahead of the
13 federal documents by virtue of the things that we have adopted
14 which recognizes the sensitivities of those other road users.

15 I mean, just earlier in our meeting today we were
16 discussing the "Share the Road" sign around detour sites, which
17 is not yet in the federal manual. And I could go on and on
18 about that. But I'm just worried about the artificial
19 distinction and the characterization of us as being the highway
20 guys and the motorized guys, and that does concern me. And I
21 agree with others that it -- there was -- isn't really a clear
22 indication of a problem that's trying to be solved.

23 But I'm also concerned about having a quorum at these
24 meetings. I'm concerned about the turnover. I'm concerned
25 about the stability. I'm concerned about what it would take to

1 get -- well, no it's a three-quarters vote of the committee and
2 how that will play out with adding additional members.

3 And then where do you stop with the additional
4 members. There are other road user interests out there,
5 whether it's a taxi cab association or pedi-cab users, or those
6 who travel by truck, or transit users, or whatever. I know
7 that those of us who work for public agencies have to be
8 concerned with all of that. I'm concerned about having mobile
9 advocates on the committee. But I pledge to work with whatever
10 legislation is approved or, if no legislation, the
11 administrative actions that Caltrans mandates that we take.

12 So with that I guess that we'll go on in the agenda
13 to identify the date of our next meeting and location for it.

14 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And a guarantee we don't change
15 the date of the next meeting once we pick it.

16 CHAIRMAN FISHER: I guess our next meeting would be
17 in Northern California. Does -- would it necessarily be in
18 Sacramento or is there another --

19 MEMBER BAHADORI: Isn't it easier for Caltrans to --

20 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) (Inaudible.)

21 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So Sacramento, and October.
22 There needs to be enough time then for -- once we take action
23 at the next meeting for Johnny to make the changes and to get
24 the document approved and published. So the 26th?

25 Johnny, what -- what time do you -- what time of the

1 month do you prefer?

2 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. The way
3 I'm looking at this is probably after the next two days of
4 workshops and getting a clearer, somewhat clearer direction, by
5 next month, end of August at the latest I'll be able to put
6 the -- post the final draft. And there's a 30-day comment
7 period. So that will take it to the end of September. And any
8 time after that we will be then having our public meeting and
9 discussing those submitted comments. So --

10 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So end of October?

11 MR. BHULLAR: Mid-October or --

12 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Last -- last Wednesday of October
13 is 26th, just to give you the maximum.

14 SECRETARY SINGH: (Off mike.) (Inaudible.)

15 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Or -- or the 27th. I'm just
16 saying that --

17 CHAIRMAN FISHER: October 27th.

18 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah. Sorry.

19 SECRETARY SINGH: October 27th?

20 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny do you want it on the 20th
21 or the 27th?

22 MR. BHULLAR: I'll be okay on the 20th, as well.

23 CHAIRMAN FISHER: The 20th? Thursday, October 20th,
24 Sacramento, presumably at the Caltrans location.

25 MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The 20th?

1 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. Okay. Would -- motion to
2 adjourn?

3 MEMBER BAHADORI: I make the motion to adjourn.

4 CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Adjourned we are.

5 (Thereupon the California Traffic Control
6 Devices Committee adjourned.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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 3rd day of August, 2011.

 /s/ Martha L. Nelson