

Brief Summary of Actions taken by the CA Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) during the October 17th, 2013 Meeting

Organization Items

Membership – Bill Winter, Deputy Director Public Works, LA County, replaced Mike Robinson who recently retired from the County of San Diego as a Voting member for the Southern California State Association of Counties (CSAC). Michael Kenney, San Diego County, was appointed as an Alternate member on the CTCDC for Southern California to represent CSAC.

Election: Hamid Bahadori was elected Chairman and Mark Greenwood was elected Vice Chairman for the next two years.

Approval of Minutes of the July 25th, 2013 Meetings – A motion was moved by Larry Patterson and seconded by Mark Greenwood to adopt the minutes of the July 25th, 2013 meeting. Motion was passed 9-0 (Robert Brown from Northern AAA did not attend the meeting)

Public Comments - James Lissner spoke about the warning signs modified by Senate Bill SB 1303 {CVC 21455.5 (a) and CVC 21455.5 (j)} for the red light cameras. James' letter written to the CTCDC is shown below:

James Lissner
2715 El Oeste Drive
Hermosa Beach, California 90254
(310) 376-4626
October 13, 2013
California Traffic Control Devices Committee
c/o: Mr. Devinder Singh, Executive Secretary, by email
Venue: October 17, 2013 CTCDC Meeting, Marina del Rey - Public Comments

Subject: Warning Signs for Red Light Cameras

Honorable Chairman and Committee Members:
On January 1, 2013, SB 1303 (Simitian) went into effect.

SB 1303 (codified in CVC 21455.5(a)(1) and CVC 21455.5(j)) removed the option for cities to post their red light camera warning signs at the entrances to town; the bill requires signs only at intersections and only on the one or two approaches (of the four) actually having a camera. Many cities will have fewer warning signs than they did before 2013. In some towns which have just two cameras (examples: Highland, Lynwood, Rancho Cordova, San Rafael, Walnut) there will be just two signs, while under the previous law those towns were likely to have substantially more than two

signs if they chose to post the entrances to town, or eight signs if they chose to post the intersections.

When cities posted only the entrances to town - an option that SB 1303 took away – drivers new to town were left uncertain about the specific locations of the cameras. If you think about it, that uncertainty was actually a *good* thing.

Under the revised law, drivers new to town no longer have to guess where the cameras are, and the scofflaws among them are guaranteed that if there isn't a big warning sign right in front of them, there's no camera at that intersection and they can blast through without risking a ticket.



Under SB 1303 we are telling scofflaws exactly where red light cameras are - and are not - so why not require cities to post this sign too?

The camera Industry has been claiming that there is a Halo Effect - that the presence of cameras at just a few intersections has led to better behavior all over town. If the Halo Effect does exist, SB 1303 will put an end to it.

CONCLUSION

SB 1303's change to the warning sign requirements leaves Californians less safe. Please do whatever you can to change the rules back to the way they were.

Sincerely,

Agenda Items

Public Hearing

- 13-10 Reduced Speed Limits in TTC Zones (Proposed to amend various Sections & Figures in Part 6 of the CA MUTCD 2012)

Action: The Committee recommended adoption of the amended signs and policy as was presented by Caltrans. There was only one public speaker, David Royer, who is a former LA City engineer and currently an instructor for ITS Tech Transfer at UC Berkeley teaching work zone training, he also provided comments of support on this proposal. The detailed policy can be viewed on the following website:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/newtech/agenda/Agenda-2013-10-17-item-amended.pdf>

Request for Experimentation

- 13-07 Request to Experiment with Bike Boxes

Action: This experiment request was submitted by National City. There were number of questions raised on the proposed concept by the Committee members. In the proposal, there were some elements which were not consistent with the California Vehicle Code (CVC), such as new signs and non-standard striping details. There were two motions made, however both failed. The first motion was to continue the item and for National City to come back with a revised proposal which addresses the Committee's questions. The second was to approve the experimentation with conditions such as to delete signs which are not consistent with the CVC, use standard striping details, and a few more. Then, a third motion was made which was consistent with the first one, to ask National City to come back by addressing all the questions raised by the CTCDC members. Motion passed. National City was asked to work with CTCDC non-motorized members to address questions raised during the discussion.

Note: CTCDC By Laws require seven votes out of ten to recommend/authorize any item to Caltrans. It is not a majority vote.

- 11-4 Experiment with Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) vs. Existing Circular Rapid Flashing Beacon (CRFB)

Action: The City of Santa Monica presented the final report and stated that rectangular rapid flashing beacon showed more compliance compared to the traditional circular rapid flashing beacon. Both devices (tools) can be used by agencies based on current standards. The Committee accepted the final report submitted by the City of Santa Monica and appreciated the City submitting good data.

- 08-7 Experimentation with new Warning Sign for Bicyclists

Action: The Committee recommended removing this item from the "Items Under Experimentation" as suggested by the staff.

- 06-2 Experiment with Colored Bike Lane
Action: The Committee recommended removing this item from the “Items Under Experimentation” as suggested by the staff.

Information Items:

- 13-08 Minimum Yellow Light Change Interval Timing for signalized Intersections (update by Subcommittee Chair)
Subcommittee Chairman Hamid Bahadori gave an update to the full committee on the two teleconference calls held by the Subcommittee on the ‘Minimum Yellow Light Change Interval Timing’. He informed the committee that the goal of the Subcommittee is to wrap up its discussion during the third teleconference which is scheduled on November 14, 2013. He also informed the Committee that the Subcommittee’s recommendations will be placed on the next CTCDC meeting agenda for review and action.

Tabled Items:

- 12-20 FHWA’s 2009 MUTCD Revisions 1 and 2 –Engineering Judgment & Compliance dates

Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for February 20, 2014 in Northern California at the following location:

Main Library
55 West 3rd Avenue
San Mateo, Ca 94402

Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm.

Note: The verbatim minutes will be available within three weeks and will have a detailed discussion on each item. The minutes will be posted on the following website:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/newtech/minutes.htm>