

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

MEETING OF THE
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

SAN MATEO PUBLIC LIBRARY
OAK ROOM
55 WEST 3RD AVENUE
SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA

VOLUME I OF II

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2014

1:00 P.M.

Reported by: John Cota

ALL AMERICAN REPORTING, INC.

(916) 362-2345

A P P E A R A N C E SCommittee Members

Hamid Bahadori, Chairman

Mark Greenwood, Vice Chairman

John Ciccarelli

Bryan Jones

Rick Marshall

Emma Olenberger

Larry Patterson

Lt. David Ricks

Devinder Singh, Committee Secretary

Bill Winter

Alternate Committee Members in Attendance

Michael Kenney

Sam Morrissey

Caltrans Staff - Sacramento Office

Johnny Bhullar

Atifa Ferouz

Don Howe

Caltrans Staff

Rob Stinger, Chief, Traffic Engineering & Operations
District 2

A P P E A R A N C E SAlso Present

Kevin Korth
US Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Dave Snyder
California Bicycle Coalition

Jim Lissner
Hermosa Beach Resident

Brian Eaton
Tuolumne County Public Works Department

Tony Dang
California Walks

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
Welcome	5
<u>Organization Items</u>	
1. Introductions	9
2. Membership	12
3. Approval of Minutes of the October 17, 2013 Meeting	13
4. Public Comments	13
<u>Agenda Items</u>	
5. Public Hearing	
14-01 Proposal to adopt "TURN AROUND, DON'T DROWN" signs by amending Sections 2C.35 & 6I.06 - Submitted by Napa County	71
14-02 Proposal to adopt "PRESERVE AMERICA" sign by adding a new Section 2D.104(CA) to the CA MUTCD - Submitted by National City	18
14-03 CA MUTCD Illumination policy change on Overhead Guide Signs (Proposal to amend Section 2D.03 and 2E.6) - Submitted by Caltrans	Tabled
14-04 Proposal to amend various Sections of Part 3 of the CA MUTCD - Submitted by Caltrans	87
14-06 Proposal to amend Section 7B.15 of the CA MUTCD to define "WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT" sign - Submitted by Caltrans	50
Adjourn	128
Certificate of Reporter and Transcriber	129

1 selecting our next city manager so that may determine my
2 future.

3 (Laughter.)

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It could be you.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: It could be me. So I
6 didn't want to disrupt that and say no, we don't want you to
7 make a good decision, come on up and talk to the Committee.
8 But they did want to pass on their gratitude for having the
9 Committee meet in San Mateo, which I think may be the first
10 time this Committee has ever been in -- so another momentous
11 day, a gavel and a great place to meet.

12 I will tell you just a little bit of logistics.
13 The restrooms are outside this door. The downtown in San
14 Mateo has been awarded the Rand-McNally small town for food
15 title. So we are now known at least nationally as a great
16 place for good things to eat. So tomorrow we should get a
17 chance, hopefully, to get a little bite to eat. I know the
18 Committee is used to having these great meals at the time of
19 the meeting, usually a box lunch or a bag of chips. But
20 just across El Camino there are great restaurants and I can
21 point you in the right direction tomorrow or this evening if
22 you have an interest in getting a good meal.

23 So we do welcome the Committee. I apologize again
24 for the mayor not being able to be here but I think in terms
25 of priority, selecting someone as the next city manager

1 probably took precedence, just temporarily, and maybe he'll
2 be able to come by tomorrow. So anyway, welcome to San
3 Mateo.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you very much.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, could I
6 ask Larry, do we need to do anything special if we're parked
7 in the garage downstairs?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: No.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Your car has probably
11 been towed.

12 (Laughter.)

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: We took care of it.
15 No, the parking downstairs, the hours that we're here the
16 library is open so the garage is open during that entire
17 time as well. If for some reason you leave your car there
18 and the library will close you can't get down in the garage
19 so you need to make sure it's out before the library closes.
20 If you're in the building and the library closes you can
21 still get out, there's a detector that will open the gate
22 for you. Anyway, it shouldn't be a problem. There is no
23 charge and no time limit so you are in good shape.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Thank you.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you very much,

1 Larry, we appreciate it. This is a beautiful facility. I
2 was just walking through downtown on Third Street before the
3 meeting and there were a lot of nice places over there, a
4 gorgeous community. Our first time and we are happy to be
5 here for both days, today and tomorrow.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Excellent.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And we'll spend a
8 few tax dollars on a hotel and dinner around here also.

9 Let us go with our agenda. This committee meeting
10 we have, we have a two-day agenda. And we are going to
11 cover what we have on the agenda for today but I understand
12 they are going to close the facility at 5:00.

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, but we can leave
14 the stuff here, yes.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Introduction?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, let's -- we're
18 going one step at a time.

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We have to leave
21 here by 5:00 so wherever we are on the agenda like about 10
22 minutes to 5:00 -- hopefully we are going to be done with
23 the agenda for today way before 5:00. Otherwise, I will
24 stop the agenda at 10 minutes to 5:00 and then whatever, if
25 there is any left over, we are going to carry for tomorrow.

1 With that, back to the agenda. Our first item on
2 the agenda is introductions and I am going to start with
3 Mr. Marshall over there.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I am Rick Marshall
5 with Napa County Public Works and I am on the Committee
6 representing northern counties.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: And I am Bill Winter
8 with Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. I
9 represent the southern counties.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLENBERGER: Emma Olenberger with
11 AAA of Northern California, Nevada and Utah.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Mark
13 Greenwood, I am the Director of Public Works for the City of
14 Palm Desert; I represent southern cities.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I am Devinder Singh.
16 Basically I am the Secretary for the Committee but today I
17 am acting as a voting member too.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Lieutenant David Ricks,
19 California Highway Patrol.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Larry Patterson, I am
21 formerly the Public Works Director for the City of San
22 Mateo. Currently the Interim City Manager and we'll see
23 about my future tomorrow.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We wish you good luck.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Thanks.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: John Ciccarelli,
2 Bicycle Solutions, local consultant and San Francisco
3 resident.

4 MR. HOWE: My name is Don Howe, I'm technical
5 staff to Devinder and the Committee.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And when we are
7 going through the audience I appreciate if you'd tell us
8 which item you are here for. If you are here just to
9 observe that's fine, but if you have a specific item it
10 helps us to maybe rearrange the agenda to minimize the
11 burden on your time. We are going to start with --

12 MR. SNYDER: My name is Dave Snyder with the
13 California Bicycle Coalition. I'm just here for the public
14 comment.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sam?

16 MR. MORRISSEY: Sam Morrissey, City Traffic
17 Engineer of Santa Monica, I am the southern cities
18 alternate.

19 MR. LISSNER: Jim Lissner. I do the website
20 highwayrobbery.net, which is about red light camera tickets.
21 And I am here for public comments and also there is an item
22 on the agenda about the lighted signs along the MTA bus way
23 down in LA.

24 MR. EATON: Brian Eaton with the Tuolumne County
25 Public Works Department, here for agenda item number 2, the

1 "PRESERVE AMERICA" sign.

2 MR. HEAP: I am Gary Heap with the City of San
3 Mateo Public Works, I am just here as an observer.

4 MR. CHIN: Ken Chin, City of San Mateo Public
5 Works, just observing.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And the lady?

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: She's Johnny's wife.

8 (The introductions moved on to the next person.)

9 MS. FEROUZ: I'm Atifa Ferouz and I am with
10 Caltrans Traffic Operations and I am here for most
11 everything but mainly the 14-04 agenda item.

12 MR. WONG: I'm Garland Wong, the City Traffic
13 Engineer for the City of Fairfield. And I am here observing
14 but in particular the (inaudible).

15 MR. STINGER: I'm Rob Stinger, Caltrans District 2
16 Traffic Operations. I am here for agenda item 14-06, "When
17 Children Are Present."

18 MR. KENNEY: My name is Mike Kenney. I am the
19 County Traffic Engineer for the County of San Diego and I am
20 the alternate representative of the southern counties.

21 MR. TONG: My name is Duper Tong, I am (inaudible)
22 Traffic Engineer with Caltrans; I am observing today.

23 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway,
24 California Division. I am here to comment on all the agenda
25 items.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans, the
2 editor for CA MUTCD. I am here for none of the items but
3 all of the items.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Perfect, thank you
5 all.

6 On the membership, are there any announcements
7 that the members would like to make, off-agenda
8 announcements? Yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: On behalf of my
10 colleague, Bryan Jones, who also represents non-motorized
11 travelers. Bryan is now with the City of Fremont just
12 across the Bay. Also he has transitioned up from Carlsbad
13 to a more prestigious title.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, and I called
15 him and talked to him and congratulated him. I was looking
16 forward to seeing him, maybe he shows up later or tomorrow.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Two things. We want
18 to table Item 14-03, 14-03, no discussion.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so 14-03 will
20 be removed from the agenda.

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It will be tabled.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It will be tabled
23 for now.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: And we want to move
25 14-06 before 14-04.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. And we bring
2 14-06 up before 14-04.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Are there any other
5 comments, suggestions, announcements from members?

6 Okay, seeing none let's go to Item number 3 which
7 is approval of the minutes of the October 17th. This
8 traditionally we put on the agenda and these are verbatim
9 minutes. But in case you have noticed any misquote or
10 misrepresentation of what you said in the last meeting. Any
11 comments?

12 Seeing none do I have a motion for approval of the
13 minutes?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Move for approval.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I would second.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion
17 and a second. Discussion?

18 All those in favor?

19 (Ayes.)

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

21 Seeing none, Item number 3 passes unanimously.

22 And now we go to public comments. At this time,
23 members of the public may comment on any item not appearing
24 on the agenda. Matters presented under this item cannot be
25 discussed or acted upon by the Committee at this time. For

1 items appearing on the agenda, the public is invited to make
2 comments at the time the item is considered by the
3 Committee. Any person addressing the Committee will be
4 limited to a maximum of five minutes so that all interested
5 parties have an opportunity to speak. When addressing the
6 Committee, please state your name, address and business or
7 organization you are representing for the record.

8 Anyone who wishes to address the Committee?

9 MR. SNYDER: Like I said, my name is Dave Snyder.
10 I am with the California Bicycle Coalition; I am the
11 Executive Director.

12 (Mr. Snider was asked to step to the podium.)

13 MR. SNYDER: My name is Dave Snyder, I am the
14 Executive Director of the California Bicycle Coalition. And
15 I am grateful that you have come to the Bay Area where we
16 have offices in Oakland so that I could come by and say hi.

17 The Bicycle Coalition unites all of the local
18 advocacy organizations that you probably know about.
19 There's 14 of them with professional staff and they have
20 among them 15 -- no, sorry, 30,000 dues-paying members. We
21 unite all of those to support our mission of enabling more
22 people to bicycle in California for safer, healthier and
23 more prosperous communities.

24 We have a specific goal: It's to triple bicycling
25 by 2020. It is no secret that the traffic controls of

1 California do not do as good a job as they could protecting
2 people who bike and walk on our streets. It is also no
3 secret that you all are doing more to fix that than any
4 committee has done in the past and I am very grateful. On
5 behalf of everyone thank you for giving more attention to
6 the importance of bicycle safety than I have ever seen.

7 Going forward I look forward to working with you.
8 I encourage any of you to call me at any time if you have
9 any questions relating to bicycles.

10 In a future meeting we would like you to consider
11 the inclusion of a sign that reminds motorists of the Three
12 Feet for Safety Act and I'll be working with cities and
13 counties and AAA and others to figure out how to get that
14 kind of sign approved for use in California.

15 For now I just want to say thanks for coming to
16 the Bay Area and keep up the good work.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Thank you.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you,
19 Mr. Snyder.

20 Anyone else who wishes to address the Committee?
21 Mr. Lissner.

22 MR. LISSNER: Hi, I'm Jim Lissner, 2715 El Oeste
23 Drive in Hermosa Beach, California.

24 Most of you probably watched the Olympics last
25 week. And one thing that I noticed was that in a lot of

1 endeavors at the Olympics you're over the hill by the time
2 you're age 25. I mean, that's pretty amazing. But you
3 shouldn't be over the hill by the time you're age 25 when
4 you're driving and yet the red light cameras seem to put it
5 that way.

6 I requested a little sampling of the tickets
7 issued in the City of Hawthorne. Originally it was to look
8 at the zip codes of the people who were getting the tickets,
9 I wanted to see whether they were people from hawthorne or
10 not. There wasn't anything really unusual there, about half
11 the people were outside of Hawthorne. What was unusual was
12 that the age of the people was unusual. Hawthorne has a
13 double left turn, a long pocket, pretty high-speed, tight
14 left turn -- a tight radius left turn at the end of it. It
15 issues the most red light camera tickets of any left turn in
16 California. And I've written to this Committee about that
17 before, probably six months ago.

18 The average age of the people at that -- getting
19 the tickets at that double left turn was 50.5, probably the
20 average age in the room here. The average age of the rest
21 of the tickets in town was 42.1, a little bit younger.
22 That's pretty interesting. What was also really interesting
23 was that there wasn't anybody under the age of 26 getting a
24 ticket anywhere in town in the sample I got.

25 I just wanted to throw this out there just, you

1 know, as food for thought. Namely, we need to make sure
2 that older drivers, as we all are or are going to be, are
3 not -- that the roads aren't made too difficult for them.
4 That they need to be designed so that older drivers can
5 still drive, you know, within reasonable limits. But it
6 shouldn't -- it shouldn't be nailing people at the average
7 age of 50 or 42.

8 My theory, by the way, as to why nobody under 26
9 gets the tickets is, one, greater athleticism, and two,
10 they're just totally hip to everything. They know where the
11 cameras are, probably. Their personal electronic device
12 probably makes a noise when they're coming to one. And they
13 talk about this stuff. But I think a lot of it is
14 athleticism. Anyway, thank you very much.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Thanks.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you,
17 Mr. Lissner.

18 Anyone else who wishes to speak under public
19 comments?

20 Seeing none we close public comments; we go to our
21 regular agenda. Let's see. If we have people, Mr. Singh,
22 for 14-02 and 14-06 maybe we go to 14-02 and 14-06 so they
23 don't have to wait here and then we go to 14-01.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's move to 14-02
25 first.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, let's go to
2 14-02. We go to Item 14-02, which is a proposal to adopt a
3 "PRESERVE AMERICA" sign by adding a new Section 2D.104(CA)
4 to the CA MUTCD. Mr. Marshall, you have sponsored the item,
5 would you like to introduce it?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes, thank you,
7 Mr. Chairman. I was contacted by Mr. Eaton from Tuolumne
8 County who is the audience regarding his agency's interest
9 in posting these signs. It's a program of the federal
10 government and numerous federal agencies collaborated on
11 developing the program, including the Department of
12 Transportation.

13 The sign is provided to the agencies that qualify
14 to receive this designation from the government. But when
15 Tuolumne County approached their local Caltrans district
16 interested in posting the signs at their community
17 entrances, which in their case would be the county line
18 around their perimeter, Caltrans District 10 declined their
19 encroachment permit indicating, correctly to a point, that
20 this is not in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control
21 Devices. So they suggested that Tuolumne County contact me
22 as the northern counties representative and I am happy to
23 bring their case before the Committee.

24 Devinder has provided the Committee with a
25 photograph of the sign actually in use in Sacramento. As I

1 understand this is not on a state route but it is the sign
2 in question and it would just simply change the individual
3 place name.

4 So I submitted the various pieces of
5 correspondence between Tuolumne County and Caltrans District
6 10 along with my own recommendation at least to be a
7 starting point for our discussion of some potential language
8 to be added to our manual to enable the use of this sign for
9 those agencies that have qualified under this program, which
10 is on page 43 of our agenda, and I would be happy to answer
11 any questions.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Do you
13 have any questions for Mr. Marshall or do you want to hear
14 from Mr. Howe and Mr. Bhullar and then maybe Federal Highway
15 before we start discussing this? Any questions?

16 Don.

17 MR. HOWE: Don Howe from Caltrans, I work with
18 signs. We reviewed this. One thing we did notice is that
19 the sign itself is the non-standard highway font. And I'll
20 go ahead to go to the page, I think that's the example by
21 Tuolumne County. Is it 24, Johnny?

22 MS. FEROUZ: Twenty-eight.

23 MR. HOWE: Twenty-eight, I'm sorry, okay. I'll
24 zoom in a little bit on this.

25 It's a brown background sign that has the -- it

1 has the art work and it is red lettering on white
2 background, as you see in your agenda. I apologize for the
3 quality of this picture, it's kind of a black and white.
4 But it has that Preserve America logo. As you can see these
5 are non-standard -- these are not highway fonts.

6 As I see this, this works great out in front of
7 the city hall, in a kiosk, in a park. Something that is
8 viewed by persons who are on foot and not from a vehicle so
9 it gives the idea that, you know, this is -- explore and
10 enjoy our heritage, it's a great message. But these are not
11 standard highway fonts to be put on a high-speed facility.
12 That would be my take.

13 Also, the arcing letters across the top.
14 Generally for a sign we don't have the decorative signs.
15 This looks more like something we would see in a community
16 wayfinding sign configuration.

17 Hamid, if that's what you wanted me to convey,
18 that was my take on the sign. That it's really not a
19 traffic control device per se but it's a great poster o a
20 billboard that we will put up to promote the county.

21 MR. BHULLAR: I'm Johnny Bhullar with California
22 Caltrans, editor for CA MUTCD. Basically, when I look at
23 this proposal, at least my take on this initially is because
24 regardless of the discussion and what the outcome is, it is
25 going to come in as a recommendation.

1 Before I look at anything coming to my plate and
2 trying to put it into the manual, is it a traffic control
3 device? Because there are a number of signs that we do have
4 and as long s they do not meet the five elements of the
5 criteria, and I exactly forget but I can bring that up, but
6 the criteria being that is there a need, does it communicate
7 with the motorist? So based on that criteria, at least in
8 my opinion, this is not a message that is going to the
9 driver and it is essential for the driver, for the road user
10 for his purpose. Yes, the message is there but it is for a
11 different purpose.

12 So my question to the Committee is, if it is not a
13 traffic control device would we want to -- there might or
14 there could be merit to the sign but does it belong in the
15 CA MUTCD and is for the purview of this Committee? That's
16 my main question.

17 And since this one has a national, I would say,
18 perspective and background on it, I do believe we have Kevin
19 from FHWA California Division Office and I would like to get
20 his opinion as to what does FHWA think about this sign
21 because this is not a state issue for the sign. Kevin.

22 MR. KORTH: Mr. Chairman, there are a --

23 MR. BHULLAR: Your name, please.

24 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway
25 Administration, California Division.

1 Mr. Chairman, there are a number of government and
2 private incentive and grant programs where communities and
3 counties get recognized. For example, this Preserve
4 America, Bicycle Friendly, Business Ready, Storm Ready, a
5 Caring Community. There's a lot of these different types of
6 programs that come out there and cities are granted these
7 designations. But the sign as it is provides no -- like
8 Johnny and Don said, it doesn't provide any navigational use
9 for the road user. It's a sign in the sense that yes, it's
10 a metal sheet. But like Don said, you can place this in a
11 parking lot, a rest area, in front of a city hall, but it is
12 not a traffic control device.

13 Back in may of 2004 the Federal Highway
14 Administration, we talked with the Forest Service and voiced
15 our concerns that this is not a traffic control device and
16 that we wouldn't be putting it in the manual. So that's why
17 you didn't see it in the 2009 MUTCD because it's not a
18 traffic control device. But if a city or county like Fresno
19 - and Sacramento was brought up - have these designations,
20 those signs will be placed in public buildings or the public
21 areas but not on a highway facility.

22 I do want to point out that I am going to
23 designate the Preserve America, the heading there, I'm going
24 to call that a pictograph. And if the county would like to
25 create a sign -- not this one but create a sign -- they

1 could use the pictograph on the top half of the sign. And
2 if they go to the CA MUTCD Section 2H.02 and figure 2H-1,
3 there are guidelines in that section to -- based on the
4 lettering style, the size, the legend, background colors,
5 that the pictograph could be displayed in a jurisdictional
6 boundary sign based on the guidelines provided in 2H.02.

7 So the two options that I recommend the counties
8 and cities that have this Preserve America designation is
9 they can use the sign as is. Not a traffic control device
10 but they can place the sign as is in rest areas, parking
11 lots, in front of a county or city building but not on the
12 highway facility. Or if they would like the PRESERVE
13 AMERICA pictograph, follow the guidelines in the CA MUTCD
14 Section 2H.02 and also Figure 2H-1 for guidelines on how to
15 use that pictograph in a jurisdictional boundary sign.

16 Thanks.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you, Kevin.

18 We have been struggling with this over a few signs
19 that have come to the Committee over the last decade that at
20 least I have been on the Committee. The last one was the
21 watershed sign that people in San Diego brought to the
22 Committee and we put those poor people through like about a
23 year and a half going back and forth, fine-tuning the sign
24 and all that even though they were not traffic regulatory
25 signs, they are not traffic control devices.

1 The idea was that because they were -- they kept
2 coming back to and asking us and they wanted to put it on a
3 -- next to the freeway. They said Caltrans says that
4 somebody has to make a recommendation and approve and this
5 is the only committee in the state that even looks at stuff
6 like this. So if you guys don't look at it, who else? So
7 by default we ended up looking at like the watershed signs.
8 And we approved the watershed signs after like I think two
9 or three meetings which took them about over a year.

10 So this is pretty much a similar situation the way
11 I see it here. This obviously is not a traffic control
12 device, we all know that. But then if people want to place
13 it on a public right-of-way where it's visible by the
14 driving public then the idea was to at least have some level
15 of control so we don't start putting all these Christmas
16 tree-type signs all over our highways in California to be
17 distracting from the real signs that you people to pay
18 attention to, the stop signs and speed limit signs and no
19 turn signs and those things.

20 So just I provided that background a little bit
21 for a few of our colleagues who have recently joined the
22 Committee that this, the whole concept we have been
23 struggling with for the last few years. That these are not
24 traffic control devices. However, when folks want to put it
25 on a public right-of-way or Caltrans or city or county

1 right-of-way where it's visible from the roadway, this
2 committee is pretty much the only committee in the state
3 that looks at this stuff.

4 So we heard what the representatives from Caltrans
5 and FHWA have to say. Gentleman from the county, do you
6 have anything to add?

7 MR. EATON: I'm Brian Eaton with the Tuolumne
8 County Public Works Department.

9 The county was given this designation years ago
10 and we have been trying and trying and trying and keep
11 getting denied in order to get them in. I understand that
12 it's not a traffic control device.

13 The one comment I kind of picked up on was someone
14 said, yeah, if you want to put it in a park or something
15 like that. Tuolumne County kind of is a park. I mean, We
16 border Yosemite. Our highways, all of the highways that
17 enter into our county, there are no stop signs, anything
18 like that. It wouldn't be an interference. There are other
19 signs that I notice on the highways like the Adopt a Highway
20 sign for the groups that go along and pick up litter and
21 stuff. That itself isn't a traffic control device yet it is
22 a sign that's in the right-of-way so I don't know, you know.

23 Obviously, this was our kind of last resort as to
24 -- we were awarded this designation, many other counties
25 have it. We are allowed currently to put them on our

1 county-maintained roads but all the entrances and exits into
2 Tuolumne County are on state highways. So that's kind of
3 why we're here. And this will be our last resort unless
4 otherwise we can change them but then it isn't what we were
5 awarded, it's something we are creating ourselves. So
6 that's that.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

8 Colleagues, so that you know, 38 out of the 57
9 California counties have been given the Preserve America
10 designation so it's not like a single county issue. 38
11 counties have such designations but they're the people who
12 are approaching us. Like now, Mr. Marshall, your own county
13 you have that designation. I'm looking at this --

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's not all counties,
15 it's cities and counties.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, cities and
17 counties.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Thirty-eight.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, thank you for
20 correction. So it's 38 jurisdictions, not counties.

21 So one county has decided to approach us and ask
22 for approval of the sign. But the others probably faced the
23 same issue, they just haven't decided to do anything about
24 it yet.

25 Okay, any questions from the people who presented

1 their views?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, could I
3 give some responses to what I've heard so far?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I appreciate the
6 perspective provided by Caltrans staff and FHWA staff. I am
7 one of the newer members on the Committee so I didn't know
8 all of that background so that was very educational to me.
9 I think for future reference as a committee member
10 presenting an item to the Committee I would have appreciated
11 receiving some of that feedback ahead of the meeting so I
12 could be better prepared to address those concerns.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I would make that
15 request for the future.

16 I agree, this to me is not really a traffic
17 control device, but as you pointed out, we are the only such
18 place to bring such topics. I brought a photograph of
19 something a little bit similar in my mind. I only have the
20 one copy if you can pass it along. But some other examples
21 were mentioned in the testimony, Bicycle Friendly Community
22 was the one I got written down fast enough. In the
23 photograph is Tree City USA, I see those everywhere. So
24 clearly there is a way by which Caltrans permits people to
25 put signs in the right-of-way which are not traffic control

1 devices. And yet Caltrans' district office pointed this
2 agency at us, telling them they needed to follow this path.

3 I'm okay if the other also works but I am not
4 inclined to believe that it will work. That we can just
5 say, oh, it's not a traffic control device, and that will
6 produce any satisfactory result for Tuolumne County in
7 District 10. So I would -- I would encourage my fellow
8 Committee Members to support my recommendation as much as
9 possible. Thank you.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Anyone
11 else who wants to speak on this item or ask questions from
12 the staff before we open it to the public? Mr. Patterson.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No, John.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: John.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm looking at the
16 other signs described in 2H. We have in California the
17 county line sign, the G10(CA) which says, for example, Kern
18 County Line or San Mateo County Line. We also have a
19 modified version of that, G10-3, which is Kern County Line
20 but it allows the subtext "Where We Honor Veterans." So
21 that's sort of slouching in the same direction but with
22 text.

23 Looking at the sign proposed, it seems to me that
24 there are two parts of it. There's the upper part, which is
25 pretty much a pictograph, and this lower part which is sort

1 of like a county line sign. So I wonder whether it might be
2 possible to allow the posting of the pictograph portion of
3 the sign in combination with a sign that is already inside
4 -- in the manual, the G10-3, which is the county line sign
5 or any jurisdictional line sign that's appropriate.

6 And if it were treated as a plaque, that is down
7 below the sign, then the guidance function of the main sign,
8 if any, like County Line, that's useful to know if I'm
9 crossing the county line boundary, would be primary and the
10 plaque's function, which is more informative and
11 recognition-based, would be secondary. Instead of the sign
12 being relied upon to both welcome you to the county and to
13 announce that the county had been recognized.

14 So my suggestion would be to consider allowing the
15 use of the pictograph below a standard sign. That's kind of
16 what's going on in the St. Helena image that was passed
17 around.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar, I see
19 you went to the podium. Do you have any thoughts on the
20 suggestions?

21 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, this is Johnny Bhullar.
22 Actually I was trying to look up or bring up the CA MUTCD.
23 And just to facilitate the discussion here I was trying to
24 look up what Kevin had alluded to earlier in terms of the
25 pictograph. Because normally the rules are that if this

1 could be probably at least reduced to a pictograph and twice
2 the height of the largest letter that is on the sign and the
3 sign could be -- that could be like a compromise that could
4 be worked out. That's what I was looking for at least.

5 In the case -- it's not that I'm supporting the
6 sign or going against it, just I'm trying to look up in the
7 manual. Because of several other cases pointed out, that we
8 have had similar instances. As long as, say, governmental
9 or jurisdictional type of logo and it's twice the height.
10 So let me see.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: While he is looking
12 for that can I make a clarifying point?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Tuolumne County is not
15 asking for permission to invent their own sign, they are
16 asking permission to post a sign that has been provided to
17 them by the federal government, apparently not the
18 Department of Transportation. But the federal government
19 has already made the sign; designed it and made it
20 available. They didn't really ask for our opinion on its
21 design. Thank you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's interesting.
23 I mean, just because -- and I'm not surprised. You all know
24 the federal bureaucracy is so gigantic. I'm not surprised
25 that somebody who prepared the sign didn't know that

1 probably they have to go to DOT if they want to put the
2 signs in the public right-of-way.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: That's what this has
4 in common with the other agenda item I brought today.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's the way it
6 works.

7 Mr. Bhullar, did you find what you were looking
8 for?

9 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, basically I was just looking
10 for twice the letter height, that type of language. But
11 since we already are hearing that you don't want to redesign
12 it so I am going to leave it at that.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Kevin? Did
14 you have anything to add, Kevin?

15 MR. KORTH: Just that the -- just to reiterate.
16 The Preserve America pictograph that they -- don't
17 necessarily need approval from the Committee because it's
18 already in the language of the CA MUTCD, 2H.02 which Johnny
19 paraphrased that twice the letter height of the capital
20 letter is the size the pictograph can be on a jurisdictional
21 boundary sign. And that the sign as is, they may use it,
22 just they can't use it at the proposed locations that they
23 asked Caltrans in all those letters and memos back and forth
24 from District 10. Those locations would not be allowable.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. As you are

1 looking for the material just one thing that -- having put
2 people through the experience of the watershed signs in San
3 Diego County, I felt really bad for them and I felt
4 embarrassed because they had to come back to three meetings.
5 So whatever we do we don't want to relive the experience of
6 the watershed signs. This is not a traffic control device,
7 we already know that. But this is the only committee that
8 Caltrans has that they can bring this stuff to.

9 So there is a proposal by John and that proposal
10 -- Mr. Marshall, what do you think about that proposal?

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I have one question,
12 Mr. Chairman.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Just remember county
15 proposed 11 signs.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So there are 38
18 agencies who are recognized for Preserve America. So if all
19 put 10, 15 signs, that's 400 to 500 signs more on the public
20 roadways.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The 38
22 jurisdictions, no one has approached us yet, no one has
23 approached Caltrans yet. I don't know if some of them might
24 have put it on their own city and county streets, they don't
25 need to approach anyone. So Redlands and San Clemente might

1 have signs already on their city streets.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Like Sacramento.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, like Sacramento
4 might have it on their city or county streets. But this
5 county approached Caltrans because they have to get
6 Caltrans's approval, that's why it's here. But it doesn't
7 mean that this sign is not already out there in some shape
8 or form because 38 jurisdictions, someone might have put up
9 a sign.

10 What do you think, Mr. Marshall, about what John
11 suggested, his proposal to use one of the standard signs for
12 welcome to the county and then use the pictorial portion as
13 a plaque?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I'm okay with that as
15 an alternative if the agency is interested but I remain
16 interested in trying to allow them to use the sign they were
17 provided.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: They were provided.
19 Have you manufactured the 11 signs already or the federal
20 government has given them to you?

21 MR. EATON: We were provided with the one.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

23 MR. EATON: Basically, here is what you're
24 getting.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

1 MR. EATON: And then we had -- we put up three of
2 the other ones that are county-maintained roads coming into
3 the county but the other eight locations are within the
4 Caltrans jurisdiction. We do have the signs. They're
5 sitting in the sign shop and just waiting.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's fine. So if
7 -- John, go ahead.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair, we are
9 still on discussion, right?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We were still in
11 discussion, then we have to open it to the public and hear
12 from the public also.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm really -- I have
14 to say I'm really sympathetic to the proposal. I want to --
15 I will support it. And the reason I'll support it is
16 because I don't see any downside. It's a jurisdictional
17 boundary sign by nature. The only downside I can see is if
18 it conflicts with the glance recognition of important
19 regulatory or warning signs where some adverse traveler
20 interaction is going to occur because this sign was posted.
21 I just think that's farfetched.

22 I think that there is value in programs. Maybe
23 not every program that one can think of but programs that
24 incentivize certain civic actions. I think this is one of
25 them. Bicycle-Friendly Community is another, there are many

1 others, Tree City. And I think that there's -- there is
2 really no downside to this. I think it should be Caltrans'
3 policy to allow this on state highways provided that it
4 doesn't interfere with the traffic control function of a
5 nearby sign or a series of signs. I don't see any downside,
6 I see upside and I will support it.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You support the
8 initial sign as proposed by --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I will. I wanted to
10 offer the option of taking the pictorial part and using that
11 as a supplement, as a plaque. But I also see the value not
12 only in terms of reduced complexity of process but just
13 because it's being done elsewhere I'm staying with the
14 original proposal.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anyone else?

16 Caltrans staff, Johnny and Don, do you have
17 anything to add? No? Okay.

18 MR. HOWE: No.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If there are no more
20 discussions in the Committee before we further consider this
21 I would like to hear from the public.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: I'm sorry, just maybe
23 one quick thing.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: I think what, John,

1 you're alluding to is maybe it seems fitting in the 2H
2 section of the manual. Because I know the narrative that
3 Mr. Marshall provided was the 3D section of the manual. I
4 don't know if as we get into this, if we are going to accept
5 it. Because I too am sympathetic to this and I see it as
6 similar to the county line sign, which is in 2H.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes, 2H.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: But maybe just as a
9 point of -- if we are going to get down to editing of this
10 is maybe just to change it from a 2D designation to like a
11 2H.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm not sure if it
13 even needs to go in the manual. But the county line sign
14 that is in the manual is discussed in 2H and the figures
15 appear in 2H.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Patterson.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I think for me I will
19 not be supporting the motion or the suggestion. But to give
20 some explanation, I am not -- I am sympathetic to the idea.
21 I just think adding a section, which is what is requested,
22 in the MUTCD for this specific sign is not the right
23 approach.

24 I think what we have talked about today is
25 something where it may make more sense to have a section of

1 the MUTCD that deals in general with this type of a sign,
2 whether it's Tree City or it's the Preserve America or it's
3 any other. Because adding this one says, well then which
4 other ones do we need to add in the same way.

5 So I think a broader discussion and setting some
6 criteria that would prevent placement of these signs in a
7 way that distracts from the actual traffic control devices
8 would be part of the advisory part of the language in the
9 MUTCD. So it would give someone like Tuolumne County a
10 chance to include these. It would give them some guidance
11 about placement and other restrictions but would not
12 recognize them as a traffic control device and have them
13 placed in the MUTCD.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Anyone
15 else on the Committee? John.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I like what he just
17 said. I realize that the original proposal is to place it
18 in the manual and I think -- although that would entail
19 another round of languaging. I think it's more general and
20 it would take care of future proposals of the same type that
21 have positive value.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: As I said, this is
23 like the second or -- this is the third sign like this that
24 comes to the Committee and we say, this is not a traffic
25 control device but we have to do something. So it might be

1 better if we approach it in a more --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I don't want to
3 stall Tuolumne County forever so I'd be curious to hear the
4 sense of my fellow members on the Committee as to the
5 approach that Larry just suggested.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Can I suggest,
7 Mr. Chairman?

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So Mr. John, Larry and
10 Rick work together and come up with proposed language.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That could -- let's
12 go through the motion, let's go through the process,

13 Anyone else on the Committee? No? Okay.

14 Let's open it to the public to hear on this item.
15 Anyone, any member in the audience who wishes to address the
16 Committee and share their thoughts or suggestions on this
17 item? Sam, could you please -- Mr. Morrissey.

18 MR. MORRISSEY: Thank you. Sam Morrissey, City
19 Traffic Engineer, City of Santa Monica.

20 I want to say that I am sympathetic to this
21 request, it does seem like a good request.

22 I just want to point out that in the Manual of
23 Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Section 2D.55, which is
24 what it looks like they're modeling their proposed edition
25 off of, it's a section on National Scenic Byway signage.

1 And there's a -- some specific statements in here, it's a
2 very specific type of sign with coloring and lettering that
3 doesn't look like anything else.

4 It seems to me like the proper approach would be
5 to use this language. Maybe approach the national committee
6 to add this type of sign or other similar signs. It's got
7 language in here that says when certain routes have been
8 designated by the U.S. Secretary of Transportation or other
9 federal body such as this sign.

10 I don't want to belabor Tuolumne County. I think
11 the recommendation by Mr. Patterson is great for the
12 interim. But I think in the long-term if the federal
13 government is going to keep putting out different types of
14 signs we should actually have the national committee modify
15 the language in the MUTCD to account for any type of sign
16 that looks a little bit different. That's my only comment,
17 thank you.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

19 Anyone else? Okay, seeing no one we close the
20 public hearing part of this agenda item, bringing it back to
21 the Committee.

22 Okay, we have a few proposals on the table. One
23 is the initial proposal just to allow the sign to go in and
24 be added to the CA MUTCD.

25 There is a modified proposal to allow the use of a

1 typical Welcome to a Certain Community sign that's already
2 approved in the MUTCD and use the pictorial part of Preserve
3 America, the upper part, as a plaque under that sign.

4 And then there is another proposal not to deal
5 with this sign specifically but rather add a section to the
6 MUTCD, the CA MUTCD, that addresses how Caltrans goes around
7 approving these signs or how communities develop those
8 signs.

9 At least these are the three that I remember. If
10 there was anything else I don't remember. So what is the
11 pleasure of the Committee? Mr. Marshall.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Thank you.
13 Mr. Chairman, I agree those -- I think those are the options
14 that are before us.

15 I want to thank Mr. Morrissey. He is exactly
16 correct, that is exactly the section I used to model my
17 recommendation after.

18 So just for the spirit of things I would like to
19 make a motion to approve my original recommendation and see
20 where that goes.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion;
22 is there a second to the motion?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion
25 and a second. So there is a motion that we approve the

1 proposal as outlined and presented in our agenda and there
2 is a second. Any discussion on the motion?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I have one clarifying
4 comment. Note that my recommendation to place it in Section
5 2D means that this applies only to conventional highways and
6 not freeways.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: We are not talking
9 about placing this on such facilities.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. So with the
11 clarification that the proposal is to place these on
12 conventional highways and streets and not freeways. Any
13 discussion? Seeing none. Okay, John.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It seems to me --
15 what I would like to see if this passes is that this be
16 considered as the last such sign that we adopt by adding to
17 the manual and I would like to see kind of like a rider on
18 the motion that says, and by the way, we direct Caltrans --
19 request that Caltrans adopt a process to address all such
20 signs. What that might lead to in the future is that 2D.104
21 as proposed goes away and it's replaced by a more general
22 treatment in a future manual, whether that's a California
23 manual or a federal manual. In other words, I want to see
24 this go through but I also want to see a better process in
25 the future.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Do you consider
2 adding this to your motion, Mr. Marshall?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I am comfortable
4 with that, yes.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So the motion has
6 been modified. The person who has seconded the motion, are
7 you okay with that, with the addition?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Johnny.

10 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. Just a quick
11 comment on that, John. Working on the national committee
12 you might be aware that the feds had proposed a section
13 which dealt with non-traffic control devices. And there is
14 a section that was proposed for the National MUTCD and it
15 talks about addressing non-traffic control devices and why
16 they shouldn't be in the manual. But that later on in the
17 final version did get pulled but there is still work on that
18 one that is going on so we might want to mirror that if we
19 do take that route. But for the time being that's the
20 reason why the manual is silent, because the feds have
21 proposed -- we are just waiting for them for the section
22 that deals with non-traffic control devices in the manual.
23 So I would rather leave it at that.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Do you know if that
25 work is still underway at the guides -- guided motorist

1 information?

2 MR. BHULLAR: I haven't followed that up recently
3 but it was part of the initial proposal for the 2009. And
4 then because of certain public comments it got pulled.

5 So I don't want to make a California precedent on
6 that but yes, we can probably -- you and I can catch up on
7 that and then if that's the way we want to go.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm not sure it
9 would be me. I think Rick has the ball on this.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So the national
11 manual might have something next edition?

12 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. They might have a proposal,
13 initially they proposed something but they pulled it back
14 for different reasons. And that section deals with how to
15 deal with non-traffic control devices in the manual.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Larry.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I just wanted to say
18 we have a motion and a second on the floor. It would be
19 helpful if we dealt with that motion and second because now
20 we are talking about other options we might do.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, but the motion
22 had an addendum for Caltrans to develop a process to deal
23 with these non-traffic control signs. I think Mr. Bhullar
24 clarified that if you want to do that, to ask Caltrans to do
25 that, you don't want to jump ahead of the federal process if

1 the feds are going to put something in the next edition. We
2 don't want to be developing our own section.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Okay, thank you.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, thanks.

5 Anyway, that's the motion with the addendum and there is a
6 second. Any other discussion on the motion? Bill.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: I am not sure if I want
8 to do it as a friendly amendment but I did notice in the
9 narrative it says that where used the sign shall be
10 installed on the right at entrances. I notice in the
11 Sacramento picture it's actually in the median, so I don't
12 know if we want to just strike out "at right." If we need
13 that much specificity to placement of the sign or not.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Don, do you have any
15 -- I see Mr. Howe going to the podium. Is there any reason
16 why it should say to the right or it can be placed in the
17 median also?

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: The standard
19 definition should be deleted, it's not needed.

20 MR. HOWE: I'm sorry, what was the question?

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is there any reason
22 that the language should say specifically to the right or
23 the sign can be placed in the median also?

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's under the
25 standard statement.

1 MR. HOWE: In the standard statement, that's the
2 strongest language we would place. It would probably be
3 best not to even say.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

5 MR. HOWE: That would be my opinion.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The maker of the
7 motion, are you okay with deleting that reference to be that
8 specific as to where it is?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I would be happy to
10 amend my motion to recommend deleting paragraph 03.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Question about that.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: John.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A question about
14 that proposal. Would this be to delete the entire standard
15 paragraph or only the words "on the right" leaving the words
16 "at entrances"?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: This is why it would
18 be good to have had some of this input ahead of the meeting.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Absolutely.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So yes. Paragraph 3
21 to read: "The Preserve America Community (G31(CA)) sign,
22 where used, shall be installed at entrances to the
23 community."

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's it. So
25 that's your final motion.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: The final answer.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The person who was
3 the second, you're okay with that?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The second is fine.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And as for Caltrans
6 looking in the process, look in the process. And if the
7 feds are going to do that then wait until the feds do it.

8 Any other discussion on the motion? Larry.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I just want to
10 explain because I continue to be sympathetic, I appreciate
11 the work that you've done to put this together. I will
12 still be voting against the motion because there is enough
13 uncertainty about that addendum process that I still think
14 we end up with another sign in the manual and more to come.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: I'd just like
16 to say I agree with Mr. Patterson in that I'll also vote no
17 but not because I don't think the sign should go up in local
18 communities but because the process needs to be improved.

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I will be abstaining.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: This is actually
21 interesting because if the county and city reps are not
22 comfortable with it then -- that makes it interesting.

23 Any other discussion on the issue?

24 Okay, hearing none there is a motion and there is
25 a second and let's vote. Do you want a roll call or just --

1 all those in favor raise your hand to say aye.

2 (Four hands raised.)

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: One, two, three, four.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Four. All of those
5 opposed?

6 ((Three hands raised.))

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Abstain.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And one abstaining?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER OLENBERGER: Two.

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Two abstain.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And two abstain.

12 The motion fails. We need seven ayes for any action of the
13 Devices committee to pass. We do not have seven votes.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I'll be
15 happy to make a new motion.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There you go.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: That we refer this
18 matter to a subcommittee to develop a policy along the lines
19 of Mr. Patterson's suggestion that identifies such non-
20 traffic control devices more generally can be placed and
21 will come up with some language to recommend to bring back
22 to the Committee.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, that is a very
24 good -- are you making it in terms of a motion?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I am making that

1 motion.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's a motion, is
3 there a second?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there is a
6 motion and a second. So that is very good. But I'm a
7 little concerned that if the feds are working on this,
8 Mr. Bhullar, and if they are going to have a chapter in
9 their new Federal MUTCD do we want to develop our own
10 process independent and then be forced to change it to match
11 theirs?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: My thought is that the
13 first thing such a subcommittee would do is answer that
14 question.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay,

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And report back.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there is a
18 motion for a subcommittee to be formed to look at the
19 process of dealing with these so-called non-traffic control
20 devices signs that government agencies want to place in
21 public right-of-ways. There is a motion and a second; any
22 discussion? John.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I support
24 Mr. Marshall's direction because on the bike signals item,
25 which is for tomorrow, I am already tracking it. Quite a

1 complicated process going on at the federal level at both
2 the Federal Highway and the National Technical Committees.
3 And rather than recommending adoption of the interim
4 approval I am going to recommend that we track so I think
5 that's a good approach.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Mr. Marshall,
7 as part of your motion do you have any suggestions for the
8 membership of the committee?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Sure.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Or the subcommittee.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: I would like to
12 recommend Rick Marshall to chair the subcommittee.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And pick his own
14 members.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I am happy to do so
16 and I honestly would rather just let people volunteer than
17 conscript anybody.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, that's great.

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's ask now, you
20 know, then we know.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Sure.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Larry will
23 participate, John will participate.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So those were two
25 volunteers.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Two volunteers.

2 (Laughter.)

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We need someone from
4 Caltrans. And Johnny Bhullar.

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Johnny.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And then the
7 chairman of the subcommittee can add members if he needs
8 more expertise and advice.

9 Okay, a motion and a second with some names to be
10 potential members of that subcommittee. Any other
11 discussion?

12 Okay, all those in favor say aye.

13 (Ayes.)

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

15 Abstention?

16 The motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

17 Moving on to Item number 14-04 now. Actually
18 14-06 because we have someone on that one who wanted to
19 speak also. So we go to Item 14-06 after 14-02. Item 14-06
20 is a proposal to amend Section 7B.15 of the CA MUTCD to
21 define "WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT" sign. This has been
22 submitted by Caltrans.

23 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

24 This request came from District 2. They have some problem
25 and need some directions on an enforcement issue. So Rob

1 Stinger from District 2 is here. He is going to share his
2 opinion with the Committee.

3 At the same time I received a number of comments
4 to not make a final decision during this meeting so we will
5 discuss this item but we will not make any decisions. We
6 will continue this item for a future meeting.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so let me ask
8 one thing. So this is going to come back to the Committee
9 again?

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: At this point we don't
11 know. We will see -- there is going to be discussions
12 between District 2 and the advocate groups like District 4,
13 Pedestrian Committee, there are a few other committees.
14 They want to discuss with District 4.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So what's --

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We want to see if the
17 request --

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So if Caltrans is
19 not ready to receive recommendation from the Devices
20 Committee why should the Committee spend time discussing it
21 now?

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We want to get your
23 opinion. You probably have -- the local agencies probably
24 have similar problems so this is good

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So colleagues, keep

1 in mind that you are not going to be making a decision on
2 this item but please share your thoughts and suggestions
3 with Caltrans. Larry.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I was very pleased to
5 see this on the agenda because this is a message that we put
6 out on the street that I actually hate. It is so ambiguous
7 that it's not just the judges that are drawing up different
8 interpretations, it's the drivers, which makes it even
9 worse. And so I don't think the issue is defining it in the
10 manual, I think it's -- I just personally don't care for the
11 sign because it is too vague and open to too much
12 interpretation by the driver themselves. I don't know that
13 we have the ability to remove that option. I don't think
14 any language you put in the MUTCD is going to be that
15 helpful, it's still a vague, ill thought out sign, I think.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That sign has been
17 -- that plaque has been there forever, as long as I
18 remember, and I've always had the same sentiment, what the
19 heck is that supposed to mean, "when children are present"?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: It's a -- if I might
21 just add. It's generally a trick question and public works
22 when they have someone new in the traffic section is to ask
23 them what that means, just to see how they respond. It's a
24 good interview question.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Most people

1 interpret that as the opening and closing times of the
2 schools and when you see some parents dropping off kid and
3 all that.

4 Okay, who wants to do the presentation? Go ahead.

5 MR. STINGER: Hi, I'm Rob Stinger from District 2.
6 I'm sorry I missed a lot of your discussion there, I'm sorry
7 about that, we were trying to get this thing pulled up here.

8 I just wanted to give you a real -- just a brief
9 presentation just to see where we're coming from. I know
10 there's been some groups that have written about it and want
11 to postpone it. But just to give you some background and
12 just to raise the issue.

13 Basically, what does this mean "When Children Are
14 Present"? You do a quick Google search, I don't know if you
15 n read some of that, but there is a lot of discussion. It's
16 not just in California, it's throughout the nation. I'll
17 give you an example. The school zone reads "25 When
18 Children Are Present." How come I got a ticket? I'm on
19 Wilson Road at 3:42 and there was not a single child
20 present, you know.

21 And then the last bullet there goes into a lot of
22 detail. But what if it's after school hours and kids are in
23 the school zone? There's a lot of ambiguity that -- it just
24 raises a lot of questions.

25 Several years ago up in our district it caused

1 some problems. CVC 22352 basically talks about the 25 mile
2 per hour speed limit in school zones. Just a couple of
3 blurbs there. While children are going to or leaving the
4 school, either during the school hours or during the noon
5 recess period. And then it goes on to talk about when
6 they're approaching or passing any school grounds which are
7 not separated from the highway by a fence, gate or other
8 physical barrier while the grounds are in use by children.

9 What I'd like to do is just go through a couple of
10 examples to show you where we have our issues.

11 I consider this a typical neighborhood school that
12 a lot of us think of when we think of a school zone. As you
13 can see you have your school grounds right across from a
14 residential area. A lot of local surface streets here. Low
15 speed, 25 miles per hour. We've got some yellow crosswalks.
16 You can just picture the kids walking along here and
17 motorists driving appropriately, slowing down, yielding to
18 the pedestrians as they cross. So this is an example. You
19 know, it's only two lanes wide, relatively low ADT.

20 This is the one that really kind of kicked things
21 off in our district. This is in Red Bluff, kind of a rural
22 community, got a five lane highway. As you can see this is
23 the school right here. Basically just a parking lot in
24 front, all the fields and all the buildings. There's a
25 fence around the grounds and all the play area is away from

1 the highway. There's no crosswalks on the road. We have
2 open fields across the way so there's no reason for kids to
3 cross.

4 Here is another look at it. A 45 mile per hour
5 speed limit. This is a highway that connects Chico to Red
6 Bluff so you have a lot of non-local traffic that drives
7 through this area. A lot of times people don't even know
8 they're at the school until they're right there because it
9 mixes in with a lot of the other buildings.

10 Here is another view. There's the 25 mile per
11 hour WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT sign. This picture actually
12 shows what we have done since then. We added a flashing
13 beacon but that's another story I'll leave for later.

14 And there is the school itself. As you can see
15 it's hard to tell in this picture here but we do have, there
16 is fence around the school grounds but it is open where the
17 parents come in and drop the kids off. Literally no kids
18 walk to school, they are either bussed in or the parents
19 bring them in so there's not a lot of visual cues for the
20 traveling public to know that they need to slow down through
21 this area.

22 Some parents got into a letter writing campaign,
23 made some phone calls to CHP and about 2010 they were out
24 here in force. We had radar feedback signs, they were
25 ticketing people trying to lower the speeds through here,

1 people weren't slowing down. The local judge in Red Bluff,
2 his interpretation of "when children are present" is even
3 when the students are in the classroom. So to me that
4 creates a speed trap. How does someone who doesn't have a
5 child going to this school know that there are kids in the
6 classroom.

7 This is another one. This is where my kids go to
8 high school. This is West Valley. This is where the busses
9 drop the students off. I measured that on Goggle Earth.
10 With Google Earth it's about 200 feet from the highway.
11 It's a rural highway. This is what it looks like. The
12 school grounds are contiguous to the highway, which has the
13 25 - WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT. I could probably count on
14 two fingers over the years how many kids I've actually seen
15 walk to school, this is a high school. As you can see it's
16 a two lane highway, a little higher ADT. Actually it's
17 still relatively low in this area.

18 But there's a -- there's a place where the school
19 busses drop the kids off. A person in our office got a
20 ticket, I think it was 1:30 in the afternoon, school was in
21 session. There were students parked in the parking lot
22 there. I think he was going 45. He got a ticket from the
23 CHP officer. And his interpretation of it was it didn't
24 matter if there was a student in the farthest back corner of
25 the campus, the 25 mile per hour speed limit applied. Again

1 how is a motorist supposed to know that? And there is no
2 fence or anything. There is no fence or anything between
3 the school grounds and the highway so there is no physical
4 barrier other than basically a drainage ditch.

5 The last one I put together just as another rural
6 example of what we're dealing with. This is out on Highway
7 99, a high-speed highway. This is Lassen View School; it's
8 an elementary school. There's the buildings. All the
9 school grounds are out behind the buildings. But you can
10 see it's set back from the highway.

11 Here is another view. There's the 25 mile per
12 hour sign, WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT. When you're out here
13 in the middle of the day you can see the separation from the
14 highway to the parking. There are no kids walking here.
15 There's no crosswalks. It's a little higher ADT, 6700, high
16 speed. I believe it's 55 in this area. But there is no
17 gate or fence or physical barrier between the parking lot
18 and the highway here.

19 One of the problems at the school. They contacted
20 us and asked us for help because what they have is some
21 people were slowing down to 25, other people were not. They
22 had one situation where someone used this right turn lane as
23 a passing lane, decided to pass on the right, and actually
24 T-boned a parent that was pulling out of the driveway right
25 there about where that car is. So one of the problems with

1 people not understanding when they're supposed to drive 25
2 raises those kinds of issues. People take chances and make
3 dumb, you know, dumb decisions.

4 So the basic problem with this is there's just too
5 much uncertainty about when the conditional speed zone --
6 speed limit applies. It would be nice to get traffic
7 engineers, law enforcement and motorists all on the same
8 page of what that means.

9 The result if we were to clarify this: Better
10 motorist understanding of the law when driving through
11 school zones, improved driver behavior, consistent law
12 enforcement and fewer challenges to traffic citations.

13 This is what we put together, this was a couple of
14 years ago when we first raised the issue to Caltrans
15 Headquarters was, well come up with some working that you
16 think would address this issue. And the reason I wanted to
17 show some of those pictures of the schools that we were
18 dealing with is to show you there was a horizontal buffer, a
19 certain amount of distance between the highway and the
20 school grounds where -- at what point is a child considered
21 safe from the highway?

22 And the first bullet there, motorists can see
23 children on foot or bicycling within 30 feet of the highway
24 travel way. We have gotten some comments that they don't
25 really care for that motorists can see. My main reason for

1 that, I think, from two years ago when we put this together
2 was that interpretation from the local judge that children
3 are present even when they're in the classroom. So I felt
4 the motorists should have some sort of visual cue that there
5 is something going on and they need to slow down.

6 And the second bullet, you know, the basic. There
7 is no fence, gate or physical barrier separating the
8 children from the highway.

9 Then we went into it a little bit more just to
10 describe it's really when kids are arriving to school in the
11 morning, departing in the afternoon. Depending on the
12 school, if it's like a middle school or a high school where
13 kids leave campus during lunch, maybe it would apply during
14 those times. But it does not apply when children are not
15 present along the highway such as when they are in the
16 classroom.

17 So that was our suggestion and I feel like it's
18 just a starting point for the conversation. I imagine some
19 wordsmithing needs to be done.

20 The question that keeps coming back is where did
21 you get 30 feet? We did kind of pull it out of the air but
22 some of the things that we look to is the maximum distance
23 from the highway for a roadside sign is 30 feet. We feel
24 that's part of the reasoning behind that is for visibility
25 reasons. If children are more than 30 feet outside the edge

1 of the travel way they are less likely to dart out in front
2 of oncoming traffic.

3 And then the last one. This 30 foot is the
4 distance we use for freeways for clear recovery for an
5 errant vehicle. That gives them a chance to regain control.
6 We feel like, again, it's kind of the uniform distance that
7 we use and it should provide a similar safety benefit for
8 school zones.

9 As a comparison, this is what the state of
10 Washington does. They call this Administrative Code 468-95-
11 335. This is how they define "when children are present."

12 Number one: "School children are occupying or
13 walking within the marked crosswalk." Pretty basic.

14 Number two: Basically children are waiting to
15 cross at a crosswalk.

16 But the big one is number three. Basically saying
17 school children are present when they're walking along the
18 highway, either on the adjacent sidewalk, or in the absence
19 of sidewalks, on the shoulder with the posted speed limit
20 zone extending 300 feet, or other distance established by
21 regulation. So this is even more specific to their walking
22 basically in the roadway prism.

23 So that's just as a comparison, what other states
24 are doing to address the issue.

25 This is probably an extreme examples of things

1 that are out there. So the main thing I wanted to impress
2 on you guys is the issue with the wording being vague or
3 people having different interpretations of what that means.
4 It does cause a lot of problems. And I think in the case of
5 enforcing it when children are in the classroom is basically
6 a speed trap. That's all I had.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Just one
8 question I had for you and Caltrans, if you have even looked
9 at this and CHP might be able to help us with this. The
10 reduced speed zone in the school area is established by the
11 California Vehicle Code. I don't recall anywhere in the
12 vehicle code that it allows the Department to define wherein
13 children are present.

14 When the vehicle code wants certain things to be
15 defined and decided administratively it says so very
16 specifically. For example, it says in the case of the
17 yellow timing for red light cameras, it says in the case of
18 PTS for establishing speed zones. In this section - and I
19 have to go and read it again and refresh my own memory - the
20 vehicle codes doesn't allow the Department of Transportation
21 to define when children are present.

22 I totally agree with you that we need a better
23 definition. I am not just sure if the Department has the
24 authority under the vehicle code to even do this in the CA
25 MUTCD. So I don't know if you have looked at it, if you

1 have asked your attorneys or CHP.

2 I'm glad we are not voting on this today. But
3 just for the purpose of discussion before this committee and
4 before a whole bunch of people go out there and start coming
5 up with language. I just want to make sure that Caltrans
6 was given the authority to define that section of the
7 vehicle code in the MUTCD administratively. Johnny.

8 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
9 Basically here what has happened is -- let me, if I may,
10 bring up the California Vehicle Code here.

11 Basically, you are right. In general, no. But in
12 this case what has happened is -- since we are still looking
13 up the memo that I am going to make reference to. But
14 basically what happened is that there was a court case and
15 the judge --and the judgment of the judge indicated the term
16 "when children are present." And the reason being -- let me
17 bring up -- I believe it's 455.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But the judge has
19 jurisdiction -- that's the judge's job, to interpret law.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: He or she can go and
22 read the vehicle code and say, based on my opinion this is
23 what the Legislature meant.

24 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But what I am asking

1 is, is there anywhere there that allows DOT to define "when
2 children are present"?

3 MR. BHULLAR: All right. Basically here, this is
4 -- when you look at the bottom of the screen there. This is
5 the section that was called in question. And if you read
6 here. Let me see exactly. Of course what Rob was alluding
7 to earlier is about B, when it says:

8 "When approaching or passing a school
9 building or the grounds thereof, contiguous to a
10 highway and posted with the standard "SCHOOL"
11 warning sign, while children are going to or
12 leaving the school either during school hours or
13 during the noon recess period."

14 Fine. The next sentence as well. The question
15 came up in the '90s and that's when we created the WHEN
16 CHILDREN ARE PRESENT plaque because our office was at that
17 time asked to come up with this term. And that alludes to
18 the second sentence which is:

19 "The prima facie limit shall also apply when
20 approaching or passing any school grounds which
21 are not separated from the highway by a fence,
22 gate, or other physical barrier while the grounds
23 are in use by children and the highway is
24 posted --"

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The way --

1 MR. BHULLAR: So that determines -- the second
2 sentence is what the judge interpreted as when children are
3 present in terms of any official activity going on at the
4 school, whether it's in the evening, on a weekend. And
5 because of that then there was a legal interpretation made
6 by Caltrans Legal requesting that this term "when children
7 are present" be created by Traffic Ops.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I'm glad you put
9 that section up. That section doesn't say at all "when
10 children are present."

11 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, it does not.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: As far as the school
13 being contiguous to the highway and no physical separation
14 and all that, that's very obvious. But as far as the time
15 the section says very clearly -- it says, while children are
16 getting to or leaving the school, either during school hours
17 or during the noon recess period. So if there is an
18 activity in the school during the weekend this section
19 doesn't apply.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Well first of all the term "when
21 children are present" is not a California term, it's a
22 National MUTCD term.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, but that is not
24 law.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, when you say,
2 "when children are not present" that is not law.

3 MR. BHULLAR: Of course.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, no. If an
5 officer wants to issue a ticket to a driver they must refer
6 to a section of the California Vehicle Code. They cannot
7 refer to a section of the CA MUTCD.

8 MR. BHULLAR: That's true.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And there is nothing
10 here that says "when children are present" it says only
11 those three specific time periods. I would like to hear
12 more from the CHP rep to see what you guys think about this.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Well it says when grounds
14 are in use. And the way our Academy has defined that as
15 when -- obviously the first part is obvious, when they're
16 going to and from school and recess.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: It's the second part. So
19 the way our Academy has interpreted that, which is just
20 their interpretation, is that any time there is a -- if it's
21 not enclosed by a fence, gate, anything, anytime there is a
22 child visible on the school grounds. So if it's a weekend
23 and you've got a soccer -- like my kids' elementary school,
24 there is a soccer field right next to it. That thing is
25 packed on the weekends.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So if there is one
2 kid playing by himself in the school ground, that qualifies?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: That would qualify due to
4 the -- due to the ambiguity of the law that's the only
5 interpretation our department could come up with.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And do you think
7 based on your judgment that -- Chief, do you think that
8 Caltrans has the authority to further define this section or
9 do we have to clear it legislatively?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: It would have to go
11 through the Legislature. We are not going to be able to
12 refer back to the CA MUTCD for a violation, it's going to be
13 what is in the vehicle code.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: My only question was
15 that if we spend a whole bunch of time, not only as a whole
16 lot of other smarter people out there trying to define,
17 further define when children are present. If it does not
18 going to have any legal standing is it really the right way
19 of doing it or do we need to go and clean up the legislative
20 language in the vehicle code. Which way do you think is
21 better? That's the question. At least -- I don't know the
22 answer, I'm just asking the question.

23 MR. BHULLAR: I think we are on the right track
24 that there is some ambiguity here and there have been issues
25 raised. This is not the first time so we need to resolve

1 the issue at least, I would say, legally.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anyway, so knowing
3 that we are not going to vote on this it's good to share at
4 least our thoughts and comments with the staff so when they
5 go back and work with the community they know what the
6 Committee things. Who wants to go first? Any thoughts?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I had reached the same
8 conclusion that was just expressed, that this felt more like
9 a legislative matter than a manual matter.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anyone else? Mark.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: I agree, this
12 is for the Legislature to fix.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anyone from that
14 side? John.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Just thinking like
16 an engineer or a planner. It seems to me that somebody has
17 to think about this in a performance way, which is -- it has
18 to solve -- address the issues that the presenter raised.
19 You have these cases where it shouldn't be reasonable to be
20 ticketed because of the lack of conflicts, the potential
21 conflicts on the facility on the frontage.

22 It seems to me that we have a letter signed by a
23 whole lot of health, walking and bicycling organizations and
24 hopefully they will be involved as first-class players in
25 the discussion of how to make better language. I do need to

1 make a recommendation to that effect or have we already
2 given a sense of that to Caltrans?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No. We can share
4 our thoughts and comments with them but I, for one, really
5 need to hear from someone who knows the law. Whether even
6 the CA MUTCD can define or get into specifics for a section
7 of vehicle code when the law does not give the Department of
8 Transportation authority. Because in certain cases the law
9 specifically says, per guidelines directed by the Caltrans
10 Director or Department Director.

11 But in this case the law in black and white says
12 what it means, it doesn't need any further clarification.
13 If you want to further clarify you have to go and clarify
14 the section in the vehicle code. It doesn't say that the CA
15 MUTCD can clarify that section of vehicle code. That's the
16 question I have.

17 Anyway, let's hear from the public also and bring
18 it back to the Committee because it's on the agenda. We are
19 not going to be voting on this but if any member of the
20 audience wishes to share their thoughts on this issue please
21 step up.

22 MR. DANG: Hi, I'm Tony Dang, I'm with California
23 Walks. I'm with the 27 other organizations that sent in the
24 letter. So we are just concerned with some of the proposed
25 language and I'm glad that there is going to be no real vote

1 on this and we would really appreciate the opportunity to be
2 involved in any further discussions.

3 The reason that we were so concerned is this
4 proposal kind of came out of the blue. And as public
5 stakeholders in this process we have a very strong interest
6 in preserving child safety in school zones. So we really
7 appreciate the Committee pushing for strong public
8 engagement as this process goes forward so thank you so
9 much.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Can I ask you a
11 question?

12 MR. DANG: Sure.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The organizations
14 that you represent, that coalition. Have you looked at this
15 issue, if this is something that needs to be further
16 clarified through a legislative process in the vehicle code
17 or if it's something that the CA MUTCD can address?

18 MR. DANG: Our initial sense is that it would have
19 to be clarified legislatively in the vehicle code and not
20 through the MUTCD.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

22 MR. DANG: Thanks.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anyone else from the
24 public?

25 Seeing none we close the public hearing on the

1 item and bring it back to the Committee. So what do you
2 wish to do with this?

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman, what we
4 want, Rob Stinger and Tony are here. If they want to work
5 they can work and, you know, come up with some resolution
6 and we'll see how where we go. If there is a need further
7 to bring to this Committee we'll bring it back.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: If not then we'll
10 discuss --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just one thing I
12 would like to request is that if you bring it back to the
13 Committee have something in writing from Caltrans'
14 attorneys.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Correct.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That says
17 specifically whether this Committee has been vested with the
18 authority to clarify this section of the vehicle code. I
19 don't see it but I'm not an attorney.

20 And second is that if we can do, what can we do?
21 What part of it we can modify. Because there is no point
22 coming up with language if it doesn't have legal standing.
23 You may be better going to the Legislature and do it in a
24 bill.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other thoughts?

2 Okay, thanks. We are moving on from the item.

3 We go now to Item number 14-04.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Are you going to come
7 back to 14-01?

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's do first 14-01,
10 yes.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, we'll go to
12 14-01 14-01, proposal to adopt "TURN AROUND, DON'T DROWN"
13 signs and amending Sections 2C.35 and 6I.06. It is
14 submitted by Mr. Marshall from Napa County.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Thank you. This item
16 came to my attention from staff at my own agency, coworkers
17 of mine in our flood control division were contacted by the
18 regional office of the National Weather Service dangling a
19 carrot. They had a free sign they wanted to give us that
20 said "TURN AROUND, DON'T DROWN" and it turns out it's part
21 of this larger campaign that they have worked on.

22 As with the previous item that I brought, federal
23 agencies are -- numerous federal agencies are involved,
24 including the Department of Transportation. And FHWA has
25 issued a letter that's included with the agenda materials

1 saying they're okay with this and yet for reasons I don't
2 know they didn't put it in the manual.

3 We were offered the gift of one free sign and
4 asked, where would you like to put it? My first reaction
5 was, well, I don't think it's in the book, let's check into
6 that. So I contacted Devinder and asked to have this placed
7 on the agenda.

8 The proposal involves two main components. There
9 is a sign that is intended to be a permanent installation
10 and it says "When Flooded Turn Around Don't Drown" and then
11 there is one that is intended to be a temporary incident
12 management type sign with neon pink and it says "Flooding
13 Ahead Turn Around Don't Drown."

14 One thing that came up in my conversation with
15 Devinder, my electronic conversation with Devinder this
16 week. The National Weather Service has actually trademarked
17 the slogan because for them it's part of a larger campaign
18 to reduce injuries and deaths from flooding. And they have
19 in mind that people might want to use the expression on
20 other kinds of printed materials and they simply ask that if
21 you are going to do so you get permission from them, if
22 you're going to make T-shirts or pamphlets or something.
23 But I confirmed with their staff that use of it as a sign is
24 pre-approved. Even though they call it trademarked it's not
25 any concern of theirs that we consider taking this action to

1 place it in the California manual.

2 So as with the previous item that I brought I came
3 up with a suggestion of some language of where to put it in
4 the book and -- interestingly it got edited a little bit
5 from what I wrote and so I brought a fresh copy of my
6 original language just to -- the main difference is the
7 difference between the two signs. The yellow one says "When
8 Flooded" because it would be there all the time but
9 sometimes it's not flooded. The pink one says "Flooding
10 Ahead." And for some reason the version in the packet
11 changed both of them to say "Flooding Ahead" so that's
12 really the main reason -- the main difference between what I
13 am handing you and what is in the agenda packet.

14 And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Great, thank you,
16 Mr. Marshall. So I'm waiting until everybody gets the -- is
17 this different from page 23? Or actually page 21, I
18 believe.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: It's a little
20 different from page 21. Look at paragraph 6 and 7. That's
21 the essential difference.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, so you have
23 made some changes. Oh yes, I can see.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Well I flipped back
25 the changes that were made after me.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: From 21. Okay. So
2 colleagues, please discard page 21 of the agenda, look at
3 the one that just was passed around, that's the actual
4 proposal. Thank you, Mr. Marshall.

5 Any comments from Caltrans or official US staff on
6 the proposal? Don.

7 MR. HOWE: My comments are probably really picky
8 details like the size of the sign and the letter height and
9 so forth. But generally speaking when we discussed in our
10 planning meeting to come I did speak with Kevin Korth and he
11 said that this was something he would look into for us and
12 I'd like to invite Kevin to come up and talk about what sign
13 has been adopted by the state of Texas, which is basically
14 this sign.

15 My comments were that the sign is very small.
16 It's a 30x30 sign and the letter height I think as proposed
17 are a very odd letter height like two-and-three-eighths or a
18 2.39 inch high letters. I'm just trying to remember from
19 the details. If we look at the -- I think the pink sign,
20 the letter heights are 3 inch letters, which are relatively
21 small. But the five lines of "When Flooded Turn Around
22 Don't Drown" the letter heights there are the Dimension D,
23 which are 3.39 inches. And again, there's a lot of
24 information in that sign.

25 Kevin, could you come up and give us just a little

1 summary on what you found in Texas with the sign. He sent
2 me an e-mail in preparation.

3 My issue is not so much with the sign, it looks
4 like it's well-endorsed. It's just the one that is proposed
5 here is a 30x30 inch sign here and then the other sign is --
6 it's a 24x30 inch sign. So these were designed to be very
7 small signs. Assume this is going to be for a small roads
8 or a conventional state route application. Kevin.

9 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway
10 Administration.

11 My initial discussion was based on Don's
12 questioning. Based on all this, there's about 8 to 10
13 states that have their own state manual and I reviewed all
14 the other states. The only state that has any of these
15 signs proposed by the National Weather Service is Texas DOT
16 and they only use the warning diamond sign. They don't have
17 the incident management sign in their manual.

18 A lot of people they have the Flooded sign, which
19 is -- the Road May Flood, which is the W8-18. Many states
20 use that sign as their incident management sign for a
21 flooded roadway. So they just take the W8-18 and turn it
22 fluorescent pink and they can use that in incident
23 management.

24 As far as this sign, the warning sign. Texas has
25 language in it and they use a 48x48 as the only size sign

1 that they have. It's conventional roadways, no matter the
2 speed, they're using a 48x48 inch sign. And that can be --
3 the language they have in it is in Section 2C.35 of the
4 Texas MUTCD. And they said that they can only use this sign
5 in conjunction with the W8-18, which is Road May Flood. So
6 they have -- in order to place this sign, which is 48x48,
7 the Texas manual says that they must have a Road May Flood
8 prior to that sign and this sign may be placed.

9 That's all I have initially about that sign.

10 MR. HOWE: Thanks, kevin.

11 So that was just my comments. The sign as
12 proposed is 30x30, it's a small sign. But Texas, who has
13 adopted this sign, they've gone with a standard sign, 48x48
14 and they do require that it be used in conjunction with the
15 W8-18.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Good. So it's
17 basically the sizing and the size of letters, not as much
18 the sign itself.

19 MR. HOWE: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman?

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Can I just point out
24 that I have no problem with that. I agree that it's a lot
25 of information and if the size would be better I'm fine with

1 that. The graphics that are included were actually taken
2 directly from the Weather Service website, they are not my
3 own creation. So I don't know --

4 And certainly you are not who to ask. I don't
5 know what they are doing with this. If they posted a spec
6 for a sign that nobody in the country is using. Maybe
7 that's why they're trying to give them away.

8 (Laughter.)

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: The good news in the
10 sense is that my county, because of me being on this
11 committee, we dithered too long and the free offer went away
12 already. But we might be interested in making our own and
13 using this tool, or at least having it as a tool we can have
14 in our toolbox. So we could make it at whatever size is the
15 right size.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I haven't seen that,
17 I've just read your report. The National Weather Service is
18 not the appropriate agency to design any traffic signs
19 anyway. It's like us designing a Doppler radar and giving
20 it to them.

21 (Laughter.)

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Could we agendize
23 that for the Committee?

24 (Laughter.)

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, anyone else?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Maybe I could say
2 something.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Bill Winter.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: I have some definite
5 empathy for what is being proposed here by Napa County.
6 Like Napa County, in Los Angeles County we also in my
7 department administer the flood control district. And I
8 think the National Weather Service is a fantastic partner to
9 us as managing our system, our flood control system, they
10 give us great forecasts.

11 So that on occasion when we've had to deal with a
12 flooded road, a dip crossing or something, we actually would
13 go out, the road commissioner authority would be to post the
14 road actually closed and we would put up the regulatory
15 signage, the standard sign. You know, Road Closed. If
16 there is maybe a need for some through traffic to get to go
17 a little ways we may say "Road Closed to Through Traffic" of
18 the flooding is actually at a point where you still have
19 driveways or something had to be served.

20 We have unfortunately had instances, even with
21 those regulatory signs, where people have gone around them.
22 It makes great evening news, I suppose, when you see that,
23 that people are stuck and having to be rescued from their
24 cars. We have had one fatality that I can recall of
25 something that happened up in the Antelope Valley when

1 something had happened of that nature.

2 I think if I am the Weather Service I am probably
3 viewing this as a public service announcement. I think it
4 probably makes -- and the fact that they have trademarked it
5 probably is indicative that they do hope that people put
6 this on T-shirts and bumper stickers and get the word out
7 there.

8 I am not sure that it would be effective as a
9 warning sign. Again, if I know -- as people go around
10 regulatory signage. So I am not -- well I say I have
11 empathy, I definitely have some empathy with this, I am not
12 sure that it quite is another one of those signs that quite
13 fits into the manual as a warning sign when, as I saw in the
14 exhibit that was passed out here or what Mr. Korth had gone
15 through, that there are other signs. Specifically I guess
16 you're pointing out the W8-18 that the road may flood. That
17 may be another tool you already have in the manual.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

19 Anyone else? John.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: When I first looked
21 at the proposal I was stunned at the amount of text and the
22 number of lines on the sign. And going back to the
23 principles of an effective traffic control device, I think
24 it's 1A.02, 1A.10 or something like that. And being able to
25 recognize the sign and respond to it is an issue. A 48-inch

1 size certainly makes the text more readable. Whether
2 anybody is going to read five lines of text is a question in
3 my mind.

4 Now that made me think, well, do any other warning
5 signs have five lines of text? It turns out they do.
6 There's a bunch of four-liners, there's a bunch of five-
7 liners. But I am still concerned with the message. It's
8 kind of like, who sees this and who is going to respond to
9 this? And it got me started thinking that this might, if
10 it's even possible, be better with a graphical component.

11 I don't want to make it complex but there are some
12 really memorable graphical hazard signs in the warning
13 pantheon. One is the shoulder drop off where you get a car
14 destabilized by a longitudinal step. There's the cliff
15 about to drop rocks on you. There's the squiggly lines, the
16 slippery pavement behind the car. There's five or six of
17 them that really stick in my mind. I wonder whether there
18 is a way to create a graphical message saying, this is what
19 could happen to you in your car.

20 So I just want to -- I don't have any conclusions
21 on this. Just the sign is very wordy; I'm worried about
22 glance recognition. I do like the idea of warning someone
23 that the road may flood if that is something that they
24 wouldn't otherwise be watching out for on that stretch of
25 roadway, like they have never driven it before.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman, word
2 message signs we can include in the CA MUTCD. But when we
3 are we about the graphical, then we have to go to the
4 federal too, so we would need federal approval.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I totally
6 understand.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So we can't address
8 that one here.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Anyone else?
10 Okay, let's open it to the public. Any member of
11 the audience who wishes to address the Committee and share
12 your thoughts and views about this item and this proposal
13 with the Committee. Mike. Mr. Kenney from County of San
14 Diego.

15 MR. KENNEY: Well good afternoon; Mike Kenney,
16 County of San Diego.

17 I also got approached by the National Weather
18 Service about this sign several months ago. I set it aside,
19 maybe a bit too quickly, I didn't realize it was coming
20 before the Committee.

21 The County has several managed dip crossings. And
22 they tend to be heavily managed with flashing beacons, we
23 have opportunities to close the road, and it didn't seem
24 like this sign would really supplement what we were already
25 doing.

1 We have several areas where we flood on the road
2 side and we want to warn people that there is flooding ahead
3 but we don't want them turning around. That may not be the
4 best move in that instance if you know that the shoulder is
5 flooded. That your lane may be flooded but the adjacent
6 lane may not be. There may be other moves than turning
7 around. So we were a little concerned about whether or not
8 we would be able to use it in those instances.

9 And we were struck by the text as well. That is
10 very clever phrasing to get people to be aware and stick in
11 their mind about flooding problems. But whether or not that
12 was appropriate for signage is what we weren't sure. So we
13 probably wouldn't be interested in using that sign if it was
14 available.

15 The incident management sign may have more appeal.
16 If the public road supervisor went out to a flooded area and
17 had that sign on his truck and we didn't have any of those
18 usual features where we would anticipate a crossing we might
19 use that sign, the incident management sign, if turning
20 around was the best option. But just the warning sign alone
21 we didn't really see a place for them. Thank you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

23 Anyone else from the audience? You technically
24 are not audience, you're staff.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I just wanted to

1 reiterate what Don had said and also I did find a couple of
2 signs in the manual that actually do have probably I would
3 say one or two words more than this but there are only a
4 couple in the manual. But as long as we get the letter
5 height's minimums somehow addressed and the overall size of
6 the sign is going to increase I think we should be okay with
7 that.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

9 Anyone else from the public?

10 Okay, we will close the public hearing part of it,
11 bring it back to the Committee. Okay, who wants to go?

12 Mr. Marshall, you heard what --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: -- Caltrans and FHWA
15 said and what Mr. Kenney from San Diego said and what
16 Mr. Winter said.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I am going to take a
18 shot at this and see where it goes. I am going to move
19 approval of the recommendation revising the dimensions as
20 recommended by Caltrans.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is there a second to
22 the motion?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'll second and I'll
24 state that I like the 48 inch addition. I don't see a
25 downside here. To the extent it doesn't reach 100 percent

1 of motorists that might be at risk could be better than
2 nothing. I think the incident management version is very
3 strong. I have questions about the yellow one. And I think
4 there might be room for improvement in the future, I don't
5 see a reason to hold back at present, though. I will
6 support it.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there is a
8 motion and a second that the proposal be approved and that
9 Caltrans staff be asked to prepare the sign standard, put it
10 in the CA MUTCD, complying with the size of 48x48 and the
11 appropriate letter size.

12 Any discussion on that motion? John.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually I wanted to
14 ask Rick whether he thought it made sense what Texas, I
15 think it as Texas did, whereby the Road May Flood is to be
16 posted before the When Flooded Turn Around sign, what you
17 thought of that?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I would rather keep it
19 as an option. I can think of an example in my county where
20 the distance between the beginning of the road at a T
21 intersection and the place where it floods is pretty short
22 and so there wouldn't be room to do two separate postings
23 and to put them together would be even more of an
24 information overload. I'd rather have the option of
25 choosing the one that I think fits the situation the best by

1 just adding this to the toolbox.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Would it be
3 something that would make sense in guidance where we just
4 mention the presence of the other sign without making it a
5 shall or a should? It seems like a good idea for a lot of
6 corridors I can imagine where you're driving down there and
7 you don't really see the area that makes it clear that it
8 could flood and then you finally do get to the area that
9 floods. I'd be willing to support it without.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I think rather than
11 try to make you all wait I digest this language from Texas
12 I'd rather just keep it simple.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there's a
14 motion and a second. Any more discussions?

15 Okay, all those in favor say aye.

16 (Ayes.)

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

18 (One hand raised.)

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: One opposition.

20 Abstention?

21 Okay, one, two, three, four, five --

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Pass. Eight.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The motion passes,
24 we have seven votes -- eight votes actually.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Eight. We need eight.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We need at least
2 seven.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, we need eight.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Really?

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, we need seven,
6 you're right. It used to be 75 percent, now it's 70.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: What do you think
8 I'm doing all through the meeting? I'm just trying to
9 count, you know. I'm just counting, do I have seven votes?

10 (Laughter.)

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We used to have 75
12 percent, now two-thirds. Thank you.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, we are done
14 with that item.

15 Moving on, what else do we have? Let's see. We
16 are done with 01, we are done with 02.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let's have a 10 minute
18 break, there's only one item left.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Which one?

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: 14-04.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No?

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, only one item
23 left.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Which one, 14-04?

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: 14-04.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So if you want,
2 colleagues, we can take a 10, 15 minute break and please be
3 back by 3:05. We can go over 14-04 at that time.

4 (Off the record at 2:48 p.m.)

5 (On the record at 3:05 p.m.)

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Good afternoon,
7 let's call the meeting back to order. It's 3:05 and we have
8 but one item left on the agenda for today before we adjourn
9 to our meeting tomorrow morning at 8:30.

10 That item is Item 14-04, proposal to amend various
11 Sections of Part 3 of the CA MUTCD and it was submitted by
12 Caltrans.

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So everybody has the
14 large table, It might be better instead of looking over --
15 Mr. Chairman, this item is the result of comments
16 made during the 2012 CA MUTCD Adoption and some of the
17 comment were deferred for the future. So we discussed these
18 comments in a workshop with the Committee Members and
19 finally we were able to put together -- and Johnny and Atifa
20 are going to take over.

21 First of all Atifa, she is our new coworker. She
22 replaced Roberta McLaughlin, so she is our pavement marking
23 person.

24 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, good afternoon. Johnny
25 Bhullar, Editor for CA MUTCD. And?

1 MS. FEROUZ: Atifa Ferouz with the Caltrans
2 Traffic Engineering.

3 MR. BHULLAR: So Atifa has replaced -- for those
4 of you that have worked with our committee before, Roberta
5 McLaughlin, she was helping us with Part 3 Markings. She
6 has taken a reassignment in our District 2 office and we are
7 happy to have Atifa join our office. As of now she will be
8 helping mostly with our Part 3 Marking.

9 And since we have a history here on the workshop
10 and Atifa was not involved I have asked her to just help us
11 out with some of these items. So in case there is any
12 discussion or questions come up she will be able to assist
13 us.

14 But I would like to first get the opinion of the
15 Committee here. Do you want us to run through every comment
16 and go through like a spreadsheet or if you have had a
17 chance to look that over and to -- maybe for ease of things
18 I can probably just go through the agenda with page numbers
19 and just jump to the changes and what they are.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I can speak only for
21 myself. I have gone through them but I would like to hear
22 from the rest of the Committee. What is your preference?
23 Do you want him to go through the changes or do you want to
24 go line by line? What do you want?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I have gone through

1 them as well and would be happy to just go directly to the
2 two or three small questions that I have.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: I agree.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

6 MR. BHULLAR: All right. In that case then I
7 would like to jump to page number, from the agenda, page
8 number 50. And the first one there is a figure. And as you
9 can see on the figure basically there was a change made.
10 The clarification that was made was that on the bottom
11 figure that you see there we had the "8 inch White Line" and
12 then also the mention of "See Detail 8." However, on the
13 figure, which is 36A figure, there was no clarification. So
14 we have added "See Details 8, 9 or 10" and added the verbiage
15 "Non-retro-reflective Raised White Pavement Markers may also
16 be used to simulate this line." However, that same
17 information is redundant on Figure 36B so that has been
18 removed except for "See Detail 8." That was a comment that
19 had been made before so we are trying to address that just
20 for the clarification of the figure. Any questions?

21 Okay, the next page is page number 51. So on page
22 number 51 on the bottom. If you see the last paragraph
23 there paragraph number 17. The standard statement there
24 says that the left-turn or right-turn lanes shall be
25 separated from the through lanes by a single solid 8 inch

1 wide white line as shown in the figure.

2 If we left it the way it is as this statement
3 indicates and that's all we have in our current manual,
4 Steve Pyburn from FHWA had made the comment that if you
5 leave it --

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Not Steve. Not Steve,
7 Ken.

8 MR. BHULLAR: No, Steve Pyburn had made the
9 comment in 2011 and that's the comment we are addressing.
10 That comment was that in that case there are situations
11 where we want to have a wider separation or even channelized
12 lines like chevrons, especially if there is a right turn
13 lane and that is a wider space. So if we strictly went with
14 the standard here it will indicate that all we are allowed
15 to do is only a single, solid 8 inch wide white line.

16 So what we are doing is we are proposing -- and
17 this is something that probably does not show up on the
18 agenda. But we are proposing first of all to add to that
19 sentence in paragraph number 17, we are adding the verbiage,
20 comma, "unless allowed in Paragraph 18." And we are adding
21 a new paragraph 18 on the next page.

22 So if you go to the next page, which is page 52 in
23 red, the paragraph number 18 is: "Left-turn or right-turn
24 lanes may be separated from the through lanes by multiple
25 solid 8 inch wide white lines or two longitudinal solid 8

1 inch wide lines with diagonal lines used for crosshatch
2 markings." So basically trying to address that concern that
3 was in the public comment. Any questions on that?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If you go with the
5 island with the hatch lines do we still use the 8 inch?

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: The right lane and
7 left -- the right lane and left lane are separated by an 8
8 inch line.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, but if you want
10 to separate it by more than one line and we go with a
11 chevron arrangement or some kind of parallel lines and we do
12 hatched you still want to use two 8 inch?

13 MR. BHULLAR: One of the new criteria in the
14 manual, I can look that up quickly is, it's based upon
15 speed. I believe it's 40 or 45 miles. Below and above that
16 the width changes from 4 inch to 8 inch.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. So over 45
18 you go from 4 inch to 8 inch?

19 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. But I'm not sure if it's 40 or
20 45. That -- I believe I can quickly look it up if you want
21 but it's in the manual.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, that's fine.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Then on the next page if
24 there are no questions, page 53. on page 53 it's paragraph
25 number 20. And we are adding the statement there: "Where

1 crossing the lane line markings is discouraged, the lane
2 line markings shall consist of a normal or wide solid white
3 line, except as provided in Paragraph 5." So here basically
4 what was happening is that the Paragraph number 20 of the
5 National MUTCD, which is on page 43 of your agenda, and then
6 Paragraph 5, which is on the previous page, page 52, the one
7 that says "except as." So Paragraph number 5 says: "Except
8 as provided in Paragraph 6, where crossing the lane line
9 markings with care is permitted, the lane line markings
10 shall consist of a normal broken or white line." So here we
11 are actually just making a reference so that those two
12 paragraphs are so far away that sometimes the connection is
13 not made.

14 And I believe this comment is addressed in your
15 table here. Let me look it up. It's comment number 3. So
16 if you see on the spread sheet that we have handed out,
17 comment number 3 from Laura Wells, City of San Jose. And
18 basically they said, this would allow the use of a solid,
19 single white line through a curved section of roadway where
20 lane changes are discouraged. So we are just addressing
21 that need by making a reference.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Johnny, do you want to
23 mention we are going to delete "Where crossing the lane line
24 markings" in the text. So we are going to cross that part,
25 just going to add Paragraph 5 and period.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, thanks Devinder for the
2 clarification. In paragraph number 20 on page 53 of the
3 agenda we had proposed that we were going to add "except as
4 provided in Paragraph 5 where crossing the lane line marking
5 is permitted." But after talking to Kevin of FHWA
6 California Region, he is in the audience here, we agreed
7 that probably just to have the verbiage "except as provided
8 in Paragraph 5" would be sufficient so we don't need to have
9 the extra verbiage. Any comments?

10 All right. Then the next change as part of the
11 deferred comments is on page 54 of the agenda. On this one,
12 again, basically this is similar to the figure that we had
13 been looking at. So we are adding -- on Paragraph number 31
14 we are adding "if used, shall be" rather than -- the
15 terminology here was "will be" so we have crossed out the
16 "will." So it's "if used, shall be recessed, otherwise, use
17 Details 8 or 11." And I believe this one deals with the
18 snow areas where we have either -- we can use just the
19 marking versus the raised retroreflective markers. So we
20 are trying to at least consider that situation. Any
21 questions? Yes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So you're modifying
23 paragraph 31, right?

24 MR. BHULLAR: That's correct.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's an awful long

1 sentence. Is it understandable as written? I understand
2 that the words in the third line, starting with the word
3 "except" modify what went before. I wonder whether it's
4 possible to achieve the exact same meaning without so many
5 modifying clauses?

6 MR. BHULLAR: All right. In that case I do
7 profess, as I have on a number of occasions previously, that
8 English is my fourth language. So --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's good English,
10 it's just a lot of modifying clauses.

11 MR. BHULLAR: So John, if you can help us
12 probably, either now or if you don't have the time, on the
13 side. Probably we could use a little bit of clarification
14 in terms of how it could be understood. Larry.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I was just going to
16 say a simple solution might be to put a period after
17 "collector roads" and strike "except" and then say "when
18 used in snow areas" and the rest of the sentence. So you
19 just split it into two sentences and leave the "except" out.

20 MR. BHULLAR: I see.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The question there
22 would be what the word used after the word "except" when is
23 used referring back to the lane line patterns or is it
24 referring forward to raised pavement markers?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: It's forward, I

1 think. Right?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: So it would say "when
4 used in snow areas the raised pavement markers" and then you
5 take out the second "if used" I guess. "When used shall be
6 recessed; otherwise, use Details 8 and 11."

7 MR. BHULLAR: All right. I think probably -- yes.
8 We would probably -- can we take it on the side and try
9 to --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yes.

11 MR. BHULLAR: -- work with John? All right.
12 Thanks, appreciate that. Yes, there is -- I do agree it's
13 really long and wordy.

14 Then the next one is page 55 and Section 3B.16.
15 Adding the words "if used." Because in this case -- let me
16 see if this is also related to the next page. On the bottom
17 where there's paragraph number 20 and a similar situation
18 here, limit lines. So on page number 55 on the Section
19 3B.16 we are adding "Stop lines, if used, should be used to
20 indicate the point." So because it's not that stop lines
21 have to be used in every instance and your limit line could
22 be the stop line. So because to clarify the differences
23 between the stop line and the limit line or sometimes even
24 a, I would say a pedestrian crosswalk and that line becoming
25 your limit line. So trying to clarify that language. That

1 was the public comment that was made and that's the reason
2 why we are using the "if used" statement. Hamid?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Johnny, does this
4 belong really in the MUTCD to say that if you want to
5 install them on the state highway you need an encroachment
6 permit and maintenance agreement? These are like
7 intergovernmental procedural issues, why are we adding that?
8 And that's just such a small paragraph. I'm just saying,
9 but why are we adding it?

10 MR. BHULLAR: When you say encroachment permit,
11 which --

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I'm looking at the
13 paragraph, the one under Standard on page 55. You're saying
14 in the Standard: If used on a state highway than markers
15 shall be installed by an encroachment permit and a
16 maintenance agreement. Those are procedural issues, why are
17 we --

18 MR. BHULLAR: Well, Hamid, we are not touching
19 that paragraph at all. Right now the only comment that we
20 are addressing was on Section 3B.16. What you are referring
21 to is paragraph number 8?

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

23 MR. BHULLAR: And that one is already in our
24 current manual and I do not know -- if you want to at least
25 discuss it I'll be more than happy to but we --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It's just one
2 paragraph and I couldn't care less whether it stays or not,
3 I'm just saying it doesn't belong in the MUTCD.

4 MR. BHULLAR: But that's not what we are proposing
5 at least as part of this item here.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: But there is
7 background of why they put this language in the CA MUTCD.
8 We can discuss some other day.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Another time because
10 it just says you need to get an encroachment permit and have
11 a maintenance agreement, it's got nothing to do with
12 devices.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Sure. Maybe we need another
14 workshop for that?

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I am not available
17 that day.

18 (Laughter.)

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: And now John has
20 switched my switch and I am now in the editorial mode. But
21 if you look at line 1 in 3B.16.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Mm-hmm.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Just to make it
24 clean. I think given what you've added it should be changed
25 to read "Stop lights, if used, should indicate."

1 MR. BHULLAR: I see.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So should be used.

3 MR. BHULLAR: Well, now we are wordsmithing but
4 that is more of Kevin Korth's type of issue because that is
5 black text and that is the Federal MUTCD text.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Okay.

7 MR. BHULLAR: I wouldn't mind if Kevin agrees.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: It's just a matter of
9 if you could say "if used" then it makes the other use --

10 MR. BHULLAR: I see.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So basically it's not
12 elimination --

13 MR. BHULLAR: So Kevin, can I have your buy-off on
14 that right on the fly or would you want to take time?
15 Because it does say "If used and be used" here. I do agree
16 it's more a directive of the same term.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Again, this is
18 guidance, Johnny.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yes.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Well, for guidance we can --

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, so let's move on.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I didn't mean to slow
23 us down.

24 MR. BHULLAR: All right.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'll slow us down

1 for a bit because so many of these comments refer to limit
2 lines and stoplights. I notice that the CA MUTCD definition
3 104a defines limit line but stop line is separately defined.
4 Can you enlighten me, at least, as to when one uses one term
5 and not the other.

6 MR. BHULLAR: All right. I think the limit line
7 is defined in the vehicle code. Is that what you were
8 looking at?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's in blue text so
10 it's a California-only thing. Plus it's 104a, so clearly
11 California-only. It's "a solid white line not less than 12
12 nor more than 24 inches wide." "Refer to Vehicle Code 377.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: John.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Then stop line is
15 separately defined.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: John, could you
18 speak up or use the mic because the people on the other side
19 cannot hear you.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm sorry. My
21 question was, I noticed that there are separate definitions
22 for Limit Line, definition 104a and Stop Line, which is --

23 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Stop Line is
25 definition 224, that's a Federal Highway definition. Why

1 the two terms?

2 MR. BHULLAR: All right. I think the question
3 here is regarding the stop line and the limit line and what
4 is the difference and why are there two terminologies?

5 First of all the limit line is defined in the
6 vehicle code and the limit line is typically the line where
7 the vehicles are required to come to stop; but however, the
8 stop line works directly with a stop sign. So normally if
9 you have a paved I would say surface, a road surface and
10 there is a stop sign, then the stop line can be put on the
11 road. Or I think it's a "should" or a "shall" I forget
12 exactly. That if the surface is paved then you should have
13 a line, which will be the stop line, and that will act as
14 your limit line.

15 However, if it is a traffic signal or if there is
16 a stop sign but there is a pedestrian crossing then the two
17 parallel lines for the pedestrian cross, the first line that
18 is approached by the vehicle becomes your limit line but it
19 is not a stop line because that is like a pedestrian
20 crosswalk. So the lines can mean different things but the
21 limit line is the first line encountered by motor vehicles
22 when approaching a traffic control, it could be a sign or a
23 yield sign, a stop sign or a traffic signal. And the first
24 transverse line that they approach, that is where they are
25 required to comply so that becomes the limit line. It could

1 be a stop line, it could be a yield line, it could be a
2 crosswalk.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay, I see.

4 MR. BHULLAR: So that's the difference.

5 All right, if we are okay with that then jumping
6 on to page 56. And similarly -- I think we just addressed
7 that. Because sometimes -- on the bottom of page 56 we're
8 talking about the yield line. Sometimes the line can be
9 either a yield or a stop line so I think I have already
10 discussed that.

11 Then continuing on.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I have a question
13 there.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Sure.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: According to the table
16 there was a comment regarding paragraphs 13 and 14 where it
17 says "yield" and then "stop" in parentheses in both places.

18 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, let me get to the comment.
19 That's in Section 3B.18. Comment number 6, you said?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: It's comment number 7.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Comment number 7. And that pertains
22 to Section 3B.16.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Right. Part of the
24 comment is regarding paragraphs 13 and 14.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, paragraph 13 and 14, okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And the commentor's
2 recommendation was to remove the word "stop" that's in
3 parentheses. And the workshop resolution indicates that we
4 agree but that is not being proposed to be removed.

5 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. So Atifa, here basically they
6 are saying --

7 MS. FEROUZ: I think we are right now doing
8 comment number 6.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, no, but we do say here --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I heard us about to
11 leave this page.

12 MR. BHULLAR: But here it says: "Paragraph 13 and
13 14." We say "Remove "(stop)" references to be consistent
14 with California law." And we said, "Agree, add reference
15 to --"

16 MS. FEROUZ: I think he we are saying we are
17 agreeing that we need to do something but we don't say we
18 particularly agree with what they are saying, so that's why
19 we just made reference to it.

20 MR. BHULLAR: No, but we do say here: "Section
21 3B.16 Paragraphs #1, #13 & #14 comments." We are agreeing
22 with it.

23 So in that case let me take a look. Yes, that's a
24 good catch. I think we did overlook that.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So basically Paragraph

1 13 we'd need to eliminate "stop" in the parentheses.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And in 14. Thirteen
3 and 14 have --

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Thirteen and 14 both.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Have the same
6 situation.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes. So just -- we
8 can cross out now and include it in the final.

9 MR. BHULLAR: But normally only a yield is
10 required. You see, I am trying to make sure that the
11 resolution -- I'll have to revisit my resolution on that
12 because California law only requires you to yield to a
13 pedestrian. And that could be accomplished by slowing down
14 when you approach. And when you are near if the crosswalk
15 is clear you don't have to come to a complete dead stop.

16 However, in other states you have to come to a
17 complete dead stop, even from a distance, if there was a
18 pedestrian. But once you come near -- and that's the reason
19 why we had struck out the stop here, the word. So I am
20 wondering if we may have mis-spoken or mis-agreed to that.
21 So let me look into it.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

23 MR. BHULLAR: And I'll probably bring it back at
24 the next meeting if we need to.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Do you want to bring

1 back to the next meeting or we fix it?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Whatever is necessary
3 is fine with me.

4 MR. BHULLAR: I will revisit that one and probably
5 bring it back. Because right off the bat when I look at it
6 I don't think I agree with it so it could be a mistake on
7 our part.

8 MS. FEROUZ: I think what we are saying here is
9 that these are regarding these paragraphs. But then we
10 agree that it needs a change but we only did the changes
11 that we agreed to as to reference Paragraph 5 for Paragraph
12 20.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. See, I think we are saying we
14 are only agreeing to add reference to Paragraph 5 and then
15 for Paragraph 20. But I will double-check anyhow.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

17 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. It could be an omission on our
18 part so I -- all right, we'll just look into it still to
19 make sure and report back to the Committee.

20 And then page 58. The words on page 58, "TRAIL
21 XING." They were not part of the manual before. We have
22 added it because -- because what has happened is in that
23 case there has been the TRAIL XING new signs have come up.
24 So because of that a similar word message for the pavement
25 marking so that has been added as well to the tools in the

1 toolbox.

2 And also I believe there is a figure that we
3 changed in our standard plans as well as the figure. And
4 figure is on page -- let me see. On page -- of your agenda
5 if you look at page number 68. We have added the dimensions
6 or the specifications with the dimensions as to showing how
7 you lay out the pavement markings for the words "TRAIL" --
8 "XING" is already there so that's not needed.

9 Then continuing on to page 59 of the agenda On
10 page 59 what we have done is we have added a Support
11 statement because there was a question that came up
12 regarding the pavement markings that we have on the side of
13 the road for CHP, especially for aircraft when they are --
14 for enforcement purposes when they are up in the aircraft
15 and trying to measure speeds of the vehicles out on the
16 highway below. And there is a change in the equation. What
17 we do is we try to have a marking that shows that at least
18 the distance is not consistent. So I believe if you go to
19 page -- the figure is shown in -- do we show the figure,
20 that figure?

21 (Mr. Bhullar and Ms. Ferouz discussing
22 amongst themselves.)

23 MR. BHULLAR: All right. Probably if you want I
24 can bring that up on the manual here.

25 Don, can you help us get the figure in the

1 meantime. While Don is pulling up the figure, basically the
2 comment that happened here was -- In this case what happened
3 there is that the question -- the comment was that was an
4 equation or what is the meaning behind the standard
5 statement in the paragraph above, which is Paragraph number
6 7 we have in the current manual on page 59 of your agenda
7 which says: "Where there is an equation of more than 100
8 feet in a 1 mile posting, a white "X" pavement marking shall
9 be placed at each end of the section to indicate the
10 markings are less than 1 mile apart."

11 We need the manual.

12 MR. HOWE: It's not -- it wasn't in the packet.

13 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. It's not in the agenda? For
14 some reason -- Probably close it. How many Caltrans
15 engineers do you need to bring up a figure?

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. BHULLAR: In Paragraph number 8 that we will
18 be numbering -- that we are putting a support statement that
19 says: "An equation is a place where post mile on a linear
20 feature, such as a highway or rail line, fail to increase
21 normally, usually due to realignment or changes in planned
22 alignment." So basically just trying to explain what it is.
23 Because as you can probably see, some of the new
24 engineers -- So here basically what we tried to do is we
25 tried to put the -- so this is the X that is marked on the

1 side so that at least it is not a contiguous distance. So
2 the other day I did ask or check with CHP and it's quite an
3 important bit of information, so we do not want the
4 engineers, especially the newer engineers, to forget as to
5 what the equation is and what is meant by that so it's
6 basically to define that in the manual.

7 And then after that we jump to page number 60 of
8 your agenda and to paragraph number 8 and 9. And those are
9 basically the National MUTCD paragraphs, numbers 8 and 9,
10 that in our current manual we have deleted them for some
11 reason. And again Steve Pyburn of FHWA California Division
12 Office had made a comment as to what was the purpose of
13 deleting it, at least.

14 Because there were a number of other things we had
15 deleted that were, I would say, appropriate, but this
16 happened to be the one that by mistake we had so we are
17 undeleting it, basically. It is not our information.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: So just a quick
19 question. So you don't know why or when maybe it was
20 deleted?

21 MR. BHULLAR: I know why.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Okay.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Basically when we were deleting
24 there were, like for curb marking here, basically we said
25 "The California Vehicle Code describes the colors of the

1 curb markings" and we just want to stick with that. And for
2 that reason we -- I would say in our haste we struck these
3 out as well. But when you read them it is very clear that
4 the retroreflectives here, they are not talking about the
5 colors that are in the vehicle code nor are they conflicting
6 with those. But in our haste at that time we wanted to say
7 the curb colors are defined by the California Vehicle Code,
8 we don't need anything else so we just had deleted them.
9 But, at least, these were not appropriate deletions, I would
10 say.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Yes. Because I was kind
12 of maybe telling myself a story. I thought maybe the idea
13 was kind of a preference to get away from marking your curbs
14 in the medians to trying to use object markers instead.
15 Because that blue text that was added there implied to me
16 that it was trying to give you some judgment to go put in an
17 object marker as a preferential treatment to your median
18 nose.

19 MR. BHULLAR: No. Since you are digging a little
20 bit below the surface I'll go into a little bit more detail
21 in that here the history is a little bit to deal -- it deals
22 with the older driver issue. So the feds took a little bit,
23 I would say opposition to it. Because even though our
24 reason was different and it wasn't applicable here but they
25 are encouraging the use of retroreflective markers not on

1 flat but vertical so that they give you some
2 retroreflectives on the bullnoses of medians and curbs. And
3 because of that all of a sudden when they saw this it was
4 running counter to what we are trying to do for the older
5 drivers.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Yes. Because we have
7 even gone further, as you know, with the KEEP RIGHT sign and
8 other median nose treatments --

9 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: -- to even go further
11 than just, you know, markings.

12 MR. BHULLAR: That's right.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: So I don't know, maybe
14 -- I don't have a problem with the change that is being
15 made, you know, to revert back to the federal language, but
16 I think the whole topic -- I've brought it up before. I
17 think probably eventually, I'm working in my mind, maybe a
18 future agenda topic just dealing with, you know, both the
19 signage and the markings and getting some consistency there
20 on how we're doing that for median, median nose treatments.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Well now that you are a voting
22 member you should be free to bring in an agenda item on
23 that.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Sure.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Sure. Okay, then on page 61.

1 Basically we had not deleted the figure before and now we
2 are deleting this figure for a couple of reasons. And the
3 reason primarily being the two-way left turn lane markings,
4 the way they are shown and the signs, we are already
5 indicating now in a much more clear way in our figures. And
6 the types of arrow or the shape of the arrow on the pavement
7 marking, the two-way left turn lane, is different the way
8 it's shown here as well as the -- so that's the reason why
9 we are deleting it.

10 And then on the next page when you look at it,
11 even we are deleting our own previous figure. And what
12 actually "deleting" means, if it's a California figure we
13 are just removing that and replacing it with the one that is
14 on the next page. And the primary difference that you will
15 see on page 62 and 63 is when you look at the pavement
16 markings for the arrows in the two-way left turn lane --

17 For some reason no one caught on but we had made a
18 mistake. And this one goes quite a way back in the sense
19 that our arrows that we are showing on page 62 are high-
20 speed arrows and normally high-speed arrows are not supposed
21 to be used on the regular roadway, they are primarily for
22 offramp type of situations. So we are modifying -- as you
23 can -- if you compare the shape of the arrows on the two-way
24 left turn lanes between existing and proposed on pages 62
25 and 63 you can make the connection. So we are just trying

1 to correct that.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Johnny.

3 MR. BHULLAR: Sure, John.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: In the lowest sub-
5 figure on agenda page 63 there is still one big arrow.

6 MR. BHULLAR: That's right. Yes, but still that
7 -- Yes, but that one also needs to be corrected, Atifa.

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That's for a left turn
9 pocket and it may be appropriate.

10 MS. FEROUZ: That's for left turn and --

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: This is for the left
12 turn pocket.

13 MR. BHULLAR: I see.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes. So it's a left
15 turn --

16 MR. BHULLAR: It depends on the speed of the
17 roadway. Yes, that will be the high speed.

18 MS. FEROUZ: We only changed the --

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: And again, left turn
20 arrows are different. The two are left turn arrows so
21 that's left --

22 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, but I think I still want to
23 check into it because normally high speed arrows are mainly
24 for offramps. For left turn lanes it might not be the way
25 we have shown it.

1 MS. FEROUZ: Like on the Sacramento streets most
2 of the left turns have these big arrows.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It is correct, Johnny.

4 MS. FEROUZ: So before changing it I did look
5 around.

6 MR. BHULLAR: All right. See, that's why I don't
7 take responsibility for Part 3 Markings.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Isn't the left arrow
9 on the other end of that figure wrong?

10 MR. BHULLAR: Which one?

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: There is also for the
12 left turn.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: The arrow on the
14 right hand side of that figure is backwards.

15 MS. FEROUZ: Yes. It's already been changed in
16 the -- I just didn't want to bring more paper.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: All right, okay.

18 MS. FEROUZ: When it goes to the manual it's going
19 to be correct.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Then that's the
21 smaller arrow and the other one is the high-speed arrow.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, so it's going to be -- yes.
23 See I told you, Atifa, the Committee does very closely look
24 at all our proposals.

25 MS. FEROUZ: But I still think the high-speed

1 arrow should still be a high-speed arrow for the left turn.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: But if you look at the
3 other one, a small one, that is not an intersection, you
4 know, it's just some --

5 MS. FEROUZ: No, that small arrow that is the
6 wrong direction, that's still part of the left turn.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Correct.

8 MS. FEROUZ: So that's why we changed it to small.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So is the other one.

10 MR. BHULLAR: So probably is this something that
11 we could --

12 MS. FEROUZ: No, because that one there is an
13 intersection, an intersection.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So we will correct --
15 make the correction and I don't think we need to bring it
16 back, you know. So we can make the correction.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Those are
18 editorial.

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Mark had a question.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: You covered
21 it.

22 MR. BHULLAR: All right. Then page 64 and page
23 65. Here basically in a nutshell what has happened is --
24 for those of you that weren't working with us back in 2006,
25 What we did is -- at that time was the first time the feds

1 had proposed what we call the yield line markings. And when
2 initially the yield line markings came in they came in as
3 shown in Figure 3b-16, not 3B-16(CA).

4 And at that time when we were working through our
5 workshop we figured that if we go with the feds there is
6 quite a variance in terms of the size of the yield
7 triangles. So the gap can be anywhere from 3 to 12 inches,
8 the size of the triangle itself can be anywhere from, I
9 would say, a 12 to 24 inch width and the height is from 18
10 to 36 inch.

11 So at that time we felt that if each jurisdiction
12 was doing their own way we could end up with a number of
13 small triangles or we could end up with just a couple of
14 large ones. So we tried in our, I would say wisdom at that
15 time, to try to standardize it because this was a new device
16 coming for California. We wanted to standardize it from day
17 one.

18 And we ended up going, of course, with the
19 dimension which is the max when you look at the federal
20 dimensions. However, as you can see, when you look at the
21 Figure 3B-16(CA) on page 64 you end up with -- on a 12-foot
22 lane you end with, I would say, a 6 inch on each side and
23 that's where you can lay out four.

24 But if you are trying to do the yield line
25 markings, say for a roundabout or a traffic circle and you

1 are trying to lay out rather than this perpendicular line or
2 a transverse line to the roadway, now you are trying to lay
3 out a line that is curving. Trying to do that with four
4 triangles, versus if you had the flexibility of the smaller
5 triangles the line lays out a little bit better.

6 So now we are trying to, in our proposal here,
7 revert back to the feds' original dimensions. So we are
8 trying to delete our only the max dimensions for the yield
9 line marking and go back to the flexibility so that the
10 engineer decides on certain cases, maybe a curvilinear
11 alignment, they can use the smaller triangles, the line lays
12 out better. So basically switching back to the feds'
13 figure. Okay. John.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I've been following
15 this because I'm interested in roundabouts and also advanced
16 yield lines for crosswalks. So as I understand the federal
17 figure, as I understand the federal figure, it states
18 minimums and maximums but it doesn't state fixed dimensions.

19 MR. BHULLAR: Then on page 66 of the agenda the
20 comment that was made was that there are a number of types
21 of markings for the crosswalks. However, there is a
22 national terminology, sometimes there are local
23 terminologies on what type of -- what are the terms or the
24 nomenclature for the crosswalk markings. So we were
25 requested and asked to come up with a standardized way at

1 least for the CA MUTCD as to what type of crosswalk markings
2 they are and what should we call them. So here is our
3 proposal, as you can see. We would take any comments if
4 there are any.

5 But if you look at page 66 on the top figure on
6 3B-19. For just the two parallel lines we want to stick to
7 the term Standard or Transverse. And then for -- then you
8 see the Diagonal then the Continental. On the bottom,
9 Ladder, Bar Pair then Double Continental. And of course the
10 open question is that the unmarked crosswalk, we are not
11 naming it. Do we want to call it Unmarked Crosswalk?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No.

13 MR. BHULLAR: All right. So any questions
14 regarding the terminology we have picked?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I've got all sorts
16 of questions from the lay public about whether is this
17 crosswalk if it's not marked and we have to go to is it an
18 intersection, is it not an intersection, et cetera. I don't
19 know whether it actually would clarify things to put the
20 word "unmarked" there but I had never heard of the
21 suggestion before and I'm intrigued by it. I don't want to
22 push it, though. Because people look at this figure and
23 they say, oh, there's only three crosswalks there.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: John, could you
25 speak up a little bit because I don't think Rick back there

1 can hear you and neither can probably Bill.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I was intrigued by
3 the comment someone else just made about should the unmarked
4 leg be so labeled. That's all that was said.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I think that's what
6 Johnny asked, if you want to call it an unmarked crosswalk.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: And I am also asking
8 regarding the terms we have picked even for the others.
9 Bill?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Yes. I am not
11 suggesting change to -- as far as the unmarked crossing, I
12 mean, just leaving it blank is fine. But I think -- How
13 does this tie in with other terminology in the manual
14 calling for high-visibility crosswalks? Is that term -- I
15 mean, the standard is, I believe -- it's not high-visibility
16 but -- are these other treatments? Or do you want to add a
17 cross-reference to show which are high-visibility?

18 MS. FEROUZ: I think that except for the standard
19 all the others are high-visibility.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: You are right, yes.

21 MS. FEROUZ: And the first figure, it was already
22 there in the California -- in the Federal MUTCD. And then
23 the bottom one, we added that figure.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Okay.

25 MS. FEROUZ: So we should -- I need to label it.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: So maybe just like a
2 little asterisk or -- it's up to you.

3 MS. FEROUZ: But these are -- well.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So basically, Bill,
5 except the top one is standard.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: All others are high-
8 visibility crosswalks. When you have more lines they
9 believe is more high --

10 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, but I believe Bill's question
11 is do w want to somehow identify that as high-visibility.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: If the text is saying
13 we just -- we are just referring to the text language on the
14 crosswalks, there is nothing else to say that. Because
15 that's in that.

16 MR. BHULLAR: If there is a need we could do it
17 with an asterisk.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Is there a need, Bill?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I would think that
20 would be a positive development.

21 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Because
23 practitioners new to the nuances of crosswalk markings may
24 not understand which is it, which is not, to the extent that
25 a support statement, explanatory statement is needed. The

1 thing that distinguishes a high-visibility marking, so-
2 called, is that it has markings in the longitudinal
3 direction that serve to increase the acuity beyond the two
4 transverse lines. I am not sure if you need to state that.

5 MR. BHULLAR: We'll come with the mechanism --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

7 MR. BHULLAR: -- to do it.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I like the asterisk
9 approach.

10 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Any other comments?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Kevin.

12 MR. KORTH: Did you say you're going to make the
13 bottom half a California figure?

14 MS. FEROUZ: Yes.

15 MR. KORTH: Number? A new number?

16 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

17 MS. FEROUZ: Can we also get an agreement for the
18 standard? Do we want to call it Standard or Transverse? Or
19 the bottom one, do we call it Double Continental or Triple
20 Four? Or we could just leave it as it is.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The specific term
22 Triple Four, I first heard it in Sacramento's standards and
23 it's -- by looking at that pattern you wouldn't guess that
24 it would be called Triple Four. The reason it's called
25 Triple Four is because each of those elements is four feet

1 wide.

2 MS. FEROUZ: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's a four foot
4 wide strip in the pedestrian's vision and a four foot wide
5 gap in the middle between the two. So a Double Continental
6 allows more geometries, Triple Four is a statement not only
7 -- Triple Four specifies --

8 MS. FEROUZ: It limits you to --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Dimensions.

10 MS. FEROUZ: Yes.

11 MR. HOWE: It probably should be more
12 proportionate so it does have a four-foot/four-foot.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Or equally
14 (inaudible).

15 MS. FEROUZ: Yes, I'll change that.

16 MR. BHULLAR: So you got that, Atifa?

17 MS. FEROUZ: Yes.

18 MR. BHULLAR: All right.

19 MS. FEROUZ: But should we call it -- so we will
20 call that one Double Continental. How about the first one?
21 Do we call it Standard or Transverse?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: I would just describe
23 it as Standard.

24 MS. FEROUZ: Standard, okay.

25 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Then continuing moving on to

1 the next page, page 67. On page 67 I do want to first
2 clarify that that's an existing figure from the current CA
3 MUTCD. And what you see in red is not the proposed change,
4 that is how the figure is and it's showing a red curb
5 marking. And basically it is trying to define that whether
6 an intersection is signalized or not, what type of controls
7 there are. How much amount of parking that needs to be
8 limited or restricted on either end for visibility or sign
9 distance purposes from the cross intersections.

10 So we are not making any amendments or changes to
11 that figure. The only change that we are proposing is a
12 dimension that was missing in our current manual and that is
13 on the bottom figure where you see in red there the four
14 feet dimension. That was left open and silent so we looked
15 it up through the design manual and we tried to come up with
16 -- and we are just adding that in just for clarification
17 that that is the four feet, what was the gap.

18 All right. The next page is page 68. We already
19 discussed that. We added the word TRAIL -- those are the
20 pavement stencils for the marking for the roadway.

21 Then the next one is page 69. On page 69 there
22 was a comment made and let me explain it. I would say at
23 face value the comment does not stand out as well because
24 initially even in our workshop we were getting confused and
25 then we realized what the comment was. Basically here what

1 is happening is (stepped away from the microphone to point
2 to the figure) on this figure what you see is that you see
3 this is even on the outside as well as the inside.

4 And normally the policy that we have in the CA
5 MUTCD is that the curve on the outside is where it gets
6 delineated. So the question was, why do you have it on the
7 inside as well? And because of that we are trying to
8 clarify now, the inside somehow -- this is not a California
9 figure, it's a National MUTCD figure. But the way it was
10 shown is that this is the only figure where they are showing
11 in this chapter for delineation purposes.

12 But the feds also chose to include not only just a
13 simple curve but they also included a very narrow bridge or
14 a restriction. And because of that here you see -- you have
15 a guardrail or some type of feature like that. And because
16 of that, as you can see, the ends of the guardrail are
17 coming in here and how it has become an object. And because
18 of the object -- so when you see those delineators here,
19 they are for this object, these delineators are for the
20 curve.

21 So the question was, why do we show it on both?
22 So we are trying to now indicate with this asterisk here
23 that not only about the distance but we also say use of
24 delineators when guardrail or other. So this side is -- we
25 tried to clarify that more -- (Mr. Bhullar returned to the

1 microphone) otherwise there was confusion regarding that so
2 that's who we are addressing the public comment. Any
3 questions?

4 All right. If not then we are on to page number
5 70. Here we are just making a reference to the
6 channelizers. Basically here the channelizers, the way they
7 were shown is, of course, only for the permanent type of
8 channelizers. However, we also have for work zones we have
9 channelizers and the portable channelizers that can be used.
10 When we say "portable" that doesn't mean temporary so
11 portable ones can be used for some other applications.

12 And because of that all we are doing here is
13 adding that figure reference. And let me see if I can pull
14 up that figure in our manual. And those certainly could be
15 used. So we are just making a reference to this figure as
16 well that this is where we lay out the difference between
17 what is a delineator versus what is a channelizer. So the
18 reference has been added in Chapter 3H because that was a
19 comment made.

20 And also we have in Paragraph number 10 on page 70
21 of your agenda, we have stricken out the words "on State
22 highways" meaning that during the workshop we did discuss,
23 we don't want to have -- of course, that still there are a
24 number of situations in the CA MUTCD where we have, on state
25 highways do this, on local roadways do this. So this

1 happened to be the one that at least we discussed and at
2 that time we felt that even though the current language in
3 the manual says, this is how you do it on state highways.
4 But since local agencies in the workshop were agreeable to
5 this so we chose to strike out the words "on State highways"
6 and by doing that it becomes applicable to all public
7 roadways.

8 And I believe that is it. Any questions,
9 comments? Thank you very much.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: A lot of changes.
11 Let me -- technically I have to open it to the public also
12 to see if anyone has any comments on this but first I want
13 to make sure the Committee is all done with it. Any more
14 comments or questions from the Committee Members on these
15 proposed changes?

16 Seeing none I open it to the public. Any members
17 of the public who wish to address the Committee on any of
18 these proposed changes?

19 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway. I just
20 wanted to double-check. In your Table, number 7, on page
21 690.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: What is the agenda
23 page? Fifty-six?

24 MR. KORTH: Page 56. The reference that we should
25 just amend it to seeing Paragraph 5 and not clarify it, like

1 we mentioned in a previous agenda item.

2 MR. BHULLAR: I see.

3 MR. KORTH: That we are just going to mention
4 Paragraph 5 but don't include the additional description.

5 MR. BHULLAR: We agree with that. Basically I
6 forgot to mention that when we talked about page number 53
7 when we were -- at that time I said that we were going to
8 add the term "except as provided in Paragraph 5" and just
9 leave it at that and strike out the rest. So Kevin is
10 suggesting that we do the same thing on page 56 of the
11 agenda and we agree with that.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's on paragraph
13 20, right?

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

15 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, it is.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Thank you.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Anyone
18 else from the public who wishes to address the Committee on
19 these proposed changes?

20 Seeing none we close the public hearing; back to
21 the Committee. Okay, we have had a good dialogue back and
22 forth. Now we need a motion to approve the proposed changes
23 with the amendments and discussions that you had.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Move to
25 approve per our discussion with the amendments as noted.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion,
2 is there a second?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Second.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion
5 and a second. Discussion?

6 Seeing none, all those in favor?

7 (Ayes.)

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

9 Abstention?

10 The motion passes unanimously.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Thank you very much.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thanks, Mr. Bhullar.
13 Great job, as always.

14 Okay, I guess we are done with the agenda for
15 today so we are going to adjourn at 4:00 o'clock exactly.
16 We will convene tomorrow at 8:30, the same place.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Could I, Hamid?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure, Larry.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Can I make just a
20 couple of comments?

21 Tomorrow morning at 8:00 o'clock the library -- or
22 8:30, the library is not open yet but the garage will be
23 open. And when you enter you won't go through the library
24 itself. There is a gate on the side over here and you will
25 come in this door or the other side door to get in, in the

1 morning.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So basically this door
3 on this side?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: There's two gates. So
6 I will try to put a sign tomorrow. I will be here around
7 8:00 o'clock, maybe before 8:00, 7:45. So I'll put up a few
8 signs. So we are not going to go through the main gate,
9 there's side gate over here, two gates, so they will be
10 open.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PATTERSON: And we have one more
12 comment. As we go through our discussions tomorrow, we are
13 time limited to about 3:00 o'clock. We need to be out of
14 here at 3:00 o'clock. Looking at the agenda, that shouldn't
15 be difficult but I'll try not --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We'll be done by
17 3:00. Those of you who have flight reservations for anytime
18 later, including myself, change your flight time because we
19 are going to be done before 3:00.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes, we should, yes.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you for the
22 reminder.

23 And so tomorrow --

24 By the way, so somehow if there are people who
25 come for agenda items tomorrow, they need to be warned that

1 the library is closed but they have to access from the side
2 gate.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I will post some
4 signs.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, will do.
6 Thank you all. See you tomorrow.

7 (Thereupon, the meeting of the California
8 Traffic Control Devices Committee adjourned
9 at 4:00 p.m., to continue February 20, 2014
10 at 8:30 a.m.)

11 --oOo--

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, John Cota, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Department of Transportation, California Traffic Control Devices Committee meeting; that it was thereafter transcribed.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 17th day of March, 2014.

JOHN COTA

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

March 17, 2014

RAMONA COTA, CERT**478