

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

MEETING OF THE  
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

CALTRANS DISTRICT 7  
ROOM 01.040.A  
100 SOUTH MAIN STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2015  
9:00 A.M.

Reported by: Martha L. Nelson

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

Hamid Bahadori, Chairman

Mark Greenwood, Vice Chairman

Rob Brown

John Ciccarelli

Chris Engelmann, Committee Secretary

Bryan Jones

Rick Marshall

Lt. David Ricks

Duper Tong

Jay Walter

William Winter

Alternate Committee Members in Attendance

Michael Kenney

Rock Miller

Caltrans Staff - Sacramento Office

Jerry Champa, Statewide Traffic Safety Liaison

Don Howe, Chief, Signs Branch  
Office of Traffic Engineering

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

Bob Bronkall  
Humboldt County Department of Public Works

Ken Husting  
Los Angeles Department of Transportation

Kevin Korth  
US Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration

John Lieswyn  
Alta Planning + Design

Zaki Mustafa  
Los Angeles Department of Transportation

Michelle Mowery  
City of Los Angeles

Luu Nguyen  
Caltrans, Division of Traffic Operations  
Office of District Traffic Liaisons/Reviewers

Craig Rhodes  
Traffic Management Incorporated

David Royer  
Consultant

David Somers  
Los Angeles Department of City Planning

LeGrand E. Velez  
Coachella Valley Association of Governments

Lewis Yee  
Caltrans, District 7

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
Welcome	6
<u>Organization Items</u>	
1. Introductions	6
2. Approval of Minutes of the September 25, 2014 Meeting	10
3. Public Comments	10
4. Items Under Experimentation	11
<u>Agenda Items</u>	
5. Public Hearing	
14-05 Bicycle Signal Faces - CA MUTCD edits	13
15-01 Proposal to modify CTCDC meeting format	79
15-02 Request for opinion on whether new legislation is necessary in order to experiment with HOV/Express lane striping	97
15-03 CA MUTCD edits in Sections 2B.54, 2C.37, 4D.27, 4E.08, 4I.03, 4N.02	W/D
15-04 Coachella Valley NEV Plan and associated TCDs	109
15-05 Proposed update for "Construction Funding Identification Sign"	169
15-08 Modify CA MUTCD Section 6F.01 to include Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH) criteria	182

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
6. Request for Experimentation	
15-06 Request Experimental status for a dynamic roadside information sign that provides travelers information on time to destination	W/D
15-07 Request Experimental status for a pedestrian crossing flashing beacon	W/D
-- Request for Experimentation with newly designed parking signs - Submitted by the City of Los Angeles Amendment to the Agenda	185
7. Information Items	None
8. Discussion Items	
14-02 "PRESERVE AMERICA" sign not added in 2014 CA MUTCD in Section 2D.104(CA) to the CA MUTCD due to risk of not meeting substantial conformance with 2009 MUTCD	217
9. Tabled Items	None
10. Next Meeting	219
11. Adjourn	220
Certificate of Reporter/Transcriber	221

W/D = Item Withdrawn

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:10 a.m.

1  
2  
3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Let's call the  
4 meeting to order. We are starting a few minutes late, we  
5 had some issues, technical challenges over there. They are  
6 giving me the thumbs up, we are ready to go.

7 Okay, good morning everyone. I am Hamid Bahadori.  
8 Welcome to the meeting of March 5th of the California  
9 Traffic Control Devices Committee.

10 With that we go through our agenda. We start with  
11 introductions and we will start with Mr. Marshall over  
12 there.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Good morning. I'm  
14 Rick Marshall with Napa County Public Works and I represent  
15 the northern counties on the Committee.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Good morning, Mr. Chair.  
17 Jay Walter, Public Works Director of the City of San Carlos  
18 and I represent the northern cities of California.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: And I'm Bob Brown. I'm  
20 the VP of Communications and Community Affairs for AAA of  
21 Northern California, Nevada and Utah.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Good morning. I'm Bill  
23 Winter, Deputy Director for the Los Angeles County  
24 Department of Public Works and I represent the southern  
25 counties.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Good morning. Lieutenant  
2 David Ricks with the California Highway Patrol.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: Good morning. My name is  
4 Duper Tong. I'm with Caltrans. I'm the Office Chief of  
5 Traffic Engineering. The CA MUTCD and CTCDC is under my  
6 office.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Good morning.  
8 Chris Engelmann; I'm with the Caltrans Office of Traffic  
9 Engineering under Duper. I am currently the Acting Editor  
10 of the California MUTCD and the secretary.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Good morning. I am  
12 Mark Greenwood. I am the Director of Public Works for the  
13 City of Palm Desert and I represent southern cities.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Good morning. John  
15 Ciccarelli, Consultant based in San Francisco, Bicycle  
16 Solutions, representing the needs of non-motorized  
17 travelers.

18 MR. HOWE: Good morning. My name is Don Howe.  
19 I'm technical support today. I do have a presentation for  
20 Agenda Item 15-05.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Before  
22 we go to the audience, Mr. Miller, I forgot who you are  
23 alternating for. Is that for John or for Bryan?

24 ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: It is for  
25 Bryan, who is absent.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So why don't you  
2 come sit at the dais --

3 ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Until he shows  
4 up.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Until he shows up,  
6 if he shows up.

7 ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I'll be happy  
8 to.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So do you want to  
10 introduce yourself, Mr. Miller?

11 ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Rock Miller  
12 with Stantec Consulting, a consultant representing walking  
13 and biking interests.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: As our tradition  
15 goes, we go to the audience. If you would please introduce  
16 yourself, the agency you represent, and if there is any  
17 agenda item that you are specifically here for.

18 (The members of the audience introduced  
19 themselves away from the microphone.)

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Chris,  
21 do we have any item that, before we go to public comments,  
22 any item that needs to be deferred or delayed?

23 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: There's a couple  
24 OF items. One is Agenda Item 15-03, CA MUTCD edits.  
25 Basically, what this is about, it includes the METER ON

1 signs that are activated blank-out signs. In our last  
2 meeting in September the entire agenda item was not  
3 discussed but it turns out that the METER ON activated sign  
4 was previously approved in, we believe, 2013, at a CTCDC  
5 meeting. So I felt, well, we don't need to talk about it  
6 again.

7           And then the other portion of that is some edits  
8 where we are changing "blank-out sign" to "activated  
9 blank-out" or "internally illuminated" to "activated  
10 blank-out." We are also providing the sign designations for  
11 the METER ON activated blank-out sign. So I felt these are  
12 just some minor editorial items that would not need to be  
13 discussed at this meeting.

14           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So 15-03 is removed  
15 from the agenda?

16           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: That's one item.

17           And then we had a couple of requests for  
18 experimentation, 15-06 and 15-07. Those items have been  
19 withdrawn. And that's all the changes I have.

20           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So 15-03, 15-06 and  
21 15-07 will not be heard today.

22           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Correct.

23           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anybody who is here  
24 on those items, your item is not going you be on the agenda  
25 today. Thank you.

1           With that, we will go to public comments. And if  
2 there is any member of the audience who wishes to address  
3 the Committee on an item that is not on the agenda, if you  
4 would please step forward. Seeing none, we close.

5           I missed the approval of the minutes, number two.  
6 Let's go back to approval of the minutes. Any member who  
7 wishes to make a motion for approval of the minutes?

8           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I'll  
9 move approval.

10          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's a motion.  
11 Is there a second?

12          COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Second.

13          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's a motion and  
14 a second. Any discussion, additions, corrections to the  
15 minutes? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

16          (Ayes.)

17          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

18          The motion passes unanimously.

19          Under public comments, also, are there any  
20 comments from the Committee Members on issues that are not  
21 on the agenda?

22          Seeing none we move forward. Four, Items Under  
23 Experimentation. Which one is that, Chris?

24          COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I have just a  
25 couple of comments on that.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: So on Item 11-13,  
3 the County of Los Angeles has requested an additional year  
4 of collecting data. This is the "Reckless Driving  
5 Prohibited" signs. I spoke with former CTCDC Secretary  
6 Devinder and felt like it would be okay to provide them with  
7 additional time to finish their experimentation. So they  
8 had issues with collecting the data, the collision data and  
9 the number of citations issued.

10 The other item is there was an update on Item  
11 12-9, experiment with yellow LED border on pedestrian  
12 signal. The agenda shows what the update is. And  
13 Mr. Stinger with District 2 informed me that at the next  
14 CTCDC meeting they will be presenting a final report on  
15 this.

16 That's all I have.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Great, thank you.

18 Any questions on Item 4 from members of the  
19 Committee? Any members of the audience who wish to address  
20 the Committee on Item 4?

21 Seeing none, moving forward, on the  
22 experimentation just -- colleagues, you noticed that there  
23 was a last minute amendment to the agenda. That was a  
24 request from LADOT. It's kind of unorthodox and it's not  
25 like a tradition of the Committee to bring items for

1 experimentation on such a short notice. And I appreciate  
2 Caltrans for accommodating that.

3           It goes back to the core issue of what the  
4 Committee's function is and how we serve Caltrans and the  
5 state as a whole. That we have worked for decades to reach  
6 uniformity and to reach some standard of practices in the  
7 signage and striping in public right-of-ways.

8           So it is very important, also, to remain flexible,  
9 at least to meet some city's urgency needs. Politics and  
10 local requirements and community concerns, to kind of  
11 accommodate them so that they do not see the Devices  
12 Committee and Caltrans' approval as a (inaudible), but as a  
13 facilitator. And to work with them and to make the  
14 experimentation process more efficient rather than the city  
15 saying, oh, well, this is a cumbersome process, it's going  
16 to take forever and it's going to take six months for me to  
17 get on the agenda.

18           So that's why we asked this. This is an important  
19 issue for the City of Los Angeles. That's why it was added.  
20 And we applaud the City of Los Angeles for not bypassing the  
21 Committee process and to -- and awaiting signage.

22           And again, as I said, we have all worked for  
23 decades in the state and nationally to come to some  
24 uniformity. Because traffic is like water and it's like  
25 air; locals do not have their own air quality standards and

1 they don't have their own water quality standards.

2 As far as traffic is concerned, the political  
3 boundaries, they are meaningless, they are invisible lines.  
4 When a driver drives from the City of L.A. to the City of  
5 Pasadena, he's just driving. So it's very important to have  
6 the same uniform standards. And we appreciate the city  
7 staff for bringing that to the Committee.

8 We go to public hearing. Agenda 14-05, which is a  
9 bicycle signal face. Mr. Ciccarelli, that's your item.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thank you, Hamid.

11 I have presented this item at a prior meeting and  
12 we had substantial discussion. It was felt that more work  
13 was needed. There were several unresolved issues. In  
14 addition we had comments from the California Bicycle  
15 Advisory Committee. It was decided to bring it to our  
16 January meeting, which became this meeting, and so I have  
17 had an opportunity to take it twice to the California  
18 Bicycle Advisory Committee, in December and again in their  
19 February meeting. In discussing also with several  
20 practitioners who are interested in deploying this device,  
21 in particular City of Berkeley for use of the device with  
22 the pedestrian hybrid beacon, and Beth Thomas, D4 Branch  
23 Chief for Bicycle and Pedestrian, who is working with the  
24 City of Berkeley and was a good reference on what Caltrans  
25 would and would not allow to be approved based on draft

1 language that it is in this item.

2 I've made some changes. I think the changes have  
3 resolved all the issues that were raised by the public and  
4 raised at the California Bicycle Advisory Committee, which  
5 was the source of most of the substantive comments. So what  
6 I have --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I think you need to  
8 use the tip of a pen to push that button there. It did  
9 that --

10 MR. HOWE: Actually, that one is that way. This  
11 one should probably be working today.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I just saw a  
13 gentleman do that this morning.

14 MR. HOWE: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Until they get the  
16 mic fixed, let the minutes reflect that Mr. Jones, a  
17 Committee Member, also arrived and is joining us.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Sorry, Amtrak was a  
19 little late, they had a malfunction on the tracks.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Is the microphone  
21 that I'm using working?

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I can pass this on  
23 and then we can pass it back.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thank you,  
25 Mr. Chair.

1           So what I've done is modified the text that's in  
2 the current agenda packet. And the text that is in the  
3 current agenda packet is substantially unchanged from the  
4 version that I presented in September. But I have  
5 additional modifications that I want to bring to the  
6 Committee that resolve the public input, especially from  
7 CBAC, so this draft is not in the packet.

8           The draft presented in September used colors to  
9 indicate its source. And to recap, this is not a proposal  
10 composed of whole cloth. It's rather derived from work that  
11 was done at the national level by the NCUTCD, that's our  
12 national corresponding committee, and it's subcommittees  
13 called the Bicycle Technical Committee and the Signals  
14 Technical Committee. The BTC and STC put together a joint  
15 proposal with much deliberation based in turn on Federal  
16 Highways Interim Approval Number 16 for bicycle signal  
17 faces. So that NCUTCD proposal was approved and is on its  
18 way to FHWA for the, presumably, 2016 US MUTCD. So it's  
19 pretty solid. It's been heavily vetted at the national  
20 level.

21           That said, California actually led the way on  
22 bicycle signal faces. We had it in our manual before it was  
23 even discussed at the national level. It was first  
24 originated as an item in Davis and brought forward to the  
25 CTCDC in the 1990s. It made its way into the Caltrans

1 Traffic Manual, and then into the, I believe, the 2003 or  
2 2006 CA MUTCD.

3           The definition and rules for use in the CA MUTCD  
4 to date has been very restrictive. There was fear among  
5 bicycle technical advocates that proliferation of a bicycle  
6 signal would lead to onerous restrictions on the movement of  
7 bicycles; so that fear was expressed in three warrants.

8           One was a geometric warrant, which is reasonable.  
9 It basically governs the approaches that shall be controlled  
10 by a bicycle signal.

11           There was also a collision warrant. And the  
12 collision warrant was sort of a chicken or the egg situation  
13 for local jurisdictions that wanted to apply the device  
14 because a lot of the installations were new installations  
15 where there was no collision history.

16           And the third was a volume warrant. It was a  
17 product of motor vehicle-entering volume and bicycle-  
18 entering volume into the intersection. And that was a bar  
19 that was set rather high, I think the product was 50,000.

20           So the collision and volume warrants and the  
21 geometric warrant are in the current MUTCD.

22           To compare, the federal version that is going  
23 forward to the next National MUTCD does not have such  
24 warrants. It has the usual language governing how a signal  
25 or a signal element shall be applied, including which

1 approaches it shall be facing and what the meaning of the  
2 signal face is for those approaches. So in that respect  
3 they have not introduced at the national level warrants  
4 comparable to our collision warrant or geometric or volume  
5 warrant. And so one of the changes in the U.S. version, the  
6 draft U.S. version that we wish to accept, is this deletion  
7 of warrants.

8           So in the full proposal before our Committee I've  
9 done a couple of things to indicate the changes from the  
10 current CA MUTCD in terms of sections that would be deleted,  
11 for example, those warrant sections that would no longer  
12 apply because they've been superseded by the lack of a  
13 volume warrant or a collision warrant at the national level,  
14 and conversely, some way of indicating content that would be  
15 specific to California.

16           There are certain restrictions in the national  
17 draft that, based on our California experience and also work  
18 that we did that goes beyond the time that the National  
19 Committee has had to work, we wish to apply the device in  
20 contexts that the national proposal does not address.

21           One in particular is the use of the bicycle signal  
22 face in combination with what i called a pedestrian hybrid  
23 beacon. A pedestrian hybrid beacon is a traffic signal-like  
24 device.

25           This is -- so the structure of the national

1 proposal, which is incorporated into what's before the  
2 Committee here -- I guess I ought to scroll the right way --  
3 is that the national proposal begins with a cover memo. And  
4 the cover memo contains a summary and a discussion. These  
5 are not part of the eventual MUTCD text but rather  
6 background information and context information to help you  
7 understand the proposal. So we have incorporated this in  
8 our CTCDC proposal verbatim. And if you wish to read some  
9 of the rationale that went into the national draft you can  
10 do so in this initial segment.

11           The proposal itself begins here with recommended  
12 changes to the CA MUTCD. Notice the green text. This was  
13 my way of indicating California-specific content. So this  
14 would be content that might be specific to removing certain  
15 existing sections of the CA MUTCD, namely those warrants, or  
16 additions or changes to the national proposal. So this was  
17 explained before the Committee back at our September  
18 meeting, I just wanted to recap that.

19           And today I have introduced yet another color  
20 because there are certain edits that I made recently to  
21 address the public comment and the CBAC Advisory Committee  
22 comment, and I've made those changes in blue. So blue is  
23 also confusingly the color that the CA MUTCD uses to denote  
24 differences between our state manual and the federal manual.  
25 My use of blue today is not that use, it is to indicate late

1 changes to the proposal before us today.

2           So I want to go through -- in the correct scroll  
3 direction. So for example, where there are California-  
4 specific changes I have bracketed those changes with the  
5 "Begin California only" and "End California only". In some  
6 cases there's commentary which I have put in in green  
7 highlight.

8           So as with any traffic control device the MUTCD  
9 content actually begins in section 1A in the definition  
10 section. If it's a new thing it needs to be defined. So  
11 this is federal language, draft federal language,

12           "A bicycle signal face is a signal face  
13 consisting of three or more signal sections that  
14 exclusively controls a bicycle movement from a  
15 designated lane or separate facility such as a  
16 shared-use path, and that displays signal  
17 indications applicable only to the bicycle  
18 movement."

19           And a signal indication is the piece -- the single  
20 section and what it displays that goes into making up a  
21 bicycle signal face.

22           So here begins a California-only section, which is  
23 to delete the existing 4C.102, signal Warrant, and to  
24 supersede the geometric warrant in 4C.102 with the new  
25 proposal from the Federal level, 40.04 and 90.03, which

1 govern the geometries of intersections where this will be  
2 used. So what follows is a deletion of existing CA MUTCD  
3 content and then begins the bulk of the national content.  
4 So restating the desire of the use of the device.

5           The signal face itself is composed of indications,  
6 as is any signal. Those indications in bicycle signal faces  
7 can be either bicycle symbol icons, that is the shape of a  
8 bicycle that lights up red or yellow or green, or they can  
9 be circular indications like a conventional signal, if and  
10 only if accompanied with a new sign, the bicycle signal sign  
11 be placed adjacent to the bicycle signal face to make it  
12 clear to all approaching users that this is a signal face  
13 that applies only to bicycle traffic.

14           In addition, faces composed of arrow indications,  
15 again accompanied with the bicycle signal sign, can be used  
16 to control bicycle movements that involve turns.

17           The new section XX.02, How To Use These, begins  
18 with a short summary of the uses anticipated for this  
19 device. One is to address bicyclists' noncompliance with  
20 previous traffic control, to provide leading or lagging  
21 bicycle interval. It is desirable, especially at large  
22 complex intersections with heavy right-turn movements, to do  
23 something analogous to what is done with what's called  
24 leading pedestrian interval, which is to allow bicyclists a  
25 head start into the intersection so they can get beyond or

1 occupy the area where a right-turn conflict will occur  
2 before the motorist that will conflict with them is allowed  
3 to enter the intersection. That's called a leading  
4 interval.

5           To continue the bicycle lane on the right side of  
6 an exclusive turn lane. On some facilities intense  
7 arterials are being equipped with what's called a cycle  
8 track. A cycle track is a right-side facility similar to a  
9 bike lane, but it is separated from the major cross-section  
10 of the roadway by, for example, parked cars or other raised  
11 barriers. So this is unusual in conventional bike lane  
12 practice and it requires separate signal control when you  
13 get to the intersection. Because if you're kept at the curb  
14 you're essentially in what would otherwise be the right-turn  
15 area.

16           And so this is one use of a bicycle signal face at  
17 such an intersection as to convey the bicyclists in the  
18 intersection while holding off through movements and turning  
19 movements by other traffic. That would be item C.

20           To augment the design of a contra-flow bicycle  
21 facility, a contra-flow bicycle facility is conceptually a  
22 two-way street for both motor traffic and bicycle traffic on  
23 which the motor traffic in one direction has been removed.  
24 Okay. So all that's left is the bicycle traffic. It's a  
25 two-way street but it's mode specific in one direction.

1 That can be surprising to motorists who are turning across  
2 or proceeding in the opposite direction of the contra  
3 bicycle traffic. It's not really contra to any traffic law,  
4 it's just a degenerate case of a two-way street. So a  
5 bicycle signal face may be able to offer clarity in that  
6 regard.

7           Item E is to handle, it's kind of the catchall,  
8 provide for unusual or unexpected arrangements.

9           And finally, something that was omitted or  
10 prohibited in the Interim Approval 16, and also not  
11 addressed by the national draft, is to provide for bicycle  
12 movements parallel to the pedestrian crossing movements  
13 controlled by a pedestrian hybrid beacon. A hybrid beacon  
14 faces the major -- it's to control a crossing of a major  
15 street by a minor street. This is a situation where, for  
16 example, you might have a four-way intersection and the  
17 minor leg would otherwise have a stop sign. Okay. You want  
18 to provide a more positive way of getting both pedestrians  
19 and bicyclists across the major street without having to  
20 wait a long time for gaps.

21           And so the pedestrian hybrid beacon is directed at  
22 making that easier for pedestrians. It faces the major leg  
23 with a three-section indication, two reds over a yellow,  
24 kind of like a firehouse signal. And it has its own  
25 sequence which, unlike a signal, rests in a dark phase. So

1 that's why it's a beacon instead of a signal. And by  
2 stepping through flashing yellow, solid yellow, solid red,  
3 flashing red, and back to dark, it provides a phase sequence  
4 into which the minor street can see a pedestrian cycle. So  
5 when the pedestrian -- when the major street finally gets to  
6 solid red the minor street or the crossing direction if it  
7 is not a street, gets a pedestrian "walk" indication. And  
8 then during the next phase, which is the wigwag flashing red  
9 for the major street, the minor street gets the pedestrian  
10 clearance interval or countdown.

11 So this is a device that was added to the MUTCD in  
12 2009 Federal and 2012 California. It is the subject of  
13 Chapter 4F. So this is in the manual.

14 What this proposal wants to do is provide for a  
15 way to combine that with a separate indication, also facing  
16 the minor approaches for bicycle traffic, so bicycle traffic  
17 can be safely conveyed across. Why is this needed? Why  
18 can't the bicyclists simply look at the pedestrian signal?  
19 Because there's a catch; there's a gotcha.

20 When the pedestrian countdown is operating the  
21 major leg if seeing a flashing red, which is equivalent to a  
22 stop sign. That is a stop, look and proceed. But  
23 bicyclists approaching a conventional intersection at which  
24 a countdown is operating think that they still have a green  
25 indication. So absent a conventional traffic signal they

1 think that the condition is still such that they can go into  
2 the intersection without looking or yielding. So they could  
3 be nailed by a motorist proceeding from the legal stop  
4 condition on the major leg during the flashing red.

5           So by phasing the bicycle signal face in such a  
6 way that an additional phase is added, we can resolve this.  
7 So what we have done is allowed for that here in sentence F,  
8 and also added a bit of additional detail to the phasing  
9 diagram for the pedestrian hybrid beacon and that becomes a  
10 new figure in this proposed section. So I will explain that  
11 in a little bit more detail later.

12           Guidance for agencies, okay, one issue that came  
13 up. I want to go through this as an overview and then come  
14 back and cover in detail the seven areas of public comment  
15 that were addressed by my latest edits, but here is one of  
16 them. In the guidance paragraph the national proposal says  
17 that a bicycle signal face should only be used to control  
18 bicycle movements from basically either a bicycle only area,  
19 that is a designated bicycle lane, or from a separate  
20 facility such as a shared-use path which is non-motorized,  
21 so it's bicycles and pedestrians.

22           To use a bicycle signal face in a street-street  
23 intersection where the minor leg is a neighborhood street,  
24 an ideal place to convey bicycle traffic across a major  
25 street, that approach is not going to have a bicycle lane

1 typically. It's a minor street, it doesn't justify a  
2 bicycle lane, and it's also not a shared-use path. So  
3 without the permission to also control a shared-lane  
4 approach, the device couldn't be deployed in the context in  
5 which most of the cities that are doing what are called  
6 bicycle boulevards or neighborhood streets, sort of a  
7 secondary network part of the bicycle network, couldn't use  
8 it.

9           There was concern --

10           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Ciccarelli?

11           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes?

12           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sorry to interrupt  
13 you. Let me ask the members if they want to go through the  
14 detail of each new item and the rationale, or if they have  
15 questions? If you have had the chance to read the report  
16 and if you would prefer to ask Mr. Ciccarelli specific  
17 questions or do you want him to still continue and go  
18 through the whole thing? Mr. Marshall. Mr. Secretary.

19           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I think if  
20 Mr. Ciccarelli could just point out just the changes that  
21 he's proposing today that we have not seen yet --

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Great.

23           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: -- that has been  
24 distributed to us. We've had a chance to read this.

25           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: We don't need to  
2 be taking --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I think it might  
4 expedite the process a little bit. Sorry, go ahead.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thanks. I was all  
6 set for a dissertation. I'd be glad to.

7 So one of the seven items that came up was whether  
8 control of a shared-lane approach should be added to the  
9 differences between our proposal and the federal proposal --  
10 the federal draft, I should say. And the issue here is that  
11 many streets, including very major streets, don't have a  
12 bicycle facility and they don't have a bicycle lane. So a  
13 typical L.A. five- to seven-lane arterial coming up to an  
14 intersection, if bike lanes haven't been put on there then  
15 the outside lane is a shared lane.

16 Okay, so does it make sense to place a bicycle  
17 signal there for whatever reason to convey bicycles into the  
18 intersection separately, perhaps in advance of motor  
19 traffic? And how does the motorist in that shared lane  
20 interpret the two indications that are being given, which is  
21 the bicycle indication and the conventional traffic signal  
22 indication?

23 However, in the case of the pedestrian hybrid  
24 beacon usage, what's facing the motorist is not a traffic  
25 signal and it's not a multi-lane approach, it's most likely

1 a single-lane approach. So to cover the case of the bicycle  
2 boulevards or neighborhood greenways, it would be sufficient  
3 to allow the use of the bicycle signal face on a shared  
4 approach, provided that shared approach was only a single  
5 lane. So that is the compromise that I've inserted here to  
6 allow use with the street zone, which most practitioners are  
7 going to want to deploy this. So that's one difference.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Mr. Chair?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes. Go ahead.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Question, John. As far  
11 as that goes, in that application where you've shown the  
12 change, a single-lane shared-lane approach, is it intended  
13 that the traffic signal would have a separate phase for the  
14 bicycle signal face, as well as the regular ground ball  
15 vehicular indications?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Because this  
17 paragraph governs where a bicycle signal face can face, the  
18 approaches it can face, presumably there's existing traffic  
19 control for motor vehicles approaching. If it's a  
20 signalized approach they would be seeing a traffic signal.  
21 If it's a pedestrian hybrid beacon approach they would be  
22 seeing a pedestrian hybrid beacon. That is, no motor  
23 traffic indication.

24 Now the issue came up -- I'm glad you actually  
25 brought this up, it's worth covering. Because Berkeley's

1 specific sort of test intersection is State Highway 13,  
2 Ashby Avenue, intersecting Hillegass Street, which is one of  
3 these local streets. At that intersection the current  
4 traffic control for Hillegass, the minor leg, is a stop  
5 sign. The MUTCD and the California Vehicle Code clearly  
6 prohibit the use of a stop sign in addition to a traffic  
7 signal on the same approach.

8           And I went back and forth with Berkeley on this.  
9 And with the advice of Beth Thomas Berkeley said, well, what  
10 if we replace that stop sign with a flashing red ball, and  
11 maybe posted a sign on the flashing red ball that said  
12 "vehicle signal", which is not an existing sign. And  
13 Caltrans District 4 agreed that that would address it and  
14 Berkeley is happy with it so that's actually what I'm  
15 proposing, is that we never have stop sign indication  
16 combined with a bicycle signal face, just as we'd never have  
17 a stop sign combined with a conventional signal face.

18           Have I answered your question?

19           COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: No, but go on. You said  
20 you had other changes that you suggest making, but it didn't  
21 really answer my question as it related to separate control  
22 phases for the bicycle signal indications versus the  
23 vehicular indications?

24           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That is the whole  
25 idea of a bicycle signal face is that it's a new traffic

1 control device that would be added to an intersection. If  
2 it's being added to a signalized approach the existing  
3 signal would still be there and it would still govern the  
4 motor vehicle movements.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: What he was asking is, do  
7 the phases have to be separate or can they be combined? Is  
8 that the question?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually, are you  
10 asking about exclusive phases?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: That's my -- my sense is  
12 bicycle signal face, an exclusive phase for the bicyclists.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's possible that  
14 the bicycle signal face could be used to give a bicycle  
15 green in advance of a motor vehicle green, but otherwise  
16 show bicycle yellow and bicycle red in concert with the  
17 motor vehicle red. So it's not necessarily true that the  
18 bicycle signal face would have to go through a whole phase  
19 sequence of its own, red-yellow-green - well, red-green-  
20 -yellow - before a motor traffic phase sequence could  
21 commence. There can be overlap between the two and they can  
22 share some phase timing in common.

23 I am not a signal expert. I am actually a  
24 transportation planner who knows a lot about engineering. So  
25 I am working with Caltrans Signals on this and will want

1 them to vet this to make sure we don't have any remaining  
2 issues regarding the fine details of signal operation.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: And just one thing I  
5 wanted to add is our Traffic Signal Committee will need to  
6 review that to make sure that our control is handle the  
7 phasing and make sure the software can handle all the  
8 additional phasing. So they are looking into the proposal  
9 now.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Continuing then in  
11 the correct scroll direction. This section is part of the  
12 use of -- XX.02, The Use of the Signal Faces, is the longest  
13 section in draft. And here, this paragraph has to do with  
14 California-specific content that replaces a very simple  
15 sentence that effectively prohibits the use with a  
16 pedestrian hybrid beacon. In the national draft it says:

17 "A bicycle signal face may be used at a  
18 mid-block traffic control signal where there are  
19 no motor vehicle movements parallel to the bicycle  
20 crossing."

21 For example, it could be used where a minor street  
22 has motorists approaching but those motorists are not  
23 allowed to proceed through. Berkeley and other local  
24 agencies specifically want to allow its use on approaches  
25 where you have a minor street and motorists are allowed to

1 proceed through. So this goes back to how do the motorists  
2 make sense of their traffic control? If you can't use a  
3 stop sign, what do you use?

4 So the blue content is added since our September  
5 meeting and it is within the California-specific section.  
6 So this red section here was in the September presentation.  
7 That hasn't changed. So it says,

8 "When a bicycle signal face is used to  
9 control movements in the direction parallel to the  
10 crossing movement of a hybrid beacon the phasing  
11 should be as described in Figure xx-2."

12 So that's the phasing figure for modifying the  
13 phasing of a pedestrian hybrid beacon.

14 What I've added is to resolve the stop sign  
15 conundrum. When motor vehicles approach in the direction  
16 parallel to the pedestrian crossing movement of the  
17 pedestrian hybrid beacon, that's just parallel language to  
18 this:

19 "At which a bicycle signal face is installed,  
20 those movements shall be controlled by a  
21 single-section flashing circular red indication  
22 combined with a vehicle signal sign."

23 And the vehicle signal sign, I'll show you a  
24 graphic later on. It's basically a lot like the  
25 no-right-turn-on-red ball regulatory sign. It's parallel,

1 if you will, to the bicycle signal sign. The bicycle signal  
2 sign, which is the new sign in this draft, states, for a  
3 regulatory perspective, that this thing, this bicycle signal  
4 face applies only to bicycle traffic. At cases like this  
5 Berkeley saw the need, and I agree with it, for a sign that  
6 specifically says motorists, look at the red ball, don't  
7 look at the bicycle signal face. So that's what I'm  
8 bringing forward.

9           Let me scroll all the way down to show you that  
10 sign. So that's the idea. It's pretty simple. The signal  
11 is a single indication. It's always going to be flashing  
12 red. But that's exactly what the motorist would face at  
13 these minor streets controlled by a hybrid beacon. So that  
14 is another resolution of an issue that came up in public  
15 comment and CBAC comment, namely, what do you do when the  
16 motorist is allowed to proceed through?

17           Other changes, this is Section 5, The Meaning of  
18 Bicycle Signal Indications. If you look in the Signals  
19 chapter, the Signals part of the MUTCD, there are long and  
20 detailed sections that explain the meaning of all the  
21 possible indication states such as steady red, flashing red,  
22 steady red arrow, flashing red arrow, et cetera. This  
23 section defines those indications for bicycle-shaped signal  
24 indications. And the ~~strikeout~~ here and the replacement  
25 with the blue here is to allow the use with the shared-lane

1 approach. So the words "designated Bicycle Facility"  
2 implies either a bike lane or a shared-use path. Okay.  
3 This opens that up to the use of a shared lane.

4           The next section specifically discusses the  
5 semantics of red, yellow, and green bicycle signal  
6 indications. I've added a section for flashing yellow, and  
7 this is for another issue that came up in public comment,  
8 namely the implementation of what's called a scramble phase.  
9 There are several instances of these, including in Los  
10 Angeles, where bicyclists are allowed to enter an  
11 intersection provided that they yield to other traffic,  
12 similar to a pedestrian scramble where pedestrians are given  
13 the right to enter the intersection exclusively. And yet  
14 there may be conflicting bicycle movements and conflicting  
15 pedestrian movements to which the entering party is required  
16 to yield.

17           So in that case you display a flashing yellow  
18 instead of a steady green, and this basically adds that  
19 functionality, and then edits the steady yellow semantic so  
20 that it handles the flashing yellow case. Because a  
21 flashing yellow is displayed in the face where a steady  
22 green would be located on the face. So it's red, steady  
23 red, steady yellow, and then flashing yellow instead of  
24 steady red, steady yellow, steady green.

25           So the big blue paragraph defines the semantics

1 for the flashing yellow and the B paragraph above with its  
2 edits basically says not only will a steady yellow follow  
3 the green, but it will also follow a flashing yellow where  
4 used.

5           Layout hasn't changed.

6           Placement hasn't changed.

7           The vehicle signal sign, I need to work with  
8 Caltrans to get the semantics right. This is basically the  
9 use of the sign. Here is the sign itself.

10           Actually, before I get to the sign figure, there  
11 were edits to the typical arrangements figure. The first  
12 figure is lifted from the national draft and it shows both  
13 bicycle-shaped signal indications and steady -- excuse me,  
14 circular-signal indications and arrow indications where  
15 these would be accompanied by the bicycle signal sign. To  
16 those I added a flashing yellow figure. Actually, it didn't  
17 make its way in here. I'm sorry, the superseded figure is  
18 down here, here we go. So that national content is modified  
19 as follows to add the flashing yellow option here. So in  
20 addition to the normal red-yellow-steady green, there would  
21 be red-yellow-flashing yellow for use specifically with the  
22 scramble approaches. That's the only change there.

23           Also there was a missing asterisk in the national  
24 draft as to where the signal sign is required, and I think I  
25 corrected that in this. No, this is an explanation of the

1 flashing yellow symbol.

2           Figure XX.02 is an update of a figure that  
3 appeared in the September presentation. This is the signal  
4 facing for use in a bicycle signal face in combination with  
5 a pedestrian hybrid beacon. It was redrawn for clarity. No  
6 real changes. We just made it clearer how it works.

7           And finally, this is the sign that was in the  
8 September draft from Federal Highway, same sign, followed by  
9 the proposed vehicle signal sign for use specifically to  
10 replace a stop sign on the minor approach. And that is the  
11 set of changes.

12           Before I close my comment I wanted to run through  
13 real briefly what the list of seven was. Give me a second  
14 here. The first was the use of the bicycle signal face at  
15 the pedestrian hybrid beacon. This was resolved by  
16 modifying the national draft phasing.

17           There were questions about the visibility of a  
18 bicycle signal face to users whose movements it does not  
19 control. The response there was to follow the national  
20 proposal because the national proposal states the usual  
21 signal practice which is to use program visibility and other  
22 means such as alignment to address indications that  
23 shouldn't be seen or shouldn't be interpreted by someone  
24 else.

25           The third issue of seven was where to require the

1 bicycle signal sign. And our only difference from the  
2 national proposal is to add "should be used with the  
3 pedestrian hybrid beacon" which is something that's not  
4 addressed by the national proposal.

5           There was concern, also, with the sign that it  
6 would be ambiguous if visible on an adjacent approach.  
7 That's really the same as issue number two, and it's handled  
8 by program visibility and alignment.

9           The third question about the bicycle signal sign  
10 had to do with how law enforcement would be educated. This  
11 is going to require education of all users. It's no  
12 different from any other new traffic control device.

13           Issue four out of seven was whether to allow it to  
14 control a shared-lane approach. This is not allowed in the  
15 national draft. Our desire is to allow it to be used with  
16 these bicycle boulevards or neighborhood greenways which  
17 are, almost by definition, shared-lane approaches. And the  
18 compromise proposal is to allow it only for a single-lane  
19 shared-lane approach.

20           Issue five was whether to allow a special yellow  
21 backplate around the signal. This came up because Long  
22 Beach does it. And Long Beach not only put a yellow  
23 backplate around the signal face to call attention to its  
24 difference from a normal signal face, but put the word  
25 "Bike" and "Signal" on the backplate. So there's really two

1 issues here, is the yellow backplate okay, and is text on  
2 the backplate okay?

3           The national proposal says nothing on the  
4 backplate, so no text, no graphics; that's actually what the  
5 MUTCD says. But the MUTCD language on backplate says that  
6 backplates shall be matte black, but they may have an up to  
7 three-inch yellow border. So that sort of allows the Long  
8 Beach yellow backplate, if it adheres to current MUTCD  
9 language about yellow borders for backplates. Considered  
10 resolved.

11           Issue six of seven was scramble phases. We  
12 handled that with the introduction of the flashing yellow  
13 bicycle indication and the changes that go with that.

14           And issue seven of seven was the issue of  
15 modifying an intersection where the motorist would otherwise  
16 have a stop sign control. That was handled by requiring a  
17 flashing red indication combined with a new vehicle signal  
18 sign.

19           And so with that, I consider all the Committee-  
20 raised and public-raised issues to be resolved and I present  
21 this very complex proposal to the Committee.

22           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you very much  
23 for that very thorough presentation. So your recommendation  
24 and your request to the Committee is to --

25           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I am hoping to make

1 -- I'm hoping to make a motion for approval with the  
2 condition that I work, or my subcommittee works, with  
3 Caltrans Signals and Caltrans MUTCD staff to finalize the  
4 language - for example, the big blue blob in the vehicle  
5 signal sign section - and make sure that it conforms with  
6 standard practice for MUTCD, especially in the signal  
7 section which is a fairly arcane section that we want to get  
8 right.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

10 So with that draft motion in place let's have a  
11 discussion. Committee Members, if you have questions or  
12 discussions on the item? Mr. Marshall.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: John, I'm sure you've  
14 done some thinking about this but help me know how confident  
15 are you that we can do this within the context of where the  
16 federal process is.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I was pleased that  
18 Federal Highway, namely Kevin in the audience here, seemed  
19 to indicate that this was an okay procedure back at our  
20 September meeting, and I hope that hasn't changed.

21 The indication that I got from Kevin and from  
22 Johnny Bhullar at Caltrans, the MUTCD Editor at the time,  
23 was that this would allow us to move forward. So I need to  
24 revisit that and make sure it's still the case.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Other questions?

1 Mr. Walter.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Yes. John, as it  
3 specifically relates to the vehicle signal sign, can you be  
4 a little more -- explain a little bit further why there was  
5 a feeling that that sign is necessary? Because it seems  
6 that motorists are used to circular and arrow indications  
7 and so I'm wondering why you would want to point what  
8 appears to be the obvious?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The use of this sign  
10 would be in a very restrictive case, namely -- and the way  
11 to think about this is what would exist before the  
12 installation of the bicycle signal face. So suppose you  
13 have a major-minor street intersection, all movements  
14 allowed, including motor vehicle through movement from the  
15 minor leg. Ad what exists there now is basically a two-way  
16 stop control so that the main line does not have a stop,  
17 it's free flow, and the minor leg has a stop sign on each  
18 minor approach.

19 When a pedestrian hybrid beacon is installed the  
20 major leg now sees the three-section indication that allows  
21 the pedestrians to cross when motor vehicle traffic is held  
22 red. The minor leg still has a stop sign, okay, because the  
23 stop sign still allows the motorist to approach on the  
24 minor, wait for a gap, regardless of the state of the major  
25 leg pedestrian hybrid beacon, and proceed when there is a

1 safe gap to do so.

2           Step two is to add a bicycle signal face on the  
3 minor approaches. Now you've got a signal-like device. In  
4 fact, I looked at the definition section in the MUTCD and  
5 "beacon" is a subset of "signal" and "hybrid beacon" is a  
6 subset of "beacon." So technically, although it doesn't  
7 really act fully like a signal, from an MUTCD definitional  
8 perspective it appeared to me that a hybrid beacon had to be  
9 treated as a signal with respect to the MUTCD's restriction  
10 that you shall not use a stop sign on the same approach as a  
11 signal.

12           Given that and my own misgivings about how  
13 motorists would understand a stop sign facing them at the  
14 same time a bicycle signal face is facing them on this minor  
15 approach, Berkeley suggested, and I thought it was a good  
16 idea, that they replace the stop sign with a single red  
17 ball. Okay. And they thought that to make it abundantly  
18 clear that the single red ball applied only to the motor  
19 traffic, in other words, to create the same condition as  
20 applied before with a stop sign, that the vehicle signal  
21 sign might be a good idea.

22           So that and only that is the only use case that I  
23 would see this being used, not in the general case where a  
24 bicycle signal face would be added to an already  
25 conventionally signalized intersection.

1           COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Okay. And I guess maybe  
2 I misunderstood. I believed that the pedestrian hybrid  
3 beacons were typically not used where there were  
4 intersections on the side, except for occasions where you'd  
5 have a pedestrian-bicycle path that would be crossing the  
6 main line. So that's why -- that's what is confusing about  
7 it, is because I don't expect that I would ever see that at  
8 an intersection.

9           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That is indeed what  
10 a lot of local agencies are wanting to do. And again, if  
11 you consider a typical L.A. grid layout. There's one-mile  
12 arterials. The big streets are on a one-mile grid and then  
13 on the half-mile points there's minor streets. And the  
14 minor streets sometimes come up with a signal at the  
15 half-mile points but sometimes they come up with just stop  
16 control. Those minor -- those half-mile streets are ideal  
17 from a low volume and yet through connectively perspective  
18 for building what's called a secondary network as part of  
19 your bike network, but the issue is how do you get across  
20 the major street?

21           So the solution, if the minor-major intersection  
22 doesn't meet signal warrants, is to go after pedestrian  
23 hybrid beacon. The agencies that I'm working with are  
24 comfortable with that. Actually, Ronnie Bell who is the  
25 Chair of the Signals Technical Committee at national level

1 said that in his opinion it was not -- it was a mistake to  
2 have the restriction. He says there's no real reason why it  
3 shouldn't be applied at a minor intersection. That said,  
4 there is that issue.

5 But for example, Los Angeles, Berkeley and other  
6 cities do want to apply pedestrian hybrid beacons at minor  
7 intersections.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Brown?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Brown?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Yeah. What's the  
11 potential cost of something like this?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The bicycle signal  
13 face itself?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Yeah.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It would be  
16 accompanied with a signal controller. So if there is an  
17 existing full signalized intersection and you add a bicycle  
18 signal face to that leg, it would be like adding another  
19 conventional signal face. The signal controller would all  
20 -- would have to have the capacity to incorporate that in  
21 the phase sequence.

22 On the pedestrian hybrid beacon you've already got  
23 a signal-like controller to control the phase sequence of  
24 the PHB. So it's not a lot more to ask it to control the  
25 bicycle signal face. The difference in the conventional PHB

1 phase sequence that's in the Chapter 4F of the existing  
2 manual and the proposed modified signal phasing sequence is  
3 an addition of two minor phases that specifically gives the  
4 bicyclists a flashing red instead of a bike green when it  
5 would conflict with flashing red on the major leg. So it  
6 doesn't add a lot of complexity to the signal control.

7           That said, you've already had to make an  
8 investment in mast arms and two or three major street signal  
9 -- the three-face -- three-section heads. So the way to  
10 think about this is a pedestrian hybrid beacon really is  
11 like a little signal. It's like a firehouse signal in terms  
12 of cost and complexity.

13           COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Thanks.

14           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other questions  
15 before I open it to the audience?

16           Mr. Greenwood?

17           COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I came here today  
18 fully prepared to support the proposal that was presented to  
19 us in our agenda package, having studied that thoroughly.  
20 And as Mr. Ciccarelli indicated, this is a complex proposal.  
21 And now we've been presented seven significant changes  
22 without even the benefit of having the papers so that we can  
23 review them so I am not comfortable approving this today.  
24 I'd certainly welcome the conversation but I want it to be  
25 known that I don't think it's appropriate to ask us to

1 approve this without ever having had a chance to review it.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you for your  
3 comment.

4 Any other questions or comments?

5 Mr. Walter?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: I did have one more  
7 questions, John, as it relates to the scramble phase that  
8 you described and the idea that we would have the flashing  
9 yellow bicycle signal indication -- bicycle signal face at  
10 an intersection like that. What's the -- again, explain to  
11 me why this is something that is important enough to do now?  
12 Is the bicycle scramble phase something that is widespread  
13 in use and is it important that we put it in now or is this  
14 something that's just going to happen at very few locations?

15  
16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This is actually in  
17 use in several locations already. And they tend to be next  
18 door to college campuses where a major path that is an  
19 entrance to campus forms a fourth leg of what would  
20 otherwise be a three-leg intersection for motor traffic.  
21 The edge of the UC Davis campus had really the original  
22 example of this that kind of drove the desire for bicycle  
23 signals in the first place. And I know Michelle here from  
24 LADOT has something, I think it's next to USC, that -- I'm  
25 not sure about that -- that also allows a scramble entry by

1 bicyclists.

2           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah. When I was in  
3 Carlsbad we did them down in the village as well. We did  
4 two pedestrian scrambles down there just because we were  
5 having so many pedestrians crossing the intersection that  
6 motorists weren't able to turn right on red or green. So we  
7 just removed the pedestrians from the vehicle movements and  
8 did it that way and as a result the pedestrian volumes went  
9 up from 8,000 to 12,000 through the intersection. But the  
10 cyclists going up and down the Coast Highway are having a  
11 difficulty. Can we go during that pedestrian phase? And in  
12 a lot of cases they could, but technically by the Vehicle  
13 Code they couldn't.

14           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

15           Any other questions, comments, from the Committee  
16 Members?

17           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So, Mr. Walter, I  
18 again see this as being applied very restrictively in very  
19 specific situations where it's justified.

20           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. If there are  
21 no more comments or questions from the Committee, I'll open  
22 it to the audience. Any member of the audience who wishes  
23 to address the Committee on this specific item, if you'd  
24 please step to the podium, introduce yourself, the agency  
25 you represent. And please, in the interest of time, keep

1 your comments to the point. Thank you.

2 MR. MILLER: Rock Miller, Stantec Consulting,  
3 Alternate to the Committee but not seated on the Committee,  
4 so I'm speaking as an individual.

5 This proposal is kind of new to me. I missed the  
6 last couple of meetings and they've apparently done some  
7 things I was unaware of. I have a lot of concerns over the  
8 deletion of the bicycle signal warrant. Oh, I preface that,  
9 I'm a member of the Bicycle Technical Committee and a voting  
10 member of the National Committee. I'll come back to that  
11 later.

12 With respect to the bicycle warrant, California is  
13 about the only state I'm aware of that has a bicycle  
14 warrant, but I believe the trend is going to be for the rest  
15 of the country to start adding that warrant. When you build  
16 yourself a multi-million dollar bike trail on an abandoned  
17 railroad right-of-way and it crosses a six-lane arterial, to  
18 not take care of control at that location and have timid  
19 users expected to go across until one day you can go out  
20 there and count 50 is really not a wise provision.

21 I strongly believe that there should be  
22 flexibility in the MUTCD to allow the designer to conclude  
23 that probably it is wise to provide a form of control across  
24 a four- or six-lane heavily used arterial for construction  
25 of what I would term a regionally significant bikeway. I

1 don't know exactly how to advocate that in there but I know  
2 at the national level there's a lot of looking at the  
3 California bike warrant with consideration for should we be  
4 taking that approach at the national level.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Rock, when you're  
6 done I have a question about that specifically.

7 MR. MILLER: Okay. The other areas, I think they  
8 probably just need a little bit further study. I think I  
9 have probably found a way to make myself more comfortable  
10 with the provisions. On the hybrid beacon I understand the  
11 concern. I think if there was language to suggest that it  
12 would be appropriate only if there was not another  
13 substantial form of control for the location it would have  
14 been a satisfactory alternative.

15 I know particularly the people on the signal side  
16 that review these proposals, they're very concerned that  
17 there be a provision that somehow we have to go out and  
18 install bike signals at every traffic signal out there. We  
19 already install pedestrian signals at every signal, just for  
20 a slightly different way of timing. Well, if we were adding  
21 a bike signal out there just to do a slightly different way  
22 of timing, I don't think the proposal would have moved  
23 forward.

24 I'm very aware of what the proposal is trying to  
25 do. I confronted that when I was working with the City of

1 Long Beach several years ago to do some bikeway crossings of  
2 a four-lane arterial. Luckily it was striped for bike only  
3 to go straight so we had the bike facility and the cars were  
4 forced to either turn left or right at that location. So I  
5 think we avoided that problem.

6 But generally speaking, if there is a vehicle  
7 traffic signal going red-yellow-green at that intersection  
8 that would allow the bicycle to proceed, I don't think  
9 there's a need for a separate bicycle signal.

10 Scramble; I echo the concerns. I've done some  
11 work on the UCLA campus. The bicyclists there just have no  
12 clue what to do at the scramble intersections on Westwood  
13 Boulevard at the entrance to the campus. They basically go  
14 with caution during the pedestrian phase. I guess it works.  
15 I would probably look for more of a signing solution to that  
16 than introducing bike signals and a flashing yellow, thereby  
17 requiring it to be done.

18 So again, I think this is on the right approach  
19 but I think it would be a horrible mistake to delete the  
20 bike warrant at this point. Once it's out it's going to be  
21 a lot harder to ever get it back in. And then I certainly  
22 invite your comments.

23 I can also tell you that I don't think we know yet  
24 what the FHWA response to the National Committee is going to  
25 be. The interim approval they granted was very poorly

1 worded and the committee spent a lot of time improving the  
2 wording to facilitate the usage that the users on that  
3 committee, which included me, at the time, saw fit and we  
4 were very comfortable with it.

5           The revisions you are proposing are things I'd  
6 really want to look at just to make sure the applications  
7 such as do we have cause to be done or are currently causing  
8 to be done would still be in compliance with it.

9           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Ciccarelli, did  
10 you have a question?

11           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Should I speak --  
12 should I speak with the microphone or what?

13           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just go ahead.

14           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Specifically with  
15 regard to the warrant, the national draft says no new  
16 warrants are introduced over and above what's already in the  
17 Signals part. So if California didn't already have a  
18 history of a restrictive warrant and we found it acceptable  
19 to adopt the national draft, waiting for 2016 and 2018 to do  
20 that as part of our normal cycle of updating the CA MUTCD,  
21 we would have a warrantless part. So I don't understand  
22 what you mean by preserving the warrant.

23           MR. MILLER: If there is no warrant for a bicycle  
24 traffic signal there is no way an engineer designing a  
25 bikeway crossing of a busy arterial can justify a traffic

1 signal. The issue already some up now because the only way  
2 you can justify it is to insist that there will be 50  
3 bicycles an hour crossing the intersection. The warrant  
4 perhaps should be loosened, because if you are building a  
5 ten-mile bikeway along a railroad abandoned and you're  
6 crossing four- and six-lane arterials which used to have  
7 railroad crossings, I think you'll be wise to want to put a  
8 traffic signal there if you truly expect 50 or more  
9 bicyclists an hour to use the facility. If you do not  
10 you'll get two or three bicyclists looking both ways and  
11 running through gaps when safe.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So I don't  
13 understand what you are advocating here. Because the  
14 national -- the national language on which this is derived  
15 doesn't have any specific bicycle warrant. It rests on the  
16 signal, the conventional signal warrants.

17 MR. MILLER: The National Committee was evaluating  
18 the issue of bicycle signal faces generally for use at  
19 signalized intersections. They were not undertaking an  
20 analysis, to the best I can describe it, but whether there  
21 should be a warrant for bicycle signals. There's a lot of  
22 discussion about whether there should be, and a lot of  
23 people in other states do ask each other, does anybody have  
24 a warrant for bicycle signals? And the most common answer  
25 to that is, yes, California has one. Maybe a little bit

1 restrictive in terms of technically you have to wait and  
2 count 50 bicycles before you can put a traffic signal in,  
3 but it at least suggests that if you have 50 bicycles an  
4 hour and a given level of auto traffic it is appropriate and  
5 reasonable to provide the signal as warranted.

6           Absent that warrant you cannot conclude a signal  
7 is warranted. And a signals engineer would tell you if you  
8 don't meet any warrants you don't put a signal in there.  
9 That's the issue I'm really trying to avoid right now, which  
10 I definitely foresee as coming forward. I already get  
11 involved in the issues of, we know we want to put a signal  
12 there. We don't have 50 bikes there today because we  
13 haven't built the bridge over the water so the cars aren't  
14 there yet. We're very confident.

15           I always tell the story about when I put the  
16 bicycle signal on the Vista Bike Boulevard in Long Beach. I  
17 actually had to predict there would be 50 bicycles an hour  
18 there. The end of that story has always been the publicity  
19 of the facility actually got the 50 bicycles an hour there  
20 before the signal was built. But without that provision I  
21 would not have been able to build a signal there.

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: With regard to  
23 your --

24           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

25           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: With regard to your

1 other point about wanting this device to be deployed only if  
2 there was not any other -- with regard to your other point  
3 about not wanting this device to proliferate if there's  
4 another more conventional way of doing it. I think that's  
5 already in the draft federal language, that statement that,  
6 you should do it another way if you can.

7 MR. MILLER: That's the position of the larger  
8 Committee. They are very concerned that if there was a  
9 provision that said you have to put this at every traffic  
10 signal there would not have been a consensus towards adding  
11 the provision.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right. Right.

13 MR. MILLER: The understanding was that it would  
14 only be used under special situations, as you've indicated,  
15 where it has been determined that a different form of  
16 traffic control is necessary than what's currently --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right. So what --

18 MR. MILLER: -- in the MUTCD.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So what I'm saying  
20 is that concern, that particular concern seems, on my  
21 reading, to have been already addressed in the draft federal  
22 language in a support statement, if I recall correct.

23 MR. MILLER: I think it relates to mostly your  
24 single-lane approach. And there was comments on the  
25 Committee regarding your single-lane approach. Would it be

1 timed differently? I think the answer is, no. Would it --  
2 you know, you've suggested it because there are cases where  
3 there's no control on that approach. I think the vision is  
4 if you already had a traffic signal crossing a busy street,  
5 would you have to add bicycle signals to that intersection?  
6 I think the answer is, no. Therefore I would propose that  
7 to use a bicycle signal you would, at least from a design  
8 perspective, have concluded that the vehicle signal  
9 operation is not suitable for control of bicycles.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you,  
11 Mr. Miller, an interesting interchange. I don't see us  
12 being ready to go forward on this in the final form.  
13 Definitely there are still a lot of issues so I encourage  
14 further debate, and especially bringing in people like  
15 Mr. Miller to the debate.

16 MS. MOWERY: Michelle Mowery, Senior Bicycle  
17 Coordinator for the City of Los Angeles.

18 I wanted to thank the Committee, and John very  
19 specifically for the amount of work he's put into this. I  
20 know he came before the California Bicycle Advisory  
21 Committee last month and has done a fair amount of research  
22 in determining what bicyclists and what bicycle designers,  
23 planners, and engineers need to put in a bicycle signal that  
24 will serve the needs of the State of California.

25 We are in dire need to have these standards

1 adopted and included in the CA MUTCD. Many agencies, such  
2 as ourselves and Long Beach, have been going forward and  
3 putting in signals with or without the warrants and trying  
4 to get the best take on what we can do there. We'd like to  
5 have adopted standards and guidance so we can follow what  
6 the state would like to do and what we think the state is  
7 going to do. So I'd encourage you not to delay and move  
8 forward on this as quick as possible. I understand that  
9 John has dropped some new things on you today. But again, I  
10 encourage you to move forward very quickly on this.

11 I did want to make a comment on the warrants and  
12 note that they are extremely restrictive. They're not  
13 slightly restrictive. They were clearly designed to keep  
14 these signals out of everyday play. And I wanted to suggest  
15 that the world of bicycle design and bicycle engineering is  
16 moving very, very quickly on the national and state level  
17 and facilities that were not thought of when these warrants  
18 were adopted are now going into place, such as cycle tracks  
19 and new bicycle lanes.

20 So again, I want to encourage you to move quickly.  
21 I want to support John's recommendation to remove the  
22 warrants as they now exist and thank you for your  
23 indulgence.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.  
25 Mr. Royer?

1 MR. ROYER: David Royer, LADOT, retired for many  
2 years now. I'm a consultant now.

3 I just have a couple of questions on the use of  
4 this -- of the hybrid beacon at a regular intersection. You  
5 mentioned that Berkeley -- or is it -- it must be Oakland.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Berkeley.

7 MR. ROYER: But anyways, where they have one. Was  
8 that -- did they get a legal opinion from Caltrans legal to  
9 use a flashing red -- and I assume it's on the far side like  
10 a regular traffic signal, not on the near side where you  
11 have a beacon above a stop sign. So I assume -- it just  
12 seems to me like perhaps that use is a method of cheating or  
13 getting around -- I don't want to say cheating because I  
14 think I'd like to see hybrids at intersections. To get  
15 around the use of the stop sign by just going to a flashing  
16 signal, and now you've removed the words 'stop sign?' out of  
17 the Vehicle Code.

18 And so I didn't know whether they actually had a  
19 legal opinion. Unfortunately, I don't see -- I'd like to  
20 see the PowerPoint picture of how it exists out there.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

22 MR. ROYER: Because this would have pretty good  
23 ramifications for the use of the hybrid beacon now at  
24 intersections, in some cases just for pedestrians. They're  
25 used a lot back east where their vehicle codes allow that.

1 And so what happens, when a pedestrian comes up the  
2 intersection all of a sudden just becomes an all-way stop.  
3 And as soon as the pedestrian can clear it, it's a yield,  
4 then the cars can start moving through the intersection.  
5 And I wonder how that would also interface with bicycles,  
6 because you have to yield to pedestrians but do you -- the  
7 bicycle would have to come through the intersection just as  
8 an all-way stop.

9           So those are a couple questions I had. I'll be  
10 truthful, I would like to see this be legal in the state,  
11 officially legal, perhaps even addressed in the Vehicle Code  
12 section that prohibits stop -- signal -- any signal control.  
13 Because does that even include a flashing signal? And it  
14 works very effective back east. And they get around having  
15 the overhead strobing beacons for pedestrians and the  
16 in-pavement lights for pedestrians where they want to have a  
17 pedestrian protection at an intersection, they put it in the  
18 HOC (phonetic), and that's what the HOC was developed for.

19           In California it was determined by Caltrans legal  
20 that that flashing HOC was a signal, and so therefore that  
21 was a signal control. And so that -- that should be  
22 addressed as well. And perhaps they did get a legal  
23 opinion. I would hope they did before they decided to do  
24 such a thing.

25           So that's all I have.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Thank you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Do you want to  
3 address the public discussion?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah, real quickly.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Very quickly,  
6 please, because we're spending a lot of time on this issue.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I know we're  
8 spending a long time.

9 Specifically, Dave, with regard to how this has  
10 rolled out in Berkeley. District 4 has never really had an  
11 issue with Berkeley's desire to place the pedestrian hybrid  
12 beacon at an intersection, so I don't know how they got to  
13 that point. Where the red ball versus stop sign came up was  
14 to try and resolve the MUTCD and CBC's clear prohibition of  
15 the use of stop sign control in combination with a signal  
16 device. So it was kind of late in the game in this round  
17 robin discussion I've been having with Eric Anderson at  
18 Berkeley and Beth Thomas at District 4 about how to design  
19 this test case in a way that Caltrans District 4 can approve  
20 it.

21 So as far as I know, and I don't know what legal  
22 opinion they've solicited within Caltrans, they were already  
23 okay with a PHB at an intersection. Their heartburn was  
24 that adding a bike signal face introduced a gotcha into the  
25 phase sequence that had to be resolved by modifying the

1 conventional PHB phase sequence.

2           The stop sign issue came up kind of late in the  
3 game when I read the chapter and verse of the MUTCD and we  
4 decided that ball red was the way to go to resolve that. So  
5 it wasn't an end run around anything. It was kind of trying  
6 to avoid what was a clear prohibition about the stop sign.

7           MR. ROYER: Correct. I understand that. I just  
8 would like to see a real legal opinion, and then perhaps  
9 change the Vehicle Code. Because I think the National MUTCD  
10 allows it at intersections. California, because of our  
11 unique Vehicle Code requirement, we had to prohibit hybrids  
12 at intersections in California. Other states do not have  
13 that in their vehicle code so they can integrate the hybrids  
14 with the stop sign, and maybe that would be an approach,

15           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you,  
16 Mr. Royer.

17           Next speaker?

18           MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Luu  
19 Nguyen, a Traffic Safety Specialist for Caltrans Division of  
20 Traffic Operations.

21           In this position I have a chance to work with all  
22 Caltrans traffic city engineers in all 12 districts to  
23 address the issue of operation and safety at many  
24 intersections along our conventional highway system. The  
25 concern I have today is related to the proposal and I thank

1 you, the gentlemen, for a very detailed presentation. But  
2 since there are several provisions that are being added  
3 today, and we haven't gotten real time to digest it, my  
4 concern particularly focused on the bicycle signal. How is  
5 it going to be incorporated into the overall cycle then?  
6 And how is it going to be in combination with pedestrians in  
7 the location where we have a high speed, high volume complex  
8 operation in our system?

9 Now as a traffic safety engineer we strongly  
10 support and understand the concern from the locals to  
11 accommodate the movements of bicycles and pedestrians. But  
12 based on the reason and concern I would ask that the members  
13 allow us the time to digest this information. We support  
14 that but we need a little time. So I would ask that we  
15 don't kind of decide on a motion today and allow us a little  
16 time to review and kind of address all the concerns we have.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you for your  
18 comments.

19 Any other questions or comments?

20 MR. SOMERS: Yeah. My name is David Somers.  
21 Department of City Planning, the City of Los Angeles.

22 I'm sorry I missed the initial presentation; I did  
23 have some preliminary discussion about this already. And,  
24 you know, I just wanted to address what's perceived to be a  
25 real need in the city to provide, you know, some -- some

1 higher level of protection across major intersections. I'm  
2 part of the staff and the team right now that's developing  
3 the Citywide Mobility Plan which will designate a whole set  
4 of networks, bicycle networks, pedestrian networks, and even  
5 vehicle networks and transit networks throughout the city  
6 that will indicate, you know, somewhat of a priority  
7 preference along given corridors.

8           And you know, one of the things in Los Angeles  
9 that we really struggle with, with congestion, is being able  
10 to balance all those modes, you know, along a single  
11 arterial. So one of the great opportunities that we have in  
12 the city is how to create regional -- patch together  
13 regional networks on neighborhood streets for --  
14 particularly for bicyclists. And the major bottleneck  
15 really becomes how to -- why aren't those already given  
16 preference? The thing about bicyclists is that they  
17 perceive that, you know, there's choke points. They can't  
18 get across a major arterial because it's not signalized and  
19 that kind of thing. And so this is just a very -- a real  
20 need for the city to have some type of a device that is able  
21 to promote bicycle travel, even along an existing  
22 high-volume corridor, say for a signal op. It's something  
23 that we can orient bicyclists to through way-finding signage  
24 so they can get to transit easier and that type of thing.

25           And one of the things that -- that we have to

1 contend with, as well, in implementing these strategies in  
2 neighborhoods is how to do so in such a way that it doesn't  
3 also encourage traffic to, you know, to start taking those  
4 as corridors? If we give a full signalization then it all  
5 of a sudden becomes -- that may become the ways route, you  
6 know, the convenient get around. And so neighborhoods would  
7 perceive this as perhaps the full signalization treatment as  
8 being a cause to them as far as incurred traffic congestion.

9           And also this is something I was struggling with,  
10 adjacent jurisdictions as well. I'm currently working on a  
11 project that has joint jurisdiction with the City of West  
12 Hollywood. And they specifically were very interested in  
13 promoting bicycle travel on a neighborhood local street  
14 across a major arterial, but they were very concerned about  
15 incurring the -- the cut-through traffic that would come  
16 with full signalization.

17           So when I was looking through, you know, the NACTO  
18 guidelines, the -- the pedestrian -- the hybrid beacon, the  
19 HOC, you know, came up. To me it seems like an ideal  
20 solution. It's something that would give the preference to  
21 bicycle and pedestrian crossing, and having a full stop  
22 control so that they would be, you know, give them priority.  
23 But it would not be incurring, at the same time, that same  
24 incentive for cars to take that as like a preferred, you  
25 know, path of travel or cut-through rather than taking an

1 arterial.

2           So, you know, I just wanted to present this as  
3 just, you know, something that's a very urgent need for the  
4 city to resolve as far as the design issue and take that  
5 into consideration. Thank you.

6           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Thank  
7 you. Mr. Howe?

8           MR. HOWE: I'm sorry?

9           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: What are you doing?

10          MR. HOWE: I'm just adjusting the --

11          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Adjusting?

12          MR. HOWE: -- the volume so we don't get -- we  
13 were getting feedback.

14          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Fine.

15          MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
16 Administration, the California Division Office.

17                 Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to remind the  
18 Committee for all the other items we have today, moving  
19 forward on the meeting, if you would like to ask a question  
20 of the Federal Highway during your panel discussion, please  
21 acknowledge me and bring me up to the podium, because I  
22 cannot speak while you guys are all presenting for those  
23 members that are newer. So I waited until the end until you  
24 called for the public to come forward here today. So feel  
25 free if there is anything that you'd like me or us from

1 Federal Highway, please address me to the podium.

2 I'm just going to discuss because it sounds like  
3 there's not going to be a motion for approval in this  
4 meeting today. I'm just going to go through responses to  
5 some of the comments that were made by the public as well as  
6 the Committee. And I'll save my comments from the -- for  
7 the agenda item for a future meeting or an email discussion.

8 John Ciccarelli --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Kevin, before you go  
10 forward, if you hadn't stepped up to the podium I would have  
11 asked you, would you address the issue of the process,  
12 before you get into technicalities and standards and stuff  
13 like that? In terms of the process, how is this going to  
14 jibe in and match in with the current process?

15 MR. KORTH: Okay. As far as -- you look on page  
16 11 of your agenda from the National Technical Committee on  
17 uniform traffic control devices, in red bold underline  
18 underneath their memo that they're providing to Federal  
19 Highway, the National Committee is not a governing body. I  
20 would address that they are probably the most influential  
21 and also most technically sound committee that provides  
22 recommendations to Federal Highway and have -- have probably  
23 the most weight, in my personal opinion, to -- to D.C. But  
24 anything that they provide, as they list here in this memo,  
25 is not to be taken as guidance or to be put into the

1 National MUTCD until it's gone through the rule-making  
2 process. So they're not the governing body, Federal Highway  
3 is the Federal Law for the National Manual.

4 So anything that they provided here was proposed  
5 to Federal Highway. We have the final say during the notice  
6 for proposed amendment for the 2016 National MUTCD to  
7 provide any modifications to what that committee proposes to  
8 us that were released in that notice for proposed amendment  
9 for public comment. So this -- this is a different body  
10 than Federal Highways.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I understand that;  
12 thanks for the clarification. But in terms of timing, how  
13 is that timing? When is an official decision expected,  
14 scheduled?

15 MR. KORTH: The notice for proposed amendment is  
16 scheduled to be released this summer. And then at some  
17 point in 2016 will be when the next National MUTCD comes  
18 out, that's the proposed schedule right now. And so it will  
19 be -- all those interim approvals leading back to the  
20 pedestrian -- to the rectangular flashing beacon, that was  
21 actually internal approval that was released prior to the  
22 2009 MUTCD. But due to the notice of proposed amendment we  
23 couldn't provide that interim approval in the 2009 MUTCD, it  
24 got kicked into the next cycle. So all those interim  
25 approvals we have for the EV plug, the flashing yellow

1 arrow, the three-section head and also bicycle signals, they  
2 will be -- are being evaluated for the 2016 manual.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.  
4 Now go back to your own comments. Thank you.

5 MR. KORTH: So John Ciccarelli mentioned -- I'm  
6 going to go in reverse order and hope that everybody's  
7 long-term memory kicks in when I go back to the beginning.

8 So most recently John Ciccarelli mentioned -- he  
9 quoted it as a test case between Caltrans and Berkeley. I  
10 believe this test case could be resolved by requesting an  
11 experiment. And once there is an approved experiment from  
12 Federal Highway and the CTCDC, I don't see any reason why  
13 Caltrans would limit wherever their proposal is to be used  
14 it on Ashby Boulevard. There's already an approved  
15 experiment for this test case, as he quoted it. That would  
16 be a way to alleviate the issue that's going forward versus  
17 trying to get this test case into the CA MUTCD.

18 David Royer talked about the pedestrian hybrid  
19 beacon not being -- being classified as a signal by Caltrans  
20 legal. I cannot confirm that. Maybe Duper can. But it's  
21 my understanding that the pedestrian hybrid beacon is in  
22 itself a beacon. It's primarily used for mid-block  
23 crossings. There is a guidance statement in the current  
24 National MUTCD, as well as the CA MUTCD, that says -- gives  
25 you a certain offset from any major driveways or

1 intersections. But you do -- the engineer does have the  
2 ability to place the pedestrian hybrid beacon at a minor leg  
3 of the intersection.

4           Rock Miller, he also mentioned, he said there's a  
5 need for a study, which I would like to believe that any of  
6 these additional amendments to the pedestrian scramble phase  
7 and the hybrid beacon should be experimented on before they  
8 are made national policy.

9           For the bicycle signal warrant, my opinion, if the  
10 Committee was to pursue Interim Approval 16 as an action  
11 that the CA MUTCD could leave any kind of bicycle warrant in  
12 the manual and use that as an additional restriction here in  
13 California. Obviously, IA 16 would give us a little more  
14 leeway. But if you guys were wanting to leave a warrant in  
15 the state system or in California as a whole, I don't think  
16 that that would be a problem. But you could seek an  
17 official interpretation from D.C. on whether or not you  
18 would be able to maintain your warrant for the bicycle  
19 signal at all, still getting that blanket approval for IA  
20 16.

21           Bryan talked about pedestrian signals, a  
22 pedestrian signal in the scramble phase. I gather that the  
23 bicycle signal scramble phase is completely different than a  
24 pedestrian scramble phase. The pedestrian indication is a  
25 walking man and that provides the ability to cross all four

1 lanes and also diagonally, if they so choose. But with a  
2 bicycle signal I have issue with having a red-yellow-yellow,  
3 4D.08 through 4D.10. For establishing what a traffic signal  
4 is, you need a red-yellow-green indication.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No.

6 MR. KORTH: How is a signal maintained with just a  
7 yellow flash? What is the bicycle going to do during those  
8 periods?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's obscure, but if  
10 you read where flashing yellow circular is to be applied, it  
11 has to be applied lower than the flashing -- than the steady  
12 yellow indication. It's in the -- it's in the manual.

13 MR. KORTH: The flashing yellow is allowed for the  
14 left turn indication, as well as a warning beacon. But the  
15 circular flashing yellow on a traffic signal is not a cycle  
16 approach. You can use a flashing right-turn arrow, a  
17 flashing left-turn arrow in either yellow or red, but  
18 there's no flashing yellow circular indication anywhere.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I beg to differ; and  
20 I read this. San Francisco uses it and uses it for this  
21 particular case.

22 MR. KORTH: Jay and David had questions about a  
23 single section stay-red indication. And I don't believe  
24 that meets the definition of a signal head. A signal head  
25 means a minimum of three sections on that indication.

1 Federal Highway has been asked from agencies before on this  
2 issue in California, as well as other states of having just,  
3 say, one section single-solid red. That's not a traffic  
4 signal. A traffic signal needs at least three sections.  
5 Because what is the driver to do on a minor leg if they see  
6 a single solid red? That's not a stop control. A stop  
7 control is a flashing red indication. A solid, steady red,  
8 they would never be able to turn from that intersection. If  
9 they have a three-section head and it was solid red they may  
10 be able to do a right on red.

11 I know in some states the vehicle code, special  
12 vehicles, busses or hazardous waste vehicles, they're not  
13 allowed to turn on any solid red, even if it's permitted by  
14 other vehicles. So that may become a problem if you never  
15 provide a green indication --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Perhaps I --

17 MR. KORTH: -- in the main --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Perhaps I mis-spoke.  
19 What Berkeley proposed was a flashing red, not a solid red.

20 MR. KORTH: In that case, that was another point I  
21 was going to address, is what is the main road -- what is  
22 the traffic control cycle, being if there's a green -- a  
23 green indication on the major road and there still is a  
24 flashing red, the manual says you have to have all red  
25 flashing -- in flashing mode, not just a single approach.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This is --

2 MR. KORTH: And now you have stop control and  
3 still not having priority.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This is -- this  
5 would specifically be for pedestrian hybrid beacon  
6 installation where the main -- main line gets the -- the  
7 three-section PHB at -- and the minor leg gets the flashing  
8 red ball.

9 MR. KORTH: Okay. It is my opinion that the  
10 pedestrian hybrid beacon is a beacon in itself, so you could  
11 use a stop control if the engineer wanted to on that minor  
12 approach. They could do an activated blank-out with a  
13 right-turn prohibition or a left-turn prohibition. They  
14 could put in a channelizing island to help alleviate any  
15 conflicts they think that's going to occur off that minor  
16 leg during the pedestrian hybrid beacon placed at an  
17 intersection. But it's a beacon, not a signal.

18 As far as John Ciccarelli, his initial showing of  
19 the agenda item, I don't believe that the circular device --  
20 the circular indication is not in IA 16. This would be,  
21 like was mentioned about the National Committee by Rock and  
22 John, the circular indication isn't in the IA 16 nor the  
23 National Committee's proposal. Right now as it's heard this  
24 IA 16 is only to be used on Class 1 and Class 2 facilities,  
25 which is bike lanes or shared-use path or the conjugal

1 bicycle facilities, it is not to be used on any shared lane.  
2 That's how IA 16 reads. It's only provided with a bicycle  
3 signal face, the sideways bicycle that would provide  
4 protected movement for any direction the bicycle wants to  
5 proceed in that intersection, or you can use the arrows with  
6 the bicycle signal sign to provide the bicycle protected  
7 movement either straight through or left, wherever they  
8 would like to choose.

9           But its circular indication would be against what  
10 IA 16 currently allows and what the -- the CA MUTCD, as  
11 well, as far as having a protected or exclusive movement.  
12 The circular indication provides admmissive movement. So  
13 that would be something new that is being approached.

14           As far as the backplates, a yellow backplate  
15 and/or text on a backplate doesn't meet the definition of a  
16 backplate currently. It is -- black is the only color. And  
17 there is an option to use a one- to three-inch yellow  
18 reflective border along that black backplate. But black is  
19 the only approved color for the backplate itself. Now the  
20 backplate housing and some other elements of the signal mast  
21 arms, that's kind of outside the scope of the -- of the  
22 manual. But as far as the backplate itself, it must be  
23 black with no text and then there is the option to provide a  
24 one- to three-inch yellow reflective border.

25           And that concludes my comments from what the

1 Committee talked about and the public talked about today.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you very much.

3 Anyone else from the audience who wishes to  
4 address the Committee?

5 Seeing none, let's close the public hearing on  
6 this and bring it back to the Committee. I'll bring it back  
7 to the Committee and with just (inaudible) the Committee,  
8 just I don't know if you are ready with all of the  
9 discussions.

10 And I believe this is thing isn't working.

11 Don, is this working?

12 MR. HOWE: I'll turn the -- I'll turn the --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, it's okay.

14 That's fine.

15 MR. HOWE: It's just we got feedback from that  
16 one.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: As long as -- as  
18 long as the table can hear me. So this is -- this is  
19 something -- this is something that we definitely need and  
20 it's a good proposal. But it's just a matter of how we  
21 approach it and in my mind it's a two-fact thing. One is  
22 the synchronization of our schedule and our approval with  
23 what the feds are doing so that we don't end up coming back  
24 again in 2016 and redo the whole thing. And the other thing  
25 is just all the technical issues that came up.

1           But I would like to applaud Mr. Ciccarelli for  
2 bringing it forward to the CTCDC, it's a very, very needed  
3 addition.

4           But the question is how do we go from here  
5 forward? Any comments, any thoughts, suggestions?

6           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Hamid, can I say  
7 about two sentences?

8           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure. If this thing  
9 is even working.

10          COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Sure. The original  
11 genesis of this was to avoid having to wait four years, two  
12 years for the new Federal Manual and two more years for the  
13 California Manual to follow it, which is the usual way  
14 things work.

15          The second genesis of it was that Interim Approval  
16 16 was deemed far too restrictive. Major cities are crying  
17 out to apply the pedestrian hybrid beacon in combination  
18 with a bicycle indication to get bicycles across the big  
19 streets where they can't get across right now. So that's  
20 why -- that's why we stretched so far to make this work. If  
21 we -- if Interim Approval 16 did what we wanted it to do  
22 that would have been a far easier course to take.

23          Instead I'm reminded of the old saying we used to  
24 have in the software industry, that you can tell the  
25 pioneers by the arrows in their backs. So I'm feeling a

1 little like the pioneer right now. But I think it's -- it's  
2 worthy to try and move this along.

3 That said, I've introduced substantive changes  
4 that have not been reviewed by either the public or the  
5 Committee. I fully expect that this not votable today. I  
6 need some help moving forward. I was chartered with a  
7 subcommittee. I did not consult that subcommittee. I sort  
8 of lone-wolfed it and took it to CBAC and got what I thought  
9 was my best resolution of it. But I really need to run it  
10 by Caltrans, at the very least, and my subcommittee as well.  
11 I propose to do that going forward.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. And just  
13 my thought, with the interim approval being restrictive,  
14 that's actually -- that's the red flag for me because it  
15 tells me that they did an interim approval, they don't like  
16 some things, that there's still at least -- I shouldn't say  
17 they don't like it, they're still contemplating options and  
18 alternatives. And so I wouldn't put a lot of money on that  
19 interim approval because the following will change a lot.  
20 In other words, they will not just give blanket general  
21 approvals without (inaudible).

22 But now moving forward, I definitely am not  
23 advocating waiting on this four years until we go through  
24 the whole federal cycle and all that. But moving forward, I  
25 for one, am not ready today to vote on this as a package

1 because a lot of new issues came up, and some issues that I,  
2 for one, have to think, you know, and some issues, that  
3 issue of warrants, I mean, is it good, bad, whatever.

4 But again, you know, I want us -- if you're going  
5 to move this forward to the next meeting you at least have a  
6 process so that the next meeting you don't have all these  
7 issues brought up again in the Committee discussion here,  
8 that all these issues are at least resolved and the  
9 Committee is presented some votable package. And how do you  
10 propose to do that, Mr. Ciccarelli?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I believe that -- I  
12 believe that the set of issues that were not resolved at the  
13 September meeting, my so-called list of seven, the scramble  
14 issue, the pedestrian hybrid beacon phasing issue, and the  
15 others, I think the changes that I've made are a good effort  
16 at resolving those. I hope I'm not proven wrong, but I  
17 don't anticipate another significant issue of that class  
18 popping up. So I think that I'd like to enter into a phase  
19 of refinement on a couple of tracks.

20 First of all, just the top level stuff, do we need  
21 a warrant? Okay. How can that warrant be made to encourage  
22 the proper use of this device without continuing to be too  
23 restrictive? And also I just need help with MUTCD language  
24 and structure. I'm not Johnny Bhullar. No one is. And  
25 this needs to be made ready to vote and ready to -- for

1 practitioners to use without any omissions and errors in the  
2 language itself.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.

4 So the good thing is the now we keep verbatim  
5 minutes so that all the comments that everyone has made, you  
6 can have a full document.

7 I would like to hear a little bit more from others  
8 who might have thoughts on this.

9 Mr. Walter?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
11 A couple of suggestions perhaps for this.

12 The idea of an experiment for the City of  
13 Berkeley, applying for an experiment so that they could go  
14 ahead and put this into place and see how well it works, I  
15 think that's a good way for them to move forward now without  
16 having to have this approved by the Committee and adopted.

17 I guess I would offer a suggestion too now, John,  
18 as we go forward for the next round of deliberation that  
19 there could be no more changes that would then have to be  
20 reviewed and brought back before the Committee, especially  
21 when you're trying to follow along the document that we  
22 received from Chris and what you showed on the screen, very  
23 confusing. Not to say that those changes weren't meaningful  
24 and everything else, but it's certainly helpful to have them  
25 ahead of time.

1           And then I believe the comment made by the  
2 gentleman from Caltrans about coordinating what you're  
3 proposing with signal ops folks at Caltrans at the top level  
4 is really important at this point. So that's -- I see it as  
5 a going forward thing because you're introducing quite a bit  
6 of complexity to these traffic signal systems. And we want  
7 to make sure that the guys who are really knowledgeable in  
8 that area are involved in those types of decisions. So I  
9 would think that would be a really good group to reach out  
10 to. And maybe through Duper and Caltrans the organization  
11 and others that would be interested would like to be  
12 involved in that.

13           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you very much,  
14 that's an excellent comment. Because this is like an  
15 introduction and some significant changes in signal design  
16 and practices. So Caltrans, the Signal Committee at a  
17 minimum should be consulted and presented this. And as the  
18 gentleman mentioned, all the signal operation and design  
19 ramifications need to be evaluated. The same way that it  
20 was presented to the CBAC from their bicycle perspective, we  
21 want the signal people also to look at that for safety.

22           Mr. Winter?

23           COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Just again to echo what  
24 I heard from my colleague here, the suggestion of  
25 experimentation. And later in the agenda today, when we get

1 into that discussion of the HOV striping, it's -- it's --  
2 one of the questions, if I understood that item, is do you  
3 experiment and perhaps have to look at legislative change?  
4 And so in the topic of the hybrid beacon and the mix of it,  
5 with it perhaps being used at a stop sign, it may lend  
6 itself to a similar question there, which is does  
7 legislation need to change to make it conform. But it also  
8 would allow us as a Committee, I think, to see a practical  
9 application of what's being proposed.

10           So only -- you know, not that that's an item we're  
11 suggesting today to somebody to take ownership of. But if,  
12 as we heard some of the speakers say, there is an interest  
13 in doing this in different cities, then they should be very  
14 welcome. And we as a Committee should do all we can to  
15 speed up that process of reviewing and perhaps even  
16 approving experimentation requests.

17           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you, Mr.  
18 Winter.

19           Any other comments, thoughts?

20           Well, Mr. Ciccarelli, again as I said, I think  
21 this is -- this is a welcome improvement, definitely.  
22 You've made great work to this point, but a few more steps  
23 before we get to a point that it is votable. And I think  
24 the verbatim minutes is going to help a lot. And you need  
25 to work with your subcommittee. You need to work with the

1 feds, with Caltrans traffic signal people, other experts  
2 such as Mr. Miller, and come maybe for the next meeting when  
3 we'll be able to vote on this.

4 So what is the pleasure of the Committee? Is  
5 there a motion on this item? I need to have a motion.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I withdraw any  
7 motion I may have appeared to have made.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Well, I still need  
9 to have a motion for continuance to the next meeting.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I move that this  
11 item be referred to the subcommittee that was defined at the  
12 September meeting, and that it be also through that  
13 subcommittee's Caltrans contacts, run through Caltrans'  
14 Signal Operations and Signals Committee, and that it be  
15 brought back in a votable form. Is that sufficient?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's a motion.  
17 Is there a second?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: I second.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There's a motion and  
20 a second. Any discussions?

21 Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

22 (Ayes.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No opposition?

24 The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very  
25 much. We look forward to the resolution of these issues and

1 having a vote next meeting.

2 Moving forward, we are at 11 -- item 15-02,  
3 request for -- No, actually, it's 15-01, I'm jumping ahead.  
4 Proposal to modify California Traffic Control Devices  
5 Committee's meeting format.

6 Mr. Tong, that's your item?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: Yes. This item is we're  
8 working with the agency level and looking for a way to  
9 improve and streamline the process of the CTCDC and also  
10 with the assessment, the SSTI. We proposed some format,  
11 minor format changes on how we do the meeting. Thank you.  
12 There is a consent item, information action, and you can  
13 down to number three, it is an action item.

14 So I would like to quick go through the details,  
15 exactly the proposal, what we are and why -- what we're  
16 trying to achieve.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Thank you. Chris  
18 Engelmann.

19 So the SSTI report basically wanted to help  
20 streamline or suggest the streamlining of information and  
21 how items are processed at this meeting. And I know  
22 Mr. Walter also made recommendations on how we vote and see  
23 things come through here. And basically we have three  
24 levels of items that we address.

25 Number one would be a consent item, very routine

1 corrections like typos, things like that in the MUTCD that  
2 don't need significant discussion. We could even address  
3 those through email prior to the meetings that have a  
4 consensus, and then it would just be a matter of mentioning  
5 them at the meeting.

6           The second item would be new things that come  
7 across our tables here that are complex and need discussion,  
8 new agenda items that are introduced for the first time.  
9 And then we -- we get a presentation and we have  
10 discussions, but we are not going to take an action on it at  
11 that point; we defer that to the following meeting. That  
12 gives Committee Members plenty of time to just study this  
13 and then come back to make a vote at the next meeting.  
14 Items will be based on a limited time and so we don't spend  
15 hours on each item.

16           The third one is action items that are on the  
17 agenda that are continuing discussions from the prior  
18 meeting that were information items. And at this point  
19 there would be an action requested. This kind of follows  
20 the CTC in a sense, some of their formatting and how they  
21 run their meetings.

22           We would also ensure that the meetings are held on  
23 a quarterly basis. In the past typically we've had meetings  
24 four times a year, sometimes three times a year. But we  
25 would shoot for quarterly meetings. And also we look at

1 locations and dates ahead of time. I think it helps put  
2 these on each of our calendars early on and reduces  
3 conflicts down the road. And these are all items that the  
4 agency was asked -- asking us to look into.

5           Also there was a request that we get agenda items  
6 to the Committee Members a little sooner. Typically in the  
7 past they'd been sent out four/three weeks prior to the  
8 meeting. We have to put them on the internet 30 days before  
9 the meeting so it would be nice to have a little more time  
10 to review all these items.

11           And also, if you go to the -- just to mention, the  
12 next -- skip ahead two pages. Let me just talk about the --  
13 the dates. We have deadlines on when to submit new agenda  
14 items because, as we discovered today, we had late changes  
15 that, you know, we don't feel comfortable voting on. So for  
16 the next meetings we at least propose dates for when items  
17 get sent to the CTC secretary and when those items can get  
18 sent out for review.

19           The previous page is a comment matrix that we are  
20 proposing to use for each new agenda item that voting  
21 members can make comments and then send them back to the  
22 secretary prior to the meeting. And then we have a better  
23 idea of what the feeling is among the members for each of  
24 these items.

25           A question?

1           COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Just a minor correct,  
2 that Emma's name, my colleague, is AAA Northern California.  
3 I think I have it as "Southern" on mine.

4           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Okay. We will  
5 make that correction, thank you.

6           So that's kind of, in summary, the highlights  
7 here. Where this is coming from and what we want to do.

8           And then the other big item is rather than waiting  
9 two years for updating the CA MUTCD, the agency is proposing  
10 why not make the CA MUTCD more of a living document. So we  
11 would update it semi-annually or annually. You know, we  
12 could try one and see how that works. If it's too crazy and  
13 things don't work out we can go to an annual basis. So  
14 those are some thoughts in terms of implementing updates.  
15 You know, we can post things on the Internet, like we have  
16 the MUTCD up there now. And then updated versions can be  
17 then printed and inserted into the existing paper copy that  
18 practitioners have.

19           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

20           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Questions?

21           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

22 Questions?

23           Mr. Jones?

24           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So does that mean that we  
25 would never be taking an action item in just one meeting?

1 Because we have a lot of local jurisdictions that are trying  
2 to do things, and oftentimes politics at the local  
3 jurisdictions, maybe something has been promised to a mayor  
4 or a council that something would be implemented. And if  
5 they have to wait three or six months or something like that  
6 to do one meeting and then a follow-up meeting, is there a  
7 way that we can have an action item to be done in one  
8 meeting?

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I'm open. I think  
10 -- I think that's something we should discuss.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I think that -- I  
12 think that goes to that item that we just amended the  
13 request from the City of L.A.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We want to encourage  
16 the locals to facilitate the process, to come through the  
17 Committee. Not to see the Committee as a cumbersome step  
18 and they say, oh my god, it's going to take me a year to go  
19 through those people. So we want to -- we don't -- some of  
20 these standards have serious safety ramifications, so it's  
21 just one -- you don't want to do approve anything just  
22 willy-nilly. But at the same time you don't want to just --  
23 I still remember that we put the city under the Water  
24 District in San Diego through one-and-a-half year of  
25 approval process for a watershed project. And that was not

1 helpful. So we don't want that. But at the same time --  
2 Mr. Walter or Mr. Marshall?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Actually, I think the  
4 items, kind of at the judgment of the secretary, can be  
5 determined to be complex. And that would be the study and  
6 have the conversation, and then take that forward and bring  
7 it back for approval the next time. And some can be just  
8 like a business item, a relatively straightforward, can be  
9 discussed at the Committee level at that day, approved right  
10 then and there.

11 It seems to me that there's -- you know, there are  
12 those three levels which can be fit into the format of what  
13 we want to do.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Marshall?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I really like a lot of  
16 the suggestions that are provided in this. And I agree with  
17 Mr. Walter about -- because I was about to suggest the same  
18 idea. Let's make sure we have some way that we can allow  
19 ourselves to go ahead and finish something. If we have  
20 achieved consensus, let's get it done.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I had a couple of  
23 separate points, one of which is extremely minor. I like  
24 the idea of the comment matrix. And it looks to me like  
25 potentially it harkens back to our famous brochure that

1 talks about our Committee in the sense that we are listed  
2 in, apparently, random order. I have no idea. It's not  
3 alphabetic. It's not organized by out appointing  
4 organizations. It is -- I think it would be helpful if it  
5 were organized in one of those ways. If one of us wanted,  
6 or anybody from the public wanted to find the comments from  
7 a particular person, it's just a little thing but I think it  
8 would be helpful.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: On the comment  
10 matrix, just make sure that the comment matrix (inaudible)  
11 also. Where the comment matrix then comes back to you and  
12 stays with you, to make sure that everybody else and  
13 (inaudible) the public. Because this Committee is governed  
14 by the Brown Act and we don't want to get into  
15 pre-deliberations between the members.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And my one other  
17 comment was I especially like the idea of scheduling our  
18 meetings out for all year. That's going to be very helpful  
19 to me. And I like the idea of setting the really well  
20 organized deadlines for getting materials together. I'm  
21 hoping that built into this process you already have in mind  
22 the best way to incorporate and accommodate the input from  
23 FHWA. Because it seems like some of the time poor Kevin is  
24 stuck in the position of having to deliver the bad news on  
25 the spot. This thing, you've all read all this material and

1 prepared for it, you can't do it. W we should get that  
2 input before we get that deep into the whole process.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That has been a  
4 critical point, to make sure that FHWA reviews and they're  
5 okay with this.

6 Mr. Greenwood?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Following up on  
8 Mr. Marshall's comments. I had made a note that since the  
9 proposal is for the agenda to be distributed to us six weeks  
10 in advance, maybe we could request FHWA provide their  
11 comments two weeks in advance. That would give them four  
12 weeks to review the agenda, make their meaningful comments,  
13 get that to us, and that gives us two weeks to ruminate on  
14 FHWA's opinion. And hopefully that would be enough time for  
15 FHWA to give meaningful comment.

16 While I have the floor, on that distribution of  
17 the agenda, you know, on this agenda we did have some late  
18 changes. And I would hope that because we're proposing to  
19 have four meetings a year rather than the three required by  
20 the bylaws, that there would simply no additions to the  
21 agenda once it's set. So once it's set, it's set, and  
22 you're only missing it by three months rather than an  
23 undetermined amount of time.

24 And then I also like finding out ahead, but I hope  
25 that the locations and dates would be in consultation with

1 the Committee Members.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Those are good  
3 comments. And especially the dates. And if they are posted  
4 on the website then the agencies know what is the deadline  
5 for submitting applications.

6 Mr. Jones and then Mr. Ciccarelli.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: In the sheet it says  
8 "Caltrans Non-Motorized". With Caltrans new mission of  
9 being inclusive to everybody rather than just We Move Cars,  
10 maybe we can change that to Active Transportation or  
11 something more positive, rather than you're not driving.  
12 Especially with all the complete streets movements and  
13 everything.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I don't remember how  
15 we refer to those two positions in the bylaws.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: They're non-motorized  
17 representatives. And maybe we could work towards -- it was  
18 on the street -- the L.A. Streets blog, kind of making fun  
19 of Caltrans, saying maybe it's time to take heat on this  
20 SSTI report and be a little bit more positive about people  
21 that do other than buying cars.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Even if we are not  
23 consistent with the bylaws, who cares? Just whatever  
24 Mr. Jones is happy with.

25 Mr. Ciccarelli?

1           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes. I wanted to  
2 ask a specific question about a one-meeting versus two-  
3 meeting process as regards with request to experiment. For  
4 example, I may be bringing forward at our June meeting a  
5 request to experiment for something that's already under  
6 experimentation in other states. It seems, although I tend  
7 to be a cockeyed optimist, it seems to me that it should be  
8 relatively straightforward for an experiment to be approved  
9 here. So what would govern whether an experiment would be  
10 sent back for rework? I guess it's a matter of the  
11 Committee judgment; right? A clarification question.

12           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Yes, it would.  
13 Yes. I would say if it's something simple, you know,  
14 approval could be given. But if it's more complex --

15           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. And I also,  
16 as the most egregious example of not bringing something  
17 forward earlier enough for consideration, I am very much in  
18 support of the new framework.

19           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Did you hear that?  
20 Any other comments? Mr. Walter?

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Maybe just a couple.

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mea culpa.

23           COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: John, I appreciate your  
24 humility in this because it has been quite a slog for you.

25           And along that line I think it would be helpful,

1 based on the visual of what we were looking at from the  
2 previous item, with the green, yellow, red, blue language in  
3 there. That's fine from a legislative draft standpoint.  
4 But I would propose that you would immediately following  
5 that have what the final language looks like. So then it's  
6 not, I'm trying to remember, is this part in the National?  
7 Is this going to be in California? Do we want to take this  
8 out of this one? This changed, that didn't change. So the  
9 final version of that language I think would be very helpful  
10 for the Committee as you are trying to sort of keep straight  
11 what is proposed to be changed versus not.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Kind of like looking at  
13 track changes versus --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Exactly, yes, exactly  
15 right.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Anything else?  
17 Mr. Winter.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: And it's not in here but  
19 on the topic of the website and the posting of the agenda on  
20 the website. I do note that it was an older agenda, it's  
21 not the 62 page version of this agenda that is actually on  
22 your website.

23 And one of the suggestions I would have for an  
24 enhancement, and maybe this is more directed to your  
25 webmasters, find a way to once agendas are posted, do an

1 auto-notification. In other words, have people subscribe to  
2 when changes are made on the website so that they are kept  
3 informed. I think as members we try to reach out to our  
4 different elements of who we represent to let them know if  
5 there are changes or if there are minutes posted or agendas  
6 posted. But if Caltrans could take that back in. And elder  
7 parts of your organization do have those types of email  
8 blasts when changes are made to the website. That seemed to  
9 be a very low-hanging piece of fruit to be inclusive of the  
10 rest of the state that would be interested in the Committee.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: If I may comment  
12 on that. We did add that recently and I think there is now  
13 a link on the website where you can subscribe to the CTCDC  
14 items, similar to what we do with the CA MUTCD. We just  
15 didn't get this out in time for the meeting.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, any other  
17 comments? Seeing none. Since this is under a public  
18 hearing I need to open it to the public also. Any member of  
19 the audience who wishes to address the Committee on this  
20 specific item?

21 Seeing none I close it, bring it back.

22 Oh, there is one. Sorry, sir, I apologize.

23 MR. RHODES: Most of the items, of course, have  
24 nothing to do with the public. But one issue was brought up  
25 by Mr. Engelmann about making the CA MUTCD a living

1 document, six months to one year. I would have a little  
2 problem.

3 Craig Rhodes with Traffic Management, traffic  
4 engineering.

5 The issue would be, if making a living document,  
6 we already have problems with many of the agencies taking  
7 anywhere from six months to a year to adopt a brand new one,  
8 even though it should be. And sometimes when we submit  
9 plans in a design process it could take anywhere from one to  
10 two years for the design process to get all the way through.  
11 If you make it a living document then all of a sudden you  
12 are going to complicate and extend out those design changes,  
13 possibly. My thought would be, if I submit a plan and it  
14 can get done in less than three or four months through  
15 Caltrans then maybe possibly, you know, every six months  
16 would be an issue.

17 I would recommend if we go forward with making a  
18 living document, to make it at least one year, maybe a year  
19 and a half. Six months, I would think, would be just a  
20 little bit too much because you are talking about a lot of  
21 individuals. You are also affecting contractors who have to  
22 buy new equipment, new items. And I believe at one of the  
23 last ones, the temporary road strip I believe was an issue.  
24 So all of a sudden if you progress a little bit too fast the  
25 contractors may have an issue. So if you also look at the

1 end-users as well, not just the design engineers. So thank  
2 you.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Very  
4 excellent comment.

5 Kevin, do you have a comment?

6 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
7 Administration. As far as how the public meetings are laid  
8 out. When I first took over this position, how it was  
9 explained to me, is anytime there is an item brought forward  
10 by a sponsoring member of the Committee that it has to be  
11 brought to public hearing and it can't be axed prior to the  
12 meeting so it has to be heard.

13 I have a pre-meeting with Caltrans, with Duper, to  
14 discuss some of these items but we have to -- I have to let  
15 it come to the Committee when the sponsoring member then  
16 provides the information and then -- possibly during the  
17 deliberations from the other Committee Members the item  
18 could change so much that Federal Highway no longer has a  
19 problem with it.

20 So I don't want to initially hamper the creative  
21 process of this committee and of sponsoring members bringing  
22 items to the Committee. Because it's a public hearing  
23 process, the public will provide input, and then my input is  
24 just part of that process here in California. I am not to  
25 disallow agenda items prior to them being brought to the

1 public hearing. So I am just another person in that  
2 process.

3           If you'd like to consult with me as the sponsoring  
4 member on your item prior to getting it finalized in the  
5 agenda then that's something we could pursue as well; I  
6 could talk with each Committee Member. But as far as once  
7 it is brought to the Committee and it is on the agenda, it  
8 has to be heard and then I will provide my input from there.

9           As far as talking about experiments and people  
10 using the manual. I just want to remind people they have  
11 section 1A-09, Engineering Judgement, it's in the CA MUTCD  
12 as well as the National MUTCD, it's the exact same language.  
13 The professional engineer has the ability to use that  
14 section to provide flexibility. If they want to be using  
15 the manual as their primary leg for tort liability and  
16 things like that, then the manual could be used in that  
17 nature but you also have engineering judgment to provide any  
18 modifications that aren't within the CA MUTCD.

19           And as far as the experiments. If it's  
20 California-specific language that our agency is requesting  
21 to be changed to that experiment, it could go straight to  
22 the CTCDC and the experiment be put forward. But if it's on  
23 the black text standard language from the National MUTCD it  
24 would have to either go -- it goes to Federal Highway first.  
25 Once we approve it then the state CTCDC committee will

1 approve it. There has been some flexibility in the past  
2 where the CTCDC is willing to hear items prior to Federal  
3 Highway's approval, provide additional input before it is  
4 sent to headquarters. So they have flexibility in that  
5 aspect. But the state, the blue text standard language.  
6 That's based on -- I don't want to say "more restrictive"  
7 but it's standard language in blue text that can be heard  
8 directly by the CTCDC for experiment without Federal Highway  
9 input.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

11 Any other member of the audience?

12 Seeing none, now I close and bring it back to the  
13 Committee.

14 I just heard something. I was thinking, you know,  
15 that if you are preparing traffic construction plans and we  
16 agenda this document every six months then what is the  
17 consultant supposed to comply with? What is the contractor  
18 supposed to comply with? It usually takes more than six  
19 months to prepare these plans and get them approved and you  
20 prepare them by the latest version. So that's just  
21 something for -- because if this is law and this is design  
22 standard, and I don't know of any design standard that you  
23 change every six months. This is going to make it very  
24 difficult to comply with that. Just a thought.

25 Mr. Ciccarelli.

1           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It seems to me there  
2 is a tension between not wanting to subject practitioners to  
3 useless churn, as the commentor commented, versus certain  
4 additions to the manual. That you would want to minimize  
5 the delay getting it out. So it seems to me, and I am not  
6 going to be in the hot seat to make these changes by and  
7 large, I am not staff on Caltrans or anything like that, but  
8 it seems to me that a judgment call might want to be made  
9 between certain changes that would have the effect of  
10 impacting contractors and certain changes such as the  
11 introduction of a new sign that doesn't currently exist that  
12 would not have such impact. And the suggestion to complete  
13 the thought is that changes that would have, say, what I am  
14 going to call a contractor impact, might want to come out on  
15 a less-frequent change cycle than changes that wouldn't have  
16 such impact.

17           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And that's true.  
18 I'm thinking if I am a consultant, I have a contract, I know  
19 this is the CA MUTCD. They are not going to change it. So  
20 my design contract has to comply with this thing. But if I  
21 start a design contract and then before six months my  
22 project is not over and the document has changed, then do I  
23 have to go change my design? Just a thought.

24           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Just a comment on  
25 that topic. I don't recall the specific section but it does

1 allow you to go back and use a prior version of an MUTCD if  
2 it is not cost-effective to utilize the latest standards.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Well, any other  
4 discussions on this? I still need a motion on this.  
5 Anybody ready to make a motion on this item?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: It didn't say that it  
7 was -- the recommendation is just for us to provide  
8 recommendations; I think we have done so. Did you really  
9 need a motion?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Do you  
11 need --

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: You don't need a  
13 motion.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Do we need some  
15 directions to Caltrans to prepare an agenda based on the new  
16 recommended practice?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Chair, a  
18 question?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: One of the comments  
21 I heard from Committee Members had to do with where to give  
22 first input to FHWA in the process. It seems to me like  
23 that is something that needs to be stated.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I believe what we  
25 want to do is have FHWA provide us feedback two weeks prior

1 to the meeting, and that way they would have had four weeks  
2 to review the items.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. So we are  
4 okay with the recommended proposal by Caltrans to conduct  
5 our meetings in the new fashion, hopefully making it more  
6 efficient. Thank you.

7 Moving on to the next item.

8 It's 11:20; does anyone need to have a break?

9 Seeing no hands raised I move to 15-02; 15-02 is a  
10 request for opinion on whether new legislation is necessary  
11 in order to experiment with the HOV/Express lane striping.  
12 A proposal from Caltrans District 4. Who is going to  
13 present that?

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I can start. Is  
15 Jerry here?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Champa.

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Well, I'll start  
18 us out real quick. So District 4 has a location on Highway  
19 237 that they have an HOV/Express lane. The issue there is  
20 with the onramps and traffic accessing the HOV lane.  
21 Basically, there is insufficient weaving distance to get in  
22 there and to get out of there.

23 So District 4 is proposing a new striping  
24 configuration for ingress and egress of these particular  
25 lanes. Jerry is going to scroll down. Basically right now

1 the current design is -- if we maybe move on to the next  
2 page -- this is what is in the MUTCD for HOV lanes. We are  
3 using the eight inch solid, white double lines.

4 The new configuration would be a standard four  
5 inch set of double lines, whereas one of them is broken on  
6 either side, depending on what the intent is at that  
7 location. Whether you enter the HOV lane or you exit the  
8 HOV lane.

9 Jerry, chime in.

10 MR. CHAMPA: Again, Jerry Champa, Caltrans; I am  
11 the Statewide Traffic Safety Liaison. And I will be  
12 speaking from my experience as basically a technical  
13 assistance specialist working with our districts in District  
14 4 and also District 12. We have a representative here.  
15 They are both at this point pursuing or studying this detail  
16 as a solution for a difficult conflict area.

17 So again, this is -- the request here is for  
18 specific situations that are in our project development  
19 process. However, there are many, many more potential  
20 applications for this type of detail to be employed. That's  
21 because of existing, what we call safety hotspots and  
22 operational bottlenecks that are created by the substantial  
23 conflict that happens with cross-freeway weaving, two-sided,  
24 cross-freeway weaving between our HOV or carpool lanes and  
25 the right side entrance and exit ramps. so that happens on

1 a regular, daily basis. And the amount of conflict, it's so  
2 great, that this strategy can help us reduce the amount of  
3 conflict. Basically, instead of two way or crown weaving we  
4 would have it be only one way.

5 This proposal to experiment with this would be at  
6 least for two locations that are, again, approaching the  
7 final design and construction phase.

8 I think it is important to note that this detail  
9 has been employed. It is on the highway system, I believe  
10 in other states' freeways, and I believe it has been  
11 employed on the California freeway system as well. Chris.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Let me make one  
13 comment that the proposal here is to get an opinion on  
14 whether or not we need to change the Vehicle Code or  
15 legislation to support this striping configuration. So that  
16 -- the experimentation is something we can pursue.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: We have a picture  
19 on the Word file that kind of shows the location now. There  
20 is a map, if you scroll down, that shows the area where we  
21 have traffic coming in from 880, I think, and then 237. The  
22 picture was taken where the red arrow is.

23 This is an example in other -- this is in Hawaii,  
24 where they use this type of configuration to help streamline  
25 cars coming onto the freeway and not crowd that number four

1 lane. So it keeps people out of that. New York uses this  
2 striping pattern as well for their HOV lanes. And there's  
3 more pictures if we need to see them.

4 Basically the request here is, do we need to  
5 change the Vehicle Code to utilize this? And then  
6 specifically --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Could you just for  
8 clarification say what the legislation says today that we  
9 just got approved a few years ago. And what does that  
10 authorize and how that authorization is different than what  
11 you are proposing to do? And then again, what does the new  
12 proposed striping, what does the Vehicle Code say about this  
13 striping? Does the driver know what he or she is expected  
14 to do?

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Vehicle Code  
16 21460, it talks about double parallel lines. This is not  
17 (a) because that talks about yellow, you can't drive to the  
18 left.

19 But if double parallel solid white lines are in  
20 place, you may drive across under the following conditions.  
21 And one of them is under Item (c)(1):

22 "If the driver is on the side of the roadway  
23 in which the broken line is in place, the driver  
24 may cross over the double lines or drive to the  
25 left of the double lines when overtaking or

1 passing other vehicles."

2 So that would be a condition in an express lane  
3 where this is plausible.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Isn't the proposal  
5 the combination of solid and broken?

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Then that's all we  
8 need within the Vehicle Code and the driver knows what he is  
9 expected to do.

10 One question, Mr. Champa. You may know or the  
11 District 12 reps may know. They just recently did the HOV  
12 lanes on the 22 freeway down in there as a continuous  
13 access. What standard did you use?

14 MR. CHAMPA: The broken white wide, broken --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So this is already  
16 in place on the 22.

17 MR. CHAMPA: On the 22, correct.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The 22 freeway  
19 already has this striping in place.

20 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: No, no. We don't have  
21 the proposed striping in place, we have the broken --

22 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: The third one down.

23 MR. CHAMPA: This is what -- this version is what,  
24 the third, is what is in place on State Route 22. So that's  
25 option C.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Just let me  
2 know when you are done with your presentation so I can --

3 MR. CHAMPA: I believe I am.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Thank  
5 you, Jerry.

6 Questions, comments? Mr. Ciccarelli.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I encountered this  
8 section within the last year or so, not in the context of a  
9 freeway or a major arterial operations but in the context of  
10 clarifying what constituted a buffer bike lane. Buffer bike  
11 lanes, which consist of a solid white or broken white on  
12 either side of a transverse marked area, are frequently  
13 confused with double solid white lines for the purpose of  
14 prohibition. There is a widespread misunderstanding.

15 I satisfied my own curiosity but just as a major  
16 edit suggestion I think this section in the VC would be a  
17 whole lot clearer if there were subsections specifically to  
18 the yellow case and specifically to the white case. So I  
19 submit that for edit suggestions should the Vehicle Code  
20 section be revisited.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That is beyond the  
22 scope of the Committee and beyond the scope of this item but  
23 that is a good suggestion.

24 Again, you know, this is kind of a unique item  
25 because we are asked to render a legal opinion whether this

1 requires a legislative change. I have my own personal view  
2 on this and I have had actually legal consultation. But  
3 anybody else?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'm not a lawyer.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: You just look like  
6 one.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I just look like one.

8 (Laughter.)

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Greenwood.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: My opinion is,  
11 yes, it does need the legislation changed in order to be  
12 meaningful.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: CHP, will you be  
14 able to enforce the new striping as they are proposing and  
15 cite the section of the Vehicle Code that allows your  
16 officers to cite the vehicle for violating that striping?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yes, I had my Vehicle  
18 Code unit at our Academy look at it and their opinion was  
19 that under 21460, it does fall under that because where it  
20 talks about the solid and the broken line it doesn't specify  
21 the color. So just on the face of it, yes, it would fit  
22 into that.

23 Their thought was, enforcement-wise, talking to  
24 the field personnel, the double white lines, there is still  
25 confusion on those for some folks with the carpool lanes.

1 So adding another configuration of another color may just  
2 cause more confusion.

3           One of the solutions, they thought possibly, was  
4 under 21655.8 where it talks about the actual ingress and  
5 egress from the carpool lanes. Where it says in there "only  
6 allowed in designated areas." The thought on that was that  
7 -- I don't know if there are signs out there, I don't know  
8 how the carpool lanes are set up down here. But if there  
9 are signs specifying that at that point, you know, to give  
10 further direction to the motorist of what they are  
11 approaching so they will further understand at that point.

12           Possibly changing the legislation under that  
13 section as opposed to 21460. So just to further clarify it  
14 for them and then have the sign posted out there when that  
15 particular configuration is going to be used with the white  
16 lines. So their thought is, yes, under the current law it  
17 would be allowable but you are going to have some issues.

18           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So your comment is  
19 that they don't need legislative change now but you  
20 recommend some clarification in the future.

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Under that 21655.8, yes.  
22 Their problem was -- I don't know if anything needs to added  
23 to that but just the way it's worded that in designated  
24 areas. Possibly if there is some type of signage that could  
25 be put up. I don't there currently is any type of sign that

1 would cover that; I couldn't find anything. But another  
2 sign posted with the carpool sign so when you roll up in  
3 that area, to say, this is an exit or an entry zone,  
4 whichever it might be.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: So current law is enough  
6 and then there would be some administrative or regulatory  
7 compliance. Is that?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: It could be enforced.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: But just, it might be  
11 difficult. You might get a lot of officers once they, once  
12 you go to court and testify on it and there's a lot of  
13 confusion on the side of the motorists out there, they are  
14 not going to be willing to go in and battle that because  
15 they understand that confusion.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Let Caltrans staff  
18 address your comments.

19 MR. CHAMPA: I would just like to add that  
20 Caltrans and the project sponsors would be more than willing  
21 to work on a design for these experiments, these pilot  
22 installations. And I believe signing is really important to  
23 include, especially when we first try these projects.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Again, this  
25 is not a discussion on the design itself, this is a

1 discussion on whether we need a legislative change.

2 Mr. Winter, any thought?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: I did not think that  
4 legislation was needed. I think it kind of also falls maybe  
5 a little bit on the engineering side. Maybe what we are  
6 hearing here is what can be done to minimize the motorists'  
7 confusion. Here in District 7, we still have multiple HOV  
8 lanes with the double yellows or the double-double yellows  
9 as the separator. And I know the legislation of a few years  
10 ago was intended to begin a transition to get away from the  
11 yellow separators for the direction moving in the same  
12 direction and to go to some white.

13 I know when it was done out on the 10 freeway with  
14 the toll lane that was installed, it was kind of alluded to  
15 there was some motorist confusion. Caltrans certainly on  
16 their changeable message signs, they tried to put out some  
17 public announcement of that, you know, what those solid  
18 white lines meant. So it's probably more in the sense of  
19 the education side of it and what you can do on that but not  
20 so much on the legislative side.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Brown?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: No comment.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Marshall?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I agree with

25 Mr. Winter, I don't think legislation is needed, but I just

1 had a comment on the topic generally. I found it really  
2 hard to exactly envision what is being described here. I  
3 had to consult with my neighbor at the desk here with my  
4 sketch to see if we had the same understanding of it. We  
5 have just the little snippets of the different striping  
6 details, but more of a layout to show, here is really how  
7 these fits together, would tell the story more effectively.  
8 That's all I have.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. We have had  
10 enough discussion. Mr. Ciccarelli.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Just a clarification  
12 question. I noticed that in Subfigure A with the double  
13 solid white there is a diamond symbol in the preferential  
14 lane but in B and C, et cetera, there is no such diamond.  
15 Is that intentional? It actually is a question that sort of  
16 bears on enforcement as well. Because if it is more legible  
17 what is a preferential lane and what is not then that would  
18 seem to help with motorists' compliance and also  
19 enforceability.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Champa.

21 MR. CHAMPA: I think it's just an oversight or an  
22 omission. I think that it is supposed to be part of any HOV  
23 lane, the marking as a requirement.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Jerry, that would  
25 include the areas of the HOV lane where ingress and egress

1 are allowed?

2 MR. CHAMPA: i'm sorry, I didn't hear the last  
3 part.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That would include  
5 the broken line areas where ingress and egress are allowed,  
6 correct?

7 MR. CHAMPA: Yes, if it's a long stretch, yes.  
8 And I was just informed that the diamond marking is not a  
9 requirement if this is a designated/classified as an express  
10 lane, toll and carpool lane.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It is my  
12 understanding also that your own legal staff at Caltrans  
13 have looked at this and they don't believe that there is a  
14 legislation change required at this point.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Correct.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Except for  
17 one member of the Committee I guess pretty much everyone  
18 else agrees with the Caltrans attorneys that under the  
19 existing law you can do this; but if it is to be done you  
20 need to sign it and better education so that the drivers  
21 understand what this is all about.

22 MR. CHAMPA: Yes, sir.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Do you need a motion  
24 on this or you just wanted some feedback and comments?

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Feedback. And a

1 formal comment?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: If the Committee  
4 would support that the District do this in an experiment  
5 they could come back at the June meeting for a formal  
6 request, but in the meantime go ahead and perhaps look at  
7 implementing those changes.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I believe that is  
9 all okay. Do you have any comments on that?

10 I don't see any objection.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Okay. Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you, Jerry.

13 MR. CHAMPA: Thank you.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, moving on. We  
15 have withdrawn Item 15-03.

16 We go to Item 15-04, which is Coachella Valley NEV  
17 Plan and associated TCDs. Mr. Greenwood, that is your item.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Thank you. I  
19 will ask CVAG representative LeGrand Velez to go the podium,  
20 or his consultants, while I do a very brief introduction.

21 Coachella Valley Association of Governments, CVAG,  
22 has a very ambitious, active transportation plan. A 50  
23 mile, roughly, bicycle, walking, NEV path to traverse the  
24 entire Coachella Valley from Palm Springs to at least Indio  
25 and maybe to coachella. And they have several devices that

1 they feel they need to innovate and so they put them before  
2 the Committee. I will turn it over to CVAG.

3 MR. LIESWYN: With the Committee's permission, we  
4 were about to introduce it. We didn't know how long the  
5 previous item was going to go and LeGrand just stepped out  
6 to the toilet. But I can get started or we could wait a  
7 second.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Please get  
9 started.

10 MR. LIESWYN: My name is John Lieswyn of Alta. I  
11 have been working with LeGrand Velez on the Neighborhood  
12 Electric Vehicle Plan for about two years now.

13 This plan is authorized by Assembly Bill 61. The  
14 legislation permits a city or a group of cities within the  
15 county or the County of Riverside to adopt an NEV  
16 transportation plan.

17 One of the requirements of AB 61 - there's  
18 LeGrand. LeGrand will speak briefly about the context that  
19 we have been working on the NEV plan, specifically the CV  
20 language.

21 MR. VELEZ: Hello. My name is LeGrand Velez with  
22 the Coachella Valley Association of Governments. I  
23 apologize, I was in the restroom.

24 Today we are here to get your review and  
25 recommendation of our Neighborhood Electric Vehicle

1 Transportation Plan. That is a corollary plan to our CV  
2 Link Master Plan. This is a brief video about the CV Link  
3 project that hopefully will work.

4 (A video was played.)

5 MR. VELEZ: Thank you. I thought that was the  
6 best way to give you an introduction to this project, which  
7 is a very innovative, aggressive and ambitious project  
8 initiative to transform transportation in the Coachella  
9 Valley of Southern California.

10 The radical thing about this proposal is that it  
11 is an alternative transportation corridor that combines  
12 bicycle, pedestrians and low-speed electric vehicles; that  
13 would be neighborhood electric vehicles as well as golf  
14 carts, within the same corridor that primarily runs along  
15 drainage channels in our valley. It would connect eight of  
16 the nine cities initially with Desert Hot Springs being left  
17 out of the initial phase but we are working with Desert Hot  
18 Springs now to bring them into the loop as well.

19 We are here today because we are required to do  
20 this project. We are required to do an NEV Transportation  
21 Plan. We are authorized to do that under Assembly Bill 61  
22 for Riverside county and all jurisdictions within Riverside  
23 County. And under that authorizing legislation we are  
24 required to get the review and recommendation of this  
25 Committee in order to move on to get the approval of the

1 Director of Caltrans, who ultimately must approve any  
2 transportation plan.

3 I have a copy of the plan here if anybody is  
4 interested. And also -- so we are going -- our presentation  
5 is going to be -- that's the introduction and overview. Our  
6 presentation, of course, is going to be specifically about  
7 some non-standard traffic control devices that are proposed  
8 for this innovative, non-standard type project.

9 The memo and argument we are going to make in  
10 support of these standards is supported by two FHWA memos;  
11 and I brought copies of those, which I'll distribute. And I  
12 will turn over the details of the traffic control devices to  
13 my colleague, John Lieswyn.

14 MR. LIESWYN: Thank you, LeGrand.

15 As you can see, some of these are not specifically  
16 included within the MUTCD, federal or state. However, many  
17 of them are not precluded by, and so what we are asking for  
18 is motions and decisions or votes on one of four options for  
19 each of these devices. So to either include it in the MUTCD  
20 if the Committee feels appropriate; to approve some or all  
21 of them without explicit inclusion because the Committee  
22 feels like they can be covered through engineering judgment,  
23 they are not precluded by the MUTCD; or to conditionally  
24 approve some of these for experimentation, for example; or  
25 do not approve the specific devices.

1           Using your input today we propose to revise the  
2 design component, which is a required chapter of the NEV  
3 Plan from AB 61. The Design chapter has these elements in  
4 it. There are other elements which we have not brought to  
5 your attention because they are already approved MUTCD  
6 devices.

7           Shall I proceed through these in order or do you  
8 have any questions before we start?

9           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Please proceed.

10          MR. LIESWYN: So the first one is just an NEV  
11 parking sign. Currently throughout the Coachella Valley and  
12 I'm sure in your communities throughout California there is  
13 a plethora of different kinds of parking signs. The most  
14 common one within the Coachella Valley is "Golf Carts Only"  
15 and it is generally a black text with white background with  
16 a black border, as seen here, but there are some other  
17 versions of golf cart parking. The basis for this is I  
18 believe one of the two memos you have, which goes into  
19 FHWA's recommendation on such signs. And that's -- from  
20 that we developed this sign. So although this is not  
21 currently in the MUTCD it is similar to some of the signs,  
22 R22 through R25. Shall we call for a motion on whether  
23 to --

24          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Let's go in a faster  
25 fashion through all your requests and then we'll come back.

1 MR. LIESWYN: Sure. So these are some specific  
2 parking signs, which are legend-only regulatory signs. They  
3 basically help both private and agency staff establish  
4 operations of parking areas throughout the Valley but also  
5 along CV Link.

6 This one is a proposed crosswalk. The top image  
7 is what is shown in -- there are 25 such crosswalks along CV  
8 Link. This is not a valley-wide request; we would only be  
9 placing that colored crosswalk along CV Link. It is a  
10 standard ladder style, however, it uses the color themes  
11 from CV Link, which are present in other elements along CV  
12 Link such as the light tubes. We are using this to indicate  
13 to users of CV Link that they have entered an area of mixed  
14 use. It's sort of a speed control treatment. Those colored  
15 bars are present throughout CV Link and we propose to use  
16 that to help people know when they are along CV Link. It's  
17 otherwise a standard ladder style. We could also place it  
18 between two white transverse lines to increase the  
19 standardization with the MUTCD.

20 The next one is -- there's a couple of examples of  
21 other colored crosswalks for your information there.

22 In many cases there are not only the 25 major  
23 roadway crossings where we have CV Link but there are many  
24 places throughout the Valley where NEV operators are  
25 currently being directed to use shared paths and are

1 crossing at crosswalks. Where we have NEV lanes in complex  
2 traffic environments it may be that in the short term we  
3 would direct those NEV drivers and bicyclists to use the ped  
4 signal in the interim period until active detection or  
5 passive detection can be installed.

6           So the next ones are basically our lane striping  
7 options. From a pretty simple one which is already present  
8 in Coachella Valley. The difference is that in Coachella  
9 Valley we are generally using a golf cart symbol. And so we  
10 are trying to clarify, because golf carts are not allowed on  
11 many streets where NEVs would be allowed due to their  
12 different speed abilities, we are trying to clarify to users  
13 that this is different from the existing golf cart lanes.  
14 So that is why we chose and are proposing to use the letters  
15 N-E-V.

16           And then a few buffered lane options as you can  
17 see here.

18           The next things are really about the need to  
19 control NEV users where currently there are not a lot of  
20 used roadways over 35 miles an hour unless there is a  
21 dedicated space. And in many cases we can't provide a path  
22 or a lane and we have to direct them to make a turn, so we  
23 need some sort of device. Already these are standard, it's  
24 just that we are adding the words "NEV" to it. And then we  
25 are also coming up with a new sign that jurisdictions may

1 use in their street networks to indicate that condition  
2 where they are no longer legally permitted to travel.

3           And then a supplemental sign. The "EXCEPT BIKES"  
4 I believe, correct me if I'm wrong, I believe that that has  
5 just been -- CBAC has been talking about an "EXCEPT BIKES"  
6 sign for some time as a supplemental sign. We are simply  
7 adding the words "EXCEPT NEVS/BIKES".

8           And then a route guidance sign in green.

9           So that's it. How shall we go through this?

10          MR. VELEZ: Thank you.

11          COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

12          Mr. Marshall.

13          COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I heard from the  
14 initial comments that a lot of this rests on legislation  
15 that is specific to Riverside County. But somewhere in the  
16 materials there was reference to that some other communities  
17 have either plans or facilities for NEVs as well. I  
18 remember Lincoln being mentioned and something too that I  
19 can't remember. So what does that mean? Is this only in  
20 this location or should we be thinking about this as, if we  
21 approve this it can potentially then be used other places?

22          MR. LIESWYN: I think the latter. We researched  
23 the other NEV plans in coming up with these proposed traffic  
24 control devices and basically took the best that are  
25 available from there, looked at the most recent guides,

1 including the two memos that you have in front of you, and  
2 have come forward with this. So should some of these  
3 devices be included in the MUTCD or the Committee decide  
4 that it doesn't need to be specifically included because it  
5 is not prohibited by it, that is useful guidance that will  
6 end up in a final NEV plan and be a reference for other  
7 jurisdictions that may, should AB 61 start to be rolled out.

8           Because one of the things in AB 61 is that by  
9 January of 2016 the agency, CVAG in this case, needs to  
10 write a report that recommends to the Legislature whether it  
11 be expanded statewide.

12           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So part of the reason  
13 why I ask that question is I happen to own a home in Grass  
14 Valley, which is in Nevada County, and I am wondering about  
15 the acronym NEV. Is it already adopted and standardized and  
16 there is --

17           MR. LIESWYN: Yes.

18           MR. VELEZ: Yes.

19           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: -- no room to move it?

20           This is going to be very confusing if it ever  
21 comes to Nevada County. Or frankly, anyplace else in the  
22 vicinity of the Nevada state line. I don't know what the  
23 solution is to that but I find this -- There is a potential  
24 challenge there.

25           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That is the acronym

1 that actually they use in the law also. As was just  
2 mentioned, it's in Lincoln, it's in Rocklin and South Orange  
3 County unincorporated, they all have authority to do NEV  
4 plans.

5 Mr. Walter.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: I guess a couple of  
7 comments. With the signage that you propose, I think it's  
8 -- I think we are using too much text. And I think that  
9 signage seems to be going towards symbol-type signs rather  
10 than the text. So, you know, I would want us to be looking  
11 for symbols rather than text. And partly because of that  
12 reason as well, for the definition of the NEV.

13 And then I wasn't clear. Is your NEV plan the  
14 first in the state?

15 MR. LIESWYN: No.

16 MR. VELEZ: No.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Okay. So have these  
18 issues been tackled by other communities with NEV plans that  
19 they have had to install traffic control devices on?

20 MR. LIESWYN: I don't know the answer to that.  
21 Does anyone in the room know? I couldn't find any examples  
22 of like the City of Rocklin or -- Western Riverside County  
23 has an NEV plan.

24 MR. HOWE: Hi, I'm Don Howe from Caltrans.

25 Yes, we did have a request for experimentation,

1 which is ongoing. The City of Lincoln, the proponents and  
2 the champions for that I believe retired or their funding  
3 has dried up and so it is considered an ongoing experiment.  
4 Those signs are in place and operational in the city of  
5 Lincoln.

6 My understanding is the city of Rocklin was to  
7 adopt a plan and they also did not have funding to go  
8 forward but they are in legislation and able to do that.

9 We never really closed the loop on the Lincoln  
10 proposal, nevertheless there are signs out there that are  
11 similar to some in these proposals.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Okay. So again, I  
13 guess, maybe from my perspective, it would have been nice to  
14 have seen what other munis have used as examples of traffic  
15 control signage, which at least at the time they thought was  
16 compliant or would get across the message. And then again,  
17 how that compares to what you are proposing.

18 MR. LIESWYN: Sure. LeGrand here has taken a  
19 whole bunch of photos in an area and some of those signs are  
20 exactly as we proposed. The "NEVS PROHIBITED BEYOND THIS  
21 POINT" that's already established on a right-of-way in  
22 Lincoln.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I think in general,  
24 as it was mentioned, this is a growing trend. More and more  
25 communities will introduce NEVs as part of the adopted

1 transportation plan and all that.

2           Unfortunately, City of Lincoln didn't come back  
3 and -- you were just showing me the picture of the sign that  
4 they have actually installed there; which is the same sign.

5           MR. LIESWYN: Yes, it's the same sign.

6           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So you have the  
7 signs already installed elsewhere but maybe it's time to  
8 kind of come up with some standard signs.

9           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: And Lincoln's signs have  
10 been in place for what, 10 or 15 years?

11           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Ten years.

12           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Ten to 15 years now.

13           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Ten-plus, ten-plus.

14           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Maybe 20.

15           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Ten-plus because  
16 they got their authority in the early '90s.

17           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: There was Sun City up  
18 there.

19           MR. LIESWYN: May I respond to a couple of the  
20 other comments?

21           One was on symbology rather than text. At Alta we  
22 are very keen to do that, to have symbols; it is more  
23 international. CV Link is going to have a lot of  
24 international users, that's the hope anyway. So the issue  
25 is that there is already symbology for a golf cart. We have

1 to come up with a standard symbol for NEVs and thank you for  
2 that input, we'll look into that.

3 As far as definitions, there was a comment about  
4 confusion. The DMV has a pamphlet that defines an NEV  
5 versus a golf cart versus a modified golf cart. And it is  
6 one of the recommendations of this plan that all DMV  
7 locations in Coachella Valley post that pamphlet in a  
8 prominent place. It's got pictures and definitions.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any comments?  
10 Mr. Winter.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: A question, I suppose,  
12 first. The "NEV PARKING ONLY" sign. It's not clear to me.  
13 Is that an on-street placement or -- I saw in the video it  
14 looked like maybe what was being depicted is along the path  
15 there might be areas of parking along the path. So I am not  
16 quite sure, where was the application going to be of this  
17 sign?

18 MR. LIESWYN: Valley-wide, not just CV Link. It  
19 would be -- it could be used in parking lots that are  
20 private or public. It could be used in on-street angled  
21 parking spaces. Typically the way that they are used right  
22 now in Coachella Valley is in private parking lots where the  
23 spaces are smaller. They are conveniently located and they  
24 are generally at charging stations as well but not  
25 necessarily.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: And my reason for  
2 asking, and thank you for the clarification. Generally  
3 private properties or others, there has been past discussion  
4 about hopeful conformance with the manual. But, you know,  
5 it's different than if it was necessarily an on-street  
6 application of that sign. So we want to maybe get into the  
7 discussion points.

8 MR. LIESWYN: Well, if it was explicitly included  
9 in the MUTCD it would be a lot easier, I think, for private  
10 developers to select the right sign. Because it would avoid  
11 this plethora of signs that exist already.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Okay. I also saw the  
13 reference - and I apologize, I didn't go back. On the  
14 "right turn must turn right" where your request is to add  
15 the "except NEV and bike" you're noting that that was  
16 something we approved in the fall of 2014; is that --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: September of 2014 we  
18 approved the "EXCEPT BIKES" for the right turn movements.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Was that part of that  
20 experiment from Union City?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I don't believe it was an  
22 experiment, I think it was changed in the CA MUTCD.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Oh, the update.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It was part of the  
25 contra-flow bike lanes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The contra-flow of bike  
2 lanes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Okay. Then the only  
4 question, I guess, the plurals. As it was expressed, with  
5 NEV being something that people have to get used to, but  
6 then adding the plural of NEVS. I didn't know if the  
7 necessity was really needed for the plurals to be part of  
8 that. More of a comment. That was it for me.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Tong.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: I would like to ask Kevin  
11 Korth about the symbol. I know FHWA is very specific about  
12 using a symbol. So is it an option that the applicant can  
13 use a symbol for NEV instead of wording?

14 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
15 Administration. What the applicant is referring to about  
16 the flexibility is in the national manual they can use a  
17 text-only sign, and in every other state besides California  
18 because of the Vehicle Code, that local agencies can create  
19 text-only signs without having it be in place in the  
20 national MUTCD. Here in California the applicant would have  
21 to come, if he wants to use the CA MUTCD as a reference  
22 point, would have to come to you to use the text-only sign  
23 and get approved by this committee.

24 As far as a symbol, they would have to request an  
25 experiment at the national level with the Federal Highway

1 Administration if they were to come up with an NEV symbol.  
2 As far as the text, the national MUTCD already allows that  
3 for local agencies. It's here in California where the  
4 committee needs to act under legend-only signs.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: Thank you.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Is there a way we can not  
7 be the only state that requires that?

8 MR. LIESWYN: We're special.

9 (Laughter.)

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I know, but we are trying  
11 to also streamline things for cities to be innovative and  
12 creative.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other comments,  
14 thoughts, suggestions?

15 Okay, thank you for your presentation. I have to  
16 open it to the public.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Hamid? Hamid?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have a couple of  
20 comments.

21 With regard to the colored crosswalks. The issue,  
22 as I understand it from a low vision specialist is the  
23 contrast edge be present to guide someone who basically can  
24 see but not much. So they can see where the edge of the  
25 crosswalk is. So I would refer you to specialists such as

1 B. Z. Benson (phonetic), who advises Federal Highway on many  
2 things.

3 MR. LIESWYN: Pardon me. Would we need that if we  
4 put the transverse white line?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No. If you have a  
6 white line in the same direction of travel as the user of  
7 the crosswalk that is the contrast edge. The illustration  
8 of Alabama Street and Michigan Street in Indianapolis does  
9 not have such a contrast edge but I note that the crosswalks  
10 on Webster in Oakland do, so that's key to note there. So  
11 you have got all sorts of colored stuff. It's not so much  
12 that the colored stuff is permitted, it's that the contrast  
13 edge is required.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: They actually do have a  
15 contrast line up there, it's just faded and not maintained.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right. But I'm  
17 thinking -- I couldn't tell from the photo, from the  
18 illustration in the top sub-figure whether that features was  
19 effectively present in the proposed crosswalk marking.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I was just saying in the  
21 Alabama one.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right. Suggestion  
23 regarding "NEV BIKE USE PED SIGNAL" sign. Would be to do  
24 what you've done further down that page on the "NEV/BIKE  
25 LANE" sign, and that is to put a slash between "NEV" and

1 "BIKE" and possibly place them on the same line. Because  
2 otherwise the interpretation could be, what's an NEV/BIKE.  
3 Okay. NEV is an established terminology, I've seen it for  
4 probably 15, 20 years.

5           With regard to the "NEVS PROHIBITED BEYOND THIS  
6 POINT" sign. I wanted to suggest considering splitting it  
7 into an "NEVS PROHIBITED SIGN" that might be symbol-based  
8 and "BEYOND THIS POINT" as a qualifier. Because there could  
9 be cases where any of these prohibited messages alone would  
10 be useful in a regulatory context. So consider making  
11 "BEYOND THIS POINT" effectively a plaque that could modify a  
12 sign that was "NEVS PROHIBITED".

13           I second another member's comment that some of the  
14 signs, for example the plaque "EXCEPT NEVS/BIKES" is awfully  
15 texty in a dense sort of way that is hard to read. Although  
16 at NEV speeds it may be more than readable at the traveler's  
17 speed, which is what really counts for a legible MUTCD sign.  
18 That's all the comments.

19           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.  
20 Mr. Greenwood.

21           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: I had myself  
22 talked into the colored crosswalk but the August 2013 FHWA  
23 memo, the conclusion is that Paragraph 3 of Section 3G.01 in  
24 the MUTCD limits the use of colored pavement used as a  
25 traffic control device to the colors of yellow and white.

1 Interim Approval for green for bike lanes. So the very memo  
2 that you provided in support for your proposal actually  
3 excludes your proposal.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I think we have had  
5 at least half a dozen items in my tenure on the Committee  
6 about the colored crosswalk. And it has always been my  
7 understanding that if you have the two white transverse  
8 lines you can do whatever you want in the middle. If you  
9 don't have those two it doesn't matter what you do; that is  
10 not a crosswalk.

11 So like when I am looking at the illustration up  
12 there. Not the picture, the illustration, that is not a  
13 legal crosswalk except that it a the intersection. Whether  
14 they paint it or not it's a legal crosswalk. But if you put  
15 it somewhere like mid-block or somewhere or on a trail or  
16 something, by no definition in the law that's a crosswalk.  
17 That's a nice aesthetic treatment of the pavement but it is  
18 not a crosswalk.

19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I have a question.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Are they showing  
22 ladder markings on that illustration, though? The white  
23 ladder markings?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: As long as you have  
25 the two white or yellow lines, the edge lines.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And by the way, what  
3 you do in the middle is your business.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think FHWA  
5 considers a crosswalk to have the contrast edge if it just  
6 consists of the ladder rungs because the strength of that  
7 edge is enough to guide a low-vision user. So if the  
8 background pavement were dark enough that white fill was  
9 used in-between the colored bars -- and the colored bars  
10 essentially are irrelevant as a traffic control device. The  
11 traffic control device and eligibility becomes the white  
12 ladder bars. So if that illustration up there consists of a  
13 color alternating with white on a dark ground, that seems to  
14 me that would be equivalent to just a white ladder without  
15 -- without the --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: A continental crosswalk.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes, continental.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So the continental  
19 crosswalk that is in the Caltrans manual doesn't have  
20 transverse lines, it just has the continental lines on it.  
21 So you don't have to have the -- you don't have to have the  
22 stop bars.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We have been told  
24 repeatedly by Caltrans predecessors that --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right. But the Caltrans

1 manual --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We were told, and it  
3 is my reading also, the latest edition of the manual that  
4 they are passing around, that if you don't have those lines  
5 it is not a crosswalk.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right. Well then we need  
7 to change the Caltrans manual because it has a standard that  
8 does not have the lines.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And then at the same  
10 time they're saying you can paint a Michelangelo on the  
11 pavement as long as you don't expect a driver to do anything  
12 with it. They have restriction on the colored pavement.  
13 You can put whatever you want there as long as you don't  
14 expect drivers to do anything.

15 Any other thoughts, comments, questions?

16 We will turn to the public, to the public hearing.  
17 Any member of the audience who wishes to address the  
18 Committee on this item?

19 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
20 Administration. Don, can we go back to the very first  
21 figure?

22 MR. HOWE: Yes.

23 MR. KORTH: My question with the NEV parking sign.  
24 I think it was kind of addressed here. If the CA MUTCD was  
25 to include such a sign, some of the application of it and

1 the operation of it, would be wanting to be addressed in the  
2 language. If the sign is to be only used in parking stalls  
3 that have a substandard width that would only fit these NEV  
4 vehicles and that is when the sign is placed, or is the  
5 expectation that the NEVs would be allowed to park in  
6 standard stalls or on the streets and diagonal parking as  
7 well, then the sign would be appropriate to put in standard  
8 stalls and limit all vehicles besides these NEVs. So that's  
9 just a question I have is what the presenter was intending  
10 the application of that sign would be or if it would be  
11 both?

12 As far as on the next figure, the no parking  
13 signs. California already has EV parking signs and no  
14 parking signs in Section 2B.46, paragraph 84. And also if  
15 you see figure 2B.24(CA), there are parking standing signs  
16 and plaques. The R7 series that have -- in the 2014 Manual  
17 about electric vehicles. So are these signs substantially  
18 different than the intentions that are already in the CA  
19 MUTCD? Do we want all these variations? Because I believe  
20 those signs, they reference this "EV" versus "electric  
21 vehicle" so do we want to have all these additional  
22 abbreviations versus full text? So that's something for the  
23 Committee to consider.

24 As far as the crosswalk. None of the three images  
25 that are shown as examples/illustrations need a position

1 from Federal Highway for the recommended practice of colored  
2 pavement in 3(09)-24(I). One question I ask for the  
3 presenter to come up here real quick before I continue my  
4 comment is, are those colors of the additional pavement  
5 markings, are they retroreflective or are they not?

6 MR. LIESWYN: Retroreflective pavement markings  
7 are proposed for wherever CV Link is crossing the roadway.

8 MR. KORTH: So there is a separate Federal Highway  
9 interpretation that has come from Florida. Within those  
10 marked crosswalks, the paragraph 6 that we talked about,  
11 3G.01, those are -- if it is retroreflective that is a  
12 traffic control device and so the only colors are white,  
13 yellow and blue for handicapped parking stalls. So these  
14 are colors that are not permitted as pavement markings.  
15 Obviously those colors have signs, oranges for parking signs  
16 in part 6, but as far as the pavement markings, blue,  
17 yellow, white, are the only colors that can be  
18 retroreflective.

19 So the pavement markings here would have to be  
20 not-retroreflective to be proceeded with at all. But in the  
21 Guidance, in the official interpretation as listed here,  
22 these colors would be too bright and they don't need the  
23 interpretation from Federal Highway. It is only a guidance  
24 statement that we are providing the interim interpretation  
25 of so the city could proceed as they wish. Definitely there

1 is a separate interpretation that I could find for them that  
2 says they cannot be retroreflective. There is a white; and  
3 then here in California for the school zones, yellow can be  
4 used to mark the crosswalk with retroreflective colors.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Kevin, question. As  
6 I read the interpretation that uses the words "subdued  
7 colored." So if it is not retroreflective and it doesn't  
8 compete with the white marking it would be allowable,  
9 correct?

10 MR. KORTH: You could ask for an official  
11 interpretation for this color scheme from Federal Highway.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It says --

13 MR. KORTH: In the interpretation it's talking  
14 about earth tones and bricks. There's multiple colors  
15 within the old City of Oakland one as well so that is not  
16 one that we necessarily would agree with that follows the  
17 interpretation. The same with the -- separately, with the  
18 Indianapolis, for example. There is an icon in that  
19 crosswalk and there is no -- in the interpretation we don't  
20 recommend using icons or prohibiting icons to be used in the  
21 crosswalk.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other comments?

23 MR. KORTH: As far as the striping on the next  
24 page for the double line striping. I think that is  
25 something we kind of covered with the HOV. The top image

1 that's shown, that would be an experimental double wide  
2 striping having the broken and the solid next to it. Why  
3 wouldn't there be a need just to use the solid, single wide,  
4 solid white line for a buffer space if they were to mark out  
5 a bike lane, like there normally is?

6 That's all I had for the figures.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

8 Mr. Kenney.

9 MR. KENNEY: Good morning, Mike Kenney with the  
10 County of San Diego.

11 I want to say it's a tremendous project, I wish  
12 you the best. It was great seeing the bridge extrude out  
13 across the sky.

14 The sizes, I don't have any particular comment  
15 about that. I did not know what an NEV was. Maybe I'm one  
16 of the few in the room but I guess that education will  
17 commence.

18 I did have some concerns about the crosswalk. We  
19 have had real problems maintaining color and maintaining  
20 design in the pavement as the pavement shifts. And I was  
21 really surprised where you're coming from with the sun and  
22 the heat that you wouldn't have similar problems. I'm  
23 questioning whether or not we are making problems here. Six  
24 months is probably (inaudible). I don't know that I would  
25 be supportive of a really complex forward crosswalk like

1 that just for those reasons. But it's a great project; I  
2 wish you the best.

3 MR. LIESWYN: What was your experience with the  
4 markings?

5 MR. KENNEY: The pavers, you've got to power wash  
6 them every six months. The applique that goes into the  
7 asphalt, that's the one that rotates with the asphalt. And  
8 thermal will chip and fade as cars make a right turn across  
9 it. You see a difference where the cars are torquing it and  
10 where they are going straight. You see a difference.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Any  
12 other comments?

13 Hearing none we will close the public comment  
14 portion and bring it back to the Committee. So who is going  
15 to lead it? Especially this one.

16 Mr. Greenwood, do you want to lead the discussion  
17 or make a motion or a suggestion?

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Well frankly,  
19 I'd like to hear what the Committee has to say.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Walter.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Mr. Chair, do we want to  
22 take them one at a time and have the discussion on each one?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We can take them one  
24 at a time. That's the first question. Do we even need to  
25 look at this and include it in the MUTCD? For example, the

1 parking sign, for example, as the FHWA representative said,  
2 you already have signs in there. Why do you want to  
3 introduce new signs with a little bit of difference here and  
4 there? Why don't you just use the signs that are there?

5 And on the NEV/BIKE ONLY, I think we might have  
6 probably approved that; I am not sure.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So I think the answer  
8 might be different for the different things.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Let's move quickly  
10 without spending a whole lot of time. On the NEV PARKING  
11 ONLY what is the pleasure of the Committee?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'd make a motion to  
13 approve it.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, very simple.  
15 A motion; is there a second?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Second.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there is a  
18 motion and a second for discussion purposes.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Discussion?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Ciccarelli.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: NEVs and EVs are  
22 different animals. An NEV is much --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, they are  
24 legally defined differently.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Not only differently

1 but because of their speed regime they operate differently.  
2 They are like golf carts, in that that is their closest  
3 cousin. I think it is a legitimate need to mark a parking  
4 space for an NEV that would not be legal for an EV, which is  
5 a full-speed car.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
7 that we do exactly that, allow the new sign to be for NEV  
8 parking only. Mr. Marshall.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So the proponents had  
10 suggested that we choose between a couple of options if we  
11 are in favor, one of which is to fully include it in the  
12 manual and one of which is to just say, it is okay as a  
13 text-only sign, it doesn't have to be actually added to the  
14 manual. Which of those is the motion?

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: My inclination is to  
16 include it in the manual because NEV is a growing trend.  
17 And there are other communities that are using them and will  
18 be using them.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: A lot of cities are  
20 trying to move toward sustainability and a net-zero  
21 footprint for carbon -- carbon reductions to encourage their  
22 communities to have these neighborhood electric vehicles to  
23 get people around for those trips that are three to six  
24 miles around their home, you know, that they might not walk  
25 or bike to. So it's a great thing that a lot of communities

1 are moving towards, a lot of senior communities are doing it  
2 as well.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And every single  
4 year there is at least one or two bills on NEV trying to  
5 expand the network they can use and things of that nature.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So I appreciate the  
7 good reasons for needing this and the spirit of it; I am  
8 just clarifying to make sure I have the right understanding.  
9 Would the result of the - if we pass this motion - be that  
10 Caltrans goes and comes back with proposed language, et  
11 cetera?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, typically the  
13 way that we have done it is that we look at the sign. If we  
14 don't like the verbiage or the language we just say we don't  
15 like it and we change it.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay, so it will be  
17 done today.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Once we approve it  
19 then Caltrans' sign design group, they take it and they  
20 develop the details for their specs.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: And just to be clear,  
23 the narrative as well that would go into the actual manual?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Exactly.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Because there is some

1 guidance.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: One comment here in the  
4 room we heard is, perhaps the sign is supplemental to the  
5 actual marked space, which is going to be a narrower space  
6 than traditional or maybe not. Either way, that kind of  
7 distinction should be made in the narrative that would go  
8 into the manual with the sign.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's true.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So my motion was for any  
11 space, whether it is specifically designed for NEV or wider,  
12 that they could put this sign and use this sign to restrict  
13 it just for NEV parking.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That was your  
15 motion; that is my understanding.

16 Any other discussion on the motion?

17 Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

18 (Ayes.)

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

20 Seeing none, the motion passes unanimously. So  
21 Caltrans will develop the appropriate sign details for this  
22 sign and incorporate it into the MUTCD for use by anyone in  
23 the state.

24 Now on the parking signs. Who wants to make a  
25 motion or a comment? Mr. Ciccarelli.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have a question as  
2 to what is being requested here based on the illustration; I  
3 am unclear on this.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: What's your question?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Approve the use of  
6 legend-only regulatory signs. I don't see any legend-only  
7 regulatory signs except for the vehicle must be plugged in  
8 and vacate stall. Those already have our numbers so what is  
9 being requested here? I am confused.

10 MR. LIESWYN: I apologize, it has been some time  
11 since I put this together. There is -- I think it's the OTS  
12 has published -- these signs have been in development for  
13 some years. I believe San Diego County started with a  
14 guideline to help developers and agencies implement parking  
15 signs specific to NEVs. And the OTS has come out with  
16 another set of guidelines and I believe it was those  
17 guidelines we based these on.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So are these not-  
19 yet-approved signs?

20 MR. LIESWYN: I don't believe so.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So they have  
22 provisional sign designation numbers? I am not familiar,  
23 without looking at it, at the parking chapter of the MUTCD.  
24 So these four or six or five images here are provisionals?  
25 Don?

1 MR. HOWE: I am just checking our sign chart that  
2 members of the committee received.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Howe, we have  
4 the charging station. I have seen signs all over town that  
5 say "no parking except where charting" or something. We  
6 have something for the electric vehicles. And in that  
7 respect, NEVs are no different than electric vehicles, they  
8 are just charging.

9 MR. HOWE: Well we are talking about neighborhood  
10 electric vehicles. These look to be broader, encompassing  
11 all electric vehicles.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: But an NEV is a form  
13 of an electric vehicle so it falls under the category of  
14 electric vehicle. And if you have signs for parking  
15 restrictions for electric vehicles why can't they just use  
16 those signs, or do we need new signs?

17 MR. HOWE: That's a good observation. I know that  
18 we wanted to get away from the concept of them being parking  
19 places because they are charging stations, so we don't want  
20 to call them "parking places," they are "charging places".  
21 So the concept of no parking except while charging. We have  
22 in your sign charts that you have -- the new signs that we  
23 developed for that are on sheet 4 of 14. And we have the  
24 symbol "no parking except for EV charging" and then it is  
25 all spelled up. We have the alternate version that is

1 R-113a(CA). Then there is the permissive 4 hour EV charging  
2 from 8 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. That's R-114 and the alternative  
3 to that is the R-114a(CA) 4 hour electric vehicle charging  
4 that has a time frame. So that is what we developed  
5 according to our zero emission vehicle policy directive and  
6 that was reviewed with and vetted through this Committee.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So what I am asking  
8 is that if you have those signs available why do we need new  
9 signs? NEV is a subcategory of an electric vehicle. If you  
10 already have those restrictions and those signs are already  
11 available why do we need an all new set of signs?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Mr. Chair?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Walter.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Actually, based on what  
15 you just described, why did we need to do the first sign?  
16 If NEVs are a subcategory of electric vehicles why can't  
17 signs for electric vehicles be sufficient?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That was for  
19 parking. That was for parking. One of the things in that  
20 -- I hear what you are saying. The only difference between  
21 NEV and electric vehicle is the type of arterial or the  
22 street that they can operate on and their safety equipment.  
23 That's the only difference. Otherwise it's a form of an  
24 electric vehicle.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: It was my

1 understanding that the regular electric vehicles could be  
2 full-size, full-speed automobiles, essentially.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Whereas these  
5 neighborhood ones are likely smaller. And I think there is  
6 some potential that some locations might create reduced size  
7 spaces that need to be posted "NEV" rather than "EV." I  
8 think that's why we need the first one but probably don't  
9 need this one.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. So what are  
11 your thoughts on this set of signs, on the parking signs?  
12 any comments, a motion?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I move we accept the  
14 applicant's request to withdraw this one because it is not  
15 needed.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
17 and do we have a second?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: We've got a hand up over  
19 here.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Don.

21 MR. HOWE: Just as a technical thing. The plaques  
22 that are shown, "VEHICLE MUST BE PLUGGED IN", "VACATE STALL  
23 WHEN CHARGING COMPLETED", those are new and they may have  
24 some value to augment the existing ones that we have in the  
25 CA MUTCD. So just those two alone might be helpful.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Those two, the two  
2 plates. I'm looking at R7-113a and 113b. Those two, we  
3 don't have anything like those?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So the numbers are  
5 just potential numbering schemes, they don't mean they  
6 actually already exist; is that correct?

7 MR. HOWE: They don't have the CA suffix so they  
8 are not in our manual. These may be something in  
9 development in another jurisdiction such as was mentioned,  
10 San Diego County. But I don't know what context this is  
11 used in. These are regulatory so R would be the correct  
12 prefix.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay. So I will  
14 replace my motion to approve the two plaques.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. so there is a  
16 motion to approve those two plaques, the R7-113a and 113b.

17 Yes, Mr. Ciccarelli.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Not being well  
19 versed in the nuances of policy-making around these things  
20 and the communities that are likely to use them, I would ask  
21 the requestor what the down side of not approving, say, the  
22 first sign, the R7-111, would be? What is the use case for  
23 this sign? Without trying to drag out the discussion.  
24 That's really, that's really how we decide whether the sign  
25 is worthwhile.

1           MR. LIESWYN: The rationale for -- and apparently  
2 there is already one there, which we didn't see, it's a  
3 symbol sign, "no parking except for EV charging." So the  
4 rationale was to promote the use of NEVs and to dedicate  
5 spaces that were close to CV Link or other specific  
6 facilities, rather than a highway-capable EV. So  
7 potentially the Committee could offer us feedback to come  
8 back with a different sign that would be targeted at NEVs  
9 rather than EVs, as that would benefit the NEV plan.

10           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The three parking  
11 signs, I just don't see the need. Because if you want to  
12 restrict parking except for when charging, you already have  
13 signs that say that. They don't say what vehicle is  
14 charging, full-size electric vehicle or NEV. But those two  
15 plaques, as Mr. Marshall mentioned, I see value in the  
16 plaques.

17           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I'll second  
18 Mr. Marshall's motion.

19           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, there is a  
20 motion and a second. Any discussion? Mr. Walter.

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Question as far as those  
22 two small plaques are concerned. Because they are black on  
23 white are they immediately regulatory and then enforceable  
24 and is that something that our law enforcement folks are on  
25 board with as far as that goes? Is there any reason why

1 they wouldn't be?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I don't see why not.  
3 Once it is a regulatory sign and it's a parking sign they  
4 can issue tickets.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: They could. it might be  
6 difficult to enforce. Vacate stall when charging completed.  
7 How are you going to know when charging is completed.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Well, I would  
9 imagine as long as they are plugged in they are charging and  
10 you wouldn't know when they are fully charged or not.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: The charger at my work  
12 place includes a feature where it will send you a text  
13 message when it's done, then you can come move your vehicle.  
14 So such things exist. That's the way it's headed.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: It also sends the meter  
16 maid a text that your car is done. See who can get there  
17 first.

18 (Laughter.)

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think on a simpler  
21 note, it's likely that in jurisdictions that deploy this  
22 that at least the local law enforcement would be trained to  
23 look at the specific charger that the jurisdiction has  
24 selected. There is not likely to be a wide variety of these  
25 chargers and there is likely to have a charge complete

1 indication like a blinking light that goes solid or  
2 something.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So we have the  
4 motion and we have a second; any discussion?

5 All those in favor?

6 (Ayes.)

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

8 Seeing none, the motion passes unanimously.

9 Now we go to the crosswalks. Kevin, you have  
10 something to add?

11 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
12 Administration. My recommendation to the Committee is that  
13 they don't have to voice any opinion on this actually and  
14 let the Federal Highway interpretation letter speak for  
15 itself. Let the Agency review that letter and do as they  
16 see fit with the guidance statement.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I fully support your  
18 position but bring it back to the Committee.

19 We heard from FHWA's representative. Any  
20 comments?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think I really  
22 support FHWA's guidance on this because I am tasked with, in  
23 part, looking out for the needs of the pedestrian crosser.  
24 And I want the crosswalk to be readable not only to the  
25 pedestrian for a guidance perspective but from the

1 approaching cross-conflict motorist that it stands out. And  
2 I wonder whether the applicant might consider instead  
3 something that is off-roadway immediately in advance of the  
4 crossway that strongly identifies it from a branding  
5 perspective but doesn't actually mark the crosswalk itself.  
6 Suggestion.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just for future, if  
8 anyone wants to bring -- to members, if any agency comes to  
9 you for a colored crosswalk or anything like that, encourage  
10 them to go and read the last ten years' minutes of the  
11 Committee. At least seven times we have had this  
12 discussion, over and over and over.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: On the way here from  
14 Union Station, there's a whole bunch of different, beautiful  
15 crosswalks out there that are great examples. I commend LA  
16 DOT for being innovative and creative.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If John Fisher --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Mr. Chairman, if I can  
19 make a motion? Since we are the Traffic Control Devices  
20 Committee, and I think the discussion on this is that this  
21 perhaps is not a traffic control device but that the FHWA  
22 memo does provide guidance, then my motion on this is to not  
23 approve this particular matter but again, as FHWA's  
24 representative has said, is perhaps let the applicant  
25 consider it.

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

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Second.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
5 and a second. Let it be noted also that the FHWA memo is  
6 the decision on this issue. Okay.

7 MR. VELEZ: May I ask for clarification?

8 So it is my understanding that we could do  
9 something creative with, say, using the colors of the CV  
10 Link colors. This whole idea is sort of way-finding, iconic  
11 thing to distinguish this is a CV Link crossing as opposed  
12 to just a standard crossing. As long as we meet the FHWA  
13 guidelines as far as what colors can be retroreflective,  
14 having the transverse lines, that we could do some play  
15 within colors within that, granted, the limitations that  
16 were pointed out by my colleague from san Diego. My  
17 interpretation is correct?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: As long as it is a  
19 legally defined crosswalk location.

20 MR. VELEZ: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: If it's not, don't  
22 except the driver to treat it as a crosswalk, because it's  
23 not.

24 MR. VELEZ: Okay. Thank you.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any comments?

1 Okay, we have a motion. Do we have a second? We have a  
2 second. Any discussion?

3 All those in favor say aye?

4 (Ayes.)

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

6 The motion passes unanimously.

7 Okay. Did we have another item here? We had the  
8 striping issue, right?

9 (Several people speaking at once.)

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Move approval with  
11 two modifications. One is a "slash" after "NEV" and the  
12 second is the placement of the word "NEV" and the word  
13 "BIKE" on the same line, for consistency with the sign at  
14 the bottom left of the page.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
16 and a second. Any discussion?

17 Seeing none, all those in favor?

18 (Ayes.)

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

20 The motion passes unanimously.

21 Okay. Going down the line. What else do you have  
22 there?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The combined NEV and  
24 bike lane.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We have a new

1 proposals for new stencils which says "NEV/BIKE LANE."

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This is parallel to  
3 the use of preferential lanes for motorized vehicles where  
4 the type of vehicle is multiple. For example, in San  
5 Francisco there are bus and taxi lanes. So this is a  
6 parallel construct in the bike lane. I have no heartburn  
7 whatsoever with allowing NEVs in bike lanes in the  
8 jurisdictions that have decided to pursue that. The NEV is  
9 so well established there in the form of a golf cart and the  
10 cyclists know what to do. If the agency sees fit to deploy  
11 this they have made a substantial investment in combining  
12 the two modes in that part of the roadway.

13 We can't expand the roadways infinitely and have a  
14 bike lane and a golf cart lane and a general purpose travel  
15 lane. I think the speeds are compatible. If it doesn't  
16 work they are going to take it out anyway. So I am  
17 supportive overall of this whole NEV-plus-bike lane for the  
18 jurisdictions that have chosen to go that route. And this  
19 looks to me like the way that matches how multi-vehicle type  
20 HOV lanes are done, or preferential lanes are done in a  
21 general sense.

22 I move approval of this one.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion;  
24 is there a second?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I'll second.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
2 and a second for approving the new stencils. Any  
3 discussion? Mr. Winter.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: One question just  
5 occurred to me now. The bike lane, traditionally you  
6 accompany that with a sign that says "BIKE LANE." So this  
7 doesn't depict if it would have signage associated with the  
8 bike lane. Is there a suggestion maybe to change a sign  
9 that would also say -- well, below, I guess it's the next  
10 one. The next one would get into that then, okay. So we're  
11 sort of -- my comment will, I guess, be appropriate to the  
12 next one, the "NEV/BIKE LANE."

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I have a question,  
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure, go ahead.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Is there a minimum  
17 width requirement. Because you wouldn't be able just to do  
18 this with any bike lane.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Correct.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I imagine that they  
21 would comply with the minimum bike lane requirement.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: The NEV Plan specifies  
23 seven foot minimums.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Seven foot.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So we have a motion

1 and a second. Go ahead.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It seems to me that  
3 this would require modifications to Part 9 of the MUTCD,  
4 which defines the use of bike lane markings, 9C.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, you are  
6 absolutely right there.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's it, I am  
8 still supportive.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: It could be its  
11 own separate item, Part 3 under Pavement Markings.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'd actually prefer  
13 that because it mainstreams it.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: That will change  
15 the bike chapter.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Limited to the  
17 application. There are very places that there are combined  
18 NEV/bike lanes.

19 Okay, a motion and second. Any further  
20 discussion?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually it's a  
22 question. Would Caltrans be tasked with developing the Part  
23 3 language?

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Yes.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: They do that.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I would like to  
2 revise my motion. I support the marking scheme, provided  
3 that Caltrans develops supporting language in Part -- 3C it  
4 would be, right, Chapter 3C?

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Part 3, yes. And  
6 probably Part 9 as well; there might be some references in  
7 Part 9.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'll say the  
9 appropriate parts.

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Yes.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, we have a  
12 motion and it was seconded. Okay, there is a revised motion  
13 and a second. Any further discussion?

14 Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

15 (Ayes.)

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition? Seeing  
17 none, the motion passes unanimously. Going down the list.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'll take this one.  
19 I move to approve the three variants of the buffered  
20 NEV/bike lane striping. I have a question before finalizing  
21 the motion. That is, whether the solid combined with dotted  
22 line is currently allowed in the MUTCD. I thought Kevin had  
23 a comment to that effect, that it is not. In other words,  
24 the variant.

25 MR. KORTH: Yes, this is the same issue brought up

1 by Jerry Champa. They were going to be requesting an  
2 experiment for a managed lane on a highway facility to use  
3 this type of marking. What was discussed, the vagueness  
4 would not -- the color of the current Vehicle Code would  
5 allow for them to proceed with their experiment, that  
6 managing facility, so that's why I brought it up here. The  
7 bike lane, what does that marking just broken and solid  
8 represent? That first line stripe marking I would say, if  
9 that is going to be an experimental marking, just as it was  
10 for the managed lane that Jerry Champa brought up in his  
11 item.

12 MR. LIESWYN: Since we prepared this I understand  
13 that the City of Davis has come up with an alternative and I  
14 am unsure as to whether that was brought to this committee.  
15 It's just a wider paint stripe; I believe it's 10 or 12  
16 inches wide. The reason that there are three presented is  
17 basically reduced width. It is an attempt to provide a  
18 buffer to the adjacent motor vehicle lane. If the space is  
19 there then there would be a standard buffer and if the space  
20 is not there then we are looking for something to strengthen  
21 that dividing lane line. And I understand just a wider line  
22 is something that some communities are trying.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thanks for the  
24 clarification. Is there a motion on the new proposed  
25 striping? Or any discussion?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I would like to  
2 move --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Walter.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: I'll wait until there is  
5 a motion and a second.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, let's have the  
7 motion then we'll have discussion. Mr. Ciccarelli.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have a question in  
9 my own mind about the recently added content that I brought  
10 forward on buffered bike lanes. It seemed to me that there  
11 was something that we actually inherited from the national  
12 draft on which it was based that said if the width and  
13 buffer is below a certain width then you don't use  
14 transverse markings. So it seems to me that Case 1 might  
15 already be covered in the buffered bike lane language but I  
16 don't know chapter and verse, I'm going to look at it.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: That was part of the  
18 September discussion on the buffered bike lanes. And if  
19 it's -- it was below two or three feet, or I can't remember  
20 the exact dimension, then the transverse diagonal lines did  
21 not need to be installed.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER: I think it was below four feet.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Is it below four feet?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Below four feet, yes.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So Case 1 of 3 would

1 seem to be covered already in the manual in the case of  
2 buffered bike lanes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: But don't those have  
4 both lines solid and not one of them dashed?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Give me a minute and  
6 let me find the text that was added and see if I can resolve  
7 this. Buffered bike lanes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The only difference on  
9 those is adding the word, the three letters, NEV as the  
10 markings. All the other buffers we approved in September.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: There is a "should",  
12 it says:

13 "If used and where there is parking on the  
14 right side of the buffered bicycle lane, the right  
15 most lane line should be broken. Where vehicles  
16 are expected to cross the buffered driveways, both  
17 lines should be broken. Where neither condition  
18 exists, both lanes should be solid."

19 So it is a "should", it's a guidance right now. I  
20 would expect that -- well it says, it's called driveways.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Well, we don't want  
22 to spend too much time on this item either. Are we ready to  
23 make a motion or we are just not going to make it.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'd like to move  
25 approval of the Case 2 and Case 3 markings and defer Case 1.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion,  
2 is there a second? Case 1 being the top one. That's what  
3 you mean, right?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Case 1, 2 and 3 are --  
5 the stripings are already there. The questions is, adding  
6 NEV to the markings. Because all the striping already  
7 exists in the MUTCD.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Didn't we just approve  
9 that? On the page --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: In September --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So this is the --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: We already approved  
13 the marking and then --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So, we already approved  
15 the "NEV" so we don't really need to do any of that  
16 striping.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: No the NEV lanes, bike  
19 lanes sign.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's one of the  
21 things we approved already.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Did we already approve  
23 that?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We already made the  
25 motion.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay. I don't believe we  
2 did.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We didn't?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: No.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is there a motion  
6 and second on those three signs, those three plaques?

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Yes. I'll  
8 move approval as shown.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Second.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
11 and a second.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: We don't need the two  
13 small ones, do we?

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: "BEGINS" and "ENDS"?  
15 "BEGINS" and "ENDS", we have those "BEGINS" and "ENDS" for  
16 all kinds of uses.

17 MR. LIESWYN: We only put them in there for  
18 context.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. So it's only  
20 the left side, the sign that says, "NEV/BIKE LANE". Because  
21 we have "BEGIN" and "END" plaques for all other purposes.

22 Okay, there is a motion and a second. Is there,  
23 actually, was there a second?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: All those in favor.

1 (Ayes.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

3 Seeing none it passes unanimously. Okay, and --

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Mr. Chair, what do  
5 we do on the three striping variations?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We don't need to do  
7 anything because the striping is already there and we  
8 approved a combination of NEV and BIKE LANES.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: All right, thank  
10 you.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Can you scroll down to  
12 the next page.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually I have a  
14 question before we go forward from this page.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Could you stay on  
16 that, Mr. Howe, please.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's actually  
18 germane to getting this in the manual. The manual, there is  
19 a section on buffered bike lanes. It is not a section on  
20 buffered NEV plus bike lanes. So, how does Caltrans resolve  
21 that?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: We took the vote up there  
23 that says the markings of what goes into them.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So what is the  
25 change to the manual that allows this to go in?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I think that the --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We got the text up,  
3 the would allow the text to the appropriate section.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Add the text to  
5 Part 3 and we can make references to Part 9 for the striping  
6 configurations.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Sorry to pick this  
8 point but this is important because buffered bike lanes are  
9 so new. Will the text in Part 3 say something like, you may  
10 add the word "NEV" to any of the bike lane striping  
11 configurations in Part 9-whatever.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: If it meets the  
13 criteria for NEV lanes, yes.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Kevin.

16 MR. KORTH: Kevin Korth, Federal Highway  
17 Administration. Part 9 is the bicycle facilities but is  
18 also covers shared use facilities, there could be bikes and  
19 peds off the main right of way. So there could just be a  
20 support statement put in place for context of the discussion  
21 they had and all the legislation that was put in place to  
22 allow this varying of both bicycles and NEVs. But it would  
23 be in the Part 9 Bicycle Facilities part of the CA MUTCD.  
24 A support statement to help drive this issue of flexibility  
25 for all the different signs and markers that we discussed.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you. Okay, do  
2 we have anything else? Scroll down please to that  
3 "PROHIBITED BEYOND THIS POINT".

4 MR. HOWE: I'm Don Howe from Caltrans. I did want  
5 to make a clarification that the signs that are shown here  
6 are the plural of BEGIN and END but those Caltrans sign  
7 designations, those are not plural. There is, BEGIN and END  
8 for those sign designations, so. Just so you know. I'll  
9 put it in the record.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So the only thing I would  
11 say on this, the "NEV PROHIBITED BEYOND THIS POINT", is just  
12 to make it singular because NEV stands for Neighborhood  
13 Electric Vehicle or Vehicles and so you don't need the "S"  
14 on the NEV.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And also you support  
16 the idea of splitting the signs into two so that you can use  
17 them independently?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes, so you could say,  
19 "NEVs PROHIBITED" as one sign and then, "BEYOND THIS POINT"  
20 as another placard.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Or it can be for  
22 either/or.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, so that is my  
24 motion.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion to

1 make it the singular NEV, not plural, and also break up the  
2 sign into two signs.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

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

6 Seeing none, all those in favor?

7 (Ayes.)

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

9 The motion passes unanimously.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So is LA DOT going to get  
11 a whole bunch of NEV vehicles now?

12 (Laughter.)

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.  
14 We are done with this item.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No, we are not.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: One more?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The "EXCEPT NEV". So the  
18 same thing except NEV take out the "s"/BIKE.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'd like to also  
20 suggest that the word "NEV/BIKE" be dropped to a second line  
21 to be parallel with the new "EXCEPT BIKE" sign. And the new  
22 "EXCEPT BIKE" sign is a graphical bike. I don't think this  
23 needs to be graphical, I like it the way it is, but I think  
24 two lines would be more legible.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Two lines is fine.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes. So make it two  
2 lines and make it singular, both NEV and BIKE. Yes,  
3 Mr. Howe.

4 MR. HOWE: Also another point of clarification.  
5 The solidus, that's your word for the day, is the slash,  
6 those are typically only used for fractions of miles on  
7 guide signs. So, we might use it in our texting or the way  
8 we write things out in notes, but the solidus is really not  
9 a character to be used in this context. So, I would  
10 recommend if you are going to have that it would be a dash  
11 not a solidus.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. You made your  
13 comment. Yes, Chris.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: The current sign  
15 that says, "EXCEPT BICYCLES" uses the bicycle symbol. We  
16 don't have a current sign for bikes that says, "EXCEPT  
17 BIKES".

18 MR. HOWE: Actually, we do. If you look on page  
19 -- on the 2014 Sign Chart right next to our new "3 FOOT FOR  
20 SAFETY LAW" sign, it's on sheet 4 of 14. It say, "EXCEPT"  
21 and below it it has the sideways symbol of a bicycle going  
22 from right to left.

23 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: But we don't have  
24 a text version.

25 MR. HOWE: No we don't.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: So that would be a  
2 new sign then.

3 MR. HOWE: Yeah, evidently it would.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Or we could just say,  
5 "EXCEPT NEV" and then have the bike symbol. So we could mix  
6 text and symbol.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That would be really  
8 confusing.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Question for Don. I  
10 understand the current practice is to use a solidus, what is  
11 commonly known as a forward slash, to separate elements of a  
12 fraction. But is there any perceived by sign wizards,  
13 misinterpretation of this if it were also allowed to be used  
14 to separate things in the way it's colloquially done in  
15 texting? NEV/BIKE, what's the downside?

16 MR. HOWE: Well, until we start talking signs that  
17 say "LOL" and "OMG" I think we should probably the MUTCD.  
18 And it does discuss the solidus.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Does it really?

20 MR. HOWE: Yes it does.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay, thank you.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, with that  
23 comment, (indiscernible) our approval for the signs.  
24 Wherever we say --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Have a dash.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Wherever it says,  
2 slash, change it to a dash. Okay.

3 So that is the comment, "EXCEPT NEV --"

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Dash.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Dash BIKE. And  
6 under "NEV ROUTE". I am pretty sure Lincoln has them  
7 already on.

8 MR. HOWE: They are considered experimental signs.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Well, now they can  
10 make them official. Okay. Let's make a motion on those two  
11 signs also to make it all official. Is there a motion?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I think the motion is  
13 "EXCEPT NEV-BIKE".

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: On two lines.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: On two lines. And then  
16 we will also throw in the next sign, "NEV ROUTE".

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, that is the  
18 motion. Is there a second?

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Second.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Discussion?  
21 Mr. Walter.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Would there ever be a  
23 time when you would have an exclusive NEV ROUTE versus an  
24 NEV-BIKE ROUTE?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Should we have both?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: We have, BIKE ROUTE now.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We have BIKE ROUTE.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: We have BIKE ROUTE. But  
4 I'm wondering if we should combine it, just so you don't end  
5 up with, oh, I've got to put two signs on there. Have a  
6 combined version, so to speak.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Well, let's create two  
8 signs, one where you can combine them and one where you are  
9 not. That is a good point. That way we don't have to come  
10 back.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. So you want  
12 to throw in also an additional sign that says, "NEV-BIKE  
13 ROUTE"?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: I'll still  
17 second it.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So that is the  
19 motion. And now we are going to be efficient. They are  
20 proactive. We are seeing into the future.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: This needs to go in the  
22 Caltrans yearly update next year that we are beomg  
23 proactive.

24 (Laughter.)

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: We went beyond the

1 request of the applicant. Okay, so we have the motion is  
2 here. Is there a second on that motion?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Second.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The motion is  
5 seconded and any discussion?

6 THE REPORTER: Who is the second?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: I did.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Who did the second?  
9 Mr. Brown did the second.

10 Okay, any discussions?

11 All those in favor say aye.

12 (Ayes.)

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

14 The motion passes unanimously. We are officially  
15 done with this, thank you.

16 MR. LIESWYN: Thank you.

17 MR. VELEZ: So for the purposes of moving on to  
18 Caltrans with our NEV Plan. Was the action today, is that,  
19 does that completes the review and recommendation?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes. The Committee  
21 only recommends to Caltrans. All the Committee  
22 recommendations are subject to Caltrans Director approval.

23 MR. VELEZ: Great.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So once the Caltrans  
25 Director approves then the Caltrans sign design people have

1 to design the technical --

2 MR. HOWE: So, it's an automatic. Actually, yeah.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: The process from  
4 here on is automatic.

5 MR. HOWE: Thank you for clarifying that.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, we are done.  
7 Colleagues, it's 1:00. I have three items that are going to  
8 last about an hour. What is your pleasure? Do you want to  
9 break for lunch and come back or do you want to proceed and  
10 finish by 2:00?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A quick lunch break.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is no such  
13 thing as a quick lunch break. It is going to go 45. There  
14 is nothing around here. It is going to take 45 minutes to  
15 an hour to break. If you want we can break and come back  
16 and then finish by about 3:00, 3:30 or we can keep on going  
17 and finish by 2:00, 2:30. What is your pleasure?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I'd rather have a  
19 lunch break.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Let's take a vote.  
21 All those in favor of a lunch break raise your hand.

22 (Show of hands.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Take a lunch  
24 break. Let's make it quick? Let's make it 1:30.

25 (Off the record at 12:57 p.m.)



1 background. Of course, now purple is a standard sign color  
2 for electronic toll collections. We played it down a little  
3 bit here with the purple background just in the stripe.

4           So the idea here, if you go on our website in the  
5 Office of Traffic Engineering, over the last 10 years or so  
6 we have had three different types of signs that go in. The  
7 standard one that's gone -- dated back to 30 or 40 years ago  
8 is amongst Caltrans' sign people and those that prepare plan  
9 specifications and estimates, they call this the T7 Standard  
10 Plan.

11           It is the "Your Tax Dollars at Work" sign. It  
12 also features a non-standard diamond, SLOW FOR THE CONE  
13 ZONE, graphic here that has been there and even this  
14 Committee has weighed in on the non-standard nature of that.  
15 But that is the way we have done it for so many years; it  
16 has hung on.

17           This is what I would call the old version of the  
18 general construction funding identification sign. When the  
19 Proposition 1B came along, we went with a newer version with  
20 the predominant purple background and then we had a place  
21 for different local icons or icons-pictographs.

22           We also promoted "SLOW FOR THE CONE ZONE" on the  
23 bottom line there. And then we had the ARRA or the American  
24 Recovery and Reinvestment Act sign that was put forward  
25 through FHWA and had the orange temporary sign above a green

1 sign and it had its own set of pictographs that would go.

2           What our proposal is today, if you look at today's  
3 handout. And, I apologize, this was not brought forward or  
4 not processed in a timely manner, we have some of the  
5 background on the handout but we have the proposal so I'll  
6 just go ahead and jump ahead. We are suggesting that this  
7 be introduced into the CA Manual on Uniform Traffic Control  
8 Devices under Section 6F.109 and that it be an optional  
9 sign. And we have policy language that you will find on the  
10 last page of today's handout for use on projects with an  
11 estimated contract cost of \$750,000 or more and 50 working  
12 days or more.

13           And if used, the header panel shall include a  
14 local agency pictograph promoting the concept that we work  
15 with our partners, our local agency partners whether they be  
16 cities, counties, NPOs. And that that header panel be a  
17 fluorescent orange background, or if no local agency monies  
18 are included, it could default to "Your Tax Dollars at Wprk"  
19 with a scaled image of the updated version of, SLOW FOR THE  
20 CONE ZONE sign, which is rectangular, sign designation  
21 SC19(CA) to fit in that orange panel. And the installation  
22 shall be placed in advance of temporary traffic control  
23 signs, one sign installed in each direction up to two  
24 approaches.

25           So that would be the option to have this. The

1 guidance would be that information on the sign has some  
2 variable fields that would include something to do with one  
3 of these six categories or subcategories of projects and  
4 approve the types of funding and an anticipated year of  
5 completion. I put an asterisk, if the state transportation  
6 bond funds are identified, the sign legend should include  
7 white legend on a purple background.

8           So the pictures which -- or the concept that we  
9 have here is basically a fluorescent orange background over  
10 a white panel that looks very reminiscent of our "Your Tax  
11 Dollars at Work" sign. And something that is relatively new  
12 in Caltrans is our most recent safety campaign which is, BE  
13 WORK ZONE ALERT. And that is a very interesting concept  
14 where we are using the human factors of our -- these are  
15 actual children of Caltrans workers and they are on  
16 billboards. You will find them in our promotions. And it's  
17 the whole concept that you should be work zone alert and  
18 slow for the cone zone. People that we look forward to  
19 seeing at the end of the day are our moms and dads. It's  
20 how we have been encouraging folks to slow down and be aware  
21 in the work zone.

22           That's the proposal and I'd like to find out what  
23 the Committee would advise Caltrans in doing if we were to  
24 make the leap to adopt this as a standard optional format in  
25 the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

1 Thank you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you Mr. Howe.  
3 Questions? Okay. Thank you. So, what is your pleasure?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: I'll move approval  
5 Mr. Chair.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
7 for approval, is there a second?

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: I'll second.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
10 and a second. Actually, I have to take public comments at  
11 least also. Any members of the audience who wish to address  
12 the Committee on this specific item?

13 Seeing none. Okay.

14 There is a motion and a second, any discussion?  
15 Yes, Mr. Greenwood.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: I don't, you  
17 know, this sign up until now has not been in the manual and  
18 I don't think that it meets the definition of a traffic  
19 control device in that it does not guide, warn or regulate  
20 drivers. Its purpose is to inform the taxpayers that their  
21 money is being used on this project. And so I don't object  
22 to the sign, it has been in construction zones forever in  
23 various forms, I just don't think there is a need to include  
24 it in the traffic manual, the Manual of Uniform Traffic  
25 Control Devices.

1           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That is a very good  
2 comment. We have had similar signs and we go through the  
3 same thing. That these are not really traffic control  
4 devices; that these are only information signs and in this  
5 case it is a propaganda sign. We just use it but at the  
6 same -- we have signs about entering the watershed and  
7 things like that so. It was like Caltrans coming back and  
8 telling us, we need to have some mechanism to abstain and so  
9 people just don't go to different districts and do signage  
10 willy-nilly, different ways. They chose this Committee as  
11 the platform to kind of come to some uniformity for even  
12 non-traffic control devices.

13           COMMITTEE MEMBER: As Mr. Howe pointed out in his  
14 presentation, there is a state standard plan for this. So  
15 there is some consistency brought on by that standard plan.

16           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Comments well taken  
17 I'm just reporting history. Any comments? Mr. Marshall.

18           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So is the underlying  
19 reason for bringing this up to improve uniformity of these?  
20 Is that really the big motivation for proposing this?

21           MR. HOWE: Yes. Instead of having, I think I had  
22 a slide here that is showed all these different, you can see  
23 there are elements of all three of those signs that worked  
24 their way into this proposal.

25           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So even though the one

1 version has been in the standard plan, these others have  
2 been used and there wasn't anything to tell people, you  
3 couldn't, so they did, I guess. Including the one that is  
4 proposed now is actually already being used. Yes?

5 MR. HOWE: Yes. The one was done without  
6 experimentation but this sign has been part of construction  
7 area signs in Caltrans projects for some time.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I mean, I tend to  
9 agree with Mr. Greenwood; it is not really a traffic control  
10 device. And I also see the value in standardizing it so  
11 that when it is in the driving environment there aren't so  
12 many different variations to distract motorists and so on.  
13 Might it be appropriate to say, we give our support for this  
14 design but suggest it not be placed in the manual? Could it  
15 be implemented through some other Caltrans procedure?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Brown.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: I can see where the one  
18 on the far right would be an example of, you know, no  
19 information around traffic control but at least when highway  
20 construction, work zone alert, there is arguably, there is  
21 definitely a safety message there. A, here is what you can  
22 expect along this stretch of highway. It is under  
23 construction or, you know, expected date of completion. So  
24 I would argue that there is some traffic merit to that.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other thoughts

1 or comments? Mr. Winter.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Slight counter-point. I  
3 mean I know this sign, and you are pointing out in the  
4 narrative above it, that it was something used on the I-405  
5 widening project through the Sepulveda Pass. Having been  
6 somebody who actually had driven that quite a bit while it  
7 was under construction I can tell you there were other types  
8 of banners, other types of messaging that Metro was doing.  
9 They weren't necessarily signs but they were literally  
10 banners. So, Caltrans was allowing those, or I presume  
11 Caltrans was allowing those. So probably along the lines  
12 that Rick had mentioned is perhaps not putting this so much  
13 in the manual but it is just a question of how you choose to  
14 message out construction projects, how they are funded, who  
15 is maybe even carrying them out. Because at least with that  
16 project that was a little innovative I believe because Metro  
17 was maybe the lead contractor or constructor of it. So that  
18 would be just my suggestion.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Howe, let me ask  
20 you a question. Why do you -- I understand you know, if you  
21 want to bring it to the Committee for the purpose of  
22 discussion of uniformity and all that. But back to echoing  
23 pretty much what my colleagues are saying, why do we even  
24 need these signs in the manual? What is the purpose of  
25 having such a sign in the CA MUTCD? What happens if it is

1 just approved and it is a Caltrans standard sign that you  
2 use?

3 MR. HOWE: My predecessor in my position was Greg  
4 Edwards. Greg left to go to finish out his career.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I remember him well,  
6 yes.

7 MR. HOWE: You remember him well, okay. He was  
8 very competent, a very accomplished engineer. He left  
9 Traffic Operations and went to our office engineer and said,  
10 you know Don, I think this sign needs to be in the MUTCD,  
11 because he was responsible for having to adopt all the  
12 policy for all three of those signs. He says, wouldn't it  
13 be better if we had one sign that had some flexibility that  
14 we could recognize, local agencies, we could have it be  
15 basically one format that we would point to and say, let's  
16 do this this way to show funding. And so, his experience --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: No, no, I support  
18 the need for having a standard sign for all the 12  
19 districts. But what I am saying is that, can't it just be  
20 like an internal Caltrans document rather than the MUTCD?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Couldn't it be a deputy  
22 directive or something?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yeah, it could be  
24 like an executive director, what do you call it, the --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Executive order?

1 MR. HOWE: Traffic operations policy directive?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Yes, a traffic  
3 operations policy directive. And it would be just like a  
4 policy directive, something like that.

5 MR. HOWE: Well technically it is a sign so it  
6 falls into the category of a traffic control device.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I have no problem.  
8 We have put other things that are not really traffic  
9 devices.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: And again, like you are  
11 saying, changeable message signs. You are now seeing like  
12 drought messages being, you know, conserve water. So there  
13 is, I won't call those billboards but it is a public  
14 messaging. It is other types of messages that the right of  
15 way is being utilized for these types of messaging purposes.  
16 So I agree if there is some uniformity and I assume there  
17 must be some type of internal policy that your agency would  
18 go through. I know on any public agency side that is  
19 something we always confront about what types of signs would  
20 we allow in the right of way. So I see a parallel there.

21 MR. HOWE: I can tell you also that some of the  
22 information in here, like here's the picky details on what  
23 constitutes a highway construction project versus a highway  
24 improvement project, this all comes from our standard  
25 special provision that is used for procurement of how you

1 define these different elements. So it is an effort to take  
2 it out of the old standard plans and put it into the MUTCD  
3 and the sign spec.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Ciccarelli.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This reminds me of  
6 our discussion of the recognition sign a few weeks back  
7 which wasn't a traffic control device. It was, I forget who  
8 is this, Rick Marshall's time?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: The one that won't go  
10 away yet?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Just that that one  
12 was --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: I'm sorry, it is not  
14 going to make it into the manual, by the way.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I am not saying that  
16 it should. But just as I recall is that, as long as it does  
17 not interfere with the comprehension of traffic control  
18 devices nearby, we didn't have heartburn because the manual  
19 kind of addressed that already. Isn't this kind of like  
20 that in that it is not a traffic control device and the only  
21 concern is, does it detract from the use of traffic control  
22 devices that are close enough that they will be perceived in  
23 the same glance? Do we care what it looks like?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: A traffic control device  
25 is telling a motorist or a roadway user what to do and this

1 sign is not telling anybody what to do.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It tells them what  
3 to do, what to expect, you lead them somewhere, you know.  
4 But this sign doesn't do any of those things. But again,  
5 you know, we have put other signs in the manual that are not  
6 theoretically a traffic control device. So, other than the  
7 general concept of not liking this sign in the manual, do  
8 you have any comments on the sign itself?

9 Well, seeing none let's see if any member of the  
10 audience has a comment.

11 Any member of the audience has any comment?

12 Mr. Miller is running.

13 MR. MILLER: Rock Miller. In my own mind it  
14 violates a lot of the rules of signage in terms of busyness  
15 and letter size and stuff like that. And yet I do think it  
16 serves an important traffic purpose, it lets me know that  
17 there is a very large construction zone in front of me.

18 And as a motorist all I really have to do is see  
19 the orange top that says, Metro and know that. And I also  
20 know because I've seen it hundreds of times before, I really  
21 don't need to read the sign unless I want to know where the  
22 money came from and who the sponsoring agencies are.

23 In all those regards I actually think it is  
24 appropriate to put it in the manual. I would much rather  
25 see one sign of this type in the manual than have a wide

1 variety of different signs which would require me to read  
2 all 25 words on the sign in order to know, is it just a big  
3 construction zone ahead or is there something on that sign I  
4 need to know today. So, my comment.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Good comments, thank  
6 you. Anyone else?

7 Seeing none, we close the public comment and bring  
8 it back to the Committee.

9 So, is there a motion on this?

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: There already  
11 was.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Oh, there was?  
13 Okay. So there is a motion and a second, who made the  
14 motion?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: He did and I seconded it.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So, discussion?

17 We don't like it in the manual but that is the way  
18 you have been doing it. Some of these signs really don't  
19 belong in the manual but we put them there anyway. And what  
20 Mr. Miller said is worthy, you know, at least there is a  
21 reference for those things.

22 Any further discussion? All those in favor of the  
23 motion say, aye.

24 (Ayes.)

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: No.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is one  
3 opposition and the motion passes 9 to 1. Okay, thank you.

4 Mr. Howe moving on to the next item which is, 15-  
5 08, which was the first amendment to the agenda. Modify CA  
6 MUTCD Section 6F.01 to include Manual for Assessing Safety  
7 Hardware, so called (MASH) criteria.

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I will take that,  
9 Mr. Chairman.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Chris.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Basically, in 2011  
12 Caltrans adopted a different standard other than the NCHRP  
13 Report 350 for roadside safety hardware, guard rail and  
14 treatments, things like that. We never really added - the  
15 acronym is MASH - in the MUTCD. So here we are proposing  
16 some of revised text to refer back to this guideline. And  
17 since minor edits -- it doesn't have any other impacts. All  
18 the existing hardware that is out there now, unless it has  
19 been developed after January of 2011.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: It is just making  
21 the manual more consistent with ASHTO requirements.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: It's paying homage to a  
23 TV show from the '70s.

24 (Lauhter.)

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That's a nice

1 acronym. Okay, so any comments, questions about this item  
2 from the other side? Yes, Mr. Winter.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: As I see on page 46, it  
4 notes that the MASH crash testing supersede Report 350. And  
5 I did look at the FHWA website and it notes that all new  
6 testing will be done following the MASH evaluation  
7 techniques. Hardware accepted under Report 350 is  
8 appropriate for replacement and new installation and  
9 retesting is not required, which I assume, meaning if it has  
10 already been certified under 350, go ahead and leave it  
11 until such time that you decide to do a complete replacement  
12 and use something meeting MASH.

13 And then as of January 2011 all new products must  
14 be tested using MASH. So again, that supports the concept  
15 that 350 has been completely superseded. So I guess my  
16 concern, and it is more editorial I suppose, is as you get  
17 into the text of what you have suggested here for 6F.01 it  
18 says, 350 or MASH, so you are kind of putting them on equal  
19 footing. And I think really the intent here seems to be you  
20 want to show MASH is for the new testing moving forward and  
21 maybe beyond the date and time that your policy directive  
22 came out on this as opposed to trying to somehow say that,  
23 you know, one of the other could be used because really that  
24 is only the case if the device is already in place and has  
25 been previously tested.

1           So, short of me saying that, lining out stuff for  
2 you, I guess that is my comment for you to take back and you  
3 consider some editorial change to that to, again, mimic very  
4 closely with how FHWA has shown it on their website because  
5 I think they on their link that they have on this, it is  
6 very clear to me when I read that. But then it doesn't  
7 really track against the narrative that I am seeing here.

8           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: We can look into  
9 that.

10           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you,  
11 Mr. Winter. Any other comments, suggestions?

12           Okay, opening to the audience. Any member of the  
13 audience?

14           Seeing none, bringing it back. Okay. Is there a  
15 motion?

16           COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: Motion to pass with one  
17 edit.

18           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Motion is to pass  
19 the item with minor edits as recommended by Mr. Winter. A  
20 second?

21           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: Second.

22           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
23 and a second. All those in favor?

24           (Ayes.)

25           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Opposition?

1           Seeing none, the motion passes unanimously.

2           That takes us to the second amendment to the  
3 agenda and I see the applicant is here. This was a request  
4 that came last week as kind of an urgent matter the city of  
5 LA is trying to do. And I accepted to sponsor and thank you  
6 for adding it to the agenda, going back to the discussion of  
7 how important it is to accommodate the local politics and  
8 community needs while having a procedure at the same time.  
9 They respectfully approached the Devices Committee and  
10 Caltrans to approve of these signs and we should accommodate  
11 them. It is a request for experimental status for parking  
12 signs for -- a new design and pilot program by the city of  
13 Los Angeles. And Mr. Mustafa is here with his staff and he  
14 is going to be presenting the item.

15           MR. MUSTAFA: Well, thank you sir. I'd like to  
16 welcome the Committee on behalf of the general manager,  
17 Seleta Reynolds. She had to run out to a meeting. Thank  
18 you very, very much for accommodating us at the last minute.  
19 After hearing about the six weeks rules, you guys just went  
20 way over your call to hear what we have to say.

21           It was really good to see how you guys are really  
22 proactive when you guys approved a sign that was not even  
23 asked for of you. So, that is really good to hear that  
24 because we at LA DOT with over 400,000 parking signs that we  
25 have in the city; we are listening to our constituents. We

1 are trying to figure out how we can make their life easier.  
2 It is our job to listen, to see what the issues are that  
3 they are having and then come up with solutions. if we  
4 can't do that, what are we doing here?

5           So, our great team that is being led by Ken  
6 Husting and Sandeep Sonyou (phonetic); they are going to  
7 share with you some of the ideas that we have. And what we  
8 are looking for is to show you what we are going to be  
9 asking our constituents what they think about this. And  
10 once we gather all of their comments we are going to come  
11 back -- we are going to submit what we really think we  
12 should be doing out in the field. But, have an open mind  
13 and remember, we are supposed to solve problems that exist  
14 out there and listen to their needs. So with that, Ken.

15           MR. HUSTING: Good afternoon gentlemen. This is  
16 my first CTCDC meeting and I have to say, I really enjoyed  
17 it. I'm never amazed at the different variety of issues  
18 that you guys actually have to contend with. And so it has  
19 been truly eye opening and I appreciate the work that you  
20 do.

21           So as Zaki said, we are working on the new signage  
22 for LA. Let me just go ahead and explain that. The signage  
23 that you are going to see today, at least the one that  
24 Sandeep is going to show on a poster board is strictly  
25 intended as supplemental. It is a supplemental guide sign.

1           What we have been seeing so much in LA, as a  
2 matter of fact we even had a parking freedom initiative, a  
3 push back from the residents saying that they have so many  
4 complaints about different things in parking whether it is  
5 traffic, citation fees or if it is understanding parking  
6 signs.

7           And in LA we have signs that are five, six signs  
8 tall to go ahead and reflect the restrictions that are in  
9 place and that are actually taller than I am. And what that  
10 does, and having -- being in charge of the on-street parking  
11 for LA, when I see a sign like that I understand. But  
12 before I went to this division if I saw that sign, that  
13 tells me, don't even try to park here. Even if you could,  
14 you are really chancing it because you won't necessarily  
15 understand if you could park here at that time.

16           So what we are trying to do is that we are  
17 actually trying to find ways to go ahead and make the  
18 signage simpler so that if Joe says, it is safe to go ahead,  
19 or Jane, I'm not going to be sexist, Joe or Jane says, go  
20 ahead and come over and understand, can I park here.

21           And so that is really our goal. Do I think we  
22 have it right? I think we have a good attempt. I think it  
23 is going to get better with the comments that we are going  
24 to receive from the Committee today. I think it is going to  
25 get better with the comments that we are going to receive

1 from the public.

2 But why I am here is to ask for your feedback and  
3 to ask for a blessing that we are going to be coming back  
4 with, as Zaki said, what we think is going to be a better  
5 recommendation. And then ultimately what we would like to  
6 do later this year is come back with a recommendation on how  
7 we can go ahead and redo the regulatory signs.

8 We are not at that point yet. What we included in  
9 the handout is some concepts. And with the concepts that we  
10 have included these have elevated to the top, at least from  
11 the dozen or so different concepts that we have gone  
12 through.

13 And when I say a dozen concepts, we have come up  
14 with everything that is just completely off the wall to  
15 things that are a little more traditional. But after having  
16 informal polls internal within LA DOT and external, these  
17 are the ones that seemed to have come to the top.

18 We still need to do fine tuning for what we are  
19 calling Phase II of the regulatory, the sizing, the  
20 lettering, the word, everything, we are still working on  
21 that. But what I want to do is just go ahead and present it  
22 to you today to show what we are working on and, again, if  
23 you have any feedback on those concepts, we would be more  
24 than happy to take that in as we continue to go through this  
25 process.

1           So with that why don't I go ahead and Sandeep is  
2 going to show what we are proposing. And this is for a very  
3 simple case where there is one post and it's saying that the  
4 parking restrictions on both sides so you have the arrows  
5 going on both sides. Now we do have cases where we share  
6 the same post where one restriction is going to be on one  
7 side of the post and there is going to be a different  
8 restriction on the other side.

9           So, in that case we would do something like this.  
10 And by the way, these are printed to scale. And these would  
11 be, these are intended for eye level viewing because, again,  
12 this is just a supplemental sign and we don't want to put  
13 the sign, again, to where we are going to create something  
14 that is going to be about 12 feet tall.

15           So, this again, is just a concept. Now, we went  
16 through a number of iterations. Before I go to that, I just  
17 want to point out a couple different features. For one  
18 thing, we are actually trying to go more towards symbols.

19           And there has been questions, why do we even have  
20 parking guide versus just a "P"? We do have a version with  
21 that. And we are still debating, you know, is that the most  
22 appropriate? Should we go with parking guide? But we have  
23 heard from our enforcement folks and the enforcement folks  
24 said, well, when you put a "P" it is going to confuse my own  
25 officers whether or not this is regulatory. I think that

1 could be overcome with education but this is a little bit  
2 more clear that this is really more of a guide sign to help  
3 people understand what the parking restriction is.

4           We also have the red. It has diagonal lines, a  
5 little bit of discoloration because, again, we receive  
6 comments about, what about the colored line? They can't  
7 necessarily distinguish between the red and green so we run  
8 it through some software to where it actually shows enough  
9 contrast to -- so if somebody is color blind, they can tell  
10 the difference between the different colors.

11           So, we have a legend at the bottom which is  
12 showing what the different symbols mean. But something else  
13 that we have been going back and forth with but where we  
14 actually finalized or we decided to go ahead with this  
15 version; was, when it comes to the parking -- when it comes  
16 to the parking concept right here, we have the "P" with the  
17 two hours which indicates it is parking but it is a two hour  
18 limit. And then there are areas that it doesn't have it.  
19 And so there has been a question, should we make that  
20 colored because normally you don't show restrictions. I  
21 mean, the sign doesn't say, it usually just reflects the  
22 restrictions. It doesn't say when there is free parking,  
23 hey, there is free parking. And so there is a question, do  
24 we just leave it blank? Do we make it solid green? Do we  
25 put another "P"? And so what we did is we actually did have

1 a version which had "Ps" in every single green area.

2 Which is this version. And so, we took that to  
3 your people to go ahead and get their feedback. And the  
4 feedback that we got was, this is just too much visually to  
5 see all these "Ps" and every single little green space.

6 So, the reason that we are presenting what we did  
7 to you is, to again, based on the feedback, based on too  
8 much visual impact; of the different scenarios that we have,  
9 and so we settled on the other version.

10 Now, there is something else that we've considered  
11 and I definitely want to hear from the Committee on this  
12 too. Is, do we have the top green with a "P"? Do we have  
13 it black? Does it say, parking guide? Does it not say,  
14 parking guide? I know you guys, again, have a variety of  
15 comments. But what is the most appropriate?

16 Now, the reason, again, that we have brought the  
17 black to the Committee is when we had the green; the green  
18 is very similar to this green over here. And so, again, the  
19 feedback that we were getting from people other than the  
20 traffic engineers was, that is just too much green. It just  
21 gets, the parking that is in there kind of gets buried, it  
22 kind of gets lost.

23 So again, different concepts. We have gone  
24 through a variety of scenarios. Do I know what is best?  
25 Absolutely not. And that is why I am hoping to get as much

1 possible feedback from the public, from the Committee so  
2 that we can make this the best sign possible.

3           And our goal is that this can actually be a tool  
4 that is not only used in LA but it could be used statewide.  
5 And, you know, the state of California could go ahead and be  
6 leading the industry in having a new revolutionary sign that  
7 people can actually come up and see and understand.

8           MR. MUSTAFA: Why don't you tell them about the  
9 time frame.

10           MR. HUSTING: Oh yes. So, the explanation of why  
11 this is so urgent and why it was last minute. The mayor of  
12 the city of LA would like to go ahead and launch this within  
13 a matter of weeks. I can't tell you right now whether it is  
14 going to be two weeks or it is going to be four weeks, it's  
15 all a matter about the politics, as you guys know so well.  
16 But there is a sense of urgency for us to go ahead and  
17 refine the design with the comments that we could go ahead  
18 and receive to try to develop the best product. So the  
19 intent is to release this very soon. We are going to have a  
20 six month trial. We want to be able to go ahead and  
21 evaluate, take those comments and be able to report back to  
22 the Committee what we found and, you know, within the  
23 recommendations that we may have. Did I miss anything else?

24           MR. MUSTAFA: We will be coming back to you for  
25 the experimental use as a regulatory sign. After we have

1 taken all the comments into consideration and refined the  
2 signs then we will be coming back to you for approval for  
3 the experimental use to be used as a regulatory sign.  
4 Again, right now it is just an informational sign just to  
5 get their feedback as to what they think and what we need to  
6 change on this. So that will be a six month period.

7 MR. HUSTING: I think that's about it. If there's  
8 any questions we'd be --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any questions for  
10 Mr. Husting or Mr. Mustafa. Mr. Walter.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Question in regards to  
12 this first phase. You mentioned and you showed us the  
13 various examples and you mentioned that this was going to be  
14 something that was, you be put on the sign posts around eye  
15 level. So, is this a pedestrian-oriented sign?

16 MR. HUSTING: It is intended -- It is not intended  
17 for somebody to go ahead and drive by and actually be able  
18 to read that at a glance.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Okay.

20 MR. HUSTING: Because even though this is very  
21 simple and we believe it does reduce the confusion of  
22 existing parking signs, it is too much to go ahead and take  
23 in at a glance as you are driving by.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Okay, so pedestrian-  
25 oriented.

1 MR. HUSTING: Yeah.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Okay, thanks.

3 MR. MUSTAFA: The height would be at the same  
4 height as your regular signs are.

5 MR. HUSTING: And something to your point when we  
6 are talking about, again, visually for something to take in,  
7 you know. That is why we started looking at different  
8 concepts, which are also included in the memo, of how we can  
9 go ahead and maybe come up with something slightly  
10 different. Again, this is just a concept for discussion,  
11 about we could be a little bit more traditional but it is  
12 something that may be a little bit more appropriate for a  
13 vehicle, somebody that is actually driving by at a very slow  
14 speed. So we are exploring different alternatives.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Brown.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: How would you conduct the  
17 public opinion polls? Would it be through focus groups or  
18 mailing? Do you know how that is going to be?

19 MR. HUSTING: Because the experiment area is  
20 actually in downtown LA, it's just a couple --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: A very defined area?

22 MR. HUSTING: It's a very small, defined area,  
23 Spring and Main Street in our historic core. We are  
24 probably looking at doing in-person polls, just actually  
25 going out to the field.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Got it.

2 MR. HUSTING: And just go ahead and get their  
3 feedback, before and after.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other questions?

5 Let me ask you the question we always ask when  
6 people come with new ideas. It is good to be different but  
7 not just for the sake of being different.

8 MR. HUSTING: Absolutely.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So it is just that  
10 you are trying to fix something, you are trying to improve  
11 it. So what is the problem you are trying to improve or  
12 mitigate? And how would you measure if these signs are  
13 going to be effective?

14 MR. HUSTING: A very good point.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Are you goin to do  
16 parking turnover studies, parking occupancy studies, parking  
17 meter violations? How would you measure that people are  
18 actually -- that the parking situation is improving?

19 MR. HUSTING: So, there is actually three ways  
20 that we are looking to go ahead and define whether or not  
21 this sign is actually doing what it is intended to. Now,  
22 the intent is really to go ahead and simplify parking  
23 signage. So again, the city of LA, we've been on the news  
24 many times for, city of LA has done it again, they have, you  
25 know, ten signs on a post and nobody can understand what is

1 going on. We constantly receive this kind of complaint and  
2 media attention.

3 Now, this is geared more towards the complex signs  
4 but still we wanted to find something that can be universal  
5 to where it can apply to a simple parking restriction and  
6 even a complex one. Now, so our intention, do they  
7 understand it?

8 Now, there are a few different ways that we are  
9 going to go ahead and measure that. One is going to be with  
10 the surveys, the actual in-field surveys. What are the  
11 comments that we are getting? Do they understand it? Are  
12 there complaints? But we also are going to look at hard  
13 data. There are a couple different ways that we are going  
14 to be doing that. We are going to be looking at citation  
15 revenue as it relates to parking. If citations have gone up  
16 that is probably an indication that people are not actually  
17 understanding what is going on. If citation revenue has  
18 gone down, that may lead us to go ahead and believe, you  
19 know, the parking signage is actually working and maybe  
20 people are actually understanding that they can't park at  
21 this time or they need to go ahead and leave after this  
22 time.

23 Something else that we will be looking at is meter  
24 revenue. Again, if there is confusion meter revenue is  
25 going to go ahead and change, it's going to go down. We are

1 hoping that citations are actually going to go down and  
2 meter revenue will increase because of better compliance.  
3 So we are going to be looking at all three different  
4 elements to go ahead and see, are we actually achieving the  
5 intended goal.

6 We will be looking also -- we have occupancy data,  
7 we have sensors over in the street so we will be looking at  
8 that.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And you think you  
10 can do all this in the matter of six months?

11 MR. HUSTING: Yes.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Are you collecting  
13 data now for a before to do a comparative?

14 MR. HUSTING: Yes. We have a very advanced  
15 parking system called the LA Express Park, that's in LA, so  
16 we have been collecting data for years. So we have  
17 occupancy data, we have A data, we have our citation data.  
18 The only thing that we have to do is we have to go ahead and  
19 get the polling data. So we re going to go ahead and try to  
20 get some polling data before we actually implement.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any questions?  
22 Mr. Winter.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: Ken, maybe you can help  
24 me out. You said something about the black border, that you  
25 didn't want this sign to be appearing like a regulatory

1 sign. But yet the parking restrictions are regulatory in  
2 nature so maybe --

3 MR. HUSTING: Yes. Well what I was alluding to is  
4 where it says "Parking Guide" right now it has a black  
5 background. And so we could make it green, it's just that  
6 the initial feedback we were getting was it's just too much  
7 green that they are looking at. So when you are looking at  
8 the parking restrictions, or when you can park I should say,  
9 it kind of gets lost with all this green on the sign.

10 So right now it is strictly intended as a  
11 supplemental sign. So we are just trying to see if, you  
12 know, is that the most appropriate color? Right now we felt  
13 it's a little bit more discernible than having a lot of  
14 green on the sign.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WINTER: And again, not that your  
16 mockup is representative of what the actual sign will be.  
17 But at least with the lighting in this room and the distance  
18 and all, and maybe the angle of this place, it is hard to  
19 kind of distinguish the black and the green. And maybe at  
20 nighttime conditions or whatever other kinds of conditions  
21 that may start to come into play.

22 MR. HUSTING: Those are going to be the things  
23 that we actually want to find out. When it's out there,  
24 when there is a reflection, what are the different  
25 conditions, what are going to be the impacts of the sign and

1 what do we need to change?

2           ??: This sign is only

3           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: S it will be a traffic  
4 control device, then?

5           (Laughter.)

6           MR. HUSTING: Like the gentleman over there  
7 alluded to before, you know, we'll come back and see what  
8 kind of arrows we actually have in our back.

9           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: The example  
10 that you've given us I think is a good one in that it is  
11 sufficiently complex to give us the gist of it. But it  
12 seems to me that sweeping day is really going to make this  
13 sign, even this sign more complex. If sweeping day is on a  
14 Wednesday, what is that going to look like?

15           MR. HUSTING: So Wednesday, what will happen is we  
16 will have to introduce a new column. Unfortunately, that's  
17 just the case. We will have to introduce a column.

18           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: So then are  
19 you going to have Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday,  
20 Friday?

21           MR. HUSTING: Again, it depends on the case. But  
22 this particular street sign we are actually testing, it  
23 falls within the restrictions of Monday through Friday. So  
24 right now we don't have to add another column. But in cases  
25 where you do have something that is going to be not covered

1 under something that is more consistently restricted you  
2 would have to do something like that.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: And then the  
4 symbol that you have chosen for the no stopping i think is  
5 going to be troubling most of us.

6 MR. HUSTING: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: That is a  
8 brand new symbol and it's, from here, very difficult to  
9 read, it just looks like a blob. We are going to have to  
10 find something different ... no stopping.

11 MR. HUSTING: That symbol we were taking from  
12 Europe, I believe. I stand corrected. My systems analyst  
13 who actually put this together. We felt that was the  
14 universal symbol. Again, if that is not the appropriate  
15 symbol, it's something that we get a lot of feedback as far  
16 as confusion, they can't discern what that actually is, we  
17 are more than willing to go ahead and revisit that.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I can tell from here, up  
19 close, when you get like that close to it, it's an octagon  
20 shape so it's obviously a stop sign. However, from this  
21 distance right here in a blown-up version, that looks like a  
22 circle inside of a circle.

23 MR. HUSTING: What would you recommend? A  
24 singular stop --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: I would just say, spell

1 out "no stopping", much like our regulatory parking signs  
2 today say "no stopping."

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: That sign for no  
4 stopping, that sign -- Canada uses that sign.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: There is a no  
6 stopping sign. No, no stopping symbol.

7 MR. HUSTING: And really that was kind of the  
8 intent.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Let's bring it back  
10 to -- let's not have side discussions. Mr. Walter.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A  
12 question.

13 MR. HUSTING: Sure.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Obviously, you guys are  
15 one of the biggest cities in the country. So did you do  
16 research in the other big cities where they would have very  
17 similar type of parking restrictions and everything else and  
18 what are they doing?

19 ME. MUSTAFA: Of course we have looked around the  
20 nation to see what others are doing but I think we are going  
21 to be the first in the nation to install and implement, to  
22 try out and get the feedback for something like this in the  
23 nation. So we will be the first. New York has something to  
24 that effect but nothing official.

25 MR. HUSTING: And actually we did look at other

1 major cities and New York had some interesting concepts,  
2 which actually we felt were more complicated and a little  
3 too much verbiage. Actually just looking at it, it was just  
4 too much visually to take in. But we have been looking  
5 around before we ever came up with the concepts. Yes.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A couple of  
7 suggestions from a sign design perspective. I question  
8 whether you need the Ps at all, okay. If you are trying to  
9 communicate what hours the time duration is allowed just put  
10 the 2H in there.

11 Number two, where several of the date columns like  
12 Monday through Friday, Saturday and/or Sunday share the  
13 same, why not break the barrier between them. For example,  
14 in all cases in the 12 A.M. to 2 A.M. period they all are  
15 free parking. So break out the white lines and just have a  
16 single, wider, common green band and perhaps put the word  
17 "free" in there, or not, that's a separate suggestion.

18 MR. HUSTING: There is a big debate internally  
19 about putting something "free" on the sign.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. The main  
21 suggestion is to coalesce the area so that it reads visually  
22 the same. And that becomes more effective in the 2 A.M. to  
23 5 A.M. area, where if you break it out and go to one symbol  
24 instead of three symbols, it's a lot less visual clutter.

25 MR. HUSTING: Okay.

1           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. Likewise, as  
2 you work down. On the left side you have got something  
3 changing at 7 A.M., okay. So what I would do there is from  
4 5 A.M. to 7 A.M. I'd coalesce it into one green block. From  
5 7 A.M. to 8 A.M. I'd have the green block coalesced in the  
6 Saturday/Sunday region and then so on and so forth down.

7           For "no stopping" I think that the circle is  
8 confusing because it looks so much like the circle-P. I'd  
9 put a big X through it; something very clear. You know,  
10 don't even think of stopping here. You are not trying to  
11 mimic the MUTCD sign and pull elements off of that because  
12 they are being scaled down so small here that they become a  
13 different type of visual atom. So don't think that you have  
14 to -- similarly, instead of slash-P with the TOW-AWAY  
15 borrowed from the other sign where it reads a lot better,  
16 just put a big, freaking tow truck in there for tow away.  
17 People know what "tow away" means because once they get a  
18 ticket they can read it in any language.

19           COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Just don't make it a AAA  
20 tow truck.

21           (Laughter.)

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: What I am saying is  
23 what is being done here is to borrow iconography that works  
24 at a bigger scale and repeat it with such frequency that it  
25 becomes decorative, it is not legible.

1           The last observation is that this reads -- this  
2 will work well as a horizontal sign too with the times going  
3 from left to right and the date zones going up and down and  
4 that would let you express your legend as sort of the left  
5 boundary of that. So it may depend on how many date/time  
6 variations there are but in some cases the horizontal  
7 variant may actually work better.

8           MR. HUSTING: Thank you.

9           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other comments?

10          Mr. Jones.

11          COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: The 30 minutes -- the 30  
12 minutes and the 2 hour, the 30m and the 2h. It doesn't say  
13 that it is a limit and there is nothing on the sign that  
14 says it's a limit of how long you can park there. So  
15 somehow clarifying that that's regarding what that is  
16 referring to.

17          MR. HUSTING: Actually surprisingly, when we did  
18 the polls.

19          COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yes.

20          MR. HUSTING: People actually understood what  
21 was --

22          MR. KORTH: I got it intuitively too, I just -- if  
23 I were going to fight you in court for a parking citation I  
24 would say, it didn't say it was a limit, it just said 30  
25 minutes.

1           MR. HUSTING: Well again, and that's kind of the  
2 beauty of the guide sign, the regulatory is still going to  
3 dictate that they --

4           COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Okay.

5           (Several people speaking at once.)

6           MR. HUSTING: That's actually a very good comment  
7 though, thank you.

8           COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: At this point,  
9 though, it is just supplemental, this isn't a regulatory  
10 sign.

11          MR. HUSTING: Correct.

12          COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: It's something  
13 that will get worked on down the road.

14          MR. MUSTAFA: So just to get everyone's input.

15          COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: I really like  
16 this as an attempt to help straighten out parking. I like  
17 the black upper and lower border. I think the parking guide  
18 should be the universal parking symbol rather than the words  
19 "Parking Guide". Especially in Los Angeles, which is as  
20 multi-cultural as it comes.

21                 And I think I am fully willing to support this and  
22 I'd even like to give you a little maybe more latitude than  
23 what you have asked for in that maybe a version that doesn't  
24 have -- where the areas are broken up with vertical borders  
25 here, you could try that version. If it needs to be

1 simplified for some reason, allow you to do that as well and  
2 for you to find the best vertical sign. I really think it's  
3 going to be very useful in urbanized areas.

4 MR. HUSTING: Thank you.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other comments?

6 Mr. Marshall.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Is the entire arra of  
8 the experiment metered parking?

9 MR. HUSTING: Yes.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: And is it -- are you  
11 required to pay the meter 24/7?

12 MR. HUSTING: No.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Is there any need or  
14 desire to indicate that variable on this?

15 MR. HUSTING: And actually we were discussing that  
16 too. Because when it came to the 2 hour, as Bryan was  
17 mentioning before, those are the times that yes, you need to  
18 pay the meter. So there is a debate, do we put a meter  
19 symbol, do we put a dollar symbol? The dollar symbol didn't  
20 go over very well at all because that just -- it makes  
21 people think that the City is just really trying to make  
22 money, ka-ching, like they hit the lottery. So the dollar  
23 symbol didn't go over well.

24 Then there is an issue of a parking meter. Do we  
25 put a parking meter symbol? Then people are -- not

1 everybody recognized what a parking meter symbol was except  
2 for, you know, people in the transportation arena. And so  
3 again that is something that we are going to continue to  
4 work with but we felt this was probably a good attempt right  
5 now to refine. You brought up a very good point.

6 MR. MUSTAFA: The parking will not accept your  
7 payment if that time period does not require you to pay.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So basically the  
9 function of this sign is to tell you whether or not you can  
10 park now.

11 MR. HUSTING: Yes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Once you have then the  
13 meter will be there or whatever. The rest of the  
14 information is still there to tell you the rest of what you  
15 need.

16 MR. MUSTAFA: Correct.

17 MR. HUSTING: And actually when we approached this  
18 whole concept we approached it with a very, very simple  
19 question, "Can I park here?" And so that is what we are  
20 trying to go ahead and --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: "Can I park here now?"

22 MR. HUSTING: Yes. And so what happened is that  
23 when you park there -- because once you park you are going  
24 to have the meter right at your space. And the meters that  
25 we have are actually programmed whether or not to accept

1 your payment. You can't do much once you put in a quarter.  
2 But it's not going to give you a time. But we also say  
3 that, you know, it's free parking from whenever to whenever  
4 so we have the restrictions on the meter. So we are trying  
5 to make it as seamless as possible.

6 I personally hate paying for parking and I am in  
7 charge of the parking division. So when I came to the  
8 division my goal was to go ahead and make parking as  
9 seamless as possible for the user. And so that is what we  
10 have been trying to do, just go ahead and figure out how can  
11 we make this as easy as possible when it comes to  
12 understanding the signage as well as the technology.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Walter, did you  
14 have something?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: Yes, just one quick  
16 question on your sign. Do you guys have meter holidays for  
17 your parking in downtown or are holidays excepted?

18 MR. HUSTING: We have both, but not in downtown.  
19 Downtown, correct me if I'm wrong, meter holidays are  
20 excepted in downtown, right? Yes, they're exempted in  
21 downtown. But we do have areas where the signage actually  
22 indicates, metered at all times.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: So you don't need to  
24 worry about mentioning holidays on this sign.

25 MR. HUSTING: Not on this particular case. But

1 thank you, good question.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Jones.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: If your goal is to show  
4 more times of when you can park there, the hours aren't  
5 really to scale so that 9 to 3 P.M. is really small. For a  
6 second I thought it was only two hours in the middle of the  
7 day that you could park there and then I was like, oh,  
8 that's 9 to 3. So maybe actually showing --

9 MR. HUSTING: Very, very observant. And actually  
10 we had this, we had this discussion. We had designs where  
11 we had everything to scale. The problem is, is when you  
12 have it to scale --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: It's huge.

14 MR. HUSTING: Yes, it's massive. And so what  
15 happens is many times you will have differences between  
16 parking restrictions on the schedule where it's only a half  
17 hour. And it leaves you such little space, unless your sign  
18 is going to be massive, about my height, that you can't put  
19 anything in there.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Right.

21 MR. HUSTING: And so we went back and forth trying  
22 to figure out how can we do it and this was the best  
23 solution that we have. So it will modify depending on  
24 what's available.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other comments?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: I have one  
2 question.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Chris.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Since you have  
5 Phase I and Phase II, two different options, you know, it's  
6 a sign that you can view seven feet above the sidewalk.  
7 Anything lower than that could be just informational. It  
8 would probably require being enclosed in plastic just to  
9 keep the people from scraping up against the --

10 MR. HUSTING: Yes, we have everything rounded. We  
11 are working with our sign group to make sure that it doesn't  
12 create any kind of easy way for somebody to get cut. We are  
13 trying to take the safest approach possible.

14 If it does go regulatory, and again, we only put  
15 that for the sake of a concept right now, then absolutely we  
16 are going to make sure it is seven feet above, we are not  
17 going to have anything that is going to go ahead and be --  
18 interfere with a pedestrian.

19 But again, concept. We are looking at two  
20 different directions. Something a little bit more  
21 traditional with what's there now, versus something that is  
22 a little bit more radical is what we are proposing for  
23 experiment.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any other questions?

25 Let me just share a thought.

1           Let's go to Mr. Ciccarelli first, he has a  
2 comment.

3           COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Just a supporting  
4 observation. This is, in my mind, parallel to what happened  
5 with bike route signs in the 2009 manual where we went from  
6 bike route destination arrow to the signs that we  
7 shamelessly ripped off from the Netherlands which combine  
8 bike designation direction all on one plaque; so the  
9 simplification is attractive. I know it is probably not the  
10 biggest artistic contribution to the city of LA but it is a  
11 step in the right direction.

12           MR. HUSTING: Thank you.

13           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just one thought, if  
14 you go back to your big sign. I'm thinking, you know, we  
15 had a discussion about no parking and no stopping and all  
16 that. If somehow you can come up with a different, maybe a  
17 different shades of red, different shades of -- so we can  
18 kind of also with color distinguish between no parking and  
19 no stopping. I know, it's just a thought. Maybe those  
20 signs, you know, I'm sure you are going to come up with a  
21 good sign for no stopping. But it may also help so that  
22 when I look at it I know that there are actually three  
23 different options, parking allowed, parking not allowed,  
24 stopping is not allowed.

25           MR. HUSTING: And actually one of the comments I

1 heard today, which was very good, was, you know, maybe a red  
2 X may be the accent that -- sorry, a white X instead of the  
3 octagon. Again, very good feedback just showing this to  
4 you. You guys are saying that it looks like a round circle  
5 within another circle. That is something that we didn't  
6 necessarily see. And that is just based on, again, feedback  
7 and seeing it for the first time.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: In the interest of  
9 time let's move along. Let's go back and hear from the  
10 audience if they have any comments and then I'm going to  
11 bring it back. Any member of the audience who may want to  
12 share some thoughts on these items?

13 MR. BRONKALL: Bob Bronkall. The one thing I  
14 would suggest that the applicants do is --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Please identify the  
16 agency.

17 MR. BRONKALL: If their goal is to move forward to  
18 Phase II -- Humboldt County. With the goal to move to Phase  
19 II for a radical replacement of existing signage, then I  
20 think one of the critical things to think about is the no  
21 stopping sign, because the primary purpose of no stopping is  
22 to keep travel lanes free and clear for peak flows. And if  
23 it's unclear whether or not you can park there you may have  
24 someone that actually temporarily parks, gets out of the  
25 vehicle, approaches the sign, realizes oh, I'm not supposed

1 to even be stopping, and they have created a nuisance with  
2 respect to the traffic flow during the peak commute times.  
3 So it's just something to think about.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you.

5 Any other member of the audience?

6 Seeing none let's close the public comment, bring  
7 it back to the Committee. Mr. Ciccarelli, did you have a  
8 comment when I went to the public?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Anyone else?  
11 Okay.

12 MR. MUSTAFA: Mr. Chair, again, thank you very  
13 much for listening to what we have to say and thank you very  
14 much for being open-minded and creative. We are going to  
15 take all these ideas and come up with our final version.  
16 But would you entertain a motion of us, after getting all  
17 the feedback and because of the fact that we are always  
18 going to be running against a time line for us to get out  
19 there in limited experimental use, for the Phase II  
20 approval? We don't actually -- it is not going to be a  
21 citywide operation, it will be in a limited area for  
22 experimental use.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Just how many signs  
24 are we talking about?

25 MR. MUSTAFA: About 100. But again, the feedback

1 would be coming from focus group that are not engineers --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Are you going to  
3 spread it out through different geographic locations in the  
4 city to have a better sample coming back?

5 MR. HUSTING: At this period of time the initial  
6 intent is really just for these two corridors, Spring and  
7 Main. But with a larger rollout we are looking at  
8 Hollywood. Because we are looking at the places that  
9 actually have the most complex signage in the city, and  
10 that's downtown LA, Hollywood and some areas of West LA.  
11 But initially just Spring and Main.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Greenwood.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN GREENWOOD: For Phase II  
14 are you going to try both options?

15 MR. HUSTING: We are looking to go ahead and -- at  
16 this point we are considering both options, I can't say that  
17 we are going to go with one option or the other. The reason  
18 I am not picking one right now is because we are still  
19 working to refine Option A. We want to make sure that the  
20 lettering is adequate size, that the layout is -- that we  
21 feel it is the best it can be. So I can't say we are going  
22 to go with either one at this point.

23 MR. MUSTAFA: It depends on the feedback that we  
24 get.

25 MR. HUSTING: We will let the initial -- all of

1 the feedback that we get from downtown, Spring and Main,  
2 will help dictate that decision.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thanks for the  
4 clarification. So you are requesting a -- let's see if  
5 there is a motion to authorize the City to go on an  
6 experimental basis install about 100 of these in these two  
7 corridors. They are fine-tuning their signs through our  
8 feedback and through community feedback, and then come back  
9 in June with more -- better signs.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Can I clarify? Are  
11 you seeking authorization for both I and II today or just I  
12 today?

13 MR. MUSTAFA: We came here for I but hopefully you  
14 would be open-minded to II as well.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

16 MR. MUSTAFA: The reason for that being is, you  
17 know it's going to seem pushy but, I mean, we are going to  
18 be working against a real tight time frame. And we are not  
19 going to be just putting up these signs for the Phase II  
20 without getting the full feedback from the focus groups and  
21 from the community. It's not something that we are going to  
22 make the decision, it's everyone. By having everyone's  
23 input, and yours as well, when we have this up in Phase I,  
24 hopefully we will come up with something for the Phase II  
25 that we are going to be trying. And this will be the same

1 corridor, 100 signs. Thank you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: So there is a  
3 request from the City that we have a motion. Mr. Walter.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WALTER: I would move that we  
5 allow the City of LA to go forward with Phase I as an  
6 experiment. And I specifically say not Phase II at this  
7 time because we didn't have any conversation about those  
8 signs in the middle, which are a complete redesign of the  
9 regulatory signs. So rather than having that move forward,  
10 maybe they can think of ways they want to do that, and then  
11 bring that back to the Committee at a point later to have  
12 that separate discussion. So I would say go ahead and  
13 authorize an experiment for Phase I only.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion to  
15 authorize the City to do Phase I.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Is there a second on  
18 that?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: And there is a  
21 second. And will that satisfy the City's needs at this  
22 time?

23 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you very, very much.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
25 and a second. By the way, Mr. Husting, excellent

1 presentation. You must have had an excellent transportation  
2 course in college.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. HUSTING: Guess who my instructor was?  
5 Professor Bahadori.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: There is a motion  
7 and a second. Any more discussions?

8 Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

9 (Ayes.)

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any opposition?

11 The motion passes unanimously. Good luck to you.

12 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you very much and enjoy the  
13 rest of the day, guys.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay, we are going  
15 through our items.

16 There are no information items.

17 We have a discussion item which is the "PRESERVE  
18 AMERICA" sign not added. Do you want to explain that,  
19 please, Mr. Engelmann.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Thank you,  
21 Mr. Chair. Before we released the 2014 CA MUTCD we met with  
22 Federal Highway and they asked us to have this item removed  
23 from the MUTCD. It is something we can consider again once  
24 the 2016 Federal MUTCD is rolled out. So in order for  
25 Caltrans to receive substantial compliance we had to remove

1 this item.

2           And let me add that what brought this on was  
3 Tuolumne County wanting to put that "PRESERVE AMERICA" sign  
4 along the state routes. Last week we were okay with the  
5 Encroachment Permit Office to permit the installation of  
6 eight signs along the border of different routes in that  
7 county.

8           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Okay. Any  
9 discussion on this item? We don't need a motion or  
10 anything, it is just mostly FYI.

11           Hearing none, thank you very much.

12           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Can I?

13           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Sure.

14           COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I would like to  
15 address the item because I sponsored it. So I appreciate  
16 the good news that Tuolumne County is going to et to proceed  
17 with their project because it has long been in abeyance so  
18 thank you for that news.

19           I found this a little frustrating. The Committee  
20 as a whole empowered a subcommittee to go figure this out  
21 and report back, and we generated a report back. And then  
22 your predecessor kind of took it upon himself to take our  
23 second ranked recommendation and just implement it and tell  
24 us it was all done already. I'm kind of not surprised that  
25 it ran into a roadblock but the whole sequence of steps was

1 very confusing to me.

2           And I appreciate -- We kind of put the feds in  
3 sort of a difficult position and this is kind of the source  
4 of my earlier frustration about needing to figure out the  
5 way to get their input at the right time in the process.  
6 Because here their input came after we were, in theory, all  
7 done. Not even after the meeting itself. I don't know what  
8 exactly that is about. I don't have any problem with this  
9 outcome and am especially glad that the agency that  
10 requested it got what they were seeking. But there are some  
11 underlying process issues here that I am glad we are giving  
12 some attention to.

13           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Any further  
14 discussion? We spent some time on these signs, I remember.

15           Okay, we don't have any tabled items.

16           Our next meeting is June 4th. It is going to be  
17 in Sacramento.

18           COMMITTEE SECRETARY ENGELMANN: Correct.

19           COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Mr. Tong.

20           COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: I want to add one thing.  
21 I would like to appreciate District 7's accommodation to let  
22 us use the facility, like I appreciate Louis Yee to help us  
23 to organize the meeting and facilitate all the different  
24 parts, working with IT. We really appreciate it, Lewis,  
25 appreciate that.

1 MR. YEE: Thank you.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER TONG: Thanks.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thank you very much.

4 Thank you all. We had another good meeting. Do I  
5 have a motion for adjournment?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER: So moved.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Motion to adjourn.  
8 Second?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER: Second.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAHADORI: Thanks.

11 (Thereupon, the meeting of the California  
12 Traffic Control Devices Committee adjourned  
13 at 2:46 p.m.)

14 --oOo--

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2  
3 I, Martha L. Nelson, a Certified Electronic  
4 Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person  
5 herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Department  
6 of Transportation, California Traffic Control Devices  
7 Committee meeting; that it was thereafter transcribed.

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

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
12 this 2nd day of April, 2015.

13  
14 /s/ Martha L. Nelson

15 MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT\*\*367

16  
17 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

18  
19 I certify that the foregoing is a correct  
20 transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic  
21 sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled  
22 matter.

23  
24 /s/ Ramona Cota

April 2, 2015

25 RAMONA COTA, CERT\*\*478