

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

MEETING OF THE
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

ULATIS COMMUNITY CENTER
1000 ULATIS DRIVE
VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2011

9:00 A.M.

EHLERT BUSINESS GROUP

(916) 851-5976

A P P E A R A N C E S

Committee Members

John Fisher, Chairman

Jacob Babico, Vice Chairman

Hamid Bahadori, ACSC

Wayne Henley, Caltrans

Jeff Knowles, LOCC

Farhad Mansourian, CSAC

Robert Maynard, CHP

Deborah Wong, CSAA

Alan Wachtel - Exofficio-CBAC-Non-Voting Member

Caltrans Personnel

Devinder Singh, Committee Secretary

Johnny Bhullar, Advisor

Roberta McLaughlin

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

John Stein, Esq.

David Royer
University of California, Berkeley
Work Area Traffic Control Handbook (WATCH)

Robert Scharf
County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works

Mahesh Bhatt
City of Sacramento

David Roseman
City of Long Beach

Steve Pyburn
Federal Highway Administration

Jaime Rodriguez
City of Palo Alto

Todd Greenwood
City of Stockton

Alan Wachtel
California Bicycle Advisory Committee

Sam Morrissey
City of Santa Monica

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Organization Items</u>	
1. Introductions/Announcements	1
2. Approval of Minutes	3
3. Public Comments	9
4. Chairman's Comments	4
<u>Agenda Items</u>	
5. Public Hearing	
11-1 Adoption of National MUTCD 2009 Parts 1, 5, 7, and 9 into the California MUTCD to be called CA MUTCD 2011.	--
11-2 Proposal to adopt revised text, tables and figures in Part 6 of the CA MUTCD 2010 - Submitted by LA DOT	13
Public Comment	109
6. Request for Experimentation	
10-10 Request for permission to Experiment with modified SPEED HUMP (W17-1) Signs (Requested by the City of Stockton)	177
11-3 Request to Experiment with Buffered Bicycle Lanes on 2nd Street between Bayshore Dr. & PCH in Naples (Requested by the City of Long Beach)	193
11-4 Request for Permission to Experiment with Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (Requested by the City of Santa Monica)	215
11-5 Request to Experiment with New Bicycle Pavement Marking (Requested by the City of Palo Alto)	--
08-20 Final Report on Experimentation with Flashing Yellow Arrow for Permissive Right Turn Movement (Final Report by Marin County)	--

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
7. Information Items	
10-11 Status of speed limit procedures changes July 2009. (Summary of the data collected for the E&TSS performed between July 2009 and July 2010)	--
10-2 Proposal to amend existing typical applications and adopt new TAs for accommodating bicyclists in TTC zones and to revise CA MUTCD Sections 6D.11010 (CA) and 6G.05 and add a new Table 6H-1 (CA).	--
8. Next Meeting	236
9. Adjourn	244
Certificate of Reporter	245

1 Restrooms are just outside and to the left here if
2 you need to visit the restroom.

3 And it is my intention at this meeting to try to
4 conclude all the items on the agenda, with the exception of
5 Item 11-1, by 2:00 o'clock at the latest.

6 And if we can conclude all those items with the
7 exception of Item 11-1 before noon then we might be able to
8 go on a short lunch break. If not, we'll have to work
9 through the lunch period so that we can conclude those
10 items.

11 And then we can get to Item 11-1. And I think
12 with the number of comments that have been received I think
13 we can handle that item in about 30 minutes.

14 Some of us will have to leave at 2:30 because of
15 air flight arrangements.

16 So I ask you to keep that in mind as we discuss
17 the items today.

18 With that said -- I probably didn't introduce
19 myself, John Fisher, Chair of the CTCDC.

20 **2. Approval of Minutes (September 2, 2010 Meeting)**

21 And with that I would like to then go to Item
22 number 2 which is the approval of the Minutes from our last
23 meeting, from the September 2nd meeting of 2010. Do I have
24 a motion to approve those minutes?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: So moved.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any second?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Second.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any discussion
4 or amendments to the minutes?

5 Okay, all in favor say, aye.

6 (Ayes.)

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, the minutes are
8 so moved.

9 And I'd like, I'd now like to introduce the
10 members of the CTCDC. I introduced myself and I'd like to
11 start from the left.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Good morning. I'm
13 Farhad Mansourian. I'm with Marin County Public Works and
14 I'm one of the two representatives of CSAC; that's the
15 counties in the state of California.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: My name is Jacob
17 Babico. I work for the County of San Bernardino. I
18 represent CSAC, Southern California.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And John Fisher, I
20 work for the city of Los Angeles, Department of
21 Transportation. And I represent the League of California
22 Cities for the southern half of the state.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: My name is Wayne Henley
24 and I represent Caltrans on this Committee.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Robert Maynard,

1 California Highway Patrol representative.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Jeff Knowles, City
3 Traffic Engineer for Vacaville. And I represent the League
4 of California Cities in Northern California.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm Hamid Bahadori
6 representing the Auto Club of Southern California, AAA.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I'm Devinder Singh.
8 I'm the Secretary of the Committee.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And, now we go
10 to the Chairman's comments.

11 **4. Chairman's Comments**

12 When we had scheduled this meeting last September
13 it was our hope and expectation that we would, that this
14 would be the last meeting before the adoption of the 2011 CA
15 MUTCD. And as you know we're required to approve a new
16 MUTCD within two years after the Federal Highway
17 Administration approves the federal MUTCD.

18 And so we had expected that we would be adopting
19 the CA MUTCD shortly after this meeting. However, the
20 schedule had to be revised and so now I think we're looking
21 for adoption of the 2011 MUTCD probably some time in June or
22 July.

23 And we wanted to make sure that we had time to
24 receive comments from everyone who wished to comment. And
25 we posted those comments online but because some comments

1 have been posted later than expected we wanted to allow more
2 time.

3 So because we, this will not be the last meeting
4 before the adoption. We are not having a two-day meeting as
5 we had originally scheduled.

6 So on Item 11-1 where we're going to discuss parts
7 1, 5, 7 and 9, we're going to schedule that for the end of
8 the meeting here, but because there are only a few comments
9 we believe we can accomplish that quickly.

10 And then next time we will, at the next meeting
11 we'll be able to discuss the other comments that we have
12 received with regard to the other chapters.

13 The other thing that I wanted to mention is that
14 we members need to keep in mind what our role is in helping
15 those who want to experiment with various devices. And we
16 need to make sure we help them in a way that their proposals
17 have the best opportunity to be approved and can go through
18 the process as quickly as possible.

19 So keep in mind that any item for which
20 experimentation is requested that would change a national
21 standard, and most of the items that come to us would change
22 a national standard, they need to get approval first from
23 the Federal Highway Administration then it will come to us
24 and nine times out of ten we concur with the feds to allow
25 it, to allow the experiment to be used in California.

1 So make sure as agencies contact you who want to
2 experiment with a particular item, to let them know when
3 they have through the Federal Highway Administration so
4 their approval by the CTCDC can be undertaken at the
5 earliest possible time.

6 Also remember that for any item involving bicycle
7 use or bicycle traffic controls that when the item comes to
8 you as a sponsor it is then forwarded to the Secretary of
9 the CTCDC who then forwards it for consideration by the
10 Bicycle Advisory Committee to Caltrans.

11 So that the Bicycle Advisory Committee has an
12 opportunity to review and act on it and so that we have
13 their perspective on it before it comes to the Committee
14 here.

15 And we don't have a bicycle island that's on the
16 Committee Agenda today. And we will be joined when we
17 discuss that item by Alan Wachtel who is the Chair of the
18 California Bicycle Advisory Committee.

19 And Alan why don't you stand up. And Alan will
20 join us as we discuss bicycle matters.

21 The third thing that I wanted to mention was that,
22 you know, we all have a role in finessing a request. So
23 it's not just our obligation to forward the request but to
24 make sure that we work with the sponsors so that if we see
25 areas where the proposal can be improved, we should work

1 with that sponsor to say, well you need to look at this and
2 you need to evaluate that and, you know, because I think we
3 know some of the things that may be of concern to the
4 Committee or Committee members here.

5 So, again, keep in mind that, you know, it is
6 helpful if we finesse the proposal for them before it gets
7 officially forwarded.

8 So, I appreciate the work that all of you do to
9 make that happen and just a reminder that it needs to
10 continue to happen.

11 I recognize here that we are, we have seven
12 members here today out of the eight. The ninth member from
13 the California State Automobile Association is not here
14 today. So on items that we act on we do need six votes, so
15 we'll need six out of seven.

16 With that said I'd like to go to our public
17 hearing. And --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, yes --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- may I have a couple
21 of minutes --

22 THE REPORTER: He needs a mic, Mr. Chairman. He's
23 not being picked up without the mic.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah, we're going to
25 go to our public hearing but I'd like to give an opportunity

1 to Hamid to tell us about this new document that's
2 available.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, I'll get closer.
4 That's good, thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

5 Very briefly before the meeting I mentioned to you
6 that May is the Bicycle Safety Awareness Month and we always
7 have a campaign toward that.

8 And we have recently updated our Guide to Safe
9 Bicycling in California. This is going to print as we
10 speak. We're going to print at least 50,000 to begin with.

11 And if there is a need we will print more.

12 I just wanted to share a draft with the members of
13 the Committee or if you need it and it you pass the word
14 around in your communities and in your agencies.

15 This has been prepared with very close cooperation
16 with The Bicycle Club Coalition and Mr. Jim Boroughs has had
17 a very significant role in the review and input as did the
18 Bicycle Coalition of San Diego, CHP and Caltrans.

19 And we would like to thank all of those entities
20 and they've all been acknowledged in the document as well
21 for their contributions.

22 This is a draft form as you see. It will be
23 printed in a booklet form so that it's used both by
24 motorists and bicyclists. Thank you for giving me the
25 opportunity.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And Hamid we thank you
2 and the Automobile Club for your commitment to educating the
3 public on how to make the roads safe and accessible to all
4 modes of transportation.

5 We appreciate that leadership.

6 **3. Public Comments**

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: At this time I'd like
8 to go to public comments. Now at this time members of the
9 public may comment on any item not appearing on the agenda.

10 If you want to speak to an item on the agenda you
11 wait until that agenda item comes up.

12 Matters presented under this item cannot be
13 discussed or acted on by the Committee members. And for
14 items appearing on the agenda the public is invited to make
15 comments at the time that the item is considered by the
16 Committee.

17 Any person addressing the Committee will be
18 limited to five minutes so that all interested parties have
19 an opportunity to speak.

20 When addressing the Committee please state your
21 name and please spell it out for the recording secretary.
22 Indicate your address or business organization that you are
23 representing for the record.

24 So at this time we would like to hear public
25 comments. Please come to the podium and we welcome your

1 comments.

2 MR. STEIN: Good morning Mr. Fisher, members of
3 the Committee. My name is John Stein. I'm an attorney in
4 San Jose, California. And I represent --

5 THE REPORTER: Mr. Stein, excuse me. Please spell
6 your last name for the record.

7 MR. STEIN: I'm sorry. S-T-E-I-N.

8 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

9 MR. STEIN: And I represent Mrs. Lisa Bernstein
10 and her husband Alex as a result of some tragic litigation
11 that occurred or tragic accident that occurred down in San
12 Jose, California a couple of years ago.

13 I would like to just kind of explain to the
14 members of the Committee a little, just some very brief
15 facts about what happened so you'll understand the basis for
16 our petition here.

17 Mrs. Bernstein's daughter was killed in an
18 automobile accident as a result of a PG&E employee, a 20
19 year plus diabetic who had difficulty controlling his blood
20 sugar and before getting into his vehicle over-dosed himself
21 with medication which caused him to go into diabetic shock.

22 He got behind the wheel of his vehicle and he was
23 severely impaired because after the accident was found, his
24 blood sugar was down to 18 and you cannot operate a vehicle
25 at less than 100 reading on the blood sugar.

1 So, as a result of that he exited the freeway
2 going about 70 miles an hour on an off-ramp and killed two
3 children. One of them was Mrs. Bernstein's daughter.

4 Following the litigation against PG&E, we also
5 wanted to see if we couldn't establish a memorial sign
6 memorializing the tragic death of Mary Roe Bernstein who was
7 killed.

8 We approached Caltrans through Mr. Harrington the
9 Caltrans attorney and he referred me to Mr. Devinder Singh
10 for the Memorial Sign Program.

11 We discovered at that time that there was only one
12 sign, an S35 that was utilized by this Committee and by
13 Caltrans to memorialize a tragic death as a result of a
14 criminal act on the state's highways.

15 We felt that the "Please Don't Drink and Drive"
16 sign would be inadequate because that really had nothing to
17 do with the facts of our accident.

18 So we had numerous conversations with Mr. Singh
19 and he was kind enough to propose three new alternatives
20 which he can provide to the Committee.

21 One of the alternatives would be S35A, Please
22 Don't Drive Impaired. And then underneath that sign will
23 be, In Memory of, the person who was killed as a result of
24 the impaired driver.

25 There are two more signs, Don't Take Drugs and

1 Drive, Don't Drive Drug Impaired. I think any three of
2 those signs are adequate to inform the public and remind the
3 public as is the purpose of these messages to make sure that
4 our highways are as safe as possible.

5 Mrs. Bernstein has reviewed Mr. Singh's proposal
6 and I understand Mr. Henley had some input in this sign as
7 well and we would propose to the Committee that this
8 Committee adopt alternative signs for these memorial signs
9 on the side of the highway.

10 And for our case we thought, Don't Drive Impaired,
11 would be the most appropriate sign.

12 And that was the purpose of our negotiations with
13 Caltrans and that was the purpose of our appearance here
14 this morning.

15 So we would urge the Committee to move at the next
16 meeting to consider these alternative signs and adopt, I
17 would suggest, two or three of these signs because as these
18 tragic accidents occur on our highways the members of the
19 public do want their loved ones memorialized and with a
20 message to the public that instructs all of us drivers and
21 all of our citizens to not drive impaired or not drive under
22 the influence of alcohol.

23 If the members of the Committee have any questions
24 I'd be happy to answer them. Thank you very much.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you Mr. Stein.

1 Are there any other public comments at this time? Okay.

2 **5. Public Hearing**

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Hearing none, we go to
4 number 5 on the agenda, Public Hearing.

5 Prior to adopting any rules and regulations with
6 regard to the Uniform Traffic Control Devices and Standards
7 and Specifications we are required to go through a public
8 hearing process and this is conformance with Section 21400
9 of the Vehicle Code that says that, the public, basically,
10 must be involved in any decisions made by Caltrans to adopt
11 traffic control devices.

12 In this regard we have two items on the agenda.
13 Items 11-1 and 11-2. I indicated that we're going to defer
14 Item 11-1 to the end of the meeting.

15 And therefore we'll go to Item 11-2 which is one
16 sponsored by the city of Los Angeles regarding revised text,
17 tables and figures in Part 6 which is Temporary Traffic
18 Control of the CA MUTCD.

19 So I direct you to pages 7 through 35 in your
20 agenda. And since there are a large number of items, we
21 hope to act on this efficiently.

22 But let me give an introduction. It was the
23 intent here to adopt revised figures and text and tables
24 under Part 6 of the CA MUTCD. And whatever action is taken
25 today would be included in the 2011 CA MUTCD which I

1 indicated earlier will probably be published in June or July
2 or thereabouts.

3 And the intent here was to take some of the
4 manuals and guidelines and handbooks that have been used by
5 local jurisdictions that use their specialty manuals to
6 handle conditions in urban areas and to make sure that we
7 incorporated some of those drawings into the CA MUTCD.

8 So what I did was to meet with those members who
9 developed something called, The WATCH Manual, an acronym
10 that stands for Work Area Traffic Control Handbook that has
11 been around in various forms for many, many years.

12 And that manual was developed because, at the
13 time, the old Caltrans Traffic Manual didn't really address
14 some of the urban situations that occur and didn't address
15 some of the traffic management issues that needed to be
16 considered.

17 I know there are other manuals. Like there's one
18 put out by Southern California Edison and there are various
19 manuals that have been put out.

20 So the intent here was to meet with those who are
21 involved in developing that manual and to include those
22 drawings that we thought would be appropriate to include in
23 the CA MUTCD.

24 Along the way we looked at other things like the
25 types of devices that should be used. We also look at the

1 existing drawings and say, gee, is there an oversight here,
2 is there a disparity between what the text says and the
3 MUTCD versus what's shown in the figure?

4 So we've tried to put that all together and
5 identify all of the revisions and oversights that we saw so
6 that we could fulfill the objective of having a manual that
7 serves not only the needs of temporary traffic control in a
8 rural setting or on a highway setting but also urban
9 settings as well.

10 So that was the intent of the 19 revisions that we
11 are proposing here.

12 And what we did also was not only propose it
13 descriptively but we tried to modify the figures to indicate
14 exactly what the revisions would be.

15 So with that in mind I'd like to go through the 19
16 different proposals and if it's okay with the Committee I'd
17 like to get a vote on each of the 19 proposals before we,
18 sequentially as we go through each one and then ask for
19 approval of all 19 as they might be modified through our
20 discussion.

21 In mentioning the 19 I have decided not to pursue
22 Item number 2 which pertains to the cone height. I've
23 decided to drop that matter because I think there's some
24 additional considerations that we have to keep in mind. And
25 so, I'm not going to pursue Item number 2.

1 But what I'd like to do is start with Item number
2 1 which is Section 6F.58.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman can I ask
4 a question on the --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- procedure?

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

8 THE REPORTER: You need a mic there. Chairman,
9 you need a mic for him.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So this is your
11 cities' and your agencies' comments on Chapter 6. As we are
12 going through the adoption of the new CA MUTCD how we do
13 incorporate other comments and we may have not received even
14 a single comment on Chapter 6 as far as I know.

15 But the question may be for Mr. Bhullar, are there
16 comments and how does this fit into the public review,
17 comment period that the Chapter is open for other agencies
18 in California and the members of the public to comment as
19 well.

20 I just wanted to make sure that we are not going
21 to go and adopt something today that, when it comes to the
22 adoption of Chapter 6 we have a contradictory comment from
23 another agency.

24 I don't know, I do not recall what is the period
25 that Chapter 6 is open for public comments, if that period

1 has ended and if you have received any comments on Chapter
2 6.

3 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar, B-H-U-
4 L-L-A-R, Caltrans, Editor of CA MUTCD.

5 Basically the way the process is working right now
6 is of right now we have only parts, introduction, part 1, 5,
7 7 and 9 that were posted.

8 And that's when I got into my injury on my left
9 hand. And because of that we have postponed our work on the
10 other parts.

11 So Part 6 is right now not even posted on the web
12 and we have not received any comments yet. But even if we
13 did they will be sitting in the pipeline in the work that I
14 keep because it's not open for public comment yet.

15 But our plan is by the end of April to be posting
16 that on the web and making it available. So --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Mr. Chairman
18 may I ask a question?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar, then when
21 the goal is, if the Committee goal is to adopt these 21 or
22 22 or whatever number of recommendations that are coming
23 from the city of Los Angeles then when you close Chapter 6
24 will the new Chapter 6 incorporate these comments?

25 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes. Basically the

1 way I work on the CA MUTCD Draft is even though it's
2 focussed and the reason why we are making this new change in
3 the CA MUTCD is based on the 2009. But any work that goes
4 parallel in this Committee, for example, the bike typical
5 application Top D was issued, that traffic operation policy
6 directive since it is now official and signed you will be
7 seeing that in this new draft that I'll be posting as well
8 as any recommendations that are, at least, complete and they
9 are official recommendations to Caltrans; all that work will
10 be shown in these drafts.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, this focus
12 number is 19 actually. So if the Committee approves these
13 19 or whatever number of these, you will incorporate them
14 into the draft CA MUTCD when you post it for public
15 comments?

16 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: That's correct.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And if any agency, at
18 that time, has a concern with any of these recommendations
19 or any suggestions for improvements, they will still have a
20 chance to comment, right?

21 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yeah, just like
22 always; whenever we post the entire manual even the stuff
23 that has been around since the '70s, they can comment on it.

24 So this will be official recommendations so I will
25 be incorporating it into the final draft. But they can

1 still comment on it and we can still entertain any comments
2 on it.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. I think I
4 understood it. Thanks.

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Hamid, this item
6 already followed the processing or even if Johnny will not
7 include the draft, this followed the process of CTCDC.

8 You have 30 days from the comments. So this is
9 official. If the Committee makes any recommendations today
10 it is officially as Caltrans, we can adopt it. Yeah.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay, I see. Thank
12 you.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Before we get into the
14 items, are there any other questions about procedural
15 process here? Okay.

16 With that we'll move right into it. Item number 1
17 which would revise Section 6F.58 is merely editorial and
18 would add the word, channelizers.

19 As you go to page 10 that would change Section
20 6F.58 and the support statement to say, channelizing devices
21 include cones, tubular markers, channelizers, vertical
22 panels, durms, barricades and temporary raised objects.

23 It's strictly editorial.

24 And channelizers, the figure for that appears in
25 Figure 6F one and two which is shown on page 19.

1 Do we have a -- again, I'd like to get a tentative
2 approval on each of these items before we adopt this entire
3 items.

4 So, all those who approve this editorial change
5 say, aye.

6 (Ayes.)

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: John, just
10 procedurally, will you give the opportunity to the public or
11 some others to, at least, give any comments on any items if
12 you are taking votes?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah, thank you for
14 that good point. Any public comment on this particular
15 item, Item number 1.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just a question of
17 process. If we're making a motion on every single item then
18 don't we also need to have a public comment opportunity on
19 every single item? Or maybe you, I don't know, I've had a
20 chance to look at these very carefully before the meeting.

21 I don't know if any members have had the chance or
22 if you read any to go through every single one. Except if
23 someone has, like a comment or needs clarification.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, fair enough.
25 What I'll do is, if there is no comments on the particular

1 aspects we're considering then I will just go on to the next
2 one and take a vote at the very end. Yes, Jeff.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: This seems a lot to me
4 like the workshop, the informal workshops we were having as
5 a subcommittee going over the federal changes and, you know,
6 how we're going to incorporate them.

7 And we're always working under the rules that the
8 state could be more restrictive but we couldn't relax the
9 standard. What's the general feeling with regards to adding
10 language?

11 Aren't we adding devices that the feds didn't
12 approve for this particular application? It seems like
13 we're not following the rules we did before.

14 You know, we've struck signs but I don't remember
15 us inserting devices where the feds didn't have that
16 language in the 2009 MUTCD.

17 This seems like it's, by adding devices not
18 approved by the feds in this application, this seems
19 different to me than what we've done in the other sections.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think here, in all
21 of these items, we're not being less restrictive than the
22 feds. But we have certain -- and we'll get to it, we have
23 certain conditions where we have that high standard, a
24 higher standard.

25 And it needs to be reflected in the figure. In

1 the case here, in California we happen to have a separate
2 figure for channelizers. Figure 6F.102(CA), and because
3 we've had a separate figure for it, when we refer to the
4 figure in which these appear channelizers are in a different
5 section.

6 So, channelizers is definitely a temporary traffic
7 control device. And I just wanted to make sure that that
8 oversight was corrected here and it's strictly editorial for
9 the first one.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And my only other
11 question is, are you proposing similar language that would
12 correspond with the standard warning devices of this nature
13 just because in those cases with regards to channelizers
14 there's some applications where we do like the lower device
15 for permanent installations along the median because it
16 keeps them from being hit as often and leaning out at odd
17 angles out into the street. It's a more visually pleasing.

18 So, I need to, as you go to these mandated, higher
19 standards that, are you only applying this to the
20 construction zones or are you, have similar proposals for
21 permanent devices?

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: This item is strictly
23 on Part 6 which is temporary traffic control.

24 By the way, I see that we're joined here by our
25 eighth member. So why don't you introduce yourself.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Deborah Wong with AAA of
2 Northern California.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And we all will
4 have to make a special effort. If anyone wants to make a
5 comment on this half of the table, remind me to pass the
6 large microphone.

7 So that was Item number 1. Any discussion on it?
8 Yes, Robert.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: You know, whenever we
10 change a standard we usually have some other, you know,
11 usually it's an engineering study or something that says,
12 you know, you need to change a standard because, you know,
13 it will --

14 THE REPORTER: Mr. Chairman, mic, please.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I think our original
17 thoughts on the MUTCD or the CA MUTCD was to take the
18 federal MUTCD and then make changes. If we had laws in
19 California or if we have engineering studies that show that
20 the change is a good idea.

21 I'm not sure if this is the case in any of these.
22 But are some of these just practices that really don't have
23 any engineering basis for being different from the federal
24 MUTCD?

25 You know, as we go through them I guess that's --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I believe as we go
2 through them we're working, in some cases we're revising a
3 support statement or guidance statement. And I think we'll
4 identify those as we go through them.

5 In this case, for the first item we're simply
6 revising a support statement.

7 As requested by the Committee we'll just see if
8 there's any discussion on it and then if none, we'll go to
9 the next item.

10 So is there any discussion on adding the word,
11 channelizers, to the support statement?

12 Now we will ask for public comment after we go
13 through these 19 items. Okay. I see no discussion.

14 Item number 2. I said I would not request that.
15 So we are not proposing to change anything with regard to
16 cone height in Section 6F.59.

17 Item number 3, Section 6F.50 (sic) relates to
18 tubular markers. And that is shown on page 13.

19 And the statement here is that, tubular markers
20 that are only 18 inches high have minimum target value.

21 I was advised by those who are involved in
22 temporary traffic management that 42 inch markers are,
23 basically, the primary size that's available and have become
24 the de facto standard.

25 And because of that practice of using 42 inch

1 tubular markers and because 18 inch high markers have
2 minimal target value the proposal here is to use only 42
3 inch markers.

4 And so, on page 13 under Section 6F.60 it says
5 that, tubular markers shall be not less than 42 inches in
6 height. This will be a standard.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman for sake
8 of discussion I would say I would oppose mandating this
9 throughout the state. There are applications, I've seen
10 them on state highways, even on temporary lane control on
11 the Golden Gate.

12 I don't believe they use a terribly high marker.
13 You know, I don't see the need to toss all of our 27 inch
14 tubular markers.

15 I'm afraid I didn't review this. So I didn't talk
16 to my maintenance companies specifically but I would need to
17 hear more about why you want to mandate this one.

18 This is okay to the federal government and FHWA
19 why we want to impose this statewide.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Let this be an
21 item that we come back to because I think there will be some
22 discussion from public comments. So we'll go back to number
23 three.

24 Number four, Section 6F.101(CA). Let me see.
25 This item is really editorial. It would add a sentence on

1 page 14 that says, the spacing of channelizers shall not
2 exceed the maximum distance as shown in Table 6F.102(CA).

3 In other words, since we are including
4 channelizers as devices for temporary traffic control we
5 need the sentence that also says that, channelizers shall
6 not exceed the distance as shown in the Table, the spacing
7 requirements.

8 Again, we consider this editorial and the
9 correction of an oversight.

10 Any discussion by the Committee members on this
11 particular aspect of it?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What page is that table
13 on? Where this is coming into play Mr. Chairman is where we
14 have charity events like road races, marathon, half marathon
15 in fact in Vacaville and we did, on a temporary basis with
16 volunteers in place, use a very different cone spacing for
17 guiding traffic and runners along the street.

18 And, when you're doing a 13.1 mile event the
19 number of markers that's required is just, it would have
20 been a budget breaker.

21 So, whereas I had to see the old table with
22 regards to any suggested distances that appears in some of
23 these spacings that. This would be tough.

24 I just know this would be tough on some of our
25 local organizations. I can think of the Fiesta Run, for

1 example, where we definitely didn't follow this spacing
2 requirement; have had no problems two years running.

3 And this is going to be difficult to implement, at
4 least at the local level.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would advise that
6 this does not change the spacing requirements because it's
7 already specified in Table 6F.102.

8 The spacing requirements are already required by,
9 for channelizing devices.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It doesn't say,
11 suggested, anywhere in reference to this table.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It says, maximum
13 spacing. So it doesn't change the table at all. It just
14 clarifies that channelizers are within the family of
15 channelizing devices, and therefore, this table applies to
16 them as well.

17 Any other discussion on this particular item?
18 Keep in mind, there's a lot in Part 6. There's a lot of
19 detail and, again, those who helped me with it tried to
20 flesh out those things that were inconsistent.

21 So, I realize there's a lot of detail here.

22 Okay, hearing no more comments on number four
23 let's go to number five.

24 It would revise Table 6C-1 and 6C-1 is shown on
25 page 15. And it doesn't change the value in the columns of

1 sign distance.

2 What it would do is provide additional specificity
3 so that if you have a certain speed you know what spacing to
4 apply.

5 Now right now in the federal manual it says, urban
6 low speed, urban high speed. People say, well, what is
7 that. What's low, what's high?

8 Is it 40? Is it 45, whatever. There's rural and
9 there is expressway, freeway in the national MUTCD.

10 What we did here, and again, it was by a consensus
11 of those who, who have to apply these for a variety of
12 detour projects as well as Mr. Dave Weir who teaches
13 temporary traffic control for the University of California
14 at Berkeley, this represented the best consensus as to where
15 to apply the spacing for each speed.

16 Now in the text it identifies the range of
17 distances that should be required for a speed. In some
18 cases the distances should be four to eight times the speed
19 in miles an hour. And in other cases it should be eight to
20 twelve.

21 The way we have revised it here on page 15 would
22 still be consistent with that guidance.

23 So for urban streets, 25 miles an hour or less.
24 You'd use the spacing as shown.

25 The next urban, instead of saying, high speed, it

1 would say, 30 and 35.

2 The next column, instead of saying, rural, it
3 would say, rural or urban for speeds of 40 to 50.

4 And then the last one would be, freeway,
5 expressway for urban for those streets that are 55 miles an
6 hour and above.

7 And that was one of the problems before. There
8 are urban streets in California, suburban streets, that are
9 not freeway or expressway where the speeds are 55 miles an
10 hour. So what standard do you apply?

11 The way the federal manual read before you'd go to
12 the second one that said, urban, high speed. Well that may
13 not be good enough when the speeds get that high.

14 So that's why it was a consensus of the group that
15 we worked with to add, urban, 55 and above, to the category
16 of freeway and expressway so that we had that longer spacing
17 so that motorists could react to it given the speeds they're
18 travelling.

19 Comments on this item?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes Mr. Chairman. Two
21 points. Didn't we discuss eliminating metric references
22 from the CA MUTCD? That was just one.

23 And number two, I like the additional
24 clarification on the speeds but it doesn't it take away some
25 of my flexibility in that I would place, when you go to,

1 instead of suggested advance warning spacing, going to these
2 minimums; for example, I would put a sign, a warning sign at
3 30 miles an hour in a different position than I would at 35.

4 The same with 500 feet from me is excessive at --
5 you know, I tend to use the four times as, you know, the ten
6 times the speed limit rule.

7 So that at 40 miles an hour we would shoot for 400
8 feet. At 50 miles an hour I'd shoot for 500 feet. Now
9 you're saying, at a minimum even at a 40 mile an hour
10 roadway, regardless of trees, intersection locations,
11 whatever, I've got to be at least 500 feet in advance of,
12 you know, when I'm placing that device. I can no longer put
13 it at 40 or even adjust it a bit because that puts it, you
14 know, behind some large trees.

15 And if I had gone 50 feet, you know, farther in at
16 350 I'd actually might have had better sign visibility. I
17 mean it takes away some of my engineering discretion and
18 completely changes my practice with regards to when I'm at
19 the lower end of this bracketed space that you're calling
20 out here.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: This would remain a
22 guidance. It is not a standard.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But it does change it
24 when --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So it is suggested --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- you, when you're
2 inserting the word, minimum, which is my concern as opposed
3 to this just being this advanced target. Now this is my
4 minimum distance. So I'm here or beyond.

5 I would suggest removing, minimum.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I would agree because
8 then there's no maximum. And you can have them 1,000 feet
9 apart.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I would consider
11 that as a friendly amendment to what I've proposed. Since
12 it is a guidance statement then, maybe, minimum, tends --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Is not --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- to muddy it up a
15 little bit.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other discussion
17 on this?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Just a minor editorial
19 comment. If you --

20 THE REPORTER: Mic please, Mr. Chairman.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, since, you know,
22 you're basically taking away some of the discretion as far
23 as identifying the type of, the road type by speed maybe you
24 need to just take away the speed category to be determined
25 by the agency since that's no longer really needed.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good point, good
2 point. So --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Just take out that
4 sentence.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah. The amended
6 proposal then would take out the word, minimum, from the
7 table and would eliminate the first asterisk since we're now
8 being specific to provide more uniformity that agencies
9 would apply.

10 And then the double asterisk, I guess, would
11 become the -- we would eliminate the asterisk wherever it
12 appears in the table and the, what is now the double
13 asterisk would become the single asterisk, distances between
14 signs.

15 Okay. Fair enough. Any other discussion on this?

16 Okay. Let's go to Item number 6. Again, this is
17 editorial. On Figure 6F-6, Figure 6F-6, that appears on
18 page 16. All it does is add another column to the table
19 that indicates the appropriate use.

20 It's shown in red. The appropriate use in this
21 column replicates the language that is in the text.

22 So all this does is transport that language to
23 make it convenient so that the table encompasses everything
24 you need to know about the application of the arrow
25 displays.

1 So we consider this editorial. Any comments on
2 number six?

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioner, are you
4 taking public comments at the end.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We're going to take
6 public comments at the end.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman the only
9 thing I would suggest is that the road types we just
10 referred to in Table 6C be consistent with the phraseology
11 that we use for appropriate use.

12 So that if you've struck low speed for urban, 25
13 miles an hour or less; wouldn't it make sense that we'd use
14 that same category here so we could say, what is a low speed
15 urban street.

16 Well we just deleted low speed in our qualifying,
17 you know, what is this urban street is. So I would like
18 some, these to correlate with one another.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Well, good
20 point. All we did is export the existing language. You do
21 get into some good discussion about what's low and what's
22 high and what's intermediate.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And then what's high
25 volume? So I think that's a legitimate area of discussion.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because what's
2 intermediate? So you didn't even --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I didn't choose to --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- have that before.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- try to define that
6 because I thought that we would get enough on --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because if I'm in court
8 I don't want to be trying to argue that in court.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And what's intermediate
11 speed? I don't know that that's defined anywhere.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'd be the first to
13 agree with you.

14 And I didn't want to attempt to try to define that
15 because we just couldn't reach consensus on what that would
16 be.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman. I'll
18 speak louder. Who other than city of Los Angeles has been
19 involved as part of making these comments? My question is
20 that, are some of the smaller agencies, are they aware of
21 these changes?

22 Unfortunately, over the last two or three years we
23 have gone through a couple exercises on recommendations that
24 have made it to the manual and then there is a claim by the
25 agencies that we are never consulted.

1 And my question is, of course, is that, of course
2 you are because you have four representatives representing
3 cities and counties on the Committee. But somehow they
4 think that individually they have to be consulted which is
5 impossible with 450, 60 cities in California and 57
6 counties.

7 But my, the reason I'm asking is that if any other
8 cities, especially smaller cities that might be affected
9 operation-wise, if they, if they have been part of the
10 discussion, at least in Los Angeles County?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The answer to that is,
12 no. There is a WATCH Committee which is not exclusively a
13 city of LA Committee.

14 And I have consulted with members of the WATCH
15 Committee. I've consulted with David Royer who advises that
16 committee. And I have consulted with staff of my own who
17 are implementing numerous detours related to the
18 construction of light rail and subway projects to get their
19 input on that.

20 I didn't have the resources to reach out to many
21 of the smaller jurisdictions. But that's why this citing
22 agendized and, you know, there's been 30 days to review it.

23 So on the item we have here I think Jeff brings up
24 a very good point that in the federal manual, high speed,
25 high volume, low speed, intermediate speed does not define;

1 I didn't attempt to try to do that because I think we'd get
2 hung up here.

3 So all I did was just export the language as an
4 editorial comment here. But I do agree it's a valid
5 concern.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So are we taking that
7 intermediate speed on page 16 out?

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, unless we want
9 to identify here what those levels are whether intermediate
10 or high and unless we're prepared to do that I'm going to
11 contend this is strictly an editorial comment that just
12 simply takes language that we've already approved and
13 duplicates it elsewhere in the table.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I personally don't
15 think I would ever understand what intermediate means. When
16 you say, intermediate, it's either low speed or high speed.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: True.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: There is a threshold
19 and you say, if you're below this you're considered low
20 speed, if you're above that, you're considered high speed.
21 That's why, that's how I've been trained. Maybe it's wrong
22 but that's how I've been trained when it comes to all
23 traffic issues.

24 But intermediate, now we're introducing a speed to
25 your system. We're saying, there is the low this, and

1 between this and this and above that.

2 And I don't think any of our traffic engineers in
3 the state have even been trained to think like that.

4 The thinking has always been, low speed, high
5 speed, urban, rural. You know, we kind of categorize most
6 of our standards, we made all our standards according to
7 those kind of thinking.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would agree with you
9 but we are not proposing the new language here. This is
10 simply language we have already approved.

11 So unless we're prepared to agree to and identify
12 what low, intermediate, high is today, maybe all we can do
13 is simply to say, this is the language that's been approved
14 and we're simply just including it in the table.

15 But I'd be the first to agree with you that it's
16 vague at best.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, for the
18 Committee, I would be agreeable to the same values in Table
19 6C-1 to provide some clarity rather than leaving it so open
20 for interpretation that, as in a lawsuit I was recently in,
21 I'm in front of, you know, an arbitrator in that particular
22 case arguing with the other attorney about what intermediate
23 is.

24 I mean if intermediate is 30 to 35 roughly in what
25 we previously called urban then let's use it if at the low

1 speed our intent really is urban 25 or less why not add that
2 clarifying language?

3 I mean, if we --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do you have a proposal
5 here?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I would suggest
7 that if the Committee finds that the rationale behind making
8 the changes you proposed in Table 6C-1 are valid then
9 they're equally valid for the language on Figure 6F-6.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I agree with that.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do you have a motion?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would move that just
13 as Figure 6F-6 is broken into three speed categories and
14 Table 6C-1 is broken into three primary speed categories,
15 the urban, the urban kind of in between and the rural higher
16 speed that we use those same definitions only for high
17 speed, I guess, we'd have to be saying 45 miles an hour, you
18 know, mph or more since we don't have a, since that way it
19 would cover our expressway, freeway situations also.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So in the table
21 you would change low speed, urban streets to read how?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would change low
23 speed, urban streets to the exact same language you're
24 proposing, urban, parenthesis, 25 miles an hour or less.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And for

1 intermediate speed facilities what would you --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would use the urban
3 30 to 35 but I'm not an expert on or have much experience
4 with mobile operations on high speed roadways like your, you
5 know, your freeway sweepers as you're going down the road.

6 So I would yield to Caltrans on their opinion of
7 exactly what the appropriate interpretation of that is. But
8 then when we get to C, the high speed, high volume roadways
9 I would use our rural or urban 40 miles an hour or more
10 category.

11 But I don't have an opinion on mobile operations
12 on high speed roadways.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So the proposal
14 here is to revise the table in 6F-6 under the column,
15 Appropriate Use and substitute the words, 25 mile an hour
16 sweeps --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's 25 miles an hour
18 or less.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, 25 miles an hour
20 or less streets under A. Under B it would be 30 to 35 mile
21 an hour streets --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Or facilities. If we
23 just take our intermediate speed --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- 30 to 35 mile an
25 hour facilities --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- correct.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- and maintenance or
3 mobile operations on roadways with speeds of 40 miles an
4 hour and above.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And then under
7 C that would read, 40 miles an hour and above and high
8 volume roadways.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And then D would read,
11 still read on authorized vehicles.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Could you repeat, high
13 speed -- this was and condition for C, correct? It's a high
14 speed and high volume? So if I had a high volume, low speed
15 it wouldn't apply.

16 This is just on C, roadways that have speeds 40
17 miles an hour or more and high volume.

18 I want to be clear about your definition because
19 I've got some high volume, low speed roadways where that
20 spacing would seem excessive for that size of sign would
21 seem excessive. I believe that's an, and, condition.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Devinder as we go
23 through this can you help me because there's text relating
24 to it.

25 So if we're going to revise the table we need to

1 revise the text as well.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I'm fine with that.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, so the proposal
4 is to revise the text to reflect those speed thresholds and
5 to show that it was table where low speed would be 25 miles
6 an hour or less, intermediate speeds would be 30 to 35 and
7 high speed would be 40 miles an hour.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Or more.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. That's the
10 motion on this item. Do we have a second? Second from
11 Farhad Mansourian. So that's the sense of the group to go
12 with that. Okay. So that's a tentative adoption for this
13 particular item.

14 All in favor say, aye.

15 (Ayes.)

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Opposed and abstained?
17 Again, this would be subject to public comment
18 because we're tentatively acting on each one of these items
19 and then we'll go back and adopt the whole thing. Okay.

20 So is that clear in the room with what we need to
21 do? Okay. Thank you for those comments.

22 Number seven, Figure 6F-7. Let me see. Figure
23 6F-7, that would relate to the actions we took on number
24 four and five. Let me see what that is.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I believe you said

1 you were going to return to this item. Does it mean tossing
2 out every 28 inch post in the state?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Figure 6F-7,
4 channelizing devices. Yeah, we're going to go back to this
5 item. Thank you for that.

6 Okay, number eight, Figure 6F-101(CA). That
7 figure is shown on page 19. And that restores the, let me
8 see, it's shown on pages 18 and 19. And that restores the
9 C20 sign, Right Lane Closed Ahead and restores the panels
10 that can be placed on them like, Left Lane Closed Ahead or
11 Two Left Lanes Closed Ahead.

12 Again, we think this was an oversight. This sign
13 is mentioned in the text, what was inadvertently missing
14 from the figure.

15 So, again, the sign, C20A and C20B as shown in
16 page 18 is already mentioned in the text but for some reason
17 did not appear in the figure. So this would restore that
18 sign to the figure.

19 Any question on that? Any discussion on that?
20 Okay. We'll move on.

21 Figure 6F-102(CA). That's the channelizer at the
22 bottom of page 19. And the, let me see, what we've done
23 here is, the height requirement is clarified.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You're coming back to
25 this, right?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No, this is a
2 channelizer. It's not coming back. It's at the bottom of
3 page 19 and the height requirement is clarified to be
4 consistent with the text in 6F-101.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: May I ask Caltrans, and
6 this device is not in the federal MUTCD at all. So we're
7 not changing the federal height requirement. This is just a
8 unique device in California.

9 So I would say we're not being more restrictive if
10 we reduce the height down to 28 inches where the figure
11 originally had 35.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah, all we're doing
13 is making it consistent with the text that we've already
14 adopted.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So I did want to point
16 out with this minimum height of 28 that's kind of in
17 conflict with the post height you were proposing which
18 eliminated the 28 inch height from the posts.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That was for cones,
20 right?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It was for those posts.
22 The tubular markers which had a minimum height of 28 inches
23 and LA was proposing to increase them to 42 but the
24 channelizers you're saying do have a minimum height of 28
25 inches.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I wanted to point that
3 our for future discussion.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So all this is is an
5 editorial. Any a discussion on this?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: If I can have a
9 microphone. Yeah, I don't see it as editorial because at
10 the bottom of page 19 of 84 that's where I'm confused
11 because we're coming back to that item, channelizers. You
12 said you were not done on that yet.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The height of cones.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No. And also on
15 channelizers.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: This to me is still
18 part of that channelizer height.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Number three was
20 tubular markers --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- not channelizers.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Does it help maybe to
2 resolve the height issue rather than discussing it on every
3 single item when it comes up?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We are not proposing a
5 change in the height of the channelizers here. There's no
6 change in the --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But the question is
8 that, for example, here you are still maintaining a 28 inch
9 this type of channelizer but when it comes to the other type
10 of channelizer you are throwing them all out.

11 So that's, that might be something that -- is
12 there a specific type of channelizer that cannot be 28 inch
13 or is it in general we are saying, because most of these
14 changes are going along the FHWA's old, older driver design
15 standard recommendations they're not like 10 or 11 years
16 ago.

17 So if you are doing some of that then maybe we
18 want to consider doing here as well.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So if it's the
20 sense of the Committee that we want to increase the height
21 of other channelizers, other channelizing devices you may
22 want to consider changing the height of this as well?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm just saying that
24 if the allowed 28 inches on certain types but not allow 28
25 inches on another type, first of all, I, for one, do not

1 understand the reason behind it.

2 And, second, it may create some confusion. If 28
3 inches is too low, and I think if I recall correctly, that's
4 what the official (indiscernible) of recommendations said.
5 Then maybe 28 inches is too low for any type of channelizer.

6 Thank you Devinder for showing you're smart with
7 things (laughter).

8 COMMISSION SECRETARY SINGH: No, I got
9 instructions from them.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I know. Okay, anyway
11 I don't want to belabor the point but since it seems we're
12 going back to that height think every single item.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well let's go back to
14 number nine. I think we need to do some clarification
15 required. And I've asked Devinder to find the language with
16 regard to channelizers and we'll come back to that.

17 Let's go to Figure 6H-18, Item number 10. Figure
18 6H-18 is shown on page 20. The proposal is shown on page
19 21.

20 What we have here is a case where we have two-way
21 flow on one lane of the street. And the text says that a
22 flagger is used to regulate two-way flow on a one lane
23 facility.

24 So what we've done here is we've revised Figure
25 6H-18 to show a flagger and to show the appropriate signs

1 that would go with the flagger.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: And where is --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- Item B? Where
5 is Item B shown?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Item B?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, then you go to
9 page 22 and that shows a new drawing to address urban
10 conditions where maybe you had one wide lane available but
11 it's been channelized now to provide two-way flow.

12 And this is an instance where we believe that
13 adding another drawing provides another option for urban
14 areas.

15 So Figure 6H-18 would first be revised to show
16 two-way flow on a one lane with a flagger since the flagger
17 is required for those conditions and would add a new drawing
18 shown on page 22 that would show two-way flow by creating
19 two lanes.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman. I
21 have a comment on Figure 6H-18B. How come we are not
22 providing the arrow board in the state of the single arrow
23 sign?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: An arrow board is used
25 where you drop a lane. No lane is being dropped here.

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But you are
2 shifting.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You are shifting, yes.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Mr. Chair, so on 6H-18A
5 you're adding the sign to the flagger --

6 THE REPORTER: Mr. Maynard, the mic please.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Where's the mic? On
8 6H-18A you're adding the sign for the flagger but where does
9 that sign go in relation to the advance warning where the
10 flagger is actually standing?

11 It seems like that sign indicating, Flagger Ahead,
12 is very close to where the lane goes away. Shouldn't it be
13 kind of farther back?

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: There are guidelines
15 for where the flagger is positioned. It states that he's
16 positioned at a point where there's room for traffic to be
17 controlled before they enter the conflicting zone.

18 So it's not -- there's no actual distances
19 specified in any table to show where the flagger goes. It's
20 kind of a judgement call in the field.

21 But the point here in the figures that show that a
22 flagger would be used and the flagger sign would be used at
23 a certain distance, distance A in advance of the tapering of
24 traffic.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. So you're not

1 defining the actual distance right there.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We're not defining the
3 distance of the flagger himself because that's always
4 determined in the field.

5 And then again, in the new figure, what we call
6 18B, we're showing another option. If you're closing one-
7 half of your roadway where you would normally have one lane,
8 if it is wide enough to delineate as two lanes will show one
9 north and one south.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chair, if I'm
11 taking this practice in the field and I look at this and I
12 say, okay, my street does not have a striped center line so
13 I don't need a flagger.

14 Are we saying that only streets that have the
15 striped center line? I mean, what's the definition of minor
16 street and the way that the figure is drawn implies that if
17 I'm taking this and I'm preparing the traffic control plan I
18 look at 18A and I say, okay, on 18A my street does not have
19 a striped center line which is probably 90 percent of
20 residential streets in California and I doing some work and
21 since I don't have a center line stripe I don't need a
22 flagger.

23 Is it, because I mean, it's so loosely defined because
24 it says, minor street, it doesn't define the width
25 requirement and then it just shows a dashed, yellow stripe.

1 So if I, again, you know, I'm just thinking, like,
2 a design engineer would pick it and he would look at it and
3 say, well, it doesn't apply to me. I don't have a dashed,
4 yellow stripe.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good point. I don't
6 think there's any drawing in the MUTCD which shows it as a
7 striped street. I think the point here, though, is that
8 where you have a marked center line where traffic, by law,
9 must stay to the right and through detour operations you are
10 directing them to the left of the center line which would
11 normally be illegal, then you have to have flagger control
12 to regulate them to cross to the left of the center line.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I understand
14 that. But, by law, even if there is no center line striping
15 I have to drive to the right. On a residential street
16 there's no center line striping but if I drive to the left a
17 police officer is going to pull me over and is going to say,
18 you're driving the wrong way even though there is no center
19 line stripe.

20 So, all I'm saying is that we show this, are we
21 saying that this applies only to streets painted center
22 lines? Because that's what that figures says.

23 That figures says that the flagger requirements
24 applies only if you have a painted center line. That's what
25 you get the impression from their diagram. That's what I'm

1 saying.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And I think
3 that's what this figure shows. There's a center line and
4 we're diverting traffic cautiously to the left of that
5 striped center line.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I don't think this
8 drawing applies to a street without a center line.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But Mr. Chairman, I
11 believe you can use this one even without a center line.
12 The purpose of this one, if you are narrowing the roadway to
13 be used on one direction at a time with a flagger.

14 That's the purpose. The main purpose is this is
15 not a center line striping. So you can use this figure for
16 a roadway, a minor road without a marked, center line
17 striping just to regulate the traffic.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Keep in mind the
19 current figure doesn't even show the flagger which we say
20 was the main -- which we thought was the major of this sign.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Can I make a comment?

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Mr. Henley.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'm going back to 16H,
24 or 6H-18. You know, that situation is described in the text
25 directly and I'm not sure where it says, you absolutely,

1 positively have to have a flagger.

2 If you're in a maintenance situation where you --
3 you know you may be closing that down for, you know, five or
4 ten minutes and it may take longer to get all the signs, you
5 know the, the additional signage and you may, maybe you
6 don't have another person on your crew to be a flagger.

7 Where does it say we absolutely, positively have
8 to do this?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: In Section 6C-05 it
10 describes flaggers and I can read from there if you like.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Because I know our
12 maintenance folks who are concerned about that and they also
13 suggested that for 6H-18A there be some criteria, you know,
14 saying either the speeds or the volumes or some reason why
15 you would positively have to have a flagger.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: In 6E-05, it says,
17 flagger station should be located such that an errant
18 vehicle has additional space to stop without entering the
19 work space.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: But if you don't have a
21 flagger is what I'm trying to say.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well this says, the
23 flagger station should be established where you have someone
24 entering the -- where you have an errant vehicle which would
25 be a wrong-way vehicle.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: There's also --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me see, let me
3 quote the other things. It says, the flagger should stand
4 on the shoulder adjacent to the road use being controlled or
5 in the closed lane prior to stopping road users.

6 And then, flagger training, it says, the training
7 for flaggers shall include, let me see, methods of one-way
8 traffic control and that's what this says, one-way traffic
9 control.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, point of
11 order. May I just ask a question or a suggestion maybe more
12 than anything else. This seems to be like an issue of high
13 interest to the members of the Committee. We may have a few
14 people in the obvious were here for a very short period,
15 experimentation request.

16 Is there anyway to we may want to focus after we
17 take care of those? Just a suggestion.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, we're already
19 half way into it.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So, probably in
22 hindsight we might have done that but we're already half way
23 into it now.

24 So on Figure 10 it shows a flagger because Section
25 6C-05 at least provides guidance as to where flaggers should

1 be stationed for one-way traffic control or for one-lane,
2 two-way traffic control.

3 And we wanted to provide an additional drawing to
4 show that even if you divert everyone to the left half of
5 the roadway, if there's enough room maybe you can carve out
6 a two-way operation. We thought that would be helpful.

7 Any additional discussion on this item?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: On 6H-18B, because we
9 have the new standards, and this might just help clarify for
10 me our treatment of bicycles through work zones. Because I
11 understand you probably didn't have time to draft up every
12 single detail here but don't we have some brand new, Share
13 the Road, signs that would apply for closing the shoulder
14 and diverting everybody over the center?

15 I mean, are you suggesting that these are the
16 basic changes and this would be supplemented in the final
17 edition with all the bicycle details that we, most recently,
18 added to the detour plans?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And considering the
20 Policy Directive that just came up two weeks ago.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. A very good
22 point. The Policy Directive came out after this agenda was
23 published that said, basically you should make every effort
24 to accommodate the bicyclists and basically where you've
25 taken away their space you -- if you must take away their

1 space, you must have a, Watch the Road, sign - or, Share the
2 Road, sign.

3 And that came out after this was published. So I
4 think that's a valid point. And if we were to adopt this in
5 concept it would have to be finessed to show the, Share the
6 Road, sign that would be applicable if we are taking away
7 the space that bicyclists --

8 And that would, if we -- approve this, that would
9 be part of the action that we -- reflecting new bicycle
10 changes.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: For Figure 6H-
14 18B, northbound traffic, don't you think you need a reverse
15 turn sign in advance of the turn movement?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, what's required
17 is that we have the --

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: The single arrow
19 is substituting that?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Taper weight as shown,
21 there's no, which is half -- and, the large arrow sign shows
22 that purpose, there's not a reverse curve in the roadway
23 configuration but there's rather a shift in the traffic.

24 And that is often shown with a large arrow.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I refer you to

1 Figure 6H-32(CA) on page 32 but this is for, probably, high
2 speed. But when you are revising, providing the reverse
3 curve signs.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Figure 6H-32 has two
5 tapers and it's separated by a tangent lane.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But you have two
7 signs.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Whenever you have
10 a reverse turn movement you have the warning signs for the
11 driver that is expecting to make a reverse curve, movement.

12 The only thing that you are adding at the work
13 vehicle is that single arrow and the end of half L.

14 That might suffice, I don't know.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So your proposal is to
16 use an arrow board instead of the large arrow sign?

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: No, no, no, no.
18 I'm saying, the reverse turn in this case because it's a
19 minor street. A minor street is defined as, 25 miles per
20 hour or less then it's a turn reverse, reverse turn not a
21 reverse curve.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, well if you'll
23 give me just a minute; I'm trying to see if there's a
24 comparable example already in the MUTCD for guidance on
25 this.

1 I mean, there are cases where a large arrow is
2 shown on some of the drawings --

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- where we're
5 shifting them.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But you still
7 have their spaces.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's because we're
9 shifting them back --

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right, right.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. So, give me
12 one more minute.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Look at 6H-76.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Figure 6H-76 --

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: On what page?

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Dash 72, 6H-72-6.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Page 6H-76 --

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: No, no, not here
20 -- here, 6H-76, 6H, dash, 72, six.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. What I'd like
22 to propose then for the one that we have shown that we adopt
23 it in concept with the appropriate, Share the Road, signing
24 and have Caltrans advise whether the large arrow or a
25 reverse curve warning sign would be the appropriate sign on

1 this.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I assume you were
3 shown the actual figure in the book that's 6H-10 that
4 actually shows, you know, the need for a flagger where
5 visibility constraints actually prohibit the drivers on a
6 minor road from being able to see each other because there's
7 a curve or something.

8 Where this is a minor street. There's a lane
9 closure. Visibility is great, low volumes. So that's why
10 we're saying, in some cases we just don't need this flagger.

11 And there's already this figure 6H-10 that shows
12 when you would consider a flagger. But this isn't in any
13 way, shape or form match the diagram 6H-10 which actually
14 refers to the possible need for a flagger.

15 This is the case where most likely you wouldn't
16 need a flagger.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I believe when a
18 flagger is necessary when you are putting both traffic on
19 the same lane because there is a visibility concern.

20 The work zone itself, it will create an object, a
21 view obstruction. So you have to have a flagger to regulate
22 the traffic who is on first using the travel lane.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is there any language
24 in MUTCD which says, a flagger may not be used if --

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Here --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: What page is that?

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- page 6H-48.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Is there anything that
5 says, the flagger is not needed on low-volume roads?

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: One and two.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Where does it refer to
8 flagger? Okay. All right. Okay. So, Devinder has just
9 pointed out to me, and I thank you for this input, Jeff and
10 Devinder that it says, 6H-18, traffic may be self-
11 regulating --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- which means a
14 flagger isn't required.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Then they have 6 --

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY DEVINDER: Then it shows --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- 6H-10 which shows
18 where you might want to consider --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- go back a few pages
21 to see that.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So I thank you for
23 that. And with that then I'm going to ask that we not
24 consider this new revised drawing showing the flagger in 6H-
25 18A.

1 So we would keep 6H-18 but we'd also adopt 6H-18B.
2 That now becomes the proposal.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No, it's not out. It's
4 just that it's, you're going to add that for all your new
5 flaggers.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well we already have a
7 drawing for it, 6H-10. And that was brought to my
8 attention. So, I guess, 6H-18A, is out and 18B would still
9 be proposed with the appropriate , Watch, Share the Road,
10 signs and a determination as to whether the large arrow or
11 the reverse turn sign would be included.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But what if you
13 have a case that because of the limited side distance it
14 doesn't matter -- there are cases, you have only 10 feet
15 visibility because of the nature of the work zone --

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Then you select it.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: That's what I'm
18 saying. So where am I going to have a figure that tells me
19 that I can use the flagger? And what would be the
20 positioning of it?

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's 6H-10.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, I suggest that
24 you can always do more than --

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Then again we

1 go --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- what is shown here.

3 The key is, are we going to set, you know, jurisdictions up
4 for liability because we said, well, you have to use a
5 flagger and the engineer determined, for this minor street,
6 work this tree branch trimming, low-volume, we didn't need a
7 flagger.

8 I mean, that's the great part of the language that
9 actually refers to Exhibit 6H-10 is there are times when you
10 need a flagger, there's times when you don't.

11 As soon as you create something like this it's
12 almost like you're putting the burden on each work crew that
13 you can either provide a flagger, even on minor streets.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And that's why I kind
15 of emphasized that I wanted the record for the poor engineer
16 who has to defend this thing someday be up to it that I
17 said, are we talking about the streets that have painted
18 center line?

19 With that I'm glad we are taking 18A out but even
20 if 18A stayed I would have argued it applies only to streets
21 that have painted center line. Because that diagram is
22 showing a painted center line.

23 It doesn't matter what the text says. In most of
24 the cases that people are concerned about you don't have a
25 painted center line.

1 And those are residential streets. You're just
2 doing it 10, 15 minutes kind of tree trimming or minor
3 things and you want to get out of there.

4 And you're, obviously, blocking traffic and you're
5 pushing people to go to the other side of the travel way but
6 you can't -- I mean it's just not going to be realistic to
7 expect people to have a flagger for all of those operations.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And as Jeff and
9 Devinder have pointed out to me, there is language now that
10 says, on low-volume roads it may be self-regulating. So --

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But Mr. Chairman,
12 this figure 6H-10, it shows, when you have a horizontal
13 alignment of the roadway -- there isn't an example for the
14 tangent, straight shot.

15 And which if the work zone would create a view
16 obstruction for the approaching traffic, this is made for a
17 curved road, curvy road where the driver cannot see the work
18 zone. Then what would be the case if you have a straight
19 shot of the road yet the work zone, as such, is obstructing
20 the view of the driver?

21 You don't provide a flagger?

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I believe the language
23 says that, you use a flagger for two-way operation on a one-
24 lane road except of low-volume roads where you can determine
25 it can be self-regulated.

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But that except,
2 I don't think is enhanced safety within the work zone
3 without additional tools or means to regulate the traffic
4 zone.

5 When you do have a truck obstructing the flow of
6 the traffic on a tangent road, similar to 6H-18.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The language that we
8 have adopted before allows us to skip a flagger and have it
9 self-regulating on a low-volume road.

10 Okay guys, we have a lot to go through. Let's try
11 to plow through the rest of it.

12 On number 12, Figure 6H-21 which appears on page
13 23. It would show the use of a arrow panel because on all
14 other figures and in the text wherever we have a closed
15 lane, we use an arrow panel.

16 It's a guidance condition. It's already in our
17 language.

18 So this would simply show the arrow panel where we
19 are closing a lane.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman I
21 have only one simple comment which is a graphic comment on
22 this figure.

23 If you look at the lane number one, southbound, it
24 has to be a left turn lane. It's not a through otherwise it
25 cannot be received by --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good point.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Sorry to say
3 that.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So the, Devinder, note
5 on editorial comment on Figure 6H-21, the south bound lane
6 next to the double-yellow center line should be shown as a
7 left turn lane and not a through lane.

8 Okay, hearing no comments we go Figure 6H-22,
9 Item, let me see, 6H-22 which is shown on page 24.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, the
11 difficulty with the package you brought forward is we don't
12 have the text. So turning to these orange books I was just
13 wondering, on 6H-21 it shows the arrow board in the text as
14 an option. You know, number nine on page, was it 6H-54 of
15 this construction book, number nine says, option - a
16 vehicle-mounted arrow panel may be used to supplement --
17 where does it say that the arrow board, what you're removing
18 is the word, option, I mean, why is it no longer, optional?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me go to Section
20 6F-56.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: They say, may be used.
22 I'm not seeing any "shalls" on the use of the arrow board.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Question. I'm glad
25 that Mr. Knowles brought that up. Why are we -- assuming

1 that we want to go and clean up the text, I'm assuming that
2 we say, okay, yeah it's something that has to be cleaned up
3 on the text; on the principle, why do we want to make the
4 arrow board mandatory?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Go to, it
6 already is a guidance statement.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So if it's a guidance
8 it's always an option. Guidance --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No, no, it's guidance
10 is a, should, condition.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah but, where do you
12 see that --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Where are you seeing
14 that for this figure?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- let me finish my
16 thought on this. Guidance by its nature is an option.
17 That's the difference between guidance and a standard.

18 So anything we have in the guidance by its nature
19 is an option that the engineer uses based on the field
20 conditions and his engineering judgement.

21 So making something mandatory in the guidance, I
22 don't know if, first of all, if you feel that strongly you
23 should make it a standard.

24 And then I'm not sure if making it an arrow board
25 as a standard mandatory is really practical.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I need to refer to
2 where you're referring John because I, you know, I'm looking
3 at the notes for Figure 6H-21 to and I'm not seeing anything
4 that says, should, or, shall, with regards to the arrow
5 board.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Section 6F-56 under
7 guidance, the first guidance, an arrow panel in the arrow or
8 chevron should be used to advise approaching traffic on the
9 lane closure along multi-lane roadways or in situations
10 involving heavy traffic, volumes, high speeds or limited
11 sight distance or at other locations under conditions where
12 road users are likely to expect, are less likely to expect
13 such lane closures.

14 That's a guidance statement. In Figure 6H-21 we
15 have a multi-lane street.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So you're suggesting
17 changing the language that describes this figure also. So
18 everywhere you're changing the figure you're going to go
19 back to the notes for those figures in the construction book
20 and change all those notes to reflect what you're
21 graphically showing.

22 Because the notes don't say that. And I wouldn't
23 have thought to look back to 6F when I'm looking at the
24 figure that very clearly explains as 6H-21,

25 It sounds like there's a fundamental problem with

1 things buried back in other sections here because there's no
2 notes that reflect that on the notes for the figure.

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It also says, high
4 volume, high speed and the figure does not reflect the high
5 speed --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: -- so if it's low
8 speed --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: This could be downtown
10 25 miles an hour.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So I will leave the
12 option on there.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well no, this is a
14 multi-lane street. It should be used on multi-lane streets.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And that was 6F what ?

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It was 6F --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Section 6F-56, the
18 first guidance statement, an arrow panel in the arrow
19 chevron mode should be used to advise approaching traffic of
20 a lane closure along major, multi-lane roadways and it goes
21 on from there.

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: But the number of
23 other factors apply, high volume, high speed. So if it is
24 not high speed it's between 5 and 35. It's optional.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But what I'm suggesting

1 is that it sounds like we need more time because it's not
2 only these figures, it's the notes on the figures. It's
3 correlating what's in F, what's in H. It sounds like
4 there's some -- and you have a lot of different figures here
5 that have the arrow panels and I'd hate to see our audience
6 shrinking if we just go over all of this.

7 And it looks like there's a lot more detail here
8 than just these figures. There's all the text that goes
9 with them.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What I want to point
11 out is that there are a number of figures already in the
12 manual where we show a lane closure with an arrow board.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: As an option.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: No. We show it. Go
15 to 6H-22. Go to 6H-23. Go to 6H-24. There are a number of
16 situations where we already show the arrow board as a
17 standard device because it is a guidance.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But in 6H-22, notes for
19 the figure, it clearly says that. So what I'm saying is, it
20 appears that we need to not only revise the figures because
21 in the notes for 6H-21 there's no reference to a, should,
22 or, shall use, an arrow board.

23 So it looks like we need to be going over all the
24 language that is, you know, reflects the notes for these
25 figures.

1 There's more to it than what we're seeing right
2 here to make the document consistent.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And Johnny you
4 may want to weigh in on this. I think the standard protocol
5 has been where you have a, shall, or, should, condition then
6 that's the default situation on the drawing.

7 Where you have an option in the language then it
8 is listed as, optional.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman. The
10 concern is if we remove the word, option, in some of these
11 figures and that's where the contractors and the crew might
12 be only looking at these figures, it's going to come across
13 as mandatory and not having an option. I think that's the
14 point.

15 You know, the field crew, they're not going to go
16 back and forth and match the figure with every paragraph.
17 They're going to look at these, this is what they're going
18 to lay out.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, and Section 56
20 clearly says, multi-lane roads. But it also goes on to say,
21 in situations involving heavy traffic volumes, high speeds
22 and/or limited sight distance. So it's not all multi-lane
23 roadways.

24 It's multi-lane roadways under certain conditions
25 and that's why the figures show optional. It's not a,

1 should, in all conditions.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Keep in mind that the
3 current figure does not show an option for the arrow board.

4 It shows an option for a flagger or for a flag tree.

5 It doesn't even show the arrow board. Johnny.

6 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with
7 Caltrans. Just as an overall note regarding how the
8 conditions go on the figures.

9 The way we have been working on these or at least
10 the feds have been showing by example and which we have
11 followed is, that only when the device is, optional, do we
12 show it on the typical application and mark it as, optional.

13 But if it is a, shall, or a, should, meaning,
14 standard or guidance, since even the guidance is the
15 recommended practice or the default that you should be doing
16 anyhow, then we do not single them out as, optional.

17 So, unless the device was purely optional then we
18 would show it as, optional, on the figure, otherwise whether
19 it's a standard or a guidance it just goes in on the
20 typicals because the typical itself is only an example way
21 of doing things and that shouldn't be followed like, by-the-
22 book approach anyhow because out in the field situations can
23 differ so much.

24 So when John is suggesting it, I would rather be
25 in his favor in going along with the current terminology

1 which is, if the device is purely optional then we show it
2 as, optional, otherwise we stay silent and let the user
3 determine from the device and the policy in the section as
4 to what it is as a standard or a guidance.

5 However, this issue has crossed my desk a number
6 of times. So there is one other suggestion that has been
7 made. And this would be probably, at least, an opportunity
8 to look at and if the Committee suggests or looks at it from
9 that point of view we can certainly undertake that which is
10 that if we start doing it then on all these typical
11 applications we should say, shall, should or may.

12 And that is easy to do but, of course, then the
13 figure will get confusing. But we can on each of these
14 devices we can require why we can do that.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Again, normally the
16 default condition is that on a multi-lane street where you
17 have a lane closure, you show an arrow board. That's the
18 default condition.

19 The current drawing doesn't even show an arrow
20 board as an option. It shows a flag tree.

21 And clearly, that's inconsistent with the other
22 drawings that show an arrow board with lane closures.

23 So all I was proposing here is to delete the flag
24 tree and to show the default condition of the arrow board as
25 we show with other lane closures on other drawings.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And we should move
2 on to other items, come back.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: One question,
5 quick question on the arrow board, shouldn't be at the end
6 of the taper, the position? That's the general practice.

7 I have seen some of them. They are at the
8 shoulder at the beginning of the taper not at the end. So I
9 see it as not the general practice.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The general way
11 they're configured in the other drawings is that they're
12 shown just prior to the obstruction.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Well if you look
14 at page 27, 29, they are at the end of the taper. The only
15 one which violates that is on page 32. The arrow board is
16 on the shoulder, the beginning of the taper and I wonder
17 why.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Good point. On
19 this one we'll show -- because we have the symbol of a
20 flagger, flag tree in the way we showed the arrow board
21 right behind it. But you make a good point that the arrow
22 board should be right at the end of the taper.

23 So, Devinder, if we can note. That the arrow
24 board, if we approve the signing, would be right where the
25 flagger, flag tree is shown.

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Well it should be
2 where this double arrow is.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Is there a need for the
5 double arrow sign if you have an arrow board?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah, because you can
7 pass to the right.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The arrow board is
9 pointing both ways in your figure.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You can pass to the
11 right or to the left.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right. But the
13 arrow board says, two ways. So suffice the warning sign.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And what's your spacing
15 to the double arrow sign in relationship to the arrow board
16 if you move the arrow board toward the double arrow side of
17 this?

18 I mean, aren't they relaying the same message but
19 the arrow board is doing it much more clearly.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Well the arrow
21 board gets you, at the end of the taper you have to move,
22 you have to be on that specified lane. You are not
23 transitioning.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The current drawing

1 shows the double arrow down sign.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And aren't you putting
3 the arrow board in its place really.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The current drawing
5 shows you can pass to the right or to the left. The arrow
6 board is used wherever there is a lane drop.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: In fact, you can
8 put this double arrow sign just in advance of the arrow
9 board. But positioning the arrow board would be where the
10 double arrow down is which is the end of the taper.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Well, you've
12 got to put both in --

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Put them with 50
14 feet or 20 feet apart.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So the proposal
16 here would be to retain the double down arrow --

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- sign. And put the
19 -- and I can work with Johnny or Devinder on the graphics.
20 And to show the arrow board just somewhere beyond the double
21 down arrow sign.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: At the end of the
25 taper.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. Good
2 point. Moving right along. Number 15 which pertains to a
3 series of figures, 6H-23, 24, 30, 31 and 32.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: You skipped 22A.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Oh. Okay. Let me --
6 let's go to Figure 22A, thank you, 22. We wanted to provide
7 an option here. The curve figure, Figure 6H-22 shows a way
8 of -- shows a lane trap situation where we're telling the
9 right lane it must turn right but we don't have the pavement
10 markings.

11 And in consulting with those in the field who must
12 implement these type of conditions, they tell me that unless
13 you have the elephant tracks and the barrier line and the
14 pavement arrow to show a right turn lane as a trap lane,
15 motorists are going to blow through it because they're not
16 going forewarned.

17 Also, Section 3B.09 says that these markings shall
18 be used for a trap lane situation.

19 So, we're showing in the revised figure 6H-22 that
20 if you wish to create a right turn lane, trap lane out of
21 what was a through lane due to a lane blockage then you
22 would put in these controls.

23 The appropriate warning signs, the appropriate
24 pavement markings and the appropriate regulatory signs
25 because that's really the only thing that works.

1 Motorists in order to know that their through lane
2 now must turn right, they need to have a series of controls.

3 And so if you're going to put in that type of detour then
4 you've got to put in the appropriate pavement markings.
5 That's what they're going to look out for.

6 Discussion.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jacob.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Two comments.
10 Number one, what's the spacing between the two signs of the
11 regulatory, Right Lane Must Turn Right, there's no distance.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's shown at the
13 beginning and the end of the barrier line however long you
14 make it.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. The other
16 comment is that taking this into consideration, we are not
17 talking about what kind of control the intersection has.

18 It seems to me it could be either stop signs or
19 two-way stops or four-way stops or signalized intersection.

20 Because when you are turning the capacity to 50 percent for
21 the northbound you have to consider the staging, the queuing
22 analysis.

23 So I wonder what's going on here.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The current drawing
25 just shows four limit lines which implies that --

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- is always stop
3 control or a signal control.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The important point
6 here though is that if you wish to keep the right lane open
7 then you need the appropriate controls --

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right. Okay.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- to entrap the right
10 turn lane. That's all this is intended to show. It's
11 consistent with Section 3B.09 of the MUTCD that requires
12 this type of striping treatment and signing.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So are you suggesting
14 we cross out Standard 6H-22 and in California adopt 6H-
15 22A(CA)?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What you're saying is
18 that 6H-22 doesn't work.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I don't see the need
21 for both. Yeah, that's okay.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I don't know. I
23 mean there's a conflict. Northbound lane number two, going
24 through the intersection.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Keep in mind this is

1 not only for the motorists who must figure out what we're
2 trying to do, it's for the safety of the road workers.

3 So that if you haven't provided effective controls
4 to make them turn right they may proceed forward and hit the
5 work zone and endanger the safety of the workers there.

6 Anymore discussion on this figure?

7 Okay, we'll go to Item 15, 14 which shows, okay,
8 let's say you don't want to go to the extravagance, and this
9 is shown on page 25, let's say like you don't want to go to
10 the extravagance of -- let me see, in tracking the lane.

11 You have the option, then of -- let me see. Let's
12 see. Let me see. New figure cross space at 6-22B -- what
13 is 6H-22B? Let me see, I'm confused here.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Primarily it looks like
15 it's the repeated issue of deleting, optional, on the arrow
16 board for multi-lane roads. Just that whole discussion
17 about the best way to relay that, should, from Section F
18 and, I don't know, it would be nice to have some clarifying
19 language in the figures notes that, again, bring up the high
20 speed, high traffic volume, the sight distance issues that
21 really trigger that F.

22 I agree it doesn't hurt to show it as a default
23 with the arrow but, you know, it would be nice to restate
24 the conditions in 6F-56 within the notes.

25 So an engineer has something to fall back on in

1 the legal case whether it says, in this case I had low
2 speeds and low volumes during this period of time; just
3 closed the lane at 10 a.m. and it was open by 11. So we
4 didn't haul in the arrow board.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Devinder, there may
6 have been a drawing that wasn't forwarded to you. I'm
7 referring to 6H-22B but I don't see the drawing here.

8 And I think that drawing showed an option for what
9 we call 6H-22A where you could close the right turn lane
10 instead of putting in the fancy striping here.

11 So you'd have the option of either closing it and
12 then creating a right turn lane. It'd be the mirror image,
13 yeah. Here's what we submitted and somehow it didn't get on
14 the agenda. Thank you Dave.

15 Yeah, it's a mirror image of 6H-23. I'll pass it
16 down the table so all can see. But it provides an option
17 for what we just went over.

18 And that is, if you don't want this fancy
19 striping, fine. You could close the lane through coning and
20 then you can, through coning, create a right turn pocket
21 lane.

22 But at least you close the lane first so that no
23 one can blow through.

24 So, and pass it along the team up here and it's a
25 mirror image of what appears in 6H-23.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That was what the
2 public concern was, you know -- that, I mean, striping for
3 short --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And we wanted
5 to provide that option. So you can cone it off or you can
6 stripe it properly.

7 And that will be passed along to you.

8 What I'll do now then as that is being passed
9 along to you and considered I will, then, go to Item number
10 15 which is Figure 6H-23, 24 and 30, 31 and 32. And that's
11 the old arrow board situation where we had shown the arrow
12 board as optional and the fed language reads that way but
13 the California language does not.

14 So, it would simply strike the word, optional,
15 where the arrow board is shown on those figures. In other
16 words, it wouldn't be an option; it's the fall-back
17 condition. It's a guidance condition as described in the
18 text. And as earlier explained.

19 Again, the arrow boards are already shown there
20 but they have the word, option, there and that isn't
21 consistent with the text that we have previously adopted.

22 So, that's deleted as what we believe is an
23 oversight.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So you're not open to
25 the concept of within the notes for these figures like the

1 notes for Figure 6H-23, that the language be imported as a
2 note from 6F-56 which refers to multi-lane roadways, yes,
3 but it's, you know, the heavy volumes, the high speeds and
4 are limited sight distances; so that we include that within
5 the notes for the figure.

6 So we're striking that, optional, but we're
7 providing that support where the engineers most likely to
8 see it which is on the notes for the given figure.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I will yield to Johnny
10 on this one. Johnny, Wayne or Jeff is suggesting that maybe
11 we have additional notes that refer to the conditions under
12 which arrow boards are used on each of the notes.

13 To me, that's an editorial matter and --

14 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yeah, we could do
15 that.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I mean, it strengthens
17 that it's less of an option than this figure seems to
18 indicate but it's still brings that comment forward.

19 So if an engineer says, because of the light
20 volumes and low speeds clearly, you know, the notes reflect
21 that he had that discretion.

22 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Sure, yeah, we'll look
23 at the text to whatever is suggested we can at the notes and
24 we can certainly entertain that.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Probably additional

1 reference and clarification would be helpful.

2 Okay, moving right along.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I have some
4 comments.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Now, for the
7 northbound lane number one you're converting --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What drawing?

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- 6H-23.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, well we're --
11 okay.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- on page 25.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Lane one,
15 northbound you are converting it from through traffic to
16 exclusive left. Shouldn't you do propose a left turn
17 pavement marking similar to the previous one?

18 And then, why do you need the cones to separate
19 the left turn from the through traffic? You didn't do it on
20 the previous one.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Existing 6H-23 which
22 is already in the manual --

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- is an option where
25 you're not trapping the lane, rather you're dropping it.

1 And after you drop it then they can pull in a pocket fashion
2 to enter the left turn lane.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: What's the
4 difference between the left turn exclusive then the previous
5 figure which is right turn exclusive? You have the right
6 turn arrow. You don't have it here for the left turn arrow.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The figure that was
8 just passed along to you shows an option if you want to do
9 it by coning only.

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: You can have this
11 option too. Just --

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: It didn't say
13 here.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's an option.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So this is a coning
16 option here that's already in the manual. If you don't want
17 extravagant pavement markings, you're in and out in one day,
18 you cone it off.

19 The only thing we're showing is that whenever you
20 cone it off you provide an arrow board. It's not an option.
21 It's a guidance statement. That's the only change we're
22 making here.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Believe me,
24 somebody will be sitting here and then will make a diagonal
25 movement to go through.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But you've got the,
2 Left Lane Must Turn Left, sign.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Well it's way far
4 to the right. Anyway --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Item 16, Figure
6 6H-24. What we have here is in 6H-24 the existing one shows
7 that we're transitioning a full lane width through the
8 intersection. I don't know anyone who does this.

9 A full 12 foot transition within the width of an
10 intersection. I was advised, no one does this. It's not a
11 safe operation.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: We're about to. For
13 Davis Street widening we're going to transition in the
14 middle of the human way, in fact. So --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: A full lane width
16 through the intersection --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- I'm going to put the
18 signal on four-way flash to control speeds --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- and then we're going
21 to transition because of a major widening we're doing there.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. What we're
23 proposing here is that there be the transition just in
24 advance of the intersection so that motorists can proceed in
25 a straight-shot fashion through there.

1 And I was advised and I personally agree that it's
2 better to transition in advance of the intersection so that
3 you --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: If you had the
5 capacity.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: A question. So, the
9 proposal is that 6H-24 on page 26 be completely deleted?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And replaced by the
11 drawing on page 27.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. I have a
14 few comments.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: What is this one
17 half L on the left hand side, indicates to what?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, one question.
19 What if the field condition does not allow the revised or
20 the proposed 6H-24?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because the notes for
22 that display allow me to do what I'm proposing to do and
23 now, if you change those notes to say, I can't do that then
24 we have to go back and change the construction phasing for
25 this major project that we're about to start this spring.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, because I,
2 because, quite frankly, you know, in 6H-24 I can think of
3 two specific projects that I worked on that we did 6H-24 and
4 it worked.

5 I understand the desire for the revised or
6 proposed, maybe that's in group. But taking that option
7 completely out, is there any, like, strong reason why you
8 want to completely eliminate 6H-24?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah, because it would
10 require too abrupt taper through the intersection. As the
11 drawing shows, there's no stop condition for the north/south
12 streets.

13 So there going at free flow speeds.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, no, no. These
15 drawings do not show traffic control, period.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Even the previous
18 drawings, they don't show a stop sign or a signal or
19 anything.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well they still show a
21 stop --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I know, I mean,
23 like we were just discussing like if you look at the 6H-23.
24 Figure 6H-23 shows a limit line. It doesn't say if it's a
25 stop sign or if it's a signal or anything.

1 So these are like a schematic-type intersections.
2 They don't deal with the traffic control devices.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Regardless of the
4 controls --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, if you look at
6 taper rates, you're tapering a four lane with a cross a two-
7 lane roadway -- pretty abrupt taper.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I, I --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But if I've got the
10 signal on four-way flash, I've got extremely low speeds in
11 the middle of this intersection because of the placement of
12 my K-rails I have very little room to work with.

13 And it was the best I could come up with.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And see, that's
15 exactly what I'm thinking is that if the, I mean, completely
16 eliminate 6H-24. There are cases that 6H-24 can be handled,
17 quite frankly, very safe, like the one that Jeff just
18 mentioned.

19 You have a signal, you put it in all red. What's
20 wrong with that?

21 So taking that, I understand if you want to give a
22 better option maybe than the proposed one but I don't know
23 if it's really necessary to completely eliminate 6H-24
24 altogether, regardless of whether were the conditions.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, good point. So

1 you're pointing out that if all traffic must stop they're
2 proceeding from a zero speed condition and, therefore, they
3 can make the taper right.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If it's a four-way
5 stop sign or if you have a signal that you can put on a red
6 flash, which is a stop sign again, then maybe 6H-24 is the
7 best you can do at that location. Taking that option
8 completely away may not serve us well.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But wouldn't you agree
10 that we add some language on the drawing that says, always
11 stop condition or something to that effect.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You would need to
13 because here they don't even have any advisory speed signs
14 in advance of this.

15 So clearly, and, but they're not showing any,
16 there's no limit line. This is like an uncontrolled
17 intersection, not likely.

18 So, yes, if it, you know, you would have to, at a
19 minimum, reduce speeds. And I'm going to do it by putting
20 the signal on four-way red for months as we, you know, widen
21 from three lanes to five lanes. And I have to have room for
22 K-rails and everything else.

23 But, whatever you want to add, but, let me put
24 this forward also. This is a case of having an engineer
25 with some discretion. It was obvious that I can't run the

1 signal in full operation and have speeds of 30 miles an hour
2 through here.

3 So this engineer decided, well, I'll put the
4 signal on four-way flash.

5 I mean, I don't know exactly what you're trying to
6 solve with all these but the engineers out there are
7 thinking locally. And, you know, we're just giving them
8 some options but this is, even these don't cover every
9 single case every engineer is ever going to run into in
10 their entire careers.

11 So, you know, no matter how many exhibits you come
12 up with. I'm not, you know, we're spending a lot of time on
13 this.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So would you agree
15 that we would, we should keep existing Figure 6H-24 but with
16 a, some sort of note on the drawing or in the title that
17 it's one always stop condition?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Or extremely low
19 speeds, yes, yes.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So that'll be
21 the case.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I was wondering,
23 as long as the option is kept that sometimes you really
24 cannot do transition out of the intersection.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. I will consider

1 that a friendly amendment. Number 17, Figure 6H-25 which is
2 shown on pages 28 and 29.

3 That would be revised to show the arrow panels
4 instead of the flag tree since a lane is being closed.

5 And also it would be revised to, the way they do
6 it, traffic in the number one lane under the current drawing
7 on page 28 is pretty much entrapped into the left turn lane.

8 They have no way of knowing that they're being
9 entrapped into a left turn lane. So what the drawing on the
10 right on page 29 would show that before you entrap them, if
11 you want to do it strictly with coning, you close the lane
12 first as we've done on previous drawings and then you let
13 them enter the left turn lane in a reverse-curve fashion, in
14 a pocket fashion so that they will better recognize they're
15 entering a left turn lane and are not entrapped in one.

16 Discussion on this item.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman.
18 You are recommending removing the flag tree. Shouldn't you
19 remove the symbol too, the sign inside the cone?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Where? Yeah.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Is that for the
22 lane closed?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah, it was intended
24 to be a lane closed. So we'll add an arrow to that.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Oh, okay.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any discussion
2 on this item? Okay, two more figures to go.

3 Figure 18. I'm sorry, number 18, Figure 6H-46 on
4 page 33. And that shows a flagger -- let me see, it's a new
5 figure. Hold on, let me find my way.

6 Figure 6H-46 we have three drawings showing
7 conditions near a railroad crossing and what they show is
8 a --

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: You have 6H-51.
10 You passed that.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What they show is a
12 flagger for a lane reduction at a railroad crossing for
13 queuing control because there's always a concern by the PUC
14 that with the lane reduction traffic can queue over the
15 tracks, therefore, a flagger is needed to control that.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Which figure is
17 that?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Figure 6H-46 --

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Why did you pass
20 6H-30?

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Why did I pass 6H-30?

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Figure 6H-30.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We discussed Figure
24 6H-30 on number 15. That was just to remove the option.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: How about 6H-31?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That was on item 15.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yeah. We didn't
3 discuss that.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes we did.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: When?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That was to remove the
7 option --

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I have comments.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- a sign over the
10 arrow board --

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I have a comment.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Look at the --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let's go back to
15 number 15.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- page 31. What
17 does this S mean here?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, one
19 question of clarification on page 23. That's only for
20 uncontrolled gate crossing, right?

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: We are on 31 now.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Hold on. Jacob has
23 asked to go back to Figure 6H-31 and the only thing there
24 was to remove the word, optional.

25 And he said, his question was, what does the, S,

1 stand for? It stands for speed and miles an hour. And,
2 there is, right here it refers to 4S. So that's what it
3 refers to.

4 So are you okay on that?

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Boy, oh boy.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Thank you.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So moving right along.

9 The Figure 6H-46, again, it shows a flagger in advance of a
10 restricted roadway condition up ahead because flagger
11 control is required in Section 8A.08 of the 2009 federal
12 MUTCD, plus the PUC has advised this.

13 Wherever you could queue traffic over the tracks
14 you have a flagger to break up that queue.

15 And that's what being proposed then in Figure 6H-
16 46 and 6H-46A and 6H-46B.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, just one
18 footnote. On page 31 there's an asterisk with S, that says,
19 speed and miles per hour. Where does that asterisk refer
20 to? And there's not speed value in that diagram.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That was Jacob's
22 question. Right below it there's a distance that says 4S.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay, so the asterisk
24 probably needs to move to the S other than --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. This is the

1 way the existing drawing is --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- but I would yield
4 to --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- that S --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- Johnny to --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- yeah, that's --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- kind of clean,
9 clean it up.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- yeah, that's a
11 footnote. Let me ask my question, a previous question
12 again. Page 33 applies only to uncontrolled gate crossing?
13 Because it doesn't show any gate or anything.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It could apply whether
15 there are gates. It could apply even if there aren't gates
16 and lights.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But that's not what
18 the diagram says. If I look at --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But the intersection --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- yeah, but --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- the diagram --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- but, yeah but if I
23 look at that diagram I'm saying that this diagram applies
24 only to uncontrolled gate crossings because I don't see any
25 gates.

1 So either we have to show somehow that there's a
2 gate or add a note to the diagram because otherwise --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, the notes for the
4 diagram, 6H-26 notes clearly says, in standard two that
5 that's with or without grate crossing gates.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So, but --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You just --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I understand. And
9 that goes back to the point that you said, that you're only
10 looking at diagrams and not having the text --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Exactly.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- but --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: What we show as Figure
14 6H-46A, again, is already shown in the CA MUTCD. What we're
15 really trying to add is Figure 6H-46B and C to show other
16 conditions that might occur in urban areas where, where a
17 flagger would be needed.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All we're doing is
20 adding a couple more drawings.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: How you number it,
23 I'll leave it up to Caltrans.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Correct. I have
25 comments on 46B. Why the cross box is in advance of the

1 gate? Usually it's at the nearest location where the track
2 crosses the road, as shown in the previous figure, 64A, 46A.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Didn't catch that,
4 but --

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: It's going to be
6 shown for both directions.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good point. Again,
8 the purpose here is to illustrate a common urban condition
9 where you have two lanes of traffic approaching, not where
10 you're diverting traffic over to the left side of the
11 roadway as shown in the previous drawing.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So, that's the purpose
14 here, to show flagger control. The presence or absence of
15 the gates we can take care of editorially.

16 And the location of the cross buck and the, Do Not
17 Stop On Railroad Tracks, signs needs to be appropriately
18 shown. And we'll take care of that editorially.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Very good.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: How about the gate
21 cones? Was that a typo or if that's intended could we
22 please add that to the notes for the sheet to more clearly
23 explain what gate cones are.

24 I'm assuming you're having your flagger actually
25 place cones across the lane when he stops traffic.

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yeah.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I've never seen that,
3 this before. So I would at least want a note if that's
4 really what you're proposing.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Good point.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yeah.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I don't, yeah, I'm not
8 familiar with showing cones across there. I think it would
9 be an optional item.

10 And I will agree as a friendly amendment to delete
11 these cones.

12 Finally, 6H-46C, the other component of this shows
13 another common urban condition where you have a rail
14 crossing parallel to a main roadway near an intersection.

15 We thought it would be helpful to show how to
16 handle traffic not only on the main line but on the side
17 street because the side street could be queued due to the
18 lane blockage on the main street.

19 So we're showing a flagger here. And so, it was
20 intended to show another common situation that normally
21 occurs. But in this case the railroad tracks don't cross
22 the main street. They cross the side street, so what do you
23 do for the side street.

24 So flagger control is shown here as well as a,
25 because it, because of the condition of possible queuing

1 that would affect the right turn move onto the main street.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I have some
3 comments.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Is that 24/7? I mean,
5 if you have a utility that, there's a sink hole, whatever,
6 what do you do at night, is it, is there anyway to button
7 this up at night or are you really calling for a 24/7
8 flagger out there for as long as that lane is closed in 6H-
9 46C?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: In Section 6A.08 of
11 the federal MUTCD, which we haven't adopted yet but we will
12 shortly, it says that if there is a probability of queuing
13 across the tracks with a lane reduction a flagger is needed.

14 And if you have a blockage very close to the train
15 tracks there probably is a probability of queuing across the
16 tracks.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. I have
18 many points or comments. The east lane for two-directional
19 traffic, it has to be, the signage has to be yellow not lane
20 drawing.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You're absolutely
22 right.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Now for westbound
24 traffic just by the limit line, there is a sign says, can I
25 read that end of construction road work -- this one?

1 It shouldn't be there.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Next --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So noted.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- for the same
6 direction of traffic, westbound, why do you need to stop the
7 traffic? What's stopping the traffic? You are closing one
8 lane, lane number two for the northbound. Why do you want
9 this flagger or the Prepare to Stop?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Because --

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: The right turn
12 movement, you have to --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- there could be
14 queuing on the main street because of the blockage of the
15 lane.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: You mean for the
17 northbound?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: For the northbound,
19 that could queue back to the intersection affecting the
20 movement, the right turn movement onto the main street.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. You are
22 thinking that the eastbound/westbound traffic is very minor,
23 light relatively to the north and south. Okay.

24 The next comment is the cross box, you didn't
25 identify it, where it's located. Again, the same thing.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes. And keep in
2 mind --

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- we're showing
5 concepts and --

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yes.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You're right. Some of
8 the graphics we didn't get all the details.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. For the
10 northbound --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- I will work with
12 Johnny on that.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. For the
14 northbound traffic the, you have the taper approaching when
15 you drop the lane then you have the shifting. So you need
16 to show the dimensions of the shifting the length, L over
17 two.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, it's a lane drop
19 and a shift --

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: See here --

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- so it's L --

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- see here, this
23 distance.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: From the arrow

1 board to the end of the shifting.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, this is a right
3 turn pocket lane.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I know --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So it can be as short
6 as you want.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Well, usually in
8 a shifting operation there will be L over two.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But this
10 isn't, this doesn't accommodate a through move. It's a
11 pocket lane.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Then what would
13 be that length for the pocket? I mean, this distance. I
14 want to lay down the cones. What would be my distance here?
15 Shouldn't I know it?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It would be whatever
17 your agency uses for pocket lengths, pocket entries.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But, previous
19 areas you show it L over two.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. That L over
21 two applies to through traffic. It doesn't apply to turning
22 traffic.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Would it, again,
24 we are not consistent. And then --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll work with Johnny

1 to identify --

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- what that length
4 should be.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: And what is the
6 spacing between the two regulatory signs for the northbound?
7 Right turn must turn right.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: At the beginning and
9 end of the coning.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: And there is no
11 distance between the arrow board and the first regulatory
12 sign for the same direction, this distance.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. The arrow
14 board would go at the end of the taper L.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Well, I know that
16 but there's no distance dimensions.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'll work with Johnny
18 to see if there should be a distance for the pocket
19 entrance.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Excellent. I'm
21 done.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman. On page
23 35, on page 35, the flagger. I'm looking at the text on the
24 CA MUTCD, page 4H-107. It says, if the queuing of vehicles
25 across active rail tracks cannot be avoided, a uniformed law

1 enforcement officer or a flagger shall be provided at the
2 highway, rail grade crossing to prevent vehicles from
3 stopping within the high rail gate crossing.

4 That flagger has, actually, no functionality. He
5 cannot do anything to help you, flag for, what the text is
6 saying.

7 The flagger is put ahead of the gate. The gate is
8 already down. You don't need a flagger.

9 If you want to move the queue, the flagger or the
10 officer must be at the intersection because that's when the
11 people who are not making the right, they're queued already
12 back. The gate has already come down.

13 The purpose of the flagger or the uniformed
14 officer is to stop the through traffic to give right of way
15 to move the right turn in traffic.

16 The flagger is not going to do anybody any good
17 because the flagger is ahead of the gate. The gate is
18 already down. You don't need a flagger. Nobody can get on
19 the track.

20 You want some --

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The purpose of this is
22 to prevent queuing even if there aren't gates; and even when
23 the gates are up.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, no, no. What I'm
25 saying, what I'm saying is that, okay, the flagger has no

1 clue back there when to stop the people. He sees the bells
2 going off and the light is going off and he knows that the
3 gate is going to come down.

4 When the gate comes down whoever has not made it
5 on top of the tracks is not going to make it because the
6 gate is down.

7 But if anybody is stopped on the track, if there
8 is a right turning traffic that's backed up to the track,
9 that flagger is not going to do any good to them.

10 You need somebody at the intersection as the text
11 says to make that right turn move, whatever it takes to stop
12 the opposing left turn or to stop the other side traffic
13 going from two to make that a priority number one clear the
14 tracks.

15 That flagger is not going to be able to do the
16 clearing of the tracks. I don't think you want a flagger
17 there.

18 You want a flagger at the intersection. I have no
19 problem with that as the text says, for a uniformed officer.

20 But putting a flagger ahead of the gate, upstream
21 of the gate is not going to do anybody any good.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The flagger is
23 intended to control the queue --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The flagger is --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- even when there is

1 not preemption, in advance of preemption.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- that flagger
3 upstream of the gate cannot control the queue. The queue is
4 already flowing.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yeah.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The queue is already
7 on the tracks. The gate comes down. You want to move the
8 queue. You want the people who are on the track, for
9 somebody to give them priority and move them.

10 That flagger is not going to be able to do that.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: You know, it looks like
12 to me like that flagger is supposed to meter the cars across
13 the tracks so that the queue never develops across the
14 tracks.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And that's very hard to
16 do on --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I realize that.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- a green light, on
19 the side street --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: -- hard as --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- to try to guess,
22 okay, the yellow --

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: He can't, the
24 height --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- and then once --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: -- it is --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- and then once, and
3 if somebody is stuck on the tracks then how do you, --

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- yeah --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- you've got to get
6 them off the tracks. You can't do it from that position.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Oh, you're right.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: If the guy, if
9 the right turning traffic is queued up on the track which is
10 quite possible --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And then it's your ass.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- and then the gate
13 starts coming down, that flagger upstream is not going to do
14 anything. He cannot do anything.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Help them out of their
16 cars.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You need somebody at
18 the intersection to clear the que. That's the intent of the
19 text in the standard the way I read it on 6H-107 in the CA
20 MUTCD.

21 So I agree with the need for a flagger or the
22 uniformed officer. The standard is a good one but what I'm
23 saying is that placement of the flagger, the way it's shown
24 on the diagram, that's not going to really help prevent
25 accidents.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well it depends on how
2 far the tracks are from the intersection.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, a lot of the --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And you could have an
5 additional -- you could have an officer at the intersection.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, but --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But you probably also
8 need a flagger to prevent any more traffic from entering the
9 zone --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Maybe you need two.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- before traffic
12 starts to queue back.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, maybe you need
14 two. I'll give you that. Maybe you need the upstream off
15 the gate flagger. But that flagger is not going to serve
16 the purpose as is written in the text.

17 And there are a lot of variables. It depends on
18 the distance. It depends if there's a signal in there.

19 If there is a signal or control you can do a lot
20 of good things with the preemption to make sure that the
21 queuing doesn't happen on the tracks.

22 But it can be a stop sign or other. But that
23 flagger has a very limited role in stopping people from
24 queuing on the track. That's what I'm trying to say.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And, do I understand

1 correctly that your point is that one flagger alone is not
2 sufficient?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Exactly.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You need more than
5 that?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Exactly. What I'm
7 saying is that if I look at this and I say, oh, okay, I put
8 my flagger over there upstream of the gate, I have prevented
9 people from queuing at the track. That can be misleading to
10 the practitioner in the field. That flagger has a very,
11 very limited capability to clear the queue on the track.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So what I would
13 propose then is that I'll work with Johnny that we develop
14 some notes that would refer to the appropriate sections that
15 are currently in the CA MUTCD and will be adopted by us to
16 indicate that where enforcement or other flaggers may be
17 needed.

18 Good point, excellent point. And I will do that.
19 I think we also, though, wanted to make everyone aware that
20 you need to think about this, that other flaggers are
21 needed.

22 Okay, we've gone through the 19 items and I want
23 to ask for a 10 minute break here. And I think we're going
24 to forego our lunch period because this, a lot of detail
25 here and it took a long time.

1 Let's go for a 10 minute break. We'll come back
2 for public comments then we'll act on the items as a whole
3 with the understanding of what we've amended along the way.

4 (Off the record at 11:40 a.m.)

5 (On the record at 11:57 a.m.)

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'd like to call the
7 meeting back to order. To recap, we've gone through a large
8 number of items, mostly pertaining to the figures in Part 6.

9 There's a lot of detail. Along the way we agreed
10 to modify something or to amend something.

11 And in one case we deferred discussion of the
12 tubular markers and channelizers. And I think at this point
13 we want to hear comment from the public on this.

14 And then we will then take action after we've had
15 the public comment. So do we have any people in the public
16 who want to speak on this item?

17 Please come up to the podium, state your name,
18 your affiliation and spell your last name, please.

19 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I'm
20 going to reserve my comments until the end when everyone
21 else has spoken. But I just wanted to comment on what Don
22 is handing out.

23 Don is handing out the Item number 11-1 which is
24 the public comments received on Parts 1, 5, 7 and 9. And I
25 want it distributed now so that people that are not

1 interested in certain, like, experiments or other items
2 while they are sitting through at least they have, you can
3 utilize their time going through those comments so that when
4 the time comes up they'll be better prepared.

5 MR. ROYER: My name is David Royer. The last name
6 is spelled R-O-Y-E-R, University of California at Berkeley.

7 And also a longtime member of the WATCH Committee.

8 And on that WATCH Committee note I just want to
9 make one statement. Most of the diagrams that John
10 presented are diagrams that came out of the WATCH Manual and
11 it was developed around the worker that has to do the job in
12 the field.

13 The CA MUTCD, well the federal MUTCD diagrams the
14 typical applications, TAs, kind of through the poor field
15 worker for a loop, trying to put in trap lanes without
16 pavement markings just didn't work and so on.

17 And so, most of the diagrams that John showed are
18 just longtime used diagrams that the poor guy in the field
19 does not read one word in the manual. He looks directly at
20 the diagrams and that's what that person uses.

21 The engineer, you know, knows better or reads this
22 stuff and can do a lot of stuff and there's also a lot of
23 engineering discretion on it.

24 Anyway, I have a couple comments. And when I'm
25 done I'm going to give this to Johnny.

1 Most of my comments are really just minor
2 corrections in there. Page 13 where we 6F.60 tubular
3 markers. Since we have separated tubular markers from
4 6F.101 which is channelizers, permanent type, the glued down
5 surface marker. I believe it should say, tubular markers,
6 and then in parenthesis, portable.

7 Like down at the bottom it says, channelizers, and
8 then in parenthesis it says, permanent.

9 The portable marker has to be minimum of four
10 inches wide. They can be tapered to eight inches if you
11 want. But they, the portable marker, the two inch, you
12 couldn't even see it.

13 And so, the 200 millimeters, both the first
14 standard paragraph and the third standard paragraph should
15 say, 200 millimeters or if you, I don't, are you going to
16 drop metric?

17 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes we are.

18 MR. ROYER: Oh. Okay. So then just four inches,
19 a four inch minimum diameter. That's the standard marker.

20 And as John had mentioned, the markers that
21 everybody uses, the portable markers are all 42 inches high.

22 And I have never seen anybody use anything except the 42
23 inch high marker.

24 Page 16, page 16 on the speeds. I agree with
25 that. I prefer that, this wording by the way came out of

1 NCHARP-476 and particularly the poor field guy, he knows
2 what the speed is but he doesn't know what intermediate
3 speed is.

4 And the only thing I might recommend would be
5 slightly increasing the speed limit from the earlier
6 recommendation.

7 Obviously, type A panel. It's very small for 25
8 miles an hour. Type B panel, 30 to 50 and then the type C,
9 that's that big eight foot wide arrow board and it only,
10 usually only comes on a trailer, would be 55 and above.

11 And that would be my recommendation on the speed.

12 Let's see, oh, there was discussion on the
13 channelizer? Yes, I would prefer the channelizer to stay
14 like California has had it for a long time at 36 inches.

15 Again, you go out and buy them and this is the
16 only channelizer we use in California. I have never seen
17 anybody try to use the wrong channelizer.

18 This California channelizer invented by Caltrans
19 and it's 36 inches high. They'd probably have to pay more
20 to get a shorter one. And there's no advantage of a shorter
21 one, 36, 36.

22 On page 21, just a side note; page 21 which is
23 typical application 80, 6H-18A (CA), there's also an
24 alternate to this one where you can put in a Yield sign, by
25 the way, which is 6H-11.

1 So you don't actually have to use a flagger. You
2 can put, Yield Ahead or a Yield sign and all of that and
3 actually do it with a Yield sign per 6H-11 but that's just
4 kind of an editorial note on my part.

5 Page 24. This typical application, the cat tracks
6 that are shown in this typical application should only be
7 started at that last sign, the Right Lane Turns Right Ahead
8 which is a 73A in California.

9 According to figure 3B-12 (CA) which is out of the
10 Chapter 3, the dash barrier line or as we call them,
11 elephant tracks, starts at the C73A sign. It does not start
12 at the, well in this case you showed it starting at the Road
13 Work Ahead sign.

14 So that needs to be consistent with Figure 3B-12
15 (CA).

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm sorry, you're on
17 Figure what?

18 MR. ROYER: Oh. It's 6H-22A, page 24.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And what sign
20 needs to be revised there?

21 MR. ROYER: Oh, not the sign, the elephant tracks
22 or the dash barrier line --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

24 MR. ROYER: -- they start, the dash barrier
25 starts, barrier line starts at the Right Lane Turn Turns

1 Right Ahead sign and continues to the solid barrier line.

2 It doesn't start back at the W4 sign or at the
3 Road Work Ahead sign.

4 And it's important, I think it should also refer
5 to that because that also refers to dimension D. And so you
6 know how much, what it should be.

7 But, anyway, perhaps refer to that figure or just
8 show it on here.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

10 MR. ROYER: Page 31, 6H-31 (CA) figure. The
11 Reverse Turn sign. California, or this is a Reverse Curve
12 sign. California only uses the single arrow.

13 California does not use the multiple arrow further
14 in the manual. They only use the single arrow.

15 The California Manual only shows the single arrow.
16 It does not show the multiple arrow. In fact, the multiple
17 arrow was crossed out in your manual or in the sign portion
18 of this.

19 Other states like Nevada, if it's three lanes you
20 use Three Lane Reverse arrow. California only uses single
21 one for all conditions.

22 The -- I'm waiting until John finishes writing.
23 Page 34, the question came up of gate cones. That's what
24 Caltrans shows in their, The Flagger's Handbook.

25 They show the use of gate cones. But I noticed in

1 the CA MUTCD, 6H-10 which is the flagging layout doesn't
2 show California's gate cones.

3 So, if that doesn't show California's gate cones
4 unless you want to change all the flagging ones to show the
5 three California gate cones on each side; I'd recommend
6 taking the gate cones out for consistency.

7 You either put them in on all of them or take them
8 out on all of them.

9 And, by the way, all these flagger layouts, these
10 came from the California Regional Rail Authority, Southern
11 California Regional Rail Authority because of operating
12 problems. And also, most of our railroads now carry high-
13 speed light rail trains.

14 And the, so the, the Regional Rail Authority
15 requires that any construction in proximity of a railroad,
16 they have to be notified ahead of time.

17 And they require flaggers because they have
18 problems with people queuing across the tracks.

19 So the flagger, when the traffic signal is red at
20 the intersection the flagger stops the through traffic at
21 the limit line.

22 And holds them at the limit line until the light
23 turns green.

24 And when the light turns yellow he's back out
25 there stopping that traffic because every once in a while

1 they get the signal preempt come on and traffic on the main
2 highway is jammed right through the intersection.

3 And the traffic can't clear the tracks.

4 So all three of these came, all, I guess all
5 three, yeah, all three of these layouts that show the
6 railroads came out of the recommendation, and they sit on
7 the WATCH Committee as well.

8 And, if you approve all these then the WATCH
9 Committee will probably significantly change the WATCH
10 Manual. And so our diagrams will be exactly out of yours.

11 And the WATCH Manual will really become a field
12 operating handbook which engineers like it too.

13 Engineers follow the WATCH Manual because it's
14 more simplistic and so on.

15 So, anyway, if you have any questions either now
16 or later.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any questions for
18 David. Jacob.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: If you are, if
20 this will be approved and you're going to change the WATCH
21 are you going to continue calling it WATCH or it's going to
22 be a part of the, a pocket version of the Part 6.

23 MR. ROYER: What I, I can't speak for the
24 Committee, but what several of us on the Committee have
25 talked about is, it would really be a field worker's manual

1 for Part 6.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: The reason I'm
3 asking this because we have Southern California Edison
4 approached us.

5 They have their own.

6 MR. ROYER: That's very good.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. Then the
8 California Vehicle Code says, hey, only the state of
9 department, the Department of State, they have the authority
10 to have this manual, nobody else.

11 So, they, if you have WATCH --

12 MR. ROYER: They, the one --

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: If you have
14 WATCH, they --

15 MR. ROYER: -- yeah.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- Edison and we
17 have this. CA MUTCD --

18 MR. ROYER: The Edison one is engineered plans
19 that are in conformance with the CA MUTCD.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Some of them,
21 they have special cases.

22 MR. ROYER: Of, okay. I'm thinking of the one
23 done by the --

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I have one --

25 MR. ROYER: -- utility, the joint --

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- I just carry
2 it --

3 MR. ROYER: -- the Joint Utility Committee --

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: -- yes --

5 MR. ROYER: -- the Joint Utility Committee, those
6 are actually, those, those diagrams were prepared by John
7 Fisher's people, city of Los Angeles for the construction of
8 the red line and the relocation of all the utilities
9 downtown.

10 That's where all the standard plans originated
11 from. And they took those and they brought them up to CA
12 MUTCD standards to my knowledge.

13 And so, they're more of an engineered plan. And
14 they are wanting, when it's finally produced, I think, their
15 hope was to actually have them conform to the CA MUTCD,
16 requirements of the CA MUTCD.

17 And that's the exact same thing with the WATCH
18 Manual. The WATCH Manual we're going to work very hard to
19 make sure it conforms 100 percent to the CA MUTCD and say it
20 right on the cover.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: So, but you --

22 MR. ROYER: Conforms to the requirements, you
23 know, the standards and guidance of the CA MUTCD.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I understand
25 that. But what I'm saying is that if you are going to

1 change that accordingly, you will continue calling it WATCH
2 Manual?

3 MR. ROYER: I probably will. It's been in
4 existence since 1946.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. I don't
6 know what the position of the panel to have multi-guidelines
7 or manuals for work zones. Okay.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let's let Johnny
9 advise on that.

10 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. And I
11 just, I'm just going to comment on this particular issue
12 regarding WATCH and the Joint Utilities Manual and our
13 manual, but I'll reserve my right for the other comments.

14 Basically the way I see it is from -- all three
15 manuals do cross my desk. Of course I'm the editor of the
16 CA MUTCD. But for the Joint Utility one, they had
17 approached me and I did review and -- reviewed their manual
18 just to make sure that they were not in conflict with our
19 manual. And there is, they actually put my email blessing
20 it in front of that.

21 But at the same time a few years back I also
22 worked with the WATCH Manual Committee because of the
23 inconsistencies between our manual and their manual. And of
24 course I am not the keeper or the controller of the other
25 two manuals but I do try to work with them all the time to

1 make sure that there are no inherent conflicts.

2 Ours being the official manual but I do see a need
3 for the other two manuals. I'm not sure if we can provide
4 that need and then they can do away with it or how that's
5 going to work. The way I see the need, at least from my
6 perspective and the questions and comments and calls I get
7 on a regular basis is ours is official and legal manual.
8 And of course, as per the State Vehicle Code it's required.

9 However, to lug around a big book or even the
10 smaller version of our book, it's still -- sometimes it's
11 not easy. So the WATCH Manual serves that gap by having
12 someone out in the field who doesn't need to know the
13 policy, they are not the engineers. They are the workers,
14 all they need is the distance or the placement. That's
15 where the WATCH Manual comes in.

16 However, the Utility Manual, which I didn't
17 realize until a couple of years back when I started reading
18 it, is coming from another perspective. And I think that's
19 where our Part 6, even from the federal MUTCD as well as
20 ours, does lack.

21 And what it does is there are two or three pages
22 at the beginning of Chapter 6(G) which talk about it but
23 they do not go to the next level. Which is that when you
24 are having a short duration project -- so it's not short-
25 term. Short-term is more like a one day operation but short

1 duration is less than one hour.

2 When you are having a less than one hour project
3 the feds themselves in those two sections that I said, 60.01
4 and 60.02, discussed this philosophy that you should
5 actually do the opposite. Meaning, not more devices, not
6 full control setup but actually just compensate for less
7 devices. No need to set up the cones and set up a full
8 spectrum of things because you're going to be five, ten
9 minutes, less than an hour. And if you are going to have a
10 work duration less than an hour but then you start setting
11 up a closure it could become four hours or six hours.

12 So our typical applications don't show it. There
13 aren't enough examples in Part 6. But the philosophy and
14 the reason why they came out with a Utility Manual is to
15 take care of those situations where you compensate for less
16 devices by having strobe lights or stronger notifications on
17 the vehicles themselves. But what you do is less than an
18 hour you are not exposing your workers to the traffic and
19 the public does not get exposed to four to six hours of
20 closure just for a half an hour job so that leads to safer
21 situations.

22 So that philosophy I think is the need why they
23 have their Utility Manual that they came out with. So it's
24 serving different purposes but not still being in conflict
25 with our manual. So I do see their uses but I am not the

1 editor or the controller of those. So just trying to give
2 everyone at least a little bit of background on why they
3 are.

4 MR. SCHARF: Good afternoon. My name is Robert
5 Scharf, last name spelled S-C-H-A-R-F, and I represent and
6 work for County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works.

7 I have a couple of comments as well.

8 You know, at the County of LA we do appreciate the
9 efforts behind this agenda item. You know, especially where
10 it cleans up and helps clarify inconsistencies. But in so
11 doing some of the items are very substantive. And we looked
12 at it and it has tremendous impact on our county and our
13 operations and we think that also applies to many of the
14 other counties across the state. A couple of items I want
15 to go through to seek clarification and just to express some
16 specific concerns.

17 But before I do. You know, we communicated to a
18 number of counties prior to this meeting as well as to a few
19 of the Committee Members outlining where our concerns are.
20 But as a result of some of the amendments made in this
21 meeting as well as some of the clarifications given, a lot
22 of our specific concerns have gone away on specific items.

23 But it doesn't really take away the underlying
24 concern that we have that, in essence, we haven't seen a
25 demonstrated problem that this amendment item is trying to

1 solve. You know, we tend to believe that the federal MUTCD
2 and the current state MUTCD goes a long way in making our
3 roadways and workers safe.

4 If there were added public outreach prior to this
5 where we could have gotten on board with it and even
6 participated in on it, you know, it may have been different.

7 We were hit somewhat cold with this agenda item and our
8 immediate reaction was, you know, do we really have a
9 problem we're trying to solve because there are significant
10 expenses associated with some of these items.

11 So specifically in some of those areas. Just as a
12 point of clarification first. Number 2 on the cones. So
13 granted, that item was pulled. But that also includes that
14 part of the item which disallows anything less than a 28
15 inch cone. That will be the whole item, right?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We're pulling that
17 whole item relating to cone height and would keep the
18 language as it is.

19 MR. SCHARF: Okay, okay, just wanted to double-
20 check that. So I won't include comments on cones.

21 On the arrow board item in general. It touches a
22 lot of the specific numbers but in general. Consistent with
23 some of the comments made by the Committee Members, we were
24 also under the earlier belief that the intent was to change
25 it to a "shall" condition. But I appreciated the comments

1 by Johnny that no, you know, it is a recommended or shall
2 condition. We don't need to comment on the arrow board
3 specifically. And I realize as well that all the figures
4 refer to multi-lane approaches so that's more of a
5 consistency area.

6 But the item that was talked about at length,
7 which is the addition of speed criteria associated with the
8 use of arrow boards. You know, what that implies to a local
9 agency is that we darn well better get the larger size arrow
10 boards. Or we need specific multiple arrow boards of
11 different sizes for the different applications. So it is
12 substantive.

13 You know, prior to the addition of this
14 appropriate use language, regardless if you put in numerical
15 speed criteria or low speed, intermediate or high-speed,
16 prior to this or currently it was kind of a one-size fits
17 all, you know. They were all seen as acceptable. Now this
18 specifically, in my opinion, you know, gives us specific
19 requirements to meet or exceed that criteria. So if we do
20 have an inventory of the smaller panel size arrow boards,
21 you know, we need to supplement it now because we've got a
22 lot of high-speed roadways.

23 Another area. As I mentioned earlier, we
24 communicated prior to this meeting to a number of counties
25 and Committee Members. Cones, back on cones again. That

1 was certainly one area that we commented on. Our comments
2 were never meant to include the tubular markers. So I don't
3 know if that has any bearing on where you may go with
4 tubular markers or not. You know, I understood the comments
5 about consistency between cones and tubular markers but I
6 kind of agreed with what Dave was bringing up on that as
7 well. So LA County, we don't have the concerns on the
8 tubular markers aspect.

9 And I think that may be it. I think that's it.
10 So thank you for your time and I'm available for questions
11 as well.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any questions
13 for Mr. Scharf? First Farhad.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Scharf, I want
15 to make sure I understood LA County. So you're obviously
16 okay with withdrawal from the Item 2.

17 MR. SCHARF: Correct.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: And you're saying
19 you're okay with Item 3, the tubular marking heights?

20 MR. SCHARF: Yes, we were okay with that.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay. And then you
22 are not in favor of Item 5?

23 MR. SCHARF: And just if I may add one comment on
24 Item 3.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Sure.

1 MR. SCHARF: Our examination of these items were
2 sort of split between the value of that item that it
3 provides as opposed to the cost that we would experience or
4 the impacts we would experience. The cost associated with
5 Item number 3 was much -- and the overall impacts for Item
6 number 3 is much smaller than that of Item number 2. You
7 know, regarding on the other side of the spectrum the safety
8 that it provides.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: No, I don't
10 understand.

11 MR. SCHARF: I refer to the NCHRP report --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: How about Item 5?

13 MR. SCHARF: What was that item?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Item 5 is the one
15 that talks about page 15, which is assigned speed limits.

16 MR. SCHARF: You know, I greatly appreciated some
17 of the comments that were made by the Committee Members as
18 that item was discussed. I think the practitioner, the
19 detour engineer, you know, the person in charge in the field
20 needs discretion. You know, I agree 100 percent that
21 especially in the urban area about driveways and parked
22 vehicles that could affect the spacing of signs. But
23 overall we didn't have major concern with that item.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because I thought I
25 just heard you saying before we clarified it we could use

1 one size. Now -- were we looking at the same number?

2 MR. SCHARF: I don't think so. I'm looking at
3 Table 6. Item 5 to me is Table 6C-1.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right.

5 MR. SCHARF: The minimum advanced warning sign
6 spacing.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I'm sorry, page 15.

8 MR. SCHARF: Oh, okay.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Page 15. The
10 proposal is to add specific speed limits. And I thought you
11 said before there was one size for everything, now we have
12 to carry different sizes.

13 MR. SCHARF: Page 16, correct?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Page 16, I'm sorry,
15 right.

16 MR. SCHARF: Okay, I'm with you, I'm with you now.
17 Yes, we have concerns with that one.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Okay. So 16, which
19 is item -- Item 6. Item 6 you're opposed to.

20 MR. SCHARF: Correct.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So, Bob, to clarify.
22 On page 16, the original proposal was to keep the words "low
23 speed, intermediate speed, high speed, high volume." Do you
24 object to that or do you object to the specific speeds that
25 were discussed as an amendment to that?

1 MR. SCHARF: We believe that the language in the
2 current manual is sufficient. Which as I understand it
3 doesn't really refer to a speed criteria and it gives that
4 engineering discretion to the engineer involved in the
5 design of that TTC.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, the next
8 question for Bob. Was it Hamid or? I think Hamid you had a
9 question and then Jacob.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Just one
11 question. You said that -- in the beginning you said that
12 one of your primary concerns went away with the discussion
13 and comments that we have. Were you referring to Item
14 number 2?

15 MR. SCHARF: Yes, that was one of our primary
16 items of concern, Item number 2.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So other than that,
18 that has been withdrawn, your only concern is on page 16?

19 MR. SCHARF: Primarily. But then the overall --
20 not from just the technical point of view but also from the
21 cost implications.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. And you are
23 probably the second-largest county -- not probably, you are
24 the second-largest county in California. Have you had any
25 problems that you think any of these will address?

1 MR. SCHARF: Quite frankly, no, not that we're
2 aware of. And as I mentioned earlier, if there was that
3 outreach done prior to this and we became aware of
4 situations that this was attempting to solve it may have
5 went a long way.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Good, thank
7 you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jacob.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Again on the same
11 page, 16. What is more important for the professional
12 engineer? Is it the appropriate use of the speed for that
13 corresponding arrow board or it is the minimum legibility
14 distance to provide? If I maintain this column of
15 eligibility why do I need to have the speed limitation?
16 What's the purpose of that?

17 MR. SCHARF: You know, related to what you're
18 saying as well, if I may. You know, it appeared to us on
19 our review that an attempt -- by using speed as a criteria
20 an attempt was made to distinguish an application between
21 local roadways versus, for example, state expressways or
22 freeways.

23 But similar to San Bernardino County, so many of
24 our high-speed local roadways are rural in nature, have
25 very, very low ADT and very, very good visibility.

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right. What I'm
2 saying is that you can get away with this proposed changes
3 if you maintain this column and the minimum legibility
4 distance.

5 MR. SCHARF: Agreed.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Then why do we
7 need?

8 MR. SCHARF: That's a long way of saying I agree
9 with you.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yeah, correct.
11 Why do we need that?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: If I may. The issue we
13 were trying to address is we do have written language in
14 Section 6F-56 and it's black text so it's the federal
15 language. It says: "Arrow panels shall meet the minimum
16 size legibility distance, number of elements and other
17 specifications shown in figure 6F-6." So that's exactly the
18 figure we are referring to.

19 The problem with 6F-6 is it has language that --
20 it doesn't quantify exactly when you use A, B and C. And so
21 we were trying to make it clearer as to when you -- because
22 right now what would the engineer fall back on as to why
23 they used A, B or C? It does say that you have to -- there
24 is a standard. You know, like I said, 6F-56 that started
25 that whole arrow board in all these applications, multi-lane

1 roadway. But this isn't talking just about multi-lane
2 roads.

3 So I thought that for myself -- and all the times
4 I've dealt with contractors. Because a contractor comes in,
5 the City requests an arrow board. The contractor starts to
6 fight that because there's extra expense involved. And this
7 gave us more to lean on saying, look, you know, we don't
8 need to argue about is this an intermediate speed or not,
9 you know. It's 35 -- 30 to 35, use an arrow board. And it
10 made my job a whole lot easier in dealing with the
11 contractors that wanted to fight me on all these issues.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But in cases with
13 the low speed you have undulated or vertical profile of a
14 roadway that forced you to have a larger size of the arrows.

15 So the speed is not the big issue. The main issue is the
16 legibility.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But on limited
18 visibility, no matter generally, no matter how big the size
19 of the sign, you can't see it because it's around a corner,
20 it's behind a tree. I mean, it's speed that really
21 determines -- like all of our various sizes have lot more to
22 do with approach speeds on all of our standard warning and
23 regulatory sign sizes than obstructions.

24 And that's the case with the arrow boards is it's
25 really driven by the speed of the approaching traffic and

1 how far away they need to be able to see that. Visibility
2 constraints is a separate issue because regardless of the
3 size of the sign, if you've got a curve, if you've got a
4 bridge, you're not going to see it anyway regardless of its
5 size.

6 MR. SCHARF: And if I may add as well. An added
7 impact to our agency, which I'm sure is true for many others
8 is -- not contractors but our own forces. You know, there's
9 numerous groups that could affect a lane closure. Those
10 that are often involved in road maintenance activities are
11 traffic operations. They're outfitted with arrow boards and
12 et cetera.

13 But the more -- I want to use the word "obscure"
14 but that's probably a bad word. Those obscure groups, you
15 know, dealing with the sewer system or the flood control
16 system or the surveyors, they're operating out of vans or
17 pickup trucks. Often, in our case at least, with those
18 groups they're not outfitted with arrow boards. They're
19 using arrow sticks or the flag trees and et cetera, which is
20 now discouraged at a minimum.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: A question for you,
22 Bob, just to clarify. So you've made an issue on page 16
23 that you like the discretion to determine what is a low
24 speed street, an intermediate speed street, a high speed
25 street, high volume. And you don't think that the

1 thresholds that have been discussed to define what low,
2 intermediate and high speed is, is helpful to you?

3 MR. SCHARF: I think it creates a simple and easy
4 to use guide or standard but it has major cost implications.
5 And I don't know -- and like I said earlier, I don't know
6 if there is an issue or a problem that this is really
7 correcting, I haven't seen that demonstrated.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I guess your point
9 is that red color shouldn't be there.

10 MR. SCHARF: Correct.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's really what
12 you're saying is the red language --

13 MR. SCHARF: In LA County --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Correct. Page 16,
15 that item we should leave it alone. There should be no red
16 color proposed.

17 MR. SCHARF: In LA County's opinion, yes.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: That's LA County's
19 recommendation.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, I've got to ask
21 you about that. Because all that does is replicate the
22 language that is already in the text. So all they did was
23 transport that language. It doesn't change. It doesn't
24 make a new requirement. It just simply reflects the
25 language that's already there but puts it all in one table.

1 MR. SCHARF: Okay, if that's the case I would want
2 to look at that as well. I was unaware.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yeah, that's in --
4 look in Section -- where was it? Look in Section 6F-56. It
5 simply replicates that language, it doesn't make a new
6 requirement. It is an editorial comment. It is editorial
7 language only.

8 MR. SCHARF: Thank you. You are correct, John.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So what Jeff's
10 proposal was is to make it more specific. Dave had a
11 counter-proposal to that but it was an attempt to make it
12 more specific so that there's more uniformity as to what's
13 applied out there with greater specificity. So now that
14 we've clarified that, the language is already there
15 regarding low, intermediate, high speed streets. I will ask
16 again, do you think then specificity would be helpful?

17 MR. SCHARF: It does appear to mirror the language
18 of the other provisions so I would tend to agree with you.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. But do you
20 think going the next step, that adding to identify what is
21 low, like 25, or what is intermediate, 30 to 35 or 30 to 50,
22 do you think specificity of the speeds would be more
23 helpful?

24 MR. SCHARF: Yes, yes. Because in general the use
25 of those vague, you know, semi-vague descriptors like low,

1 intermediate, high speed or volume, you know, there always
2 is that subjectivity to it.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Thank you, Bob.

4 MR. SCHARF: Okay.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other comments,
6 any other public comments? Come on up to the podium. Try
7 to keep your comments succinct as time is ticking.

8 MR. BHATT: Good afternoon. My name is Mahesh
9 Bhatt, M-A-H-E-S-H, B-H-A-T-T, and I'm with the City of
10 Sacramento. I just have some minor editorial comments on a
11 couple of the figures.

12 I'm assuming Item 4 is still on the table.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Item what?

14 MR. BHATT: Item number 4, channelizers are still
15 under the -- Figure 6F-102(CA), page number 19.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Figure 6.

17 MR. BHATT: Page number 19.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Page 19.

19 MR. BHATT: Channelizers, 6F-102(CA). There is
20 just one editorial comment. If at all the Committee is
21 deciding to leave 28 inch minimum then I think there has to
22 be consistency with the text on page number 14. The figure
23 says 28 inch minimum where speeds are 50 or less relative
24 test, here speeds are 40 or less. That's one little
25 comment.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm not understanding.

2 This is the channelizer and --

3 MR. BHATT: If you look at Figure 6F-102.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

5 MR. BHATT: At page number 19.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

7 MR. BHATT: The part on the right. It says 28
8 inch minimum --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

10 MR. BHATT: -- where speeds are 50 miles per hour
11 or less. That is the text on page number 14.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Four-zero?

13 MR. BHATT: One-four, sorry, 14.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Oh, one-four,
15 okay, all right. Okay, okay.

16 MR. BHATT: Sorry about that.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Go ahead.

18 MR. BHATT: It says the height shall be 36 inch
19 minimum and then it says 28 inch where speeds are 40 miles
20 per hour. So I think the figure needs to be corrected for
21 40 instead of 50.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, let me make sure
23 we absorb this. So the drawing is not consistent with --

24 MR. BHATT: The text.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you for

1 that.

2 MR. BHATT: And the next editorial comment is for
3 Figure 6H-18B on page number 22. I think two things need to
4 be specified. It calls out the dimension L like one-half L,
5 one-half L, but it doesn't show what L is. So we need to
6 show what the distance L --

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: L is the length
8 of the -- which depending on the speed is $L=WS$ or $L=\text{speed}$.

9 MR. BHATT: I would like -- if a contractor is out
10 in the field with this figure he wouldn't know where
11 distance L is in context of this figure. But if you look at
12 the next figure, like page 23, it shows what L is.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yes, you need to
14 add this note, it should be here.

15 MR. BHATT: Small point. We need to show what is
16 L on that figure.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny, are you
18 getting this? It sounds like an editorial comment.

19 MR. BHATT: Yes, it is editorial.

20 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes, it is editorial.

21 John, I think what's happening is on all our figures
22 basically we say, there's a note saying see Tables 6H-2 and
23 6H-3 where the meanings of all the letters and codes is
24 described. So I think the note needs to be transferred to
25 the new figures that you addressed.

1 MR. BHATT: Yes, that was going to be my --
2 another comment. Thanks, Johnny.

3 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: So that will cover the
4 L.

5 MR. BHATT: That will cover -- most likely.
6 That's it, I'm done. Any questions?

7 MR. ROSEMAN: David Roseman, City of Long Beach,
8 City Traffic Engineer. I just wanted to point out --

9 THE REPORTER: I need you to spell your last name
10 for the record.

11 MR. ROSEMAN: R-O-S-E-M-A-N.

12 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

13 MR. ROSEMAN: I just wanted to point out a couple
14 of things. The way I've always viewed these diagrams is
15 that they graphically depict traffic control concepts. And
16 it seems like we're trying to add a lot of things in here
17 when they're really just trying to show how you're supposed
18 to do something in relation to something else.

19 And that's why, you know, I support or I concur or
20 echo a lot of the comments and concerns that Hamid has come
21 up with and Jeff has said. Because if we are limiting the
22 flexibility of engineers to interpret things or trying to
23 use these as a cookbook I think we're going in the wrong
24 direction. They're still to demonstrate a concept of
25 traffic control in each, in each scheme.

1 And that's why the one concern that I really do
2 have that I wanted to voice was on 6H-21, which is on page
3 23. The concept of requiring these arrow boards. I'm of
4 the same opinion as Jeff is that sometimes the text, at
5 least the way I interpreted it is that on certain multi-lane
6 roadways you don't have to have an arrow board if it's low
7 volume or low speed or the conditions are low volume or low
8 speed.

9 And why I think that's important is that, you
10 know, in Long Beach today there's probably more than 100 of
11 these closures going on now. Probably in Southern
12 California I'd speculate there's more than 1,000 of them
13 going on and they don't have arrow boards now.

14 A lot of these vehicles that are parked, they're
15 utility vehicles that are accessing manholes, storm drain
16 cleaning, Southern California Edison vaults, you know, these
17 types of things. Even loop cutting. They don't always have
18 an arrow board but that truck has a smaller version of
19 either a strobe light or flashing lights or a flashing arrow
20 board.

21 And by mandating an arrow board in this situation
22 I think we have escalated the cost of doing it, the time
23 that they're out there doing that activity, and making it a
24 lot less efficient. And I don't know of any accidents we've
25 had in Long Beach specific to this where construction

1 workers have been struck in a multi-lane environment for a
2 two or three hour closure while they access a manhole.

3 So that's really my concern in being able -- when
4 you take a lot of these things that are optional for arrow
5 boards and make them mandatory we may end up with a fleet in
6 California of every truck carrying an arrow board. And I
7 don't know that that makes it safer but it is going to add
8 to a lot of costs.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Question, Dave.
10 Currently the language in the current manual, they are not
11 an option, they are guidance for those conditions, multi-
12 lane streets, high volumes, et cetera. So that's why the
13 figure was changed. Not to change the requirement but just
14 to reflect what was in the text.

15 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, but I think there's some
16 clarifying language that Jeff pointed out about the -- about
17 the multi-lane roadways also having high volumes and --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I ask a question,
19 Mr. Chairman?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: When you look at the
22 manual, is your understanding as a practicing engineer that
23 anything that's guidance is an option? That you don't have
24 to --

25 MR. ROSEMAN: I don't view it as a standard.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

2 MR. ROSEMAN: A standard is something I have to
3 do.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So do you agree that
5 guidance in nature is optional, period. That you don't have
6 to comply with the guidance, as the name implies. If
7 something is mandatory we have to put it under standard,
8 that's why we have standards and we have guidance. Guidance
9 is just something just to help an engineer, give him some
10 parameters. Therefore, everything in guidance is by nature
11 optional.

12 MR. ROSEMAN: I would agree with one
13 clarification. That if you don't follow the guidance you
14 should have some reason why you didn't follow it but I still
15 think it's optional. As opposed to if it's a standard, if
16 this is standard that we have to have an arrow board every
17 time, then every single construction truck is going to have
18 to have to --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, no, I agree with
20 you on that one. I personally do not support eliminating
21 optional under the arrow boards. But I just wanted to hear
22 your thoughts on your --

23 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, I view, if it's mandatory --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: (Overlapping) the
25 second largest city in the LA County and you've got 400,000

1 people. So what is your understanding when you look at the
2 guidance?

3 MR. ROSEMAN: My understanding is if it's required
4 it has to be a standard, otherwise it's option.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other public
7 comments.

8 MR. PYBURN: Hello, Steve Pyburn, that's P-Y-B-U-
9 R-N, Federal Highway Administration. And I have just a
10 couple of comments on this item.

11 On page 16. I think it's important to have
12 consistency and terminology of language with designation of
13 speeds consistent with, for example, Table 6C-1. Specify
14 that -- what speed zones they apply to. So I reiterate the
15 previous comments. And that the speed zones should be
16 relatively similar to those in 6C-1 just for consistency.

17 I also have -- as a practitioner I used to have
18 trouble with high speed/high volume. What if it's high
19 speed/low volume or low speed/high volume? They happen. So
20 where you have high speed/high volume you may want to
21 clarify and/or -- high speed and/or high volume.

22 Really the governing issue is speed rather than
23 volume because at the highest volumes you have lower speeds,
24 at low volume you tend to have higher speeds. So the
25 governing factor is the speed. The volume is somewhat

1 irrelevant but eliminating the ambiguity would be the
2 suggested.

3 And then the next comments on page 17. I looked
4 at the definition of each of these devices, the barrels, the
5 tubular markers, the cones and I think that the drawing is
6 ambiguous. And it's ambiguous in the federal manual and you
7 have the opportunity to clear up the ambiguity. The
8 ambiguity is the white stripes have to be reflective.

9 The notes on some of the drawings, like the
10 tubular markers at the top and the middle say the white
11 stripes are reflective, other white stripes. But the barrel
12 right next to it, there is no note saying the white stripe
13 is reflective. So for clarity you might add, all of the
14 white stripes are reflective, and that's what's reflected in
15 the text, 6.58, 59, et cetera.

16 And then the last comment, sure to put me in the
17 unpopular federal government category. The California
18 channelizer as it's defined in the text conflicts with 6F-
19 58. The channelizer language says you can use it to guide
20 traffic but 6F-58 reserves the guidance of channelizing
21 traffic only to the devices in 6F-7. Therefore, your
22 channelizer in 6F-102 cannot be used to guide traffic per
23 the definition of a channelizing device in 6F-58. You can
24 use that device though on a shoulder to delineate a shoulder
25 or a drop off or something but 6F-58 precludes it from being

1 used to channelize traffic.

2 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I
3 would partly agree with Steve's comments on that except that
4 our channelizer has been grandfathered in by the feds
5 themselves as per the matching and the letter we have on
6 file. So at least through the end of -- until we make any
7 changes to our manual, by the grandfather clause I think we
8 should be okay.

9 MR. PYBURN: I'm just pointing out you have an
10 ambiguity in your manual. It violates -- the 6F-102
11 violates the definition of channelizer in 6F-58.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Would the correction
13 of that require action by this Committee or could it be
14 taken care of editorially as we rewrite the section for the
15 2011 MUTCD?

16 MR. PYBURN: I think it should be resolved during
17 the 2011 MUTCD revision.

18 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Okay. Thanks.

19 MR. PYBURN: Thank you.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other public
21 comment?

22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I've got one. Jaime Rodriguez, R-
23 O-D-R-I, G as in gas, U-E-Z, with the city of Palo Alto. I
24 have an item that says I might not speak. I figured I'd
25 make my trip productive by at least making some comment.

1 I just wanted to suggest that when it comes to
2 intermediate versus high speed, check what IMSA also
3 publishes in their traffic control manual. Because a lot of
4 the electricians and utility staff within Palo Alto and
5 within the Bay Area get a lot of their training through
6 IMSA. And IMSA defines high speed over 45. So we're
7 talking about arrow board sizes, which will be size two.
8 That's typically what we use as a, as a standard up to 45.

9 The other note is that I design traffic plans all
10 the time through a side business that I own. A lot of
11 what's in the manual I never really even use it because I do
12 everything site-specific. And so one of the discussions
13 that happened earlier regarding the tapers through the
14 intersection, whether we should allow it or not. I actually
15 agree with Los Angeles on that, I never do that. And when
16 my clients come to me and ask me to do that I never support
17 it and I push them away from it. Or I say, if that's what
18 you want to do then I won't design your plan for you. So
19 just a, just a note.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you.
21 Okay, Johnny.

22 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I'm
23 just going to have a few comments on the Item number 11-2
24 but I'll be brief.

25 First of all I'll just go through the page numbers

1 to make it easier. On page 15 of 84, I am not going to
2 reiterate all the comments that have been already discussed
3 but I do want to point out one thing. Which is that on page
4 15 we are coming up with these new speed categories, which
5 is fine.

6 But still we do need to look at Section 6C.04.
7 And Section 6C.04, basically what it says is there's a
8 philosophy discussed by the feds that in urban settings the
9 speed -- the spacing should be four to eight times the
10 speed, and in the rural the spacing should be eight to
11 twelve times.

12 So if I apply the criteria to the speeds that are
13 suggested here for the second row, which is urban 30 to 35
14 miles per hour. Looking at say 30 miles per hour, my
15 distances for urban are four to eight times as per Section
16 6C.04. So even with the eight times I am getting only a
17 distance of 240 feet for 30 miles. For 35 miles they'll be
18 280 feet.

19 So we are talking about for the second row of our
20 urban, 30 to 35 miles per hour, I'm getting a distance of
21 240 to 280 feet as the distance. So of course I do realize
22 it is not violated because it's more than that but that's
23 the range they are giving. Meaning, four on the lower end,
24 eight on the higher end, in Section 6C.04.

25 I'm okay with the table but I just want to make

1 sure that we fix Section 6C.04 text accordingly because
2 otherwise we will be conflicting with Section 6C.04 text.

3 Similarly for rural. If we go to row number three
4 where it says 40 to 50 miles per hour for rural. The rural
5 is 8 to 12 so 8 times 4 makes it 320 feet on the lower end.

6 So we might be okay there but I am just trying to throw
7 out --

8 And then the last one, urban 55 mile. Urban the
9 criteria in Section 6C.04 is only 4 to 8 times the speed.
10 So if I'm in an urban setting with 55 miles, even my 8 times
11 is only getting me 400-something feet and the distance here
12 is giving me 1,000, 1,500 and 2,640.

13 So I'm perfectly okay going either way, just
14 pointing out that we need to at least either amend Section
15 6C.04 text so that at least it jibes with these distances or
16 vice versa. So keep that in mind when we are sorting this
17 out. And of course probably on the side we might be sorting
18 out -- any questions on that?

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yes,
20 Mr. Chairman.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jacob.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Now, is it
23 possible on Table 6C-1 where we -- the column Road Type. If
24 we cross-referenced the Section 6C.04 and get rid of the
25 designation of the mileage per hour. That way you are more

1 flexible. First you would be defining what is that type of
2 area and what is required per the section without
3 specifically defining the speed because the speed might
4 conflict with the distance between the signs.

5 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: I'll leave that open
6 to the -- the section is right there. And basically what
7 I'm talking about is Section 6C.04. Currently what it says
8 is, if you look at paragraphs -- I would say from 12,
9 paragraph number 41 says "on urban streets." It says:

10 "On urban streets the effective
11 placement of warning signs should range from
12 four to eight times the speed limit in miles
13 per hour with the high end of the range being
14 used when speeds are relatively high."

15 Then --

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Wait a second.
17 In the first part of that it says, the range is from .75 to
18 1.5.

19 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: That is a metric. I'm
20 just trying to --

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Oh, okay.

22 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: -- make it easy for
23 everyone.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay.

25 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: So should range from

1 four to eight times the speed limit in miles per hour. So
2 when they are saying that for effective placement they want
3 us to make sure that we don't have it too far out, that the
4 motorists aren't forgetting about it, that's why the range
5 is there, four to eight times. And this is very similar to
6 the table at 2C-4, criteria that we have for warning sign
7 placements.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: So that you don't want
10 to have it too far out so that by the time a motorist sees a
11 warning sign, he gets to the point, he has forgotten about
12 the warning.

13 So going with that philosophy, when we are trying
14 to amend our table let's keep that in mind that that
15 language is there. Either we deal with this language and
16 then amend the table, because that's where the reference to
17 the table is also as you can see in this paragraph. For
18 rural it goes to 8 to 12 times.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Four to eight
20 times gives you the flexibility.

21 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay.

23 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: But it doesn't say, go
24 beyond eight because --

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: No.

1 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: -- that is defective
2 placement.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: No. And what is
4 the table on the A and B, C distances? That is not
5 flexible.

6 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: That is -- okay. But
7 if you look at it, when you --

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: That's very
9 rigid.

10 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yeah, that is rigid,
11 but at the same time if it falls between this four to eight
12 that's fine.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But wouldn't
14 this --

15 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: What I'm saying this,
16 by our amendment we are actually violating that four to
17 eight times.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: That's right.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.
20 Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question?

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Mr. Bahadori.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Johnny, is that your
23 understanding that the language was written like this here
24 to exactly give the flexibility that the field engineer
25 needs to make those judgment calls based on the field

1 conditions, the prevailing traffic conditions, both speed
2 and volume, the driveways, the median, the trees, the
3 direction of the sun, all kinds of things. And by moving
4 toward a very specific table we are actually tying down
5 their hands.

6 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes. In my opinion
7 what is happening here is that of course this language does
8 give you the flexibility, at the same time pointing out to
9 make it effective you stay within this range. And our table
10 is fine. But once we are giving these speeds and distances
11 to these tables we are violating that principle.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: See, that's what I'm
13 saying. The table initially had suggested a minimum and we
14 moved away from it. But even when we put suggested in there
15 it goes back to the question I asked Mr. Roseman from the
16 City of Long Beach, that what is your understanding. And
17 his understanding is that well, if you say suggested I
18 better have a reason to violate it. When you give them a
19 range you encourage them to use their engineering judgment
20 to actually decide. So do we actually even need to get any
21 more specific than what the text is saying? Your opinion?

22 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: In my opinion that's
23 why either we leave the table the way it is because that
24 gives the range or we can have a reference to the sections.
25 Or someone if we amend the table then keep it within that

1 range.

2 Because the feds are giving some guidance. I
3 believe it is based upon some research and there is a lot of
4 history behind it. Otherwise they wouldn't say, effective
5 four to eight times.

6 And it's this very similar PIEV logic that they
7 use in Table 2C-4 and try to point out that you shouldn't
8 use it so far in advance that the motorist forgets by the
9 time he gets to the opportunity of what you're trying to
10 warn them of.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm glad you mentioned
12 the PIEV because even now there are three official PIEVs out
13 there in the street so what do you use?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Could I ask him a
15 question? How would you interpret then, looking at the
16 language and the fact that you're looking at existing
17 language in the federal manual and then you've got an
18 existing Table 6C-1 in the federal manual. So one gives you
19 a lot of flexibility and the other one really takes it away.

20 In fact, it's odd in the way it does in that
21 you're using 100 foot spacing at Category A for anything
22 over, you know, 25 miles an hour or less. So you're not
23 using any mathematics there whatsoever. If it's less than
24 25, 25 or less, you're not multiplying, you don't have a
25 high and a low, it's just where it is.

1 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Well Jeff, that's why
2 the feds did not assign a speed to the table, we did, and
3 now we are amending our own speed.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Can I say -- if
5 you look at the title of Table 6C-1 it says "suggested."

6 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yeah.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: It is not
8 minimum, it is not maximum.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But we added minimum,
10 that's why I asked --

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: No, no, what I'm
12 saying -- I agree with that. But it is suggested.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What I'm saying,
14 Jacob, is that if you are giving a range why do you need to
15 have a suggested value.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I agree with you.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: You are providing a
18 range and the engineer decides based on the field condition
19 what you need. The minute you put suggested in there it
20 goes back to the question of what is a typical engineer's
21 understanding. And I asked Mr. Roseman and he said well, if
22 I want to violate from it I need to have a reason. But when
23 we give a range they have to think about the field
24 conditions and they have to decide what's right.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Then what to do

1 with the MUTCD, national? They have it. Shall we follow or
2 not?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And then there's --

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Or revise?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But the real world
6 application, and this is where it gets difficult. A lot of
7 these construction zones aren't set up by engineers. Your
8 contractor and your inspector, they want a standard that
9 says, okay, the speed limit is 25, we're going to use this
10 spacing.

11 I've got a rolling detour that's going with my
12 overlay project. I've got a rolling detour that's moving
13 with my tree trimming. You know, that's the problem is in
14 the real life they don't want to do any math. They just
15 want to know, where do you want the arrow board. Is it
16 always 100 feet or 300 feet from -- and, you know, they
17 don't like that flexibility at all in the real world when a
18 construction project is going on.

19 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: So what I would
20 suggest is in that case why don't we do this approach where
21 we have the text up there, we have the road type with the
22 speeds that we want to give to the workers out there so that
23 they don't have to do any engineering and have this at least
24 something that they are either trying to estimate.

25 But how about the distance between the signs

1 portion? That's the one where we start doing these
2 completions and get the range. We could do that. I mean,
3 it's all suggested. This table is all suggested. We could
4 easily go in there and actually change those numbers that
5 fall into the criteria. Why don't we do that?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: What I would suggest is
7 -- what's really beautiful about having a suggested, not
8 minimum just a suggested advance warning, that really gives
9 a contractor and the inspector with no other guidance
10 something to work from.

11 The other section gives the engineer flexibility
12 if they're really -- this is a static project, it's going to
13 be here for nine months. How are we going to engineer it?
14 That gives the engineer the flexibility but this gives the
15 contractor and the inspector something that's really
16 suggested where those engineering calcs aren't done for a
17 unique project.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But Jeff --

19 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes. However --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But Jeff, you and I
21 here sitting discussing it, are having that discussion.
22 When the manual is printed the practitioners are not going
23 to understand it. There is going to be a discrepancy in the
24 manual and there are going to be questions. And I don't
25 want to even talk about the legal implications.

1 If you want to make it like that, that that's for
2 the engineer and the table is for the contractor, let's say
3 it. Let's make it very clear under the table. Say, this is
4 to be used for projects that are no longer than 24 hours or
5 depending on the field conditions.

6 I personally don't like the idea. I will not
7 support it to have this kind of very specific requirements.

8 Because the field conditions really are important. On
9 something like this you can't really go out there and say
10 it's suggested.

11 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Well I have a
12 suggestion here. Let's look at page 15, Table 6C-1. If we
13 go with the speeds the way we are showing them, and that's
14 the direction that probably a worker out in the field needs,
15 that's good, let's keep it that way.

16 But going with this language up there that I'm
17 showing for the very first row, Urban 25 or less, right? So
18 going with the 25 speed I'm getting -- in an urban 4 to 8
19 I'm getting 100 to 200 feet. Why don't I in that table put
20 100 to 200 feet.

21 And similarly I go along and change those
22 distances and that gives you -- and if you want just one
23 number then I'll put 150 feet because that's the half of 100
24 and 200. So that way we get at least a practical solution
25 to the problem out in the field for someone trying to

1 estimate it. But at least we choose the middle ground with
2 these 4 to 8 and 8 to 12s and let's do it that way.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That text in there,
4 those 4 to 8 times, there is some reason --

5 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- some engineering
7 calculations behind it? If we want to have a table, I like
8 your idea. The table could have the lower range and the
9 higher range, let them decide based on the field conditions.

10 The table is going to be just a mathematical
11 representation of the text.

12 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: That's right.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I will support that.
14 But the table with the specific number without math and
15 engineering behind it --

16 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Okay. Should I follow
17 up with John or -- if we would be willing to then that's the
18 direction we could take.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me ask on that
20 then. If you show a range under A, B and C would you still
21 want Urban 55 and above under Freeway and Expressway? Or
22 would you just want to have Urban 25 or Less and Urban 30
23 and above?

24 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Probably Urban 30 and
25 above and Urban 25 and below, that will be better.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. and then if we
2 were to do that then the next categories would be Rural,
3 period, and then Freeway/Expressway, as it were originally
4 in the federal text.

5 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: That's right.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So the proposal then
7 would be to have Urban 25 or less, Urban 30 and above,
8 Rural, Freeway/Expressway.

9 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: That way all we do is
10 define the urban category.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: With giving the
13 range of these distances.

14 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: And yes, we will do
15 that.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Rounded ranges in feet
17 only.

18 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: That's correct.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But where I have a --
21 where I have an urban 45 it seems like my distances are too
22 short. I mean, where I have a real-life road that's --

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I see.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I've got many of them,
25 you know. You know, 45 miles an hour speed limits. If

1 we're going 30 and above it just seems like my 350 is too
2 close. When I give this in a watch book or a manual or just
3 a standard I tear out a page and make a Xerox and give it to
4 a contractor or my inspector. It seems like that's going to
5 cause some problems to have the urban higher speed such a
6 wide category.

7 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: I see. Well in that
8 case for --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Because you're
10 pointing out the distance is 360 for 45 miles an hour, not
11 350.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Correct.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well wouldn't you take
14 care of that in the range that you would show?

15 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yeah, but at the --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The range is too wide.
17 If you're going from 30 all the way to 5 that's a -- it's
18 an impractical range.

19 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Well nothing should
20 stop us from having a ten mile increment for the urban
21 ranges if we want to do, redo this table. That will be more
22 accurate, if that helps.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, one
24 question on process. What are we doing? Are we giving
25 these as recommendations to Caltrans? Because I am not

1 hearing a motion on any approval of any of these items.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We haven't come to
3 that point yet.

4 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: But I was just making
5 comments.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because I heard you
7 asking Johnny if he's going to do it so I heard -- okay,, is
8 that already a done deal, he's going to do that?

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: To me I think this
10 item needs a workshop, especially because there's too
11 many --

12 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Then let me just be
13 brief and continue with a couple of other comments I have.
14 On page 16 just a quick comment. I do like what John
15 Fisher, at least in this item, is trying to do. Because
16 basically it is highlighting sometimes a lot of things that
17 are lost in the text. So I'm just supportive of that.

18 Of course I still agree that low and intermediate,
19 if somehow they can be defined. But whatever we do we
20 should be consistent in the text and the table. But I do
21 like the approach because highlighting some of the things
22 that are lost in the text.

23 Then carrying on further with page 28. So just on
24 page 20. What I would like to do is retain 6H-18 for the
25 reason that I was describing earlier, that Section 6G-11 as

1 well as 6G-01 and 6G-02 talk about that when it's a short
2 duration project, not short-term, the difference being short
3 duration is one hour or less.

4 In those type of situations there is a lot of
5 philosophy that the traffic can be self-regulating as long
6 as you compensate that with bigger lights, strobe lights and
7 other things on the vehicles or even the signs on the
8 vehicles. So since the philosophy is there I do not want to
9 take that option out totally for at least utility companies
10 who are out there for less than an hour, for that situation.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's Figure 6H-18 is
12 it?

13 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We agreed we would
15 retain that.

16 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Okay. Then --

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: And we are
18 deleting --

19 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Okay, that's about it.

20 Then the only last comment I have is that just
21 during the break I was talking to Dave Royer so I just want
22 to at least put it into the meeting minutes. And probably
23 Dave can come up and describe the cost difference between a
24 28-inch and 36-inch cone and the weight difference. Because
25 that we would like to at least discuss it even though we are

1 opposed because that is an older driver item that we had put
2 it into that section where we started recognizing the 36-
3 inch. So at least that there is a -- we understand the
4 difference.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Any other
6 public comment?

7 All right. Let me ask Johnny Bhullar a question.
8 Johnny, as we have gone through this we've had discussion.
9 We've amended proposals, we've amended the amendment to the
10 proposals. With whatever we may adopt today would you be
11 able to -- would you have enough time to amend the drawings,
12 amend the text and post it for comment before this Committee
13 considers adoption of the 2011 MUTCD?

14 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: I would say yes.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And that way
16 everyone will have an opportunity to take another crack at
17 this.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And then we don't --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, but we need to
20 identify what we're proposing that be included online.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Farhad.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: You know, I hate for
24 us to have spent four hours 15 minutes and then walk away
25 perhaps with no action but I really think that is the best,

1 best thing we can do. I really --

2 I don't think the process, we've communicated
3 effectively with cities and counties. Very few people saw
4 this. I speak for me. I saw a lot of comments but I'm not
5 making some of these comments with the language on another
6 section, which could affect language on another section and
7 another section. We talked concepts.

8 And I think there could be, not that there is,
9 there could be a lot of major confusion out there. The best
10 example is the dialogue you and I had with LA County today
11 where we were opposed to page 16. And after you explained
12 that this is the same language then LA County says, I'm
13 fine. But it demonstrated that we are not all on the same
14 page. In these times of significant financial constraints I
15 want to make sure people don't start panicking, not
16 realizing what all the details are.

17 So speaking for me, I am not ready to act on any
18 of these because I haven't seen the full picture yet. Many
19 of these make sense. Many of these -- but I haven't seen
20 the text. And I'd like an opportunity to show all of these
21 to cities and counties and make sure their concerns and
22 fears are put to rest.

23 Right now a lot of people are assigning major
24 dollar amounts to some of these items. Some may be true but
25 some of it maybe it's because they are not understanding the

1 details as well as you are. So that's really where I'm
2 heading with that.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And I'll comment to
4 that. That's why I'm recommending that we at least give
5 Johnny something that he can post so that we can all read,
6 read the final text and the revisions that we've made here
7 so that everyone can comment on it before anything is
8 adopted in the 2011 MUTCD. If we don't give Johnny anything
9 today then all we have is what's there now, which does have
10 a lot of oversights and omissions in it.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, one
12 question, let me ask, John, first. When you say to give
13 Johnny something, it has to be a full-blown recommendation
14 off the Committee by at least six votes. Otherwise we have
15 had a lot of discussions and comments. And for all I'm
16 concerned, none of the 22 proposals are approved, period.
17 We're just having a discussion.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. We haven't, we
19 haven't had the motion yet. You're right on that.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What I'm saying is
21 that -- so when you want to give Johnny language, or at
22 least a concept, you had to at least have had a vote on what
23 is it that you're asking to draft before he posts. Because
24 if he takes some of these and of his own volition makes
25 changes and then posts Chapter 6, then it's implied that the

1 Devices Committee has endorsed that draft.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I don't feel
4 comfortable with that.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And I would -- when we
6 conclude much of this discussion I will forward a motion for
7 consideration for the six votes here to have Johnny -- to
8 give some direction to Johnny on what to show on the website
9 so that it's available for comments before the 2011 MUTCD is
10 adopted. Because there are some things we have had some
11 good, healthy discussion on, there are some things that are
12 just omissions and oversights.

13 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I do
14 want to verify that the way I understood it is unless I get
15 a full recommendation from the Committee then it will show
16 up in the 2011 draft. Otherwise I am going to work on it
17 separately and show you a separate one that everyone can
18 review. Because I can do it either way but without a full
19 recommendation I cannot put anything into the draft.
20 Because to the draft I have to have a reason and logic
21 behind anything that I do, even if it's a change in comma,
22 so I can't do that.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jacob.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Can I suggest

1 that we bring this item back again to the next meeting with
2 all the changes, all the corrections, all whatever is going
3 on, for our review back again and then have a motion.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But that's my
5 question, Mr. Babico. What corrections, what modifications?
6 We have just had some discussions. And like on the
7 question of the arrow board, what is the recommendation? Do
8 we want to take the word "optional" out or do we want to
9 keep it in? We have just had discussions.

10 Or on the issue of the table, the one with the
11 speed limits. Do we even need the table, do we need to
12 change that table, do we want to show a range? We have had
13 discussions. That's why I feel a little uncomfortable
14 saying, bring it back with some revised language because I
15 don't even know what we approved.

16 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Just to facilitate
17 maybe some of the discussion that's going on. To think how
18 this item can proceed and still make it into the final CA
19 MUTCD.

20 I do want to highlight one thing that we haven't
21 mentioned yet but just attending the National Committee
22 meeting a couple of weeks ago in Washington DC, what was at
23 least indicated to us was that the feds will be issuing a
24 new final rule regarding the shall definition of the -- the
25 issue that has been going on. And of course our inkling is

1 that it's going to happen before the next National Committee
2 meeting in June.

3 But even if we are ready from our side with our CA
4 MUTCD 2011, I will be waiting for that "shall" final rule so
5 that first of all, I don't have to revise the manual again
6 just because of this one revision that the feds come out
7 with.

8 Secondly, that has been giving us heartburn and
9 that's the reason why, one of the reasons why it wouldn't be
10 beneficial to us to wait until at least January 15, 2012.
11 But they are going to do it, I believe they said, in summer.

12 But once they come out with the "shall" then we will be
13 issuing the new manual.

14 So even if we are ready on our side by June we
15 might just hold off the manual. Which might make it to the
16 next meeting then for this item, if that's what you're
17 thinking of trying to bring this item into the final 2011
18 manual when we issue that.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, the
20 question I am struggling with here is that typically when we
21 change something in the manual, I hope that the feds go
22 through the same process. I know they do. Maybe even more
23 extensively than we do. There is a documented problem and
24 there is a need. And then that documented problem with the
25 proposed alternative is supposed to take care of the problem

1 out in the field.

2 Let me zero down on one specific item. Making
3 arrow board mandatory. Where are the documents saying that
4 we are creating accidents out there by improper of lack of
5 use of arrow boards in the construction work area. So
6 taking the word "option" out are we saying that we have some
7 documents that we know that it is very good to go and
8 strongly recommend?

9 Or about the spacing of the signs depending on the
10 speed limit. Yeah, it's true that the contractors may come
11 and hassle the city officials saying, give me a specific as
12 to the distance and all that. But there's documentation
13 that the 4 to 8 times recommendation that's in the manual is
14 not enough and we have to have some very specific -- tie it
15 down to a specific speed limit.

16 Again, you know, in my days of practicing I've
17 prepared pretty close to 1,000 traffic control plans. I
18 didn't prepare all of them but at least I signed and stamped
19 them. So I understand the value of giving flexibility due
20 to field conditions. And I feel a little uncomfortable when
21 we tie down too much details. Especially I think Dave also
22 mentioned -- these diagrams, these are just schematics. So
23 when we get into these like nitty-gritties and things like
24 that I feel a little uncomfortable.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Let me reiterate again

1 that the arrow boards are not an option now. They are a
2 guidance statement and we are proposing nothing which
3 changes that condition.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. If you put it in
5 a guidance statement and then in the graphic, you put
6 "optional" under it. I would argue that guidance by itself
7 is an option. And putting the word "option" on the diagram
8 is reaffirming the option.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny doesn't agree.
10 Whenever you have a guidance for a standard condition it's
11 shown on the drawing and then you refer to the language.
12 Whenever you have an option condition it will say "option"
13 under the drawing. That's always been the standard.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But now you're saying
15 here that any lane closure on a multi-lane highway in
16 California you must use an arrow board. Has anyone really
17 thought about the implications of that?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It says it's a
19 guidance, it's a guidance today. We have approved language
20 previously that says it's a guidance statement. We are not
21 proposing to change that condition one bit. And we have
22 also indicated that in the notes we would add notes that
23 refer to the appropriate section to clarify that. There was
24 no change there, no substantive change.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So why even make the

1 change?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Because it's
3 incorrect. The drawing is not consistent with the text.
4 All we were trying to do is make them consistent. It is an
5 editorial change.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Is there any
7 possibility that we replace "option" with a footnote so that
8 we put a footnote underneath the arrow board? It refers to
9 the note for that figure. And that note will read as is
10 shown in 6F-56. Because it's not required that an arrow
11 board be used on all multi-lane roads with a lane closure.
12 It's recommended that it be used in situations involving
13 heavy traffic, high speeds or limited sight distance. It's
14 not -- it does not say, use an arrow board on any lane
15 closure on any multi-lane road. It's conditional, it's
16 conditioned on heavy traffic, volumes, high speeds and
17 limited sight distance.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Could we show notes
19 that apply to the drawings where an arrow board is shown to
20 indicate the appropriate application of the arrow board?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And again -- I'm
22 sorry. And again, one thing following Mr. Knowles, what he
23 said, is that it's kind of -- it's a little discomfoting to
24 me as a member of the Committee that even the county or the
25 city of LA, they say they haven't seen this, they are not

1 comfortable with it. So can you imagine people like in
2 Tulare and Visalia, all over the place, in Mono County.
3 They have no clue, they haven't see this.

4 I kind of like the idea that Mr. Mansourian had.
5 To actually, if you're going to go to some of these changes,
6 to have an outreach. Because we have done it a couple of
7 times on a couple of issues the last few years. As it is
8 the counties come back and they say, you guys are changing
9 this, nobody knows what you're doing.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Again, that's why I
11 propose that it be submitted for online comments. So that
12 people can review it, they have time to comment on it before
13 the 2011 MUTCD is adopted. How else can they comment on it
14 unless it's --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: But that requires --
16 but that requires an action by us today.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: We're not ready for
19 action.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Can we do it on
22 stages? Bring it back next month -- next meeting. Let's
23 discuss it and if we have consensus then we will direct.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So Johnny, let me go
25 to you. Which do you think is the best way to have comments

1 on items, on these items, that will be revised based on our
2 discussion today, so that this can be adopted for the 2011
3 MUTCD? Would it be to take action now and have those
4 comments online, or have these adoption online for further
5 comments, or does Caltrans want to come back with the
6 revisions or how would you want to handle it?

7 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: I think the best
8 approach is still going to be like I'm saying. Probably
9 take it to the next Committee Meeting. And after that,
10 because that's still going to be before June, or even if
11 it's some time around that. We will still have plenty of
12 time for whatever recommendation gets made at the next
13 meeting that I can easily, even if it's -- because this is a
14 separate process from my 2011 draft and the 2009 changes.
15 So even at the next meeting, once you have a full
16 recommendation coming to me and I still have not finalized
17 the Final MUTCD or made it official yet, I still have plenty
18 of time to put it in.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Who would you
20 want to prepare those revisions? Do you want me to do it
21 since I submitted it initially?

22 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: We can help.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Or do you want you to
24 do it?

25 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: I think the first

1 iteration if you can, based upon the discussions here, since
2 it's your item and your closer to it, if you can do that.
3 Once you send it to us we can have our graphics person as
4 well as we can then modify it and include it in the agenda
5 for the next meeting between the two of us.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So what do you want me
7 to do, bring this back to the next meeting with the
8 revisions that we discussed? Is that what I'm hearing?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So I think since
10 this was Mr. Chairman, your proposal, you are the most
11 knowledgeable about it, and today you demonstrated that by
12 answering some of the questions. I think you should come
13 back and clarify some of the questions.

14 I think the style I like is when Johnny goes
15 through this, he shows us an existing text, he shows us the
16 proposed text and he shows us the conflict. So everything
17 reads and flows, there is no ambiguity. And the reason for
18 action. Right? That's how Johnny does it.

19 Here, for example, the easy part is page 16. If
20 you want to say, here is the proposal because this chart is
21 in conflict with paragraph X then that's the best way, okay.

22 And once you give that to the representatives of the cities
23 and counties we send it to all of our -- for example,
24 counties. I'll send it to all 58 counties and say, here is
25 the revisions. Think about it, give us your comments.

1 That's the level of outreach I'm looking at.

2 That's my recommendation is prepare it, send it to
3 Johnny, have him take a look at it with Devinder. Then give
4 it to us for, you now, and give us time. For example, the
5 cities and counties, they're all meeting middle or end of
6 March. Get it ready and I'll volunteer, I'll distribute it
7 to everybody for you. But that's the level of participation
8 I'm looking for.

9 I want to make sure when we remove the word
10 "option" for the billboard that people don't scream saying,
11 you are now requiring this on every road closure. And now I
12 have to say no, on such and such paragraph we think it
13 already says that. No, it needs to be clarified and then we
14 see whether we agree or not. Thank you.

15 If you want I can make a motion to continue the
16 item. I don't know if you need a motion or not.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Seeing that there has
18 been no action taken here and no motion to adopt these
19 things as we've discussed them and amended them I will bring
20 this item back with my best effort on revising the drawings.

21 I do expect though that I'm not a -- I don't have
22 the full services of the drafting support and correcting all
23 the text.

24 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: We can do --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I would expect that

1 from Caltrans to assist me. But I will bring this back to
2 the next meeting. I presume the next meeting will be held
3 before the 2011 MUTCD is adopted; is that correct?

4 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman. The
7 suggestion that Mr. Mansourian had. If it can be
8 accommodated I think it's going to help the process a lot.
9 The draft that is being placed on the Committee Agenda when
10 there is an issue of substantial change and impact is shared
11 through you and the other representatives of cities and
12 counties, with your colleagues.

13 If they choose not to comment, so be it. But
14 otherwise if it comes here and then we recommend something,
15 I don't want people to come back and say, nobody knew that
16 you were going to be changing that part of the manual.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That was the purpose
18 of sending this out 30 days in advance of the meeting.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But most cities and
20 counties -- and you know it well, they don't look at the
21 Devices Committee agenda. They don't -- they do not follow
22 it and they don't know. They end up with a policy directive
23 that Caltrans issues and then all the complaining starts.
24 How come we didn't know, nobody even asked us about this
25 change.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: What's happening is
2 Farhad is distributing that to the counties but we're not
3 doing the cities. Because Jeff and Fisher need to take a
4 role and send to all the cities something like this critical
5 so everybody knows.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Mr. Chairman, I
7 would recommend for the record you also state that it is
8 your intention that Item number 2 will not be something that
9 we're going to revisit so we can put to rest that issue.
10 This is the one you withdrew but for the record.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So we will bring this
12 item back to the next meeting and we'll act on it at that
13 time.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I second it.

15 **6. Request for Experimentation**

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right, requests
17 for experimentation. We have Items 10-10, 11-3 and 11-4.
18 I'd like to take no more than ten minutes on these. If we
19 think we are going to approve it I'd like not to take a lot
20 of time because we are pressed for time here. I did want to
21 end this meeting at two o'clock so that we could then get to
22 Item number 11-1. So I'd ask Jeff on Item 10-10 and the
23 City of Stockton to discuss their experiment with the
24 modified speed hump.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just want to

1 introduce Todd Greenwood from Stockton, He'll be making the
2 presentation.

3 Basically it's a request -- for any cities that
4 have used a lot of speed humps before, the current
5 requirement is that you have an advisory sign in front of
6 every single bump. So in certain neighborhoods it would be
7 nice to consolidate this so that you indicate that there are
8 speed bumps, plural, or something like that ahead.

9 And they have designed a very good experiment with
10 before and after data and surveys to take a look at a
11 proposed modified sign, very similar to approved traffic
12 control devices but a little bit different.

13 I have been advised that Johnny has an opening
14 comment on this particular item. Caltrans has a concern.

15 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes. If I may.
16 Johnny Bhullar, Editor of CA MUTCD.

17 This an item regarding an experiment for a speed
18 hump and speed bumps. Basically here I do want to point out
19 this was a question that was going back and forth as to how
20 to approach it. So first of all I do actually commend the
21 City of Stockton for at least raising the issue and the
22 question and for coming up with the request and asking the
23 right questions and keeping us honest at the Committee here.

24 But what I would say is -- I mean, of course we
25 can go into the details but my suggestion as editor of the

1 CA MUTCD is that this thing shouldn't be requiring an
2 experiment because -- of course it does now because our
3 manual still does not account for it.

4 But I would rather amend the manual based upon
5 language saying that just like we have in sections of Part 1
6 and Part 2 where we talk about the word messages on signs,
7 that they can be modified based upon the date, the day, the
8 time, type and the place name situations.

9 For that same reasoning or the logic why not have
10 it so that we can also have it the plural version of any
11 word portion of the message on the signs. For example, if
12 we have a speed hump sign, just because now we say "speed
13 humps" we shouldn't have a new device.

14 So that is at least my recommendation but I would
15 like to have at least -- because this will be changing the
16 manual. And if you do this change then the experiment is
17 not needed. But if you don't do the change of course then
18 we have to go through the experiment. But I am not trying
19 to get away from the experiment but just trying to avoid
20 future similar experiments on a host of things.

21 I don't have the authority but since I see a lot
22 of members missing here -- but if Wayne or someone would
23 propose, or someone from the Committee would make this
24 recommendation to Caltrans and it gets voted upon then I
25 have a slight wording similar to -- that will fix this

1 situation.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The only thing I would
3 suggest is with a device like this that involves speed
4 humps, and having taken a look at some cities that use speed
5 humps without adequate signing or striping, some of the
6 early experiments in Brea, there were tremendous gouge marks
7 in the roadway because people weren't anticipating the speed
8 hump because it blended in with the rest of the road.

9 So that would be the main reason I would see there
10 would be an advantage. If we're decreasing the number of
11 warning signs they're using as they're using pavement
12 undulations is that, you know, there is that potential for
13 vehicle damage, road damage and resulting collisions. If
14 there was a good reason to require a sign at every hump it
15 might be, in this case, good to document that they can be --
16 the quantity can be reduced and still provide a safe street.

17 And I think they have done a good job of quantifying the
18 before and after effects of their experiment.

19 MR. GREENWOOD: Good afternoon. My name is Todd
20 Greenwood, City of Stockton. My last name is G-R-E-E-N-W-O-
21 O-D.

22 First of all I want to thank the Chairman and the
23 Board for continuing this item from last time. That was in
24 Southern California. It made a long trip for us.

25 Anyway, if you refer to Item 10-10 under request

1 for experimentation. We're proposing to experiment with a
2 modified speed hump warning sign, the W17-1 signs.

3 First of all, we submitted the request to FHWA and
4 received a response from Mr. Bruce Friedman and he indicated
5 in an email response, and I can provide that if necessary,
6 quote:

7 "There is no need to experiment with the
8 signs the city proposes to use. Paragraph 4
9 of Section 2C.03 of the 2009 MUTCD allows the
10 city to modify the word message on the W17-1
11 sign to fit their conditions. Therefore,
12 FHWA did not need to approve a request to
13 experiment."

14 That said, Caltrans has not adopted the 2009
15 federal MUTCD. And under current -- it's my understanding
16 that under current CA MUTCD 2010, Caltrans retains the
17 reservation of making wording changes to warning signs and
18 does not pass that on to local agencies.

19 I'm aware of other agencies that have kind of
20 taken it upon themselves to make changes. We wanted to
21 basically be -- follow the letter of the law through,
22 through the Committee and, you know, possibly it will turn
23 out where we don't need to experiment with this and that
24 there can be a text change that allows the plurality issue
25 to be addressed on signs.

1 What the proposal is, to have modify it to where
2 you have two different types of signs. We have this first
3 one which would be placed in advance of a series of humps
4 and -- we note that under the current signage you can
5 supplement with a head placard underneath. But in our case
6 we want to put the advisory 15 mile per hour sign. So by
7 combining it all into here allows us to still put the
8 advisory 15 mile per hour and just hold it to two signs.

9 The second sign is where we would have a
10 neighborhood where there's limited access. You may have
11 three or four access points. Rather than have all the
12 streets in the neighborhood littered with, you know, speed
13 hump signs, we would just introduce to the driver, you're
14 entering an area. And then once you're inside all the humps
15 would still be supplemented with an on-pavement marker of
16 "bump."

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hump, not bump.

18 MR. GREENWOOD: Well, we're using bump as the --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The sign says "hump."

20 MR. GREENWOOD: The sign says hump. But what I'm
21 saying is the marking on the pavement that we use would be,
22 would be "bump" rather than dealing with the issue of having
23 the other word all over the pavement. So basically --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: By the way, we have
25 made the transition to using the word "hump" as a pavement

1 marking and the reaction wasn't what we thought it would be.

2 MR. GREENWOOD: Okay. Maybe we were
3 hypersensitive on that.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We have 1500 of them.

5 MR. GREENWOOD: Okay. As far as I know the
6 current manual allows you to use either one so.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I'm going to ask that
8 we speed it up because we are running out of time.

9 MR. GREENWOOD: Okay. So basically our point is
10 that with the proposed request for experiment we'd be able
11 to limit the number of signs in the neighborhoods quite
12 substantially and just supplement with, you know, go ahead
13 and do the initial first one in a series of humps, give the
14 advisory sign and then all subsequent humps after that
15 would, would have the -- just the legend.

16 Our experimental process would be it's basically
17 we're going do six neighborhoods in six segments to document
18 before and after and then bring that information back to the
19 Committee for whether to incorporate it into the MUTCD or
20 not at that time.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you.

22 MR. GREENWOOD: I'll just kind of wrap it up at
23 the end there. I could go on in more details of what type
24 of before and after but I'll stop there.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Discussion by

1 the members?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Question.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Greenwood, that's
5 an excellent application, thank you. Just a couple of
6 questions on the principle. I remember when the speed humps
7 were being introduced, there was a big discussion mid-'80s,
8 the very beginning of my career. That people and this
9 Committee, we were saying, these are not traffic control
10 devices. And I still think that speed humps are not traffic
11 control devices. They are pavement/highway features. But
12 that train has already left the station, I'm not going to
13 re-debate that issue.

14 The reason that we said that was -- and I remember
15 we were even calling them pavement undulation. So if you
16 are introducing a change in the profile, an abrupt change in
17 the profile. Speed hump is, in fact, a dip in reverse.
18 Instead of pavement going down, pavement coming up.

19 Would you go into an area that you have dips and
20 just say, dip area be careful, or do you want to actually
21 highlight that so that the drivers are more aware?

22 And the second question that I have is that the
23 effectiveness of the speed humps is usually with their
24 visibility and notice. So do you want to maximize it or do
25 you want to minimize it by taking away the sign. And

1 especially the chevrons that you showed on the speed humps.
2 Paints these days are all water-based and they wash off and
3 they are very pale at night.

4 So those two questions. First, do you want to
5 actually reduce the warning that the driver has, especially
6 motorcycles and things like that and that they can really
7 hurt themselves? And second, aren't you actually
8 diminishing the effectiveness of the hump by taking away the
9 sign?

10 MR. GREENWOOD: Well I don't believe so. I think
11 the dip example, you're going to encounter that on a one-
12 time experience where the driver is not ready to have that.

13 Here we're saying that there is a number of speed humps in
14 the area, be aware of them.

15 And to address the other issue with not using the
16 sign. I would say that in our proposal the pavement
17 legends, which we've got a lot of feedback. We've been
18 using them also to supplement the signs. We've got a lot of
19 positive feedback that people say, I never even -- yeah, I
20 never even see the signs but I see the legend in front of
21 me. So, you know, we're not proposing to just put up a sign
22 and then not have any indication, you know, advanced warning
23 of it. They would, they would have the marking in front of
24 them. And the ones we have been using are thermal and
25 they've got a very good life span.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So your reason is only
2 to avoid sign pollution? Is that the only reason?

3 MR. GREENWOOD: Primarily. And we've gotten a
4 number -- we've had to deal with a number of residents
5 where, you know, why is the sign in front of my, you know,
6 out in front of my house. And then we've relocated them.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But that one they
8 can't have their cake and eat and eat it too.

9 MR. GREENWOOD: That's true.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If they want a speed
11 hump on their street they put up with the sign.

12 MR. GREENWOOD: That's true. But it's -- yeah.
13 It's for those couple of reasons, is to limit the number of
14 signs so they're not, so there isn't sign pollution and then
15 also to address the feedback from the neighbors.

16 And I don't know if I -- did I answer your second
17 question? What was your second question?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I still disagree with
19 the premise but that's a good application. It's very well
20 prepared, thank you.

21 MR. GREENWOOD: Any other --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any other questions
23 for Mr. Greenwood?

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman. I
25 wonder if this is a -- why do we need to experiment this?

1 Why not to have it just before us for voting, take action.
2 We know the intent of this and what kind of results from the
3 experimentation will bring to us. I don't know that.

4 The only thing is the purpose of these two signs
5 proposals is to eliminate the intermittent signs. Is that
6 adequate? Especially for at dark, at the night, okay, and
7 you've got so many drivers as well as bicyclists. They're
8 going to use these, okay, without the sign. And there are
9 gouges on these humps, usually. It will take away the
10 pavement marking. And then if it's faded out, without a
11 sign. It's a dilemma.

12 So my suggestion is that, two issues. Can we
13 adopt, take action on this one without experimentation? Or
14 go with the experimentation but these are the
15 recommendations, whatever is that.

16 MR. GREENWOOD: Keep in mind that we aren't
17 eliminating the sign. I mean, when we have a series of
18 three humps you're still going to have, at the beginning of
19 it, speed hump, 15 miles per hour and then just the
20 subsequent ones would not have the sign. I'm not saying,
21 get rid of all the signs, I'm just saying, scale back and
22 use more appropriately, basically

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: What are the
24 average spacing in your area, these humps?

25 MR. GREENWOOD: On the humps?

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yes.

2 MR. GREENWOOD: They vary from, you know, five to
3 -- I think our minimum is like five or six hundred up to,
4 you know, a single one to cover a, cover a whole block.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: On a single one
6 you are not going to post ahead, right? If you have a
7 single hump you are not going to use one of these two signs?

8 MR. GREENWOOD: Right, it would just have the, it
9 would just have the standard one that's in the manual now
10 with the advisory speed. Yeah, those would be treated just
11 like they --

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yeah.

13 MR. GREENWOOD: Consistent with the manual.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, let's bring it
15 back to the Committee. Do we want to discuss or is there a
16 motion to approve the experiment?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'd like to make a
18 motion to approve the experiment.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do we have a second?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'll second it.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, moved and
22 seconded. Any comment by Committee Members?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I would
24 just say I agree with what Johnny was saying earlier. I
25 don't know that we need an experiment on this. Even the

1 before and after, the way they're going to get the results
2 of this success is by polling residents to see whether they
3 know there's speed humps after they remove the signs. And
4 the residents aren't the problem, it's the people that
5 aren't familiar with the neighborhood that are the problem.
6 And if those people encounter a problem City Hall is going
7 to hear about it.

8 It's not going to be any more or less effective
9 than doing a full-blown experiment with all the
10 administrative stuff that goes along with that. I think in
11 concept it makes sense that they're adding a word or a
12 letter to the sign and we haven't got a strong enough
13 objection to say, you can't take those signs away. I think
14 the experiment just gums up the works, like Johnny was
15 saying. I think that we just do whatever we need to do to
16 allow the new sign and move on.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But I'll point out
18 that we have language before us that would amend the text in
19 the CA MUTCD.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I thought Johnny said
21 he had some.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny, do you have
23 language?

24 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Well, first of all,
25 yes, I do have language. But I'll be honest, English is my

1 fourth language so I'm not really good at it. So if anyone
2 has any suggestions I'll take it. Right now the wording
3 that we have in the manual -- and of course I want to also
4 clarify, for the City of Stockton, even though the 2009
5 manual says Agency is allowed to do that, that is even in
6 the 2003 and even in the previous manuals.

7 But it is the Vehicle Code and Caltrans legal
8 giving us a legal opinion that in California you cannot,
9 even though the feds give you the authority to deviate on
10 what message signs in California you can, it's Caltrans or
11 the Committee here has to go through and issue those word
12 message signs. So that's nothing new and that same thing is
13 going to be reflected, even in the 2009 adoption. So the
14 same, it will be continuing.

15 However, for the message. Right now the wording
16 that we have is "Highway agencies may develop place/facility
17 name or day/date/time portion of the word message on signs."

18 And my wording at least that I have suggested, and I'm
19 trying to keep it very simple, is that I'm going to add to
20 that: "Highway agencies may revise the word message portion
21 on signs for the purpose of plurality." And then give an
22 example, such as speed hump to speed bumps and leave it
23 that. Very concise, simple and brief.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But that wouldn't
25 accommodate the term, speed hump area.

1 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Once you're adding
2 area or ahead within the message of the sign then we need
3 them as different signs because once you start doing that we
4 need to have a different code for the sign. And also the
5 specification will change to see if those wordings can fit
6 on the sign or not. But just with an S, that can be
7 accommodated probably with existing signs.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. So you're
9 pointing out that if we simply make it a plural, speed
10 humps, speed bumps.

11 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes. But for ahead --

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Your change would make
13 that okay. But that wouldn't accommodate an additional word
14 on the sign --

15 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: That's right.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: -- or the word area.

17 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Then we need new signs
18 for that.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, and I assume that
20 doesn't take care of the need for a sign at every roadway
21 feature. So although they've changed the message there's
22 this whole issue about, do you need a sign at every bump on
23 both approaches. Which is a separate issue from what the
24 sign actually says.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Which is why I feel we

1 need to go through the experiment, so that we see where we
2 want to be down the line and what language we want to
3 modify.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: They're going to look
5 at before -- it's not just a survey. They're going to look
6 at before and after collision data, before and after speed
7 data. It's going to have more than just, you know, how do
8 people feel about it. We'll have hard data after the
9 experiment.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we have a
11 motion on the floor, we have a second. We've had comment
12 here by Committee Members. Do we have any public comment on
13 this item?

14 MR. PYBURN: Yes, Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
15 Administration, P-Y-B-U-R-N.

16 Notwithstanding FHWA's notice saying you don't
17 need a right to experiment, I'm here as a licensed traffic
18 and civil engineer concerned about the use and the placement
19 of the signs. So there may not be a formal need to
20 experiment, there is caution that I want to present on
21 behalf of Federal Highways.

22 First of all the speed hump sign section 2C.24
23 does not require a sign at every hump. If they're in series
24 you can put one sign at the beginning.

25 More importantly though is that pavement markings,

1 there's a question of whether they can be used alone. And
2 in the federal manual 2C -- excuse me, 3B.20 says twice that
3 pavement markings can be used to supplement warning signs.

4 Can pavement markings be used alone is the
5 question. Clearly in 2B it doesn't say they have to be
6 placed they have to be placed, it says to supplement a
7 warning sign. The implication there is you have to have the
8 sign at the series of bumps.

9 As a -- I'm concerned that if you use one area
10 sign and you have a neighborhood with access points and five
11 or six streets, and all of the streets in there don't have
12 the bumps, there could be some question on the part of the
13 driver, are there bumps on that speed or not.

14 So the term limited access isn't really defined.
15 How many streets does it apply to in the neighborhood? A
16 driver coming out of a house late at night, may have been
17 there for some time, forgets about the bump. So I'm just
18 expressing concern that: A, you can't use the pavement
19 marking alone without the sign and that the area sign I
20 don't think is adequate delineation.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, Steve. Any
22 other -- any questions for Steve or any other comments from
23 the public?

24 Okay, that being the case we bring the item back
25 to the Committee. We have a motion, we have a second, any

1 further discussion?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I think
3 -- I still think speed humps are not traffic control
4 devices. They just didn't know where else to put it so they
5 put it in MUTCD.

6 This is an excellent application, I'm willing to
7 support it.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we'll vote
9 on the motion. All in favor say aye.

10 (Ayes.)

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Opposed?

12 None. Abstentions?

13 None. Congratulations, your experiment is
14 approved.

15 MR. GREENWOOD: Thank you, Committee.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We'll go next to an
17 experiment from the City of Long Beach regarding a buffered
18 bike lane. This matter came to me and I had forwarded it to
19 the Secretary. I'd like to ask that Alan Wachtel join us at
20 the table here since this is a bikeway matter.

21 This was an experiment for a buffered bike lane.
22 When I discussed it with the City of Long Beach I pointed
23 out there may be some discussion about having parallel lines
24 to create the buffer and if separated by more than two feet
25 and would that constitute a painted island or not, which

1 would not be traversable. So Long Beach came back with a
2 number of options here with specific types of markings.

3 I will then ask Dave Roseman representing the City
4 of Long Beach to summarize their proposal. Again I'd ask
5 that you do it as quickly as you can, thank you.

6 MR. ROSEMAN: Dave Roseman with the City of Long
7 Beach. I'm standing in for our Transportation Programs
8 folks who have put this application together.

9 I just want to tell you real quickly that Second
10 Street in Long Beach is a regional arterial that carries
11 approximately 40,000 vehicles a day. And a portion of this
12 roadway goes through Naples, which is an island. And where
13 we're proposing to do this is in the eastbound direction
14 only in Naples.

15 About a couple of years ago there was a political
16 decision to reduce the number of eastbound lanes from three
17 to two. This stretch, which created the extra right of way
18 or roadway -- it was restriped to two lanes with a wider
19 bike lane and a wider parking lane. And what we found was
20 that a lot of people started to drive either by confusion or
21 just didn't understand the striping, started to drive in
22 that bike lane. So this was a suggestion that came forward
23 to create a striped buffer between the travel roadway,
24 vehicle-traveled roadway and the bike lane to try to keep
25 cars in the two lanes and not drive in the bike lane.

1 So in August the City made a request of FHWA for
2 the right to experiment with a buffer. In October we had
3 staff meet with the California Bike Advisory Committee to
4 review it. They asked us to come back with some more design
5 details. And then we received in October also approval for
6 the right to experiment from FHWA.

7 Then we had a second meeting by phone with the
8 California Bike Advisory Committee to discuss some of the
9 proposed details. And out of that meeting it became pretty
10 clear -- in your package you have a number of concepts that
11 were presented, A, B and C, which is in Attachment C. A, B,
12 C and D.

13 And based on the discussion the City now prefers
14 Concept C as an experiment for this section of roadway. And
15 basically the concept is that the bike lane is a nine-foot
16 bike lane with four of it striped out. So you have a dashed
17 line and diagonal lines connecting those dashed lines to the
18 outside edge of the bike lane. And that provides the buffer
19 space between the bicyclist who is riding in the bike lane
20 and the motorist that's driving in the travel lane.

21 That's essentially it as quick as I could do it,
22 Mr. Fisher.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That was pretty quick.
24 Almost too quick. Are there any questions for Mr. Roseman?

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yes, I have two

1 comments. On the Concept C, which is preferred to the City.
2 Do you think the parked car can go and cross to enter the
3 roadway?

4 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, that's the intent of this is
5 that there's only two solid lines which create a similar
6 bike lane.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But you have the
8 hash lines.

9 MR. ROSEMAN: But we have the hash marks. But
10 they're broken, they're attached to a broken line.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

12 MR. ROSEMAN: So there's not three lines, there's
13 only two lines.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Is there any
15 misunderstanding on the part of the driver that he would
16 like to cross these?

17 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, that would be the focus of the
18 evaluation.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I see.

20 MR. ROSEMAN: To see if this new striping is
21 understood by people that they can cross it and get to the
22 parked car.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

24 MR. ROSEMAN: And that they can leave from the
25 parking location and drive across the bike lane and into the

1 travel lane.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay. The second
3 concern I have is on page 62, the next paragraph figure.
4 Where you have the intersection.

5 MR. ROSEMAN: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: What would be --
7 on the south leg you don't have a bike lane and you will not
8 propose the buffer zone.

9 MR. ROSEMAN: That's correct.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Do you have --
11 are you going to present such a scenario in the
12 implementation?

13 MR. ROSEMAN: No. Along Second Street is
14 primarily a major thoroughfare in one direction. All the
15 side streets are very minor because they're on an island.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: No, no. My point
17 is that -- imagine northbound traffic on this figure.

18 MR. ROSEMAN: Oh, in the opposite direction.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I'm saying, the
20 south leg there is no bike lane.

21 MR. ROSEMAN: Correct.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: When they cross
23 the intersection northbound they are facing the bike lane,
24 the buffer and to the right is the parking area.

25 MR. ROSEMAN: That is correct.

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But there would
2 be some interference of the northbound through with the bike
3 lane and the buffer. Is there such a case?

4 MR. ROSEMAN: No, I think if you're approaching
5 the intersection on the south leg you can go into the bike
6 lane to make a right turn. If you were continuing straight
7 you would continue straight and the buffer kind of creates
8 this diagonal.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Are you saying
10 the curb lane is always exclusive right turn lane? You
11 don't have through/shared right?

12 MR. ROSEMAN: No, in this situation it would have
13 to be a right turn only.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I'm saying, are
15 you going to have in your study experimentation such a
16 through lane interfacing with the bike lane?

17 MR. ROSEMAN: No.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Okay.

19 MR. ROSEMAN: No.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: All right.

21 That's it.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Dave, your experiment
25 is going to be only on the south side of Second Street,

1 right?

2 MR. ROSEMAN: That's correct. The north side
3 isn't as wide. It's a street that's off-center.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Now the section
5 between Bayshore and PCH, you have a lot of side streets
6 intersecting with Second Street. So you are going to go
7 through all these transitions every --

8 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, there are -- there are a
9 number of side streets in this area but there are some
10 pretty good lengths between them as well. There's more
11 driveways than there are side streets in this area.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

13 MR. ROSEMAN: So there will be cars coming out of
14 a driveway, have to cross across this median and then get
15 into the through lane. I think half of the side streets are
16 signalized. About half of them are the other half are not.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So your reason not
18 choosing C and going to D was that so parked cars are not
19 confused as getting out of the parking lane?

20 MR. ROSEMAN: No, I suggested that C was the one
21 that's preferred by the City.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay, so I'm thinking
23 you're saying D. Okay, so you want to go with C.

24 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. D from our perspective is a
25 little more confusing, we believe, to the motorists as to

1 what all these dashed lines mean.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So Dave, the
3 understanding then is that if we were to approve this
4 experiment you would be implementing Concept C and no other
5 concept, is that correct?

6 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. We would -- what we would do
7 is we'd go through a design phase to implement the C concept
8 within the street network.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. All right, any
10 other questions for Mr. Roseman?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Do you now have two
12 travel lanes on the south side of Second Street?

13 MR. ROSEMAN: Correct.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So you're taking one
15 and converting it into a bike lane.

16 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. Right now what we have out
17 there now is basically two lanes. Two through lanes, a
18 really wide number two lane and then a bike lane and then a
19 wide parking lane. So that area that's now wide we would
20 stripe out with this new striping.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What's the volume on
22 Second Street?

23 MR. ROSEMAN: It's about -- it's a little over
24 40,000 vehicles a day.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Forty thousand?

1 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So if it's bi-
3 directional, pretty much 20,000?

4 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: In one direction?

6 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: How are you going to
8 handle 20,000 cars with one lane?

9 MR. ROSEMAN: It's with two lanes. But that's why
10 I said that it was a political decision to reduce, to get
11 rid of the third lane.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But they have two now,
13 they want to go to one?

14 MR. ROSEMAN: No, no, no.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, you still will
16 keep two?

17 MR. ROSEMAN: We had three.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

19 MR. ROSEMAN: And now we're going to two.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because the diagram
21 doesn't show that, sorry.

22 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, it's kind of missed. It's at
23 the top of the line, there's another dashed line that's the
24 second, it's the number one lane.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Good luck with

1 the calls to the City Hall.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, discussion by
3 the members? Mr. Wachtel.

4 MR. WACHTEL: Mr. Chairman, Alan Wachtel
5 representing the Bicycle Advisory Committee. We discussed
6 this request in October and again in December. We had many
7 of the same questions that I think this Committee has had,
8 in particular about whether motorists would be willing to
9 cross the buffer zone, not only to enter and leave parking
10 but to turn right at intersections and driveways where
11 there's a possibility that the buffer will induce them to
12 stay too far to the left and create right hook conflicts.

13 We are still also concerned about how this fits
14 into vehicle law. Section 21651 of the Vehicle Code, which
15 was cited in the request, prohibits not just crossing double
16 parallel lines but driving on any area of the roadway, any
17 marking that divides a highway into two separate roadways.
18 And I would interpret that as including, for instance, any
19 kind of core that's marked off as not part of the roadway,
20 whether it's striped or not, areas striped with diagonal
21 markings. I would suggest that this would more
22 appropriately be chevrons than diagonal lines, but in either
23 case it seems to indicate an area that is not part of the
24 roadway and that motorists therefore shouldn't drive on and
25 bicycles also should stay off.

1 The Committee discussed these questions and didn't
2 come to any conclusion but it did recommend that a
3 subcommittee be formed to work with the City of Long Beach
4 on refining the proposal. And I don't know whether that
5 subcommittee was created or met.

6 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, we're waiting for that
7 subcommittee to form on your end. And we'd be happy to show
8 our designs to you as we go through this design process.

9 MR. WACHTEL: All right. Caltrans was asked to
10 coordinate that and perhaps that hasn't happened yet.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not for this proposal.
12 We're waiting for the action from the --

13 MR. WACHTEL: Waiting for the action from this,
14 from this Committee? All right. So there's some question
15 about what the priority of action should be.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Alan, do I understand
17 correctly that the Bicycle Advisory Committee took no action
18 on this proposal?

19 MR. WACHTEL: The only action was to suggest
20 referring it to a subcommittee. We took no action for or
21 against.

22 MR. ROSEMAN: My understanding -- my understanding
23 of that was that once we received approval of this concept
24 then we would develop designs and work with the subcommittee
25 on those designs. But there's no point in going through a

1 design effort if we don't have the approval to move forward
2 with the concept.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And I know we go round
4 and round on who do we go to. When it comes to this
5 Committee, we're supposed to take action on the proposal one
6 way or the other, defer it, approve it, don't approve it,
7 whatever. And we need to have a solid proposal here, a
8 specific proposal that we're taking action on. And before
9 it comes to us we need the advice of the Bicycle Advisory
10 Committee to know how they feel about it. They weren't
11 ready to approve it.

12 I support this experiment but I think something
13 was brought up that I overlooked. And that was the diagonal
14 line between the travel, modus travel lane and the bicycle
15 lane. I think a good point was made, the appropriate
16 marking is a chevron because it's -- the line is supposed to
17 point in a forward direction with respect to the direction
18 of travel and it points backwards with respect to the bike
19 lane here. So that would be the concern that I have.

20 MR. ROSEMAN: I don't think the City has a problem
21 with using a chevron here.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

23 MR. ROSEMAN: That was one of the things that I
24 think that was discussed as part of the conference call with
25 the California Bicycle Advisory Committee.

1 MR. WACHTEL: I might also mention another
2 suggestion. Thank you. I just want to mention another --
3 is it on now? All right. I want to mention another
4 suggestion that was made in the Bicycle Committee just for
5 your consideration. And that was to address the questions
6 about how this design fits in with the understanding that we
7 don't normally cross an area that's been striped off with
8 diagonal lines or chevrons.

9 One possibility, although it's unusual, might be
10 to create two parallel bicycle lanes going in the same
11 direction. And then bicyclists who didn't feel comfortable
12 riding in the one on the left could ride in the one on the
13 right. And all of the usual legal framework of not crossing
14 bike lanes would then apply.

15 MR. ROSEMAN: And that was something else that was
16 brought up. The City would prefer to experiment with a
17 buffer as opposed to have a dual, two bike lanes right
18 adjacent to each other.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Are you saying,
20 in the same direction?

21 MR. ROSEMAN: In the same direction.

22 MR. WACHTEL: Yes. It would be a very unusual
23 design but it does provide -- it assigns the requisite width
24 to bicycle traffic.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But are you

1 saying that two bike lanes side by side, same direction, to
2 the left will be a buffer area, then to the right, no
3 buffer?

4 MR. WACHTEL: No buffer.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: But the main
6 purpose of this one is to have a buffer.

7 MR. WACHTEL: But the left hand bicycle lane could
8 act as the buffer.

9 MR. ROSEMAN: You'd have two bike lanes side by
10 side. Correct me if I'm wrong but I think we could do that
11 without experimentation but it would be -- I think it's an
12 interpretation that would allow us to do that. But we would
13 prefer to try to stripe this out to provide the safe area
14 for the -- the separation between the moving traffic that is
15 at a 35 mile an hour speed limit and the bikers that may be
16 traveling somewhat slower.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: The definition of
18 the bike lane, would that allow you two lanes, same
19 direction?

20 MR. ROSEMAN: I don't think it says you can't do
21 it.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: It doesn't
23 mention, it's silent.

24 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, that's why I'm saying it would
25 be an interpretation.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But there is no
2 striping pattern to show the separation of one lane versus
3 the other.

4 MR. ROSEMAN: It would be -- we would be using the
5 standard stripes by having, you know, a second striped lane.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Probably your
7 experimentation will implement what the definition --

8 MR. ROSEMAN: I don't really want to do that, I
9 would like to do this.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. As sponsor of
11 the proposal I supported it because I think there is a need
12 for a buffer. I think the dilemma is, how do you stripe the
13 buffer and that's what we are struggling with here.

14 I believe they have done their best to address the
15 issue by trying to break one of the lines so that that
16 section of the Vehicle Code that says, two lines separated
17 by two feet or more shall constitute, whatever it says, a
18 painted island in effect. And I think they have done their
19 best to try to address it. Do we have any better ideas as
20 to how to do this?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'd like to ask the
22 applicant, what do you see as the drawback to striping two,
23 four and a half foot wide bike lanes. So you have -- you
24 have a bike lane which by code has the six inch solid wide
25 line, you use the four inch dash between the two lanes.

1 you've got plenty of buffer between the parked cars so it's
2 not like the outside lane is undesirable because you're
3 close to a parked car because you've got 13 feet from the
4 curb face to the first lane line.

5 And typically in a four or five foot lane it's
6 hard for two cyclists to ride side by side or pass one
7 another. I mean, there's a lot of advantages if you've got
8 the pavement area. Then the striping is so much more
9 standard than putting a chevron out in the middle of no
10 man's land that nobody -- you might use more bicycle
11 stencils than normal to mark the two lanes but it's very
12 clear if you have got two, four and a half foot lanes that
13 it's not for motor vehicles. You've got the bicycle
14 stencils that reinforces that it's not for mopeds and
15 motorcycles and those kinds of things.

16 What would be the down side to doing that?
17 Because it's actually more standard than what you're
18 proposing.

19 MR. ROSEMAN: Right, that's correct. One of the
20 drawbacks is at the intersections the right turning vehicles
21 would now be crossing over two lanes of traffic to make a
22 right as opposed to one.

23 In a bike lane that's with a buffer that comes to
24 a point and then picks up again you've narrowed the conflict
25 location between bikes and right turners at the actual

1 intersection where they're going to make that conflict move.

2 So that's one.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But, I mean, can't you
4 just dash the outside of both as you approach within 200
5 feet of that intersection and terminate the number one
6 bicycle lane? That's kind of like what you're showing in
7 that display.

8 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, we could. I mean, that would
9 be a -- your number one bicycle lane then would start and
10 end and start again and end and start again and end and
11 start again and end. I'm not sure that that has a great
12 value. I mean, it's something. If this, if this concept
13 does not -- is not acceptable we would probably try to do
14 something along those lines.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because as a cyclist
16 you know even riding over thermoplastic, if you've got, you
17 know, your high-tech tires, you know, it's bump-bump. You
18 know, it's not a desirable place to even ride a bike. So
19 two side by side lanes, even if the number one lane is
20 beginning and ending, it's a much more bicycle friendly
21 environment for me as a rider to have that ability to easily
22 pass -- to ride beside a child, for example. I can be the
23 buffer, you know, when I need to be, you know. And it seems
24 like it's not as great a barrier for those trying to reach
25 the parking lane as opposed to driving across a series of

1 chevrons.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But I'll point out
3 what we would have then, if we had two parallel bike lanes,
4 we'll probably have a solid stripe between them.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Why?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Six inch -- because
7 that's the standard, a six inch solid stripe.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Why not a -- the detail
9 for a bike path striping shows a dashed yellow line down the
10 center, four inch white. I don't know why two parallel in
11 the same direction wouldn't use a dashed white. The bike
12 path is dashed yellow.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But we don't have a
14 standard for a dashed white bike lane anywhere in our
15 standards.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No, but the outsides
17 are bounded by six inch bike lanes and the inside is just a
18 dashed four inch. So your bike lane is bounded by standard,
19 six inch solid bike lane lines per the standard.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: And a four inch how
21 long?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Standard dash. We
23 don't need to reinvent the wheel.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well that's 17 feet
25 for a vehicle but you down-scale everything for bikes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: If you feel that's
2 necessary you could half the distance if you wanted to but
3 there's -- I mean, that's part of the experiment.

4 MR. ROSEMAN: You know, there's one other thing I
5 just want to throw out here. This is not a very long
6 distance either. I mean, it's about maybe a little over a
7 quarter mile of roadway, it's just on the island. And
8 there's probably -- I'm just trying to think of all the
9 streets in my head but I think there's probably six or seven
10 intervening streets in that quarter mile.

11 So you're -- I could see the benefit of having
12 that if you're going long distances but I don't think you're
13 really going that long of a distance so that that extra
14 striped lane -- we're going to end up with a lot of, you
15 know, the lane starts and then we merge it to end it.
16 Starts, merge it to end it. As opposed to just having
17 something consistent all the way down this quarter-mile
18 stretch.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: If this experiment is
20 wildly successful what's it going to look like when you're
21 done?

22 MR. ROSEMAN: What would it look like?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I mean, are you going to
24 have fewer accidents or no right hooks or what do you think
25 is going to come out of this?

1 MR. ROSEMAN: A successful experiment would be, in
2 our opinion, would be that we didn't discourage motorists to
3 access the parking. Or when they left the parking they
4 immediately got into the travel lane as opposed to drive
5 down the bike lane to try to enter at an intersection. That
6 would be, that would be one of the key aspects for us.
7 Motorist behavior, is it the type of behavior we were trying
8 to get them to do.

9 And secondly would be to try to have motorist
10 behavior that didn't drive down this lane. Because that was
11 why we were asking for a buffer, because motorists were
12 driving in the bike lane. So we want to discourage that
13 type of activity.

14 And third, we would like to see no increase in
15 accidents. And this stretch here is relatively low accident
16 rate anyway but we wouldn't want to see a spike in
17 accidents.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And what is the
19 duration of the test? I saw that you were willing to remove
20 it all three weeks after the test but I didn't spot how long
21 the test was.

22 MR. ROSEMAN: I would think that -- if it's not in
23 this package I would say a year would be good for us to get
24 a good amount of data.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because you spoke

1 earlier about collisions on green pavement so I was
2 wondering. And there was a question of, has it been a long
3 enough sample to really say, you know, this increase in
4 collisions is caused by green pavement. It seems like we
5 need to define what's an adequate test.

6 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah. You know, the difference
7 between the green pavement one and this is that if we see
8 poor driver behavior here or a confusion from drivers then
9 we probably want to end -- terminate this experiment
10 earlier. If it's successful then we may want to extend it
11 to see if there's any accident correlation.

12 In the case of the green pavement we saw a spike
13 in total accidents went up about 50 percent. And so, you
14 know, that's concerning. But we can't directly relate that
15 to the green pavement, it's just that area there's been an
16 increase in accidents.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, further
18 discussion by the Committee?

19 Do we have a motion to approve the experiment?

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I got confused.
23 Is the item before us for a single bike lane and buffer or
24 two bike lanes?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: The item before us --

1 MR. ROSEMAN: The item we brought forward was for
2 a bike lane with a buffer.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: With a buffer.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: As shown in Attachment
5 C. With the understanding that there would be a chevron
6 marking rather a diagonal marking between the vehicular
7 travel lane and the bike lane.

8 We have got one more experimentation request we
9 have to hear so I'd like to see if we have a motion to
10 approve this experiment.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I move to approve
12 this experiment.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I second. The motion
14 has been approved and seconded.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Who seconded?

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I did.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Oh.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do we have any
19 comments from the public on this motion?

20 Do we have any further discussion by Committee
21 Members on this item?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My only discussion
23 would be I wish there was enough roadway as such that you
24 could test both the chevron buffer and the dual bike lane
25 design so that you could just see what -- because I think

1 the dual bike lane design is superior from the cyclist
2 standpoint. And if it had the same collision record then
3 that would be the preferred way of going. And it's also
4 less expensive to install.

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: You don't need
6 experimentation if you put in dual bike lanes.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I wouldn't think so.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well I would argue you
9 do because you want to then develop a standard to show what
10 that lane line separating them would be like.

11 So we have a motion to approve the experiment for
12 the buffered bike lane, which would be Concept C amended to
13 show a chevron instead of a diagonal line. All in favor say
14 aye.

15 (Ayes.)

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Opposed?

17 No opposition. Anyone abstain?

18 No? Okay. Congratulations, City of Long Beach.

19 Okay, for our final item on experiments we have a
20 request from the City of Santa Monica to experiment with a
21 rectangular rapid flashing beacon.

22 As you might be aware, the feds gave approval to
23 experiment with the RRFB, blanket approval for that because
24 they found it provided benefits.

25 This item has come to the Committee before with

1 the rectangular rapid flash beacon. We did not approve it
2 because I think we wanted to see, is it -- does the two-
3 inch-by-five-inch rectangular shape work as well as the
4 round shape and the City of Santa Monica has agreed to test
5 both.

6 So what I'd like to do is introduce Sam Morrissey
7 representing the City of Santa Monica, who can briefly tell
8 us about this experiment.

9 MR. MORRISSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members
10 of the Board. I'm Sam Morrissey, the last name is M-O-R-R-
11 I-S-S-E-Y, Principal Transportation Engineer with the City
12 of Santa Monica.

13 You can find our request for permission to
14 experiment on page 65 of your packet. It's a fairly
15 straightforward experiment as John explained, we'd like to
16 test the rectangular rapid flashing beacon.

17 The reason for our desire to test this device goes
18 back to our city's desire to constantly look for ways to
19 enhance pedestrian safety, particularly at marked,
20 unsignalized crosswalks throughout the city.

21 We in the past have deployed a number of other
22 techniques, curb extensions, enhanced paintings and markings
23 and signage and in-pavement -- in-roadway flashing lights.
24 The last of which are fairly effective and are also an
25 incredible maintenance nightmare that require replacement on

1 average about every year and a half at a cost of
2 approximately \$30,000 per location.

3 So we're looking at something that maybe is a
4 little more cost-effective. Maybe as good or even more
5 effective in terms of yielding response. And we look to the
6 rapid rectangular flashing beacon as a device that might do
7 that.

8 We propose to test it on a location on Santa
9 Monica Boulevard, which is a four lane roadway, two lanes in
10 each direction with parking on either side. It carries
11 about 28,000 vehicles per day; a little under ten percent of
12 those vehicles in the peak hour.

13 At this location where we're testing it we
14 previously had in-roadway warning lights. We've since taken
15 those lights out due to resurfacing activity in anticipation
16 of this experiment and hopefully getting approval to do this
17 experiment.

18 Our experiment is proposed to take about eight
19 months from start to finish. We've got today
20 representatives from W-Trans, Steve Weinberger, who will be
21 doing the evaluation for us, as well as representatives from
22 the manufacturer who will be working with us to make the
23 standard rectangular rapid flashing beacon, as well as a
24 similar device that would utilize eight inch circular LEDs.

25 Our desire is to test the effectiveness of both in

1 terms of yielding response rates, what is the distance from
2 the stop bar that vehicles are yielding, what is the
3 percentage of vehicles that yield. Testing it during
4 daylight and evening conditions with the device on and off.

5 We have also done preliminary evaluations at the
6 site without a device so we'll have a full spectrum of
7 traffic control devices to compare against.

8 At the conclusion of this experiment we'll submit
9 some reports as well as 30, 45 and 90 day follow-up
10 evaluations of the effectiveness of this device.

11 And that's it. I hope you authorize our request
12 to experiment.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, thank you. Any
14 questions for Mr. Morrissey?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just one question,
16 Mr. Chairman. Does this even need experimentation? Does
17 this even need experimentation? Because like isn't this
18 like kind of an LED? And the manual already uses the use of
19 LED in conjunction with signs. We say, as long as you don't
20 put LED in the letters. If instead of this if they were
21 putting LEDs on the perimeters of the sign they wouldn't
22 even be here. However, I see this as that this is just a
23 larger LED. Do they even need request for experimentation?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well it is a beacon
25 and it's --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Is it a beacon?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: It's provided outside
3 the perimeter of the sign. It's in a rectangular shape.

4 MR. MORRISSEY: It's in a separate device below
5 the standard --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah, I've seen them,
7 they're very small, you know.

8 MR. MORRISSEY: We do deploy the LED signs. We
9 have flashing LEDs with LEDs around the perimeter. We use
10 those.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If they want to
12 experiment, experiment, but the way I see it they don't even
13 need to request for experimentation. But it may give some
14 additional information for other cities.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think the thing that
16 I found particularly helpful is that they would test another
17 more standard device like a typical signal lens, a round
18 shape, and we'd be able to determine if that is as effective
19 as a rectangular shape. Which would mean then that they
20 will -- those would be generally available, versus getting
21 the particular two-by-five from, you know, a limited number
22 of vendors.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My understanding is,
24 though, that the circular indication, if you're doing the
25 standard, flashing yellow beacon, ped-activated, is a much

1 different flash rate. But you're going to use those
2 irregular flashing, high-intensity strobe kind of LED look.

3 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah, for the circular and the
4 rectangular it will be a high-intensity strobe more similar
5 to what you see on a police or fire vehicle.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. So it's really
7 not shapes at all, it's a very different type of operation.

8 MR. MORRISSEY: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Now, how -- if somebody
10 else was looking at the same device, and as you know it's
11 looking like the hotbox is coming to California. I was
12 going to say, are you going to help me get it closer to
13 intersections than 300 feet, which is currently proposed,
14 100 feet by the feds.

15 But I mean, how do you see the advantage of this
16 over other devices simply because it still means nothing
17 other than just drawing the driver's eye or attention to the
18 fact that there may be a pedestrian present, versus
19 something that literally stops traffic and rests in the
20 dark.

21 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah. Kind of leaving the
22 argument aside about overall pedestrian control and how we
23 may want to pursue more rigid controls at all pedestrian
24 crossings. The whole notion of the argument that California
25 says yield to pedestrians in crosswalks when other states

1 actually say stop. I'll put that aside and tell you the two
2 main reasons I'm looking at this.

3 Number one, I mentioned the cost issue. These in-
4 pavement flashing lights are like swimming pools. They're
5 holes in the ground, we keep throwing money into them. I
6 would really like to, and I think our city especially in
7 these budget times, would really like to not put \$30,000
8 every year and a half into some of our 22 or more in-
9 pavement flashing locations.

10 Second, this device really seems effective being
11 that it's at eye level rather than being at pavement level.

12 Even though it's off to the side of the street, with the
13 high-intensity flashing beacons at driver's eye level -- the
14 studies out of Florida and from the 2010 study show
15 effectiveness readings that are actually slightly higher
16 than the in-pavement lights. So we think it's more
17 effective, more cost-effective and will get the same job
18 done.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The question of
20 curiosity, how much are they, the solar panel and the whole
21 thing?

22 MR. MORRISSEY: I think they're around 15,000
23 unless we can get a discount from the manufacturer.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Fifteen thousand for
25 one approach or both approaches?

1 MR. MORRISSEY: Probably for the whole location,
2 roughly. We haven't ironed out the pricing details but it's
3 around 15,000 from what I've determined.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Expensive.

5 MR. MORRISSEY: Maybe if we buy them in bulk we
6 can get them better.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, any further
8 questions of Mr. Morrissey?

9 Discussion by Committee Members?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Move approval.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We have a motion to
12 approve the experiment. Do I have a second?

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I second it.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Jacob Babico seconds.

15 Comments by the public?

16 MR. PYBURN: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Steve.

18 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
19 Administration.

20 Their application says that there was a interim
21 approval by Federal Highway Administration in 2008 to use
22 this rapid flashing beacon. Do you know if that was
23 reflected in the 2009 MUTCD?

24 MR. MORRISSEY: That I don't know.

25 MR. PYBURN: Okay. So going to beacons then, the

1 rectangular rapid flashing beacon may not be an acceptable
2 device in the 2000 MUTCD -- 2009 MUTCD. Therefore, a
3 request to experiment is required from Federal Highway prior
4 to enactment in California.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Steve, I thought the
6 feds gave a interim approval for the rectangular rapid flash
7 beacon.

8 MR. PYBURN: In 2008.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And it was
10 issued so late that it could not be incorporated into the
11 2009.

12 MR. PYBURN: Well if the --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So it's my
14 understanding that that interim approval still stands.

15 MR. PYBURN: I would request the time to
16 investigate that. The 2009 MUTCD was published in December
17 of 2009. And if the interim approval was published in 2008
18 where did those 11 months go?

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, because they
20 didn't go out to public comment. They didn't post it on
21 their web.

22 MR. MORRISSEY: I can't say -- I first reached out
23 to FHWA in mid-2009 and I spoke with the representative
24 associated with this device. I forget his name, I think it
25 was Scott.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Scott Wainwright?

2 MR. MORRISSEY: Scott Wainwright. And Scott first
3 directed me back to this Committee and said nothing about --

4 THE REPORTER: Sam, we need you up at the mic.

5 MR. MORRISSEY: Said nothing about FHWA approval
6 or any relationship to the MUTCD. But Scott Wainwright
7 directed me to this Committee to get approval from the state
8 level.

9 MR. PYBURN: Okay. Until it's shown -- until the
10 research is done on the interim approval, if you could find
11 it on the --

12 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: No, it's not there.

13 MR. PYBURN: It's not there or you can't find it?

14 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: It's not in the 2009.

15 MR. PYBURN: Okay. Then I would have to at this
16 point -- we can't confirm that a request to experiment is
17 not required. So therefore we can't say it's not required
18 from Federal Highways.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well Steve, my
20 understanding though is that the feds have issued an interim
21 approval. Which means that from the federal perspective
22 they're giving carte blanche to do these experiments. But
23 this Committee did not adopt that interim approval because
24 we wanted to see a test with the other shape. So the feds
25 have issued their interim blanket approval. I don't know

1 what more the feds can do at this point.

2 MR. PYBURN: Well, what's not clear to me is if
3 the federal approval was issued in 2008 why is it not
4 reflected in the 2009 MUTCD?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Because they didn't go
6 out for public comment when they -- in the NPA when they
7 went out to say, what shall we approve. Before they adopt
8 anything they like to go out to public comment. And this
9 2008 interim approval was issued a little bit too late to
10 have gotten that public comment or to go through that cycle.

11 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Maybe I can add to the
12 issue. Steve, I think what happened is that the 2009 manual
13 that they came out with was originally released back in --
14 the draft was released back in January of 2008 and the
15 public comment period closed in end of July, July 31st, for
16 the 2009 that they came out with.

17 So what John is referring to is, maybe what
18 happened is by the time they came out with interim approval,
19 because I remember this is the last interim approval out of
20 the eight or nine that they had. So this might have come
21 after the July 31st deadline so it was actually -- it wasn't
22 as of January 1st when they released in 2008. Whatever was
23 open for the public to review.

24 MR. PYBURN: Well two, two comments. One, I think
25 everybody on this panel is aware that Federal Highways

1 included things in the '09 MUTCD that was not commented on
2 in the public comment period.

3 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: And you had mentioned
4 that --

5 MR. PYBURN: Most specifically the engineering
6 judgment comment, the most controversial line in this
7 manual, didn't go out to public comment.

8 And I don't doubt what you're saying, John, or
9 what Johnny is saying but it's speculation at this point
10 until we can confirm that yeah, the interim approval is
11 valid. And there's a -- that's why it's not in here because
12 of the publication date. All very plausible. Until I
13 confirm that I can't say that federal approval is not
14 required. So some verification of those two facts is
15 necessary.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Can I make comment?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Steve, you are right.

19 After FHWA issued the interim approval we came to this
20 Committee and this Committee said we are not going to adopt
21 in California because it was only tested itself. It was not
22 compared with any other device. So we never adopted that
23 interim approval in California.

24 MR. PYBURN: And in addition the flashing beacons
25 here are specified in a certain design configuration, which

1 doesn't include the rapid flashing.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Do we have any other
3 comment by Committee Members?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: I made a motion for
5 approval. I think we can just move on, and for the record,
6 let the applicant know that they need to either do the
7 research and verify with FHWA that in fact this interim
8 approval stands, or our policy. And if FHWA policy is that
9 you need to get their approval as well. So I think that
10 doesn't prohibit us from making our action, it's just an
11 implementation. You need to do a little bit of research on
12 your end.

13 MR. MORRISSEY: I'm happy to do that. It seemed
14 to be my hearing of the statement that FHWA was actually
15 going to confirm for themselves internally, get all their
16 ducks in a row. And I'll verify on our end and we're happy
17 to do whatever it takes.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So what is the action?
19 That we consider approving this subject to confirmation
20 that no further approval from the FHWA is required?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Subject to
22 confirmation it's not required or that if it is required
23 they need to get it before implementation.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I'm sorry. Johnny,
25 you want to make comment?

1 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Actually I want to
2 make a public comment. While I was in the discussion I
3 think I lost the time. If I may?

4 My public comment is going to be just a question.
5 In fairness to the city I wanted to see, was this going to
6 be like a one year, two year experiment? Because at least,
7 to me, once the feds have issued an interim approval, we are
8 the ones who rejected it. I don't want this to be a really
9 long experiment. Because we are not looking at too much
10 difference between the flashing beacon circular and the
11 rectangular.

12 I would rather -- we have received -- a number of
13 times questions have crossed my desk, why did we reject this
14 interim approval. I would be rather in favor of very
15 quickly looking at something and very quickly issuing,
16 actually accepting this for all of California as a device.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, Hamid.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: This is a relatively
20 minor comment. There is no way to really evaluate the
21 effectiveness of these things. Because any device, I think
22 we should just give them the authorization to do an
23 experiment. If they have to get it from FHWA then it's
24 their thing, they go get it from FHWA. I don't want them to
25 just come back to this Committee to prolong it because it's

1 really a minor item. And I really don't know how you even
2 measure the effectiveness or the differences between these
3 different kinds of beacons. They all pretty much do the
4 same thing.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You now we did ask, we
6 did ask the City of Santa Monica to consult with the feds.
7 He did talk with the federal representative in Washington.
8 It was his understanding that no further fed approval was
9 required. I think there's a legitimate point that Steve
10 Pyburn brings up. And I think the feds need to talk
11 together to determine if any further federal approval is
12 required.

13 And what I would like to propose as part of the
14 motion is that we approve this with the understanding and
15 the confirmation that no further federal approval is
16 required. If further federal approval is required then
17 we're going to have to ask that the City seek it and come
18 back to us.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What if the federal
20 government doesn't give them authorization?

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: That's why they --
22 then they would have to come back to us.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Can the approval be
25 subject to them getting federal approval if one is needed?

1 Why come back a second time.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I don't want them to
3 come back a second time.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Right.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: If they got approval.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: So why not make that
7 subject?

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Only to come back if
9 they need to get approval.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Why would they come
11 back? We just say -- Mr. Chairman, there is two scenarios,
12 that they either don't need an approval or yes they do need
13 it. Why can't our motion be subject to clarifying the
14 federal? Whether they need one or not this is subject to.
15 Our approval is subject to either you clarify with FHWA, or
16 if one is required go get it. That way they don't come back
17 here a third time. Because they came back first time, this
18 is second and now a third time.

19 So that's my motion is we approve this with
20 subject to clarification with FHWA. If one is not required,
21 you're done. If one is required then you need to go get
22 that before implementation. That's the motion.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Second. I second.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well it has to be a
25 friendly amendment to the first motion. Did you move

1 previously?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Yeah.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: I think Jacob seconded
4 it, right?

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yes, yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So do you accept that
7 as a friendly amendment?

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Yes, yes, yes.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. And in the
10 meantime, Steve, how quickly could you find out if any
11 further -- is Steve here? How quickly could you find out if
12 any further approval from the FHWA would be required?

13 MR. PYBURN: I'll make a request when I get back
14 to the office.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

16 MR. PYBURN: And then whenever they get around to
17 responding.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you'll communicate
19 that to Devinder and Devinder will let the Committee Members
20 know one way or the other. Okay.

21 THE REPORTER: Mr. Chair, excuse me. For
22 clarification of the record could I get the actual motion
23 that have moved and seconded and will supposedly approve?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: The motion is to
25 recommend approval of the requested experimentation subject

1 to either clarification from Federal Highway Administration
2 that no experimentation from them is needed, or receiving
3 approval from FHWA for an experimentation if one is needed.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay, we have the
5 motion on the table, we have a second, we've had discussion.

6 We will vote on it now subject to no further comments.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No further comments,
8 just a footnote for future experimentation requests. Can
9 staff verify before putting it on the agenda if the federal
10 authorization is needed. If it is then after it's secured
11 maybe you want to bring it to the Committee.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well in answer to
13 that, I did verify because I know what the interim approval
14 indicated. And I'm pretty confident that that will stand
15 but -- I think we'll receive confirmation of that shortly.

16 Okay, all in favor of the motion say aye?

17 (Ayes.)

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Any opposition?

19 Any abstentions?

20 Okay, the motion is carried with that
21 understanding.

22 And we have come to the point in our meeting where
23 we basically run out of time. We had hoped to go to the
24 Item 11-1 to look at the comments for parts 1, 5, 7 and 9.
25 I don't believe we have time to go over them so we'll have

1 to defer that to the next meeting.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You skipped 11.5, Palo
3 Alto.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: We did but the
5 approval from the feds did not come in. I didn't want to
6 place this on the agenda unless the approval from the feds
7 had come in but I was assured that it would come in shortly
8 and it did not. So unfortunately we'll have to wait until
9 it does. And there were some other items we wanted to get
10 to but we just simply ran out of time.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: What page, please?
12 The second page?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Don't have time for
14 it. People have got to catch planes at five o'clock.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Right.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We still have to
17 decide about the next meeting.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right.

19 MS. McLAUGHLIN (SPEAKING FROM THE AUDIENCE): I've
20 got (inaudible).

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

22 MS. McLAUGHLIN: This is Roberta McLaughlin, last
23 name M-C-L-A-U-G-H-L-I-N. And this is just a speed data
24 summary of the data that was sent to us for the period of
25 July 1, 2009 to July 1, 2010 of E&TSS completed during that

1 time period. We had 160 surveys submitted. Forty of those
2 showed a speed limit increase of about five miles per hour,
3 ten showed speed limits reduced and 107 of them had no
4 change in the posted speed limit.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Could you pass those
6 around.

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Thank you.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Thank you, Roberta.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Mr. Chairman, I need to
11 point out that the minutes from the last time we discussed
12 this showed that we didn't want this to be back on the
13 agenda, you wanted the data just to be given to Caltrans.
14 There was going to be no further discussion about this.

15 MS. McLAUGHLIN: This is information.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So the League of
17 California Cities purposely did not pursue getting
18 memberships to submit any data because it seemed like it was
19 just going to be a waste of time. As the minutes reflected
20 it was a closed issue, the Committee didn't want to discuss
21 it anymore. So this does not represent, really, the
22 results. We are not asking for more time but I wanted to
23 make it clear, I'm surprised this is on the agenda because
24 the Committee specifically said they didn't want to see this
25 again and that's why the cities decided in most cases not to

1 submit data because it seemed like it was a waste of staff
2 time.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well I know I
4 encouraged agencies to submit data. I don't see any from
5 Southern California who did so.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well like you said, you
7 know, the people that people that led this --

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I don't see San
9 Bernardino County.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- was Thousand Oaks,
11 Vacaville and San Jose and none of us submitted data because
12 it seemed like an absolute waste of time.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: All right. Well --

14 MS. McLAUGHLIN: And it was not, it was not a
15 requirement. It was something that was suggested in the --
16 this is to address the concerns that by rounding to the
17 nearest five mile per hour that we would see increases
18 overall in the speed limits throughout California.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: Didn't you
20 receive ours?

21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: I did not. This is what I have.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: I think I sent it
23 to you and you confirmed it.

24 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Was it a email?

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRMAN BABICO: No, in that last

1 meeting.

2 MS. McLAUGHLIN: We'll have to find out what,
3 yeah. There was a couple that got misplaced but I found
4 them. So I have to --

5 **8. Next Meeting**

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we're going
7 to now select the meeting for next time. Johnny, do you
8 think it needs to be a two-day meeting?

9 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes, at least two days
10 because for the comments I had distributed today, the
11 comments that have been received on Parts 1, 5, 7 and 9.
12 And surprisingly what happened is you might see the list
13 there, there were like 36 comments. Out of which four
14 actually were not applicable, I just included them in error,
15 but there were still 32 comments.

16 And more than half of them came in -- and I was
17 thinking no one pays attention to my deadlines but almost
18 half of them or more than half of them came in like from
19 22nd to almost yesterday. So there were substantial
20 comments that came. And most of the comments that came in
21 at the end, not only were they more than half but they were
22 substantial. So we need one day just on I would say Part 1,
23 5, 7 and 9. Primarily those comments are on bicycle issues
24 primarily and they are quite -- so I definitely need an
25 extra day for that.

1 And by that time whatever Part 2, 4, 5 and I hope
2 if my hand is okay I'll be able to complete the entire
3 manual so we might even be getting comments for that
4 portion. But once we get there we will see how many others.

5 But definitely the comments that we have received
6 up to date qualify for an extra day anyhow just for handling
7 that through a workshop setting but open to the public.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny, how are these
9 organized?

10 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Well they were
11 organized -- because a lot of people were commenting on Part
12 1, 7 and 9 so they're just organized as per the dates that
13 we received them. Because if I start dissecting them then I
14 have to take them out of context if I put them with the
15 sections of the parts. But I can certainly do that by the
16 next time if --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Would there be a way
18 that we can organize these by parts of the manual?

19 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: I can do that,
20 definitely if that's the preference.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. Okay. I think
22 that would be helpful. Because we're going to segment our
23 discussion into parts.

24 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Okay. Well then I can
25 even lay them out as per sections to so that they follow in

1 a chronological order.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Right. And when we
3 consider comments, beyond reading them and trying to
4 understand them are we obligated to discuss each and every
5 comment?

6 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: No.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So we read
8 them, we look at them. We feel if there is anything
9 compelling that would require us to consider revising the
10 manual based on the comment, we could bring that up as part
11 of the discussion. But if we feel the comment is not
12 substantive we could elect to ignore it, is that correct?

13 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes. For the record I
14 have to include all the comments the way they came in but I
15 can compile them separately for our working group so that --
16 and I can even use my judgment as to editorial errata that I
17 can take them out so that we use our time only on the ones
18 that are substantial. But I will post them on the web as
19 they come in so that at least every person that has been
20 submitting their comments does see that his comments have
21 been accepted for the public record process.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So by the time
23 we have the next meeting --

24 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Devinder, you had
25 something?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I must say, if we are
2 going to discuss in a workshop then we need another 30 days.

3 If we discuss comments in a workshop we cannot make a
4 decision next day.

5 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: No, when I said -- it
6 shouldn't be a workshop it should be an open public meeting,
7 just an extra day. I don't mean a closed workshop setting
8 because that we have already done.

9 So once we have received the comments in open
10 public meeting we'll just discuss them and give the
11 opportunity if someone from the public wants to come. But
12 we will, and the meeting minutes will reflect that we will
13 go through all the comments, the substantial ones.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So if the last
15 set of comments are due on April 30th how much time would
16 you need to compile them and then when would we need to have
17 the meeting?

18 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Well --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Such that you get them
20 out 30 days before the meeting.

21 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: I would need at least
22 -- this time around, even though I had the deadline as the
23 24th, and I can choose to ignore anything I received after
24 the 24th, as you can see there were quite a few that did
25 come in after the 24th. But just as a common courtesy I

1 still included them.

2 But if I do have the cutoff as April 30th,
3 learning by the experience this time around and trying to
4 have Dawn come in this morning because they were still
5 printing those copies and I was doing late last night still
6 trying to add some of the comments that came in. So I would
7 say I would need at least a two week gap, a week to two
8 weeks. Minimum one week.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: So you need mid-May
10 before you're able to compile them. And therefore that
11 would have to go out 30 days before our meeting. So we're
12 looking at mid-June.

13 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: No, we don't need 30
14 days after compiling the comments that we need, right?

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: If that's going to be
16 on our meeting doesn't that need to be part of the public
17 agenda?

18 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Because I'll be
19 posting the comments as I do get them. But then Devinder,
20 you tell me.

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It depends upon if you
22 are going to put full manual on the website.

23 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Whatever comments we
24 are going to discuss, if I have a deadline for those
25 comments, then to be posted on the website do we need -- I

1 believe there's a 14 or a 15 day minimum gap if we have to
2 resort to that. I'm asking.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: You're asking
4 Devinder?

5 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Devinder.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: How the public will
7 know what action we took on those comments?

8 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes. No, the action
9 will come later. But I just asked you a question. So April
10 30th, if I'm getting the comments and I'm posting the
11 comments as I receive them. But the ones that I get on
12 April 30th, if I post them on the website so that others can
13 see what those comments are then we would need at least -- I
14 can post them on the web say the very next week in a matter
15 of a couple of days. But then you need about 14 days,
16 right, minimum for electronic?

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's ten days.

18 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Ten days? Okay, so
19 ten days say after May 2nd or May 1st. So we're talking
20 about May 15th, around there, is when we can have the next
21 meeting, as a suggestion.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So you'd be
23 ready May 15th. Then the package would have to go out 30
24 days in advance of the meeting, right?

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We're not going to

1 include those comments in the package, we're just going to
2 list the item.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: But we have to have
4 read them before we come to the meeting.

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: How are we going to do
6 -- at this time if -- let's say we're discussing 1, 5, 7, 9
7 in two days. You are going to take action because this is
8 already posted on the website.

9 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes, I was posting
10 them as I was getting them but the ones that I got at the
11 very end, they just got posted yesterday.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's only me,
13 basically. On the website we need to post 30 days before
14 the meeting. But the comments, they get noted.

15 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: It doesn't matter for
16 the question, it shouldn't matter.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well I thought we were
18 going to review all the comments.

19 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: But I'm not sure where
22 of the process --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. We don't have
24 to act on every one specifically, we don't have to discuss
25 every one, but we have to have read them before the meeting.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: As long as we have 30
2 days on the website draft we are okay.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Okay.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Well, can the members
6 be sent the comments organized by part in advance of the
7 meeting so that we have a chance to read them before the
8 meeting?

9 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: If I get a week after
10 April 30th to compile them and then how much time the
11 members need, that's how I can work.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So it sounds
13 like we need -- if we meet the first part of June we will
14 accomplish that.

15 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: Yes.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So when shall
17 we set the meeting in June?

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: June 15 or 16; 15 is a
19 Wednesday, 16 is a Thursday.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can we meet a week
21 earlier?

22 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I'm sorry?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Can we meet a week
24 earlier? There are graduation ceremonies in June.

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: The week before is 8

1 and 9.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Yes, okay. We'll
3 tentatively meet June 8 and 9 in Southern California?

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I have a conflict on
7 the 9th, if we could accommodate that. Otherwise I can try
8 to work with it.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We can have 7 and 8,
10 why we have Thursday? We can have Tuesday and Wednesday.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MANSOURIAN: Because Tuesday is
12 our Board of Supervisors for counties.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Johnny, is the 9th a
14 hard date for you that you have to keep?

15 COMMITTEE ADVISOR BHULLAR: No, I can work it.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FISHER: Okay. So tentatively
17 June 8th and 9th, Southern California, perhaps Long Beach.
18 We'll identify the location in the next few days.

19 With that we carry over the items that we didn't
20 accomplish this time and we declare the meeting adjourned.

21 (Thereupon, the meeting of the California Traffic

22 Control Devices Committee was adjourned at

23 3:02 p.m.)

24 --oOo--

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of February, 2011.

JOHN COTA