

APPEARANCES

MEMBERS

Michael Robinson, Chair

Devinder Singh, Secretary

Mark Greenwood

Rock Miller

John Ciccarelli

Hamid Bahadori, ACSC

Janice Benton

Lt. David Ricks

Jeff Knowles, League of California Cities

Rick Marshall

Robert Brown

Sam Morrissey, Alternate Member, City of Santa Monica

ALSO PRESENT

John Presleigh, City of Santa Cruz

Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans

Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans, Science Branch Chief

Dave Head, Sonoma County, Fleet Manager

Jim Helmer

Bob Bronkall

Bill Winter, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

Stephen Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration

Peter Caruso, Caltrans, District 12

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)

ALSO PRESENT

John Liu, Caltrans, District 6

Jay Dinkins, City of Santa Monica, Traffic Engineer

Emma Olenberger

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>Action Items:</u>	
1. Introduction	5
2. Membership	1
3. Approval of Minutes of the August 30, 2012 Meeting	11
4. Public Comments	11
5. Public Hearing	
12-16	67
12-20	102
12-22	154
12-23	11
12-24	181
6. Request for Experimentation	
12-25	188
08-21	257
7. Information Items	
12-17	159
12-26	--
8. Next Meeting	259
9. Adjourn	262

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

PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 9:01 A.M.

(The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.)

SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2012

MEETING BEGINS AT 9:01 A.M.

CHAIR ROBINSON: Good morning, everybody. It's time to call the December 6th, 2012 meeting of the CTCDC Committee to order. I would like to welcome you all hear. Thanks for coming in. This is a very nice city. I haven't been to Santa Cruz in so long. It's just great to be up here. This was a good selection for Northern California. So I want to thank John Presleigh, Director of Public Works for Santa Cruz County.

And, John, I think maybe you have a couple of words for us.

MR. PRESLEIGH: Yeah. Thank you for coming here to Santa Cruz and using our restaurants and hotels. And we love to have the company here. And I used to sit on this as an alternate. It was -- it was enough to do as an alternate for about 10 or 12 years, so a few years back. But I really appreciate you doing -- having the meeting here, so thank you very much. Continue to use our -- our restaurants and hotels out here. We appreciate it. So thanks.

(Off mike colloquy between Ms. McLaughlin, Mr. Presleigh, and Chair Robinson)

CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. At this time I'd like to have our California Traffic Control Devices Committee introduce

1 themselves starting down on my left with -- with our newest
2 member.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Yes, very good. It's my
4 first meeting. My name is Bob Brown. I'm the public affairs
5 director for AAA of Northern California and Nevada and Utah,
6 and we're based out of the East Bay.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. And you replaced Dwight
8 Ku who was --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Yes.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- here for quite a while, as well.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: And my alternate and
12 colleague, Emma Olenberger.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I'm Rick Marshall, Deputy
14 Director of Public Works road commissioner and county surveyor
15 for the County of Napa, and I'm representing Northern
16 California Counties and the State Association of Counties.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm Jeff Knowles with the
18 City of Vacaville, Deputy Public Works Director, representing
19 the League of California Cities North.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: I'm David Ricks, Lieutenant
21 with the California Highway Patrol.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Janice Benton with
23 Caltrans, Division of Traffic Operations with Caltrans.

24 SECRETARY SINGH: Devinder Singh. I'm secretary of
25 the committee.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: And Janice is -- this is her first
2 meeting, as well.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: There are a number of us who are
5 inside of a year. So welcome, Janice.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Thank you.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: I'm Mike Robinson. I'm Deputy
8 Director of San Diego County Department of Public Works. And
9 I'm the chairman this year.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm Hamid Bahadori
11 representing Automobile Club of Southern California, AAA.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: John Ciccarelli,
13 Bicycle Solutions, San Francisco, representing nonmotorized
14 travelers, appointed by Caltrans.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Rock Miller with Stantec
16 Consulting. I'm an alternate to the committee but my primary
17 member is absent, so I am the voting member today. I was also
18 appointed by Caltrans to the committee several months ago to
19 represent walking and biking interests.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I'm Mark Greenwood. I'm
21 the Director of Public Works for the City of Palm Desert, and
22 I'm representing League of California Cities South.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you all. And we have Caltrans
24 Staff here.

25 Johnny, do you want to start?

1 (Off mike audience introductions are made and not transcribed.)

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. I think now that we all know
3 each other I'd like to -- Devinder, thank you for the notes.
4 We -- we -- the bathrooms are situated right behind this wall.
5 You'll go down -- down this hallway, make a left. Once you get
6 to the foyer you make a left and the bathrooms are just 15 or
7 20 feet beyond that. There is a vending machine, in case
8 anybody feels like they need a little snack while we're in
9 procession. So feel free to move around and pick up your snack
10 if -- if you want it. Let's see, I think that's pretty much
11 all the notes that we had for the -- we -- it looks -- I think
12 we'll just go ahead.

13 Oh, Hamid, you have a new AAA publication that you
14 wanted a moment to talk about.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 Those of you who have been following the Devices
17 Committee meetings you know that we struggle with the speed
18 limit issue for, god, what, three or four years. We went
19 through two or three full-day workshops. We even had a
20 workshop hearing that Caltrans director and CHP commissions in
21 person attended and sat through hours of discussion. And
22 finally we had some rules changed and modified and clarified.
23 And as soon as we did that the legislature jumped in and they
24 introduced a piece of legislature. And there was a little
25 modification again last year which became effective this year.

1 So, again, those of you who are familiar with our
2 publication, we had a set of four booklets. One of them was
3 the realistic speed zoning. And the -- it was first published
4 in 1962. And then it was revised several times. The last edit
5 was done in 1993, republished in 1998. It was pretty outdated.
6 The rules did not apply anymore because we had changed the
7 procedures and the law had changed. And also the -- the
8 graphics were of the 1960s and '70s. So with help from a lot
9 of folks in this room, mentioning Roberta McLaughlin, the
10 representatives from CHP, County of San Diego, Rock Miller, and
11 a lot of people who looked at that realistic speed zoning, and
12 they gave us some good feedbacks.

13 We have updated the manual, or I should call it
14 booklet. And I have left copies over there. I'm not planning
15 on taking any of these back to my office, so please take as
16 many as you want. These -- we're doing it here to introduce it
17 to the committee first. But these will be distributed -- these
18 will be sent directly to all the directors of public works of
19 all the cities and counties in California, plus all the CHP
20 divisions and sheriff offices, and all the police chiefs in
21 California. And we will do that by the year end, probably
22 before Christmas.

23 So you're the first folks to see it. And this has
24 been a very effective tool for the cities and the counties
25 communicating the speed issue with their constituents when they

1 come and they say, oh, why can't I get a 25-mile-per-hour here?
2 Why does it have to be 40 miles per hour? It makes your life
3 easier, those of you who are in the field, to just say, oh,
4 well, here's -- here's why you can't get a 25. Go read it.

5 So we have these in volume in our warehouse. If you
6 want any more copies, please. The information for contact is
7 here. We are all going to -- we are also going to put the .pdf
8 electronic ally on our website at AAA.com/roadahead, and you
9 can download the .pdf file, as well.

10 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: All free; right, Hamid? They're all
12 free?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: They're all free. I can
14 send you each up to about 100 for free. But if you want more
15 than 100 I'll probably ignore the email. Okay. No, I'm
16 kidding. I'm kidding. Caltrans, CHP, counties, as many copies
17 as you want, as many numbers as you want, please let us know.
18 We will share that with you for no cost to you.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Over the years I can't imagine how
20 many I have sent out to concerns members of the public, and it
21 really is a great help so feel -- it's -- it's a really great
22 publication. Hopefully you guys can pick up a few and benefit
23 from it as well. Okay.

24 Now it's time to -- we've had one request to take an
25 item out of order. Item 12-23 will be the first agenda item

1 that we hear.

2 Before we get there, though, I'd like to look at
3 approval of minutes for the August 30th, 2012 meeting. Do we
4 have any comments relative to those minutes?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I make a motion we
6 approve the minutes since they're verbatim minutes.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you, Hamid. And do we have a
8 second on that motion?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: All right. John, thank you. John
11 Ciccarelli, second. And so without further comment, all in
12 favor of approving last meeting minutes, raise your hand. All
13 opposed? Looks like we have a unanimous decision on the
14 minutes. Okay.

15 We'll jump right into the agenda items. By the way,
16 I do have -- I've made a promise to Devinder that by around
17 three o'clock we're going to be vacating this building, which
18 means we've got -- we've got a lot of work to do between now
19 and then. But I think three o'clock is -- or earlier will be a
20 reasonable time to be done.

21 So our first item -- oh, thank you. Yes.
22 Before we get into that item, if there is anything -- thank you
23 for reminding me Devinder.

24 If there's anything that members of the public might
25 have, this would be the opportunity for them to come up and

1 speak on items that are not on the agenda. Seeing none, we'll
2 go ahead and get started.

3 The first item would be electric vehicle charging
4 station signs and pavement markings. And this is a proposal by
5 Caltrans.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: All right.

7 Janice, are you going to --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes. I'll introduce the
9 topic. Thank you, Chairman.

10 The item, agenda item 12-23, Electric Vehicle
11 Charging Station Signs and Pavement Markings. To introduce
12 it, the California Plug-In Electric Vehicle Collaborative and
13 the governor's Office of Research and Planning, along with
14 members of my staff, have been meeting with the Electric
15 Vehicle Charging Guidelines Working Group during the past
16 several months to develop today's agenda item for the electric
17 vehicle charging station signs and an option pavement marking.
18 Excuse me. I'm going to start using the abbreviation EV just
19 for the sake of getting through the discussion. So EV is
20 electric vehicle.

21 To introduce the item, Mr. Dave Head, fleet manager
22 from the Sonoma County General Services Department, and Don
23 Howe with my staff, who have been part of the working group to
24 develop the policies, specifications, and recommendations to
25 implement several new signs, and a pavement marking to guide

1 plug-in EV drivers to these stations and to regulate the use of
2 these off-street EV charging station operations. Dave Head has
3 been the program manager for establishing EV charging stations
4 for Sonoma County fleet vehicles that are plug-in electric
5 vehicles. Don is the Caltrans science branch chief and
6 coordinates the policy development for part two of the
7 California MUTCD.

8 Their proposal includes three new regulatory signs,
9 two new general service guide signs, and an optional pavement
10 marking. Details include suggestions to delete some existing
11 federal signs in the California MUTCD and amend various
12 paragraphs of policy language and other figures and table
13 information in the -- in the manual.

14 So please welcome Dave Head from Sonoma County and
15 Don Howe from Caltrans to provide the details of
16 recommendations for this item.

17 MR. HOWE: Thank you, Janice. My name is Don Howe,
18 and I am the -- thank you, Janice. Good morning. My name is
19 Don Howe, and I am the science branch chief at the Division of
20 Traffic Operations at Caltrans headquarters. And I'm pleased
21 today to direct your attention to the handout that was a
22 revised version. You have that in front of you. Anything that
23 has been revised from the printed agenda that's been circulated
24 online is highlighted in yellow. So if you have questions we'd
25 happy to explain it, why -- why it's yellow, and so forth.

1 So it's my pleasure today to introduce our -- our
2 guest who is Dave Head. Dave is a fleet manager for Sonoma
3 County, and he tells me he has quite an interesting job. And
4 he'll tell you today a little about the experience he's had
5 with implementing electric vehicle charging stations for his
6 fleet and in public locations in Sonoma County. And then we
7 have some signs and a pavement marking that we would like to
8 put before you for your recommendation to include in the
9 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Dave
10 Head.

11 MR. HEAD: Thank you. And not that I haven't been
12 introduced enough today, but my name is Dave Head. I'm the
13 fleet manager for the County of Sonoma. And you might ask,
14 well, what's a fleet manager doing here talking about traffic
15 control devices? We run over signs, don't put them up.

16 So basically several years ago the County of Sonoma
17 decided that -- that battery-supported vehicles would be our --
18 our alternative fuel vehicle of choice for county operations.
19 So we have a very extensive hybrid vehicle program. And there
20 a natural progression for us to move from hybrid vehicles into
21 plug-in vehicles, all electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles.
22 And, in fact, we've been integrating those into our fleet over
23 the last few years.

24 What we found when we started putting in charging
25 stations is there was no clear guidance on how to put in a

1 charging station, what the rules were for construction, what
2 the rules were to be in compliance with the American
3 Disabilities Act, what the rules were for signage. There was
4 some -- some general guidelines out there, but they weren't
5 specific enough to really tell us what to do and how to do it,
6 and -- and they were being interpreted differently by every
7 permitting department in the county. So it was really
8 challenging to put these charging stations in our -- in our
9 offices. And as a county entity we have officers in every city
10 in the county. So we were dealing with different permitting
11 rules everywhere we went.

12 So in early 2011 we brought together a workgroup of
13 county officials. There were state officials. There were
14 clean cities involved. We had -- there are two air districts
15 in Sonoma County. We had both air districts involved. We had
16 members of the -- the Plug-In Electric Vehicle Collaborative
17 from their resources board involved. Altogether we had about
18 50 people come together over an eight-month period to write
19 guidelines for installing electric vehicle charging stations,
20 and a part of that was signage.

21 A background on signage is we looked to see what
22 other areas were doing and what other regions were doing. We
23 leaned a lot on the Puget Sound area because they -- they had
24 some guidelines and some signage recommendations. And we
25 looked at what the federal government and the state were doing.

1 And we came up with a group of signs that we thought were best
2 suited for electric vehicle charging stations. And -- and our
3 goal was -- is to take what we had done and move that up
4 through the system to eventually have these signs and our
5 guidelines adopted by the state as the general guidelines and
6 rules for electric vehicle charging stations. So that brings
7 us to where we are today. With a few modifications that have
8 happened recently, most of the signs that we are presenting
9 today are signs that we put together in Sonoma County in 2011.

10 So this is -- this is one sign that we did not
11 project but we think is -- we're fully endorsing. We -- we
12 think this is a great sign, and essentially this is a sign that
13 tells drivers that they have to be plugged in, be connected to
14 the charger to use that charging station. One of the things we
15 did in our guidelines, we specifically -- we make a specific
16 difference between a parking space and a charging station.
17 When you put a charger in -- in a parking space in a parking
18 lot it's no longer a parking space; it's a charging station.
19 It's a fuel point. So our guidelines are written around that.
20 And this ensures that somebody just won't randomly park in --
21 in a charging station that they have to be connected. And that
22 is also online with recent state law.

23 So one of the questions is, is the location of this
24 sign. Does this go at the charging station location? Does
25 this go at the entrance to the -- to the parking facility? And

1 how many are required? So that's one question that's still
2 outstanding. But this is the sign that we believe best meets
3 the intent of the law.

4 This sign is pretty simple. It's -- you can't park
5 there. You can -- you can only use that space if you're
6 charging. So -- and that, in conjunction with the previous
7 sign, you have to be plugged in. One of the questions that's
8 come up in discussion, and just briefly hit on it and let you
9 know that it's been discussed, we've decided we're kind of
10 going the route that if the vehicle is plugged in the
11 assumption is it's charging, because there's no way that the
12 driver can know if he plugged in his vehicle, whether it's
13 fully charged or not. So the -- the real key is the vehicle is
14 plugged in. So with this sign and the previous sign, if
15 there's a vehicle in that charging station it needs to be
16 plugged in.

17 We also saw that we needed to have more permissive
18 signs that tell you what you can do and what, you know, what --
19 what you can do in a charging station. In Sonoma County we
20 have charging stations that are fleet vehicles. But if there's
21 a fleet vehicle not using that charging station it's available
22 to the public. But we also want it available for the fleet
23 vehicle when it comes back. And the other thing we didn't want
24 to do is to have somebody that had driven their electric
25 vehicle eight miles to work to plug in and take up a charger

1 all day long when they really don't even need a charge, because
2 they've only got eight miles to go home.

3 So the best way we saw to do that was to put a time
4 limit on charging. And, obviously, each entity could decide
5 whether it's a two-hour or four-hour, whatever their time limit
6 is. But we came up with this sign so that we can show that --
7 that this is the time limit that you're allowed to use that
8 charging station. With our -- with our joint use charging
9 station our rule is, is that if it's a fleet vehicle, county
10 fleet vehicle, then the time limit doesn't apply, because
11 that's the primary use of that charging station. It's only
12 available to the public if there's not a fleet vehicle using
13 it.

14 This is your -- the freeway sign. This is just like
15 the gas sign that we see on the freeways, that you guys are all
16 well aware of, that let people know that there's a charging
17 station at the next exit. And this will also likely be on
18 secondary roads and in parking areas. So the -- the variations
19 of this sign, there -- there's another one that it's like the
20 regular gas pump sign that you'll see with the -- the nozzle
21 going into the side of the dispenser. We didn't think that
22 that -- we thought that this was a better sign because it shows
23 the difference, that this is an electric vehicle plug-in.

24 So here, fast charging is slowly moving into the
25 industry. That's a play on words. But fast charging is going

1 to be one of the technologies that's going to be available in
2 the future throughout California, throughout the United States.
3 It's already big in -- in Japan. But there are different
4 technologies in fast charging. There's two or three different
5 technologies, and they haven't -- they haven't -- the Society
6 of American Engineers is working on coming up with standards
7 and they're working on coming up with preferred technologies,
8 but that's not done yet. So we can't put in here that it's
9 level three charging, or we can't put in that it's -- it's 4E
10 volt charging or something.

11 We decided in our workgroup at -- at the governor's
12 office is that fast charging was -- was a good generic
13 description, that this is a charger that has the capability to
14 charge at a faster rate. And it could be -- it could be AC, it
15 could be DC. It's -- but specifically this charges at a faster
16 rate. Level two charging charges at about 7.2 kilowatts per
17 hour. Fast charging charges at -- at several times faster than
18 that. So we decided that a generic sign, small sign that you
19 could be above the standard EV charger sign that just says
20 "Fast" will let the -- the consumer know that there's fast
21 charging available. Next.

22 This is the diagram of the optional marking on the
23 pavement in the charging station. That's what it might look
24 like. And it's just -- it's there so that it would be towards
25 the rear of the parking -- or the charging station, and it's

1 there so somebody driving by, and if they're looking down at
2 the pavement they would see that. It wouldn't necessarily be
3 required in every charging station. It's -- it's an optional
4 marking, pavement marking that could be used. So that's it.

5 So with that, that's our -- the -- the signs and the
6 markings that we're recommending. And if you have any
7 questions, Bob and I will be more than happy to answer the.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. Just to clarify what --
9 the rules that we're going to be working with today. We --
10 this is a public meeting. After our -- the presentations we
11 will come back to the committee and offer a round of comments
12 to the committee members. Once we've done that, then we will
13 offer back to the public any comments or questions that may
14 come up. We'll close that part of the -- of the item, and then
15 bring it back to the committee finally for final discussion
16 and -- and a decision.

17 So thank you very much. I'll bring this to the
18 committee. Jeff?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So with modifications and
20 with your electric fleet -- and the City of Vacaville has a
21 large electric fleet -- have you implemented this locally at
22 your various facilities, just to see the practicality of this?
23 Because right now, you know, our fleet charging stations are
24 also used as the EV storage parking spaces. And nobody is in
25 the habit of going -- you know, we just use the car, leave it

1 plugged in, and walk away. Nobody at the end of the day is
2 responsible for moving the cars out of those spots to free them
3 up for the public. We certainly don't have any limited time
4 parking.

5 So as the fleet manager how has -- has Sonoma County
6 actually implemented any of these things and how is it -- I
7 mean, are these regulations practical?

8 MR. HEAD: Yes, we have. We've put up -- our -- our
9 initial version of this signage, really the only difference
10 was -- is on the restrictive sign and the permissive sign is we
11 spelled out electric vehicle instead of using just the term EV.
12 So this sign and the next -- the next sign, we are using them
13 now and we have since we put in our first charging stations at
14 all of our charging stations that have some level of public
15 access. We have restricted charging stations that are fleet
16 only, and those don't have signage on them because --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Like -- like at your
18 corporate yard?

19 MR. HEAD: Right.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But like at city hall or
21 your -- your county buildings?

22 MR. HEAD: So like in our permitting department and
23 in front of the board chambers there's a charging station. The
24 one at the permitting department, they have a plug-in vehicle
25 that uses that. But we have those signs up. And so if -- if a

1 county vehicle is not using that charging station it is
2 available for public use. But it is restricted by a four-hour
3 time limit, and they have to be plugged in.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Do you know whether
5 they've implemented a policy that designates an employee to go
6 out there, like at the end of the day, to move all the county
7 EVs out of those spaces?

8 MR. HEAD: Actually, at the end of the day, that's
9 when we expect the county vehicles to be in those spaces. We
10 want them out in the field during the day. So the -- the
11 reason we chose to -- to make them public access is because the
12 spaces are not being used by county vehicles during the day
13 because that building inspector is out in the field. Or, you
14 know, in our case we're going to put ten stations in for our
15 environment health department. And those inspectors will be
16 out in the field during the day, so those -- those stations
17 will be available for use by other entities, but the priority
18 goes back.

19 What we haven't resolved, actually, is when that
20 inspector comes in at the end of the day, if there's -- if
21 there's somebody from the public in that space what do we do?
22 And to tell you the truth, that hasn't been a problem yet. But
23 it's something we're aware of that could be a problem and we're
24 in dispute. We've kind of left the discussion open until it
25 becomes a problem so that we can come up with a resolution with

1 the department. That may be different at each department.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So then when -- when -- at
3 the end of the day on a Friday when the employees park their
4 cars for charging, does anybody move them so that the rest of
5 the weekend they're available to the public?

6 MR. HEAD: No. Again, our parking spaces, our
7 charging station are -- are at facilities that the public
8 doesn't go to on the weekends.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But don't you --

10 MR. HEAD: You go -- you go to --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That sign is to guide the
12 public with EVs to your public charging stations.

13 MR. HEAD: Right. There's probably -- we have -- at
14 the county center, as an example, we have -- four locations at
15 our county center we have charging stations. One is completely
16 restricted. That's in -- that's in our fleet yard. Two of
17 them are for use either by county or the public. And then the
18 fourth one is in front of the board chambers, and that's
19 essentially public only. There's no county vehicles assigned
20 there. The two that have that -- that double use, those
21 vehicles -- well, first off, our county center, nobody goes
22 there on the weekends.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well --

24 MR. HEAD: So --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- let me clarify.

1 MR. HEAD: Yeah.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So our city hall is
3 probably a half a mile from a freeway interchange.

4 MR. HEAD: Right.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So to promote EV use we'd
6 want a sign as a public charging station --

7 MR. HEAD: Right.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- but we have eight pool
9 vehicles that are parked in those spots, electric pool vehicle
10 that are parked in those spots most of the time.

11 MR. HEAD: Right.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And so practically,
13 they're unavailable to the public almost -- you know, unless an
14 inspector is out. Well, they actually used fuel vehicles
15 because the EV wouldn't have a long enough charge to get them
16 through their day.

17 MR. HEAD: Right.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But -- so I'm trying --
19 you know, before I take this back to my fleet manger and public
20 works director and say we've got to post these signs, we need
21 to implement this, we need to make it work, I need to make sure
22 that this is practical and that somebody else says we passed
23 this -- these rules that will be handed down to every
24 jurisdiction in the state are actually implementable.

25 MR. HEAD: We believe they are. But we think that

1 each entity -- because you have circumstances that are
2 different than I do, you're going to have to decide how you
3 implement that. For me, my first priority is that our county
4 vehicles get charged because I need those vehicles to be able
5 to go into the field first thing Monday morning. So our
6 priority of charging is county vehicle first. But if it's
7 available the public can use it. As we put in more charging
8 stations at the county center, which our plan is to do that, as
9 we put in more public charging stations we'll probably go back
10 and restrict those double-use charging stations to fleet
11 vehicles only.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And we -- can we do
13 that --

14 MR. HEAD: Absolutely.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- in a public parking
16 lot?

17 MR. HEAD: Well, what we have done, in our guidelines
18 that we have written we have allowed us to -- you know, we
19 have -- we've written that in that we can do that. We can
20 designate charging stations as restricted to specific use.
21 That's obviously not in your signage thing. That's in a whole
22 other part of the guidelines. Your fleet manager, that's
23 Dave --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, right now it's Brian
25 McLean --

1 MR. HEAD: Uh-huh.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- with the changeover in
3 staff. But this, the report we seem to have, seems to indicate
4 that CVC 12511 mandates these no parking signs, that, you know,
5 these are charging spaces not parking spaces. We sure know
6 about police departments, so you know, it's kind of easy to
7 enforce. But I just -- as I said, I understand the intent, and
8 it's a good one, but it's the practicality of, you know, is
9 this really saying I've got to post all my charging stations
10 for no parking? You know, they really are charging stations
11 not parking spaces, because this is a public lot. And how in
12 the world are we going to implement this? This really means
13 somebody's got to take the time to move those cars out of those
14 spaces after they're charged.

15 MR. HEAD: My interpretation is if -- if you post
16 this signage then you need to follow that signage. If -- if
17 you're going to leave these stations open for anybody to use,
18 then I wouldn't post the signage. I would let them stay as
19 they are. Anybody could use them, you know, in that way.
20 Again, I think each jurisdiction is going to have to decide how
21 they manage that.

22 Our goal was we -- we came up with signage that fit
23 all the applications that we could think of, recognizing that
24 as soon as these hit the field somebody was going to think of
25 something that we didn't. There's no way we could think of all

1 the options. And we -- we felt that this was the best
2 blending, plus staying with signs that the public was used to.
3 We took signs that have already been approved, and they're
4 being used every day in applications all over the place, and
5 just modified them a little bit for EV charging. So we're not
6 trying to introduce a brand new sight, a brand new vision, or
7 anything else. We're trying to stay with consistent signage.

8 So I think in your case what may have to happen is --
9 is the city decide how you're going to manage those charging
10 stations and whether you are going to restrict them to EV only
11 or to -- to doing certain hours they are used by city -- city
12 people. Each jurisdiction is going to have to make those types
13 of decisions as -- as this technology advances. In a few years
14 we're hoping that there will be enough charges stations that
15 questions -- that this issue will go away, because there will
16 be enough charging stations to support -- support the need.
17 But that's still a few years off.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I had one other question.
19 Did your group approach the feds about the modification to the
20 fueling symbol? Because supposedly we don't have the ability
21 to change federal symbols.

22 MR. HEAD: That's been -- and Don can speak to that.
23 But that's been addressed in Federal Highway.

24 MR. HOWE: I have a letter here dated August 10th of
25 2011 wherein, basically, Wayne Henley made application that we

1 could adopt this in California because it was part of an
2 interim approval, that FHWA said, yeah, for this case, putting
3 something with a fuel nozzle next to high voltage electricity
4 may not be the best symbol, so let's put a plug-in rather than
5 a fuel nozzle. So this is already established as an interim
6 approval. And what we're doing is we're -- we're adding the
7 word "Station" to the name and we're giving it a California
8 Sign Code as part of this policy that's proposed. So as I see
9 it, all the work has been done for this symbol.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Quick question.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Hamid.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just very briefly, we are
14 using the charging stations in our own facility in our parking
15 lot. And out of, like I think we have about 1,300, or maybe
16 more, 1,400 parking spaces, we have one charge station. But
17 they're coming. They are the sign of the future.

18 So we have come up -- when our facilities' people ask
19 me what should we put here for our -- we just came up with some
20 Mickey Mouse sign, you know, and we put it there.

21 As far as the enforceability, I see this pretty much
22 similar to handicap parking spaces. I mean, we have handicap
23 parking spaces that we post them. And if you park there and
24 you don't have a tag you get towed. But if nobody is
25 patrolling that parking lot or nobody is enforcing parking

1 rules in that parking lot, hey, you can park there and nobody's
2 going to do anything to you. You -- you are violating the law.

3 The same thing I see here with these. I mean, you
4 can say it's reserved for charging station. But if people find
5 out that nobody really enforces the sign, the sign is not going
6 to do anything. People are going to start parking there.

7 The only thing -- I have a couple minor comments.
8 One is on the -- on the big sign, do we really need -- if -- I
9 think I looked at the size and you're proposing a 24 by 24.
10 This the first one, the big one with the sign on the -- with
11 the symbol on the top. Yeah, that one. Do we really need to
12 say "Towed vehicles may be claimed at" such and such or that
13 phone number? Typically we just give a phone number.

14 MR. HOWE: This sign is specified in 22 -- 22511.
15 That's word for word --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I know.

17 MR. HOWE: -- how it says in vehicle codes.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I know. But what I'm
19 saying is that typically other cases where we say vehicles may
20 be towed, even on the city streets where we have a tow
21 provision of two different lanes full of them where have tow
22 provision in the peak hour for parking, you just say -- we give
23 a phone number. I don't want to pick a point on that. I'm
24 just saying, it's such a small sign; why do we need so many
25 lines in there?

1 MR. HOWE: It is a very wordy sign. But, again, if
2 we go -- go by the vehicle code --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

4 MR. HOWE: -- that's exactly how it reads.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. That's fine.

6 MR. HOWE: The -- the comparison sign is the R100(b)
7 (phonetic) which is the --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

9 MR. HOWE: -- disabled tow-away sign, which is
10 basically the same version --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Especially
12 because --

13 MR. HOWE: -- and it has both -- it has both the
14 address, as well as the phone number.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Especially because you
16 say "Towed vehicles may be reclaimed at," but then that address
17 itself is going to be an addition two lines probably because
18 you have to give the street address and the city and the zip
19 code, and all that stuff. So it's going to be a very wordy,
20 very -- anyways, I just feel comfortable with the phone. But
21 if you want to keep address, keep address.

22 On the hour issue, the only thing is that, again,
23 going back to Mr. Knowles question about the practicality of
24 these things. The only way you're going to be able to enforce
25 hours is that if you have a parking maid that actually goes and

1 chalk marks the tire. Otherwise, how do you know how long the
2 vehicle has been there? I mean, they can --

3 MR. HEAD: And we recognized that in our development
4 of these signs originally. It's -- it's -- if you're -- if
5 you're not monitoring it, then essentially the rule doesn't
6 exist. But we -- we developed that sign around -- the
7 application that we had is that we do monitor it. And -- and
8 people will get cited if they're there more than the -- the
9 limit on the sign. And we have some two-hour limits and we
10 have some four-hour limits.

11 Again, it's -- it's a decision for the agency that's
12 using the sign. It's not mandatory that you have that sign.
13 If there's no restriction on charging, don't put up the sign.
14 Or if you can't monitor it then it would -- you wouldn't put up
15 the sign. It's -- it's a waste of money to put up a sign that
16 you can't monitor. So it's the decision of whoever is
17 installing or paying for the installation or the entity, the
18 municipality, whether you use the sign or not. This is a
19 permissive sign that says that you can use it from here to --
20 you know, in these hours or this many hours and this time
21 period. But, again, if it's not being monitored, and there's
22 no way to regulate that, it doesn't make a lot of sense to use
23 the sign at all.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I mean, this
25 one -- you have to forgive my ignorance on this -- how long is

1 the typical charge time for a full charge on these vehicles?

2 MR. HEAD: Well, every vehicle is different.

3 Because, first off, a little -- just step back a little bit.

4 With the exception of fast charging, all of these level one and

5 level two charging stations are essentially electric outlets.

6 The charging is -- the charger is actually onboard the vehicle.

7 So this plugs in the vehicle to a power source, and the charger

8 onboard is what's actually charging the batteries. So every

9 manufacturer is using chargers that have different rates of
10 charge.

11 So if you had a Nissan Leaf, the first generation

12 Nissan Leaf, it has a small capacity charger that's 3.2

13 kilowatts per hour. If you're completely drained down it could

14 take seven or eight hours to fully charge that car. If you

15 have a Ford Focus, that has a 6.6 kilowatt hour charge. It's

16 going to charge in less time.

17 But another thing that -- that needs to be considered

18 here is that the -- the industry as a whole, and this is the

19 manufacturers, these are the people deploying the vehicles,

20 these are -- these are charging stations, these are people

21 driving the vehicles, everybody will tell you that primary

22 charging is done at your residence, where you -- essentially,

23 where your car spends the night. Public charging is -- is what

24 they call the third level of -- of the charging pyramid. The

25 first level is home charging. The second level is workplace

1 charging.

2 Public charging is the third level, or the smallest
3 component of where people will charge. I like to refer to it
4 as opportunity charging. Geez, I've been running around town
5 all day, doing all my errands. My vehicle is at half charge,
6 and I would just feel a little more comfortable if I could
7 charge for an hour while I go get lunch, before I go home.
8 That's an opportunity charge. There's a charger there. It's
9 available. I really don't have to do it, but it just makes
10 me -- it improves my comfort zone.

11 That's what these public chargers are going to be
12 used for primarily. These are not going to be for the person
13 that is using that charger to fully charge their vehicle every
14 day. So we see it as less of an issue. And as -- and what I'm
15 finding in the plug-in vehicles I my fleet is the drivers have
16 figured it out. You know, I -- I give a ten minute
17 introduction to the vehicle, and it doesn't take them very long
18 to figure out where they can go, how many miles they can drive
19 in different weather conditions and different topography. So
20 they figure it out real quick as to what they can do with that
21 vehicle. And we aren't having, even a necessity for the
22 opportunity charging at this point. So I think the drivers
23 will figure it out real quick.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Thank you.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: A few thoughts and
2 comments. I know the law specifies the words on the wordy red
3 sign. I immediately recognize it as the sign that people put
4 in private parking lots so you know where to get your car if
5 it's towed away. But this one doesn't give the CVC code
6 number. And I'm wondering if for enforcement purposes, the
7 officer or whoever is authorizing it to be towed probably isn't
8 going to know that code section. And I'm just wondering if
9 that's a problem. I hate to put more on the sign. But I would
10 normally stick the CVC code on the sign in very small letters
11 to aid that.

12 The four hour charging sign, I'm not sure if -- well,
13 I understand it, but I'm just not sure if the average person is
14 going to understand that sign within the context of other time
15 limit parking signs. And in particular, if there was a thought
16 that a vehicle would be towed after the four hours I don't
17 think the combination of regulations you have in here would
18 necessarily allow you to tow the vehicle, and yet that might
19 have been the intent of doing it. The -- the green sign
20 doesn't say anything about tow-away. The red sign says tow if
21 you're not plugged. But the green sign doesn't say you're
22 towed if you're plugged but it's more than four hours.

23 On the blue, I'm assuming FHWA bought in -- we're
24 kind of changing from the lighter blue to the darker blue. And
25 I'm -- I'm wondering if that, in fact, did happen. Because I

1 think there's a sense that the dark blue was supposed to be
2 protected for more of an ADA purpose. So I'm just wondering if
3 the color, the shade of blue that's proposed is the right
4 shade. I don't know if there's logic behind that or not.

5 My last comment was you've indicated in the
6 presentation that particularly the time limits, some other
7 features of this would be optional. The language in front of
8 us I think reads that it's mandatory and that if this was put
9 in the MUTCD I think locals would presume no option, other than
10 to have to go out and post to all these areas. So I think the
11 language needs to be reviewed a little bit to indicate that if
12 the agency deems the need to apply the time limits or whatever
13 these signs would be used for that purpose. That's my
14 comments.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. Anyone? Why don't we go
16 ahead, and before we begin our second round of comments let's
17 get some information in from the --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I mean, I think this
19 one is important.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Go for it.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So if the code copy that I
22 have here which is dated 2012 is correct, 22511 says "may" with
23 regard to the signs, that a local agency has to pass a local
24 ordinance if they want to designate these parking spaces as
25 charging only. So at some point the decision -- this is one of

1 those "if used" that we talked about yesterday. I think first
2 there needs to be a sentence that says this is optional. And
3 then you've got to go to if used, these are the signs that
4 shall be used. But there's nothing I'm seeing in this proposed
5 MUTCD language that first makes it clear that this is an option
6 and only comes into play after local ordinance is passed that
7 puts this into play. It's -- it's not mandatory. If my
8 thought here of the law is correct it's -- it starts with local
9 agency may do this, just like we may rig up bikes on the
10 sidewalk, but I can't use the sidewalk unless that ordinance is
11 passed; correct? Because I was just wondering why shall got in
12 here and not the, you know, this "may" provision that appears
13 to be in the actual code.

14 MR. HEAD: And I'm not a code language guy. But our
15 intent has always been that each -- each entity would have to,
16 again, as you say, adopt these signs as their signs, and
17 whether they're optional at different locations or not. So
18 they would set the final parameters on how they're using. Our
19 goal here was to get signs that could be used.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That was my major concern,
21 was I'm seeing this is a mandate. I have no choice. It says
22 shall, shall, shall, shall, shall, and the code says may, may,
23 may, may, may; I shall use these signs if I choose to pass a
24 local ordinance.

25 MR. HEAD: Right. That's always been my

1 understanding.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. But that's not the
3 way --

4 MR. HEAD: And that's -- yeah.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- this language was
6 written in this proposal to us.

7 MR. HEAD: Okay. All right.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. Thank you. Just
9 wanted to make sure.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Anyone else from the
11 committee before we go to the public. Okay. We'll open this
12 up to public comment.

13 Oh, did I -- John?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: We haven't addressed
15 the input from the Golden Gate Bridge Highway Transportation
16 District about the --

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you for the reminder.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- the --

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Let's do that first.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- stall marking.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yeah. We did -- we did just
22 receive, it looks like an email from a gentleman from the
23 Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District, and he
24 had a couple comments.

25 And, Don, can you address the comments that he made?

1 MR. HOWE: I haven't seen the email, so I'll be happy
2 to entertain that information. It's brand new to me.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Oh, it's new to you?

4 MR. HOWE: I -- yeah. I haven't seen the -- the
5 comment. Is it from Maurice Palumbo?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It is. To summarize,
7 he's saying that if a vehicle is actually parked on the black
8 marking, obscuring all but the first line closest to the
9 traveled way that all you're going to see is only, and that the
10 wording be reorganized so that it can be clear to the enforcing
11 officer that it's an EV charging restriction.

12 MR. HOWE: I believe the height of the -- or that --
13 we'll call it the depth of the pavement marking, I can invite
14 Roberta to come up and -- and respond to the pavement markings.

15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans. We
16 did receive that in our office a few days ago. And regarding
17 the pavement marking, we reversed the order when we're in a
18 travel lane and the vehicles are coming down the highway they
19 see the first word first, second word, third word in order.
20 But in a parking space, either no parking or whatever
21 restriction we have in that parking space, the normal way to do
22 that is what we've shown with the EV on top.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I don't -- I don't -- I
24 don't agree with his comparison of it to the -- the order on
25 the traveling lane. But I do believe he has an issue with

1 regard to if the vehicle is parked there and it's obscuring the
2 text that's closer to the curb, that the remaining line of
3 visible text should tell what's being enforced. So EV charging
4 might be good to be on the outside rather than the inside.

5 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right. And we understand that
6 concern as well. The -- the pavement marking isn't optional.
7 It's supplementing the signs, and the signs are the regulatory
8 part of any citations or a violation of parking there when
9 you're not charging. So our recommendation is to do it as
10 we've shown here with the EV charging only, similar to other
11 parking markings.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have to disagree.
13 Certainly, that detail of law is clear to the enforcing
14 officer. But to the public that is trying to determine whether
15 they should park in this space, perhaps at some future date, it
16 would be good for them to have more of a clue, rather than less
17 of a clue, based on what they can see with a vehicle parked in
18 place.

19 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Right. But when it's not parked in
20 and it's -- it is available --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No question.

22 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: -- then you would see the whole EV
23 charging only. I understand what you're saying, that -- but,
24 you know, some cars, they're going to cover that as well, I
25 mean, even though that it's the -- the last word. But just

1 seeing the word EV may not give them the message that we wanted
2 to say EV charging only.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: But certainly, just
4 seeing the word "only" will do nothing.

5 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: However, there are signs in place,
6 very numerous signs. So we -- we understand the concern, our
7 recommendation. But if the committee sees otherwise, the
8 normal procedure for parking, surface parking, is to have them
9 in this order. If you were in a travel lane we'd understand
10 the reverse order. Thank you.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Hamid.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The -- the reference to
14 the code, Don needs to be corrected. It's -- the vehicle code
15 does not have a 21511. It has a 22511.

16 MR. HOWE: That's one of the revisions. Are you
17 looking on just the printed agenda that was circulated?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I'm --

19 MR. HOWE: -- or are you looking at the revised
20 edition that has had that correction made.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, okay. No. I'm
22 looking at the one that I've got on my laptop. Okay.

23 MR. HOWE: So we did -- the first thing I mentioned
24 when I got up was that we had distributed that. And that --
25 that section has been revised.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: We got it now. Thank you. Okay.
2 Any other -- other comments before we go to public? If you
3 have any comments, please come up and speak to the microphone.
4 That way you -- your comments will be recorded. Include your
5 name and where you're from, and you'll have a five minute
6 maximum.

7 MR. HELMER: Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee,
8 it's a pleasure to be here. Jim Helmer speaking on the topic.
9 I have been before the committee before in my capacity with the
10 City of San Jose, as well as Santa Cruz over the years.

11 First off, I'd like to just -- just indicate to you
12 that this is a national issue. And I actually brought these
13 signs to your -- recommended signs to your attention a couple
14 of years ago, at least to some of your staff. And I think I
15 have to commend you now for -- for addressing the issue because
16 there's confusion across the country in terms of how to enforce
17 time limits and how to really regulate electric vehicle --
18 electric vehicles in what are typically considered public
19 parking spaces.

20 To stay within my five minutes I'll just say I would
21 like to commend Sonoma County for its Northern California
22 leadership and state-wide leadership, as well as national.
23 They've been recognized as the leader throughout the state in
24 terms of taking these issues on and bringing them to the
25 state's attention. And Dave Head is really a prime mover for

1 that nationally.

2 The MUTCD, as you know, is primarily for -- well,
3 it's for public roadways. There's a great amount of latitude
4 on parking lots, as you know. And all the signs that go in
5 parking lots have to convey a clear, simple and -- and
6 understandable message. But the MUTCD gives latitude, and
7 let's not forget that.

8 About 95 percent of your charging stations will be in
9 public parking lots and private parking lots, but there's a few
10 that will be on public streets. These signs are really to help
11 our public agencies better regulate, enforce regulations on the
12 public roadways where you have your responsibility. And, of
13 course, they have to pass the proper ordinances and resolutions
14 as called for in the state to post such signs. But they should
15 have the latitude to put variations to these signs, which
16 you'll see in the Federal MUTCD they can't.

17 I would like to encourage you to allow an alternate
18 sign, and that is to allow the full spelling of electric
19 vehicle, as well as EV. You have PHEVs, HEVs, EREVs, and many
20 other EVs coming. And I'll tell you, 90 percent of the general
21 public really isn't aware of what an EV is yet. So while we
22 all in this room are understanding it, I think an alternative,
23 which would be certainly up for discussion, would be to allow
24 the words "Electric Vehicle." Oregon, Washington,
25 Pennsylvania, Hawaii, and many other states are using the full

1 word right now.

2 And in closing I'd like to just thank you for taking
3 on this issue. To Mr. Miller's comment, the blue is probably
4 just an issue of how it came across on the printing, but
5 certainly it has to comply with the Federal MUTCD blue colors.
6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you, Jim. Anyone else?

8 MR. BRONKALL: Bob Bronkall. One suggestion for the
9 four hour charging sign, it may be appropriate to go ahead and
10 add the words "Only" underneath of it, that it's specific for
11 EV charging. And then it also sounds like for the instance
12 where Sonoma is looking at trying to reserve the spots after
13 the restricted hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Typically, with
14 this sort of a parking restriction, that expires at 6:00 p.m.
15 and anyone could park in those spots. It doesn't necessarily
16 reserve that spot for a county vehicle or a specific use.
17 There may need to be an additional reserve sign that may not
18 already be in place in the MUTCD, preserve it for a specific
19 county-type vehicle that's intended to charge overnight there.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thanks, Bob. Okay. I think that's
21 it for the public. We'll bring -- bring the conversation back
22 into the -- the committee. Do we have -- it looks like we have
23 three or four issues that have been brought up that probably
24 need a little further discussion. Word order is one.
25 Defined -- out of order I'm going to -- I'm going to just throw

1 out define electric vehicle versus other types of EVs. And
2 perhaps include the CVC number on the -- the towing sign. Make
3 the signs optional; that's another comment that we got. And
4 then location, what's the best location for these signs.

5 Do we have other issues, Devinder? Did you note
6 anything else?

7 SECRETARY SINGH: No.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Did you say mandatory
9 versus --

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mandatory versus optional, yeah.
11 Okay.

12 Well, those -- those appear to be the issues that --
13 that are yet to be resolved. Do we want to discuss that now?
14 Do we want to perhaps table the item until these can be --
15 until recommendations can be made on -- on these issues? I'd
16 entertain a recommendation from the committee.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I would ask
18 Caltrans, do you want some tie to create that option statement
19 that precedes this and then this become more -- if used, is
20 there time during the lunch break to craft that language and to
21 revisit this after lunch, or should be table it to another
22 meeting. I don't know how urgent this is from the governor.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I would -- I would
24 recommend that we -- we finalize this item today. Now does
25 that mean just making these changes and bringing the language

1 back to the committee today, this afternoon? Then -- then I
2 don't -- I don't think we're in a position to be able to do
3 that to show the new wording, and so forth. But can we -- can
4 we move forward with -- with those -- the clarification to what
5 Mike, the Chairman, has identified, can we move forward with
6 making an approval or non-approval based on those comments,
7 based on those changes that we will do?

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Devinder?

9 SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman, these four issues you
10 raised, they're not a problem for us to make a statement, if
11 used. And other spelling, certainly we can create an optional
12 sign. I think we are okay with these four clarifications, and
13 we want the committee to move a motion, subject to these
14 clarifications. The final language will address these four
15 issues.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Including the CVC number on the
17 towing?

18 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: And then the -- the one remaining
20 that I'm seeing is the various different types of EVS, how
21 would we want to address the -- the various different types?
22 Include -- identify all those that exist today and -- and list
23 them as possible for the signs?

24 SECRETARY SINGH: We can ask Jim. He's raising his
25 hand. He knows.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: Jim must have a great idea for it.

2 MR. HELMER: As you know, the state authorizes local
3 agencies to regulate on-street parking, except it's a
4 cooperative effort on the state highways, as we know. Every
5 city has to pass an ordinance and a resolution so that they can
6 regulate that parking, and in so they -- they create
7 definitions. Every municipal code, parking code, streets
8 and -- and streets and traffic code in a city creates
9 definitions.

10 What I have seen going across the country is a range
11 of definitions, one which describes an electric vehicle. And
12 it's -- it's -- it's appearing across the country, really, in
13 that an electric vehicle is a vehicle that does the following,
14 it has -- it receives its power from an on -- from an off-board
15 source. It doesn't say anything that it can be a hybrid or a
16 plug-in hybrid. It just clearly describes locally for that
17 agency what an electric vehicle is. Once that -- once that
18 resolution or ordinance has been passed, the signs apply. And
19 that's really applicable, if you think about it, in all types
20 of loading zones, freight zones, other parking control zones.
21 It really just becomes a definition issue.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thanks.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Hamid.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I think on this,

1 the variations, as you said the plug-in hybrid, the hybrids and
2 all that, the -- for the purpose of the charging stations, it's
3 not really making any difference. Because as far as you're --
4 you're concerned they're just using different kinds of plugs
5 there and you're just plugging them into the outlet. This is
6 just an outlet.

7 So I think probably rather than introducing a whole
8 lot of new signs, if they come in the future, that's fine.
9 Otherwise, as soon as it says electric vehicle charging
10 station, if I'm driving a plug-in hybrid versus a purely
11 electrical, like a Tesla or something. But to me it's the
12 same. It means that I can get charged here. So I don't know.

13 But -- but with the comments that came up I feel
14 comfortable, you know, respecting Caltrans wish for having a
15 decision on this today and moving on, and approve the signs as
16 -- as -- as presented to us with consideration of the comments
17 made, and specifically that inclusion of the California Vehicle
18 Code reference and the other comments made by Mr. Knowles.

19 So I would like to make a motion that we -- we
20 approve the signs and direct the staff to work on the details
21 as was discussed in the meeting by the members of the committee
22 and the public.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Hamid, I have a
24 clarification question for you, before the motion goes forward.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Sure.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm not sure what the
2 procedure is. But specifically, I have a clarification
3 question regarding a comment that was heard that it might be
4 better to allow the words electric and vehicle to be spelled
5 out. I was wondering if that was in reference to the G6621B
6 (phonetic) sign, the -- the fuel pump sign. And if so, where
7 it was proposed that all that additional text would go. Can
8 you address that, Don?

9 MR. HOWE: In response to this -- this sign that I
10 have displayed --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: What -- what's that?

12 MR. HOWE: -- that's an established by FHWA. EV is
13 one of the approved abbreviations that are approved for use on
14 official traffic control devices. As far as making the --
15 making the -- or having a sub-plaque to add that, we do have
16 the word message that spells it all out, which is "Electric
17 Vehicle Charging Station," that could be placed in addition to
18 that, that spells it all out. In fact, you probably have seen
19 this. This has been, I think, on the book since 1990.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

21 MR. HOWE: And that's -- if there's a sign out
22 there --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: My question is just
24 that I personally did not understand what the comment was, the
25 comment -- someone made a comment that said instead of EV

1 they'd like to see the possibility of electric vehicle. I
2 don't know what the action item is there.

3 MR. HOWE: I'll -- I'll go with this sign. Jim
4 Helmer mentioned that there are existing signs out there that
5 spell out electric vehicle rather than the abbreviation EV.
6 And that is a sign that is used in Sonoma County currently.
7 And I have no problem with the alternate, having electric
8 vehicle. It's just that you end up with four lines of text --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. So --

10 MR. HOWE: -- with the symbol, and the symbol is
11 going to have to go smaller.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: John, I don't think the intent was
13 to spell out electric vehicle on the symbol sign.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: All right. Good.
15 Good. So if I understand correctly, any agency that felt that
16 EV was not sufficiently clear to the -- the user could use the
17 existing G6621CA (phonetic) text sign, word message sign?

18 MR. HOWE: Yes. And that is an option currently.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Item resolved.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So we have a motion on the
21 floor to approve.

22 MR. HEAD: Could I make one more comment on that?

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yes.

24 MR. HEAD: Okay. A lot of agencies that have already
25 adopted local code have used electric vehicle as the

1 definition, not EV. So given that option allows those signs to
2 still be legal and consistent.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: There's an option but -- there's a
4 motion, but no second yet to approve.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Second.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I would like to second.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: I think Mr. Brown seconded the
8 motion. Any comment, any additional comment from the -- from
9 the committee?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Typically, I like motions
11 like that to be just a little bit more specific.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So the motion, as I
13 understand it, is to approve the recommended signage with the
14 modifications to include the CVC number on the -- the towing
15 sign, to make the signs --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Optional.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- optional and subject to ordinance
18 by the -- the local communities, to -- let's see, the word
19 order that we discussed, the word order will remain the same on
20 the legend on the ground, and -- and that there will be various
21 different terms or -- or definitions of EV, depending on how
22 the -- the -- the type of vehicle that is used.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I don't understand the
24 last point. What does that have to do with changing the text
25 or the --

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: It --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- the --

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: It will not.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: It will not change it.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The -- the last point,

7 I think, I had written down to allow the spelling of the words

8 electric vehicle on the R Sub Y (phonetic) and the R Sub Z

9 (phonetic) series signs. I think those are the --

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Oh.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- the time limit sign

12 and the --

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- the slash P sign.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. No, I understand. All right.

16 If the -- so then the R Sub Y and the R Sub Z signs, the -- the

17 "No Parking" and the "4 Hour Parking", this will be a

18 clarification that I didn't have, so that will be good. We're

19 using EV on both of these signs. And the -- the recommendation

20 then would be to allow the electric vehicle as opposed to EV.

21 Is that -- is that the way you understood it?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's sort of what I

23 was looking here in the motion.

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So is that -- is that -- will

25 that be acceptable to the -- the requester, that we could use

1 EV or electric vehicle?

2 MR. HOWE: If we go with an alternate sign it will
3 have to be larger than 12 inches wide by 18 inches high.
4 That's just -- that will be the impact of that. I don't see a
5 problem. We can develop a sign specification that will spell
6 it all out.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: So my question will be, will that be
8 a stumbling point for this committee? Everybody's good with
9 it?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Good.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rick?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I have a related question
13 about the specifics of that.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Well, I think we've --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I just -- I --

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- clarified everything so far, so
17 we'll go ahead and see if we can answer Rick's question.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I -- I thought I had
19 understood in the comment that the idea of spelling out
20 electric vehicle as an option might also apply to the proposed
21 marking and not just the signs we're discussing. Was that
22 correct or incorrect an understanding?

23 SECRETARY SINGH: We can have optional, if the
24 agencies want to spell out. It's up to the agency. If they
25 want to put a big sign, fine. So --

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: The --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Well, just as we're
3 defining the motion --

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: The -- the issue is --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: -- if we had included
6 that or not.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- that it's not addressed and we
8 need to be included in the item.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman --

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: And so --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I think we
12 might be making a mountain out of this. It's just -- okay, if
13 I go somewhere and I see a sign that says "EV Vehicle," I know
14 whether my car is EV is or not. If my car is not EV, even if I
15 don't know what EV is, I know I don't belong there.

16 So I understand, you know, the reason for wanting to
17 have it spelled out, but not having it spelled out is not going
18 to confuse some driver saying can I park here or I can not
19 park. I know whether my car is EV or not. My car is not EV,
20 so I don't belong in this parking space. And the person who
21 drives an EV, he has bought the thing so he knows what EV is.
22 So it's not really that big a deal to make it like -- make it a
23 big discussion item.

24 If we want to give the option to the agencies, I have
25 no problem with it. But I think EV has been well introduced

1 into the lexicon of our culture and people know what EV is.

2 And if I don't and my car is not EV, then I don't park there.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: You're the motion maker. Do you
4 want to include --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm just saying --

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- optional use?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm just saying it's not
8 really a big deal whether you spell it out or not.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It's just --

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: All right.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- it's either keep it
13 what we have. And if you want to give them the option and they
14 want to go to a larger sign, they go to a larger sign and they
15 spell it out.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Does that translate into --

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: So that --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: -- you don't care if
20 people --

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: I think that --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: -- spell it on the
23 pavement?

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: I think that includes the option of
25 saying with --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Everybody knows what EV
2 is.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- EV or electric vehicle, either
4 one.

5 SECRETARY SINGH: So we have motion. We have second.
6 Let's ask for voting on this.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. We have one more. Go ahead,
8 Jeff.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. Well, my concern
10 is -- and Hamid has been here longer than I have -- but I've
11 never been involved with making -- with adopting something
12 where we have concept language but not the final language. I
13 mean, maybe it's because I was only here when John Fisher was
14 here. But we could get things down to the commas, down to the
15 exact spellings of the words so that we would -- we would never
16 approve something with the understanding that there will be
17 follow-up language crafted that will make us all happy.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We usually --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I hate to set that
20 precedent where we're making this -- this blank check. I mean,
21 we have an understanding, but we would always finish the
22 language before we actually adopted something.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: We -- let me -- let me
24 make a comment.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: One moment.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: One moment. What that means is that
3 this item will be tabled because that's not something that
4 Caltrans has indicated that they're capable of doing today.

5 So if the current motion to approve as -- as we had
6 identified, to allow Caltrans to make that change, does not
7 pass, then I would entertain a new motion to -- to table for
8 the corrections to be made and then brought back. Does that
9 sound reasonable to everyone?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. That's -- so I'll
11 be voting no --

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: So we'll --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- because I want the
14 final language.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: So we'll go ahead --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I don't want to set a
17 precedent that we -- we adopt things, where we don't really
18 know what we're -- we're approving.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: I think that's -- that's a very good
20 observation and one that I'm probably going to take to heart,
21 as well.

22 So with that we'll go ahead and vote on the motion.
23 Those who --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, can I make
25 just a minor clarification?

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: Hamid, go ahead.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: On some of this stuff
3 from Mr. Knowles, for example, if -- and it has happened a lot
4 in the past -- a sign comes to us, like the sign that is in
5 front of us, and one of the members of the committee says it's
6 a good sign, but add the CVC section. Caltrans says, okay, the
7 note taken. We don't ask them to bring it back. They just go
8 and add the CVC section to the final sign. And some of the --
9 that's the reason that I made the motion is that I hear the
10 comments being more editorial in nature. We are not
11 questioning the policy or the premise of the sign. But
12 anyways, that's my two cents.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: To me there's a big step
14 between the language who says -- that says globally you shall,
15 and creating this new option statement. Because this is all --
16 this is all optional, following the adoption of a resolution.
17 So it's not a simple straight-forward statement that needs to
18 make that clear to all practitioners. And I would like to see
19 that language before we adopt this, because otherwise what
20 we're adopting is something that tells everybody you shall
21 install these signs at every single charging station that the
22 public has access to.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I think that's the
24 state law.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No, it's not. It's may.

1 A local agency may adopt a local ordinance that designates
2 certain parking spaces as charging only. If they do that, then
3 you use these signs. That's a very different statement than --
4 than saying you shall install these signs at every single
5 charging station.

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: That's a great comment.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Completely different
8 meaning.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock, you had a comment?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. I was going to say,
11 from an applicant's perspective, how frustrating it is to go to
12 a meeting like this and not get an action for meeting after
13 meeting after meeting. And I, therefore, am looking for some
14 kind of action that gets as conclusive as possible. I'm
15 sensitive to the -- the desires to see the language on the
16 policy for use of these signs. And I would be supportive of
17 asking the revised language to come back to the committee for a
18 second scrubbing or -- or a routine approval on a consent
19 calendar, or something like this. But what I'd really like to
20 do is send a message that as far as the manufacturing of signs
21 go, we're pretty happy if you put the code section on the one
22 sign. Because I think then the applicant leaves knowing
23 they've gotten the information they need and they know exactly
24 what minor things they have to do to get it finished for us.

25 So with the understanding that the -- the language of

1 option support standard comes back to us for review, I would be
2 in full support of passing of the rest of the proposal.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: To clarify, you're -- you're -- you
4 would be in support of approving the actions today on the
5 proviso that they're going to come back to confirm what we've -
6 - what we've approved?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yes.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Clarification question.
10 So to further clarify what you're suggesting, we would be
11 approving the design of the signs, but not the -- the wrapper
12 that makes them optional?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: The -- the policy regarding
14 the use is, I think, the only element that I feel we need to
15 see again.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So we've got a motion and a
17 second on the floor. Would we want to -- would the second and
18 the motion maker --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: We don't have a motion
20 to that affect.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: No, we don't. And so what I'm --
22 what I'm doing is asking if -- if the motion maker and the
23 second would like to take that into consideration and -- and
24 pull the motion and the second. If not, we'll go ahead and
25 vote on it as it is. It looks like it probably is not going to

1 be passing as it was originally made. And then we would -- we
2 would go through and make another motion and a second.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, then I have a
4 question for the CHP on the -- the ordinance issue. Right now
5 in the state we have a CVC code that says by local ordinance
6 you can -- you can prohibit bicycle riding on the sidewalk.
7 But I would assume that as a law enforcement officer, when you
8 cite somebody you're not citing for the vehicle code because it
9 doesn't even come into affect unless you have the local
10 ordinance. You cite for the ordinance violation.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So I would think on these
13 signs you'd actually cite the local ordinance, Rock, and not
14 the CVC section. Because the ordinance just gives the locals
15 the power. It's the -- I mean, the CVC section gives --
16 empowers the locals to pass an ordinance. It's the ordinance
17 that's enforceable.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: You're getting out of my
19 area of expertise, but I think it's the sign gives the
20 enforcing authority the authorization to order the vehicle
21 codes.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, that just -- that
23 was the good example, though, is -- is the CVC gives locals the
24 power to pass and ordinance to prohibit bicycle riding on the
25 sidewalks. But you couldn't actually cite for the CVC because

1 it's powerless without the local ordinance. You'd cite for
2 violation of the local ordinance. This is powerless without
3 the local ordinance because this code only gives the locals the
4 power to pass an ordinance to prohibit parking here. This code
5 by itself can't be enforced without that ordinance. So you'd
6 put the ordinance on the sign. Because without the ordinance
7 the sign has no meaning.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No, well, actually --
9 actually, 22511.1, once you designate this stall, allows you to
10 because the --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But you have to designate
12 it by ordinance.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Yeah. But you
14 don't need, necessarily, to have the ordinance number on the
15 sign. You can put it on the sign but still it can be towed.
16 Because 22511.1, the subparagraph there, the main section says
17 that actually a person shall not park or a leave a vehicle in
18 the stall or space designated pursuant to section 22511. So
19 once you designate it, then the vehicle code allows the
20 officers to tow. But I think that's -- that's triviality. I
21 mean, you don't necessarily need to put the ordinance number on
22 the sign. If you want to put it you can put it. But even
23 without that, as soon as you designate it, then the vehicle
24 code rule applies and you can tow.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. Because most

1 agencies I've worked for, when we were towing by local
2 ordinance we cited the ordinance on the sign.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I think that has to do with
4 the type of citation that was being issued. In this case, I'm
5 no legal expert, but I think you could tow under authority of
6 this vehicle code. But I think it would be very wise to show
7 the section on the sign.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: I would agree with that.
9 Devinder?

10 SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman, I just want to
11 clarify to the committee. In the past, a number of times this
12 committee approved the item subject to following changes. The
13 bigger issue Jeff is saying the policy needs to be optional.
14 And we are agreed to making that optional. So why we have to
15 wait another six months just adding word option? So we -- we
16 could run the draft policy through the committee again if it
17 addresses your concern. But why does it need to just make one
18 thing optional and wait for six months?

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Hamid, I'm going to ask you
20 to repeat the original -- the motion as -- as you intended it.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, as I intended it.
22 Okay. I think that I heard Caltrans, that for some reason they
23 see urgency into this. And I also share the sentiment of Mr.
24 Miller, that when the applicant comes they expect to get
25 something. But if it's really something that's too ambiguous

1 or has very serious policy implications we really -- I agree
2 with Mr. Knowles, we don't want to move the item until we have
3 the final language.

4 And in this case the reason that I made the motion
5 was to try to -- I can't foresee -- the reason I made the
6 motion, I can not foresee a local agency or a private owner
7 going through the expense of installing a charging station and
8 not wanting to restrict its use only for charging. So they
9 want to enforce it somehow. Otherwise, what's the point of
10 going through a charging station installation and maintenance
11 cost, and then anyone can park there and the electric vehicle
12 can not use it for charging. So I think if people do the
13 charging station they want a restriction, they will go hand in
14 hand, but still giving the local -- the flexibility.

15 The reason I made the motion was because I heard a
16 representative from Caltrans that they preferred to see this
17 moving. So I -- again, if you want me to --

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: I --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- reword it --

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Everybody needs to know what they're
21 voting on.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The voting was voting on
23 approving the signs presented to us with the five specific
24 items that you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, and have Caltrans bring
25 back the final language for information to the committee,

1 because I didn't see any of those changes of the magnitude that
2 requires a revisit and re-discussion of the committee --

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- such as including --
5 such as including the California Vehicle Code section on the
6 sign and having the option of spelling electric vehicle or not
7 spelling it, thinks of that nature.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: And making the policy optional.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So we've got optional policy.
11 We've got the -- the choice of EV or electric vehicle. We have
12 inclusion of CVC on the towing sign. That's three. What else
13 was there? Was that it, three items --

14 SECRETARY SINGH: That's all of them.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- to change?

16 SECRETARY SINGH: CVC, electric vehicle optional.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: So --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Hamid, a question. You
19 use the word bring back for information to the committee. Do
20 you mean for final approval to the committee?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. Just whenever we
22 have had items like this they always share back with us, even
23 they don't wait for next meeting. When the language is final,
24 the sign is final, they just email it to use and they say,
25 okay, this is --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Right. If -- if we don't
2 like it we can make a new item.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. If --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: But I'm sure we'll be
5 happy.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: If they miss something
7 you just tell them.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm good with that.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, can I make a
11 friendly amendment, or does it have to be seconded first?

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: We've got -- we've got a motion and
13 a second. You can -- you can voice your request for a friendly
14 amendment.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I was wondering if the --
16 the motion -- the person who presented the motion would agree
17 to including a provision that Caltrans won't issue any
18 operational directive or policy directive, whatever they call
19 it, until this committee approves a final language. So that
20 gives them basic approval at this time. But basically the way
21 we advertise this to all agencies would be held off until we
22 approve the final language.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I have no problem with
24 amending the motion, including that. Knowing how Caltrans
25 operates I'll be surprised if they issued a policy before our

1 next meeting.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: He didn't mean to say that.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It usually takes about
4 six months to issue a policy directive.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

6 SECRETARY SINGH: Six months to a year.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. I'm -- I'm
8 confused now. Because the question I just asked Hamid was
9 weather the motion included bringing back the final language
10 for approval by the committee, and I think that's what Mr.
11 Knowles is looking for.

12 What I heard you say, Hamid, I think, was that you
13 would expect Caltrans to give us an email or something with the
14 final language in it.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That was my intent. If
16 you want to go with what you're saying, to bring back the final
17 for approval, then as Mr. Chairman suggested, you just table
18 the item and say bring it back next time, and we reopen and we
19 revisit it.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Well, we can vote on the
21 amendment, rather than table the item, which accomplishes
22 nothing.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: I think that's probably where we're
24 headed. So what I've done is I've now got the option of EV or
25 electric vehicle, include the CVC number, make the signs

1 optional, and then no directive until CTCDC confirms final
2 language. Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I'm okay with that.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: All right.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm also okay with
6 that.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: So I'll call for the question. All
8 in favor of approving these signs with the amendments that I've
9 just described, raise your hand. Okay. Any opposed, raise
10 your hand. Well, we got a unanimous decision out of this
11 group. Congratulations.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Thanks to your
13 leadership.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: All right.

15 MR. HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you all. All right.

17 Moving on, we're going to go to item 12-16.

18 Do we -- did we have any others to take out of order,
19 Devinder?

20 SECRETARY SINGH: No. No. No.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Item 12-16, proposal to amend
22 Section 3B.18 of the California MUTCD, to enhance uncontrolled
23 intersection of mid-block crossings. This was a proposal by
24 Caltrans.

25 Janice, do you have a comment on this?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes. Yeah.
2 Under this agenda item -- excuse me, let me get my -- 12-16,
3 the proposal to amend Section 3B.18, to enhance uncontrolled
4 intersection of mid-block crossings. This is a follow-up item
5 from the August 2012 committee meeting. The committee
6 recommended -- there was two alternatives presented through the
7 committee. The committee recommended alternative two which
8 included the application on state highways and local roadways
9 for the specified recommendations, with follow-up comments
10 recommendations that apply to the guidance.

11 In response to the those follow-up items we have made
12 changes to Section 3B.18. The information is shared in the
13 agenda items on page 10. It's the modified language under the
14 insert guidance section, about three-quarters down the road --
15 I mean down the page. In addition, there was a copy of the
16 revised -- revised figure 3B.17, which each Committee member
17 got a revised copy handed out to them in front of them. There
18 was one small or minor change to the figure that was shared.
19 So that figure has addressed all the comments presented, along
20 with language change in 3B.18.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you, Janice.

22 Do we have any initial comments by the -- the
23 committee? No initial comments by the committee?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Let me just ask a question.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock, yeah.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I know on the draft figure
2 I had marked that I liked the ability to not strike the lane
3 line between the advance limit line and the crosswalk. Would I
4 have the ability to not do that under this figure, or would I
5 be obliged to strike the line? Because I think that strike
6 leads a motorist past the old line to the stop line.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Okay. Can you again, Rock,
8 can you please verify what -- which one you're talking about?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I --

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Janice, I think he's probably
11 talking about --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Oh, okay.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Are you talking about that bottom
14 one?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. I --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Thank you.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I wanted to know if I would
18 have the option of not putting the stripe in here if this
19 figure was in the manual, and terminate the lane line at the
20 advance line instead of at the stop line. Okay. And I've
21 talked quite a few agencies into doing this, and we've always
22 not put the line there. And I always thought it did help to
23 induce the vehicles to stop at the yield line and not at the
24 crosswalk.

25 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans,

1 Pavement Markings. This particular dash, again, this is an
2 illustration, an example. I mean, we still want to tell -- you
3 know, that's quite a ways back, 20 to 50 feet. So without any
4 pavement marking -- and often times our pavement markings go
5 clear up to the back of the crosswalk -- I'm not sure there's
6 an advantage to eliminate that one little dash. But if it were
7 left off I don't think anyone would have an issue with it. I
8 mean, this is not meant to give you a standard detail of any
9 particular approach.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm supportive of
11 Rock's comment because the issue is for motorists not to
12 overtake other motorists and cause a multiple-threat crash
13 where one vehicle hides another that kills the pedestrian.

14 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Understood.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And I know that this is
16 not the -- the force of the MUTCD is not the figures.
17 Nevertheless, people look at these figures and they make
18 inferences from them. So this is -- is not -- it's not a minor
19 issue.

20 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: However, the lane is still going to
21 be occurring in here. And we can not say in the field how
22 these particular dashes are going to fall on the pavement based
23 on where this line is to -- in other words, you're suggesting
24 when we set up this pavement marking that you eliminate this
25 spot, but that also, you know, is going to depend on where all

1 the existing dashes are. And -- and, again, this particular --
2 this is in the pavement marking section, but it's also showing
3 you the relationship of signs and so forth. But I don't think
4 we want to get into changing the details on all these figures
5 based on nuances on what's going to occur on your particular
6 location. You know -- excuse me. I didn't want to put that in
7 your eyeballs. But these, you know, these markings here, maybe
8 that's not the best place for those markings as well.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Roberta, I think what I'm hearing --
10 what I'm hearing is you -- you would not be adverse to if an
11 agency were to choose to leave those off, that would be all
12 right?

13 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That's correct. And --

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: And so the --

15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: -- that's an option. It's not going
16 to be something that's going to be stated in writing or shown
17 with an illustration. As we know, in the field, these markings
18 could be -- I mean, they're -- you know, they're always lined
19 up properly with each other, the -- where they're going to be
20 begin and end regarding the shark's teeth. You know, I guess
21 if you took this literally your shark's teeth would have to be
22 at the end of one of those lane-line dashes. That's not
23 what --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No. No.

25 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And I understand your concern. But

1 I think we still need to delineate these -- that lane marking
2 isn't necessarily going to keep -- you still have to indicate
3 that there's two -- two approaches to that crosswalk.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Just for a point of clarification on
5 the -- on the earlier two comments. Are you suggesting that it
6 may be a good idea to add a comment that extension of the lane
7 lines is not required as shown on the plan?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I would not have any
9 concerns over the issue if the figure made it clear that
10 marking between the yield line and the crosswalk line was
11 optional.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Got it. Okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: And I would simply tell
14 people not to market there.

15 I want to add to that, that's a nice representative
16 of marking, but virtually every agency in the state always
17 wants to paint a 50-foot solid line up to their crosswalks.
18 And I'm quite fearful that that's going to end up a 50-foot
19 solid line based upon local practice to do a solid lane line
20 approaching all crosswalks. And they're not going to do the 50
21 feet from the yield line; they're going to do the 50 feet from
22 the -- the solid line.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Somebody over --

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Fifty feet from the solid lane line?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: From -- from the crosswalk

1 line.

2 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: So this distance here --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Most agencies -- if this
4 wasn't here, everybody paints a solid 50-foot line rather than
5 a skip-up to approaching the intersection, the skip begins 50
6 feet and beyond.

7 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Intersection.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: And -- and that includes
9 most of Caltrans districts who have ever drawn signs.

10 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Intersection. However, we're -- we
11 are talking a drop here.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. Yeah. Agencies will
13 want to put that 50-foot line either here or here.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: And if the skip is here the
15 50-foot line is going to end up here, and you're going to have
16 some pretty strong markings that define the attempt of the
17 limit line to get vehicles to stop at the limit line and not
18 pull across the limit line to stop at the crosswalk. So I
19 don't want it to look like the lanes continue up to the
20 crosswalk, because it looks like they do now.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: But the -- the -- but the
22 lanes do continue up to the crosswalk. It's where the vehicle
23 is supposed to yield is what we're trying to delineate.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: It's not the intersection.
25 We don't draw the skip lines through the intersection, unless

1 there's a special reason to have to do so.

2 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: But this is not in the -- they don't
3 go through the intersection because we have cross-traffic.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Motorists are used to
5 stopping where the lane lines stop.

6 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I would beg to differ. But the --
7 the limit line, you know, I understand what you're trying to
8 attempt here, but the lane lines, if you don't have -- if you
9 don't have any lane line, especially when you get to wider
10 situations, you know, and this is not a long distance, but then
11 you're -- you're not delineating where the cars should be
12 within the -- the roadway. And then the limit line is where
13 you stop, even if there was a solid line here, a solid line
14 discourages lane changing. So we're saying don't change a lane
15 through the crosswalk, which we similarly do through -- in the
16 approach to an intersection.

17 Chairman, you have a comment down here, as soon as
18 the chairman recognizes you.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Brown?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Yeah. So are you saying
21 that it's -- with the yield line, if it's occupied with
22 pedestrians then you -- you stop on that limit line?

23 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Correct. The purpose of the shark's
24 teeth is when you see that it's occupied with a pedestrian
25 you're to stop at this -- this limit line.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Approaching the crosswalk
2 or --

3 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: This is approaching the crosswalk.
4 So this -- these arrows indicate direction of traffic. This is
5 meant to be a two-way street. This is illustrating a one-way
6 street. Reverse the signs. This particular sign was changed
7 at our revision to indicate pedestrians could be entering from
8 this direction.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I just -- just -- just to
10 clarify, also, what we're trying to say, because this is with
11 the federal diagram, as well, which is where the lane lines
12 originally are shown.

13 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Any other comments from the
15 committee before we go out to the public?

16 Seeing none, any comments from the public on this
17 item?

18 MR. WINTER: Bill Winter, Los Angeles County
19 Department of Public Works. Just one very brief comment. I
20 know there was a lot of discussion at the least meeting on
21 this, and I do see that the staff has incorporated much of the
22 comments that I had made last meeting. I do see, though, you
23 still have to alternatives in front of you, that -- if this
24 should be on state highways then here's the wording versus if
25 it's all roadways.

1 I think last meeting, and I just want to reinforce it
2 with you, my opinion is that if it is adopted it should apply
3 to all roads. It shouldn't -- this shouldn't be the
4 segregation of for state highways do this. I think that was
5 expressed by some of the committee members is we -- we tried to
6 be more conclusive in the manual for all -- for all public
7 roads. So that -- that's just, again, my opinion of that.
8 Thank you.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: And just to clarify that,
10 that was -- that was the -- the direction of how the revised
11 language was put into 3B.18.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Bill, are you -- was -- was your
13 statement an indication that it's not?

14 MR. WINTER: It is.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

16 MR. WINTER: It's just basically that I appreciate
17 it.

18 MR. MORRISSEY: Hi. Sam Morrissey, City Traffic
19 Engineer, City of Santa Monica. I just wanted to echo Rock's
20 comments. You know, yesterday at the workshop we had a lengthy
21 discussion about various lines and the stop bar, and the
22 effectiveness of high-visibility crosswalks when you add all
23 these additional lines. In our city we don't include the
24 striping between the yield lines and the crosswalk. And we do
25 find that that heightens the visibility of the crosswalk.

1 I would recommend or suggest for the committee to
2 consider, since you've got the little asterisks with optional
3 there, if there's a way to just apply the optional asterisks to
4 the striping; perhaps that would give people a leeway. I know
5 from a liability standpoint we worry when a lawyer goes up and
6 says why doesn't your crosswalk look like this picture in the
7 manual. So having the optional tag would be helpful for us and
8 would allow us that flexibility.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Anyone else from the public
10 on this? Steve.

11 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
12 Administration. I want to reiterate my concern from the last
13 meeting for people who may not -- Committee members who may not
14 have been present.

15 The -- I think the 50 feet is excessive for a yield
16 distance. At 40 miles an hour, a vehicle traveling 40 miles an
17 hour, that's 60 feet per second roughly, 2 second perception
18 reaction time. And that vehicle has to see the pedestrian 170
19 plus the 50 feet. So 220 feet -- I'm sorry, a 170 foot total
20 in order to stop at the yield light.

21 Would parking -- that 170 feet raises the question of
22 would parking be prohibited in that visible area so that person
23 in the number two lane, driving the number two lane could see
24 the pedestrian, etcetera?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Well, I'd just -- I would

1 just like to respond with we're -- we're taking it from the
2 federal guidance. So if we want to make a change to the
3 federal guidance or the federal figures then that would be the
4 concern that what we're -- what we're recommending is we be
5 consistent with that, allow the flexibility to the -- to the
6 engineer making those decisions between the 20 and 50 feet.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thanks, Janice.

8 Johnny, do you have a comment.

9 MR. BHULLAR: I'm Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans, the
10 editor. And from the editorial perspective I do like the
11 exchange that's going on. But at the same time I'm also
12 hearing that some of these things, we are okay with.

13 So from my perspective, once this recommendation gets
14 worded and reaches my desk, I want to make sure that everything
15 is explicit, whether it's to prohibit the parking or whether it
16 is to have the option to have that lane line be omitted or not.
17 If they are explicit in the manual it's clear to everybody, so
18 the discussion that we are having gets lost.

19 So once it reaches my desk I hope that the motion,
20 any which way the final shape it takes, to make it at least
21 clear to me so that I can explicitly show it one way or the
22 other, whether the marking is optional or not for the lane
23 line, the parking, I'm clear about that.

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you, Johnny. And the
25 way I understand it currently, the only -- the only option

1 that -- that would be considered at this point is the concern
2 about the option of including or not including the lane lines
3 beyond the stop -- the stop indication.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And the parking, Mr.
5 Chairman?

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: And the -- well, the parking is
7 listed in -- it's shown on here. It says, "Adequate visibility
8 should be provided by parking prohibitions."

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Mr. Chairman, may
10 I make a comment on that one?

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yes.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think I said it last
13 time that it was at the committee, that pedestrian accidents
14 happen only and only for one reason, the driver can not see the
15 pedestrian and the pedestrian can not see the vehicle.
16 Otherwise, no pedestrian intentionally steps in front of the
17 vehicle, and no vehicle intentionally hits a pedestrian. It
18 happens when they can not see each other.

19 So all the signage and all the marking and all the
20 warnings are great, but as long as the parking restriction does
21 not provide that clear triangle, the triangle of the site, that
22 they can see each other, the yield line and keep clear and all
23 kinds of things, and whether we continue with the lane line, we
24 don't continue with the lane line, it may not fundamentally
25 change and improve the safety aspect of what we were trying to

1 do. So -- and the location, especially when the vehicle does
2 not expect a pedestrian, which is typically at the mid-block
3 crossing, which these locations are, and the vehicle is going
4 at 35, 40, whatever the posted speed limit might be, and all of
5 a sudden within 50 feet he's expected to see a pedestrian and
6 come to a full stop, it's just not going to happen.

7 So I still, you know, I understand the implications,
8 and I understand how the locals may not like it. But if you
9 really want to improve the safety of the mid-block crosswalks
10 you really need to go with the parking restrictions so the
11 pedestrians can see the cars, cars can see the pedestrians
12 stepping off the curb.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you. We're going to go
14 ahead and bring this back to the committee now. Your -- your
15 staff, Roberta, you're safe.

16 Devinder, you had a comment?

17 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, there's a
18 handout in front of the committee members. And Section 2B.11
19 addresses Hamid's concern under the guidance. So -- and we are
20 very consistent with the federal figure, but I'm not sure
21 parking prohibition. But it's -- it is mentioned in the
22 (inaudible). So if you read that guidance statement --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Thank you, Mr. Singh.
24 And just, yeah, the guidance, any common practicing engineer
25 and I'm doing this kind of design in the field, and read this,

1 if for no other reason, obviously, first reason for -- because
2 it's good engineering practice, I will restrict the parking.
3 Even if I don't exercise good engineering judgment, I will
4 still restrict parking because I'm going to lose the case in
5 the court if there's an accident because I was told that I
6 should consider restricting parking if I use this design. I
7 mean, I'm glad it's there, at least, you know, in some way.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

9 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Devinder -- Robert McLaughlin,
10 Caltrans -- can you give us that paragraph number?

11 SECRETARY SINGH: It's paragraph two -- oh, I'm
12 sorry, yeah, paragraph two.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. It's on --

14 SECRETARY SINGH: Page 140.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- page 140.

16 SECRETARY SINGH: It's in the a handout.

17 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. I've got the handout in front
18 of me.

19 SECRETARY SINGH: So we do not allow to show the
20 diagram. Because if you show something on the diagram, then
21 it's going to be automatically implemented. So there's an
22 option, there's a guidance to prohibit the parking. And on the
23 diagram we show saying, "Adequate visibility should be
24 provided."

25 So I think we covered every comment that the

1 committee made during the last meeting.

2 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Well, and -- and I just want to --
3 Roberta McLaughlin again -- wanted to add that the drawing is
4 not to scale. So regarding the removal of one or two dashes,
5 it's -- it's not going to be illustrated in the -- in the
6 figure because we're not doing that to scale. So we could have
7 two or three dashes with it. But that certainly is an
8 adjustment that can happen in the field. And regarding the
9 comment that attorneys look at this as, well, you didn't do it
10 according, it's only an example. It's not meant to be in
11 detail.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thanks, Roberta.

13 John?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: A couple things.
15 Addressing the point that Roberta just spoke to, I think that
16 the text needs to clearly state that lane markings -- lane line
17 markings, the broken line between the yield line and the
18 crosswalk are optional. That should be a California language.

19 Point two, with regard to the parking, the note on
20 the draft figure 3B.17 says, in my printed copy, "Adequate
21 visibility should be provided," but it does not say by parking
22 prohibition. And I question whether we shouldn't add those
23 words to make it clear that we intend to provide that
24 visibility by prohibiting parking.

25 And number three has to do with actually the text --

1 let's get it up here -- it's actually both federal text in our
2 insert guidance on page 10 to 58 in the agenda, and it has to
3 do with 40 miles per hour. This new guidance is based on
4 DeGeare's (phonetic) unmarked crosswalk markings' study. And
5 the findings in that study are laid out in a table that relates
6 to three key variables that were found to be significant.

7 Speed was not the -- one of the three key variables, but it's
8 also expressed in the table because it had a secondary affect.

9 And our guidance says "where speed limit exceeds 40
10 miles per hour." But if you look at the DeGeare table, Table
11 1 -- which I'm trying to get up here now -- the values in the
12 table that discourage application of markings alone are a
13 little bit more extensive for the four-lane cases, the multi-
14 lane cases, than strictly 40 miles per hour. There's a couple
15 additional cells.

16 So I'm -- I'm wondering whether we shouldn't modify
17 the insert guidance language to more clearly reflect the
18 tenants of DeGeare's Table 1.

19 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Which paragraph?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Paragraph -- it's the
21 inserted guidance paragraph.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: The insert guidance.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The red paragraph.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Well, just to -- to add,
25 this is additional comment provided after last Committee

1 meeting. So was there discussion and -- because I wasn't there
2 regarding this? And if not or if so, then it's going to be
3 another -- another one of these processes where we go -- we're
4 going to keep going back and forth. So we need to make sure
5 we're capturing all the comments the first time they're
6 presented so that we can make sure that we do make those
7 changes in a timely manner.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: And my understanding is Brian
9 discussed with you this proposal. And every time we get new
10 comments, you know, then we bring something. And I -- I asked
11 Brian to discuss with you the revised proposal.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. Well, I --

13 SECRETARY SINGH: And he did.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I've obviously missed
15 my opportunity to affect this. But I do note that there are
16 some cells in DeGeare's table that are not covered by the
17 insert guidance language as stated. But I'm willing to let
18 this go.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Other comments?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well --

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Knowles?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- I would ask the -- our
23 two non-motorized representatives, because I'm concerned also
24 about the 40 mile an hour speed. Where I used this the speed
25 limit was less than 40, but still multi-lane. With your

1 various pedestrian studies, because I know Mr. Miller has
2 conducted a lot of them, is -- and looking at the table in that
3 report, is there a lower limit other than 40? Where did the 40
4 come from in terms of speed? Is that somewhere in that report
5 or -- it seems a little high to me, although I guess the main
6 difference is you may use the striping treatment at much lower
7 speeds. This is at what point you say you should use it.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The way -- the way
9 DeGeare Table 1 works is it has four major columns, according
10 to vehicle ADT. And then it has roads corresponding to the
11 roadway configuration, two lanes, three lane, multi-lane with
12 median raised, and multi-lane without raised median. And then
13 within the major columns of vehicle ADT there are breakouts by
14 speed, less than 30, 35, and 40. And then the -- the key
15 takeaway for a practitioner is contained in the markings that
16 go with the cells. There are three markings that DeGeare, his
17 team, created. One is the C marking which is basically
18 markings alone, probably fine; a candidate side for marked
19 crosswalk. A sort of yellow-flag marking, if you will, is P,
20 "possible increase in pedestrian crashes may occur if
21 crosswalks are added," that means marked, "without other
22 enhancements." And then the most severe, the strongest
23 guidance against simply marking is the cell value N which says,
24 "Markings alone are insufficient."

25 The -- the -- the columns corresponding to 40 miles

1 per hour without raised median are all in the most severe
2 legend. With a raised median, at 40 miles an hour it's clearly
3 not sufficient. But sort of yellow-flag marking, possibly
4 increases crash risk, extends down to the 35 miles an hour
5 range. I'm losing my voice here.

6 So I am more comfortable as a non-motorized
7 representative with making that number 35 miles per hour
8 instead of 40, because it covers more neatly the multi-lane
9 cases where DeGeare's team had a concern.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I can support this at
12 40 or 35. It's just a step a right direction to start
13 including this kind of language.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: With respect to the no
16 parking, I'm highly sympathetic with the intent to get clear
17 site lines. I also know one of the tools we're pushing are
18 curb bump-outs that provide for the site distance and allow the
19 parking to remain. I think it would be a mistake to say the
20 parking has to go. I think if there was to be language it
21 should indicate that if parked vehicles are within the required
22 view area a parking prohibition should be included. But I
23 don't think it should be absolute that you prohibit parking, I
24 don't think in all cases, at least.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Rock, on that, can

1 I follow that? The curb bump-out or the curb bump-out --

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yeah.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- I really -- it's a
4 great idea. But how many of these locations do you think the
5 jurisdictions actually are going to go through the expenditure
6 of doing the -- that actual physical changes?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Many jurisdictions are now
8 reviewing all crosswalks of this category, asking themselves
9 what they need to do to bring them up to compliance with the
10 MUTCD. If those jurisdictions are particularly interested in
11 walk friendliness, many of them are entertaining the use of
12 curb extensions to shorten the crosswalk distance. Not a lot
13 of them in the past, but there will be a whole lot of them in
14 the future.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Because older cities,
16 especially on four-lane highways, they have a whole bunch of
17 these mid-block crosswalks.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yeah.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And probably they're not
20 going to go and retrofit to the extent that you're talking
21 about, which is great, to do the actual physical improvement.
22 But I am not insisting in putting the language under standard.
23 But under guidance, once we put it there at least they know
24 that if they do this kind of treatment they're encouraged to
25 consider the parking.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I would most be looking for
2 the language to indicate to prohibit parking where it has been
3 determined from an engineering study that the parked -- the
4 presence of parked cars would interfere with vision.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: So can I -- can I clarify?
6 It sounds like we're talking about a couple different things.
7 And I think we've done some of those where we insert the
8 guidance. We did -- we did say "Adequate visibility should be
9 provided by parking prohibition." And then on the figure we
10 added "Adequate visibility should be provided." Again, the
11 figure is intended to be the example, not the guidance of the
12 specifics. So we've addressed both of those. We've addressed
13 that situation, both the figure and the language, the text.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And I'd like to point out
15 that the note in the exhibit is important, because we have more
16 than parked cars we're dealing with in many of the -- there's
17 fences. There's trees that need to be trimmed up and shrubs
18 that need to be trimmed down. So, you know, visibility covers
19 a lot of different things. You know, not every street is
20 straight like this. We have curvatures and all kinds of
21 things. So I think it's covered well in the text. And I like
22 the fact that the note on the exhibit covers all visibility,
23 not just parking-related visibility.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And I agree with what Mr.
25 Knowles says completely. One assumes -- and, again, this is a

1 big assumption -- if you're not going to put a mid-block
2 crosswalk where you have limited visibility because of those
3 other features, such as curvature or shrubs, block walls, and
4 things of that nature. So I will take for granted that you are
5 not going to put a mid-block crosswalk where (inaudible).

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I wouldn't take that for
7 granted.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But that's --
9 yeah, and that's a good assumption. Yeah.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Mike --

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yeah?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: -- the other half of the
14 comment related to this -- these issues, I did interpret this
15 item as basically more or less mandating this be the treatment
16 at certain types of locations in the absence of other
17 treatments. I don't think I have any problems reducing it to
18 35 miles per hour. I was happy with it at 40 miles an hour.
19 Because I think once agencies are used to having to do this in
20 many of their multi-lane marked crosswalks, I think they're
21 going to just start automatically doing it at others. But if
22 35 fits better the DeGeare's study, and if 35 meets the -- the
23 approval of the rest of the committee, I certainly have no
24 problem with lowering it to 35.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I just want to respond,
2 just for additional information, that the crosswalk team that
3 looked at this item did extensive studies -- or not studies,
4 did extension research on this and looked at the DeGeare's
5 study. That was the -- the gist of where the Caltrans staff
6 got the information and utilized that, the 40 miles per hour.
7 I don't have that particular table in front of me, and I don't
8 have the particular document that -- that the crosswalk team
9 used. But I do know there was a lot of discussion regarding
10 the -- the speed limits. And we were trying to be consistent
11 with all the information out there. So at this point I would
12 recommend that we stay with the 40 miles per hour.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Johnny?

14 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. I wanted
15 to point out, once you start mentioning 35 miles per hour,
16 basically, one of the big changes in the 2009 manual that we
17 have adopted this time around deals with three things. One
18 is -- and this is based on NCHRA's (phonetic) research --
19 basically what it does is it calls out for a roadway that is
20 multi-lane. The ADT is (inaudible) or lower, and the speeds
21 are 40 miles or lower. And this criteria still has -- you look
22 at this type of roadway classification, it has been given the
23 treatment for larger for larger signs and traffic signals.
24 They have signs that need to be posted right over the lanes.
25 So it touches about two -- which is fine -- about three

1 markings, and then about four signals. And a number of the
2 locations just aren't that type of roadway.

3 And as soon as you deviate from that, then you're
4 deviating from the research upon which most of the changes that
5 are (inaudible) and some of those major changes are based on.
6 So I would not like to have at least Caltrans or California be
7 responsible for deviating from that multi-lane 12,000
8 (inaudible) and 40 miles per hour.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman?

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rick?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I see one detail that I
13 wasn't going to bring up, but may be more important based on
14 these comments. What Johnny just said talked about having
15 these type of treatments start at 40 miles per hour. But the
16 language that's recommended for consideration today is that
17 this particular treatment would start when the speed limits
18 exceed 40 miles per hour, which means at 40 they wouldn't even
19 apply as worded on staff's request. And I don't if that was on
20 purpose or not. But --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: We were just -- just --
22 we're just trying to be consistent with the language right
23 above --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: -- in 3B.18 that -- that

1 uses that same speed limit exceeds 40.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: So, yeah.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: So when it equals 40 it
6 wouldn't apply as currently phrased, so that's -- okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Well, just to clarify is
8 this is -- this is providing the guidance for when it exceeds
9 40. It does not eliminate the ability to do this if your speed
10 is less than -- is at 40 or below. You can do this anywhere
11 you'd like.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Sure. Yeah. I just
13 wanted to make sure I understood.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Okay.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Any -- any other --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: John has pulled up a table
17 from DeGeare's study. And it sure looks to me like those
18 recommendations would apply at posted 40 miles per hour. And
19 if our recommendation is for higher than 40 miles an hour, I
20 think we're a little bit inconsistent with the study. Now, I
21 don't know the -- the process that Caltrans staff went through
22 to come up with this number. But I know being charged with
23 care for pedestrians, I don't think there's a problem if we're
24 a little bit more conservative than everything because we're
25 not talking a huge expense right there. And yet if we're

1 saving serious injuries we're talking a very substantial
2 savings.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: DeGeare's says,
4 independent of the table, actually, it's the double asterisk on
5 the speed limit, so it applies to every value on the table. It
6 says, "Where the speed limit exceeds 30 miles an hour marked
7 crosswalks alone should not be used at unsignalized locations."
8 So he doesn't have any conditionals on volume or anything like
9 that if it's a posted speed of greater than 40 miles per hour.

10 His research looked at several speed ranges. And 40
11 miles per hour posted was one of the speeds that they included
12 in the study. So the table has a column that says 40 miles per
13 hour; it doesn't say greater than 40 miles per hour. But his
14 asterisk comment says if you push it over 40 don't use just
15 marked crosswalks.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Anyone else?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well --

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Jeff?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- on that point, and I
20 can support, you know, 40 is high, but we are creating a new
21 should. My only question would be, why aren't we saying shall
22 when we're talking about over 40 and the statistics that we've
23 been seeing over the last few years with regards to how risky
24 this is on multi-lane roads over 40. But you should -- you
25 shouldn't put in a crosswalk by itself. So if we're going to

1 go with high is over 40, why -- why was the decision to make
2 this a should and not a shall?

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Well --

5 SECRETARY SINGH: Shall is too strong, you know?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yeah.

7 SECRETARY SINGH: Shall is too strong, Jeff. So
8 should is --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, what would be the
10 reason for not doing this on a roadway over 40? There's no
11 good reason not to do this. It's not that expensive and it
12 makes a big difference. Why wouldn't you say, based on all the
13 research, you shall do this on multi-lanes over 40 miles an
14 hour? We're talking about existing crosswalks, not the new
15 ones. And so we've got all these unprotected crosswalks out
16 there. What -- and we're only talking about 40. So that's why
17 I'm saying, why not shall? What's the reason for why not -- I
18 mean, speaking for pedestrians or even -- okay. So I represent
19 motorists. I don't want to hit a pedestrian. So I mean,
20 why -- why, if we're only talking over 40 isn't this even
21 stronger than should?

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Roberta?

23 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans. I
24 think that you're -- once you put the shall in there you're
25 tying the hands of particular situations where urban districts,

1 for instance, removing parking is a very, very sensitive thing.
2 And if you require that they remove parking to 50 feet back
3 from every marked crosswalk or downtown areas, I think you're
4 going to have some very angry people. But there's other ways
5 of -- of enhancing the crosswalks or in the presence of
6 pedestrian, in addition to this is one tool in the toolbox. So
7 I don't think that we want to state that this is applicable to
8 every situation where -- where you have a marked crosswalk in
9 an uncontrolled intersection -- excuse me, uncontrolled
10 process.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Devinder, did you have a comment?

12 SECRETARY SINGH: No.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: No? Good. Anyone else? All right.
14 We've got a few different issues on the floor right now, I
15 think.

16 Go ahead, John.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: At a minimum, in the
18 proposed language I'd like to see exceeds 40 miles per hour
19 changed to whatever the correct terminology is for equals or
20 exceeds, because that clearly ties it to DeGeare's table.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: The only -- the thing is
23 then we'll have to go through and change additional locations.
24 Because above that there's references to 40 and -- and I'm
25 pretty sure other sections are referencing may exceed 40.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think if -- I think
2 if the team, Brian Elkonsel (phonetic) and everyone else took
3 DeGeare's which is the state of -- state of the practice and
4 translated that into a very detailed, that we ought to be true
5 to the intent. So if it's additional work then that's the
6 intent of the -- that's what the research is telling us.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Well, okay, I'm sorry. Let
8 me clarify. It wasn't the intent of the words. What I'm
9 saying is does the committee think that we need to go through
10 and identify those letters? So if we change it here we need to
11 make sure it's consistent. So that will be part of the
12 committee's decision. Do we need to go through and change --

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: -- other locations that
15 reference the exceeds 40 miles per hour?

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Johnny, did you have a comment?

17 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just
18 trying to respond to that, again, just voicing the same concern
19 earlier that the language that is being proposed, as you can
20 see it is very similar to the FHWA language. And once we
21 change it to even 40 have the DeGeare's study, that has been
22 around for quite awhile. And if you want to go and just use
23 that as our standard, then based upon that, that's a CTCDC call
24 all the same. But I would rather rely on the federal language
25 of the National MUTCD and try to stick close to that rather

1 than try to set a precedent here. Because then the DeGeare
2 study has a lot of other regulations, and we must start
3 modifying our manual based on the DeGeare study that is around.
4 It's well respected. But the facts do incorporate some of the
5 elements; they do list them, but not some. So we will start
6 working from that.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think that I'm most
8 comfortable with the MUTCD representing the best available
9 research. There are many cases in the MUTCD where it's just
10 conjecture; not this -- this part of the MUTCD. And we kind of
11 take our best guess at it. This is one case where we've got
12 solid research that's well respected. And I'm rather puzzled
13 at the FHWA language says exceeds 40 miles per hour. And I'm
14 going to go back to my colleagues on the national committee.
15 There is no pedestrian technical committee there, but there
16 are -- there's a large degree of overlap between some of the
17 other technical committees and the people who work on
18 pedestrian issues there. I'm going to ask Bruce Friedman at --
19 at Federal Highway, why does that say exceeds 40 instead of
20 equals 40. It's my -- it's my feeling, based on my understand
21 of DeGeare's study, that the federal language should say meets
22 or exceeds 40.

23 So I don't know the answer to that, Johnny. But I
24 think that there are cases where California is more
25 conservative than -- than federal, for good reason. And this

1 has got the best reasoning of all behind it. It's a solid
2 study that's not the -- the landmark in the pedestrian safety
3 field. This is not a trivial issue because of the kinetic
4 energy of what determines the damage potential of a collision.
5 And for pedestrians, 45 miles an hour is way up on the curve
6 towards guaranteed fatality; 40 and 45 differ substantially,
7 and 35 differs qualitatively from 40. So we're talking about
8 exacting a power of two curve here. So I need to do my
9 homework at a federal level.

10 But I don't think that -- and the other thing is I've
11 seen the sausage get made at the federal level. And often
12 stuff gets watered down because it was deemed impractical to
13 pass it at the federal level through national accounts and
14 through sponsors. Case in point is the shared lane marking
15 language which California actually pioneered. There was a
16 backing away from increasing the minimum offset from the curb
17 sufficient to position the shared lane marking outside of the
18 door zone of the parked cars because we felt we couldn't pass
19 it, we couldn't get 12 feet through national, the sausage-
20 making issue. It wasn't because it wasn't the right thing to
21 do. It was the right thing to do.

22 So I don't place all my faith on the federal having
23 superior backing for their number. That's why I'll do my
24 homework.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just
2 briefly responding to that, well, I'm going to let the
3 committee decide and Caltrans, if California wants to
4 (inaudible) and if we want to go with basically the DeGeare's
5 study, at least that -- there, there is the basis. Sometimes
6 we do make recommendations under a basis. So I'm open to that.
7 But like I said, I'm a little bit, of course, leery of going in
8 that direction. But that's why I sit on this side and I let
9 the committee decide.

10 But regarding the (inaudible) and the fatality rates,
11 I'm working with CHP on investigations and (inaudible). We
12 found out that 30 miles or more is where the fatalities occurs.
13 So we shouldn't say because 40 is where we draw the line as to
14 the fatalities, and more like 30. The human body at 30 miles
15 or lower is where your (inaudible) solutions begin. And so --

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Good -- we've had good
17 healthy discussion. Is -- are we at a point now where someone
18 would be interested in trying to formulate a motion on this, or
19 is there any new information that we should be considering?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I would like to put a
21 motion forward to vote on approving the -- the draft language
22 and the figures as presented to the committee with, at this
23 time, no recommendations for editing, but then a second piece
24 of that would be that at the national committee that John would
25 move forward and find out the information on why the other

1 language throughout the -- or above in this same section
2 references the speed limit exceeds 40, and then we could bring
3 that topic back. But for the sake of getting this information
4 out there for using I would recommend that we approve this
5 language as is, and then we can make edits as the national
6 committee or as additional is provided to support the
7 additional changes to the speed.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Motion by Janice to -- to --
9 to basically approve exactly as originally proposed, with John
10 to report back after the national meeting why the -- why the
11 40 -- above 40 has been listed.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'd like to second that.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: So a motion by Janice, a second by
14 Jeff. Discussion?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Actually, it's a
16 question for the -- the maker of the motion. Did you -- are
17 you sympathetic to including option language for allowing the
18 omission and removal of markings between the old line and the
19 first crosswalk line?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: No. At this time we're not
21 recommending that change, just because we're -- we're being
22 consistent with the figures in the federal guidance.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Any other questions,
24 comments? We have a motion and a second. The motion, to
25 repeat it again, is to approve this item exactly as it is

1 proposed with no changes to the speed at which the -- the
2 configurations are to be implemented.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Mr. Chair, I don't know how
4 you handle this, but if we want to propose amendments that may
5 or may or may not be friendly did you want to handle them as
6 amendments or -- because I would be happy with everything,
7 except that I'd prefer than instead of exceeds 40 it would say
8 exceeds 35.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: What I'm -- what I'm understanding
10 is the motion maker and the second wants to leave it as it is
11 until there is a reporting back on why -- why it exceeds 40.
12 So I think, unless there is an agreement to -- to change that,
13 then I think we'd have to vote on this motion.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And as -- as the person
15 with the concern who may be tasked with taking this back
16 through national, I think such good work has been done in
17 creating these figures. It's such a qualitative improvement
18 over the existing state of California practice that I'm -- I
19 would be happy to vote in favor.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. All right.

21 SECRETARY SINGH: That works.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Then I'll call for the question.
23 All in favor for the motion as stated, please raise your hand.
24 All those opposed, please raise your hand. Seeing none --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I haven't raised my hand

1 yet.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: We -- those who abstain, if you
3 abstain would you please raise your --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Call me and aye. Call me
5 an aye.

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: Call you -- okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Because I'll -- I'll expect
8 some good information back in front of us from John --

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So I --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: -- at the next meeting.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: I'm hearing that we have -- this was
12 a unanimous vote. We got two in a row. Okay.

13 SECRETARY SINGH: Give minutes?

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: It is -- it is ten minutes after
15 11:00. Yeah, we'll take a five minute break. I want to get
16 through one, and possible two more, before we go to lunch. So
17 we're a little bit behind, I would say, and I'd like to catch
18 up.

19 (Off the Record From 11:11 A.M., Until 11:23 A.M.)

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: The committee is back in session.

21 And the next -- the next item on our agenda is item 12-20.

22 Folks, can we -- can we kill the conversation out there.

23 The next item is 12-20, FHWA's 2009 Manual Uniform
24 Traffic Control Device Revisions 1 and 2, engineering judgment
25 and compliance dates proposal by -- it's proposed by Caltrans.

1 And, Janice, do you have this one as well?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes. And I need Johnny
3 Bhullar. But, yes, okay, I'll introduce --

4 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Johnny is right here.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Okay. So for item --
6 agenda item 12-20, Federal Highways' 2009 MUTCD Revisions 1 and
7 2, on May 14th, 2012 Federal Highways issued an official
8 revision to the National MUTCD 2009 edition regarding
9 engineering judgment and compliance dates. California is
10 required to incorporate these revisions into the California
11 MUTCD on or before June 13th, 2014. This item was an
12 informational item at the August 2012 meeting and contain the
13 web links and references. At this meeting item 12-20 is on the
14 agenda as a public hearing item and contains detailed proposals
15 with background and recommendations on the changes to the
16 California manual that we'll need to incorporate the federal
17 highway official revision.

18 So I want to introduce Johnny Bhullar, the editor of
19 the California MUTCD, to provide the details and revisions.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
21 Thank you, Janice. Okay.

22 I'll bring your attention to page 14. So I'll walk
23 you through the pages, at least explain what the proposal is
24 here. So basically when we start out on page 14 I do have some
25 background and some links. On purpose I did not include those,

1 because if I do that it becomes -- all those links because like
2 an APPH (phonetic) proposal by itself.

3 But basically what it is, is there are two separate
4 revisions. And, of course, I do apologize for lumping them
5 together as one item. But working with Devinder, he said it
6 will be of interest if we just have it as one item. But
7 essentially there are two different proposals. But these are
8 federal MUTCD official revisions. And they have been -- they
9 were released on May 15th, and they have become effective as of
10 June nationwide to all the states who have it as their official
11 policy to incorporate them as to a typical location. However,
12 the feds do allow two years for any state. And we happen to be
13 in that situation where we take our time, look at it, and make
14 sure that it does comply. Any official language that gets --
15 gets made to the manual does get reviewed by this committee, as
16 well as (inaudible), to ensure that not only it complies with
17 the state law, but also it complies with other above standards
18 and policies. So that is the background on that.

19 But at the same time, once the feds do release it we
20 are under, I would say, a deadline now for two years -- in this
21 case it happens to be June 13th of 2014 -- by which date the
22 official language that we have today needs to be revised and
23 officially incorporated into any revisions that occur from the
24 feds.

25 So working with that date, that's the reason we

1 started this as an informational item at first. We wanted to
2 make sure that everyone was getting up to speed on the
3 (inaudible). But today we have it as an agenda item. And we
4 are seeking the condition from this committee for this item.
5 So basically I'm looking through the pages now and make sure
6 that we are -- everyone is on the same page.

7 Page 15 is -- the way I've done this proposal is
8 first I have worked with the current manual, the way it is and
9 the by-line changes so that anyone that wants to, they make the
10 comparisons. So page 15 is Section 1A.09 the way it is today.
11 And as you can see, the black and the blue areas, the black is
12 the National MUTCD language incorporated, and the blue language
13 is California in reference to that. But here I'm not showing
14 any changes because this is basically just to show what is the
15 policy to date. But the sections that are affected are 1A09.
16 And then the next section that is affected is 1A.13. And
17 again, I've just included those.

18 And then after that, when we get to page 16, that's
19 where the recommendation of our proposal begins. And on page
20 16, if you go to the section that I've highlighted here in red,
21 basically here what's happening is that I'm showing, in case we
22 want to go over this proposal, how it's going to be
23 incorporated into the manual. Paragraph number three that you
24 see, I mean, this paragraph three is a brand new proposal -- I
25 wouldn't say a proposal. Actually, this is the official change

1 to the National MUTCD that the feds have made. So that is --
2 I'm proposing here to go along with paragraph number three.

3 And the paragraph that here says 02A (phonetic) is if
4 you compare it to page, I believe page 14 here, 15. So this is
5 the language we had, 02A and 02B (phonetic) on page 15. This
6 is our existing language. And for those of you that were
7 involved, you might recall that we had incorporated this
8 language based upon a federal proposal that was made to a
9 change. And this wording did not (inaudible) or with this
10 committee. But this was now an official wording. This was
11 wording that was in a proposal to the (inaudible) manual that
12 affects. However, in our adopting it as of January of this
13 year we got the blessing from the feds and we incorporated that
14 as a means of explanation.

15 So this paragraph 02A and 02B, in a nutshell they say
16 that -- they explain that the (inaudible) location should be
17 made on the basis of either (inaudible) study or the
18 application of (inaudible) judgment.

19 And now this paragraph 02A is incorporated in the
20 final language on the next page in paragraph three that you see
21 in red. So that is the reason I am striking out our previous
22 paragraph 02A. So if you see on page 16 on the screen,
23 basically what I'm doing here is I'm deleting this because it's
24 incorporated up here. Then rather than continuing down, the
25 remaining paragraph, which was paragraph 02B, I'm giving it a

1 new title, but I want to keep the second portion of that
2 paragraph that we had before. And the reason why is that it
3 does more explicitly explain what we mean when we say that you
4 are going to deviate from a shall.

5 So my proposal, at least to here, is that I want to,
6 in this section, adopt the federal guidance paragraph that they
7 have made official change, which is paragraph three. At the
8 same time I want to carry over what we had previously adopted
9 and the feds have blessed, which is paragraph number 03A
10 (phonetic). However, if either Steve Pyburn or the committee
11 or anyone else objects, then I'm okay with option two. But my
12 recommendation is to go with option one which will still carry
13 over the language that we already have in our current manual.

14 And let me just go to the next page before I break,
15 because then the topic will change. So the other element to
16 this is on page 17, section 1A.13, the language that is in
17 paragraph -- first subheading A under standards, the last
18 sentence, there is -- has -- now we (inaudible). And the feds
19 have made that a proposal. So that, in a way it's a moot
20 point. We have already currently crossed out in our manual.
21 They were just helping me to do that.

22 And in a nutshell the issue regarding Region 1 is
23 that the feds have added a statement which said standard
24 statements shall not be modified or compromised based on any
25 changes (inaudible) study. And in a nutshell what that's

1 saying is that we are not to deviate from a shall, period. And
2 issues (inaudible) by the actual members, as well as by
3 Caltrans, and a lot of other cities and counties around the
4 nation. Now saying that, this leads us into a liability corner
5 because if we can not agree on a shall, then essentially
6 engineers can not use their knowledge, they can not use their
7 education, they can not use their experience. So basically
8 they become technicians and try to follow a book that is
9 oblivious or not even aware of the actual field conditions
10 which they're trying to solve here.

11 So in a nutshell that is the issue. And I will stop
12 there because the Region Number 2 deals with the separate issue
13 (inaudible).

14 Does the committee have any questions?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, since we are
16 visiting this issue, Johnny, and we might have brought this up,
17 on the option one, I have no problem with the option one that
18 you're suggesting on page 16 in that -- in that box. But one
19 thing that I've always been, and it better be practiced out
20 there, that the agency may deviate from that standard statement
21 at that location.

22 I would like to add a sentence at the end of that,
23 that the reasons for lack of compliance with the standard need
24 to be well documented and kept in perpetuity. Because --
25 because this, I'm just -- we all have been through

1 interrogatories and depositions and court proceedings where a
2 deviation was made 25 years ago, no one remembers what
3 happened, why it was done, there's no record of document, and
4 it's actually for -- if for any other -- it's not for any
5 reason but actually protecting the agencies, that whenever
6 there is a deviation from the standard it must be well
7 documented and kept in perpetuity, not subject to the record
8 destruction policy where they usually destroy all the records
9 in like seven-year cycles. So that would be good if you add
10 that since we're already -- and it's an option language
11 anyways, just -- just --

12 MR. BHULLAR: So, Hamid -- and again, Johnny Bhullar.
13 If I understand correctly, what would be that exact language
14 that you're proposing? Because if you say it -- because if you
15 say it's optional then the meaning gets lost. Optionally,
16 would that (inaudible)?

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Well --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Go ahead.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- let me try.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Sure.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: What he's suggesting is adding a
22 sentence at the bottom of -- of paragraph 03A that says reasons
23 for deviating from the standards shall be documented and kept
24 in perpetuity.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But you can not add that

1 this is optional. So if you have --

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: If -- and the intent --

3 MR. BHULLAR: Well, I'll make it --

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: The --

5 MR. BHULLAR: -- as a separate paragraph if -- if it
6 becomes a shall. But you just give me the language. I can
7 worry about the paragraph and where it fits in there.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: The intent would be if -- if the
9 engineer just determines to go with this option then he's
10 committing to documenting and keeping his rational.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: See, one of the reasons
12 I'm saying is that -- okay, let me think of one specific case.
13 One of the things in this manual is the setting of speed law;
14 right? So California Vehicle Code says you do the speed says
15 you do the speed -- posting of the speed limit by the methods
16 established by the California Department of Transportation;
17 right? So you come to this document and this document tells
18 you, you have to do the 85th percentile and do this and do
19 that, and conditions not readily apparent and all that.

20 Now, if I introduce something here that says that
21 based on an engineering judgment that I don't even have to
22 document I can deviate willy-nilly from any standard statement
23 in this document, then pretty much all that we are saying here
24 is somebody can say it was my engineering judgment, I didn't
25 want 45 miles here, I put 35. And if you ask them why they say

1 it was engineering judgment.

2 So I think -- I think we need to have some kind of
3 protection, not only so that we don't go from one extreme to
4 the other, we don't go from the extreme of saying engineering
5 judgment doesn't have any role to a place that any engineer can
6 get into any field condition and say it's my engineering
7 judgment, I don't have to comply with MUTCD for such and such
8 here. But it must be well documented and it must be kept.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. For the record, I do
10 support that. It's just that I don't want to come up with the
11 language. So if the committee can help me, I'll be able to do
12 that.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Mr. Chair --

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: -- I could start that
16 process by offering -- I think the phrase should be modified to
17 delete the words "for the application of engineering judgment."

18 SECRETARY SINGH: Can I make a comment?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: That -- that --

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Just one moment. One moment. Where
21 are you, Rock?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: On option one it currently
23 reads "when an engineering study," and then the next six or
24 seven words should be deleted, "for the application of
25 engineering judgment." It -- it should only be based on an

1 engineering study.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Miller, that's an
3 excellent suggestion. If I may, add then the -- add "when a
4 documented" --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I was going to do that.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- "when a documented or
7 a written engineering study."

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Engineering study, pretty
9 much by definition, requires documentation.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: So we're half way there.
12 The only thing that's missing is the admonition that the
13 justification be maintained in perpetuity. And I was going to
14 go on to suggest that first those words be deleted and that a
15 phrase be added basically stating "and such engineering studies
16 shall be maintained in perpetuity."

17 MR. BHULLAR: Just -- Johnny Bhullar. First of all,
18 that optional language that you're looking at is going with
19 official policy. It came -- the wording came from the feds,
20 not from us. Thirdly, once you take out the word (inaudible)
21 judgment, now what you're saying is any deviation from a shall,
22 an agency will be required to do an engineering study, which is
23 a big burden. So --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I don't think it's a burden
25 to violate a standard of the MUTCD. I think it should be a

1 mandatory burden to consider doing it.

2 MR. BHULLAR: But that's how the feds see it in their
3 interpretation of this policy. And the reason why I did not
4 include, like I said, the 80 to 90 pages of this proposal, and
5 the first four links I was sharing with you previously, they
6 highlight the -- this exact interpretation and why it is so.
7 So I then would like to have, probably even this item be
8 (inaudible). I'm in no rush to have this item be completed. I
9 would rather defer it and have the members read the federal
10 guidance and look into this. Is it -- because this is a very,
11 I would say, involved issue, even though it started with one
12 sentence in the manual at the national level. This is one of
13 these issues that only four or five issues in the last 30 years
14 where the state duties and the feds (inaudible).

15 So because of that I would rather that everyone then
16 gets up to speed and looks at the federal lawyers and their
17 interpretation before I go away from just the (inaudible)
18 study, not the application (inaudible).

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Johnny, if I understand the
20 process, regardless of what we do, any word change of any kind
21 has to go to -- back to the feds for verification of
22 substantial conformance. So I believe we have a little bit
23 more flexibility to adjust the words on this, knowing any
24 change we make still has to go back to FHWA for concurrence.
25 Now, I don't know if they'll concur on it or disagree with it.

1 But I -- I just have a feeling they're going to agree that
2 engineering judgment alone should not be efficient to deviate
3 from the mandatory standards.

4 MR. BHULLAR: But that is not what they proposed.
5 And that's what their lead lawyers interpreted. That's not
6 even California, the language that they're --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: This is in here. I just
8 don't think they're going to find us out of compliance if we're
9 heightening the bar to deviate.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Until now they told us they
12 didn't want us to deviate.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock, I'm told that -- that there is
14 a pretty significant amount of -- of material to read, and that
15 Caltrans is -- has got two years to -- to make good on this
16 language. And so I think the request would be that they --
17 that they take this back, take our comments, craft it in a
18 manner that we -- that we want it to be, and then send it back
19 to FHWA.

20 SECRETARY SINGH: We'll bring -- we'll bring back
21 this item so that -- until the next meeting.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: But since it's on the
23 agenda there's --

24 MR. BHULLAR: But let's -- let's receive all the
25 comments. I want to receive all the comments.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yeah. You need to hear the
2 comments.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Since it's on the agenda
4 there's no point bringing it back and having the same
5 discussion, so let's get the points out. Engineering judgment
6 is a very vaguely defined term. If you send two engineers to
7 the field condition they're going to have two different
8 engineering judgments. So it must be documented. It must be
9 said, because the right-of-way was not available, or because it
10 would have cost us half a million dollars to put the stop sign,
11 even though the manual said you should put it there. And it
12 should be kept because the engineer that did the field visit
13 and made the determination, he's going to retire, he's going to
14 move on. Nobody knows why the deviation was done. It's a
15 normal standard practice in the industry, in the
16 municipalities, even in the consulting business, that when you
17 deviate from a standard you document it. All that I'm saying
18 is that we need to somehow say that you can't send an engineer
19 out there, then five years from now you don't know who the
20 engineer was and why he decided that it was not feasible to
21 do -- comply with the standard.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

23 MR. BHULLAR: Hamid, I totally agree with that.

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: Wait a minute, Johnny. I think what
25 we -- what we can do is create from this a standard that will

1 require documentation --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- of reasons for deviating.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That's all I'm asking.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: And -- and that -- that's something
6 that we can put right in.

7 SECRETARY SINGH: That should be no problem, Johnny,
8 adding, under the optional standard, the reason to deviate
9 shall be --

10 MR. BHULLAR: No, I agree with that. The only issue
11 that I had was when we struck (inaudible), that's the issue
12 that I'm not willing to do.

13 SECRETARY SINGH: We're not going to touch anything
14 but add (inaudible) add standard statement under the option.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Okay.

16 MR. BHULLAR: And that's a good -- that's a good
17 suggestion.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: John, you had your hand up first.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This -- my question
20 speaks to that point. If we strike "for the application of
21 engineering judgment" so an engineering study is required, I
22 want to tie that back to something that I experienced with the
23 committee. I'm on the Bicycle Technical Committee at the
24 national level. And this issue of deviation from standard came
25 up in the context of sign placement over pads. If you've got a

1 very constrained vertical and horizontal right-of-way, like
2 going through a tunnel or something like that, the figure 9B1
3 (phonetic) and supporting language says you shall not have any
4 portion of a sign within two feet of the -- the paved portion
5 of the path.

6 Clearly there are cases where you want to punch that
7 path under a railroad or something like that. You've got to go
8 three miles out of the way to get to the next crossing, you
9 really don't have that path there, and yet you need a sign.
10 In -- in that case if engineering judgment weren't on the table
11 what would -- what would a study consist of? Would it consist
12 of the engineer observing and saying I've studied it, it
13 doesn't fit, therefore, and is that -- what's the nature of a
14 study if judgment is not allowed? Is it -- is always a big
15 heavyweight thing? And I'm -- and I'm asking this as someone
16 who is coming up just from the planning world, not from the
17 engineering and municipal world. So it's really a question for
18 practitioners.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Anybody?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: And I think, John, that's a
21 really good question, even coming from an engineering world,
22 because that's what we get caught up in is how -- what is
23 required when you do an engineering study. So then if we take
24 away the application of engineering judgment we're getting into
25 a whole other world of the terminology of an engineering study,

1 an engineering analysis, and all that. So I --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I do not particularly
3 insist on taking engineering judgment out at all, as long as
4 the engineering judgment is kept but it is documented. So
5 we -- basically we --

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: Wait a minute. We have -- we
7 have --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It can be a simple, even
9 from engineering and supervisors, and I did the field visit and
10 I didn't have the vertical clearance; that's why I can not
11 comply. And that email is the engineering judgment
12 documentation.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mark, you had your hand up.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Since you're asking for
15 comments, I support the language as written, if it is, in fact,
16 consistent with the federal manual. I also don't think it's
17 the role of this committee or the MUTCD to require agencies to
18 provide any additional documentation. They're already doing
19 it. And I think my agency counterparts are going to agree with
20 me.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I agree 100 percent,
22 actually. Because in the real world, sometimes we have to make
23 snap judgments. We've got construction zones. We've got
24 emergencies. Sometimes we just have time constraints. And I
25 don't want to get involved in a court hearing with some

1 attorney trying to argue now, well, the judgment, did we do an
2 engineering study? You know, what is -- what is involved with
3 an engineering study. And as far as I can see isn't what
4 you're proposing as option one exactly the same language we
5 approved before as paragraph 2B? The feds are just saying,
6 okay, we'll accept your exact language, don't change it. We're
7 just going to number it as 3A instead of your old 2B.

8 MR. BHULLAR: No. No. Basically --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So that word for word it's
10 the same.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Yes. Basically, what happened
12 here is -- let me explain. What happened here is that you see
13 on page 15, paragraph 02A and 02B were what we adopted, but it
14 was never in the National MUTCD.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. Right.

16 MR. BHULLAR: That's what they had proposed. But
17 from the time that the 02A and 02B got finalized, they got
18 finalized as 03 paragraph that you're seeing there.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, weren't we told this
20 language was coming so we incorporated into our, even though
21 they hadn't adopted it yet.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. So it was their
24 language actually?

25 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, it was their language --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

2 MR. BHULLAR: -- as they proposal. So what I'm
3 saying is that we are okay with the new language, but we also
4 want to hold onto the previous language because that does
5 explain more explicitly some of the terms that have been
6 changed in paragraph three. Because in paragraph three they
7 have made it much more generic, but the underlying explanations
8 are still the same in the federal language where they were
9 explaining it. So California is number six liability-wise when
10 we look at the states. And, of course, if you look at just
11 transportation issues, then we are even higher than number six.
12 And for that reason I'd like the more explicit language that
13 I'm trying to keep in paragraph -- option one.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right. So this -- so as a
15 local agency representative what I'd like to say is be careful
16 about what you add that is a new requirement. Because you're
17 just handing that to the opposing attorney.

18 MR. BHULLAR: That's right.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So whatever language you
20 come up with is just to help them sue the city.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, let
22 me -- let me just very, very, very realistic scenario. I'm a
23 traffic engineer for City of Santa Cruz. There is a street --
24 and this committee and Caltrans has gone through the agony
25 about three years of discussions about how to set speed limit.

1 And I'm the city traffic engineer for City of Santa Cruz. And
2 my mayor comes to me and says I don't care what the state law
3 says, I don't want 45 mile on that street; I want 35. And I go
4 and I read this and I say -- I go to the field, I look at it,
5 unusual site specific conditions. They have too many
6 overhanging wire utility here. That's an unusual safety
7 condition. Based on that engineering judgment that I have not
8 even documented it, I post 35. And the manual completely
9 allows me to do that because it doesn't define what the
10 engineering judgment is. It doesn't say that I have to
11 document it all. All that is says is that an engineer can go
12 look at the site specific conditions. Based on his individual
13 judgment he can -- he can deviate from standard statement of
14 this manual at that location and he doesn't even have to
15 explain it or write it anywhere.

16 So what is this manual good for if any engineer can
17 say it's my engineering judgment, I don have to comply with the
18 standard? That's all I'm saying, is you have to document it.
19 You can just say engineering judgment.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Janice, did you have a comment?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yeah. I just want to
22 comment back to what was said earlier with the documentation is
23 I'm pretty sure every agency has policies on procedures on how
24 they document all of their decisions, all of their engineering
25 decisions, all of their -- whether it's a traffic control

1 device, a design decision, and so forth. So I would -- I would
2 be cautious if we're trying to put in this manual that
3 requirement when all other agencies are handling it their way,
4 they've all got their own ability to handle responses with why
5 did we make those decisions and so forth.

6 So I would refrain from putting that in this manual
7 and have the agencies themselves handle that situation. But I
8 don't think it's -- I don't think this is a new issue with
9 anybody in this room.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. I continue to agree
12 with Hamid on this one. And I probably have as much experience
13 from a liability scenario on this as anybody on the panel.
14 We're not talking any deviation from anything in the manual.
15 We're talking about deviation from standards. That's not a
16 once-a-day occurrence. It's not a once-a-week occurrence. For
17 most local agencies it's probably going to be a once-in-a-
18 lifetime occurrence. You know, Hamid's example of speed zoning
19 to me isn't the best one.

20 A better example is what circumstances in the world
21 would cause me to want to have a stop sign with seven sides on
22 it? Well, if I came up with a need to have a stop sign with
23 seven sides on it I wouldn't want to use engineering judgment
24 and leave my agency with a seven-sided stop sign for all
25 eternity when I guarantee you, anything that associates with

1 that stop sign, why does that stop sign have seven sides? We
2 don't know. Somebody 25 years ago decided that stop sign
3 should have seven signs. You just don't want to be in that
4 situation.

5 You want to have the reason why that stop sign has
6 seven sides. This is not a guideline we're talking about.
7 Guidelines we have to get around frequent. This is a standard
8 we're talking about. It's really, in my judgment, almost a
9 once-in-a-lifetime event. And to require a higher level of
10 documentation, to me, is pretty reasonable.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And just, if I may, to
12 add to what Mr. Miller said, there is a reason that we have a
13 hierarchy of provisions in the manual. We have a shall, we
14 have a should, and we have a may. I'm not suggesting that all
15 these issues from may and should, should be documented. But if
16 shall really is not that important, why do we even have a
17 shall? If shall can be easily modified and deviated from
18 without any really strong reason, documented reason, why even
19 bother with the shall? Let's make all the manual a should and
20 a may. And if the engineer feels that he has to do it, he's
21 going to do it. If he doesn't have to do it, he's not going to
22 do it.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Johnny.

24 MR. BHULLAR: I mean, of course, we can debate it.
25 But most of the, I would say deviations, even from the shall

1 that I normally see have to do with when the signs have been
2 made it, are later deleted, and they are beginning to be used,
3 or there are signs or sizes, size issues, minimum size issues
4 and things like that, and those deviations sometimes occur
5 either unknowingly, or in other cases there are situations
6 where they have to come up with their own devices.

7 So -- but anyhow, I welcome comments.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: John?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Having sat on the
10 National -- on the Bike Tech Committee for over a decade now,
11 the last year or so has -- you know, concurrent with this
12 change in the federal language there's been a big push at
13 national to change as many shalls as makes sense to be shoulds,
14 basically leaving the federal manual with a minimum highly-
15 defensible set of shalls. Each committee, each technical
16 committee was -- was asked to do that, and we all did our
17 homework and came back with results of that. So this isn't
18 something that Federal Highway has done arbitrarily. There's a
19 bit of background.

20 Regarding the documentation issue, I certainly, as a
21 member of the public, not a member of this committee, would
22 like to see significant engineering decisions documented. It
23 sounds like we have two viewpoints being expressed here. One
24 is that agencies are doing this anyhow, and we shouldn't
25 mandate it in language in the manual. And the other is

1 basically the alternate viewpoint that says we want the manual
2 to ensure that they do it. And I -- I wonder whether Mr.
3 Miller is aware of or has a sense of agencies that would, in
4 fact, not document sufficiently if we don't put language in
5 this part of the manual to require them to do that.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: My only response to that is
7 I don't think that the exceptions are as common as what Mr.
8 Bhullar described. I suspect with research we'd find most of
9 those were should situations that were accepted, not shall
10 situations. The -- as you've indicated, the trend is to have
11 fewer shall conditions. And as a result of that there will be
12 fewer needs to get around this. But the reason this really
13 came up and became an issue is that states and cities did
14 acknowledge, they do run into once-in-a-lifetime situations
15 where they can't follow the standard. The prior language said,
16 tough, follow it anyway. And we're now dealing with the
17 aftermath of a standard that said there was no flexibility
18 trying to put in a limited amount of flexibility.

19 So you know, I can't, in all honestly, can't give you
20 a lot of occasions where a shall statement was deviated from.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Any other comments from the
22 committee before I send it out to the public?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, just don't
24 want to belabor this, if the agencies are already doing this
25 then what's the harm putting this in the manual? If the

1 agencies are not doing it then they shall, then you have to put
2 it in the manual. Either way I think it belongs in the manual.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Just for the record, Caltrans legal, as
5 well as in our trainings through Caltrans, we do see it always
6 documented. We just haven't put it in the manual, just for the
7 same reasons that were being discussed. But if the local
8 agencies want to, I think we'll be okay with it. But we are
9 neutral, I think, on this issue.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. Now we'll open up to
11 members of the public.

12 MR. CARUSO: Peter Caruso, District 12, Traffic
13 Operations.

14 Hamid, I agree with you wholeheartedly. This is --
15 if our engineering license means anything we shouldn't be
16 afraid to put it on a piece of paper. My experience is local
17 agencies do not have any sort of documentation process. And
18 often they'll say it was an engineering judgment. And they'll
19 say, which engineer made that decision? And they'll say we
20 don't even know. They'll just say it was engineering judgment.
21 And your example with the speed zone surveys is 100 percent my
22 experience with local agencies is they will send somebody out
23 there to get the numbers that they wanted to get, and then
24 they'll just hide behind engineering judgment and they won't
25 even know who did it.

1 So if they do have some sort of process it doesn't
2 have to be elaborate. It could just say who -- which engineer
3 made this decision could be step one. Step two could be
4 describe why.

5 And, Jeff, yesterday you were concerned about cutting
6 up a wild turkey crossing sign because it wasn't in our manual.
7 And today you're saying you make snap decisions deviating from
8 shalls and you don't want to document it. So I'm seeing a
9 little confusion on understanding how you didn't just put up a
10 wild turkey sign yesterday.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It wasn't just a snap
12 decision.

13 MR. CARUSO: Right. Your snap decisions are in
14 deviating from shalls, so I'm a little confused by that.

15 But also with this, Johnny, with this it says here
16 this manual describes the application of traffic control
17 devices which shall not be a legal requirement for the
18 installation. What is the legal requirement for their
19 installation?

20 MR. BHULLAR: Can you pull up the reference?

21 MR. CARUSO: Yeah, the big bold. It says right here,
22 "It shall not be a requirement for the installation." Then
23 what is?

24 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. Basically, what the manual is
25 trying to say is it's not the law.

1 MR. CARUSO: But the CVC says this is the law.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. But -- but at the national
3 level -- because this is a federal regulation. That black line
4 that you see up there, they're saying because it's a federal
5 regulation, but not the state law. So it's state. And maybe
6 that's the disconnect that we should check with our legal, but
7 that speaks to the issue.

8 MR. CARUSO: And that's -- not only that, but here in
9 the red it says "standards." Does this manual allow providing
10 standards? Standards are legal; right?

11 MR. BHULLAR: The whole manual in California, based
12 on the CVC, the whole manual becomes the law. And -- but the
13 flexibility within the manual is that you can deviate from, of
14 course, the shall, the way we are trying to describe here,
15 based on your engineering license. And then, of course, the
16 should, may, and the poll is take it or leave it, basically,
17 you don't have to go with those.

18 MR. CARUSO: Okay. Okay. But I do think this is a
19 legal document. It may not require the installation, but it
20 does talk about standards, guidance, and options for their
21 installation, which are legal requirements.

22 And then the second part with this -- then the other
23 one part of this is that I think that, Hamid, when you say
24 deviation from a shall should be -- I think even a should
25 should be. A should should at least have the name of the

1 engineer that made the decision, and that should be documented.
2 And even if it's just two sentences saying why he deviated,
3 that should be a requirement.

4 And one other thing is that the engineering judgment
5 section, you said that was going to be defined. I don't see it
6 here. But I think that would be even better if we put that
7 under engineering judgment. The definition of engineering
8 judgment, the last part should be what you said, that the
9 engineering judgment would be described, at least who the
10 engineer was and even just a brief description of why he
11 deviated.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you.

13 Steve, were you in line?

14 MR. PYBURN: No.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: No? Any other comments from the
16 public? Okay. Bringing the conversation back to the
17 committee, we -- I think we have a couple of trains of thought
18 here, one, that we need to provide documentation for
19 deviations, and I think there are some who think that may not
20 be necessary. So maybe that -- oh, Mark, you had -- you had a
21 comment?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I have a question. I'm
23 struck that we have Caltrans representatives here arguing two
24 different sides of the same case. And I wonder, what is
25 Caltrans official recommendation here?

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: That's a good question --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: It would be --

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- and I'll leave that to Janice.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Back to my comment that I
5 said before, is our Caltrans recommendation is as proposed here
6 in the agenda item. And then just comments regarding the
7 documentation, I go back to what Johnny says, which I do
8 support, is if the local agencies want to add that language in
9 there I don't think there's any issues on our end on doing that
10 because we do have a process and procedures on how to document
11 that decision.

12 So I would defer -- I don't support it in terms of
13 providing that information specifically in the manual. But if
14 the local agencies are in support of that I can -- I can
15 support their decision.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Janice, thank you.

17 I'm going to go ahead and voice my own opinion on
18 this, as well. I've worked in several different agencies, some
19 that have had very good processes for documenting deviations to
20 standard, and others that have no processes. And it's those --
21 those agencies that end up paying the big bucks when things go
22 to -- to jury trials. I've, over my years, determined that
23 it's best to have a documented justification for deviations to
24 standard. I have done a few. And so I'm going to be in favor
25 of adding some language that requires any deviation to be

1 documented in some form or fashion.

2 So, Hamid?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chair, I think if you
4 remember why we are even having this discussion, public
5 agencies use design immunity all the time. And they kept the
6 cases summarily dismissed because the judge says, yes, design
7 immunity applies. And the design immunity goes back, we all
8 know, to the sovereign immunity, and sovereign shall do no
9 wrong and all that. We are passed those days. Design immunity
10 applies only if you follow the standards that are approved. If
11 you deviate from the standard you must have had very good
12 reason, you must have had it documented. If you don't do that
13 even you can not apply design immunity, as our chairman said,
14 you're going to lose big bucks. Because they're going to say,
15 and as one of the speaker said, you don't even know which
16 engineer made that judgment. So I don't know, it might be too
17 trivial, but I think it will promote, at least, better use of
18 deviation from design standards over long term. The next 10 or
19 20 years you are going to see a shift, I hope.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. We've -- we've started
21 repeating some of the issues that we've had. I think the --
22 the one issue that we're talking about is whether or not
23 deviations need to be documented. I think the action on -- on
24 this item --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: May I make a motion then

1 and --

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: I would entertain a motion.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So I move that we adopt
4 Caltrans recommendation with the text as they've included it in
5 their staff report.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Second.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. We have a motion and a second
8 for exactly the language that's in there. Discussion?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: To discuss my motion, I'd
10 like to point out I've worked for seven different agencies.
11 Quite often when I come in there's no explanation for what
12 particular work orders were prepared. So we institute policies
13 to begin preparing memos for every work order. But for
14 liabilities sake, you know, I do not want -- just because it's
15 in this manual doesn't mean -- every engineer does it. And I
16 would just be up against a wall.

17 I think legally if this -- if we had passed this ten
18 years ago and if certain cities hadn't followed it, to me it
19 only complicates -- good engineers are going to follow good
20 practices. But I think for the agencies I represent this
21 creates more legal burden to insert that language in. And I
22 think that I really like the language as its existed for years
23 in the manual, and as we approved it when we approved the 2012
24 California MUTCD.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, a question
2 on the motion.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Hamid.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Who seconded the motion?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: It was Mark.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mark, the question on the
7 motion, so the motion, if approved and if Caltrans inserts this
8 language in the manual, any agency can deviate from any part of
9 it without ever keeping any record of who made the decision
10 based on what? Because -- because it simply says -- it simply
11 says engineers --

12 SECRETARY SINGH: Recommendation of engineering
13 judgment is not required. That is a federal shall. And this
14 is where the feds (inaudible) come in really handy. And for
15 us -- the states do have the right to amend that sentence.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Fine. What I'm saying is
17 if you put this language in the California MUTCD, I repeat my
18 question again, it means any agency can deviate from any clause
19 on a standard shall, should or may of this manual, of the
20 MUTCD, with absolutely no documentation as to who made that
21 decision and why that decision was made.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: This statement, we're not
23 adding to it; it's already there. This isn't adding any new
24 language.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But what I'm

1 saying is that -- is that really going to allow that or not? I
2 can say some engineer, I don't know who he was, went to the
3 field, I don't know when he went, and he made some decision,
4 and I don't know how the decision was made, but some
5 engineering judgment was used to deviate from this clause of
6 the manual. And it can be used all the time. We are not
7 really helping anyone by doing that. If agencies are doing,
8 good for them. Adding the shalls in there is not going to hurt
9 them. If agencies are not doing it, they should. Then we
10 should encourage them. That's --

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thanks, Hamid.

12 John?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Having been shown the
14 language, the federal language by Johnny, I'm really curious
15 what FHWA's legal take is on this. And I would like to know
16 more about that before wanting to add it to the California
17 manual.

18 That said, I'm very sympathetic to the issues raised
19 by Hamid, and seconded, if you will, by Rock, and would have --
20 and again, I'm speaking as someone who has never had a
21 municipal position, probably never will. I don't know why the
22 feds say that. So I'm curious, at the very least, and
23 sympathetic to California differing on that. But I would like
24 to know more before taking action of that sort.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. We'll call for the question

1 then. We've got a motion and a second on -- on the table to
2 approve the -- the engineering study and engineering judgment
3 language exactly as presented. All in favor, respond by
4 raising your hand.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I'm asking
6 for a role call vote on this.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: A role call vote it is, starting
8 with Mr. Brown.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: No.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: No? Mr. Marshall?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Knowles?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Highway Patrol?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yes.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Caltrans?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: I'm voting no.

19 Hamid?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: John?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm going to base --
23 I'm going to abstain based on my lack of qualifications as a
24 PE.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Abstention.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: No.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: That's -- we have an abstention, and
3 a no.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yes.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: And Rick?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Excuse me. Yes.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: A yes. Okay. So how did we go on
8 that? Could somebody -- did somebody keep count? Did we not
9 keep track?

10 SECRETARY SINGH: One, two, three, four -- four no.
11 Four no, one abstain, and five yes. So the motion fails.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: So the motion -- we need -- we
13 need --

14 SECRETARY SINGH: Seven. We need seven votes. So --

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: So this -- that motion failed. I
16 would entertain a new motion.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I would like to make a
18 motion that Caltrans, in consultation with FHWA and some legal
19 opinion, and the survey of the practice among the agencies
20 about such issues come back with a report to the committee with
21 the ramifications of either alternative of adding the language
22 or not adding it, so the committee can make it better, more
23 informed, better educated decision on the whole issue.

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: Is that -- is that a motion to table
25 the issue until the next meeting?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It is a motion not to
2 bring it back as it is, but bring it back with more
3 information, answering those questions. That is the common
4 practice. Whatever ramifications, whatever legal issues
5 associated would be their decision.

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. We have a motion on the
7 floor. Is there a second to that motion?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: We've got a motion and a second, a
10 motion by Hamid and a second by John.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Seconded by who?

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: By John Ciccarelli.

13 And do we have comments on the motion? Caltrans?

14 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar. I'm with Caltrans. On
15 the motion the only comment I have is that we will be bringing
16 in the proposal that Caltrans, at least, (inaudible). So you
17 can't require through a motion for us to bring something
18 different.

19 However, what we do promise is before the next
20 meeting, and as part of it I will include as part of the agenda
21 the -- some of the background issues regarding legal, working
22 with feds as well as legal. So I'll be more than happy to
23 include that so that it can at least help the committee, as
24 well as everyone, to make a decision. And I do welcome -- it's
25 perfectly okay for us to delay this. There is really no rush

1 for us, so we can take time. And I'll be more than happy to
2 bring more additional material. It was part of some of the
3 links that were already there. But I understand if we don't
4 have the time to go through that.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: And -- and I would request that if
6 this motion does pass that Hamid will work directly with
7 Caltrans staff to ensure that his concerns are addressed as
8 closely as possible through the -- in the next report that
9 comes to us.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Sure.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: And just to clarify, what
12 Mr. Bhullar provided commitment to do is -- well, we don't have
13 the ability to survey other agencies and find out what their
14 common practice is. So we can get the background information,
15 the Federal Highways' register, and get all that information
16 done.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, again, I would like
18 to thank you, thank Caltrans to stop, for their willingness to
19 work on the issue. I will be happy on my part to work with
20 them. I will do the research at the public agencies. It's
21 relatively easily done through the engineering associations.
22 But I think it's an item that probably the committee as a whole
23 will benefit knowing a little bit more about. And thank you,
24 Mr. Bhullar, for your willingness to work with us.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Ciccarelli?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I wanted to say, as
2 seconder I'm very comfortable with the entire content that's
3 been brought forward in this agenda item. The only question I
4 have in my mind is the question that's been raised by others,
5 is what -- what -- what about the specific issue of documenting
6 engineering judgment.

7 So I don't -- it's not my intention to see this
8 turned wide open for discussion and modification. You know,
9 the committee may do that anyway. But I think for me it's a
10 narrow point.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Any -- any final comment before I
12 call for the question? Seeing none, all -- does everybody
13 understand the motion?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. Hamid did say
15 survey.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well, I did not --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Caltrans said they would
18 not do that.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can I repeat the motion?

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Hamid, would you please repeat?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: That -- that we revisit
22 this next meeting. Caltrans can bring it back with a little
23 bit more clarification on what, actually, this legally means,
24 what we are doing by introducing this to the manual. And
25 whatever legal ramifications of either approach, putting the

1 statement there or not. And as far as the survey, as Mr.
2 Miller said, definitely I don't want to burden Caltrans staff.
3 God knows they already have enough to do. I will use
4 engineering societies, do a kind of -- a kind of unofficial
5 survey of the larger agencies and see what the practice is in
6 terms of documenting deviations from standards.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So we've got a motion that
8 was just stated, and it has been seconded. We're going to do a
9 role call vote again, starting down here on the left. Mr.
10 Brown?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Aye.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mr. Marshall?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Jeff?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: CHP?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Yes.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Caltrans?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: I vote yes.

21 Hamid?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yes.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: John?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yes.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mark?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: No.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. New numbers? Don't tell me
5 we didn't count again.

6 SECRETARY SINGH: No.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: We had -- we had two nos.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: We had two nos.

9 SECRETARY SINGH: Two nos.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Two nos. That -- that motion
11 passes.

12 So, Hamid, you'll be working with Caltrans on this to
13 get into our next meeting.

14 SECRETARY SINGH: Can I make a comment? You know
15 what, Hamid is asking, (inaudible) Caltrans requested a
16 federal -- FHWA to allow us to change the standards. So I
17 don't know what type of clarification we're going to ask. We
18 asked to deviate from standards. So we can bring it next time
19 and we can attach that language we wrote to the FHWA to
20 requesting we want to deviate from standards in certain
21 conditions.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. At this point we're going
23 to -- we're down to item 12-22.

24 Janice, do you think that this is one that we should
25 tackle?

1 MR. BHULLAR: The second part of this item --

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: That's right, we haven't --

3 MR. BHULLAR: So as you know, and this is what we
4 experienced -- this is, again, Johnny Bhullar. This is what we
5 experienced at the national level. Like I said, this is one of
6 those issues that is about one of the five issues in the last
7 30 years where the state and the feds don't see eye to eye.
8 And as you can see here, this issue is even one sentence, but
9 it is quite controversial, so to speak. So that's good. It
10 just makes (inaudible) at the national level.

11 So now, let me get to get to the second element. And
12 the second, that portion of the proposal is the one that deals
13 with compliance dates. For those of you who have been working
14 on the manual, you might recall that there are about 58
15 compliance dates. And what I mean by compliance dates is that
16 these are the dates by which the field conditions need to be
17 changed to match the manual. And they result only for very few
18 instances where the manual has made some changes that are
19 safety related that we can not wait for the feed over time to
20 start reflecting what has been changed in the manual.

21 And based upon this, in a nutshell the background of
22 this was it started off with a street name sign issue in New
23 York. And once it started in the media all of a sudden some
24 people got to the congress and the U.S. Congress said that --
25 that why are we acquiring the street name signs, all of them to

1 be changed by a certain date to reflect that they are going to
2 be all upper case or all caps? And all of a sudden from that
3 everything then snowballed into this issue that I'm going to be
4 discussing now. So even though it started with street names,
5 but basically U.S. Congress said, at least the White House,
6 either you change or require effectively to change these
7 policies or they will have an act.

8 So this is a result from (inaudible) on that. And
9 now what has come down now is this is an official revision to
10 the federal manual. And out of those 58 dates what the feds
11 themselves did was they eliminated 46 of these compliance dates
12 themselves as part of the official change. And the remaining
13 12 out of the 58, 4 they extended the dates to give the
14 agencies more time, and 8 they were really so critical that the
15 feds said we're not going to change it. I will not go through
16 all the details unless requested to. But let me then walk you
17 through our handout as it's going to pertain to this
18 background.

19 So basically on page 18, 19 and 20 you're going to
20 see, these are the 3 pages from the current manual. Page 18 of
21 the agenda, 19 of the agenda, and 20 of the agenda. These are
22 the three sheets of tables that are reflecting those dates.
23 And you might notice and the question, why do we already have
24 them crossed out? The reason is that even though the feds had
25 58 dates, but a bulk of them were already crossed out because

1 as part of the California adopting the manual back in 2004, a
2 lot of these dates actually had to come around, even before.
3 So we were told at one time we were grandfathered in to not go
4 by the dates that were ongoing. And California promised in the
5 future we will be going with any new dates that get
6 established. So the reason why you see some of the cross outs
7 in those three pages in our current manual is those dates were
8 never applicable in California because we weren't given an out.

9 And then on the bottom of page 20 you will see street
10 name sign. And the reason why I copied that is because later
11 on I'll show you there is a minor amendment of that section.
12 But here I'm just repeating that section 3043 that deals with
13 street name signs, and it's just the way it is currently as our
14 official manual today, and all the way up to page 22.

15 So page 23 is where the proposal actually begins.
16 And as you will notice here, on page 23 now those three sheets
17 of tables have shrank down to only these issues. And this is
18 going to be the proposed table that will show up in our next
19 manual if, of course, I get the recommendation from the CTCDC.
20 So the 58 dates are -- have been shrunk down. And basically
21 what I've done is the only amendment that I've done to the
22 federal official region is that they had mentioned in the
23 compliance date column of the verbiage that says two years from
24 the effective date of this revision in the -- in the 2009
25 MUTCD, they weren't sure when that date was going to happen, so

1 that's what they put in. But now that we have the luxury of
2 knowing when the date was I'm putting an exact date so that
3 it's much more clear for California. Otherwise, the agencies
4 will be struggling, what was the effective date.

5 So that's the only amendment I'm making to the
6 federal region. But I'm okay with their table. And in that
7 table, of course, they are sticking to eight of those -- four
8 of those dates -- eight of those dates and extending four. And
9 also I'm showing as part of that, there's one date that is
10 still the Section 2A.10. That is a carryover from prior. So
11 that one which we are currently going to need to delete because
12 we have been grandfathered in California. But that is the
13 table. So the proposal is this will be the new table replacing
14 the three sheets of tables. It's going to shrink down to this
15 one table.

16 And then continuing on to page 25, again, I'm
17 repeating the sections of the street name sign just to show you
18 how it's going to reflect in the new manual. So once you get
19 to page 25, if you read paragraph number 24 of that is a brand
20 new paragraph that the feds have introduced as part of this
21 compliance date change. And basically what that paragraph
22 reads is -- and for those of you following on the screen, this
23 is paragraph 24 -- it says, "On lower speed roadways historic
24 street name signs have been identified in historic districts
25 that are consistent with the criteria contained in 36 Code of

1 Federal Regulations 60.4 for such structures and districts
2 where it may be used without complying with the provisions of
3 paragraphs 3, 4, 6, 9, 12 through 14, and 18 through 20 of the
4 section.

5 Essentially what that means is that if you are in a
6 locally identified historic district you are immune from the
7 all caps, upper case, lower case issue, the color issue, the --
8 I would say the border and the sign issue. So basically you
9 have a lot more flexibility on street name signs in historic
10 district under that condition. So that's giving you those out.
11 You would be referring to those paragraph numbers, and if
12 anyone wants to go to them.

13 So essentially the proposal is we are pretty much
14 going with exactly the way the feds have made revision two as
15 official without any modifications, except for the date that I
16 inserted. We are perfectly okay with the federal compliant --
17 I mean, revision two, and that's what we are proposing here.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. Bringing the first
19 conversation into the committee. Hamid?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chair, Mr. Bhullar,
21 on page 23, Table 1.2 -- 1.2, the one, two, three, four, five,
22 sixth column -- sixth row, sorry, 4D.26, yellow change and red
23 clearance intervals, I would like to suggest that the -- I have
24 no problem with the June 13, 2017 compliance, even though I
25 think it's way, way too much time. The agencies should do

1 signal timing much sooner than that. But there are 36,000
2 traffic signals in California; only about 420 have red light
3 cameras. Red light cameras must comply -- must have complied
4 as the date that we adopted it. So we need to clarify that the
5 red light cameras should comply with the yellow timing
6 requirement as it is in the MUTCD.

7 Because, if you remember, that was the nexus of the
8 whole discussion, and the City of San Diego, the lawsuit ten
9 years ago that some jurisdictions were using very artificially
10 low yellow timings, and they were using trap conditions to
11 ensure a very large number of citations using red light
12 cameras. And that's when we got into the whole issue of the
13 yellow timing and all that.

14 So on that one I would like to suggest and ask for
15 the committee's support that we say that for the yellow change
16 and red clearance intervals, intersections that -- that have an
17 automated photo enforcement must comply as of now, that they
18 don't have until June 13th, 2017 to put one second yellow and
19 have trap conditions.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Other comments from the
21 committee? Janice?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Just a comment related to
23 that, and I don't have information readily available, but my
24 understanding is the vehicle code already says that you have to
25 go out and do signal timing prior to installing the red light

1 camera. So therefore this -- this does apply to those
2 locations where they're installing the cameras.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. The vehicle code,
4 it says that the jurisdictions must comply. It was introduced
5 as part of AB 1022 in 2013.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Correct.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It made it into the
8 vehicle code. The vehicle code says that if you have a photo
9 enforcement at the signalized intersections you must comply
10 with standards established by the Department of Transportation.
11 Now if I'm an attorney or if I'm an agency, I come to this
12 document and I say I am complying with the standard. The
13 standard gives me until June 13th, 2017 to comply.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: But -- but what I'm saying
15 is there is a requirement to go out and do a signal timing
16 study to support the photo -- the automated enforcement.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. But the existing
18 ones. The existing ones, they have already installed it. I
19 just don't want them to say -- you know, I understand exactly
20 what you're saying. But I think it will protect at least
21 our -- the people I represent, the drivers. It's protecting
22 them better if somebody doesn't go there and say I'm complying
23 with Caltrans. Caltrans is giving me until June 13th, 2017 to
24 comply.

25 MR. PYBURN: That's not what the vehicle code says.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The vehicle code says
2 comply, do it -- what -- according to the Department of
3 Transportation.

4 MR. PYBURN: If you're -- if the committee --

5 SECRETARY SINGH: Steve, you'll have to come up here,
6 please.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Before we -- before we go out, is
8 there -- are there other comments from the committee? If not,
9 then we'll go ahead and open it up to the public.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Okay.

11 SECRETARY SINGH: No. Johnny wants to --

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Oh, Johnny, do you have --

13 MR. BHULLAR: Can I respond to Hamid? I want to,
14 first of all, keep these issues separate. Because as you can
15 see, the title of this table says "Target compliance dates
16 established by FHWA." If we start changing that, then it's not
17 established by FHWA. So let's keep the two issues separate.

18 First of all, here we are adopting a federal official
19 revision to the manual. I do not -- at least, I'm not in favor
20 of trying to modify something that we are saying the feds are
21 imposing on us. Because the title of the table says "Imposed
22 by FHWA."

23 Similarly, I did not include it here, but if you were
24 to recall, there are three signs that the CTCDC and Caltrans
25 has a compliance date on that are currently in the manual. So

1 maybe that's the place or the location where as a separate
2 issue we can do it, but not as -- when the title is they have
3 been established by the feds by a national, we shouldn't be
4 changing, or at least trying to amend it. That's my comment.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. Steve, you had something
6 for us?

7 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
8 Administration. Curiously, looking -- oh, why don't you -- the
9 vehicle code may have some semantics and it's --

10 MR. BHULLAR: And what is it?

11 MR. PYBURN: I'm sorry. 21455.7.

12 (Colloquy Between Mr. Pyburn and Mr. Bhullar)

13 MR. PYBURN: Just for the record, we -- we wouldn't
14 have any objection to accelerating the compliance date, as --
15 as was suggested.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Which one is it?

17 (Colloquy Between Mr. Pyburn and Mr. Bhullar)

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: So my interpretation is that the
19 vehicle code is the higher reference. The higher reference
20 refers to specific yellow and all-red timing within the manual,
21 which does not recommend a one-second yellow.

22 Thoughts, comments from the committee?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. This manual, all
24 that the vehicle code says is that it shall comply with traffic
25 manual of Department of Transportation. And if the manual of

1 Department of Transportation says that for this standard of
2 this manual you have until June 2017 to comply, I can be in
3 compliance when I'm not complying because the manual is giving
4 me until June 2017 to comply. If you don't want to mess around
5 with the table I fully understand. I -- I would like to see a
6 statement somewhere that says that the intersections with red
7 light camera must comply with Table 4D-102 as of today.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: Why you not put those items for the
9 next meeting, submit that item so we can place on the agenda
10 and get recommendation from the committee?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. We can do it that
12 way.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: All right. So this issue will
14 come -- will be brought back from --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. Just we will insert
16 the language on top of 4D-102, Table 4D-102 that for
17 intersections that have red light cameras, compliance with this
18 table is mandatory as of the time of the photo enforcement
19 installation.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Johnny, did you have a comment?

21 MR. BHULLAR: No.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Don, you're up there. Did
23 you have a comment?

24 MR. HOWE: Oh, I'm just waiting around --

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

1 MR. HOWE: -- for the next agenda item.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: So -- so then we'll -- we'll go
3 ahead and bring the communication back to the -- this
4 committee. Any further comments? If not, I would entertain a
5 motion.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I would like to move the
7 motion to vote on this as presented.

8 MR. CARUSO: Public comments?

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: We're -- we were already -- did
10 somebody miss it? Because I did open it up to public.

11 So now we have -- now we have a motion on the floor.

12 One -- go ahead, make your comment.

13 MR. CARUSO: Yes. Peter Caruso, District 12. For
14 the first one here in the -- in the big table it says that we
15 have to come up with a plan by January 2012.

16 SECRETARY SINGH: Which one?

17 MR. CARUSO: The first one.

18 SECRETARY SINGH: Okay.

19 MR. CARUSO: I'm not seeing that on the -- on the
20 abbreviated table. Because I just took the class at Techs
21 Transfer for -- from Berkeley on this, and they said we have to
22 have a plan by 2012, January 2012.

23 MR. BHULLAR: All right. But you can -- you might
24 have taken the class from UC Berkeley, but they're not the
25 authority. The authority is the California MUTCD.

1 MR. CARUSO: Right.

2 MR. BHULLAR: And what I'm pretty sure here is the
3 feds have extended that date. So maybe UC Berkeley teaching
4 the class were not aware of this.

5 MR. CARUSO: Yeah. They said that they -- they said
6 they changed the date for when we have to implement it, but
7 they didn't change the date for when we had to come up with a
8 plan of how we were going to implement it.

9 MR. BHULLAR: That information is wrong.

10 MR. CARUSO: Okay.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So we have a motion on the
12 floor to --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'll second it.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- to approve the table as it was
15 submitted. Is there a second?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Second.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: Jeff.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Seconded by Mr. Knowles?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Any -- any final comments before we
21 vote? Call for -- all in favor, raise your hand. Opposed?
22 Unanimous approval. Okay.

23 We're on to the next item, which would be 12-22. It
24 is 25 minutes to 1:00. We have one -- we have two more items
25 to go, and then two requests for experimentation. I suggest

1 that --

2 SECRETARY SINGH: This is a five minute item, five
3 minute.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Not with this committee, but I'm
5 going to go with the recommendation of my secretary who says
6 that it's going to be a five minute item. So we will go -- we
7 will move into 12-22 before we break for lunch.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Mr. Singh, is it -- is
9 it that it shall be a five minute item or should be.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: All right. I'd like to
11 introduce agenda item 12-22, amendment to Sections 2B.04 and
12 4D.34. And we're bringing this one forward with the intention
13 of just clarifying and making consistency changes in these two
14 sections from the Part 2 and Part 4. We're also making Part 2
15 consistent with Part 4. And I'd like to introduce Don Howe to
16 present this, to share the details.

17 MR. HOWE: Thank you, Janice. I'm Don Howe from
18 Caltrans. And as the recommendation suggests, we are looking
19 to make parallel two sections that are in two separate parts of
20 the California MUTCD Part 2 and Part 4, Part 4 being signals,
21 signal operations.

22 So on the -- on page 26 of the agenda you have a
23 matrix there that shows side by side what -- what language is
24 included in Section 2B.04, and that's for regulatory signs,
25 right-of-way at intersections. And there are -- there's

1 mention there, the only California content that exists is
2 paragraph 10a. And these are pretty much comparable between
3 the two. But what you'll see is in Section 4D.34, Use of Signs
4 at Signalized Locations. There are items that are struck --
5 struck out, but they continue to exist back in Part 2.

6 So turning the page to page 27 you'll see where we
7 have taken the federal language and made the two sections read
8 the same way. And that way there's no ambiguity between the
9 two. And we add an option, if you compare up you can see where
10 we -- we mined that -- that optional language from to include
11 yield or stop signs may be used at a channelized turn light if
12 -- if it is separated from the adjacent travel lanes by an
13 island and channelized turn light is not controlled by a
14 traffic control signal.

15 So that is our proposal for the -- the way that we
16 would make these two sections read the same.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. We'll go ahead and start
18 our committee conversation on this. Anybody have any comments
19 relative to taking these two slightly different standards
20 and -- and turning -- and making them the same?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I make a motion we
22 approve the staff recommendation, keep it under five minutes.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Wow. So I've -- we've got a motion
24 to approve the staff recommendation as written.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I'll second.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: Who seconded? Mark Greenwood
2 seconded.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I think you still have
4 to open to public comment.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: We'll get there. And so we've got a
6 motion and a second. And I would like to entertain any
7 conversation or communication from the committee first. Seeing
8 none, I'll take this out to the public.

9 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
10 Administration. It's kind of a knit-picky point, but in this
11 paragraph that's being added I would hope to see a
12 clarification, if the adjacent travel lanes are in the same
13 direction as the turn lane or in the opposite direction of the
14 turn lane. Both situations can physically occur, but it's not
15 clear what the intent is for both.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Do you have a recommended change to
17 the -- to the wording?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yeah.

19 MR. PYBURN: Well, the recommendation is that it --
20 it depends on the intent. If the intent is the turn lanes are
21 in the same direction as the adjacent travel lanes, that should
22 be stated. If the turn lane could be a left turn lane and it's
23 separated from an adjacent travel lane by an island but the
24 lane -- the adjacent travel lane is going in the opposite
25 direction, that should be clarified also. I'm not sure what

1 the intent of the language is, therefore I can't suggest a
2 revision to meet that intent.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I just -- I understand
4 what you're saying. It may be simply fixed if you say if it's
5 separated from the adjacent travel lanes traveling in the same
6 direction.

7 SECRETARY SINGH: Same direction.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Same direction.

9 SECRETARY SINGH: Same direction.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

11 SECRETARY SINGH: We will insert that wording.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Travel lanes moving in the same
13 direction?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Moving in the same
15 direction.

16 MR. HOWE: If you're curious as to where we got the
17 language, okay, I can clarify that.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: The language has been
19 around a long time.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yeah.

21 SECRETARY SINGH: Thank you, Steve.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Would the motion maker agree to that
23 friendly request?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Absolutely. I always
25 agree with the federal government.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: And -- and the seconder?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Yes.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So now we have a modified
4 motion that adds some wording to the -- the MUTCD to ensure
5 that we have clarity in the direction of the travel lanes
6 versus the -- the turn lanes.

7 Any other -- we opened up to the public. Any other
8 communication from the public?

9 Bringing it back in to the committee? Any final
10 comments from the committee before we vote? Then I'll call for
11 the question. All in favor of the staff recommendation with
12 the modification of having "moving in the same direction" to
13 the -- the optional language, all in favor, state by saying
14 aye.

15 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Opposed? Motion carries
17 unanimously.

18 It is 20 minutes to 1:00. I'm -- I would recommend
19 -- I'm going to propose that we take a 30 minute lunch break.
20 That will --

21 SECRETARY SINGH: 1:15.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: That will get us back here by 1:10.
23 I've got 20 minutes to 1:00.

24 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah. Okay. Okay.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: So we'll get here -- we'll get back

1 and start and 1:10; right? And the -- and the next item that
2 we'll be discussing will be an information item --

3 SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- draft intersection control
5 evaluation policy.

6 (Off the record from 12:40 p.m., Until 1:19 p.m.)

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: The meeting has started back. The
8 next item that we're going to take is an information item.
9 It's item 12-26. No action is required by this committee.
10 It's a draft intersection control evaluation policy.

11 Janice, where did you go? Oh, there you are.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I'm right here. Okay. I
13 just -- part of this agenda item, I just want to let you know
14 that we -- we have a team that's been working on a policy to
15 further provide guidance and direction on decisions being made
16 at intersections regarding traffic control, whether it's a
17 signal, stop, yield, or yield intersection, also known as a
18 roundabout. So I just -- I'm going to hand this item off to
19 John Liu. He is our Deputy District Director for Operations
20 and Maintenance in our Fresno office that covers District 6 for
21 the Central Valley.

22 So, John?

23 MR. LIU: Thank you, Janice. Yeah. Good afternoon.
24 To get started I just want to show a short four-hour -- or, I'm
25 sorry, four-minute video on roundabouts that FHWA put together.

1 And this new process is really driven because we know that
2 roundabouts are one of the -- the most successful safety
3 countermeasures that we have, and it's something that's
4 currently being underutilized. And we're trying to develop a
5 process within Caltrans that we do have a process, that we do
6 make the right engineering decisions and we actually build more
7 roundabouts. Because right now we need to do a lot of
8 education. We need to mainstream and streamline our processes.
9 So as soon as Johnny could get that running.

10 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

11 MR. LIU: And most of you are probably very familiar
12 with roundabouts, how they have greatly reduced the -- the
13 accident rates compared to other types of intersections,
14 especially signalized intersections.

15 (Whereupon a video presentation is made and not transcribed.)

16 MR. LIU: Okay. That concludes this excerpt of this
17 FHWA video. And if I could get the -- the PowerPoint slides.
18 This is part of a 12-minute video which is actually very
19 informative. It's good for using at -- at public meetings just
20 to educate the public about what a roundabout -- what a
21 roundabout is.

22 I'm going to very quickly go through some -- some
23 slides and gives some background about what we're doing as far
24 as proposing this intersection control evaluation policy, which
25 we call ICE. And then I'll tell a little bit about the

1 timeframes.

2 (Colloquy Between Mr. Liu and Mr. Bhullar)

3 MR. LIU: Okay. What Caltrans is doing right now, as
4 I mentioned, we are coming up with new intersection control
5 evaluation policy. Right now we don't really have a uniformity
6 as far as making decisions about what type of intersection
7 control. You know, generally we start up with the -- with the
8 two-way stop, and then we have a progression of -- of, you
9 know, for instance, always stops at signals. And we want to
10 make sure that we are making the right decisions. So we are
11 formalizing this -- this policy in this document.

12 And one of the things that is lagging is
13 implementation of -- of roundabouts. You know, Caltrans was
14 very early in coming out with a design information bulletin,
15 that would be DIB 80 (phonetic) back around 1990. And it was a
16 process about how you would implement a roundabout. And it was
17 actually a very onerous process at times that really
18 discouraged a lot of people from implementing roundabouts. And
19 as we saw across the country and the local communities
20 implementing roundabouts with -- with great success, we at
21 Caltrans knew that we had to streamline our process to -- to
22 build more roundabouts, just because we know how successful
23 they are.

24 I did mention that this is one of the nine safety
25 countermeasures that FHWA is promoting. We've also been

1 getting a lot of input from our local partners at the local
2 agencies, that they want to put more roundabouts, but our
3 process is very difficult.

4 So in general, as I mentioned, there is a natural
5 progression. We started out with a two-way stop. And a lot of
6 times it's just automatically you put a traffic signal, because
7 that's what traffic engineers are used to. Traffic signals are
8 very familiar. But since we know the advantages of -- of
9 roundabouts, the 90 percent reduction in fatal accidents, the
10 75 percent reduction in injury accidents, we know there are a
11 lot of benefits from safety. There's also a lot of operational
12 benefits; less congestion, which results into less -- less air
13 pollution.

14 On the state highway system we only have about 17
15 roundabouts. And I'll show -- I'll show you a map in -- in a
16 following slide. But it's mainly focused in the Sacramento
17 area and in the -- the Southern California area. And there are
18 locations for -- there's been a lot of -- of local buy-in
19 for -- for these roundabouts.

20 State -- in the United States there are approximately
21 3,000 roundabouts. The first roundabout was built in about
22 1990, and they've actually been growing exponentially. So you
23 can look at the numbers; Caltrans, only 17 on the state highway
24 system. On the local system in California there's
25 approximately 200. So you can definitely see that -- that we

1 are light. Okay.

2 And this map might be a little bit hard to see. But
3 you can see that most of the roundabouts, which is going to be
4 that dark red color, some of the more familiar roundabouts that
5 you may know is in the Truckee area. There's a few in the
6 central coast. Over in the north coast there's actually --
7 Fort Bragg was one of our more recent ones on Highway 101.
8 Down south, our Palmdale roundabout on 138. Another roundabout
9 is PCH and -- and Highway 19, which actually has been
10 reconstructed a few times. If you look in the central valley
11 where you only see green, and green means planned, and that's
12 my district, we have about a dozen roundabouts in the planning
13 and the design process. And we hope to have the first
14 roundabout built by -- by next year. It's been one of my -- my
15 personal initiatives to get more -- more roundabouts, because I
16 know that they will be very successful. And I've been dealing
17 with some of the issues of -- of the opposition and trying to
18 work through that. It has been very challenging at times.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Where is the Bay Area
20 roundabouts?

21 MR. LIU: The Bay Area roundabouts, actually,
22 District 4, I don't believe they have any roundabouts. They --
23 they have a traffic -- more of a traffic signal -- a traffic
24 circle in the North Bay, but it's not really a true roundabout.
25 But they -- they have been looking at some locations. There

1 was a proposal for roundabouts at the Gilman interchange and
2 at -- at Ashby. Those have kind of sputtered.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

4 MR. LIU: Okay. I'm trying to get the hang of this.
5 Could you do the next slide? Okay.

6 And I've kind of gone over some of the -- the more --
7 more noteworthy ones. And we can go to the following slide. I
8 mentioned the -- the Palmdale --

9 MR. BHULLAR: The next one?

10 MR. LIU: Yeah. Just go ahead to the next one. This
11 is the Palmdale roundabout, which is a high-speed roundabout, a
12 lot of trucks in the high desert where the state has two of the
13 legs that make 90 degrees. There were a lot of accidents prior
14 to the installation of this roundabout, which was built about
15 five years ago and has been very, very successful. And this
16 roundabout is actually designed that it could be expanded by
17 reconstructing some of the splitter islands.

18 But most of you probably are familiar with some of
19 the physical features of the roundabout. It's the inscribed
20 circle that varies from about 130 feet to -- to 200 feet. You
21 have pedestrian features, crosswalks that go through the
22 splitter islands, so you'd have less pedestrian crossing times.

23 When you do go with multi-lane roundabouts you do
24 have a little bit more challenges in -- in the sense that it's
25 more difficult for pedestrians to cross the additional lanes.

1 And there is research about what -- what are the best ways to
2 accommodate the pedestrians. Bicycles could either go through
3 the roundabout or the -- the sidewalks are extra wide to design
4 for -- for bicyclists.

5 So we've learned a lot of lessons from -- from all
6 the installations that have gone on in California and -- and in
7 the U.S. And, of course, roundabouts are designed for trucks.
8 And you have the -- the truck that you put in the center.

9 Go to the next slide. And this is just an example of
10 one of the roundabouts on an interchange. I believe this is I-
11 10 in Southern California. The Truckee interchange at I-80 and
12 State Route 89 is very similar where you have a diamond
13 interchange, and then you have roundabouts that typically
14 teardrop, and very successful. A lot of times you only
15 require -- a lot of times you can utilize the existing two-lane
16 bridge. You get a lot of capacity at -- at the intersection.
17 So it's a very cost-effective way of increasing the capacity of
18 an interchange, existing one.

19 Next slide. So our current approach of what we do
20 for intersection control, Caltrans is very warrant oriented and
21 guideline oriented. And we've all been very signal with the
22 signal warrants. So a lot of times we go to the MUTCD, we do
23 our traffic counts, and then we decide a two-way stop or a
24 four-way stop is no longer adequate for our operations, you
25 automatically go to a signal.

1 Warrants for roundabouts do not exist. So here you
2 have to use a lot more engineering judgment. You can use the
3 warrants for a traffic signal or (inaudible) for a guide,
4 knowing that you need some sort of improvement. But there are
5 no hard and fast warrants for -- for roundabouts. So what our
6 new process wants to incorporate, some of the things that a
7 practitioner should be looking at and deciding whether a
8 roundabout makes sense.

9 Next slide. So this new process really is
10 performance related. We do want to look at what are some of
11 the -- the safety improvements, what are some of the -- the
12 capacity improvements. Looking at the cost benefits, it's a
13 little harder to -- to put a cost on pollution. You can't put
14 a cost on operations, electricity, and -- and how much it costs
15 to -- to run a traffic signal. So those are things that can be
16 looked at as part of our process.

17 We also want to be involved with the community and
18 make sure that our traffic control is compatible with what the
19 locals want. We do look at context sensitive solutions.
20 And -- and this is very much part of the downtowns that -- that
21 go -- the state highway goes through the -- the smaller cities.

22 Next slide. So real quickly, what the process is
23 being proposed is a two-step process. There's an initial
24 screening where we just want to say it doesn't make sense to
25 look at a roundabout further. A lot of times you are going to

1 have a lot of constraints where whether it's you're already on
2 a signalized corridor, it doesn't make sense to put a
3 roundabout there. You may have right-of-way constraints.
4 There's absolutely no way you're going to get the circle there.
5 You may have very sensitive areas that you can't encroach into.
6 So this is jus the very initial screening, taking a real photo,
7 putting a couple of circles, and kind of deciding, hey, this is
8 looking -- worth looking at more or this should be dismissed
9 outright.

10 And in the Caltrans process this is typically done
11 pre-PID project initiation development document or doing the --
12 the PID, the project study report. So that will probably be
13 able to screen a lot of locations where it just doesn't make
14 sense. We're not going to go further.

15 But where it does make sense to consider the
16 roundabout, that's where you go to step two. And that's
17 generally in the Caltrans process will which will be the PANED,
18 the project approval and environmental document process. We
19 want to take all viable alternatives to that -- to that second
20 step and where you're preparing the -- the project report,
21 typically as your document. This is where you're going to go
22 into the more in-depth traffic studies, doing the -- the full
23 traffic projects, determining the design life, and -- and doing
24 the full traffic analysis and -- and queuing and such.

25 At the second stage we are also going to be looking

1 at the performance in regards to the safety improvements. We
2 are going to be using methodology from Federal Highways, the
3 highway safety manual, until we get a good, solid data set in
4 California as to what our California experience will be. We'll
5 be basing the safety improvements on federal data. And we'll
6 also be doing the life-cycle analysis, looking at the cost to
7 maintain a signal versus a roundabout, for instance. Okay.

8 Next slide. So the document that we're currently
9 working on is a TOPD, which is traffic operations policy
10 directive. This policy, we are trying to finalize by the end
11 of the month. And a target date for the actual implementation
12 of the new process is July 1st, 2013. So this will give us
13 some time to fine tune the guidelines as to what the
14 expectations are to actually analyze the roundabouts. The TOPD
15 will apply only for state highways. We do envision elements of
16 the TOPD eventually be incorporated into the MUTCD around 2015
17 or so.

18 But for the half a year between -- we get the TOPD
19 out and we get the actual implementation, we do want to have a
20 lot of training in our district offices. We are also trying to
21 develop a number of roundabout experts within the districts so
22 that we don't always have to go to headquarters to get things
23 evaluated. And we are going to be counting on federal -- FHWA
24 for assistance. We also are going to be hiring a consultant to
25 have that technical expert. But eventually the way we envision

1 it is instead of always going to headquarters we're going to
2 talk to these other district experts when we had questions
3 whether a roundabout makes sense. And a lot of times it's
4 going to be for these more complicated roundabout designs,
5 five-legged, unequal distribution, and those types of things.

6 Some of may know that we have currently the
7 roundabout conceptual approval report process which sometimes
8 can get quite -- quite onerous. Our Design Information
9 Bulletin 80 is in the process of being updated and we are
10 looking at ways to streamline it because we know, for instance,
11 you have a two-legged intersection, 90 degrees, there's very
12 few constraints. It may not make a lot of sense to do a very
13 in-depth study just to say it's -- it's feasible. So that's a
14 parallel process to this TOPD.

15 So at this point I'm -- I'm open to any -- any
16 questions or any comments.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. Jeff?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, it's nice to hear
19 you say this from Caltrans. But it's so difficult to get
20 Caltrans to approve a roundabout at an interchange. Right now
21 we're -- we're in design at the 505 at Vaca Valley southbound
22 off ramp. We're having to try to squeeze in a left-turn pocket
23 between the bridge structure and the intersection. We're
24 having to widen the off ramp. I'm having to add a northbound
25 right turn, everything to support a traffic signal.

1 MR. LIU: Right.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And we have all the right-
3 of-way necessary for this very simple intersection to build a
4 roundabout. But I'm told by my capital improvement engineers
5 Caltrans won't go for a roundabout at that intersection and
6 that we've got a city signal 250 feet away with no -- which
7 will have no coordination. So, of course, a roundabout would
8 solve that issue too.

9 MR. LIU: Correct.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So I hear what you're
11 saying, but you're the biggest impediment to building, that's
12 the state.

13 MR. LIU: That's the culture change we're -- we're
14 trying to -- to implement. And, you know, my counterpart in
15 District 3, I guess where you're located, they've actually been
16 a little bit more ahead of the curve. So I am surprised that
17 you --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That's why there's no
19 roundabouts in the Bay Area.

20 MR. LIU: Right. And, of course, they have other
21 issues of a lot of built-up environment where -- where it may
22 not make sense. But in the North Bay it may make --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's surrounded by open
24 fields.

25 MR. LIU: Yeah.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The right-of-way exists.

2 MR. LIU: And, you know, that's part of the reason
3 why I'm on the steering committee. I kind of represent the --
4 the growing, the rural, the high-speed locations. And that's
5 one reason why I have, you know, 12 roundabouts in the works,
6 including at interchanges, high-speed locations, as well as
7 built environments.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You can have one next year
9 in Vacaville if you can cooperate.

10 MR. LIU: So I just encourage you to talk to the
11 folks in District 3 further and -- because I can't really
12 address the specifics. But it's just indicative of the culture
13 change that we are trying to --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Because nobody at Caltrans
15 said it wouldn't work, they just don't want to talk about it.
16 They want a signal. We build signals in this district.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Jeff, sorry you're -- sorry you're
18 having so much trouble on that.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. That's why I'm
20 going to retire. I'd like to see it, though, before I left.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: We have -- we have another question
22 from Rock.

23 MR. LIU: Sure.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yeah. It's more of a
25 comment than a question. I just want to indicate to the

1 members of the committee that I've been invited to participate
2 to a certain extent in some of these discussions, primarily
3 through the wearing of my ITE hat, and in particular because IT
4 did recently adopt a policy of our own we're urging all
5 agencies to consider roundabouts whenever intersection changes
6 are being controlled.

7 I think I was also the first one to say in a small
8 subcommittee meeting, probably some of this eventually belongs
9 in the MUTCD, acknowledging that there's nothing in the MUTCD
10 that leads you from a needs analysis to a roundabout conclusion
11 at this time. And I will probably continue to monitor the
12 discussion and be available to bring my version of it any time
13 anyone wants to hear it.

14 MR. LIU: Yeah. And we're trying to put the
15 roundabout on an even playing field with the signal. And there
16 are actually -- a lot of states have gone to that roundabout-
17 first policy. So all things being equal they will
18 automatically go to the roundabout. And that's almost how I
19 take it in the Central Valley because there's a lot of issues
20 with -- with high-speed traffic signals, for instance. So I
21 definitely have -- have moved towards the roundabouts. And
22 it's hoping -- I'm hoping that throughout the state that --
23 that we will move in that direction eventually. But we, at
24 least right now, we want to make sure that the -- the engineers
25 at least consider the roundabout and get it on an even playing

1 field.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: As one of the
3 representatives of non-motorized travelers on the committee, I
4 am generally quite supportive of roundabouts. I do want to
5 make clear that there's qualitative differences for both
6 pedestrians and bicyclists between a single-lane entry-exit
7 designs and multi-lane entry-exit designs, in part because of
8 the higher -- the higher diameters allow for higher circulating
9 speeds, and therefore higher entering and exiting speeds. It's
10 a tougher task to get through on a bicyclist -- a bicycle.

11 So the provision of bypass arrangements is -- I think
12 should be required for the multi-lane roundabouts and included
13 in the right-of-way analysis. And then for pedestrians there's
14 also a qualitative difference between single-laners and multi-
15 laners because of the multiple threat of collision potentially,
16 potentially on -- particular -- particularly on the exit legs
17 where there's not as much expectation of needing to yield to
18 the pedestrian.

19 On a whole separate track there's issues with how do
20 you convey blind pedestrians across multi-lane movements when
21 there's no sound queues. I do believe that DOJ is going to
22 come down and -- and force the use of rapid-flashing beacons or
23 pedestrian-hybrid beacons on multi-lane exits at the very
24 least, so work that in.

25 That said, roundabouts are transformative, not only

1 at the intersection but potentially in the land use surrounding
2 the intersection. So one of the things I would hope that
3 your -- your TOPD and related guidance considers is potential
4 benefits, especially for pedestrians and bicyclists distant
5 from the intersection.

6 Here's what I'm thinking. Okay, a roundabout
7 basically deletes a need for turn lanes, and also minimizes or
8 eliminates the need for storage lanes. In other words,
9 American highways are traditionally built with the storage
10 lanes needed at the intersection, extending all the way back to
11 the next intersection, especially in highly urban areas like
12 L.A., when, in fact, that storage isn't needed for many of
13 those roads, except within the storage distance of the
14 intersection.

15 If you get a roundabout replacing a major signal or
16 even a medium-size signal you can do a road diet on the -- the
17 connecting roadway. And that road diet would have its benefits
18 in terms of being able to drop in pedestrian refuges and
19 opportunities for people to cross and, perhaps, stitch together
20 the grid to provide additional circulation opportunities in the
21 broader area beyond the analysis area of a typical signal.

22 So what I'm -- to make a long story short, I would
23 hope that your analysis for the benefits of the roundabout,
24 compared to say a signal of equivalent capacity, would extend
25 quite a bit further from the intersection center point than

1 would a signal where you look at the storage depth and the
2 transition depth, and then you're back to mid-block and you
3 don't care about that anymore, okay, is, in fact, at the mid-
4 block area that you can drop in the road -- the road diet that
5 so benefits things.

6 Case -- case in point is all these commercial strips
7 that you see. It's like L.A. is full of them. You've got a
8 major signal, major signal, six lanes in between, no way to
9 cross the street. Okay. One or two roundabouts can transform
10 that completely. So that's comment number one.

11 And then you're probably doing this already, but
12 differentiate between single-lane designs and multiple-lane
13 designs.

14 The third and last suggestion is I'm -- I'm more
15 familiar with the first iteration of the Federal Highway's
16 Information Guide than the -- than the one that replaced it.
17 But in the first one, at least, and this may not be true in the
18 second one, the issue of a pedestrian crossing the intersection
19 was almost ignored for the rural designs. Okay. Pedestrians
20 do walk on the shoulders roads. They do need to cross the
21 intersections. They shouldn't just be thrown to the winds
22 there. I'm not talking about blind pedestrians even. I'm
23 talking about just providing splitters where pedestrians can
24 walk across, or provisions for them to cross distant from the
25 intersection if -- if they can't be accommodated at the

1 intersection. Be sure to include pedestrian crossing safety
2 and convenience in the rural designs.

3 MR. LIU: Okay. Great. Very good comments. I'll
4 follow up on some of your comments. This process will also
5 apply to expand any kind of significant intersection expansion.
6 So even though there's -- there's already a signalized
7 intersection. If we have to, for instance, add to a less to
8 "unless right turn lanes" we also want our engineers to say,
9 hey, does it make sense to replace what we have with -- with a
10 roundabout? And, definitely, there are a lot of benefits
11 upstream and -- and downstream at the intersection. And we
12 also want to get our planners engaged in the process. So we
13 are looking at system planning, working with the -- the -- the
14 cities and counties, looking at the general plans, and there
15 say it makes sense to have roundabout instead of signalized
16 intersections. So we actually want to get, you know, before
17 intersections are built things -- things kind of mapped out.

18 Multi-lane roundabouts, definitely much more
19 challenging than -- than single-lane roundabouts. And we're
20 very keen on -- on the disabled population having more
21 challenges. And we haven't gotten firm guidance as far as the
22 treatments. But, you know, for instance, the -- the hawk
23 (phonetic) or the rapid rectangular flashing beacon, those --
24 those are part of our -- our toolbox that -- that we would
25 consider.

1 And I absolutely agree with you on pedestrian
2 facilities for -- for rural locations. And all of my rural
3 roundabouts are having pedestrian crosswalks, foot-arounds, to
4 accommodate that, so we're with you there. So thank you.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. We need to continue to move
6 ahead. I think I had one final comment, I think, from Mark.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: A question here. This
8 policy here seems to carefully avoid the turn roundabout, yet
9 your presentation you used that -- that term repeatedly. Why
10 is that?

11 MR. LIU: Well, we don't want to make it sound like
12 we're -- we're biasing everything towards a roundabout. But
13 we -- we -- we know roundabouts have a lot of benefits. And
14 what we're -- we're trying to put guidelines that say you look
15 at every single type of treatment. And -- and at an
16 intersection it may be you prohibit movements and make it a
17 right-in/right-out and not have any type of treatment. So
18 we're asking our engineers to look at all things. And, you
19 know, we firmly believe that this will steer a lot of decisions
20 towards the roundabout. But we don't want to have, you know,
21 any kind of biases saying this is -- this is what we always
22 want.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: And then my last thing,
24 the example you used in Southern California on I-10 of the --
25 the roundabouts at the interchange, have you ever been there?

1 MR. LIU: I haven't been to that particular -- I've
2 been to the one in Truckee but not to this one.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Well, it points out a
4 great example of something that should be in this guide, and
5 that's to look at the vertical alignment, as well. That
6 roundabout has a vertical crest, vertical curve it. And you
7 lose the road over the hood of the car. The curb it covered in
8 skid marks. There's skid marks all through the median. So
9 that's -- that's an important aspect that is completely --
10 usually completely ignored.

11 MR. LIU: Okay. Comment noted. Thanks.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Hamid twisted my arm. He
13 gets the last say.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. Just this -- this
15 actually got a lot of attention down south in orange county,
16 and a lot of cities, you have heard from them. And a lot of
17 cities got very nervous and they thought that this is something
18 that's going to go in the MUTCD this year. And that every time
19 they do a signal work analysis they have to do a roundabout
20 study, which they -- which doesn't make sense, obviously. And
21 they -- but then we talked with the District 12 people and
22 there's a signal roundabout, what they call the RTS roundabout
23 now, and I went and I talked with them and I said, "Hey, you
24 had better watch whatever comes to the Devices Committee.
25 Otherwise, you're going to live with the results, whatever the

1 final is."

2 You may -- now that it's more like a Caltrans in
3 general thing, you may want to think beyond. Because this
4 committee has made it as a matter of policy that it's one
5 state, one rules, one regulations. We are not going to have
6 set up policies for state highways and one for cities and
7 counties. It's going to apply to everybody.

8 So what -- what you were thinking, think about the
9 implications on -- because Caltrans doesn't do a whole bunch of
10 new signals. Caltrans has very limited new signal warrants
11 that they may do in a given year, but the cities and the
12 counties, they have a lot of signals, a lot of intersections
13 that because of the traffic pattern changes and land use
14 changes they need to go through ICE, intersection control
15 evaluations, ICE. And when you do that you may want in your
16 guidelines to think about kind of a tiered approach, as we do
17 to environmental process, that they are certain projects that
18 are categorically exempt; you don't even look at anything. And
19 then there are certain projects that are like negative DAC
20 (phonetic), mitigated neg DAC. And very few projects after a
21 certain threshold get into a full blown EIR.

22 So if you can come up with some kind of
23 classification, not that every single warrant that a city or a
24 county has to do, they have to do a roundabout analysis at the
25 same time. That as the primary concern they had down there

1 that they asked me to convey to the committee.

2 MR. LIU: Okay. Okay. Thanks.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Final chance, anybody?

4 Thank you, John. Appreciate --

5 MR. LIU: Thank you much.

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: Appreciate this information.

7 We're going to move back into the agenda items now.

8 And our -- our next item, our last agenda item before we get
9 into requests for experimentation is item 12-24, Updates and
10 Corrections to -- for Accessible Parking Space Markings.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Mr. Chair, excuse me, if
12 I -- if you don't mind my interrupting, I have to leave to
13 catch to leave my flight.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Mark?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: I wonder if you wouldn't
16 mind if my alternate sat in my spot. Sam Morrissey is here.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: That's --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: He's been here the whole
19 meeting.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: That's very appropriate.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Thank you.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thanks, Mark.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Sorry for the
24 interruption.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Good seeing you again.

1 Janice, go ahead.

2 (Colloquy Between Chair Robinson and Secretary Singh)

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Let's do it.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Okay. I'll introduce
5 agenda 12-24, Updates and Corrections for Accessible Parking
6 Space Markings. The -- the California and federal regulations
7 provide a comprehensive set of standards covering areas of
8 accessibility for persons with physical and sensory
9 disabilities. California's regulations are found in Title 24
10 of the California Building Standards Code and are designed to
11 comply with the requirements of the ADA and state statutes.
12 The California Building Standards Code, however, does not have
13 authority over public street standards, only the off-street
14 facilities.

15 The international symbol of accessibility is used on
16 signs and as pavement markings to designate parking spaces to
17 be used by persons with disabilities. The federal MUTCD states
18 that the ISA symbol should be used in each designated space.
19 However, the 2012 California MUTCD has crossed out the should
20 and replaced with shall because the California Building
21 Standards Code require the symbol to be used in off-street
22 parking lots.

23 Therefore the wording in figures in the California
24 MUTCD that refer to the international symbol of accessibility
25 need to be changed to reflect the recommended use of the -- of

1 the symbol and designated accessible parking spaces located on
2 public streets. And to clarify, the -- the international
3 symbol of accessibility is not required for on-street parking
4 spaces.

5 So with that I'll -- I'm going to hand it over. And
6 I'd like to introduce Roberta McLaughlin from the Caltrans,
7 Pavement Markings Branch, also coordinating policy associated
8 with Part 3 of the markings to present the details and
9 recommendations.

10 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Janice. Roberta
11 McLaughlin, Caltrans, Division of Traffic Operations. And
12 we're looking at page 38 of our handout. I'm going to try to
13 run through this fairly straightforwardly.

14 The proposed changes in the text are shown on page
15 28. The guidance statement paragraph 18 has been crossed out
16 to replace with language that clarifies that the ISA parking
17 space marking should be placed on on-street parking spaces
18 designated for use for persons with disabilities. And then
19 the -- then we're crossing out the option. And the standard, I
20 believe there's no additional changes in the language at the
21 bottom of that page.

22 To illustrate, if we turn to page 40 we can see the
23 existing pages that are in the 2012 California manual. And
24 primarily this -- this was brought to our attention by David
25 Cordova who is in our design division who is the keeper of the

1 ADA markings' portion of the -- for accessible parking spaces,
2 and he brought this to our attention. So some of the -- some
3 of the things that need to be corrected is in figure 3B.22 we
4 wanted to clarify that the top figure is for off-street
5 parking, and that you need to refer to the standard plan for
6 additional examples. And the reason why we've included this is
7 it's been in some of our previous manuals, but often times --
8 well, we include it in our standard plans because of -- of rest
9 areas and some other areas that include off-street parking
10 areas.

11 Then, also, there's a few minor changes to the text
12 down below, and we've shown that with some red indication on
13 that page. And then if you turn to the next page we also had
14 duplicated that off-street parking one more time, so that
15 wasn't necessary. So we're eliminating that top detail. And
16 then we had a few minor corrections to the on-street parking
17 which talks about the border around the cross-hatched area is
18 required to be blue. And then we added the -- the asterisk
19 for -- in that figure, as well as the one below it, that the
20 ISA symbol is recommended. I believe the -- "ISA is optional
21 for on-street accessible parking."

22 So this was brought to our attention by a couple
23 local agencies when they saw the new manual and when they had
24 signed -- signed and placed blue painted curb on their on-
25 street parking they were not aware that they would have to put

1 the ISA symbol on pavement on the road, on the street for those
2 particular accessible parking spots. And they were correct.
3 It's not required for on-street parking, so we didn't expect
4 them to go back and -- and change those.

5 So on the following pages 42 and 43 is what we are
6 proposing for the revise3d drawings, again clarifying the
7 differences between off-street parking and on-street parking on
8 the following page.

9 The -- the other particular issue here, which was
10 brought up to our attention also, and we have some
11 correspondence. And I -- well, that was -- the correspondence
12 was from our previous workshop.

13 The -- some of the differences between the -- the
14 dimensions as shown on the bottom of our first figure, which is
15 on the bottom of page 42, the wheelchair within the blue square
16 has different dimensions than what is required for off-street
17 parking. Off-street parking is mandated by the California
18 Building Code. And in that current wording it says "it shall
19 be 36 inches by 36 inches." Often times we're causing some
20 confusion because people will come to this manual, the
21 California MUTCD, pull out the dimensions here or the
22 dimensions off our standard plan, apply that to a private
23 parking lot. In some cases the building official says it is
24 not exactly 36 inches by 36 inches; remove it and put in the
25 proper marking. So we're trying to -- that's something that

1 needs to be resolved between the California Building Code, the
2 accessibility requirements.

3 And it was brought to our attention that there are
4 some new proposals coming out regarding those changes,
5 specifically marking of -- it's one of the minor changes was
6 marking of -- of the parking stalls. I was able to review that
7 this morning. And what I could gather from this morning's
8 review is that it is not being required for on-street parking,
9 but the wording for off-street parking now will be changed or
10 is proposed to be changed to a minimum of 36 inches by 36
11 inches. So I think we're kind of coming together now on some
12 agreement on this little blue box that goes in the ADA spot --
13 parking spots.

14 So I believe that covers most of the changes that we
15 wanted to bring forth today, primarily is to clarify that it's
16 not required that the ISA symbol be used on street parking.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Going ahead and bringing the
18 conversation back to the -- the committee for initial comment.

19 Rock?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I always something to say.
21 A couple things that aren't quite related to this, but the --
22 the drawing you have that shows the cut-out of the sidewalk to
23 make way for the parking stall, to the best of my knowledge the
24 vehicle code wouldn't allow the vehicle to park that far from
25 the curb and use that stall the way that it's intended. I

1 don't know -- this committee's charge isn't to change the
2 vehicle code, but I think this committee needs to kind of be
3 made aware of -- of the fact that the vehicle code does need to
4 be changed in order to allow that stall to be used the way it
5 was intended.

6 I'd also just like to -- to make a remark. I imagine
7 a lot of us have studied the considerations at the federal
8 government level with the access board. And the requirements
9 to do these things in downtowns and in commercial parking areas
10 are very likely to be strengthened as soon as the next set of
11 accessibility guidelines are issued. So it's a pretty
12 significant subject and we definitely need to figure out how to
13 mark it.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Thanks. Anyone else?

15 Let's go ahead and bring the --the conversation out
16 to the public. Members of the public, no comments? Well, you
17 guys are easy this afternoon.

18 Let's bring it -- bring it --bring it back to this
19 committee for any further discussion or motion.

20 (Colloquy Between Chair Robinson and Secretary Singh)

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Quickly, before Hamid gets back.

22 The --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I'd like to move the motion
24 to recommend approval of the changes with -- with -- with one
25 correction. Roberta just -- and she -- we've talked about

1 this, is on the -- on page 43 of figure 3B-22, the one below
2 the on-street parking where the asterisk says "ISA marking is
3 optional for on-street accessible parking", the ISA marking is
4 recommended for on-street accessible parking.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: There's also a typo.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yeah. And then that will
7 be changed in the text, as well.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: The text is already -- the text is
9 already there.

10 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: The text is -- does say that
11 correctly.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I'm sorry. Thank you.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: So I would entertain a motion to
14 approve the Caltrans staff recommendation to make the changes
15 to both the guidance and the examples for on- and off-street
16 handicapped ISA marking and to incorporate a change in the --
17 in page 43, changing the asterisked ISA marking, removing
18 operational -- or, I'm sorry, "optional" to "recommended" for
19 on-street accessible parking.

20 Anybody care to make that motion?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So moved.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: John Ciccarelli makes the motion.

23 SECRETARY SINGH: Janice -- Janice--

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: No, I -- I made the motion.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Oh, Janice. You made -- you -- I --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: I made the motion.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: I didn't hear that as a motion.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Oh, I'm sorry.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So Janice -- Janice made the
5 motion. Do you care to second, John?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Second.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. We have a motion and a
8 second. Any -- any communication after that? Anybody
9 interested in discussing the motion and the second?

10 Seeing and hearing none. I'll call for the vote.
11 All in favor of -- of approving as moved say aye.

12 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Opposed? The motion carries
14 unanimously. Very nice.

15 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you very much.

16 SECRETARY SINGH: I was scared.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. That does it for our regular
18 agenda items.

19 Now we can get into a request for experimentation.
20 And the first item is 12-25, "Request for permission to
21 experiment with various bicycle treatments", proposed by the
22 City of Santa Monica. This was -- John, would you like to
23 introduce this or would you just like for Sam to make the
24 presentation?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm going to let Sam

1 make the presentation since he's sitting at that point.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

3 MR. MORRISSEY: Well, actually, the presentation will
4 be made by Jay Dinkins, transportation engineer of the City of
5 Santa Monica.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Great.

7 MR. MORRISSEY: I thought I'd bring reinforcements
8 today. Jay will talk to us about our request. We're --we're
9 asking for permission to request -- excuse me, permission to
10 experiment with five different treatments for bicycle lanes.
11 What we're going to bring forward today, hopefully, is none of
12 the things you see will be new to the committee, but the way
13 that we're applying them is slightly different than what's set
14 forth in the MUTCD. So we're asking for some direction and
15 guidance and input on how we're applying these devices. And
16 then, hopefully, you'll authorize the request to experiment
17 with these devices.

18 So as we pull this up --

19 (Pause)

20 MR. DINKINS: Good afternoon. Like Sam said, I'm Jay
21 Dinkins, transportation engineer with the City of Santa Monica.
22 Thank you for this opportunity to let us present to you our
23 changes to the -- or modifications to signing and striping that
24 are currently not approved by the State of California.

25 Just some background on Santa Monica. We're only

1 about 8 square miles, 90,000 population, but it swells to about
2 250,000 to 500,000 on -- given the weather or work day or
3 weekend, if it's nice. We have lots of -- lots of tourists so
4 lots of unfamiliar people. Our terrain is very open for bike
5 riding, as well, flat, weather, ideal for cycling, the beach
6 and everything, as well.

7 In 2010 we adopted the land use and circulation
8 element, which is basically our city's master plan. In that we
9 had some objectives as growing bicyclists by 14 to 35 percent,
10 as well as a no-new-net-car-trips goal. So to achieve that we
11 implemented the loose calls for the -- the Bike Action Plan to
12 be implemented. The Bike Action Plan, which was passed about a
13 year ago, had a 5-year plan and a 20-year plan, the 5-year plan
14 being more just straight bike lanes, new paint, anything else
15 that includes the expedition of a separated bike path. The 20-
16 year plan, a little more sophisticated, a lot more planning and
17 money involved, separated bike lanes and that.

18 Some of the new facilities that are recommended in
19 the bike action plan that we're also trying to implement here
20 in the next first five years, this first one -- first two being
21 bike boxes, two separate locations, and I explain those
22 locations in our request for experiment, why they're important
23 and what their design would want to be. As you know the bike
24 box is something that is still approved by FHWA for
25 experimental use, and we're looking to do the same with --

1 here. It helps to just bring the bicycles up to the position
2 to the front of the intersection, as well as get over to the
3 left-turn pocket when necessary.

4 Next is the left and right turning sharrows that we
5 have here. We -- we want to install this where we have a bike
6 street turning onto another bike street. So where we have bike
7 lanes that end, there's also a no left-turn pocket. So anytime
8 you -- on your -- in your bike lane and you want to position
9 yourself in the traffic lane, this is where you should do it
10 and this is kind of where we're guiding bicycles to do that, as
11 well as letting motorists know that it's a place where you can
12 expect bicyclists to be when making the proper left turn onto
13 another bike-lane street.

14 Next is the -- the combination lane. This is a
15 right-turn pocket that we wanted to carve out a space for
16 bicycles to make it all the way up to the intersection. This
17 is just a 4-foot space carved into the 11-foot right-turn
18 pocket to make room for that space. It's completely fine for a
19 vehicle to -- to ride over the full 11-foot space, but we want
20 to, like I said, just carve out an area for bikes where they --
21 it's easier for them to go through.

22 Next is the -- the bus -- the sharrows on top of the
23 bus pad. This -- we kind of see using the sharrows in any kind
24 of shared space. Now I know that we've kind of talked about --
25 or the rules say that sharrows are only -- are to be used when

1 vehicles and bikes share the same space, but we kind of took it
2 a step further in that busses and bikes are sharing the bike
3 lane areas. But this is a bike lane on top of the bus pad, and
4 this kind of alerts busses that bikes are in their -- in their
5 bus pad and vice versa.

6 Next I want to talk about buffered bike lanes. Our
7 first priority when it comes to the buffered bike lane is to
8 put in the parking buffer, and at least a two-foot buffer
9 between the parked cars and the bike lane. We have a lot of
10 high turnover areas, a lot of parking turnover, lots of door
11 dings and conflicts that way. If we have room we try to put in
12 the -- the traffic buffer, as well.

13 We found a nice loophole in the traffic buffer rules.
14 If you go less than 18 inches you get into what counts as a
15 double white, which your car is not supposed to, technically,
16 cross to get to the parking space. If you go more than 18
17 inches you get into like 24-inch realm; that becomes a striped
18 median which you're also not supposed to cross as a bike -- I
19 mean, as a car. So kind of found a nice little sweet spot in
20 there.

21 We've used the -- the Detail 30 which is a skipped
22 six-inch white line as our buffer separation line, 39 -- and
23 that's Detail 39, 39A; 39 is the solid white on the far left
24 side there. It's a six-inch white. That's technically the --
25 the defining splitting space between the vehicles and the

1 bicycles. We used the 27B which is a four-inch white on the
2 other side. And all -- those are both the recommended -- all
3 three of those were actually recommended by the NACTO Bicycle
4 Guidelines for Design.

5 These are more examples of our buffered bike lanes,
6 the two buffers on each side. As an example of when we want to
7 do -- without the traffic buffers. So we have the three-foot
8 buffer space on the parking side, and there's the four-foot
9 riding space. Like I said, we have lower speeds in our city on
10 all of our streets; very urban area. We don't really -- the
11 traffic buffers are definitely the second lower priority.
12 These -- these are all commercial spaces on Montana Avenue
13 where we have the same thing, four-foot riding space, three-
14 foot buffer for the parking side.

15 Our evaluation plan will be before and after studies
16 of random observations, almost on a daily basis, done by city
17 staff. We will plan to interview cyclists on the streets and
18 do soliciting direct feedback from our bicycle advocacy group,
19 as well.

20 Here's some of the bullet points from -- from our
21 experimental -- from our request for experiment. Most of these
22 just kind of go back to the idea that we want to monitor the
23 compliance between bicycles and vehicles.

24 Our schedule, we've already started implementing as
25 you can see from our photos. We had some budget constraints

1 and deadlines that we had to meet, and we're also piggybacking
2 onto our annual resurfacing project. So we want to get some of
3 these out and in place, and then come back here and start the
4 experiment as well. So we're going to be experimenting for
5 this -- for six months, and then evaluate for the year after
6 that.

7 At this time I'll be glad to answer any questions
8 anybody has?

9 MR. DINKINS: Yes, John?

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: John.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I first wanted to share
12 some communication that I had over lunchtime with -- with Sam
13 and Jay about some of these treatments. The -- the bus zone
14 treatment, as I mentioned, looks to me like a bike lane going
15 through a bus area. And as such the use of a shared lane
16 marking in a bike lane is categorically prohibited by MUTCD
17 because it's a bicycle-exclusive space. And the other way to
18 look at that is that it's, I think, analogous to a non-bus
19 vehicle crossing a bike lane to access curb-type parking. It's
20 more like a loading zone, if you will. In fact, it's a
21 passenger loading zone. So I question the use of the share
22 lane marking in that context.

23 As for the buffers, it still looks like a double
24 white line to me. There are many ways to -- to address that.
25 In San Francisco they use a combination of transverse markings

1 to make it clear that it's a buffer.

2 MR. DINKINS: Right. That's -- yeah.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Either chevrons or --
4 or diagonals, depending. And also they break the outer line so
5 that it's clear to the bicyclist that they can travel in the --
6 in the buffer and use it as an extension of the bike lane. And
7 it's less -- less of a heavyweight treatment than -- than two
8 solid lines, even though you're kind of using the loophole to
9 make it clear that -- I don't want to further confuse the --
10 the traveling public about double whites. That's the
11 suggestion there.

12 As far as the bike box, we're wrestling with the
13 national committee too. And we've got some disturbing results
14 from Portland recently where they've put in green bike boxes
15 and got some right-turn hook crashes with serious injuries.
16 I'm not categorically against them, but I would hope that
17 you're evaluation would pay really good attention to the things
18 that are getting cyclists in trouble in Portland and other
19 places. For example, late arrival on a stale red --

20 MR. DINKINS: Right.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- when it's hazardous
22 to move laterally, especially on the bike boxes where you have
23 a two-lane reservoir area and you're -- you're providing a way
24 to the bike -- for the bicyclist to move left two lanes, well,
25 across a full lane into a left-turn position, I would really

1 hope that data would be collected as -- as far as late
2 arrivals.

3 Also, does the bicyclist use that -- that L-shaped
4 path at all, or do they approach sort of diagonally across?

5 And the second hazardous behavior that we're seeing
6 in some installations is the bicyclist is still subjecting
7 themselves to right-turn cut-off from the -- the through lane.
8 So look at all the ways that a bike box could be misconstrued
9 by both parties, motorists and cyclist and pay special
10 attention during your observations and data collection, rather
11 than leaving it at the does it feel right, were they satisfied
12 with it. We're -- we're particularly concerned about these
13 edge conditions which look like potential for problem.

14 MR. DINKINS: Okay. And the bike box, too, we have a
15 separate project, experimental project going for that. So
16 we're going to be collecting more extensive data than just
17 random observations. We've got -- we're going to be
18 videotaping those locations and having a consultant go through
19 and pick out the different compliance things. So that should
20 be good, yeah.

21 And in our design here we've tried to really
22 separate -- not -- not try to do the -- the no right turn on
23 red, like we tried to carve out a right-turn pocket and
24 separate the -- the cars from the bikes whenever possible in
25 those. But we know the drivers aren't going to like not being

1 able to make that right turn anymore at those intersections
2 where they used to be able to. So there was just more of, like
3 I said, with the right-hook conflict and the other thing, as
4 well. So it will be interesting to see how that goes.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: Any other comments from the
6 committee?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yes.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: On the subject of bike
10 boxes, Portland has produced some recent information. They've
11 also produced some analysis of that, and they seem to be of a
12 growing conclusion that certain features seem to not be
13 associated with safety issues, and other features don't. So
14 I'd just like you to review anything and everything you can get
15 out of some of the Portland experience to -- to learn from what
16 they're doing.

17 MR. DINKINS: Sure.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I personally believe if
19 there is a marked right-turn pocket, some of the issues that
20 John has raised are probably going to be minimized.

21 MR. DINKINS: Right.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: And we could end up in the
23 end with a better bike box experience if there's a right turn
24 lane present to the right of the bike box than the reverse.
25 Just keep an eye on that.

1 Also on the buffer bike lane, I took a look at that
2 figure. My first conclusion was that is a double-white stripe,
3 and I would not be wiling to cross it to park if a policeman
4 was present.

5 My second conclusion is the skip stripe almost gives
6 me the illusion of a two-way bike lane.

7 MR. DINKINS: It does. But I think when you're out
8 there and you see it in person, I could definitely see that
9 when you have the -- the three- and four-foot split --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Uh-huh.

11 MR. DINKINS: -- like this one.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Yeah.

13 MR. DINKINS: But we're, like I said, we're following
14 the NACTO guidelines on this. And when you're out there and
15 you see it in person, we haven't gotten any complaints about
16 that and -- and -- from any riders or cars or anybody that it
17 actually looks like a two-way -- or a two-lane bike lane.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I shall be out there to see
19 it in person within a week.

20 MR. DINKINS: Yeah. And I think the -- the parking
21 Ts help differentiate that as well. It makes it just feel more
22 like a buffered no-man's land as opposed to a second lane.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I have seen a number of
24 other buffered striping treatments. And, you know, I will look
25 at it in person at the first opportunity and tell you if I feel

1 the same way.

2 MR. DINKINS: Yeah.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Other treatments I've seen
4 seem like they're more natural towards what we're trying to
5 accomplish --

6 MR. DINKINS: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: -- with this. So early
8 observations, if you start seeing a lot of people riding the
9 wrong way on that treatment they would be particularly exposed
10 to some hazards. So that would be kind of an early sign of
11 watch out what you're doing.

12 MR. DINKINS: Okay.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: John?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Back to bike boxes for
15 just a second. It would help to be specific in naming the
16 parts of the bike box and its -- its surround when discussing
17 what happened, what you observed. And I believe NACTO's
18 document uses the term ingress lane for the -- the skinny --
19 the bike lane leading up to the reservoir. I'm not sure --

20 MR. DINKINS: The approach part of the bike lane --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The approach part.

22 MR. DINKINS: -- that leads into the bike box?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Either approach --

24 MR. DINKINS: Okay.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- or ingress. And

1 then if they -- you don't have in this proposed implementation
2 one of the features that you see in Portland, which is beyond
3 the crosswalk there is another patch of green. They call that
4 the egress lane. It's -- and I have particular heartburn for
5 that because when I look at those in Portland it's squarely in
6 the path of the right-turn conflict. So to the extent possible
7 use specific terminology in your report so it helps us
8 understand it at the -- the federal committee level.

9 MR. DINKINS: Okay. So egress and ingress for --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Right.

11 MR. DINKINS: Okay. Got you.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Waiting area, or
13 whatever the -- the box itself is called.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: I'm going to take the opportunity to
15 ask a couple of questions on this one. I'm assuming because
16 it's out there you've already taken your before studies.

17 MR. DINKINS: Taken what?

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Your before study.

19 MR. DINKINS: Yes, we have.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

21 MR. DINKINS: Yes.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: So there are two areas that I want
23 to inquire about, the first one having to do with the -- the
24 shared bike lane and the right-turn pocket. What is the --
25 what is the issue, what is the problem that you have observed

1 that you're -- that you're taking care of with this special
2 configuration?

3 MR. DINKINS: The initial impressions were -- people
4 were a little bit confused by this. They were like -- cars
5 were trying to squeeze into that seven-foot space. But then as
6 we explain it to them or we -- we respond to citizen concerns
7 or complaints about these they -- they then realize that, yes,
8 okay, I am now -- I see the solid line and it's an 11-foot
9 area, I am allowed to use that little space now. So it's --

10 MR. MORRISSEY: Mike, I can chime in.

11 MR. DINKINS: Yeah.

12 MR. MORRISSEY: Before that in the bike action plan,
13 so our land use and circulation element kind of looked at
14 30,000 feet and said here's all the streets that have bike
15 lanes. The Bike Action Plan came through and said here's the
16 kind of bike lane we want on each street. Then when they hand
17 it to use to go out and do it we get to some streets where,
18 hey, there's -- there's a designated right-turn pocket here but
19 the Bike Action Plan calls for a bike lane. How do we fit that
20 in?

21 So I think that's kind of the problem that we're
22 trying to address is there are knee-deep goals of this Bike
23 Action Plan that our community bought into, but also recognize
24 the geometric conditions that are in place and try and --

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: So then --

1 MR. MORRISSEY: -- match the two.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: So then what you're -- what you're
3 determining is if this will create a problem.

4 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: Because you probably didn't have a
6 problem before.

7 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah. Well, I mean, or the problem
8 was our community demands bike lanes, but we also have right
9 turn lanes. And we, yeah, we're going to see, can we achieve
10 what the community wants without degrading the -- the --

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. The other one that -- the
12 other question that I have was relative to the -- the shared
13 bike lane with the -- the bus stop where you have the sharrows
14 and the -- the solid white line there. What -- what was the
15 issue there? Was it -- is this again where you're trying to
16 just simply put back the bike -- bike lanes in or --

17 MR. DINKINS: The issue here -- well, and actually
18 talking to John over the lunch is that the sharrows are
19 supposed to be exclusively used for vehicles and bikes sharing
20 the same space, whereas I would like to take this a step
21 further in being a shared space between the bus and the bike.
22 This is a direct conflict which has the -- the bike lane is
23 going right on top of the bus pad. And it's just -- it's an
24 area that where they're both -- they're actually sharing that
25 space. If we want to use a different symbol or maybe a

1 dashed -- dashed bike lane through the bus pad, maybe that's a
2 better treatment for it when this under our experiment.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: I'm guessing that -- that might be
4 and that the -- basically the sharrows in that area are
5 probably not necessary because you've got -- you've got bike
6 markings on either side of the bus stop probably. So that --
7 as a minimalist, as somebody that's going to have to maintain
8 this all the time, I would hope that -- that you're findings
9 are that you don't need these out there because I wouldn't want
10 to have to paint them every year.

11 MR. DINKINS: Yeah. That's true. We do have bike
12 lane symbols and arrows just past the bus pads as -- it counts
13 -- that counts as the beginning of the bike lane so, yeah,
14 that's true.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: Anyone else?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rick?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: On page 46 of our staff
19 report (inaudible) in the area of our bike boxes, there is
20 mention of retro reflective materials mixed in with green, all
21 of which I understand within it says "fill in our outlining
22 bike boxes". Are you considering doing some of each and
23 comparing those two concepts or what?

24 MR. DINKINS: We'd -- initially when we started
25 looking into bike boxes over a year ago, all of them were

1 painted solid with reflective material. City of L.A. has come
2 out and done a few studies of their own with the bike boxes and
3 had found that just outlining the bike boxes is good enough to
4 show the area and the space and the visual effects that you're
5 going for. And it's not as -- as slippery in the rain and
6 things, and it's less paint, it's less maintenance, and you'd
7 still get the same point across.

8 So we'd be open to trying either one. I don't know
9 if we've decided one way or the other. I think we were leaning
10 towards just doing the outline just for the maintenance and --
11 standpoint. But I don't think we've decided yet.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: John?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: You're combo right turn
14 lane -- is that on the ground already?

15 MR. DINKINS: Yes.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. If it had not
17 been I would have wondered whether you could first lay down the
18 sharrows to create a treatment that's already blessed by the
19 FHWA, and then add the skip-stripe to see whether there was a
20 behavior change.

21 Because if you -- Federal Highway maintains a
22 website -- web page that goes down through all the innovative
23 treatments that people have brought forward and says what the
24 status is under the MUTCD or interim approval or
25 experimentation or categorical prohibition. And for a combined

1 bike lane right turn lane, it says "experimental if bike lane
2 markings are used," but can be implemented at present time if
3 shared lane markings are used instead of bike lane markings.
4 So it would -- it -- for future --

5 MR. DINKINS: So if we -- so if we didn't have the
6 white skip line, you're saying that it wouldn't even need to be
7 experimented with --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That's correct because
9 --

10 MR. DINKINS: -- that we already --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- because it's a
12 shared space, and especially you -- you wouldn't use the custom
13 sign. Presumably you'd use the right turn only, except
14 bicycles.

15 MR. DINKINS: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah.

17 MR. DINKINS: But I'm just wondering, too, also,
18 thinking out loud here, maybe this defines the space better.
19 This is maybe more clear. That's going to maybe come from our
20 experiment.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm eager to see the
22 results of the experiment.

23 MR. DINKINS: Yeah.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: My concern as -- as a
25 designer, someone who contributes to design, is that it appears

1 to create a lane that is overlapped by another lane. A right
2 turning, four -- two-tracked vehicle can not physically fit in
3 a seven -- well, you can fit in a seven -- six-foot space. But
4 if you're parking, for a realistic movement you're gong to be
5 overlapping that -- that stripe. And that's actually the
6 intent of -- of the combo lane, is that if you get there first
7 and you're the motorist, you occupy the whole space. If you
8 get there first as the bike -- bicyclist, you occupy the left
9 side of the space.

10 MR. DINKINS: Right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: But I don't think
12 anywhere else is there a lane that -- that is designed for
13 straddling.

14 MR. MORRISSEY: I do think, John, in our case, we
15 have a lot of what we call defacto right turn lanes in our city
16 where the lane is wide enough and people squeak around, because
17 we've got such limited right of way. We're kind of interested
18 in seeing can we tell people to make the most use of the space?
19 You know, there is room for a car to make a right turn and the
20 bike to situate itself, and can we try and promote that with
21 this? I think that's a little bit of our mindset. But perhaps
22 we can modify it and remove the -- the skip striping and
23 compare the two and see what that does.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. When Glen Greek
25 (phonetic) was a very bicycle innovative traffic engineer in

1 the city of Cupertino he took the opposite approach. He said
2 make the whole damn thing a bike lane and position the bike
3 lane markings to the left of the space so the cars
4 move into this gigantic 11-foot bike lane to make their right
5 turn and they're prevented from going through it. So there's
6 all sorts of --

7 MR. DINKINS: Yes.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- thoughts on this.

9 MR. DINKINS: Yeah. And the problem we have, too,
10 with our older bike lane design is that the bike lane just
11 drops off about 150 feet, 200 feet before the intersection
12 approach and we -- we didn't want to do that anymore. We
13 wanted to try to carry that as far as possible and define the
14 space all the way up to the intersection. So that's -- that's
15 the point of this.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: I just noticed your -- the sign that
17 you have up, and I'm thinking of myself as the first time user
18 of this lane -- this road. I'm seeing a sign and I'm seeing
19 what appears to be dashed -- a dashed line between the right
20 turn and the -- and the sharrows with the -- with the bike. To
21 me, I -- if I see that sign I'm going to try to squeeze myself
22 in that, what I guessed to be about seven feet if I'm the
23 first -- first time user.

24 MR. DINKINS: Exactly. Yeah.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: And --

1 MR. DINKINS: That -- that's one of the things we're,
2 yeah, we're concerned about, as well. Is -- is a car going to
3 try to really squeeze in -- into that seven foot space to -- or
4 how do we -- how do we further identify or define that space as
5 a car can -- is allowed and entitled to use the full 11-foot
6 lane there? What's the best way to show that?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: But is it a bad thing if
8 we're trying to get them to squeeze over? Because what if a
9 bike comes in later after the bike --

10 MR. DINKINS: Right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: -- after the car is in the
12 right turn lane? This gives that bike that extra little bit of
13 space to --

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Well, except that you have a
15 substandard lane.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Right. But if -- if the
17 vehicle can squeeze in there the vehicle can squeeze in there.

18 MR. DINKINS: But the lane is officially defined as
19 that 11-foot space, so --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes. Exactly.

21 MR. DINKINS: -- I don't know.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And -- and this is
23 actually the same sign that was used -- this -- this treatment
24 first arose in -- in Oregon in an experiment documented by the
25 researcher Bill Hunter in Eugene. And Federal Highway

1 sanctioned that experiment. They used that exact same sign, so
2 it's a --

3 MR. DINKINS: Right. That's where we got it from.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- it's the Eugene
5 sign.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chair, can I ask a
7 question?

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Hamid?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I have a question from
10 CHP representative here. If I'm a vehicle and I'm in that lane
11 I don't have to be on that side of the space. I can use the
12 bike lane as well; right? I'm not violating any law?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Correct.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. So it's just a
15 matter of education; right? Is that --

16 MR. DINKINS: It could be confusing to them.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Pardon me?

18 MR. DINKINS: It could be confusing to the motorist,
19 obviously.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: It can be confusing. But
21 if I am occupying both I'm not violating any section of the
22 vehicle code?

23 MR. DINKINS: No.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: All right. So I don't think we've

1 got any other questions or comments from the committee.

2 Anybody care to make a motion?

3 MR. DINKINS: Well --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MCLAUGHLIN: Public comment.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: Oh, the public. Anybody from the
6 public care to make a comment? Roberta, would that be you?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin,
8 Caltrans, Traffic Operations Division. Regarding this detail
9 here, I'm a little -- first of all I would like to -- I'm not
10 hearing a lot on how the evaluation is going to occur, whether
11 that's going to be surveys of drivers or how it is. But I
12 agree, this particular treatment is very confusing. It's
13 indicating there is a lane, bike lane there using a sharrow.
14 So I could see somebody going back to their city and start
15 using the sharrow and their bike lane, so that -- that causes
16 some issues. And the -- the dashed line does indicate a lane
17 that you probably should try to stay within.

18 And so we have -- we have some big concerns with the --
19 the definition of the width of that lane. I believe, and I --
20 and I am not -- not -- don't have that particular vehicle code
21 section, but staying within your lane and that dashed line
22 indicates a lane line creates a problem if, you know, if there
23 were a collision or something between a bicycle and -- and a
24 vehicle there.

25 I would feel more comfortable looking at the options

1 without the dashed lines, because that's what the sharrow
2 means, that you're sharing a lane, in this case sharing a right
3 turn lane, and somehow to get that message across to the
4 bicyclists that they can go through. That's been an issue in
5 the past. I -- as markings -- Sign Markings Chief -- Branch
6 Chief, I'm very interested in what's going to come out of this
7 experiment because this is a buffered bike lane use of sharrows
8 is -- is being widely acceptable throughout the state, and
9 different treatments out there. We do have a couple of other
10 experiments.

11 One of my primary concerns, and perhaps number of
12 representatives can -- can give us some feedback on this, is
13 this -- if this has been ran -- ran through the California
14 Bicycle Advisory Committee and getting some input from them.
15 I'm not sure how that communication occurs prior to some of
16 these meetings but at some point I believe CBAC -- CBAC would
17 be very interested in what's going on here, as well.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. Anyone else?

19 MR. PYBURN: Yes.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Steve.

21 MR. PYBURN: Sorry. Just reading our headquarter's
22 response. Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration.

23 First of all, Federal Highway officially frowns on
24 using experimental devices before we approve the experiment.
25 The Federal Highway has received a request for this experiment.

1 There's been a response back from our headquarters with some
2 preliminary information, but the request to experiment has not
3 been approved.

4 I echo Roberta's comments on the skip line, the right
5 turn lane, especially with the sign, the right-turn arrows
6 looks definitely like it's not a shared lane. There are two
7 separate lanes. And that -- if you go back to that figure that
8 was just up there, I think there's going to be significant
9 concerns in request to experiment for how busy that particular
10 graphic is. There's a lot of information there that -- that I
11 think is difficult for the driver to discern. So thank you for
12 the opportunity.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yes, Hamid?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can -- can we ask the
16 Federal Highway Administration representative, what's the
17 status of the experimentation request? Will they -- will they
18 approve, not approve? Is it under review? And when do you
19 think, based on your experience from previous requests for
20 experimentation, when do you think the folks in D.C. will issue
21 an opinion on this?

22 MR. DINKINS: And, also, who do I send the fruit
23 basket to?

24 MR. PYBURN: The F.B.I. As long as it's under \$10.00
25 and I can make it available to everybody in the office, that's

1 fine.

2 MR. DINKINS: There were some good fruit stands on
3 the way up here.

4 MR. PYBURN: The -- our -- our headquarters
5 representative, Kevin Dunn (phonetic), sent a response back to
6 the city with the preliminary cursory review of the experiment
7 request. There's no indication of yes or no or a timeline.
8 But it -- what it -- what the gist of the email was is to break
9 that experiment up into four separate experiments, because
10 there's four different elements to be evaluated.

11 I also got a request to comment on the experiment
12 back to headquarters, our thoughts. And I wanted to wait until
13 the end of this meeting before brining those comments forward.
14 So a timeline, I would expect it within a couple of weeks.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. BRONKALL: Bob Bronkall. I'd like to echo
17 Roberta's comments regarding the skip line at the right-turn
18 pocket, as well. One thing that I did note with the sign,
19 based on our earlier discussions, is that maybe more of a lane
20 channelization sign that includes the other travel lanes might
21 be appropriate to fully educate the traveling public of what
22 directions you might turn or go in for all the travel lanes.
23 That might clean this up a bit and remove that dashed line from
24 the sign, as well.

25 And then, lastly, this is more to the applicant, I'm

1 kind of curious on what they're considering these as whether
2 they're bike lanes or bike routes as you transition from an
3 actual bike lane to the sharrow condition and then, most likely
4 after the intersection, transition back to a bike lane.

5 MR. DINKINS: Well, it's definitely considered a bike
6 lane. We're considering it a bike lane all the way through the
7 intersection, especially since we've defined that four foot
8 space all the way up to the crosswalk. And it -- there is --
9 there's a receiving bike lane directly on the other side of the
10 street. It's kind of hard to see in that picture, but we're
11 defining that as a bike lane.

12 MR. MORRISSEY: All right. I think also, Jay, in our
13 bike action plan we've told the community, and the community
14 has bought in, that these certain cross-town streets will have
15 a separated, designated bike lane. So the entire corridor is
16 considered a street with a bike lane, but there's some tricky
17 points where we can't necessarily fit that bike lane in.

18 MR. DINKINS: Right. And accommodate left-turn
19 pockets, through lanes, and the right turn pocket in this. So
20 this is a nice compromise that we have come to.

21 MS. OLENBERGER: Emma Olenberger, but talking -- I'm
22 an avid cyclist myself. If I were approaching this
23 intersection I would be very, actually, afraid because it does,
24 actually, does look like the right hand turn and, plus with the
25 bike lane next to it, and then seeing the space. I'd be afraid

1 if I'd showed up first, as a cyclist, of being taken out by a
2 vehicle that's not paying attention, that doesn't see a cyclist
3 sitting there and would overtake me.

4 I think definitely removing the skip line, both on
5 the markings and on the sign, would then show me as a cyclist
6 that -- usually with the right-hand turn lane dedicated, I
7 would move to the left of that to indicate that I'm going
8 through straight. So I appreciate having the bike okay with
9 the sharrow with the arrow indicating to go forward as being
10 that that would be a safe area for me and be okay for me but
11 without that skip line, so then I know I'm going to be okay.
12 And again, not fearing in the back of mind that some, you know,
13 un-paying attention {sic} motorist might try and squeeze in
14 behind me.

15 So I appreciate your guys' efforts to increase bike
16 safety but this one definitely had -- my radar went up. I was
17 going, oh, my gosh.

18 MR. DINKINS: And some of our before observations
19 actually did see a lot of cyclists using that same path right
20 there anyway. So, I mean --

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Can you speak into the mike?

22 MR. DINKINS: Sorry. Some of our before observations
23 showed the cyclists using that -- that path anyway, so we just
24 went ahead and marked it as such. And then we found the Oregon
25 research that -- that further helped our case.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: Anyone else from the public? Okay.
2 We'll bring the communications back into the
3 committee.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, it may help
5 if you take the same approach that the federal government is
6 taking, that we look at these as four different experiment
7 requests and handle them one at a time.

8 MR. MORRISSEY: One point of clarification. We have
9 five requests before the committee.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Sorry. Sorry.

11 MR. MORRISSEY: There's four before the feds
12 because --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

14 MR. MORRISSEY: -- we have a separate request for
15 bike boxes in with them.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: If that's -- if that's the desire of
17 the committee, I'd be happy to break them apart as long as
18 the -- the city would be willing to do that, and then take each
19 one individually.

20 MR. DINKINS: Sure. Yes, we'd be willing.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Then we'll start with the --

22 MR. DINKINS: Bike box.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- the bike box.

24 MR. MORRISSEY: Well, see, the bike box is in the
25 same -- we already have that one approved.

1 MR. DINKINS: I'd consider it approved, but we're
2 asking the committee --

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: So that will be -- that will be a
4 little bit easier maybe for this committee to agree with.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Quick question about
6 that. Are you saying that you have approval to move forward
7 with the bike box that's part of this presentation?

8 MR. MORRISSEY: We have approval from FHWA to do bike
9 box experimentation with the two locations shown here.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. So -- so if we
11 were to break this proposal before us into parts, how many
12 parts would there be?

13 MR. MORRISSEY: One part for bike box, and the
14 federal can then --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So the bike box
16 combo --

17 MR. MORRISSEY: Combo --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- buffer --

19 MR. MORRISSEY: -- buffer, and the bus sharrow pass.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And what about the
21 left-turning sharrows?

22 MR. MORRISSEY: Oh, yeah, left-turning sharrows.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So there's five?

24 MR. MORRISSEY: There's -- there's five elements.

25 SECRETARY SINGH: So there -- we are recording the

1 meeting so please, you know, take turns when you communicate.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So it sounds like there are
3 five different areas that we will be breaking this into.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, one
5 question of clarification also that was brought up in terms of
6 interaction with the CBAC. Have any of these been presented to
7 California Bicycle Advisory Committee -- Caltrans Bicycle
8 Advisory Committee?

9 SECRETARY SINGH: Can I answer that question? Since
10 we have two normal trans members, we stop that process until
11 these two members tell us, take it to the CBAC.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

13 SECRETARY SINGH: So please do not bring those issues
14 back. I have written letter to CBAC and cc to all the
15 committee members. It's up to these two members to tell us if
16 they were -- if -- if this thing need to be to CBAC.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay. So this -- because
18 traditionally, and you are right, Mr. Singh, traditionally
19 before we had non-authorized reps the practice of this
20 committee was that anything bicycle related would go to CBAC
21 first. And this committee necessarily did not endorse all the
22 CBAC recommendations all the time. And we have the benefit of
23 the CBAC discussion and recommendation. So from now on we are
24 not going to wait for CBAC to give us feedback; is that the new
25 policy practice?

1 SECRETARY SINGH: That's what I'm saying. If -- if
2 these two members say this need to first go to CBAC then we
3 will send to CBAC.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

5 SECRETARY SINGH: It's -- It's up to these two
6 members.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Okay.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So any communication
9 regarding the boxes or would I -- Jeff?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: With the number of
11 experiments going on with bike boxes, who's going to eventually
12 cross tabulate the results so we can stop experimenting and
13 decide whether they work or not? It seems like maybe with this
14 being the last request in, part of your experimentation and
15 documentation should be to compile the results from what the
16 Long Beach, the San Francisco, and your study so we get more of
17 a composite look of what worked, what didn't work, you know,
18 with regards to bike boxes so we can really resolve this issue
19 of is that a good design feature or not.

20 MR. DINKINS: Yeah, we're all for that as well. We'd
21 love to see the results. So, yeah.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I'll just speculate on that
23 and you can -- there are bike box experiments going on
24 throughout the country. I think there are at least 12 cities
25 that are experimenting with them now. I think we're expecting

1 ultimately that it's at the federal level that decisions and
2 recommendations will be made regarding whether they should
3 become standard treatments. And the other committee that John
4 sits on will probably be instrumental in ultimately making that
5 decision, and then that will come down to California and we'll
6 evaluate it like we do all other federal proposed changes.

7 MR. PYBURN: Mr. Commissioner, if I may.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yes, go ahead.

9 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highways.

10 Jeff, what you have the right to do is try this in
11 your state. You don't have the right to add it to your manual.
12 You can only do that after the federal government says we've
13 looked at all the experiments and we think this is the good and
14 the bad from all of these experiments, here's how it should be
15 implemented.

16 So the next step would be an interim approval issued
17 by Federal Highways with conditions, or a new manual comes out
18 with them incorporated. So I would expect, and I was kind of
19 surprised that the green bike lane treatment already has met an
20 approval because I thought it was implemented or tried after
21 the bike boxes. But I would expect the bike box interim
22 approval to be somewhat settled in the -- in the not too
23 distant future.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Okay.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: John.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: And -- and as a member
2 of the National Technical Committee on Uniform Traffic Controls
3 Devices Bicycle Technical Committee, we are actively discussing
4 bike boxes. And I second Steve's comments that we're trying to
5 resolve this as soon as possible because so many people are
6 waiting on it.

7 I've already given my comments on what I'd like to
8 see the experiment address as far as your particular bike box
9 locations.

10 MR. DINKINS: Okay. Great. And I just want to ask
11 the committee, too, what -- what have you seen as far as bike
12 box results, Rock or anybody --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: The only formal --

14 MR. DINKINS: -- one way or the other or --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: The only really formal
16 results I've seen is the information that just came out of
17 Portland in the past couple of months --

18 MR. DINKINS: Uh-huh.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: -- which indicated most of
20 them seemed to be working well, a few of them have problems.
21 And they're -- they're articulating they think there are
22 patterns to the ones with problems and that they're hoping they
23 can learn how to avoid the problems at future locations.

24 I've not seen any effectiveness or compliance or --
25 or safety studies come out of other areas. Most of those

1 surveys are probably less than two years old, so that
2 information would be being compiled and coming back to FHWA at
3 this time.

4 MR. DINKINS: Okay.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Hamid, you -- I think you
6 originally made the recommendation to break these up.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think it's easier to
8 just look at them one at a time.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Would you -- would you like to
10 recommend approval on -- on any one of these?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: On -- on -- on call box I
12 don't -- pardon me, not call box, bike box. On -- on -- on
13 bike boxes, since they already have an interim approval and --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No, they don't.

15 SECRETARY SINGH: No, no. There's no interim
16 approval yet.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The relevant interim
18 approval is only for the use of --

19 SECRETARY SINGH: Green --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- green as an
21 enhancement color in bike lanes.

22 SECRETARY SINGH: Green -- green bike lanes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So if this is a
24 location where there is an approaching bike lane the --
25 what's -- what NAFTO (phonetic) calls the approach or the

1 ingress portion could be colored green without experimentation,
2 but they're experimenting on the whole configuration here.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: They do have, though, if I
4 understand right, a request to experiment on this experiment
5 has been approved by FHWA.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. I, yeah, I
7 personally do not see any problem with that. I mean, it just
8 enhances the visibility of that area. I understand the
9 potential. I look at the picture you have in your request, and
10 I look at that and I can see the potential for a right hook
11 because the -- that bicyclist is just putting his foot on
12 the -- on the ground. And by the time he wants to start, the
13 vehicle in front of him, he may make a right turn. I can see
14 those potentials, but they exist in any configuration of a bike
15 box. And we've already had that discussion when we were
16 looking at the bike boxes. I don't see any harm in adding
17 paint, except if you don't like the concept of bike box to
18 begin with.

19 SECRETARY SINGH: So we need to move on. Anybody
20 want to move motion?

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Does anybody want to make a motion
22 on any of these?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yes.

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: Jeff.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, my question is by

1 that right hook argument, is there any need, and I don't
2 know -- have a full knowledge of all the experiments, but in
3 terms of arrow lane designations here, clearly where it says
4 "wait here" that's actually the through right lane; correct?
5 And the lane to the left of the bike box is through only. So
6 to avoid right hooks, is there a need for a through lane
7 arrow --

8 MR. MORRISSEY: Can I -- can I clarify this --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- so that nobody tries to
10 turn right around those folks?

11 MR. MORRISSEY: Can I clarify? This photo is not
12 what we're proposing. It's just a photo of an example of a
13 bike box. So what we're proposing is actually these two design
14 plans that are the subsequent pages. So we actually don't have
15 any situation like this photo. We actually only have locations
16 where it's a left lane and a through lane --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. Got it.

18 MR. MORRISSEY: -- and a separate right turn lane.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Got it.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rick?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes. A question for --
22 probably for John and Rock. Did you have any thoughts on the
23 topic of -- any preference between solid versus outlined green?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: You mean a skip green?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: No, for the box itself.

1 There was a mention in the text about --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I hadn't -- I hadn't
3 actually heard of that possibility until Jay brought it up. I
4 think it's a good idea. I don't want to burden his experiment
5 with a suggestion that it could be done in two stages,
6 especially you're green is already on the ground; right?

7 MR. DINKINS: No. We don't have any green on the
8 ground yet.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I don't know if you
10 have any -- any opportunity to first try border line -- border
11 green and then full fill green, but is that what you're driving
12 at?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Well, I was thinking that
14 there's two locations. Maybe they do one each way, or your
15 idea also works. I hadn't thought of that. And so I was
16 looking for your expertise, if there was other perspective on
17 it.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think if I were to
19 make the motion I would suggest that if you have an opportunity
20 to do so that a staged application of green be considered.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: May I --

22 MR. DINKINS: Okay. So start with the outline and
23 then a few months later add the solid, is that what you mean by
24 staged?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Something like that.

1 Exactly.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: May I make a suggestion?
3 I -- I like John's idea a lot, yeah, but you don't have the
4 problem of the right hook because you're right. And since
5 they're doing, John, since they're doing two locations, they're
6 doing one on Michigan Avenue and one on 11th Street, two
7 different intersections, is this an opportunity to actually
8 even experiment with both, one with the --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Could you back up one
10 slide?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- one with --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm sorry. You were
13 there already. The more complicated one.

14 MR. DINKINS: The more complicated one.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: The one on --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: On the northeast
17 quadrant, the westbound approach, if it's north, south, east,
18 west, there is no right turn lane; correct?

19 MR. DINKINS: Right. That's correct.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: The other three --
21 three approaches all have dedicated right turn lanes; right?

22 MR. DINKINS: Yes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: So you have the
24 opportunity at this intersection to test outcomes, both with
25 and without a right turn lane?

1 MR. DINKINS: That is correct.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: No. I was -- I was
4 referring to if you say the fill in with green or just do the
5 perimeter of the box, maybe they can do one intersection one
6 way, the other intersection the other way so they can
7 compare --

8 SECRETARY SINGH: Same time.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- same time, compare the
10 two treatments.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think, speaking as a
12 member of the national committee, I would like to see a phased
13 implementation with the border line being done at all locations
14 at both intersections and then overlaid with solid fill,
15 because it would give us information as to whether a border
16 line works in these various sub-conditions at the various
17 intersection approaches, and then see if anything changes with
18 the full fill.

19 MR. MORRISSEY: If I can just comment. We -- we can
20 consider that. I think there might be some implications for
21 how we're actually going to do the installation. It -- it --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Absolutely.

23 MR. MORRISSEY: -- it is a grant-funded project so
24 we -- we may actually be hiring a contractor to install it. We
25 may not have the opportunity to bring them back twice to do

1 something, but that's something we can look into.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think these -- at
3 least from -- I understand your constraints, and this would
4 take the form of a suggestion rather than a requirement on --
5 on your experiment.

6 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah, we can definitely look at it.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think --

8 MR. DINKINS: And maybe, too, if -- if we get full
9 compliance with just the outline, maybe there's no need to fill
10 it in.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I actually think it
12 would be worth going to the full fill just to see if you get
13 any down sides from that. I think, I suspect the chair would
14 like us to move towards --

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: That would be a good idea.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: -- a motion. I'd like
17 to suggest that it take the form of -- of a list of suggestions
18 for consideration for the experiment for each one of the five
19 sub talks.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. So for the bike
21 boxes?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: For the bike boxes, I
23 would like to move approval of the proposed experiment for the
24 bike box element with the following suggestions.

25 The first suggestion would be a phased implementation of

1 green, perhaps starting with no green at all. It seems to me
2 that there are -- there's the ingress lane element, and then
3 there's the reservoir element. I don't think you're going to
4 do border green on the ingress lane. So you'd probably do
5 solid green on the ingress lane combined with border green in
6 the reservoir, followed by a fill of the reservoir; right?

7 MR. DINKINS: Right.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. So -- so the
9 first suggestion would be to phase application of green into
10 two phases.

11 Second suggestion -- is there any other suggestions
12 we have for bike boxes, team?

13 MR. DINKINS: Yes. There actually is two more that
14 we were going to add on to for -- for experimentation, yes.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: And just -- and the way
16 that they're showing the bike box that you're showing, that has
17 like the legend that says "wait here."

18 MR. MORRISSEY: That's typical.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So it is -- it's going to
20 be with the installation. And then are we going to have the
21 picture of the bicycle, the legend, the -- after the stencil of
22 the bicycle in the call box {sic} also or not?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: That would be whatever
24 they --

25 MR. DINKINS: Yeah.

1 MR. MORRISSEY: It'd have "wait here;" right?

2 MR. DINKINS: "Wait here" and the bicycle symbol.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So that's going to be
4 regardless of the paint, whether it's painted or not?

5 MR. MORRISSEY: That's some of the technical
6 installation issues he's talking about.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes. I would move
8 approval of the bike box element of the experimentation request
9 with the proviso that we encourage phased implementation of the
10 green color.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I can second that.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: All right. We have a motion and a
13 second. Any -- any --

14 SECRETARY SINGH: Who seconded?

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: Hamid.

16 Any comments? Okay. We've got -- we'll call for the
17 question. All in favor of approving the bike boxes with the
18 recommendation that hey do an implementation of phased green,
19 indicate by saying aye.

20 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Any opposed? Motion carries
22 unanimously.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'd like to move
24 approval of the turning sharrow element of the experimentation
25 request it to be next -- be the next simplest to discuss. I --

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: This is the right turn lane?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: No. This is the one
3 showing on our screen right now behind you.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Without -- without recommendations
5 or suggestions?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, I assume that the
7 motion has to be seconded, and then there's discussion;
8 correct?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Second.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. My only issue
11 with this is that it really extends the sharing of the shared
12 lane marking into a trailblazing type of context. Shared lane
13 markings have been used for trailblazing, but that wasn't their
14 original intent. I would think that as long as the body of the
15 sharrow is correctly communicating the position, the lateral
16 position within the lane that the bicyclist is expected to
17 take, which fulfills the primary function of reducing conflicts
18 between motorists and bicyclists by -- by claiming the lane
19 where it's appropriate to claim the lane, that is to prevent
20 overtaking, that the angled chevron is an interesting thing to
21 experiment with. So I have no particular heartburn over this,
22 and I think it's a worthy experimental element.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. I've got a motion and a
24 second. Any -- any comment?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'll second it.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I already seconded.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: Well, I think it was seconded by --
3 was it Rock?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I seconded. I didn't
5 second anything else today, so --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But I did have a question.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: A question.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: We did not vote on the first
9 motion.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, we did.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yeah. Yeah.

12 CHAIR ROBINSON: It was unanimous.

13 SECRETARY SINGH: Unanimous?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I think on this one the
15 educated bicyclist knows what this means. The average driver
16 is going to look at this and say, oh, they screwed up, they put
17 the chevron.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Maybe that's what they're going to
19 find.

20 Jeff, you had a question?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I was questioning
22 the position. And I know, well, is this what you've had on the
23 ground or is this an example of somebody else?

24 MR. DINKINS: Yes. We have this on the ground right
25 now.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So I wasn't -- I thought
2 everywhere else we were putting the sharrows was telling the
3 motorist where they would likely encounter a cyclist. So, I
4 mean, when I'm riding, in this example I'm usually to the right
5 side of the left-turn pocket because the left-turn vehicles are
6 going to go faster than I am when the light turns green. So
7 typically -- I'm surprised you didn't -- why wouldn't the
8 sharrow for the left turn have been on the right side of the
9 left turn lanes?

10 MR. DINKINS: They're -- they're only putting these
11 in when there's no left turn lane. This is one lane each
12 direction with a bike lane. So that's actually shared through
13 left, right lane. It's just -- it's just one lane in that
14 direction. So we're giving the -- the cyclist the space where
15 they're getting them in the proper position to make the left
16 turn, the correct left turn.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, they go out there
18 and they stop traffic until there's a gap for them to turn
19 left?

20 MR. DINKINS: Yes. That's what you're supposed to do
21 as a cyclist is command the space.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: And this is a normal two-
23 lane?

24 MR. DINKINS: Yeah, two-lane, one lane each direction
25 for cars.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: So is it okay for the bicycle to go
2 straight?

3 MR. DINKINS: Yeah. The bicycle, they have their own
4 bike lane on this street. So -- and they're only putting these
5 on the streets where we have bike lanes in both directions on
6 both streets. So they have -- the cyclists can go through in
7 their own bike lane because the sharrow, the left-turning
8 sharrow is there to --

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Just to accommodate the left turn?

10 MR. DINKINS: Yes, for the left-turning bikes.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. All question answered? We
12 have a motion and a second to approve the -- the left-turn
13 sharrow. All in favor, say aye.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Aye.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER GREENWOOD: Aye.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Aye.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Aye.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Aye.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Aye.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER RICKS: Aye.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Aye.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROWN: Aye.

23 MR. MORRISSEY: Aye.

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: All opposed say no. Carried.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm going to abstain from

1 this one.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

3 SECRETARY SINGH: Can we add the motion approval --
4 approvals are subject to the FHWA approval?

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: Yes. These -- you know what, that's
6 a very -- that's an excellent point. We can make approvals but
7 we're not -- we can't use usurp what FHWA has done.

8 SECRETARY SINGH: This is subject to the FHWA.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: They haven't approved this
10 one yet? They have not granted approval to test this yet?

11 SECRETARY SINGH: No. No.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes. So do we need to
13 revote?

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: Actually, we -- we probably should
15 revote on this if this was not approved.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay. I will amend the
17 motion to say subject to FHWA approval of this element.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: Concurred and seconded.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So then we'll -- we'll revote
20 on it. And the bottom line on this is it's subject to FHWA
21 approval, do they get our approval. So all in favor, aye.

22 ALL COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Opposed?

24 SECRETARY SINGH: Jeff?

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Jeff, you still abstaining?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Subject to FHWA approval
2 I'll -- okay, aye.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'll support it.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: So that was a unanimous vote.

6 So now on number -- now on number three. So this is
7 the -- the combined bike through vehicle right turn lane. I
8 personally have some heartburn with approving this one at all.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I agree the same. This
10 is not a good --

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: And it's not approved by FHWA. You
12 want to make a motion?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Just this -- if -- Mr.
14 Chairman, if -- if this is a continuation of the bike lane or a
15 bike trail or whatever, we do that at all intersections. We --
16 we drop the striping and bicyclists know that the bike lane
17 continues through the intersection.

18 I think the more that I look at this picture and the
19 more I listen to people, introducing this broken striping, it
20 just causes confusion. It doesn't help anybody. It doesn't
21 help the motorist. It doesn't help the bicyclist. I have
22 no -- I have no problem with keep the sharrows. But the dashed
23 line, that's the one that's really confusing. It implies that
24 these are like two separate lanes, one is a bike lane, one is a
25 vehicle lane, which -- which is not through -- so I don't feel

1 comfortable with this one as it stands.

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: You could -- you could move subject
3 to approval by FHWA and removal of the dash line.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Clarification on that.
5 Looking on FHWA's own page listing experimental interim
6 approved and other innovative treatments it says in no
7 uncertain terms that this treatment is already implementable
8 without the dashed line. There's really two elements, two
9 aspects of this element of the application, the first is the
10 marking, and the second is the sign.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: So the idea behind this is taking
12 the dashed line, and it's implementable without
13 experimentation?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Yeah. And the sign, you
15 know, because the sign makes it actually more confusing because
16 that implies that that's a through bike lane and a right turn
17 vehicle lane, which it's not.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah. I am sympathetic
19 to the desire of the community to have continuity of bike ways,
20 but this really is a shared situation here. It's shared, not
21 so much in space, but it's shared in time. It's shared
22 longitudely in space. If you get there first you occupy the
23 lane. I don't know how you're going to explain this to your
24 bicycling and traveling public, but --

25 MR. DINKINS: Well, it sounds like if we just take

1 out the center line that splits the lane it's -- everyone seems
2 to be okay with that. And we're still defining a space for the
3 bicyclist to make it all the way up to the intersection --

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: You don't -- you don't need --

5 MR. DINKINS: -- by the sharrow.

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: You don't need this committee's
7 approval if you do that.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think if I were to
9 advise on -- and I'm not a PE so I wouldn't implement this.
10 But if I were to advise implementing this in some other city I
11 would say -- what I would suggest is the sharrows in the
12 position that you're got them pictured here, and the sign
13 replaced with "Right turn only, except bicycles," which is a
14 sign that is used many other places.

15 So this if this needs to turn into a motion we are
16 not really moving approval, we're suggesting against moving
17 forward with this experimental element.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: John, before your motion, I have a
19 question from Jeff.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah. So the sign came
21 from Oregon? They used this same sign?

22 MR. DINKINS: Yes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Now, what striping did
24 they use with this sign?

25 MR. DINKINS: They used the same striping that we're

1 using.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The same striping?

3 MR. DINKINS: Yeah.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And did they have FHWA
5 approval to experiment with this?

6 MR. DINKINS: They had a study done in '95 that I
7 think I quoted in my request to experiment that -- and I don't
8 know the outcome of that, but it was --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This -- this appeared
10 in a draft 1995 State of Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
11 But the Oregon State Traffic Control Devices Committee, my
12 understanding is, declined to incorporate it in their MUTCD.
13 It did not go to the final plan.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So as far as you know this
15 wasn't actually field tested either in Oregon?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: This -- this was field
17 tested in Eugene, Oregon, at several locations in that city
18 alone.

19 MR. DINKINS: Yeah. And then it is -- it is on the
20 ground in other places in Oregon still today.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's -- it's on the
22 ground in Oakland, actually. And it's -- it's working, in my
23 estimation, well in Oakland. But the issues regarding lane
24 assignment have not been sorted out. Oakland proceeded, to my
25 knowledge, without experimentation.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: With -- with the stripe?
2 With the dashed stripe?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah.

4 MR. DINKINS: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yeah.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And it's working well?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It's -- it's at a slow
8 speed right turn in front of a Whole Foods on Harrison Street
9 right downtown. And it works as you'd expect it to work. The
10 bicyclists line up to the left. The car drivers are suitably
11 vigilant and don't make a last-minute right turn. It's kind of
12 first come, first served. It seems to work. But I think there
13 are issues with the -- the treatment with regard to the
14 definition of a lane.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But -- okay. I like to
16 stick with what works and not to reinvent the wheel. So with
17 FHWA's approval of the test I would support the test as it's
18 been proposed, if you've got examples of where it's actually
19 working.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I actually need to
21 correct my comment. Oakland did not use a shared lane marking.
22 They used a bike lane marking in -- in place of the sharrows.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Rock?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: I hate to ask the -- the
25 city that I know is trying to do wonderful things for bicycling

1 to change it. I've seen a treatment not unlike this that
2 actually, I think, addresses a lot of the concerns we've
3 raised. I don't think it got an FHWA experiment either. But I
4 know of a place where they did the skip right in the vicinity
5 of the sharrow and they left it blank for 30 to 50 feet, and
6 then did another skip adjacent to the next sharrow. And the
7 turn arrow they moved to about midway between the two markings.

8 And -- and having seen that, when I saw that I
9 thought that's an interesting treatment. I feel that's
10 logically conveying the message they're trying to convey. And
11 then when I compare that to this I say I'm kind of confused.
12 If I had a car six feet wide I don't know what I'd do.

13 I might encourage you all to consider alternate ways
14 of marking this to see if you can find a way that might be a
15 little bit less likely to cause confusion than the way you've
16 selected, because I think there may be one out there.

17 MR. DINKINS: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Sam?

19 MR. MORRISSEY: Maybe if it pleases the committee,
20 since FHWA would approve of our use of this without the dashed
21 lines, perhaps we can remove this request for experiment,
22 currently proceed with our request of FHWA and see what they
23 see, if they suggest alternate striping or treatment. And if
24 we want to do something else we can come back and report to the
25 committee.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: Well, that sounds like a good action
2 right there. I think we can -- we can --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'd actually like to
4 make an alternate suggestion.

5 SECRETARY SINGH: Don't make alternate. They're
6 taking it back.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: They're recommending to take it
8 back.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Yes, I understand that.
10 But one thing that is an active topic of research and
11 experimentation is whether a green background enhances the
12 meaning of the sharrow. So it might be useful to transform
13 this into an experiment whereby you first lay down what FHWA
14 already allows, which is everything minus the skip stripe. And
15 then as an experimental treatment reapply the sharrow with a
16 green background.

17 MR. DINKINS: That would be good. That would define
18 the space, as -- as we're trying to do with the --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: But not --

20 MR. DINKINS: -- splitting the lane --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: But not with the solid
22 band of green but --

23 MR. DINKINS: -- but it wouldn't actually be a
24 stripe.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Just background green;

1 not a solid line.

2 MR. DINKINS: Yeah, just the solid. Yeah.

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: Is that -- is that -- is it
4 necessary to get FHWA approval for that?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: It is.

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: Steve?

7 MR. PYBURN: If I may, all of this is pending Federal
8 Highway approval. Please don't go out and do that. And I say
9 that especially for the green behind the sharrows because
10 there's been a lot of emails coming out of headquarters about
11 is this being done without proper experimentation, and our
12 headquarters are getting kind of frustrated that these agencies
13 are going out and doing that because one other agency did it,
14 maybe based on conversations like this. Well, Oregon is doing
15 it. Well, we're not really showing what Oregon did -- is
16 doing. I couldn't find it on the experimental page. It's not
17 interim approval. You can apply for it. You can mention that
18 other cities are doing it. But please don't do it yet.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Okay.

20 MR. PYBURN: Thank you.

21 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay, Sam, we will -- we will
22 consider that this has been removed from consideration. Okay.
23 So that was the third one.

24 The fourth is the sharrows at bus stops.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have -- I have issues

1 with --

2 CHAIR ROBINSON: John.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have issues with this
4 on several counts. First is the use of sharrow in what seems
5 to me to be a bike lane. It's much more analogous, as I
6 mentioned before, to the issue of a motorist crossing a bike
7 lane into a curb-side parking area. I think that's the analogy
8 here. The solid line, also, I think is not properly putting
9 the bicyclist on notice that a conflict from the left is about
10 to occur. So there's that.

11 I wonder whether the city can modify standard bike
12 lane treatment with a dotted line to the left, and possibly
13 with bike legends to put the bus driver on notice that they're
14 moving through a bike area, and do this with conventional
15 treatment.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Other comments?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: If --

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Sam --

19 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah, I think on this one, as well,
20 due to our conversation before we brought this up, I think this
21 is probably something that we want to take back and revisit in
22 terms of striping treatments.

23 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So we'll strike -- we'll
24 strike the fourth one.

25 And then the final one is the buffered bike lanes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I have serious
2 heartburn with two parallel white lines, despite the fact that
3 they slide through a loophole in the distance specification. I
4 think this is going to be misconstrued by the traveling public
5 as a prohibition condition. I think there are numerous other
6 examples throughout the state and the country at this point for
7 how to indicate to the bicyclists that they have additional
8 optional protective area to the left of their travel space that
9 they can, if they need to, move into. And yet that the buffer
10 can be crossed to access parking, which is the case in this
11 illustration.

12 So I would not like to see a double parallel white
13 treatment without the -- either breaking one or both of those
14 lines or -- and/or introducing a transverse or chevron marking
15 between the two lines to make it clear that it's not a
16 prohibition condition.

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Other comments?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: I agree and support all
19 that he said.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Sam?

21 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah. I --

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Would you like to remove that one
23 or --

24 MR. MORRISSEY: I think we would like to --

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- do you want a consideration of

1 the -- of the --

2 MR. MORRISSEY: Maybe some --

3 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- committee on this one?

4 MR. MORRISSEY: -- some suggestions, kind of like the
5 bike box type treatment or --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I would -- I would
7 commend you to examine some of the implementations that San
8 Francisco has done. San Francisco has done a lot of buffered
9 bike lanes. Alameda Boulevard is one. Laguna Honda is
10 another, downtown in many locations south of market. And they
11 typically dotted the line adjacent to the bicycle travel area.
12 They typically, also, included some sort of transverse line
13 within the buffer. And I think those are the -- the primary
14 things I'm seeing there. And then they also go to double
15 dotted when there are significant conflicts, such as a break to
16 allow people to move into right turn area for a crossed street
17 or a major commercial driveway.

18 MR. MORRISSEY: We did consider the transverse lines.
19 I think one of our big concerns was the maintenance standpoint.
20 We talked about what we'd do, too, about installation and
21 maintenance. We were looking for something more cost
22 effective. I mean, this is something we can take back and look
23 it. It probably wouldn't come back before the committee
24 anytime soon.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm sympathetic to the

1 maintenance considerations. I'm operating as a committee
2 member here, more of not wanting to encourage anything to move
3 towards standardization that I think is going to be
4 misconstrued.

5 MR. MORRISSEY: Right.

6 MR. DINKINS: We have different designs of the bike
7 lane, too. I mean, we've got this one, and then we've got the
8 other ones where it's just -- where there is no traffic buffer.
9 How is that going to work with -- if we decide to move forward
10 with an experiment. It's -- it's just -- it's a lot of
11 variables here. Like what are we experimenting with, the
12 traffic buffer or the parking buffer and different widths, or
13 would you -- I guess I'll look for your guidance on that in
14 what we should be experiencing.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I'm -- I'm sympathetic
16 to the notion of a buffered bike lane. I use them and enjoy
17 them in San Francisco. I think they have a real relative way
18 in encouraging more cyclists onto the street in a safe line of
19 travel that feel uncomfortable with a simple conventional bike
20 lane. I'm just really responding to the design elements in the
21 current proposal.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, I think
23 that we deal with the comments of the -- of non-motorists
24 representative, which I totally agree with. I don't know if
25 the city is going to have support of the committee to proceed

1 with this, except if we can come up with something now.

2 Otherwise --

3 MR. MORRISSEY: I think we'd appreciate whatever
4 direction the committee --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Well --

6 MR. MORRISSEY: -- provides us on that.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think Federal Highway
8 has got, again, in their -- their web page, their buffered bike
9 lanes, let's see here, "can be implemented at present time if
10 pavement markings that are compliant with the MUTCD are used."

11 I think there's still a need for California
12 standardization, not to say -- not to mention federal
13 standardization, for us to know what works and conveys a clear
14 meaning to all traveling public. But the motorists, through
15 motorists crossing the area, and bicyclists. So I think
16 experimentation or research is still valuable on this. But it
17 can be implemented at present time, providing that you use only
18 MUTCD elements.

19 MR. MORRISSEY: Well, and that's the direction that
20 we've taken. But I think we -- we clearly hear from you that
21 the loophole of the MUTCD does present some confusion. I mean,
22 we're -- we're using MUTCD compliant designs, and we're
23 interested in seeing how people respond. We're looking for
24 kind of a cost effective, in terms of maintenance and -- and
25 installation standpoint. But I think at this point we'd just

1 welcome whatever the committee decides. If -- if there's a
2 motion to not approve I think we'd respect that.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: Well, come visit me in
4 San Francisco and let's go for a ride.

5 CHAIR ROBINSON: I don't know what you're -- what
6 you're recommending in terms of any modification that you want
7 to put in front of -- in front of the committee.

8 MR. MORRISSEY: We don't have any recommendations
9 right now.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So do you -- do you just want
11 the committee to vote on it or do you want to pull it?

12 MR. MORRISSEY: I think if the committee is going to
13 vote to not approve it I think we'd appreciate hearing that.

14 CHAIR ROBINSON: I think that's a likely situation.

15 MR. MORRISSEY: Okay.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So you want to go ahead and
17 do it?

18 SECRETARY SINGH: Is there a motion?

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Call for the question?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I don't think -- I
21 don't think that --

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Do we have a motion to approve, is
23 my -- is my question?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I need some, actually,
25 clarification from our FHWA member of the audience. Does

1 experimentation -- does an experimentation request for this
2 particular element need to be submitted?

3 MR. PYBURN: What is the experimental feature?

4 MR. MORRISSEY: Well the application of --

5 MR. PYBURN: Let me put the question a different way.
6 What feature is not in the MUTCD?

7 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah. All of them together, I guess.

8 MR. PYBURN: Okay. I think that there's -- this
9 particular pattern is not compliant with the -- either the
10 Federal or the State MUTCD. One, two, three, four -- four
11 lines to define a bikeway is unusual. That feature, I think,
12 itself requires experimentation. You take the 27B which is a
13 right edge line, that's -- that could go on the right side of
14 the bike lane. That defines traveled way. The -- the parallel
15 lines, I think, have some legal implications, specifically in
16 California. And the dashed line in the middle of the bike
17 lane, the dashed, the skip line is -- for a bike lane is
18 typically used at intersections where right turning vehicles,
19 or left turning on a one-way street, can encroach into the bike
20 lane to make that -- to make that movement. And while it's --
21 the skip line is required because you can't drive in the bike
22 lane, unless it's got that broken line.

23 So I think, yes, an experimentation -- this being
24 outright compliant, I would have to see a very strong argument.
25 And since it's not compliant, then the experiment is necessary.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So do we have a motion to
2 approve or deny this particular buffered bike lane?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I move approval --

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: -- as recommended. I'd
6 like to see this figured out and come back with information.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So there's a motion to
8 approve. Is there a second?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes. And I'd just like to
10 add a comment that if we don't allow experiments we're never
11 going to know what does work. So if the city is willing to
12 experiment and collect data and do all the work that's
13 associated with it, then I think those are good reasons. So
14 for -- from my perspective I second it.

15 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. We've got a motion and a
16 second.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: We've got a motion that is subject
18 to the FHWA approval.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Is it subject to FHWA?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: I'm sorry, yes. I
21 understood that to be applied.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman --

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: So any more comments before we vote?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman --

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: Jeff?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, it sounded like one
3 of the reasons why they wanted to try this pattern was for kind
4 of O and M reasons. But I didn't see anything in the
5 evaluation that the cost per foot of installing these four lane
6 lines compared to the cost of having done kind of a middle
7 strip all in green was being evaluated. It seems like --
8 didn't you say that part of this is trying to avoid the
9 maintenance cost of trying to put down and maintain that much
10 green, you know, paint? Shouldn't that be part of the
11 evaluation then as a good cost comparison of the two methods?

12 MR. MORRISSEY: I mean, we'll probably keep that data
13 internally. But we didn't think for -- as a traffic control
14 measure that's what the people would be interested in seeing.
15 We don't typically talk about that.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But that's part of the
17 point of your proposed experiment was exactly the offsetting of
18 doing green paint versus four thermal plastic stripes; right?

19 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah. Yeah.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So it seems like that
21 would be valuable data to include in the -- the final report if
22 you get approval to actually do this study.

23 MR. MORRISSEY: Yeah. I mean, that's something we
24 can add in, that info.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I mean, that's the whole

1 argument for this is, you know, this is far less expensive,
2 theoretically, but I wouldn't know until I saw the figures.

3 MR. MORRISSEY: Sure.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Look at this picture. I
6 can not just think sometimes more is just more. That's all
7 you're doing; you're just putting more lines there. You're not
8 doing anything substantially to really improve safety here.
9 And it's -- I just -- having four lines of the striping to
10 define a bike lane, that's just a bit too excessive.

11 MR. DINKINS: Yeah. I mean, it all has a purpose
12 here. We have -- we have a buffer, an 18-inch buffer between
13 the rider and -- and vehicle traffic, and a 2-and-a-half-foot
14 buffer between parked cars. And so we have buffers on both
15 sides.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: So right -- right on
17 the --

18 MR. DINKINS: We had the space to do it. We said why
19 not put in a nice cushy bike lane.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: See, right on the buffer
21 you can just eliminate that skip line and put the solid line
22 there. Then the bicyclist is going to be to the left of the
23 solid line, and the buffer is going to exist. The vehicle
24 still has to comply with the vehicle code and park 18 -- within
25 18 inches from the curb. The vehicle is going to park where

1 the vehicle is going to park. So if you have that additional
2 two-and-a-half feet, just move the solid line or stay with the
3 skip line or something. There is no reason to add two lines
4 because you are not changing -- you are not affecting the
5 location of the parked vehicle with respect to the curb.
6 That's already decided by the vehicle code.

7 So all -- if you have that space left there, okay, if
8 you want to put a line, put a line there. And I don't see why
9 you need to have a buffer. I mean, what is the point of the
10 buffer? I mean, what would that additionally give you that the
11 traditionally bike lane designation is not going to give you?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER CICCARELLI: I think -- I think the
13 reason for wanting to put more paint on the street here is
14 twofold. The first is to more clearly define the door zone,
15 where the parked car's door can open, while continuing to
16 discipline the parking behavior.

17 The ideal outcome here is that the parkers park near
18 the curb and don't get sloppy, that the bicyclist understands
19 roughly how far the door is going to open so they can stay
20 clear of it with their entire bike, including their right
21 handle bar, that the bicyclists see what the main travel way is
22 for the bicycle, and the bicyclist perceives a separation area
23 between their left side and the motor vehicle lane to their
24 left, and that motorists traveling in that travel lane
25 understands that they can cross to access parking and to make

1 right turns and to access driveways, but they're generally
2 discouraged from doing -- from traveling in the bike lane. And
3 furthermore, you don't want to create a situation where you've
4 got this big wide space that is technically a bike lane but
5 looks driveable. This is trying to accomplish a balancing act
6 between too much paint and too little messaging.

7 MR. DINKINS: Right. That is true. I mean, if you
8 take away the inside lane and the skip lane you basically have
9 a nine-foot bike lane which counts and looks exactly like a
10 travel lane, and we didn't want that.

11 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So we've got -- we have a
12 motion and a second, and we have a question from -- from Jeff
13 Knowles. If --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, it's a friendly
15 amendment, that the experimentation report --

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Did they -- did they agree to do
17 that?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- include a cost
19 analysis.

20 CHAIR ROBINSON: Is -- did the motion -- the motion
21 and the second agree to do that?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSHALL: Yes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Yes.

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. So we've -- so included in
25 the motion to approve is that they will review the cost

1 difference between all green and the cost of the stripes.

2 Okay.

3 Any final comments? Roberta, you're standing up
4 there. Do you have a comment?

5 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: No. I'm just waiting for the vote.

6 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

7 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And then I was going to get
8 clarification.

9 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you. And this is all subject
10 to approval of FHWA.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Mr. Chairman, on this one
12 I have to vote no, because not that it's --

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Well, that's okay. I understand.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- not that it's -- not
15 that it's dangerous or bad, it's just bad traffic
16 engineering --

17 CHAIR ROBINSON: I understand.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: -- design.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: All -- all in favor, raise your
20 hand. All opposed?

21 SECRETARY SINGH: So three, the motion passed.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. That's all five.

23 MR. DINKINS: Great. Thank you.

24 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: May I take my moment to clarify?

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: Roberta?

1 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans. The
2 discussion about the 18 inches and whether that's this
3 loophole, regarding section on divided highways, it says,
4 "double parallel lines," and normally that would be in the
5 center line in the roadway, "double sets of yellow parallel
6 lines," but there is quite a bit of confusion on double white
7 lines, whether they're 18 inches, 2 feet, or however far apart,
8 double -- double parallel lines have been used in a number of
9 other applications.

10 The City of Long Beach also has been looking at
11 buffer bike lanes. I think they're a really good thing. And
12 breaking that second line inside of the -- the bike lane line
13 is a good way to approach that with some cross hatching to --
14 to -- so it does not look like a separate lane, of sorts. So
15 there -- there are some other experiments out there that are
16 good examples of buffer bike lanes.

17 I think that my personal opinion is 18 inches is
18 probably not a big enough buffer to really help anybody out.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thanks, Roberta.

20 The next item is another request for experimentation,
21 proposal to experiment with regulatory sign "Bikes in lane"
22 with -- with bicycle symbol. This was originally submitted as
23 bike may use full lane signs. Recommended to remove from --
24 oh, this is -- we're removing this from the agenda? I thought
25 we were doing another one. So we're removing this one from the

1 agenda.

2 SECRETARY SINGH: Mr. Chairman, during 2008 committee
3 authorized Caltrans District 5 to conduct experiment with "Bike
4 in lane" sign, subject to the FHWA approval. However, Caltrans
5 District 5 now received FHWA approval. So I just want the
6 committee to know I'm removing this item from the pending item
7 under experimentations.

8 CHAIR ROBINSON: Is there action necessary on this
9 one, Devinder?

10 SECRETARY SINGH: No. Just, you know, some
11 information for the committee. So I'm removing from the items
12 under experimentation.

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: Thank you.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: So we don't need to move to
15 remove it?

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: We don't need to move.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: No. We don't need a motion. No.

18 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. And then our final action
19 item today is another information item, interim approval issued
20 by FHWA for the optional use of an alternative design for a
21 U.S. bike route.

22 SECRETARY SINGH: That item, Mr. Chairman, was on the
23 agenda during last meeting. And the committee asked to seek
24 blanket approval from the FHWA. So this is a symbol sign. We
25 have received the blanket authorization, and it's not really

1 included in the agenda. This is just information for the
2 committee and for the local agencies. If they want to use this
3 sign they can use it without seeking FHWA approval.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you for that.

5 Moving down to off agenda items. Does any committee
6 member have an item they would like to have placed on?

7 Seeing none, let's see, I would like to make a
8 comment. We're a pretty new committee here. There's --
9 there's a number of us who haven't -- haven't been on here for
10 a while, and we're -- we're kind of stumbling around in some
11 situations on -- on -- on specifically what sorts of actions we
12 should take. And -- and I want to recommend that perhaps a day
13 before our next meeting we go -- we have some -- some training,
14 perhaps that -- that Caltrans can put on, maybe even some past
15 members who might be willing to help us out there, so that we
16 can work as smoothly as we should be. And I'm -- I think we'll
17 get there ultimately, but it would be nice to have a little
18 kick start.

19 SECRETARY SINGH: What we will do if we have workshop
20 before the next meeting, we can set aside like two hours for
21 orientation. And we can have question and answer. I will put
22 some brief background, how the committee was working and the
23 bylines, and then we can question and answer like two hours
24 before the workshop.

25 CHAIR ROBINSON: That sounds good. Is everybody in

1 agreement with that? Great. So we'll -- we'll have that
2 next -- next time if we have a --

3 SECRETARY SINGH: Workshop.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: -- workshop. Okay.

5 Moving on down, our next meeting, we have a choice of
6 March 21st, 28th, or April 4th.

7 SECRETARY SINGH: So the March 28th option, the 21st,
8 or April 4th. And the meeting will be in Palm Desert. So pick
9 up which day you want, March 21st or April 4th.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can we do April 4th, if
11 the other committee members are okay?

12 SECRETARY SINGH: April 4th is okay?

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: We've got a request to consider
14 April 4th. Is everybody okay with that?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: April 4th, if my calendar
16 is right, is a conflict which is occurring right now. It's the
17 CBAC meeting. And if you, in fact, want either of the two of
18 us to participate at that level, as well as this level, there
19 could be some problems.

20 SECRETARY SINGH: You don't need to. If Brian, you
21 know, can attend the meetings you don't need to attend, so --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MILLER: My -- my sense --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Were there problems with
24 the April -- with the March 21st date? It's just as long as we
25 still have the backlog of correspondence to go through with

1 regards to the MUTCD changes, I'd like to have, even if we can
2 squeeze it in, you know, before the workshop, just finish off
3 the backlog of letters. So I'd go for the earlier date --

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay. Okay.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- because it makes it
6 easier to squeeze another meeting.

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: I agree with that. Why don't we --
8 why don't we go ahead and decide on March 21st.

9 SECRETARY SINGH: March 21st is -- is okay, yeah.

10 CHAIR ROBINSON: And --

11 SECRETARY SINGH: And then we will have workshop on
12 March 20th, okay?

13 CHAIR ROBINSON: And then we'll take a motion to --
14 let's see, and that's in Palm Desert?

15 SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah, Palm Desert.

16 CHAIR ROBINSON: Okay.

17 SECRETARY SINGH: Mark Greenwood want to host the
18 meeting.

19 CHAIR ROBINSON: Any final business? I would
20 entertain a motion to adjourn.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So moved.

22 CHAIR ROBINSON: Second?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BENTON: Second.

24 CHAIR ROBINSON: Moved by who?

25 SECRETARY SINGH: Moved by Jeff.

1 CHAIR ROBINSON: By Jeff. Seconded by Janice. All
2 in favor, say aye.

3 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

4 CHAIR ROBINSON: Opposed?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BAHADORI: Can we have discussion on
6 the motion?

7 CHAIR ROBINSON: No. There is not discussion on this
8 motion.

9 (Thereupon the California Traffic Control Devices
10 Committee Adjourned at 3:31 p.m.)
11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

