

State of California

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
May 2, 2024

ATTENDEES

Voting Members Present (9 Total):

- Jason Welday, League of California Cities (LOCC), City of Rancho Cucamonga (Chair)
- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin (Vice Chair)
- Robert Bronkall, County Engineers Association of California (CEAC), Humboldt County Public Works
- Lt. Brad Hopkins, California Highway Patrol (CHP)
- Bryan Jones, Caltrans Active Transportation (CAT), Greenlaw Partners
- Kevin Murai, Caltrans Headquarters (HQ)
- Mike Sallaberry, CAT, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Mahmoud Zahriya, American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah (AAA-N)

Voting Members Absent (1 Total):

- Marianne Kim, American Automobile Association of Southern California (AAA-S)

Alternate Members Present (6 Total):

- Florencia Allenger, Caltrans
- Melainie Boyack, CHP
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC, Placer County
- Virendra Patel, LOCC, City of Concord
- Tony Powers, CAT, Dokken Engineering
- Wei Zhu, CEAC, Orange County Public Works

Alternate Members Absent (4 Total):

- Tim Chang, AAA-S
- Michelle Donati, AAA-N
- Andrew Maximous, LOCC, Culver City

- Rock Miller, CAT, Rock E. Miller & Associates

Committee Staff:

- Florencia, Caltrans HQ, CTCDC Secretary
- Bryan Luong, Caltrans HQ, Alternate CTCDC Secretary

Presenters:

- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans HQ
- John Liu, Caltrans, District 6
- Bryan Luong, Caltrans HQ
- Kevin Murai, Caltrans HQ
- Joe Wang, City of Oakland
- Wil Buller, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit Agency (AC Transit)
- Randy Durrenberger, Kimley-Horn Associates
- Aung Maung, Caltrans, District 4

Public Speakers:

- Jim Baross, California Association of Bicycling Organizations (CABO)
- Richard Moeur, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD)
- Steve Pyburn, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introductions

Chair Welday opened the meeting at 9:02 a.m.

The CTCDC members introduced themselves.

2. Membership

Chair Welday reviewed the changes to the CTCDC membership.

3. Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall moved to approve the February 1, 2024, California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Jones. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote with no members abstaining.

4. Public Comments

Mr. Jim Baross, President of the California Association of Bicycling Organizations, commented on how freeway access for bicycle riders is prohibited in most areas while approximately 1,000 miles allows access, signage for these accessible sections, and signage distinguishing motorized bicycles and electric-assisted bicycles.

5. Experimentation Items

Mr. Luong, Alternate CTCDC Secretary stated that there were no further updates.

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

6a. Consent Items (minor discussion with vote expected)

None

6b. Action Items (Continuing discussion from prior meetings with vote expected)

24-03: Legislative Information – Session Year 2023-2024

Mr. Bronkall commented that the Legislative Template Letter is an effort to help the CTCDC be more effective in implementing the will of the Legislature insofar as the CA MUTCD is concerned, with the main goal of alerting the Legislature of the Committee and assistance. This would help the Legislature gauge the feasibility of implementing changes. We need to make sure that information concerning new legislation is available to the Committee (CSAC will assist in this). A future consideration may be to realign our meeting schedule to better align with the legislative process.

Mr. Bhatia requested more clarity from Caltrans regarding the involvement of the Sub-Committee with the Legislature.

Lt. Hopkins reiterated the importance of finalizing the Template Letter language as well as considering the necessity of the Sub-Committee.

Chair Welday noted that previous meeting minutes show that the Template Letter language was generally accepted, and additional changes had not been received by Caltrans.

Caltrans staff suggested that Caltrans Legal should determine if the language used in the Template Letter is allowable before adding it as an action item to the next CTCDC meeting agenda.

Jim Baross has consulted with Caltrans staff regarding pending legislation pertinent to AB 2290 and SB 1216. The Legislature and their staff could benefit

from advice from the CTCDC. Caltrans staff may or may not be involved in the development of new legislation. Jim recommended a liaison between the Legislature and appropriate Caltrans staff.

Chair Welday noted that this item may need to be taken in a couple of steps because discussion regarding the establishment of the Sub-Committee would be in order.

Mr. Bronkall noted that the general language of the Template Letter had been agreed upon, however, a number of loose ends still need to be addressed before proceeding. The Committee needs to identify the remaining concerns and work with Caltrans to review them, addressing this agenda item again at the next CTCDC meeting.

Chair Welday suggested a motion to confirm the general Template Letter concept, that it be vetted by Caltrans Legal regarding extent and permissibility of use of the letter, and that the Template Letter be circulated to the Committee for comments on the language to be discussed at the next meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall moved for adoption of the Template Letter after discussion of the general concept of the Template Letter, the legal aspect of the Template Letter, and addressing of any comments or concerns pertaining to the actual language of the Template Letter, Mr. Scharff seconded. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

24-05: Class IV Bikeway Sign

Mr. Liu, Deputy District Director, Caltrans District 6, Division of Maintenance and Operations presented that there is currently no approved Class IV bikeway sign in the CA MUTCD. There are no regulations within the CA Vehicle Code for bicyclists or motor vehicles travelling in or on Class IV bikeways.

Mr. Liu proposed an optional-use guide sign because some local jurisdictions have installed unapproved or inappropriate signs. Pavement markings can fade and be obscured or rendered illegible in low-light or wet conditions. A sign would supplement markings. Mr. Liu suggested the wording "CYCLE TRACK" for these guide signs. The beginning and ending of Class IV bikeways need to be shown. Another option is to not establish Class IV bikeways until approved legislation is passed.

Mr. Bronkall asked for the reason the Vehicle Code uses the term "Class IV Bikeway" instead of "Cycle Track".

Mr. Liu answered that the term "bikeway" was considered. Without an accompanying phrase describing bikeway type, the term "bikeway" may be vague.

Mr. Pyburn, Federal Highway Administration, mentioned that policy relating to this sign is in transition. Support for a sign like this may arrive when the Chapter 10 Update for the 2026 MUTCD is completed.

Mr. Sallaberry added that without vetting different signs, this sign should be optional. FHWA may provide further guidance in the future. Mr. Sallaberry supports a rethinking of the bicycle facilities categories in California.

Vice Chair Bhatia agreed on waiting for guidance from FHWA. Vice Chair Bhatia asked how will this affect jurisdictions converting their Class II bike lanes into Class IV bike lanes?

Mr. Moeur, Executive Secretary of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD), noted that the NCUTCD Bicycle Technical Committee does not have a current agenda item to address specific signing for cycle tracks. The 11th Edition of the MUTCD contains a lot more information on this class of bikeway. At the national level, California is the only state that uses bike facility categories of Class I, Class II, Class III, and Class IV. Signing referring to these categories may not be recognizable to non-California residents.

Mr. Baross stated it is important for potential bicyclists to be able to choose where they ride on the roadway or which type of bikeway they use. California has a mandatory bike-use law, CA Vehicle Code 21208, and California bicyclists are expected to use these designated bike lanes. Appropriate signage is needed and important. The term "bikeway" can be applicable to any of the four California bicycle facility classes, so "bikeway" may not be appropriate for this sign. At some point, we need to pursue California Vehicle Code changes that would allow signage and enforcement of "NO PARKING" in a Class IV facility. We also need a "NO PEDESTRIAN USE" in Class IV facilities. Our organization would favor the introduction and use of a "CYCLE TRACK" informational sign, white on green in the interim.

Mr. Bhullar, Caltrans CA MUTCD Editor, mentioned that the CA MUTCD does not limit itself to the CVC (California Vehicle Code) if there is a traffic control device and state law addressing it. He suggested that Steve request this agenda item as a request independent of the CA MUTCD.

Mr. Powers said that there is an urgency to have an acceptable Class IV sign. The "CYCLE TRACK" version would be fine as an intermediate sign.

Mr. Liu added that there is no sign within the current or new Federal MUTCD that we can use. When a local jurisdiction wishes to convert a Class II to a Class IV, they should be removing the Class II bike signs.

Lt. Hopkins commented that the general public may be confused by the term "CYCLE TRACK".

MOTION: Mr. Sallaberry moved to continue the conversation on Item 24-05, seconded by Vice Chair Bhatia. The Motion passed unanimously.

6c. Informational Items (New items that may be voted on or brought back as an Action Item in a future meeting)

23-03: Legislative Information – Session Year 2023-2024

Mr. Luong presented the Summary Table of Session Year 2023-2024. This item is provided as an attachment to the agenda.

23-09: Caltrans Process in Adopting NMUTCD 11th Edition

Mr. Bhullar, Caltrans, provided an update on Caltrans' ongoing National MUTCD (11th Edition) adoption process. Caltrans has formed ten subject matter expert (SME) workgroups with Mr. Bhullar as CA MUTCD Editor. Several new additions in the 11th Edition MUTCD and the CA MUTCD Draft Timeline was shown.

Mr. Scharf asked if any SME Working Groups were short of members, eliciting Mr. Bhullar to note that solicitation is ongoing and local agencies seem to be underrepresented. Member referrals or recommendations are welcomed by Caltrans.

Mr. Moeur noted the possibility of Revision 1 not being PROWAG.

23-10: CTCDC Agenda Items Status

None

6d. Request for Word Message Signs Approval

None.

6e. Request for Experimentation

19-11: Request for Closure of Experiment for Red Colored Transit-Only Lanes

Mr. Luong commented that Red Colored Transit-Only Lanes are now in the National MUTCD 11th Edition. This experiment automatically closed.

MOTION: Chair Welday moved to close the experiment, seconded by Mr. Bronkall. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

24-04: Request to Experiment with Red Paint Alternatives for Bus-Only Lane

Mr. Wang, City of Oakland Department of Transportation, introduced the request for experimentation with an alternative way to stripe red paint in a transit only lane. Project history and developments were listed and discussed. The Quick Build Project is officially owned and managed by AC Transit.

Wil Buller, AC Transit, presented. Treatments to be evaluated were listed and discussed. The current project status was presented. Proposed pilot treatments were shown and discussed.

Mr. Durrenberger presented a detailed discussion of each alternative. Traffic flow, location and volume were discussed. Three reasons for the request were listed and explained. The Project Evaluation Plan was presented.

Mr. Bronkall commented that the narrow band down the travel lane is intriguing because it avoids the wheel path of the buses possibly extending the longevity of the pavement coloring. The narrow band in Alternative 3 does not seem to be very intuitive.

Vice Chair Bhatia had a similar concern with Alternative 3. The 12-inch band does not seem to be very intuitive. For the public to be able to distinguish between the red band being on the left or the right side of the white lane may be difficult.

Mr. Pyburn shared that Interim Approval 22 does make this treatment available currently. FHWA Headquarters approval is required before implementation. The cost issue and its impact on the City should be highlighted in the application. FHWA is going to see this under IA-22 as an experiment under the 11th Edition. The request is to not have full-width red pavement. Mr. Pyburn's perspective is based on the 11th Edition and a variation from the full width requirement.

Mr. Bhullar agreed that we should be covered utilizing the Interim Approval.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall moved to approve the experiment for Alternates 1 and 2 contingents on FHWA final approval, seconded by Mr. Scharff. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Welday stated that the next meeting was scheduled for August 1, 2024. Committee Members voiced a preference for a virtual meeting.

Mr. Scharf offered the L.A. County facility for future in-person meetings held in Southern California.

8. Adjourn

Chair Welday adjourned the meeting at 10:56 a.m.