

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting
November 7, 2024

ATTENDEES

Voting Members Present (6 Total)

- Jason Welday, League of California Cities (LOCC), City of Rancho Cucamonga (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), City of Menifee
- Robert Scharf, CEAC, Los Angeles County Public Works
- Mahmoud Zahriya, American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah (AAA-N)

Voting Members Absent (4 Total)

- Pratyush Bhatia, LOCC, City of Dublin (Vice Chair)
- Marianne Kim, American Automobile Association of Southern California (AAA-S)
- Mike Sallaberry, CAT, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- Amjad Obeid, Caltrans HQ

Alternate Members Present (2 Total)

- Florencia Allenger, Caltrans HQ
- Tony Powers, CAT, Dokken Engineering

Alternate Members Absent (8 Total)

- Melainie Boyack, CHP
- Tim Chang, AAA-S
- Michelle Donati, AAA-N
- Andrew Maximous, LOCC
- Rock Miller, CAT
- Richard Moorehead, CEAC
- Virendra Patel, LOCC
- Wei Zhu, CEAC

Committee Staff

- Florencia Allenger, Caltrans HQ, CTCDC Secretary

- Timothy Kong, Caltrans HQ, Transportation Engineer, Acting CTCDC Secretary

Presenters

- Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans HQ
- Andreas Krause, Caltrans D1
- Yvette LaDuke, Cal OES
- Laura Wells, City of San Jose
- Tasha Higgins, Caltrans D7
- Sam Morrissey, LA28

Public Commentors

- Zoubir Ouadah, Wilson & Company, Inc.
- John Fisher
- Steve Pyburn, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Lorenzo Sevidal, Caltrans D7
- Craig Rhodes, Traffic Management Inc.
- David Royer, City of Santa Clarita

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Chair Welday opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

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 August 1, 2024, and September 3, 2024, California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Scharf. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4. Public Comments

Chair Welday reviewed proposed changes to the order of Agenda Items to be discussed. *Agenda Items 24-15, 24-11 and 24-12 were taken out of order. Item 24-15 was heard first, after Public Comments; 24-11 and 24-12 were heard after 24-08 at the end of the meeting.* There was no public comment.

5. Updates on Items under Experimentation

Mr. Kong provided updates via a table shared with attendees. See pages 5-8 on the Meeting Agenda.

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)

24-11: Review and Finalize CA MUTCD 2026, Part 5

Chair Welday introduced Item 24-11 and the presenter, Johnny Bhullar.

Mr. Bhullar, Caltrans HQ, made a presentation to attendees.

Discussion

- Mr. Bronkall:
 - Additional meetings may be needed to meet our deadline.
 - In regard to the many, small, editorial comments made to Chapter 5 - why isn't the language in the National Manual adequate? We should consider leaving the national language as it is.
 - Mr. Scharf concurred with Mr. Bronkall and found the "place holder" comment intriguing.
 - Ms. Allenger agreed that most of the changes are editorial, and the standards should be adopted.

Public Comment

- Mr. Ouadah recommended approval of proposed changes.
- Mr. Rhodes stated that Part 5 is a place holder because many items will be amended and modified before final approval.
- Mr. Pyburn, FHWA:
 - Caltrans is to be commended for the extensive amount of work done on this.
 - We are working to bring non-conforming items in the CA MUTCD into conformance with the National MUTCD 11th Edition.
 - Most of the changes proposed by Caltrans for Part 5 are mostly guidance and support statements, and don't have any legal meaning. We would prefer that they not be changed.
 - A large part of our assessment will be risk, and the changes to this section are low risk.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall moved to recommend Item 24-06, using the National language except for Paragraph 6 where the state edits will be incorporated. Mr. Scharf seconded. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

24-12: Review and Finalize CA MUTCD 2026, Part 7

Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans HQ, made a presentation to attendees.

Discussion

- Mr. Powers:
 - Proposed changes to 7A.02, Paragraph 3 - Why are bicyclists not allowed to use the sidewalk and why is this used in deciding whether or not to consider bicyclists? This is found in the federal language.
 - The implication is that bicyclists belong on the sidewalks in general. There is room for looking at this later.
- Mr. Pyburn, FHWA:
 - Our office has nothing to do with the text in the National Manual.
 - I support and agree that bicyclists should be fully considered in the safety of our public roads.
 - I believe that paragraph is saying, if bikes cannot legally ride on the sidewalk, there should be consideration of their safety and operations in the roadway.
 - California has the option to make this a requirement.
 - The federal guidance does not offer a lot to the reasoning behind this sentence.
- Lt. Hopkins:
 - Generally, California law allows bicycles to use sidewalks unless local ordinances do not allow it.
 - This may be referring to situations where local ordinances do not allow it.
- Chair Welday:
 - I feel that this is not a limitation on what the planning should do, but more of a floor of what the planning should do.

Public Comment

- Mr. Pyburn:
 - I have the same comments on this section as I had on Part 5.
 - Signs in this section that do not conform with the National Manual will have to be brought into conformance.
- Mr. Royer, City of Santa Clarita:
 - We allow the use of bicycles on the sidewalk. We are having a severe problem with the electric bikes because of the high speeds attained by these bikes.
 - Existing signs will not have to be taken down until they wear out (life cycle replacements).
- Chair Welday led a discussion covering Sections 7A, 7B, 7C, and 7D. Changes, modifications and/or additions were discussed.
- This item was tabled for review of comments by Caltrans and interested groups to be brought back at a later meeting.

24-13: Tsunami Hazard Zone Signs

Chair Welday introduced Item 24-13 and the presenter, Andreas Krause. Mr. Krause, Caltrans, noted the following:

- This proposal was jointly developed by Caltrans Headquarters, Traffic Signs and Safety Devices, District 1 and the California Office of Emergency Services, Tsunami Program.
- We have received letters of support from the three regional government associations in District 1.
- The history, background, and developments pertinent to this agenda item were listed and discussed.

Discussion

- Lt. Hopkins:
 - Lt. Hopkins inquired into the process and procedure of maintenance of tsunami signs.
- Ms. Yvette LaDuke, Tsunami Program Manager, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services:
 - Annual funding sources are used for maintenance of tsunami signs.
 - Ongoing maintenance efforts are coordinated with local agencies and authorities.
 - Entrance and exit signs are recommended by the National Program and we want commuters to be able to determine when they are in an area no longer impacted by inundating waters.
- Ms. Allenger:
 - For your pilot, was there reasoning to place entering/exiting signs as opposed to just Tsunami Zone
- Ms. LaDuke:
 - Low points in a given area can be intermittent and this is important to communicate clearly to the travelling public whether they are still in an area impacted by inundation.
- Mr. Bronkall:
 - The existing signage is actually working.
 - In certain areas there isn't sufficient high ground to escape the flooding. Evacuation sites and drills have been established.
 - Off-road signage pertaining to evacuation zones needs to be deployed as well.
- Mr. Krause:
 - Signage in District 1 has been very effective and CalOES has annual drills in the county in conjunction with Caltrans.
 - Hazards zones in District 1 have been updated necessitating moving certain signs to different locations. This relocation cannot be implemented because they are not officially approved signs.

- Given that there is not federal approval for these signs yet, we are limiting our request today to only signs that have an approved background.
- CalOES will be working with FHWA to try to get the full range of signs approved.
- Tsunami evacuation route signs should not be mixed with tsunami hazard zone signs that indicate that you are still in the zone.

Public Comment

- Mr. Pyburn:
 - The 11th Edition of the National MUTCD includes evacuation warning signs as shown on the screen. We look at California-proposed signs within the context of the requirements of the National MUTCD.
 - It may be that we cannot allow the signs. If we don't, there is no issue with using "plaques" under the federal signs.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall moved to recommend Item 24-13 subject to revisions that Federal Highways may have. Mr. Scharf seconded. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

24-14: Safety Corridor Definition Requirements

Chair Welday introduced Item 24-14 and the presenter, Laura Wells.

Ms. Laura Wells, City of San Jose:

- AB 43 in 2021 authorized cities to reduce speed limits an additional 5 mph more than what might be called for by the Engineering and Traffic Survey.
- The bill also required Caltrans to define "Safety Corridor".
- Last year AB 645 authorized six agencies to pilot speed safety cameras and San Jose is one of those cities and eligible for camera deployment.
- Historical developments and actions were noted.

Discussion

- Mr. Bronkall:
 - Verbiage pertaining to "crash density" should be further clarified insofar as injuries and fatalities are concerned.
 - The word "injury" should be changed to "crashes".
 - The data should be expanded and not limited to just serious crashes and fatalities.
 - How does "crash severity" get weighted when we are only dealing with serious and fatal crashes?
 - It seems like the "crash severity weighting factor" would only be fatal crashes and would not necessarily include the "serious injury crashes". This may cause confusion.
- Ms. Wells:

- In terms of weighting, a city could elect to give a higher weight for fatal injury crashes versus severe injury crashes.
- This weighting is very important when the number of corridors to be selected is limited.
- AB 43 relates to both types of crashes, serious and fatal. A city can choose to assign more weight to fatal as opposed to serious injuries.
- The original “can” in the CA MUTCD made it seem optional and using “shall” eliminates that ambiguity.
- The previous CA MUTCD stated, “the data may be from the most recent Engineering and Traffic Survey“ and other sources. Cities have the option to use their own internal data source and determine their own weighting criteria.
- From a high level there needs to be the presence of fatal and/or serious injury crashes, and this is a requirement. The “shall” weighting factors are to be used in conjunction with this. Prioritization of factors is to be determined by the individual jurisdictions.
- “Safety Corridor” is defined and includes the “where the highest number of serious injury and fatality crashes occur” and part of the definition. This is a standard and is required.
- Lt. Hopkins:
 - AB 43 originally stipulated that “Safety Corridor” be defined and additional clarifying definitional language pertaining to a number of terms used needs to be added.
- Ms. Allenger:
 - “Shall be developed” makes this mandatory and the asterisk is confusing because specific crash data is not identified.
 - What options are available to different jurisdictions?
 - It would make sense to update the language as to what the “shall” requirements entail. This would help reduce the confusion inherent in the asterisk directions.
 - “Crash data” is not very specific and a wide array of data could be included here.
 - “Mandatory data requirements” is not defined and adds to confusion. What factors or data are mandatory?
 - Reinforcing what is already required does not create confusion.
- Mr. Powers:
 - By changing it to “shall” these are no longer “suggested” factors and “suggested” needs to be removed.
 - Do these changes allow jurisdictions to use factors not listed as would be the case using “suggested” factors?
- Chair Welday suggested edits:
 - The inclusion of “and other weighting factors” would help reduce confusion. Jurisdictions are then able to use factors specific to their particular situation whether listed in the CA MUTCD or not.

- The first part of the table found in Section 12N and Section 12O should be deleted and just leave the bullet points. The introductory sentence is causing confusion.

Public Comment

- Mr. Ouadah:
 - I am currently working with San Diego County and San Diego City on their Safety Corridors.
 - San Diego City wants to use a factor called systemic collisions or systemic crashes, which are predicted crashes.
 - My recommended changes to the CA MUTCD:
 - Paragraph 12N stays the same
 - Paragraph 12O amended as follows "One or more of the required crash weighting factors as provided in Paragraph 12xx of this section, shall be used to prioritize the location of fatal and serious injury crashes in developing the Safety Corridor
 - Paragraph 12P as an Option under Paragraph 12O - "The crash weighting factors listed in Table 2B-105(CA) may be used to prioritize the location of fatal and serious injury crashes in developing the safety factors."
 - Table 2B-105(CA)
 - Take introduction statement in Table 2B-105(CA) out. The asterisk is not necessary.
 - Add "systemic or predicted crashes"

CHANGES TO CA MUTCD BASED ON CTCDC MEETING COMMENTS:

CVC Section 22358.7(a)(1) – “Safety Corridor” Definition

Standard:

¹²ⁿ A safety corridor shall be defined as a roadway segment within an overall roadway network where the highest number of serious injury and fatality crashes occur.

^{12o} One or more ~~of the required~~ crash weighting factors as provided in paragraph 12p of this section ~~listed in the Table 2B-105(CA)~~ shall be used to prioritize the locations of fatal and serious injury crashes in developing the “Safety Corridor”.

Option:

^{12p} The crash weighting factors to prioritize the locations of fatal and serious injury crashes in developing the "Safety Corridor" may include, but are not limited, to the factors included in Table 2B-105(CA).

Table 2B-105(CA). Safety Corridor ~~Definition Requirements~~ Factors

Category	Factors
Crash Weighting Factors to Develop One Serious/Fatal Injury Safety Corridor	<p>Crash weighting can be developed using fatal and serious injury crash data and other factors to prioritize safety corridors. Suggested weighting factors are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crash severity: Fatal Crashes, Serious Injury Crashes ▪ Mode: Pedestrian-bicycle related crashes, vehicle/other ▪ Disadvantaged Community Status: MPO/RTPA or locally defined disadvantaged community status based on most current version of CalEnviroScreen ▪ Vulnerable Populations: Seniors (age 65 and older) and Youth (under age 15) based on the American Community Survey ▪ <u>School proximity (within 0.25 miles) based on the California School Campus Database</u> ▪ <u>Systemic or Predicted Crashes</u>
Crash Density	<p>Each roadway segment block can<u>may</u> be converted into ~ 0.25 mile overlapping <u>or contiguous</u> “corridor” segments to create a consistent unit of measurement and <u>assess</u> the concentration of linear patterns of injuries <u>crashes</u> within a <u>defined</u> distance. The highest scoring (i.e. most fatal and serious injury crashes per mile) “corridor” segments within a street needs to be identified and an appropriate threshold set to determine safety corridor eligibility.</p>
Maintenance	<p>The jurisdiction can<u>may</u> establish a review and re-evaluation frequency for safety corridors. However, such frequency need not exceed seven years.</p>

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall moved to recommend Item 24-14 with changes and/or modifications as read into the record by Ms. Wells. Chair Welday seconded. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

24-16: SB 1216 Shared Lane Marking Usage

Chair Welday introduced Item 24-16 and the presenter, Florencia Allenger. Ms. Allenger, Caltrans, noted the following:

- Our recommendation is to include the proposed revision to the CA MUTCD, Section 9C.07 to prohibit the installing of new shared lane markings on the roadway where the speed limit is greater than 30 mph except at or near intersections for the purpose of connecting Class I, II or IV bikeways.
- SB 1216 states that new sharrows shall not be installed after a specific date, so the existing ones are allowed.

Discussion

- Mr. Bronkall:

- Where jurisdictions have installed sharrows on roadways of 30 mph or higher, it looks like they are no longer allowed to be there.
- These agencies may have liability with existing sharrows that are no longer covered within the scope of the CA MUTCD.
- Perhaps editing should be applied to Paragraph 02. Proposed edits were read into the record.
- It should be made clear that the law has prohibitions, but existing sharrows on roadways of 30 mph or greater may remain and there is no obligation to remove them.

Public Comment

- Mr. Sevidal, Caltrans District 7, Office of Transportation Safety:
 - We want to make sure that our in-development projects are compliant with this law.
 - The changes proposed use the verbiage, “except at or near intersections”. Do we need an objective definition of “near”? With this current wording, decisions pertaining to this are left to the engineering judgment of project development teams.
- Mr. Pyburn, FHWA:
 - No agency will be able to use or apply this until we approve the change to the CA MUTCD.
 - The definition of “near” in the Caltrans manuals applies strictly to Caltrans facilities. Other agencies not applying the Caltrans manuals' definition of “near” need to determine this for their specific situations.

MOTION: Mr. Bronkall moved to recommend Item 24-16 with modifications and a friendly amendment read into the record. Mr. Scharf seconded. The Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

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

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

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

23-10: CTCDC Agenda Item Status

Mr. Kong presented an updated list of Agenda Item Status of CTCDC activity pertinent to agenda items.

24-08: Caltrans Status Updates for NMUTCD 11th Edition Adoption and CA MUTCD 2026 Development

Mr. Bhullar, Caltrans, provided a PowerPoint presentation update on Caltrans' ongoing National MUTCD (11th Edition) adoption process.

24-15: CA Supplement LA28

Tasha Higgins, Caltrans, and Sam Morrissey, LA 28, presented.

- Mr. Morrissey:
 - Mr. Morrissey shared his background and bona fides with the group.
 - The 2023 Olympics will be the largest peacetime gathering in history.
 - Venue events and logistics are being developed.
- Ms. Higgins:
 - Ticket sales are expected to generate 10 to 15 million dollars.
 - Approximately 50,000 athletes and media will need to get to the games.
 - An estimated 45,000 to 100,00 permitted vehicles will need to have some sort of secure access to the sporting venues and the Games Route Network (GRN).
 - The GRN will promote a transit-first priority for the games.
 - Local agencies are collaborating on developing the GRN.
 - A construction moratorium will be in effect during the games.
- Mr. Bhullar emphasized various points via his presentation.

Discussion

- Mr. Bronkall:
 - The necessity and duration of flipping lanes should be carefully apportioned.
 - Transit signage and ease of understanding should be optimized.
 - Temporary changes and/or modifications should reside in Section 6J, under Temporary Traffic Control.
- Ms. Higgins:
 - Ongoing modelling will determine the extent and depth of the above-mentioned suggestions.
 - Commuters will be given temporary expanded travel options.
- Mr. Scharf:
 - Local agency participation in changes and/or modifications is essential.
- Ms. Allenger:
 - The light blue color may be confused with other types of signs such as emergency services/hospital signs.
- Ms. Higgins:

- Light blue signage was deemed the most favorable to blend with the Olympic Brand. The hue of the light blue has not been decided yet.
- Prepping and public information campaigns will be implemented at least a full year before the Olympics.
- Mr. Powers:
 - A bicycling component and facilitation of such might be useful.

Public Comment

- Mr. Ouadah:
 - Signals and temporary programming of these signals is very important.
 - Autonomous vehicles may be useful during this event.
 - Modelling must consider potential crashes probabilities.
- Mr. Fisher:
 - The blue used for signage must be readily distinguishable (such as fluorescent) and another color in conjunction with the blue might be useful.
- Mr. Pyburn, FHWA:
- Our perspective is centered around, "what can we do."
- Experiment is the only legal mechanism we have to allow these temporary changes and/or modifications insofar as the National MUTCD is concerned.
- We will be flexible regarding process and procedures.

6d. Request for Word Message Signs Approval

None.

6e. Request for Experimentation

None.

7. Next Meeting

Chair Welday stated that the next meeting is scheduled for February 6, 2025. CTCDC Chair and Vice Chair elections will be held at the next meeting.

8. Adjourn

Chair Welday adjourned the meeting at 1:20 p.m.