

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

July 15, 2011

Meeting Minutes

ODOT Technical Leadership Center, 4040 Fairview Industrial Drive SE, Salem, Oregon

Members Present: [Massoud Saberian](#), Chair, City of Lake Oswego; [Joseph Marek](#), Vice-Chair, Clackamas County; Doug Bish for [Bob Pappe](#), Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; [Brian Barnett](#), City of Springfield; [Ed Chastain](#), Lane County; [Mark Davie](#), OSP; [Joel McCarroll](#), ODOT Region 4; [Charles Radosta](#), ITE, Kittelson & Associates; [Cynthia Schmitt](#), Marion County

Members Absent: [Alex Georgevitch](#), City of Medford

Others Present: [Pam O'Brien](#), DKS Associates (oncoming OTCDC member replacing Charles Radosta for ITE Oregon); Scott Cramer, Rodger Gutierrez, Kevin Haas, Katie Johnson, Mike Kimlinger, Kathi McConnell, Gary Obery, Don Wence, Heidi Shoblom, Zahidul Siddique, ODOT Traffic/Roadway Section; Angela Kargel, ODOT Region 2 Traffic; Julie Yip, ODOT Safety Division; Steven Huillet, Oregon Department of Education; Jim Renner, Oregon Travel Info Council; Carole Astley, Scott West, Travel Oregon; Natalie Inouie, Travel Lane County; Terry Hockett, City of Salem; Michael Mills, Washington County

Introduction – Approval of Minutes – Additional Agenda Items

Chair person Massoud Saberian called the meeting to order. All attendees then introduced themselves. Massoud then recognized Charles Radosta for 12 years of services to the OTCDC with a certificate of appreciation and letter of recognition, which meeting participants applauded.



Brian Barnett then moved and Cindy Schmitt seconded, and the committee approved the May 13th meeting minutes.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Non Agenda Items

Mike Kimlinger said he had something regarding a request for information. Doug Bish said Don Wence has some information on revising the Signal OAR for committee information.

New Member for ITE position introduced

Massoud Saberian introduced Pam O'Brien from DKS Associates, who will be replacing the long-serving Charles Radosta at the September meeting.

[\(Listen - Meeting Intro\)](#)

MUTCD Supplements – Editing the Final Draft for the OTC

Kevin Haas asked members to refer to the [draft MUTCD Supplements](#) in regard to about a half a dozen issues still needing to be resolved to the satisfaction of the committee and FHWA. Nick Fortey was not able to attend, but he has had several meetings with ODOT staff, since the last meeting seeking to resolve remaining issues. He also provided a [spreadsheet describing remaining issues](#).

Kevin said the OAR to adopt the 2009 MUTCD and Supplements is currently open. The rule making process has started and is open for public comment until next week. On the Secretary of State's website, people can see the changed OAR, follow a link to the draft Supplement. The new OAR will be adopted at the August 18th OTC meeting and the OTCDC can still act on the draft in the meantime.

The issues that FHWA still has outstanding may lead us up against the FHWA rulemaking from four years ago, which describes what FHWA considers substantial conformance with the federal MUTCD. It is very contentious right now with several states pushing back against FHWA.

[\(Listen - MUTCD Intro\)](#)

Section 2A.11 on Sign Dimensions -- Nick said in May that FHWA was contemplating issuing errata that would address the committee's issues leading to the proposed Supplement to this Section. Mike Kimlinger said that in ODOT's opinion, the draft errata that FHWA has produced covers all but one of Oregon's concerns.

The proposed errata changes are as follows:

Table 2D-1 (Sheet 2 of 2)

In the Conventional Road column, the asterisks should be deleted from the sizes for the 2-line and 3-line D3-2 signs, and the size of the 4-line D3-2 sign should be "Varies x 54" instead of "Varies x 60*."

Table 2E-1 (Sheet 2 of 2)

In the Minimum Size column, the size of the D1-1 sign should be "Varies x 24" instead of "Varies x 30," the size of the D1-1a sign should be "Varies x 24" instead of "Varies x 30," the size of the D1-2 sign should be "Varies x 42" instead of "Varies x 54," the size of the D1-2a sign should be "Varies x 42" instead of "Varies x 54," the size of the D1-3 sign should be "Varies x 60" instead of "Varies x 72," the size of the D1-3a sign should be "Varies x 60" instead of "Varies x 72," the size of the D2-1 sign should be "Varies x 24" instead of "Varies x 30," the size of the D2-2 sign should be "Varies x 36" instead of "Varies x 54," the size of the D2-3 sign should be "Varies x 48" instead of "Varies x 72," the size of the 2-line D3-2 sign should be "Varies x 36" instead of "Varies x 42*," the size of the 3-line D3-2 sign should be "Varies x 48" instead of "Varies x 66*," and the size of the 4-line D3-2 sign should be "Varies x 66" instead of "Varies x 84*."

What we don't see is anything pertaining to the exit number signing which still shows an excessive amount of green space to the left and right of the legend. Mike said we're waiting to see if FHWA intend to address that. This is a minor part of ODOT concerns, so for now he'd like to hold up eliminating the Supplement until we hear back from FHWA. This Supplement mostly concerns ODOT, since it applies largely to freeway signing. The committee consensus was to go along with Mike's suggestion pending further word from FHWA.

Section 2D.43 on Street Name Signs -- Nick says FHWA is okay with the proposed Supplement with two minor changes. First, he wanted the lower case letters to be at least 6 inches in height, which would correct a technical oversight that had it as 5 inches in the Support statement. Secondly, FHWA would like to emphasize the preference for larger dimension signing where the Support Statement establishes that overhead street names signs are more visible and preferred, and that supports use of above minimum letter heights. They proposed that the Option statement for this Supplement be changed to read as follows:

"Where engineering judgment determines that structural limitations, such as the load capacity of the mast arm or lateral spacing of signal heads, prevent the prescribed dimensions for overhead Street Name signs from being met, the lettering on overhead Street Name signs may be reduced with initial upper-case letters at least 8 inches in height and lower case letters at least 6 inches in height. Larger sizes are preferred."

Kevin suggested the committee accept the 6 inch change as already discussed and instead go along with FHWA's intent by modifying the end of the Support statement as follows, which he said Nick is fine with:

Overhead Street Name signs are more visible to drivers and are preferred over post-mounted Street Name signs at signalized intersections. Some road authorities have overhead structures with limited load capacity. Allowing reduced letter sizes results in smaller overhead Street Name signs that can be accommodated on these smaller structures, however larger letter sizes are preferred

Decision: Brian Barnett moved to approve this Supplement as amended. Charles Radosta seconded, and the committee voted in favor.

Section 21.06 on Brake Check Area signs and 21.07 on Chain-Up Area Signs. – These are the OW22-4 and OW22-6 signs in the [Sign Policy and Guidelines](#).



Mike Kimlinger explained that FHWA is determined that these signs are motorist information signs and need to be white on blue in design. They said there *“was a conscious decision made in the final rule promulgating the 2009 MUTCD that Brake Check, etc. signs are for roadside areas, similar to rest areas”*, which is not the case in Oregon. Here, they’re often next to the fog line, at wide spots in the road or a wide shoulder. They’re not always paved either.

Mike believes Oregon can use engineering judgment to sign black on yellow for safety near the road. He’s not aware of any counties that use these signs. His preference is to drop these two supplements and ask FHWA to do a reinterpretation to allow us to do the black on yellow signs systematically, but if they don’t that we go forward with these signs using engineering judgment, and have that language in the Sign Policy and Guidelines for use next to the traveled way in Oregon. His fear is that there will not be complete uniformity in the state because of the one location on I-84 where the chain up area is in a rest area. He [shared photos](#) with the committee of Highways 26, 97 and 20 that he wants to use to illustrate to FHWA that Oregon is not generally using these signs in separated type rest areas and the white on blue signs don’t belong there.

Jim Renner noting his work for the NCUTCD Guide and Motorist Information Signs technical subcommittee (G/MI), in which they reviewed this part of the Manual and not a single member of the committee agreed with white on blue signing. They all believe--and told the feds--that it’s inappropriate, dangerous, the wrong classification for these signs. He thinks Oregon is doing it right and he knows of no state that has accepted this change to the MUTCD. He is really surprised that FHWA is coming back and disagreeing with Oregon on this Supplement. His own opinion is that we should keep these supplements and not follow FHWA’s mandate. It’s all about public safety and white on blue signing does not work in this application.

At this point Kevin Haas stressed to the committee that at this point, with about six issues left that FHWA may use to decide that Oregon is not in substantial compliance with all standards in the MUTCD as demanded in the 2007 rule, we need to pare back to just one or two of the issues. Even changing the color of signs illustrated in guidance statements are viewed as violating a Standard. Otherwise, we risk being found not to be in substantial compliance and losing a significant amount of federal funding which we can’t afford to let happen. We can do this black on yellow signing under the engineering judgment in Section 1A.13. But we need to look at the other outstanding Supplements and be sure we are able to choose the most important one or two. We don’t have enough leeway to go for much more than that.

Decision: Ed Chastain moved and Mark Davie seconded deleting Supplements to 21.06 and 21.07 and support Mike Kimlinger’s work to persuade FHWA to consider reevaluation/reinterpretation of their position in view of Oregon’s use of the signs, and to

maintain engineering judgment language in the Sign Policy and Guidelines on these signs. The committee voted in favor. Mike Kimlinger said that he would continue to pursue the issue with FHWA.

Section 2I.08 on Tourist Information and Welcome Center Signs – Kevin said that FHWA is also against use of the “fire hydrant i” symbol, and is insisting that we drop this supplement. Kevin quoted their reasoning:

“The official symbol sign for Information is the D9-10 “INFO” sign. Alternative word legends are permissible but not the use of a new symbol. Further, the “i” symbol was tested for comprehension and a significant number of respondents erroneously thought it stood for “Internet.” Ultimately, the symbol adopted was the INFO legend which, in most languages, starts off the word for Information and had very high comprehension in the evaluation.”

Jim Renner said that the “i” symbol is used commonly, internationally, universally. If you’ve turned on the computer, you’re likely to find the “i” symbol displayed on the screen linking to further information. Mike Kimlinger said he did a Google search for “information symbol” and he got seven pages, most of them “i” symbol. Jim asked Scott West from Travel Oregon to speak to the issue.

Scott West said that the “i” sign is clearly the international symbol for tourism info and one that is very important from the perspective of sharing information with visitors. His organization believes the symbol is important for tourism in a global economy. The wi-fi symbol looks different and only indicates that internet service is available. Scott pointed out that we’re an export-oriented state for domestic and international consumers amounting to nine billion dollars annually – related to tourism spending.

Scott said 20-30 million overnight visitors to the state is a big deal. Travel Oregon believes the “i” sign is ultimately the right thing to convey to both domestic and international visitors. He said they have done some federal studies that show the internet is being used to obtain visitor information, but over 60% of visitors are still looking for a place to stop and rest and get travel information. They instantly understand the informational “i” symbol.

Scott said it’s important to know that the U.S., for the first time in 20 years has a national tourism promotion vehicle of about \$200 million a year that will launch next year. In the mid-90’s when we had a national tourism promotion agency and the U.S. was the #1 global destination for travelers, we had a \$30 billion balance of trade in the tourism sector. Marketing our state is a fundamental necessity for our country and state’s economic strength. Tourism is one of the top industries in the global economy and the \$200 million national program will help return us to a positive balance of trade. Oregon plays very strongly in both the international and domestic market so having a global symbol makes great sense.

Asked if the research mentioned is readily available, Scott said sure, he’d be happy to send this over. [TravelHorizons](#) is a national research program. It’s about a year or two

old. The research focuses on whether visitor centers are still relevant and what kind of facilities/assets visitors are looking for when they stop. The research findings show that visitors are still looking for information; therefore the “i” sign is the strongest symbol to convey the visitors resources they are looking for. The report is [available here](#).

Kevin, noting that Jim is a member of the National Committee, said he knows how much credence the National Committee and FHWA give to research studies and we’re going to face this when we deal with the accessible pedestrian signal as well. They have this research, and so the devil’s advocate will say, “Well this is the research and it shows confusion”. It’s the same thing where some people take issue with the research on accessible pedestrian signals, so how do you refute the argument that the research shows confusion?

Jim said regarding the research that FHWA cites for their position, that he found fault with the research method. Three things were shown to the focus group: a question mark, the “i” symbol and the word message, “info”. The group was asked which of them communicates best to them, “looking for information”. And of course they said “info”. Jim said that is two apples and an orange and people naturally selected the orange. He thinks the very essence of the study was flawed and should be called into question, perhaps for some follow-up study. The small “i”, as a symbol, is very clear.

Jim noted that on the National Committee level, typically, blue and white signing is not very interesting to them. Guide signing in the GMI community interests them more, so it’s not paid a lot of attention there. Nevertheless, he thinks Oregon was correct in identifying the “i” sign, and the charge was in fact led within ODOT by now retired State Traffic Engineer, Ed Fischer. He said Fischer was not overly concerned about FHWA’s reluctance to going forward with this sign.

Scott was asked how much of the tourism dollars involved in Oregon’s economy are from international visitors. He responded that the overall annual visitor spending in the state of Oregon is 8.7 billion and it is estimated that 8% of that is from international visitors (about \$700 million).

Brian said he was hoping for a larger number than 8% so then he could emphasize how vital it is that our international visitors are already accustomed to this symbol.

Doug asked what the difference was between “Visitor Info” and the “i”. Jim said it communicates the same thing. Natalie Inouie from Travel Lane County said she liked that the Supplement puts both of them together so that international travelers are going to see and recognize the “i”, well travelled domestic travelers will also recognize it and domestic travelers who aren’t familiar with it will see the “i” together with the “Visitor Info” and learn to recognize the “i”. And the first place you see it anywhere in the state, the two are both there and then the “i” is often used as a follow-up sign. But the having them both together the first time you see it is incredibly clear--and even more clear than just “Info” alone.

Joel McCarroll asked for clarity that both signs are supposed to be seen first in a series with the “i” as a follow-up. Mike said that’s the intent in the Sign Policy. Kevin said this brings up an interesting question. If ODOT was doing signing from the interchange and used the standard “Info” sign in the MUTCD and followed up with the “i” signing, do we get to a point where FHWA objects and threatens to withhold funding, would there be a problem with that? Natalie said that is confusing, making it harder to follow the trail.

Joe Marek asked about using the “i” sign with an “info” rider. Mike said we’re not allowed to put a new symbol out without some sort of a human factors study and experimental approval from FHWA. The only study done so far was a pooled fund study that has been referred to. ODOT is still a partner to the pooled fund. If the committee still thinks this is the way to go, he can try to get a new study started to move it forward but in the interim, FHWA says you can’t have the symbol because it didn’t pass the only study done on it. And you can’t have experimentation on it either. So we’re stuck with no immediate solution if we want to use the symbol without risking federal funding.

Doug Bish said that he’d like to join Kevin in encouraging the committee to cut down to just a few things that FHWA objects to in the Supplements. He said that we’ll have an easier time dealing with FHWA if we do so. Doug said that ODOT Director Matt Garrett is going to the WASHTO meeting where Victor Mendez, FHWA director will be. He expects Matt will talk to Mr. Mendez with



other states to push FHWA to make more exceptions to the Shall statements requirement. He predicts that if Matt comes back from WASHTO and says FHWA is unmoving, he will also direct us to remove the objectionable Supplements. If we only have a few of these outstanding, he hopes that we’ll have a better chance of getting to keep them.

Cindy Schmitt said she has no problem with the “i” but she has faith in the process. FHWA has made a decision in favor of national conformity. We need to deal with that and look at alternatives for pushing the research and providing studies that show that the “i” is an international symbol which should be recognized. She said that Marion County, and all of Oregon for that matter, cannot afford to push any of the issues still on the table to the point of losing federal money.

Doug Bish said that he thinks Scott is right that we’re in the forefront, putting a symbol out there, and we should be going to symbols; but it appears FHWA firmly disagrees.

Scott said he appreciates ODOT’s assistance and inclusion of Travel Oregon in the process and while it’s unfortunate that FHWA won’t bend, they appreciate ODOT’s work to challenge them.

Mark Davie said he had to agree with Cindy that this symbol is not worth a fight and risking the federal funding over. Get rid of this Supplement and go forward with further studies to try again down the road.

Decision: Joe Marek moved to drop this Supplement 2I.08 and encourage ODOT and TIC to continue with FHWA on researching the use of the more internationally oriented “i” symbol sign. Mark Davie seconded, and the committee voted to approve.

It was clarified that existing signing may remain until it needs to be replaced, and only then if it all related signs in a series need replacement.

[\(Listen - MUTCD Part 2\)](#)

Section 3B.16 on Stop and Yield Lines – Katie referred members to the May meeting discussion regarding this subject and said that based on those discussions, she’d come out with [three options](#) for the committee to choose between. ODOT recommends retaining the Supplement as already agreed to, which is Option 1. The second option is a possible addition to the Supplement if the committee thinks it needs some “beefing up” of the requirement for a total 10 feet width from the stopping point to the far side of the crosswalk, and the third option is to delete the Supplement.

It was asked how this fit in with the concerns that Mojie Takallou raised at the March meeting. Kevin said that was one reason this was being brought back. He said that Mojie’s concerns were based on the Charley Zegeer study from 20 or 30 years ago which does not apply to this situation. Kevin said Mojie has been talked to off-line and still disagrees but has been kept in the loop on all the information including meeting material and scheduling and apparently has decided not to attend.

The committee consensus was to take no action, thus retaining this Supplement as written. The committee then took a break.

[\(Listen - MUTCD Part 3\)](#)

Section 4D.05 on Application of Steady Signal Indications – Kevin said there have been several discussions with FHWA around this Supplement. Nick Fortey still believes that a W25-2 “Oncoming Traffic May Have Extended Green” sign is needed if the “yellow trap” occurs, even if only under the preemption sequence. Kevin said he’s proposing removing the sentence that states “The operation only occurs during a preemption sequence at the end of 4(b) and replacing it with:

“A steady green signal indication is being displayed to the opposing approach during a preemption sequence.”

He’s also proposed adding statutory language to the Support statement:

“Oregon law (ORS 811.145 and ORS 811.455) requires drivers to yield to emergency vehicles and stop for a railroad signal regardless of traffic control signal indications.”

Kevin said that this, by far is probably the biggest issue the OTC and ODOT have with FHWA. We want to keep this Supplement because we think the sign is ridiculous and has no value whatsoever.

Doug Bish said ODOT believes FHWA will yield on this Supplement if this is one of the only Supplements that modifies a Shall statement. He agreed that this is the number one Supplement that ODOT wants to keep over FHWA objections. If our Director tells us we're not going to risk FHWA wrath and directs us to remove this Supplement, we will do so but he doesn't think FHWA will insist on removing our federal funding just for this Supplement.

Gary Obery said that a letter was sent to Nick Fortey on the 13th with a broader explanation of why we don't think the signs are appropriate and why other options don't seem appropriate, explaining the past and proposed practice in Oregon regarding the use of signs W25-1 and W25-2. He said Nick seemed satisfied with the explanation. The committee asked to have it provided to them and the body of it is reproduced below:

Background

Section 4D.05, P3, B.4 of the MUTCD states that a steady CIRCULAR YELLOW signal indication

"Shall not be displayed to an approach from which drivers are turning left permissively or making a U-turn to the left permissively unless one of the following conditions exists:

- (a) A steady CIRCULAR YELLOW signal indication is also simultaneously being displayed to the opposing approach;
- (b) An engineering study has determined that, because of unique intersection conditions, the condition described in Item (a) cannot reasonably be implemented without causing significant operational or safety problems and that the volume of impacted left-turning or U-turning traffic is relatively low, and those left-turning or U-turning drivers are advised that a steady CIRCULAR YELLOW signal indication is not simultaneously being displayed to the opposing traffic if this operation occurs continuously by the installation near the left-most signal head of a W25-1 sign (see Section 2C.48) with the legend ONCOMING TRAFFIC HAS EXTENDED GREEN; or
- (c) Drivers are advised of the operation if it occurs only occasionally, such as during a preemption sequence, by the installation near the left-most signal head of a W25-2 sign (see Section 2C.48) with the legend ONCOMING TRAFFIC MAY HAVE EXTENDED GREEN. "

This language requires the posting of either W25-1 or W25-2 anytime a permissive left (or U-turn) is terminated with a yellow ball and the opposing through movement is not terminated. This particular sequence of signal displays is often termed a "yellow trap" as left-turning motorists on the terminated approach may be located within the intersection but are not able to turn due the oncoming traffic that still has a green indication. Some left-turning motorists may incorrectly assume that opposing drivers also have a yellow indication and that the opposing drivers are stopping and

a crash may result. The above MUTCD language limits, or at least mitigates, the use of this particular signal display sequence.

Current Oregon Practice

Most jurisdictions, if not all, meet the requirement of Section 4D.05, P3, B-4 under normal operations by satisfying condition (a) above. ODOT staff and other representatives on the



W25-1



W25-2

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee have not identified any intersections operating in Oregon where a left turning motorist could regularly experience the "yellow trap", and so there are no known postings of sign W25-1.

In Oregon, most intersections operating with permissive left turns on opposing approaches have separate channels for emergency vehicle preemption. This operation results in red indications for all approaches except the approach with the emergency vehicle which will have a green indication. A CIRCULAR YELLOW indication may be necessary to terminate one of the approaches from which permissive left turns may be made. The preempted approach will stay green. Jurisdictions in Oregon have not posted sign W25-2 that is required for this sequence as stated in condition (c) above. It is estimated that the sign would be required at over 1,500 intersections statewide that have either rail or emergency vehicle preemption on approaches with permissive left turns.

Oregon's experience with the preemption operation as described above suggests that drivers respond appropriately during preemption events. Oregon drivers are subject to ORS 811.145

which requires that they yield to an approaching emergency vehicle. A stopped driver facing an oncoming emergency vehicle is expected to remain stopped, and not turn in front of the vehicle, regardless of the signal indication. Because of this expectation, the practice of potentially displaying a CIRCULAR YELLOW indication to permissive left turning drivers (while opposing approach has CIRCULAR GREEN) is not thought to create an unacceptable hazard.

Alternatives to conform to MUTCD

Several alternatives are available to bring Oregon practice into compliance with the language of the MUTCD. These include:

- Post the W25-2 signs as required by condition (c);
- Change preemption operation to not terminate the opposing approach;
- Change the preemption sequence to bring up an all-red period before serving the preempted approach; or,
- Install a FLASHING YELLOW ARROW signal head for affected permissive left turn approaches

Jurisdictions have been reluctant to post the W25-2 sign as required in both the 2003 and 2009 MUTCD due to a strong doubt that drivers could understand and respond appropriately to the sign. When the sign only applies during a preemption event and only in limited phase conditions, it seems to have very limited benefit. The added clutter and driver distraction caused by the sign might outweigh any benefit it does bring. Furthermore, posting the sign would be expensive as it presents a large structural load on the signal equipment, ongoing maintenance needs, and the sheer number of affected intersections. The understanding of W25-2 is likely diminished when, in the instance of all roads in Oregon, there are no known postings of W25-1.

Jurisdictions in Oregon have strived to actually separate opposing approaches when a preemption event occurs. This operation appears to clear the preempted approach most quickly and safely. Emergency vehicle operators are somewhat accustomed to this operation and to change the operation would introduce issues related to driver re-training.

The option of bringing up an all-red period before serving the preempted approach would eliminate the "yellow trap" sequence, but it would introduce additional delay to the emergency response system. Furthermore, drivers on the preempted approach might not anticipate the rapid signal phase changes (green to yellow to red and then back to green) that would be necessary under this scenario.

The last option above would involve installing a FLASHING YELLOW ARROW (FYA) signal head for the affected permissive left turn movements. This option would eliminate the need to utilize sign W25-2 by continuing the FYA if it was active when the preemption sequence started. Upon further consideration of this option, it has some drawbacks. Since most of Oregon's signals are set up to preempt on only one approach at a time, this option would result in adding FYA's to nearly all of Oregon's permissive left turn approaches. To date, we have not seen any data

supporting the conversion of CIRCULAR GREEN indications to FYA indications for permissive left turns.

The benefit of utilizing a FYA to mitigate a potential "yellow trap" on an approach affected by rail preemption was also considered. In conversations with staff of the ODOT Rail Section and the Traffic-Roadway Section, there was concern that the FYA would add unneeded complexity during both normal operations and rail-preemption event operations. ODOT and other Oregon jurisdictions have not shown interest in utilizing the FYA for permissive-only left turns. We have no antidotal evidence or reports of "yellow trap" crashes or near-misses during rail preemption events. For these reasons, the FYA does not appear to be a good solution towards meeting the requirements of Section 4D.05, P3, B(4) during neither emergency nor rail preemption. A graphical explanation of Oregon's practice regarding rail preemption and opposing permissive left turns is shown in Attachment A.

In short, none of these alternatives appear to offer safer conditions for roadway users as compared to Oregon's existing practices. While we do have concerns and awareness of the potential "yellow trap" hazard, we have not identified a more appropriate signal design or operation to mitigate the hazard.

Proposed Oregon Supplement

The Oregon Department of Transportation and the Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee have proposed the following Supplement to Section 4D.05, P3, B.4:

- 4. Shall not be displayed to an approach from which drivers are turning left permissively or making a U-turn to the left permissively unless one of the following conditions exists:**
 - (a) A steady CIRCULAR YELLOW signal indication is also simultaneously being displayed to the opposing approach;**
 - (b) ~~An engineering study has determined that, because of unique intersection conditions, the condition described in Item (a) cannot reasonably be implemented without causing significant operational or safety problems and that the volume of impacted left turning or U turning traffic is relatively low, and those left turning or U turning drivers are advised that a steady CIRCULAR YELLOW signal indication is not simultaneously being displayed to the opposing traffic if this operation occurs continuously by the installation near the left most signal head of a W25-1 sign (see Section 2C.48) with the legend ONCOMING TRAFFIC HAS EXTENDED GREEN; or~~**
 - (c) ~~Drivers are advised of the operation if it occurs only occasionally, such as during a preemption sequence, by the installation near the left most signal head of a W25-2 sign (see Section 2C.48) with the legend ONCOMING TRAFFIC MAY~~**

HAVE EXTENDED GREEN. A steady green signal indication is being displayed to the opposing approach during a preemption sequence.

Support:

Oregon law (ORS 811.145 and ORS 811.455) requires drivers to yield to emergency vehicles and stop for a railroad signal regardless of traffic control signal indications. Oregon practice has been to avoid

displaying a steady CIRCULAR YELLOW signal to an approach from which drivers are turning left permissively unless a steady CIRCULAR YELLOW is also simultaneously being displayed to the opposing approach under normal signal operations.

The supplement would effectively eliminate the option to operate a signal with a regularly occurring "yellow trap". This supplement would allow jurisdictions in Oregon to continue with their current methods of preemption operation and not posting sign W25-2.

Joe asked if we know if other states have an issue with this. Joel said the warning sign group at the National Committee had issues with the sign two or three years ago. Gary said that CALTRANS struck the signs from their Manual in 2003. He talked to a signal engineer down there a few days ago. They don't have many permissive lefts on the state highway down there. A lot of cities do, but they're not in compliance with the MUTCD and they do have the yellow trap preemption.

Gary said WASHDOT has a policy of taking everything to a red condition and then going back to the preemptive phase, so they are following FHWA guidance. This is apparently a new practice. They sent Gary an explanation of how they accomplish this with all their different controllers.

Doug Bish said there was the suggestion that this was a reaction to trying to get a lot of the states who still time signals on a regular basis with yellow traps to stop using yellow traps.

Kevin Haas said this section of the MUTCD is married to Part 2 in Chapter 2C where we've already said that these signs shall not be used in Oregon. So if FHWA makes us back down, we will also have to adjust that Supplement. But what we're proposing right now is to keep the Supplement with a few changes made at the request of FHWA and as a result of our own deliberations with the following changes to Section 4D.05(B)(4)(b) and the Support statement that follows, adding Oregon law to the support to help buttress the reason for this Supplement:

~~(c) Drivers are advised of the operation if it occurs only occasionally, such as during a preemption sequence, by the installation near the left most signal head of a W25-2 sign (see Section 2C.48) with the legend ONCOMING TRAFFIC MAY HAVE EXTENDED GREEN. A steady green signal indication is being displayed to the opposing approach during a preemption sequence.~~

Support:

Oregon law (ORS 811.145 and ORS 811.455) requires drivers to yield to emergency vehicles and stop for a railroad signal regardless of traffic control signal indications.^[KJH13] Oregon practice has been to avoid displaying a steady CIRCULAR YELLOW signal to an approach from which drivers are turning left permissively unless a steady CIRCULAR YELLOW is also simultaneously being displayed to the opposing approach under normal signal operations.

Decision: Brian Barnett then moved readopting this Supplement with Kevin's language changes. Joe Marek seconded and the committee voted in favor.

Section 4E.11 on Accessible Pedestrian Signals and Detectors—Walk Indications –

Kevin said the one issue where Nick Fortey was unequivocal that we could lose FHWA approval of our Supplements was where our Supplement allows the option of a speech walk message instead of percussive tones for distances more than 10 feet from other signals. He's gotten word from above that the national study has been done, the gavel has fallen and you shall comply with Section 4E.11. Kevin said this is not a big issue for ODOT but it is for Salem and Eugene and Springfield.



He asked Doug for his thoughts. Doug said he'd like to hear from the committee on this. He has made it clear to ODOT Director Matt Garrett that these two signal control issues are outstanding and he'd like them brought up with FHWA's Director. He'd like to have the ability to have at least two Shall statements but his personal preference is for Section 4D.05 over 4E.11. So if push comes to shove with FHWA, Matt may order 4E.11 to be dropped.



Brian said he's made contact with Scott Windam at the [US ACCESS Board](#). He said that Windam told him that the basis for their determination that the speech WALK message was less desirable than the percussive tone for sites where the poles are more than ten feet apart is [NCHRP Project 3-62, Web Document 117B](#). Windam said that "it is what it is", the research supports it.

Brian said that he went back and read the document and found issues with the research. The speech message was not used during testing when there were two poles involved. They instead used the rapid tick and the coo coo sound. So in the circumstance in which Springfield want to use the speech message on two poles, it was not tested, it was only tested on a single pole.

Second, Brian said that when they did use the speech message on the single pole installation, the speech message has a half to a third of the error rate of the rapid tick and coo coo sounds. So the speech message is far and away superior to either sound for the pedestrian to start the crossing. He said the signal response delay between hearing the signal is only different by 8/10 of a second, and isn't material when you're in a pedestrian crossing that has a seven second minimum WALK interval and then you have a clearance interval based on three feet per second. He said that a survey even said that 64% of participants actually preferred the speech message. The study prefers the percussive tone but they don't provide data to back it up.

Cindy asked whether the Supplement was the best way to challenge the findings. It's a way to push the issue but would it not better to ask them to reopen the issue and do additional research.

Brian said it would be appropriate to reopen the research but to force us to change our behavior when we at least know that 64% of the people in Portland prefer the speech message without an adequate basis in research doesn't seem right. He'd turn it around and say there's not a basis for the decision that's been made. Otherwise, if we wait for a new research study to be opened, who's going to be interested in doing it, who's going to pay for it, how long will it take, how long will it take the USACCESS Board and FHWA to accept it? It might not be before the next MUTCD in 2019. He doesn't want to wait that long to do the right thing.

Cindy said that's pretty much the way it's been historically with FHWA. She personally prefers the speech message but hates to see us insist on this Supplement. The ACCESS Board stuff has been going on for years and has been highly volatile. They've set a national standard and maybe we should just adapt to it.

Doug said the other option is for jurisdictions to use the speech method on a case by case basis. Some of us don't agree with the research used to get us to that point so we would need to write some kind of justification for why we're putting speech message back in the Supplement and we would need to have that justification in such a way that it would be strong enough that we're making a strong enough engineering argument back to FHWA that they could see our point. It seems like we're just arguing with the research.

Joel said the research is never as clear as we'd like. But Springfield is an example. If they have nothing but speech walk out there, since there's no compliance date and if adding in a percussive signal at a new location would just confuse the issue with the existing speech messages, they may be able to get by with a Supplement option that maintains consistency within a corridor or a city. Walking is local, particularly if you're disabled. Maybe that's how you frame it. If a city council won't fund a change in all the signals, you're stuck with an unworkable standard.

Kevin said FHWA has never taken to the corridor approach. They're not worried about consistency. They say as signs wear out, for instance, you will have to start updating as you go along. Doug said he likes Joel's point and he thinks it would be easier for local jurisdictions to make such a decision using engineering judgment.

Charles Radosta suggested that if we changed the semantics of how this is presented. Maybe we leave the Standard statement alone and use some May language in an option statement to establish a local standard with the disabled community. Kevin said that Nick still sees it as messing with a Standard statement and that's not okay with FHWA. Charles continued that maybe also adding some support statement that the research that led to the decision for the feds to put this in did not adequately analyze the 10-foot spacing.

Doug said he liked that option because he thinks Nick has moved a little bit in similar cases where we do something like this. In this case, he agrees with Kevin that he's probably not going to move on this case. But he thinks that that might be a budging

point if we can reopen this and make it an option to use a speech WALK message where it's been used in the past, and where the local community has decided that is their preference. Kevin said he doesn't think FHWA will budge despite flaws in the research based on the ACCESS Board's decision. It's non-negotiable.

Cindy noted that it's taken FHWA years and years and years to get an agreement with the ACCESS Board. So they're not going to want to mess with that.

Rodger Gutierrez said that having read the study, he came to the same conclusions as Brian did and he appreciates their position, having a lot of pedestrian signals that are spaced 10 feet apart. In most cases, in the rest of the state, these are on the same signal pole, not ten feet apart. By design, if it's 9.8 feet apart, it can still be a speech WALK message. Only those who have tried to be in compliance with ADA standards are being punished by having to follow the interpretation of the study that says they can't use the speech WALK message. If you're going down a corridor, it's only the signals that over 10 feet apart that will have the tick message, not the speech WALK message. All the rest of the signals down the corridor that are not spaced 10 feet apart are going to have the speech Walk message anyway. He said very few ODOT are 10 feet apart.

Joe Marek asked if the Oregon Commission for the Blind has expressed a preference. He said when they do an accessible signal, it's usually that Commission that calls them for someone they work with that's needing help with getting around. Brian said that they generally work with the people directly, not the Commission. He said if we're going to take a different position, it would be good if we're doing so in accord with the Commission for the Blind because it's what their clients are preferring.

Massoud said there are a couple locations in Beaverton that have a combination of both the tick message and the speech message. He wondered if it's possible to just do that. Scott said there is a tick to locate the button that's on all the time, and then there's the rapid tick or the coo coo or the chirp in some cases or the speech message that tell you to walk. The rapid tick is known as the percussive message.

Kevin said we only have two options – either change the Supplement with an option statement or remove it. As it is, it's not going to fly, and not even if we add options because the MUTCD has done exactly what the ACCESS Board wanted done. Our local blind community may disagree with the ACCESS Board but the Board has spoken. This doesn't stop Brian or Tom Larsen from documenting why they're going to continue using the speech WALK message as we had for 1A.13, modifying the Standards. It will make work for them, though. He agrees, at the same time, that FHWA and the ACCESS Board should still be approached about the deficiency in their study and resulting decision.

Rodger said the MUTCD standard for speech messages versus percussive tones is the same as the guidance in the draft [Public Rights of Way Accessibility Guidelines](#) (PROWAG). The draft PROWAG documents are the state of practice but have not

been formally adopted by DOJ. They're supposed to implement that soon. When it is implemented, if you didn't follow the MUTCD Standard, you would be in violation of both the MUTCD and the [Americans with Disabilities Act](#). So you would have to document for both why you're not complying. Our process would be to document it and have it sent on up the ladder.

Doug Bish said that from what he knows about the ADA, the process is onerous, and very well documented. There's only a few reasons that you can take exception to the ADA. One is that it is impossible to do. The other is that it's so financially impossible to do as to be impractical. You can't use engineering as a reason to take exception to ADA standards. If you truly have to go through an exception to ADA, there won't be any good reason to use a speech WALK message.

Rodger said but even if our Supplement said that you could do it this way, you'd still have the ADA violation, and need to seek an ADA exception if that's even possible.

Brian said keep in mind that the ADA is a civil rights law. So it only has an impact if you receive a civil rights claim and then you have to convince a judge or a jury that you were reasonable in your approach in complying with civil rights law. It's also clear to him that the US ACCESS Board has promulgated their rules and then promoted them as if they were law when they have not yet been accepted by the Department of Justice. So that's just the nature of the type of agency we're dealing with.

Doug said he's most familiar with the geometric conditions in the rules. And if the same logic is applied to this case, we would never make an exception for the speech WALK message.

Joe asked if the way out of this is to delete the Supplement and, as done with another Supplement which is to encourage further research and point out problems with how the study was done. He thinks the other issue with the signal issue in Section 4D.05 is the one we want to duke it out with FHWA over. It sounds like this is another Standard that was adopted without the best interpretation of the research and we can only go back again and say, "Are you sure that's what you really meant to say. And he doesn't know that that will get us far.

Brian said he understood what Joe is saying but that he has had a fair amount of interaction with the US ACCESS Board and his regard for their ability to change course is pretty low. Joe said he didn't doubt that.

Brian Barnett then made a motion to strike the "or a speech walk message" language in the Standard statement and replace it with an Option statement to the effect that where local conditions warrant, a speech walk message can be used. Charles seconded.

Joe asked what we do if FHWA rejects that. Do we go to the mat on that or do we drop it? Brian said that we listen to what the response is and then make the judgment when

we hear the response. Joe asked if we have time to make the judgment before the August adoption by the OTC.

Kevin said that the committee would have to give ODOT discretion to draft it up. He would want the motion modified to include Support paragraphs to explain why we're even providing that option. Brian said he would agree.

Doug Bish said that what's likely to happen is we'll take this back and Nick will strongly object even if he softens his position somewhat. But if it comes down to Matt Garrett not getting any movement out of FHWA in his discussion with Victor Mendez, then his direction will be to strike this Supplement.

Mark asked if the ADA is on board with the US ACCESS Board too, are we trying to fight an uphill battle that we're just not going to win. Do we really want to fight it. Joe said maybe we should take it up at a later date.

Brian said he understands that we may not win this but he wants to use every venue we have to make it clear why we are pursuing an Option statement. That is a part of the longer term correction of this action. He recognizes we may not get it corrected in the longer term but this is clearly the way for the State of Oregon to make clear we feel there are deficiencies in the research and therefore deficiencies in the decision and deficiencies in the adoption. We're trying to provide wiggle room for agencies to make a better choice. He thinks Rodger had a very good contrast of punishing those who are trying to do what's right as defined in the rest of the ADA standards. Massoud asked if there is only two options or is there another one.

Kevin said that before the committee decides to vote on the motion, he wants the committee to allow ODOT to draft an Option and Support paragraphs which would be shared with the committee. He would add the caveat that Doug mentioned that ODOT would insert this into the Supplements going to the OTC, up until the point that FHWA comes back, after Garrett's meeting with Mendez, that this one issues is holding up the Supplement, he would want the committee's prior approval that ODOT has discretion to remove it from the Supplements.

Brian said that as the motion maker, he would accept that approach with the understanding that ODOT will make a good faith effort to carry it forward, which he has no reason to doubt they will do. It was pointed out that FHWA would be getting a copy of the minutes for this meeting and Brian agreed that puts us in a poor position to negotiate since our fall-back position will be known before hand.

Doug Bish said that likely what will happen is if we can't agree with Nick and he says this Supplement is just going to be a no-go, and we continue to push with permission from ODOT management, it will turn into a letter-writing campaign, which soon is raised to the level of the FHWA Division Administrator and the ODOT Director, who will make the final decision. He thinks that is what Brian wants us to do, to push it to that level.

Brian said that he wants to try and educate those who have that decision-making ability so they're making the decision with both eyes open to what the facts are. He doesn't wish to push it for the purpose of being arbitrary. He just wants the issues to be fully articulated so the decision is made in a responsible manner. He just doesn't want to step away from the confrontation because it's the easy thing to do. He doesn't want to cast any aspersions on ODOT in making that statement. This is a significant issue that is going to effect the disability community and he feels it's his ethical responsibility to serve that community the best he can and this is how he believes it is best served.

Doug Bish asked if, in addition to ODOT drafting Option and support statements, could he could count on Brian to write up a paper that would state our position in more detail? He said it should be similar to what Gary did with the "Oncoming Traffic May Have Extended Green" sign issue. Brian said yes, he would. Doug said that the paper would become our position and we can use that as part of our argument. He doesn't mind pushing that.

Cindy said that one of the thoughts she has is around the timing of all this with the deadline of August 18th. There's one avenue where we can draft this option language and pursue it, which is fine with her to try. Matt Garrett may put the kibosh on it for various reasons. But even if he doesn't, if, as we go through the process further, will it come back to the committee so that we can jointly make the decision? She's okay with ODOT having discretion along that one path, but if does continue on further and there are decisions to be made that change the language or other alternatives come up, could it come back to the committee for a quick vote to see if we should continue to push? Doug Bish said that if it comes down to it, we can change some language, we should be bringing it back to the committee. The thing that hasn't been mentioned here is that this committee is an advisory committee to the State Traffic Engineer and the State Traffic Engineer really has the authority to make the decision. So if push comes to shove, the decision will be made at ODOT and we're not going to come back to the committee for that decision. If we want to modify the wording, certainly this committee is the best place to be doing that kind of thing and working on it. Cindy said she was thinking of the opposite scenario where maybe ODOT decides they really do want to push it, but that local agencies being affected by the decision and the decision eventually effecting federal funding, that would be a concern.

Doug Bish said that he doesn't see a scenario where ODOT would risk losing federal funding. If FHWA were being serious and they wrote ODOT a letter saying federal funding would be jeopardized by this particular Supplement, ODOT would strike it and not go any further. We're trying to push back and ask if FHWA's really going to jeopardize our federal funding for two things? We don't think they're going to do that over the "Oncoming Traffic" sign issue. But Nick has said that this will jeopardize federal funding. So we're saying "Really, Nick? Is it just you saying that?" Or does he have some back-up.

Kevin said that the timing is fortuitous because we've gotten an inquiry from the Director's office from Travis Brower who is our lead Washington D.C. person, saying

that Matt Garrett is meeting with Victor Mendez next week and he specifically asked us how is the MUTCD going. Doug told him how the process has been over the last year. He specifically mentioned these two Part 4 issues as issues to bring up with Victor Mendez. So it's going to get an audience or at least mention next week about some of the frustrations that we're having about this process.

Cindy asked if there are any updates after that meeting about how the discussion went, that they be emailed to the committee. Doug answered in the affirmative. Kevin said that we're not the only state having consternation. Doug said that Nick intimated that they're going to go back to the issue of California's Supplement and also indicated that Utah and Texas have the same issue regarding modifications to Shall statements in their Supplements and having to deal with FHWA over it. Mark said if other states aren't having issues with this same section then he doesn't see why Oregon would be the only one have a problem on it.

Decision: Massoud reminded the committee that there is a motion on the table that has been seconded. Brian repeated the motion to strike the "or a speech walk message" language in the Standard statement in Section 4E.11 and replace it with an Option statement to the effect that where local conditions warrant, a speech walk message can be used. Doug noted that the suggestion to add language giving ODOT permission to pull this Supplement if FHWA insists, isn't necessary since the State Traffic Engineer already has that power. The question was called and all members voted in favor.

Kevin said the remaining issues are pretty much just housekeeping in nature.

[\(Listen - MUTCD Part 4\)](#)



Section 7D.05 on Operating Procedures for Adult Crossing Guards – Kevin said that the language previously adopted on this Supplement around flagger certification training really concerns the DOE. ODOT has met with the DOE and in response, ODOT is proposing to remove the second paragraph:

"If used, the STOP paddle shall only be operated by an adult crossing guard that has obtained flagger certification through a training course approved by the Oregon Department of Transportation."

He said we also did some word smithing to the first paragraph so that it simply says:

"Adult crossing guards shall use either SCHOOL flags or a STOP paddle approved by the Oregon Department of Education."

Kevin said that the big thing is to delete the flagger certification training and asked Steven Huillet of the Oregon Department of Education to speak to the issue.

Steven passed out DOE's [Traffic Patrol Manual for Schools](#). He said that the cost of flagger training which is not specific to the Safety Patrol Program, is the main issue with

them. Training specific to use of the STOP paddle should be adequate. Expecting volunteer adult crossing guards to spend anywhere from \$150 to \$175 training is not reasonable and may result in them not having volunteers out there. He said most schools don't have the money to hire these people or pay for their training. One of Steven's staff is going to go through the flagger certification training so he can develop and give the training that they feel is appropriate to volunteers for schools that do use the STOP paddle. They're also looking at doing some on-line training that will be a good option to make sure that anyone using the STOP paddle are adequately trained for the job.

Doug said that in looking at the Traffic Patrol Manual, it does talk about required training, as well as procedures. He sympathizes with the problem the school district has with affording training or getting enough volunteer crossing guards. He said that it is the responsibility of the DOE to provide this training by Oregon Statute anyway.

Decision: Brian moved and Mark seconded making the changes as suggested by Kevin Haas above, noting that the third paragraph requires the devices and practices used by the DOE must comply with the MUTCD. The committee voted in favor of the revised Supplement.

Kevin then said that in addition, they've been looking at the beginning of in Section 7D.01C with the DOE and are suggesting adding a Support statement that refers people to the Oregon Traffic Patrol Manual for Schools as follows:

The "Oregon Traffic Patrol Manual for Schools" published by the Oregon Department of Education provides information regarding the organization, administration, and operation of school traffic patrol programs in Oregon.

Brian Barnett asked if there was any conflict between the OTPMS and the AAA manual. Kevin said he hasn't looked but that it is only a Support statement that doesn't modify any Standard. There was some concern about taking student patrols out of this Manual and we don't want to go down that road to add that back into the Supplement. We just want to point people to the state manual under 7D.01C.

Brian then suggested striking the language in the MUTCD below 7D.01C that says:

Information regarding the organization, administration, and operation of a school safety patrol program is contained in the "AAA School Safety Patrol Operations Manual" (see Section 1A.11).

Decision: Brian moved adding the Support statement suggested by Kevin and striking the Support statement above from the MUTCD in Oregon's Supplement to Section 7D.01C. Joe seconded, and the committee voted in favor.

[\(Listen - MUTCD Part 7\)](#)

Section 9C.04 on Marking For Bicycle Lanes – Kevin reminded the committee that we agreed to come back to the issue of marking bike lanes and contra-flow bike lanes. We've talked to DOJ about an interpretation and we want consistency in the State. There are differences between Oregon law and the MUTCD. In Oregon law, bike lanes are not considered part of the roadway. In Eugene, they had a contra-flow bike lane and to cover their bases, they used an 8-inch white line plus two double-yellow lines, which ODOT thinks is over-kill. Therefore, Kevin proposed adding a line after the Standard that states:

"An 8 inch wide longitudinal white line shall be used to separate motor vehicle lanes from bicycle lanes traveling in the same direction. Double yellow longitudinal lines shall be used to separate motor vehicle lanes from bicycle lanes traveling in the opposite direction."

In this process, we will be able to repeal an OAR that says the same thing and putting it where it should be in the Oregon Supplement to the MUTCD. This will deal with the contra-flowing bike lanes in Oregon.

Doug Bish said that nationally, most states are like the MUTCD where the bike lane is part of the roadway, so they use the double-double yellow as demonstrated in a NATCO Guide. So it's probably more important to be consistent and use a double yellow rather than just make up our own markings to be consistent with our state law. The Attorney General agreed the bike lane is not part of the roadway and it would be an edgeline. So, it's not an official interpretation, so we don't have to use it but there is no other state law that was really governing this and it was just that bit about the bike lane not being a part of the roadway.

Decision: Brian moved adoption of the additional language proposed for Section 9C.04 and Cindy seconded. The committee voted in favor of the revised Supplement.

Kevin said we will commit to get the revised 4D.11 language out to the committee via email in the next week or so.

[\(Listen - MUTCD Part 9\)](#)

Sign Policy and Guidelines Changes

With time running out, Heidi Shoblom didn't have time to return to the full presentation of signs that can be removed from the document, but she did want to address adopting two signs, one a Snow Lane Control sign (No. OR3-10a) and a TRUCKS RIGHT TWO LANES ONLY sign (No. OR 4-5). Mike said that we've had several applications on the interstate for limiting trucks to the right two lanes on the Interstates. It is likely that only ODOT will have need of this sign. He wants to formalize the use of these signs in the Manual.

Regarding the snow lane control signs, Mike said that we've had requests from our region office for this for cases when snow is covering the lines on the ground. This may also be of use to other road authorities.

Decision: After little discussion, Cindy moved to adopt both signs. Mark seconded, and the committee voted in favor.

[\(Listen - SignPolicy\)](#)

NOA's

Mike brought up a report he's gotten about signs collecting dust quickly and hurting their retroreflectivity on the new DG Qubed sign sheeting. Reportedly this is requiring excessive cleaning. If anybody else in the counties and cities are having these issues, he'd like to hear from them.

Kevin said that we have gotten an official interpretation from FHWA that the actual height for a warning beacon should be 25.6 feet, not 19 feet as shown in the MUTCD. This confirms the mistake we pointed out to them that has been in the last three versions of the Manual.

Don Wence advised the committee that ODOT is working on a revision to the Signal OAR. This is following up on an initiative that was started a few years ago and not completed. There is some badly needed updating to comply with the OAR's now. It's a huge, complicated and lengthy process but he's up to it. He has an advisory committee formed and he has a project management information system he plans to use, with meetings, and communications with all who are interested. He thinks the project scope is a good one and looks forward to completing it. The advisory committee includes Joel McCarroll, Massoud Saberian, Doug Bish, Charles Radosta, Don Wence, and Darren Lawrence. In addition, he has contributors from across the State in every region. The rules apply mostly to State highways. Doug said at the same time, we'll also be updating the [Traffic Signal Policy and Guidelines](#). It is at least five years old and we will have the opportunity to get a lot of our new traffic signal control systems into the new manual, including traffic responsive systems and coordination.



Jim Renner asked if the [Oregon Temporary Traffic Control Handbook](#) is on track to be finalized with the MUTCD Supplements OAR, and Doug Bish said yes. Kevin said that Division 20 will adopt the Federal Manual, the Oregon Supplements and the Short Term Traffic Control Handbook.

Kevin added a request to the committee to help with outreach to the rest of the State, especially the smaller cities as we complete the MUTCD/Supplement process in the coming months. The [League of Oregon Cities](#) has not been as helpful as we'd like in

the past on this issue. Members agreed to be as helpful as possible in that regard. Joe Marek said he'd put together a small Powerpoint presentation to take on the road and advise cities in Clackamas County on significant changes in the Manual.

Adjournment

With no further business, Massoud adjourned the meeting just before noon. The next meeting is scheduled for 9 A.M., September 16th, [4040 Fairview Industrial Drive, Salem](#), in the Alsea Conference Room.

[\(Listen - NOAs to Adjourn\)](#)