

Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

[November 16, 2012](#)

Meeting Minutes

ODOT [Technical Leadership Center](#), 4040 Fairview Industrial Drive SE, Salem, Oregon

Members Present: [Joseph Marek](#), Chairperson, Clackamas County; [Brian Barnett](#), City of Springfield; [Mike Caccavano](#), City of Redmond; [Doug Bish](#) for [Bob Pappe](#), Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; [Ed Chastain](#), Lane County; [Joel McCarroll](#), ODOT Region 4; [Pam O'Brien](#), DKS Associates; [Cynthia Schmitt](#), Marion County; [Tim Plummer](#) for Mark Davie, OSP. *Member present via I-Link:* [Alex Georgevitch](#), Vice Chair, City of Medford

Member Absent: [Bob Pappe](#), Secretary; [Mark Davie](#), OSP

Others Present: Nick Fortey, FHWA; Frank Hagen, Oregon State Police, Craig Black, Kevin Haas, Katie Johnson, Mike Kimlinger, Justin King, Ervin Lanier, Eric Leaming, Scott McCanna, Kathi McConnell, Laura Prusakiewicz, Chris Rowland, Heidi Shoblom, ODOT Traffic/Roadway Section; Diane Cheyne, Oregon Travel Experience; Terry Hockett, Kevin Hottmann, City of Salem; Sarah Owens, Washington County. *Others present via I-Link:* Charles Radosta, Kittelson & Associates; Jeff Wise, ODOT Region 5

Introduction – Approval of Minutes – Additional Agenda Items

Chair Joe Marek called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. then members and other attendees introduced themselves. Brian Barnett then moved, Mike Caccavano seconded, and the committee approved the [September 2012 OTCDC Meeting Minutes](#).

Business from the Audience/Public Comment on Non-Agenda Topics

None to report.

Red Light Running Camera Guidelines

Doug Bish reported on his [final draft](#) of the updated Guidelines with a [summary handout](#) of the changes as requested by the committee at the September meeting. The committee had no objection to any of these changes during this presentation and Doug asked for final committee approval for the new 2012 version.

Decision: Brian Barnett moved, Mike Caccavano seconded, and the committee voted in favor of approving the final draft of the Red Light Running Camera Guidelines for 2012.

Roundabout Directive Update

Doug then reported on a new [draft directive](#) issued by ODOT Highway Division on the *“expectation and processes concerning freight mobility to be followed whenever a roundabout is proposed to be installed on the state highway system.”*

The expected workability of the new directive was discussed in general with some examples of how this would support ongoing consideration of roundabouts on state highways. Discussions and agreement with designated representatives of the freight industry for the individual roundabouts will be memorialized in writing prior to building any roundabout. This will memorialize that the process has been followed and specific outcomes have been agreed to. Brian said the end of the moratorium on new roundabouts should be a great step forward. He said that complimentary to this process, the Freight Route Advisory Committee working under [ORS 366.215](#) will have as much or more of an effect as this agreement/directive.

The new directive was given final [approval](#) by the Highway Division Administrator Paul Mather on November 9th.

Update on School Zone Issues and Pending Legislation

Kevin Haas updated on this issue [brought up at the September meeting](#) by Cindy regarding efforts from some interests to expand what a school zone includes, such as Head Start or other educational uses in repurposed school buildings. These don't currently qualify under Oregon law and policy. Some are also requesting changes in hours covered by signs or flashers. Rumors about the next Legislature possibly being influenced to make changes to school zone law are going around. Proposals could include variations in school-type speed limits or in authority for setting these up.

Kevin said that ODOT's legislative liaison would like to hear Traffic-Roadway input on any proposed legislation that comes up. Kevin encouraged cities and counties to maintain contact with him and Katie Thiel or Betsy Imholt in ODOT Government Relations.

Kevin also noted that ODOT is part of the Executive Department under the Governor so it falls in line with the Governor's opinion at the end of the day. Cindy noted that counties and cities are in pretty much the same position. The ITE as a non-governmental organization may end up being the only independent entity that can speak for traffic engineering professionals. There are indications that the ITE may get more respect from legislators than government engineers.

The committee agreed that all members will need to pay attention to what the Legislature comes up with and be ready to collaborate on short notice on whether providing professional input to any emerging legislation is a good idea. Cindy said Marion County is waiting to hear more from their sources. She will advise/provide copies of any proposed legislation that comes up. It may not be until early in 2013.

Changes proposed by NCUTCD to 2009 MUTCD

Kevin provided the committee information on [NCUTCTD-recommended changes](#) to the MUTCD. There wasn't anything earth-shaking. ODOT made some comments on wording of proposed changes to Part 6 and Part 2. He can give people more specifics if they're interested. In proposed changes on preemption and clearance intervals, the NCUTCD is moving towards Oregon's position. There's also a movement between traffic safety and traffic engineering engineers to break down siloes between the MUTCD, AASHTO's Green Book and the Highway Safety Manual. The goal is to have all come together and harmonize around all the transportation engineering disciplines.

Trucks In Roundabout Signs and the Pooled Fund Study

Mike Kimlinger reported on a pooled fund study dealing with [comprehension and legibility of selected symbol signs](#). Trucks in roundabouts were a part of that in that *"[a] sign that indicates to drivers that trucks may use multiple lanes in a roundabout is needed, i.e. that trucks may encroach into lanes other than their own as then enter, proceed through and exit the roundabout. There are currently no signs that meet this need in the MUTCD (2009)."*

The research team identified various options for testing that are either in use by some states already, or that have been proposed for use pending sign tests. For Oregon purposes the study was not as helpful as it might have been because they included both warning and regulatory signing. In Oregon, we're dealing with a regulatory condition under state law so studying warning signs doesn't help us. The MUTCD doesn't allow cross-use of symbols between different applications without separate testing so we can't even borrow them from the warning signs for use on regulatory signs (or visa versa).

The study did have an option (3) that used a symbol of a truck driving down the middle of two lanes with two passenger vehicles side-by-side right behind it and the word message, "TRUCKS USE BOTH LANES" below it. That seemed to be comprehensible to a large percentage of test subjects. But it doesn't convey the roundabout layout and it doesn't adequately convey the law as it applies to non-truck drivers in a roundabout situation. Kimlinger said if we require a symbol sign, the study seems to indicate that Option 3 is a viable alternative to sticking with the word message sign, [DO NOT DRIVE BESIDE TRUCKS](#) (approved January 2012). This is worth consideration since new research in regards to use of the currently rejected "i" sign shows that there are a lot of foreign drivers on Oregon roads who may do better with symbol signs. Joe quickly sketched a version of Option 3 that includes the curvature of a roundabout but even that doesn't include the left/right/left deflection of a roundabout. Brian is not in favor of 'demanding' that trucks use both lanes (as Option 3 appears to do). ODOT is part of several states working with a Kansas Study on trucks recommending that multi-lane roundabouts be designed to allow trucks to remain in their lanes throughout a roundabout maneuver. So it's not desirable to adopt this symbol sign option.

Doug noted that Oregon law has two parts; DO NOT PASS and DO NOT DRIVE BESIDE trucks. He said that Option 3 seems to cover the first part directly and the second by inference. Cindy suggested of the options, the existing text sign in Oregon is the best option. Tim Plummer noted the symbol sign doesn't make clear how long the condition is in effect, which is going to frustrate drivers.

The consensus of the committee was to stick with the current text message sign OR 4-22 (page 3-65 of the Sign Policy and Guidelines) unless something better comes along.

Updates to the Sign Policy & Guidelines

Scott McCanna updated the committee on proposed changes to motorist service signs ([business access signs](#)) in construction projects. He said these signs are causing confusion for users and current Sign Policy language conflicts with the sign design. Planned updates to the policy start with changing 'Policy' to 'Guidance' in the title. This is to make it clear there is flexibility for these signs. Also, in item number 4, the draft document will be changed to allow either Series 'B' or 'C' font for the legend. He went through other updates to the language in some detail. The intent is to minimize the number of word to delineate business types available and to require blue tubular markers at accesses--not allowing for white tubes if blue is not available. Scott expects the changes will help provide flexibility for projects and maintain certain necessary standards.

Heidi then went through some clean-up for the Sign Policy. She proposes to eliminate five no-longer needed signs under page 6-13 (Putting Oregon Back to Work). ([6-13](#)), ([6-13a](#)), ([6-13b](#)). The committee agreed.

Heidi next addressed signs advising turning vehicles to stop for pedestrians and bikes as discussed last year. We have these with "YIELD" now instead of "STOP", in conflict with our laws requiring drivers STOP for pedestrians. The first proposal is a STOP FOR BIKES AND PEDS (Sign No. [OR10-15a](#)). The second is a STOP FOR BIKES (Sign No. [OR 10-15b](#)), and the third is a STOP FOR PEDS (Sign No. [OR 10-15](#)). During committee discussion, it was clarified that drivers only need to yield for bikes. So the more restrictive STOP wording is only needed for bikes in the ([OR10-15a](#)) instance when both pedestrians and bikes are covered. Therefore existing sign OR 10-15b in the SP& G is correct as it is.

Decision: Brian moved, Doug seconded and the committee voted in favor of accepting changes to signs OR10-15 and OR 10-15a, leaving OR 10-15b as is.

Then Heidi noted that the EV sign in the SP&G is just a bit different than the FHWA version that has interim approval. She suggested editing [page 5-21](#) to refer people to FHWA's site and the deletion of page [5-22](#) (Sign OD 9-11b).

From [FHWA Site](#):

April 1, 2011 — Interim Approval for Optional Use of an Alternative Electric Vehicle Charging General Service Symbol Sign (IA-13)

- Interim Approval (IA-13) Memorandum [[HTML](#), [PDF Letter](#), [PDF Version Attachments](#)]

Decision: Joel moved Mike Caccavano seconded and the committee voted to approve the editing and deletion as described above.

The next item is a proposal to remove [Pages 5-110 to 5-141](#) in the SP&G on TODS and Logo signs. Language would be added referring people to the Travel Info Council for this kind of documentation. This would allow the Travel Info Council (Oregon Travel Experience) to contain the designs in their own publications according to their governing OARs. Concerns were expressed that these are still traffic control devices and may need to still be a part of ODOT's SP&G. The committee discussed the history of these signs and how they got into the SP&G. When TIC/OTE was created, it didn't have drafting skills/equipment to do the policy on design so it was practical to maintain these pages in the SP&G. That is no longer the case. Other things have changed over the years, such as elimination of riders with messages incorporated into each business plaque some time ago.

Nick Fortey expressed concern that ODOT maintain control of policy complying with the MUTCD rather than farming it out to other agencies. Proper policy and guidance in a TIC-generated OAR now could be changed in the future without ODOT or FHWA having any say in the matter. This has been an issue in the past in regards to things like Rail Section's authority over devices that affect rail traffic (and rail-highway crossings).

Kevin Haas suggested there may be wording already in the [Oregon Supplements](#) to the MUTCD that maintains necessary control by ODOT in conjunction with what's in the [2009 Edition](#) of the MUTCD itself. There was no time to thoroughly review these resources in context in this meeting, so the committee agreed to bring this proposal back to the next OTCDC meeting in January of 2013.

Scott provided a memo regarding [possible alternatives](#) to the no-longer-available TRUCKS Warning Sign for Highway Work Zones. The old sign was replaced with the [W 11-10 symbol sign](#) in the MUTCD. Scott thinks the original TRUCKS legend lacks construction-related specificity that would be helpful to drivers in work zones. His four proposed new legends are designed to improve on the W 11-10 sign. Scott could also accept a truck symbol like a dump truck over the existing symbol sign. The committee was not prepared to approve these changes, preferring to instead recommend existing TRUCKS ENTERING XXX FT. (CW 23-7) and TRUCKS LEAVING XXX FT. (CW 23-8) signs. Scott will bring back samples of these on diamond signs at the next meeting.

Select Chair & Vice Chair for 2013 / Review Proposed Meeting Schedule for 2013

Joe then opened nominations for new OTCDC officers for 2013.

Decision: Cindy nominated Pam to serve as Chairperson. Brian seconded. Pam said she would serve if elected and the committee voted unanimously to elect her.

Decision: Pam then nominated Cindy to serve as Vice-Chairperson and Mike C. seconded. Cindy agreed to serve and the committee voted unanimously to elect her.

The committee then reviewed Kathi McConnell's proposed meeting [schedule and agenda build](#) rules for 2013. Pam said she will talk to the ITE Board and see if they are ready to decide on the joint ITE-OTCDC meeting as soon as possible. Members agreed to set the first meeting for January 11th (changed due to state furlough). They will check their schedules in the meantime, regarding other meetings and settle those dates on January 11th.

Local Jurisdiction Issues - Discussion

Right Turn Permitted Without Stopping signs -- Ed said he was curious if other agencies are swapping their RTPWOS signs out since the new MUTCD has the equivalent EXCEPT RIGHT TURN sign. The consensus was that either sign is now acceptable and it is up to local jurisdictions to decide. Nobody in the meeting appeared to be in any hurry to swap out existing RTPWOS signing.

NHS MAP 21 -- Cindy said Marion County is still trying to determine the full impact on local jurisdictions of the MAP 21 authorization. As of October 1st (last month), it expands the National Highway System to include local facilities that are considered to be principle arterials. Marion County is having meetings with ODOT on the implications. Requirements that used to just apply to the states will now also apply to cities and counties on many roads. They will have to meet AASHTO criteria for design standards, preservation projects, etc., to some degree. Other new (to locals) requirements are still being figured out. Outdoor billboards regulation may be one of these, likely causing political heat for local agencies. There's not much local governments can do to change the situation except possibly change the functional classification of their local roads. Unfortunately, as of October 1st, it is up to FHWA as to whether they will go along with any such changes.

Not-on-Agenda Items

Mike Kimlinger said he'd just been asked about whether Tri-Met busses are permitted to use the truck route bypass on I-5 in Portland and he wondered if anybody thinks that the signing is confusing as to the right for other vehicles to use that route. Other vehicles are using it now but is there any reason for anybody to be confused? It was a regulatory sign some years ago. It is not any more. Nobody at the meeting had heard of it being an issue although confusion may be understandable.

Joe Marek returned to his question from the September meeting regarding signing to warn trucks of winter closures on some remote roads. He found out ODOT has a sign on Highway 224 that says SNOW CLOSURE XX MILES AHEAD. So Clackamas

County has installed that kind of sign up on Lolo Pass Road in two locations up towards Mount Hood. The Forest Service will flip the signs for them. That will give them the winter to work out something to help keep commercial trucks from attempting this based on their GPS systems over this winter.

Ervin Lanier reported on [his research](#) to the providers of GIS services which resulted in valuable information for all interested parties. We don't yet know how fast these services will turn around changes in mapping information. The information should be given to John Oshel at the AOC to pass on to other counties.

Mike Caccavano asked why Oregon doesn't set up striping to direct slower traffic into the right lane when an additional lane is initiated like they do in other states. This might lessen the cases of slower vehicles blocking traffic unnecessarily in these circumstances. He's seen nothing in the MUTCD on the matter. Katie said ODOT's looked into that in the past as to whether other possible striping treatments were advisable. They didn't see any record of public complaints to demonstrate a problem for the public, so no action beyond that has been taken. ODOT also explored whether signing should say LEFT LANE ENDS or RIGHT LANE ENDS to address passing issues. Doug said there is information in the ODOT [Traffic Manual](#) that addresses this. Kevin said we're also being more judicious about putting lane drop arrows at the end of passing lanes.

Adjournment

Joe adjourned the meeting at 11:54 a.m.