

# Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee

[July 17, 2015](#)

## Meeting Minutes

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

*Members Present:* [Jeff Wise](#), ODOT Region 5, Chairperson; [Bob Pappé](#), Secretary, ODOT State Traffic Engineer; [Brian Barnett](#), City of Springfield; [Mike Caccavano](#), City of Redmond; [Ed Chastain](#), Lane County [Joseph Marek](#), Clackamas County; [Cynthia Schmitt](#), Marion County

*Members Present via join.me:* [Alex Georgevitch](#), City of Medford; [Jeff Lewis](#), OSP

*Members Absent:* [Pam O'Brien](#), DKS Associates, Vice Chair

*Others Present:* Scott Beaird, Kittelson & Associates; Terry Hockett, Kevin Hottman, City of Salem; Jabra Khasho, City of Beaverton; Eric Niemeyer, City of Springfield; Doug Bish, Craig Black, Scott Cramer; Kevin Haas, Katie Johnson, Mike Kimlinger, Kathi McConnell, Gary Obery, Heidi Shoblom, ODOT Traffic/Roadway Section; Bert Hartman, ODOT Bridge Section

### **Introduction – Approval of Minutes – Additional Agenda Items**

Chair Jeff Wise called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and called for introductions from all attending, including via join.me (see attendance above). Bob Pappé introduced Jeff Lewis, the new representative for the Oregon State Police and gave some information on his career to date. Joe Marek then moved, Mike Caccavano seconded, and the committee approved the [March 20, 2015 OTCDC meeting minutes](#).

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

None to report.

### **Signal Policy and Guidelines Update**

Craig Black reported back on further refinements of this draft, summarizing from his [Revision List](#) for the [March 2015 Signal Policy and Guidelines](#) draft. He's received two comments from committee members, which are among the things being addressed.

In Section 1.2.5 on Temporary and Portable Signals – Craig added language as a safety aspect as follows to be sure sight distance is considered in case of windy roads, etc.:

When considering the use of temporary or portable traffic signals, a site visit to observe field conditions should be conducted when investigating their possible use in work zones. Sight distance to the potential signal display locations shall be per MUTCD, Table 4D-2 "Minimum Sight Distance for Signal Visibility"

In Section 4.1.1 on Left-Turn Signal Modes, addition was made as follows:

According to Section 4D.05 of the MUTCD, it is required to install a W25 - 2 sign (ONCOMING TRAFFIC MAY HAVE EXTENDED GREEN) if preemption is allowed for an approach from where drivers are allowed to make left turn movements permissively. Historically, based on engineering judgement, ODOT never installed this sign on state highways and no safety and operational problems have been reported due to the absence of this sign. Besides, this sign doesn't provide clear message to the drivers. Based on these factors, this sign is not used on state highways.

This is needed as railroad consultants are bringing up this sign required by the MUTCD which Oregon has never used on state highways. We need to formalize this policy in the Signal Policy.

In Section 4.3 on U-Turns, several sentences were added and removed in the first two bullets to move language from the Sign Policy to the Signal Policy so the description of the U-Turn sign will reference the signal policy, which Heidi is taking care of in the Sign Policy.

Among the things he researched was the history of the road widths used to determine if U-turns may be permitted. It was an evolving process ODOT staff went through from the AASHTO Manual 56 foot width. Through rule-making, an exception was made in 1976 down to 52-feet based upon an intersection in Salem and several other locations. While smaller cars don't need as big of a turning radius as a larger vehicle, generally, you need to design for the largest vehicle but there is still a need to allow for design exceptions on an individual location basis. There was discussion of the desirability of allowing for more exceptions; perhaps with a smaller minimum radius jurisdictions could adhere to if there was a history of this working well in many cases. There is a certain amount of leeway as it is which should be helpful if a jurisdiction does the work to document it and ODOT will look into this further as time permits without making changes to the Signal Policy draft at this time.

Eric asked about allowing permissive U-turns at intersections to prevent build-up above capacity in left turn lanes. Craig said ODOT could look at this down the road but for now, we're not ready to allow other than protected-only phasing. ODOT will need to look at how this works for the State before adjusting this. The same would go for allowing U-turns on flashing yellow turn signals. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to advise ODOT of locations where drivers are already making some of these turns and it seems to be working. The committee was interested in seeing June Ross's [2005 study report](#) for the Legislature, which legislators had asked for in preparation for possibly allowing U-Turns unless otherwise signed to see what all she looked at.

In Section 8.1 on Railroad Preemption (Heavy Rail), ODOT wanted to add to the first bullet in order to incorporate a tech bulletin which talks about protective green clear-out phasing in order to have it in the Signal Policy in accordance with current practice.

When a vehicle clear-out interval (VCOI) is required, the indication for the clearance phases shall be green. VCOI operation shall include a green left-turn arrow if a left turn movement exists, *even if the left-turn movement operates permissively. Under normal operation, if the left-turn movement is permissive only, the display of the left-turn green arrow shall be used during rail preemption only. The use of green arrow is not allowed for use by emergency vehicle preemption and transit priority users.*

Doug thought it might clarify to add “normally” to the phrase above so it reads “even if the left-turn movement *normally* operates permissively”. Craig said he’d look at the wording on this again.

In Appendix C, under Traffic Signal Operational Approval, Pam noted one area in the flow chart where “Traffic Signal Approval Request Form or” is still in a box under the State Traffic Engineer. This will be removed.

Brian wanted to return to Section 4.1 on Protected Only Left Turn Signal Modes, suggesting more flexibility should be written in. Eric suggested under b) the word “provided” be replaced with “considered” for cases where protected-only left turn mode isn’t needed. Craig said the document as written already provides sufficient flexibility if the traffic engineer just documents the situation and the decision. Bob said this needs further consideration by ODOT because the current wording works well for ODOT and ODOT needs time to further consider any such change. Bob expressed willingness to look if we can further accommodate Brian’s needs without damaging ODOT’s desire to have clearer guidance in most circumstances. Doug Bish suggested “considered” may bring up legal issues in court if everything which should have been “considered” wasn’t properly documented as having been considered. Eric suggested “provided” might also be a legal issue.

Scott Cramer sought to clarify how ODOT uses the policy for local jurisdictions. Each case is considered separately and if the policy doesn’t apply, this is documented and adjusted for. The policy is not chiseled in stone. Bob reiterated ODOT is willing to take more time internally to look into this further.

Decision: Joe moved, Brian seconded and the committee agreed to recommend approval of the Signal Policy and Guidelines with minor edits discussed and with a commitment to examine the issue of the protective-permissive left turn phasing and the language, as well as the U-turn issues discussed and bring it back to the Committee within the next six months.

## **Traffic Signal Systems Engineering**

Scott Cramer reported on the current status of ODOT’s planning and activities moving forward towards the next generation of hardware, software systems engineering. One of

the goal is to be able to integrate with local agency systems where they will be able to adopt to and make use of our engineering, software packaging as much as possible. It's still on the 170/2070 ATC style. Architecture in the cabinet is going away from individual wires to serial buses and more communications with other systems. Towards the beginning of 2016, ODOT hopes to start having something to move forward in the field with. We have nothing solid from FHWA on connected vehicle systems, they are expected to have something out in 2016, at which ODOT will be looking closely at what/how this can be integrated in a tiered approach to our system. It likely will not even involve the vehicle to infrastructure phase which is expected to be developed using signal systems data by the technology engineers of vehicle manufacturers.

### **Single Hauling Vehicle Signs**

Heidi Shoblom and Bert Hartman brought back two new versions of weight limit signs: [Weight Sign 1](#) (6 X 4.5 ft.) and [Weight Sign 2](#) (6 X 5 ft.). The larger sign includes a note single-trip permitted loads are not subject to weight limits. The signs are extruded aluminum and as stand-alone signs, they may be placed on wood posts at about \$700 when installed by state forces. If not stand alone, they will require a TBB frame for from \$3,000-5,000 each. Advance warning signs would also be needed. Most would go on local roads. The committee still felt the signs would not work because they are too big to fit, too complex to easily enforce and too expensive. Local jurisdictions would find it impossible to comply with such weight sign requirements. The market is driving a need for these signs so something needs to be worked out.

Action Item: The committee suggested a working group (including county traffic engineering and enforcement personnel) look for more workable signs. Volunteering for a working group were Joe Marek and Cindi Schmitt. The League of Oregon Cities may also be asked if they have someone available. Bert will coordinate setting this up.

### **SCOTE Meeting Update**

Mike Kimlinger [reported on](#) the AASHTO Subcommittee on Traffic Engineering conference held in San Antonio, Texas June 14-17. The link above links through to presentations and a summary of these.

Sinusoidal rumble strips and progress towards finding a location and vendors for testing them were briefly discussed.

Mike reported on the pooled fund annual [meeting in Atlanta](#) last month including:

- TCD Pooled Fund has Two reports published:
  - Elongated Pavement Markings
  - Warning Sign Legends for emergency Incident
- Current Projects
  - Countdown Pedestrian Signals Legibility and Comprehension without Flashing Hand

- Lane Line Markings in Advance of Lane Reduction Transitions
- Human Factors Evaluation of Intersection Conflict Warning Systems
- Next Up
  - Symbol Sign Evaluation
  - Lane Reduction vs Lane Drop
  - Guide Signing for U-Turn Intersections
  - Enhancing Conspicuity for Standard Signs and Retroreflective Stripes on Posts
  - Simplification of Channelizing Device Delineation Patterns
  - Signing for Pedestrians for Pedestrian Activated Beacons (instructions)

## **June NCUTCD Meeting Update**

Scott Beaird reported on the June [NCUTCD Meeting](#) held June 17-19 in San Antonio, Texas. Attending from Oregon with Scott were Mike Kimlinger, Randy McCourt, Tom Lancaster and Lee Rodegerdts. It was a fairly light meeting given the delay in publishing the next MUTCD.

Scott summarized activity of the Roundabouts Task Force

- Pedestrian treatments at roundabouts
  - NCHRP 3-78B – Develop guidelines for pedestrian treatments at roundabouts
  - FHWA – Final report on RRFBs at multilane roundabouts is nearly final
- Signalization
  - January meeting – discuss language on how to do signalization at roundabouts
- Developing research needs statement for 3rd edition of Roundabout Guide

Scot also summarized the Signals Technical Committee, including Update on RRFB research (above/below), update on PBH research, and a Research need statement (automated pedestrian detection for activation of APS locator tone and walk activation).

Finally, the bulk of the summary was on FHWA

- Kevin Sylvester is the new team leader
- Advertising for two openings
- Next edition of MUTCD
  - Not included in FHWA's Priority Rulemakings for 2015
  - Draft NPA unlikely to be advanced to OM&B this year
    - Economic impact analysis already done will likely need to be expanded
  - Tentative timeline:
    - May 2016: NPA published in Federal Register
    - Nov 2016: End of 6 month comment period
    - Oct 2017: FHWA finalizes MUTCD
    - Nov 2017 – Apr 2018: Internal and OM&B reviews
    - May/June 2018: Publish next MUTCD
- Proceeding with RFC on future direction of the MUTCD (Sept 2015)

## **Legislative Update**

Kevin Haas gave a [legislative update](#) on bills of interest passed during the 2015 Session.

- Senate Bill 192 — Work group to study allowing ATVs to operate on state highways
- Senate Bill 533 — Allows bicyclists and motorcyclists to violate traffic signals
- Senate Bill 921 — Directs ODOT to close all freeway medians 100 feet or less in width
- House Bill 2621 — Allows City of Portland to operate permanent photo radar
- House Bill 3035 — Flashing beacons in rural school zones
- House Bill 3402 — Increases speed limit on several central and eastern Oregon highways

There were clarifying questions and some discussion on most of these bills, particularly HB 3402 and its implications. (Note: Governor Brown signed the bill July 20<sup>th</sup> and the new speed limits will be effective March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016.)

## **Roundtable**

Brian said as a result of a triple-fatality to pedestrians on Main Street (Hwy 126B), Springfield has received an inquiry from Red Flex offering to provide automated red light enforcement, he'd like to hear from anybody who has experience with this after the meeting. Alex said Medford runs these cameras and suggested Brian talk to the Medford Police.

Alex said Medford is still looking to hire a Transportation Manager so if anybody knows anyone who might be a candidate, please pass this on.

He also asked about having a supervising electrician do the design work for a signal cabinet removal/relocation. The consensus was if there is trenching, a new base installed, etc., it would be considered engineering and require an engineer to do the designing. [OSBEELS](#) would be a good resource.

## **Not On Agenda**

Bob noted there is a Transportation Safety Conference October 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> at the Embassy Suites at Washington Square after a several-year hiatus. The OTCDC has in past rescheduled the September meeting to be held in conjunction with the Conference. Bob said he'd like to hear if members are interested in doing the joint meeting this year. There was general approval with the idea. ODOT will check for any conflicts and get further information out to the committee regarding a final decision.

Mike Kimlinger noted ODOT has acquired 5 new [CARS](#) Ball Banking tools they will be willing to loan out on a first-come-first-serve basis. Eric Leaming will be the contact for this

opportunity and Mike will be working on what kind of intergovernmental agreement needs to be formulated.

### **Agenda Items for Future Meetings**

None surfaced.

### **Adjournment**

Jeff Wise adjourned the meeting at about 12:10 pm.