January 7, 1:00 PM – 5:30 PM; January 8, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

A. Call to order (Gene Hawkins)
   1. Self-introductions
      a. Recognition of new members
   2. Distribution of attendance rosters (member and visitor) – each day.

B. Committee Business 01/07/09
   1. Approval of June 2009 minutes
   2. Report from the Edit Committee (Tim Taylor); they met from 10:30-11:30 AM on 01/07/09
      Discussion items
      a. What constitutes a traffic control device
      b. Metric issue – Committee agreed to keep both metric and English units
      c. Need for research problem statements
   3. Gene mentioned two presentations MTC will attend tomorrow
      a. Red LEDs as markings along light-rail lines (Signals Technical Committee)
      b. Arrow markings near railroad tracks (Railroad Technical Committee)
   4. Scott Wainwright mentioned that there were 15,200 comments and almost 2,000 letters. Hari will do a presentation tomorrow on the NPA comments. Mentioned that MTC docket comments were well done. Also mentioned use of in-pavement lighting, colored pavements, and crosswalk design variations (upcoming TTI study).

C. Minimum Retroreflectivity for Pavement Markings 01/07/09
   1. Gene Hawkins gave introduction. Ballot item went to sponsors in October 2008 on proposed new Section 3A.06 Longitudinal Pavement Marking Retroreflectivity. He is not going to moderate discussion because of his involvement with FHWA on this topic. Tim Taylor to moderate.
   2. Tim Taylor mentioned sponsor comments, but wanted committee members to bring up specific changes for each section first before going through the comments one by one.
   3. TRB Report “Review and Development of Recommended Minimum Pavement Marking Retroreflectivity Levels” was discussed. Table 11 shows recommended minimum $R_L$ values.
Concern was voiced about one of the categories being ≤50 mi/h because it would encompass all local and low speed roadways as well.

4. P.D. Kiser made a motion to adopt Table 11 from TRB report, but removing the word “Recommended” from the title. No formal vote (motion failed).

5. Joy Shamay made a motion to include mention of structured markings because of the concern of getting proper readings from testing equipment. Motion failed (no second).

6. Jim Ellison made a motion to adopt Table 11 without values but including a column for ≤30 mi/h and a column for 35-45 mph. Motion passed 15-3-2 (for, against, abstain). Included a comment to FHWA with our concern about the 575 value in the TRB table.

7. Jim Ellison made a motion (Passed 16-0-2) to move the first support statement to after the first guidance statement. Table 3A-1 was moved to guidance. The following changes were made:

**Standard:**

Public agencies or officials having jurisdiction shall establish an assessment or management method for the attainment of maintaining longitudinal pavement marking visibility with respect to the minimum levels identified in Table 3A-1, for center lines, edge lines, and lane lines.

**Guidance:**

The assessment or management methods should be consistent with the recommended minimum levels identified in Table 3A-1.

8. Zoubir Ouadah made a motion (Passed 15-1-2) to modify the following support statement:

b. Visual Nighttime Inspection - The retroreflectivity of existing markings is assessed by a trained inspector conducting a visual inspection from a moving vehicle during nighttime conditions.

9. Joy Shamay made a motion to mention other methodologies (besides 30-meter retroreflectometer) for measuring marking retroreflectivity. Motion failed (no second)

10. Jim Ellison made a motion (Passed 17-0-3) to modify the following guidance statement:

c. Expected Marking Life - The replacement of markings is based on the experience of pavement marking retroreflectivity degradation. Degradation experience is based on such items as materials test results, traffic volumes, geographic area, weather, snowplowing, pavement type and roadway type.

11. Jim Ellison made a motion to change “include” to “apply to” in the guidance section. Passed 19-0-2.
12. Jim Ellison made a motion (Failed 10-7-3) to modify the following support statement:
   Markings are replaced as resources and conditions permit.

13. Zoubir Ouadah made a motion (Passed 13-6-1) to modify the following support statement:
   Markings are replaced as resources conditions permit.

14. Joel Marcuson made a motion (Passed 18-0-1) to remove the following option statement:
   The reduced minimum levels are shown in Table 3A-1.
   The motion also included making the following comment to FHWA:
   Comment to FHWA: We would also like FHWA to address the effect of continuous roadway lighting either in the table or in the text.

15. Joel Marcuson made a motion (Passed 19-0-0) to modify the following support statement:
   Agencies and jurisdictions are deemed to be in compliance provided an assessment or management method is in use even though some sections of markings are below minimum levels or methods cannot be employed for a time. These times include but are not limited to:

16. Joel Marcuson made a motion (Passed 18-1-0) to modify the following support statements:
   - localized or abnormal wear (such as vehicular abrasion by heavy trucks or severe erosion); and
   - budgetary; and
   - other resource constraints.

17. Jim Ellison made a motion (Passed 19-0-0) to modify the following support statement:
   - weather (such as snow, ice, temperature, and rainy seasons);

18. Eric Hedman made a motion (Failed 10-8-1) to remove the following support statement:
   Studies and research to date have shown no correlation between increased levels of retroreflectivity above the minimum levels and crash reduction or safety.

19. Jim Ellison made a motion (Passed 12-4-1) to modify the following support statement:
   Studies and research to date have shown no correlation between increased levels of retroreflectivity above the minimum levels and crash reduction or safety. Enhanced retroreflectivity of longitudinal pavement markings generally improves nighttime driver comfort level, particularly for older drivers. Studies and research to date have yet to show a direct correlation between pavement marking retroreflectivity levels and crash reduction or safety.
D. Minimum Retroreflectivity for Pavement Markings 01/08/09

1. Discussion on compliance dates. Zoubir Ouadah made the following motion (Passed 17-0-4):
   
   **Compliance Period:**
   
   *4 years from the effective date of the Final Rule to have a method in place*
   
   *7 years from the effective date of the Final Rule to be in compliance and/or when the road is being resurfaced, but in no case greater than 10 years from the effective date of the Final Rule.*

2. Discussion on all sponsor comments. Tom Grant made a motion (Failed/withdrew to re-word) to modify on the following support statement:
   
   *Retroreflectivity is one of several assessments associated with nighttime pavement marking visibility.*

3. Tom Grant made a motion (Failed 12-6-2) to delete the first support statement:
   
   *Retroreflectivity is one of several assessments associated with pavement marking visibility.*

4. Larry Corcoran made a motion (Passed 18-0-2) to change the first support statement:
   
   *Retroreflectivity is one of several assessments a factor associated with pavement marking visibility.*

E. Research Discussion 01/08/09

a. The MTC discussed potential research projects that we will recommend for FHWA to consider. We will develop a one page problem statement on the following two topics:

   i. In-roadway lighting (P.D. Kiser)
   
   ii. Transverse marking retroreflectivity (Dave Woodin)

F. Metric Units Discussion 01/08/09

a. The MTC discussed the three options for units in the MUTCD:

   i. Metric (English)
   
   ii. English only
   
   iii. English (Metric)

b. The vote was 2 for Metric (English), 0 for English only, and 18 for English (Metric)
General National Council Session January 9, 8:00 AM – 9:15 AM – Notes on Council Discussion on Retroreflectivity Ballot Item (not formal NC meeting minutes):

1. Gene Hawkins made the introduction on the ballot item. Tim Taylor presented the ballot with changes made in MTC.

2. Motion by John Fisher to make the minimum retroreflectivity apply to all markings (not just center lines, lane lines, and edge lines). Motion failed 19-12-4.

3. Motion by Ken Kobetsky (with friendly amendment by David McKee to also remove the last paragraph) to remove the table and all references to it. Motion passed 30-1-2.

4. Motion to approve the ballot item with the previously approved removal of the table. Motion passed 26-6-2.

5. A request was made that the MTC work with FHWA to develop minimum retroreflectivity values for the table.