June 18, 2009, 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM

A. Call to order (Gene Hawkins)
   1. Distribution of attendance rosters (member and visitor) - Quorum of members
   2. Self-introductions

B. Committee Business
   1. Approval of Jan 2009 Meeting Minutes (unanimous)
   2. Report from the Edit Committee (Tim Taylor); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM on 06/18/09
      Discussion items
      a. What constitutes a traffic control device
         i. Edit Committee plans to develop a table that lists those devices that are not considered to be traffic control devices
      b. Traffic control devices on private property
         i. Edit Committee has concerns about parking areas, garages, etc., where all parts of the Manual cannot be applied
      c. Engineering judgment vs. engineering study
         i. Edit Committee to review shall, should, or may conditions
   3. Is there a global definition of what a traffic control device should be that would be in Part 3? (Gene H.)
      a. Homework assignment – everyone to bring a definition to the MTC meeting tomorrow
   4. Private Property Issues Task Force Meeting Report (Dave Jones)
   5. Roundabout Task Force Meeting Report (PD Kiser)
   6. ITE Delegation Meeting Report (Gene Hawkins)

C. Retroreflectivity for Transverse Markings Problem Statement (Dave Woodin)
   MTC Discussion on proposed language:
      a. Need to include the location that the transverse markings are measured
b. Need to include marking symbols and pavement messages

c. Change to say that retroreflectometer can be used but it may not be the most efficient assessment tool

d. Make a distinction on maintenance vs. measurement

e. Make other editorial changes

D. Minimum Retroreflectivity for Pavement Markings (Tim Taylor)

1. Gene Hawkins gave introduction. Approved language by NCUTCD council (Jan. 2009) did not include minimum retroreflectivity values. He is not going to moderate discussion because of his involvement with FHWA on this topic. Tim Taylor to moderate.

2. Tim Taylor gave some background. Three person task force developed new language and table of minimum values. Need to send changes to sponsors.

3. Discussion by MTC:

   a. Yellow vs. white – requiring both markings to have the same minimum requirements

   b. NH DOT pavement marking technicians described their process for measuring retroreflectivity

   c. Tom Grant proposed wording changes to the proposed Table 3A-1. Tim Taylor made a motion to adopt the new table with Tom Grant’s changes. Jim Ellison made a friendly amendment to change “Posted Speed” to “Posted or Statutory Speed Limit” (passed – unanimous). Original motion with Jim’s revisions passed 14-4-1.

   d. Jim K. made an amendment to revise the Option statement to include “Section 3B.12” as a reference to the use of retroreflective raised pavement markers to be consistent with Table 3A-1. Passed 16-0-2.

E. Murray Bodin (guest) made a presentation discussing the misuse of yellow and white striping, primarily around channelizing gores/islands.

   Straw vote – Edge line for left side of lane abutting an island shall be yellow (unanimous).

   Straw vote – Channelizing lines in the gore area shall be white until it is physically impossible to cross because of an obstruction (unanimous).

Gene asked for a task force to review the issue and have information ready for the Jan. 2010 meeting.

1. Task force includes Jim K., Dave W., Jim E., and Mike H.

2. Task force to develop figures and recommended ballot language

   a. Consider difference in marking flush islands vs. raised islands

   b. Could create a new section – Pavement markings for islands

F. Private Property Conformance with the MUTCD

1. Gene discussed the Wal-Mart docket letter that he helped write

2. Murray Bodin (guest) – most drivers do not recognize that there is a difference between public and private areas for driving purposes
3. Gene H. – need to require that signs and markings be used correctly, but other items not as important. Need to define what we do and do not care about.
4. Jim K. and Zoubir – need to care about the road to the front door. Parking aisles don’t matter.

June 19, 2009, 10:00 – 11:30 AM; 1:00 – 2:30 PM

A. Call to order (Gene Hawkins)
   a. Distribution of attendance rosters (member and visitor) - Quorum of members

B. Private Property Task Force
   Volunteers from MTC: Dave Jones, Dave Woodin, Gene Hawkins, Zoubir Ouadah, Steve Vetter, Jim Kellenberger

C. Part 3 Reorganization
   1. Prepared a draft outline – see separate document e-mailed by Gene Hawkins
   2. Assigned members to the different sections. Action items:
      a. Determine the existing section numbers that should be included in the reorganized sections
      b. Include text from existing sections – only the portions that are appropriate to the reorganized sections.
   3. Web conference set for Friday, September 25 (2:00 EST) (Gene Hawkins action item)

D. Presentation by New Hampshire DOT on measuring effect of snowplowing on retroreflectivity values
   a. Two year study
   b. Measured retroreflectivity before and after winter. Kept track of number of times a snow plow crossed a given location during the winter
   c. Average loss – 71% in 2007-2008 with an average of 1,200 plow counts per site
      Average loss – 54% in 2008-2009 with an average of 980 plow counts per site

E. Discussion of topics that need to be discussed by MTC
   a. Skid resistance
      i. Steve V. to prepare problem statement
   b. Colored pavements
   c. Private property
      i. What are the critical things that need to be discussed from a markings perspective
      ii. Focus on parking areas
   d. Wet retroreflectivity
e. Internally-illuminated markings
   i. Need to get a task force formed with the Signals Technical Committee

F. Private property discussion
a. NY has been dealing with the issue since 1979. If a private property wants traffic
   enforcement, they have to follow the MUTCD – otherwise a violation will not stick
   because of errors on the signing and marking
b. What about private subdivisions?
c. A driver should see a seamless system between public and private roads
d. Roads within the development should follow MUTCD; not as concerned about parking
   aisles
e. A lot of municipalities have ordinances that provide requirements for commercial
   properties
f. Who ends up paying for the changes? Who will patrol to make sure they are compliant?
g. If used, a TCD should conform with the Manual
h. What time frame will apply? Getting the message out to existing private developments
   will be difficult