Meeting Minutes
Markings Technical Committee
National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
January 19 – 21, 2011
Arlington, VA

January 19, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

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

B. Committee business
   1. Approval of June 2010 Meeting Minutes – unanimous
   2. Edit Committee report (Michael Metzig and James Kratz); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00N on 01/19/11
      a. Edit Committee proposed a new definition for a traffic control device
      b. Discussion on engineering study vs. engineering judgment
         i. The committee wants each technical committee to review the use in the different Parts of the MUTCD
      c. Private property discussion
   3. Task Force for Traffic Control on Private Property report (Jim Ellison, Zoubir Ouadah, Steve McDonald); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00N on 01/19/11
      a. Reviewed a first draft of introduction for proposed Part 10
      b. There is a draft of a new barricade section
      c. Discussed signing and setting speed limits
      d. Discussed what the MUTCD applies to (ring road vs. parking lots)
   4. No Research Committee report
   5. Roundabout Task Force report (Joel Marcuson)
      a. Discussed conflicting movements on multi-lane roundabouts – exiting from internal lane vs. entering from external lane.
      b. Discussed impacts of railroad crossings adjacent to a roundabout.
6. Report on the objection of the 2009 MUTCD statement that “Standard statements shall not be modified or compromised based on engineering judgment or engineering study” in Section 1A.13. (Gene Hawkins)
   a. AASHTO Board passed a resolution saying that FHWA needs to change the language
   b. FHWA Rulemaking will occur concerning the definition of the STANDARD

7. Report on MUTCD compliance dates (Gene Hawkins)
   a. Recent media reports have discussed the costs associated with replacing street name signs with upper and lower case letters. Many incorrect media reports stating that there is a date requirement for replacing the affected street name signs (Requirement is changing out signs with normal replacement schedule).
   b. Many docket comments proposed that FHWA should abolish all compliance dates
   c. How does a requirement (Standard) to meet a compliance date align with a Guidance statement?

8. Discussion of extension of lines through intersections that connect a white line on the approach to a yellow line on the departure—should we use yellow vs. white? Gene wants proposed language developed prior to full discussion.

C. Private roads open to public travel

1. MTC comments to take back to the task force:
   a. Parking stall markings
      i. Define color on a local basis
   b. Crosswalks
      i. Crosswalks shall be white only
      ii. Transverse lines comply with MUTCD. Longitudinal or diagonal lines can deviate from MUTCD
      iii. Some maximum width needs to be set that will require interior markings between the transverse lines?
   c. Centerline markings? Do 10’-30’ broken lane markings make sense?
   d. STOP line cannot be used by itself. Either use with STOP sign or “STOP” pavement marking
   e. Word markings
      i. Must be white
ii. “STOP” pavement marking cannot be used by itself; it must be used with a STOP line. Maybe a 4’ minimum text height instead of 6’.

D. Proposed changes to Section 3B.18 Crosswalks

1. Kay Fitzpatrick with TTI discussed the FHWA study that she performed:
   a. Several types of crosswalk markings and detection distances were compared.
   b. Transverse markings tend to disappear at high speeds at mid block crossings.
   c. Bar pair markings and continental markings are preferred to transverse markings at mid block crossings.

2. Tom Grant and Jim Ellison worked with Kay Fitzpatrick to develop changes to the language in the Section. Major proposed changes:
   a. Define basic crosswalk markings as two transverse lines and high-visibility markings as ones that consist of diagonal or longitudinal lines parallel to traffic flow with or without transverse lines.
   b. Include new types of crosswalk markings – bar pair, double continental, and ladder.
   c. Recommend high-visibility markings at non-intersection locations.
   d. Modify Figure 3B17 to show high-visibility markings for the mid-block crossing.
   e. Replace the existing Figure 3B-19 with a new figure that demonstrates the different crosswalk marking options.

3. Proposed changes were discussed and voted upon. Discussion continues on January 20.
   a. Add Guidance about using 8’ minimum width for high-visibility crosswalk markings at non-intersection locations when speeds are greater than 35 mph. Passed 14-3.
   b. Add Guidance on the use of the bar pair crosswalk marking. Passed 18-0.
   c. Add Guidance that high-visibility crosswalk markings should be installed for marked crosswalks at non-intersection locations. Add Option that two transverse lines may be used at a non-intersection location where engineering judgment determines it would be adequate at the given location. Passed 13-4-1.
   d. Reworded the Standard statement (paragraph 04), but kept the same intent. Passed 13-1-4.

E. Other discussion items

1. Discussion on use of 4” vs. 6” for normal lines and 2x normal for wide lines
   a. Florida uses 6” as a normal line and an 8” wide line
   b. Gene H. wants to send a sponsor ballot for Section 3A.06
c. General MTC consensus that a wide line is at least 8 inches wide.

2. Discussion on zigzag markings
   a. No action by MTC until more research is performed

January 20, 2011; 1:00 PM – 6:00 PM

A. Discussion on Research Committee (Dave Woodin)
   1. Committee will meet tonight. They will find out which projects will receive pooled funds.
   2. Task force was formed to show what a proposal should look like for applying for research.

B. Four new MTC members were approved by the Board on 1/19/11
   1. RJ Porter, Assistant Professor of CE, University of Utah
   2. Stacey Glass, State Traffic Engineer, Alabama DOT
   4. Rich Deal, City Traffic Engineer, City of Monterey, CA

C. Proposed changes to Section 3B.18 Crosswalks
      a. In Paragraph 09, keep the word “marked” instead of changing it to “basic” in the following phrase: “New marked crosswalks alone, without other measures...should not be installed at uncontrolled roadways ...” Passed 21-2-1.
      b. Adopt all of the changes for Section 3B.18 as presented in the revised document. Passed 22-0-2.
   2. Revised Section 3B.18 is provided in a separate document, which tracks changes and describes proposed changes.
   3. Revised Section 3B.18 will be sent out to sponsors for comment.

D. New signal and markings subcommittee
   1. Scott Wainwright with FHWA requested that a new subcommittee be formed with the Signals Technical Committee and the MTC to discuss illuminated (steady-burn) markers
   2. Gene will make sure it gets moving and coordinate with the Signals Technical Committee.

E. Single Solid Centerline
   1. Discussion on the prohibition of the use of the single solid centerline
   2. Could it change from a Standard to Guidance so that the single solid centerline can be used in certain instances?
3. Zoubir is to lead a task force on Section 3B.01

F. Change to Section 9C.04

1. Richard Moeur from the Bicycle Technical Committee presented changes being sent out to sponsors that will make Section 9C.04 consistent with Section 3D.01 Preferential Lane Word and Symbol Markings. The Bicycle Technical Committee would like concurrence from the MTC.

2. The proposed changes make the bicycle lane symbol or word markings a requirement along with the longitudinal pavement markings when defining bicycle lanes.

3. MTC approved the proposed changes (passed 23-1)

G. Review of the Edit Committee’s definition of a traffic control device

1. A proposed definition was presented from the Edit Committee

2. MTC recommended several changes:
   a. Instead of using “measure”, use “treatment”. Passed 17-5 to use “treatment” instead of “methods” as the best alternative to “measure.”
   b. Add “all modes of traffic” after “guidance message to” and remove the first of the first sentence. Unanimous
   c. Remove “roadway lighting”. Failed 13-7-2.
   d. Add channelization devices to definition. Passed 18-2-2
   e. Approved the revised language presented below. Passed 18-3-1. No changes to sentences 2 or 3.

   Traffic Control Device- a sign, signal, marking, channelizing device or other device—measure treatment that use colors, shapes, symbols, words, sounds and/or tactile information for the primary purpose of communicating a used to regulatory, warning, or guidance message to all modes of traffic placed on, over, or adjacent to a street, on a highway, private road open to public travel, pedestrian facility, or shared–use path bikeway, or private road open to public travel, by authority of a public agency or official having jurisdiction, or, in the case of a private road open to public travel, by authority of the private owner or private official having jurisdiction. Infrastructure elements that restrict the road user’s travel paths or vehicle speeds, such as curbs, speed humps, chicanes, channelization, and other raised roadway surfaces, are not traffic control devices. Operational devices associated with the application of traffic control strategies and traffic control devices, such as in-vehicle electronics, fencing, roadway lighting, barriers, and attenuation devices,
are shown in the Manual for convenience but their design, application, and usage are not specified and they are not traffic control devices.

H. Discussion on Section 3F.03 Delineator Application

1. Discussed the need to change Paragraph 02, which provides requirements and exceptions for the use of delineators on freeways and expressways. Failed 10-12.

2. The paragraph could be reworded by a subcommittee and brought back before the MTC for discussion.

I. Part 3 review of Standard statements

1. Assignments were made for the review of the Standard statements, with small groups for each section. Need consensus from each group on changes.
   a. Should it stay as a Standard or change to Guidance?
   b. Should the Standard be reworded?

2. Gene will use Google documents for the group to review and make changes before the June 2011 meeting.