June 22, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM Markings Technical Committee Meeting

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

B. Committee business
   1. Approval of January 2011 Meeting Minutes – unanimous
   2. Edit Committee report (Michael Metzig); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00 on 06/22/11
      a. Edit Committee proposed a new definition for a traffic control device
         i. They made changes based on sponsor comments
      b. Discussion on engineering study vs. engineering judgment
      c. Discussion on Standard statements
   3. Task Force for Sites Open to Public Travel report (Jim Ellison, David Jones, Zoubir Ouadah, Steve McDonald); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00 on 06/22/11
      a. We should see comments within the next year
   4. No Research Committee report
   5. Roundabout Task Force report (Joel Marcuson); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00 on 06/22/11
      a. State of Oregon passed a law prohibiting cars from being in the roundabout at the same time as heavy trucks because of sight obstructions
      b. Need to look at other design issues over time
         i. An example is that snowplows have issues operating within smaller radii roundabouts.
C. Review of sponsor comments on crosswalk ballot item (Revisions to Section 3B.18)

1. The ballot item was sent out to sponsors during Spring 2011.

2. Task force (Kay Fitzpatrick and Sue Chrysler from TTI, Jim Ellison and Tom Grant from MTC) reviewed sponsor comments and recommended additional changes to Section 3B.18 in response. Jim Ellison led the discussion at the MTC:

   a. There were comments that requested minimizing the number of types of crosswalks.
      i. Task Force recommended de-emphasizing diagonal crosswalk and eliminating the double continental
      ii. MTC agreed to remove diagonal crosswalk from any figures and leave as an Option (22-2 vote)

   b. There were comments discussing aesthetic treatments (artwork, colored pavement).
      i. No action is recommended on these comments with this ballot item. It should be discussed at a later date.

   c. There were some comments requesting the inclusion of yellow crosswalks and eliminating the bar pair and diagonal markings.
      i. The Task Force does not recommend adopting these sponsor comments.

   d. Change Guidance that “adequate visibility should be provided by parking restrictions” near crosswalks at non-intersection locations to an Option – “Added visibility may be provided by parking prohibitions.” (23-1 vote)

3. Revised ballot item was presented to the Council on 6/23/11.

D. Discussion on a crosswalk marking comment by Charlie Zegeer concerning the guidance in the section for when marked crosswalks at uncontrolled intersections should not be installed without other measures to improve pedestrian safety. This comment will be addressed in a separate ballot item in the future. The committee unanimously approved the following change:

   *New marked crosswalks alone, without other measures designed to reduce traffic speeds, shorten crossing distances, enhance driver awareness of the crossing, and/or provide active warning of pedestrian presence, should not be installed across uncontrolled roadways where the speed limit exceeds 40 mph and either:
   A. The roadway has four or more lanes of travel without a raised median or pedestrian refuge island and an ADT of 12,000 vehicles per day or greater; or
   B. The roadway has four or more lanes of travel with a raised median or pedestrian refuge island and an ADT of 15,000 vehicles per day or greater; or
   C. The speed limit exceeds 35 mph.*
E. Presentation by Paul Carlson from TTI on signing and marking for horizontal curves

1. RWSTC would like to revise Table 2C-5 Horizontal Alignment Sign Selection
   a. Should there be a similar table in Part 3?
   b. Other treatment options besides just signs when there is a speed differential between posted and advisory speeds? Examples – wider edge lines, RPMs, delineation, and high friction.

2. They would like a **combined new task force** made up of RW and MTC members.

3. Joy Shamay will look for European research and provide to Paul Carlson.

F. Crosswalk art discussion

1. Discussion on whether the MTC should try to address this issue.

2. **New task force** members: Sue Groth, Joy Shamay, Mike Metzig, Arturo Serna, Kevin Lacy, and Stacey Glass. Also a non-committee member, Robert Dingess, was added to the task force.

3. Task force needs to develop language that should be added to Part 3.

G. Strategic planning discussion

1. What content could be removed from the MUTCD? It could be placed in a separate applications manual and/or best practices manual.

2. What needs to be defined in the MUTCD?

---

**June 23, 2011; 8:00 AM – 12:00 General Council Session**

A. Crosswalk ballot item from MTC

1. Gene led the discussion
   a. Mentioned that the major change from what went to sponsors was that MTC voted to de-emphasize diagonal crosswalk marking by removing from the figure of examples and making it an optional use.
   b. Stepped through each of the proposed changes approved by MTC based on sponsor comments.

2. Comments from Council
   a. John LaPlante - What about changes recommended by Charlie Zegeer?
1. Gene explained that those changes will be sent out in a separate ballot item by the MTC.

b. John Fisher – What about adding an exhibit that shows mid-block crossings at uncontrolled intersections? (No action)

c. Michael Moule – Why remove double continental? Make the bar pair have 8” or 12” for width of stripes and spacing – change in the text and the figure.

1. Concerning the proposed removal of the double continental marking by the MTC, Gene explained that there were some sponsor comments that there are too many types of crosswalks shown, that double continental was not part of the study by Kay Fitzpatrick, and that it is not in common practice at this time.

2. There was general agreement that changing the bar pair to be 8” or 12” was acceptable.

3. The motion passed the Council 23-7-1, which included the change for the bar pair width to vary from 8” to 12”.

June 23, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM Markings Technical Committee Meeting

A. Presentation by Roxane Mukai from Maryland Transportation Authority on use of purple dots at toll plazas

1. Maryland Transportation Authority received permission to experiment from FHWA. Scott Wainwright is the FHWA contact for the experimentation.

2. The purple dots provide wayfinding guidance for vehicles equipped with an E-Z Pass to go to an E-Z Pass only lane

3. The Transportation Authority wants to see if other states would also like to experiment. FHWA wants to see experimentation at other locations with different geographic areas and populations.

   a. Jeff Tidaback will reach out to his Illinois and Pennsylvania contacts.

   b. Joy Shamay will reach out to her Florida contacts.

B. Part 3 review of Standard statements

1. **Gene Hawkins will set up conference calls for this fall to discuss this topic.**

   a. One should be Monday or Friday mid-day.

   b. One should be Wednesday or Thursday mid-day.
2. The members of the committee had assignments before the June meeting to review the Standard statements in each section of Part 3. Many of the sections were discussed with a working Word document of Part 3 being modified with changes and comments added. This task is still ongoing.

3. Gene Hawkins and Jeff Jeffers will take a first cut at revising the wording concerning the color of extension lines through intersections.