Meeting Minutes
Markings Technical Committee
National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
January 18-20, 2012
Arlington, VA

January 18, 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 June 2011 Meeting Minutes – unanimous
   2. Edit Committee report (Michael Hare); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00 on 01/18/12
      a. Engineering judgment vs. engineering study
      b. Review of current standard statements
      c. Sites Open to Public Travel task force recommended integrating new chapters into each Part of the MUTCD. Edit Committee wants to see the new chapters first to see if they should be a new Part 10 or if they are integrated into each existing Part.
   3. Task Force for Sites Open to Public Travel report (Jim Ellison, Zoubir Ouadah); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00 on 01/18/12
      a. Committee recommended (instead of a new Part 10) to add applicable information to each existing Part of the MUTCD and then create a separate practice guidebook with illustrations and examples.
      b. Paul Box resigned as chair. They are searching for a new chair.
      c. James Kratz will join the task force from the MTC.
   4. Roundabout Task Force report (Joel Marcuson); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00 on 01/18/12
      a. Discussed ADA issues concerning multi-lane roundabouts and need for signalization for pedestrians. There will be an ITE forum on Friday afternoon to discuss the issue and the need for guidance in the MUTCD.
   5. Research Committee report (David Woodin); committee last met in June 2011
      a. Committee is still looking for more research topics if anyone from the MTC has one.
         i. Possible topic – Crosswalk art
6. Technical committee chairs meeting (Gene Hawkins); they met from 10:00 AM – 12:00 on 01/18/12
   a. MTC has new proposed members that will be voted on by the Executive Committee tonight.
   b. NCUTCD website. They want to update the website and are looking for volunteers for a new task force.
      i. **James Kratz and Cindy Cramer volunteered to be on the NCUTCD website task force**

7. Signing and Marking for Horizontal Curves task force (Stacey Glass); met 01/18/2012
   a. Upcoming NCHRP research will probably last for the next couple of years
   b. Task force is working in two teams – one working on the table and one working on the language.
   c. Current guidance for horizontal curve signage is proposed when roads have greater than 1,000 ADT, while most guidance for markings is when roads have greater than 3,000 ADT.
   d. **James Kratz is now on that task force as well.** Task force was formed in June 2011 with members from MTC and the RWSTC

C. Channelization Devices – Ballot #1 that was sent to sponsors in fall 2011
   a. Ballot proposed to remove “lane separators” and “raised islands” from Section 3H.01 because they are not considered traffic control devices. Ballot as sent to sponsors is in blue and red text below.
   b. Gene Hawkins led the review and discussion of the sponsor comments.
   c. Based on comments, MTC proposed a new Support statement (see text in green below). Approved by MTC 26-1.
   d. Proposed language – excerpt from Section 3H.01 Channelizing Devices

   **Option:**
   Channelizing devices, as described in Sections 6F.63 through 6F.73, and 6F.75, and as shown in Figure 6F-7, such as cones, tubular markers, vertical panels, and drums, ** lane separators and raised islands, ** may be used for general traffic control purposes such as adding emphasis to reversible lane delineation, channelizing lines, or islands. Channelizing devices may also be used along a center line to preclude turns or along lane lines to preclude lane changing, as determined by engineering judgment.

   **Support:**
   Although not defined as traffic control devices, lane separators and raised islands can be used for channelizing purposes.
D. Crosswalk Markings at Uncontrolled Intersections – Ballot #2 that was sent to sponsors in fall 2011

a. Ballot proposed to provide guidance that “other measures” be included for crosswalks at uncontrolled intersections for all roadways where the speed limit exceeds 35 mph.

b. Jim Ellison led the review and discussion of the sponsor comments.

c. MTC member proposal to move “the speed limit exceeds 35 mph” to the previous paragraph so that the “other measures” are recommended for crosswalks on roadways with at least four lanes and a speed over 35 mph. Failed 3-17-4.

d. Based on sponsor comments, MTC proposed to clarify the Guidance statement (see text in green below). Approved by MTC 22-0-4. (At the presentation to the NCU TCD Council on 1/19/12, the word “one” was removed, which is why it is struck through below)

e. Proposed language – excerpt from Section 3B.18 Crosswalks

Guidance:
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 any one of the following conditions exist: 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. Crosswalk Art task force (Sue Groth); they met on 01/18/2012

a. Discussion:

i. MUTCD probably going to be forced into allowing crosswalk art.

ii. Need to develop some guidance language. Place it near the colored pavement section

iii. What is crosswalk artwork? MTC definition: Any treatment that has more than one color between the white lines

iv. There should be transverse white lines to define the edges of the crosswalk anywhere with the artwork

v. Require contrast to separate the white lines from the artwork (black outlines)
vi. Is there a speed limit where crosswalk art should not be used? 30 mph? What about signalized intersections?

vii. Artwork should not be retroreflective. It should be slip resistant, not have advertisements, and follow mid-block guidance.

b. Gene’s recommendations:
   i. Have the task force come up with recommended language for a new section. Nothing stronger than Guidance.
   ii. Address treatments within a crosswalk
   iii. Include artwork with just one color, different textures
   iv. Address temporary treatments
   v. Address entire intersection artwork later
   vi. Be ready to present at the June 2012 meeting

   a. Do any of the guidelines need input from the MTC?
      i. MTC has no comment concerning recommending changes to the Proposed Accessibility Guidelines
   b. Issues to address in Part 3 to comply with Proposed Accessibility Guidelines:
      i. Page 35. Slip resistance. “The surfaces of pedestrian access routes and the surfaces at accessible elements and spaces that connect to pedestrian access routes must be firm, stable, and slip resistant.”
         1. Should Part 3 just refer to the Accessibility Guidelines for requirements on slip resistance?
         2. Skid resistance is inversely proportional to reflectivity. Should there be more U.S. research on this topic to develop requirements?
      ii. Page 71. On-street parking spaces
         1. MUTCD needs to show accessible spaces in Figure 3B-21.

G. Direct tapers without curves at freeway exits
   a. Current exhibits in the MUTCD show angled exits. Current practice also uses curves at the exit.
   b. Gene will prepare a new option statement and bring it before the MTC on 1/19/12.
H. Colored Pavement for Bus Only Lanes
   a. NYCDOT experimented using red bus lanes
   b. FHWA has allowed the continued use of the red bus lanes and asked MTC to look at MUTCD recommendations.
   c. MTC needs to develop language within the colored pavement section of Part 3.
      i. NYC experiment was not for a full time bus only lane. Part 3 says that colored pavements used as traffic control devices are required to always apply.
      ii. Need a new task force to address this issue in Section 3G Colored Pavements Certain times of day are bus only.

   1. Members of the new Colored Lanes Task Force: Rob D. – new chair; Rich D., Jeff T., Zoubir O., Harry C.
      iii. Colors to consider – Red = buses, green = bicycles, blue = handicapped.
      iv. Also coordinate with the crosswalk art task force. Members of that Crosswalk Art task force: Sue Groth, Joy Shamay, Mike Metzig, Arturo Serna, Kevin Lacy, Stacey Glass, and Robert Dingess.

I. Differences in how Part 3 and Part 6 address tapers
   a. MTC does not propose changes to Part 3 at this time.

January 19, 8:00 AM – 12:00 – General Council Session

A. New MTC Chair: Dave Woodin
B. New MTC Vice-Chair: Jim Ellison
C. Gene Hawkins has accepted a NCUTCD officer position to be Vice Chair of Programs
D. New MTC members: Rob Dingess, Brian Walsh and Harry Campbell. Kathy Zahul was added to the MTC in June 2011, although this meeting was her first in attendance.
E. Channelizing Devices (Section 3H.01) ballot item from MTC

   1. Gene led the discussion
      a. Ballot proposed to remove “lane separators” and “raised islands” from the Option statement because they are not defined as traffic control devices.
      b. Mentioned that the only change from what went to sponsors was to add a new Support statement based on sponsor comments that mentions that “lane separators” and “raised islands” can be used for channelizing purposes.

   2. Comments from Council
b. Ronnie Bell – The proposed Support statement uses the word “can”, which sounds like an option. Gene Hawkins responded that because lane separators and raised islands are not defined as traffic control devices, they cannot be an option.

c. Michael Moule – Change “can be” to “are commonly”. No second.

3. Gene proposed approval of the language as proposed. Unanimous approval from the Council.

F. Crosswalks (Section 3B.18) ballot item from MTC

1. Gene led the discussion

   a. Ballot proposed to provide guidance that “other measures” be included for crosswalks at uncontrolled intersections for all roadways where the speed limit exceeds 35 mph.

   b. Mentioned that the only change from what went to sponsors was to add clarification by replacing “either” with “any one of the following conditions exist”

2. Comments from Council

   a. Ronnie Bell – Remove the word “one” from the proposed text. Friendly amendment that was accepted.

   b. John Fisher – What about considering a left turn bay or TWLTB as an “other measure” that can act as a pedestrian refuge?

      1. MTC did not feel that an unprotected area in a turn bay should be considered as a pedestrian refuge.

      2. John LaPlante said that the research did not consider left turn bays as an “other measure.”

3. Gene proposed approval of the language proposed by MTC and amended by Ronnie Bell. 34-2-1 approval from the Council.

January 19, 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. Beginning after this meeting, new MTC Chair is Dave Woodin and Vice Chair is Jim Ellison. Gene Hawkins will still be involved with the MTC but has the new responsibility as NCUTCD Vice Chair of Programs.
2. New MTC members are Rob Dingess, Brian Walsh, and Harry Campbell.

C. Presentation by Paul Carlson on “The Effectiveness of Wider Edge Line Pavement Markings”
   1. Wider lines could be 6” instead of 2x the normal line. This would require changes to definitions in Part 3.
   2. Look at using wider edge lines on rural 2-lane roads because of increased safety.

D. Discussion on Sites Open to Public Travel led by Randy McCourt
   1. How would it look to address the issue in Part 3? New sections?
   2. Follow what is happening on the website
   3. MTC should provide comments to Jim Ellison

E. Curved Transition Line - New option statement for Section 3B.04
   Option:
   A curved transition may be used where an edge line, channelizing line, or dotted extension line changes direction. Examples of locations where a curved transition may have value include at freeway exit ramps and turn bays.

   1. Discussed adding this new Option because it is used in practice. Vote passed 21-3-1
   2. New Option will go out as a ballot item.

F. Gene gave a demonstration of the Wiki page as a way to make proposed changes to Part 3.

G. Part 3 review of Standard statements
   1. Chapter 3B – Confirm change of selected Shall statements to Should statements (see Word document with proposed changes and the sponsor ballot item for details) – Passed as a unanimous vote.

H. New task force – Use of internally illuminated RPMs. Members are Rich Deal (chair), P.D. Kiser, Brian Walsh, and Kathy Zahul.