

**The next meeting date will be Wednesday, July 13, at the
Mn/DOT Waters Edge Office, Conference Room 176 from 12:30pm to 3:00pm.**

**MINNESOTA COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES
JUNE 8, 2011
WATERS EDGE**

Attendees:

Janelle Anderson
Dharam Bobra
George Calebaugh
Tiffany Dagon
Heather Lott
Ken Schroepfer
Will Stein

Explained Absence:

Tim Chalupnik
Rob Egge
Joe Gustafson

Unexplained Absence:

Marc Culver
Jeff Miller
Howard Preston
Mark Sehr
Paul St. Martin

Guests:

Mitch Bartelt

cc:

Susan Groth
Kristi Sebastian



Meeting started at 12:40 PM

Announcements

None

Business from the Floor

Ken Schroepfer made a brief presentation on the status of the 2011 MN MUTCD (see Attachment 1). Artwork has been delivered to the printer for the cover and the tabs. An estimated release date for the 2011 MN MUTCD had to be selected. To this end, October 2011 was selected. This date should easily be met pending a prolonged shutdown of State offices.

A question was raised regarding having the MN MUTCD online in HTML format. Ken explained that as soon as it is ready to go to print, he will create a pdf format set of files and then begin work on the HTML version.

Correction to the Minutes

None

Old Business

1. FHWA Update

Will Stein reported that Minnesota and the FHWA have reached agreements on the various Requests for Interpretation. However, with respect to Guidance statements, there are some differences between Minnesota's MUTCD and the FHWA MUTCD. Minnesota will have to demonstrate why there is a difference from the FHWA MUTCD. This can be done through the use on engineering judgment and past history plus crash occurrence/frequency, and engineering studies.

2. Requests for Experimentation

Janelle Anderson presented update reports on the status of Requests for Interpretation (see Attachment 2) and Requests to Experiment (see Attachment 3).

3. Minnesota MUTCD 2011 edition, Chapter 3

Mitch Bartelt, Pavement Marking Engineer started the review of Part 3.

There were no comments/corrections in Chapter 3A-General (see Attachment 4). Chapter 3A was approved by those present.

With respect to Chapter 3B-Pavement and Curb markings (see Attachment 5), the following comments were made:

- a. Section 3B.1-Yellow Centerline Pavement Markings and Warrants, 1st Support (para 8 on page 2) - there was a discussion on whether or not to retain the reference to the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances (NCUTLO) since this is not an active organization. It was agreed that since there are other references to this organization in the MUTCD, then for uniformity it should remain. It was noted that the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices has taken NCUTLO “under its wings” it may be resurrected and work will again commence on the Uniform Vehicle Laws. Reference to NCUTLO will remain in the MN MUTCD.
- b. Section 3B.2-No Passing Zone Pavement Markings and Warrants, 2nd Support (para 10 on page 8) - there was a discussion on whether or not to retain the reference to the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances (NCUTLO) since this is not an active organization. It was agreed that since there are other references to this organization in the MUTCD, then for uniformity it should remain.
- c. Section 3B.2-No Passing Zone Pavement Markings and Warrants, 2nd Guidance (para 13 on page 9) - there was a discussion on whether this statement be a Guidance (should) or an Option (may). Those present understood the task force’s recommendation about changing this from an Option to a Guidance statement but felt that this may be too restrictive. Mn/DOT may still wish to adopt this as their policy and have it placed in the Traffic Engineering Manual.
- d. Section 3B.4–White lane Line Pavement Markings and Warrants, 2nd Standard, 2nd paragraph (para 6), - There was some discussion on items C and D. The concern was about the length of 2 miles or less between and entrance ramp and an entrance ramp. Mn/DOT has been using dotted white line using a distance of 1 mile or less. The concern was that a distance of 2 mile seems quite excessive.

Will Stein will do some research on the distances in items C and D

- e. Section 3B.4–White lane Line Pavement Markings and Warrants, 2nd Guidance, 4th paragraph (para 17), - There was some on the gap distance between the dots on a dotted white lane line used for a lane drop. The FHWA MUTCD states a 9-foot gap. The task force recommends that Minnesota would use a 12-foot gap.
- f. Section 3B.4–White lane Line Pavement Markings and Warrants, 3rd Guidance, (para 25), - The task force would like to addressing the use of a dotted white line before a turn lane as a second paragraph. The proposed text would read as follows:

On approaches to intersections, a wide solid white lane line should be used for the turn lane line if a wide dotted white line is installed in advance of the turn lane.

- g. Figure 3B-8 – Examples of Dotted Line and Channelizing Line Applications for Exit Ramp Markings (1 of 2) – Minnesota’s practice is to use wide white lines for exit gore markings. All solid and dotted lines leading up to and thru the gore shall be changed from white channelizing lines and dotted white lines to wide white channelizing lines and wide dotted white lines.

- h. Figure 3B-8 – Examples of Dotted Line and Channelizing Line Applications for Exit Ramp Markings (2 of 2) – Minnesota’s practice is to use wide white lines for exit gore markings. All solid and dotted lines leading up to and thru the gore shall be changed from white channelizing lines and dotted white lines to wide white channelizing lines and wide dotted white lines.

This ends the review of Chapter 3 at this meeting.

The next meeting will commence review at Chapter 3B.5.

New Business

1. **TEO Signing Committee**

No update

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 PM.

Next Meeting

**The next meeting date will be Wednesday, July 13, at the
Mn/DOT Waters Edge Office, Conference Room 176 from 12:30pm to 3:00pm.**