

**MINNESOTA COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES  
NOVEMBER 12, 2014 MEETING MINUTES  
WATERS EDGE**

Members				Guests	
Janelle Anderson	X	Chris Byrd		Ken Johnson	
Heather Lott	X	Paul St. Martin	X		
Diane Colton	X	Tim Plath	X		
Tiffany Dagon		Tim Chalupnik			
Ryan Barney	X	Howard Preston	X		
Will Stein		Tom Sohrweide			
Jon Krieg	X				
Joe Gustafson	X				
Mark Sehr					

**Explained Absence:**

Will Stein  
Mark Sehr  
Tim Chalupnik  
Tom Sohrweide

**Unexplained Absence:**

Tiffany Dagon  
Chris Byrd

**cc:**

Susan Groth  
Kristi Sebastian

Meeting started at 12:30 PM

**Announcements**

None

**Business from the Floor**

None

**Correction to the Minutes**

**Old Business**

- **Requests for Experimentation, Conditional Use and Interpretation – Janelle Anderson**  
The FHWA approved MnDOT Metro District’s Request to Experiment with polyethylene gore diversion indicators on October 9, 2014.

**The next meeting date will be Wednesday, December 10, 2014  
MnDOT Waters Edge Conference Room 176 from 12:30pm to 3:00pm**

# New Business

## 1. MN MUTCD Section 2H.2.2 – Heather Lott

### 2H.2.2 County/City Name Marker Signs (I2-3, I2-5)



I2-3



I2-5

#### SUPPORT:

The County Name Marker (I2-5) sign is placed at all county line boundaries on the trunk highway system.

#### OPTION:

The City Name Marker (I2-3) sign may be used by all cities throughout the state to designate the boundaries of their jurisdiction. When used, it should be installed at or near the municipal limits of a city.

#### GUIDANCE:

All incorporated cities should have the current population figure on their City Name Marker signs. This figure will be taken from the last official Federal or State census. Unincorporated communities, which do not have official current population figures but still warrant a City Name Marker sign, should have only their town name on the sign.

#### STANDARD:

There shall be no other signs designating items such as County Land Use Zoning laws, Township boundaries, "Radar Patrolled", etc. installed or retained on County Marker signs or their structures or on any other sign assemblies on trunk highways.

#### GUIDANCE:

When a county feels a need for this type of sign the local road authority should review the request and may permit the separate installation, within a developed area, as long as it does not interfere with other traffic signs or devices on the trunk highway.

#### Discussion points:

- The Standard states that there shall be no other signs on County Marker signs on trunk highways.
- The TEM allows community recognition panels under City Boundary signs (TEM Section 6-7.07.03, pg. 6-44). The TEM does not allow "extraneous sign panels" installed under County Name signs (TEM Section 6-7.07.04, pg. 6-45).  
<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/trafficeng/publ/tem/2009/Chapter-06.pdf>

- A Signing Memo was recently passed that states that a Yellow Ribbon County sign is allowed under the County Boundary sign and also states that “No additional sign panels shall be mounted below the county sign name”.  
[http://www.beyondtheyellowribbon.org/images/pdfs/MNDot\\_Yellow\\_Ribbon\\_City\\_Signs\\_Aug\\_2014.pdf](http://www.beyondtheyellowribbon.org/images/pdfs/MNDot_Yellow_Ribbon_City_Signs_Aug_2014.pdf)
- Should the standard be deleted?
- Change “shall” to “should”?
- Change to shall except for Yellow Ribbon initiative?
- Match language to TEM (more generic)?

Action Item:

Heather will review and revise the language in the MN MUTCD and bring to the signing committee for discussion. She will also send to MUTCD committee for review.

**2. *Proposed changes to the MUTCD language (from the FHWA) with comments by the NCUTCD – Janelle Anderson.***

Janelle discussed recommendations by the NCUTCD to the FHWA to add or revise content of the MUTCD. Sue Groth, Director of the Office of Traffic, Safety & Technology, has submitted comments to these changes (see attached). There will be other opportunities to review and comment on the changes. There are 16 different categories. Below are some comments made during this meeting.

**Bicycle No. 101: Bike Two-Stage Turn Queuing Box.**

- Minneapolis is proposing to use these on Washington Ave.
- The figure should show a dotted line for vehicular right turn lanes.
- The Standard under Section 9C.XX.04 “Passive detection of bicycles in the two-stage turn queuing box shall be provided if detection is required to actuate the signal which allows bicyclists to cross” – shall should be changed to should.

**Bicycle No. 102: Turning Vehicles Yield to Bicycles Sign.**

The proposal is an attempt to standardize yield pedestrian and bicyclist signs and proposes modifications of the existing standard sign R10-15 to include bicycles.



R10-15a  
30" x 30"



R10-15b  
30" x 36"

- Howard: Did the sign go through an operational experiment process? This would measure the sign effectiveness.

**Bicycle No. 103: Bicycle Lane Extensions through Intersections.**

This proposal provides for the extension of bicycle lanes through intersections to denote the expected path for bicyclists and advise motorists that bicyclists are likely to use the intended path.



- These could interfere with intersections that have cat tracks.

**Bicycle No. 104: Wayfinding Signs for Shared-Use Paths.**

This proposal establishes criteria for the use of community wayfinding signs for shared-use paths.

- Should shared-use path signs be reflective? Section 2D.50 of MUTCD (go to page 174, line #11) states “To further minimize the conspicuity to vehicular traffic during nighttime conditions, pedestrian wayfinding signs should not be retroreflective”.  
<http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/pdfs/2009r1r2/mutcd2009r2chpt2d.pdf>
- Janelle - will discuss this with FHWA.
- Heather – Gas/Food/Lodging signs should be allowed.

**GMI Signs No. 101: Jurisdictional Boundary Signs.**

This FHWA concept adds language regarding jurisdictional boundary signs. This modification is revising the proposed FHWA language.

- No comments

**GMI Signs No. 102: State Welcome Signs.**

This FHWA concept adds language regarding jurisdictional boundary signs. This modification is revising the proposed FHWA language.

- No comments

**GMI Signs No. 103: Use of Pictographs on guide signs.**

The language proposed by FHWA for the future manual removes the options to place pictographs on guide signs for colleges and universities as well as governmental jurisdictions. The use of pictographs on guide signs has been a practice used by states for decades and the removal of this option in the future is highly likely to place states in non-conformance with the next MUTCD as the removal of pictograph usage by states that have been using them will not likely occur.

- No Comments

**GMI Signs No. 104: Specific Service Signs.**

The FHWA proposed rewrite of Section 2AY.07 removed the option statement allowing the use of the exit number plaque on specific service signs. The option statement should remain to allow for the efficient use of existing signs.

- No Comments

**GMI Signs No. 105: Use of Recreational and Cultural Interest Area Signs.**

GMI proposes to continue to allow the use of symbols for recreational and cultural interest areas on tourist-oriented directional signs which is consistent with the 2009 MUTCD.

- No Comments

**GMI Signs No. 106: Recreational and Cultural Interest (R&CI) Signs.**

This proposal deletes FHWA proposed Section 2BB.02 Standard addition and the deletion of the Section 2BB.04 Support statement to remove the National Park Service recreation area signs and symbols from the MUTCD (Figure 2M-8 and Table 2M-1). A GMI Task Force has been formed to identify and recommend those recreational and cultural interest area symbols that should be retained for use on roadways outside of park facilities.

- No Comments

**GMI Signs No. 107: Memorial or Dedication Signing.**

GMI reviewed the proposed FHWA Revisions to Section 2M.10 and recommends that the proposed FHWA text addition which states that the legend of a memorial or dedication sign shall not include “ROAD” or “HIGHWAY” be deleted.

- No Comments

**GMI Signs No. 108: Changeable Message Signs (CMS).**

The FHWA Fall 2013 Compilation of Draft Technical Updates/Considerations proposed additional restrictions on CMS use. The proposed restrictions affect current programs and practices. GMI recommends that the proposed FHWA restrictions in Section 2BA.02 be deleted until regulatory and programmatic conflicts with existing practices are resolved.

Note: The crossed out blue text was proposed by the FHWA as part of this a new standard. It was subsequently crossed out by the GMI committee. MnDOT (Sue Groth) recommends creating a Guidance Statement referring to this text instead of deleting it. Janelle will review and comment.

**Standard:**

~~When a CMS is used to display a safety, transportation-related, emergency homeland security, or AMBER alert message, the display~~ The format of CMS displays shall not be of a type that could be considered similar to advertising displays.

~~Safety messages shall not be displayed on CMS unless they are part of an active, coordinated safety campaign that uses other media forms as the primary means of outreach and, where regulations apply, includes coordinated enforcement efforts.~~

Create a guidance statement from this text.

**GMI Signs No. 109: Weigh (Inspection) Stations.**

The proposed modification replaces the word “weigh” with “inspection” and provides an option to specify the type of inspection activity that is conducted.

- No Comments

**RRLRT Signs No: 101 – Proposed Changes/Additions to Section 8C.06 (Four-Quadrant Gate Systems).**

The proposed changes provide for consistency between changes approved by the Council and accepted industry practices with regard to Four-Quadrant Gate Systems.

- No Comments

### **RW Signs No. 101: Selecting Type of Traffic Control for Unsignalized Intersections.**

Proposal is almost a complete rewrite of the section.

- Studies show that uncontrolled low volume intersections have lower crash rates than low volume controlled intersections.
- Howard mentioned two studies (Texas and Iowa State) that showed local roadways with low volumes are safer with uncontrolled intersections.

### **RW Signs No. 102: Intersection Conflict Warning Systems.**

Intersection Conflict Warning systems are being used throughout the country. There is a need for the NCUTCD to provide some guidance on the signs being used. The use of these signs is optional.

- Howard stated that most conflict warning systems come from County Road Safety Plans that identified high risk areas.

### **3. *Committee membership replacement for Tim Chalupnik, TKDA.***

We need a replacement from the consulting world. Anyone with ideas or suggestions let Janelle know.

### **4. *Round Robin:***

Howard reported that an update to MnDOT's "Traffic Sign Maintenance/Management Handbook" is finished and is now available online at <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/stateaid/trafficsafety/retroreflectivity/mndot-traffic-sign-maint-man-small.pdf>.

Howard has completed three workshops so far that provided an overview including new provisions of the MN MUTCD, review of alternative methods for sign maintenance, and an approach to developing a budget for sign maintenance. Recurring themes at the workshops include taking signs down and budgets.

Heather will be presenting the one-day introductory Signs "101" Course on Thursday, November 20, 2014.