

## Agenda: Minnesota Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

April 8, 2020, 1:00 – 3:00

Skype Meeting

### Attendance

- Sara Buermann, Wright County
- Diane Colton, MnDOT
- Joe Gustafson, Washington County
- Tiffany Kautz, MnDOT
- Jon Krieg, Hennepin County
- Scott Poska, Alliant Engineering
- Howard Preston, Engineer Emeritus
- Ron Rauchle, MnDOT
- Mark Sehr, Rock County
- Tom Sohrweide, SEH
- Will Stein, FHWA
- Josie Tayse, MnDOT
- Scott Thompson, MnDOT
- HunWen Westman, City of St. Paul

### Guests

- Ken Johnson, MnDOT
- Jeff Morey, MnDOT
- Ted Ulven, MnDOT
- Girma Feyissa, State Aid
- Terry Haukom, RTMC

1. **Membership Update/Introductions**
2. **Corrections/Updates to the Minutes**

None

### 3. Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting

#### 1) **Table I-2. Target Compliance Dates Established by FHWA (Page I-4)**

Reminder of the Dec 31 2019 deadlines.

**Action Item:** Tiffany will talk to rail office to confirm who is responsible for signs.

**An email went out to the MN MUTCD mailing list April 1<sup>st</sup> outlining the dates.**

#### 2) **Section 6F.65.1 – Surface Mounted Delineators – Scott Thompson, Ken Johnson**

Fed MUTCD has Section 6F.65 Tubular Markers

MN MUTCD has Section 6F.65 Tubular Markers and Section 6F.65.1 Surface Mounted Delineators

**Action Item:** MnDOT's Temporary Traffic Control Group to look into possible modifications to these sections of the MN MUTCD.

**There is a TEO committee mtg next Thursday – Ken will bring to that agenda.**

#### 3) **Section 2L – Changeable Message Signs, Message Board**

**Action Item:** Ken will draft some language for this section.

**Will be talking about that at today's meeting. Will look for direction from the committee on how to pursue. Terry Haukom from RTMC has ideas on this as well.**

4) **Section 2M – Recreational and Cultural Interest Area Signs**

**Action Item** – Diane will update this chapter in the next revision of the MN MUTCD.  
**Will include in next revision.**

5) D7-X8a is a Minnesota only symbol sign that has not been approved by the FHWA.

**Action Item** – Tiffany will pursue getting D7-X8a federally approved.

**Tiffany reached out to the FHWA MUTCD team. In order to get approval we would need a human factors study. MnDOT has no plans to complete a human factors study. This symbol will be removed from the MN MUTCD with the next update.**



D7-X8a  
Carry-In Access

6) **Section 3F.4 – Delineator Placement and Spacing Tenth Mile Markers**

**Action Item:** Tiffany will request approval from the FHWA Minnesota Division Office for this change.

**In February we received approval from FHWA to move forward with tenth mile marker offset to go from a max of 8 to a max of 12. The necessary guidance statement will be updated with the next MN MUTCD revision.**

7) **FHWA Updates – Will Stein**

Nothing new to report on the new manual.

8) **Request for Experimentation Update – Tiffany Kautz**

No updates

9) **NCUTCD Ballot Recommendations – Tiffany Kautz**

Tiffany went through the comments she received. The committee agreed with the comments. Tiffany will bring the comments to Brian Sorenson.

10) **Adjustments to CMS/PCMS language in the MN MUTCD – Ken Johnson**

Issue:

None of the products on the APL meets the criteria in the MN MUTCD, Section 2L.4. Currently there are no devices available on the market that follow all of the MN MUTCD's guidance statements.

Discussion:

- The MN MUTCD/Federal MUTCD hasn't kept up with the CMS/PCMS technology. The discussion focused on if we should create a performance measure to use rather than using the existing MN MUTCD criteria?
- MnDOT Maintenance would like to get signs in their trucks as soon as possible. MnDOT Maintenance is advocating for smaller letter height. They've held up ordering new PCMSs waiting for guidance.
- The issues with CMS/PCMS is not unique to Minnesota. Other states aware of it and are concerned. This is an on-going issue. This was brought up 2-3 years ago at the Midwest round table. There were two or three state FHWA reps that were going to bring it back to their superiors.
- The National Committee has discussed some of this – they would like to have objective criteria rather than a performance measure as sign legibility can be subjective. It's possible that the national

committee and its subcommittee would welcome some suggested language for revisions, especially if you had support letters from the manufacturers.

- Will we be required to do a human factors study? We may need to do a human factors study if we wanted an exemption, but not to propose new national language.

**Discussion Summary:**

- There's a reluctance to going only with legibility criteria at this point.
- We should stick with the criteria that we can meet.
- We will work more closely with the FHWA to find out what the next steps are.

**Action Items:**

- 1) Will will set up a call with Marty from FHWA to get more insight into what the MUTCD team and National Committee are working on. Will, Ken, Terry and Tiffany will be included on the call at a minimum.
- 2) Send an email to Tiffany if you would like to be included on the call.

**11) TTC for Adopt a Highway Volunteers – Ken Johnson**

Issue:

Working through issues of traffic counters not following Field Manual layouts brought up concerns regarding Adopt a Highway Volunteers. The existing guidance was set up 30 years ago and is not clear on what traffic control is necessary. There are 3,800 Adopt a Highway segments on the highway system. Volunteers typically go out 2 times per year.

Mitigation:

The current direction for MnDOT's Adopt-a-Highway program is to provide roll-up signs to the Adopt-a-Highway volunteers. The volunteers will attached to these roll-up signs to the in-place Adopt a Highway signs.

Discussion:

- The topic was brought forward to the MCUTCD committee because, counties also have Adopt a Highway programs.
- Jeff Morey has been reviewing the Adopt a Highway training documents to make sure there's some level of temporary traffic control is discussed.
- Traffic counters were also discussed.
  - At MnDOT, they are going to transition to a system so that traffic counters will not have to cross the road for counts.
  - District Traffic engineers will use their judgement as to what is considered low volume and will make the decision when they can use less significant traffic control.

## 12) Standard Signs & Markings Manual – an MUTCD document or MnDOT? – Josie Tayse

Issue:

Should the Standard Signs and Markings Manual be considered a Minnesota document or a MnDOT document.

Conclusion:

The Committee agreed that the Standard Signs and Markings Manual should remain a MnDOT document.

Discussion:

- We've updated the summary and manual. The manual has Minnesota specific signs that aren't in the MN MUTCD – federal signs are no longer included in the manual.
- The FHWA Standard Highway Signs and Markings Book is a supplement to the MUTCD.
- The Minnesota Standard Signs and Markings Summary is MnDOT document and a supplement to MUTCD.
- Scott – as a consultant I like the MnDOT sign summary doc - it's convenient to pull out. One obvious drawback is that not every roadway is under MnDOT jurisdiction so some signs aren't in there. I use the MN MUTCD Appendix along with the summary to look up signs.
- Hunwen - I find it useful to have one document that shows all signs that have standard designs. If making it a MUTCD supplement means not including Minnesota specific signs, I'd find that less useful.
- Joe - I concur with HunWen and Scott. I use it often as does my staff. It's a handy reference in part because it includes and excludes what it does. It doesn't need to include absolutely everything. We can always dig deeper into the MUTCD if we are in search of something less common. I'm definitely grateful that it includes many MN-specific signs such as the black and white county route marker.
- Mike – having one reference document electronically it seems there could be one state document with a hyperlink to the federal manual. A document that included both state and national would be helpful.
- Josie – we're working on the website right now. The summary shows if a sign is a Minnesota sign. There are links to the federal manuals in the introduction. There's something similar in the manual.

## 13) Round Robin

Howard: Over the last 5-7 years LTAP has had me do sign training around the state. They've asked me again starting next fall.

Question – we've been using the [Minnesota's Best Practices for Traffic Sign Maintenance/Management Handbook](#) MnDOT published in 2014. If anyone has thoughts on things they'd like to add let Howard know. Does the manual need a major overhaul or minor revisions?

### **Action Item:**

Please share thoughts you may have regarding the handbook.