

## Minutes: Minnesota Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

July 14, 2021 1:00 – 3:00

Microsoft Teams Meeting

### Attendance

- Sara Buermann, Wright County
- Diane Colton, MnDOT
- Joe Gustafson, Washington County
- Tiffany Kautz, MnDOT
- Mike Martinez, HDR
- Tim Plath, City of Eagan
- Scott Poska, Alliant Engineering
- Ron Rauchle, MnDOT
- Mark Sehr, Rock County
- Tom Sohrweide, SEH
- Will Stein, FHWA
- Scott Thompson, MnDOT

### Guests

- Girma Feyissa, DOT
- Ken Johnson, MnDOT
- Jeff Morey, MnDOT

### I. Membership Update/Introductions – Tiffany Kautz

### II. Corrections/Updates to the Minutes – Tiffany Kautz

Motion to approve the minutes made by Tom Sohrweide, seconded by Scott Poska.

**VOTE:** Motion passed.

### III. MN MUTCD Revision Update/Timeline, Revision 9 – Diane Colton

#### A. Current list:

1. Appendix C – remove Appendix C and all references to it from the MN MUTCD.
2. Figure 2M-12 – remove (was supposed to have been removed in Rev 8).
3. 2C.12 – review One-Direction Large Arrow language.

### IV. FHWA Updates – Will Stein

- There were over 25,000 comments made to the NPA – 75% more than in 2009.
- MnDOT made 693 comments - probably the highest of state DOTs.
- Minnesota comments were very detailed and specific.
- Complete Streets and Safe Systems are of high importance to the current leadership – there will probably be more guidance coming out regarding this.
- Not aware of any effort to start over from scratch.

## V. Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting - Tiffany Kautz

None

## VI. Meeting Location: Online vs In-person - Tiffany Kautz

MnDOT will be transitioning in the next few months back to the office. What are thoughts on how we want the meetings structured.

Discussion:

- Online versions have been going well.
- Online seems best for shorter agendas.
- Quarterly in person meetings would be great.

Vote to meet quarterly in person with other meetings online.

**VOTE:** Passed.

Note: First in-person meeting won't take place until after October when MnDOT has transitioned fully back into the office.

## VII. Requests for Experimentation Update/Process - Tiffany Kautz

What involvement would the committee like to have regarding Requests for Experimentation? Does the committee want to approve or deny; support or not support; or simply be aware of Requests for Experimentation? See MN MUTCD [Figure 1A-0 and 1A-1](#).

Discussion:

- Committee should just be made aware of requests.
- Would not support having the committee judging whether requests move forward or not.
- Has the committee in the past weighed in with comments/suggestions on how an experiment could be improved?
- There may have been a more in-depth review for some requests in the past – not for all.
- Does the committee want to know about potential RFE or ones that have been approved by the FHWA?
- Committee would be made aware of requests as they are made – not just after they've been approved.

Vote that the MCUTCD only be made aware of Requests for Experimentation.

**VOTE:** Passed.

There have been two new requests from the City of Minneapolis:

1. An addition to an advisory bike lane experiment currently underway.
2. Request to add some bike signals in a way that's different than the MUTCD allows - proposing a leading bike interval.

**Action Item:** Tiffany will find a place to put Request to Experiment documents and will provide links for the committee to access.

**Action Item:** Tiffany will update MN MUTCD Figures 1A-0 and 1A-1 to show that MnDOT is copied on Requests rather than that all Requests need to go through MnDOT. She will present the updated material at a later meeting.

### VIII. 2B.13 Speed Limit Sign (R2-5P, R2-5aP, R2-5bP, R2-5cP) - Tiffany Kautz

The following paragraph from the National MUTCD (Sect. 2B.13) and the CITYWIDE (R2-5aP), NEIGHBORHOOD (R2-5bP), RESIDENTIAL (R2-5cP), and UNLESS OTHERWISE POSTED (R2-5P) plaques were not included in the MN MUTCD.

Option:

08 If a jurisdiction has a policy of installing Speed Limit signs in accordance with statutory requirements only on the streets that enter a city, neighborhood, or residential area to indicate the speed limit that is applicable to the entire city, neighborhood, or residential area unless otherwise posted, a CITYWIDE (R2-5aP), NEIGHBORHOOD (R2-5bP), or RESIDENTIAL (R2-5cP) plaque may be mounted above the Speed Limit sign and an UNLESS OTHERWISE POSTED (R2-5P) plaque may be mounted below the Speed Limit sign (see Figure 2B-3).



Changes to Minnesota Speed Limit legislation more easily allow cities the ability to establish speed limit for city streets. The proposal was to update the MN MUTCD by adding back in the paragraph and plaques (listed above) to Section 2B.13. The paragraph and plaques listed above are currently found in the National MUTCD.

Discussion:

In general the committee expressed reservations regarding signs for citywide speed limits. The committee did not support the NEIGHBORHOOD and RESIDENTIAL plaques:

- NEIGHBORHOOD and RESIDENTIAL plaques could complicate signing for speed zones and make it more confusing for motorists.
- The terms neighborhood and residential are not defined.
- NEIGHBORHOOD and RESIDENTIAL are supplemental plaques – becomes more of an informational plaque, not a regulatory sign.

The committee agreed to modify the Federal MUTCD as follows:

If a jurisdiction has a policy of installing Speed Limit signs in accordance with statutory requirements only on the streets that enter a city, neighborhood, or residential area to indicate the speed limit that is applicable to the entire city unless otherwise posted, a CITYWIDE (R2-5aP) plaque may be mounted above the Speed Limit sign and an UNLESS OTHERWISE POSTED (R2-5P) plaque may be mounted below the Speed Limit sign (see Figure 2B-3).

Motion to add the paragraph above and the UNLESS OTHERWISE POSTED (R2-5P) and CITYWIDE (R2-5aP) plaques to section 2B.13 of the MN MUTCD was made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Tim Plath.  
**VOTE:** Passed.

## **IX. Next Meeting**

Next meeting is August 11, 2021.

## **X. Round Robin**

None

## **XI. Future agenda items (to be discussed after NPA):**

### **Modification to 2D.29 – Tiffany Kautz, Josie Tayse**

Add an exception (to 1<sup>st</sup> Standard, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph) for signed township route and (maybe) National Forrest routes.

### **2I.5.1 Public Water Access Signs – Tiffany Kautz, Josie Tayse**

Working with DNR to establish guidelines regarding sign placement. Tiffany and Josie talking with DNR about this section.

### **2C.27 Low Clearance Signs – HunWen Westman**

- First Option in MN MUTCD states “The Low Clearance sign **should** be installed on **and** in advance of the structure. If a sign is placed on the structure, it **should** be a rectangular shape.....”
- MUTCD states “The Low Clearance sign **may** be installed on **or** in advance of the structure. If a sign is placed on the structure, it **may** be a rectangular shape.....”