

Minutes: Minnesota Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

March 10, 2021 1:00 – 3:00

NPA Special Meeting

Microsoft Teams Meeting

Attendance

- Sara Buermann, Wright County
- Diane Colton, MnDOT
- Joe Gustafson, Washington County
- Tiffany Kautz, MnDOT
- Jon Krieg, Hennepin County
- Tim Plath, City of Eagan
- Scott Poska, Alliant Engineering
- Howard Preston
- Tom Sohrweide, SEH
- HunWen Westman, City of St. Paul

Guests

- Ken Johnson, MnDOT
- Jeff Morey, MnDOT
- Michelle Moser, MnDOT
- Ted Ulven, MnDOT

I. Membership Update/Introductions – Tiffany Kautz

II. Corrections/Updates to the Minutes – Tiffany Kautz

A. Comments on NPA for MCUTCD spreadsheet.

Discussion:

- Tiffany has been providing background information along with comments on the spreadsheet. How does the committee feel about this?
- Committee agreed that providing background information is a good thing and that Tiffany should continue doing this.
- If anyone has concerns with the comments let Tiffany know.

Page 4 – NASC was corrected to NACE (National Association of County Engineers).

Motion to approve minutes and comments made by Tom Sohrweide, seconded by Joe Gustafson.

VOTE: Motion passed.

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

No Update

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. Request for Experimentation Update – Tiffany Kautz

The City of Minneapolis submitted to FHWA documents regarding RTE's for bike signals they're using. If you would like the information send Tiffany an email.

V. Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting – Tiffany Kautz

- **Action Item:** Tiffany will post the MCUTCD comments spreadsheet to the MN MUTCD website - DONE
- **Action Item:** Joe will develop language regarding the use of in-street pedestrian crossing signs for discussion at next meeting - DONE
- **Action Item:** items that may have come up from the City Engineering Traffic meeting on February 11th. DONE

VI. NPA Update/Timeline

A. Additional Items to Review?

- 2D.29 Junction Assembly (NPA, page 169)
Minnesota has added the word "signed" number route.
- 2D.29 Route Sign Assemblies (NPA, page 169, Lines 32 to 34) – New Option Statement

Route Sign assemblies may be omitted for routes that are part of an agency's internal numbering system, such as for maintenance or other purposes, and are not publicly mapped or intended to be used for navigational purposes by the general public.

Motion to discuss at next meeting made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Howard Preston.

VOTE: Motion passed.

Action Item: Add to next meeting agenda.

B. Possible discussion at the February 24th meeting for items that may come up from the City Engineers Association traffic meeting on February 11th. Tim Plath

The City Engineers Association's first point of comment would be through the MCUTCD. If there is a topic not adopted by MCUTCD Tim would it bring back to the Association.

Action Item: Add to next meeting agenda.

VII. NPA Topics for Discussion – Tiffany Kautz

A. In-Street Pedestrian Crossing signs.

NPA: 2B.20, Preamble #66, MUTCD page 73.

Action Item: Joe will develop language regarding the use of in-street pedestrian crossing signs for discussion at next meeting.

From Joe:

Background: In-Street Pedestrian Crossing (R1-6) signs have been used with positive results in several specific applications, which would be prohibited by the language in the proposed NPA. Some of these applications include:

- 1) As a temporary educational measure at unmarked crosswalks, where a crosswalk legally exists but is not marked, and where permanent installation of crosswalk markings or warning signage is not justified.
- 2) In “gateway” treatments, with the signs installed on lane lines and/or the right-hand side of the roadway in addition to the centerline or median.
- 3) On roundabout approaches, where the installation of a W11-2 sign would cause sign clutter and obstruct drivers views of the yield sign.

When installed behind a curb, it is common that these signs be post-mounted to reduce maintenance, though at a low height similar to flexible bases.

Suggested Revisions:

- 1) Delete lines 16 and 17 (page 74).
- 2) Revise Line 14 (page 74), Item C, to “or, on a lane line, except when approach speeds exceed 35 mph”.
- 3) Delete new language as proposed on lines 20-25 (page 74).
- 4) Restore Option statement shown on Lines 33-36 (page 74).
- 5) For clarity, on line 10 (page 74) remove “at one of the following locations.” (added by Tiffany, HunWen).

Discussion:

- The MCUTCD felt that the proposed language was too limiting, and the committee felt that more flexibility to use the signs at additional location is needed.

Motion to adopt Revisions 1-5 above to section 2B.20 made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Jon Krieg

VOTE: Motion passed.

B. Height of Portable Work Zone Signs (tabled from 2/10/2021 meeting) – Ken Johnson
6F.02 - page 546, lines 3, 7.

Discussion:

- Most of the warning signs you see in work zones would be required to be put on sign supports much higher if after 3 days.

- Proposing:

Content in FHWA MUTCD:

Guidance:

Except as provided in Paragraph 12, signs mounted on portable sign supports that do not meet the minimum mounting heights provided in Paragraphs 4 through 6 should not be used for a duration of more than **3** days.

Proposed content in Minnesota MUTCD:

Guidance:

Except as provided in Paragraph 12, signs mounted on portable sign supports that do not meet the minimum mounting heights provided in Paragraphs 4 through 6 should not be used for a duration of more than **30** days.

Estimated Mn/DOT Fiscal Impact If Change Not Made:

Estimated Statewide Fiscal Impact If Change Not Made:

Significant – Minnesota contractors invested heavily into crashworthy portable sign supports between 2006 and 2010 for supports that met height requirements in the 2005 Minnesota MUTCD.

- Need to have portable sign supports that are crashworthy.
- Advocate asking for 30 days for this application.
- MnDOT will be making the 30-day comment.

Motion to change 3 *days* on lines 3 and 7 to **30 days** made by Tim Plath, seconded by Howard Preston.

VOTE: Motion passed.

C. Chapter 3C Crosswalks

Section 3C.01 General, page 368.

Discussion:

- The MCUTCD has concerns with the new Standard on Line 4, page 368 (Text-Mark up). The concern is that the Standard may be misinterpreted to require a jurisdiction to install crosswalk markings at any place pedestrians cross. This could result in misuse of the Standard and require jurisdictions to install crosswalks at undesired, non-intersection locations.
- The Committee decided that it would be better to leave the old language. It is less confusing.

Motion to remove the Standard statement starting on line 3 “Crosswalk markings shall be provided at non-intersection crosswalk locations” and keep the old language “ (crossed out) on line 12 of the Support statement “At non-intersection locations, crosswalk markings legally establish the crosswalk” made by HunWen Westman, seconded by Joe Gustafson

VOTE: Motion passed.

Section 3C.02 Application of Crosswalk Markings, page 368.

Discussion:

- Concerns with this section? None

No Motion made

3C.03 – Design of Crosswalk Markings, page 370

Discussion:

- If you have older roads where curb ramps are at a 45 degree point – does this push us into moving the crosswalk markings. Do we put the markings where we wish the ramps were?

Motion to change the Standard statement starting on page 370, line 23 to a Guidance statement to better accommodate existing curb ramps. Motion made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Jon Krieg

VOTE: Motion passed.

3C.04 – Basic Crosswalks, page 370

Discussion:

- **No concerns**

Section 3C.05 – High Visibility Crosswalks, page 370

Discussion:

- Do we need to add the requirement for an Engineering Study into this section?

Motion to recommend adding the need for an engineering study made by Tim Plath, seconded by Joe Gustafson.

Discussion:

- After further review of the proposed language. The Committee determined that the need for an engineering study was already adequately addressed.

VOTE: Motion failed.

Other Discussion:

- Joe - lines 18 and 19 regarding double-paired crosswalks. On a one-way approach to a roundabout – you wind up with 2 ½ pairs. What is being proposed would not allow us to do this.



Motion to remove the second line of the Standard statement “For the double-paired crosswalk design (see Section 3C.08), a coupling set of two longitudinal bars shall be considered to be one individual longitudinal element”. It creates maintenance and visibility issues. Motion made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Jon Krieg.

VOTE: Motion passed.

Action Item: Joe will provide Tiffany with photos to include with the comments.

- HunWen – what if you used three standard continental blocks?
- Joe – if you put a 36” block against the curve you lose the pavement marking.

Before:



After:



Location where there is sort of 3 sets:



- Howard – what if you put the pair in the gutter pan? Would reduce wear by removing them from wheel path.
- HunWen – remove the Standard starting on line 20, page 371.

Motion to remove this Standard statement on lines 20-22 “The dimensions of the individual longitudinal element and the lateral spacing between subsequent individual longitudinal elements for a high-visibility crosswalk shall be uniform when establishing the crosswalk” so we can keep blocks on lane lanes made by HunWen Westman, seconded by Joe Gustafson.

VOTE: Motion passed.

3C.06 – Longitudinal Bar Crosswalks

Discussed at last meeting.

3C.07 – Perpendicular Crosswalks

No concerns.

3C.08 – Longitudinal Bar Pair Crosswalks

29 24 inches or greater than 60 inches, or 2.5 times the width of the total width of a bar pair.

30 Longitudinal bar pair crosswalks shall not be installed with accompanying transverse lines.

31 Section ~~3C.05~~ ~~3C.09~~ Crosswalk Markings at ~~Roundabouts~~ Circular Intersections

Motion to strike Line 30 made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Tim Plath.

VOTE: Motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned.

- D. 3H.03 Aesthetic Treatments in Crosswalks
NPA: 3H.03, Preamble #367, MUTCD page 390.
- E. 4F.17 Yellow change and Red Clearance Intervals
NPA: 4F.17, Preamble #413, MUTCD page 457.
- F. Trapped lane turning into a turn lane (from 1/13/2021 meeting)

VIII. Future Meeting

- A. Chapter 2L (page 316) – Changeable Message Signs (from 2/10/21 meeting)

IX. Next Meeting

Next meeting is on March 24, 2021.

X. Round Robin

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

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

Add an exception (to 1st Standard, 1st 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.....”