

Minutes: Minnesota Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

March 24, 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
- Howard Preston
- Ron Rauchle, MnDOT
- Tom Sohrweide, SEH
- Josie Tayse, MnDOT
- HunWen Westman, City of St. Paul

Guests

- Rashmi Brewer
- Jeff Morey, MnDOT
- Michelle Moser, MnDOT

I. Membership Update/Introductions – Tiffany Kautz

No Update

II. Corrections/Updates to the Minutes – Tiffany Kautz

None

A. Comments on NPA for MCUTCD spreadsheet.

Motion to approve Minutes and Comments made by Tom Sohrweide, seconded by Howard Preston.

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

City of Minneapolis is in touch with FHWA on a couple of projects – nothing new to add.

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

Action Item: Joe will provide Tiffany with photos to include with Section 3C.05 comments. DONE

VI. NPA Update/Timeline

- A. Additional Items to Review? - None
- B. Topics from the City Engineers Association – None currently.

VII. NPA Topics for Discussion – Tiffany Kautz

- A. National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD) – Resolution Encouraging MUTCD Final Rule.

National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has sent a letter requesting FHWA reframe and rewrite the MUTCD. AASHTO, ITE and the National Committee are responding that it's important to proceed with the new proposed MUTCD.

The MCUTCD will not provide a response to this.

- B. Chapter 3C Crosswalks

NPA: 3C, Preamble #316, MUTCD page 368.

Section 3C.09 Crosswalk Markings at Circular Intersections – Line 31, page 372

Figure 3D-1 No comments

Figure 3D-2 No comments

Figure 3D-3 No comments

Figure 3D-4 “ONLY” pavement marking not shown as optional.

Motion made to mark all optional “ONLY” pavement markings with an asterisk and identify as optional on all figures. If the “ONLY” pavement marking is a guidance (should) or standard (shall), supplemental explanatory information should be included on the figure. Motion made by Tim Plath, seconded by Ron Rauchle.

VOTE: Motion passed.

Figure 3D-5 No comments

Figure 3D-6 No comments

Figure 3D-7 No comments

Figure 3D-8 No comments

Section 3C.10 Crosswalks for Exclusive Pedestrian Phases that permit Diagonal Crossings – Line 1, page 373. – No Comments

Section 3C.11 Crosswalks at Diamond Interchanges with a Transposed Alignment Crossroad - Line 12, page 373.

Motion to comment that Figure 3B-29 is missing made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Tim Plath.

VOTE: Motion passed

Section 3C.12 Pedestrian Islands and Medians – No Comments

C. 3H.03 Aesthetic Treatments in Crosswalks

NPA: 3H.03, Preamble #367, MUTCD page 390.

Figure 3H-1 – MnDOT will be making a support statement relating to type of surface used and surface continuity.

Discussion:

- Aesthetic treatments can become political and can impact projects.

MCUTCD - No Comments

D. 4F.17 Yellow Change and Red Clearance Intervals

NPA: 4F.17, Preamble #413, MUTCD page 457.

36 Engineering practices for determining the duration of yellow change and red clearance intervals can be
37 found in ITE's "Traffic Control Devices Handbook" and in ITE's "Manual of Traffic Signal Design".
38 "Guidelines for Determining Traffic Signal Change and Clearance Intervals: A Recommended Practice of the
39 Institute of Transportation Engineers" (see Section 1A.05).

40 **Standard:**

Discussion:

- There's a pool fund study that is looking at the recommended practice cited above. The understanding is that it will change the ITE practice. The thinking is that the practice will likely either go away or will be changed.

7 *Guidance:*

8 A yellow change interval should have a minimum duration of 3 seconds, and a maximum duration of 6
9 seconds for through movements and 7 seconds for turning movements. ~~The longer intervals should be~~
10 ~~reserved for use on approaches with higher speeds.~~

11 ~~Except when clearing a one lane, two way facility (see Section 4O.02) or when clearing an~~
12 ~~exceptionally wide intersection, a red clearance interval should have a duration not exceeding 6~~
13 ~~seconds.~~

Discussion:

- Blue underline is what is being proposed. The reasoning is that if a vehicle is approaching a signal in the through lane it is going the speed limit and so easy enough to calculate the yellow so that the vehicle can safely stop before entering the intersection.
- For a left turn the calculation is being made based on the idea that the left turner is slowing down already. That they need more time to get into and clear the intersection.
- At this point no one is giving 7 seconds for that movement.
- You may have a person getting used to driving into a 7 second yellow then encounter another that has 3 seconds.
- Opposition to adding 7 seconds.

Motion made by Jon Krieg, seconded by Joe Gustafson:

- 1) Delete the reference to *“Guidelines for Determining Traffic Signal Change and Clearance Intervals: A Recommended Practice of the Institute of Transportation Engineers* on lines 38-39, page 457,
- 2) Reinstate the red overstrike *ITE’s Traffic Control Devices Handbook”* and in *ITE’s “Manual of Traffic Signal Design”* on line 37, page 457, and
- 3) Delete *“for through movements and 7 seconds for turning movements”* on Line 9, page 458

Vote: Motion Passed

E. Trapped lane turning into a turn lane (from 1/13/2021 meeting)

The concern is that when you have a lane that drops at an intersection, the right lane ends sign is not allowed. The right lane must turn right sign or intersection lane assignment sign is sometimes too late.

Example: A six lane arterial where the outside lane becomes a right side turn only lane. Any vehicles not turning in that lane need to start making the lane change out a considerable distance back. To say the only acceptable sign is a regulatory sign is a little too late.

Motion made to table the topic until next time made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Jon Krieg.

VOTE: Motion passed

Action Item: Joe will draft some language for discussion at our next meeting.

F. 2D.29 Route Sign Assemblies and 2D.30 Junction Assembly

NPA 2D.29 Route Sign Assemblies, Preamble 164, MUTCD page 169, Lines 32 to 34

Discussion:

- In Section 2D.29 of the current MN MUTCD, Minnesota added the word “signed” number route (page 2D-12) in the first Standard. The intent of this was to limit the number of route assembly signs that would be required if the crossing street was unsigned.
- The word “signed” does not appear in the new NPA and would need to be added on line 6, page 169.

No Comments

Discussion:

- MnDOT will be making the comment to add an option that would allow route sign assemblies to not be required if the route is a minimum maintenance type roadway. This will include numbered Forest Routes that are not plowed in the winter or traversable by a normal vehicle year-round.

No Comments

NPA 2D.30 Junction Assembly, Preamble: NONE, MUTCD page 169

No Comments

VIII. Future Meeting

IX. Next Meeting

Next meeting is on April 14, 2021.

X. Round Robin

None

Motion to adjourn meeting made by Joe Gustafson, seconded by Jon Krieg.

VOTE: Motion passed

Meeting adjourned at 2:33.

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.....”

2B.13 Speed Limit Sign (R2-1)-Tiffany Kautz

Add in Option for Citywide signs.