

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

NCUTCD Technical Committee – Parts 8 and 10
Railroad/Light Rail (RR/LR)
DRAFT Meeting Minutes:

Date: June 28, 2006
Location: Overland Park, Kansas
Time: 1:00 PM
Quorum: Yes

Safety Briefing by Chairman

Introductions:

Chairman: Rick Campbell, Railroad Controls Limited
Vice-Chairman: Darin Kosmak, TX DOT
Secretary: Danniell MacDonald, BNSF Ry Co
FHWA Rep: Pete Rusch

Self introductions of committee members followed. Welcome David Lanning, OR DOT Rail Division, who was attending his first meeting.

Note to Dan – Randy Frederick is with Ralph Whitehead & Associates. He was put on our committee in Jan 2006 and attended the 2006 meeting.

Meeting Minutes:

Upon motion made and duly seconded, the minutes from the January 2006 in Washington, DC, were approved as amended.

Upon motion made and duly seconded, the minutes from the June 2005 Technical Committee meeting in Buffalo, NY were approved as presented.

Procedural items:

Chairman discussed Technical Committee membership issues:

National Committee By-laws

Required membership split for public and private members – Public agency members must make up 51% or more of technical committee membership.

Several categories of public members

Requested all members pursue good candidates for committee, especially from public agencies – send contact information to RR/LR secretary

“Friends of committee” category for RR/LR

In-between guest and a member of RR/LR

Will receive correspondence, can attend meetings

Chair will recognize for inclusion in discussions; can not vote

Richard Bowden, Jim Murphy, Scott Winfrey??.

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Discussion of payment terms to NCUTCD:

Upon motion made, seconded, and passed it was resolved that the secretary should draft a letter for the Chair's signature to the Executive Committee of the NCUTCD requesting credit card and invoicing be accepted for payment to attend the conference.

Chairman's Updates:

Chairman presented update from NCUTCD Chairman's meeting:

NCUTCD Human Factors Taskforce formed:

Limited number of people with expertise in this field who attend NCUTCD

Chairman appointed Brian Gillian, FRA to this taskforce.

Secretary to inform National Committee.

First meeting of Human Factors Task Force will be at January 2007 meeting.

NCUTCD Retro-reflectivity Taskforce –

Key RR/LR concerns: Impact to Crossbucks on active and passive devices. Need to identify supplemental and other issues with crossbucks. Gate arm may be an issue as well. Federal Docket is open until November 2006 for comments. Methodology of replacement is an issue. This rulemaking is in response to a Congressional mandate.

FRA and FHWA encourage comments.

Chairman appointed Bill Shrewsbury as RR/LR committee to this taskforce.

Comment period has closed on NPRM for all roadway workers. This is on a fast track for approval. Roadway workers include all individuals working within the right-of-way, not just on the roadway itself. Includes public and private employees and all emergency response personnel.

Comment on worker safety – will likely impact railroad employees who work in roadway and around warning devices.

At FHWA's request, Chairman tabled Pete Rusch's report to Thursday.

Committee Reports:

Edit Committee report submitted by Kathy Davis:

Edit committee had 9 items on its agenda – but no quorum. Paul Box's report on traffic control devices on private property was discussed. Edit committee sent report back to taskforce on urbanization. Edit committee felt there were numerous items in the report that were appropriate to include in the manual. Many are design issues. Federal agencies will be covered in the 23CFR655 rule making. Inconsistent language in the manual was discussed – "if, when, where" – voted that the word of choice is WHERE. RR/LR does not agree with this. Asked Kathy to take back to edit committee RR/LR concerns.

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Brief discussion on FRA's proposed rulemaking on private crossings. A public Forum is planned.

RR/LR Taskforce Reports:

Urbanization Taskforce: No actions. Dave Peterson to contact Tom Hicks at Maryland State Highway Administration to get involved with this taskforce.

Light Rail Taskforce: No actions; they did not meet in between the meetings.

Preemption Taskforce – Bernie Morris – he met with National Committee Roundabout Taskforce. RR/LR has a proposal out to sponsor's comments (RR#3). After reviewing the items with the NCUTCD Taskforce, revisions to RR#3 have been drafted. Preemption Taskforce will present these revisions during review of sponsor comments for RR#3 under new business. Rick Campbell discussed roundabout signalization issues with Ronnie Bell, Chair Signals TC for discussion regarding preferred display for approaches entering roundabouts.

YIELD/STOP Taskforce – The FHWA issued a guidance memo on the use of YIELD/STOP signs at passive crossings in March. The work of the Taskforce is completed.

The YIELD/STOP Taskforce was formally disbanded – Chairman extended a well deserved thank you Bill Shrewsbury and Tom Zeinz for their leadership of the taskforce and work on this issue.

Pedestrian Taskforce – Tim Huya reported that the RR/LR Pedestrian Taskforce met earlier in the day. The taskforce is working on creating a new Part to the manual. A brief overview of the work completed to date was presented for the Technical Committees information. Direction and feedback on the items discussed were provided to the Taskforce. These included:

- RR/LR Taskforce will need to coordinate with NCUTCD Pedestrian Taskforce

- RR/LR Technical Committee will need to coordinate with other technical committees on this issue

- Request by members to cease advancing pedestrian gates as “The” solution – they are generally viewed as not effective devices by the technical committee. Maintenance costs and lack of proper design render the devices ineffective.

 - Fencing is a necessity to create compliance with pedestrian TCDs.

 - Treatments should be specific to pedestrians – direction not to mimic treatments for highways at a pedestrian size. Direction to make items adaptable to human scales.

 - Different types of active devices should be considered – vertical lights, traditional pedestrian signal heads, etc.

 - Desire to provide guidance on size, shape and location of signs

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Desire to incorporate items already in the manual for bicycle treatments

Recessed at 14.55 - Reconvened at 15.30

Pedestrian Taskforce – continued discussion

Desire is to allow engineers to have more options and guidance – not intended to advocate for a specific device. Taskforce to meet again tomorrow at 08.00.

It was moved, seconded, and passed that the report be accepted from the Pedestrian Taskforce and further more, the that the issue be returned to the Taskforce for further development taking the above items under consideration with a report due at the January 2007 meeting.

Unfinished Business:

Andy Davis presented information on the Barrier Gate system. It was recommended to the committee that an addition section to the manual be added to address the barrier gate. The Technical Committee discussed the issue. Key items of discussion included:

Specific requirements for the medians associated with the Barrier Gate.

Questions on who would maintain the barrier gate.

Was the barrier gate covered in language currently in Chapter 8D?

The locking mechanism and gate foundation may be a point hazard.

Has it gone through FHWA approval process? Does FRA approve?

Upon motion made, seconded, and passed it was resolved that the FRA investigate the status of the barrier gate system as it complies with 49CFR234 and FHWA investigate the status of the approval of the device with the FHWA.

New Business:

Proposed revisions to Parts 8 and 10 from CPUC:

Item 1: Revision to 8B.14

Standard:

A NO TRAIN HORN (W10-9) sign (see Figure 8B-5) shall be installed at each highway-rail grade crossing in a quiet zone established pursuant to 49 CFR Part 222 where there is a ~~Federal Railroad Administration authorization for trains to not sound a horn~~. The sign shall be mounted as a supplemental plaque below the Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Advance Warning (W10-1) sign (see Figure 8B-2).

Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to send the above revision to Sponsors for comments.

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Item 2: Revision to 8D.07

Proposal to replace “movements are very slow” with “speed does not exceed 16 km/h (10 mph)” This item was dropped from consideration by the Technical Committee as it potentially could impact interstate commerce and was therefore preempted by the ICCTA and STB.

Item 3: Revision to 8B.17

This item was referred back to Varouj Jinbachian for development and presentation tomorrow to the Technical Committee.

Item 4: Revisions to 8A.01

Proposal to include definitions of Private and Public at-grade crossings. This item was dropped from consideration by the Technical committee as it is in FRA rulemaking.

Item 5: Revisions to Figure 10D-1

Proposal to modify Figure 10D-1 to include different LRT signal aspects. Some “typical” LRT signal indications included in the current MUTCD have never been utilized. Of special concern was the flashing yellow triangle which could be misinterpreted as a flashing circular yellow in inclement weather. Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, this item was sent to the RR/LR Light Rail taskforce for review and development with a report due at the January 2007 meeting.

The Charman recommended that the Light Rail Taskforce review all of Part 10 for discussion at the January 2007 meeting.

Item 6: Revisions to 8B.15

Proposal to remove the “NO GATES OR LIGHTS” and “NO SIGNAL” signs. This item was dropped from consideration as it conflicts with other changes proposed for the 2008 MUTCD as previously recommend by the Technical Committee and adopted by the full National Committee.

Recess at 17.15 – Reconvene at 17.31

Review of Sponsor Comments:

Sponsor comments

RRLRT #1 (New Definitions – 8A.01)

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

The Technical Committee considered and discussed all sponsor comments received on this proposal. The Technical Committee revised the proposed definitions based on sponsor comments. Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to forward the new definitions for Section 8A.01 as amended to the National Committee for consideration.

Discussion on the need for a definition of the term “Fail-safe” was tabled by the Chair to the January 2007 meeting.

RRLRT #2 (Wayside Horn – 8D.05)

The Technical Committee considered and discussed all sponsor comments (including Pline’s and Fishchers) received on this proposal. The Technical Committee revised the proposed section based on sponsor comments. Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to forward the new Section 8D.05 as amended to the National Committee for consideration.

Upon motion made, seconded, and passed the Technical Committee adjourned for the evening at 20.15.

NCUTCD Technical Committee – Parts 8 and 10
Railroad/Light Rail (RR/LR)
DRAFT Meeting Minutes:

Date: June 29, 2006
Location: Overland Park, Kansas
Time: 1:05 PM
Quorum: Yes

Review of Safety Briefing by Chairman

Chairman's Report:

The chairman gave a report of the morning session of the full National Committee:

Public Agency definitions were discussed

Dave Lanning and Ken Rouse are now technical members to the NCUTCD
FHWA reports -

FHWA is cutting funding. The next MUTCD will be an abbreviated document, or they may publish only a limited number of revisions as an addendum to the 2003 MUTCD. No decision has been made. Publication delayed to late 2008 or 2009. No new standard signs book.

23 CFR 655 – working on definition of private roads “open to public travel”. Recommend that committee members watch this. 2005-23182 docket number, page 23881 under section 655.603(a). Locate due date for comments to NPA

Retro-reflectivity report – some confusion over report on reflectivity testing. Unclear as to who is responsible for conducting test. Technique and comparison testing needs to be looked at and reviewed by Technical Committee members.

Safety apparel requirements reviewed and discussed in 23 CFR 634.

Reports:

FHWA Report by Pete Rusche:

Follow up information from questions raised during discussion yesterday:

Can two supplemental plaques be placed on a sign – YES

However, they must conform to mounting height requirements below the primary sign

Barrier Gate issues – questioned if it is accepted for use

FHWA noted it is a fixed object in their letter.

Based on FHWA's understanding of the status of the Barrier Gate, the Chairman discussed the need to create a new RR/LR Taskforce for review of the Barrier Gate as it relates to Parts 8 and 10. Technical Committee still needs FRA's input as requested yesterday. Key items will be to review existing devices in MUTCD

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

(resistance gate); should supplemental warning be provided; look at installation requirements for the device (not its design), etc. FRA noted it is a test level 2 certification – this will impact where it can be placed.

Barrier Gate Taskforce (BG) Created - Allen Kuhn (Chair), Rich Brown, John Sharkey, Andy Davis, Brian Gilleran, Ken Rouse.

Section 8B-19 skewed crossing sign – Supplemental sign (word message sign) may be allowed – by existing MUTCD. Tabled for a discussion in January 2007.

FHWA has received several questions on the final STANDARD paragraph in Section 8D.07. As written, it appears to be confusing to practitioners. The Technical Committee discussed the issue. Clear storage distance is a factor which must be considered as must the “yellow trap” condition (left turns and emergency vehicle preemption). FRA requested a drawing be considered for this item. Chairman referred this issue to the Preemption Taskforce for review, development, and to prepare a report for the January 2007 meeting.

Bill Browder (AAR) distributed information regarding highway-rail grade crossing safety conferences as well as information on the FRA private crossing initiative.

Sponsor comments

RRLRT #4 (Wayside Horn – 10D.05)

The Technical Committee considered and discussed all sponsor comments (including Pline’s and Fishchers) received on this proposal. The Technical Committee revised the proposed section based on sponsor comments. Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to forward the new Section 10D.05 as amended to the National Committee for consideration.

Notice from Chairman – Warrant #9 passed in signal committee and was referred to the National Committee.

RRLRT #5 (Quite Zones – Chapter 8E)

The Technical Committee considered and discussed all sponsor comments (including Pline’s and Seyfried’s) received on this proposal. The Technical Committee revised the proposed section based on sponsor comments. Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to forward the new Chapter 8E as amended to the National Committee for consideration.

Recess @ 17.15 – Called to order @ 17.30

Based on discussion items considered in the adoption of the proposed new Chapter 8E, the Chairman allowed a brief discussion on issues associated with the status of Part 10 as a whole. The Technical Committee referred the question of issues with Part 10 in its entirety to the Light Rail Taskforce. The Taskforce was charged with reviewing all of Part 10, noting items of concern, items that are

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

not in line with current practices, items to be revised, additional reference material to be considered (APTA/FTA) and additional information which should be added. The Taskforce will do this over the summer via email and perhaps a meeting on the West Coast. The Taskforce will prepare discussion items and proposals for the Technical Committee to consider at the January 2007 meeting.

Following the above discussion, the discussion of Sponsor Comments continued:

RRLRT #7 (2004) (Emergency Notification Signs – 8B.12)

The Technical Committee considered and discussed all sponsor comments previously received in 2005 for this proposal. The proposal was sent to Sponsors in June 2004. The Technical Committee revised the proposed section based on sponsor comments. Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to forward the revised Section 8B.12 as amended to the National Committee for consideration.

RRLRT #5 (Roundabouts – 8D-07)

Bernie Morris presented the recommendation of the Preemption Taskforce on this issue. Based on the Taskforce's meeting with the NCUTCD Taskforce on Roundabouts, it was recommended that a new section, Section 8D-08 be created and the proposed alteration to 8D-07 be deleted. The Technical Committee considered and discussed all sponsor comments received on this proposal as well as the recommendation of the Preemption Taskforce. The Technical Committee deleted the proposed addition to Section 8D-07 and created Section 8D-08. Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to forward the revised RRLRT #5 as amended to the National Committee for consideration.

Tom Zeinz discussed the FHWA rule making on retro-reflectivity.

FHWA has done Supplemental Notice of Proposed Amendment. NCUTCD's recommendation previously sent to the FHWA to amend Section 2A.09 was not included in the SNPA. The NCUTCD Taskforce on this issue wanted to have this recommendation included in the SNPA. Unfortunately, it was not clearly communicated if this issue will be raised tomorrow in the full NCUTCD general session.

Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved that the Chairman is authorized to introduce the retro-reflectivity comments previously submitted by NCUTCD to FHWA to the National committee if no other committee initiates discussion. Tom will provide the Chairman with information by tomorrow's NCUTCD general session. This was completed and introduced by Bruce Ibarguen before the full National Committee.

New Proposal (Rough Crossings – 8B-17)

Varouj Jinbachian presented a proposal to create a new Section 8B-18
Proposed to delete the following Option from Section 8B-17:

Option:

DRAFT – NOT APPROVED BY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

~~If the highway-rail grade crossing is rough, word message signs such as BUMP, DIP, or ROUGH CROSSING may be installed. A W13-1 advisory speed plaque may be installed below the word message sign in advance of rough crossings.~~

Create a new Section 8B-18 with the above inserted with corresponding figures:

Section 8B.18 Rough Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Signs

Option:

If the highway-rail grade crossing is rough, word message signs such as BUMP (W8-1), DIP (W8-2), or ROUGH CROSSING (W10-15) may be installed. A W13-1 advisory speed plaque may be installed below the word message sign in advance of rough crossings.

Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to forward the proposed revision to Section 8B-17 and new Section 8B-18 to the National Committee for Sponsor Comments.

Upon motion made, seconded, and passed, it was resolved to have the Pedestrian taskforce provide the secretary a copy of the work completed to date for distribution to the full technical committee for review, and distribute a copy to the NCUTCD Pedestrian Taskforce for review and comment.

Upon motion made, seconded, and passed the Technical Committee was adjourned at 20.45 until the next meeting in January 2007.

Respectfully submitted:

Danniel MacDonald
Secretary
NCUTCD Technical Committee Parts 8 and 10